Colorado River Basin Salinity Control Program

Manila - Washam Unit

Monitoring and Evaluation Report, FY2013

U.S. Department of Agriculture
Natural Resources Conservation Service

The U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) prohibits discrimination against its customers. If you believe you experienced discrimination when obtaining services from USDA, participating in a USDA program, or participating in a program that receives financial assistance from USDA, you may file a complaint with USDA. Information about how to file a discrimination complaint is available from the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Civil Rights. USDA prohibits discrimination in all its programs and activities on the basis of race, color, national origin, age, disability, and where applicable, sex (including gender identity and expression), marital status, familial status, parental status, religion, sexual orientation, political beliefs, genetic information, reprisal, or because all or part of an individual's income is derived from any public assistance program. (Not all prohibited bases apply to all programs.)

To file a complaint of discrimination, complete, sign, and mail a program discrimination complaint form, available at any USDA office location or online at www.ascr.usda.gov, or write to:

USDA
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Civil Rights
1400 Independence Avenue, SW.
Washington, DC 20250-9410

Or call toll free at (866)632-9992 (voice) to obtain additional information, the appropriate office or to request documents. Individuals who are deaf, hard of hearing, or have speech disabilities may contact USDA through the Federal Relay service at (800)877-8339 or (800)845-6136 (in Spanish). USDA is an equal opportunity provider, employer, and lender.

Persons, with disabilities who require alternative means for communication of program information (e.g., Braille, large print, audiotape, etc.) should contact USDA's TARGET Center at (202)720-2600 (voice and TDD).

Executive Summary

Project Status

TREATED ACRES: Of 10,100 irrigated acres, 7,780 acres are projected to be improved. Since 2007, treatments on 4,111 acres have been planned and 3,596 acres applied. In FY2013, 100 acres were planned and 191 acres applied.

ON-FARM SALT LOAD REDUCTION: Of approximately 27,000 original on-farm tons/year of salt load, 9,078 tons/year salt load reduction has been planned and 8,599 tons/year has been applied, calculated using procedures revised in 2007. In FY2013, 239 tons/year were planned and 457 tons/year applied on-farm.

PLANNED OBLIGATIONS: For FY2013, NRCS obligated $90,000 in financial assistance (FA). Cumulative obligations total $5.31 million FA nominal ($6.61 million 2013 dollars).

APPLIED EXPENDITURES: For FY2013, NRCS expended $192,000, FA. Cumulative expenditures total $4.40 million FA nominal ($5.03 million 2013 dollars).

COST/TON: Planned salt load reduction cost for FY2013 contracts is $39/ton, FA+TA. The cumulative cost is $84/ton, FA+TA (2013 dollars) for planned practices. For practices applied in FY2013 the cost is $44/ton FA+TA, with a cost of $66/ton FA+TA (2013 dollars), for cumulative applied practices.

NEPA PROJECTED COST/TON: In 2013 dollars, pre-project NEPA documents anticipated salt load reduction costs of $89/ton. Cumulative planned cost is $84/ton, and cumulative applied cost is $66/ton.

DEEP PERCOLATION due to system leaks, inadequate irrigation water management (IWM), and poor system maintenance is relatively minor. New sprinkler operators are more likely to under-irrigate than to over-irrigate.

THE 2014 FARM BILL funds EQIP through FY2018.

Wildlife Habitat and Wetlands

- There were no wildlife habitat development projects planned and funded in FY 2013. No wildlife habitat replacement was applied in FY 2013.
- US Bureau of Reclamation completed piping Peoples Canal in FY2010. USFS Wetland Complexes continue to be monitored.

Economics

- Alfalfa production is in an upward trend.
- Interest in salinity control projects has waned. Two new pipeline projects are underway, which may increase interest in on-farm improvements.

Table 1. Project Progress Summary

Manila Washam Unit, All Programs, FY2013 Program Summary				
CONTRACTS PLANNED	UNITS	CURRENT FY	CUMULATIVE	TARGET
1. CONTRACT STATUS				
A. Contracts Approved	Number	3	50	
	Dollars	$90,367	$5,311,108	
	Acres	100	4,111	7,780
On-farm	Tons/Year	239	9,078	18,000
Off-farm	Tons/Year	-	8	
B. Active Contracts	Number		22	
Obligated dollars not expended	Dollars		$166,334	
Planned acres not treated	Acres		149	
Planned salt load reduction not reported On-farm	Tons/Year		350	
Planned salt load reduction not reported Off-farm	Tons/Year		-	

PRACTICES APPLIED	UNITS	CURRENT FY	CUMULATIVE	TARGET
2. EXPENDITURES				
Financial Assisstance (FA)	Dollars	$191,603	$4,399,553	
3. IRRIGATION SYSTEMS				
A. Sprinkler	Acres	191	3,592	7,780
B. Improved Surface System	Acres	-	-	
C. Drip System	Acres	0	4	
4. SALT LOAD REDUCTION				
A. Salt load reduction, on-farm	Tons/Year	457	8,599	18,000
B. Salt load reduction, off-farm	Tons/Year	-	-	

*Note: On-farm Salt Load Reduction has been calculated using the procedure adopted in FY2007 by three Upper Basin States.

NRCS Salinity Control Programs in Manila - Washam Unit				
Program Name		Acronym	Start Year	End Year
Environmental Quality Incentive Program		EQIP	FY2007	Current
Basin States Parallel Program		BSPP	FY2007	FY2012
Basin States Program		BSP	FY2012	Current

For further information, please contact:

Jim Spencer, Wildlife Biologist
USDA-NRCS
240 West Highway 40 (333-4)
Roosevelt, UT 84066
(435)722-4621 ext 128
jim.spencer@ut.usda.gov

Ed Whicker, Civil Engineer
USDA-NRCS
240 West Highway 40 (333-4)
Roosevelt, UT 84066
(435)722-4621 ext 124
ed.whicker@ut.usda.gov

Table of Contents

Executive Summary 3

Project Status 3

Wildlife Habitat and Wetlands 3

Economics 3

Table of Contents 5

Tables 7

Figures 7

Historical Background 8

Monitoring and Evaluation History and Background 9

Project Status 10

FY2013 Project Results 10

Cumulative Project Results 10

Detailed Progress Analysis 10

Pre-Project Salt Loading 10

Salinity Control Practices 11

Planning Documents 11

Planned Practices 11

Salt Load Reduction Calculation 11

Cost/Ton Calculation 12

FY2013 Obligation Analysis 12

Cost-Share Enhancement 12

Applied Practices 13

FY2013 Expenditures 13

Hydro Salinity Monitoring 15

Salinity Monitoring Methods 16

Cooperator questionnaires, interviews, and training sessions 16

Irrigation Water Management (IWM) 16

Irrigation Record Keeping 17

Soil Moisture Monitoring 20

USGS Water Quality Monitoring 21

SPARROW 22

Wildlife Habitat and Wetlands ***23***

Background 23

Wildlife Habitat Contract Monitoring 25

Voluntary Habitat Replacement Error! Bookmark not defined.

