

**DEVELOPMENT OF UPDATED DESIGN NORMS FOR SOIL AND
WATER CONSERVATION STRUCTURES IN THE SUGAR INDUSTRY
OF SOUTH AFRICA**

by

DANIEL OTIM

Submitted in partial fulfilment of the academic requirements of

Doctor of Philosophy

in Agricultural Engineering
School of Engineering
College of Agriculture, Engineering and Science
University of KwaZulu-Natal
Pietermaritzburg
South Africa

February 2020

PREFACE

The research contained in this thesis was completed by the candidate while based in the Discipline of Agricultural Engineering, School of Engineering of the College of Agriculture, Engineering and Science, University of KwaZulu-Natal, Pietermaritzburg, South Africa. The research was financially supported by South African Sugarcane Research Institute.

The contents of this work have not been submitted in any form to another university and, except where the work of others is acknowledged in the text, the results reported are due to investigations by the candidate.



Signed: Professor JC Smithers

Date: 6 May 2020

DECLARATION 1: PLAGIARISM

I, Daniel Otim, declare that:

- i. the research reported in this dissertation, except where otherwise indicated or acknowledged, is my original work;
- ii. this dissertation has not been submitted in full or in part for any degree or examination to any other university;
- iii. this dissertation does not contain other persons' data, pictures, graphs or other information, unless specifically acknowledged as being sourced from other persons;
- iv. this dissertation does not contain other persons' writing, unless specifically acknowledged as being sourced from other researchers. Where other written sources have been quoted, then:
 - (a) their words have been re-written but the general information attributed to them has been referenced;
 - (b) where their exact words have been used, their writing has been placed inside quotation marks, and referenced;
- v. where I have used material for which publications followed, I have indicated in detail my role in the work;
- vi. this thesis is primarily a collection of material, prepared by myself, published as journal articles or presented as a poster and oral presentations at conferences. In some cases, additional material has been included;
- vii. this dissertation does not contain text, graphics or tables copied and pasted from the Internet, unless specifically acknowledged, and the source being detailed in the dissertation and in the References sections.



Signed: D Otim

Date: 6th May 2020

DECLARATION 2: PUBLICATIONS

My role in each paper and presentation is indicated. The * indicates corresponding author.

The following are the list of publications in this thesis:

Chapter 2

Otim, D*, Smithers, JC, Senzanje, A and van Antwerpen, R. 2019b. Design norms for soil and water conservation structures in the sugar industry of South Africa. *Water SA* 45 (1): 29-40.

Chapter 3

Otim, D*, Smithers, JC, Senzanje, A and van Antwerpen, R. 2019a. Assessment of trends in run-off and sediment yield from catchments under sugarcane production and management practices*. *International Sugar Journal* 121 (1443): 216-219.

Chapter 4

Otim, D*, Smithers, J, Senzanje, A and van Antwerpen, R. "In press". Verification of runoff volume, peak discharge and sediment yield simulated using the ACRU model for bare fallow and sugarcane fields. *Water SA* "In press".

Chapter 5

Otim, D*, Smithers, JC, Senzanje, A, van Antwerpen, R and Thornton-Dibb, SLC. "In press". Development and assessment of an updated tool for the design of soil and water conservation structures in the sugar industry of South Africa. *Agricultural Engineering International: CIGR Journal* "In press".

Chapter 6

Otim, D*, Smithers, JC, Senzanje, A and van Antwerpen, R. “In press”. Investigation of system design criteria for extreme events leading to most soil loss and the economic impact of varying design return periods. *Applied Engineering in Agriculture* “In press”.

Chapter 7

Otim, D*, Smithers, JC, Senzanje, A and van Antwerpen, R. “In press”. Impacts of soil and water conservation structures on stream flow reduction in the sugar industry of South Africa. *Water SA* “In press”.

The following papers were presented at national and international conferences:

Otim, D*, Smithers, J, Senzanje, A. and van Antwerpen, R. 2019. Verification of runoff volume, peak discharge and sediment yield simulated using the ACRU model for bare fallow and sugarcane fields. In *Proc. of the Proceedings of the Annual Congress-South African Sugar Technologists' Association*, 77-81.

Otim, D*, Smithers, JC, Senzanje, A and van Antwerpen, R. 2018. Assessment of trends in rainfall and runoff at the La Mercy catchments under bare fallow conditions and sugarcane production. In: eds. Akdeniz, RC and Yaldiz, O, *CIGR 2018 XIX. World Congress of CIGR Program and Abstracts' Book*, 201. CIGR, Antalya, Turkey. 22 – 25 April, 2018.

