

Salinity and Drainage in San Joaquin Valley, California

GLOBAL ISSUES IN WATER POLICY

VOLUME 5

Editor-in-chief

Ariel Dinar

Series Editors

José Albiac

Eric D. Mungatana

Víctor Pochat

Rathinasamy Maria Saleth

For further volumes:

<http://www.springer.com/series/8877>

Andrew C. Chang • Deborah Brawer Silva
Editors

Salinity and Drainage in San Joaquin Valley, California

Science, Technology, and Policy

 Springer

Editors

Andrew C. Chang
University of California
Center for Water Resources
Riverside, CA, USA

Deborah Braver Silva
University of California
Center for Water Resources
Riverside, CA, USA

ISSN 2211-0631

ISBN 978-94-007-6850-5

DOI 10.1007/978-94-007-6851-2

Springer Dordrecht Heidelberg New York London

ISSN 2211-0658 (electronic)

ISBN 978-94-007-6851-2 (eBook)

© Springer Science+Business Media Dordrecht 2014

This work is subject to copyright. All rights are reserved by the Publisher, whether the whole or part of the material is concerned, specifically the rights of translation, reprinting, reuse of illustrations, recitation, broadcasting, reproduction on microfilms or in any other physical way, and transmission or information storage and retrieval, electronic adaptation, computer software, or by similar or dissimilar methodology now known or hereafter developed. Exempted from this legal reservation are brief excerpts in connection with reviews or scholarly analysis or material supplied specifically for the purpose of being entered and executed on a computer system, for exclusive use by the purchaser of the work. Duplication of this publication or parts thereof is permitted only under the provisions of the Copyright Law of the Publisher's location, in its current version, and permission for use must always be obtained from Springer. Permissions for use may be obtained through RightsLink at the Copyright Clearance Center. Violations are liable to prosecution under the respective Copyright Law.

The use of general descriptive names, registered names, trademarks, service marks, etc. in this publication does not imply, even in the absence of a specific statement, that such names are exempt from the relevant protective laws and regulations and therefore free for general use.

While the advice and information in this book are believed to be true and accurate at the date of publication, neither the authors nor the editors nor the publisher can accept any legal responsibility for any errors or omissions that may be made. The publisher makes no warranty, express or implied, with respect to the material contained herein.

Printed on acid-free paper

Springer is part of Springer Science+Business Media (www.springer.com)

Kenneth K. Tanji
University of California, Davis, California
1931–2007

Preface

Salinity and drainage are challenges of irrigated agriculture in semiarid and arid climates that transcend history and geography. Three thousand years before Christ, the Mesopotamia culture emerged and prospered, aided by domestication of crops and animals and employment of a water conveyance and irrigation network. When the civilization crumbled millennia later, it was broad-spectrum socio-economical turmoil, poor governance, and institutional weakness that led to societal decline and eventually resulted in dilapidated water delivery infrastructure, rising shallow groundwater tables, salinization of soils, and crop failures. When and wherever irrigated agriculture has ascended in history, the populace sooner or later has been forced to cope with the threat of soil salinization. Examples today include Egypt, Jordan, China, Peru, India, Pakistan, Australia, and California. While water movement, salt buildup in soils, and plant injuries are molecular-scale processes governed by the natural laws, over time, it has been failures in public policy, institutions, and management, which have culminated in wholesale crises in irrigated agriculture.

At different temporal and spatial scales, salinity and drainage issues would take distinctively different forms and shapes. In 1983, the reproductive failures and deformed embryos of shore birds appeared at the Kesterson National Wildlife Refuge, a wetland fed by subsurface tile drain effluents from farmlands in the western San Joaquin Valley. A looming ecological catastrophe caused by irrigated agriculture was unfolding. At the process level, as drainage waters congregated in the terminus water body, micro-quantities of waterborne selenium bio-accumulated unnoticed through the aquatic food chain and quickly reached levels toxic to biota occupying the top ecological echelon. Instantaneously, the ecosystem harm brought the sustainability of irrigated agriculture in the Valley into question, a crisis at the regional level. Basin-wide options to address the issues were constrained by water rights, special interests, public policies and legal mandates, and political actions at the local, statewide, and federal levels. On farms, if irrigated agriculture were to continue, the irrigation and cultivation practices had to be adjusted to contain and/or eliminate the release of selenium via drainage water discharge. There were technology gaps to be closed. “How to fix it?” was a multifaceted dilemma.

