

All too often, problems with sprinkler coverage come to light when the turf is faced with drought conditions.

# Irrigation Design, Rocket Science, and the SPACE Program 

Selecting sprinklers and determining the spacing is not rocket science.
Not when using the SPACE program to model coverage and distribution. by MIKE HUCK

ITDOESN'T TAKE a rocket scientist to determine that the effectiveness and efficiency of an irrigation system is more greatly influenced by the distribution uniformity of complementing sprinklers than the high-tech computer controlling the system. In this era of space-age technology, countless dollars and hours are spent evaluating and installing state-of-the-art irrigation control systems that turn water off and on with split-second accuracy. At the same time, however, very little time or effort is invested in evaluating the actual performance of sprinklers, spacings, and nozzle combinations. All too often problems with sprinkler coverage are not identified until it is too late, after they are buried in the field. With the price of new irrigation systems exceeding a million dollars, a very frustrating and embarrassing situation can arise if after a new irrigation system is installed the turf
is still plagued with wet spots, dry spots, or, even worse yet, donuts.
Sprinkler performance has long been evaluated with statistical calculations such as Christiansen's Coefficient of Uniformity (CU) and Distribution Uniformity (DU). Both CU and DU are estimates of complementing sprinklers' application uniformity that were originally developed to evaluate agricultural irrigation. The ideal CU or DU is $100 \%$; however, this is unattainable because even rainfall does not fall with $100 \%$ uniformity. A closer examination of CU and DU reveals why they alone do not guarantee success with regard to evaluating turfgrass irrigation. This is due to their methods of evaluating the underand over-watered areas.

## CU: Christiansen's Coefficient of Uniformity

The CU statistically analyzes the sprinkler pattern for uniformity based
on an average of the entire area. It treats over-watered and under-watered areas in the same way. Since it is an average, it offers no indication of how poor the coverage may be in localized areas.

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{CU} & =100(1-\mathrm{D} / \mathrm{M}) \\
\mathrm{D} & =(1 / \mathrm{N}) 3^{*} \mathrm{Xi}-\mathrm{M}^{*} \\
\mathrm{M} & =(1 / \mathrm{N}) 3 \mathrm{Xi}
\end{aligned}
$$

Where: CU = Christiansen's Coefficient of Uniformity (\%)
D = Average Absolute Deviation
M = Mean Application
$\mathrm{Xi}=$ Individual Application Amounts
$\mathrm{N}=$ Number of Individual Application Amounts
3 = Symbol for summation

*     * = Symbol for absolute value of quantity between the bars


## Irrigation Efficiency Analysis Poor Coverage Example

Sprinkler Name: Poor Coverage Sprinkler Model: A3
Nozzle Size: A3
Flow Rate (gpm): 34.00
Date/Time of Test: 02/01/91 02:41
Testing Facility: User Created Comment:

Base Pressure (psi): 80.0
Riser Height (inches): 0.0
Set Screw Setting: 0
Degree of Arc: 360
Minutes/Revolution: 1.30
Record Number: 1003

## Irrigation Efficiency Analysis Good Coverage Example

Sprinkler Name: Good Coverage
Sprinkler Model: A1
Nozzle Size: A1
Flow Rate (gpm): 25.00
Date/Time of Test: 02/01/91 12:47
Testing Facility: User Created Comment:

Base Pressure (psi): 80.0
Riser Height (inches): 0.0
Set Screw Setting: 0
Degree of Arc: 360
Minutes/Revolution: 3.00
Record Number: 1001


The Profile Report shows graphically and quantitatively the precipitation amounts and their relative distance from the sprinkler to the terminal point that the water is thrown.

## Irrigation Efficiency Analysis Uniformity Evaluation Poor Coverage Example

Sprinkler Name: Poor Coverage Sprinkler Model: A3
Nozzle Size: A3
Flow Rate (gpm): 34.00
Date/Time of Test: 02/01/91 02:41
Testing Facility: User Created Comment:

