

# **Treated Wastewater and Nitrate Transport Beneath Irrigated Fields near Dodge City, Kansas**

## **Final Report to KWRI**

**Marios Sophocleous<sup>1</sup>, Margaret A. Townsend<sup>1</sup>, Fred Vocasek<sup>2</sup>,  
Liwang Ma<sup>3</sup>, Ashok KC<sup>1</sup>**

<sup>1</sup>Kansas Geological Survey, University of Kansas, Lawrence, KS

<sup>2</sup>Servi-Tech Laboratories, Agri/Environmental Consulting, Dodge City, KS

<sup>3</sup>Agricultural Research Service, USDA, Fort Collins, CO



**Kansas Geological Survey Open-File Report 2008-12  
Lawrence, KS, July 2008**

KANSAS GEOLOGICAL SURVEY  
OPEN-FILE REPORTS

>>>>>>>>>NOT FOR RESALE<<<<<<<<<<

Disclaimer

The Kansas Geological Survey made a conscientious effort to ensure the accuracy of this report. However, the Kansas Geological Survey does not guarantee this document to be completely free from errors or inaccuracies and disclaims any responsibility or liability for interpretations based on data used in the production of this document or decisions based thereon. This report is intended to make results of research available at the earliest possible date, but is not intended to constitute final or formal publication.

# **Treated Wastewater and Nitrate Transport Beneath Irrigated Fields near Dodge City, Kansas**

## **Final Report to KWRI**

**Marios Sophocleous<sup>1</sup>, Margaret A. Townsend<sup>1</sup>, Fred Vocasek<sup>2</sup>, Liwang Ma<sup>3</sup>, Ashok KC<sup>1</sup>**

<sup>1</sup>Kansas Geological Survey, University of Kansas, Lawrence, KS

<sup>2</sup>Servi-Tech Laboratories, Agri/Environmental Consulting, Dodge City, KS

<sup>3</sup>Agricultural Research Service, USDA, Fort Collins, CO

**Kansas Geological Survey Open-File Report 2008-12  
Lawrence, KS, July 2008**

# **Treated Wastewater and Nitrate Transport Beneath Irrigated Fields near Dodge City, Kansas**

## **Abstract**

There is concern that the use of treated wastewater for irrigation south of Dodge City, Kansas, an area of mainly silty clay loam soils, has resulted in high nitrate-nitrogen (N) concentrations (10 – 50 mg/kg soil) in the subsurface layers of the upper 15-m vadose zone, and also in the underlying deep (20-45 m) ground water. The goal of this two-year field monitoring project was to assess how and under what circumstances N nutrients from the secondary-treated wastewater-irrigated corn reach the deep ground water of the underlying High Plains aquifer, and what can realistically be done to minimize this problem. We collected deep soil cores for characterization of physical and chemical properties characterization; installed neutron moisture probe access tubes and suction lysimeters for periodic measurements; sampled area monitoring, irrigation, and domestic wells; performed dye tracer experiments to examine soil preferential flow processes through macropores in two wastewater-irrigated study sites; and obtained climatic, crop, irrigation, and N application rate records. These data and additional information were used in the comprehensive Root Zone Water Quality Model (RZWQM2) to identify key parameters and processes that influence nitrogen losses in the study area. We demonstrated that nitrate-N transport processes result in significant accumulations of N in the thick vadose zone. We also showed that nitrate-N in the underlying ground water is increasing with time. RZWQM2 simulations for two wastewater-irrigated study sites indicated that macropore flow is generated particularly during heavy rainfall events, but during our 2005-2006 simulations the total macropore flow was only about 3% of precipitation for one of the sites, whereas it was more than 13% for the other site. Our calibrated model indicated that reducing current levels of corn N fertilization by more than half to 170 kg/ha substantially increases nitrogen use efficiency (NUE) and achieves near-maximum crop yield. Combining such measures with a crop rotation that includes alfalfa should further reduce the residual N in the soil.

## Introduction

With increasingly limited ground-water resources, reuse of treated municipal wastewater provides an alternative source of irrigation water for crops and landscaping. In addition, utilization of the nutrients in recycled wastewater as fertilizer may decrease the need for commercial fertilizers in a plant system. However, municipal wastewater can contain high levels of nitrogen (N) and other constituents, such as salt, heavy metals, and pharmaceuticals (Pettygrove and Asano, 1985; Toze, 2006; Kinney et al., 2006), that can be detrimental to surface and ground-water supplies if it is not carefully applied. Nitrate-N ( $\text{NO}_3\text{-N}$ ) leaching into ground water is widespread in the U.S. Central Plains and elsewhere, and has been linked to the over application of commercial fertilizers/or animal waste (USGS, 2004). The environmental impact of treated wastewater irrigation practices needs to be evaluated to determine if and when these practices may affect usable ground water at depth and what management practices can be changed to slow the downwards migration of a particular nutrient of concern, nitrate-N, due to its potential to contaminate drinking water sources.

Understanding the losses and transformation processes of effluent N in the soil as well as N management are essential for the sustainable use of treated wastewater irrigation in agriculture. This understanding and environmental impacts of wastewater irrigation activities can be addressed by careful field-data collection and analysis in combination with simulation models capable of assessing the consequences of certain factors and farming practices on N losses to the environment.

Bond (1998) pointed out the conflicting requirements of effluent irrigation, namely that leaching is essential to prevent salinization of the root zone, yet leaching will result in the movement of salt- and N-laden water to the deeper vadose zone and ground water. Bond (1998) also pointed out that research challenges in effluent irrigation include quantitative prediction of N transformations to evaluate scenarios for N management, and development of specific and more rigorous guidelines for wastewater applications. This paper makes a contribution towards addressing these particular research issues.

A long-term crop irrigation project with treated wastewater south of Dodge City in semiarid to subhumid southwestern Kansas (Fig. 1), which is underlain by the High Plains aquifer, is the focus of this study. Although the study area is characterized by deep water table (ranging from 20 to 45 m below ground surface) and soils with a silty clay component (predominantly Harney and Ulysses silt loams—Dodge et al., 1965), evidence suggests nitrate-N is migrating to those water-table depths through the vadose zone (Zupancic and Vocasek, 2002). Zupancic and Vocasek (2002) estimated that once nitrate-N reached beyond the upper 1.5 m of the root zone, it can leach as much as 1.2 m in a wet year. Given that the average depth to water table in the study area is more than 38 m (Sophocleous et al., 2006), preferential flow processes may be involved in speeding up the transport of nitrate-N to the underlying water table. The U.S. Geological Survey's National Water-Quality Assessment and other studies in the central High Plains aquifer region suggest that N fertilizer and animal waste have reached the Ogallala portion of the High Plains aquifer due to increased recharge from irrigation and preferential flow processes (USGS, 2004).

It is now generally recognized that preferential flow occurs to some degree in most soils (Shipitalo and Edwards, 1996). In some soils, macropores can serve as important pathways for preferential flow that allow rapid gravitational flow of the free wastewater available at the soil surface or of the accumulated soil water above an impeding soil horizon, thus bypassing the soil matrix. Short-circuiting to ground water through macropores is of serious concern because of the possibilities of rapid transport of a portion of fertilizers, pesticides, and other chemicals applied on the soil surface. It is generally known that under flood or high-rate sprinkler irrigation, when water is allowed to pond on the soil surface, transport down preferential pathways becomes more likely and deep movement of solutes can be expected (Magesan et al., 1999). Flury et al. (1994) in a dye-tracing field study of 14 different sites found significant differences both in the flow patterns and depth of dye penetration for sprinkling versus flood irrigation, with the latter resulting in a dye penetration twice as deep as that for sprinkling, despite the fact that the intensity of the sprinkler system used was relatively high (96 mm/hr). As macropore development, preservation, and continuity can be strongly affected by soil

management, such concerns have been exacerbated by the growing practice of minimum or no-tillage. No-till allows chemical solutes in surface water applied on the soil to accumulate and enter macropores at the land surface; it also retains plant residues on the land surface thus enhancing worm activity and allowing worm holes and other macropore channels to stay open (Ahuja et al., 1993).

The research reported here focuses on the use of the Root Zone Water Quality Model (RZWQM—Ahuja et al., 2000), a deterministic, integrated model that simulates the movement of water and nutrients over and through the root zone of a representative area in an agricultural field, and which also has the capability of addressing preferential flow processes (Ahuja et al., 2000). The RZWQM is used as a tool for comparing alternative agricultural management strategies with respect to crop production and water quality impacts of wastewater irrigation. A unique feature of this applied research is the field use of a modified version of the RZWQM, now incorporated into the latest released version (version 1.5) RZWQM2 (3/24/2008), to handle the deep vadose zone profiles that characterize the study area. From here onwards, any reference to RZWQM should be considered as referring to RZWQM2.

Therefore, the objectives of this paper are

- 1) to study the possibility of N leaching to ground water under secondary-treated wastewater irrigation treatment in the study area using field sampling and monitoring; and
- 2) to model the above data using the recently released RZWQM2 model version and to propose alternatives to current management practices using the RZWQM.

## **Methodology**

### **Background**

The Dodge City Wastewater Treatment Plant collects wastewater from Dodge City and a meat-packing plant into a collection station. The collected wastewater is piped 17 km south of the City (Fig. 1) into a wastewater treatment facility, which consists of

three covered anaerobic digesters and three aeration basins. The treated water is stored in lagoons with a capacity of more than  $3,454 \times 10^3 \text{ m}^3$ . A pumping system, consisting of several centrifugal pumps, distributes the water to irrigate more than 1,100 ha of cropland in 25 fields (Fig. 1-circles). The system is managed by CH2M Hill Operations Management International (OMI) and monitored by the agronomic firm Servi-Tech, Inc., under contracts with Dodge City.

Use of the treated wastewater has resulted in relatively high soil nitrate-N concentrations (10–50 mg/kg) in the soil profile at the sites irrigated with this treated effluent, as well as in nitrate-N concentrations in ground water from a number of monitoring wells in the area exceeding the USEPA safe drinking-water limit of 10 mg/L (Zupancic and Vocasek, 2002).