Economics ***25***

Cooperator Economics 25

Production Information 25

Expense Information 26

Public Economics 26

Land Use Land Cover 27

Summary 27

Glossary and Acronyms 29

Appendix ***33***

References ***35***

Tables

Table 1. Project Progress Summary 4

Table 2. FY2013 results 10

Table 3. Project goals and cumulative status 10

Table 4. Planned practices, cost/ton, nominal and 2013 dollars 12

Table 5. Applied practices, cost/ton, nominal and 2013 dollars 13

Table 6. Wildlife Habitat Replacement Planned and Applied in FY2013 25

Table 7. Cumulative Wildlife Habitat Replacement since Project Inception 25

Figures

Figure 1. Consensus pre-project salt load allocation 10

Figure 2. Cost of Contract Enhancement 13

Figure 3. Acres planned by contract type 13

Figure 4. Planned and applied acres 14

Figure 5. Planned and unplanned acres 14

Figure 6. Cost/ton, planned, applied, projected 14

Figure 7. Treated and untreated acres. 15

Figure 8. IWM Self Certification Spreadsheet input page 18

Figure 9. Sample graphs from the IWM Self Certification Spreadsheet 19

Figure 10. Sample Soil Moisture Data Logger with graph 20

Figure 11. AWC estimated from downloaded soil moisture data 21

Figure 12. USGS Salt Load Monitoring (provisional) 22

Figure 13. Manila - Washam Unit alfalfa production and Mountain Precipitation 26

Figure 14. Historical Water Related Land Use. 27

Historical Background

With settlement of the Colorado River Basin, demands on the Colorado River grew rapidly. In the late 1800s and early 1900s, hundreds of canal companies were created and millions of acres of land were irrigated to sustain growing populations. In the mid-1900s, dozens of dams and water projects were constructed on the Colorado River and its tributaries.

By the 1960s, concern over increasing water consumption and decreasing water quality led to a national effort to direct environmental policy at the federal level. In 1969, the National Environmental Protection Act (NEPA) was signed into law, requiring extensive public involvement and analysis of environmental impacts when planning federally funded projects (federal actions). As part of NEPA, the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) was created in the Executive Branch.

In 1970, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) was created by a Nixon executive order (Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1970, which also created the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration). In the early 1970s, salinity control was overseen by the EPA.

The Colorado River Basin Salinity Control Forum (Forum) was created in 1973, when the governors of the seven Colorado River Basin States, each appointed three water resource professionals to coordinate salinity control efforts among the states, federal agencies, and other major water management agencies. The Forum has been instrumental in promoting salinity control to the benefit of all.

It is estimated that in the 1960s, more than two-thirds of water taken from the Colorado River was used to irrigate agricultural lands. Nearly all of this irrigation was by flooding, resulting in massive amounts of salt being dissolved by excess irrigation water and carried back to the river. With irrigation being the largest contributor to salt load in the river, it was determined that irrigation improvements, both on-farm and off-farm, would provide the most cost effective opportunity to reduce salt loading by improving irrigation efficiencies to reduce deep percolation and seepage.

The Colorado River Basin Salinity Control Act of 1974 authorized federal funding of salinity control projects to manage salinity in the Colorado River.

Federal funding of salinity control practices began in the early 1980s in the Grand Valley of Colorado and the Uinta Basin of Utah.

The first salinity control projects in the Manila – Washam Unit were funded by the Environmental Quality Incentives Program (EQIP), beginning in FY2007. EQIP funding is authorized through FY2018.

Monitoring and Evaluation History and Background

The Colorado River Basin Salinity Control Program was established by the following Congressional Actions:

- The Water Quality Act of 1965 (Public Law 89-234) as amended by the Federal Water Pollution Control Act of 1972, mandated efforts to maintain water quality standards in the United States.
- Congress enacted the Colorado River Basin Salinity Control Act (PL 93-320) in June, 1974. Title I of the Act addresses the United States' commitment to Mexico and provided means for the U.S. to comply with provisions of Minute 242. Title II of the Act created a water quality program for salinity control in the United States. Primary responsibility was assigned to the Secretary of Interior and the Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation). USDA was instructed to support Reclamation's program with its existing authorities.
- The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) promulgated a regulation in December, 1974, which established a basin wide salinity control policy for the Colorado River Basin and also established a water quality standards procedure requiring basin states to adopt and submit for approval to the EPA, standards for salinity, including numeric criteria and a plan of implementation.
- In 1984, PL 98-569 amended the Salinity Control Act, authorizing the USDA Colorado River Salinity Control Program (CRSC). Congress appropriated funds to provide financial assistance through Long Term Agreements administered by Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service (ASCS) with technical support from Soil Conservation Service (SCS). PL 98-569 also requires continuing technical assistance along with monitoring and evaluation to determine effectiveness of measures applied.
- In 1995, PL 103-354 reorganized several agencies of USDA, transforming SCS into Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) and ASCS into Farm Service Agency (FSA).
- In 1996, the Federal Agricultural Improvement and Reform Act (PL 104-127) combined four existing programs, including the Colorado River Basin Salinity Control Program, into the Environmental Quality Incentives Program (EQIP), which has continued through the 2002 and 2008, and 2014 Farm Bills.

Over the years, Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) has evolved from a mode of labor/cost intensive detailed evaluation of a few farms and biological sites to a broader, but less detailed evaluation of many farms and environmental concerns, driven by budgetary restraints and improved technology

M&E is conducted as outlined in "The Framework Plan for Monitoring and Evaluating (M&E) the Colorado River Salinity Control Program", last revised in 2001.

Project Status

FY2013 Project Results

FY2013 project results for the Manila-Washam Unit (MW) are summarized in table 2.

Cumulative Project Results

Cumulative cost/ton through FY2013 is below the cost of $89/ton (2013 dollars) anticipated by the EA. (Table 3)

Table 2. FY2013 results

FY2013	Units	Planned	Applied
Irrigation Improvements	acres	100	191
Federal cost share, FA	$	$90,000	$192,000
Amortized federal cost share, FA+TA	$/year	$9,400	$19,900
Salt load reduction	tons /year	239	460
Federal cost, FA+TA	$/ton	$39	$44

Table 3. Project goals and cumulative status

FY2013 Cumulative Improvements	Units	NEPA	Planned	Applied
Irrigation improvements	acres	7,780	4,111	3,596
Federal cost share, FA	2013$	$13,430,000	$6,610,000	$5,030,000
Amortized federal cost share, FA+TA	2013$/yr	$1,608,000	$761,200	$569,400
Salt load reduction, tons/year	tons/year	18,000	9,078	8,599
Federal cost/ton, FA+TA	2013$	$89	$84	$66

Detailed Progress Analysis

Pre-Project Salt Loading

Agricultural irrigation is a major source of salt loading into the Colorado River and is completely human induced. Irrigation improvements have great potential to control salt loading.

In 2007 NRCS and Reclamation reviewed available literature and came to a consensus agreement on the most reasonable pre-project salt contribution from agriculture prior to implementing federal salinity control measures in the Manila – Washam Unit (MW). The result of this effort is depicted in figure 1.



Figure 1. Consensus pre-project salt load allocation

Salinity Control Practices

On-farm practices, used to reduce salt loading, include improved flood systems, sprinkler systems, and advanced irrigation systems, along with diversions, water delivery systems, pumps, ponds, etc., required for the proper operation of irrigation systems. On-farm salt load reduction is achieved by reducing over-irrigation and deep percolation.

