The spatial variability of the wind in a sprinkler irrigated district: implications for irrigation management.
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Abstract

The spatial variability of the wind in the Montesnegros Irrigation District (MID), in Spain, has been analysed. From a wind series (2004-2007) registered by the reference weather station, a windspeed > 2 m s\(^{-1}\) was observed about 50% of the time. During these periods about 70% of the time it blew from the northwest (known as the Cierzo).

Wind was monitored at the reference site and at 17 sites throughout the MID. Using regression a series of the local wind velocities for the irrigation seasons 2004 to 2007 were estimated from the reference station data. Wind exposure for 39% of the MID area was found to be similar to that of the reference site; 25% were less exposed and 36% considerably more exposed.

The spatial variability of the wind was used to calculate the suitable time for irrigation (STI, %) using Ador-Sprinkler software. STI was simulated for different irrigation systems and strategies: standard - Christiansen's uniformity coefficient (CUC) > 84% and wind drift and evaporation losses (WDEL) ≤ 20%, restrictive - CUC ≥ 90% and WDEL ≤ 15% and relaxed - CUC > 80% and WDEL ≤ 25%. At the reference site, STI varied from 50 to 56% of the total time during the irrigation season time for standard strategy, from 68 to 77% for the relaxed strategy and 8 to 30% for the restrictive strategy. Excluding the restrictive strategy, the least exposed sites averaged 14% greater STI than the most exposed sites.
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Nomenclature

a.g.l.: Above the ground level.

\textit{CUC}: Christiansen's uniformity coefficient (\%).

\textit{GMT}: Greenwich meridian time (h).

\textit{INM}: Spanish Meteorology State Agency.

\textit{MCP}: Measure-correlate-predict.

\textit{MID}: Montesnegros irrigation district.

\textit{R}^2: Coefficient of determination.

\textit{RH}: Relative humidity of the air (\%).

\textit{SIAR}: Agro-climatic information service for irrigation.

\textit{STI}: Suitable time for irrigation (\%).

\textit{WD}_z: Wind direction (\(^\circ\)) at height \(z\) (m) where used.

\textit{WDEL}: Wind drift and evaporation losses (\%).

\textit{WV}_z: Windspeed (m s\(^{-1}\)) at height \(z\) (m) where used.
The distribution uniformity and application efficiency of sprinkler irrigation systems are potentially high, but these parameters are highly dependent on the weather conditions, especially on wind (Cuenca, 1989; Keller & Bliesner, 1990). Wind strongly affects the sprinkler irrigation performance since it lowers the uniformity and the efficiency of the water distribution (Seginer, Nir, von Bernuth, 1991; Seginer, Kantz, Nir, 1991; Tarjuelo, Carrión, Valiente, 1994; Kincaid, 1996; Dechmi, Playán, Cavero, Faci, Martínez-Cob, 2003; Dechmi, Playán, Cavero, Martínez-Cob, Faci, 2004; Playán et al., 2005; Zapata et al., 2007).

Consequently, it is necessary to increase technical knowledge and develop tools that can improve sprinkler irrigation performance in windy conditions.

Wind monitoring is essential to manage sprinkler irrigation districts where moderate or high winds are frequent and extensive. Usually one reference weather station, located close to the irrigation district, is used to assess the water needs of crops for the whole of the area. The information provided by these stations is useful to assess the water needs of crops and to schedule irrigation. However, both can be improved by accounting for the spatial variability of the wind within the irrigation district, a topic commonly disregarded.

The estimation of the wind conditions at sites with no or few records can be performed by linking a location to a nearby place for which a wind series is available. This is based on the idea that within a certain distance, given by the local meso-scale conditions, overall wind conditions are the same (Landberg & Mortensen, 1994). The suitability of the data provided by a meteorological station may vary since its representativeness depends on the complexity of the terrain and nearby obstacles (Troen & Petersen, 1989). Wind close to the
Earth's surface is strongly influenced by the nature of the terrain surface (Petersen, Mortensen, Landberg, Hojstrup, Frank, 1998). The components that cause variation are changes in the land surface and hills (Kaimal & Finnigan, 1994). Wind exposure can vary within an irrigation district, and specific irrigation management may be advisable depending on the degree of exposure. Nevertheless, the problem is complex and scale-dependent (Achberger, Ekström, Bärring, 2002).

Among the methods used to predict the wind resources at target sites, empirical methods are based on statistical correlations between the time series from different sites. However, these methods are usually applied to describe general and average conditions rather than to find relationships for short periods such as irrigation events. The Measure–Correlate–Predict (MCP) technique is an empirical method often used to estimate the wind parameters at a site (Landberg et al., 2003). It relates the wind measurements at two different sites by means of a regression analysis. Over the last fifteen years, a number of the MCP techniques have been proposed. MCP algorithms differ in terms of overall approach, model definition, use of direction sectors, data used for the validation and their length, criteria to evaluate the length of concurrent data required and criteria to evaluate the effectiveness of the approach (Rogers, Rogers, Manwell, 1994).