Otim, D*, Smithers, JC, Senzanje, A and van Antwerpen, R. 2018. Verification of runoff volume and peak discharge from sugarcane fields simulated using the ACRU model. In: eds. Akdeniz, R and Yaldiz, O, *CIGR 2018 XIX. World Congress of CIGR Program and Abstracts' Book*, 46. CIGR, Antalya, Turkey. 22 – 25 April, 2018.

Otim, D*, Smithers, JC, Senzanje, A and van Antwerpen, R. 2018. Assessment of trends in runoff and sediment yield from catchments under sugarcane production and management practices. *Proceedings of South Africa Sugar Technologists' Association*, 98-102. SASTA, Durban, RSA. 14 – 16 August, 2018.

Otim, D*, Smithers, JC, Senzanje, A and van Antwerpen, R.2018. Assessment of trends in runoff, peak discharge and sediment yield from catchments under sugarcane production and management practices. South African Institute of Agricultural Engineers (SAIAE) Symposium and Biennial CPD Event. Durban North, South Africa. 17 – 20, September 2018.

In all the above papers and manuscripts, I reviewed, summarised and synthesised the literature and wrote the papers and manuscripts. My co-authors, Prof JC Smithers, Dr A Senzanje and Prof R van Antwerpen provided guidance and reviewed the papers and manuscripts.

Mr SLC Thornton-Dibb contributed to the manuscript in Chapter 5 by setting up and automating the Agricultural Catchments Research Unit (*ACRU*) model, thus enabling timely and speedy simulations.



Signed: D Otim

Date: 6th May 2020

ABSTRACT

Sugarcane in South Africa is grown on wide-ranging soils, sometimes in non-ideal climates and on steep topographies where soils are vulnerable to erosion. A consequence of unsustainable soil loss is reduction in field production capacity. Sugarcane fields are protected against erosion through, *inter alia*, the use of engineered contour banks, waterways and spill-over roads. A comparison of design norms in the National Soil Conservation Manual and norms used in the sugar industry clearly shows discrepancies (*e.g.* maximum slope and cover factor of sugarcane) that need to be investigated. Furthermore, the sugar industry design nomograph was developed based on an unsustainable soil loss limit, does not include any regional variations of climate and the impact on soil erosion and runoff and does not include vulnerability during break cropping. The aim of this research was to develop updated design norms for soil and water conservation structures in the sugar industry of South Africa. Many soil loss models exist, of which empirical models are the most robust and provide stable performances. The Modified Universal Soil Loss Equation (MUSLE) which is embedded in the Agricultural Catchments Research Unit (*ACRU*) model, estimates event-based soil erosion and, given that the majority of soil erosion occurs during a few extreme events annually, the design norms were updated using the MUSLE. The *ACRU* model is a daily time step, physical-conceptual agrohydrological model. Runoff volume, peak discharge and sediment yield were simulated with the *ACRU* model and verified against the respective observed data. The results showed good correlations and the *ACRU* model can be confidently applied in the development of updated design norms for soil and water conservation structures in the sugar industry of South Africa. The *ACRU* model was used to conduct simulations for the different practices in the sugar industry and the results used to build the updated tool for the design of soil and water conservation structures in the sugar industry of South Africa, using MS Access with a background database and a graphical user interface. The updated tool is robust, based on sustainable soil loss limits, includes regional variations of climate and their impact on soil erosion and runoff and also includes vulnerability during break cropping. It is more representative of conditions in the sugar industry of South Africa and therefore recommended for use in place of the current sugar industry design norms. The results also indicate that soil and water conservation structures result in insignificant reductions in stream flow and would not likely necessitate their declaration as Stream Flow Reduction (SFR) activities as contained in the National Water Act of South Africa. Consequently, a 20 year return period is

recommended for the design of soil and water conservation structures and the cost implication of varying design return periods from the minimum 10 year return period to the 20 year return period ranges from 16% to 35% across the four homogenous regions in the sugar industry of South Africa.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am highly indebted to South African Sugarcane Research Institute (SASRI) for funding this research. Without this funding it would not have been possible for me to pursue studies at the University of KwaZulu-Natal (UKZN).