Base Pressure (psi): 80.0
Riser Height (inches): 0.0
Set Screw Setting: 0
Degree of Arc: 360
Minutes/Revolution: 1.30
Record Number: 1003

| CU (Christiansen): 88\% Sched. Coeff. (5\%): 2.2 | Min. (In./Hr.): 0.253 <br> Mean ( $\mathrm{In} . / \mathrm{Hr}$.): 0.7620 .895 (Theor.) <br> Max. (In./Hr.): 0.952 | Spacing <br> Equilateral <br> $65.0^{\prime} \times 56.3^{\prime}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Data Grid in 0.001 Inches/Hour |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| Sose mism |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| (1) |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| (1) |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  <br>  <br>  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  <br>  |  |  |
| Critical 5\% Window Siz |  | Vindow Size |
|  |  |  |
| Mean In./Hr.: 0.762 | Sched. Coefficient: 2.2 | $9^{2}$ |
| Min. Window In./Hr.: 0.343 | Min. Window \% of Mean: 45\% |  |
| Ir.: 0.905 |  |  |

## Irrigation Efficiency Analysis Uniformity Evaluation Good Coverage Example

Sprinkler Name: Good Coverage Sprinkler Model: A1
Nozzle Size: A1
Flow Rate (gpm): 25.00
Date/Time of Test: 02/01/91 12:47
Testing Facility: User Created Comment:

Base Pressure (psi): 80.0
Riser Height (inches): 0.0
Set Screw Setting: 0
Degree of Arc: 360
Minutes/Revolution: 3.00
Record Number: 1001

| Distr. Uniformity: $84 \%$ |
| :--- |
| CU (Christiansen): $89 \%$ |
| Sched. Coeff. (5\%): 1.2 |

Min. (In./Hr.): 0.477
Mean ( $\mathrm{In} . / \mathrm{Hr}$.): 0.6130 .658 (Theor.) Max. (In./Hr.): 0.915

Spacing Equilateral $65.0^{\prime} \times 56.3^{\prime}$

## Data Grid in 0.001 Inches/Hour
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## Critical 5\% Window Size

 $\begin{array}{ll}\text { Mean } \operatorname{In} / / \mathrm{Hr} \text { r: } 0.613 & \text { Sched. Coefficient: } 1.2 \\ \text { Min. Window } \operatorname{In} . / \mathrm{Hr} \text { : } 0.493 & \text { Min. Window \% of Mean: } 80 \% \\ \text { Max. Window } \operatorname{In} . / \mathrm{Hr} .: ~ 0.797 & \text { Max. Window \% of Mean: } 130 \%\end{array}$

The Grid Listing Report analyzes the synthesized numeric coverage of a sprinkler overlap pattern.

## DU: Distribution Uniformity

DU represents the average of the lowest $25 \%$ of the application rates in the sprinkler pattern divided by the average application rate of the entire pattern. This method sorts all values from the lowest to highest; the average of the lowest $25 \%$ of catchments is then divided by the mean value of the entire area. This method, however, does not take into account the location of the individual values or any benefit that may be derived from values immediately adjacent to the low values. In other words, the lowest $25 \%$ of catchments could be dispersed throughout the pattern and not necessarily be in the same localized area. Therefore, a benefit may be derived from an over-watered area immediately adjacent to an underwatered location.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \mathrm{DU}=100(1-[\mathrm{LQ} / \mathrm{M}]) \\
& \mathrm{Where}: \\
& \mathrm{DU}=\text { Distribution Uniformity }(\%) \\
& \mathrm{LQ}=\text { Average of the Lowest } 1 / 4 \text { of } \\
& \text { the Irrigation Amounts } \\
& \mathrm{M}=\text { Average of the Irrigation } \\
& \\
& \text { Amounts }
\end{aligned}
$$

Golf course irrigation designers recognize that sprinklers with high CU or DU ratings could still develop significant wet or dry areas when irrigating turf. This, in turn, required many designers to rely upon past field experience when selecting sprinklers and appropriate spacings. Now, however, the advent of the personal computer has created another method. Sprinklers now can be evaluated before they are installed in the field with the SPACE program. No, this has nothing to do with rocket science; SPACE is an acronym for Sprinkler Profile And Coverage Evaluation. The SPACE program is personal computer software developed by the Center for Irrigation Technology (CIT), at the California State University, Fresno, California.

## Capabilities of SPACE

Using the SPACE program, one can evaluate the distribution and uniformity of sprinklers either at one's own site or, for a small fee, in the CIT laboratory. This is accomplished through a combined analysis of statistical, numerical, and graphic data, all based on the actual application of water collected from one sprinkler. This can be accomplished before installing the equipment in the field.

