

Technical Report TR01-6

Agricultural
Extension
Station

Cooperative
Experiment

Department of
Soil and Crop
Sciences

Southwestern
Colorado
Research Center

November 2001

Assessment of Irrigation Water Management and Demonstration of Irrigation Scheduling Tools in the Full Service Area of the Dolores Project: 1996-2000

Part I: Survey Results

Abdelfettah Berrada
Mark W. Stack
Grant E. Cardon

**Colorado
State
University**

Knowledge to Go Places

Acknowledgments

We thank John Porter, General Manager of the Dolores Water Conservancy District (DWCD) and Patrick Page, Coordinator of the Water Conservation Programs for the Upper Colorado Bureau of Reclamation Region for their encouragement and support throughout the study. Special thanks are extended to DWCD Full Service Area landowners and operators who took the time to fill out the questionnaire and return it to us. Thanks also to John Porter, Calvin Pearson, and Reagan Waskom who reviewed this report and provided valuable comments.

Disclaimer

Trade names are included for the benefit of the reader and do not imply any endorsement or preferential treatment of the products by the authors or Colorado State University.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	i
TABLE OF CONTENTS	ii
LIST OF TABLES AND FIGURES	iii
ABSTRACT	iv
GENERAL INTRODUCTION	1
1996 IRRIGATION WATER MANAGEMENT SURVEY	
INTRODUCTION	4
METHODOLOGY	4
SURVEY RESULT SUMMARY	5
1. Land use	5
2. Irrigation equipment	5
2.1. Mainline	5
2.2. Sprinkler system	6
2.3. Sprinkler nozzle size	6
3. Irrigation management	
3.1. Irrigation frequency	7
3.2. Sideroll management	7
3.3. Irrigation timing	7
3.4. Nozzle size	7
3.5. Sideroll set time	8
3.6. Irrigation water used	8
3.7. Runoff	8
3.8. Irrigation metering and timing devices	8
3.9. Irrigation information needed	9
3.10. Additional comments	9
DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS	9
LITERATURE CITED	12
TABLES AND FIGURES	13
APPENDIX A: Outreach activities and publications	18
APPENDIX B: Irrigation Survey Questionnaire	20
APPENDIX C: Detailed Survey Results	24

LIST OF TABLES

1. Dolores project water allocation	13
2. Water requirements for FSA	15
C1. Irrigation Survey Results I: Land Use	24
C2. Irrigation Survey Results II: Irrigation System	26
C3. Irrigation Survey Results III: Irrigation Management	27

LIST OF FIGURES

1. Irrigated acreage in FSA and water release in 1987-2000	13
2. Water use per irrigated acre at FSA in 1987-2000	14
3. Crop acreage at FSA in 1990-1999	14
4. Alfalfa hay yield and water use at FSA (Fairview Block) in 1996	16
5. Alfalfa hay yield and water use at FSA (Cahone Block) in 1996	16
6. Crop yield at FSA in 1990-1999	17
7. Irrigation water use histogram in 1996 at FSA	17

Assessment of Irrigation Water Management and Demonstration of Irrigation Scheduling Tools in the Full Service Area of the Dolores Project: 1996-2000¹

Part I: Survey Results

Abdelfettah (Abdel) Berrada, Mark W. Stack, and Grant E. Cardon

ABSTRACT

A survey was conducted in the fall of 1996 to assess irrigation water management in the Full Service Area (FSA) of the Dolores Project. Forty four percent of the farm operators in the FSA responded to the survey. The majority of the respondents (88%) reported using siderolls to irrigate their fields. Twenty one percent of the respondents reported using sprinkler nozzles of nine gallons per minute (gpm) or larger. This far exceeds the FSA system capacity and could lead to significant runoff if not carefully managed. Water runoff was observed by 63% of the respondents. Runoff can be minimized through proper irrigation system design, management, and maintenance. This is particularly important in the FSA due to the erosive nature of the soils (low organic matter, low to moderate infiltration rate, hilly terrain). Several respondents suggested using deep tillage and catch basins to increase soil water infiltration. Seventy-four percent of the respondents reported using more than their water allocation in 1996, which was a particularly dry year. About half of the respondents reported using a shovel or soil probe to check soil moisture before irrigating, but it is not clear how this information was used to schedule irrigations. Only five percent of the respondents reported using crop consumptive use (ET) information to schedule irrigation. An encouraging outcome of the survey was the large number of respondents who indicated the need for information on irrigation equipment innovations, irrigation scheduling, and other information that could help them conserve water and get the most out of their water allocation. Several workshops and field demonstrations have been organized since 1997 to provide such information.

GENERAL INTRODUCTION

A study was initiated in 1996 to assess irrigation water management in the Full Service Area (FSA) of the Dolores Project, demonstrate irrigation-scheduling tools, and disseminate information related to these topics. This report contains relevant information gathered between 1996 and 2000 and recommendations on irrigation water management and the use of the Watermark sensor and ETgage atmometer for scheduling irrigation. The recommendations are intended to meet the needs of FSA irrigators, but some are general in nature.

The Dolores Project was built in the 1980s to provide a dependable supply of water for irrigation, municipal and industrial use, recreation, fish and wildlife, and for the production of hydroelectric power. The main feature of the Dolores Project is McPhee reservoir on the Dolores River, formed by McPhee Dam and the Great Cut Dike. The total storage capacity of McPhee is 381,000 acre-feet, of which 229,000 acre-feet is active capacity. The reservoir was designed to hold two years of water supply in case of drought (one normal year and one dry year). According to the Dolores Water Conservation District (DWCD), the annual water supply from McPhee reservoir is fully allocated. Current allocation is 92,500 acre-feet for irrigation, 8,700 acre-feet for municipal and industrial (M&I) uses, and 29,300 acre-feet for fish and wildlife habitat. Allocation details are shown in Table 1.