I also wish to express my gratitude to the following persons and institutions for the support granted during this study:

- a) Prof JC Smithers, my supervisor, for the guidance, continuous support and positive energy during this study. Thank you.
- b) Dr A Senzanje and Prof R van Antwerpen, my co-supervisors for their endless support, input and advice.
- c) Prof RE Schulze for his expert opinions and guidance at the various stages.
- d) Mr N Davis for extracting and collating climatic data from the relevant data bases.
- e) Mr SLC Thornton-Dibb for his assistance in setting up and automating the Agricultural Catchments Research Unit (*ACRU*) model, thus enabling timely and speedy simulations.
- f) Mrs K Smithers for her assistance in reviewing and refining the algorithms embedded in the Contour Spacing Design Tool (*CoSDT*).
- g) Dr P Tweddle from SASRI for guidance in costing soil and water conservation structures.
- h) Ms I Thompson and Ms A Makhaye from SASRI and Mr D Wilkinson and Ms N Gumede from Noodsberg Cane Growers Association for provision of Land Use Plans for various areas in the sugar industry.
- i) UKZN for availing office space, internet access and stationary.
- j) My family and colleagues for the support and encouragement extended to me throughout this study.
- k) My parents, Dan and Kate Opito, for the support they have continued to give me in my pursuit of quality education.
- l) My wife, Josephine, and our two children for their love, patience and support, including the numerous sacrifices made while I accomplished my studies. I love you.

Above all, acknowledgement goes to God, my Heavenly Father for giving me the opportunity, knowledge, strength and wisdom to pursue my studies. All glory and honour is yours. Amen.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE.....	ii
DECLARATION 1: PLAGIARISM	iii
DECLARATION 2: PUBLICATIONS	iv
ABSTRACT.....	vii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	ix
LIST OF TABLES	xvii
LIST OF FIGURES	xx
LIST OF ACRONYMS	xxiv
1 INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Background.....	1
1.2 Rationale	2
1.3 Aim	3
1.4 Specific Objectives	3
1.5 Originality of the Study	3
1.6 Outline of thesis structure	4
1.7 References.....	5
2 DESIGN NORMS FOR SOIL AND WATER CONSERVATION STRUCTURES IN THE SUGAR INDUSTRY OF SOUTH AFRICA.....	7
Abstract.....	7
2.1 Introduction.....	8
2.2 Agronomic Practices in the Sugarcane Production System.....	11
2.2.1 Land preparation	11
2.2.2 Planting	11
2.2.3 Weed, Pest and Disease Control	12
2.2.4 Harvesting	12
2.3 Design for Soil and Water Conservation Structures	13
2.3.1 Hydrologic design.....	13
2.3.2 Hydraulic Design	16
2.3.2.1 Contour bank design.....	16

2.4	Models for Soil Erosion Estimation.....	24
2.5	Climate Change Impacts on Design Floods.....	28
2.6	Discussion and Conclusions	29
2.7	References.....	32
3	ASSESSMENT OF RELATIONSHIPS IN RUNOFF, PEAK DISCHARGE AND SEDIMENT YIELD AT THE LA MERCY CATCHMENTS LOCATED IN SOUTH AFRICA UNDER BAREFALLOW CONDITIONS AND SUGARCANE PRODUCTION	41
	Abstract.....	41
3.1	Introduction.....	42
3.2	Impact of Management Practices on Hydrological Responses under Bare Fallow and Sugarcane Production Conditions.....	43
3.3	Impact of Land Use Practices on Sediment Yield under Bare Fallow and Sugarcane Production Conditions	45
3.4	Data and Methods	45
	3.4.1 Study area.....	46
	3.4.2 Data.....	49
	3.4.3 Assessment of data relationships	50
3.5	Results and Discussion	51
	3.5.1 Rainfall consistency test	51
	3.5.2 Daily runoff versus daily rainfall.....	52
	3.5.3 Event rainfall versus event runoff.....	54
	3.5.3.1 Accumulated runoff volume.....	56
	3.5.4 Daily peak discharge.....	60
	3.5.4.1 Relationships between event peak discharge and event runoff	61
	3.5.5 Event sediment yield.....	63
	3.5.6 Relationships between accumulated sediment yield.....	66
3.6	Conclusions.....	68
3.7	Acknowledgements.....	71
3.8	References.....	71
3.9	Appendix 3.1: Inconsistent Rainfall and Runoff Data at the La Mercy Catchments ..	75
3.10	Appendix 3.2: Inconsistent Peak Discharge Data at the La Mercy Catchments	78
3.11	Appendix 3.3: Inconsistent Sediment Yield Events at the La Mercy Catchments under Sugarcane Cover Conditions.....	82
4	VERIFICATION OF RUNOFF VOLUME, PEAK DISCHARGE AND SEDIMENT YIELD SIMULATED USING THE ACRU MODEL FOR BARE FALLOW AND SUGARCANE FIELDS	83

