1 Scheduling Irrigation using an approach based on the Van Genuchten Model

2 Xi Liang^{1, 2*}, Vasilis Liakos¹, Ole Wendroth³, and George Vellidis¹

3 1. Department of Crop and Soil Sciences, University of Georgia, 2329 Rainwater
4 Road Tifton, GA 31793 USA. 2. Department of Plant, Soil, and Entomological
5 Sciences, University of Idaho, Aberdeen Research and Extension Center, 1693 S
6 2700 W Aberdeen, ID 83210 USA. 3. Department of Plant and Soil Sciences,
7 University of Kentucky, Ag. Sci. North N-122M Lexington, KY 40546 USA.

8

9 * Corresponding author at: Department of Plant, Soil, and Entomological Sciences,
10 University of Idaho, Aberdeen Research and Extension Center, 1693 S 2700 W
11 Aberdeen, ID 83210.

12 Email address: xliang@uidaho.edu

ABSTRACT

Crop irrigation which results in high water use efficiencies typically uses science-based irrigation scheduling tools to determine irrigation application timing and quantities. Although a large variety of sensors are available for measuring soil moisture status, there are a few easy-to-use irrigation scheduling tools which provide a yes/no irrigation decision or recommend how much water should be applied to return the soil profile to an optimal soil moisture condition. The work described here developed a method which uses soil water tension data from soil moisture sensors and the van Genuchten model to provide irrigation scheduling recommendations. The strength of the method is that it can use data readily available from USDA-NRCS soil surveys to predict soil water retention curves and calculate the volumetric water content and soil water tension of a soil at field capacity. Those parameters are then used to translate measured soil water tension into irrigation recommendations which are specific to the soil moisture status of the soil. The method was validated by comparing its results to other published methods and with continuous soil water tension data with multiple wetting and drying cycles from six fields in southern Georgia, USA. Finally, the model was incorporated into a web-based irrigation scheduling tool and used in conjunction with a wireless soil moisture sensing system to schedule irrigation in a large commercial field during 2015. By the van Genuchten model, we used about two thirds of the irrigation water and produced about the same yields as a commonly used yes/no irrigation decision tool. The presented method can be used to build

1 resiliency to climate variability because it provides growers with data which they
2 can use to make informed decisions about managing their water resources.

3

4 Key words: field capacity, permanent wilting point, volumetric water content, soil
5 water tension

6

1. Introduction

Agricultural irrigation is vital to food production in many parts of the globe and a critical tool for ensuring food security. Irrigation not only serves to reduce risk of crop loss but also to build resiliency to climate variability and yield stability in food production systems. Irrigated agriculture provides 40% of the world's food while being used on only 18% of the cultivated land (FAO, 2015). The United Nations Food and Agricultural Organization estimates that the world currently consumes about 70% of available fresh water for irrigation (FAO, 2015). In the United States, irrigation withdrawals were estimated at 435 million m³ per day in 2010 and accounted for 38% of total freshwater withdrawals (Maupin et al., 2014). In light of projected food needs of a growing world population, significant improvements in agricultural water use efficiency (WUE) leading to more crop per drop should be a high priority across multiple disciplines of science.

Irrigation which results in high WUE typically uses science-based irrigation scheduling tools to determine irrigation application timing and quantities. A large number of techniques and tools have been developed to assist growers to estimate when and how much water to apply to crops. Yet data recently released by the 2013 USDA National Agricultural Statistical Service Farm and Ranch Irrigation Survey indicated that more than 72% of irrigated farms still rely either on a fixed schedule or on visual symptoms of plant stress such as wilting. Only 28% use any type of science-based irrigation scheduling tools and even fewer (12%) use irrigation scheduling methods such as soil moisture sensors or web-based tools that address conditions specific to their farms (NASS, 2013). Typically, farmers

1 will apply a standard amount (for example, 25 mm or 1 in) at each irrigation event.
2 As a result, both the timing and depths of irrigation may be inappropriate and may
3 lead to yield, nutrient, and soil losses. The extent to which improper timing of
4 irrigation can result in yield losses has been documented for many crops. For
5 example, Vories et al. (2006) found that improper timing of irrigation in cotton can
6 result in yield losses of USD 370 ha⁻¹ to USD 1850 ha⁻¹. Sensors have been used
7 to collect data for irrigation scheduling using several methods including sap flow,
8 canopy temperature, and soil moisture measurements (Jones, 2004;
9 O'Shaughnessy and Evett, 2010). In this paper we will focus on irrigation
10 scheduling using soil water potential measurements.

11 *1.1 Estimating Field Capacity*

12 Knowing the range of plant available soil water content (AWC) is necessary
13 to avoid crop water stress. The dry end of this range is at permanent wilting point
14 (PWP) and the wet end is at field capacity (FC). FC is generally described as the
15 point at which gravitational water flow has ceased after rain or irrigation (Nemes et
16 al., 2011) and is also defined as having a soil water potential in the range of -5 to
17 -33 kPa (Tolk, 2003). PWP is generally defined as the soil water content at which
18 plants irreversibly wilt and fail to recover and is also defined as having a soil water
19 potential of -1500 kPa (Tolk, 2003). Soil water tension (SWT) is equal to the
20 modulus of the soil water potential (Shock et al., 2013) and for simplicity will be
21 used throughout the remainder of this paper instead of soil water potential.

22 For agronomic crops, soil water depletion down to 35-65% of AWC is often
23 used as the threshold for initiating irrigation and the exact threshold varies between

1 soil types and crop species (Alan et al., 1998; Girona et al., 2002; Irmak et al.,
2 2014). Frequently the goal of irrigation events is to return the soil profile to FC
3 (Irmak et al., 2014; Zotarelli et al., 2009). For proper irrigation controlling, it is
4 particularly important to have a good estimate of FC otherwise irrigation events
5 may result in the under- or over-application of water.

