Aplication Efficiency: Corn 2001 Table 1 - Application Efficiencies for different Irrigation Systems Application Efficiency (AE) is a performan-Application Efficiencies (%) ce criterion that expresses how well an irriga-Irrigation System High tion system executes when is operated to de-Surface Irrigation HR 01=72.5 Wild Flood liver a specific amount of water. AE express-Border es how well an irrigation system can potential-Basin 83 ly distributes the water across the field. AE is Furrow the ratio of average water depth applied and Surface - Sprinkler Side-Roll Surface - Sprinkler Hand- Mov target water depth during an irrigation event Sprinkler (Burt et al.1997). The lower quartile depth Permanent was considered as the target water depth. Hand-Move 60 73 70 82 Linear-Move Side-Roll Table 1 shows the AE values used for different Micro-Mini HR 08[±]-99 irrigation systems (Canessa et al. 2011). Re-Center - Pivo Drip gional AE estimates in Table 2 were estimated using a weighted average of AE and Above ground 95 irrigation system's crop acreage for each Buried drip region (Tindula et al. 2013). The main assu-Table 2 - Application Efficiency Estimates mptions is that every farmer provided the lo-HR 05=72.4 tion Efficiency (%) Mean High Applicat wer quartile depth during each irrigation event Hydrologic Region to meet crop water requirements. San Francisco Bay Central Coast 72.7 67.5 85.3 60 A correction for water losses may applied South Coast 71.9 for irrigation systems of Sprinkler and sur-Sacramento River 60.2 72.4 84.7 San Joaquin River 72.5 84.3 face irrigation (Rogers et al. 1997). Tulare Lake 59 5 72.6 85 1 Read Sandoval-Solis et al. (2013) for a North Lahontan thorough description of the assumption South Lahontan Colorado River and values provided in this map. Note. -99 values mean not data available The AE provided in this map are intended to be used for water planning and management estimates at medium to large scale regions. Local and field AE values may vary from those displayed here due to individual irrigation practices HR 06=72.5 HR 07=72.6 High: 90 HR 09=72 Low: 50 HROANTI.O 100 Miles 100 120 140 160 Kilometers HR 10=71.9 UC Davis Water Management Research Group http://watermanagement.ucdavis.edu Developed as a cooperative project between University of California, Davis United States Geological Survey and California Department of Water Resources Map prepared by P.I.: Samuel Sandoval Solis, Ph.D. © 2013.