Knowledge of the local wind conditions is an important topic in many applications such as sitting of wind turbines and estimating the environmental impact of air pollution from a point source (Achberger et al. 2002). Important advances have been achieved in the description and modelling of the spatial and temporal variation of the wind within an area. They present a great
opportunity to improve the quantification of the crop water needs and scheduling of sprinkler irrigation towards a more efficient use of water.

When farmers are forced to irrigate under unfavourable and prolonged windy conditions, and when the period with low wind is not sufficient to irrigate the whole irrigation district, then average irrigation performance of the district can be improved by including the wind exposure of each zone as a management factor. In addition, the crop rotation schedule needs to be improved by observing the sensitivity of the crops to the irrigation uniformity together with the local wind exposure. The spatial variability of the wind is also a criterion to be included in designing the sprinkler spacings and arrangements adopted in new sprinkler installations. Nevertheless, despite the close relationship between the spatial variability of the wind and sprinkler irrigation performance and scheduling, it is a subject that has not been deeply studied.

During the last two decades, national and regional policies in Spain have encouraged the modernisation of irrigation districts. Recent projects have installed pressurised sprinkler irrigation systems incorporating, in many cases, automation and monitoring systems (MAPA, 2001; Forteza del Rey, 2002; Carrión, Tarjuelo, Montero, 2001). From 2003 onwards, a network of weather stations designated SIAR has been deployed in representative Spanish irrigation districts to specifically provide the water needs data for each irrigated zone. These stations provide, amongst other meteorological variables, wind conditions.

Sprinkler irrigation models have been developed in the last decades in Spain (Dechmi et al. 2004; Carrión et al. 2001; Montero, Tarjuelo, Carrión, 2001; Playán et al., 2006). The family of programs Ador provides tools for multi-
criteria decision making in irrigation management including economic, agronomical, technical, environmental and social criteria (Dechmi et al. 2004; Carrión et al. 2001; Montero et al. 2001; Playán et al., 2006; Shkiri, 2007; Playán et al., 2007). These models are valuable tools to simulate the irrigation performance according to meteorological conditions.

The present work was performed in the Montesnegros irrigation district (MID), located in the central part of the Ebro river valley (Fig. 1). The MID represents an average irrigation district in this windy region. The windspeed at 2 m above the ground level (a.g.l.) ($WV_2$) in the MID is, on average, 2.8 m s$^{-1}$ (Zapata et al., 2007). Several studies have analysed the implications of wind for sprinkler irrigation management in different irrigation districts of the Ebro river valley (Faci & Bercero, 1991; Dechmi et al. 2003; Playán et al. 2005; Playán et al., 2006; Zapata et al., 2007)

The Ebro basin, in the northeast corner of the Iberian Peninsula (Fig. 1), includes 347 rivers, 12000 km in total length, and comprising an area of 85362 km$^2$, almost 99% of which are in Spain; the remainder being in Andorra and France. It is the largest river basin in Spain (17.3% of the Spanish territory in the Iberian Peninsula). In many irrigation districts throughout the Ebro Valley it is difficult to achieve uniform and efficient sprinkler irrigation because the wind is strong and persistent along the valley. The connection between the regional wind conditions and the Ebro Valley orography have been thoroughly described (Masson & Bougeault, 1996; Frangi & Richard, 2000; Gomes et al., 2003). Common winds in the region are named the Cierzo and the Bochorno. They are, respectively, winds from the northwest and the southeast. The Cierzo is the most frequent and strongest wind in the Ebro Valley. In this area, in terms of
daily averages, $WV_2$ exceeds 2 m s\(^{-1}\) (Puicercús et al., 1994; Hernández Navarro, 2002; Martínez-Cob & Tejero-Juste, 2004). At 50 m a.g.l. (i.e. $WV_{50}$), the Cierzo exceeds 6.5 m s\(^{-1}\) over open plains; even more over a high proportion of the territory along the axis of the valley (Troen & Petersen, 1989).

In this work, the spatial variability of the wind in the MID will be analysed. The windspeed measured at several locations in the MID is correlated with that simultaneously recorded at the reference meteorological station. The implications of the spatial variability of wind in the sprinkler irrigation performance and management will be analysed by calculating the suitable time for irrigation ($STI$) at these locations and at the reference site over several years.

1. Material and methods

The MID is an illustrative example of a current sprinkler irrigation district in the windy Ebro Valley. It is located along the limits of Zaragoza and Huesca provinces in the Northeast of Spain and has an area of 7352 ha, 3456 ha of which are sprinkler irrigated. This study is based on the irrigated area (Fig. 1). The MID was set up in 1995 and at present, 247 farmers have joined the district.

In the MID, farmers irrigate using an on-demand scheme. This procedure offers the greatest potential and provides farmers with great flexibility, allowing them to adjust water application to crop water requirements (Lamaddalena & Sagardoy, 2000). Water is pumped from a local reservoir using electric pumps powered by diesel generators. Consequently, water use in the district is expensive (0.048 € m\(^{-3}\) in 2004) and the cost is not varied whether the pumps work during day or night (Skhiri, 2007). The maximum network capacity is
241920 m$^3$ d$^{-1}$ and the average theoretical continuous flowrate is 0.8 l s$^{-1}$ ha$^{-1}$ (Zapata et al., 2007). Also, many hydrants are shared among various plots. Thus, the flexibility in the irrigation scheduling is restricted because limitations in the irrigation network.