Abstract.....	83
4.1 Introduction.....	84
4.2 Simulation of Stormflow Volume, Peak Discharge and sediment Yield in the <i>ACRU</i> Model.....	85
4.2.1 Stormflow volume	86
4.2.2 Peak discharge	87
4.2.3 Sediment yield	88
4.3 Data and Methods	89
4.3.1 Study area.....	89
4.3.2 Data.....	91
4.3.3 Model verification and performance.....	92
4.3.3.1 Simulation and verification of daily runoff volume	93
4.3.3.2 Simulation and verification of daily peak discharge	93
4.3.3.3 Simulation and verification of daily sediment yield.....	94
4.4 Results and Discussion	95
4.4.1 Verification of runoff volume	95
4.4.2 Verification of daily peak discharge	108
4.4.3 Verification of daily sediment yield	109
4.5 Conclusions.....	110
4.6 Acknowledgements.....	112
4.7 References.....	112
4.8 Appendix 4.1: <i>ACRU</i> Variables used in the Simulation of Runoff Volume	117
4.9 Appendix 4.2: The MUSLE Parameters used in the Simulation of Sediment Yield. .119	
4.10 Appendix 4.3: Sediment Yield Events used in Final Verification at the La Mercy Catchments under Sugarcane Land Cover	120
5 DEVELOPMENT AND ASSESSMENT OF AN UPDATED TOOL FOR THE DESIGN OF SOIL AND WATER CONSERVATION STRUCTURES IN THE SUGAR INDUSTRY OF SOUTH AFRICA.....	122
5.1 Introduction.....	123
5.2 The MUSLE.....	125
5.3 Data and Methods	128
5.3.1 Study area.....	128
5.3.2 Methodology	131
5.3.2.1 Data	132
5.3.2.2 Identification of relatively homogeneous regions.....	132
5.3.2.3 Selection of daily weather stations.....	132
5.3.2.4 Selection and parameterisation of soils.....	133

5.3.2.5	Simulation scenarios and parameterisation	134
5.3.2.6	Development of an updated tool for the design of soil and water conservation structures and checking the adequacy of existing designs in the sugar industry of South Africa	135
5.3.2.7	Analysis of relationships in accumulated annual rainfall and runoff across different relatively homogenous climatic zones.....	136
5.3.2.8	Analysis of regional variations of climate on sediment yield	137
5.3.2.9	Analysis of variation of sediment yield across different soil types.....	137
5.3.2.10	Comparison of designs from the CoSDT and the current sugar industry design nomograph for spacing of contour banks	137
5.4	Results and Discussion	138
5.4.1	Relationships in accumulated annual rainfall and runoff across different homogenous climatic zones.....	138
5.4.2	Impact of regional variations of climate on sediment yield.....	140
5.4.3	Impact of soil texture on sediment yield.....	141
5.4.4	Comparison of designs from the CoSDT and the current sugar industry design nomograph for spacing of contour banks	147
5.4.5	Comparison of designs from LUPs prepared by specialists in the sugar industry and designs from the CoSDT.....	151
5.4.5.1	North Coast	152
5.4.5.2	South Coast	154
5.4.5.3	Zululand and Irrigated region.....	156
5.4.5.4	Midlands region.....	158
5.5	Conclusions.....	161
5.6	Acknowledgements.....	163
5.7	References.....	163
5.8	Appendix 5.1: SASRI Design Nomograph.....	169
5.9	Appendix 5.2: Slope-Effect Chart.....	170
5.10	Appendix 5.3: ACRU Parameters for the Simulation Scenarios used in the Development of the CoSDT for the Design of Soil and Water Conservation Structures in the Sugar Industry of South Africa	171
6	INVESTIGATION OF SYSTEM DESIGN CRITERIA AND THE ECONOMIC IMPACT OF VARYING DESIGN RETURN PERIODS FOR SOIL AND WATER CONSERVATION STRUCTURES	180
6.1	Introduction.....	181
6.1.1	Risk and return period.....	182
6.1.2	Hydraulic design of soil and water conservation structures	183
6.1.3	Costs of soil and water conservation structures	183

