

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT OF WINERY EFFLUENT IN THE WESTERN AND NORTHERN CAPE PROVINCES

by

AZWIMBAVHI RECKSON MULIDZI

Mini - dissertation presented in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree

of

Magister Institutionis Agriculturae in Land Use Planning

In the Department of Plant Production and Soil Science
Faculty of Natural and Agricultural Sciences
University of Pretoria

Supervisor: Prof M.C. Laker

Co-supervisor: Mr L.H Van Schoor

May 2001



Declaration

I, the undersigned, hereby declare that the work contained in this dissertation is entirely my own original research and that it has not at any time, either partly or fully, been submitted to any university for the purposes of obtaining a degree.

Signed: ARMulifi Date 20 July 2001



ABSTRACT

This study is an integral part of a multidisciplinary research programme that was started as a result of a lack of information on the disposal practices of winery effluent in South Africa. The objective of this study was to investigate the environmental impacts of winery effluent applied in different ways on different types of soils so that guidelines for the identification and selection of suitable combinations of disposal methods and soil types for land disposal of winery effluent could be developed, and also to propose alternative management strategies which comply with national and international legislation.

Ten wineries were selected for the study. The soil and effluent samples were collected at each winery on a monthly basis and analysed. From the results it was clear that different wineries use different disposal methods and on different soils. The study confirmed that winery effluents pose definite pollution problems. The biggest problem when winery effluent is applied to soil is the high organic matter levels in the effluents during the winemaking period. Most of the soils do not retain it and it leaches straight to a water table at the bottom of the soil profile and from there seeps through to nearby streams or ground water bodies, thereby polluting the environment.

In the study it was found that there are many similarities between wineries but there are also major differences between them such that general recipe cannot be used. From the study it was also clear that deep, highly permeable, sandy soils (especially those with E horizons) are not suitable for disposal of winery effluents, either by means of irrigating pastures or ponding.



ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my sincere thanks to the following:

Prof M.C. Laker and Mr L.H. van Schoor for their assistance, guidance, patience and support with this study and with the preparation of the dissertation.

Mr P.J.E. Louw for his assistance and constructive criticism.

The Agricultural Research Council (ARC) for making this study possible and for permission to use the results for dissertation purposes.

The staff of the Soil Science Section of the ARC – Fruit, Vine and Wine Research Institute for technical assistance.

All wineries which participated in the study. Without their co-operation the study would not have been possible.

Winetech for financial assistance.

Dorah Mulaudzi for her patience and support.

My mother for her support over the years.

My heavenly Father for His grace, power and strength, without which this dissertation would not have been possible.



CONTENTS

| Abstracti |
|---|
| Acknowledgementsii |
| Table of contentsiii |
| List of Figuresvi |
| List of Platesvi |
| List of Tablesvii |
| CHAPTER 1 - INTRODUCTION |
| 1.1 Background |
| 1.2 Problem formulation and objectives of the study |
| 1.3 Structure of the dissertation |
| CHAPTER 2 - LITERATURE REVIEW |
| 2.1 Production and composition of winery wastes5 |
| 2.2 Characteristics of winery effluent6 |
| 2.3 Disposal of winery effluent |
| 2.4 Irrigation with winery effluent |
| 2.5 Disposal of winery effluents in evaporation ponds |
| |
| CHAPTER 3 - RESEARCH METHODOLOGY |
| |
| 3.1 Site selection |
| 3.2 Effluent sampling and analysis21 |
| 3.3 Soil investigations and analysis22 |