The SPACE program is capable of evaluating two distinctly different types of data. The first type of evaluation is
known as a single-leg profile analysis, while the second is a grid analysis. The single-leg profile analysis is used when a sprinkler is being selected either for a new system design or for a retrofit or upgrade of an existing system. The single-leg profile data are then used to create overlaps and reports that simulate how one can expect the sprinkler to perform in the field. The grid analysis is used to field audit the efficiency of existing systems or examine wind effects on a single sprinkler. By following a step-by-step procedure, a great deal can be learned about an existing or proposed system.

## Single-Leg Profile, Overlaps, Multiple Spacing Analysis, and Associated Reports

Creating a Single-Leg Profile: To create a single-leg profile, raw data from a single sprinkler are collected from a single row of catchments placed in a straight line on 1-foot or 2-foot intervals from the sprinkler outward. The sprinkler is operated at a specified pressure for a period of time sufficient to collect a representative amount of water in each catchment. The water in each catchment is measured to the nearest hundredth of an inch and entered into the computer. The time the sprinkler is allowed to run (in minutes), along with other data such as sprinkler make, model, nozzle size, operating pressure, flow rate (gpm), arc (degrees of rotation), test date, and minutes per revolution, are collected to become part of the test record.

Overlaps: Once a profile has been developed, overlaps can be generated with SPACE. Overlaps simulate performance and coverage using the singleleg profile data, based on spacings and configurations determined by the computer operator. Spacings of up to 100 feet can be selected, with available configurations including square, rectangular, triangular, equilateral triangles, offset rows, single row, and single head.

Reports: Once an overlap is generated, a variety of information can be viewed from the monitor or printed as individual one-page reports. Profile, Grid Listing, Densogram, Histogram, Sliding Window, and Multiple Spacing reports are available.

Profile Report: The profile report represents both graphically and numerically the water collected in the single row of catchments. The graphic portion represents the accumulation of water plotted on an X- and Y-axis. By
studying this graphic, areas of low and high precipitation can be observed as to their relative positioning from the sprinkler to the terminal point that water is thrown. Quantitative data for each catchment are also represented in inches per hour and reported numerically with a reference for the location of each catchment in the row. The most ideal profile for turfgrass irrigation is wedge shaped, as this will deliver the most uniform distribution when overlapped at a proper spacing. The wedgeshaped pattern is also the most forgiving and maintains more uniform coverage where slight spacing adjustments are required around greens, bunkers, and trees.

Grid Listing Report: Numeric data representing the overlapped pattern are termed a grid listing. A table of numbers represents each calculated value of the simulated catchments within the overlap matrix. Each number depicts the amount of water applied within that area when the sprinklers are spaced at the selected distance and configuration. All data are represented in inches per hour.

Histogram Report: The histogram report is a bar graph depicting the application rates of each data point from the overlap, categorizing them from $100 \%$ below the mean to $100 \%$ above the mean in $5 \%$ increments. This report represents graphically both the percent variation from the mean and the number of simulated catchments falling into each range. The most ideal results are represented by the least variance from the mean application in both categories.

Densogram Reports: The densogram report is a two-dimensional dot matrix graphic of the grid listing showing the relative wet and dry areas within the pattern. Darker areas represent wetter portions, and lighter areas represent drier portions of the overlap. Perfect uniformity would be represented by a uniformly shaded printout.

Sliding Windows Report: The sliding window examines a $1 \%, 5 \%$, and $10 \%$ area of the overlap pattern in both its wettest and driest locations. Values for mean inches per hour, minimum window inches per hour, minimum window percent of mean, maximum window inches per hour, maximum window percent of mean, and scheduling coefficient are calculated for each size window.

Mean Inches Per Hour: This value is the average application rate of the entire pattern. Each catchment in the
entire pattern is added together and divided by the total number of catchments.

Minimum Window Inches Per Hour: This value represents the area of the pattern that receives the lowest application rate. The value listed is the lowest average of catchments found in the selected window size.

Minimum Window Percent of Mean: This value is the percentage of the mean application rate of the entire pattern that the average application rate of the catchments in the window size receive in the area receiving the lowest application rate.

Maximum Window Inches Per Hour: This value represents the area of the pattern that gets the highest application rate. The value listed is the highest average of catchments found in the selected window size.

Maximum Window Percent of Mean: This value is the percentage of the mean application rate of the entire pattern that the average application rate of the catchments in the window size receive in the area receiving the highest application rate.

