

# Colorado River Basin Salinity Control Program

## Manila - Washam Unit

Monitoring and Evaluation Report, FY2014



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](http://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, audiotope, etc.) should contact USDA's TARGET Center at (202)720-2600 (voice and TDD).

## Project Synopsis

The Salinity Control Act (PL-93-320) (SCA) and subsequent related legislation authorizes the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA), acting through the Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS), to implement salinity control throughout the Colorado River Basin. The NRCS' Manila-Washam Salinity Control Unit (MW), on the north slope of the Uinta Mountains, encompasses 11,100 agricultural acres irrigated with water diverted from tributaries to Flaming Gorge Reservoir in Daggett County, Utah. The irrigated portion of the area, approximately 20 miles east to west and 8 miles north to south, is a source of dissolved solids from Tertiary lacustrine deposits on the south side and Cretaceous marine deposits to the north. The pre-project agricultural salt load was estimated to be 27,000 ton/year, on-farm. Water, diverted to irrigate cropland and pasture, deep percolates through saline sediment, dissolving and transporting salts to the river system. MW was established by a 2006 Environmental Assessment (EA) and Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI). USDA first funded salinity control projects in FY2007. Salt load reduction is achieved by improving irrigation efficiency and reducing deep percolation. The 2006 EA anticipated treating 7,780 acres, controlling 18,000 tons/year of salt at a cost of \$92/ton (2014 dollars). Through the end of FY2014, USDA has funded treatment of 3,700 acres controlling 8,900 tons/year, on-farm (48% of EIS projection). Of the original 11,100 irrigated acres, 6,900 acres or 62% have not been planned for irrigation improvements. As prescribed by the Salinity Control Act, impacts to wildlife habitat foregone resulting from salinity control implementation, are assessed to assure that replacement of habitat is "concurrent and proportional" to installation of salinity control measures. With concurrence from U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, habitat replacement acreage is to exceed two percent of improved irrigation acreage, or 75 acres through FY2014. Actual habitat replacement in MW is about 8 acres, or 0.2% of improved irrigation acres. NRCS is actively seeking additional habitat replacement opportunities. Additional potential for additional salt control remains. NRCS continues to use its resources to implement salt control consistent with its authorities and resources.

## Executive Summary

### Project Status

**TREATED ACRES:** Of 11,100 irrigated acres, 7,780 acres are projected to be improved. Since 2007, treatments on 4,248 acres have been planned and 3,741 acres applied. In FY2014, 137 acres were planned and 145 acres applied.

**ON-FARM SALT LOAD REDUCTION:** Of approximately 27,000 original on-farm tons/year of salt load, 9,412 tons/year salt load control has been planned and 8,942 tons/year has been applied, calculated using procedures revised in 2007. In FY2014, 334 tons/year were planned and 343 tons/year applied on-farm.

**PLANNED OBLIGATIONS:** For FY2014, NRCS obligated \$175,000 in financial assistance (FA). Cumulative obligations total \$5.49 million FA nominal (\$7.15 million 2014 dollars).

**APPLIED EXPENDITURES:** For FY2014, NRCS expended \$144,000, FA. Cumulative expenditures total \$4.54 million FA nominal (\$5.55 million 2014 dollars).

**COST/TON:** Planned salt load reduction cost for FY2014 contracts is \$53/ton, FA+TA. The cumulative cost is \$87/ton, FA+TA (2014 dollars) for planned practices. For practices applied in FY2014 the cost is \$43/ton FA+TA, with a cost of \$70/ton FA+TA (2014 dollars), for cumulative applied practices.

**NEPA PROJECTED COST/TON:** In 2014 dollars, pre-project NEPA documents anticipated salt load reduction costs of \$93/ton. Cumulative planned cost is \$87/ton, and cumulative applied cost is \$70/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 FY2014. No wildlife habitat replacement was applied in FY2014.
- To be concurrent and proportional with installation of the salinity control measures, 75 acres of wildlife habitat would need to be applied. Actual habitat replacement in MW Unit is about 8 acres, or 0.2% of improved irrigation acres.