6.2	Methods and Assumptions	185
6.2.1	Distribution of sediment yield events	185
6.2.2	Investigation of relationships between large sediment yield events and the associated rainfall, runoff and peak discharge events	185
6.2.3	Investigation of the economic impact of varying design return periods.....	186
6.3	Results and Discussion	187
6.3.1	Event sediment yield distributions.....	187
6.3.2	Relationships between extreme events of sediment yield and the rainfall, runoff and peak discharge events associated with them.....	194
6.3.3	Economic impact of varying design return periods across different homogenous climatic zones	198
6.4	Discussion and Conclusions	200
6.5	Acknowledgements.....	201
6.6	References.....	201
7	IMPACTS OF SOIL AND WATER CONSERVATION STRUCTURES ON STREAM FLOW REDUCTION IN THE SUGAR INDUSTRY OF SOUTH AFRICA	204
7.1	Introduction.....	205
7.2	Methods and Assumptions.....	207
7.2.1	Impacts of soil and water conservation structures on stream flow reductions in the sugar industry.....	208
7.2.2	Relationships in stream flow reductions due to soil and water conservation structures across different homogenous climatic zones	208
7.3	Results and Discussion	208
7.3.1	Impacts of soil and water conservation structures on stream flow reductions	208
7.3.2	Relationships in stream flow reductions due to soil and water conservation structures across different homogenous climatic zones	215
7.4	Conclusions.....	217
7.5	References.....	217
7.6	Appendix 7.1: Total Stream Flows and Stream Flow Reductions.....	220
8	DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH.....	223
8.1	Study Objectives	223
8.2	Review of Design Norms for Soil and Water Conservation Structures in the Sugar Industry	223
8.3	Verification of Runoff Volume, Peak Discharge and Sediment Yield.....	225
8.4	Development and Assessment of an Updated Tool for the Design of Soil and Water Conservation Structures in the Sugar Industry of South Africa	226

8.5	System Design Criteria and the Economic Impact of Varying Design Return Periods	228
8.6	Impacts of Soil and Water Conservation Structures on Stream Flow Reduction Activities in the Sugar Industry of South Africa	229
8.7	Achievement of Objectives and Novel Aspects of the Study	230
8.8	Trends in Runoff, Peak Discharge and Sediment Yield from Catchments under Bare Fallow Conditions and Sugarcane Production	231
8.9	Recommendations for Further Research.....	232

LIST OF TABLES

	Page
Table 2.1 Soil loss tolerances in South Africa	18
Table 2.2 Comparison of South African design norms and norms used in the USA and Australia	22
Table 3.1 Characteristics and management practices of the La Mercy catchments (after Platford and Thomas, 1985)	46
Table 3.2 Soil type distributions in the La Mercy catchments (after Platford and Thomas, 1985; Smithers et al., 1995; Smithers et al., 1996; van Antwerpen et al., 2013).....	48
Table 3.3 Effects of catchment slope, overland flow path, soil type, tillage practice and conservation structures on runoff at the La Mercy catchments under sugarcane land cover.....	59
Table 3.4 Soil erodibility and crop cover factors for each of the La Mercy Catchments	67
Table 3.5 Effects of catchment characteristics and management practices on runoff, peak discharge and sediment yield	70
Table 3.6 Inconsistent rainfall and runoff data at the La Mercy catchments.....	75
Table 3.7 Inconsistent peak discharge data at the La Mercy catchments under bare fallow and sugarcane cover conditions	78
Table 3.8 Inconsistent sediment yield data at the La Mercy catchments under sugarcane cover conditions	82
Table 4.1 Characteristics and management practices of the La Mercy catchments (after Platford and Thomas, 1985; Smithers et al., 1996)	90
Table 4.2 Soil type distributions in the La Mercy catchments (after Platford and Thomas, 1985; Smithers et al., 1996)	91
Table 4.3 Estimated time of concentration	94
Table 4.4 The cover management factor (C) for sugarcane (after Smithers et al., 1996).....	95
Table 4.5 Regression statistics for simulated vs observed runoff, peak discharge and sediment yield	111
Table 4.6 Soil variable and parameter selections (after Smithers et al., 1996).....	117
Table 4.7 MUSLE parameters used for the simulation of sediment yield.....	119
Table 4.8 Sediment yield events used in final verification at the La Mercy catchments under sugarcane cover.....	120
Table 5.1 Representative weather stations for the sugarcane growing regions (Schulze and Davis, 2018)	133