6 FC is notoriously difficult to measure *in situ* and the results are often not
7 repeatable. Field experiments (e.g., Brito et al., 2011; de Jong van Lier and
8 Wendroth, 2016) using the method of fluxed-based estimation and simulation
9 studies (e.g., Twarakavi et al., 2009) show that it may take several days for a
10 saturated soil profile to reach FC. For example, Brito et al. (2011) observed that it
11 took 52-205 hours to reach FC (defined as the soil water content at a flux rate of
12 0.01 mm d^{-1}) and that time was a function of soil texture and profile depth. In
13 another study, drainage reached a flux rate of 0.01 mm d^{-1} after 83 h for sand and
14 303 h for clay (Twarakavi et al., 2009). Thus, *in situ* measurements are labor and
15 time consuming. Lab measurements of FC usually determine the soil volumetric
16 water content (VWC) at a SWT of 33 kPa (Majumdar, 2013; Rawls et al., 1982;
17 Saxton and Rawls, 2006). However, this threshold is somewhat arbitrary and does
18 not represent soils of different textures and with different horizons. FC should be
19 defined for each specific soil and not by a universal SWT value (Nemes et al., 2011;
20 Zacharias and Bohne, 2008) and its estimation should rather be flux- than SWT-
21 based. For example, a SWT of 33 kPa is an underestimation of the *in situ* soil water
22 content at FC in coarse-textured soils. FC is usually determined for the 12 USDA
23 textural classes (Nemes et al., 2011; Twarakavi et al., 2009) overlooking some of

1 the characteristics that individual soils within a certain textural class possess and
2 their impact on FC. For instance, different percentages of silt and clay lead to
3 variation in FC even within sandy soils (Zettl et al., 2011). It is thus imperative to
4 further improve approaches to estimate soil-specific FC and SWT at FC.

5 *1.2 Soil Water Retention Curves*

6 The transpiration requirements of plants result in tension being transmitted
7 to the roots to extract water from the soil (Muñoz-Carpena et al., 2005; Shock et
8 al., 2013), also known as the soil-plant-atmosphere continuum. As a measure of
9 the energy status of soil water, SWT has been widely used in irrigation
10 management and irrigation scheduling thresholds are often suggested in terms of
11 SWT rather than VWC.

12 Soil matric sensors measure directly the tension required by plants to
13 extract water from the soil (Thompson et al., 2007; Vellidis et al., 2008; Shock et
14 al., 2013; Irmak et al., 2014). For effective irrigation scheduling, SWT thresholds
15 must be converted to soil-specific irrigation volumes which replenish soil moisture
16 but do not add excessive irrigation water which would result in water moving below
17 the root zone causing leaching of nutrients and other crop inputs. To estimate this
18 optimal irrigation amount, it is necessary to convert measured SWT to VWC and
19 to also know the VWC of the soil at FC and PWP.

20 Soil water retention curves (SWRC) characterize the relationship between
21 SWT and VWC and by those curves it is possible to describe the respective
22 amounts of recharge and depletion of soil water between FC and PWP. SWRC
23 can be utilized to translate SWT into VWC but the curves are difficult and time

1 consuming to create experimentally and consequently generic curves found in the
2 literature are frequently used (Fredlund and Xing, 1994; Rajkai et al., 2004;
3 Ghanbarian-Alavijeh et al., 2010). A prerequisite for their use is to evaluate their
4 accuracy in describing the changes in soil water status observed under field
5 conditions.

6 *1.3 Objectives*

7 The goal of this study was to develop techniques for using SWRC to
8 estimate optimal irrigation amounts from measured soil water tension by applying
9 the van Genuchten (1980) model. The specific objectives of this research were to:
10 1) propose a new method of calculating FC using the van Genuchten model; 2)
11 evaluate the accuracy of the van Genuchten model in converting SWT into VWC
12 under field conditions; and 3) develop irrigation scheduling recommendations from
13 the calculated VWCs.

2. Methods

2.1 *The van Genuchten model*

The van Genuchten model has been widely used to describe water retention behavior of soils. The model describes this relationship in a continuous function. Through the capillary rise equation SWT can be converted to an equivalent pore diameter, and the first derivative of SWRC reflects the pore size distribution of a soil. In the transition from saturated to increasingly unsaturated conditions, at first, the larger pores and subsequently pores with decreasing equivalent diameter are drained. The water in the larger pores is only weakly held by capillary forces, and with decreasing pore diameter, the water is retained with increasing SWT. Therefore, given the same cross sectional area of water-filled pore space, water in large pores flows much faster than in a bundle of smaller pores, we may conceptually link the segments of the SWRC to different rates of water transport. Large soil pores that are known to drain rapidly after long rain periods cover the range between water saturation and an inflection point of the SWRC. This range is also known for relatively small SWT changes with decreasing VWC. Between the inflection point and the PWP, soil water is held in smaller pores. In this range, SWT changes increasingly rapidly with each unit of soil water content decrease. The inflection point of SWRC segregates “structural” soil pores (i.e., draining at SWT lower than the inflection point) and “textural” pores (i.e., emptying at SWT higher than the inflection point) (Dexter, 2004; Reynolds et al., 2009). The slope of the line tangent to the inflection point reflects soil physical quality, including relative field capacity (the proportion of soil VWC at FC over saturation), plant-available

water capacity, air capacity, and macroporosity (Reynolds et al., 2009). The “textural” pores determine FC (Aschonitis et al., 2013). In the range between FC and PWP, soil water is barely draining but available for plant water uptake (Brady and Weil, 2008), even if it becomes increasingly difficult for plant roots to extract water from these smaller pores. Soil water content at the inflection point of the van Genuchten model is strongly affected by soil texture (Reynolds et al., 2009). The inflection point between the rapid and slow drainage can be used to identify FC (Zotarelli et al., 2009). The intersection of lines tangent to the inflection point and the PWP identifies the soil’s FC, VWC and SWT at that point (Fig. 1).

The equation below is used by the van Genuchten model to describe the relationship between VWC and SWT:

$$\theta(h) = \theta_r + \frac{\theta_s - \theta_r}{[1 + (\alpha h)^n]^{1 - \frac{1}{n}}} \quad (1)$$

where θ is soil VWC ($\text{cm}^3 \text{ cm}^{-3}$), h is the pressure head (cm); θ_s and θ_r are the saturated and residual VWC ($\text{cm}^3 \text{ cm}^{-3}$), respectively; α is an empirical parameter which is often referred to as the inverse of the air entry point (cm^{-1}); and n is an empirical constant affecting the shape of the curve (van Genuchten, 1980).