Off-farm practices used to reduce salt loading are associated with the reduction and/or elimination of canal/ditch seepage, usually by installing pipelines.

Planning Documents

In 2006 NRCS developed an Environmental Assessment (EA) for the Manila-Washam Salinity Area (MW) to treat 7,780 acres with improved irrigation systems, primarily sprinklers. A Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) was issued by the NRCS State Conservationist for Utah. Development of salinity control contracts began in FY2007.

The Manila – Washam Unit is mapped in red on the cover of this report.

In FY2007, recalculation of potential salt load reduction was reduced from 24,900 tons/year to 18,000 tons/year, based on a reanalysis of data in the EA.

The EA and NRCS plans address only on-farm practices in MW. In FY2009, Peoples Canal Company received a USBR grant to pipe the entire Peoples Canal using American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) funds. The pipeline was completed in 2010.

In Reclamation's 2013 Funding Opportunity Announcement (FOA), Sheep Creek Canal Company was granted funding to pipeline the Cedar Hollow and South Valley Canals. Construction is underway on the Cedar Hollow pipeline. Work will begin on the South Valley Pipeline in autumn, 2014.

Planned Practices

Planned practices (obligations) represent contracts with participants to apply improved irrigation practices to the participant's agricultural activities. Only the federal share of project cost is analyzed in this section.

The installation of salinity control practices is voluntary on the part of landowners. An incentive to participate is created by cost-sharing on practice purchase and installation using federal financial assistance. In essence, federal cost-share purchases salt load reductions in the Colorado River, while the participant's cost-share buys him/her reduced operating costs and increased production.

Federal cost-share is obligated when a contract is signed with the participant, assuring timely installation, to federal standards, of salt load reducing irrigation practices.

Salt Load Reduction Calculation

The estimated salt load reduction from FY2013 planned practices is 239 tons/year, calculated by multiplying the original tons/acre for the entire basin, by the acres to be treated and a percentage

reduction based on change in irrigation practice (84% for periodic move). For example, 20 acres x 2.67 tons/acre-year x 84% = 45 tons/year salt load reduction for a 20 acre wheel-line.

Cost/Ton Calculation

The federal cost/ton for salt load reduction is calculated by amortizing the federal financial assistance (FA) over 25 years at the federal discount rate for water projects (3.750% in FY2013). NRCS adds two-thirds of FA for technical assistance (TA) and the amortized total cost is divided by tons/year to yield cost/ton. TA covers the cost of contract administration, project design and construction inspection, and contract review and maintenance through the life of the project. USBR, typically installing longer-lived pipeline projects, amortizes over 50 years and adds nothing for TA, making cost/ton comparison between NRCS and USBR projects problematic.

Normalization to 2013 dollars is based on the Producer Price Index (PPI) for agricultural equipment purchased, maintained by the National Agricultural Statistics Service (NASS).

FY2013 Obligation Analysis

In FY2013, $90,000 was obligated to treat 100 acres, reducing salt loading by 239 tons/year. The resulting cost is $39/ton.

In 2013 dollars, cumulative obligation thru FY2013 is $6.61 million FA, planned on 4,111 acres, with a salt load reduction of 9,078 tons/year, resulting in an overall cost of $84/ton. (Table 4)

Table 4. Planned practices, cost/ton, nominal and 2013 dollars

FY	Federal Water Project Discount Rate	Contracts Planned	FA Planned Nominal	Acres Planned	Salt Load Reduction Planned	Amortized FA+TA Nominal	$/ton FA+TA Nominal	2013 PPI Factor	FA Planned 2013$	Amortized FA+TA 2013$	$/ton 2013$	Cum $/ton 2013$
2007	4.875%	17	$2,596,059	1,835	3,609	$303,160	$84	135%	$3,499,698	$408,684	$113	$113
2008	4.875%	9	$802,932	708	1,700	$93,764	$55	120%	$966,239	$112,834	$66	$98
2009	4.625%	10	$1,121,501	829	2,004	$127,682	$64	116%	$1,305,327	$148,610	$74	$92
2010	4.375%	6	$424,759	406	973	$47,130	$48	112%	$473,676	$52,558	$54	$87
2011	4.125%	2	$36,872	32	72	$3,986	$55	104%	$38,311	$4,141	$58	$87
2012	4.000%	3	$238,618	201	481	$25,457	$53	98%	$234,217	$24,988	$52	$85
2013	3.750%	3	$90,367	100	239	$9,388	$39	100%	$90,367	$9,388	$39	$84
Totals		50	$5,311,108	4,111	9,078	$610,567	$67		$6,607,835	$761,203	$84	

Cost-Share Enhancement

Typical federal cost-share, over the last several years, has been about 75% of total installation cost. A feature of the 2002 and 2008 Farm Bills is cost-share enhancement, increasing the approximate federal cost-share to 90% of total cost for limited resource, beginning, or socially disadvantaged farmers or ranchers.

Cumulatively in MW, 19 contracts on 791 acres for $1.59 million (2013 dollars) are cost-share enhanced. Estimated salt load reduction is 1,858 tons/year. The average enhanced salt load reduction cost is $99/ton FA+TA (2013 dollars), compared to $83/ton for all contracts and $79/ton for unenhanced contracts. (Figure 2)

The incremental cost of enhancement is $265,000 FA (2013 dollars), about 4.0% of total FA. All 19 enhanced contracts are beginning farmers.

About 19% of salinity obligations are with beginning farmers/ranchers. (Figure 3)



Figure 2. Cost of Contract Enhancement

Applied Practices

FY2013 Expenditures

In FY2013, $192,000 FA was expended applying practices to 191 irrigated acres. The estimated salt load reduction is 457 tons/year, at an amortized cost of $44/ton FA+TA.

Cumulative expenditure FY2007-FY2013 is $5.03 million FA (2013 dollars), applied to 3,596 irrigated acres, reducing salt loading by 8,599 tons/year at a cost of $66/ton FA+TA (2013 dollars). (Table 5)

There is a time lag between obligating funds and constructing salinity control practices (application). Between planning and application, a few contracts are de-obligated for various reasons such as design modification, change in ownership or contract cancellation. (Figure 4)



Figure 3. Acres planned by contract type

For tracking, acres-treated and salt load reductions are assumed to be proportional to dollars paid out.

Salt load reduction in this report is calculated using procedures from "*Calculating Salt Load Reduction*", July 30, 2007.

Table 5. Applied practices, cost/ton, nominal and 2013 dollars

About 7,780 acres were expected to be treated by the environmental assessment (EA). Fifty-three percent or 4,111 acres have been planned and forty-six percent or 3,596 acres have been treated. (Figure 5)

The cost/ton is below the cost anticipated by the EA. (Figure 6) Treated and untreated acres are mapped. (Figure 7)

FY	Federal Water Project Discount Rate	FA Applied Nominal	Acres Applied	Salt Load Reduction Applied	Amortized FA+TA Nominal	$/ton FA+TA Nominal	2010 PPI Factor	FA Applied 2013$	Amortized FA+TA 2013$	$/ton 2013$	Cum $/ton 2013$
2007	4.875%	$32,363	32	72	$3,779	52	135%	$43,628	$5,095	71	71
2008	4.875%	$1,068,816	857	2,041	$124,813	61	120%	$1,286,201	$150,199	74	73
2009	4.625%	$1,832,775	1,566	3,762	$208,660	55	116%	$2,133,186	$242,861	65	68
2010	4.375%	$780,211	499	1,205	$86,570	72	112%	$870,064	$96,539	80	70
2011	4.125%	$403,838	366	873	$43,655	50	104%	$419,596	$45,359	52	68
2012	4.000%	$89,947	84	189	$9,596	51	98%	$88,288	$9,419	50	67
2013	3.750%	$191,603	191	457	$19,905	44	100%	$191,603	$19,905	44	66
Totals		$4,399,553	3,596	8,599	$496,978	58		$5,032,566	$569,377	66	



Figure 4. Planned and applied acres



Figure 5. Planned and unplanned acres



Figure 6. Cost/ton, planned, applied, projected



Figure 7. Treated and untreated acres.