### 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, FY2014 Program Summary				
CONTRACTS PLANNED	UNITS	CURRENT FY	CUMULATIVE	TARGET
<b>1. CONTRACT STATUS</b>				
<b>A. Contracts Approved</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>52</b>	
	<b>Dollars</b>	<b>\$175,497</b>	<b>\$5,486,605</b>	
	<b>Acres</b>	<b>137</b>	<b>4,248</b>	<b>7,780</b>
	<b>On-farm Tons/Year</b>	<b>334</b>	<b>9,412</b>	<b>18,000</b>
	<b>Off-farm Tons/Year</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	
<b>B. Active Contracts</b>	<b>Number</b>		<b>22</b>	
	<b>Dollars</b>		<b>\$1,339,572</b>	
	<b>Acres</b>		<b>1,289</b>	
	<b>On-farm Tons/Year</b>		<b>3,043</b>	
	<b>Off-farm Tons/Year</b>		<b>-</b>	
<b>PRACTICES APPLIED</b>				
UNITS	CURRENT FY	CUMULATIVE	TARGET	
<b>2. EXPENDITURES</b>				
<b>Financial Assistance (FA)</b>	<b>Dollars</b>	<b>\$144,365</b>	<b>\$4,543,918</b>	
<b>3. IRRIGATION SYSTEMS</b>				
<b>A. Sprinkler</b>	<b>Acres</b>	<b>145</b>	<b>3,737</b>	<b>7,780</b>
<b>B. Improved Surface System</b>	<b>Acres</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	
<b>C. Drip System</b>	<b>Acres</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>4</b>	
<b>4. SALT LOAD REDUCTION</b>				
<b>A. Salt load reduction, on-farm</b>	<b>Tons/Year</b>	<b>343</b>	<b>8,942</b>	<b>18,000</b>
<b>B. Salt load reduction, off-farm</b>	<b>Tons/Year</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	
*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  
 815 South 400 West  
 Roosevelt, UT 84066  
 (435)722-4621 ext 128  
[jim.spencer@ut.usda.gov](mailto:jim.spencer@ut.usda.gov)

Ed Whicker, Civil Engineer  
 USDA-NRCS  
 815 South 400 West  
 Roosevelt, UT 84066  
 (435)722-4621 ext 124  
[ed.whicker@ut.usda.gov](mailto:ed.whicker@ut.usda.gov)

# Table of Contents

<i>Project Synopsis</i>	3
<i>Executive Summary</i>	4
<b>Project Status</b>	4
<b>Wildlife Habitat and Wetlands</b>	4
<b>Economics</b>	4
<i>Table of Contents</i>	6
<i>Tables</i>	8
<i>Figures</i>	8
<i>Historical Background</i>	9
<i>Monitoring and Evaluation History and Background</i>	10
<i>Project Status</i>	11
<b>FY2014 Project Results</b>	11
<b>Cumulative Project Results</b>	11
<i>Detailed Progress Analysis</i>	11
<b>Pre-Project Salt Loading</b>	11
<b>Salinity Control Practices</b>	12
<b>Planning Documents</b>	12
<b>Planned Practices</b>	12
Salt Load Reduction Calculation	12
Cost/Ton Calculation	13
FY2014 Obligation Analysis	13
Cost-Share Enhancement	13
<b>Applied Practices</b>	14
FY2014 Expenditures	14