Pressure head (h) reported in centimeters is converted to SWT in units of kPa by using

$$SWT = \frac{h \times 9.8}{100} \quad (2)$$

For convenience, we will hereafter refer to h as SWT.

The inflection point of the model is obtained by setting its second derivative to zero. The first derivative of the model is:

$$\frac{d\theta}{dh} = \alpha^n(1-n)(\theta_s - \theta_r) \frac{h^{n-1}}{[1+(\alpha h)^n]^{\frac{1}{n}-2}} \quad (3)$$

The second derivative of the model is:

$$\frac{d^2\theta}{dh^2} = \alpha^n(1-n)(\theta_s - \theta_r) \{ (n-1)h^{n-2} [1 + (\alpha h)^n]^{\frac{1}{n}-2} - h^{2n-2} \alpha^n (2n - 1) [1 + (\alpha h)^n]^{\frac{1}{n}-3} \} \quad (4)$$

At the inflection point: $\frac{d^2\theta}{dh^2} = 0$

Therefore, the SWT (h_i) and soil VWC (θ_i) at the inflection point are:

$$h_i = \frac{1}{\alpha} \left(\frac{n-1}{n} \right)^{\frac{1}{n}} \text{ and } \theta_i = \theta(h_i).$$

The equation of the line tangent to the inflection point (h_i, θ_i) is $\theta - \theta_i = S_i(h - h_i)$ or $\theta = S_i(h - h_i) + \theta_i$. Its slope (S_i) is the first derivative of the equation which is defined as $S_i = \theta'(h_i)$. Similarly, the equation of the line tangent to the PWP (h_{PWP}, θ_{PWP}) is $\theta - \theta_{PWP} = S_{PWP}(h - h_{PWP})$ or $\theta = S_{PWP}(h - h_{PWP}) + \theta_{PWP}$. Its slope (S_{PWP}) is defined as $S_{PWP} = \theta'(h_{PWP})$. The parameter h_{PWP} has been assigned a value of 15310 cm which is equivalent to a SWT of 1500 kPa (Tolk, 2003). The corresponding VWC is $\theta_{PWP} = \theta(15310)$.

The intersection of the two tangent lines is defined as

$$S_i(h - h_i) + \theta_i = S_{PWP}(h - h_{PWP}) + \theta_{PWP} \quad (5)$$

The SWT at the intersection is

$$h_{inter} = \frac{\theta_{PWP} + S_i h_i - S_{PWP} h_{PWP} - \theta_i}{S_i - S_{PWP}} \quad (6)$$

and the soil VWC at the intersection (or FC) is $\theta_{FC} = \theta(h_{inter})$ ($\theta_{PWP} < \theta < \theta_i$ and $h_i < h < h_{PWP}$).

1 Plant available water content (AWC) at FC is calculated as $\theta_{AWC} = \theta_{FC} - \theta_{PWP}$.
2 Available water quantity (AWQ) in a certain soil profile is calculated as
3 $\theta_{AWQ} = \theta_{AWC} \times D$, and the soil profile depth (D) was either 0.38 or 0.76 m in the
4 current study.

5

6 *2.2 Generating soil water status parameters using the van Genuchten model*

7 Nine agricultural soils ranging from sands to sandy clay loams commonly
8 found in southern Georgia, USA, were selected. Soil texture and dry bulk density
9 were assumed to be homogeneous throughout the respective soil profiles (Table
10 1). Particle distribution of sand, silt, and clay, and bulk density at depths of 0-0.38
11 m and 0-0.76 m were averaged in a depth-weighted way across horizons (Perkins
12 et al., 1986). The soil profiles of 0-0.38 and 0-0.76 m (0-15 and 0-30 in) were
13 selected for shallow- and deep-rooted crops. Soil physical parameters (i.e., particle
14 size distribution and bulk density) (Table 1) were entered into the RETC software
15 (RETC, 2009), and parameters of the van Genuchten model (θ_s , θ_r , n , and α) were
16 generated based on the H1 model of the ROSETTA pedo transfer function
17 (Schaap et al., 2001) (Table 2). FC, SWT at FC, PWP, and AWC at FC of the nine
18 soils were calculated following the method described in Section 2.1.

19

20 *2.3 Comparing FC and AWC from the van Genuchten model with other methods*

21 The calculated FC was compared to the FC generated from 1-dimensional
22 simulations of internal drainage in soil profiles. For these simulations, the
23 HYDRUS-1D software (HYDRUS-1D, 2012) was used. HYDRUS-1D is widely

1 used to analyze soil water flow and solute transport. For the simulations, the profile
2 depth was set to 0-0.38 and 0-0.76 m. The initial soil water conditions were set at
3 saturation. The upper boundary condition was constant flux at zero, and the lower
4 boundary condition was free drainage. Field capacity can be defined as the soil
5 water content when the drainage flux decreases from the initial saturation to a
6 predefined negligibly small value, such as 0.001, 0.01, and 0.1 cm d⁻¹ (Twarakavi
7 et al., 2009). Drainage flux rates of 0.01 and 0.1 cm d⁻¹ at the bottom of the profile
8 (0.38 or 0.76 m) were selected in this study. The flux rate 0.01 cm d⁻¹ was found
9 more accurate to estimate FC across a range of soils evaluated by Twarakavi et
10 al. (2009). Since the drainage process is more rapid in coarse-textured compared
11 to fine-textured soils, a higher flux rate (i.e., 0.1 cm d⁻¹) was also selected in the
12 current study. In order to compare the van Genuchten model approach with the
13 simulated drainage, linear regression was performed between both methods.
14 Linear regression was performed in SigmaPlot (ver. 13.0 Systat Software Inc. San
15 Jose, CA) (the same as below).