Hydro Salinity Monitoring

Before implementation of salinity control measures, Manila - Washam Unit agricultural operations contributed an estimated 40,000 tons of salt per year to the Colorado River (on-farm and off-farm), from an average of 10,100 acres of annually irrigated land. Salt loading of 27,000 Tons/year was allocated to on-farm activities and 13,000 tons to off-farm canals and large laterals.

Three assumptions guide the calculation of salt load reduction from irrigation improvements:

1. Salt concentration of subsurface return flow from irrigation is relatively constant, regardless of the amount of canal seepage or on-farm deep percolation.
2. The available supply of mineral salts in the soil is essentially infinite and salinity of out-flowing water is dependent only on solubility of salts in the soil. Therefore, salt loading is directly proportional to the volume of subsurface return flow.
3. Water that percolates below the root zone of the crop and is not consumed by plants or evaporation will eventually find its way into the river system. Salt loading into the river is reduced by reducing deep percolation. (Hedlund, 1994).

Deep percolation and salt load reductions are achieved by reducing or eliminating canal/ditch seepage/leakage and by improving the efficiency and uniformity of irrigation. It is estimated that upgrading an uncontrolled flood irrigation system to a well-designed and operated sprinkler system will reduce deep percolation and salt load by 84-91%.

NRCS salinity control programs focus on helping participants improve irrigation systems, better manage water use, and sharply reduce deep percolation/salt loading.

Salinity Monitoring Methods

The most recent "*Framework Plan for Monitoring and Evaluating (M&E) the Colorado River Salinity Control Program*" was adopted in 2001. Having established that properly installed and operated practices yield predictable and favorable results, the 2001 Framework Plan addresses hydro-salinity by:

- Utilizing random cooperator surveys to collect and evaluate cooperator understanding, and impressions concerning contracts and equipment
- Formal and informal Irrigation Water Management (IWM) training and encouragement
- Equipment spot checks and operational evaluations
- Agricultural statistics collected by government agencies

In MW, virtually all salinity program irrigation improvements are sprinkler systems. Center Pivot systems are preferred by three to one over wheel lines, on an acreage basis, presumably due to large average field size. The average contract size is 82 acres.

Cooperator questionnaires, interviews, and training sessions

No cooperator questionnaires have been completed in the Manila – Washam Unit. It is anticipated that it will take a few irrigation seasons for cooperators to become familiar with system operations before interviews would become practical.

Irrigation Water Management (IWM)

The goal of IWM is to assure that irrigated crops get the right amount of water at the right place at the right time, which will accomplish the goal of minimizing deep percolation and salt loading in the river. Proper IWM is achieved by careful equipment design, cooperator education, and maintenance resulting in implementation of effective water management techniques.

In general, sprinkler systems designed by NRCS are capable of irrigating the most water-consumptive projected crop in the hottest part of the year. When growing crops with lower water needs, or at other times in the growing season, these systems are capable of over-irrigating, to some extent.

Crops generally use water before irrigation begins and after irrigation ends, leaving the soil moisture profile partially depleted. Filling the soil with water requires additional irrigation, over and above crop needs, in the spring, to fill the soil profile.

Preventing over-irrigation is a contractual obligation of the cooperator. To help cooperators fulfill this obligation they must be educated and coached in the proper use and maintenance of their irrigation systems.

This is achieved by creating financial incentives for IWM, initial IWM training sessions, periodic water conferences, and developing IWM tools that simplify record keeping and help cooperators properly

time irrigation cycles. Incentive IWM payments have resulted in greater interest in keeping records and understanding soil/water relationships.

Water management seminars and conventions are sponsored by various government, educational, and commercial groups, encouraging everyone to manage and conserve water. NRCS is a willing and eager participant in these partnership educational endeavors.

Additionally, personal guidance is available to cooperators, on request, at local NRCS field offices.

Intensive and continuous IWM training is essential to successful, long term salt load reduction.

To help cooperators with irrigation timing, a major part of IWM, NRCS demonstrates two simple, low-cost approaches:

1. Irrigation record keeping, wherein the cooperator keeps track of water put on the field and compares the volume used to the volume required by the crop
2. Soil moisture monitoring, wherein the cooperator determines when to irrigate, based on measured available water content (AWC) of the soil

Irrigation Record Keeping

To help with irrigation timing, NRCS has developed and provided the, "IWM Self Certification Spreadsheet" which allows cooperators to graphically evaluate available water content (AWC) of the soil and compare actual irrigation with projected average crop water requirements and/or with modeled crop evapotranspiration. Evapotranspiration is calculated from climate data collected by NRCS and other public agencies, using Penman-Montieth procedures outlined by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO).

The spreadsheet contains an input form used to enter system design data, location, crop data, soil data, and the date when each irrigation cycle begins. AWC and deep percolation are calculated and transferred to the graph portion of the spreadsheet. (Figures 8 and 9)

In order to receive incentive payment for IWM, each irrigator must do the following:

1. attend a two hour IWM training session or a water conference or have one-on-one training in his own field
2. with help, augur a hole and determine the soil moisture by the feel method
3. present irrigation records to the local field office, where data is entered into the spreadsheet and results are calculated, graphed, and discussed. Graphs are printed for the farmer's reference

In general, cooperators respond positively to this training and work hard to irrigate more efficiently.

From FY2008 to FY2013, 71 IWM Self Certification Spreadsheets, representing 2,707 acres, were submitted for payment. Ten projects were deep percolating excessively. Total deep percolation from

all 71 fields was about 52% of design deep percolation, suggesting that salt load reduction estimates are conservative.