The manager of the MID must place an order for the farmers' water needs to the Ebro River Basin Agency two days before the water is released in the district system. The reservoir capacity of the MID is limited, hence if farmers fail to irrigate because of strong winds or rain, the water previously requested has to be returned through the spillways to the basin system. The authorities of the Ebro River Basin punish this practice with a financial penalty. This is particularly important in the MID since windy conditions are common.

The average wind conditions in the MID were first characterised according to the wind series recorded over eleven years by a meteorological station which is the property of the Spanish Meteorology State Agency (INM) located in Bujaraloz (Fig. 1 and Table 1). This is the longest time series available for this area. The INM station recorded $WV_{10}$ and $WD_{10}$ every 10 min. These variables were averaged every 30 min. $WV_{10}$ was transformed into $WV_2$ using the conversion factor reported in Table 2.9 of Annex 2 published by (Allen, Pereira, Raes, Smith, 1998), i.e., $[WV_2 = 0.748 \times WV_{10}]$. After these transformations, the format of the data matched those registered by the SIAR reference station. The INM station used 3-cup rotor anemometer model SV.5 and wind direction sensor model SD.5 (Seac S.A., Madrid, Spain), connected to a data-logger from the same manufacturer.

Despite the INM weather station providing the longest data series in the area, the reference weather station of the SIAR network located at Valfarta (
Table 1, Fig. 1) is the reference agro-meteorological station for irrigation scheduling purposes in the MID. The wind series from the SIAR reference station between 2004 and 2007 was used. The distance between the SIAR reference and the INM weather stations is 2455 m.

The SIAR reference station monitors $WV_2$ and $WD_2$ using a propeller-type anemometer (Young’s wind monitor Model 05103, Campbell Scientific, Inc., Shepshed, Leicestershire, UK). According to the manufacturer’s specifications, the starting windspeed threshold and accuracy were 1.0 m s$^{-1}$ and $\pm$ 0.3 m s$^{-1}$, respectively. For wind direction, its accuracy was $\pm$ 3º and the starting threshold at 10º displacement is 1.1 m s$^{-1}$. Data were averaged every 30 min.

Sixteen sectors of wind direction were defined and analysed, clockwise: 
$North$ ($N$), from 348.75 to 11.24º, $North-North-East$ ($NNE$) from 11.25 to 33.75º, and so on up to $North-North-West$ ($NNW$) from 325.25 to 348.74º. Winds from direction between 236.25º and 326.24º were considered as Cierzo and winds between 56.25º and 146.24º were considered as Bochorno winds.

1.1.1. Characterisation of the spatial variability of the wind

To analyse the spatial variability of the wind, the windspeed was measured in situ at seventeen sites uniformly distributed throughout the (Table 1, Fig. 1) between February and March in 2005, resulting in approximately one monitoring point every 200 ha. Four sets of measurements were carried out. During each set, the SIAR reference site and four of these points (five during the third set) were monitored simultaneously. Cierzo wind conditions prevailed during the monitoring period. The monitoring period for each set of
measurements lasted enough to register an ample range of windspeeds, approximately one day; the fourth period was extended to about three days.

Local $WV_2$ was monitored using A100R 3-cup-rotors anemometers (Vector Instruments™, Rhyl, UK) and recorded every minute using a CR10X data logger (Campbell Scientific Ltd, UK). The records were later averaged every 30 min to match the format of the SIAR reference station records. The devices were powered by solar panels.

The local measurements were carried out during the period when fields were without crops because during this period the differences in the roughness conditions amongst sites were reduced. The advection term was considered small enough because the monitoring period was very cold (average temperature of the air was 0.4 °C) and differences in soil moisture amongst locations were reduced because of the regular rainfalls during autumn and winter. Thus, we could expect most of the spatial variability of the wind to occur because of terrain features.

Simultaneous records of local and reference windspeeds were related using linear regressions. Afterwards the local windspeeds were assessed during the irrigation seasons (i.e. from April to September) between 2004 and 2007 for each of the seventeen sites. When the WD was a Cierzo and $WV_2$ at the reference weather site was $> 2$ m s$^{-1}$, local $WV_2$ was calculated from the reference $WV_2$ through the regression models. When the $WV_2$ at the reference site was $< 2$ m s$^{-1}$ or the WD was not a Cierzo, the $WV_2$ was considered to be the same at the local and reference sites. This is because at MID we focus on Cierzo and because windspeeds $< 2$ m s$^{-1}$ are not considered to be detrimental for sprinkler irrigation (Faci & Bercero, 1991).
From the local windspeed series from 2004 to 2007, the ratio of the local to the reference windspeeds was computed for reference windspeeds greater than 2 m s\(^{-1}\) and Cierzo conditions. The average ratios for each of the seventeen sites were interpolated throughout the irrigated area of the MID using kriging in order to produce a contour map that illustrates the spatial variability.