In 1985, the University of California (UC), Division of Agriculture and Natural Resources, in response to the environmental crises, launched the UC Salinity Drainage Research Program, mobilizing resources and personnel for a concerted effort to tackle problems associated with salinity, selenium, and drainage in the western San Joaquin Valley. UC researchers initiated a diverse range of research studies, worked with local special service districts, and participated in inter-agency review panels. It was a period of focused academic pursuits by students and faculty alike and intense interactions with public agencies, water management professionals, and individual growers. Research findings were disseminated in presentations at workshops and conferences, in written reports distributed among concerned public agencies, in proposals and plans for feasibility assessments, and in technical articles in professional journals. It was the first time salinity drainage problems of an irrigated crop production region were systematically and comprehensively investigated.

The UC Center for Water Resources asked selected participants in the Salinity Drainage Research Program to critically recapture findings that over the time span of two-plus decades had been scattered in the scientific literature of diverse disciplines. As the subject matter is revisited and updated, we all benefit from the perspective of time and experience, additional research findings, new technologies, and greater knowledge base, to view the material with wisdom.

This compendium of 15 chapters is a collection of independent treatises, each depicting a distinctive salinity drainage topic with fresh perspective. As environmental scientists, engineers, and biologists, we are cognizant of the multiple scales at which complex issues should be examined, and we recognize the need to integrate those scales to recommend viable solutions. At first, the subject matter covered in this collection may appear random and lacking in relationship, but when the scales are invoked and integrated, then a mosaic of irrigated agriculture in time and space emerges. The following are synopses of the chapters:

Time, Geography, and Scale

Chapter 1 provides background information and a water distribution map to familiarize readers with the San Joaquin Valley, setting a stage for events and issues that developed.

Chapter 2 delineates the evolution of irrigated agriculture in the San Joaquin Valley over the temporal scale. Water rights doctrines, state and federal water policies, and infrastructure building played decisive roles in how water was distributed and used then and now. Processes that facilitated irrigated agriculture to blossom also led to delays in solving salinity and drainage problems. Later, the constraints were set forth by federal mandates in the Clean Water Act and Endangered Species Act and by eco-toxicological crises of selenium.

Chapter 3 depicts the geochemical and hydrological processes that define the San Joaquin Valley, including the physics, chemistry, and biology attributes that impact water management policies and strategies in the Valley.

Chapter 4 provides a comprehensive discussion of how scales entered into the salinity drainage research and management in the San Joaquin Valley. Scaling, the tools of integrating data obtained at different scales, is imperative in accurately assessing impacts at the regional level.

Biogeochemistry of Selenium

Chapter 5 elaborates chemical reactions that transform selenium when irrigation water passes through the soil profile and facilitates its transport to subsurface tile drains.

Chapter 6 explains the biochemical roles of plants in absorbing selenium from soils and transforming and volatilizing it as gaseous methyl selenium. The processes have the potential to reduce and eliminate selenium from the drainage water.

Chapter 7 describes how microbial reductive processes to precipitate selenium species found in the drainage water are affected by environmental factors and demonstrates a path to optimize the reduction of selenium.

Chapter 8 describes the aquatic chemistry and biology of selenium in evaporation ponds that are employed to retain and concentrate dissolved salts in the drainage water. Again, the processes may be employed to reduce the selenium load of the drainage water stream.

Coping with the Salts

Chapter 9 shows that evaporation ponds, while acting as the repository for selenium and dissolved salts in the drainage water, might be a threat to the safety of foraging shore birds. However, providing alternative and compensatory habitats for the birds can mitigate the potential hazards. The evaporation pond systems operated by the Tulare Lake Drainage District are a successful example.

Chapter 10 documents on-farm and plot-level irrigation provisions that would reduce agricultural drainage outputs and examines their effects on plant performance. These meso-scale practices might be implemented on a basin-wide level to enhance irrigation efficiencies and reduce drainage and salt disposal requirements.