Irrigation Water Use Record - Farmer Self Certification

Cooperator:		**Crop:**	Grass Hay/Pasture	**Year:**	2010
Tract/Field:		**Root Depth, ft:**	2.50		
Date:	02/02/11	**Station:**	Manila	**CU:**	24 inches

Soil Texture:	Loam	**Irrigation method:**	Pivot
AWC, In/Ft:	2.16	**Efficiency:**	75%
AWC Max, in:	5.40	**Acres:**	69.74
MAD, in:	2.70	**Evaporation %:**	10%
Pre-season AWC, In.	2.70	**Cycle Hours:**	168
		Flow rate, gpm:	450

Start date of irrigation cycle	End date of irrigation	Total Cycle Hours	Alternate Cycle Hours	Flow, gpm	Inches Applied Cycle	Inches Applied Season	CU Season (Table)	Irrigation Balance	AWC	Deep Perc
05/18/10	05/25/10	168		450.2	2.42	2.42	3.27	-1.09	1.61	0.00
05/25/10	06/01/10	168		450.2	2.42	4.84	4.06	1.39	3.00	0.00
06/01/10	06/08/10	168		450.2	2.42	7.26	5.10	1.13	4.13	0.00
06/08/10	06/15/10	168		450.2	2.42	9.68	6.15	1.13	5.26	0.00
06/19/10	06/26/10	168		450.2	2.42	12.10	7.79	0.54	5.40	0.40
06/30/10	07/07/10	168		450.2	2.42	14.52	9.68	0.29	5.40	0.29
07/11/10	07/18/10	168		450.2	2.42	16.94	11.71	0.15	5.40	0.15
07/22/10	07/29/10	168		450.2	2.42	19.37	13.73	0.15	5.40	0.15
08/02/10	08/09/10	168		450.2	2.42	21.79	15.69	0.23	5.40	0.23
08/13/10	08/20/10	168		450.2	2.42	24.21	17.62	0.24	5.40	0.24
08/24/10	08/31/10	168		450.2	2.42	26.63	19.56	0.24	5.40	0.24
09/04/10	09/11/10	168		450.2	2.42	29.05	21.02	0.72	5.40	0.72
09/15/10	09/22/10	168		450.2	2.42	31.47	22.48	0.72	5.40	0.72
Total inches of water applied during the season (total of all lines above):								31.47		3.14
Total Acre Feet Applied during the Season:								182.9		
Seasonal Irrigation Efficiency (CU requirement/inches of water applied per acre):								71%		

Figure 8. IWM Self Certification Spreadsheet input page





Figure 9. Sample graphs from the IWM Self Certification Spreadsheet

In the first graph, the blue line represents AWC, which should be maintained in the Managed Allowable Depletion (MAD) range of 50 to 100% for maximum crop growth. Red peaks above the 100% line indicate deep percolation. In the second graph, the blue line is a long-term average water requirement, based on location and crop. The red line is the actual water applied. Where data is available, the purple line is modeled from current local data collected at a nearby weather station.

Soil Moisture Monitoring

A time-tested method for timing irrigation involves auguring a hole to determine the water content of the soil in order to decide when to apply the next irrigation. This may well be the best method available for irrigation timing, both simple and inexpensive. However, few irrigators take time to do it.

Figure 10. Sample Soil Moisture Data Logger with graph

NRCS is demonstrating and guiding participants in the use of modern soil moisture monitoring systems, utilizing concentric electrical-resistance sensors and data recorders. Such systems can now be installed for about $700, giving the cooperator information on the water content of their soil at several different depths, without time-consuming auguring.

In a typical case, sensors are installed at various depths, such as 12", 24" and 48". Using a simple data recorder, indicated soil pore pressure (implied soil moisture content) is read and recorded multiple times per day. With some recorders, soil pore pressure is presented graphically on an LCD display in the field, making it a simple matter to estimate when the next irrigation will be required (figure 10).

Since gravimetric drainage generally does not occur unless the soil horizon is nearly saturated (above field capacity), it is assumed that deep percolation is not occurring if the deepest probe reading is below -10 centibars.

Soil moisture data recorders typically store 10 months of data or more in nonvolatile memory and can be downloaded using a laptop computer or PDA. Battery life is over a year, using AA or 9 volt batteries. When carefully installed, maintenance requirements are minimal.

Available water content (AWC), the soil moisture available to the plant, can be roughly estimated, using multiple probes. The AWC calculation is dependent on many soil and environmental parameters and is tedious to model accurately, but when an operator becomes familiar with the system, he will be able to use it well for irrigation timing. (Figure 11)

In the Manila – Washam Unit, four data recorders were purchased and installed by Daggett Soil Conservation District members.

In the NRCS payment schedule, an additional IWM Intense (449) practice is included that increases the IWM payment for participants who agree to install soil moisture monitoring equipment in addition to taking classes, attending workshops, and keeping records. It is hoped that future contracts will capitalize on this opportunity to enhance instrumentation and IWM interest at the field level.



Figure 11. AWC estimated from downloaded soil moisture data

USGS Water Quality Monitoring

US Geological Survey (USGS) studied salt loading from the Manila-Washam Salinity Area (MW) from July 1, 2004 to June 30, 2005. From this data they prepared **SCIENTIFIC INVESTIGATIONS REPORT 2004-05, ENTITLED "CHARACTERIZATION OF DISSOLVED SOLIDS IN WATER RESOURCES OF AGRICULTURAL LANDS NEAR MANILA, UTAH, 2004-2005"**. The amended final report estimated the total agricultural salt loading to be 31,200 tons/year. Of the 31,200 tons/year, NRCS estimates that 8,600 tons/year has been eliminated due to the installation of sprinkler systems.

Because MW is small in size, isolated, and with well-defined water sources and drains, USGS continued to monitor the discharge of dissolved salts into Flaming Gorge Reservoir through the end of 2011. Provisional data provided from USGS by email, is enigmatic. Data indicates that salt loading initially dropped by nearly half but has steadily increased since the first year of practice installations. We can speculate that the initial drop was due to irrigation interruptions while sprinklers were being installed. As irrigation came back on line, salt loading increased, but never to the levels of 2004-2005. Weather may have also influenced salt loading.

USGS has indicated that Birch Springs Draw carries about 80% of the total runoff into Flaming Gorge Reservoir. NRCS plans to install a flume on Birch Springs Draw, to continuously monitor flow into Flaming Gorge Reservoir. The installation should be completed in mid-2014.



Figure 12. USGS Salt Load Monitoring (provisional)

Applied on-farm practices through April, 2011 should have reduced salt loading by about 7,100 tons/year. USGS provisional data indicates that salt loading for the 12 months from May, 2004 to April, 2005 was about 38,500 tons. For May, 2010 to April 2011, the provisional load was about 25,800 tons, fitting nicely with a 7,100 ton decrease since project inception. (Figure 12)

SPARROW

In 2009, USGS issued **SCIENTIFIC INVESTIGATIONS REPORT 2009-5007, "SPATIALLY REFERENCED STATISTICAL ASSESSMENT OF DISSOLVED-SOLIDS LOAD SOURCES AND TRANSPORT IN STREAMS OF THE UPPER COLORADO RIVER BASIN"** (SPARROW91), which models salt loading throughout the Upper Colorado River Basin. This model is based on water and climate data from 1991.

Adjustment factors have been established to make the data more relevant to long term averages as opposed to the most data rich year, 1991. The most current adjustment factors are signified as Anning 2.2. The Anning 2.2 adjusted SPARROW model estimates the total average pre-project on-farm and off-farm agricultural salt load in MW to be 18,000 tons/year with a potential margin of error of ±51%. By comparison, the 2006 EA estimated a total agricultural load of 31,200 tons/year.

Wildlife Habitat and Wetlands

Background

In February, 2007, the Manila-Washam project was recognized as a Colorado River Basin Salinity Control Program (CRBSCP) Salinity Area. Salinity irrigation and wildlife habitat development plans are eligible to compete for funds allocated to the CRBSCP. Impacts, from this project, to wildlife habitat and wetlands will be monitored and evaluated and subsequently replaced. Replacement is accomplished on a voluntary basis by private landowners through applications for funding from the Environmental Quality Incentives Program (EQIP). Impacts may include loss of wildlife habitat and wetlands, conversion of wetland habitats to upland areas such as agricultural fields, or other vegetation changes brought about by the more efficient use of irrigation water.