The quality of the measurements has been reported as one of the most likely sources of uncertainty comparing wind records among sites (Schaudt, 1998). To analyse the differences between sensors, local and reference windspeeds were measured simultaneously at the reference site by installing a 3-cup rotor anemometer with its logger at the SIAR site from February 16\(^{th}\) to March 4\(^{th}\), 2005.

1.1.2. Implications of the spatial variability of the wind in the sprinkler irrigation performance

The ballistic model in the Ador-sprinkler software (Dechmi et al. 2004; Playán et al., 2006) was used to analyse the variation in irrigation performance with weather conditions. The model requires a combination of meteorological and operational inputs. The operational parameters include the solid-set arrangement, sprinkler height and model, the number and diameter of the nozzles, the operating pressure and the sprinkler-bearing lines azimuth. The meteorological parameters windspeed, wind direction and relative humidity of the air (RH) must be defined.

Two triangular sprinkler arrangements were simulated: 18 m between sprinklers along the lateral; 18 and 15 m between the laterals; they were designated T18x18 and T18x15, respectively. An azimuth angle of 105° between North and the sprinkler-bearing line was fixed. The performance of two
calibrated sprinklers, *VYR-70* (VYRSA, Burgos, Spain) and *RC-130H* (Riegos Costa, Lleida, Spain) with principal and auxiliary nozzles of 4.4 and 2.4 mm in diameter mounted at 2 m a.g.l. was examined. An operating pressure of 300 kPa was set for the sprinkler nozzle. These combinations are widely used in the area.

From these data, the *Ador-sprinkler* software yielded the *Christiansen’s Uniformity Coefficient* (*CUC*, %) (Christiansen, 1942) and the *Wind Drift and Evaporation Losses* (*WDEL*, %). One value of *CUC* and one value of *WDEL* were computed for each 30 min interval for the series of local windspeeds found between 2004 and 2007. The wind direction and *RH* monitored by the *SIAR* reference station were considered the same throughout the *MID*.

*WDEL* was computed according to the equation proposed for day and night operation conditions by Playán et al. (2005):

\[
WDEL = 24.1 + 1.41WV - 0.216RH
\]  

where *WV* will be *WV*₂ in m s⁻¹ and *RH* in %.

The suitable time for irrigation (*STI*, %) was defined as the percentage of the time for which irrigation can be performed above a specific *CUC* threshold and below a specific *WDEL* threshold. *STI* was calculated as the percentage of records observing this condition with respect to the total 30 min records for the 2004-2007 irrigation seasons. Thus, *STI* depended on the distribution of the windspeed and on the spatial variability of the wind.

Four different management strategies were established (Zapata et al., 2007):

*Standard strategy: CUC > 84% and WDEL ≤ 20%.*

*Restrictive strategy: CUC ≥ 90% and WDEL ≤ 15%.*
Relaxed strategy: \( CUC > 80\% \) and \( WDEL \leq 25\% \).

\( WV < 3 \text{ m s}^{-1} \).

\( STI \) was calculated for the \( SIAR \) reference station and local sites for each sprinkler combination and strategy.

2. Results and discussion

2.1. General wind conditions in the MID

Fig. 2 shows that, in terms of daily averages, \( WV_2 \), i.e., at the level of the sprinklers nozzles, was \( > 2 \text{ m s}^{-1} \) for almost all of the year. Windspeed varies both during the day and during the year. It is strongest for February, March and April. For these months, \( WV_2 \) was \( > 3 \text{ m s}^{-1} \) during most of the daytime. The irrigation season for alfalfa and maize, two crops extensively cultivated in the \( MID \), is from April to September, with the greatest water demand occurring during July and August. During these months, the daily variation of the windspeed differs from the rest of the year, both in profile and the time at which the maximum windspeed occurs (Fig. 2).

Sprinkler irrigation can be improved in terms of uniformity and efficiency by irrigating during the night since windspeed decreases considerably during the night (Martínez-Cob, Zapata, Sanchez, Playán, 2005). However, farmers' water demands in the \( MID \) cannot be met completely during the night since the water conveying system is limited in section and water demands are high and concentrated (Zapata et al., 2007). For this reason, farmers are forced to irrigate during the day, facing windy conditions.

General wind conditions in the area were also analysed using the wind series monitored between 2004 and 2007 by the \( SIAR \) reference station.
Wind direction mostly follows the contours of the Ebro Valley, particularly during the Cierzo (Fig. 3). In the MID, the Cierzo slightly veered from WNW to W. Considering the whole series, Cierzo winds blew half of the time, almost twice as much as Bochorno. During the irrigation season, Bochorno increased moderately (5 units in %) at the expense of Cierzo. Light winds ($WV_2 < 2 \text{ m s}^{-1}$) occurred around half of the time (Table 2). The frequency of Cierzo greatly increased when $WV_2 > 2 \text{ m s}^{-1}$ only were considered (Fig. 3).

