Irrigation Water Reuse Reduces Effectiveness of Modernizing Irrigation Technologies Coupled with Enhanced Aquifer Recharge: Example from the Upper Snake River Basin, Idaho, USA

Shan Zuidema[1*], Richard B. Lammers[1], Danielle S. Grogan[1], Alex Prusevich[1], Sarah Gilmore[2], Paula Williams[2]

[1]University of New Hampshire, Institute for the Study of Earth, Oceans, and Space, Durham, NH, USA
[2]University of Idaho, Center for Resilient Communities, Moscow, ID, USA

WATER BALANCE MODEL

WBM is a distributed hydrologic model utilizing conceptual soil, surface runoff, and shallow groundwater pools, a one-dimensional river network with hydrologic routing, and representations of dams, impervious surfaces, irrigation, and human water use. WBM tracks components of water fluxes, notably irrigation returns, through each represented pool and flux.

We applied a lumped aquifer representation to the entire ESPA (same domain as IDWR, 2014). Fluxes are both distributed (natural and incidental recharge, abstractions), and point (losing streams, and head-dependent springs).


Irrigation technology from Jägermeyr et al. (2015) Technology by county from USGS Water Use Statistics. *Not limited by water rights.*

Validation

4 criteria assessed model performance for natural and human controls of basin hydrology. Forced outflows at three major reservoirs in lieu of networked operations; a critical control in system (Rougé H14F-08).

Accuracy in springflows evident as baseflow at King Hill, Idaho; lumped approach missed seasonality.

Metric	% BIAS	NSE
ESPA spring discharge	-0.69	0.11
Irrigation in 2010/15	-33	0.25
Headwater discharge	27.	0.40
Reservoir storage	-2.6	-0.33

Parameterizations of irrigation technology modernization.

We altered the distribution of surface (flood) to sprinklers for Eff.A—Eff.E. Then we increased the fraction of direct (drip) irrigation for Eff.F—Eff.I.

We also represented declining proportions of open-surface conveyances (switching to pipes), and represented lining of all canals.

	Fraction of			
Parameterization	baseline surface irrigation	open-surface conveyances	Unlined canals	Fraction of direct irrigation
Baseline	1.0	0.83	1.0	0.00
Eff.A	0.89	0.82	0.95	0.10
Eff.B	0.86	0.80	0.8	0.10
Eff.C	0.82	0.70	0.60	0.10
Eff.D	0.77	0.60	0.40	0.10
Eff.E	0.73	0.50	0.20	0.10
Eff.F	0.53	0.40	0.15	0.33
Eff.G	0.40	0.30	0.10	0.50
Eff.H	0.27	0.15	0.05	0.67
Eff.I	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.00

Irrigation Water Reuse Reduces Effectiveness of Modernizing Irrigation Technologies, when not Coupled with Enhanced Aquifer Recharge: Example from the Upper Snake River Basin, USA

Shan Zuidema[1]*, Richard B. Lammers[1], Danielle S. Grogan[1], Alex Prusevich[1], Sarah Gilmore[2], Paula Williams[2]

[1]University of New Hampshire, Institute for the Study of Earth, Oceans, and Space, Durham, NH, USA [2]University of Idaho, Center for Resilient Communities, Moscow, ID, USA

*Download a copy and supporting material.*

Knowledge Gap

Modernizing irrigation technology and implementing Enhanced Aquifer Recharge are adaptations to reduce drawdown in stressed aquifers. *How does modernizing irrigation technology reduce the system scale* **reuse** *of incidental returns, and does* **recharge** *mitigate the loss of this "source" of water?*

Effective Irrigation Efficiency increased more slowly than Classical Irrigation Efficiency when **simulated technologies** *were modernized.*

When coupled with enhanced recharge, reuse through actual recovery increases the effectiveness of modernization.

Increasing recovery is the key to adaptation in conjunctively managed systems.


As both adaptations increase, changes in outlet discharge more closely match aquifer drawdown (never perfectly), approaching parity between aquifer and downstream shortfalls.

A.1 As technology modernizes, less *recharge* is needed than incidental *returns* lost.
A.2 Increasing irrigation efficiency yields greater drawdown than discharge gained.
A.3 Enhanced aquifer recharge at an efficiency level exceeded drawdown without.

0.83±0.02
Piecewise linear slope with standard error
0.09±0.06

Left: Recharge required above baseline to stabilize aquifer plotted against the reduced *irrigated percolation* from baseline. At 95% classical efficiency (CIE) the benefit overcomes baseline *recharge* requirement.
Right: Aquifer drawdown is always greater than the change in outlet discharge from baseline.


Change in aquifer storage (top) and *recharge* required for aquifer stability (bottom) for each pair of parameterizations. Stabilization is less than 10% of baseline drawdown.

Drawdown is less than *recharge* required.

Solid lines (bottom) depict the negotiated *recharge* mandate (lower), and the estimated maximum feasible *recharge* capacity (upper).