In the upper Colorado River Basins there are several Salinity Areas, each with its own unique methodology for monitoring and evaluating impacts and replacement of wildlife habitat and wetlands. The Manila-Washam, Salinity Unit is a relatively small project, and impacts may be observed from project inception. The Monitoring and Evaluation Team (M&E) monitors land cover maps utilizing aerial photography from the National Agricultural Image Program (NAIP). The NAIP images are one meter resolution, true color, or color-infrared aerial photos intended to be re-flown tri-annually. With these high resolution photos, M&E has the ability to zoom in close and create a reasonably accurate land cover map which can be verified with minimal ground truthing. These images can be compared through time to monitor land cover changes. By the use of Geographical Information System (GIS) software, estimates of gains or losses in wildlife habitat or wetlands can be quantified. Subsequent images may be utilized if technology advances and NAIP images are surpassed in quality.

Representative photographic points will also be established, to be compared throughout the years, to assist with land cover mapping efforts, defining vegetation composition of the land cover elements and what impacts, if any, are occurring.

The U.S. Forest Service (USFS) has created two wetland complexes west of Flaming Gorge reservoir. The Henry's Fork complex, located north of the Utah-Wyoming border, has a secure water right which may need to be more carefully managed in the event that irrigation improvements reduce the amount of excess run-off now being collected and channeled through this USFS property. The Linwood Pond complex, located south of the Utah-Wyoming border has no secure water right and could be impacted by reduced tail-water availability associated with irrigation improvements.

USFS has been encouraged to obtain more secure water rights for this wetland complex. As irrigation improvements are planned, NRCS cooperators will be encouraged to work with USFS to assure an adequate water supply for the complex.

These wetland complexes represent an important aspect of wildlife habitat found in the Manila-Washam Salinity Area. Many species of plants and animals are found in these areas and they are also used by many members of the public for recreation such as wildlife viewing. These wetlands are located on federal, public land and provide access to all people wishing to enjoy their natural resources.

M&E intends to work with USFS personnel and NRCS customers to help monitor the health of these systems, and provide input for solutions to the uncertain outcome of potential tail-water reduction.

In FY2009, Reclamation funded a project to pipe the Peoples Canal near the town of Manila. This project was completed in FY2010. Piping of this canal, and subsequent changes in irrigation practices (flood to sprinkler), may impact USFS constructed wetland complexes and other wetlands downstream from the development. Photographs of the areas below the canal were taken in late summer 2010, to attempt to capture changes (if any) in subsequent years. Changes will also be monitored using current and updated NAIP aerial photos. USFS wetlands are also being monitored by comparative photographs and plant species list comparisons, to determine if any impacts will be realized from the piping of the Peoples Canal and irrigation conversion.

Wildlife Habitat Monitoring

On November 27, 2012 NRCS received a response to a letter sent to Ms. Patricia S. Gelatt, Western Colorado Supervisor for the USFWS regarding proposed changes in the assessment method of wildlife replacement needed to offset incidental fish and wildlife values foregone resulting from salinity control projects in the State of Utah. The Service supported the proposal for minimum habitat improvement to be greater than 2 percent of irrigation acres treated for salinity control, and that wildlife habitat losses resulting from irrigation improvements will be replaced on a 1:1 acreage basis. The Service also stated that they agree that permanent easements would be preferred, but if not possible the habitat practice lifespan will be as long as, if not longer, than the lifespan of irrigation improvement practices (see Appendix).

NRCS Salinity wildlife projects are voluntary on the part of landowners. The federal government is committed to mitigate adverse effects of federal actions. Federal and State funding programs are in place to promote wildlife habitat replacement. NRCS is fully invested in outreach for applications for high quality wildlife-only projects on public or private lands, consistent with rules and regulations associated with EQIP. This information is advertised annually in local newspapers, in Local Workgroup meetings, and in Conservation District meetings throughout the Salinity Areas. The Utah NRCS Homepage also has information and deadlines relating to Farm Bill programs.

Through the end of FY2013, improved irrigation practices have been applied on 3,600 acres. In the same time, 9 acres of Habitat improvement has been applied or 0.25% of irrigation treatments. In the MW Salinity unit habitat replacements are not concurrent and proportional with salinity irrigation improvements. Efforts to plan and apply habitat replacement, to exceed the committed 2% level, will continue.

Wildlife Habitat Contract Monitoring

FY2013 is the seventh year MW Salinity Unit has been eligible for salinity funding. There were no Salinity Wildlife Only contracts planned and funded in FY2013, and no acres of upland habitat were applied. (Table 6)

Table 7 represents total cumulative acres of wildlife habitat improvement planned and applied in the MW Salinity Unit. Wildlife habitat improvement projects applied have all been sub-items included in irrigation projects. There have been some issues with timely application of these practices some resulting in program appeals. There have been several wildlife habitat only project applications received in the years since project eligibility, however, none have advanced toward funding obligation.

Table 6. Wildlife Habitat Replacement Planned and Applied in FY2013

Acres of Wildlife Habitat Creation or Enhancement				
FY2013 practices planned and applied				
Program	Acres Planned		Acres Applied	
	Wetland	Upland	Wetland	Upland
BSPP	-	-	-	-
BSPP	-	-	-	-
EQIP	-	-	-	-
WHIP	-	-	-	-
Total	-	-	-	-

Table 7. Cumulative Wildlife Habitat Replacement since Project Inception

Acres of Wildlife Habitat Creation or Enhancement				
Cumulative practices planned and applied				
Program	Acres Planned		Acres Applied	
	Wetland	Upland	Wetland	Upland
BSPP	-	-	-	-
BSP	-	-	-	-
EQIP	-	8	1	8
WHIP	-	-	-	-
Total	-	8	1	8

Economics

Cooperator Economics

It is logical to expect that upgrading from flood to sprinkler irrigation improves profitability by increasing production while decreasing costs for water, fertilizer, labor, and field maintenance. Irrigation system maintenance may increase somewhat, but should be less variable on an annual basis.

Production Information

Farming in the Manila area is principally related to livestock production. Crops are generally forage related and alfalfa production is a reasonable indicator of output. In the Manila – Washam Unit (Daggett County), alfalfa yields have been cyclical over the past thirty years. A linear regression on production indicates an uptrend, but it is difficult to relate that to the salinity program, started in 2007. (Figure 13)



Figure 13. Manila - Washam Unit alfalfa production and Mountain Precipitation

Expense Information

Reliable expense information is difficult to obtain. Many of the farms are family operations and the cost of family labor is rarely evaluated or reported. From National Agricultural Statistics Service (NASS) data, labor benefits are elusive as both *Hired Farm Labor* and *Total Farm Production Expenses* have increased steadily over the 1987, 1992, 1997, 2002, and 2007 Agricultural Censuses. County data from the 2012 Census of Agriculture will be available in May, 2014.

From the 2007 Census of Agriculture, 85% of farmers hire no outside labor and 62% have full-time occupations other than farming, it is assumed that most cooperators are satisfied with their personal labor savings.

