FIELD EVALUATION OF A SMARTPHONE APP FOR SCHEDULING IRRIGATION IN COTTON

George Vellidis
Vasilis Liakos
Calvin Perry
Phillip Roberts
Mike Tucker
Crop and Soil Sciences Department / University of Georgia
Tifton, Georgia
Ed Barnes
Cotton Incorporated
Cary, North Carolina

Abstract

Ground water is depleting at an alarming rate in many cotton growing areas, thus many cotton producers and the organizations representing cotton producers are interested in irrigation scheduling tools, which improve water use efficiency. For farmers to adopt irrigation scheduling tools on a large scale, the tools must be easy-to-use, cheap, provide the users with actionable information when irrigation is required, are accessible from smartphone or tablet platforms, and can be used for conventional or precision irrigation. This study describes a Smartphone App for scheduling irrigation in cotton. The App and the irrigation model which drive it are described in detail. Calibration and evaluation results are also presented. The evaluation of the Smartphone App in commercial cotton fields proved that it can estimate soil water balance accurately during the growing season. Plot studies showed that the App resulted in equal or higher yields while using significantly less water than other irrigation scheduling studies. The App can also be used to schedule irrigation for individual irrigation management zones within a field.

Introduction

Cotton production is an important economic factor in the USA. It is grown in 17 states from Virginia to California with the annual production acreage ranging from 5.1 to 6.3 million ha. Cotton is an intensively managed crop which requires varying amounts of water during its phenological stages to maximize yield. Approximately 40% of U.S cotton is currently produced under irrigated conditions. Because irrigation water is becoming limited in many cotton growing areas such as the Texas high plains, Arizona, and California, and competition for water is increasing rapidly in areas normally associated with plentiful water resources, many cotton producers and the organizations representing cotton producers are interested in irrigation scheduling strategies which improve water use efficiency.

Researchers understood that cotton's water needs are a function of phenological stage. For example, McGuckin et al. (1987) optimized irrigation scheduling using accumulated heat units and not a chronological frame. Researchers also realized that evapotranspiration (ET) is an important factor in estimating daily plant water use. Several irrigation scheduling tools have been developed which use estimated crop ET (ETc) to develop irrigation recommendations. These models typically multiply a crop coefficient (Kc) with an estimated reference ET (ETo) to calculate ETc.
Although models which use only ETc to estimate irrigation requirements have been used extensively because they are simple, they do not consider the moisture available in the soil profile and do not calculate a soil water balance. This sometimes leads to over-application of irrigation water. Incorporating soil water balance increases the number of parameters needed as well as the complexity of the model. Dejonge et al. (2012) used ET along with other meteorological, soil, crop management activities, and the crops phenological stage to simulate environmental stresses, soil water balance, crop growth and yield in a dynamic agroecosystem model. The SiSPAT model (Braud et al, 2013) was created to estimate irrigation needs in southern France. The model estimates the heat and water transfer in the soil while taking into account the water vapor transfer, the soil heterogeneity, the root size, the interception of rainfall by the vegetation and weather variables. Five-Core (Chopart et al, 2007), an irrigation scheduling model for sugarcane, is another model which computes daily water balance. AquaCrop (Steduto et al, 2009) is a more complex model which requires soil and weather data in order to estimate crop development and soil water balance.

The crop simulation models described in the previous paragraph are excellent research tools but are not suited for use by crop consultants, farmers, or other professionals making daily irrigation decisions. Migliaccio et al. (2013) described a suite of smartphone apps for scheduling irrigation including apps for citrus, strawberries urban turf, and cotton. The citrus, strawberry and urban turf apps were released in 2013. This paper describes the SmartIrrigation

Cotton App and presents the results of the evaluation process which carried out in 2014 growing season. The Cotton App was released in 2014 and is available at www.smartirrigationapps.org.

Material and Methods

ET and Kc

The model uses meteorological data to calculate reference ET (ETo) using the Penman–Monteith equation (Allen et al, 1998). The model's daily ETo is a five-day running average of calculated ETo. The model then uses a crop coefficient (Kc) to estimate crop ET (ETc). The crop coefficient (Kc) is widely used to estimate crop water use and to schedule irrigation. Kc changes during the life cycle of the plant. For annual crops, it typically begins with small values after emergence and increases to 1.0 or above when the crop has the greatest water demand. Kc decreases as crops reach maturity and begin to senesce. Perry and Barnes (2012) described crop coefficient functions for cotton in southeastern states. Information from this work and the authors' experience were used for developing a prototype Kc curve for Cotton App model. Field experiments took place in 2012 and 2013 to calibrate and validate the Kc curve for conditions in southern Georgia and northern Florida. Changes in the model's Kc values are driven by accumulated heat units commonly referred to as growing degree days (GDDs). GDDs are calculated using equation 1.

$$GDD = \frac{T_{max}+T_{min}}{2} - T_{base} \qquad (1)$$

The GDDs calculation for cotton crops considers that T_{base} is equal to 15.5°C. Any temperature below T_{base} is equal to T_{base} and consequently the GDD is equal to zero. Additionally, daily average air temperature higher than 37.7 °C is considered equal to 37.7°C because growth is limited above this temperature. The specific GDDs required for each phenological stage of cotton are derived from Ritchie et al. (2004).

