SOIL WATER SENSING – FOCUS on VARIABLE RATE IRRIGATION

S.R. Evett[1], P.D. Colaizzi[2], R.C. Schwartz[1] and S.A. O'Shaughnessy[2]
Research Soil Scientist[1], Research Agricultural Engineer[2]
USDA-ARS Conservation & Production Research Laboratory
Bushland, Texas
Voice: 806-356-5775   Fax: 806-356-5750
Email: steve.evett@ars.usda.gov, paul.colaizzi@ars.usda.gov,
robert.schwartz@ars.usda.gov, susan.o'shaughnessy@ars.usda.gov

SOIL WATER SENSING – RELATIONSHIP TO IRRIGATION SCHEDULING

Soil Water Criteria for Irrigation Scheduling

Irrigation scheduling using soil water sensors is an exercise in maintaining the water content of the crop root zone soil above a lower limit defined by the management allowed depletion (MAD) for that soil and crop (Fig. 1), but not so wet that too much water is lost to deep percolation, evaporation and runoff. The management allowed depletion for a corn crop on a clay loam soil is only about 0.08 inch/inch. To be useful for managing water to prevent over filling the soil or allowing it to dry so much that the crop yield is compromised more than acceptable, soil water sensors must be accurate. The accuracies needed are on the order of 0.02 to 0.04 inch/inch (Table 1), which is better than many commercial soil water sensors are able to provide. Values of field capacity and permanent wilting point for a particular field (needed for determining the available water holding capacity and MAD values) may be found from NRCS soil maps, at least to a close approximation. The values are, however, likely to change with depth in the soil and with position in the field, meaning that irrigation management should be site specific to be most effective, and to do that requires sensors be installed in the different soils of the field. NRCS soil maps are available on the Internet: http://websoilsurvey.sc.egov.usda.gov/App/HomePage.htm.

Plant root zones deepen during the growing season, often extending to five foot depth and sometimes deeper if the soil does not have a restrictive horizon and soil water content is large enough to encourage root penetration. Since soil water sensors typically are sensitive only to the soil immediately around them, and since most sensors are small, it is typical that two or more sensors must be installed at different depths in order to understand how soil water content is changing in response to irrigation and crop water uptake. Depths of six and 18 inches or six and 24 inches are common. Seeing that the soil is above field capacity at 24 inches may indicate that deep percolation losses are occurring.


Figure 1. Sketch defining the key crop root zone water content values. In the clay loam soil depicted here, the water content at saturation is about 0.42 inch/inch and equal to the soil porosity. The soil cannot hold more water than saturation, and a saturated soil layer will drain to drier soil layers beneath until the soil reaches field capacity, about 0.33 inch/inch for this soil. If the soil dries to the permanent wilting point, about 0.18 inch/inch in this soil, the crop will be permanently damaged. The refill point is the water content below which the crop will be water stressed and yield may be reduced. It is about 0.25 inch/inch for a corn crop in this soil. The difference between the field capacity and the refill point is the management allowed depletion, about 0.08 inch/inch in this soil for a corn crop.

Spatial Variability of Soil Properties

Center pivots are sometimes placed on sloping land that changes from one soil type to another across the area covered by the pivot. Sometimes there are soil type changes unrelated to slope and aspect, for example in glacial till soils, flood plains, salt affected soils, etc. Figure 2 illustrates a situation with slope and soil type variations. There are four soil types irrigated by this pivot, the Lazbuddie clay and Loften clay (LcA and LoA) are in

irrigation capability class 2 due to their small slopes and deep profiles. They represent the margins of a playa. The Pullman clay loam (PuB) under the pivot is in class 3 due to its greater slope and potential for runoff. The Pep clay loam has slopes of 3 to 5% and so is in class 4 due to very high runoff potential. Site-specific, variable rate irrigation could be used to reduce irrigation rates on the areas with high runoff potential.

Table 1. Example calculation[†] of management allowed depletion (MAD, m^3 m^{-3}) in three soils with widely different textures. The small range of MAD severely tests the abilities of most soil water sensors, particularly for the loamy sand soil.