Reuse of returns **declines** *with increasing efficiency of irrigation technology, but recharge resulted in* **more** *AND* **more effective** *reuse.*

B.1 Irrigation *reuse* was always greater with *recharge* represented.
B.2 *Beneficial* consumption of *reuse* increased with *recharge*.
? *Reuse* was underestimated in the model.

Volume flux of *reuse* (top) and percentage of *beneficial* use from prior incidental *returns* across gradient of classical irrigation efficiency of parameterizations.

Terminology
beneficial Evapotranspiration of supplied irrigation water by crops (FAO56).
irrigated percolation Net percolation from irrigation minus local abstractions.
recharge Managed or Enhanced Aquifer Recharge.
returns incidental returns/percolation. Non-consumptive loss.
reuse Abstraction of prior *returns* for irrigation.
**baseline** Flux or storage at contemporary best model estimate.

Model
The Water Balance Model (WBM) is a rasterized, conceptual hydrologic model with explicit representations of irrigation technology, dams, and sectoral water allocations. Daily time-step. 780m resolution.

Setting and experimental design

0.00 0.15 0.30 0.45 0.60
Fraction of Irrigation Reuse
(proportion of previous returns in gross abstractions)

The Upper Snake River Basin (USRB) of southern Idaho is semi-arid with robust dairy and commodity crop agriculture supported by seasonal snow melt and the highly productive Eastern Snake Plain Aquifer (ESPA). Surface irrigation from 1900-1950 added storage to ESPA. Recent adjudication requires aquifer storage to remain at current head. Conjunctive management focuses on managed recharge, with continued irrigation technology modernization.

We simulated 10 parameterizations that increased irrigation technological efficiency from contemporary to extremely efficient between 2008 and 2017 with and without sufficient *recharge* to stabilize the aquifer. Aquifer stabilization by manual calibration.

Fate of Abstractions

① **Gross Irrigation** (abstraction)
② **Beneficial** consumption
③ *Returns* (**Non-consumptive** loss) (**L**)
④ **Non-beneficial** consumption
⑤ **Reuse**

Aggregate fluxes normalized by gross irrigation.

Plot-scale

WBM tracks incidental returns through each pool and flux within the model, permitting characterization of the ultimate fate of all returns. The system-scale diagram below represents fates that are proportional to each flux at baseline.

Terminal Fates
(E)vaporation, Human (U)se, E(X)port, (S)torage

Pristine abstractions (in white), Incidental returns and reuse (in gray).
Recoverable Fraction (RF) (Simons et al. 2015) = 53% (baseline), 5% for Eff.I.
Observed recovered fraction implies 1e-4 (Eff.I) to 0.19 (baseline) cycles of reuse.

Irrigation Water Reuse Reduces Effectiveness of Modernizing Irrigation Technologies Coupled with Enhanced Aquifer Recharge: Example from the Upper Snake River Basin, Idaho, USA

Shan Zuidema[1*], Richard B. Lammers[1], Danielle S. Grogan[1], Alex Prusevich[1], Sarah Gilmore[2], Paula Williams[2]

[1]University of New Hampshire, Institute for the Study of Earth, Oceans, and Space, Durham, NH, USA
[2]University of Idaho, Center for Resilient Communities, Moscow, ID, USA

Works referenced

Contor, B. A. and Taylor, R. G.: Irrigation and Drainage, 62(3), 273–280, doi:10.1002/ird.1717, 2013.

Dieter, C. A., et al.: Estimated use of water in the United States in 2015, 2018.

Grogan, D. S., et al.: Environ. Res. Lett., 12(3), 034017, doi:10.1088/1748-9326/aa5fb2, 2017.

Idaho Water Resources Board: Eastern Snake Plain Aquifer Comprehensive Aquifer Management Plan, 2009.

Idaho Water Resources Board: ESPA Review of Comprehensive Managed Aquifer Recharge Program, 2016.

Grafton, R.Q., et al.: Science, 361(6404), 2018.

Jägermeyr, J., et al.: Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. 19(7), doi: 10.5194/hess-19-3073-2015, 2015.

Kjelstrom, L. C.: Streamflow gains and losses and groundwater budgets for the Snake River plain, 1995.

Lankford, B.: Agricultural Water Management, 108, 27–38, doi:10.1016/j.agwat.2011.08.010, 2012.

Le Van Chinh: Faculty of Science, University of Copenhagen, Kbh., 2012.

Maupin, M. A., et al. : Estimated use of water in the United States in 2010, 2014.

Plummer, L. n., et al.: Ground Water, 38(2), 264–283, doi:10.1111/j.1745-6584.2000.tb00338.x, 2000.

Portmann, F. T., et al.: Global Biogeochemical Cycles, 24(1), doi:10.1029/2008GB003435, 2010.

Simons, G. W. H., et al.: Journal of Hydrology, 522, 558–571, doi:10.1016/j.jhydrol.2015.01.016, 2015.

Simon, D.: Master of Science, University of New Hampshire, 2018.

Stewart, R.J., et al.: Water Resources Research, 47(1), doi:10.1029/2010WR009896, 2011.

Wollheim, W.M., et al.: Global Biogeochem. Cycles, 22(2), doi:10.1029/2007GB002963, 2008.