Public Economics

No cooperator surveys have been completed in MW, but local farmers seem to have positive attitudes about the salinity program. Ninety-five percent of survey respondents, from other salinity areas, believe that salinity control programs have a positive economic effect on the area and region.

Positive public perceptions of the Salinity Control Program include:

- Reduced salinity in the Colorado River
- Lengthened irrigation season
- Increased flows in streams and rivers
- Economic lift to the entire community from employment and broadened tax base
- Aesthetically pleasing, green fields, denser, for longer periods of time

- Improved safety and control of water resources, with a reduction in open streams

Negative public perceptions of the Salinity Control Program include:

- Conversion of artificial wetlands to upland habitat and other shifts in wildlife habitat
- Changes in Water Related Land Use (WRLU)

Land Use Land Cover

Utah Division of Water Resources maintains a Water Related Land Use layer (WRLU), updated every six to eight years. Rapidly improving technology presumably leads to improved WRLU accuracy, but also makes comparison with past evaluations somewhat questionable. Improved irrigation should shift crops from pasture to forage hay, as indicated in the latest WRLU. (Figure 14)



	1992	2000	2006	2012
Riparian	71	2	238	199
Urban	633	520	1,137	1,275
Idle Agricultural	14	942	886	662
Pasture	2,681	3,762	5,104	1,001
Alfalfa/Hayland	5,448	4,603	4,239	8,191

Figure 14. Historical Water Related Land Use.

Summary

Local land owners are willing and able to participate in salinity control programs. At present funding levels, ample opportunities exist to install improved irrigation systems and reduce salt loading to the Colorado River system. Salinity programs in other areas indicate that participants are apparently satisfied with results and generally positive about salinity control programs.

Irrigation installation costs are escalating. Increased world energy prices have resulted in much higher costs for pipe, transportation, labor, and equipment. It can be assumed that the value of downstream damages will also be escalating due to energy impacts.

With labor, material, and equipment prices rising, it is expected that the cost/ton of salinity control measures will also increase. However, the FY2013 average planned cost of $39/ton does not approach

the cost of downstream damages from excess salt. Colorado River Basin Salinity Control Programs are successful and cost effective in reducing salt load in the Colorado River.

Glossary and Acronyms

Available Water Content (AWC) – Water contained in the soil that can be utilized by the plant, defined to be the difference between Field Capacity and Permanent Wilting Point, usually expressed as inches/foot.

Average salt pickup – The increase in the amount of salt carried by a stream as a result of inflows containing increased salt from dissolution of the soil. Usually expressed as tons/acre-foot.

Annual average salt load – The average estimated annual salt load carried by a stream, based on a period of record of several years. Usually expressed as tons/year.

Application efficiency – The portion of the irrigation water delivered to the field that is stored in the soil, expressed as a percentage of the total delivery volume.

Applied Practices – Functioning practices for which Federal cost share dollars have been expended.

BSPP – Basin States Parallel Program – managing LCRB matching funds from FY1997 to FY2012.

BSP – Basin States Program - managing LCRB matching funds starting in FY2012.

Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation or USBR) – A branch of the U.S. Department of Interior charged with water interests in the United States. Reclamation is the lead agency for salinity control in the Colorado River.

Catch-can testing – a procedure whereby dozens of containers are spread out under a sprinkler system in an array, to determine how much water is being applied to different spots of ground under the sprinkler to evaluate uniformity.

cfs – Cubic feet per second or second-feet.

Christiansen Coefficient of Uniformity (CCU) – a sprinkler uniformity rating. In a catch-can test, CU is the sum of the squares of the ratio of each catch to the average catch.

Continuous Move Sprinkler – a sprinkler system designed to move continuously, such as a center pivot, lateral move, or a big-gun on a reel.

Cover Map – a map categorizing land use based on surface cover, e.g. urban, crop type, wetlands, etc.

Crop Consumptive Use (CU) – The amount of water required by the crop for optimal production. It is dependent on many factors including altitude, temperature, wind, humidity, and solar radiation.

CRBSCP – Colorado River Basin Salinity Control Program

CRSC – Colorado River Salinity Control Program, a USDA funding program from FY1984 to FY1995.

Daubenmire cover class frame – An instrument used to quantify vegetation cover and species frequency occurrences within a sampling transect or plot.

Deep Percolation (DP) – The amount of irrigation water that percolates below the root zone of the crop, usually expressed in acre-feet.

Dissolved salt or Total Dissolved Solids (TDS) – The amount of cations and anions in a sample of water, usually expressed in milligrams/liter, but often expressed in Tons/Acre-foot for salinity control programs.

Distribution Uniformity (DU) – A measure of how evenly the irrigation water is applied to the field. If DU is poor, more water is needed to assure that the entire crop has an adequate supply. Using a catch can test, DU is the ratio of the low quarter average catch to the total average catch.

EQIP – Environmental Quality Improvement Program, FY1996 to present.

Evapotranspiration (ET) - The amount of water used by the crop. ET is generally synonymous with CU and is frequently mathematically modeled from weather station data.

Field Capacity (FC) – The total volume of water contained in the soil after gravimetric drainage has occurred. The soil pore pressure is 0 to -33 cb.

Financial Assistance (FA) – The Federal cost share of conservation practices. For USDA funding, FA is normally 60% of total cost of conservation practices.

Gated Pipe – Water delivery pipe with individual, evenly spaced gates to spread water evenly across the top of a field.

Gravimetric drainage – The volume of water that will drain from a saturated soil profile due to gravity alone.

Hand line – An irrigation system composed of separate joints of aluminum pipe, each with one sprinkler, designed to irrigate for a period of time and be moved to the next parallel strip of land.

Improved Flood – Increasing the efficiency of flood irrigation systems with control and measurement structures, corrugations, land-leveling, gated pipe, etc.

Irrigation Water Management (IWM) – Using practices and procedures to maximize water use efficiency by applying the right amount of water at the right place at the right time.

Leakage – Water loss from ditches and canals through fissures, cracks or other channels through the soil, either known or unknown.

Management Allowable Depletion (MAD) – The fraction of AWC that allows for maximum production. Typically 50%, only the top 50% of AWC should be used for crop growth.

National Agricultural Statistics Service (NASS) - A branch of the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) charged with keeping agricultural statistical data.

Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS) A branch of the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) charged with providing technical assistance to agricultural interests and programs.

NEPA – National Environmental Policy Act which sets out requirements for Federal Agencies to evaluate impacts of Federal projects on the environment, prior to initiating the project.

Periodic Move – A sprinkler system designed to irrigate in one position for a set amount of time, then periodically moved to a new position by hand or on wheels repeatedly until the field is covered. (includes sprinkler systems such as hand-line, wheel-line (side-roll), pod, big-gun, etc.)

Permanent Wilting Point (PWP) – The volume of water in a soil profile that cannot be extracted by the plant. Normally, watering a plant at this point will not restore its vitality. Soil pore pressure is about -1,500 cb at the PWP.

Pivot or Center Pivot – A sprinkler system that uses moving towers to rotate a sprinkler lateral about a pivot point.

Planned Practices – Practices for which Federal cost share dollars have been obligated by contract.

Pod – A periodic move sprinkler system consisting of several plastic pods at fixed spacing along a small-diameter (1.25-2.00”), flexible HDPE supply line. Each pod has a sprinkler and the operating lateral is typically moved by dragging it with a four-wheeler.

