

EXTENSION FACT SHEET

TURFGRASS CONSUMPTIVE USE: FLAGSTAFF, AZ

Paul W. Brown
Extension Specialist, Biometeorology
University of Arizona

Wade Albrecht
Coconino County Cooperative Extension
University of Arizona

Publication: AZ1353
December 2004

Introduction

Irrigation of turfgrass is an issue of growing concern in northern Arizona cities and towns as population growth places increasing demands on limited water supplies. Understanding the water requirements of turfgrass is essential if we are to improve irrigation management and better plan for future urban growth. Consumptive use (CU) curves (e.g., Brown, 2003) that provide average rates of turfgrass water use (evapotranspiration; ET_T) provide this much needed information. The University of Arizona, through its TRIF¹ Water Sustainability Program, is presently developing new and/or updated information on turfgrass CU for northern Arizona. This Fact Sheet provides turfgrass CU curves and related data for the Flagstaff area.

Turf CU Methodology

Turfgrass CU values (ET_T) were estimated by applying crop coefficients (Kc) appropriate for acceptable (parks and lawns) and high quality (golf course) turf to mean daily values of reference evapotranspiration (ETos; Brown, 2000) for each month of the year:

$$ET_T = Kc * ETos$$

The meteorological data used to compute ETos were obtained from the National Weather Service observation site located at the Flagstaff airport. ETos was computed using the standardized reference

¹This work was supported by the University of Arizona, Technology and Research Initiative Fund (TRIF), Water Sustainability Program

evapotranspiration procedure appropriate for a short crop and daily computational time step (see Brown, 2004). Meteorological data used in the ETos computation included monthly mean values of maximum, minimum and dew point temperature; wind speed; solar radiation; and estimates of soil heat flux computed from monthly mean temperature data (see Walter et al., 2004). Crop coefficients for high and acceptable quality turf were set to 0.95 and 0.80, respectively during the primary growth months of May through September (Albrecht, 1993; NCWCD, 2003). Crop coefficients were decreased to 0.625 (high quality) and 0.55 (acceptable) during the months when the grass is transitioning to (October) or from (April) dormancy (NCWCD, 2003). Crop coefficients were set equal to 0.3 irrespective of turf quality during the winter months when the turf is dormant (November through March).

Turfgrass CU for Flagstaff

Monthly totals of ETos, precipitation (PPT) and turfgrass CU are presented in Table 1 for the Flagstaff area. CU values are provided in units of inches per month (0/Mnth) and inches per day (0/Dy). PPT is presented in units of 0/Mnth and as a % of CU for the two indicated levels of turf quality. The CU data are presented graphically in Figure 1 in the form of annual CU curves.

CU of high quality turf during the growing season (April - October) varies from ~2.2" in October to ~6.9" in June and totals ~34.3". Calendar year CU, which includes evaporation from dormant turf during the winter months, totals ~37.4". Acceptable quality turf exhibits a lower rate of consumptive use during the growing season with monthly totals ranging from ~2.0" in October to ~5.8" in June. Growing season and calendar year CU for acceptable quality turf total ~29.1 and 32.2", respectively.

It is important to note that the CU values provided in Table 1 and Figure 1 represent gross evaporation rates from turf and do not take into account PPT which can reduce or eliminate the need for irrigation in some months. To use this CU information to determine the amount of water required for irrigation, one must first subtract the amount of effective PPT (PPT not lost to deep percolation and runoff) to determine the net water requirement for any period. PPT during the growing season (April to October) in the Flagstaff area averages 11.86" (35 - 41% of CU) and should reduce irrigation water requirements substantially. PPT often exceeds CU in the fall and winter and should greatly reduce or eliminate the need for irrigation in most years.

The final step in determining the irrigation water requirement involves making adjustments to: 1) account for system nonuniformity and 2) ensure leaching is sufficient to maintain soil salinity at acceptable levels. Adjustments for nonuniformity and salinity management increase the amount of irrigation water required and vary dramatically with location due to differences in irrigation design, topography, local weather conditions, and water quality. An irrigation audit is required to assess and properly correct for irrigation nonuniformity. Water tests are required to determine how much water must be applied in excess of CU to facilitate leaching.

References

Albrecht, W. 1993. Turfgrass Water Use in Northern Arizona. Extension Bulletin No. 93-03. The Arboretum at Flagstaff.

Brown, P.W. 2000. Converting Reference Evapotranspiration into Turf Water Use. Turf Irrigation Management Series No. 2, Ext. Bulletin AZ1195. Arizona Cooperative Extension.

Brown, P.W. 2003. Turfgrass Consumptive Use Values for the Tucson Area. Turf Irrigation Management Series No. 4, Ext. Bulletin AZ1313. Arizona Cooperative Extension.

Brown, P.W. 2004. Standardized Reference Evapotranspiration: A New Procedure For Estimating Reference Evapotranspiration In Arizona. Ext. Bulletin AZ 1324. Arizona Cooperative Extension.

NCWCD. 2003. Crop Coefficient Curve Model. Northern Colorado Water Conservation District [Online]. Available at <http://www.ncwcd.org/weatherdata/turfcurve.htm> (verified Dec. 18, 2003).

Walter, I.A., R.G. Allen, R. Elliot, D. Intefisu, P. Brown, M.E. Jensen, B. Mechem, T.A. Howell, R. Snyder, S. Eching, T. Spofford, M. Hattendorf, R.H. Cuenca, D. Martin, and J.L. Wright. 2004. ASCE's Standardized Reference Evapotranspiration Equation. ASCE Tech. Rpt. (In Press).

Table 1. Reference ET (ETos), precipitation (PPT) and consumptive use values (CU) for high and acceptable quality turf for the Flagstaff area. ETos and CU values are presented in units of inches per month (0/Mnth) and inches per day (0/Dy). PPT is provided both as monthly totals (0/Mnth) and as a percentage of turf CU.

Month	ETos		PPT	Turf CU: High Quality			Turf CU: Acceptable Quality		
	"/Mnth	"/Dy		0/Mnth	"/Mnth	"/Dy	PPT	"/Mnth	"/Dy
			% CU				% CU		
JAN	1.62	0.05	2.18	0.48	0.02	>100	0.48	0.02	>100
FEB	1.96	0.07	2.56	0.59	0.02	>100	0.59	0.02	>100
MAR	3.07	0.10	2.62	0.92	0.03	>100	0.92	0.03	>100
APR	4.44	0.15	1.29	2.77	0.09	47	2.44	0.08	53
MAY	5.97	0.19	0.80	5.67	0.18	14	4.78	0.15	17
JUN	7.25	0.24	0.43	6.89	0.23	6	5.80	0.19	7
JUL	6.88	0.22	2.40	6.54	0.21	37	5.51	0.18	44
AUG	5.92	0.19	2.89	5.62	0.18	51	4.73	0.15	61
SEP	4.83	0.16	2.12	4.59	0.15	46	3.86	0.13	55
OCT	3.54	0.11	1.93	2.21	0.07	87	1.95	0.06	99
NOV	2.14	0.07	1.86	0.64	0.02	>100	0.64	0.02	>100
DEC	1.59	0.05	1.83	0.48	0.02	>100	0.48	0.02	>100
TOTAL	49.20"		22.91"	37.41"			32.18"		




Figure 1. Turfgrass CU for high and acceptable quality turfgrass grown in the Flagstaff area.