CHAPTER 4 - RESULTS AND DISCUSSION PER WINERY

| 4.1 General remark | 25 |
|---|-----|
| 4.2 Paarl 1 winery | 25 |
| 4.3 Paarl 2 winery | 31 |
| 4.4 Paarl 3 winery | 37 |
| 4.5 Stellenbosch winery | |
| 4.6 Robertson 1 winery | 48 |
| 4.7 Robertson 2 winery. | |
| 4.8 Worcester winery | 57 |
| 4.9 Berg river winery | 62 |
| 4.10 Olifants river winery | 69 |
| 4.11 Orange river winery | 74 |
| | |
| CHAPTER 5 - INTEGRATED COMPARATIVE DISCUSSION ON THE | |
| COMPOSITION OF WINERY EFFLUENTS | |
| 5.1 Introduction | 80 |
| 5.2 Effluent pH. | 80 |
| 5.3 COD levels | 81 |
| 5.4 SAR and sodium. | 83 |
| 5.5 EC and chloride. | 84 |
| 5.6 Potassium. | 86 |
| | |
| CHAPTER 6- INTEGRATED COMPARATIVE DISCUSSION ON THE | |
| EFFECTS OF WINERY EFFLUENTS ON SOIL AND POSSI | BLE |
| POLLUTION OF WATER BODIES | |
| 6.1 General | 88 |
| 6.2 Phosphorus trends | 88 |
| 6.3 Potassium trends. | 90 |
| 6.4 ESP trends. | 92 |
| 6.5 Manganese, zinc and copper | 95 |
| 6.6 Response of mineral element levels in soils to levels in effluent | 95 |



CHAPTER 7 - FATE OF ORGANIC COMPONENTS OF WINERY EFFLUENTS IN SOILS

| 7.1 General | 101 |
|---|-----|
| 7.2 Organic substances from the wine making process | 101 |
| 7.3 Observations regarding diatomaceous earth | 108 |
| CHAPTER 8 - CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS | |
| 8.1 Conclusions. | 110 |
| 8.2 Recommendations | 112 |
| REFERENCES | 114 |
| APPENDICES | 120 |



LIST OF FIGURES

| Figure 6.1a | Potassium trend of effluent at Orange river winery | 97 |
|-------------|---|---------|
| Figure 6.1b | Potassium trend of topsoil (0-30cm) at Orange river winery | 97 |
| Figure 6.1c | Potassium trend of subsoil (30-60cm) at Orange river winery | 97 |
| Figure 6.1d | Potassium trend of subsoil (60-90cm) at Orange river winery | 98 |
| | | |
| Figure 6.2a | Sodium trend of effluent at Orange river winery | 99 |
| Figure 6.2b | Sodium trend of topsoil (0-30cm) at Orange river winery | 99 |
| Figure 6.2c | Sodium trend of subsoil (30-60cm) at Orange river winery | 99 |
| Figure 6.2d | Sodium trend of subsoil (60-90cm) at Orange river winery | 100 |
| | | |
| LIST OF P | PLATES | |
| Plate 7.1 | Samples of black soil from the water table at Robertson 1 winery | and |
| | white sand remaining after washing of a similar sample | 103 |
| Plate 7.2 | Samples of black material from the drainage ditch at the disposal | site at |
| | Robertson 1 winery and normal white soil from the disposal site | 104 |



LIST OF TABLES

| Table 2.1 | Conditions to which wastewater must comply for irrigation6 |
|------------|--|
| Table 2.2 | Environmental and social impacts of different wastewater |
| | characteristics |
| | |
| Table 3.1 | Code numbers, code names and disposal methods of wineries21 |
| | |
| Table 4.1 | pH, COD, SAR, EC and Na data for effluent from Paarl 1 winery26 |
| Table 4.2 | K, Ca, Fe, Mg, B and Cl contents of effluent from the Paarl 1 winery27 |
| Table 4.3 | Soil analyses for Paarl 1 winery |
| Table 4.4 | Bulk densities of the soils at Paarl 1 winery31 |
| Table 4.5 | pH, COD, SAR, EC and Na data for effluent from Paarl 2 winery32 |
| Table 4.6 | K, Ca, Fe, Mg, B and Cl contents of effluent from Paarl 2 winery34 |
| Table 4.7 | Soil analyses for Paarl 2 winery |
| Table 4.8 | Bulk density analyses for the soils of Paarl 2 winery35 |
| Table 4.9 | pH, COD, SAR, EC and Na data for effluent from Paarl 3 winery38 |
| Table 4.10 | K, Ca, Fe, Mg, B and Cl contents of effluent from Paarl 3 winery39 |
| Table 4.11 | Soil analyses for Paarl 3 winery41 |
| Table 4.12 | pH, COD, SAR, EC and Na data for effluent from Stellenbosch |
| | winery |
| Table 4.13 | K, Ca, Fe, Mg, B and Cl contents of effluent from Stellenbosch |
| | winery |
| Table 4.14 | Soil analyses for Stellenbosch winery46 |
| Table 4.15 | Bulk densities for the soil at Stellenbosch winery |
| Table 4.16 | pH, COD, SAR, EC and Na data for effluent from Robertson1 winery48 |
| Table 4.17 | K, Ca, Fe, Mg, B and Cl contents of effluent from Robertson1 winery49 |
| Table 4.18 | Soil analyses for Robertson1 winery51 |
| Table 4.19 | Bulk densities for the soil at Robertson1 winery52 |
| Table 4.20 | pH, COD, SAR, EC and Na data for effluent from Robertson2 winery54 |
| Table 4.21 | K, Ca, Fe, Mg, B and Cl contents of effluent from Robertson2 winery55 |