Scheduling Coefficient: This value is the mean application rate of the pattern
area, divided by the average application rate found in the driest window area. The scheduling coefficient is used as a run time multiplier as it relates to the driest portion of the entire pattern. This is based on the value 1.0 being perfection. (A 1.0 is impossible to obtain, as even rain does not fall this uniformly!)

Multiple Spacings Analysis: The SPACE program has other capabilities, including that it can (1) evaluate a given sprinkler over a range of spacings, (2) examine which spacing is most efficient, and (3) determine how performance will suffer where adjustments in spacing must be made. A series of values are calculated by the computer based upon the range of spacings selected by the computer operator. The result is a graph that plots continuous values for the Scheduling Coefficient (SC), Coefficient of Uniformity (CU), and Distribution Uniformity (DU) and can be displayed or printed as a report. Numerical data listing the spacings, CU, DU, SC (based on a $5 \%$ window), minimum inches per hour, mean inches per hour, theoretical inches per hour (based on gpm of sprinkler, configuration, and spacing), and maximum inches per hour are also provided. The
program selects the best spacing based upon the lowest SC.

## Grid Analysis and Associated Reports

A grid analysis is a combination of graphic and data reports based upon a conventional catch-can test. Grid analysis can be performed for two different evaluations. The first is to performance test or audit an existing irrigation system. This test determines the system's overall efficiency. The second is where a single sprinkler is tested to use this data in generating overlaps. (This can demonstrate the effects of wind on the pattern of a single sprinkler.) The overlaps that follow this test are similar to those of the singleleg profiles discussed earlier, with the exception that raw data are gathered from the entire area influenced by the sprinkler as opposed to a profile.

Grid Analysis of an Existing System: Data collection for grid analysis of an existing system begins with the layout of catchments between two rows of sprinklers. The catchments are laid out in square arrangements, at a predetermined distance, uniformly spaced throughout the area influenced by the

## Irrigation Efficiency Analysis <br> Uniformity Evaluation <br> Poor Coverage Example

Sprinkler Name: Poor Coverage
Sprinkler Model: A3
Nozzle Size: A3
Flow Rate (gpm): 34.00
Date/Time of Test: 02/01/91 02:41
Testing Facility: User Created Comment:

| Distr. Uniformity: 76\% | Min. (in./Hr.): 0.253 | Spacing |
| :--- | :--- | :---: |
| CU (Christiansen): $88 \%$ | Mean (In./Hr.): 0.7620 .895 (Theor.) | Equilateral |
| Sched. Coeff. (5\%): 2.2 | Max. (In./Hr.): 0.952 | $65.0^{\prime} \times 56.3^{\prime}$ |

Frequency Distribution


## Irrigation Efficiency Analysis Uniformity Evaluation Good Coverage Example

Sprinkler Name: Good Coverage Sprinkler Model: A1
Nozzle Size: A1
Flow Rate (gpm): 25.00
Date/Time of Test: 02/01/91 12:47
Testing Facility: User Created Comment:

| Distr. Uniformity: 84\% | Min. (In./Hr.): 0.477 | Spacing |
| :--- | :--- | :---: |
| CU (Christiansen): $89 \%$ | Mean (In./Hr.): 0.6130 .658 (Theor.) | Equilateral |
| Sched. Coeff. (5\%): 1.2 | Max. (In./Hr.): 0.915 | $65.0^{\prime} \times 56.3^{\prime}$ |

Frequency Distribution


Histograms are used to represent the irrigation distribution in $5 \%$ increments. The frequency of each synthesized catchment occurs in the Grid Listing Report.


On-site profile data gathered on new sprinklers or nozzle combinations with single row of catchments are later used in the SPACE Program evaluation process.
overlap of the sprinklers. Any number can be used, with a maximum of 60 rows by 60 columns for a possible total of 3600 catchments. The more catchments used, the more precise the analysis. (It is suggested by irrigation texts that the maximum spacing for catchments be 5 feet by 5 feet if sprinkler spacing is less than 60 feet, and 10 feet by 10 feet if sprinklers are spaced over 60 feet.)
The area selected for testing should be representative of the entire system and conducted in wind conditions typical of those found during normal irrigation. An ideal way to perform this test is to set up the catchments the evening before and allow the sprinkler system to operate automatically. A minimum of 15 minutes run time is suggested to obtain an adequate amount of water in the catchments. For the sake of the test, run times of all stations influencing the catchments must be set to operate for the exact same amount of time while collecting data.
The water collected in the catchments is then measured to the nearest
hundredth of an inch and entered into the computer. Data such as sprinkler run time in minutes, sprinkler make, model, nozzle size, operating pressure, flow rate (gpm), arc (degrees of rotation), test date, and minutes per revolution are recorded. These data become part of the permanent test record.