<b><i>Hydro Salinity Monitoring</i></b> _____	<b>16</b>
<b>Salinity Monitoring Methods</b> _____	<b>17</b>
<b>Cooperator questionnaires, interviews, and training sessions</b> _____	<b>17</b>
<b>Irrigation Water Management (IWM)</b> _____	<b>17</b>
Irrigation Record Keeping _____	18
Soil Moisture Monitoring _____	21
USGS Water Quality Monitoring _____	22
SPARROW _____	23
<b><i>Wildlife Habitat and Wetlands</i></b> _____	<b>24</b>
<b>Background</b> _____	<b>24</b>
<b>Wildlife Habitat Monitoring</b> _____	<b>25</b>
<b>Wildlife Habitat Contract Monitoring</b> _____	<b>26</b>
<b>Voluntary Habitat Replacement</b> _____	<b>26</b>
<b><i>Economics</i></b> _____	<b>27</b>
<b>Cooperator Economics</b> _____	<b>27</b>
Production Information _____	27
Expense Information _____	28
<b>Public Economics</b> _____	<b>28</b>
<b>Water Related Land Use</b> _____	<b>29</b>
<b>Summary</b> _____	<b>29</b>
<b>Glossary and Acronyms</b> _____	<b>30</b>
<b><i>Appendix</i></b> _____	<b>34</b>
<b><i>References</i></b> _____	<b>36</b>

## Tables

Table 1. Project Progress Summary	5
Table 2. FY2014 results	11
Table 3. Project goals and cumulative status	11
Table 4. Planned practices, cost/ton, nominal and 2014 dollars	13
Table 5. Applied practices, cost/ton, nominal and 2014 dollars	15
Table 6. Wildlife Habitat Replacement Planned and Applied in FY2014	26
Table 7. Cumulative Wildlife Habitat Replacement since Project Inception	26

## Figures

Figure 1. Consensus pre-project salt load allocation	11
Figure 2. Cost of Contract Enhancement	14
Figure 3. Acres planned by contract type	14
Figure 4. Planned and applied acres	15
Figure 5. Planned and unplanned acres	15
Figure 6. Cost/ton, planned, applied, projected	15
Figure 7. Treated and untreated acres.	16
Figure 8. IWM Self Certification Spreadsheet input page	19
Figure 9. Sample graphs from the IWM Self Certification Spreadsheet	20
Figure 10. Sample Soil Moisture Data Logger with graph	21
Figure 11. AWC estimated from downloaded soil moisture data	22
Figure 12. USGS Salt Load Monitoring (provisional)	23
Figure 13. MW % of Operators with non-ag, full-time Professions	27
Figure 14. Manila - Washam Unit alfalfa production and Mountain Precipitation	28
Figure 15. Historical Water Related Land Use.	29

## Historical Background

With settlement of the Colorado River Basin, demands on the Colorado River grew rapidly. In the late 1800s and early 1900s, scores 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 driven by the EPA.

In 1973 the Colorado River Basin Salinity Control Forum (Forum) was created 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 entities. 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 (SCA) authorized federal funding of salinity control projects to manage salinity in the Colorado River. The SCA also created a Federal Advisory Committee (FAC) which has been traditionally been populated by the same people as the Forum.

Federal funding of salinity control practices began about 1980 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

### FY2014 Project Results

FY2014 project results for the Manila-Washam Unit (MW) are summarized in table 2.

### Cumulative Project Results

Cumulative cost/ton through FY2014 is below the cost of \$93/ton (2014 dollars) anticipated by the EA. (Table 3)

**Table 2. FY2014 results**

FY2014	Units	Planned	Applied
Irrigation Improvements	acres	137	145
Federal cost share, FA	\$	\$175,000	\$144,000
Amortized federal cost share, FA+TA	\$/year	\$17,700	\$14,600
Salt load reduction	tons/year	334	340
Federal cost, FA+TA	\$/ton	\$53	\$43

**Table 3. Project goals and cumulative status**


FY2014 Cumulative Improvements	Units	NEPA	Planned	Applied
Irrigation improvements	acres	7,780	4,248	3,741
Federal cost share, FA	2014\$	\$14,000,000	\$7,150,000	\$5,550,000
Amortized federal cost share, FA+TA	2014\$/yr	\$1,676,000	\$821,400	\$626,400
Salt load reduction, tons/year	tons/year	18,000	9,412	8,942
Federal cost/ton, FA+TA	2014\$	\$93	\$87	\$70

## 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 agreed 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 outlined 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 pipe the Cedar Hollow and South Valley Canals. Construction of the Cedar Hollow pipeline is complete. The South Valley Pipeline is under construction with completion expected in spring 2015.