### **Field Monitoring Sites/Field Experiments<sup>1</sup>**

We established two main treated wastewater-irrigated monitoring sites (N7 and R8 in Fig. 1) and one ground-water-irrigated, control site (Y8 in Fig. 1). The sites are considered representative of the general wastewater-irrigated and ground-water-irrigated sites by Servi-Tech personnel who manage and monitor the area for the City of Dodge City. Site R8 (latitude 37°-34'-32" N, longitude 100°-3'-8" W) has a long-term treated wastewater irrigation history (since 1986), whereas site N7 (latitude 37°-37'-9" N, longitude 100°-2'-19" W) has a shorter-term treated wastewater irrigation history (since 1998). Crop-history records indicate corn (*Zea mays* L.) was planted at site N7 each year since 1998, and at site R8 since 2003. From 1997 to 2002, site R8 was planted with alfalfa (*Medicago sativa*). During 2005, the first year of this study, sites N7 and R8 were planted with corn (April 22-23, 2005), whereas site Y8 was planted with sorghum (milo). During 2006, the final year of field monitoring, all three sites were planted with corn. A LEPA-sprinkler irrigation system applied the treated wastewater at an average rate of 7.3 mm/day for Site N7, and 6.1 mm/day for Site R8.

---

<sup>1</sup> Additional details on field and laboratory experiments and analyses are presented in Sophocleous et al. (2006).



At the beginning of this study (April 2005) we collected three deep (15.2 m) soil cores from each of the sites for a number of physical and chemical analyses using a truck-mounted Giddings probe. Care was taken to minimize compaction during core sampling by carefully cleaning the sampling tubes after each core retrieval. Textural, soil hydraulic, and additional physical and chemical analyses were performed by NRCS personnel at the Lincoln, NE, National Soils and Soil Mechanics Laboratories. Nitrogen, carbon, and related analyses were conducted at the Kansas State University (KSU) and Servi-Tech Soil Analysis Laboratories. The soil bulk density down to 15.2 m was determined from collected cores of known diameter by cutting the core in 15.2-cm increments, weighing them in the field, and then oven-drying them in the lab. The bulk density was also determined by the clod method (Grossman and Reinsch, 2002). Table 1 summarizes the measured soil physical properties by layer, which were subsequently used in the simulation model (explained further below).

A neutron probe (Campbell Pacific Nuclear {CPN} 503DR Hydroprobe) was used to collect moisture-data profiles to 15.2-m depth. Aluminized steel pipe was used for the neutron probe access tube. The neutron probe was calibrated in the field based on core measurements collected from the access tube borehole and on “wet” and “dry” corner plots, equipped with neutron probe access tubes that were measured occasionally. Additional details of neutron access tube installation and probe calibration are presented in Sophocleous et al. (2006). Periodic (twice monthly for 2005, monthly for 2006) measurements of neutron probe-based soil water content down to 15.2 m were conducted throughout the growing seasons in 2005 and 2006.

Three suction lysimeters were installed in each site at various depths, shallow (1.6–1.8 m), intermediate (5.2–8.0 m), and deep (9–15 m), for collecting pore water samples for occasional analyses. A 0.48-MPa vacuum pressure was put on each sample one week prior to sampling. The site R8 shallow and sites R8 and N7 intermediate-depth lysimeters were the only ones to yield pore-water samples in 2005.

All of the existing monitoring wells (14) in the area (shown later in Fig. 5) were sampled twice a year to check any nutrient N impacts on the relatively deep water table, which ranges from about 21 m close to the ephemeral Mulberry Creek to more than 45 m deep as one goes away from the usually dry Mulberry Creek (Fig. 1). Additional water samples from monitoring, domestic, and irrigation wells and wastewater lagoons were periodically collected.

To explain deep occurrences of N concentrations through possible preferential pathways, we conducted two dye-tracer experiments in each of the two wastewater-irrigated study sites, site R8 in Harney soil (fine, superactive, mesic Pachic Argiustolls), and site N7 in Ulysses soil (fine-silty, mixed, superactive, mesic Aridic Haplustolls). Brilliant-blue food-coloring dye (FD&C Blue 1, tri-phenyl-methane dye) was used as a tracer because of its desirable properties of mobility and distinguishability in soils, and also because of its non-toxicity (Flury and Fluhler, 1994, 1995; Flury et al., 1994). Based on these studies, a dye concentration of 4 g/L was used to flood the test sites, which were enclosed in 91.4-cm by 152.4-cm wooden rectangular frames of 30.5-cm height, with approximately 750 liters of dye solution per test site. It is expected that ponding would generate more preferential flow than sprinkling, as was also alluded to in the introduction. Additional details on these dye tracer tests are presented in Sophocleous et al. (2006).

### **The Root Zone Water Quality Model (RZWQM)**

The USDA-ARS developed a comprehensive agricultural systems model known as Root Zone Water Quality Model (RZWQM) as a research tool to investigate the effects of agricultural management on crop production and environmental quality (Ahuja et al., 2000). The RZWQM is an integrated physical, biological, and chemical process model that simulates plant growth, and the movement and interactions of water, nutrients, and pesticides over and through the root zone at a representative area of an agricultural cropping system. It is a one-dimensional (vertical into the soil profile) model designed to simulate conditions on a unit-area basis. Details on all aspects of the model can be found in Ahuja et al. (2000).

The water-flow processes in the RZWQM are divided into two phases: 1) infiltration into the soil matrix and macropores and macropore-matrix interaction during a rainfall or an irrigation event, modeled by using the Green and Ampt approach (Green and Ampt, 1911); and 2) redistribution of water in the soil matrix following infiltration, estimated by a mass-conservative numerical solution of the Richards' equation (Celia et al., 1990). Rainfall or irrigation water in excess of the soil-infiltration capacity (overland flow) is routed into macropores if present. The maximum macropore flow rate and lateral water movement into macropores in the surrounding soil are computed using Poiseuilles' law and the lateral Green-Ampt equation, respectively. Macropore flow in excess of its maximum flow rate or excess infiltration is routed to runoff. In the RZWQM, water can only enter the macropores at the surface. High-intensity rainfalls generally yield greater water flow and chemical transport in macropores than low-intensity rainfalls (Shipitalo and Edwards, 1996), and this is true with the RZWQM as well.

The hydraulic properties are defined by the soil-water characteristic or retention curves, and the unsaturated hydraulic conductivity function. Those relationships are described by functional forms suggested by Brooks and Corey (1964) with slight modifications (Ahuja et al., 2000).

The volumetric soil water content ( $\theta$ ) versus the capillary pressure head or matric suction head ( $\psi$ ) relationship representing the water retention or characteristic curve is formulated as follows:

$$\theta(\psi) = \theta_s - A_1 |\psi| \text{ for } |\psi| \leq |\psi_a| \quad (1)$$

$$\theta(\psi) = \theta_r + B |\psi|^{-\lambda} \text{ for } |\psi| > |\psi_a| \quad (2)$$

where  $\theta_s$  and  $\theta_r$  are the saturated and residual soil-water contents ( $\text{cm}^3/\text{cm}^3$ ), respectively;  $\psi_a$  is the air-entry or bubbling suction head (cm);  $\lambda$  is the pore-size distribution index (and represents the logarithmic slope of the water retention curve);  $A_1$  and  $B$  are constants, where  $B = (\theta_s - \theta_r - A_1 \psi_a) \psi_a^\lambda$  and  $A_1$  was set to zero in our case,

thus reducing equations (1) and (2) to the Brooks and Corey (1964) model. The Brooks-Corey parameters were obtained by fitting the RETC (RETention Curve) program (van Genuchten et al., 1991) to measured soil moisture data.

The hydraulic conductivity ( $K$ ) versus matric suction head ( $\psi$ ) relationship representing the unsaturated hydraulic conductivity function is formulated as follows:

$$K(\psi) = K_s |\psi|^{-N_1} \quad \text{for } |\psi| \leq |\psi_a| \quad (3)$$

$$K(\psi) = K_2 |\psi|^{-N_2} \quad \text{for } |\psi| > |\psi_a| \quad (4)$$

where  $K_s$  is the saturated hydraulic conductivity,  $N_1$ ,  $N_2$ , and  $K_2$  are constants and  $K_2 = K_s |\psi_a|^{-N_2}$ ,  $N_2 = 2 + 3\lambda$ , and  $N_1$  was set to zero in our case, thus reducing equations (3) and (4) to the Brooks and Corey (1964) model.

The soil carbon/nitrogen dynamics module of the RZWQM model (Shaffer et al., 2000) contains two surface residue pools (fast and slow decomposition), three soil humus pools (slow, medium, and fast decomposition), and three soil microbial pools (aerobic heterotrophs, autotrophs, and anaerobic heterotrophs). Despite the complexity of this organic matter/N-cycling component, good estimates of initial soil carbon content and nitrogen are generally the only site-specific parameters needed. The required inputs (e.g. fast pool, slow pool) are then usually determined through an initiation wizard and calibration (Ma et al., 1998).

As mentioned previously, the RZWQM is a research-grade complex tool that was designed to analyze soil and plant processes only within the root zone. However, for our application, we had to initially modify and extend the RZWQM to deal with deeper vadose-zone processes and additional irrigation and fertilization events to handle multiyear simulations, although the recently released RZWQM2, version 1.5 can similarly handle deeper profiles. The soil profile was extended to 30 m depth in RZWQM2. Because of model limitations, we had to combine a number of soil horizons into a maximum of 10 layers as shown in Table 1. A unit gradient was assumed for the lower boundary condition, set at 10.8 m (the lowest depth for which we had detailed soil

hydraulic analyses). The first neutron probe soil-water profile measurements before crop planting in April 2005 were used as the initial soil-water depth distribution in the modeling.