Single Sprinkler Grid: Grid data of a single sprinkler are collected much the same way as for an existing system, but the capability of operating only one sprinkler must be available. To arrange the catchments for collecting data, the radius of the sprinkler coverage must be known. After obtaining this information, the catchments are laid out in a square arrangement with the sprinkler located in the center and catchments positioned uniformly throughout as far as water is thrown.
Data are then collected and entered into the computer in the same manner as with an existing system. The difference is that these data can be overlapped, similar to a single-leg analysis, to examine different spacings and configurations. The data can then be viewed or printed as a grid listing,
densogram, histogram, or sliding windows report for either the single head or a selected overlap.

## Interpretation of Data and Summary

Interpretation of the final data and reports requires some time, and all the data must be taken into consideration. The final sprinkler selection should not be based on any one numerical or graphic representation alone. A good place to start, however, is with the profile. The more wedge-shaped the profile, the more uniform the coverage can be expected. Looking beyond the profile, one needs to examine the wettest and driest areas through the minimum and maximum values presented on the sliding windows report, determine how significant these might become, look for the lowest Scheduling Coefficient in combination with the highest CU and DU, most uniform Densogram, narrowest range of variation on the Histogram, and, finally, compare how well the sprinkler performs across a range of spacings. The

## Irrigation Efficiency Analysis Uniformity Evaluation Poor Coverage Example

Sprinkler Name: Poor Coverage Sprinkler Model: A3
Nozzle Size: A3
Flow Rate (gpm): 34.00
Date/Time of Test: 02/01/91 02:41 Testing Facility: User Created Comment:

Base Pressure (psi): 80.0
Riser Height (inches): 0.0
Set Screw Setting: 0
Degree of Arc: 360
Minutes/Revolution: 1.30
Record Number: 1003

$\left.$| Distr. Uniformity: $76 \%$ <br> CU (Christiansen): $88 \%$ <br> Sched. Coeff. (5\%): 2.2 | Min. (In./Hr.): 0.253 <br> Mean (In./Hr.): 0.762 <br> Max. (In./Hr.): 0.952 | 0.895 (Theor.) |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | | Spacing |
| :---: |
| Equilateral |
| $65.0^{\prime} \times 56.3^{\prime}$ | \right\rvert\,

## Irrigation Efficiency Analysis <br> Uniformity Evaluation Good Coverage Example

Sprinkler Name: Good Coverage Sprinkler Model: A1
Nozzle Size: A1
Flow Rate (gpm): 25.00
Date/Time of Test: 02/01/91 12:47 Testing Facility: User Created Comment:

Base Pressure (psi): 80.0
Riser Height (inches): 0.0
Set Screw Setting: 0
Degree of Arc: 360
Minutes/Revolution: 3.00
Record Number: 1001

| Distr. Uniformity: $84 \%$ | Min. (In./Ar.): 0.477 | Spacing |
| :--- | :--- | :---: |
| CU (Christiansen): $89 \%$ | Mean (In.Hr): 0.613 | 0.658 (Theor.) |
| Equilateral |  |  |
| Sched. Coeff. (5\%): 1.2 | Max. (In./Hr.): 0.915 | $65.0^{\prime} \times 56.3^{\prime}$ |

Critical 1\% Window Size

| Critical 1\% Window Size |  | Window Size 3 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mean In./Hr.: 0.613 | Sched. Coefficient: 1.3 |  |  |
| Min. Window In./Hr.: 0.485 | Min. Window \% of Mean: 79\% | 3 | $33^{2}$ |
| Critical 5\% Window Size |  | Window Size 7 |  |
| Mean In./Hr.: 0.613 | Sched. Coefficient: 1.2 |  |  |
| Min. Window $\operatorname{In} / \mathrm{Hr}$.: 0.493 Max. Window $\operatorname{In} / \mathrm{Hr}$.: 0.797 | Min. Window \% of Mean: 80\% Max. Window \% of Mean: $130 \%$ | 7 | $179^{2}$ |
| Critical 10\% Window Size |  | Window Size 10 |  |
| Mean In./Hr.: 0.613 | Sched. Coefficient: 1.2 |  |  |
| Min. Window $\operatorname{In} . / \mathrm{Hr}$.: 0.509 Max. Window $\operatorname{In} / \mathrm{Hr}$.: 0.769 | Min. Window \% of Mean: 83\% Max. Window \% of Mean: 125\% | 10 | $365{ }^{2}$ |

The Sliding Windows Report analyzes the most wet and dry 1, 5, and 10\% areas of the overlap.