16 AWC at FC and PWP obtained from the van Genuchten model was also
17 compared to that measured at a SWT of 33 and 1500 kPa, respectively. Measured
18 AWC and PWP values were obtained from Perkins et al. (1986) who had
19 performed these measurements for the same soil series as shown in Table 1.
20 Linear regressions between AWC calculated from the van Genuchten model and
21 measured at 33 kPa, and between PWP from the van Genuchten model and
22 measured at 1500 kPa were employed for comparing these approaches as well.

23

2.4 Validating the van Genuchten model under field conditions

Before utilizing the van Genuchten model in irrigation scheduling, its accuracy in converting SWT into VWC was evaluated under field conditions. Six cotton fields in southern Georgia were selected for this evaluation (Table 3). The University of Georgia Smart Sensor Array (UGA SSA) was used for collecting continuous SWT from these fields for the entire growing season. The UGA SSA is a wireless SWT sensing system which allows for a high density of sensor nodes – a feature needed to account for soil variability in fields. The term sensor node refers to the combination of electronics and sensor probes installed within a field. Each sensor probe includes three Watermark® (Irrometer, Riverside, California, USA) soil moisture sensors and up to two thermocouples for measuring soil and canopy temperature (Vellidis et al., 2013; Liakos et al., 2015).

In this study, the three Watermark® sensors were integrated into the probes at depths of 0.20, 0.41, and 0.61 m (8, 16, and 24 inches) as shown in Fig. 2 to measure SWT. UGA SSA nodes were installed in each of the fields soon after planting in the spring of 2014. The number of sensor nodes installed in each field is shown in Table 3. SWT data from the nodes were collected hourly and transmitted wirelessly to a web server where the data were stored and visualized (Fig. 3). The data from the three sensors in each probe were combined into a weighted average. A weighted average rather than a simple average was used because we assumed that more soil water extraction took place in the shallower portions of the soil profile. The SWT weighting function was:

$$h = \frac{1}{2}h_{0.20\text{ m}} + \frac{1}{3}h_{0.41\text{ m}} + \frac{1}{6}h_{0.61\text{ m}}, \text{ and } h = SWT \quad (7)$$

SWRC were generated based on the van Genuchten model for the soils given in Table 3 using soil physical properties from the USDA NRCS Web Soil Survey (USDA-NRCS, 2013) and following the procedure described in Section 2.2. The van Genuchten model was used to calculate VWC between dry and wet SWT values observed in the field. A dry SWT (h_1) value from the weighted SWT field data (Eq. 7) was entered into the van Genuchten model. After rainfall or irrigation occurred in this field, SWT decreased to a lower (wetter) value (h_2). The soil VWC difference between the two SWT values was calculated as $\Delta\theta = \theta(h_2) - \theta(h_1)$. $\Delta\theta$ is reported in terms of $\text{cm}^3 \text{cm}^{-3}$. The amount of irrigation water that must be applied to bring the soil profile from SWT (h_1) to SWT (h_2) was calculated as $\Delta\theta = \Delta\theta \times D$. $\Delta\theta$ is reported in mm, and D is the soil profile depth, which is 0.61 m, the largest depth of the sensors.

$\Delta\theta$ was compared to the change in soil water storage calculated using a simple soil water balance equation

$$\Delta S = P + I - ET - D - R \quad (8)$$

where ΔS is the change in soil water storage and P , I , ET , D and R represent precipitation, irrigation, evapotranspiration, drainage, and runoff, respectively. It was assumed that no runoff or drainage occurred. Precipitation was measured using tipping bucket rain gauges installed in the field or precipitation data were retrieved from adjacent meteorological stations. Irrigation quantities and application dates were recorded. Because of inherent difficulties, fixed amounts of water are applied at irrigation events without taking into account the exact amount of water required to bring the soil profile moisture content back to an optimal

condition. *ET* was calculated on a daily basis using reference *ET* and cotton crop coefficients developed for southern Georgia (Vellidis et al., 2014).

Several rainfall and irrigation events which resulted in observable changes of SWT during the growing season were selected from each of the fields for analysis. Both the van Genuchten model and the water balance equation were used to calculate changes in soil water content ($\Delta\theta$ and ΔS , respectively). To be consistent with the field observations, the van Genuchten model was used to calculate the soil water changes during the recharge stage (i.e., SWT from dry to wet values). Linear regression was performed between the soil water storage values calculated from the van Genuchten model and the water balance equation.

2.5 Irrigation scheduling development

For each soil series in Table 1, irrigation depths required to bring the soil water status from 10, 20, 30, 40, 50, 60, 80, 100, 150, and 200 kPa back to FC were calculated using the van Genuchten model in soil profiles of 0-0.38 m (0-15 in) and 0-0.76 m (0-30 in). The values of FC and AWQ at FC used in the irrigation scheduling were generated from the van Genuchten model as described in Section 2.1 and 2.2.

During the 2015 growing season, the method we developed, based on the van Genuchten model, was used to schedule irrigation in a study evaluating the efficacy of variable rate irrigation (VRI) (Liakos et al., 2016). The method was incorporated into the web-based user interface of the UGA SSA and used to automatically generate irrigation scheduling recommendations in a 93-ha peanut

1 field located in southwestern Georgia. The field had high variability in soils and
2 according to the USDA NRCS soil survey contained eight different soil types. The
3 majority soils were Red Bay sandy loam (53.4%), Rains loamy sand (14.5%), and
4 Goldsboro loamy sand (10.1%). The field was irrigated with a VRI-enabled center
5 pivot irrigation system.

