



2950 Niles Road, St. Joseph, MI 49085-9659, USA
269.429.0300 fax 269.429.3852 hq@asabe.org www.asabe.org



An ASABE – CSBE/ASABE Joint
Meeting Presentation

Paper Number: 141914980

Irrigation and Nitrogen Management for Subsurface Drip Irrigated Corn – 25 years of K-State’s Efforts.

Freddie R. Lamm

Kansas State University
Northwest Research-Extension Center
Colby, Kansas
flamm@ksu.edu

Written for presentation at the
2014 ASABE and CSBE/SCGAB Annual International Meeting
Sponsored by ASABE
Montreal, Quebec Canada
July 13 – 16, 2014

Abstract. *In 1989, K-State Research and Extension initiated efforts to develop the techniques for successful application of subsurface drip irrigation (SDI) for crop production in the U. S. Great Plains region. Irrigation and nitrogen management for field corn has been a major research topic during this 25 year period. Research results indicate that typically corn grain yield and crop water productivity both plateau at approximately 80% of full irrigation. However, sometimes SDI can experience a reduction in kernel set that can reduce yields 5 to 10%. Conjunctive management of both irrigation and inseason N fertigation are important for corn production with SDI. When managed correctly, corn yields, plant nitrogen uptake and crop water productivity can all plateau at a similar level of applied nitrogen which is about 80-85% of typical producer application amounts. However, anecdotal observations have shown that nitrogen can sometimes be positionally unavailable when surface applied to SDI corn. This paper will summarize some of the many years of results and also discuss some of the remaining challenges that can occur when irrigation and nitrogen are highly managed with marginal buffers.*

Keywords. *Microirrigation, drip irrigation, SDI, irrigation, water management, fertigation*

The authors are solely responsible for the content of this meeting presentation. The presentation does not necessarily reflect the official position of the American Society of Agricultural and Biological Engineers (ASABE), and its printing and distribution does not constitute an endorsement of views which may be expressed. Meeting presentations are not subject to the formal peer review process by ASABE editorial committees; therefore, they are not to be presented as refereed publications. Citation of this work should state that it is from an ASABE meeting paper. EXAMPLE: Author’s Last Name, Initials. 2014. Title of Presentation. ASABE Paper No. ---. St. Joseph, Mich.: ASABE. For information about securing permission to reprint or reproduce a meeting presentation, please contact ASABE at rutter@asabe.org or 269-932-7004 (2950 Niles Road, St. Joseph, MI 49085-9659 USA).

Introduction and Brief History

Subsurface drip irrigation (SDI) technologies have been a part of irrigated agriculture since the 1960s, but have advanced at a more rapid pace during the last 25 years (Camp et al., 2000). In the summer of 1988, K-State Research and Extension issued an in-house request for proposals for new directions in research activity. A proposal entitled Sustaining Irrigated Agriculture in Kansas with Drip Irrigation was submitted by irrigation engineers Freddie Lamm, Harry Manges, and Dan Rogers and agricultural economist Mark Nelson. This project led by principal investigator Freddie Lamm, KSU Northwest Research-Extension Center (NWREC), Colby, was funded for the total sum of \$89,260. This project financed the initial development of the NWREC SDI system that was expressly designed for research. In March of 1989, the first driplines were installed on a 1.2 ha study site which has 23 separately controlled plots. This site has been in continuous use in SDI corn production since that time, being initially used for a 3-year study of SDI water requirements for corn. In addition, it is considered to be a benchmark area that is also being monitored annually for system performance to determine SDI longevity. Currently, the NWREC SDI research site is comprised of 7.7 ha and 201 different research plots and is one of the largest facilities devoted expressly to small-plot row crop research in the world. Additional history is provided by Lamm et al., 2011.

