

CalSim Hydro Input Development

CWEMF Annual Meeting , April 2023 Presenters: Lauren Thatch (USBR) Collaborators: Mark Spears (USBR), Justin Huntington (DRI), Chris Pearson (DRI) Modeling Division, Bay Delta Office

Presentation Overview

- CalSim Hydro Background
- Project goals
- Comparison of existing and proposed methods
 - Reference ET
 - Hargraves Semani
 - Penman Monteith
 - Crop ET
 - CUP Model
 - ET Demands
- Summary of Future Work



Preprocessed Surface Hydrology for CalSim 3.0

- Separate approaches for different regions
 - Rim Watershed Hydrology
 - Valley Watershed Hydrology



CalSim 3.0 Valley Watershed Hydrology









Project Goals

- Improve representation of applied water demands.
- Leverage the best available datasets and methods to refine modeled applied water demands.
- Captures year-to-year variations in the applied water demands and better emulate changes in farming practices with climate changes.



Current CalSimHydro Reference ET Input

Hargreaves-Samani equation

 $ET_o = 0.0023.R_a. (T_{max} - T_{min})^{0.5}.(T_m + 17.8)$

- Temperature data provided by PRISM daily and monthly data
- Monthly Correction Factors based on CIMIS Stations

$$TO_{HS}^{WBA} = ETO_{HS}^{CIMIS} * f1 * f2$$

E

$$f1 = \frac{ETO_{OBS}^{CIMIS}}{ETO_{HS}^{CIMIS}}$$
$$f2 = \frac{ETO_{HS}^{WBA}}{ETO_{HS}^{CIMIS}}$$



ASCE Standardized ETo Equation

- ASCE adopted FAO Irrigation and Drainage Paper No. 56 Penman Monteith Combination Method in 2005
- Combined energy balance and mass transfer

$$ET_{sz} = \frac{0.408 \Delta (R_n - G) + \gamma \frac{C_n}{T + 273} u_2 (e_s - e_a)}{\Delta + \gamma (1 + C_d u_2)}$$

THE ASCE STANDARDIZED REFERENCE EVAPOTRANSPIRATION EQUATION



Task Committee on Standardization of Reference Evapotranspiration

Environmental and Water Resources Institute of the American Society of Civil Engineers

> January, 2005 Final Report

Your Passport to Professional Excellence



- Primary inputs: temperature, solar radiation, humidity and wind speed
- Solar radiation and humidity (can be estimated using min/max daily air temperature)

Evaluation of ASCE-PM ETo

- Compared estimated ASCE-PM reference ET (ETo) to measured ETo at <u>50</u> agricultural weather station – COOP/NWS station pairs
 - Estimated ETo used daily T_{max} and $T_{min}\,$ to estimate solar radiation, and mean monthly spatially distributed dewpoint and windspeed
- Estimated ETo is robust at annual and monthly time scales when compared to measured agricultural station ETo

Ratio of <u>Annual</u> Estimated to Measured ETo:

- Range = 0.86 -1.15
- Average = 1.03
- STD = 0.06

Ratio of *Monthly* Estimated to Measured ETo:

- Range = 0.84 -1.37
- Average = 1.03
- STD = 0.16



Crop Evapotranspiration, ET_c

• Single Crop Coefficient (most commonly used):

$$ET_c = ET_o * K_c$$

- Dual Crop Coefficients:
 - Allows for simulation of specific wetting events
 - Combination of a transpiration (basal) coefficient (Kcb) and an evaporation coefficient (Ke)

$$ET_c = ET_o * (K_{cb} + K_e)$$

• A stress coefficient (Ks) can also be applied to reduce Kcb under low soil moisture conditions (no or deficit irrigation practices)

Consumptive Use Program

- Used to develop ETc for CalSimHydro
- Single Crop Coefficient model
- Season is separated into growth periods
- Deciduous trees, vines, orchard crops can be adjusted using percentage of ground cover
- Growing season is a fixed input