The model also requires detailed meteorological data, on a daily basis, and rainfall intensity. Hourly precipitation and other meteorological data (except for solar radiation) were obtained from the Dodge City Municipal Airport weather station, 17 km northeast of the study sites; daily solar radiation data were obtained from the Garden City Agricultural Experiment Station 80 km west-northwest of Dodge City, operated by Kansas State University. Due to similar geomorphic, land use/land cover, and climatic conditions between Garden City and Dodge City, no significant impacts on calculated water budget components are expected from such climatic data translocations. This is confirmed by comparing five years (1986-1990) of daily solar radiation data when both Dodge City and Garden City weather stations were collecting such data (M. Knapp, Kansas State Climatologist, written communication, May 15, 2008). A linear regression of the daily average solar radiation values at Dodge City and Garden City during the 1986-1990 period yielded an  $R^2$  of more than 94% (Fig. 2). A year-by-year comparison indicated that the Dodge City total solar radiation as a percentage of that from Garden City was 97% for 1986, 99% for 1987, 93% for 1988, and 100% for both 1989 and 1990 (M. Knapp, State Climatologist, written communication, May 15, 2008). The model also requires specification of land-use practices such as planting and harvesting dates, specification of irrigation and fertilization events, as well as the chemical quality of irrigation. The daily precipitation and irrigation events during the 2005 irrigation season for site N7 are shown in Figure 3.

### **Model Calibration Procedures<sup>2</sup>**

For accurate simulations, RZWQM must be calibrated for soil hydraulic properties, nutrient properties, and plant-growth parameters for the site and crops being simulated (Hanson et. al., 1999), as there are significant interactions among the different model components. Available data for 2005 were employed in calibrating the model,

---

<sup>2</sup> Additional details on model calibration and simulations are presented in Sophocleous et al. (2007).

whereas the available data for 2006 were reserved for verifying (“validating”) the model. Calibration targets included the biweekly (during 2005) and monthly (during 2006) neutron soil-water measurements, soil nitrate-N analyses, and harvested corn grain yields. The number of parameters and processes in the RZWQM are so numerous that it is exceedingly difficult to decide which ones to optimize and what optimization scheme might be appropriate, if at all feasible. As a result, such agricultural system models as the RZWQM are usually parameterized by trial-and-error or iterative processes (Ahuja and Ma, 2002). In this paper, we followed the detailed procedures for calibrating the RZWQM as laid out by Hanson et al. (1999) and Ahuja and Ma (2002). In addition, a series of sensitivity analyses were conducted to identify the most important parameters in both the soil and plant portions of the model affecting model output and thus to use in model calibration (Sophocleous et al., 2007).

The model calibration strategy we used was as follows: The RZWQM was first calibrated for soil hydraulic properties, which included the pore-size distribution index,  $\lambda$  and the saturated soil-water content,  $\theta_s$  parameters for each modeled soil layer. The model was then equilibrated with respect to the initial C/N pool sizes for the fast and slow decomposition residue pools; slow, medium, and fast decomposition humus pools; and the three microbial pools (aerobic heterotrophs, autotrophs, and anaerobic heterotrophs) (Hanson et al., 1999). No laboratory procedures are known to effectively determine the sizes of these pools (Ahuja and Ma, 2002). Therefore, because previous management at a site determines the initial state of a soil in terms of its organic matter and microbial populations, simulations with previous management practices will usually create a better initial condition for those parameters (Ma et al., 1998). After entering all the model inputs and parameters, we began by estimating the three humus organic-matter pool sizes (based on the measured organic-carbon depth profiles shown in Table 1) at 5, 10, and 85%, for fast, medium, and slow pools, respectively, and set the microbial pools at 50,000, 500, and 5,000 organisms per gram of soil, respectively, for aerobic heterotrophs, autotrophs, and facultative heterotrophs, as recommended by Ahuja and Ma (2002). RZWQM was initialized for the organic-matter pools by running the model for 12 years prior to the 2005-06 actual simulation periods. A 12-year initialization run

was suggested by Ma et al. (1998) to obtain steady-state conditions for the faster soil organic pools.

Following initialization and equilibration of the carbon and nitrogen (C/N) pool, the crop parameters were calibrated by trial-and-error adjustments to match observed crop phenology and yield as simulated by the CERES-Maize dedicated corn model, available as part of the DSSAT4.0 (Decision Support for Agrotechnology Transfer—[www.icasa.net/dssat/index.html](http://www.icasa.net/dssat/index.html); Richie et al., 1998) suite of crop models incorporated in the latest model version RZWQM2. The CERES-Maize model has been extensively used world-wide for development of crop management applications (Saseendran et al., 2005). Corn calibration parameters included four physiological and two growth parameters as follows: (i) thermal time from seedling emergence to the end of the juvenile phase (P1, expressed in degree days above a base temperature of 8 °C, °Cd), (ii) photoperiodism coefficient (P2, expressed as days delay in tassel initiation per hour increase in photoperiod, d/hr); (iii) thermal time from silking to physiological maturity (P5, °Cd); (iv) thermal time between successive leaf tip appearances, known as phyllochron interval (PHINT, °Cd); (v) maximum possible number of kernels per plant (G2); and (vi) kernel filling rate (G3, mg/d). We based adjustments of these parameters for corn within the range of values used for Kansas environments (Pachta, 2007; Dogan et al., 2006; Roman-Paoli et al., 2000; Kiniry et al., 1997).

Because the nitrogen-related and plant-growth parameters are difficult to measure with independent experiments, an accurate description of the soil-water-related processes as far as possible is required to minimize N-simulation errors. Therefore, particular effort was expended in calibrating the soil-water hydrologic processes first before proceeding with the plant and N-related parameter calibration.

Three statistics were used to evaluate the simulation results: (i) root mean squared error (RMSE) between simulated and observed values, eq. (5); (ii) relative root mean square error (RRMSE), i.e., RMSE relative to the mean of the observed values, eq. (6); and (iii) mean relative error (MRE) or bias, eq. (7).

$$\text{RMSE} = \sqrt{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (S_i - O_i)^2} \quad (5)$$

$$\text{RRMSE} = \text{RMSE} \times \frac{100\%}{O_{\text{avg}}} \quad (6)$$

$$\text{MRE} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{(S_i - O_i)}{O_i} \times 100\% \quad (7)$$

where  $S_i$  is the  $i$ th simulated value,  $O_i$  is the  $i$ th observed value,  $O_{\text{avg}}$  is the average of observed values, and  $n$  is the number of data pairs.

The RMSE reflects the magnitude of the mean difference between simulated and experimental results, whereas the RRMSE standardizes the RMSE and expresses it as a percentage that represents the standard variation of the estimator (Abrahamson et al., 2005). The MRE indicates if there is a systematic bias in the simulation. A positive value indicates an overprediction and a negative value an underprediction.

## Results and Discussion

### Wastewater and Ground-water Quality

The general quality of the treated wastewater effluent applied in 2005 and 2006 using a LEPA-sprinkler irrigation system is shown in Fig. 4. The chloride concentrations were around the 300 mg/L level, but further increased during the second half of 2006, and the Total Kjeldahl Nitrogen concentrations (TKN) were generally above the 80 mg/L level for site N7. The average electrical conductivity (EC) of the effluent applied for 2005 was 2.11 mS/cm for site N7 and 2.07 mS/cm for site R8 (2.63 and 2.43 mS/cm, respectively for 2006), whereas the sodium adsorption ratio (SAR) for 2005 was 5.17 for site N7, and 7.04 for site R8 (6.34 and 5.98, respectively for 2006). Both EC and SAR values exceed the Servi-Tech, Inc. agronomic-consulting firm's recommendations of keeping EC not greater than 1.5 mS/cm and SAR values to less than 5.0 to avoid salinity problems eventually impacting crop yields (Zupancic and Vocasek, 2002). Following agronomic recommendations, the farmers averted further salt buildup on crop leaves by



converting their sprinklers from higher-pressure overhead nozzles to lower-pressured drop nozzles, and also by applying gypsum treatments to soils with high exchangeable sodium percentage (Zupancic and Vocasek, 2002).

Figure 5 shows the ground-water nitrate-N concentrations from the November 2005 survey sampling. The general ground-water flow in the study area is from west to east based on annually measured water levels by the Kansas Geological Survey ([www.kgs.ku.edu/Hydro/Levels/](http://www.kgs.ku.edu/Hydro/Levels/)). Wells shown in solid black symbols exceed the safe drinking-water limit for nitrate-N of 10 mg/L. Notice that most of the wells have more than 2 mg/L nitrate-N in the ground water. This indicates (Mueller and Helsel, 1996) that anthropogenic sources have begun to impact the ground water in the area. The temporal evolution of nitrate-N in ground water since 1988 will be described in the next section together with the temporal evolution of soil nitrate-N.

Figure 6 displays a trilinear diagram with the average water quality (major anions and cations) of the irrigation water applied in both R8 and N7 sites marked as the A-circle, the shallow- and intermediate-depth suction lysimeter-sampled pore water from both sites marked as the B-circle. Figure 6 also displays the water quality of the sampled (November 2005) domestic, monitoring, and irrigation wells in the area. The deeper ground-water quality in the general area is a calcium-bicarbonate type water characterized by relatively low nitrate and chloride concentrations (Fig. 6) with specific conductance around 400  $\mu\text{S}/\text{cm}$ . The sampled populations of applied wastewater, pore water from suction lysimeters, and monitoring and domestic wells form distinct groups in the trilinear Piper diagram (Fig. 6).