Winds other than Cierzo or Bochorno were less than 30% (Fig. 3) and were mostly light winds (Table 2). Consequently, they were not especially detrimental for the sprinkler irrigation performance in the MID. Bochorno involves a high frequency of light winds (about 60%), more than twice as much as the Cierzo (Table 2). Considering $WV_2 > 2 \text{ m s}^{-1}$, Bochorno and Cierzo winds noticeable differed too: under Bochorno conditions, $WV$ ranges mostly between 2 and 4 m s$^{-1}$ whereas under Cierzo conditions, winds $> 5 \text{ m s}^{-1}$ were as frequent as light winds.

2.2. Analysis of the spatial variability of the wind

2.2.1. Comparison between sensors in wind measurements

Fig. 4 illustrates the differences in the windspeed monitoring data between the sensors gauging local $WV$ (3-cuprotor anemometers) and the SIAR reference weather station (propeller type anemometer). The distribution of the records was bimodal, with one peak between 0.5 and 2 m s$^{-1}$ (30% of the records) and other between 4.5 and 6 m s$^{-1}$ (25% of the records). According to a linear regression, the slope and intercept coefficients were statistically significant. The 3-cuprotor anemometers measured greater windspeeds than the propeller-type. The deviation was greater for low winds and decreased with
windspeed. The mismatch was probably related to the differences in the starting threshold windspeed which was 0.25 m s\(^{-1}\) for the 3-cuprotor anemometer and 1 m s\(^{-1}\) for the propeller-type (according to the manufacturer’s specifications). The scattering of the data around the line 1:1 in Fig. 4 is appreciable. The standard error was 0.68 m s\(^{-1}\) and it was particularly greater between 3 and 4 m s\(^{-1}\) (0.96 m s\(^{-1}\)). Bias was not observed in the distribution of the residuals but they increased (in absolute terms) for \(WV > 3\) m s\(^{-1}\). According to these results, differences among sites < 0.3 m s\(^{-1}\) were carefully considered.

2.2.2. Linear Regression Models

Local windspeed was related to the reference SIAR windspeed using regression analysis on data from the seventeen sites (Fig. 1, Table 1). Local windspeed was recorded from February 16\(^{th}\) to March 4\(^{th}\), 2005 (Fig. 1, Table 1). During this time, the wind was strong and mainly classified as Cierzo. Between February 16\(^{th}\) and 17\(^{th}\), the average windspeed at SIAR reference site was 5.2 m s\(^{-1}\) and 93% of the time the wind direction was Cierzo. Between February 17\(^{th}\) and 18\(^{th}\), between February 28\(^{th}\) and March 1\(^{st}\), and between March 1\(^{st}\) and 4\(^{th}\), these figures were 4.9 m s\(^{-1}\) and 95%, 3.2 m s\(^{-1}\) and 87%, and 2.7 m s\(^{-1}\) and 54%, respectively.

The linear regression models between local and reference windspeeds under Cierzo conditions differed among sites illustrating the spatial variability of the wind (Fig. 5). Local windspeeds were greater than the reference SIAR windspeed for the sites 14, 19, 13 and 52 (where the data was almost parallel to the line 1:1) and for the sites 35 and 43 (where the differences decreased with windspeed). At the sites 25, 6 and 33, the local windspeed was greater than the reference windspeed up to the limit beyond which the trend was reversed. Local
windspeed was lower than the SIAR reference windspeed for the sites 45, 30 and 49 (the differences increased with windspeed). Site 49 \([\text{local WV} = 0.50 + 0.7156 \times \text{SIAR WV} (R^2 = 0.90)]\), monitored during the third period, is not presented in Fig. 5 in the interests of clarity. At the sites 7 and 36, local windspeed was lower than the SIAR windspeed up to a limit beyond which the opposite was true. Both local and reference windspeeds were similar for the sites 9, 23 and 21 (site 21 was the closest to the SIAR reference site). Several regressions differed despite their close proximity revealing that the spatial variability of the wind was important even for distances of about 1 km (Figs. 1 and 5).

From the analysis of the local windspeed series under Cierzo conditions for the irrigation seasons between 2004 and 2007 (light winds excluded), important differences were found among sites (Fig. 6). The cumulative frequency for windspeeds < 4 m s\(^{-1}\) was less than 50% for the most of the sites except for sites 33, 45, 30 and 49. Windspeeds > 5 m s\(^{-1}\) had a cumulative frequency greater than 60% at sites 19, 35, 43 and 7, but about 30% or less at the sites 23, 33, 45, 30 and 49.

Figure 7 illustrates the average windspeed throughout the irrigated area of the MID expressed relative to that at the SIAR reference site. The spatial variability of the wind was quantified in terms of % area in four categories (Table 3). For 39% of the MID territory, the wind was similar to that for the SIAR reference site, 25% of the area was less exposed and 36% was more exposed. The results show that wind monitored at the SIAR reference station could underestimate the windspeed found in more than one third of the MID area.
2.3. Implications of the spatial variability of the wind on the sprinkler irrigation performance

The spatial variability of the wind within an irrigation district affects irrigation performance in terms of uniformity and water losses since both depend on the wind velocity at the irrigated site, i.e., the local windspeed. Simulations with Ador-sprinkler software revealed that STI greatly varies depending on the irrigation strategy, the sprinkler system and the wind exposure (Table 4).

