

Consideration of a Nitrate Hazard Index (NHI) for Reporting and Tracking

August 28, 2013

Presentation to the CDFA Nitrogen Task Force

Joel Kimmelshue, PhD



Structure

- Nitrate Hazard Index Approach
- Past Research
- Independent Analysis
- Main Influencing Factors
 - Soil Type
 - Crop Type
 - Irrigation Method
- Conclusions

Accepted Nitrogen Impact Assessment

- Nitrate Hazard Index Approach
 - Published by the Southwestern States and Pacific Islands Regional Water Quality Program and the University of California Center for Water Resources (Universities of Arizona, California, Nevada, etc.)
 - National Academy of Sciences Water Science & Technology Board – Chose Hazard Index as preferred method
 - Includes decades of research/approaches (since the 1970s)
 - **“It is consistent with the recommendations of the nutrient Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) appointed by the CA State Water Resources Control Board.”**

Nitrate Leaching is Crop & Soil Specific

- “Not all agricultural activities have the same potential to contribute to N pollution” (Hermanson, 2000).
 - Supported by a multitude of studies all across California, US and world:
 - Harter, 2012; Burrow, et al, 1998, Tanji, et al, 1979; Letey et al, 1977, Pettygrove, et al, 2012; etc.
 - Amount of N accumulated by a crop depends on:
 - Amount of N supplied by fertilizer and soil reserves
 - Genetic potential of crop to take up N
 - Growth and yield potential of crop
 - Environmental variables
 - **Ability to retain N in rooting zone (impacted by: soil type, crop type, irrigation method)**



Mapping the Risk of Nitrate Leaching from Irrigated Fields by Use of a Nitrate Hazard Index: Case Study in the San Joaquin Valley of California

Stuart Pettygrove¹, Kristin Dzurella¹, Anna Fryjoff-Hung² and Allan Hollander²,

Departments of Land, Air & Water Resources¹ and Environmental Science & Policy², University of California, Davis, CA



Introduction

Irrigated cropland accounts for 96% of groundwater nitrate contamination in the southern San Joaquin and Salinas Valleys of California (Harter et al., 2012). Reducing nitrate leaching is primarily achieved by improving crop nitrogen use efficiency (NUE) by better matching application rates and timing of irrigation water and fertilizer to crop requirements.

The difficulty in limiting nitrate leaching from the root zone varies with the crop species, soil properties, and type of irrigation system. Under average management practices, the likelihood of high nitrate leaching loss is greater, e.g., for shallow-rooted and high-value crops that are sensitive to short-term N deficiencies; greater on highly permeable soils with low water-holding capacity, and greater under furrow irrigation compared to drip or microsprinkler irrigation.

Based on this concept, University of California scientists developed a Nitrate Groundwater Pollution Hazard Index (HI) for irrigated agriculture (Wu et al., 2005). This tool is available online to the public (see Wu et al. for web address). The HI assigns index values to crop species, soil series, and irrigation system type, which are multiplied together to produce a composite risk value.

The method allows estimation of risk severity and identification of the major factors contributing to this risk without requiring the large data set needed for more complicated assessment methods (e.g., Delgado et al., 2008; Shaffer et al., 1991). However, the HI method does not consider depth to groundwater, amount of rainfall, or the management practices in actual use on fields, such as fertilizer N rate and irrigation water applied.

In this study, we used the HI to map the risk of nitrate leaching from crop rootzones in a four-county area of the San Joaquin Valley of California. The total area analyzed was 1,318,000 ha of irrigated cropland, devoted mainly to production of grapes, deciduous tree fruits and nuts, citrus, cotton, forages, grains, and vegetables (Fig. 1).

Methods

- Crop species and irrigation type for agricultural parcels obtained from recent (1999-2006) California Department of Water Resources land use surveys for each of the four counties in the study area.
- Crop species index based on rooting depth, amount of N required, crop value, and market/product quality sensitivity to N deficiencies. Examples: Lettuce=4, alfalfa=1.
- Drip/microsprinkler with fertigation=1, without fertigation = 2, overhead sprinkler with fertigation= 3, without fertigation =3, all surface gravity systems = 4. For crops that we know are typically established with overhead sprinklers (HI=3), then switched to drip with fertigation (HI=1), we set the irrigation HI to 2.
- Soil values based on predominant soil series in SSURGO polygons. Soil index values represent the consensus of three soil scientists who considered NRCS soil series drainage and permeability characteristics, including typical pedon texture, restrictive layers and moles (indicators of poor drainage).
- Multiply together index values for crop species, soil leaching potential, and irrigation system type to obtain composite HI value from 1 to 80 (low to high risk). Matrix is shown in Fig. 2.
- Fields with composite HI above 20 (yellow highlight in Fig. 2) are considered to be at high risk of nitrate leaching when managed with typical agronomic practices (Wu et al., 2005).
- Index values were compiled in a GIS using SSURGO polygons (soil HI values) and fields (agricultural parcels) in Department of Water Resources surveys (crop species/irrigation type HI values).