3. Results

3.1 Estimating soil water parameters with the van Genuchten model

Calculated from the van Genuchten model, FC ranged from 0.12 to 0.14 $\text{cm}^3 \text{cm}^{-3}$ for sand, 0.14 to 0.23 $\text{cm}^3 \text{cm}^{-3}$ for loamy sand, 0.16 to 0.23 $\text{cm}^3 \text{cm}^{-3}$ for sandy loam, and 0.20 to 0.26 $\text{cm}^3 \text{cm}^{-3}$ for sandy clay loam (Table 4). SWT at FC ranged from 5 to 6 kPa for sand, 6 to 15 kPa for loamy sand, 9 to 15 kPa for sandy loam, and 13 to 17 kPa for sandy clay loam (Table 4). PWP ranged from 0.04 to 0.05 $\text{cm}^3 \text{cm}^{-3}$ for sand, 0.04 to 0.08 $\text{cm}^3 \text{cm}^{-3}$ for loamy sand, 0.05 to 0.09 $\text{cm}^3 \text{cm}^{-3}$ for sandy loam, and 0.07 to 0.13 $\text{cm}^3 \text{cm}^{-3}$ for sandy clay loam (Table 4). PWP was close to parameter θ_r in the van Genuchten model in sand and loamy sand soils (Tables 2 and 4). AWC at FC ranged from 0.07 to 0.10 $\text{cm}^3 \text{cm}^{-3}$ for sand, 0.10 to 0.13 $\text{cm}^3 \text{cm}^{-3}$ for loamy sand, 0.12 to 0.14 $\text{cm}^3 \text{cm}^{-3}$ for sandy loam, and 0.12 to 0.13 $\text{cm}^3 \text{cm}^{-3}$ for sandy clay loam (Table 4).

3.2 Comparison to other methods

FC values estimated using HYDRUS-1D at drainage flux rates of 0.01 and 0.1 cm d^{-1} , were close to those calculated with the van Genuchten model and were linearly correlated (Fig. 4). Values of AWC calculated from the van Genuchten model were higher than those based on SWT measured between 33 and 1500 kPa, even though they were linearly correlated (Fig. 5). Compared to FC, values of PWP from the van Genuchten model was very close to those based on SWT measured at 1500 kPa, indicated as the slope of the linear regression was close to 1 (0.928) (Fig. 5). Thus, FC should be the cause of the variation in AWC. Changes in soil water content calculated with the van Genuchten model were

1 similar to those calculated with the water balance equation and they were linearly
2 correlated (Fig. 6).

3 *3.2 Irrigation scheduling tables*

4 The above results indicated that the van Genuchten model was translating
5 SWT into VWC well enough to be used for making irrigation scheduling decisions.
6 Using the model, an example irrigation scheduling table was developed providing
7 the depth of irrigation water needed to bring a range of soils back to FC (Table 5).
8 For soil series of sand, soil water depletion was relatively rapid; and even at 20
9 kPa, irrigation quantity was more than 50% of its AWQ at FC. When the soil texture
10 became finer (i.e., sandy clay loam), soil water depletion was slowed down; and
11 the irrigation requirement of 50% AWQ at FC occurred at 50 kPa.

12 *3.3 Field evaluation of the presented method*

13 The 93 ha field in which the method was evaluated was divided into
14 alternating conventional irrigation and VRI strips with each strip 120 rows wide.
15 The VRI strips contained 13 different irrigation management zones (IMZ) (Fig. 7)
16 which were irrigated individually based on the van Genuchten model estimates.
17 The conventional strips were irrigated uniformly using Irrigator Pro (Davidson et al.,
18 2000). Irrigator Pro is a public domain irrigation scheduling tool developed by
19 USDA which utilizes soil temperature, ambient temperature, and precipitation to
20 provide yes/no irrigation decisions for peanuts.

21 A UGA SSA sensor node was installed in each IMZ (Fig 7). Data were
22 transmitted hourly from the field to the user interface where SWT data from the
23 three individual sensors at each node were used to calculate a weighted mean
24 SWT (Eq. 7). This value was then used to automatically calculate the depth of

1 irrigation needed to bring the soil profile back to 75% of FC (Fig 7). Because
2 peanut is a shallow-rooted crop, the 0-0.38 m (0-15 in) irrigation recommendations
3 were used. Seventy five percent of FC rather than 100% of FC was selected as
4 the soil water replenishment goal was to allow for rainfall and minimize the risk of
5 over irrigation. Summer rainfall is common in southwestern Georgia but because
6 of sandy soils, supplemental irrigation is widely used.

7 A 50 kPa weighted mean SWT was used to trigger irrigation. Over the entire
8 growing season, the dynamic VRI system (sensors + van Genuchten model + VRI)
9 recommended an average irrigation amount of 77 mm compared to 109 mm by
10 Irrigator Pro with approximately the same yields for both methods. The average
11 yield for the dynamic VRI system strips was 5543 kg ha⁻¹ while the average yield
12 for Irrigator Pro was 5552 kg ha⁻¹. The 2015 growing season was wetter than
13 average and the dynamic VRI system greatly outperformed Irrigator Pro in yield by
14 8.4% in the wetter areas of the field which were mostly areas of lower topographical
15 relief. In contrast, Irrigator Pro outperformed dynamic VRI yields in sandy areas
16 with higher elevations by 9.6% indicating that the 50 kPa irrigation trigger may have
17 been too dry for these areas (Liakos et al., 2016). In this field, approximately 72
18 hours were required for the center pivot irrigation system to circle the field.
19 Because plant AWC is very small above 50 kPa in sandy soils, any delay in
20 irrigation results in the SWT increasing rapidly and the crop experiencing water
21 stress. In retrospect, it appears that the threshold for these areas should have been
22 lower to account for time to irrigation.

23

4. Discussion

Using benchmark pressure heads (i.e., 33 kPa) to estimate FC from SWRC is an inaccurate method (Twarakavi et al., 2009) because it does not consider soil texture and is particularly inaccurate for sandy soils and strongly aggregated soils. By developing SWRC, Obreza et al. (1998) found that in two Florida sandy soils, SWT at FC ranged from 5 to 8 kPa. Jabro et al. (2009) calculated FC to be 18 kPa for a sandy loam and 27 kPa for a clay loam by developing the regression between SWT and elapsed time following cessation of infiltration. When the percentage of sand was higher than 80% Twarakavi et al. (2009) found that SWT at FC was lower than 12 kPa when simulated at a drainage flux rate of 0.01 cm d⁻¹. These findings match the results calculated with the van Genuchten model in this study (Table 4 and Fig. 4). It is therefore inaccurate to use a universal benchmark of SWT to estimate FC in all types of soils as such a benchmark might underestimate soil water content and lead to inappropriate irrigation scheduling decisions. Because laboratory and field studies to measure FC are difficult and time consuming, SWRC models can also be used to provide theoretical references of FC.