The area where this study was conducted, the FSA encompasses Fairview, Pleasant View, Cahone, Hovenweep, Dove Creek, and Ruin Canyon in Dolores and Montezuma counties in southwestern Colorado. Its allocation is 55,200 acre-feet corresponding to 28,000 acres of irrigable land. The FSA allocation was based on an ideal crop rotation of 55% alfalfa, 20% small grains, 15% dry bean, 3% pasture, and 7% corn (U.S. Department of the Interior, 1977). Diversion requirement is 1.97 acre-feet/acre and farm delivery requirement is 1.72 acre-feet/acre based on a weighted crop consumptive use of 1.76 acre-feet/acre and farm irrigation efficiency of 70%. Conveyance and operational losses have been lower than expected, in effect raising the on-farm allocation to 1.88 acre-feet/acre. Four pumping plants along the Dove Creek Canal and one along the south canal deliver pressurized water to FSA farmers through a series of pipe lateral systems. The Hovenweep sub-area receives irrigation water under gravity pressure. The

majority of irrigated fields in FSA are equipped with wheel line sprinkler systems, also called siderolls but center pivots are gaining in popularity due to potential labor savings.

Irrigation water from McPhee reservoir was delivered to dryland farmers in FSA for the first time in 1987. The number of irrigated acres in the FSA jumped from less than 2,000 acres in 1987 to 24,498 acres in 2000, while the amount of irrigation water released at the Great Cut dike increased from 2,116 acre-feet to 57,284 acre-feet during the same period (Fig. 1). Excess Municipal and Industrial (M&I) water¹ was used to supplement FSA allocation in 2000. Average farm delivery was 1.74 acre-feet/acre from 1987 to 2000. It exceeded the original allotment of 1.72 acre-feet/acre eight out of 14 years, but it only exceeded the current allotment of 1.88 acre-feet/acre in 1989, 1996, and 2000, which were exceptionally dry years (Fig. 2). This raises the concern that when most or all the allotted acres in FSA are irrigated (only 87% were in 2000), there may not be enough water to irrigate FSA lands at current usage rates, particularly in dry years. However, Figure 1 shows that the irrigated acreage did not change much since 1996 therefore, it is possible that FSA's full allocation of approximately 28,000 acres may never be reached.

The relatively high water usage in FSA is partly due to the significant alfalfa acreage (Fig. 3), which far exceeds what the project designers had envisioned. Crop consumptive water use and diversion requirements are shown in Table 2. The diversion requirement for FSA as a whole exceeds the original estimate by 12 to 13% when the 1995-1999 acreage is used. Poor management may also be to blame, as evidenced by the results of the 1996 survey and field monitoring in 1997-1999. Figures 4 and 5 further support the need for improvement in irrigation water management at the farm level. These figures show that the fields that had the highest water usage in 1996, which was a particularly dry year, did not necessarily produce the highest alfalfa hay yield. Water management is probably the single most important factor for irrigated crop production in FSA, but water efficiency can be greatly diminished if other production inputs such as pest control and soil fertility are not optimized. The Dolores Water Conservancy District Crop Census for 1990 to 1999 shows a slight increase in alfalfa hay yield in 1992 but not much improvement thereafter (Figure 6). There was a substantial increase in dry bean yield in 1991

¹ M&I water that hasn't been sold or leased.

from the year before. However, except for two good years, 1994 and 1999, dry bean yield only averaged 12 to 14 cwt/acre. Small grains (primarily oat and spring wheat) averaged 27 cwt/acre in 1990-1994, spiked at 45 cwt/acre in 1995 and varied from 31 cwt/acre to 37 cwt/acre in 1996-1999. Large variations in crop yield among irrigated fields and/or producers (data not shown) and experimental results at the Southwestern Colorado Research Center (SWCRC) indicate the potential for improvement. The accuracy of DWCD crop census is not known. Colorado Agricultural Statistics (2000) data for Dolores and Montezuma counties for 1995-1999 shows slightly higher crop yields than DWCD estimates.

Full Service Area irrigators have been able to supplement their water allocation by leasing water from the 'water bank', which is the unused water from undeveloped land or underutilized water allocations. The DWCD also has "excess" M&I water that can be added to the water bank and leased by irrigators on a temporary basis. This system has worked well so far but it might be stretched to the limit, as was clearly the case in 2000. Strategies need to be developed at the District and farm levels to manage severe water shortages.

The objectives of this study were to:

1. Assess irrigation water management in the FSA of the Dolores Project.
2. Demonstrate the use of the Watermark moisture sensor and the ETgage atmometer for irrigation scheduling purposes.
3. Initiate research and educational programs to address specific constraints.

Objective 1 is addressed in this report (Part I) and also in Part III (Berrada et al., 2001). Objective 2 is specifically addressed in Part III. In addition, both the Watermark sensor and ETgage atmometer were calibrated for local conditions and the results are reported in Part II (Berrada et al., 2001). The outreach activities associated with this study are listed in Appendix A of this report.

1996 IRRIGATION WATER MANAGEMENT SURVEY

INTRODUCTION

The Dolores Project is a young project as none of the lands in the Full Service Area (FSA) were irrigated prior to 1987. It is also a sophisticated project where irrigation water is delivered to each field at 45 to 60 psi with minimum conveyance and operational losses. As with any new endeavor, there is a learning curve associated with mastering the technology, which, in the case of the Dolores Project entails irrigation system design and management, irrigation scheduling, and crop allocation and management.

The objective of the 1996 irrigation water management survey was to obtain increased understanding of irrigation water management practices in the FSA and to identify areas of concern that might be addressed through research and education.

METHODOLOGY

A questionnaire was developed by Colorado State University scientists in cooperation with the DWCD and mailed to landowners and farm operators in FSA in November 1996. The questionnaire consisted of a cover letter and three pages of questions grouped under the headings (1) Land use, (2) Irrigation system, and (3) Irrigation Management. It was designed for ease of use without compromising the quantity and quality of information sought. The entire questionnaire is in Appendix B.

A total of 178 questionnaires were mailed out² and 45 were returned but only 42 were usable. At the time of the survey, there were approximately 174 individual landowners, 101 irrigator pools, and 95 farm operators. An irrigator pool is the sum of irrigation water managed by one farm operator, who typically operates several fields belonging to one or more landowners. Some of the land in FSA belongs to absentee landowners. Not all the allocated land was irrigated in 1996. In fact, only 87% was irrigated, according to DWCD Crop Census (Fig. 1). A 44% survey return was achieved (42/95). The percentages in this summary are based on the 42 completed responses. Detailed results are shown in Tables C1, C2, and C3 in Appendix C.

² The questionnaire was mailed to all landowners and four businesses.