### **Soil Nitrate Profiles**

High nitrate-N concentrations were found in the soil profile at all sites sampled as seen in Figure 7 for sites N7, R8, and Y8, respectively. The data for the spring of 2005, which were used as the initial conditions for the RZWQM, indicated the R8 (a site with a long-term wastewater irrigation history—since 1986) (Fig. 7a) had a high nitrate peak of about 40 mg/kg around 60 cm, which decreases sharply to 0.7 mg/kg level in the depth

interval of 380 to 580 cm. This decrease is possibly due to previously planted alfalfa roots consuming the nitrate at those depths, as the R8 site was cropped to alfalfa from 1997 to 2002. The nitrate increases again reaching a secondary maximum of about 7.2 mg/kg near the depth of 870 cm, then following a decrease near the 940-cm level to the 3 mg/kg level, it progressively increases with depth down to more than 1500 cm, reaching the 10 mg/kg level. It seems that a previous nitrate front has reached down to 1500 cm, with yet older fronts reaching even deeper, indicating that nitrate may have already penetrated to those depths. For site N7 (with wastewater irrigation history since 1998) (Fig. 7b) a deeper nitrate peak (of less than 28 mg/kg, i.e., not as high as that at site R8) was observed around the 240-cm-depth level. Then, the nitrate distribution progressively decreases to a minimal, background level (0.4 mg/kg) near 940 cm, indicating that nitrate penetrated to that depth but no further. Finally, for site Y8 (without any wastewater irrigation) (Fig. 7c), a high nitrate peak was observed near the 100-cm level, but at the 570-cm depth level, nitrate goes back to minimal background level (1.2 mg/kg).

Examination of soil-core data in nearby wastewater-irrigated sites (N6 and R13, shown in Fig. 5) as well as ground-water samples from nearby monitoring wells (MW3, MW7, MW10, also shown in Fig. 5) collected by Servi-Tech Inc. personnel, show progressive increases with time in both vadose zone nitrate storage and ground water nitrate-N with statistically significant increasing trend (using the Mann-Kendall test for trend (Helsel and Hirsch, 2002; Fig. 8).

### **Dye-tracer Experiments**

Numerous macropores were observed in cores not only in the upper soil profile but also at depths down to more than 10 m (for a possible explanation see later in this section). During the dye tracer experiment, the tracer at site R8 penetrated down to approximately 200 cm and formed a more-or-less uniform “finger front” at the bottom (Fig. 9). The right-hand-side picture in Fig. 9 shows evidence of dye movement through the blocky-structure soil layers of the Bt horizons (at approximately the 50- to 100-cm depth interval) where the tracer moved along the spaces between the blocky soil aggregates and concentrated in numerous fingers in the lower soil layer that did not

exhibit the heavy blocky structure of the Bt horizons above. For site N7, the dye pattern was different, forming a giant funnel front ending in a big finger down to more than 200 cm (Fig. 10). Closer examination of a side finger showed that the dye finger formed along a decaying root channel, as did other fingers examined in both sites. Sophocleous et al. (2007) presented photographs of sampled cores indicating the decaying root organic material lining the macropores.

The observed macropores at depth are probably due to the existence of deep-rooted prairie grasses that dominated the landscape prior to agricultural development. The currently practiced no-till land-use treatment further enhances worm activity near the soil surface, thus maintaining macropores open at the soil surface. Because of the existence of such preferential-flow pathways, the macropore option of the RZWQM was employed. Based on the observed macropores throughout the soil profile in both sites, macropores were uniformly distributed through all simulated layers using an average estimated pore radius of 0.1 cm and a percentage of macropores of 0.1% in RZWQM.

### **Sensitivity Analysis and RZWQM macropore-flow impacts**

For the sensitivity analysis of hydraulic properties, the response variable considered was the soil-water content, whereas for the sensitivity analysis of crop parameters, the response variable considered was the soil nitrate-N.

For hydraulic parameters, bulk density, saturation water content ( $\theta_s$ ), and the Brooks and Corey parameters  $\lambda$  and  $\psi_a$  were the most sensitive, whereas saturated hydraulic conductivity ( $K_s$ ) and residual water content ( $\theta_r$ ) were the least sensitive. Additional details on hydraulic and crop parameter sensitivity analyses for this study site are presented in Sophocleous et al. (2007).

Ahuja and Williams (1991) and Williams and Ahuja (2003) found that the soil water retention curves, as described by the Brooks and Corey equations, could be simply described by the pore size distribution index,  $\lambda$ . The importance of  $\lambda$  was used for scaling water infiltration and redistribution (Kozak and Ahuja, 2005) and for scaling evaporation

and transpiration across soil textures (Kozak et al., 2005). Because of the relatively high sensitivity of parameters  $\theta_s$  and  $\lambda$ , both of which are fitted (as opposed to experimentally measured) parameters, we decided to use primarily the  $\lambda$ -parameter and secondarily the  $\theta_s$  parameter to calibrate the RZWQM model.

The most sensitive macropore parameters were the total macroporosity fraction and the average size of pore radii (Sophocleous et al., 2007). Macropore flow is generated only during heavy rainfall events in the model. For example, the rainfall events during June 10 and 12, 2005 (Julian days 161 and 163 in Fig. 3), generated less than 2.8 cm of macropore soil-water flow at site N7. No other macropore flow-causing rainfall events occurred during the April to December 2005 simulation period for site N7, whereas a total of 11 rainfall events generated 5.8 cm of macropore flow for site R8 during the same period. During 2006, three rainfall events caused less than 0.4 cm of macropore soil-water flow, whereas 9 rainfall events generated 6.9 cm of macropore flow for site R8 during 2006. Thus, the total April 2005 to December 2006 macropore flow for site N7 was 3.1 cm, which represents approximately 3% of the total precipitation during that 2005-06 simulation period, whereas the simulated macropore flow for site R8 was more than 12.6 cm, which represents 13.3% of total precipitation during that simulation period. This significant difference in macropore flow between the two sites is mainly related to the fact that the soil texture for R8 is generally more clayey than that for N7 (Table 1), with the lower soil-infiltration capacity of the heavier-textured soil at site R8 creating more opportunities for macropore flow (see RZWQM macropore flow process explanation in the subsection on Root Zone Water Quality Model in the Methodology section). Also the total 4.8-m simulated depth for site R8 was appreciably smaller compared to the 10.8-m simulated depth for site N7.

In a sensitivity analysis when we doubled the amount of rainfall for site N7 during the rainy days of the period May 24 to June 14, 2005 (Julian days 144 to 165 in Fig. 3), the simulated macropore soil-water flow increased by more than four times. Macroporosity had also appreciable effect on nitrogen distribution (Fig. 11). Figure 11a shows the simulated nitrogen distributions in the upper 3.5m of the soil profile on the

macropore flow-causing rainy day of June 12, 2005 (Julian day 163 in Fig. 3), with and without simulated macropores. Figure 11b displays the same profile as Fig. 11a but with doubling the rain on all rainfall days across the May 24-June 14 period, including the rains of June 10 and 12, 2005. Because the presence of macropore flow led to increased N concentrations at greater depths, our results suggest high intensity storm events can initiate macropore flow when using the RZWQM. In general, the higher the intensity and amount, the higher the generated macropore flow.

Although site R8 showed appreciable simulated macropore flow, RZWQM-simulated macropore flow for site N7 during the 2005-06 study period had no major impact on the results. We believe the reasons for such RZWQM results are the following:

1. The RZWQM generates macropore flow only when there is excess water generated at the soil surface that does not infiltrate into the soil matrix. This happens when the rate of application of water (irrigation or rain) is greater than the infiltration rate in the soil. The rate of wastewater sprinkler application was relatively small, about 7mm per day, as mentioned previously. This application rate is low enough that all of the water will infiltrate into the soil matrix, and no macropore flow is generated, even though there are macropores present. Only two rainfall events during the April to December 2005 simulation period exceeded the infiltration capacity of the soil at site N7, whereas at the more clayey site R8, as previously mentioned, 11 rainfall events exceeded its infiltration capacity during the same period. If the irrigation wastewater were ponded (as in flood irrigation), the results would have been more macropore flow as actually observed with the brilliant blue dye experiments. To further prove this point, we re-ran the RZWQM model using the same conditions in all respects except for the method of irrigation, which was changed from sprinkler to flood irrigation. Using flood irrigation, macropore flow increased tremendously for site N7, from a total of 3.1 cm with sprinkler irrigation to 48.8 cm with flood irrigation during the 2005-2006 simulation period.
2. The model comparisons between the measured and double the measured rain intensities for site N7 show only modest macropore flow increases. Nitrate is a non-

adsorbed mobile anion. It is not kept near the soil surface by adsorption as other chemicals, such as ammonium ion or brilliant blue dye will be. If it were adsorbed, the higher intensity rains would probably cause more nitrate flow through macropores.

Higher rain intensity after irrigation with nitrate-laden wastewater in RZWQM simulations is not going to make much difference for nitrate, as it has already moved deeper into the soil. The macropore flow in RZWQM only carries chemical from the surface soil with overland flow (excess water generated at the surface due to infiltration being less than the rainfall or irrigation application rate).

3. An additional conceptual deficiency in the RZWQM is the following. The RZWQM does not allow macropore flow from soil water ponded over a low hydraulic conductivity (impeding) soil horizon at some depth in the soil profile; it only allows macropore flow from ground surface irrigation or rainfall rates that exceed the infiltration capacity of the surface soil.

Despite the above-mentioned RZWQM conceptual macropore deficiencies, we decided to retain the macropore option in our simulations because of our experimental observations indicating the existence of macropores throughout the soil profile and the occurrence of measurable nitrate-N at depth in the vadose zone. Overall, the major hydrologic effect of introducing macropores in the RZWQM model is to reduce surface runoff.

With regard to organic matter/nitrate cycling parameters, the aerobic heterotroph microbial population (that is organisms capable of deriving carbon and energy from organic compounds, and growing only in the presence of molecular oxygen) and transition and fast humus pool sizes were the most sensitive parameters. Finally, for corn (CERES-Maize) parameters, the P1 and P5 were the most sensitive ones from the physiological parameters, followed (in decreasing order of sensitivity) by G2 and G3 from the growth parameters. P2 was the least sensitive from the physiological parameters. (All these parameters have been briefly explained previously in the subsection on Model Calibration Procedures in the Methodology section.) The calibrated CERES-Maize parameters are shown in Table 2.