Since its beginning in 1989, K-State SDI research has had three purposes: 1) to enhance water conservation; 2) to protect water quality, and 3) to develop appropriate SDI technologies for Great Plains conditions. This paper will limit discussion to the first two objectives and will be limited to SDI efforts with field corn (maize). The vast majority of the research studies have been conducted with field corn because it is the primary irrigated crop in the Central Great Plains. Although field corn has a relatively high water productivity (grain yield/water use), it generally requires a large amount of irrigation because of its long growing season and its sensitivity to water stress over a great portion of the growing period. Of the typical commodity-type field crops grown in the Central Great Plains, only alfalfa and similar forages would require more irrigation than field corn. Any significant effort to reduce the overdraft of the Ogallala aquifer, the primary water source in the Central Great Plains, must address the issue of irrigation water use by field corn.

Conserving Water and/or Increasing Water Productivity with SDI Systems

Water Conservation Concepts with SDI

When properly managed, there is no need for any type of irrigation system to waste water. Using a similar train of thought, no irrigation system can save water. Only a human action or decision can actually save water. Howell and Evett (2005) correctly point out that difficulties can arise if incompatible temporal and spatial scales are used in statements about effective water use. For example, water savings from a reduction in deep percolation may be inconsequential if the temporal scale is large enough to allow return to the aquifer. Similarly, reduction of runoff is not a water savings on a large spatial scale when the runoff can be reused at a downstream location in the basin. The debate over the proper use of water conservation terms has and will continue to be the topic of many publications and presentations. Rather than go into this debate any further, discussion here will be limited to improvements in water usage at the farm level that can be obtained on a real-time basis. This temporal and spatial scale is highly relevant to the farmer in an economic sense, but is also relevant to society through stabilization of farm income and through its multiplying effect in the overall economy. Whether the water is actually conserved or extended to another beneficial use will not be the topic of this discussion.

Subsurface drip irrigation (SDI) applies water below the soil surface to the crop root zone through small emission points (emitters) that are in a series of plastic lines typically spaced between alternate pairs of crop rows (Figure 1). This method of irrigation can be used for small, frequent, just-in-time irrigation applications directly to crop root system.




Figure 1. Alternate row/bed 1.5-m SDI dripline spacing for corn rows spaced at 0.75 m. Each plant row is approximately 0.38 m from the nearest dripline and has equal opportunity to the applied water.

The primary ways that SDI can potentially increase crop water productivity and/or save water are:

- Reduction and/or elimination of deep drainage, irrigation runoff, and water evaporation
- Improved infiltration, storage, and use of precipitation
- Improved in-field uniformity and targeting of water within plant root zone
- Improved crop health, growth, yield, and quality.

General Effect of Irrigation Level on Corn Yields and Water Productivity

The results from four SDI studies on corn water use were summarized by Lamm, 2005. Relative corn yield reached a plateau region at about 80% of full irrigation and continued to remain at that level to about 130% of full irrigation (Figure 2). Yield variation as calculated from the regression equation for this plateau region is less than 5% and would not be considered significantly different. The similarity of results for all four studies is encouraging because the later studies included the effect of the four extreme drought years of 2000 through 2003. An examination of water productivity (WP) for the same four studies indicates that water productivity plateaus for levels of irrigation ranging from 61% to 109% of full irrigation with less than 5% variation in WP (Figure 3). The greatest WP occurs at an irrigation level of approximately 82% of full irrigation. This value agrees with results summarized by Howell, (2001) for multiple types of irrigation systems.

The greatest WP (82% of full irrigation) also occurred in the plateau region of greatest corn yield (80 to 130% of full irrigation). This suggests that both water- and economically-efficient production can be obtained with SDI levels of approximately 80% of full irrigation across a wide range of weather conditions on the soils in this region. Some of the stability in corn yield and water productivity across this range of irrigation levels may be explained by how deep percolation is managed and by how soil water is “mined” with SDI on this soil type and in this climatic region. These aspects are discussed in the next two sections.




Figure 2. Relative corn grain yield for a given SDI research study and year as related to the fraction of full irrigation, KSU Northwest Research-Extension Center, Colby, Kansas.




