



UNIVERSITEIT VAN PRETORIA
UNIVERSITY OF PRETORIA
YUNIBESITHI YA PRETORIA

**The environmental impact and sustainability of irrigation with coal-mine
water**

by

Yacob Ghebretinsae Beletse

**Submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
In the Faculty of Natural and Agricultural Science
University of Pretoria
Pretoria**

**Supervisor: Prof JG Annandale
Co-Supervisor: Dr JM Steyn**

May 2008



DECLARATION

I, the undersigned, declare that the thesis which I hereby submit for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy at the University of Pretoria, is my own work, except where acknowledged in the text, and has not previously been submitted for a degree in any form at this or any other tertiary institution

Yacob Ghebretinsae Beletse

May 2008



This thesis is dedicated:

To the glory of God and in thanks giving for my many blessings.

“Thus far has the lord helped us...Ebenezer” 1 Samuel 7:12

To my beloved son Israel and my wife Tsedal Tseggai:

You are God’s gift to me.

“Every good gift and every perfect gift is from above...” (James1:17)

To my dear parents:

I hope that this achievement will complete the dream that you had for me all those many years
when you chose to provide me with the best education you could.

*“Children, obey your parents in the lord, for this is right...
and that you may enjoy long life on earth” Ephesians 6:1-3*

To my dear brothers and sisters who always wished me every success:

Weldu, Mussie, Tedros, Isacc, Solomon, Kibrom, Saba and Feven

“ ...with God all things are possible” Mathew 19:26

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank my supervisor Prof JG Annandale for his tireless supervision, guidance, support, patience and helpful criticism throughout my doctoral program. I am sincerely indebted for his arrangement of funding through Coaltech 2020, without his continuous support I would not have gone this far.

I am deeply indebted to Dr JM Steyn, my co-supervisor, who was able to help me with the SWB model. His support in data logger programming for all the instruments, analyzing the field data and thesis guidance are highly appreciated.

I deeply thank Dr N Benadé for a lot of patience, ability in modifying SWB source code and for sharing me his knowledge in Delphi programming.

I wish to thank Coaltech 2020 and WRC for financial support without which this study would not have been carried out. I thank the project leaders Johan Beukes and M Du Plessis for their friendly approach.

My thanks are also due to fellow graduate students of Department of Plant Production and Soil Science, who helped me various works and their company made my study enjoyable. Many thanks also go to the personnel in the Experimental farm who gave me technical assistance. My thanks also goes to the Soil Science Laboratory, at the Department of Plant Production and Soil Science, staff who analyzed my soil, water and plant samples.

I would like to thank my wife Tsedal Tseggai for her love and encouragement. The moral and prayerful support of my mother, brothers, sisters and all the members of my family is sincerely acknowledged. Finally, I would like to acknowledge all those who contributed in diverse ways towards the success of this research.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	i
TABLE OF CONTENTS	ii
ABSTRACT	vi
LIST OF TABLES	viii
LIST OF FIGURES	x
LIST OF SYMBOLS AND ACRONYMS	xv
CHAPTER 1	1
General introduction	1
1.1 Introduction	1
1.2 Research approach.....	5
1.3 Thesis outline	8
References	9
CHAPTER 2	11
Literature review	11
2.1 Introduction	11
2.2 Soil and crop response to saline and saline-sodic water	12
2.2.1 Crop response to salinity	12
2.2.2 Soil salinity.....	13
2.2.3 Soil sodicity.....	14
2.3 Modelling the effects of saline-sodic water irrigation on crop growth.....	16
2.3.1 Root zone modelling	16
2.3.2 Application of root zone modelling	18
2.3.3 Field scale application of the SWB model.....	19
2.4 Irrigation with mine water in southern Africa.....	21
2.4.1 Composition of mine water	22
2.4.2 Gypsum precipitation in a soil – the opportunity to remove salt from the water system.....	23
2.4.3 Crop production using coal-mine water	25