## Model Evaluation

Both wastewater-irrigation sites, N7 and R8, were simulated starting from the spring of 2005 and finishing at the end of 2006 using the RZWQM (Sophocleous et al., 2007). Both sites were planted with corn.

The simulated and observed soil water for the various individual layers for sites N7 (total simulation depth: 10.8 m) and R8 (total simulation depth: 4.8 m) are shown in Figs. 12 and 13, respectively, for the April to December 2005 simulation period. Although for the upper layers of the soil in both sites the RRMSE and other error measures were relatively high, they improved with soil depth, as shown in the figures for the deeper layers. Using the 2005 calibration parameters, the simulated 2006 planting season for sites N7 and R8 are shown in Fig. 14 and 15, respectively, along with the three statistics (eqns. 5–7). The model seems to be satisfactorily predicting measured values, although additional measured data may have further improved this calibration.

Regarding simulated soil nitrate-N, only results from site N7 will be highlighted from here onwards, for which we had relatively more detailed hydraulic-property data for a deeper vadose-zone profile analysis resulting in generally better simulation results than those for site R8. The simulated and measured soil nitrate-N profiles in the fall of 2005 in site N7, which was planted in corn in April and harvested at the end of September, are shown in Fig. 16 for both the 2005 calibration year (a) and the 2006 prediction year (b and c). The model approximated the main patterns of the nitrate depth profile relatively well, but not the observed detailed nitrate patterns in the soil profile. The total measured soil nitrate-N in the 10.8-m modeled soil profile during the post-harvest or pre-planting core-sampling dates of November 10, 2005, April 18, 2006, and November 7, 2006, was 1224.9, 1392.6, and 1389.3 kg/ha, respectively, whereas the simulated soil-profile nitrate-N during the same dates was 1449.8, 1576.1, and 1821.0 kg/ha, respectively, thus consistently overestimating the measured profile soil nitrate by 13 to 31%. This overestimation is consistent with soil nitrate over-prediction during corn years observed by Malone et al. (2001) in evaluating numerous studies employing the RZWQM model. In a comprehensive study of the fate of nitrogen in a field soil-crop environment in the

Mediterranean region, Cameira et al. (2007) found that the prediction of residual nitrate-nitrogen in the soil, after crop harvest, presented errors ranging from 19 to 38% using RZWQM. Our results show the RZWQM is capable of simulating generally complex field conditions with acceptable accuracy.

Besides the measured soil-profile water content and soil nitrate-N values, the third model evaluation check employed was the harvested corn grain yield, which for site N7 for 2005 was 14,247 kg/ha and for 2006 was 12,553 kg/ha. The simulated corn grain yields were 15,384 kg/ha and 11,626 kg/ha for 2005 and 2006, respectively, in both cases within less than 8% of measured values.

### **Nitrogen Use Efficiency, Nitrogen Budget, and Management Scenarios**

Once an agricultural system is adequately calibrated and tested, it has the potential for use in evaluation of alternative crop-soil management practices for their production potential and impact on the environment (Hu et al., 2006). Because of the limited data we had available for calibration and evaluation of the RZWQM, the results presented here should be considered only indicative of the problem at hand.

Historical and current sampling of nitrogen in the soil at the wastewater-irrigated sites show increased accumulation of inorganic nitrogen in the soil profile with time (see also Figs. 7 and 8), suggesting the inorganic N remaining in the soil at harvest was not taken up completely by the subsequent crop. This residual N is subject to leaching to ground water when rainfall, especially of high intensity that enhances macropore flow, occurs between crop seasons. Numerical simulations indicated consistent increases in N losses due to denitrification, volatilization, and deep seepage as the nitrogen application rate increased.

Nitrogen Use Efficiency (NUE) is a term used to indicate the relative balance between the amount of fertilizer N taken up and used by the crop versus the amount of fertilizer N “lost”, and can be defined as follows (Hu et al., 2006):



$$\text{NUE} = \frac{(\text{Plant N uptake for a particular N treatment}) - (\text{Plant N uptake for zero-N treatment})}{(\text{Total amount of N applied})} \quad (8)$$

The RZWQM model was run with a zero-N treatment, and the results were used in the NUE computations.

Differences in predicted corn grain yields, plant N uptake, residual soil profile N, volatilization, and other N losses with different irrigation and fertilization treatments were analyzed using the RZWQM model (Table 3). According to OMI lab analyses (see also Fig. 4), the total N applied at site N7 during the 2005 irrigation season was 427.4 kg/ha and 520.7 kg/ha during 2006, both of which were much higher than the total N applied to site R8, which was 230.2 kg/ha and 252.8 kg/ha for 2005 and 2006, respectively. The N balance components and NUE for the 2005 and 2006 fertilization totals for site N7 are shown in Table 3. The major source of N is the applied wastewater effluent with additional, secondary sources from dead roots and incorporated residue, and the major losses of applied N are from plant uptake, with minor losses due to volatilization, denitrification, and deep seepage (Table 3). Mineralization is the major transformation of nitrogen, followed by immobilization. Large amounts of nitrate exist in the unsaturated soil profile (Figs. 7 and 8). The model-estimated 2005 storage of nitrate N in the 10.8-m-deep soil profile of site N7 analyzed in this model was 1390 kg/ha (1689 kg/ha in 2006), indicating that N leaches well below the corn root zone and accumulates in both the deeper vadose zone and underlying ground water with time (Fig. 8). The model indicates that continuing this practice of corn cultivation for the next 20 years will result in nitrate accumulation in the deeper vadose zone that will exceed current levels by more than 160% over the 6.8 to 10.8-m depth interval.

Several management scenarios were simulated using reduced fertilization treatments of 50% and 40% of the applied wastewater-N totals mentioned above (427.4 and 520.7 kg/ha for 2005 and 2006, respectively), as well as 88%, 75%, and 50% reduced irrigation totals while maintaining the same irrigation scheduling. Results suggest that reducing N fertilization by 50% using the same 2005 irrigation scheduling increases NUE significantly while achieving a maximum simulated crop yield, whereas decreasing N

fertilization to 40% of the 2005 level achieves maximum NUE while maintaining crop yield within 0.1% of maximum (Table 3). Lowering the N application rate from 521 kg/ha (the 2006 applied amount) to 427 kg/ha (the 2005 applied amount), to 261 kg/ha (the 50% of the 2006 amount), to 214 kg/ha (the 50% of the 2005 amount) to 208 and 170 kg/ha (the 40% amounts) consistently increased NUE from 38.9% to 42.2% to 76.4% to 85.6% to 91.1% to 93.7, respectively (Table 3). Reducing irrigation total amount by various percentages ranging from 12% to 50% (but keeping the same irrigation scheduling) while maintaining N fertilization levels at the near-optimal value of 170 kg/ha does not result in any NUE or grain-yield benefits, which means that the current irrigation practices are efficient and the used amounts near optimal (48.55 cm during the 2005 irrigation season—Table 3).

Reducing the fertilization levels at the study sites to around 170 kg/ha while maintaining currently used irrigation schedules and amounts increases the NUE significantly. Such lower fertilization rates can be achieved by blending treated wastewater effluent with freshwater from the underlying High Plains aquifer. (This was practiced during the initial years of the wastewater-irrigation operation but the practice was later abandoned.) As we mentioned in the wastewater and ground-water quality subsection, the deeper ground-water quality is generally good. Implementing a crop rotation system using leguminous plants, such as alfalfa, will likely decrease the rate of build-up of nitrogen in the soil profile as seen in the profile of site R8 (Fig. 7a), which has a history of alfalfa in the crop rotation.

## **Conclusions and recommendations**

The analysis carried out in this report leads to the following conclusions:

1. Soil coring down to 15.2 m and ground-water sampling in the treated wastewater irrigation area south of Dodge City, Kansas, indicated that nitrate-N is accumulating in the vadose zone and has reached the underlying ground water.

2. Soil coring and dye-tracing experiments demonstrated the existence of preferential pathways through macropores from decaying root channels throughout the sampled depths.
3. The residual soil nitrate-N is progressively increasing with depth, and nitrate-N in the underlying ground water is also increasing with time.
4. Modeling simulations using RZWQM indicated that high intensity rainfall events promote macropore preferential flows, which can transport nitrate deeper in the soil profile as indicated in items 1 through 3 above. However, we identified macropore conceptual limitations in the RZWQM in that the model does not allow macropore flow from water ponded over the subsurface impeding layers.
5. Based on sensitivity analysis, bulk density, saturated water content, and the Brooks and Corey parameters ( $\lambda$  and  $\psi_a$ ) are the most sensitive parameters affecting soil-water flow, whereas the CERES-Maize parameters P1 and P5, G2 and G3 were the most sensitive plant parameters. Quantifying the aforementioned hydraulic parameters will enhance soil-water simulations and consequently soil-nitrate transport, which will be further improved by carefully quantifying the above-identified CERES-Maize parameters.
6. The RZWQM was calibrated for the 2005 planting season based on limited data and was tested/verified for the 2006 cropping season. The model acceptably approximated the overall patterns of the observed soil water and nitrate profiles but not their detailed patterns, and generally overestimated the profile soil nitrate. In our judgment, better procedures for estimating the humus and microbial pools and plant growth parameters as well as enhancement of the plant growth module in the RZWQM will further improve the present state of N simulation. The incorporation of the Decision Support System for Agrotechnology Transfer, DSSAT4.0 suite of crop growth models in the latest released RZWQM (RZWQM2, version 1.5) is a step in the right direction. Model results may also

be improved by increasing the number of soil horizons that the model can handle and obtaining additional soil hydraulic data (mentioned in item 5 above).

7. The calibrated RZWQM model was used to evaluate indicative alternative reduced N amounts management practices on NUE and soil N. Thus, the model showed that reducing the wastewater N application rates to around 170 kg/ha increases the NUE significantly.

Adopting such measures would definitely reduce the size of residual nitrate stored in the thick vadose zone in the area and slow down its downward migration.

Combining such measures with a crop rotation that includes alfalfa should further reduce the amounts of residual nitrate in the soil.