| Table 4.22 | Soil analyses for Robertson 2 winery | 56 |
|------------|---|-----|
| Table 4.23 | pH, COD, SAR, EC and Na data for effluent from Worcester winery | 57 |
| Table 4.24 | K, Ca, Fe, Mg, B and Cl contents of effluent from Worcester winery | 58 |
| Table 4.25 | Soil analyses for Worcester winery | 51 |
| Table 4.26 | Bulk densities for the soil at Worcester winery | 60 |
| Table 4.27 | pH, COD, SAR, EC and Na data for effluent from Berg river winery | 63 |
| Table 4.28 | K, Ca, Fe, Mg, B and Cl contents of effluent from Berg river winery | 64 |
| Table 4.29 | Soil analyses for Berg river winery | 58 |
| Table 4.30 | Bulk densities for the soil at Berg river winery | 66 |
| Table 4.31 | pH, COD, SAR, EC and Na data for effluent from Olifants river | |
| | winery | 59 |
| Table 4.32 | K, Ca, Fe, Mg, B and Cl contents of effluent from Olifants river | |
| | winery | 70 |
| Table 4.33 | Soil analysis for Olifants river winery | 72 |
| Table 4.34 | Bulk densities for the soil at Olifants river winery | 73 |
| Table 4.35 | pH, COD, SAR, EC and Na data for effluent from Orange River | |
| | winery | 75 |
| Table 4.36 | K, Ca, Fe, Mg, B and Cl contents of effluent from Orange River | |
| | winery | 76 |
| Table 4.37 | Soil analysis for Orange River winery | .78 |
| Table 4.38 | Bulk densities for the soil at Orange River winery | 79 |
| | | |
| Table 5.1 | pH values of effluents from different wineries | 81 |
| Table 5.2 | COD values of effluents from different wineries | 81 |
| Table 5.3 | SAR values of effluents from different wineries | 83 |
| Table 5.4 | Sodium levels in effluents from different wineries | 84 |
| Table 5.5 | EC values of effluent from different wineries | 85 |
| Table 5.6 | Chloride levels in effluents from different wineries | .86 |
| Table 5.7 | Potassium values for effluent from different wineries | 87 |

| Table 6.1 | Phosphorus in topsoil (0-30 cm depth) | 90 |
|-----------|--|----|
| Table 6.2 | Phosphorus in subsoil (30-60 cm depth) | 90 |
| Table 6.3 | Phosphorus in subsoil (60-90 cm depth) | 90 |
| Table 6.4 | Potassium in topsoil (0-30 cm depth) | 92 |
| Table 6.5 | Potassium in subsoil (30-60 cm depth) | 92 |
| Table 6.6 | Potassium in subsoil (60-90 cm depth) | 92 |
| Table 6.7 | ESP in topsoil (0-30 cm depth) | 94 |
| Table 6.8 | ESP in subsoil (30-60 cm depth) | 94 |
| Table 6.9 | ESP in subsoil (60-90 cm depth) | 94 |
| | | |