SURVEY RESULT SUMMARY

1. Land use

The total acreage reported was 12,616 acres or 52% of the land that was irrigated in 1996 (Table C1). The respondents owned 70% of the reported acreage and leased the rest. On average, each respondent owned 221.5 acres and leased 97.5 acres. Three of the respondents did not report any owned or leased land, although one reported 150 acres of pasture in a separate category. Total irrigation water allocation was 11,011 acre-feet, which did not match the reported acreage since each acre is allotted 1.97 acre-feet (net diversion requirement) in FSA. Several of the respondents did not report their water allocation. Those who did averaged 380 acre-feet.

Of the total irrigated crop acreage that was reported (10,189 acres), 69% was in alfalfa, 14% in spring wheat, 8% in dry bean (primarily pintos), and the rest in oat (3%), winter wheat (2%), grass pasture, alfalfa/grass mix, corn, and onion (only 2.4 acres). The reported alfalfa hay yield averaged 4.3 tons/acre and ranged from 2.3 to 6.0 tons/acre. Dry beans averaged 1470 lbs/acre (900 to 2191 lbs/acre) with only nine entries. Spring wheat and oat fared much better than winter wheat. The 1996 DWCD Crop Census shows a larger percentage of the irrigated acreage in alfalfa (77% vs. 69%) and slightly lower crop yields in FSA as a whole than what the survey shows. The wide range in reported crop yields indicates the potential for improvement as well as differences in land productivity.

2. Irrigation equipment

2.1. Mainline

The survey revealed deficiencies in the design of the main line. Eighty-one percent of the respondents reported air-vacuum release valves installed, while only 52% reported having a pressure relief valve in the mainline. In areas of high pressure, some systems have experienced pipe failure while other systems have been under designed, i.e. pipe diameter too small to carry desired flow or to allow for future development. It is important that the irrigation delivery system be correctly designed to provide for trouble-free operation.

2.2. Sprinkler system

Sideroll systems were reported as being used by 88% of the respondents. Seventy-eight percent of the systems in use were 1/4 mile systems. Flow control nozzles were reported used by only 10 irrigators (26%). Flow control nozzles should be used when the pressure along the sprinkler line varies by plus or minus 10%. The flow control nozzle provides for constant flow rate the length of the system with a resulting improvement in sprinkler uniformity. Cost has been the obstacle to widespread adoption of flow control nozzles. Pressure regulators were reported as not being used by any respondent, but most center pivot sprinkler packages include either a pressure regulator or flow control nozzle.

Center pivot systems were used by 40% of the respondents. Of those who reported using center pivots, 82% (14/17) also had siderolls. Twenty-three center pivots were 1/4-mile systems while 14 center pivots were shorter in length. The majority of the pivots were equipped with drop tubes and spray nozzle packages. Only five center pivots were equipped with overhead impact sprinklers. One center pivot was designed as a LEPA (Low Energy Precision Application) system. Drop tubes are used to increase irrigation efficiency by placing the water closer to the crop and thus avoiding the wind. The drawback to this system is that the wetted diameter of the spray pattern is smaller which may result in the water application rate exceeding the soil intake rate. Overhead impact sprinklers, on the other hand, have a greater wetted diameter but are subject to the wind resulting in lower irrigation efficiencies.

The respondents who reported the irrigated acreage averaged 30.7 acres per sideroll and 115.5 acres per center pivot. No other irrigation system was reported.

2.3. Sprinkler nozzle size

Forty-one per cent of the respondents reported using 6 gallons per minute (GPM) or smaller nozzles on some of their systems, while 21% reported using 9 GPM or larger nozzles. The smaller nozzles approximate the Dolores Project pumping capacity (5.6 GPM during peak usage) while larger nozzles may result in low irrigation efficiencies (deep percolation or runoff) if not carefully monitored.

3. Irrigation management

3.1. Irrigation frequency

In 1996, growers irrigated alfalfa at least twice before each cutting. Dry beans were irrigated four to eight times (6.7 avg.), winter wheat four to seven times (4.9 avg.), spring wheat seven to nine times (7.7 avg.), and oat three to five times (4.0 avg.). Other crops were irrigated four to eleven times. Crops were irrigated more frequently in 1996 compared to previous years due to the dry winter and spring of 1996. Irrigation frequency is usually higher with center pivots than with siderolls.

3.2. Sideroll management

The majority of the siderolls were moved twice per day with a move length of three turns. Six respondents reported that they employed 24-hour sets. Alfalfa growers sometimes use 24-hour sets to reduce labor costs, which require more than one sideroll per 40 acres i.e., three siderolls per 80 acres.

3.3. Irrigation timing

Twenty-two respondents reported that they based their decision on when to irrigate by checking the soil moisture with a shovel or soil probe. Dry soil surface and crop stress were other reasons checked to determine when to begin irrigating. However, 19 respondents reported that they continuously moved their siderolls. If irrigation is begun without checking the soil moisture or employing sound irrigation scheduling techniques, continuously moving siderolls may result in applying excess water to the crop.

3.4. Nozzle size

Eleven respondents reported that they have changed nozzle sizes depending on the crop, and nine respondents reported using different nozzle sizes at different crop growth stages. Fourteen respondents (38%) reported that they do not change nozzle sizes. Reasons listed on how to select a nozzle are crop water use, water intake rate, soil moisture holding capacity, crop growth stage, and field slope. A practical guide for selecting a nozzle cited by several people was the amount of runoff from the field. Center pivots require larger nozzles as the distance from the pivot point increases.

3.5. Sideroll set time per run

Twenty-two respondents reported that they vary the sideroll set time depending on the crop and at different times during the irrigation season. Twelve respondents reported that they do not vary their sideroll set time. Irrigators indicated that set times vary depending on crop water use, crop growth stage, precipitation, temperature, wind, soil moisture, and topography. It was pointed out that set time is related to nozzle size.

3.6. Irrigation water used

Ten out of 38 respondents (26%) who answered Question #36 did not use more than their water allotment in 1996. Forty-seven percent used slightly more than their allotment and 26% used significantly more than their allotment. The year 1996 was very dry, which led to higher than average water usage as shown by DWCD records (Figures 2 & 7).

3.7. Runoff

Sixty three percent (26/41) of the respondents noticed irrigation water runoff on their fields while 37% respondents did not. Strategies for dealing with runoff included checking the irrigation system for leaks and making repairs, using smaller nozzles or shorter set times, and increasing the speed of the center pivot. A frequent suggestion for reducing runoff listed was using tillage (V-ripper, soil aerator, and catch basins) to increase water infiltration. Another suggestion was that an irrigator should be cognizant of a field's topography. Five respondents reported that they did not plan to do anything about their runoff.