Figure 3. Relative water use productivity (WP) of corn for a given SDI research study and year as related to the fraction of full irrigation, Colby, Kansas.

Minimization of Deep Percolation with SDI

Deep percolation can occur with SDI if design and management considerations such as soil characteristics, dripline spacing, dripline depth, and irrigation levels are not taken into account in operational strategies (Darusman et al., 1997 a and b; and Lamm and Trooiën, 2003). However, with proper management deep percolation can be minimized with SDI. Appreciable reductions in deep percolation (7% of full irrigation amount) were obtained by Lamm et al., (1995) when the corn irrigation level was reduced to approximately 74% of full irrigation with SDI without affecting actual corn water use (Figure 4). That is, corn water needs were more closely matched with smaller and more timely irrigation events.




Figure 4. Calculated evapotranspiration (AET) and seasonal drainage as related to irrigation treatment in a SDI water requirement study, Colby, Kansas, 1989-1991. (Data from Lamm et al., 1995).

“Mining” of Soil Water with SDI

In a study from 1997 through 2000, corn was grown with SDI under 6 different irrigation capacities (0, 2.54, 3.18, 4.23, 5.08 or 6.35 mm/day) and 4 different plant densities (81,800 73,900, 66,200, or 58,600 plants/ha). The study (Lamm and Trooien, 2001) indicated even small amounts of daily SDI can benefit corn production. Daily in-season application amounts of 2.54 mm/day resulted in corn yields of 15.9, 16.5, 14.8, and 12.6 Mg/ha for the greatest plant density in 1997, 1998, 1999, and 2000, respectively (data not shown). Even in the extreme drought year of 2000, the 2.54 mm/day capacity resulted in corn yields twice that of the non-irrigated treatment and 78% of the maximum yield (Figure 5).




Figure 5. Relative corn grain yield as affected by daily SDI capacity and plant density in the extreme drought year, 2000 at the KSU Northwest Research-Extension Center, Colby, Kansas.

Examination of soil water profiles under these SDI capacities shows some distinctive grouping of the adequately and inadequately irrigated treatments (Figure 6). A possible rationale to explain the grouping is that the upper three treatments may group together because the range of 4.23 to 6.35 mm/day is sufficient to provide a large enough portion of the daily soil water needs. Even in the drier years, there are a few opportunities to shut off irrigation for the 5.08 – 6.35 inches/day treatments. This would allow these treatments to be closer to the effective value of 4.23 mm/day, which is a capacity sufficient to reach the yield plateaus shown in Figure 5. The 6.35 mm/day irrigation capacity is approximately the long term full irrigation requirement for northwest Kansas for corn using other irrigation methods. The higher efficiency, daily irrigation may allow the SDI to be more effective than other irrigation methods.

The lower three treatment may group together for almost the opposite reason. Available soil water reserves become depleted to a large extent and the corn crop begins to shut-down plant processes that use water. This shut-down tends to reduce grain yields depending on the severity and length of the water stress period. The fact that the 2.54 and 4.23 mm/day treatments obtain respectable corn yield increases over the nonirrigated control may be a good indication of how well this balancing of water use/water conservation is being handled by the daily infusion of at least some irrigation water. The grouping of the upper three treatments suggests that an irrigation capacity of 4.23 mm/day might be an adequate irrigation capacity if the producer has the desire to allocate water to an optimum land area. It should be noted that this limited irrigation capacity would not be sufficient on coarser-textured sandy soils which have limited water holding capacity.




Figure 6. Progression of the available soil water for a 2.4 m profile as affected by daily SDI capacity for the highest plant density treatment in the extreme drought year, 2000 at the KSU Northwest Research-Extension Center, Colby, Kansas.

Does SDI Really Increase Crop per Drop?

There is growing evidence from our K-State studies (Figure 7) and others in the Great Plains that SDI can stabilize yields at a greater level than alternative irrigation systems when deficit irrigated (Lamm et al., 2012). Although we believe this is true for most crop years, we have found that SDI sometimes experiences some reduction in kernel set in extremely dry years (Lamm, 2004). Research is continuing to examine this issue in search of a solution.