2.5	Runoff and drainage from mine water irrigated fields	29
	Knowledge gap.....	35
	References	36
CHAPTER 3		53
Field sites, monitoring and modelling		53
3.1	Introduction	53
3.2	Field site locations and experimental layout	53
	3.2.1 Kleinkopjé	53
	3.2.2 New Vaal.....	56
	3.2.3 Syferfontein.....	58
	3.2.4 Waterberg.....	59
3.3	Cropping systems	62
	3.3.1 Kleinkopjé	62
	3.3.2 New Vaal.....	62
	3.3.3 Syferfontein.....	63
	3.3.4 Waterberg.....	64
3.4	Soil	65
3.5	Water qualities.....	67
	3.5.1 Kleinkopjé and New Vaal	67
	3.5.2 Syferfontein.....	70
	3.5.3 Waterberg.....	70
3.6	Monitoring the field water and salt balance	72
	3.6.1 Atmospheric Evaporative Demand	73
	3.6.2 Crop growth and nutritional status	73
	3.6.3 Soil water balance	74
	3.6.4 Salt balance	76
3.7	Modelling	78
	3.7.1 Soil Water Balance modelling.....	78
	3.7.2 Modelling, data processing and validations	79
	Conclusions	80
CHAPTER 4		81
Crop production and plant nutrition		81



4.1	Introduction	81
4.2	Crop production.....	81
4.2.1	Kleinkopjé	81
4.2.2	New Vaal.....	87
4.2.3	Syferfontein.....	89
4.2.4	Waterberg.....	92
	Conclusions	95
4.3	Plant nutrition.....	96
4.3.1	Kleinkopjé	96
4.3.2	New Vaal.....	104
4.3.3	Syferfontein.....	105
4.3.4	Waterberg.....	106
	Conclusions	110
	References	111
CHAPTER 5		114
Soil properties		114
5.1	Introduction	114
5.2	Kleinkopjé and New Vaal	114
5.2.1	Soil salinity.....	114
5.2.2	Soil pH and gypsum	117
5.2.3	Soil nutrients and fertilization.....	120
5.3	Syferfontein.....	129
5.3.1	Soil salinity.....	129
5.3.2	Soil sodicity.....	131
5.4	Waterberg.....	132
5.4.1	Soil salinity.....	132
5.4.2	Sodicity and infiltration.....	134
5.4.4	Soil solution EC	136
	Conclusions	139
	References	141
CHAPTER 6		143
Field scale medium-term modelling of crop growth, soil water and salt balances.....		143



6.1	Introduction	143
6.2	Model simulations	144
6.2.1	Crop growth and soil water deficit	144
6.2.2	Soil chemistry	149
6.3	Soil water and salt balances	153
6.3.1	Kleinkopjé	153
6.3.2	Syferfontein	158
6.4	Long-term scenarios	159
6.4.1	Irrigation with gypsiferous rich mine water	159
6.4.2	Irrigation with Na ₂ SO ₄ rich mine water	160
6.4.3	Irrigation with NaHCO ₃ rich mine water	162
	Conclusions	166
	References	168
CHAPTER 7	170
	Surface runoff from coal-mine water irrigated fields.....	170
7.1	Introduction	170
7.2	Modelling surface runoff.....	170
7.3	Model calibration	173
7.4	Measured runoff	176
7.5	Model validations	177
	Conclusions	179
	References	180
CHAPTER 8	182
	General conclusions and recommendations.....	182
8.1	Conclusions	182
8.2	Recommendations	182
Appendix A	186
Appendix B	187
Appendix C	190

**THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT AND SUSTAINABILITY OF
IRRIGATION WITH COAL-MINE WATER**

BY

YACOB GHEBRETINSAE BELETSE

SUPERVISOR: PROF JG ANNANDALE

CO-SUPERVISOR: DR JM STEYN

**DEPARTMENT: PLANT PRODUCTION AND SOIL SCIENCE
UNIVERSITY OF PRETORIA**

PHILOSOPHIAE DOCTOR

ABSTRACT

The environmental impact and sustainability of irrigation with coal-mine water was investigated from an agricultural point of view on different coal-mines in the Republic of South Africa. Field trials were carried out on a commercial and plot scale, on sites that could offer a range of soil, crop, weather conditions and water qualities such as gypsiferous, sodium sulphate and sodium bicarbonate waters. Crop production under irrigation with gypsiferous mine water is feasible on a field scale and sustainable if properly managed. No symptoms of foliar injury due to centre pivot sprinkler irrigation with gypsiferous water were observed. The presence of high Ca and Mg in the water suppressed plant uptake of K. This could be corrected by regular application of K containing fertilizers. The bigger problem experienced was waterlogging due to poor site selection, especially during the summer months. The problem is not related to the chemistry of the gypsiferous water used for irrigation. Pasture production with Na₂SO₄ rich mine effluent was also feasible, at least in the short term, but