Soil Water Balance

The model calculates ETc to estimate the daily crop water use. ETc, measured precipitation and irrigation are then used to estimate the plant available soil water. Plant available soil water is a function of the soil's water holding capacity and current rooting depth. As the plant's rooting system grows, the soil depth from where the plants can extract water also increases. In the model, the initial rooting zone depth is 6 in and increases by 0.3 in/day until it reaches a maximum depth of 30 in. At emergence, the soil profile from 0cm to 30 in is assumed to be at 85% of maximum plant available soil water holding capacity. The daily plant available soil water is calculated by subtracting the previous day's ETc from the previous day's plant available soil water and adding any precipitation or irrigation events. The model uses an effectiveness factor of 85% for all sprinkler irrigation events to account for evaporation and drift before the water droplets reach the soil. The model assumes that 90% of measured precipitation reaches the soil to account for canopy interception and other possible losses. All these parameters are used to calculate root zone soil water deficit (RZSWD) in inches and % RZSWD.

Description of the Smart Irrigation Cotton App

The Cotton App was designed to provide the most accurate, site-specific, real-time information to users. Additionally, the App was designed to require minimum user input which when necessary is solicited by sending notifications. It is not necessary for the user to check the App regularly. Finally, the App provides ready-to-use output. Meteorological data, and especially accurate precipitation data, are critical to the Cotton App. In its current version, the Cotton App pulls meteorological data from the Georgia Automated Environmental Monitoring Network (GAEMN) and the Florida Automated Weather Network (FAWN) and can therefore be used effectively in these two states. The Cotton App recommends irrigation whenever RZSWD exceeds 50%. Notifications are sent to the user as the 50% threshold approaches. If the user acts upon the recommendation, it is up to the user to add the irrigation event to the Cotton App. This can be a default irrigation depth (supplied by the user upon first use of the model) or the amount irrigated if different from the default depth.

Model Calibration and Validation

We used replicated field plots to calibrate the model and producer fields to validate the model. In 2012, 2013 and 2014 we used large plots at the University of Georgia's Stripling Irrigation Research Park (SIRP) and commercial fields all of which were located in southwestern Georgia and in close proximity to Florida. Both the plots and fields were instrumented with the University of Georgia Smart Sensor Array (UGA SSA). The UGA SSA is a fully wireless sensing system which measures soil water tension at 8, 16, and 24 in using Watermark™ sensors (Vellidis et al.,

2013). We used the soil water tension data from the plots in 2012 and 2013 to retroactively calibrate the model's Kc curve so that 50% RZSWD coincided with a weighted root zone average soil water tension of approximately 40kPa to 50kPa. Our experience with irrigation scheduling indicates that this range is a good irrigation threshold for cotton. We used the model adjustments made following the 2012 growing season to schedule irrigation in the plots during 2013 and 2014. Plots were in conservation tillage and conventional tillage. Because the model does not currently account for tillage systems, both types were irrigated the same way.
Our validation process consisted of retroactively running the Cotton App model for each of sensor node location, in each field, using local precipitation and irrigation depths as recorded by an onsite tipping bucket rain gage connected to a Hobo™ data logger and observing the pattern of the RZSWD. Our benchmark was for 50% RZSWD to coincide with a weighted root zone average soil water tension of approximately 40kPa to 50kPa

Results and Discussion

Figure 1 presents the calibration results from the conservation and conventional tillage plots at SIRP for 2012 (top) and 2013 (bottom). In 2012 the plots were irrigated with the model containing a cotton Kc curved derived from the literature while in 2013 the irrigation model contained a Kc curve which was calibrated using data from the 2012 plot studies. Figure 2 presents the 2013 validation results from three commercial cotton fields in southern Georgia, USA. Validation was done after the model was further calibrated with the 2013 plot studies.

To quantify the frequency at which the Cotton App RZSWD matched measured soil water tension, we performed a Pearson correlation analysis between these two variables using SPSS v.16 software (SPSS Inc, USA). The results were very good with correlation in the 0.7 to 0.8 range. In addition, we measured how many times RZSWD exceeded 50% and weighted soil water tension exceeded 40kPa and 50kPa. The results for the fields presented in Figure 2 are shown in Table 1.