Acknowledgements

This work was funded in part by the California State Water Resources Control Board under agreement number 09-122-250. We thank Dr. John Lowry and Dr. David Birkle for their helpful advice and assistance in rating soil series that were not included in the original UC Nitrate Hazard Index.




Fig. 1. Crop species in study area in southern San Joaquin Valley of California (Viers et al., 2012)

Crop	Soil				Irrigation
	1	2	3	4	
1	1	2	3	4	5
2	4	8	8	8	10
3	5	6	9	12	15
4	8	12	15	18	20
5	12	24	36	48	60
6	12	18	24	30	36
7	12	18	24	30	36
8	12	18	24	30	36
9	12	24	36	48	60
10	12	24	36	48	60
11	12	18	24	30	36
12	12	18	24	30	36
13	12	18	24	30	36
14	12	18	24	30	36
15	12	18	24	30	36

Fig. 2. The University of California nitrate hazard index multiplicative matrix, with highly vulnerable situations highlighted in yellow (adapted from Wu et al., 2005)




Fig. 3. Crop species by HI value. (Fresno Co., 2000; Tulare, 1999; Kings 2003; Kern 2006, Department of Water Resources surveys during summer months)




Fig. 6. Component HI values- distribution by percent of total land area in study.




Fig. 4. Irrigation system hazard index value. Source – see Fig. 3 caption.




Fig. 7. Composite nitrate hazard index map.




Fig. 5. Soil hazard index value for soil series in irrigated agricultural land.




Fig. 8. Hazard index map assuming all orchards, vineyards, and vegetable crop fields converted to drip or microsprinkler irrigation with fertigation.




Fig. 9. Decrease in land area with high nitrate leaching risk due to conversion to drip/microsprinkler irrigation (see caption Fig. 8)

Results and Discussion

- One third (33%, 435,372 ha of 1,317,906 ha) of the basin has a composite HI > 20 and therefore is vulnerable to significant nitrate leaching if not properly managed (Fig. 7).
- Much of the study area is cropped to lower risk crop species (Fig. 3), but prevalence of higher risk surface irrigation (Fig. 4) and well-drained soils (Fig. 5) contribute to the overall 33% of area at risk (Fig. 6).
- Corn (mainly for silage) and vegetable production, as well as surface irrigated trees and field crops grown on high-risk soils account for the majority of this area.
- Conversion of fruit, nut, and vegetable crops to drip or microsprinkler irrigation from the earlier (1999-2006) adoption levels would decrease the area vulnerable from 33% to 22% of the area analyzed (Figs. 8 and 9).
- Significant conversion of cropland to drip/microsprinkler irrigation has occurred since the surveys used in this study were conducted in 1999-2006, and therefore the actual situation in 2012 falls between the two maps shown in Figs. 7 and 8.
- A large proportion of the cropped area remaining at risk of nitrate leaching loss after such a conversion is used to produce silage corn and other forages, which typically receive applications of dairy manure and are irrigated by furrow or border methods. We note that in Tulare Co. (east-center of study area), dairy farmers milked approximately 500,000 cows (2010), which produced more milk than any other county in the US.

References

Delgado, J.A., M. Shaffer et al. 2008. An index approach to assess nitrogen losses to the environment. *Ecological Engineering* 32: 109-120.

Harter, T., J. Lund et al. 2012. Addressing nitrate in California's drinking water with a focus on Tulare Lake Basin and Salinas Valley Groundwater. Report for the State Water Resources Control Board Report to the Legislature. Center for Watershed Sciences, University of California, Davis. 78 p. <http://groundwaterscience.ucdavis.edu>

Shaffer, M.J., A.D. Halverson, and F.J. Pierce. 1991. Nitrate leaching and economic analysis package (NLEAP): Model description and application. p. 285-382. In R.F. Follett, D.R. Keeney, and R.M. Cruse (ed.) *Managing nitrogen for groundwater quality and farm profitability*. ASA, CSSA, and SSSA, Madison, WI, pp. 285-322.