Horizon	θ_{PWP}	θ_{FC}	θ_{AWHC}		MAD fraction		MAD m^3 m^{-3}
	---------- m^3 m^{-3} ---------						
silt loam	0.086	0.295	0.209	×	0.6	=	0.126
loamy sand	0.066	0.103	0.037	×	0.6	=	0.022
clay	0.190	0.332	0.142	×	0.6	=	0.085

[†] θ_{FC}, θ_{PWP}, and θ_{AWHC} are soil water contents at field capacity, at the permanent wilting point, and the plant-available water holding capacity (designated as AWHC).


Figure 2. Soil and irrigation capability classification map from the NRCS soil survey web site for a center pivot in the Texas Panhandle. Letter codes indicate soil type; numbers indicate irrigation capability class. See Table 2 for details.

The soils illustrated in Figure 2 are all clays or clay loams, but do differ somewhat in available water holding capacity (Table 2). The most important difference between them is their slope, in particular the greater slopes of the Pep clay loam. One could lump the Lofton, Lazbuddie and Pullman soils together in terms of soil water sensing, leaving only the Pep soil to be sampled separately. However, the interpretation of soil water content data should be viewed in light of the FC and PWP values for each soil type, which means that a given water content will have different meaning in different soils. Depending on the degree of lumping, sensors in eight locations may be necessary to guarantee that soil water content variations are adequately captured.

Table 2. Summary by Map Unit of Classifications in the Area of Interest (AOI) in Figure 2.

Map unit symbol	Map unit name	Rating	AWHC* (in/in)	Acres in AOI	Percent of AOI
LcA	Lazbuddie clay, 0 to 1 percent slopes	2	0.161	40.4	17.1%
LoA	Lofton clay loam, 0 to 1 percent slopes	2	0.140	46.5	19.7%
PcC	Pep clay loam, 3 to 5 percent slopes	4	0.170	68.7	29.1%
PuA	Pullman clay loam, 0 to 1 percent slopes	2	0.165	14.3	6.1%
PuB	Pullman clay loam, 1 to 3 percent slopes	3	0.158	65.3	27.7%
RaA	Randall clay, 0 to 1 percent slopes, frequently ponded			0.5	0.2%
Totals for Area of Interest (the square, not the circle)				**235.7**	**100.0%**

*AWHC is available water holding capacity, the water that the soil holds between field capacity and permanent wilting point. In this case it is given in inch per inch for the top 40 inches of soil.

SOIL WATER SENSING – RELATIONSHIP TO VRI

Factors that Influence Spatial Variability of Crops

Crop variations in space are influenced by other factors in addition to soil type, texture, salinity, depth and depth to restricting layers. Slope and aspect affect runoff and evaporative demand. In hilly terrain, evaporative demand is typically greater on south facing slopes than on north facing slopes. Disease and insect pressure can create field variability, as can temporary ponding due to runoff, or lack of sufficient infiltration of applied irrigation due to runoff from steeper slopes. Of course, agronomic mistakes in planting, spraying and fertilization can also create variability in the crop, which will translate into variability in crop water uptake rates and soil water content variability. Several of these factors cannot be ameliorated by irrigation, but irrigation can be varied in response. For example, irrigation of areas of a field hard hit by disease or insect pressure may no longer be economically viable, in which case a Site-Specific VRI (SSVRI) system prescription can be

written to stop irrigation in those areas. Irrigation can be reduced on field areas in which slope is causing runoff problems, thus ameliorating parts of the field prone to ponding and water logging. Soil water sensors placed in these two areas (sloping and prone to water logging) will detect problems of lack of soil water on slopes and excess of soil water on areas that pond. Reducing irrigation rates on sloping areas will, however, likely lead to crop water stress there, which can only be addressed by extra irrigations on those areas. While an SSVRI system may allow this site-specific irrigation to occur, there may not be time in the irrigation schedule to allow these extra irrigations on sloped areas. Also, it should be recognized that evaporative loss is a greater fraction of smaller irrigations than of larger irrigations since the evaporative loss doesn't change much as irrigations get larger.

Number of Measurement Locations and Depths Required

As a first approximation, the number of measurement locations needed will vary according to the spatial variability of soil types and the interactions between soil type, slope and aspect. Perhaps the most tractable and easily understood approach to this problem is to begin with defining management zones. The number of management zones that can be separately delineated by a VRI irrigation system depends on whether the system's VRI capabilities are limited to sector-only variations in application rate determined by varying lateral rotation speed (Fig. 3A), or whether it can vary both lateral rotation speed and application rate in zones radially (Fig 3B). Angular size of sectors can vary, of course, not being limited to the regular angular sizes of 18 degrees shown in Figure 3. And, radial sector sizes are not restricted to those shown in Figure 3, although radial dimensions typically are defined by the linear dimensions of banks of nozzles that can be controlled together, e.g., six nozzles per bank with nozzle spacing of 5 feet would give a radial zone width of 30 feet.

