WIRELESS SENSOR NETWORK FOR "ON FARM" SOIL MOISTURE DATA ACQUISITION AND IRRIGATION SCHEDULING

William H. Buhrig, Malheur County Extension Service, Oregon State University, Ontario, OR, 2015

Clinton C. Shock, Erik B. G. Feibert, and Lamont D. Saunders, Malheur Experiment Station, Oregon State University, Ontario, OR

Introduction

Currently, irrigation-scheduling decisions are made based on a combination of three tools: 1) ground truth where field conditions are scouted manually, 2) evapotranspiration calculations, where a "checkbook method" is used to estimate the amount of water required and is subsequently added, and 3) the use of soil moisture monitoring sensors. Irrigation scheduling is a key component of efficient water use (Shock et al. 2013b). When properly installed, soil moisture sensors provide a valuable resource for determining what is happening in the field. When the ideal soil water tension (SWT) for a crop has been estimated for a soil type, soil sensors provide excellent data to base scheduling decisions on (Shock and Wang 2011, Shock et al. 2013a). Granular matrix sensors (GMS, Watermark Soil Moisture Sensors Model 200SS, Irrometer Co., Riverside, CA) have been used as a reliable moisture sensing tool (Shock 2003, Shock and Wang 2011). One of the primary drawbacks to the use of soil sensors is the need to manually download or review the data onsite at the collection manifold. In recent years, work has been done to allow remote viewing and downloading of soil moisture data. This would enable sensors to be placed on a strategic basis rather than bound by the logistics of physical access. Proper representation of field conditions can be even more critical when irrigating during drought conditions with scarce water or when irrigating crops that are very sensitive to over- or under-irrigation (Shock et al. 2013a).

The collection of SWT data can then be used in conjunction with crop specific guidelines for proper irrigation. By utilizing previously determined parameters for the soil moisture, SWT will provide an objective dataset on which to base decisions. Figure 1 provides an example of onion irrigation with a SWT criterion of 25 kPa.

Having soil moisture data remotely accessible would enable managers to make decisions by accessing the data on their laptop, tablet, or cell phone. This report discusses a remote monitoring platform that was deployed at the Oregon State University Malheur Experiment Station near Ontario, Oregon in 2015. This cloud-based platform is the IRROmesh™ system using the SensMit Web™ radio platform (Irrometer Co., Riverside, CA). This system was installed in several different fields across the Malheur Experiment Station to determine its monitoring ability. Similar remote monitoring platforms have been developed by other companies with varying radio frequencies and strengths, with some using cell phone technology. Many are solar powered while others are battery powered. Two very similar systems are the Connect^{TM} platform by McCrometer and the WagNet^{TM} system by AgSense. These both utilize cell phone technology to provide data collection that is reported to a website for remote access and archiving.



Figure 1. Soil water tension (SWT) at 20-cm depth for furrow-irrigated onion at a criterion of 25 kPa. A SWT of 0 is saturated soil. Note the wide fluctuations in SWT and the frequent instances of saturated soil (Shock et al. 2010).

Materials and Methods

The IRROmesh system was composed of an array of nodes that communicated with each other in a relay fashion using a radio communication vehicle called the Fresnel Zone. The radio waves in the Fresnel Zone bounced from one node to another, transmitting the data to a node referred to as the base station. The base station was near a personal computer (PC) link, which is the first node in the mesh. The PC link was wired into the computer hosting the data reporting and logging of the mesh. All data collected at the computer were compiled and archived to a website. Data could then be accessed via the internet in real-time or could be exported to a Microsoft Excel file on any internet-enabled device. To access the reported data, a subscription and account was created. Nodes were solar powered and were placed on the top of poles about 6 ft above the ground. This was to facilitate the football-shaped radio waves that comprise the node communication in the Fresnel Zone.

The software was programmed to report every 30 min. Three Watermark soil moisture sensors (Irrometer Co. Inc.) and one soil temperature sensor were connected to each node. There was also a temperature sensor inside each node to provide “ambient” temperature. The temperature sensor was not a representative data point, however, since it was inside the clear plastic housing that protects the node. Some nodes were designated as “relay” nodes and some were “end” nodes. End nodes had only the hardware for collecting soil data and sending out signals while relay nodes were built to report their own data and receive messages from other nodes, then relay the data on across the mesh to the base station.