3.8. Irrigation metering and timing devices

Only four out of 36 respondents reported that they use a metering or timing device. It is noted that each Dolores Project delivery box is equipped with a meter (gallons, flow rate) used by the Dolores Water Conservancy District for billing purposes. Also, most center pivots are equipped with control panels to automatically control pivot speed and thus application rate. Water shut-off valves (gallons or time) could save sideroll operators valuable time since water is turned off automatically and siderolls are allowed to drain before they are moved. These devices are commercially available but may be suitable only for small operations or high value crops due to cost.

3.9. Irrigation information needed

Information requested by irrigators included crop water use and irrigation scheduling guidelines, soil management guidelines, and crop management guidelines. Twelve respondents requested information on irrigation equipment innovations (a linear move system was cited as an example).

3.10. Additional comments

Other comments listed by respondents not covered elsewhere in this report are:

- Better techniques are needed to monitor soil moisture.
- Farmers should be allowed to use their allocated water and then be shut-off until everyone has had a chance to use their own allocated water.
- Crop water use should be printed in local newspapers.
- For spring crops (including alfalfa), water needs to be available earlier in the spring to avoid starting out behind and playing catch-up all summer.
- Would like work done with tillage implements to measure the effect on soil water intake rate.
- Need information on center pivots getting stuck!

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

As expected, the majority of the respondents (88%) reported using siderolls to irrigate their fields. In 1986, the Soil Conservation Service found that siderolls were the least costly irrigation system for FSA (SCS, 1986). Siderolls were thought to be better suited to the rolling topography and irregular fields of FSA. There was also the concern that the application rate of the standard i.e., ¼ mile center pivots might exceed soil intake rate. This could be overcome by using shorter-length center pivots but the investment cost per acre would increase.

Since the survey was completed, several center pivot systems have been installed on newly or previously developed FSA land. More and more used siderolls are replaced with center pivots due to potential labor savings and the greater flexibility offered by center pivots. Automation, the possibility of growing tall crops under pivots, and chemigation are some of the advantages of center pivots over siderolls. The trend toward more center pivots has been encouraged by

several years of good alfalfa hay markets, advances in center pivot technology, and the narrowing of the price differential (on a per-acre basis) between center pivots and siderolls.

Probably the most significant findings of the survey relate to water management. Twenty one percent of the respondents reported using sprinkler nozzles of 9 GPM or larger. This far exceeds the FSA system capacity and could lead to significant runoff if not carefully managed. Water runoff was observed by 63% of the respondents. Runoff can be minimized through proper irrigation system design, management, and maintenance. This is particularly important in FSA due to the erosive nature of the soils (low organic matter, low to moderate infiltration rate, hilly terrain). Several respondents suggested using deep tillage and catch basins to increase soil water infiltration. Runoff does not appear to be as serious of a problem as the survey results would indicate, possibly because of the large acreage in alfalfa. A well-established alfalfa stand provides good ground cover and helps retain the soil in place due to alfalfa's deep and extensive root system. However, soil compaction (leads to runoff) can become a problem in irrigated alfalfa fields after several years of wheel traffic and the use of heavy equipment(e.g., for making one-ton bales).

Seventy-four percent of the respondents reported using more than their water allocation in 1996. Nineteen ninety six was a particularly dry year but the numbers in Figures 5 and 7 suggest that poor management may also be to blame for the high water usage. About half of the respondents reported using a shovel or soil probe to check soil moisture before irrigating, but it is not clear how this information was used to schedule irrigations. Only two of the respondents reported using crop consumptive use (ET) information to schedule irrigation. There is generally less flexibility in scheduling irrigation with siderolls than with center pivots (Berrada et al., 2001).

An encouraging outcome of the survey is the large number of respondents who indicated the need for information on irrigation equipment innovations, irrigation scheduling, and other information that could help them conserve water and get the most out of their water allocation. Several workshops and field demonstrations were organized in 1997-1999 to provide such information.

This survey provided a useful means of assessing irrigation water management in FSA. It was biased toward siderolls and did not lend itself to a separate analysis of water management with siderolls and center pivots. It reflected to some extent, the main authors' level of knowledge of local irrigation issues at the time the survey was done. Nevertheless, this was the first step in a successful attempt to gain a better understanding of irrigation water management in FSA, identify constraints to efficient water use in FSA, and initiate research and educational programs to address these constraints.

A more comprehensive survey may be warranted by the Year 2005. Its objectives would be to:

- Assess progress made since 1996
- Identify new concerns/constraints, especially in light of the proposed expansion of FSA
- Assess the impact of irrigation on:
 - The region's economy
 - FS irrigators' (and their families) quality of life.

A panel made up of university scientists, FSA irrigators, DWCD staff and board member representatives, and other interested parties should design the survey. The survey should be tested before it is mailed out and available DWCD crop census and water use information should be analyzed to help focus the survey.

LITERATURE CITED

Berrada, A., T.M. Hooten, G.E. Cardon, and I. Broner. 2001. Assessment of Irrigation Water Management and Demonstration of Irrigation Scheduling Tools in the Full Service Area of the Dolores Project: 1996-2000. Part II: Calibration of the Watermark Soil Moisture Sensor and ETgage Atmometer. Agric. Exp. Stn. Tech. Rep. TR01-7, Colorado State Univ., Ft. Collins, CO.

Berrada, A., T.M. Hooten, I. Broner, and G.E. Cardon. 2001. Assessment of Irrigation Water Management and Demonstration of Irrigation Scheduling Tools in the Full Service Area of the Dolores Project: 1996-2000. Part III: Monitoring of Irrigated Alfalfa Fields Using the Watermark Moisture Sensor and ETgage Atmometer (In review). To be published as Agric. Exp. Stn. Tech. Rep. TR01-8, Colorado State Univ., Ft. Collins, CO.

Colorado Agricultural Statistics Service. 2000. Colorado agricultural statistics. Colorado Agric. Statistics Serv., Lakewood, Colorado.

U.S. Department of the Interior. 1977. Dolores Project Colorado. Definite Plan Report. April 1977. Appendix B: Water Supply. U.S. Department of the Interior. Bureau of Reclamation. Upper Colorado Region.