Chapter 11 explores the on-farm drainage water reuse potential and tests the integrated farm drainage management (IFDM) approach. Drainage water may be retained on-farm by collecting, blending, and reusing it for irrigation of a more salt-tolerant crop. The secondary drainage water, in turn, may be reused on an even more salt-tolerant crop. The system, if properly scaled and operated, would reduce the drainage volume and concentrate the salts for final disposal.

Chapter 12 thoroughly delineates the technical merits of the reverse osmosis technologies in desalting agricultural drainage water, with emphasis on examining mechanisms of membrane clogging and on preventing microbial and mineral fouling of membranes and extending membrane life and operation time.

Chapter 13 shows how the wetlands in the San Joaquin Valley may be operated and through monitoring data evaluates their performances in accommodating the salt discharges from irrigated fields.

The Real Game: Public Policy and Management

Chapter 14 is a realistic policy analysis of the water management options for irrigated agriculture in the San Joaquin Valley and their respective outcomes, if implemented. In this exercise, the findings at the micro- and meso-scales are integrated for a basin-wide assessment.

Chapter 15 provides an international perspective on the sustainability of irrigated agriculture and returns to the thesis from the outset.

As editors, we remind readers that at different temporal and spatial scales, salinity drainage issues would take distinctively different forms and shapes.

University of California
Center for Water Resources
Riverside, CA, USA

Andrew C. Chang
Deborah Brawer Silva

Contents

1	Prologue	1
2	E. W. Hilgard and the History of Irrigation in the San Joaquin Valley: Stunning Productivity, Slowly Undone by Inadequate Drainage James D. Oster and Dennis Wichelns	7
3	The San Joaquin Valley: Salinity and Drainage Problems and the Framework for a Response Nigel W.T. Quinn	47
4	Scales and Scaling as a Framework for Synthesizing Irrigated Agroecosystem Research on the Westside San Joaquin Valley Wesley W. Wallender, Jan W. Hopmans, and Mark E. Grismer	99
5	Biogeochemistry of Trace Elements: Reactions in Soils Christopher Amrhein and Harvey E. Doner	123
6	Uptake, Metabolism, and Volatilization of Selenium by Terrestrial Plants Elizabeth A.H. Pilon-Smits, Gary S. Bañuelos, and David R. Parker	147
7	Bacterial Reduction of Selenium Yiqiang Zhang and William T. Frankenberger, Jr.	165
8	Chemical and Biological Processes of Evaporation Ponds Suduan Gao and Andrew C. Chang	185
9	Management of Evaporation Basins To Reduce and Avoid Adverse Impacts to Waterbirds Douglas E. Davis and Charles H. Hanson	211

10 Integrated Irrigation and Drainage Water Management 249
James E. Ayars and Blaine R. Hanson

**11 Drainage Water Reuse: Concepts, Practices
and Potential Crops 277**
Stephen R. Grattan, James D. Oster, John Letey,
and Stephen R. Kaffka

12 Membrane Desalination of Agricultural Drainage Water 303
Yoram Cohen, Brian McCool, Anditya Rahardianto,
Myung-man Kim, and Jose Faria

13 Advances in Wetland Salinity Management 343
Nigel W.T. Quinn

**14 Regional Economics and Management
in Closed Drainage Basins 353**
Keith C. Knapp, Kurt Schwabe, and Kenneth A. Baerenklau

**15 California and Beyond: An International Perspective
on the Sustainability of Irrigated Agriculture 381**
Dennis Wichelns and James D. Oster

Index 407

Contributors

Christopher Amrhein Department of Environmental Sciences, University of California, Riverside, CA, USA

James E. Ayars Water Management Research Unit, United States Department of Agriculture, Agricultural Research Service (USDA-ARS), Parlier, CA, USA

Kenneth A. Baerenklau Department of Environmental Sciences, University of California, Riverside, CA, USA

Gary S. Bañuelos Water Management Research Unit, United States Department of Agriculture, Agricultural Research Service, Parlier, CA, USA

Andrew C. Chang Department of Environmental Sciences, University of California, Riverside, CA, USA

Yoram Cohen Department of Chemical and Biomolecular Engineering, University of California, Los Angeles, CA, USA

Douglas E. Davis Tulare Lake Drainage District, Corcoran, CA, USA

Harvey E. Doner Department of Environmental Sciences, Policy and Management, University of California, Berkeley, CA, USA

Jose Faria California Department of Water Resources, San Joaquin District, Fresno, CA, USA