would need a well-drained profile and large leaching fraction to prevent salt build up. Forage quality was not affected by the Na_2SO_4 water used. NaHCO_3 water was of very poor quality for irrigation and is not recommended for irrigation. Salt tolerant crops that are not susceptible to leaf scorching can be produced with this water, but only with very high leaching fractions and careful crop management. Regular gypsum application will be required to prevent structural collapse of the soil. Most of the salts applied will leach from the soil profile, and will probably need to be intercepted for treatment or reuse. The Soil Water Balance (SWB) model was validated successfully. The model predicted crop growth, soil water deficit to field capacity and soil chemistry reasonably well, with simulated results quite close to measured values. Soluble salts have to be leached from the soil profile, so that crop production can be sustainable, but will externalize the problem to the receiving water environment. To assess the environmental impact of irrigation with coal-mine water, it is valuable to develop a tool that can assist with prediction of offsite effects. SWB was validated for runoff quantity and quality estimations, and was found to give reasonable estimates of runoff quantity and quality. SWB also predicted the soil water and salt balance reasonably well. This gives one confidence in the ability of the model to simulate the soil water and salt balance for long-term scenarios and link the output of SWB to ground and surface water models to predict the wider impact of large scale irrigation. This will also link the findings of this work to other research oriented towards the management of mine water and salt balances on a catchment scale. It will also help authorities make informed decisions about the desirability and consequences of permitting mine water irrigation on a large scale. Irrigation with gypsiferous mine water can be part of finding the solution to surplus mine water problems. Appropriate irrigation management of mine water is essential for the long-term sustainability of irrigation.

Key words: Coal-mine water, irrigation, SWB model, modelling, soil salinity, CaSO_4 , gypsiferous water, Na_2SO_4 , NaHCO_3 , sustainability, environmental impact

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1.1 Summary of water qualities, soils and cropping systems.....	7
Table 2.1 Average mine water quality for Witbank (Annandale <i>et al.</i> , 1999)	23
Table 3.1 Annual and perennial, temperate and subtropical pasture crops planted (Syferfontein)	64
Table 3.2 Soil classification, depth, texture and initial saturated soil salinity (EC _e) of the irrigated fields on the different mines.	66
Table 3.3 Typical irrigation water quality of the Syferfontein coal-mine.....	70
Table 4.1 Crops, cultivars and yields irrigated with gypsiferous mine water (at New Vaal).....	88
Table 4.2 Cotton yield and fibre quality obtained from the CBM deep aquifer water irrigated fields	94
Table 4.3 DRIS indices of maize on site Major	102
Table 4.4 DRIS indices for wheat on site Major	102
Table 5.1 Soil saturated paste extract (EC _e) of four sites irrigated with gypsiferous mine water for different cropping sequences	116
Table 5.2 Soil pH (H ₂ O) of four sites irrigated with gypsiferous mine water at different cropping sequences	119
Table 5.3 Mean, SD, Max and Min Ca (cmol _(c) kg ⁻¹) levels in gypsiferous mine water irrigated soils	121
Table 5.4 Mean, SD, Max and Min Ca (cmol _(c) kg ⁻¹) of the experimental soils at initial condition.....	121

Table 5.5 Mean, SD, Max and Min- Mg (cmol _(c) kg ⁻¹) of gypsiferous mine water irrigated soils.....	122
Table 5.6 Mean, SD, Max and Min- Mg (cmol _(c) kg ⁻¹) of the experimental soils at initial condition.....	122
Table 6.1 Statistical parameters of LAI, TDM, Deficit and RD for Maize cv. PHI 32P75, Pivot Major for summer season 1999/2000	146
Table 6.2 Statistical parameters of LAI, TDM, Deficit and RD for Wheat cv. SST 825, Pivot Major winter season 2000	147
Table 6.3 Simulated annual values of the soil water balance components for Pivot Major at Kleinkopjé Colliery from the start of irrigation in 1997	155
Table 6.4 Simulated annual values of the salt balance components for pivot Major at Kleinkopjé Colliery from the start of irrigation in 1997	156
Table 6.5 Predicted average annual salt balance for 20 years of irrigation with Na ₂ SO ₄ rich mine effluent	161
Table 6.6 Predicted annual components of the salt balance, using NaHCO ₃ deep aquifer water for a 22 year barley-cotton rotation with a 23% LF and a threshold deficit of 15 mm.....	165
Table 7.1 Summary of measured rainfall, irrigation and salt added between 2000 and 2006 at TWF and Major	177