Figure 1. Comparison of weighted soil water tension and % RZSWD in conservation and conventional tillage plots at SIRP in 2012 (top) and 2013(bottom). The soil water tension curves are the weighted average of measured soil water tension at 8in (50% weighting factor), 16in (30% weighting factor), and 24in (20% weighting factor).



Figure 2. Comparison of weighted soil water tension and percent Root Zone Soil Water Deficit (% RZSWD) in three commercial cotton fields during 2013. The % RZSWD curve shown here reflects changes made in the Kc and rooting depth to better calibrate the model based upon data collected from plot studies at SIRP during the 2013 growing season.

Table 1. Correlation between %RZSWD and weighted soil water tension. Frequency of observed %RZSWD values higher than 50% and soil water tension values higher than 40kPa and 50kPa.

Field No.	Correlation %RZSWD with Soil Water Tension*	RZSWD >50%	Soil Water Tension >50kPa	Soil Water Tension >40kPa
Field 1 (2013)	0.708	2	6	10
Field 2 (2013)	0.822	7	5	10
Field 3 (2013)	0.871	11	12	27

*Significant at the 0.01 level.

In 2014, the Cotton App was compared to two other scheduling methods at SIRP; the University of Georgia Cooperative Extension Service Checkbook method and the Cotton App with primed acclimation strategy. The Checkbook method does not take ET into account. It schedules irrigation by replacing the maximum expected weekly crop water use (a function of weeks after planting) minus measured precipitation and is thus a very conservative scheduling tool. Table 2 presents the yield and the amount of irrigation water used for each method.

Table 3 presents the yield results and the water allocation used in two neighbor cotton fields in Tift County in 2014. The one field was irrigated with the Checkbook method and the other one with the Cotton App. From the table it is clear that the water efficiency of the Cotton App is higher than the Checkbook. The yield of the cotton field which irrigated with the Checkbook method is slightly higher than the yield at the cotton field which irrigated with the Cotton App. However, the water allocation used with the Checkbook method was significantly higher than the Cotton App. This proves that the Cotton App suggests irrigation at specific periods when the plant's water needs are high.

Table 2. Yield and water use results from irrigation scheduling experiment at the Stripling Irrigation Research Park during 2014. Varieties = DP1252; FM1944; PHY333, Planting Date = 14 May 2014, Harvest Date = 21 Oct 2014, Rainfall = 11.2 in.

Method	Conservation Tillage		Conventional Tillage	
	Lint Yield (lb/ac)	Water Use (in)	Lint Yield (lb/ac)	Water Use (in)
Checkbook	1660	15.3	1709	15.3
Cotton App	1597	9.4	1440	9.4
Cotton App PA*	1794	9.1	1844	9.1

*PA = Primed Acclimation

Table 3. Lint yield as resulted by using the Checkbook irrigation method and the Cotton App in 2014. Varieties = PR1401; PR1404; PR1405; PR1416, Planting Date = 8 May 2014, Harvest Date = 10 Oct 2014, Rainfall = 11.1 in.

Method	Lint Yield (lb/ac)	Irrigation (in)
Cotton App	1573	10.1
Checkbook	1596	16.8

Use of the Cotton App for Precision Irrigation

For precision or variable rate irrigation (VRI) to be fully enabled, irrigation scheduling information must be available for each irrigation management zone (IMZ) delineated within a field. Although VRI has not been widely adopted yet, it has been evaluated and demonstrated in conjunction with center pivot irrigation systems at several locations by research and growers in the USA including southwestern Georgia (Vellidis et al., 2013). In these cases, soil moisture sensors have been used to develop irrigation recommendations for IMZs. The need for many sensors within a field to characterize soil moisture variability has been an inhibiting factor for the adoption of VRI because of the expense involved but also because sensors must be installed after planting and removed prior to harvest. The Cotton App provides an opportunity to implement VRI without using sensors.

Under conventional use, the Cotton App provides recommendations for an unlimited number of fields. To register a field, the user provides the geographic coordinates, soil type and operational characteristics of the irrigation system. This is done only once. In a similar fashion, a user can register individual IMZs within a field. In this case, the Cotton App treats the IMZs as individual fields and provides notifications as each IMZ approaches a RZSWD of 50%. However, farmers will not operate a center pivot irrigation system to irrigate each IMZ individually and at different times from the others. Instead, the farmer prefers to initiate irrigation when the first notification is received and apply varying amounts of water to each of the IMZs so as to replenish soil moisture to a predetermined level. To achieve this using the Cotton App, the user must retrieve the current RZSWD for each IMZ. This is easily done in less than a minute as the architecture of the Cotton App allows users to view individual fields/IMZs with the swipe of a finger across the touchscreen of the smartphone. The user can then convert the RZSWD of each IMZ into an irrigation application amount which can in turn be programmed into the irrigation system's VRI controller.