4.1 Limitations of the presented method

The effects of soil organic matter on soil water status were not considered in this study. However, VWC is positively correlated to organic matter content and each percent increase of soil carbon content can result in an increase of 0.5% in VWC in sandy soils (Saxton and Rawls, 2006; Teepe et al., 2003; Wall and Heiskanen, 2003). The results from this study were not greatly affected by organic matter because the common agricultural soils in southern Georgia are very poor

1 in organic matter which generally measures below 2%. The use of the van
2 Genuchten model and Rosetta for calculating FC and developing irrigation
3 schedules in soils with moderate to high levels of organic matter should be
4 evaluated carefully.

5 In this study, we assumed homogeneous soil particle distribution which
6 ignored the interactive effects of soil layering on soil water status (Zettl et al., 2011).
7 The capillary break resulting from differences in the hydraulic properties of
8 adjacent layers may hinder soil water redistribution in the soil profile leading to an
9 increase of *in situ* FC (McCoy and McCoy, 2009; Zettl et al., 2011). Therefore, the
10 VWC at FCs calculated in this study are assumed to be the baseline and actual
11 VWC at FCs may be higher with the additional effects of soil organic matter and
12 textural breaks.

13 *4.2 Applying the van Genuchten model to irrigation scheduling*

14 The example irrigation scheduling table developed in the current study
15 (Table 5) is calculated after an irrigation scheduling table developed by Irmak et al.
16 (2014) for irrigation scheduling in Nebraska. The Nebraska table contains soil
17 water depletion and available water capacity for sand, loamy sand, and sandy loam
18 soils of that state. In that work, the values of SWT and VWC was measured
19 experimentally for each soil and measured SWT was converted to VWC for
20 irrigation scheduling. As discussed earlier, it is expensive and time consuming to
21 experimentally develop SWRC for multiple soils across large areas and SWRC
22 models offer the advantage of creating these types of tables more easily as long
23 as the pedo transfer function used provides valid results.

1 For the method developed here to be implemented successfully for irrigation
2 scheduling, SWT should be available from SWT sensors. Online irrigation
3 scheduling tools using the van Genuchten model method which are linked to soil
4 moisture sensing system and VRI-enabled irrigation systems have the potential to
5 improve agricultural WUE by applying irrigation water in the amounts needed to
6 maintain soil moisture at optimal levels.

7 *4.3 Improving resiliency*

8 A dynamic VRI system consisting of the van Genuchten model method in
9 conjunction with soil moisture sensors can be used to enhance resiliency to climate
10 variability because it provides growers with data which they can use to make
11 informed decisions about irrigation. In times of drought and reduced access to
12 water resources, a dynamic VRI system can be used to implement deficit irrigation
13 – a strategy which maintains the soil profile in a drier condition – across many
14 individual IMZ. During wet periods, improper timing of irrigation has been shown
15 to significantly suppress yields (Vellidis et al., 2016). A dynamic VRI system can
16 be used to apply irrigation amounts that maintain the soil profile within desirable
17 SWT ranges rather than repeatedly saturating the soil profile.

5. Conclusions

A method was developed in this study to use soil water tension data from soil sensors and the van Genuchten model to provide irrigation scheduling recommendations. The method uses data readily available from USDA-NRCS soil surveys to construct soil water retention curves and calculate the volumetric water content and soil water tension for calculating an amount of water to be irrigated. The parameters (i.e., volumetric water content and soil water tension at field capacity, permanent wilting point, and available water content) calculated based on the van Genuchten model were consistent with the results from other methods. This model can thus be used to provide theoretical references of field capacity of specific soils rather than soil textural classes. Our results, obtained using a pedotransfer function based on soil texture information, also indicated the inaccuracy to use a universal benchmark of soil water tension (i.e., 33 kPa) to estimate field capacity in all types of soil.

Those parameters calculated from the van Genuchten model are then used to translate measured soil water tension into irrigation recommendations which are specific to the soil moisture status of the soil. In this study, the van Genuchten method offers the superiorities of creating irrigation recommendations over experimental development of soil water retention curves for irrigation scheduling. The method was validated for six fields in southern Georgia, USA comparing its results with continuous soil water tension data with multiple wetting and drying cycles.

1 The presented model was incorporated into a web-based irrigation
2 scheduling tool and used in conjunction with a wireless soil moisture sensing
3 system to schedule variable rate irrigation in a large commercial field during 2015.
4 The use of the van Genuchten model based irrigation scheduling allowed us to
5 apply about two thirds of the irrigation water that provided about the same peanut
6 yields as a commonly used yes/no irrigation decision tool. The developed irrigation
7 management system thus has the potential to improve the water use efficiency in
8 crop production, and enhance the resilience to climate variability by making
9 informed irrigation decisions in the evaluated areas.

10

1 **Acknowledgements**

2 Funding for this project was provided by the NOAA Regional Integrated
3 Sciences and Assessments (RISA) Program through the Southeast Climate
4 Consortium (SECC), the USDA-NRCS Conservation Innovation Grant (CIG)
5 Program through the Flint River Soil and Water Conservation District, the Southern
6 Peanut Research Initiative (SPRI) Cotton Incorporated, the Georgia Cotton
7 Commission, and by Hatch and State funds allocated to the Georgia Agricultural
8 Experiment Stations. The authors would like to acknowledge Mike Tucker, Herman
9 Henry, and Rodney Hill for their contributions to sensor installation and data
10 collection. The authors are grateful to the anonymous two reviewers for their
11 comments on the manuscript.