Soil Conservation Service. 1986. Dolores Project Area Special Study. USDA-SCS, Denver, CO. May 1986.

TABLES AND FIGURES

Table 1. Dolores project water allocation¹

Water/Entity	Acres	Acre-feet	Comments
Irrigation water			
Full Service Area	27920	55200	
Ute Mountain Utes	7634	22900	
MVIC ²	26300	13700	Supplemental
Subtotal	61854	91800	
Municipal and Industrial (M&I) water			
Towac		1000	
Cortez		2200	
Dove Creek		280	
DWCD		5220	
Subtotal		8700	
Recreation, Fish & Wildlife			
Reservoirs		1600	
Downstream fishery		29300	
Subtotal		30900	Plus water that McPhee cannot store or "spill", plus up to 3900AF in senior water rights
Total allocation	61854	131,400	

¹Source: Dolores Water Conservancy District (DWCD)

²Montezuma Valley Irrigation Company




Figure 1. Irrigated acreage in FSA and water release in 1987-2000¹

¹Dolores Water Conservancy District Crop Census




Figure 2. Water use per irrigated acre at FSA in 1987-2000¹




Figure 3. Crop acreage at FSA in 1990-1999¹

¹Dolores Water Conservancy District Crop Census

Table 2. Water requirements for FSA

	Cahone			Monument	Weighted average	
	Pleasant View Ruin Canyon	Fairview	Hovenweep	Creek Cross Canyon		
Crop consumptive use (CU) ¹	----- Acre-feet -----					
Ideal rotation ²	1.75	1.75	1.88	1.75	1.76	
1995-1999 average	1.96	1.96	2.12	1.96	1.97	
Effective precipitation ³	0.49	0.49	0.48	0.49		
Water to be supplied by irrigation per acre						
Per irrigated acre	1.26	1.26	1.40	1.26		
Per irrigable acre (95%)	1.20	1.20	1.33	1.20		
Farm irrigation Efficiency (%)	70	70	70	70		
Farm loss	0.51	0.51	0.57	0.51		
Farm delivery requirement	1.71	1.71	1.90	1.71		
Reuseable return flow	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00		
Net farm delivery requirement						
Ideal rotation	1.71	1.71	1.90	1.71	1.72	
1995-1999 average	1.91	1.91	2.13	1.91	1.93	
Conveyance loss	0.15	0.08	0.15	0.39		
Operational loss requirement (5%)	0.09	0.09	0.10	0.09		
Net diversion requirement at McPhee Reservoir						
Ideal rotation	1.95	1.88	2.15	2.19	1.97	
1995-1999 average	2.15	2.08	2.38	2.39	2.18	
Allocated acres	----- Acres -----				Total acres	
DPR (1977) ⁴	15110	7700	2000	3050	27860	
1995-1999 average ⁵	13913	8013	2649	3353	27928	
Crop acreage (%) and CU:						
Crop	Acreage (%) Ideal rotation	CU (DPR/Ideal rotation)		Acreage (%) 1995-1999	CU (DPR/1995-99 acreage)	
		Hovenweep ----- Acre-feet -----	other -----		Hovenweep ----- Acre-feet -----	other -----
Alfalfa	55.0	2.25	2.08	81.1	2.25	2.08
Small grains	20.0	1.30	1.21	6.3	1.30	1.21
Dry bean	15.0	1.40	1.31	8.7	1.40	1.31
Pasture	3.0	2.30	2.12	3.9	2.30	2.12
Corn	7.0	1.51	1.42	0.0	1.51	1.42
Total/Weighed	100.0	1.88	1.75	100.0	2.12	1.96

¹Crop consumptive use was computed by the Jensen-Haise method. CU and Peff (Effective Precipitation) are cumulative monthly totals for April through October (DPR, 1977).

²Ideal crop rotation: Alfalfa (55%), small grains (20%), dry bean (15%), other (10%)

³Effective precipitation (DPR, 1977): To allow for evaporation losses, 0.15" was subtracted from each monthly precipitation before applying the following percentages: 1" (95%), 2" (90%), 3" (82%).

⁴DPR: Dolores Project Colorado. Definite Plan Report. Appendix B: Water Supply. April 1977

⁵Sandstone (596 acres) was added in 1995-1999.




Figure 4. Alfalfa hay yield and water use at FSA (Fairview Block) in 1996¹




Figure 5. Alfalfa hay yield and water use at FSA (Cahone Block) in 1996¹

¹Inches/acre is the amount of irrigation water at the delivery box divided by alfalfa acreage. Source: Dolores Water Conservancy District




Figure 6. Crop yield at FSA in 1990-1999¹




Figure 7. Irrigation water use histograms in 1996 at FSA

¹Source: Dolores Water Conservancy District

APPENDIX A

Outreach activities and publications associated with the irrigation water management demonstration (IWMD) project

Workshops and presentations

- 3/10/00: Soil, Crop, and Water Management for Optimum Production in SW Colorado. Presented by Abdel Berrada at the Four States Agricultural Exposition in Cortez, CO.
- 2/17/00: Demonstration of Irrigation Scheduling Tools. Presented by Abdel Berrada and Thomas Hooten at the Four Corners Irrigation Workshop in Cortez, CO
- 2/17/00: Four Corners Irrigation Workshop in Cortez, CO.
- 3/18/99: Irrigation Management Research and Demonstration Study. Presented by Abdel Berrada at the Soil, Water, And Groundwater Management (SWAGMAN II) Symposium at the Ute Mountain Ute Tribe Farm & Ranch Enterprise.
- 3/13/99: Making the Most of Your Irrigation Allocation. Presented by Abdel Berrada at the Four States Agricultural Exposition in Cortez, CO.
- 3/13/99: Seminar on Irrigation Water Management at the Four States Agricultural Exposition in Cortez, CO.
- 6/09/98: Irrigation Demonstration project. Presented by Abdel Berrada at the Irrigation Field Day organized by the Intermountain Farmers Association (IFA) West of Pleasant View.
- 3/18/98: Highlights of the Irrigation Management Study in the Full Service Area of the Dolores Project. Presented by Abdel Berrada at the Irrigation Management Workshop.
- 3/18/98: Irrigation Management Workshop at the Arriola Fire Station in Montezuma County.
- Other: Various aspects/results of the irrigation water management demonstration study were presented by Abdel Berrada at the Annual Advisory Committee meetings for SWCRC and at the Annual Research Center Conferences.
- Field days/tours: Oral and poster presentations related to the IWMD project and demonstration of irrigation scheduling tools and water conservation methods were made at the August 21, 1997 and August 19, 1999 at SWCRC. The IWMD project was also highlighted at the Leadership Montezuma- Agriculture and Natural Resources Days on September 2, 1997 and October 1, 1998. In addition, field plots were set up during the summer of 1999 to demonstrate the use of PAM and dammer diker to conserve water and reduce soil erosion.