## Irrigation Efficiency Analysis Uniformity Evaluation Poor Coverage Example

Sprinkler Name: Poor Coverage
Sprinkler Model: A3
Nozzle Size: A3
Flow Rate (gpm): 34.00
Date/Time of Test: 02/01/91 02:41
Testing Facility: User Created
Comment:

| Distr. Uniformity: 76\% | Min. (In./Hr.): 0.253 | Spacing |
| :--- | :--- | :---: |
| CU (Christiansen): $88 \%$ | Mean (In./Hr.): 0.7620 .895 (Theor.) | Equilateral |
| Sched. Coeff. (5\%): 2.2 | Max. (In./Hr.): 0.952 | $65.0^{\prime} \times 56.3^{\prime}$ |



## Irrigation Efficiency Analysis <br> Uniformity Evaluation Good Coverage Example

Sprinkler Name: Good Coverage Sprinkler Model: A1
Nozzle Size: A1
Flow Rate (gpm): 25.00
Date/Time of Test: 02/01/91 12:47
Testing Facility: User Created
Comment:

| Distr. Uniformity: $84 \%$ | Min. (In./Hr.): 0.477 | Spacing |
| :--- | :--- | :---: |
| CU (Christiansen): $89 \%$ | Mean (In./Hr.): 0.6130 .658 (Theor.) | Equilateral |
| Sched. Coeff. (5\%): 1.2 | Max. (In./Hr.): 0.915 | $65.0^{\prime} \times 56.3^{\prime}$ |



The Densogram graphically shows the synthesized coverage of overlap area. The lighter shaded areas indicate drier areas and the darker areas are more wet. The small square locates the critical dry area within the overlap pattern.
more consistent the results are at varying spacings, the more uniform the coverage will be where spacing adjustments are required.

In the case of new installations, it would be prudent to send one sprinkler for testing prior to the design phase to select the best spacing. During the system installation, sprinklers should be tested at the start of the project and then again one-third and two-thirds through completion of the project as a quality-control measure. Checking several sprinklers during the project will help insure that the manufacturer has not made any drastic change in the product or that problems with molding or machining nozzles have not occurred. This small investment could help avoid many headaches down the road.
There is a case to be made for performing on-site testing, especially at high elevations where thin air will affect the distribution pattern by how far water is thrown. You cannot expect information obtained at Fresno, California, at near sea level, to be completely valid in the Rocky Mountains at 10,000 feet elevation. Additionally, the effects of wind, temperature, relative
humidity, and other unknown variables on sprinkler distribution are not yet completely known. However, the Center for Irrigation Technology is busy working with lasers to analyze actual droplet size in relationship to wind and drift. In the future, wind effects may become more predictable.

It must also be recognized that a nozzle one size larger or smaller can result in a drastic change in the shape of a profile. Some nozzles have also shown a great sensitivity in their performance with only slight variations in operating pressure. Evaluating sprinklers alone cannot guarantee success, but it may prevent certain failure. A system still needs to be properly designed hydraulically and then installed correctly. Laboratory evaluation of sprinklers is better than any other method of selection currently available, especially compared to the old-fashioned way of just sticking them in the ground and finding donuts upon completion. So don't let sprinkler selection be rocket science. Test before you invest, and put data from the SPACE program to work for you!
(SPACE is available for either DOS or Windows. For more information on

SPACE or laboratory testing, contact the Center for Irrigation Technology, California State University - Fresno, 5370 North Chestnut Avenue, Fresno, California 93740-0018, or phone 209-278-2066.)
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Multiple Spacing Graphics display the consistency or lack of consistency of the Christiansen's Coefficient of Uniformity (CU), Distribution Uniformity ( $D U$ ), and scheduling coefficient over a range of spacings.