Figure 7. Corn yields for SDI and incanopy sprinkler irrigation in wet years and dry years at the KSU Northwest Research-Extension Center, Colby, Kansas. *Note: Results are from different but similar studies, so these are not statistical differences.*

Protecting Water Quality with SDI Systems

Properly designed SDI systems have a high degree of uniformity and can apply small frequent irrigation applications, and provide an excellent opportunity to better manage nitrogen fertilization with these systems. Injecting small amounts of nitrogen solution into the irrigation water can spoonfeed the crop just-in-time (i.e., nearer the point of actual crop need), while minimizing the pool of nitrogen in the soil that could be available for percolation into the groundwater.

Comparison of Pre-plant Broadcast Applied Nitrogen and SDI Fertigation

In an early study at Colby, 1990-1991, results indicated that nitrogen applied with SDI redistributed differently in the soil profile than surface-applied preplant N (Lamm et al., 2001). Although corn yields were similar between the two fertilization methods, there was greater residual soil-N for the SDI fertigation (Figure 8).




Figure 8. Nitrate concentrations in the soil profile for preplant surface-applied and SDI injected nitrogen treatments, KSU Northwest Research-Extension Center, Colby, Kansas, 1990-91. Data is for selected nitrogen fertilizer rate treatments with full irrigation (100% of ET_c-Rain).

The additional in-season fertigation allowed for healthier and more vigorous plants that were better able to utilize soil water. The results suggest that a large portion of the applied N could be delayed until weekly injections begin with the first irrigation provided there is sufficient residual soil N available for early growth. In both years, nearly all of the residual nitrate nitrogen measured after corn harvest was located in the upper 0.3 m of the soil profile for the preplant surface-applied nitrogen treatments, regardless of irrigation level. In contrast, nitrate concentrations increased with increasing levels of nitrogen injected with SDI and migrated deeper in the soil profile with increased irrigation (Figure 8). This led to a study to determine if SDI fertigation N needs could be lowered and still retain excellent yields.

Development of Best Management Practice for SDI N Fertigation of Corn

A follow-up four year study was conducted at the KSU Northwest Research-Extension Center at Colby, Kansas on a deep Keith silt loam soil to develop a Best Management Practice (BMP) for nitrogen fertigation for corn using SDI (Lamm et al., 2004). Residual ammonium- and nitrate-nitrogen levels in the soil profile, corn yields, apparent nitrogen uptake (ANU) and water productivity (WP) were utilized as criteria for evaluating six different nitrogen fertigation rates, 0, 90, 135, 180, 225, and 270 kg N/ha. The final BMP was a nitrogen fertigation level of 180 kg N/ha with other non-fertigation applications bringing the total applied nitrogen to approximately 215 kg N/ha (Lamm et. al., 2004). The BMP also states that irrigation is to be scheduled and limited to replace approximately 75% of ET. Corn yield, ANU, and WP all plateaued at the same level of total applied nitrogen which corresponded to the 180 kg N/ha nitrogen fertigation rate (Figure 9). Average yields for the 180 kg N/ha nitrogen fertigation rate was 13.4 Mg/ha. Corn yield to ANU ratio for the 180 kg N/ha nitrogen fertigation rate was high at 53:1 (kg corn grain/kg N whole plant uptake). The results emphasize that high-yielding corn production also can be environmentally sound and efficient in nutrient and water use.




Figure 9. Average (1994-96) corn yield, apparent nitrogen uptake in the above-ground biomass, and water productivity as related to the total applied nitrogen (preseason amount, starter fertilizer, fertigation, and the naturally occurring N in the irrigation water) in a subsurface drip-irrigated corn study at the KSU Northwest Research-Extension Center, Colby, Kansas. Total applied nitrogen exceeded fertigation applied nitrogen by 34 kg/ha.