## **Acknowledgments**

This study was funded by the U.S. Geological Survey through the Kansas Water Resources Institute. Numerous people and agencies assisted us during the conduct of this study: Kansas NRCS personnel J. Warner, S. Graber, R. Still, T. Cochran, and C. Watts assisted us with field characterization and soil property lab analyses through the National Soils Laboratory in Lincoln, Nebraska. NRCS Soil Mechanics Laboratory in Lincoln, Nebraska, performed saturated hydraulic conductivity and related analyses. T. Willson and other personnel from the Garden City Experiment Station, Kansas State University, assisted us with neutron probe readings and related analyses. D. Schuette of Servi-Tech assisted us with coring, sampling, and the dye tracer experiments. W. McCall of Geoprobe Systems assisted us with the Geoprobe equipment during field site installations. The farmer-operator of the field sites, C. Nicholson, and his office personnel assisted us with land use information and access to the sites. K. Rojas of NRCS at Fort Collins, Colorado, assisted us with the RZWQM. Numerous other personnel from OMI and KGS assisted us at different stages of this project. Earlier versions of this report benefitted from constructive reviews by the USDA-ARS scientists L.R. Ahuja, S.A. Saseendran, and J.D. Jabro.

## References

- Abrahamson, D.A., Radcliffe, D.E., Steiner, J.L., Cabrera, M.L., Hanson, J.D., Rojas, K. W., Schomberg, H.H., Fisher, D.S., Schwartz, L., and Hoogenboom, G., 2005. Calibration of the Root Zone Water Quality Model for simulating tile drainage and leached nitrate in the Georgia Piedmont: *Agron. J.*, 97: 1584-1602.
- Ahuja, L.R., DeCoursey, D.G., Barnes, B.B., and Rojas, K.W., 1993. Characteristics of macropore transport studied with the ARS Root Zone Water Quality Model: *Trans. ASAE*, 36(2): 369-380.
- Ahuja, L.R., and Ma, L., 2002. Parameterization of agricultural system models—Current approaches and future needs. *In* L.R. Ahuja, L. Ma, and T.A. Howell, (eds.) *Agricultural System Models in Field Research and Technology Transfer*. Lewis Publ., p. 273-316.
- Ahuja, L.R., Rojas, K.W., Hanson, J.D., Shaffer, M.J., and Ma, L. (eds.), 2000. *Root Zone Water Quality Model—Modeling management effects on water quality and crop production*: Water Resources Publications, LLC, Highlands Ranch, CO, 372 p.
- Ahuja, L.R., and Williams, R.D., 1991. Scaling of water characteristic and hydraulic conductivity based on Gregson-Hector-McGowan approach: *Soil Sci. Soc. Am. J.*, 55: 308-319.
- Brooks, R.H., and Corey, A.T., 1964. Hydraulic properties of porous media: *Hydrol. Paper 3*, Colorado State Univ., Fort Collins, CO.
- Bond, W.J., 1998. Effluent irrigation – an environmental challenge for soil science. *Austr. J. Soil Research*, 36(4): 543-555.
- Cameira, M.R., Fernando, R.M., Ahuja, L.R., and Ma, L., 2007. Using RZWQM to simulate the fate of nitrogen in field soil-crop environment in the Mediterranean region. *Agric. Water Management*, 90: 121-136.
- Celia, M.A., Bouloutas, E.T., and Zarba, R.L., 1990. A general mass-conservative numerical solution for the unsaturated flow equation. *Water Resour. Res.*, 26: 1483-1496.
- Dodge, D. A., Tomasu, B. I., Haberman, R. L., Roth, W. E., and Baumann, J. B., 1965. Soil survey Ford County, Kansas: U.S. Dept. of Agriculture, Soil Conservation Service, Series 1958, no. 32, 84 p.
- Dogan, E., Clark, G.A., Rogers, D.H., Martin, V., and Vanderlip, R.L., 2006. On-farm scheduling studies and CERES-Maize simulation of irrigated corn. *Applied Engineering in Agriculture*, 22(4): 509-516.
- Flury M., Fluhler, H., Jury, W. A., and Leuenberger, J., 1994. Susceptibility of soils to preferential flow of water—A field study: *Water Resour. Res.*, 30(7): 1945-1954.

- Flury, M., and Fluhler, H., 1994. Brilliant blue FCF as a dye tracer for solute transport studies—A toxicological overview: *Environ. Qual.*, 23: 1108-1112.
- Flury, M., and Fluhler, H., 1995. Tracer characteristics of brilliant blue FCF: *Soil Sci. Soc. Am. J.*, 59: 22-27.
- Green, W.H., and Ampt, G.A., 1911. Studies on soil physics. 1. Flow of air and water through soils. *J. Agric. Sci.*, 4: 1-24.
- Grossman, R.B. and Reinsch, T.G., 2002. Bulk density and linear extensibility. *In* Dane, J.H. and Topp, G.C. (eds.) *Methods of Soil Analysis, Part 4, Physical Methods*. Soil Science Society of America Series, No. 5, Soil Science Society of America, Inc., Madison, WI, p. 201-207.
- Hanson, J.D., Rojas, K.W., and Shaffer, M.J., 1999. Calibrating the Root Zone Water Quality Model: *Agron. J.*, 91: 171-177.
- Helsel, D.R. and Hirsch, R.M., 2002. Statistical Methods in Water Resources. Chapter A3, Book 4, *Hydrologic Analysis and Interpretation, Techniques of Water-Resource Investig. of the U.S. Geol. Surv.*, 510 p.
- Hu, C., Saseendran, S. A., Green, T. R., Ma, L., Li, X., and Ahuja, L. R., 2006. Evaluating nitrogen and water management in a double-cropping system using RZWQM. *Vadose Zone J.* 5: 493-505.
- Kinney, C.A., Furlong, E.T., Werner, S.L., and Cahill, J.D., 2006. Presence and distribution of wastewater-derived pharmaceuticals in soil irrigated with reclaimed water. *Env. Toxicology and Chemistry* 25(2): 317-326.
- Kiniry, J.R., Williams, J.R., Vandelp, R.L., Atwood, J.D., Reicosky, D.C., Mulliken, J., Cox, W.J., Mascagni, H.J. Jr., Hollinger, S.E., and Wiebold, W.J., 1997. Evaluation of two maize models for nine U.S. locations. *Agron. J.*, 89: 421-426.
- Kozak, J.A., and Ahuja, L.R., 2005. Scaling of infiltration and redistribution across soil textural classes: *Soil Sci. Soc. Am. J.*, 69: 816-827.
- Kozak, J., Ahuja, L.R., Ma, L., Green, T.R., 2005. Scaling and estimation of evaporation and transpiration of water across soil texture classes: *Vadose Zone J.* 4:418-427.
- Ma, L., Shaffer, J. J., Boyd, J. K., Waskom, R., Ahuja, L. R., Rojas, K. W., and Xu, C. 1998. Manure management in an irrigated silage corn field—Experiment and modeling: *Soil Sci. Soc. Am. J.* 62: 1006-1017.
- Magesan, G.N., Dalgety, J. Lee, R., Luo, J., and van Oostrom, A.J., 1999. Preferential flow and water quality in two New Zealand soils previously irrigated with wastewater. *J. Env. Quality*, 28(5): 1528-1532.
- Malone, R.W., Ma, L., Ahuja, L.R., and Rojas, K.W. 2001. Evaluation of the Root Zone Water Quality Model (RZWQM): A review. *In* Parsons, J.E., Thomas, D.L., and Huffman, R.L. (eds.) *Agricultural non-point source water quality models: their use and application*. Southern

Coop. Series Bull. #398, 27 p. Also available at <http://www3.bae.ncsu.edu/Regional-Bulletins/Modeling-Bulletin/RZWQM2-word.html> (verified November 2007).

- Mueller, D.K. and Helsel, D.R. 1996. Nutrients in the nation's waters—Too much of a good thing?: U.S. Geol. Surv., Circular 1136, 24 p.
- Pachta, C.J., 2007. Improving irrigated cropping systems on the High Plains using crop simulation models. M.S. Thesis, Dept. of Agronomy, Kansas State Univ., Manhattan, KS, 126 p.
- Pettygrove, G.S. and Asano, T. (eds.) 1985. Irrigation with reclaimed municipal wastewater—A guidance manual. Lewis Publishers, Inc., Chelsey, MI.
- Richie, J.T., Singh, U., Godwin, D.C., and Bowen, W.T., 1998. Cereal growth, development and yield. In: Tsuji, G.Y., Hoogenboom, G., and Thornton, P.K. (eds.), Understanding options for agricultural production. Kluwer Acad. Publ., Dordrecht, the Netherlands, p. 79-98.
- Roman-Paoli, E., Welch, S.M., and Vanderlip, R.L., 2000. Comparing genetic coefficient estimation using the CERES-Maize model. *Agricultural Systems*, 65(1): 29-41.
- Saseendran, S.A., Ma, L., Nielsen, D.C., Vigil, M.F., and Ahuja, L.R., 2005. Simulating planting date effects on corn production using RZWQM and CERES-Maize models. *Agronomy J.*, 97: 58-71.
- Shaffer, M.J., Rojas, K.W., DeCoursey, D.G., and Hanson, C.S. 2000. Nutrient Chemistry Processes—OMNI. In Ahuja, L.R., Rojas, K.W., Hanson, J.D., Shaffer, M.J., and Ma, L. (eds.), Root Zone Water Quality Model—Modeling management effects on water quality and crop production: Water Resour. Public., LLC, Highlands Ranch, CO, p. 119-144.
- Shipitalo, M.J. and Edwards, W.M., 1996. Effects of initial water content on macropore/matrix flow and transport of surface-applied chemicals: *J. Environ. Qual.*, 25:662-670.
- Sophocleous, M.A., Townsend, M.A., Willson, T., Vocasek, F., and Zupancic, J. 2006. Fate of nitrate beneath fields irrigated with treated wastewater in Ford County, Kansas: First-year Progress Report to KWRI; Kansas Geol. Survey, Open-file Rpt 2007-14, 62 p.
- Sophocleous, M.A., Ma, L., Townsend, M.A., Vocasek, F., KC, A., Willson, J., and Schuette, D. 2007. Treated wastewater and nitrate transport beneath irrigated fields near Dodge City, Kansas. Second-year Progress Report to KWRI, Kansas Geol. Survey, Open-file Rpt 2007-25, 50 p.
- Toze, S., 2006. Reuse of effluent water – benefits and risks. *Agric. Water Management*, 80: 147-159.