William T. Frankenberger, Jr. Department of Environmental Sciences, University of California, Riverside, CA, USA

Suduan Gao Water Management Research Unit, United States Department of Agriculture, Agricultural Research Service, Parlier, CA, USA

Stephen R. Grattan Department of Land, Air and Water Resources, University of California, Davis, CA, USA

Mark E. Grismer Department of Land, Air and Water Resources, University of California, Davis, CA, USA

Blaine R. Hanson Department of Land, Air and Water Resources, University of California, Davis, CA, USA

Charles H. Hanson Hanson Environmental, Inc., Walnut Creek, CA, USA

Jan W. Hopmans Department of Land, Air and Water Resources, University of California, Davis, CA, USA

Stephen R. Kaffka Department of Plant Sciences, Air and Water Resources, University of California, Davis, CA, USA

Myung-man Kim Department of Chemical and Biomolecular Engineering, University of California, Los Angeles, CA, USA

Keith C. Knapp Department of Environmental Sciences, University of California, Riverside, CA, USA

John Letey Department of Environmental Sciences, University of California, Riverside, CA, USA

Brian McCool Department of Chemical and Biomolecular Engineering, University of California, Los Angeles, CA, USA

James D. Oster Department of Environmental Sciences, University of California, Riverside, CA, USA

David R. Parker Department of Environmental Sciences, University of California, Riverside, CA, USA

Elizabeth A.H. Pilon-Smits Department of Biology, Colorado State University, Fort Collins, CO, USA

Nigel W.T. Quinn Materials Science and Engineering Division, Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, University of California, Berkeley, CA, USA

Anditya Rahardianto Department of Chemical and Biomolecular Engineering, University of California, Los Angeles, CA, USA

Kurt Schwabe Department of Environmental Sciences, University of California, Riverside, CA, USA

Wesley W. Wallender Department of Land, Air and Water Resources, University of California, Davis, CA, USA

Dennis Wichelns Institute of Water Policy, Lee Kuan Yew School of Public Policy, National University of Singapore, Singapore, Singapore

Yiqiang Zhang Department of Environmental Sciences, University of California, Riverside, CA, USA

List of Figures

Fig. 2.1	Total and irrigated cropland of California, 1869–1997	10
Fig. 3.1	Idealized east – west geological cross section across the western San Joaquin Valley	50
Fig. 3.2	Generalized hydrogeological cross section of the western San Joaquin Valley in 1984, showing the groundwater divide and vertical flow patterns	52
Fig. 3.3	Successive reuses of irrigation water and agroforestry crops within the Integrated On-Farm Drainage Management (IFDM) System	67
Fig. 4.1	System spatial scales from plot to region	102
Fig. 4.2	Scales and scaling within and among disciplines	104
Fig. 5.1	The distribution of trace elements in solid, soluble, and gaseous forms to give the total trace element content of soils and sediments. The <i>vertical gray area</i> shows the transition between available (bio-available, mobile and soluble) and non-available forms	125
Fig. 5.2	Concentration of As using different chemical extractants at different soil depths in a constructed wetland after 2 years under flooded conditions. Pre-flood conc. Show results of bulk soil sample analysis before flooding	137
Fig. 5.3	Concentration of Mo using different chemical extractants at different soil depths in a constructed wetland after 2 years under flooded conditions. Pre-flood conc. show results of bulk soil samples before flooding	138