After 4 years of continuous application of the fertigation treatments (Figure 10), nitrate-N levels in the soil were increasing and moving downward when the fertigation rate exceeded 180 kg N/ha (i.e., equivalent to 215 kg N/ha total applications from all sources).




Figure 10. Nitrate concentrations within the 2.4 m soil profile as affected by SDI fertigation N rate after four years of continuous application, KSU Northwest Research-Extension Center, Colby Kansas.

Conjunctive Management of Water and Nutrients with SDI

When water and nutrients are highly managed for greatest effectiveness, there can be less margin of error. It is important that producers are diligent in observing the corn growth and development and in monitoring the SDI system. A couple of example cases will illustrate the need for this diligence.

Under drought conditions preplant surface-applied N can become positionally unavailable to the crop because of dry surface layers and no root exploration (Figure 11). One should immediately apply N through the SDI system to remedy this nitrogen deficiency when it is observed. The preplant nitrogen, although unavailable under these conditions, can be recovered and utilized later in the season or by future crops once the drought ends.

Water application with deeper SDI systems is largely unobserved. A problem as simple as a broken solenoid wire on a zone water valve can prevent irrigation (Figure 12). Producers should verify through flowrate and pressure that the applied irrigation is reaching the target. Soil water or plant water stress sensors can also be used to augment these observations.



Figure 11. SDI corn field experiencing N stress due to dry surface soil conditions despite having abundant nitrogen reserves in the soil surface layers.




Figure 12. A broken solenoid wire on a zone valve might go unobserved if producers do not monitor their system flowrate and pressure.

Conclusions

Research progress has been steady since 1989. Much of K-State's SDI research is summarized at the website, SDI in the Great Plains at <http://www.ksre.ksu.edu/sdi/>. Irrigators are watching the results of K-State closely. Some irrigators have begun to experiment with the technology and most appear happy with the results they are obtaining. SDI can be a viable irrigation system option for corn production, enhancing the opportunities for wise use of limited water resources and also in protecting water quality.

Acknowledgements

Several K-State faculty members have conducted and contributed to the progress of KSU SDI corn research over the years since 1989. These include, Freddie Lamm, Bill Spurgeon, Todd Trooien, Harry Manges, Danny Rogers, Mahbub Alam, Loyd Stone, Alan Schlegel, Gary Clark, Rob Aiken, Dan O'Brien, Troy Dumler, Kevin Dhuyvetter, Mark Nelson, and Norm Klocke.

This paper is also part of SDI technology transfer effort beginning in 2009 involving Kansas State University, Texas A&M University and the USDA-ARS and is funded by the Ogallala Aquifer Program. To follow other activities of this educational effort, point your web browser to <http://www.ksre.ksu.edu/sdi/>.