Publications

Abdel Berrada. 2000. Crops, Soil, and Irrigation Research. Colorado Water 17(1): 11-13. Newsletter of the Water Center of Colorado State University. February 2000. Colorado State Univ., Fort Collins.

Berrada, A., G.E. Cardon, I. Broner, T.M. Hooten, and M.W. Stack. 1999. Evaluation of irrigation water management in southwestern Colorado. Agron. Abstracts p. 278 Amer. Soc. of Agron., Madison, WI.

'Irrigation check now will prevent headaches later' by Abdel Berrada. Page 9B, Cortez Sentinel, 05/08/99

'Highlights of the irrigation management survey in the full service area of the Dolores Irrigation Project' by Abdel Berrada. Section B of the Montezuma Valley Journal, 4/10/97

'Farmers may use technology to survive severe drought' by Jim Mimiaga. Page 2B, Cortez Journal, 2/12/00. Account of interview with Abdel Berrada and Tom Hooten relating to IWMD project.

Progress reports were submitted to CAES & CE in June '99 and to BOR in Sept. '99 and Nov. '00.

Related publications

Mahdi M. Al-Kaisi, Abdel Berrada, and Mark Stack. 1997. Evaluation of irrigation scheduling program and spring wheat yield response in southwestern Colorado. Agric. Water Management 34 (1997) 137-148. Elsevier Science Inc.

Mahdi M. Al-Kaisi, Abdel F. Berrada, and Mark W. Stack. 1999. Dry bean yield response to different irrigation rates in southwestern Colorado. J. Prod. Agric. 12:422-427

APPENDIX B

Irrigation Survey Questionnaire

Cover letter

October 28, 1996

Irrigation Management Survey

Dear Irrigator:

The objective of this survey is to assess irrigation management practices in the Dolores Water Project area. The information obtained will help Colorado State University scientists and extension specialists plan future research and outreach efforts in irrigation management in southwestern Colorado.

This survey is being conducted under guidelines established by Colorado State University. Your participation is strictly voluntary, and confidentiality is guaranteed. All replies are anonymous; only summaries of the compiled results will be made public.

Please complete the questionnaire forms as indicated and return it in the envelope provided by December 1, 1996. The results of the survey will be compiled by the Southwestern Colorado Research Center, and copies of the results will be available to the public. If you would like a copy, or have any questions or concerns, please contact Abdel Berrada or Mark Stack at 562-4255.

We appreciate your cooperation and prompt reply. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Abdel Berrada
Research Scientist/Superintendent
Southwestern Colorado Research Center

John Porter, Chairman
Advisory Committee for the Southwestern
Colorado Research Center & the San Juan Basin
Research Center

Irrigation Management Survey
Southwestern Colorado Research Center
P.O. Box 233, Yellow Jacket, CO 81335

Please mark all that apply to your operation.

1. Land use

11. How many irrigated acres do you own or lease/rent in your operation?

- a. Acres owned _____
 b. Acres leased/rented _____

12. Please specify the irrigated crops you grew in 1995-96 and their average yield.

- a. Alfalfa: _____ acres _____ t/ac.
 b. Dry bean: _____ acres _____ lb/ac.
 c. Winter wheat: _____ acres _____ bu/ac.
 d. Spring wheat: _____ acres _____ bu/ac.
 e. Oats: _____ acres _____ bu/ac.
 f. Other (specify) _____

13. What is your irrigation allocation? _____ acre-feet

2. Irrigation system

21. Please specify the buried pipe you use

- a. Material: ___ PVC ___ 80 psi ___ 100 psi ___ 120 psi Other (specify) ___
 b. Pipe diameter: ___ 4" pipe ___ 6" pipe ___ 8" pipe
 ___ 10" pipe Other (specify) _____

c. Do you use ___ pressure relief or ___ air vac valves with your pipe? ___ YES ___ NO

22. What irrigation systems do you use?

221. Siderolls

- a. Pipe and wheel size
 ___ 5" pipes & 7' wheels ___ 4" pipes & 5' wheels Other (specify) _____

b. Length and number of siderolls

Length	How many?	Length	How many?
_____ 1/4 mile	_____	_____ ft	_____
_____ ft	_____	_____ ft	_____

c. Total acres irrigated with Siderolls _____

222. Center Pivots

- a. Length How many? Length How many?
 _____ 1100 ft _____ _____ ft _____
 _____ 1300 ft _____ _____ ft _____

b. Total acres irrigated with Center Pivots _____

223. Other irrigation systems: Drip _____ acres Other (specify) _____ acres

224. Please specify the type of sprinklers and sprinkler nozzles you use

a. with siderolls
____ Single nozzles
____ Double nozzles
____ Flow control nozzles
____ Pressure regulators
Other (specify) _____

b. with center pivots
____ Rotators
____ Impact (overhead)
____ Low Drift Nozzle Sprinklers (LDN)
____ Low Energy Precision Applicator (LEPA)
Other (specify) _____

c. Nozzle size

____ 9/64 ____ 5/32 ____ 9/64 x 3/32 ____ 5/32 x 3/32
____ 11/64 ____ 3/16 ____ 11/64 x 3/32 ____ 3/16 x 3/32
____ 7/32 ____ 1/4 ____ 3/16 x 1/8 ____ 7/32 x 1/8
Other (specify) _____ Other (specify) _____