Fig. 5.4	Concentration of U in San Joaquin Valley evaporation pond sediments and subsurface soil using a 0.5 M $(\text{NH}_4)_2\text{CO}_3$ extractant and concentrated nitric acid digestion	140
Fig. 6.1	Biochemical pathways of selenium uptake of bacteria, certain green algae, and higher plants	153
Fig. 7.1	Se volatilization in soils as depicted in the Frankenberger – Karlson selenium detoxification process, U. S. Patent 4,861,482, 1989	166
Fig. 7.2	Effects of EC, yeast extract and NO_3^- on reduction of Se(VI) and Se(IV) in synthetic drainage water by <i>E. taylorae</i>	168
Fig. 7.3	Reduction of Se(VI) to Se(0) in molasses drainage water inoculated with different strain of Se reducing bacteria. Error bar denotes standard deviation of three observations	171
Fig. 7.4	Se removal by <i>E. taylorae</i> in 0.1 % molasses treated natural drainage water. Error denotes standard deviation of three observations	172
Fig. 7.5	Se(VI) reduction by <i>Bacillus</i> sp. RS1 and <i>Dechloromonas</i> sp. HZ (<i>right panel</i>) and <i>Bacillus</i> sp. RS1 <i>alone (left panel)</i> in synthetic drainage water containing in the 0, 100, and 250 mg L^{-1} NO_3^- . Error denotes standard deviation of three observations	173
Fig. 7.6	Bio-reduction of Se(VI) in natural agricultural drainage water: (a) bacteria- and substrate-free control, (b) substrate free control with <i>Bacillus</i> sp. RS1, (c) 0.1 % molasses substrate with <i>Bacillus</i> sp. RS1, and (d) 0.1 % molasses substrate with <i>Bacillus</i> sp. RS1 and <i>Dechloromonas</i> sp. Error denotes standard deviation of three observations	175
Fig. 7.7	Se removal in 0.1 % molasses amended saline agricultural drainage water of San Joaquin Valley under varying experimental conditions: Control denotes aseptic control and amendment free culture, <i>C. braakii</i> denotes culture inoculated with 1 mL of washed <i>C. braakii</i> cell suspension, ZVI denotes culture treated with 1 g of 40–60 mesh zero valence iron, and <i>C. braakii</i> and ZVI denotes culture inoculated with 1 mL of washed <i>C. braakii</i> cell suspension and treated with 1 g of 40–60 mesh zero valence iron. Error denotes standard deviation of three observations	176
Fig. 7.8	Redox mediator, anthraquinone-2,6-disulfonate (AQDS), on enhancing Se(VI) reduction to Se(0) in synthetic drainage water containing 2,000 $\mu\text{g L}^{-1}$ Se(VI) and 250 mg L^{-1} yeast extract and with and without inoculation of <i>E. taylorae</i> . Error denotes standard deviation of three observations	178
Fig. 7.9	Prototype flow through Se removal bioreactor	180

Fig. 8.1	Correlation of selected chemical constituents of water in evaporation ponds: (a) Na^+ , (b) SO_4^{2-} -S and Mg^{2+} , (c) Ca^{2+} and alkalinity, (d) DOC, (e) B, and (f) As and Se with respect to that of Cl^- which is assumed to be a conservative parameter influent drainage water	190
Fig. 8.2	Biogeochemical cycling of Se in aquatic ecosystems	200
Fig. 8.3	Bioremediation pathways for breaking food chain transfer of Se resulting in toxicity at higher trophic levels	204
Fig. 9.1	American avocet and black-necked stilt nest starts at the drainage water evaporation basins (South and Hacienda) verse the compensation habitat, 1994 to 2007	234
Fig. 10.1	Distribution of chloride ion (Cl) under subsurface drip irrigation system at Britz farms	257
Fig. 10.2	Soil profile salinity around drip lines measured as dS m^{-1} of ECe for (a) average water table depth = 2 m, $\text{EC}_{\text{iw}} = 0.3 \text{ dS m}^{-1}$, and $\text{EC}_{\text{gw}} = 8\text{--}11 \text{ dS m}^{-1}$; (b) water table depth = 0.61–1 m, $\text{EC}_{\text{iw}} = 0.3 \text{ dS m}^{-1}$, and $\text{EC}_{\text{gw}} = 5\text{--}7 \text{ dS m}^{-1}$; and (c) water table depth = 0.61 and 1 m, $\text{EC}_{\text{iw}} = 1.1 \text{ dS m}^{-1}$, and $\text{EC}_{\text{gw}} = 9\text{--}16 \text{ dS m}^{-1}$	258
Fig. 10.3	Soil profile salinity around the drip line measured as dS m^{-1} of ECe that respectively received (a) 371 mm, comparable to seasonal ET for processing tomatoes and (b) 211 mm of irrigation water. $\text{EC}_{\text{iw}} = 0.52 \text{ dS m}^{-1}$ and $\text{EC}_{\text{gw}} = 8\text{--}11 \text{ dS m}^{-1}$	259
Fig. 10.4	Field layout of water control structures	264
Fig. 10.5	Depth to the water table on May 2, 1994 (a) upon control valves of drainage system being opened on April 21 (b)	265
Fig. 10.6	Influences of ground water quality on soil salinity of unsaturated zone above the water table	266
Fig. 11.1	Schematic representation of a sequential drainage water reuse system	280
Fig. 11.2	Electrical conductivity, ECe, and boron concentration of soil saturated extract in cotton plots subjected to 3-year cyclic reuse rotations. Legends <i>F</i> and <i>S</i> represent non-saline 'fresh' water and saline water application, respectively in annual sequence	283
Fig. 11.3	Relative yields vs. salinity of irrigation water for corn ($\text{ECi} = 1\text{--}6 \text{ dS m}^{-1}$) and cotton ($\text{ECi} = 1\text{--}11 \text{ dS m}^{-1}$)	287
Fig. 12.1	Schematic of cross-flow plate-and-frame RO system showing the formation of a concentration boundary layer. <i>J</i> is the water flux, C_m and C_p are the respective concentrations at the membrane surface and in the permeate. <i>D</i> is the solute diffusivity, and dC/dy is the solute concentration gradient in the y-direction	307