## 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 FY2014 planned practices is 334 tons/year, calculated by multiplying the original tons/acre for the entire basin, by the acres to be treated and an average

percentage reduction based on change in irrigation practice (84% for periodic move, 91% for continuous 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 (3.500% in FY2014). 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 outreach, contract administration, project design, 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 enigmatic.

Normalization to 2014 dollars is based on the Producer Price Index (PPI) for agricultural equipment purchased, maintained by the National Agricultural Statistics Service (NASS).

**FY2014 Obligation Analysis**

In FY2014, \$175,000 was obligated to treat 137 acres, reducing salt loading by 334 tons/year. The resulting cost is \$53/ton.

In 2014 dollars, cumulative obligation thru FY2014 is \$7.15 million FA, planned on 4,248 acres, with a salt load reduction of 9,412 tons/year, resulting in an overall cost of \$87/ton. (Table 4)

**Table 4. Planned practices, cost/ton, nominal and 2014 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	2014 PPI Factor	FA Planned 2014\$	Amortized FA+TA 2014\$	\$/ton 2014\$	Cum \$/ton 2014\$
2007	4.875%	17	\$2,596,059	1,835	3,609	\$303,160	\$84	141%	\$3,647,627	\$425,959	\$118	\$118
2008	4.875%	9	\$802,932	708	1,700	\$93,764	\$55	123%	\$990,283	\$115,642	\$68	\$102
2009	4.625%	10	\$1,121,501	829	2,004	\$127,682	\$64	128%	\$1,430,881	\$162,904	\$81	\$96
2010	4.375%	6	\$424,759	406	973	\$47,130	\$48	123%	\$523,869	\$58,127	\$60	\$92
2011	4.125%	2	\$36,872	32	72	\$3,986	\$55	111%	\$40,928	\$4,424	\$61	\$92
2012	4.000%	3	\$238,618	201	481	\$25,457	\$53	105%	\$249,874	\$26,658	\$55	\$90
2013	3.750%	3	\$90,367	100	239	\$9,388	\$39	106%	\$95,531	\$9,924	\$42	\$89
2014	3.500%	2	\$175,497	137	334	\$17,747	\$53	100%	\$175,497	\$17,747	\$53	\$87
Totals		52	\$5,486,605	4,248	9,412	\$628,313	\$67		\$7,154,489	\$821,386	\$87	

**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, 2008, and 2014 Farm Bills is cost-share enhancement, increasing the approximate federal cost-share to about 90% of total cost for limited resource, beginning, or socially disadvantaged farmers or ranchers.

Cumulatively in MW, 19 contracts on 791 acres for \$1.62 million (2014 dollars) are cost-share enhanced. Estimated salt load reduction is 1,858 tons/year. The average enhanced salt load reduction

cost is \$101/ton FA+TA (2014 dollars), compared to \$87/ton for all contracts and \$83/ton for unenhanced contracts. (Figure 2)

The incremental cost of enhancement is \$265,000 FA (2014 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)

## Applied Practices

### FY2014 Expenditures

In FY2014, \$144,000 FA was expended applying practices to 145 irrigated acres. The estimated salt load reduction is 343 tons/year, at an amortized cost of \$43/ton FA+TA.

Cumulative expenditure FY2007-FY2014 is \$5.55 million FA (2014 dollars), applied to 3,741 irrigated acres, reducing salt loading by 8,942 tons/year at a cost of \$70/ton FA+TA (2014 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)

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.