If management zones can be defined in both angular (speed control) and radial (nozzle bank control) dimensions, then management zones can be more adequately tailored to field differences (soils, slopes, etc.) that impact water infiltration and runoff (Fig. 4B). If only speed control is possible such that only sector-wide zones can be defined, then management zones may not adequately respond to field soil variations (Fig. 4A).

Assuming that the four management zones defined in Figure 4B are to be managed on the basis of soil water sensing, then at least one soil water sensing system is needed for each zone, for a total of four sensing systems, each composed of at least two sensors, one in the shallow root zone and one nearer the bottom of the root zone, for a total of eight sensors. This total assumes, however, that each system is capable of adequately representing the soil water content of a zone. There are two major factors affecting this assumption; the accuracy and spatial representivity of the sensor, and the field variation in microrelief, which will affect the surface and subsurface redistribution of water. Little can be done about field variation in production fields, except to recognize it where possible, but soil water sensors can be chosen that are more accurate and spatially representative.

Figure 3. Examples of management zones. (A) Sector-only management zones are all that can be defined by varying lateral rotation speed alone. (B) If nozzle banks can be controlled along the length of the lateral, then radial sector dimensions can be defined as well, giving much more spatial control of irrigation application.


Figure 4. Examples of management zones for the soils and center pivot shown in Figure 1. (A) Sector-only management zones prescribed to cover the low lying and shallow slope soils in the NE half of the circle (Zone 1), some of the sloping soils (Zone 2), and the rest of the sloping soils and upper elevation Pullman soils (Zone 3). (B) Management zones prescribed according to both angular and radial dimensions, for the low lying and low slope Lazbuddie clay and Loften clay loam soils (Zone 1), the sloping Pullman soils (Zone 2), the sloping Pep soils (Zone 3) and the higher lying, less sloping Pullman soils (Zone 4).

Selecting Soil Water Sensors & Systems

Due to the numbers of sensors involved, labor associated with soil water sensing for VRI must be minimized. To be useful in VRI scheduling, soil water sensors must be accurate, relatively inexpensive, and require little labor. The latter criterion means that these sensor systems must be capable of being left in the field with little or no maintenance throughout the growing season, not require moving them when machine operations (mostly spraying) are needed, and capable of wireless data transmission to either the farm office or directly to the irrigation controller.

Soil water sensors vary widely in their accuracy and spatial representivity (CPIA Proceedings: Chávez and Evett, 2012; Evett et al., 2007; Evett et al., 2012). In general, sensors can be classed as those that respond to the electromagnetic (EM) properties of soils as influenced by water content (and also by salinity and temperature), resistance blocks (e.g., gypsum blocks, granular matrix sensors and the like), tensiometers and the neutron probe. Tensiometers and the resistance blocks respond to soil water potential rather than water content, but these sensors can be useful since plants respond directly to soil water potential. Tensiometers are too difficult to maintain in the field to be useful for VRI scheduling. The resistance blocks can, however, be easily installed and left for a season, connected to a datalogger and radio transmitter. With flexible antennae, field installations can allow tractor movement. The main disadvantage of resistance sensors is their limited range. They operate best near field capacity, but may lose contact with the soil before it dries to the management allowed depletion, a particular problem if deficit irrigation is being managed to improve water use efficiency and reduce pumping costs. A VRI scheduling system using a wireless soil water sensing system based on Watermark resistance sensors with a "high density of nodes" is being demonstrated by Velledis et al. (2013a,b).

The neutron probe is an excellent research tool, but expensive and labor intensive since it cannot be left in the field. Part of the expense is the regulatory requirement for licensing and safety training due to the radioactive source involved in this method. It is not suitable for production agriculture VRI.