Implementation

The IRROmesh monitoring started on May 16, 2015 and continued through the growing season. Watermark sensors and soil temperature sensors were installed at predetermined sites in 11 fields with 10 different crops (Table 1). The sensors were installed at 20-cm depth using techniques described previously (Shock et al. 2013a) then the sensors were wired to the nodes. The array of nodes installed at the Malheur Experiment Station was representative of a layout that could be implemented by growers wanting to monitor several different crops around a base station. An example of how nodes can be deployed across the varying soil conditions of a large field is depicted in Figure 2. This shows how a grower could have multiple nodes installed within the same field to help capture soil variation, irrigation dynamic differences, etc.

Table 1. Soil water tension monitored in 10 crops with an IRROmesh^{TM} system at the Oregon State University Malheur Experiment Station, Ontario, Oregon, 2015.

Crop	Scientific name	Number of fields monitored	Irrigation method
Onion	*Allium cepa*	2	Drip
Pumpkins	*Cucurbita pepo*	1	Drip
Potato	*Solanum tuberosum*	1	Sprinkler
Stevia	*Stevia rebaudiana*	1	Drip
Fernleaf biscuitroot	*Lomatium dissectum*	1	Drip
Yellow beeplant	*Cleome lutea*	1	Drip
Rocky Mtn. beeplant	*Cleome serrulata*	1	Drip
Quinoa	*Chenopodium quinoa*	1	Furrow
Alfalfa seed	*Medicago sativa*	1	Drip
Soybeans	*Glycine max*	1	Furrow



Figure 2. An example layout for a potential IRROmesh™ system. The white triangle was the location of the base station and the receiving computer. The white triangle is where a traditional site would be, the gray triangles are where the optimal sites would be. The white bar represents a distance of 2,622 ft across this field.

Discussion

After the mesh was installed and reporting and the subscription was created, users navigated to a login page where they entered their own ID and password to access their account. When logged in, users navigated the site to a map of the nodes as deployed. Once the archived data is accessed, customized graphs immediately appeared on a smart phone or PC (Fig. 3). In this example, SWT in a quinoa field was shown for 5 weeks. The time interval of data displayed, the scale of the graph (cb = kPa), or the crop field being examined could easily be adjusted. Figure 3 shows a drying trend starting about 16 August and continuing above 50 kPa before the next irrigation on August 26. Accessed in real-time, growers could use data to increase irrigation duration or frequency to meet plant needs. In addition to seeing a spike of dryness as it is unfolding, there could be a chance to have a post-mortem evaluation at the end of the season. This format enables the grower to see when a field may have become too dry during the growing season. This may help explain quality or yield issues and enable the grower to avoid such circumstance in future years.

The internal temperature (the temperature inside the node) became very hot, often rising above the actual ambient air temperature (Fig. 4). The external soil sensor measures soil temperature and can be used to correct soil moisture sensor readings for temperature effects. Figure 4 also depicts the ability of the user to use the pop-down menu and date selection to examine specific information by date.

The software also allowed easy download for the SWT history for any field at any date.



Figure 3. An example of a soil water tension record for three Watermark soil moisture sensors at 8-inch depth in a furrow-irrigated quinoa field for a selected timeframe at the Oregon State University Malheur Experiment Station, Ontario, OR in 2015.



Figure 4. An example of a soil and air temperature record using the IRROmesh system at the Oregon State University Malheur Experiment Station, Ontario, OR in 2015.

When accessing the data, current data was available but the users could also create a custom data request. Table 2 provides an example of data exported to an Excel file at the request of a user. Data was summarized to meet the specific requirements of the viewer.

Table 2. An example of a soil moisture record exported to an Excel file for a drip-irrigated onion field for a selected timeframe at the Oregon State University Malheur Experiment Station, Ontario, OR in 2015.