About 7,780 acres were expected to be treated by the environmental assessment (EA). Four thousand, fifty have been planned for treatment. Six thousand, eight hundred, and sixty original irrigated acres (62%) have had no plans made. (Figure 5)

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




Figure 2. Cost of Contract Enhancement






Figure 3. Acres planned by contract type

**Table 5. Applied practices, cost/ton, nominal and 2014 dollars**


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 2014\$	Amortized FA+TA 2014\$	\$/ton 2014\$	Cum \$/ton 2014\$
2007	4.875%	\$32,363	32	72	\$3,779	52	141%	\$45,472	\$5,310	74	74
2008	4.875%	\$1,068,816	857	2,046	\$124,813	61	123%	\$1,318,206	\$153,936	75	75
2009	4.625%	\$1,832,775	1,566	3,764	\$208,660	55	128%	\$2,338,368	\$266,221	71	72
2010	4.375%	\$780,211	499	1,198	\$86,570	72	123%	\$962,260	\$106,769	89	75
2011	4.125%	\$403,838	366	873	\$43,655	50	111%	\$448,260	\$48,457	56	73
2012	4.000%	\$89,947	84	189	\$9,596	51	105%	\$94,190	\$10,049	53	73
2013	3.750%	\$191,603	191	457	\$19,905	44	106%	\$202,552	\$21,042	46	71
2014	3.500%	\$144,365	145	343	\$14,599	43	100%	\$144,365	\$14,599	43	70
<b>Totals</b>		<b>\$4,543,918</b>	<b>3,741</b>	<b>8,942</b>	<b>\$511,577</b>	<b>57</b>		<b>\$5,553,674</b>	<b>\$626,383</b>	<b>70</b>	




**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.

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.

Cooperator interest is enhanced by creating financial incentives for IWM. In FY2014, three practice options were available for IWM,

1. Basic IWM, which requires the cooperator to

- a. Attend a two hour IWM training session, an approved water conference, or receive one-on-one training on their farm
  - b. Keep detailed irrigation records using the IWM Self-Certification Spreadsheet or another irrigation water accounting system (check book method)
  - c. Review the records with an NRCS employee or contractor trained to evaluate and explain IWM principals
2. Intermediate IWM, which requires everything in Basic IWM plus installation and use of simple electronic soil moisture monitoring equipment.
  3. Advanced IWM, which requires everything in Basic and Intermediate IWM plus real-time estimating evapotranspiration, monitoring soil moisture, or monitoring crop temperature stress using telemetered data. Irrigation water volumes are recorded from a flow meter near the field.

Most operators are keenly interested in learning to understand IWM principals and operate their irrigation systems professionally, and profitably.

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.

Personal technical assistance is available to cooperators, on request, at local NRCS field offices.

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 (check book method)
2. Soil moisture monitoring, wherein the cooperator determines when to irrigate, based on directly 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 IWM spec sheet used to enter system design data, location, soil data, and crop data. An irrigation record sheet is used to record the date when each irrigation cycle begins. (Figure 8) AWC and deep percolation are calculated and transferred to the graph portion of the spreadsheet. (Figure 9)





**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. 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 green line is the actual water applied. The gray line represents normal deep percolation. The solid red line is calculated deep percolation. The dashed red line is the minimum deep percolation required to prevent soil salt build up.

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

From FY2008 to FY2014, 73 IWM Self Certification Spreadsheets, representing 2,717 acres, were submitted for payment. Twelve projects were deep percolating excessively. Total deep percolation from all 73 fields was about 53% of design deep percolation, suggesting that salt load reduction estimates are conservative.

### Soil Moisture Monitoring

A time-tested method for timing irrigation involves auguring a hole to determine the available water content in 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 augur the hole.

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 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 profile 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 more than 10 months of data in nonvolatile memory. The soil moisture data can be downloaded to 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)



**Figure 10. Sample Soil Moisture Data Logger with graph**

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

In the NRCS payment schedule, intermediate and advanced IWM (449) practices include increased payments to participants who install soil moisture monitoring equipment in addition to taking classes, attending workshops, and keeping records.




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 8,900 tons/year has been controlled due to installation of sprinkler systems.

USGS continued to monitor the discharge of dissolved salts into Flaming Gorge Reservoir through the end of 2011. Because MW is small in size, isolated, and with well-defined water sources and drains, it is

hoped that additional evaluation will support the science of salt loading. Provisional data provided from USGS by email, is enigmatic. Data indicates that salt loading initially dropped by nearly half but steadily increased after 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.