Viers, J.H., D. Lipstein, et al. 2012. Nitrogen sources and loading to groundwater. Technical Report 2. In *Addressing nitrate in California's drinking water with a focus on Tulare Lake Basin and Salinas Valley groundwater*. Report for the State Water Resources Control Board Report to the Legislature. Center for Watershed Sciences, University of California, Davis. <http://groundwaterscience.ucdavis.edu>

Wu, L., J. Lacey, C. French, Y. Wood, and D. Pirko. 2005. Nitrate leaching hazard index developed for irrigated agriculture. *J. Soil Water Conservation* 60(4): 30-35. Online version of UC nitrate hazard index: http://hearc.ucdavis.edu/Programs/Water_Quality/Nitrate_Groundwater_Pollution_Hazard_Index/



Southern San Joaquin Valley Nitrate Hazard Index Approach

Soil, Crop and Irrigation Methods approach used to create relative Hazard Index

Crop	Soil					Irrigation
	1	2	3	4	5	
1	1	2	3	4	5	1
1	2	4	6	8	10	2
1	3	6	9	12	15	3
1	4	8	12	16	20	4
2	2	4	6	8	10	1
2	4	8	12	16	20	2
2	6	12	18	24	30	3
2	8	16	24	32	40	4
3	3	6	9	12	15	1
3	6	12	18	24	30	2
3	9	18	27	36	45	3
3	12	24	36	48	60	4
4	4	8	12	16	20	1
4	8	16	24	32	40	2
4	12	24	36	48	60	3
4	16	32	48	64	80	4

Spatial Data Sources: DWR Crop Mapping - (Fresno Co., 2000; Tulare, 1999; Kings 2003; Kern 2006)

Southern San Joaquin Valley Nitrate Hazard Index Conclusions - Pettygrove, et al, 2012

- 33% of basin has a significant N leaching potential
- That 33% is driven by gravity/surface irrigation practices on various crops and well-drained soils
- Conversion to drip/micro systems would result in a low leaching potential (Nitrate Hazard Index) for certain crops


Significant conversion to these systems has occurred since the DWR 1999-2006 base layers (crop type and irrigation methods) were used.

- Following conversion, a large area remaining at risk is silage corn and other forages, receiving dairy manure applications via furrow or border-check methods.


Independent Analysis

- Focuses on Kern Sub Basin area only
- Uses Kern Sub Basin specific information
 - recent (2011) Kern County crop coverage
 - local climatic conditions
 - local irrigation methods
 - local agronomic knowledge specific to the Kern Sub Basin obtained from Blake Sanden and others
- Performed analysis for representative scenarios in the Kern Sub Basin area
- Our analysis aligns well in approach and enhances conclusions of Pettygrove, et al. 2012 and other researchers

Kern River Watershed Coalition Authority (KRWCA) & North Kern Water Storage District (NKWSD) Study Areas



Kern Sub Basin Generalized Soil Textures




- Coarse
- Medium
- Fine

PRIVILEGED AND CONFIDENTIAL DRAFT,
11/28/12


Data Source: Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) Soil Survey Geographic Database (SSURGO)

1990 KRWCA Crop Types




Sources: Esri, DeLorme, NAVTEQ, TomTom, Intermap, increment Corp., GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, GeoBase, IGN, Kadaster NL, Ordnance Survey, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), Swisstopo, and the GIS User Community

2011 KRWCA Crop Types




Sources: Esri, DeLorme, NAVTEQ, TomTom, Intermap, increment, Corp., GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, GeoBase, IGN, Kadaster NL, Ordnance Survey, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), swisstopo, and the GIS User Community


1990 KRWCA Nitrate Hazard Index




2011 KRWCA Nitrate Hazard Index




1990 NKWSD Crop Types




2012 NKWSD Crop Types



1990 NKWSD Nitrate Hazard Index



2012 NKWSD Nitrate Hazard Index



Nitrate Hazard Index

Conclusions/Benefits

- Simple – Does not require numerical data, but can use it if available
- Flexible – Can be used on as large or small scale as desired, or in combination with other assessment methods
- Additional – More parameters (e.g. N applied, effective precipitation, depth to groundwater, applied water, etc.) can be included and weighted to better represent the areas being classified
- Valid – Developed by multidisciplinary group of experts and validated with Central Valley groundwater data
- Temporal – Can show change over time (year to year or growing season to growing season)
- Coverage – Can cover large areas of land with a single spatial resource
- Granular – Field by field, therefore can “roll-up” (or not) for reporting
- Strategic Monitoring – Results in strategic and justified locations for monitoring – thus saving costs and human resources