Table 5.2 Simulation scenarios used in the updated design norms for soil and water conservation structures	134
Table 5.3 Select scenarios designed with the CoSDT and the current sugar industry design nomograph for spacing of contour banks.....	147
Table 5.4 Parameters from the CoSDT and the current sugar industry design nomograph	149
Table 5.5 Designs from LUPs and the CoSDT for spacing of contour banks in the North Coast.....	152
Table 5.6 Designs from LUPs and the CoSDT for spacing of contour banks in the South Coast.....	155
Table 5.7 Designs from LUPs and the CoSDT for spacing of contour banks in Zululand and Irrigated region	156
Table 5.8 Parameters from the CoSDT and the specialists’ design nomograph.....	157
Table 5.9 Designs from LUPs and the CoSDT for spacing of contour banks in Midlands region....	159
Table 5.10 Crop factors, <i>C</i> for sugarcane (after Smithers et al., 1996)	171
Table 5.11 Soil and streamflow variable and parameter selections for the <i>ACRU</i> model (Smithers <i>et al.</i> , 1995; Smithers <i>et al.</i> , 1996; Botha <i>et al.</i> , 1999; Lumsden <i>et al.</i> , 2003)	171
Table 5.12 Soil erodibility factors, <i>K</i> (Lorentz and Schulze, 1995; Smithers <i>et al.</i> , 1995).....	173
Table 5.13 <i>ACRU</i> model variables for sugarcane under different geographical and management conditions (Schulze, 2013).....	173
Table 5.14 Support practices factors, <i>P</i> (Lorentz and Schulze, 1995; Renard <i>et al.</i> , 1997)	173
Table 5.15 Topographic factors, <i>LS</i> (Lorentz and Schulze, 1995; Renard <i>et al.</i> , 1997).....	175
Table 5.16 Crop factor, <i>C</i> for green manure crops (Schulze, 1995b; Smithers and Schulze, 1995; Renard <i>et al.</i> , 1997).....	176
Table 5.17 <i>ACRU</i> model variables for cover crops (Smithers <i>et al.</i> , 1995; Schulze, 2018).....	177
Table 5.18 Crop factor, <i>C</i> for sugarcane depending on method of harvesting (Platford, 1987; Schulze, 1995b)	177
Table 5.19 Rainfall distribution type, 1 day, 2 year maximum rainfall, intensity multiplication factor and the 30 minute,2 year rainfall intensity for the different homogenous regions (Schulze, 1995a)	177
Table 5.20 Catchment lag times for the different homogenous regions (Schulze, 1995a).....	177
Table 6.1 Machinery and equipment costs for construction of soil and water conservation structures (after SASRI, 2019b)	184
Table 6.2 Top five (0.2%) sediment yield events in the four regions.....	193
Table 6.3 Extreme events of sediment yield and the rainfall, runoff and peak discharge events associated with them in the four regions for a “no structure, conventional tillage, no green manuring, burnt, re-burnt harvesting practice and 40% slope” scenario	196

Table 6.4 Sediment yield and the rainfall, runoff and peak discharge events associated with them in the four regions for a “no structure, conventional tillage, green manuring, burnt, re-burnt harvesting practice and 40% slope” scenario.....	197
Table 6.5 5 t.ha ⁻¹ sediment yield events simulated for a “no structure, conventional tillage, no green manuring, burnt, re-burnt harvesting practice and 40% slope” scenario and the rainfall, runoff and peak discharge events associated with them in the four regions.....	197
Table 6.6 Hydraulic sections and design implementation costs of soil and water conservation structures in the four homogenous climatic zones in the sugar industry of South Africa	199
Table 7.1 Variation of SFRs as a percentage of MAR from baseline activities in the South Coast, Midlands, and Zululand and Irrigated regions	210
Table 7.2 Total stream flows and SFRs due to soil and water conservation structures in sugarcane fields.....	220

LIST OF FIGURES

	Page
Figure 2.1 Nomograph for determining contour bank spacing in sugarcane fields (Platford, 1987) ..	19
Figure 2.2 Impact of soil loss on crop yield (Russell, 1998b)	20
Figure 2.3 Nomograph for contour bank spacing (van Staden and Smithen, 1989).....	21
Figure 3.1 Layout of the La Mercy catchments (Platford and Thomas, 1985).....	46
Figure 3.2 Weather stations within the vicinity of the La Mercy catchments	50
Figure 3.3 (a, b) Accumulated daily and (c, d) daily rainfall consistency plots: Base stations vs La Mercy	52
Figure 3.4 Daily runoff vs Daily rainfall: La Mercy catchments, Bare fallow conditions	53
Figure 3.5 Daily runoff vs Daily rainfall: La Mercy catchments, Sugarcane cover	54
Figure 3.6 Observed runoff vs rainfall for discrete events: La Mercy catchments, bare fallow	55
Figure 3.7 Observed runoff vs rainfall for discrete events: La Mercy catchments, sugarcane cover..	55
Figure 3.8 Accumulated daily runoff: La Mercy catchments, bare fallow (January 1978 to December 1983)	56
Figure 3.9 Accumulated daily runoff: La Mercy catchments, sugarcane production (January 1986 to December 1995).....	58
Figure 3.10 Daily peak discharge vs daily peak rainfall intensity: La Mercy catchments, Sugarcane cover, inconsistent events included (January 1986 to December 1995)	61
Figure 3.11 Daily peak discharge vs daily runoff: La Mercy catchments, Sugarcane cover, inconsistent events included (January 1986 to December 1995).....	61
Figure 3.12 Relationships between peak discharge and runoff events: La Mercy catchments, Sugarcane cover, inconsistent events excluded (January 1986 to December 1995).....	62
Figure 3.13 Event sediment yield vs event rainfall: La Mercy catchments, Sugarcane cover	63
Figure 3.14 Sediment yield vs event runoff: La Mercy catchments, Sugarcane cover, high sediment yield events circled.....	64
Figure 3.15 Accumulated sediment yield: La Mercy catchments, sugarcane cover.....	68
Figure 4.1 The <i>ACRU</i> agrohydrological modelling system (Smithers and Schulze, 1995b)	86
Figure 4.2 Layout of the La Mercy catchments, contour banks and waterways (after Platford and Thomas, 1985)	90
Figure 4.3 Daily rainfall and runoff simulated with the SCDSS: Catchment 101, bare fallow conditions.....	96