Fig. 12.2	(a) Turbidity plots for gypsum crystallization from model concentrate solution ($TDS = 26,250 \text{ mg L}^{-1}$, $SI_g = 2.9$) with five different commercial antiscalants at dosage of 3 ppm including V2000 – a phosphino-carboxylic acid polymer; V3000 – a phosphonate-blend polymer; S30 and S80 – polyacrylic acids with molecular weight of 8,000 and 100,000, respectively, S30 is fully neutralized as the sodium salt of polyacrylic acid; and F260 – a polycarboxylic acid (b) Dependence of crystallization induction time on antiscalant dosage. Solution and antiscalants are same as in Fig. 12.2a	313
Fig. 12.3	Observed gypsum crystallization induction time for different antiscalants at a dose of 1 ppm. Also shown is residual solid content for the various antiscalant formulations. Solution composition corresponded to those of Fig. 12.2a	314
Fig. 12.4	Percent of rejection for candidate membranes at different feed concentrations: (a) NaCl and (b) CaCl ₂ and flux for candidate membranes at different feed concentrations: (c) NaCl and (d) CaCl ₂ . Membranes are LFC-1 (M-A), TFC-ULP (M-B), and TFC-HR (M-C). Trans-membrane pressure = 1,379 kPa (200 psi) and temperature = 20 °C	315
Fig. 12.5	Biofouling potential for candidate membranes in desalinating Buena Vista water without buffer among those CA (std), FT-30 (n), and FT-30 (o) are membranes used as controls. A hydrophobic strain of Mycobacterium and a hydrophilic strain of Flavobacterium were used as the test bacteria	316
Fig. 12.6	Seasonal variability of water quality at sampling sites: (a) CNR, (b) LNW, (c) OAS, and (d) VGD	319
Fig. 12.7	Dependence of mineral salt solubility on pH: (a) OAS-2548, sample obtained at 09/09/2003, representing low TDS condition of $3,828 \text{ mg L}^{-1}$ and (b) VGD-4406, sampled obtained at 01/13/2004, representing high TDS condition of $29,760 \text{ mg L}^{-1}$	321
Fig. 12.8	Schematic of a plate-and-frame RO system	326
Fig. 12.9	Typical arrangement of a 2:1 array RO desalting process. The major percentage of permeate production is typically achieved in the first stage, while in the second stage the salinity is higher and thus permeate flux is typically lower. Various membrane module arrangements (e.g., with higher permeability second stage membranes) and a booster pump may be used between the first and second stage to increase the second stage pressure. Energy recovery devices can also be used (not shown) to recover energy from the high pressure retentate stream	328

Fig. 12.10 Percent rejection based on measured conductivities, percent recovery, and normalized flux of the RO system during the operation of the pilot plant. Note: unit of right hand vertical axis 1GFD = 1 gal ft⁻² d⁻¹ = 1.66 L m⁻¹ h⁻¹ and 1 psi = 6.894 kPa 328

Fig. 12.11 A schematic for high recovery reverse osmosis (RO) desalination with microfiltration (MF) feed pretreatment and inter-stage precipitation process for reducing the concentration of gypsum scale precursors 330