____ 5 gpm ____ 6 gpm ____ 7 gpm ____ 8 gpm ____ 9 gpm Other (specify) _____

3. Irrigation Management

31. How often do you usually move your siderolls in 24 hours and how far do you move them?

____ Once ____ Two turns
____ Twice ____ Three turns
____ Three times Other (specify) _____

32. How do you decide when to irrigate?

a. ____ When the soil surface is dry
b. ____ When the crop shows signs of stress
c. ____ I keep moving the siderolls from the start of the irrigation season until the crop is mature or ready to cut/harvest
d. ____ I sample the soil with a ____ probe or ____ shovel and feel how dry/moist it is
e. I rely on crop water use information obtained from ____ CoAgmet ____ Weather station ____ Newspaper ____ Cooperative Extension, Other (specify) _____
f. Other (specify) _____

33. How often do you irrigate the following crops?

Crop	Number of irrigations in	
	1996	a normal year
a. Alfalfa		
Before the first cutting	_____	_____
1st - 2nd cutting	_____	_____
2nd - 3rd cutting	_____	_____
3rd - 4th cutting	_____	_____
b. Dry beans	_____	_____

- c. Winter wheat _____
- d. Spring wheat _____
- e. Oats _____
- f. Other (specify) _____

34. Do you use different nozzle sizes? NO YES

- a. For different crops
- b. At different crop growth stages
- c. How do you decide what nozzle size to use? _____

35. Do you use different sideroll settings (number of hours per run)? NO YES

- a. For different crops
- b. At different times of the irrigation season
- c. How do you decide what setting to use? _____

36. How much water did you use in 1996?

- a. My allocated amount
- b. Less than my allocated amount
- c. Slightly more than my allocated amount
- d. Much more than my allocated amount
- e. Other (specify) _____

37. Did you notice any runoff on your irrigated fields? YES NO

38. If the answer to question 37 is yes, what do you plan to do about it?

- a. Nothing Why? _____
- b. Check my pipes and sprinklers for leaks and fix them
- c. Use smaller nozzle sizes
- d. Run the siderolls for less hours
- e. Increase the speed of center pivot
- e. Other (specify) _____

39. Do you use irrigation metering and/or timing devices? YES NO

40. What type of information do you think will help you better manage your irrigated land?

- Irrigation equipment innovations
- Crop water requirements & irrigation scheduling guidelines
- Soil management guidelines
- Crop management guidelines
- Other (specify) _____

41. Additional comments: Please provide any additional information, comments, or suggestions, which may be useful in assessing irrigation water management in the Dolores Project Area. Thank you. _____

APPENDIX C
Detailed Survey Results

Table C1. Irrigation Survey Results I: Land Use

ID	Irrigated crops grown in 1995-96									Comments
	Acres			Alfalfa		Dry bean		Winter wheat		
	Owned	Leased	Total	acres	t/a	acres	lb/a	acres	bu/a	
1	140.0	0.0	140.0	140.0	4.5					
2	154.0	0.0	154.0	71.0	-					
3	525.0	-	525.0							
4	0.0	498.0	498.0	368.0	4.0					
5										
6	50.0	0.0	50.0	50.0						
7	40.0	-	40.0	33.0	3.5					
8	0.0	70.0	70.0	70.0	3.0					
9	32.0	-	32.0	16.0	6.0					
10	90.0	40.0	130.0			100.0	900.0	30.0	25.0	
11	105.0	0.0	105.0		2.7			-	55.0	
12	280.0	0.0	280.0	280.0	4.0					
13	160.0	0.0	160.0	110.0	3.0					
14	53.0	106.0	159.0		2.3					
15	27.0	0.0	27.0	12.0	2.8					
16	300.0	0.0	300.0	100.0	7.0	105.0	1900.0			
17	300.0	0.0	300.0	300.0	5.0					
18	231.0	440.0	671.0	590.0	6.0					
19	288.0	271.0	559.0	316.0	4.8	102.0	1818.0			
20	235.0	90.0	325.0	325.0	5.0					
21			150.0							pasture
22	118.1	391.4	509.5	215.4	4.0					
23	600.0	0.0	600.0	310.0	4.1					
24	150.0	286.0	436.0	397.0	4.0	6.0	1600.0			
25	110.0	0.0	110.0	110.0	3.0					
26	225.0	0.0	225.0	150.0	-					
27	0.0	89.3	89.3			61.3	2191.0			
28	73.0	23.0	96.0			73.0	1700.0			
29	130.0	68.0	198.0	189.0	3.5					
30	158.0	0.0	158.0	110.0	-			37.0	42.5	
31	580.0	220.0	800.0	560.0	-					
32	156.8	0.0	156.8	68.0	4.6	68.0	1000.0			
33	1900.0	0.0	1900.0	1000.0	5.8					
34	280.0	0.0	280.0							
35	57.0	0.0	57.0	40.0	-					
36	137.0	160.0	297.0	195.0	6.0	72.0	1000.0			
37	73.8	0.0	73.8	73.8	4.0					
38	350.0	400.0	750.0	270.0	4.0					
39	200.0	0.0	200.0	200.0	4.0					
40	100.0	0.0	100.0	10.0	5.4					
41	186.0	157.0	343.0	112.0	-	77.0		152.0	-	
42	264.0	298.0	562.0	240.0	3.3	113.0	1125.0			
Entries	41	38	42	34	29	11	10	4	4	
Total	8858.7	3607.7	12616.4	7031.2		777.3		219.0		
Mean	221.5	97.5	307.7	213.1	4.3	77.7	1470.4	73.0	40.8	

Table C1. Irrigation Survey Results I: Land Use (Continued)

ID	Irrigated crops grown in 1995-96						Irrigation allocation acre-feet	Comments
	<u>Spring wheat</u>		<u>Oat</u>		<u>Other crops</u>			
	acres	bu/a	acres	bu/a	acres	crop		
1							178.4	
2								
3							890.0	
4	130	80						
5					1	?	6.6	Could be M&I water
6			5	-			228.0	
7								
8							103.5	
9								
10							84.1	
11							84.0	
12							459.0	
13							115.0	
14								
15							20.5	
16			60	70			510.4	
17								
18								
19			141	95			1028.4	
20							555.0	
21					150	Pasture	247.0	
22	163.8	76					643.8	
23					150	Corn	4.0	Could be M&I water
24	40	100						
25							135.0	
26	75	70					436.0	
27	28	90					136.3	
28								
29								
30							133.0	
31			100	-	100	Grass	1360.0	
32							268.0	
33	360	70					1300.0	
34	150	65					478.0	
35					17	Alf/grass		
36								
37							144.6	
38	360	80					465.0	
39							260.0	
40							179.0	
41					2.4	Oinons		
42	128	83.7					562.0	
Entries	10	10	5	3	7		30.0	
Total	1434.8	714.7	306		420.4		11014.6	
Mean	159.4	79.4	76.5	82.5	70.1		379.8	