Figure 12. USGS Salt Load Monitoring (provisional)

USGS has indicated that about 60% of total WM salt load into Flaming Gorge Reservoir is transported in Birch Springs Draw. Funded by BSP, NRCS has installed a flume in Birch Springs Draw, to continuously monitor flow and salt load into Flaming Gorge Reservoir. The installation was completed in September 2014.

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 denoted 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  $\pm 51\%$ . By comparison, the 2006 EA estimated a total agricultural load of 31,200 tons/year.

USGS is in the process of updating the SPARROW model to better reflect temporally averaged salt loads for the Upper Colorado River Basin, including MW.

## 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 Basin 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).

Through the end of FY2014, improved irrigation practices have been applied on 3741 acres. In the same time, 8 acres of habitat improvement has been applied or 0.2% of irrigation treatments. In the MW Salinity Unit, habitat replacements are not concurrent and proportional with salinity irrigation improvements. For the MW Unit to be concurrent and proportional 75 acres of wildlife habitat replacement will need to be applied. Efforts to plan and apply habitat replacement, to exceed the committed 2% level, will continue.

### Wildlife Habitat Contract Monitoring

FY2014 is the eighth year MW Salinity Unit has been eligible for salinity funding. There were no Salinity Wildlife Only contracts planned and funded in FY2014, and no acres of wildlife 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 Salinity Wildlife Only project applications received in the years since project eligibility, however, none have advanced toward funding obligation.

### Voluntary Habitat Replacement

NRCS continues to encourage replacement of wildlife habitat on a voluntary basis. Federal and State funding programs are in place to promote wildlife habitat replacement. This information is advertised annually in local newspapers, in Local Workgroup meetings, and Conservation District meetings throughout the Salinity Areas. The [Utah NRCS Homepage](#) also has information and deadlines relating to Farm Bill programs.

**Table 6. Wildlife Habitat Replacement Planned and Applied in FY2014**

Acres of Wildlife Habitat Creation or Enhancement				
FY2014 practices planned and applied				
Program	Acres Planned		Acres Applied	
	Wetland	Upland	Wetland	Upland
BSP	-	-	-	-
BSP	-	-	-	-
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
BSP	-	-	-	-
BSP	-	-	-	-
EQIP	-	-	-	8
WHIP	-	-	-	-
Total	-	-	-	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.

From the 2012 Census of Agriculture (census), the average age of the principle operator in Daggett County is 57.1 years.


The number of principal operators with full time professions outside of agriculture is increasing. (Figure 13).

### 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 14)



**Figure 13. MW % of Operators with non-ag, full-time Professions**



**Figure 14. Manila - Washam Unit alfalfa production and Mountain Precipitation**

### Expense Information

From a seven census average of \$70,000/year, the cost of hired labor jumped to \$271,000 in the 2012 Census. There are too few agricultural operations in the county to assign statistical significance to this increase. It could easily all be on one farm, or one project.

From the 2012 Census, 77% of farmers hire no outside labor and 69% have full-time occupations other than farming.

### 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)

### Water Related Land Use

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 logically should shift crops from pasture to forage hay, as indicated in the latest WRLU. (Figure 15)



**Figure 15. Historical Water Related Land Use.**

### Summary

Local land owners are willing and able to participate in salinity control programs. At present funding levels, 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 satisfied with results and positive about salinity control programs.

Irrigation installation costs are escalating. Increased world energy prices have resulted in much higher costs for plastic 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 FY2014 average planned cost of \$53/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 or total inches in the root zone.

**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.

**BSP** – 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 centibars.

**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, adjustable 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** – A periodic-move 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.

**LCRB** – Lower Colorado River Basin.

**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 actions 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 centibars at the PWP.

**Pivot or Center Pivot** – A continuous-move 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 unmeasurable 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](mailto: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)

B:\smindson\NRCS Utah\WildlifeReplacement\Comment\zbrer.docx:112712:KM

## 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 CONTROL 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 States 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 et al., <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 et al.
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. et al., FAO Irrigation and Drainage Paper No. 56, Crop Evapotranspiration, <http://www.fao.org/docrep/X0490E/X0490E00.htm>.