1 REFERENCES

- 2 Alan, R.G., Pereira, L.S., Raes, D., Smith, M, 1998. Crop evapotranspiration -
3 Guidelines for computing crop water requirements. FAO Irrigation and
4 Drainage Paper 56. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United
5 Nations.
- 6 Aschonitis, V.G., Antonopoulos, V.Z., Lekakis, E.H., Litskas, V.D., Kotsopoulos,
7 S.A., Karamouzis, D.N. 2013. Estimation of field capacity for aggregated
8 soils using changes of the water retention curve under the effects of
9 compaction. Eur. J. Soil Sci. 64, 688-698.
- 10 Brady, N.C., Weil, R.R, 2008. Soil water: Characteristics and behavior, in: The
11 nature and properties of soils, 14th ed. Pearson Prentice Hall, New Jersey
12 and Ohio, pp. 173-217.
- 13 Brito, A.d.S., Libardi, P.L., Anunciato Mota, J.C., Moraes, S.O., 2011. Field
14 capacity estimation based on retention curve and soil water flux density.
15 Rev. Bras. Cienc. Solo 35, 1939-1948.
- 16 Davidson Jr., J.I., Lamb, M.C., Sternitzke, D.A., 2000. Farm suite-Irrigator Pro
17 (Peanut irrigation software, and user's guide), The Peanut Foundation,
18 Alexandria, VA.
- 19 Dexter, A.R. 2004. Soil physical quality: Part I. Theory, effects of soil texture,
20 density, and organic matter, and effects on root growth. Geoderma 120,
21 201-214.
- 22 de Jong van Lier, Q., Wendroth, O., 2016. Reexamination of the field capacity
23 concept in a Brazilian Oxisol. Soil Sci. Soc. Am. J. (in press).
- 24 FAO. 2015. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, Aquastat
25 website. Rome, Italy: United Nations.
26 www.fao.org/nr/water/aquastat/water_use/index.stm.
- 27 Fredlund, D.G., Xing, A. 1994. Equations for the soil-water characteristic curve.
28 Can. Geotech. J. 31, 521-532.
- 29 Ghanbarian-Alavijeh, B., Liaghat, A., Huang, G., van Genuchten, M.Th. 2010.
30 Estimation of the van Genuchten soil water retention properties from soil
31 textural data. Pedosphere 4, 456-465.
- 32 Girona, J., Mata, M., Fereres, E., Goldhamer, D.A., Cohen, M., 2002.
33 Evapotranspiration and soil water dynamics of peach trees under water
34 deficits. Agric. Water Manage. 54, 107-122.
- 35 HYDRUS-1D. 2012. HYDRUS-1D version 4.15. [http://www.pc-](http://www.pc-progress.com/en/Default.aspx?H1d-downloads)
36 [progress.com/en/Default.aspx?H1d-downloads](http://www.pc-progress.com/en/Default.aspx?H1d-downloads)
- 37 Irmak, S., Payero, J.O., Van DeWalle, B., Rees, J.M., Zoubek, G.L., 2014.
38 Principles and operational characteristics of Watermark granular matrix
39 sensor to measure soil water status and its practical applications for

1 irrigation management in various soil textures. [University of Nebraska-](#)
2 [Lincoln Extension Circular EC783.](#)

3 Jabro, J.D., Evans, R.G., Kim, Y., Iversen, W.M., 2009. Estimating in situ soil-water
4 retention and field water capacity in two contrasting soil textures. *Irrig. Sci.*
5 27, 223-229.

6 Jones, H.G., 2004 Irrigation scheduling: advantages and pitfalls of plant-based
7 methods. *J. Exp. Bot.* 55, 2427-2436.

8 Liakos, V., Porter, W., Tucker, M., Liang, X., Vellidis, G., 2016. Dynamic variable
9 rate irrigation scheduling with University of Georgia Smart Sensor Array
10 (UGA SSA). In S. Boyd, M. Huffman and B. Robertson (eds) *Proceedings*
11 *of the 2016 Beltwide Cotton Conference*, New Orleans, LA, National Cotton
12 Council, Memphis, TN (paper 16778) (in press).

13 Liakos, V., Vellidis, G., Tucker, M., Lowrance, C., Liang, X., 2015. A decision
14 support tool for managing precision irrigation with center pivots. In: J.V.
15 Stafford (Ed.), *Precision Agriculture '15 - Papers Presented the 10th*
16 *European Conference on Precision Agriculture (10ECPA)*, Tel Aviv, Israel,
17 p677-683, doi:10.3920/978-90-8686-814-8.

18 Majumdar, D.K., 2013. Soil-water relationship, in *Irrigation water management*
19 *principles and practice*. 2nd ed. PHI Learning Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi, India. pp.
20 67-114.

21 Maupin, M.A., Kenny, J.F., Hutson, S.S., Lovelace, J.K., Barber, N.L., Linsey, K.S.,
22 2014. Estimated use of water in the United States in 2010: U.S. Geological
23 Survey Circular 1405, pp. 56.

24 McCoy, E.L., McCoy, K.R., 2009. Simulation of putting-green soil water dynamics:
25 Implications for turfgrass water use. *Agric. Water Manage.* 96, 405-414.

26 Muñoz-Carpena, R., Li, Y.C., Klassen, W., 2005. Field comparison of tensiometer
27 and granular matrix sensor automatic drip irrigation on tomato.
28 *HortTechnology* 15, 584-590.

29 NASS. 2013. 2012 Census of Agriculture Farm and Ranch Irrigation Survey (2013).
30 National Agricultural Statistics Service, United States Department of
31 Agriculture.
32 http://www.agcensus.usda.gov/Publications/2012/Online_Resources/Farm
33 [and Ranch Irrigation Survey/](http://www.agcensus.usda.gov/Publications/2012/Online_Resources/Farm)

34 Nemes, A., Pachepsky, Y.A., Timlin, D.J., 2011. Toward improving global
35 estimates of field soil water capacity. *Soil Sci. Soc. Am. J.* 75, 807-812.

36 Obreza, T.A., Pitts, D.J., Parsons, L.R., Wheaton, T.A., Morgan, K.T., 1998. Soil
37 water-holding characteristic affects citrus irrigation scheduling strategy.
38 *Proc. Fla. State Hort. Soc.* 110, 36-39.

39 O'Shaughnessy, S.A., Evett, S.R., 2010. Canopy temperature based system
40 effectively schedules and controls center pivot irrigation of cotton. *Agric.*
41 *Water Manage.* 98, 1310-1316.