Table C2. Irrigation Survey Results II: Irrigation System

Item	Tally ¹		Tally ¹
21. Mainline/buried pipe	38		
Rating		Pressure relief valve (PRV)	22
80 – 100 psi	36	Air-vacuum release valve (ARV)	34(20)
120-160 psi	7(4)	PRV or ARV	37
Other	1(1)	None	0
Mainline diameter	40	22. Irrigation system/Siderolls	37
4"	7	Sideroll length	
6"	26	Less than ¼ mile (38 systems)	15
8"	28(19)	¼ mile (168 systems)	35(13)
10"	20(18)	1440' to 1600' (10 systems)	6(5)
Other	6(4)		
Sideroll sprinklers	38	Sideroll pipe and wheel diameter	37
Single nozzle	24	5" x 7'	31
Double nozzle	20(7)	4" x 5'	9(5)
Flow control nozzle	10(6)	Other	5(3)
Pressure regulator	0	Total sideroll acres: 5887	33
Center Pivots	17	Center pivot sprinklers	13
1300 ft (23 systems)	10(1)	Rotator	9
1200-1300 ft (6 systems)	3	Overhead impacts	5(1)
1100-1200 ft (4 systems)	3	LEPA	1(1)
600 - 900 ft (4 systems)	2	Total CP acres: 2888	15
Other irrigation systems	0	Nozzle size	
		4-5 GPM	12
		5-6 GPM	11
		6-7 GPM	11
		7-8 GPM	5
		8-9 GPM	2
		> 9 GPM	12
		Unspecified	3

¹Number of respondents. Numbers between parentheses indicate number of respondents who marked more than one choice.

Table C3. Irrigation Survey Results III: Irrigation Management

Item	Tally ¹		Tally ¹	
31. Sideroll set time	39	Sideroll move length	9	
24-hour set	6	3 turns	27	
12-hour set	34(2)	Other	3	
Other	2(1)			
32. How do you decide when to irrigate?			40	
Soil surface is dry			7	
Crop stress			6(2)	
Continuously move siderolls			19(3)	
Sample with shovel or probe			22(11)	
Crop water use information			1	
Other			5	
Precipitation, runoff				
Every 10 to 11 days before crop stress				
Precipitation, once before 1st cut, twice between cuttings				
Checkbook, ET, crop consumptive use.				
33. Irrigation frequency	Number of irrigations			
	1996	Range ('96)	Normal	Range
Alfalfa				
Early spring	2.7	1-4	1.5	1-5
1 st - 2 nd cut	2.8	1-6	2.5	1-5
2 nd - 3 rd cut	2.6	1-7	2.3	1-5
3 rd - 4 th cut	2.1	1-7	2.0	1-5
Dry bean	6.7	4-8	5.3	4-6
Winter wheat	4.9	4-7	3.8	3-5
Spring wheat	7.7	7-9	6.7	4-9
Oat	4.0	3-5	3.7	3-4
Other crops	6.4	4-11	6.8	4-11
34. Do you use different nozzle sizes?	37	36. Water use in 1996	38	
Yes	23	Allocated amount (AA)	5	
No	14	Less than AA	5	
With different crops	11	Slightly more than AA	18	
At different crop growth stages	9(6)	Much more than AA	10	

¹Number of respondents. Numbers between parentheses indicate number of respondents who marked more than one choice.

Table C3. Irrigation Survey Results III: Irrigation Management (Continue)

Item	Tally ¹
35. Do you vary the sideroll set time?	34
Yes	22
No	12
For different crop	10
During the irrigation season	14(7)
How do you decide set time?	
• In order to germinate crop 4 to 6-hour sets are used.	2
• In 1996, 24-hour sets were used between cuttings of alfalfa due to the dry soil.	1
• Crop maturity	2
• Chemigation requires different set times.	1
• Crop use	3
• Wind, rain, temperature	3
• Nozzle size, runoff, and crop stage	1
• What crop needs and soil will take.	1
• Crop appearance or probe soil for moisture	1
• When changes in the nozzle size are not sufficient to control the water.	
• In late summer when the temperature is lower and water starts to runoff, I may move siderolls more frequently or change the nozzle size.	1
• Crop condition and availability of labor	1
• Wind (turn off if too windy), crop, growth stage, topography, infiltration rate, soil texture, time of year	1
• Soil moisture, precipitation, temperature	1
37. Did you notice runoff in your field?	41
Yes	26
No	15
38. What did you do about it?	
Nothing	5
Check for leaks	6(1)
Use smaller nozzles	10
Shorter set time	6(3)
Increase CP speed	13(4)
Other	10
I'm going to rip my alfalfa with 1" shanks. The ground is too hard.	
Check for leaks.	
I plugged the spreader nozzle on each double sprinkler.	
Maybe aerate center pivot.	
Roll aerator across alfalfa field.	
Re-engineer nozzles to slope and pressure, try aeration.	
Steep hillside	
I have cut ditches and dug holes to slow runoff.	
Replaced drains and old impact sprinklers.	
Try new tillage programs.	

Table C3. Irrigation Survey Results III: Irrigation Management (Continued)

Item	Tally ¹
39. Do you use irrigation metering/timing devices Yes No	36 4 32
41. Additional comments <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aeration is needed to help water infiltration on established fields (alfalfa). • Farmers should be allowed to use their allocated water and then be shut- off until everyone has had a chance to use their own allocated water. • Thank you for all your help. • Interested in a linear move irrigation system. Would like a linear system tested under our rolling terrain. • My runoff was mostly from lower or wetter areas, because I was putting more water on the higher areas due to the dry year. • I would like work done with tillage tools to measure the effect on soil water intake rates. • Crop water use should be printed in local newspapers. • Most irrigators use nozzles that are too large. • Excessive runoff helps no one. • For spring crops (including alfalfa), water needs to be available earlier in the spring to avoid starting out behind and playing catch-up all summer. • Need information on center pivots getting stuck. • I would like to have a better way of monitoring water in the field (storage capacity) i.e. gypsum blocks, probe, or new technology. 	12

¹Number of respondents. Numbers between parentheses indicate number of respondents who marked more than one choice.