References

- Camp, C. R., F. R. Lamm, R. G. Evans and C. J. Phene. 2000. Subsurface drip irrigation – Past, present and future. In Proc. Fourth Decennial Nat'l Irrigation Symp., Nov. 14-16, 2000, Phoenix, AZ. Sponsored by ASAE. pp. 363-372. Also at <http://www.ksre.ksu.edu/sdi/Reports/2000/K-StateRep/campis.htm>
- Darusman, A. H. Khan, L. R. Stone, and F. R. Lamm. 1997a. Water flux below the root zone vs. drip-line spacing in drip irrigated corn. *Soil Sci. Soc. Am. J.* 61(6):1755-1760. Also available at <http://www.ksre.ksu.edu/sdi/Reports/1997/WaterFluxSpacing.pdf>
- Darusman, A. H. Khan, L. R. Stone, W. E. Spurgeon, and F. R. Lamm. 1997b. Water flux below the root zone vs. irrigation amount in drip-irrigated corn. *Agron. J.* 89(3):375-379. Also available at <http://www.ksre.ksu.edu/sdi/Reports/1997/WaterFluxIrrA.pdf>
- Howell, T. A. 2001. Enhancing water use efficiency in irrigated agriculture. *Agron J.* 93(2):281-289. Also available at [http://www.cprl.ars.usda.gov/wmru/pdfs/howell 2001.pdf](http://www.cprl.ars.usda.gov/wmru/pdfs/howell%202001.pdf)
- Howell, T. A. and S. R. Evett. 2005. Pathways to efficient applications. In: Proc. Central Plains Irrigation Conf., Sterling, CO., Feb. 16-17, 2005. Available from CPIA, 760 N.Thompson, Colby, KS. pp. 84-98. Also available at <http://www.ksre.ksu.edu/irrigate/OOW/P05/Howell.pdf>
- Lamm, F. R. 2004. Comparison of SDI and Simulated LEPA Sprinkler Irrigation for Corn. In Proc. Irrigation Assn. Int'l. Irrigation Technical Conf., November 14-16, 2004, Tampa, FL. Available from Irrigation Assn., Falls Church, VA. IA Paper No. IA04-1098. pp. 475-485. Also available at <http://www.ksre.ksu.edu/sdi/Reports/2004/LS100104.pdf>
- Lamm, F. R. 2005. SDI for conserving water in corn production. In Proc. ASCE-EWRI Water Congress, May 15-19, 2005, Anchorage, AK. 12 pp. Also at <http://www.ksre.ksu.edu/sdi/Reports/2005/ASC000557.pdf>
- Lamm, F. R. and T. P. Trooien. 2001. Irrigation capacity and plant population effects on corn production using SDI. In Proc. Irrigation Assn. Int'l. Irrigation Technical Conf., Nov. 4-6, 2001, San Antonio, TX. pp. 73-80. Available from Irrigation Assn., Falls Church, VA. Also available at <http://www.ksre.ksu.edu/sdi/Reports/2001/icpp.pdf>
- Lamm, F. R. and T. P. Trooien. 2003. Subsurface drip irrigation for corn production: A review of 10 years of research in Kansas. *Irrig. Sci.* 22(3-4):195-200. Also available at <http://www.ksre.ksu.edu/sdi/Reports/2003/SDI10years.pdf>
- Lamm, F. R., A. J. Schlegel, and G. A. Clark. 2004. Development of a best management practice for nitrogen fertigation of corn using SDI. *Appl. Engr in Agric.* 20(2):211-220. Also available at <http://www.ksre.ksu.edu/sdi/Reports/2004/SDIFert04.pdf>
- Lamm, F. R., T. P. Trooien, H. L. Manges, and H. D. Sunderman. 2001. Nitrogen fertilization for subsurface drip-irrigated corn. *Trans. ASAE* 44(3):533-542. Also available at <http://www.ksre.ksu.edu/sdi/Reports/2001/dfert.pdf>
- Lamm, F. R., H. L. Manges, L. R. Stone, A. H. Khan, and D. H. Rogers. 1995. Water requirement of subsurface drip-irrigated corn in northwest Kansas. *Trans. ASAE* 38(2):441-448. Also available at <http://www.ksre.ksu.edu/sdi/Reports/1995/WaterReq.pdf>
- Lamm, F. R., D. H. Rogers, M. Alam, D. M. O'Brien, and T. P. Trooien. 2011. Twenty-two years of SDI research in Kansas. In: Proc. 23rd annual Central Plains Irrigation Conf., Burlington, Colorado, Feb. 22-23, 2011. Available from CPIA, 760 N.Thompson, Colby, KS. pp. 68-92. Also available at <http://www.ksre.ksu.edu/sdi/Reports/2011/Lamm11SDIa.pdf>
- Lamm, F.R., J. P. Bordovsky, L. J. Schwankl, G. L. Grabow, J. Enciso-Medina, R. T. Peters, P. D. Colaizzi, T. P. Trooien, and D. O. Porter. 2012. Subsurface drip irrigation: Status of the technology in 2010. *Trans. ASABE* 55(2): 483-491. Also at <http://www.ksre.ksu.edu/sdi/Reports/2012/SDI2010Status.pdf>