- U. S. Geological Survey, 2004, NAWQA, Significant findings irrigated agriculture land-use study—central High Plains: U.S. Geol. Survey, <http://webserver.cr.usgs.gov/nawqa/hpgw/sigfinds/CALFINDS.html> (verified May 2007).
- van Genuchten, M.Th., Leij, F.J., and Yates, S.R., 1991. The RETC code for quantifying the hydraulic functions of unsaturated soils: U.S. Env. Protection Agency, Rpt 600/2-91/065.
- Williams, R.D., and Ahuja, L.R., 2003. Scaling and estimating the soil water characteristic using a one-parameter model. *In* Y. Pachepsky, D.E. Radcliffe, and H.M. Selim (eds.), *Scaling Methods in Soil Physics*. CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL, p. 35-48.
- Zupancic, J.W., and Vocasek, F.F., 2002. Dealing with changes in volume and quality of effluent at the Dodge City wastewater recycling project over the last sixteen years—1986 through 2001. 2002 Tech. Conf. Proc. Irrig. Assoc., New Orleans, LA.



## List of Figures

Figure 1. Location of the study area (highlighted). Circular areas indicate irrigated fields. Black circles are the study sites.

Figure 2. Comparison of daily average solar radiation from 1986 to 1990 for Garden City and Dodge City, Kansas.

Figure 3. Daily precipitation and irrigation events during the 2005 irrigation season at site N7. The vertical lines in the lower irrigation display (in gray color) indicate times when the irrigation system was off.

Figure 4. Treated effluent irrigation water chloride, total Kjeldahl nitrogen (TKN), ammonia-nitrogen (NH<sub>3</sub>-N), and organic nitrogen concentration time series applied to sites N7 (a) and R8 (b) during 2005 and 2006.

Figure 5. Ground-water nitrate-nitrogen concentrations during November 2005. Bold numbers above well symbols indicate ground-water nitrate-nitrogen concentrations (mg/L). Circles/semicircles are irrigated fields. The study sites are highlighted. Time series distributions of ground-water nitrate-nitrogen for monitoring wells MW3, MW7, and MW10 (indicated in bold letters in the Figure) are displayed in Fig. 7.

Figure 6. Trilinear Piper diagram showing the average 2005 quality of irrigation water applied in sites R8 and N7 (circle A), the shallow and intermediate-depth suction lysimeter-sampled pore water from sites R8 and N7 (circle B), and the domestic, monitoring, and irrigation wells (with their letter/number designations) sampled in the area.

Figure 7. Measured soil profile Nitrate-Nitrogen at various times during 2005 and 2006 for the study sites (a – R8, b – N7, and c – Y8).

Figure 8. Time evolution of (upper panel) vadose zone nitrate profiles for sites N6 and R13, indicated in Fig. 4, and (lower panel) ground water nitrate-nitrogen from selected municipal wells (MW), also indicated in Fig. 4. Mann-Kendall trend line and related statistics are also indicated, where *tau* is the non-parametric equivalent of the parametric statistical correlation coefficient, and *p* is the calculated probability level that is compared to the significance level,  $\alpha$ , which was set to 0.10. Depth to water table for wells MW3, MW7, and MW10 were 22.6, 32.0, and 33.5 m, respectively, during the November 2005 measurement survey.

Figure 9. Uniform finger front from brilliant-blue dye-tracer experiment at site R8. The right-hand-side image shows in more detail the dye moving through the inter-soil block structure spaces of the Bt horizon and accumulating below that blocky layer into numerous fingers.

Figure 10. Funnel front pattern from brilliant-blue dye-tracer experiment at site N7 and side finger formed along a decaying root channel (indicated by the two arrows).

Figure 11. Simulated nitrogen profiles for the upper 3.5 m of soil at site N7 with and without macropores for (a) the observed June 12, 2005, rainfall distribution, and (b) June 12, 2005, after doubling the observed rainfall during the rainy days of the period of May 24 to June 14, 2005.

Figure 12. Comparison of model-simulated and field-measured soil water contents at various soil depths for site N7 during the 2005 calibration period. Three statistical indices, root mean square error (RMSE), relative RMSE (RRMSE), and mean relative error (MRE), all defined in the text, are used to quantify the goodness of fit of model parameterization. NP stands for neutron probe.

Figure 13. Comparison of model-simulated and field-measured soil water contents at various soil depths for site R8 during the 2005 calibration period. Three statistical indices, root mean square error (RMSE), relative RMSE (RRMSE), and mean relative error (MRE), all defined in the text, are used to quantify the goodness of fit of model parameterization. NP stands for neutron probe.

Figure 14. Comparison of model-simulated and field-measured soil water contents at various soil depths for site N7 during the 2006 prediction period. Three statistical indices, root mean square error (RMSE), relative RMSE (RRMSE), and mean relative error (MRE), all defined in the text, are used to quantify the goodness of fit of model parameterization. NP stands for neutron probe.

Figure 15. Comparison of model-simulated and field-measured soil water contents at various soil depths for site R8 during the 2006 prediction period. Three statistical indices, root mean square error (RMSE), relative RMSE (RRMSE), and mean relative error (MRE), all defined in the text, are used to quantify the goodness of fit of model parameterization. NP stands for neutron probe.

Figure 16. Measured and simulated soil nitrate-nitrogen profiles at site N7 (simulated depth 1080 cm) during the soil-sampling dates of (a) November 10, 2005, (b) April 18, 2006, and (c) November 7, 2006.

## List of Tables

Table 1. Soil physical properties for sites N7 and R8 by layer (in units employed in the RZWQM)

Table 2. Calibrated crop parameters used as input to RZWQM2 for CERES-Maize.

Table 3. Nitrogen inputs and losses predicted by RZWQM2 for the 2005 and 2006 crop seasons for site N7 for current, 50%, and 40% levels of N fertilization rates and various levels of irrigation reduction through the LEPA system.




Figure 1




Figure 2




Figure 3




Figure 4




Figure 5

Legend:

- △ Monitoring Wells near Lagoons
- + Domestic Wells
- ◇ Numbered Monitoring Wells
- ▲ Irrigation Well Y8
- ▼ N7 Lysimeter Medium
- ◇ R8 Lysimeter Medium
- \* R8 Lysimeter Shallow
- ▽ Reservoirs
- ⊕ Irrigation Stations




Figure 6






Figure 7




Figure 8




Figure 9




Figure 10




Figure 11




Figure 12




Figure 13




Figure 14






Figure 15




Figure 16

Site N7

Layer	Soil Type	Horizon Depth (cm)	Bulk Density <sup>a</sup> (g/cm <sup>3</sup> )	Porosity <sup>b</sup> (unitless)	Sand fraction (unitless)	Silt fraction (unitless)	Clay fraction (unitless)	K <sub>s</sub> <sup>c</sup> (cm/hr)	1/3-bar W.C. <sup>d,1</sup> (0.03 MPa)	15-bar W.C. <sup>d,2</sup> (1.5MPa)	Total Organic Carbon <sup>e</sup> (%)
1	Silty loam	0-23	1.280	0.517	0.056	0.686	0.258	1.3163	0.2260	0.1305	1.06
2	Silty clay loam	23-74	1.470	0.445	0.027	0.621	0.352	0.3911	0.2540	0.1690	0.53
3	Silty clay loam	74-168	1.300	0.509	0.033	0.624	0.343	0.7268	0.2710	0.1617	0.26
4	Silty clay loam	168-221	1.240	0.532	0.114	0.558	0.328	0.9829	0.2390	0.1410	0.24
5	Silty clay loam	221-363	1.380	0.479	0.115	0.554	0.331	0.2266	0.2070	0.1215	0.21
6	Silty clay loam	363-625	1.420	0.464	0.090	0.610	0.300	0.5431	0.2310	0.1185	0.05
7	Silty loam	625-848	1.350	0.491	0.126	0.631	0.243	0.7048	0.2340	0.1070	0.03
8	Silty loam	848-889	1.380	0.479	0.141	0.638	0.221	0.6966	0.2340	0.1260	0.02
9	Silty loam	889-945	1.410	0.468	0.267	0.513	0.220	0.6966	0.2480	0.0960	0.02
10	Loam	945-1079	1.520	0.426	0.344	0.416	0.240	0.1463	0.2335	0.1015	0.01

Site R8

1	Silty clay loam	0-16	1.420	0.464	0.041	0.643	0.316	0.4480	0.3540	0.1500	1.66
2	Silty clay loam	16-29	1.490	0.438	0.036	0.659	0.305	0.4452	0.3530	0.1420	1.03
3	Silty clay loam	29-50	1.280	0.517	0.023	0.599	0.378	0.1553	0.3800	0.1780	0.75
4	Silty clay	50-68	1.210	0.543	0.017	0.553	0.430	0.0890	0.3950	0.2010	0.56
5	Silty clay loam	68-90	1.260	0.525	0.021	0.592	0.387	0.2799	0.3820	0.2170	0.42
6	Silty clay loam	90-140	1.520	0.426	0.030	0.627	0.343	0.8501	0.3660	0.1670	0.34
7	Silty clay loam	140-260	1.620	0.389	0.152	0.502	0.346	0.3237	0.2990	0.1310	0.17
8	Silty clay loam	260-300	1.610	0.392	0.194	0.483	0.323	0.1543	0.2800	0.1260	0.12
9	Clay loam	300-410	1.530	0.423	0.217	0.494	0.289	0.2968	0.2730	0.1190	0
10	Silty clay loam	410-484	1.540	0.419	0.188	0.496	0.316	0.1308	0.2920	0.1280	0

<sup>a</sup> core method<sup>b</sup> calculated assuming a particle density of 2.65 g/cm<sup>3</sup><sup>c</sup> saturated hydraulic conductivity performed on collected core samples according to ASTM-D5084 Flexible wall permeability tests<sup>d</sup> soil water content (W.C.): 1-pressure-plate extraction; 2-pressure membrane extraction<sup>e</sup> LECO combustion analyzer of acid-treated sample

Table 1

Table 2. Calibrated crop parameters used as input to RZWQM2 for CERES-Maize.