Most relatively inexpensive and commonly available soil water sensors are of the EM type, of which there are two major kinds, the capacitance sensors and the travel time sensors. There are important differences between the two main kinds of EM sensors (Evett et al., 2012). The capacitance sensors radiate an EM field into the soil, thus involving the soil as part of the dielectric of a capacitor in an oscillating electric field. The frequency of oscillation decreases as water content increases, but the frequency is also affected by soil bulk electrical conductivity and bound water content. All soils are somewhat conductive, but conductivity increases with water content, temperature, content of high CEC clays and salinity. Thus the capacitance sensors are also temperature, conductivity and clay content sensors. Bound water is water that is bound by attraction to the surface charge of clay particles, and there are important amounts of bound water in high surface area clays (smectites, montmorillonites, etc.). The degree to which water is bound to clay is also temperature sensitive, which causes a secondary effect on the frequency of oscillation of capacitance sensor. Although soil-specific calibration may improve the accuracy of capacitance sensors, at least in laboratory studies, there will still be effects of varying temperature and salinity in the field.

An equally important disadvantage of the capacitance technique is related to the EM field that is radiated into the soil. This so-called fringing field does not uniformly penetrate the soil, but is instead attracted to more conductive parts of the soil. Because soil structure and water content vary a great deal on the small scale in field soils, there is a large random variation in the EM field shape and frequency response depending on the exact location of a capacitance sensor. The random response makes the capacitance sensors relatively non-representative of soil water content on the scale of plant root systems. In field studies in California and Texas of the major capacitance sensors used in access tubes, Evett et al. (2009) and Mazahrih et al. (2008) found that these sensors reported field variability of soil water content that did not in fact exist when measured directly by soil coring or by the neutron probe. The neutron probe has a much larger measurement volume and is insensitive to conductivity and temperature effects. The false variation was so large that these sensors were incapable of providing data accurate enough to schedule irrigations using the MAD paradigm.

The travel time sensors work by sending an electric pulse (step pulse) along an electrode that is buried in the soil and measuring the time it takes the pulse to move along the electrode. Longer travel times are associated nearly linearly with water content. The travel time sensors employ different physical laws than do the capacitance sensors and so are relatively immune to the effects of soil electrical conductivity, temperature and salinity, unless conductivity is so large that these sensors cannot determine the travel time. Early travel time sensing systems depended on expensive, research quality pulse time domain reflectometry instruments, coaxial multiplexers for connecting more than one soil probe to the instrument and a computer system to control the instrument and switching of the multiplexer(s). These systems required many cables and were not useful in production agriculture. Within the last ten years, however, the adoption of miniaturized high frequency electronic components of the type used in cell phones has allowed the creation of time domain measurement circuits that are inexpensive, low power and small enough to be contained in the plastic head of a soil water sensor. These tend to be superior to the capacitance sensors and typically report accurate water contents, soil bulk electrical conductivity (useful for monitoring salinity in soils prone to it) and temperature (useful for timing of planting operations). Two examples are the CS655 (Campbell Scientific, Inc., Logan, Utah) and the ACC-TDT (Acclima, Inc., Meridian, Idaho). Both can be used in solar-powered field systems with wireless connectivity that can be left unattended in the field for months.

Recently, an underground wireless communication system was tested with soil water sensors at the University of Nebraska (Tooker et al., 2012). The granular matrix sensors were buried at 16-inch depth to be clear of tillage operations. An antenna suspended from a center pivot lateral picked up the wireless signal as the lateral moved over the location of each sensor. This system is still in the development stage. Soil type, water content and amount of vegetation affect the wireless signal strength, and optimal radio frequency and antenna size and design are still being studied (Dong and Vuran, 2013; Dong et al., 2013).

ALTERNATIVES TO SOIL WATER SENSING

Conductivity Mapping

The availability of soil bulk electrical conductivity (BEC) mapping using equipment pulled by tractors or other vehicles (e.g., Veris Technologies, www.veris.com; EM38, Geonics Limited, www.geonics.com; GEM-2, Geophex, www.geophex.com) has resulted in easy availability of field BEC mapping. As explained previously, soil BEC is influenced by many factors, including temperature, salt content (including fertilizers), water content and soil texture. In a given field, more clayey soils are often more conductive both because they can hold more water than sandier soils and because the clay itself is more conductive when wet than is sand at an equivalent water content. Thus soil BEC may be related to the water holding capacity of soils, and BEC maps may be correlated with soil texture, which can provide a basis for prescriptive irrigation scheduling. Grisso et al. (2009) stated that soil EC values change over time due to wetting and drying of a field, but that mapping of relative water holding capacity remained stable over time. They also stated that soil BEC maps more accurately identified the locations of transitions between soil types and small areas of different soil texture than did Order 2 NRCS soil surveys, which were not designed to identify areas smaller than 2.5 acres and were not as accurately georeferenced. They did, however recommend using a soil BEC map in conjunction with an NRCS soil map because of the added information available from NRCS such as slope, crop suitability, etc. Factors such as large applications of manure or other fertilizer, variable irrigation in the past or very dry soils may result in misleading soil BEC maps. It should be remembered that soil BEC maps may indicate variations in soil water holding capacity, all other things being equal, but not necessary crop water needs. Also, soil BEC sensing is typically done when there is no crop in the field, and it is relatively expensive, meaning that irrigation scheduling for VRI cannot be done using this technique.