The restrictive strategy can be hardly followed in the MID as it implies extremely low STI irrespective of the sprinkler system and site (Table 4). It requires very low windspeeds combined with high RH, conditions which are infrequent in the MID. The choice of the sprinkler model is significant for this strategy. Playán et al. (2006) showed that VYR-70 sprinklers yielded higher values of the CUC than RC-130H sprinklers for windspeeds < 2 m s\(^{-1}\), while the RC-130H sprinklers had greater CUC than VYR-70 for windspeeds in the range of 2 to 5 m s\(^{-1}\). Since this strategy requires very low windspeed, the VYR-70 sprinklers gave noticeably greater STI than the RC-130H sprinklers. For the restrictive strategy, the choice of the irrigation layout (T18x15 or T18x18) was less important than the selection of the sprinkler model in terms of the STI (Table 4).

The relaxed strategy was found to be more suitable in the MID as STI greatly increases with respect to the restrictive strategy. For the relaxed strategy, the STI increases when the narrowest layout was selected: the increase is 8 units in the case of the RC-130H model and 4 units in the case of the VYR-70 sprinklers (results for the SIAR reference site). Similar trends are
found for the relaxed and standard strategies, although the STI is lower for the latter.

Predicted STI noticeably increased for the least exposed areas (sites 30, 45 and 49) when compared to the most exposed areas (sites 43 and 35) (Table 4, Fig. 7). For the standard and relaxed strategies, farmers with plots at the least exposed sites (90th percentile) have between 10 and 20% greater STI than the farmers at the most exposed sites (10th percentile), between 5 and 10 units (%) calculated as differences (penultimate and last rows in Table 4, respectively). The differences increased with sprinkler spacing. For the restrictive strategy, the STI was too low even for the least exposed sites and it was concluded that this strategy is unaffordable in the MID.

The average water needs for a maize crop (crop evapotranspiration, ETc) in the area during the most demanding month (July) are 215 mm (Martínez-Cob, Faci, Bercero, 1998). The irrigation network of the MID was designed with an average theoretical continuous flow rate of 0.8 l s⁻¹ ha⁻¹ (Zapata et al., 2007) which is equivalent to 214 mm month⁻¹. Accordingly, farmers in the MID can hardly meet the water requirements for maize during July. The network investment cost is inversely proportional to the operating time and this is connected with the local wind conditions. STI values lower than 55-60% result in important increases on the investment cost (Zapata et al., 2007). Consequently, irrigation districts located in semiarid and windy areas, subject to high evapotranspiration and with low values of the STI, must devote significant investments in water conveyancing systems in order to provide the volume of water required for a short period of time. The assessment of the STI, together
with the following analysis of the investment cost, illustrates the unusual characteristics of irrigation network designs for windy areas.

Zapata et al. (2007) related the network construction cost, including both the collective and the on-farm irrigation structures, to the STI (considered as a % of the hydrant operating time). The function presented next was assessed from those values and considering the results obtained during the year 2007 in the Callén Irrigation District, a new irrigation network similar to the MID but about 70 km to the north. The function provides the network construction cost (€ ha\(^{-1}\)) as a function of the STI (%). The function is valid for the combinations of solid-set arrangement and sprinkler model included in the present study. The equation is:

\[
\text{Cost} = 1.1116 \times \text{STI}^2 - 181.43 \times \text{STI} + 15390 \quad (R^2 = 0.98)
\] (2)

Construction costs vary significantly depending on the irrigation management regime adopted (Fig. 8). Also, the cost associated with each irrigation management depends on the solid-set arrangement, the sprinkler model and exposure to the wind.

Figure 8 shows that the restrictive strategy implies construction costs between 11000 and 14000 € ha\(^{-1}\) and, as previously stated, it is unaffordable at MID (the form of Eq. 2 stresses the differences in the STI between sprinkler models). The differences in the cost between the standard and the relaxed strategies is about 500 € ha\(^{-1}\); in all, for a district such as the MID, to shift from the relaxed to the standard strategy would involve more than 1700000 € in terms of the construction cost. It is noteworthy the effect of the spatial variability of the wind, especially for the standard strategy. For this strategy, the
differences in the network construction cost associated with the wind exposure exceed the differences due to the arrangement and model of the sprinklers. The characterisation of the spatial variability of the wind in windy areas is a valuable tool for sprinkler irrigation. Irrigating the least exposed zones to the wind during the most unfavourable periods may improve the management of sprinkler irrigation. Furthermore, accounting for the differences in wind exposure improves the estimation of the crop water requirements. Since the wind conditions depend on the roughness conditions, the resulting relationships (Fig. 5) may vary from the non-vegetative period to the irrigation season, and among irrigation seasons, depending on the farmers' decisions about cropping. This is inherent in the nature of the wind in the surface layer. When economically viable, the implementation of real-time irrigation programmers by wind velocity monitored locally is advisable.

