Saltcedar Control and Water Salvage on the Pecos River, Texas Current Status of Research



Charles R. Hart, Larry D. White, Alyson McDonald, and Zhuping Sheng

Texas Cooperative Extension and Texas Agricultural Experiment Station Texas A&M University











pplication Technology

oncerns:

niting herbicide contact with off-target getation.

aditional application methods presenter veral problems.

Spraying at 25-30 mph allows urning without banking



Three section spray boom 15 – 30 – 45 ft. swath width controlled from cockpit Accuflo Nozzle 0 Micron Droplet Jacre TSV













Pecos River Ecosystem Project Acres Treated 1999-2003

Year Treated	Cost	Acres Treated
999	\$125,020	658
2000	\$128,535	676
2001	\$263,000	1439
2002	\$660,000	3567
2003	\$820,050	3905
Total	\$1,996,605	10,245



os River Miles Treated 1999-2003

ent	Miles	Cumulative	Miles Treated	Miles
luff to mentone bridge	40	40	40	С
ne bridge te baretett	26	66	26	0
ow dam to I-20	20	87	20	О
Grandfalls	37	124	37	C
falls to Girvin	89	213	22	68
to Iraan	53	266	15	3
to I-10	19	285	16	3
Val Verde Co. line	56	341	18	39
erde Co. to hwy 90 bridge	77	418	5	73
SUM	418		199	21
	Perce	nt of River Miles Treated	47.6%	

Current Research and Monitoring

- Document acreage treated and mortality achieved
- Monitor native vegetation recovery
- Economics of saltcedar control
- Current vs. historical release/delivery data
- Measuring water quality (salinity) changes
- Estimating water salvage
- □ Shallow groundwater wells
- □ Sap flow measurements
- □ Seepage runs and flow nets to estimate fate

Allow Groundwater Wells.



sing Shallow groundwater wells with pressure ensitive data loggers for calculating water loss.



Saltcedar water loss study design

- Two sites monitored for entire year
- Each site contains 5 data loggers
- Three within saltcedar
- One outside saltcedar
- One in river
- One site treated for saltcedar control after calibration period
- Water loss on treated and untreated compared through paired plot analysis.



Pecos River Well Data

November 2000 Site A



Pecos River Well Data

June 2001 Site A



alculation of Water Loss From Saltcedar Site /ith Shallow Groundwater Monitoring Wells

Pecos River Level Site B 2001-2003

Well B1 2001-2003

Well A1 2001-2003

Untreated Site, June 2001-2003

Untreated Site, July 2001-2003

Treated Site, June 2001-2003

Treated Site, July 2001-2003

	Total Water Loss (ft.)			
Month	2001	2002	2003	
April	0.17	1.21	0.18	
May	0.21	0.81	0.71	
June	0.10	0.78	1.07	
July	0.09	1.10	1.42	
August	0.73	0.93	1.20	
September	1.87	0.46	0.99	
October	2.47	1.07	1.08	
Annual	5.64	6.36	6.65	

Pecos River Site B (Untreated), Well B1

	Total W	ater Loss ((ft.)		
Month	2001	2002	2003		
April	0.29	0.16	0.01		
May	2.21	0.05	0.01		
June	2.43	0.05	0.03		
July	2.22	0.06	0.02		
August	1.72	0.03	0.04		
September	0.69	0.16	0.01		
October	0.14	0.06	0.02		
Annual	9.70	0.57	0.14		

Pecos River Site A (Treated), Well A1

Total Water Loss on Sites A&B from Well 1

2001 Pre-Treatment Comparison

June 2001 Pre-Treatment Comparison

June 2002 Actual vs. Predicted

cos 2002 al Drawdown by month

	<u>_</u>				
	Actual	Predicted	Actual	% Reduction	
	Treated	Treated	Untreated	in Drawdown	n
ril	0.683	2.261	3.023	69.8%	16
У	0.773	1.513	2.023	48.9%	27
ne	0.691	1.461	1.953	52.7%	15
У	0.908	2.175	2.745	58.3%	8
gust	0.423	1.736	2.318	75.6%	3
otember	2.275	1.321	1.153	100.0%	2
tober	0.857	1.946	2.601	56.0%	3
tal	6.609	12.414	15.816	46.8%	
r-Jul	3.055	7.411	9.743	58.8%	

	Tota			
onth	Actual	Predicted	Salvage	% Salvag
oril	0.16	0.15	-0.01	-6.7%
ау	0.05	0.11	0.06	54.5%
ne	0.05	0.10	0.05	50.0%
ly	0.06	0.14	0.08	57.1%
igust	0.03	0.12	0.09	75.0%
eptember	0.16	0.09	-0.07	-77.8%
ctober	0.06	0.13	0.07	53.8%
nnual	0.57	0.84	0.27	32.1%

ecos River Site A (Treated), Well A1 2002

June 2003 Actual vs. Predicted

Total Draw down Actual Treated = -0.125 ft. Predicted Treated = 2.281 ft. Actual Untreated = 3.049

os 2003 al Drawdown by month

	Actual	Predicted	Actual	% Reduction	
	Treated	Treated	Untreated	in Drawdown	n
il	0.549	0.851	1.524	35.5%	9
/	0.362	1.413	1.782	74.4%	24
е	0.676	2.397	2.682	71.8%	13
/	0.328	2.759	3.718	88.1%	22
just	0.636	2.287	3.005	72.2%	22
tember	0.358	1.848	2.471	80.6%	27
ober	0.506	1.904	2.546	73.4%	23
al	3.415	13.459	17.727	74.6%	

lonth	Actual	Predicted	Salvage	% Salvag
pril	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.0%
lay	0.01	0.06	0.05	83.3%
une	0.03	0.17	0.14	82.4%
Jly	0.02	0.36	0.34	94.4%
ugust	0.04	0.16	0.12	75.0%
eptember	0.01	0.11	0.10	90.9%
ctober	0.02	0.12	0.10	83.3%
nnual	0.14	0.99	0.85	85.9%

Total Water Loss on Sites A&B from Well 1

Effects of Depth to Water Table on Saltcedar Water Use

Depth to Water Table

Stand Density Effects on Saltcedar Water Use

Water Loss from 2001

Colorado River

Pecos River

Young Saltcedar >20 ft. water table Away from River

Mature Saltcedar 5-10 ft. water table Along riverbank

Canadian River

Dense Riparian <3 ft. water table Along riverbank

Rio Grande Site D Wells - June 20 to September 19, 2002

Rio Grande Site D - April 1 to June 11, 2003