Fig. 12.12 Required calcium removal (as CaCO₃) during a chemical precipitation step that is integrated into RO desalination (as pretreatment or inter-stage treatment) and corresponding RO concentrate pH required to attain a target overall RO water recovery such that RO concentrate is (a) at a given level of saturation with respect to gypsum (*SI_G*) and (b) saturated with respect to calcite (*SI_C* = 1). Source water is LNW 332

Fig. 12.13 Process simulation for high recovery desalting with AGP integration based on feed water of OAS 2548 (TDS = 9,600 mg L⁻¹), feed capacity of 1 MGD (22.84 m³/s), permeate flux of 10 GFD (1.66 L h⁻¹ m⁻²), and overall recovery target of 95 % with permeate TDS of <500 mg L⁻¹ 333

Fig. 12.14 Implementation of high recovery RO-ACP-RO agricultural drainage water desalination based on feed water of OAS 2548 (TDS = 9,600 mg L⁻¹), feed capacity of 1 MGD (22.84 m³s⁻¹), permeate flux of 10 GFD (1.66 L m⁻¹ h⁻¹), and overall recovery target of 95 % with permeate TDS of <500 mg L⁻¹ 334

Fig. 12.15 Integration of NF precipitation concentrator with RO membrane desalting 335

Fig. 13.1 Timing of wetland drawdown compared to the assimilative capacity of the San Joaquin River 348

Fig. 14.1 Regional agricultural production with a shallow water table and no external drainage facilities 355

Fig. 14.2 Side view of the agricultural production/groundwater aquifer system on the Westside of San Joaquin Valley, California looking towards the north. The land generally slopes down from west to east. Vertical scale is exaggerated 361

Fig. 14.3 Common property usage of the regional production/aquifer system for selected cells starting from *h₀* = 100 ft mean sea level, net deep percolation (*z_{it}*), hydraulic head (*h_{it}*), and annual net benefit (*π_{it}*) 363

Fig. 14.4 Optimal management of the regional production/aquifer system for selected years starting from *h₀* = 100 f. MSL. Net deep percolation (*z_{it}*) and hydraulic head (*h_{it}*). 365

Fig. 14.5 Regulatory policies for selected years starting from the 1984 water table. (a) Net deep percolation in year 1 under common property (*CP*) and optimal management (*Opt*) (b) Marginal user cost of deep percolation by cell for selected year 368

Fig. 14.6 Schematic diagram of an agricultural production/saline aquifer system 371

Fig. 14.7 Time-series for the aquifer variables and annual net benefits in the agricultural production/saline aquifer system 373

Fig. 14.8 Optimal management of the agricultural production/saline aquifer system over time. (a) Surface water and groundwater reuse, (b) irrigation systems 374

Fig. 15.1 Groundwater levels before (pre-irrigation days of 1920) and after introduction of canal irrigation (1960) in the Punjab Province of Pakistan 388

List of Tables

Table 2.1	Chronology of water development in San Joaquin Valley (SJV), Phase I 1840–1966: early expansion of irrigated agriculture and water supply	11
Table 2.2	Chronology of water resources developments in San Joaquin Valley (SJV), Phase II 1967–1982: continued expansion amid initial environmental concerns	13
Table 2.3	Chronology of water resources development in San Joaquin Valley (SJV), Phase III. 1983–1990: Selenium contamination at Kesterson Reservoir creates regional urgency	15
Table 2.4	Chronology of water resources development in San Joaquin Valley (SJV), Phase IV. 1991–Present: search for sustainable solutions to salinity, selenium, and drainage	17
Table 4.1	Spatial and temporal scales relevant to several important water processes in irrigated hydrology	101
Table 5.1	Ionization potentials (ion charge/ionic radius) for elements found in ground water, soil solutions, and rivers	130
Table 5.2	Some chemical and physical properties of two agricultural soils (Ciervo and Panoche, 0–15 cm depth) from the Westside of San Joaquin Valley	133
Table 5.3	The distribution of selenium in soils and Kesterson sediment among various extractable forms	133
Table 5.4	Distribution of Se in Panoche soil, Ciervo soil, and Kesterson sediment using the Lipton chemical fractionation method	134
Table 7.1	Se-reducing bacterial strains isolated from various environmental settings	167
Table 7.2	Mass balance of Se and rice straw in bench top flow through Se bio-reduction pilot plant following 122 days of testing	181