Plant Water Status Mapping – Connection to ET & Soil Water Status

Irrigation scheduling can be accomplished automatically (or manually) using crop water stress data from sensors mounted on moving irrigation systems (Peters and Evett, 2008). Crop leaf temperature data from infrared thermometers (IRTs) can be combined with on-site measured weather data from inexpensive weather stations to calculate a crop water stress index that is integrated over the daylight hours to improve stability, resulting in maps of the integrated Crop Water Stress Index (iCWSI) for an entire field (O'Shaughnessy et al., 2010). The iCWSI is well correlated with plant stem water potential, which is a direct indicator of plant water stress. Automated VRI irrigation using a supervisory control and data acquisition (SCADA) system has been demonstrated to produce yields and crop water use efficiencies as good as or better than those resulting from irrigation scheduling using the best scientific irrigation scheduling method – the neutron probe used weekly in many access tubes spread over a field (Evett et al., 2006; O'Shaughnessy et al., 2012). These methods are being transferred to commercial center pivot irrigation systems for eventual sale to producers. The IRTs have been made wireless, eliminating wiring initial and maintenance costs (O'Shaughnessy et al., 2013). Other research has shown that the crop temperature data can be used in energy and water balance models of crop water use (ET),

which can be used to estimate changes in soil water content over time (Colaizzi et al., 2003), thus closing the circle between soil water sensing and crop water stress sensing.

SUMMARY

Soil water sensing for variable rate irrigation scheduling is clearly possible using presently available accurate soil water sensors and wireless data transmission to the irrigation control center. Present challenges include field installation labor and timing to avoid machine operations that disturb the soil and may damage the sensors and antennas used. Depending on the spatial variation in field soil properties, installing an adequate number of sensors may be overly expensive. Wireless plant water stress sensors mounted on moving irrigation systems may be no more expensive and offer proximal remote sensing that does not get in the way of field operations. Nevertheless, soil water sensing will remain an important tool in irrigation scheduling, including as a check on VRI prescriptions generated using plant water stress sensors.

REFERENCES

Chávez, J.L., and S.R. Evett 2012. Using soil water sensors to improve irrigation management. Pp. 187-202 *In* Proceedings of the 2012 Central Plains Irrigation Conference, February, 21-22, 2012, Colby Kansas. Manuscript in Adobe format (631 kb)

Colaizzi, Paul D.; Edward M. Barnes; Thomas R. Clarke; Christopher Y. Choi and Peter M. Waller. 2003. Estimating Soil Moisture under Low Frequency Surface Irrigation Using Crop Water Stress Index. J. Irrig. Drainage Eng., 129(1):27-35. Manuscript in Adobe format (157 kb)

Dong, X. and M.C. Vuran. 2013. Impacts of soil moisture on cognitive radio underground networks. Pp. 222-227 *In* International Black Sea Conference on Communications and Networking (BlackSeaCom), Batumi, Georgia. http://cpn.unl.edu/?q=system/files/ugcr-final.pdf

Dong, X., M. C. Vuran and S. Irmak. 2013. Autonomous precision agriculture through integration of wireless underground sensor networks with center pivot irrigation systems. Ad Hoc Networks J. 11(7):1975-1987. http://cpn.unl.edu/?q=system/files/CPS.pdf

Evett, S.R., T.A. Howell and J.A. Tolk. 2007. Comparison of soil water sensing methods for irrigation management and research. Pp. 1-27 *In* Proceedings of the 2007 Central Plains Irrigation, Kearney, Nebraska. Manuscript in Adobe format (736 KB)