3. Conclusions

Wind monitoring is essential for the management of sprinkler irrigation districts. In windy irrigation districts, the spatial variability of the wind can be important and it can be a rough simplification to assume the wind velocity ($W_V$) monitored at only one point (the SIAR reference weather station in this study) represents the whole irrigation district. The characterisation of the wind exposure can improve the design and management of sprinkler irrigation systems where moderate or high winds are frequently found such as in the MID. The analysis of the SIAR wind data series for the 2004-2007 irrigation seasons reveals that Cierzo blows 45% of the time during the irrigation season. Considering the winds that jeopardize sprinkler irrigation exclusively ($W_V > 2 \text{ m s}^{-1}$ at 2 m above the ground) this rises to 69%. Under Cierzo wind conditions,
because of the spatial variability of the wind, 25% of the MID territory was less exposed to the wind than the SIAR site, 39% was equally exposed, and 36% more exposed.

The Ador-Sprinkler simulation model can convert the differences in the wind exposure into predicted differences for the suitable time for irrigation (STI, %). Depending on the local exposure and the sprinkler system, STI ranges in the MID between 42 and 58% for a standard strategy (CUC > 84% and WDEL ≤ 20%) and between 57 and 79% for a relaxed strategy (CUC > 80% and WDEL ≤ 25%). For these strategies, the ratio of STI for the least exposed sites (90th percentile) to STI for the most exposed sites (10th percentile) ranges between 108% and 118%. This means a between 6 and 10 units greater STI for the least exposed sites. For a restrictive strategy (CUC ≥ 90% and WDEL ≤ 15%) the differences between sites and sprinkler systems increase but STI was too low for any system to be affordable in the MID (STI between 6 and 32%). For the standard strategy, the differences in the network construction costs associated with the wind exposure exceed the differences due to the arrangement and model of the sprinklers.

Because of the strong and frequent winds in the region and the limited water conveying system in the MID, the time needed to supply the irrigation water needs exceeds the hours of the day with low winds. Consequently, farmers have important limitations for their irrigation schedule. Characterisation according to the wind exposure provides new tools to improve the sprinkler irrigation management and provide new criteria to design irrigation systems. The methodology presented in this study is valid for windy irrigation districts that present significant spatial variability of the wind. This methodology could be
very useful to improve sprinkler irrigation management using data from meteorological stations in the area.

This study is a simplification of the characterisation of spatial variability of the wind since it is restricted to a specific wind conditions (i.e. Cierzo). Further studies extending the periods of simultaneous measurements are required to assess the relationships between the local and reference meteorological sites.
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Table 1. Location (UTM coordinates) and monitoring periods for each selected site for wind measurement in the Montesnegros Irrigation District in Northeast of Spain.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>Z</th>
<th>Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SIAR</td>
<td>738048</td>
<td>4601902</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>January 1, 2004 to December 31, 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INM</td>
<td>735850</td>
<td>4600809</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>July 6, 1992 to July 5, 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>737056</td>
<td>4601995</td>
<td>358</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>738056</td>
<td>4599995</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>February 16 (12:35\textsuperscript{a}) to February 17, 2005 (9:05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>741056</td>
<td>4597995</td>
<td>310</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>743056</td>
<td>4595995</td>
<td>320</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>736056</td>
<td>4599995</td>
<td>360</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>736056</td>
<td>4601995</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>February 17 (12:35) to February 18, 2005 (7:05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>739056</td>
<td>4600995</td>
<td>361</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>741056</td>
<td>4598995</td>
<td>316</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>736056</td>
<td>4598995</td>
<td>340</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>739056</td>
<td>4598995</td>
<td>320</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>740056</td>
<td>4596995</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>February 28 (14:39) to March 1, 2005 (9:38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>743056</td>
<td>4597995</td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>744056</td>
<td>4596995</td>
<td>320</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>737056</td>
<td>4599995</td>
<td>339</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>738056</td>
<td>4601995</td>
<td>355</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>740056</td>
<td>4599995</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>March 1 (19:16) to March 4, 2005 (10:08)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>745056</td>
<td>4595995</td>
<td>320</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{a} Greenwhich Mean Time (GMT) indicated within brackets.
Table 2. Distribution of the windspeed frequencies (%) according to the wind direction (Bochorno, Cierzo winds and Others) and calculated from the wind series monitored at the SIAR reference meteorological station between 2004 and 2007 (data registered every 30 min). Values are shown for the whole year (Year) and for the irrigation season (IS).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(m s⁻¹)</th>
<th>Wind direction</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bochorno</td>
<td>Cierzo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 2</td>
<td>58.9</td>
<td>57.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - 3</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>24.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 – 4</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 – 5</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 5</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3. Spatial variability of the windspeed within the Montesnegros Irrigation District (MID) calculated from the Fig. 7 and expressed as the percentage of the area corresponding to each range of ratios.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ratio</th>
<th>0.7 - 0.9</th>
<th>0.9 – 1.1</th>
<th>1.1 - 1.3</th>
<th>&gt; 1.3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area (%)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4. Suitable Time for Irrigation (STI) calculated as percentage of the irrigation season for two sprinkler models, two irrigation layouts and four management strategies. Values calculated from the wind series between 2004 and 2007. The bottom two lines of the table show the ratio (%) and the differences between the 90th and 10th STI percentiles for the sites in the table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Restrictive</th>
<th>Relaxed</th>
<th>&lt; 3 m s⁻¹</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spacing</td>
<td>T18x18</td>
<td>T18x15</td>
<td>T18x15</td>
<td>T18x18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sprinkler</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>VYR</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>VYR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>52</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>49</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[
\frac{k_{0.0}}{k_{0.1}} \times 100 = 118, 116, 112, 113, 144, 112, 134, 115, 116, 113, 109, 108, 117
\]

