

## Irrigated Ag Working Group (IAWG)

### Charge from Groundwater Management Area Advisory Committee

#### Working Group Members

Jim Trull (GWAC-Roza-Sunnyside Joint Board of Control), Bob Stevens (interested party) Bud Rogers (GWAC-Citizen), Chelsea Durfey (GWAC), Dan McCarty (interested party), Dave Cowan (interested party), Dave Fraser (Interested Party - Simplot Agronomist), Donald Jameson (interested party), Doug Simpson (GWAC-Farmer), Frank Lyall (GWAC-Farm Bureau), Ginny Prest (GWAC-Dept. of Ag), Jean Mendoza (GWAC-Friends of Toppenish Creek), Jim Newhouse (GWAC), Kevin Lindsey (interested party), Kirk Cook (GWAC-WSDA), Laurie Crowe (GWAC-South Yakima Conservation District), Melanie Redding (Ecology), Mike Shuttleworth (interested party), Ralph Fisher (EPA), Ron Cowin (GWAC-SVID), Scott Stephen (interested party), Stuart Turner (GWAC-Turner & Co.), Tom Tebb (GWAC-Department of Ecology), Rosalio Brambila (interested party), Dr. Troy Peters (GWAC-WSU); Vern Redifer, Jim Davenport.

#### Meetings/Calls Dates

Meeting: Sunnyside Valley Irrigation District Office, 120 S. Eleventh Street, Sunnyside

When: September 17, 2015 from 1:00 pm to 3:00 pm.

Call: (509) 574-2353 – Pin # 2353

#### Participants

Jim Trull (Chair), Laurie Crowe, Doug Simpson, Frank Lyall, Landon Schilperoort, Scott Stevens, James Rivard, Jean Mendoza, Jim Davenport and Greta Smith (Yakima County)

#### Key Discussion Points

##### **1. Deep Soil Sampling (DSS) Fall 2015**

Laurie and Landon reported on the upcoming DSS. They have 60 participating locations and will start on October 5, 2015. This is an increase in participants from spring in which there were only 48 locations.

A member stated that they felt that a few fields in past testing were not useful and questioned the screening process. Laurie stated that locations are screened following the same agreed-upon process that has been used from the start. Samples can only be gained from those farmers willing to participate. This sampling process is providing a baseline of numbers to start with. After it is all completed the process can be evaluated. If there is information from the DSS that is missing, please contact Laurie so she can be informed of what is missing and provide it to the group.

## 2. Review of Authorization from GWAC to prepare a Scope of Work for Review of Data Sets

Jim T. stated that GWAC has authorized IAWG to prepare scope of work for an entity or individual to analyze and comment on the PHDSS Data. That task will be discussed at a future meeting.

## 3. Review of Nitrogen Use

Jim T. reviewed the spreadsheet on Estimate of Nitrogen Usage. It is an estimate and in discussing the information with members who actively work with these crops it was determined that the numbers on the spreadsheet will need some revisions. Jim took the numbers that Yakima County gave him acreages of crops grown in the GWMA. He used crop production estimates provided by SYCD. The amounts of nitrogen removed in the harvested portion was taken from the Western Fertilizer Handbook and other references as noted on the spreadsheet. At this point they can all be regarded as placeholders. If numbers don't look right please contact him. The goal is to have information that represents our GWMA area.

In looking at Silage Corn and Field Corn, it was hard to determine through GIS aerial information the acreage of each crop as they each look similar in aerial photography. Jean provided information from the USDA Data results which shows an average of 42% for grain corn and 58% for silage corn for Yakima County using four years of data. Those percentages were then applied to the total acres of corn to arrive at acreages of grain corn and silage corn respectively.

There was no acreage for triticale due to the fact that it is double cropped with silage corn and wouldn't be observed or accounted for when the cropping survey is performed in the irrigation season Laurie and Jim estimated 9,760 acres of triticale is produced. That number is a placeholder until a more reliable figure can be obtained.

There was a question about the difference in using the words "removed" versus "uptake." It was clarified that removed is what is removed from the field at the time of harvest and uptake is the amount of nitrogen the plant utilizes. It was determined that removed is the most accurate measure to describe what is being looked at. It was asked what the goal is with the numbers indicating removal? It will indicate an estimate of how much nitrogen is applied and then how much is removed with the crop. It was suggested that an additional be column be added to show update.

It was also suggested that in the 4<sup>th</sup> column, the word "Average" be replaced with "typical."

## 5. Other Business

Meeting was adjourned at 2:30 pm.

**Resources Requested**

---

- N/A

**Recommendations for GWAC**

---

- N/A

**Deliverables/Products Status**

**Proposed Next Steps**

---