Evett, S.R., R.T. Peters and T. A. Howell. 2006. Controlling water use efficiency with irrigation automation: Cases from drip and center pivot irrigation of corn and soybean. Proc. 28th Annual Southern Conservation Systems Conference, Amarillo TX, June 26-28, 2006. 57-66. Manuscript in Adobe format (980 KB)

Evett, S.R., L.K. Heng, P. Moutonnet and M.L. Nguyen (eds.). 2008. Field Estimation of Soil Water Content: A Practical Guide to Methods, Instrumentation, and Sensor Technology. IAEA-TCS-30. International Atomic Energy Agency, Vienna , Austria . ISSN 1018–5518. Manuscript in Adobe format (3 MB)

Evett, S.R., R.C. Scwhartz, J.A. Tolk, and T.A. Howell. 2009. Soil profile water content determination: Spatiotemporal variability of electromagnetic and neutron probe sensors in access tubes. Vadose Zone J. 8(4):926-941. Manuscript in Adobe format (2 MB)

Evett, S.R., R.C. Schwartz, J.J. Casanova, and L.K. Heng. 2012. Soil water sensing for water balance, ET and WUE. Agric. Water Manage. 104:1-9. Manuscript in Adobe format (1,015 kb)

Grisso, R., M. Alley, D. Holshouser and W. Thomason. 2009. Precision Farming Tools: Soil Electrical Conductivity. Publication 442-508, Virginia Cooperative Extension, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University. http://pubs.ext.vt.edu/442/442-508/442-508_pdf.pdf

Mazahrih, N.Th., N. Katbeh-Bader, S.R. Evett, J.E. Ayars, and T.J. Trout. 2008. Field calibration accuracy and utility of four down-hole water content sensors Vadose Zone J. 2008 7: 992-1000. Manuscript in Adobe format (1,027 kb)

O'Shaughnessy, S.A., S.R. Evett, P.D. Colaizzi and T.A. Howell. 2010. Automatic irrigation scheduling of grain sorghum using a CWSI and time threshold. Proc. 5th Decennial National Irrigation Proc., 5-8 December 2010, Phoenix, Arizona. Paper No. IRR10-9011. ASABE, St. Joseph, Mich. (CD-ROM). Manuscript in Adobe format (208 kb)

O'Shaughnessy, S.A., S.R. Evett, P.D. Colaizzi and T.A. Howell. 2012. Grain sorghum response to irrigation scheduling with the time-temperature threshold method and deficit irrigation levels. Trans. ASABE 55(2):451-461. Manuscript in Adobe format (1 MB)

O'Shaughnessy, S.A., S.R. Evett, P.D. Colaizzi and T.A. Howell. 2012b. Performance of a wireless sensor network for crop water monitoring and irrigation control. Paper # 12-1338246. 2012 ASABE Annual International Meeting, Jul 29 - Aug 1 2012, Dallas, Texas. St. Joseph, Mich.: ASABE. Manuscript in Adobe format (703 kb)

O'Shaughnessy, S.A., S.R. Evett, P.D. Colaizzi and T.A. Howell. 2013. Wireless sensor network effectively controls center pivot irrigation of sorghum. Appl. Engr. Agric. 29(6):853-864.

Peters, R.T. and S.R. Evett. 2008. Automation of a center pivot using the temperature-time-threshold method of irrigation scheduling. J. Irrig. Drain. Engr. 134(3):286-291. Manuscript in Adobe format (242 kb)

Tooker, J., X. Dong, M.C. Vuran and S. Irmak. 2012. Connecting soil to cloud: A wireless underground sensor network testbed. 2012 9th Annual IEEE Communications Society Conference on Sensor, Mesh and Ad Hoc Communications and Networks (SECON). http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1203&context=cseconfwork

Vellidis, G., M.A. Tucker, C. Perry, H.E. Henry and R.W. Hill. 2013a. A soil moisture sensor-based variable rate irrigation scheduling system. 2013 Annual International Meeting of the ASA, CSSA and SSSA, Tampa, Florida. https://scisoc.confex.com/scisoc/2013am/webprogram/Paper81123.html

Vellidis, G., M. Tucker, C. Perry, D. Reckford, C. Butts, H. Henry, V. Liakos, R. W. Hill, W. Edwards. 2013b. A soil moisture sensor-based variable rate irrigation scheduling system. Pp. 713-720 in Precision agriculture '13. Wageningen Academic Publishers. DOI: 10.3920/978-90-8686-778-3_88. Online ISBN: 978-90-8686-778-3.