- 1 Perkins, H.F., Hook, J.E., Barbour, N.W., 1986. Soil characteristics of selected
2 areas of the coastal plain experiment station and ABAC research farms.
3 [Athens, GA.]: Georgia Agricultural Experiment Stations, College of
4 Agriculture, University of Georgia.
- 5 Rajkai, K., Kabos, S., van Genuchten, M.Th. 2004. Estimating the water retention
6 curve from soil properties: comparison of linear, nonlinear and concomitant
7 variable methods. *Soil Tillage Res.* 79, 145-152.
- 8 Rawls, W.J., Brakensiek, D.L., Saxton, K.E., 1982. Estimation of soil water
9 properties. *Trans. ASAE* 25, 1316-1328.
- 10 RETC. 2009. RETC model version 6.02. [http://www.pc-](http://www.pc-progress.com/en/default.aspx?retc)
11 [progress.com/en/default.aspx?retc](http://www.pc-progress.com/en/default.aspx?retc)
- 12 Reynolds, W.D., Drury, C.F., Tan, C.S., Fox, C.A., Yang, X.M., 2009. Use of
13 indicators and pore volume-function characteristics to quantify soil physical
14 quality. *Geoderma* 152, 252-263.
- 15 Saxton, K.E., Rawls, W.J., 2006. Soil water characteristics estimates by texture
16 and organic matter for hydrologic solution. *Soil Sci. Soc. Am. J.* 70, 1569-
17 1578.
- 18 Schaap, M.G., Leij, F.J., van Genuchten, M.Th., 2001. ROSETTA: a computer
19 program for estimating soil hydraulic parameters with hierarchical
20 pedotransfer functions. *J. Hydrol.* 251, 163-176.
- 21 Shock, C.C., Wang, F.X., Flock, R., Feibert, E., Shock, C.A., Pereira, A., 2013.
22 Irrigation monitoring using soil water tension. Oregon State University -
23 Malheur Extension Office: EM 8900.
- 24 Teepe, R., Dilling, H., Beese, F., 2003. Estimating water retention curves of forest
25 soils from soil texture and bulk density. *J. Plant Nutr. Soil Sci. -Z.*
26 *Pflanzenernahr. Bodenkd.* 166, 111-119.
- 27 Thompson, R.B., Gallardo, M., Valdez, L.C., Fernández, M.D., 2007. Using plant
28 water status to define threshold values for irrigation management of
29 vegetable crops using soil moisture sensors. *Agric. Water Manage.* 88, 147-
30 158.
- 31 Tolk, J.A. 2003. Soils, permanent wilting points, in Stewart, B.A., Howell, T.A.
32 (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of water science*. Dekker Press, New York, USA, pp.
33 927-929.
- 34 Twarakavi, N.K.C., Sakai, M., Simunek, J., 2009. An objective analysis of the
35 dynamic nature of field capacity. *Water Resour. Res.* 45, W10410.
- 36 USDA-NRCS, 2013. Web soil survey.
37 <http://websoilsurvey.sc.egov.usda.gov/app/HomePage.htm>
- 38 van Genuchten, M.Th., 1980. A closed-form equation for predicting the hydraulic
39 conductivity of unsaturated soils. *Soil Sci. Soc. Am. J.* 44, 892-898.

- 1 Vellidis, G., Liakos, V., Perry, C., Porter, W., Tucker, M., 2016. Irrigation
2 scheduling for cotton using soil moisture sensors, smartphone apps, and
3 traditional methods. In S. Boyd, M. Huffman and B. Robertson (eds)
4 Proceedings of the 2016 Beltwide Cotton Conference, New Orleans, LA,
5 National Cotton Council, Memphis, TN (paper 16779), (in press).
- 6 Vellidis, G., Liakos, V., Perry, C., Tucker, M., Collins, G., Snider, J., Andreis, J.,
7 Migliaccio, K., Fraisse, C., Morgan, K., Rowland, D., Barnes, E., 2014. A
8 smartphone app for scheduling irrigation on cotton. In S. Boyd, M. Huffman
9 and B. Robertson (eds) Proceedings of the 2014 Beltwide Cotton
10 Conference, New Orleans, LA, National Cotton Council, Memphis, TN
11 (paper 15551), p.175-186.
- 12 Vellidis, G., Tucker, M., Perry, C., Reckford, D., Butts, C., Henry, H., Liakos, V., Hill,
13 R.W., Edwards, W., 2013. A soil moisture sensor-based variable rate
14 irrigation scheduling system. In: J.V. Stafford (Ed.), Precision Agriculture
15 2013 - Proceedings of the 9th European Conference on Precision
16 Agriculture (9ECPA), Lleida, Spain, p.713-720. doi: 10.3920/978-90-8686-
17 778-3
- 18 Vellidis, G., Tucker, M., Perry, C., Kvien, C., Bednarz, C., 2008. A real-time
19 wireless smart sensor array for scheduling irrigation. *Comput. Electron.*
20 *Agric.* 61, 44–50.
- 21 Vories, E.D., Teague, T., Greene, J., Stewart, J., Clawson, E., Pringle, L., Phipps,
22 B., 2006. Determining the optimum timing for the final irrigation on mid-
23 south cotton. In. Proceedings National Cotton Council Beltwide Cotton
24 Conference, January 3-6, 2006, San Antonio, Texas. 516-521, 2006
25 CDROM.
- 26 Wall, A., J. Heiskanen. 2003. Water-retention characteristics and related physical
27 properties of soil on afforested agricultural land in Finland. *For. Ecol.*
28 *Manage.* 186, 21-32.
- 29 Zacharias, S., Bohne, K., 2008. Attempt of a flux-based evaluation of field capacity.
30 *J. Plant Nutr. Soil Sci.* 171, 399-408.
- 31 Zettl, J.D., Barbour, S.L., Huang, M., Si, B.C., Leskiw, L.A., 2011. Influence of
32 textural layering on field capacity of coarse soils. *Can. J. Soil Sci.* 91, 133-
33 147.
- 34 Zotarelli, L., Dukes, M.D., Morgan, K.T., 2009. Interpretation of soil moisture
35 content to determine soil field capacity and avoid over-irrigating sandy soils
36 using soil moisture sensors. Rep. AE460. Agricultural and Biological
37 Engineering Department, Florida Cooperative Extension Service, Institute
38 of Food and Agricultural Sciences, University of Florida, Gainesville, Flori