CUP+ Crop Coefficients and Seasons

Lengths of Crop Development Stages for Various Crops													
Crop Number	Crop Name	% season B	% season C	% season D	K, AB	K _e CD		Planting Month				Planting Date	Harvest Date
3.01	Almonds	0	50	90	0.51	1.10	0.60	3.00	1.00	10.00	15.00	1-Mar-15	15-Oct-15
3.02	Apple	0	50	75	0.51	1.06	0.74	4.00	1.00	11.00	15.00	1-Apr-15	15-Nov-15
3.03	Wine Grapes	0	25	75	0.41	0.74	0.32	4.00	1.00	11.00	1.00	1-Apr-15	1-Nov-15
3.04	Table Grapes	0	25	75	0.32	1.01	0.74	4.00	1.00	11.00	1.00	1-Apr-15	1-Nov-15
3.05	Raisin Grapes	0	25	75	0.32	1.01	0.74	4.00	1.00	11.00	1.00	1-Apr-15	1-Nov-15
3.06	Kiwifruit	0	22	67	0.32	1.01	0.74	5.00	1.00	10.00	31.00	1-May-15	31-Oct-15
3.07	Stone fruits	0	50	90	0.51	1.10	0.60	3.00	1.00	10.00	15.00	1-Mar-15	15-Oct-15
3.11	Walnuts	0	50	75	0.51	1.10	0.74	4.00	1.00	11.00	15.00	1-Apr-15	15-Nov-15
3.09	Peach	0	50	90	0.51	1.10	0.60	3.00	1.00	10.00	15.00	1-Mar-15	15-Oct-15
3.12	Figs	0	50	90	0.51	1.104	0.60	3.00	1.00	10.00	15.00	1-Mar-15	15-Oct-15
3.10	Plum-Prune	0	50	90	0.51	1.06	0.60	3.00	1.00	10.00	15.00	1-Mar-15	15-Oct-15
4.01	Avocado	0	50	90	0.92	0.92	0.92	1.00	1.00	12.00	31.00	1-Jan-15	31-Dec-15
4.02	Grapefruit	0	33	67	0.92	0.92	0.92	1.00	1.00	12.00	31.00	1-Jan-15	31-Dec-15
4.03	Lemon	0	33	67	0.83	0.83	0.83	1.00	1.00	12.00	31.00	1-Jan-15	31-Dec-15
4.06	Olives	0	33	67	0.83	0.83	0.83	1.00	1.00	12.00	31.00	1-Jan-15	31-Dec-15
4.07	Orange	0	33	67	0.92	0.92	0.92	1.00	1.00	12.00	31.00	1-Jan-15	31-Dec-15
3.08	Pistachio	0	33	78	0.64	1.06	0.46	3.00	1.00	11.00	26.00	1-Mar-15	26-Nov-15
											-		

ETDemands Model

- Developed collaboratively by Reclamation, the Desert Research Institute and the University of Idaho
- Based on the American Society of Civil Engineers (ASCE) Standardized Reference
 Evapotranspiration (ET) Equation (ASCE-EWRI, 2005) and the Dual Crop Coefficient Model (Allen and Robison, 2009; Huntington and Allen, 2010)
- Temperature-based daily crop coefficient calculation allows for modeling longer growing seasons due to climate change



Basal Crop Coefficient, Kcb

- Based on 30-day average air temperature (T30), cumulative growing degree days (CGDD) and killing frost air temperatures
- T30 and GDD thresholds control planting, green-up and development
- Geographic-specific calibrations are required for Kcb estimation
- End dates are based on killing frost or harvest schedule



Evaporative Crop Coefficient, Ke

- Estimated based on the soil moisture content in the top 0.1-meter of the soil profile with large increases following precipitation and irrigation events
- For crops with an open canopy such as orchards where all or most of the ground surface is effectively exposed to evaporative energy the wetted surface is assumed equal to that exposed to solar radiation, and because of this, a portion of evaporation is compensated for by increased Kcb
- ET Demands includes Kcb curve options to simulate orchards with or without groundcover



Soil Moisture Balance and Irrigation

- Daily soil moisture balance, estimated as a function of:
 - antecedent soil moisture,
 - precipitation, irrigation,
 - runoff and deep percolation.
- Irrigation events are either
 - triggered automatically based on the soil moisture balance when maximum allowable depletion occurs, or
 - set manually to model irrigation schedules and water shortage scenarios





Application of the ET Demands Model

- ET Demands can be run with spatially varying climate and crop information for regional water use assessments and planning.
- Utilizes spatial soil and crop layers and gridded climate datasets
- Simulates each crop and climate grid cell combination separately
- Spatially varying calibration accounts for varying management and crop phenology
- Previous Applications:
 - Upper Colorado River Basin
 - Klamath River Basin
 - Nevada Net Irrigation Water Requirement Planning
 - Westwide Climate Assessment



West-Wide Climate Risk Assessments: Irrigation Demand and Reservoir Evaporation Projections

- SECURE Water Act authorizes Reclamation to evaluate the risks and impacts of climate change in each of the eight major Reclamation river basins
- WWCRAs will provide projections of future changes in water supplies, water demands, and river system operations that could result from changes in climate



Process for estimating future water demands







Model Results





Changes in ET with Climate Change

- Ran 5 different climate projections
 - S1 WD
 - S2 WW
 - S3 HD
 - S4 HW
 - S5 CT
- Spatially variable changes in ET
- Larger percent changes in 2080s



Climate Change Impacts on ET Timing

- 5 Climate Scenarios
 - S1 WD
 - S2 WW
 - S3 HD
 - S4 HW
 - S5 CT
- By 2080, significant shifts in growing-season length, crop development, and cutting cycles.