Table 8.1	Geometric mean trace element concentrations of water in evaporation ponds, San Joaquin Valley	187
Table 9.1	Summary examples of egg selenium threshold response analyses	218
Table 9.2	Predicted waterborne selenium concentration associated with various egg selenium concentrations	219
Table 9.3	Chronology of TLDD constructed wetland development and modifications to South and Hacienda Evaporation Basins	225
Table 9.4	Waterborne total selenium concentrations ($\mu\text{g L}^{-1}$) in the TLDD compensation wetland	233
Table 9.5	Selenium concentrations ($\mu\text{g g}^{-1}$ dry weight) in American avocet and black-necked stilt eggs collected at the TLDD compensation wetland, 1995–2004	233
Table 9.6	Estimated numbers of nests for 14 avian species that utilized the TLDD compensation wetland, location, 1995–2004	234
Table 9.7	Fate of nests for American avocet and black-necked stilt at the TLDD compensation wetland, 1995–2004	235
Table 9.8	Comparison of American avocet and black-necked stilt nest starts at the TLDD South and Hacienda Evaporation Basins and compensation wetland habitat	236
Table 9.9	Bird use surveys conducted at the 123-ha TLDD saline winter wetland habitat	240
Table 9.10	Mayfield adjusted stilt and avocet nests at TLDD modified evaporation basins, location, 1994–2004	242
Table 9.11	Egg selenium concentrations ($\mu\text{g g}^{-1}$ dry weight) from the TLDD South and Hacienda Evaporation Basins in years with high and low floodwater storage in adjacent areas	243
Table 10.1	Adjusted crop coefficients (K_c) of cotton for different water table depths and ground water salinity	251
Table 10.2	Comparison of yield, applied water and net returns for subsurface drip, improved furrow, surge irrigation, and historic furrow irrigation systems	255
Table 10.3	Comparison of yield, applied water and net return of subsurface drip, improved furrow, and historic furrow irrigation methods	256
Table 10.4	Seasonal applied water and evapotranspiration, and field-wide leaching fractions calculated from a water balance for the four commercial tomato sites (BR, DI, DE, and BR2)	260
Table 10.5	Rainfall and applied water in furrow irrigated plots, F1 and F2	262

Table 10.6	Rainfall and applied water in drip plots, T1 and T2	263
Table 10.7	Crop yields of non saline water and non saline-saline water combination furrow irrigated fields F1 and F2 respectively and drip irrigated fields T1 and T2, respectively	263
Table 11.1	Selenium concentration (in mg kg ⁻¹ dry weight) in the edible portion of vegetable crop when irrigated with either non-saline California aqueduct water (EC _w = 0.3 dS m ⁻¹ , Se = <2 μg L ⁻¹ , SO ₄ ²⁻ = 15 mg L ⁻¹) or saline drainage water (EC _w = 7.1 dS m ⁻¹ ; Se = 45 μg L ⁻¹ ; SO ₄ ²⁻ = 1,000 mg L ⁻¹) that were spiked with Se (as selenate) injected into the drip lines Burau et al. Unpublished data	289
Table 11.2	Criteria for selecting crops for saline water reuse	292
Table 12.1	Typical guidelines for maximum acceptable RO/NF feed water parameter	310
Table 12.2	Potential RO/NF chemical pretreatment options	310
Table 12.3	Potential RO/NF mechanical pretreatment options	311
Table 12.4	Summary of annual average water quality in selected San Joaquin Valley locations for the most recent year of data (2003–2004)	318
Table 12.5	Detailed water quality analyses, 2006–2007	323
Table 12.6	Water quality and saturation indices of calcite (<i>SI_C</i>), gypsum (<i>SI_G</i>), and silica (<i>SI_S</i>) for the 2006–2007 sampling data of selected San Joaquin Valley locations	324
Table 12.7	Field water sample recovery limits	325
Table 12.8	Diagnostic flux decline experimental conditions and 24-h flux decline	327
Table 14.1	Drainage measurement under alternative drainage scenarios	359
Table 14.2	Optimal management: Sensitivity of optimal net deep percolation in the first year to interest rates and hydraulic conductivity	366
Table 15.1	Cultivated and salt-affected areas of Pakistan, 2003	389