\[k_{0.0} - k_{0.1} = 8, 8, 6, 7, 4, 3, 2, 4, 10, 9, 6, 6, 10\]
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Fig. 1. Situation of the Montesnegros Irrigation District (MID) within the Ebro basin in the Iberian Peninsula (in the upper row). Detailed map of the MID irrigated area (axes show UTM units) including the SIAR reference station, the INM meteorological station and seventeen sites at which windspeed was measured (in the bottom row).
Fig. 2. Average windspeed at 2 m above the ground level from the 1992 – 2003 series at the Bujaraloz INM weather station. Results calculated in terms of the average day from records every 30 min. Wind directions are not noted. The time is expressed as Greenwich Mean Time (GMT).
Fig. 3. Distribution of the frequencies (%) of the wind direction at the SIAR reference site between 2004 and 2007 (records every 30 min). In the upper row, all data are included; in the bottom row only data for windspeeds > 2 m s\(^{-1}\) are plotted; in the left column data for the whole year are plotted; in the right column data for the irrigation season (April to October) are plotted. The Bochorno wind directions are ENE, E, ESE and SE. The Cierzo wind directions are WSW, W, WNW and NW.
Fig. 4. Comparison between the measurements of the windspeed made with 3-cup-rotor and propeller-type anemometers. The measurements were recorded simultaneously every 30 minutes at the same site (the SIAR reference station) from February 16 to March 4, 2005. Dashed line illustrates the 1:1 ratio.

\[ y = 0.9707x + 0.27; R^2=0.91 \]
Fig. 5. Linear regression models between the local windspeeds and the windspeeds at the SIAR reference site. Values measured under Cierzo wind conditions. Each row shows sites monitored simultaneously.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Local Windspeed (m s(^{-1}))</th>
<th>SIAR Windspeed (m s(^{-1}))</th>
<th>Equation</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SIAR - 14</td>
<td>$y = 1.0469x + 0.43$</td>
<td>SIAR - 19</td>
<td>$y = 0.913x + 1.51$</td>
<td>$R^2=0.90$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIAR - 35</td>
<td>$y = 0.7783x + 2.42$</td>
<td>SIAR - 43</td>
<td>$y = 0.6482x + 2.87$</td>
<td>$R^2=0.32$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIAR - 7</td>
<td>$y = 1.1564x - 0.63$</td>
<td>SIAR - 9</td>
<td>$y = 0.9241x + 0.24$</td>
<td>$R^2=0.82$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIAR - 25</td>
<td>$y = 0.7137x + 1.36$</td>
<td>SIAR - 36</td>
<td>$y = 1.1637x - 0.81$</td>
<td>$R^2=0.84$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIAR - 6</td>
<td>$y = 0.6608x + 1.68$</td>
<td>SIAR - 23</td>
<td>$y = 0.8903x + 0.34$</td>
<td>$R^2=0.93$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIAR - 33</td>
<td>$y = 0.7695x + 0.72$</td>
<td>SIAR - 45</td>
<td>$y = 0.8014x + 0.31$</td>
<td>$R^2=0.92$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIAR - 13</td>
<td>$y = 1.0246x + 0.6$</td>
<td>SIAR - 21</td>
<td>$y = 1.1624x - 0.34$</td>
<td>$R^2=0.91$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIAR - 30</td>
<td>$y = 0.9562x - 0.35$</td>
<td>SIAR - 52</td>
<td>$y = 1.0073x + 0.79$</td>
<td>$R^2=0.84$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fig. 6. Cumulative frequency (%) of the windspeed under Cierzo wind conditions ranked by levels. The values at the seventeen sites are estimated from the values measured at the SIAR reference site during the irrigation seasons between 2004 and 2007 according to the equations in the Fig. 5. Values at the SIAR reference site < 2 m s\(^{-1}\) are excluded.
Fig. 7. Contour map of the average ratio of the local windspeed (estimated) to the windspeed at the SIAR reference site (measured) calculated for the irrigation seasons between 2004 and 2007 under Cierzo wind conditions. Values at the SIAR reference site < 2 m s\(^{-1}\) are excluded.
Fig. 8. Relationship between the irrigation network construction cost and the suitable time for irrigation (STI) according to three irrigation management strategies, two triangular sprinkler spacings (T18x18 and T18x15) and two sprinkler models (RC 130 and VYR 70). Symbols correspond to the values calculated at the SIAR site. Bars illustrate the influence of the spatial variability of the windspeed: the upper limit corresponds to the most exposed site and the lower limit to the least exposed site (according to the Eq. 2 and to the values in the Table 4).