Evaluation of ET Demands Crop ET

- Huntington and Allen (2010) Truckee-Carson crop ET
- Ratio of estimated annual to measured: Average = 1.04, STD = 0.12
- Allen et al. (2005) Imperial Valley, CA crop ET
- ± 6% uncertainty at the 95% confidence level when compared to project wide water balance
- Burt et al. (2002) Central Valley, CA crop ET
- ± 14% at the 95% confidence level when considering uncertainty in model parameters
- Burt et al. (2005) Central Valley, CA bare soil
- Ratio of average mean daily FAO-56 modeled evaporation to 'measured' evaporation was 0.98, with an average percent different in cumulative study period totals of 4.7%
- Allen (2011) Kimberly, ID bare soil
- Within 15% of study period cumulative evaporation when compared to Kimberly lysimeter



ETDemands Code

- Github.com/usbr/et-demands
- Originally written with Visual Basic for Windows – ported to non-versioned python



Future Work

- Development of ASCE-PM Standardized Reference ET Dataset
 - Leverage Spatial CIMIS (available in 2003)
 - Develop monthly correction factors between CIMIS Stations and Spatial CIMIS for pre 2003
- Development of ETDemands estimated crop ET
 - Spatially Variable Calibration to estimate Crop growth curves (crop coefficients), large data needs
 - Number of cuttings
 - Average planning (green-up) date for each crop type
 - Average harvest (end) date for each crop
 - Average time from planning to full cover

 Updating CalSimHydro using the updated IWFM IDC which includ wetlands and refuges.

Lauren Thatch Ithatch@usbr.gov



References

Allen, R.G. 2011. "Skin layer evaporation to account for small precipitation events—An enhancement to the FAO-56 evaporation model," Agricultural Water Management, 99(1):8–18.

Allen, R.G., and C.W. Robison. 2009. "Evapotranspiration and Consumptive Irrigation Water Requirements for Idaho," University of Idaho Report, 222 p. Available at <u>http://www.kimberly.uidaho.edu/ETIdaho/</u>.

Allen, R.G., A.J. Clemmens, C.M. Burt, K. Solomon and T. O'Halloran. 2005. Prediction Accuracy for Projectwide Evapotranspiration Using Crop Coefficients and Reference Evapotranspiration. Journal of Irrigation and Drainage Engineering, Vol. 131, Issue 1 (February 2005).

Allen, R.G., L.S. Pereira, D. Raes, and M. Smith. 1998. "Crop Evapotranspiration: Guidelines for Computing Crop Water Requirements," FAO Irrigation and Drainage Paper 56, Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, Rome, 300 p. Available at: http://www.fao.org/docrep/x0490e/x0490e00.htm ASCE-EWRI (Environmental and Water Resources Institute of the American Society of Civil Engineers). 2005. The ASCE Standardized Reference Evapotranspiration Equation, Report 0-7844-0805-X, ASCE Task Committee on Standardization of Reference E apotranspiration, Reston, Virginia., American Soc. Civil Engineers.

Burt, C.M., A. Mutziger, D.J. Howes, and K.H. Solomon. 2002. "Evaporation from irrigated land in California," Rep. R02-001, Irrigation Training and Research Center, California Polytechnic State Univ., San Luis Obispo, California. Available at http://www.itrc.org/reports/ reportsindex.html&

Burt, C.M., A.J. Mutziger, R.G. Allen, and T.A. Howell. 2005. "Evaporation Research – A Review and Interpretation," Journal of Irrigation and Drainage Engineering 131(1):37–58.

Huntington, J.L., and R. Allen. 2010. Evapotranspiration and Net Irrigation Water Requirements for Nevada, Nevada State Engineer's Office Publication, 266 p.

USDA. 1972. Soil Conservation Service, National Engineering Handbook. Hydrology Section 4 Chapters 4-10.Washington, D.C: USDA.