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1.1	Regional map of irrigation mine water research sites.....	6
Figure 2.1	Potential for reduction in infiltration rates resulting from various combinations of EC and SAR of applied water (Ayers & Westcot, 1985).....	15
Figure 3.1	Topographic map of the Kleinkopjé area, indicating the position of Pivot Major, Pivot Four and Pivot TWF	54
Figure 3.2	Experimental layout of the irrigated fields at Kleinkopjé.....	55
Figure 3.3	Topographic map of the New Vaal area	56
Figure 3.4	Experimental layout of the irrigated fields at New Vaal	57
Figure 3.6	Experimental layout of the irrigated fields at Syferfontein.	59
Figure 3.7	Schematic layout of the drip irrigation trial treatment (winter 2005) at Waterberg	60
Figure 3.8	Drip irrigation system layout for the CBM irrigation trial at Waterberg.....	60
Figure 3.9	Schematic presentation of the line source Sprinkler irrigation system layout (winter, 2005) at Waterberg.....	61
Figure 3.10	Line source irrigation system layout for the CBM water irrigation trial at Waterberg	61
Figure 3.11	Maize irrigated with gypsiferous mine water at Pivot Major	62
Figure 3.12	Sweetcorn irrigated with gypsiferous mine water at Pivot New Vaal	63
Figure 3.13	Fescue irrigated with sodium sulphate rich mine water at Syferfontein.....	63
Figure 3.14	Barley irrigated with sodium bicarbonate rich CBM deep aquifer water at Waterberg (winter 2005)	65

Figure 3.15 Cotton and Bermuda grass irrigated with sodium bicarbonate rich CBM deep aquifer water at Waterberg (summer 2005/06)	65
Figure 3.16 Waterlogging at New Vaal during the early growth stage of Pumpkins	67
Figure 3.17 Irrigation mine water qualities of Kleinkopie and New Vaal	69
Figure 3.18 CBM irrigation water quality applied in winter 2005 and summer 2005/06	71
Figure 3.19 EC of the less saline water and CBM water irrigated in winter 2005	72
Figure 3.20 EC of the less saline water and CBM water irrigated in summer 2005/06	72
Figure 3.21 a) Runoff weir layout and b) ISCO sampler at Pivot Major and c) Top view of ISCO sampler with 24 sample bottles	76
Figure 4.1 Mine water irrigated and dry land yield of maize (a,c and e) and wheat (b,d and f) grown at three pivots at Kleinkopje	83
Figure 4.2 Average root zone soil saturated paste extract (EC_e) of soils irrigated with mine water during the growing period and salinity threshold tolerance (TT) for maize and wheat on three pivots at Kleinkopje	86
Figure 4.3 Yields of pastures irrigated with Na_2SO_4 rich mine effluent and typical dry land	91
Figure 4.4 Leaf area index and biomass production of the salt tolerant winter crops under different irrigation management strategies	92
Figure 4.5 Leaf area index and biomass production of cotton under different irrigation management strategies	93
Figure 4.6 LAI and biomass production of Bermuda grass under different irrigation management strategies. First harvest received less saline water, whilst the second harvest was irrigated with $800\text{ mS m}^{-1} NaHCO_3$ water	94

Figure 4.7 N content of maize leaf irrigated with coal mine-water for sites Major, Pivot Four and TWF, and sufficiency range of maize leave irrigated with fresh water 97

Figure 4.8 Maize leaf K content for sites Major, Pivot Four and TWF 98

Figure 4.9 Maize leaf Mg content for sites Major, Pivot Four and TWF 99

Figure 4.10 Maize leaf Ca content for sites Major, Pivot Four and TWF..... 100

Figure 4.11 Maize leaf Ca content for sites Major, Pivot Four and TWF..... 101

Figure 4.13 N and K concentrations in the leaves of cotton drip irrigated with CBM water, following different irrigation management strategies 106

Figure 4.14 Ca and Mg concentration in the leaves of cotton drip irrigated with CBM water following different irrigation management strategies 107

Figure 4.15 Concentrations of N and K of two growth cycles of Bermuda grass drip irrigated with CBM water following different irrigation management strategies 108

Figure 4.16 Concentration of Ca and Mg of two growth cycles of Bermuda grass drip irrigated with CBM water following different irrigation management strategies 109

Figure 5.1 Temporal changes of exchangeable [K]/[Ca] for the irrigation sites..... 124

Figure 5.2 Interference of gypsum in the determination of exchangeable Ca using the routine method (Major, 2004) 129

Figure 5.3 Actual [Ca]/[Mg] ratio versus [Ca]/[Mg] artifact ratio because of gypsum interference.....129

Figure 5.4 Average EC_e ($mS\ m^{-1}$) of the soil at initial condition and during the trial period 130