Ranking – A process by which applications for federal funds are prioritized based on their effectiveness in achieving Federal goals.

Readily Available Water (RAW) – water that a plant can easily extract from the soil. A synonym for Managed Allowable Depletion.

Return Flow – The fraction of deep percolation that is not consumed by plants, animals, or evaporation and returns to the river system, carrying salt.

Salt Budget – Balancing the inflow and outflows of a salinity project to estimate unknown salt pickup.

Salts – Any chemical compound that is dissolved from the soil and carried to the river system by water. Salt concentration is frequently expressed as “Total Dissolved Solids” measured in parts per million (ppm) or milligrams per liter (mg/l). For salinity control work, it is often converted to Tons per acre-foot of water.

Salt load – The amount of dissolved salt carried by a flowing stream, usually expressed in tons/year.

Seepage – Fairly uniform percolation of water into the soil from ditches and canals.

Salt Load Reduction – A measure of the annual tons of salt prevented from entering the waters of the Colorado River. As applied to agriculture, salt load reduction is achieved by reducing seepage and deep percolation from over-irrigating.

Soil Conservation Service – The predecessor agency to NRCS.

Technical Assistance (TA) – The cost of technical assistance provided by Federal Agencies to design, monitor, and evaluate practice installation and operation, and to train and consult with cooperators. TA is generally assumed to be 40% of the total cost of conservation practices in the salinity control program.

Uniformity – A mathematical expression representing how evenly water is applied to a plot of ground by a sprinkler system. The two most common measures used by NRCS are the Christiansen Coefficient of Uniformity (CCU) and Distribution Uniformity (DU).

Utah Division of Wildlife Resources (UDWR or DWR) – Managing division for wildlife resources in the State of Utah.

Water Budget – An accounting for the amount of water entering (irrigation and precipitation) and the amount of water leaving (evaporation, CU, deep percolation) a given plot of land to determine efficiency and estimate deep percolation.

Wheel line, Wheeline, Side-roll– A periodic-move sprinkler system designed to be moved periodically by rolling the sprinkler lateral on large wheels.

WHIP – Wildlife Habitat Incentives Program, a Farm bill program instituted in 1997, designed to create, restore, and enhance wildlife habitat. The Agricultural Act of 2014 (2014 Farm Bill) eliminated WHIP and made its functionality an integral part of EQIP.

Yield (or Crop Yield) – The amount of a given crop harvested annually from an acre of ground. Yield is usually expressed as Tons/Acre or Bushels/Acre, depending on the crop.

Appendix

United States Department of the Interior

FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE
Ecological Services
764 Horizon Drive, Building B
Grand Junction, Colorado 81506-3946

IN REPLY REFER TO:
ES/CO:NRCS Salinity Program Habitat Replacement
TAILS 06E24100-2013-CPA-0003

November 27, 2012

David C. Brown, Utah State Conservationist
Natural Resources Conservation Service
125 South State Street, Room 4010
Salt Lake City, Utah 84138-1100

Dear Mr. Brown:

This responds to your July 16, 2012, letter regarding the proposed changes in the assessment method of wildlife replacement needed to offset incidental fish and wildlife values foregone resulting from salinity control projects in the State of Utah. The Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) supports the proposal for minimum habitat improvement to be greater than 2 percent of irrigation acres treated for salinity control, and that wildlife habitat losses resulting from irrigation improvements will be replaced on a 1:1 acreage basis. We agree that permanent easements are preferred, but if not possible, that habitat practice lifespan will be as long or longer than the practice lifespan of irrigation improvements. This change is in line with Colorado Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS), and we trust that it will help the salinity program offset real habitat losses with real habitat improvements. We hope this change will allow NRCS biologists to focus their efforts on implementing quality habitat replacement projects with willing landowners.

The Service commends NRCS for the habitat replacements/improvements in both the Uintah Basin and Price San Rafael River Salinity Units, that are proportional and concurrent with salinity irrigation improvements, and exceed 2 percent of the irrigation improvements. We appreciate continuing efforts by NRCS field staff to pursue and implement new projects, as well as to monitor and evaluate ongoing and completed projects. Please let us know if there is any way we can assist NRCS in reaching the replacement needs associated with the Muddy Creek, Green River, and Manila-Washam Salinity Units.

For further assistance, please contact Barb Osmundson by phone at (970) 243-2778, extension 21, or by email at Barb_Osmundson@fws.gov.

Sincerely,

Patricia S. Gelatt
Western Colorado Supervisor

cc: NRCS-SLC Utah (Travis James, Pedro Ramos)
NRCS-Roosevelt Utah (Ed Whicker, Jim Spencer)

BOsmundson:NRCS\UtahWildlifeRepaacement\CommentLetter.docx:112712:KM

2

References

1. U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management, The Effects of Surface Disturbance on the Salinity of Public Lands in the Upper Colorado River Basin, 1977 Status Report, February, 1978.
2. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service, Plan and Environmental Assessment, Manila – Washam Project Area of the Colorado River Salinity Control Program, July, 2006.
3. "Salt Primer – Water and Salt Budgets", John C. Hedlund, Soil Conservation Service, 1992.
4. "FRAMEWORK PLAN FOR MONITORING AND EVALUATING THE COLORADO RIVER SALINITY CONTROLL PROGRAMS of the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA)-Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS)", May, 2002.
5. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service, "Calculating Salt Load Reduction", internal memo, July 30, 2007, Frank Riggle, Colorado State Agronomist and Ed Whicker, Utah M&E Engineer.
6. "QUALITY OF WATER COLORADO RIVER BASIN – Progress Report #20", U.S. Department of the Interior, 2001.
7. "Colorado River Salinity Control Program, Uintah Basin Unit, Monitoring and Evaluation, 2001 Report", Draper, Brent W., Goins, Donald J., Lundstrom, D. Nick.
8. "Colorado River Salinity Control Program, Uintah Basin Unit, Monitoring and Evaluation, 2005 Report", USDA-NRCS.
9. 1987, 1992, 1997, 2002, 2007 "Census of Agriculture", United Stated Department of Agriculture, National Agricultural Statistics Service.
10. U.S. Department of the Interior, US Geological Survey, Scientific Investigations Report 2006-5211, entitled "Characterization of Dissolved Solids in Water Resources of Agricultural Lands near Manila, Utah, 2004-2005", Gerner, Steve etal., http://pubs.usgs.gov/sir/2006/5211/.
11. U.S. Department of the Interior, US Geological Survey, Results of Water-Quality Monitoring during May 2007—May 2008 in Selected Sub-basins near Manila, Utah to Evaluate the Effect of Irrigation Improvements on Dissolved Solids Loads Discharged to Flaming Gorge Reservoir, Gerner, Steve etal.
12. U.S. Department of the Interior, US Geological Survey, Spatially Referenced Statistical Assessment of Dissolved-Solids Load Sources and Transport in Streams of the Upper Colorado River Basin, Scientific Investigations Report 2009-5007, http://pubs.usgs.gov/sir/2009/5007/.
13. Allen, Richard G. etal., FAO Irrigation and Drainage Paper No. 56, Crop Evapotranspiration, http://www.fao.org/docrep/X0490E/X0490E00.htm.