		Moisture sensors	Temperature (°C)			
Node	Local time	MO1	MO2	MO3	Node	Soil
Onion Cultivar	6/8/2015 10:59	14	12	12	37	23
Onion Cultivar	6/8/2015 11:29	15	12	12	38.5	23
Onion Cultivar	6/8/2015 11:59	15	12	12	39	23
Onion Cultivar	6/8/2015 12:29	15	13	12	40	23
Onion Cultivar	6/8/2015 12:59	15	13	12	40	23
Onion Cultivar	6/8/2015 13:29	16	13	12	40.5	23.5
Onion Cultivar	6/8/2015 13:59	16	13	13	41	23.5

Under the conditions of the present trial, the mesh was able to communicate reliably at 1900 ft (580 m) between nodes. For producers who are managing a wide number of crops and fields, remote sensor technology can help ensure that farm employees are following irrigation management guidelines. A manager can review many different fields at once and have a significant grasp of conditions in the field. As management attention to soil moisture conditions becomes apparent to farm employees, this remote oversight could enhance their attention to proper irrigation and related duties. One significant barrier to adoption is the need to have a base station computer in proximity to the mesh. Platforms that operate on cell phone frequencies could be considered more flexible in their application.

Summary

There are several attributes that remote moisture sensors can provide for growers. Rapid access to soil moisture data is a great aid for efficient irrigation scheduling. While it is an attractive irrigation scheduling tool, it should not be considered a total replacement for spending time in the field assessing conditions in person. The ability to access real-time data and review the archive at the end of the season will provide quality insight into irrigation scheduling. It is important to note that optimal SWT levels for many crops have not been determined. For crops such as the quinoa depicted above, the utility is in trend watching, without having irrigation parameters to schedule by.

Dissemination

A grower tour of the deployed equipment in the mesh was held in conjunction with the annual Malheur Experiment Station Farm Fest on July 9, 2015.

Presentation on the 2015 field results was given at the ASABE Irrigation Symposium in Long Beach, California on November 10, 2015.

Presentation on the 2015 field results was given at the Treasure Valley Irrigation Conference in Ontario, Oregon on December 17, 2015.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank Tom Penning and Jeremy Sullivan of Irrometer for their support of this trial. We gratefully acknowledge support by the Agricultural Research Foundation, Oregon State University, Malheur County Education Service District, and Formula Grant nos. 2015-31100-06041 and 2015-31200-06041 from the USDA National Institute of Food and Agriculture.

References

Shock, C.C., 2003. Soil water potential measurement by granular matrix sensors. Pages 899-903 in Stewart, B.A. and Howell, T.A. (eds) The Encyclopedia of Water Science. Marcel Dekker.

Shock, C.C., E. Feibert, L. Jensen and J. Klauzer. 2010. Successful onion irrigation scheduling, Sustainable Agriculture Techniques. Oregon State University Extension Service, Corvallis. SR 1097.

Shock, C.C., B.M Shock, and T. Welch. 2013b. Strategies for efficient irrigation water use. Oregon State University Bulletin EM 8783. Revised March 2013.

Shock, C.C., and F.-X. Wang. 2011. Soil water tension, a powerful measurement for productivity and stewardship. HortScience 46:178-185.

Shock, C.C., F.X. Wang, R. Flock, E. Feibert, C.A. Shock, and A. Pereira. 2013a. Irrigation monitoring using soil water tension. Oregon State University Bulletin EM 8900. Revised March 2013.

Disclaimer

The intent of this report is to share the findings of the Oregon State University Malheur Experiment Station in regards to the use of a sensor web to efficiently manage irrigation to maintain critical soil moisture for crop production. Its intent is neither to endorse the IRROmesh™ system with its SensMit Web™ radio platform and Watermark soil moisture sensors nor criticize any competing systems or products.

Future Funding Possibilities

As this works continues forward, more platforms are available to be tested and demonstrated. Amalgamated Sugar Company agronomy personnel have indicated that they feel one of their future priorities is to better schedule irrigations and manage deep soil moisture. In 2016, a separate trial/demonstration of the McCrometer Connect™ platform will be held in conjunction with the University of Idaho Topic Team funding. In cooperation with Jerry Neufeld with Canyon County Extension, we will install two monitoring sites in grower fields. These will be used to help the grower schedule irrigations as well as provide demonstrable data to be presented at grower meetings.