Figure 4.4 (a) Simulated vs observed and (b) frequency distribution plots: Daily runoff depths simulated from Catchment 101 under bare fallow cover	96
Figure 4.5 Daily rainfall and runoff simulated with the SCDSS: Catchment 102, bare fallow conditions	97
Figure 4.6 (a) Simulated vs observed and (b) frequency distribution plots: Daily runoff volumes simulated from Catchment 102 under bare fallow cover	98
Figure 4.7 Daily rainfall and runoff simulated with the SCDSS: Catchment 103, bare fallow conditions	99
Figure 4.8 (a) Simulated vs observed and (b) frequency distribution plots: Daily runoff volumes simulated from Catchment 103 under bare fallow cover	99
Figure 4.9 Daily rainfall and runoff simulated with the SCDSS: Catchment 104, bare fallow conditions	100
Figure 4.10 (a) Simulated vs observed and (b) frequency distribution plots: Daily runoff volumes simulated from Catchment 104 under bare fallow cover	100
Figure 4.11 Daily runoff volumes simulated from Catchment 104 under bare fallow cover with observed runoff scaled by a factor of 64 %	101
Figure 4.12 Daily rainfall and runoff simulated with the SCDSS: Catchment 101, sugarcane cover conditions	102
Figure 4.13 (a) Simulated vs observed and (b) frequency distribution plots: Daily runoff volumes simulated from Catchment 101 under sugarcane cover	102
Figure 4.14 Daily rainfall and runoff simulated with the SCDSS: Catchment 102, sugarcane cover conditions	103
Figure 4.15 (a) Simulated vs observed and (b) frequency distribution plots: Daily runoff volumes simulated from Catchment 102 under sugarcane cover	104
Figure 4.16 Daily rainfall and runoff simulated with the SCDSS: Catchment 103, sugarcane cover conditions	105
Figure 4.17 (a) Simulated vs observed and (b) frequency distribution plots: Daily runoff volumes simulated from Catchment 103 under sugarcane cover	105
Figure 4.18 Daily rainfall and runoff simulated with the SCDSS: Catchment 104, sugarcane cover conditions	106
Figure 4.19 (a) Simulated vs observed and (b) frequency distribution plots: Daily runoff volumes simulated from Catchment 104 under sugarcane cover	107
Figure 4.20 Daily runoff volumes simulated from Catchment 104 under sugarcane cover with observed runoff scaled by a factor of 64 %	107

Figure 4.21 Daily peak discharge simulated using observed daily rainfall, simulated stormflow volumes and estimated catchment times of concentration with the Schmidt-Schulze lag equation.....	108
Figure 4.22 Frequency analysis of daily peak discharge for catchments 101, 102, 103 and 104.....	109
Figure 4.23 Daily sediment yield simulated from the La mercy catchments	110
Figure 5.1 Location of sugarcane production areas and mills in South Africa (SASA, 2018b).....	129
Figure 5.2 Regions with different sugarcane growth cycle lengths in South Africa (Schulze, 2013)	130
Figure 5.3 Relatively homogenous climatic zones in the sugar industry of South Africa.....	131
Figure 5.4 MS Access graphical user interface for the design of soil and water conservation structures in the sugar industry of South Africa	136
Figure 5.5 MS Access graphical user interface for checking the adequacy of existing designs in the sugar industry of South Africa	136
Figure 5.6 Relationships in accumulated annual rainfall from sugarcane fields across the different relatively homogenous climatic zones	139
Figure 5.7 Relationships in accumulated annual runoff from sugarcane fields across the different relatively homogenous climatic zones	139
Figure 5.8 Relationships in accumulated annual sediment yield from sugarcane fields across the different homogenous climatic zones	141
Figure 5.9 Relationships in accumulated annual sediment yield from different soils in the North Coast region	142
Figure 5.10 Relationships in accumulated annual sediment yield from different soils in the Midlands region	142
Figure 5.11 Frequency distribution of daily rainfall in the four regions	145
Figure 5.12 Daily peak discharge in the four regions.....	146
Figure 5.13 Variation of MUSLE storm flow factors in the four regions	149
Figure 5.14 Variation of MUSLE <i>C</i> factors in the four regions	151
Figure 5.15 SASRI design nomograph for vertical intervals.....	169
Figure 5.16 SASRI design nomograph for panel widths	169
Figure 5.17 Slope-effect chart (Wischmeier and Smith, 1978)	170
Figure 6.1 Number of sediment yield events on an annual basis.....	189
Figure 6.2 Event sediment yield distribution in the four homogenous climatic zones.....	190
Figure 6.3 Sediment yield summed from individual events on an annual basis.....	191
Figure 6.4 Annual sediment yield distribution in the four homogenous climatic regions.....	192