Summary and Conclusions

The goal of the work described here was to develop an interactive ET-based irrigation scheduling tool for cotton that can be used for conventional and precision irrigation. The model variables include soil type, meteorological data, irrigation events, phenological stage of the crop, and a crop coefficient. Extensive validation of the model proved that root zone soil water deficit is estimated accurately by the model. Perhaps more importantly, Figures 1 and 2 show that the pattern of %RZSWD closely follows the pattern of measured soil water tension. Fields located near weather stations and/or equipped with rain gauges had considerably high Pearson correlation r values as an accurate estimate of precipitation is critical to estimating the RZSWD well.

The comparison of yields resulting from different irrigation treatments were used to assess the performance of the Cotton App in ways that matter the most to farmers. 2014 was a normal year with 11.2 in of rainfall during the growing season. The results indicate that scheduling irrigation with the Cotton App is more efficient than using the Checkbook method recommended by the University of Georgia Cooperative Extension Service. At the Stripling Irrigation Park the Cotton App resulted in less yield than Checkbook method; however the water allocation used at the Cotton App method was significantly less than the Checkbook method. Additionally, the use of Cotton App with primed acclimation strategy resulted in the highest yield from all the treatments (even higher than Checkbook method) by using significantly less water.

The SmartIrrigation Cotton App can be also used to determine how much water to apply to individual irrigation management zones within a field by registering each zone as a field. The user can easily read the RZSWD for each zone from the Cotton App but must then manually enter the corresponding irrigation amount in the irrigation system's VRI controller.

Acknowledgements

This work was made possible by funding from the USDA NIFA National Integrated Water Quality Program (award # 2011-51130-31143), the USDA NRCS Conservation Innovation Grants Program (award # 69-3A75-13-83) and grants from the Georgia Cotton Commission and Cotton Incorporated.

References

Allen, R.G., Pereira, L.S., Raes, D., Smith, M., 1998. Crop evapotranspiration: guidelines for computing crop water requirements. In: Proceedings of the Irrigation and Drainage Paper No. 56. Food and Agricultural Organization, United Nations, Rome, Italy.

Braud, I., Tilmant, F., Samie, R. and Goff, I. 2013. Assessment of the SiSpat SVAT model for irrigation estimation in south-east France. Procedia Environmental Sciences, 19, 747 – 756.

Chopart, J.L., Mezino, M., Le Mezo, L., Fusillier, J.L., 2007. FIVE-CORE: a simple model for farm irrigation volume estimates according to constraints and requirements. Application to sugarcane in Réunion (France). *Proceedings of the International Sugar Cane Technology* 2007,**26(2)**,490-493.

DeJonge, K.C., Ascough, J.C., Ahmadi, M., Andales, A.A., Arabi, M., 2012. Global sensitivity and uncertainty analysis of a dynamic agroecosystem model under different irrigation treatments. Ecological Modelling, 231, 113–125.

McGuckin, J.T., Mapel, C., Lansford, R. and Sammis, T. 1987. Optimal control of irrigation scheduling using random time frame. American Journal of Agricultural Economics, 69, 123-133.

Migliaccio, K.W., J.H. Debastiani Andreis, C. Fraisse, K.T. Morgan, and G. Vellidis. 2013. Smartirrigation apps: urban turf. AE499 Agricultural and Biological Engineering Department, Florida Cooperative Extension Service, Institute of Food and Agricultural Sciences, University of Florida. http://edis.ifas.ufl.edu/ae499. (last accessed 28/11/14)

Perry, C.D. and E.M. Barnes. 2012. Cotton Irrigation Management for Humid Regions. Cotton Incorporated, Cary, NC. Available at http://www.cottoninc.com/fiber/AgriculturalDisciplines/Engineering/Irrigation-Management/. (last accessed 28/11/14)

Ritchie, G.L., C.W. Bednarz, P.H. Jost, and S.M. Brown. 2004. Cotton growth and development. Bulletin 1252, Cooperative Extension Service, University of Georgia College of Agricultural & Environmental Sciences, Athens, Georgia, http://www.caes.uga.edu/publications. (last accessed 28/11/14)

Steduto, P., Hsiao, T.C., Raes, D., Fereres, E., 2009. AquaCrop – the FAO crop model to simulate yield response to water: I. Concepts and underlying principles. Agron. J. 101, 426–437.

Vellidis, G., Tucker, M., Perry, C., Reckford, D., Butts, C., Henry, H., Liakos, V., Hill, R.W., Edwards, W., 2013. A soil moisture sensor-based variable rate irrigation scheduling system. In: J.V. Stafford (Ed.), Precision Agriculture 2013 – Proceedings of the 9th European Conference on Precision Agriculture (9ECPA), Lleida, Spain, p.713-720.