	Maize parameter	Calibrated values
P1	Thermal time from seedling emergence to the end of Juvenile phase during which the plants are not responsive to changes in photoperiod (degree days).	245
P2	Extent to which development is delayed for each hour increase in photoperiod above the longest photoperiod at which development is at maximum rate, which is considered to be 12.5 hours (days).	0.52
P5	Thermal time from silking to physiological maturity (degree days).	990
G2	Maximum possible number of kernels per plant.	1100
G3	Grain filling rate during the linear grain filling stage and under optimum conditions (mg/day).	10.0
PHINT	Phyllochron interval (degree days).	38.9

Table 3

Description of method		Total N Input (kg/ha)					Total N losses (kg/ha)							NUE <sup>c</sup> %	
	Crop yield (kg/ha)	Percent change in crop yield	Storage (10.8m-profile)	Rain	Fertilization <sup>b</sup>	Mineralization	Percent change in mineralization	Plant uptake	Percent change in plant uptake	Deep seepage	Percent change in deep seepage	Denitrification	Percent change in denitrification	Volatilization	Percent change in volatilization
1. Full rate irrigation <sup>a</sup> , full rate N fertilization <sup>b</sup>	15384	-----	1389.8	9.4	427.4	41.2	-----	360.8	-----	1.8	-----	15.0	-----	12.6	-----
2. Full rate irrigation, 50% N fertilization	15547	1.06	1270.9	9.4	214.4	41.3	0.18	364.0	0.87	1.8	0.01	4.1	-72.93	2.6	-79.63
3. Full rate irrigation, 40% N fertilization	15531	0.96	1258.9	9.4	170.4	40.1	-0.57	340.1	-5.74	1.8	0.02	3.7	-75.62	1.5	-88.09
4. Full rate irrigation, zero fertilization	11005	-28.46	1251.6	9.4	-----	40.9	-0.69	180.5	-49.99	1.8	-0.07	3.2	-78.45	0.0	-99.97
5. 88% irrigation, full rate N fertilization	13654	-11.25	1407.9	9.4	427.4	42.1	2.02	328.7	-8.92	1.8	0.37	17.3	15.18	13.1	4.34
6. 88% irrigation, 50% N fertilization	14045	-8.70	1285.6	9.4	214.4	42.3	2.73	337.7	-6.42	1.8	0.38	5.1	-66.35	2.7	-78.54
7. 88% irrigation, 40% N fertilization	14090	-8.41	1263.6	9.4	170.4	42.0	1.91	332.1	-7.95	1.8	0.38	3.8	-74.96	1.6	-87.43
8. 88% irrigation, zero fertilization	10541	-31.48	1252.5	9.4	-----	41.8	1.61	178.9	-50.43	1.8	0.51	3.23	-78.5	0.0	-99.97
10. 75% irrigation, full rate N fertilization	11834	-23.08	1427.5	9.3	427.4	42.8	3.87	294.5	-18.39	1.8	-0.15	19.5	29.82	13.5	7.71
11. 75% irrigation, 50% N fertilization	11993	-22.04	1307.0	9.3	214.4	43.1	4.71	299.3	-17.04	1.8	-0.14	6.9	-54.21	2.8	-77.63
12. 75% irrigation, 40% N fertilization	12132	-21.14	1280.8	9.3	170.4	43.2	4.82	302.2	-16.26	1.8	-0.15	4.7	-68.56	1.7	-86.71
13. 75% irrigation, zero fertilization	9866	-35.87	1252.5	9.3	-----	43.0	4.49	179.2	-50.34	1.8	-0.19	3.2	-78.60	0.0	-99.97
14. 50% irrigation, full rate N fertilization	8005	-47.97	1471.9	9.3	427.4	43.7	6.03	217.4	-39.75	1.7	-1.16	24.4	62.23	15.2	20.76
15. 50% irrigation, 50% N fertilization	8056	-47.63	1350.8	9.3	214.4	44.3	7.57	220.9	-38.78	1.7	-1.21	11.3	-25.06	3.2	-74.72
16. 50% irrigation, 40% N fertilization	8128	-47.17	1325.2	9.3	170.4	44.4	7.78	222.8	-38.24	1.7	-1.21	8.6	-43.00	1.9	-84.93
17. 50% irrigation, zero fertilization	7660	-50.21	1253.7	9.3	-----	44.9	8.91	179.8	-50.16	1.7	-1.12	3.2	-78.58	0.0	-99.97

<sup>a</sup> Full rate of 2005-season irrigation = 48.55 cm  
<sup>b</sup> Full rate of 2005-season fertilization = 427.4 kg/ha  
<sup>c</sup> Nitrogen Use Efficiency

<sup>a</sup> Full rate of 2005-season irrigation = 48.55 cm <sup>b</sup> Full rate of 2005-season fertilization = 427.4 kg/ha <sup>c</sup> Nitrogen Use Efficiency

Description of method		Total N Input (kg/ha)					Total N losses (kg/ha)								NUE %		
	2006	Crop yield (kg/ha)	Percent change in crop yield	Storage (10.8m-profile)	Rain	Ferti-gation <sup>a</sup>	Mine rali-zati on	Percent change in mineral-ization	Plant uptake	Percent change in plant uptake	Deep seep-age	Percent change in deep seepage	Denitri-fication	Percent change in denitri-fication	Volatili-zation	Percent change in volatili-zation	NUE %
1.	Full rate irrigation <sup>d</sup> , full rate N fertilization <sup>e</sup>	11626	-----	1688.9	11.4	520.7	66.2	-----	299.6	-----	4.1	-----	109.1	-----	24.1	-----	38.93
2.	Full rate irrigation, 50% N fertilization	11898	2.34	1424.3	11.4	260.7	63.1	-4.66	295.9	-1.23	4.0	-0.60	12.9	-88.13	4.7	-80.34	76.35
3.	Full rate irrigation, 40% N fertilization	11823	1.69	1389.7	11.4	207.9	59.2	-10.50	286.1	-4.48	4.0	-0.78	6.0	-94.46	2.8	-88.46	91.06
4.	Full rate irrigation, zero fertilization	5618	-51.68	1374.7	11.4	-----	45.4	-31.43	96.8	-67.67	4.0	-1.24	2.4	-97.76	0.0	-100.0	-----
5.	88% irrigation, full rate N fertilization	10068	-13.4	1731.2	11.4	520.7	66.6	0.67	267.6	-10.68	4.1	0.75	122.5	12.24	25.3	5.07	32.82
6.	88% irrigation, 50% N fertilization	10263	-11.72	1457.4	11.4	260.7	65.2	-1.46	270.8	-9.61	4.1	0.14	20.4	-81.28	5.2	-78.64	66.79
7.	88% irrigation, 40% N fertilization	10581	-8.99	1409.5	11.4	207.9	61.0	-7.81	264.0	-11.87	4.1	-0.02	8.5	-92.24	3.0	-87.40	80.49
8.	88% irrigation, zero fertilization	5725	-50.76	1379.5	11.4	-----	47.8	-27.84	96.7	-67.73	4.0	-0.57	2.6	-97.62	0.0	-100.0	-----
10.	75% irrigation, full rate N fertilization	8439	-27.41	1776.9	11.4	520.7	66.3	0.17	233.7	-21.97	4.1	1.36	135.7	24.38	27.0	11.89	26.40
11.	75% irrigation, 50% N fertilization	8720	-25.00	1504.6	11.4	260.7	65.9	-0.48	240.7	-19.64	4.1	0.78	30.5	-72.08	5.8	-75.76	55.41
12.	75% irrigation, 40% N fertilization	8826	-24.08	1448.7	11.4	207.9	64.3	-2.80	237.7	-20.66	4.1	0.67	15.2	-86.09	3.4	-86.11	68.02
13.	75% irrigation, zero fertilization	5742	-50.61	1383.0	11.4	-----	48.8	-26.32	96.3	-67.86	4.1	0.19	2.7	-97.55	0.0	-100.0	-----
14.	50% irrigation, full rate N fertilization	6817	-41.36	1874.6	11.4	520.7	63.7	-3.83	185.0	-38.26	4.2	3.62	143.7	31.63	30.9	28.13	16.70
15.	50% irrigation, 50% N fertilization	6754	-41.91	1607.1	11.4	260.7	64.1	-3.20	183.1	-38.87	4.2	3.08	50.5	-53.68	6.8	-71.91	32.65
16.	50% irrigation, 40% N fertilization	6892	-40.72	1547.7	11.4	207.9	63.6	-3.97	185.1	-38.21	4.2	2.97	31.6	-71.07	4.1	-83.02	41.90
17.	50% irrigation, zero fertilization	5645	-51.45	1391.1	11.4	-----	52.9	-20.08	98.0	-67.29	4.2	2.46	2.7	-97.56	0.0	-100.0	-----

<sup>a</sup> Full rate of 2006-season irrigation = 51.48 cm  
<sup>e</sup> Full rate of 2006-season fertigation = 520.7 kg/ha Nitrogen Use Efficiency

<sup>a</sup> Full rate of 2006-season irrigation = 51.48 cm <sup>b</sup> Full rate of 2006-season fertilization = 520.7 kg/ha <sup>c</sup> Nitrogen Use Efficiency