Figure 6.5 Economic impact of varying return periods	198
Figure 7.1 SFRs due to soil and water conservation structures in sugarcane fields in the North Coast region	209
Figure 7.2 SFRs due to soil and water conservation structures in sugarcane fields in the South Coast region	212
Figure 7.3 SFRs due to soil and water conservation structures in sugarcane fields in the Midlands region	213
Figure 7.4 SFRs due to soil and water conservation structures in sugarcane fields in the Zululand and Irrigated region.....	214
Figure 7.5 Relationships of SFRs due to soil and water conservation structures in sugarcane fields in the various homogenous regions.....	216

LIST OF ACRONYMS

<i>ACRU</i>	Agricultural Catchments Research Unit
ARC	Agricultural Research Council
CARA	Conservation of Agricultural Resources Act
CoSDT	Contour Spacing Design Tool
DAERD	Department of Agriculture, Environmental Affairs and Rural Development
DARD	Department of Agriculture and Rural Development
DAWS	Department of Agriculture and Water Supply
KZN	KwaZulu – Natal
LUP	Land Use Plan
MAP	Mean Annual Precipitation
MAR	Mean Annual Runoff
MUSLE	Modified Universal Soil Erosion Equation
NRCS	Natural Resources Conservation Service
NVFFA	National Veld and Forest Fire Act
NWA	National Water Act
RUSLE	Revised Universal Soil Erosion Equation
SA	South Africa
SASA	South African Sugar Association
SASEX	South African Sugar Association Experiment Station
SASRI	South African Sugarcane Research Institute
SCDSS	Sugarcane Decision Support System
SCS	Soil Conservation Service
SCS-SA	Soil Conservation Service – South Africa
SFR	Stream Flow Reduction
SFRA	Stream Flow Reduction Activities
SLEMSA	Soil Loss Estimator for Southern Africa
UKZN	University of KwaZulu – Natal
USDA	United States Department of Agriculture
USLE	Universal Soil Erosion Equation

1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter contains background to the study on the development of updated design norms for soil and water conservation structures in the sugar industry in South Africa. It covers the rationale, objectives of the study that include the research aim and specific objectives and an outline of the thesis structure.

1.1 Background

Soil erosion is a serious problem emanating from a combination of agricultural intensification, soil degradation and intense rainstorms (Amore *et al.*, 2004). Moreover, when the rate of soil loss is unsustainable, it leads to a reduction in crop yield and hence the need to limit soil losses to sustainable levels (Russell, 1998b). The mechanical means of soil conservation in the South Africa sugar industry is by use of contour banks and waterways (Platford, 1987), and the standards and guidelines for the design of soil conservation structures were published by SASA (2002). The nomograph for the design of soil and water conservation structures in the sugar industry of South Africa was developed by Platford (1987) who used observations from runoff plots and the long term average annual soil loss simulated using the Universal Soil Loss Equation (USLE) (Wischmeier and Smith, 1965; Wischmeier and Smith, 1978). The USLE aggregates soil loss and yet erosion occurs on an event basis (Schulze, 2013). The Modified Universal Soil Loss Equation (MUSLE) (Williams, 1975b) on the other hand is an event based model (Williams and Arnold, 1997).

The sugar industry design norms for spacing of contour banks advocate that specific designs should be used to design soil conservation structures for slopes less than 3% or greater than 30% (Russell, 1994), although the sugar industry design nomograph includes slopes of up to 40% (Platford, 1987; SASA, 2002). There are also differences between the design norms contained in the National Soil Conservation Manual (van Staden and Smithen, 1989; DAWS, 1990) and design norms used in the sugar industry (Platford, 1987; SASA, 2002) (*e.g.* maximum slope and cover factors for sugarcane). In addition, a 10 year return period is specified by SASA (2002) for the design of soil and water conservation structures. The sugar industry design nomograph does not (Smithers, 2014):