Figure 5.5 EC _e (mS m ⁻¹) measured during the trial period and threshold tolerance (TT) of pastures.....	130
Figure 5.6 Average ESP (%) of the soil at initial condition and during the trial period	131
Figure 5.7 Soil saturated paste extracts at the end of (a) the winter 2005 trial and (b) the 2005/06 summer trial.....	133
Figure 5.8 Exchangeable sodium percentage of the soil irrigated at (a) FC, (b) 23%LF and (c) 46%LF	135
Figure 5.9 EC of the soil solution captured from WFDs installed at 30 cm depth in the FC, 23%LF and 46%LF treatments and threshold tolerance (TT) to salinity (EC _e) of the crops grown in winter 2005.....	137
Figure 5.10 EC of the soil solution, EC of irrigation water and crop threshold tolerance (TT) during the summer 2005/06 growing period	138
Figure 6.1 Observed (symbols) and simulated (lines) RD, LAI, TDM, HDM and deficit to FC for Maize cultivar cv. PHI 32P75, Pivot Major for the summer season 1999/2000.....	146
Figure 6.2 Observed (symbols) and simulated (lines) RD, LAI, TDM, HDM and deficit for Wheat cv. SST 825, Pivot Major, winter season 2000.....	147
Figure 6.3 Simulated (solid lines) and measured (symbols) LAI of crops rotated between 1997/98 and 2006 for Pivot Major	148
Figure 6.4 Simulated (solid lines) and measured (symbols) TDM and HDM of crops rotated between 1997/98 and 2006 for site Major.....	148
Figure 6.5 Simulated (solid lines) and measured (symbols) soil water deficit to field capacity (Major, 1997/98-2006), positive values are deficits and negative values indicate that the profile is wetter than field capacity	149

Figure 6.6 Observed and simulated concentration of Ca, SO ₄ and Mg for Major and Pivot Four	151
Figure 6.7 Simulated (solid lines) and CC or WFD (symbols) for concentration of Ca, Na, Mg, K, Cl and SO ₄ in the soil solution at a depth of 0.4 m in the Eragrostis field (January 2002 - March 2003).....	152
Figure 6.8 Observed and simulated EC _e (mS m ⁻¹) for Pivot Major (1997-2006)	153
Figure 6.9 Predicted root density weighted soil saturated EC _e of pastures irrigated with Na ₂ SO ₄ rich mine effluent for 20 years using three different irrigation strategies (three arbitrary years at the beginning of the simulated period are shown).....	162
Figure 6.10 Simulated root density weighted soil saturated EC _e of a barley-cotton rotation irrigated at a threshold deficit of 15 mm with NaHCO ₃ deep aquifer water for three arbitrarily chosen years	163
Figure 6.11 Simulated root density weighted soil saturated EC _e of a barley-cotton rotation irrigated at a 23% LF and threshold deficit of 15 mm, compared to Maas & Hoffman (1977) norms for a 90% yield potential	164
Figure 7.1 Diagrammatic representation of runoff and salt mixing with runoff.....	173
Figure 7.2 Runoff parameter (Rop) estimated from cumulative (cum) rainfall plus irrigation and cumulative runoff for several storm and runoff events	174
Figure 7.3 Model calibration for runoff quantity and quality for Pivot TWF (a) and (b), and Pivot Major (c) and (d), Summer season 2000/01. MAE is mean absolute error and D is Wilmotts' index of agreement	176
Figure 7.4 Predicted and measured runoff quantity and quality 2002-2006	178



LIST OF SYMBOLS AND ACRONYMS

AMD	Acid Mine Drainage
CBM	Coal bed methane
CEC	Cation Exchange Capacity
D	Wilmot's index of agreement
DOY	Day of the year
DRIS	Diagnosis and Recommendation Integrated Systems
EC	Irrigation water salinity
EC _e	Soil saturated paste extract
EC _{iw}	irrigation water salinity
ESP	Exchangeable Sodium Percentage
ET	Evapotranspiration
HDM	Harvestable Dry Matter
HDM	Harvestable Dry Matter
LAI	Leaf Area Index
LF	Leaching Fraction
LR	Leaching Requirement
MAE	Mean Absolute Error
r ²	Coefficient of determination
RD	Root Depth
RMSE	Root Mean Square Error
SAR	Sodium Adsorption Ratio
SCS-CN	Soil Conservation Services Curve Number
SD	Standard deviation
SR	Sufficiency Range
SWB	Soil Water Balance
TDM	Top Dry Matter
TDM	Top Dry Matter
TDS	Total dissolved salts
WFDs	Wetting Front Detectors