Artificial Intelligence formulated this projection for compatibility purposes from the original article published at Global Journals. However, this technology is currently in beta. *Therefore, kindly ignore odd layouts, missed formulae, text, tables, or figures.*

1	Treatment of Water Drainage for Agriculture
2	Asst. Prof. Kadhim Naief Kadhim Al-Taaee ¹ and Basima Abbas Jabir Al-Humairi ²
3	¹ Bablon University
4	Received: 6 December 2012 Accepted: 3 January 2013 Published: 15 January 2013
5	

6 Abstract

16

7 This research aims to examine the processing water drainage and used for agricultural

⁸ purposes were used samples of water drainage and mixed with samples of river water at

9 different ratios to get water containing salts proportions few were these samples (drainage and

¹⁰ river from region Dujaili / Wasit Governorate) In this research ions were examine (Ca, Na,

¹¹ mg) to find a standard indicator of water quality labeled sodium adsorption ratio (SAR) as

¹² well as examine (EC, PH) was the tests in the laboratory of the College of Agriculture /

¹³ University of Wasit. And compare the results with the system laboratory salinity U.S. (USSL)

¹⁴ system and Food Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO). In this study it was

¹⁵ found that the proportion mixing (10

Index terms— system laboratory salinity, Food Agriculture Organization, salt concentration in the water,
 pH values ??of this water.

¹⁹ 1 Introduction

oth irrigation water quality and proper irrigation management are critical to successful crop production. The 20 quality of the irrigation water may affect both crop yields and soil physical conditions, even if all other conditions 21 and cultural practices are favorable/optimal. In addition, different crops require different irrigation water 22 qualities. Therefore, testing the irrigation water prior to selecting the site and the crops to be grown is critical. 23 The quality of some water sources may change significantly with time or during certain periods (such as in 24 25 dry/rainy seasons), so it is recommended to have more than one sample taken, in different time periods. The 26 parameters which determine the irrigation water quality are divided to three categories: chemical, physical and biological. In this review, the chemical properties of the irrigation water are discussed. The chemical 27 characteristics of irrigation water refer to the content of salts in the water as well as to parameters derived from the 28 composition of salts in the water; parameters such as EC/TDS (Electrical Conductivity/ Total Dissolved Solids), 29 SAR (Sodium Adsorption Ratio) alkalinity and hardness. The primary natural source of salts in irrigation water 30 is mineral weathering of rocks and minerals. Other secondary sources include atmospheric deposition of oceanic 31 salts (salts in rain water), saline water from rising groundwater and the intrusion of sea water into groundwater 32 aquifers. Fertilizer chemicals, which leach to water sources, may also affect the irrigation water quality. 33

The main problem related to irrigation water quality is the water salinity. Water salinity refers to the total 34 amount of salts dissolved in the water but it does not indicate which salts are present in High level of salts in the 35 irrigation water reduces water availability to the crop (because of osmotic pressure) and causes yield reduction. 36 37 Above a certain threshold, reduction in crop yield is proportional to the increase in salinity level. Different 38 crops vary in their tolerance to salinity and therefore have different thresholds and yield reduction rates. ??ohsen 39 Sodium-Adsorption Ratios for Tongue River and its Tributaries, Montana and Wyoming The Tongue River drains an area of about 5,400 square miles and flows northward from its headwaters in the Bighorn National Forest 40 of northeastern Wyoming to join the Yellowstone River at Miles City, Montana. Water from the Tongue River 41 and its tributaries is extensively used for irrigation in both Wyoming and Montana, and show resulting in a 42 high sodium-adsorption ratio (SAR). Disposal of ground water with high sodium concentrations into the Tongue 43 River has the potential to increase salinity and SAR of water in the river, and potentially reduce the quality of 44

water for irrigation purpose. Yaohu ??ang et.al (2010) : studies the effects of drip irrigation with saline water 45 on waxy maize and the Results indicated was the irrigation water with salinity <10.9dS/m did not affect the 46 emergence of waxy maize. As salinity of irrigation water increased, seedling biomass decreased, and the plant 47 48 height, fresh and dry weight of waxy maize in the thinning time decreased by 2% for every 1dS/m increase in salinity of irrigated water. The decreasing rate of the fresh ear yield for every 1 dS/m increase in salinity of 49 irrigation water was about 0. classifications followed were the USSL and FAO systems, and then water suitability 50 for irrigation was evaluated accordingly. The results showed that, all water samples fell within the water class 51 (C3 -S1) according to USSL system. Whereas, in FAO system, the samples fell within the class (increase in 52 salinity hazard) for the salinity hazard; within (no hazard, increase in permeability hazard) for soil permeability 53 based on Eciw and Adj. SAR indicators; within (no hazard and increasing toxicity hazard) for toxicity based on 54 (Na + +Cl -) concentrations; and within (increasing hazard) class for miscellaneous effects of irrigation water 55 based on bicarbonate as showed the high content of (Ca +2 + Mg + 2) comparatively with Na + ions decrease 56 the hazard of residual bicarbonate (RSC) effects, and hence reduce soil ESP values. 57

58 **2** II.

⁵⁹ 3 Characterizing Salinity

There are two common water quality assessments that characterize the salinity of irrigation water. The salinity 60 of irrigation water is sometimes reported as the total salt concentration or total dissolved solids (TDS). The units 61 of TDS are usually expressed in milligrams of salt per liter (mg/L) of water. This term is still used by commercial 62 analytical laboratories and represents the total number of milligrams of salt that would remain after 1liter of 63 64 water is evaporated to dryness. TDS is also often reported as parts per million (ppm) and is the same numerically 65 as mg/L. The higher the TDS, the higher the salinity of the water The other measurement that is documented in water quality reports from commercial labs is specific conductance, also called electrical conductivity (EC). EC 66 is a much more useful measurement than TDS because it can be made instantaneously and easily by irrigators or 67 farm managers in the field. Salts that are dissolved in water conduct electricity, and, therefore, the salt content 68 in the water is directly related to the EC. The EC can be reported based on the irrigation water source (ECw) 69 or on the saturated soil extract (ECe). Units of EC reported by labs are usually in millimhos per centimeter 70 (mmhos/cm) or decisiemens per meter (dS/m). One mmho/cm=1 dS/m. EC is also reported in micrommhos 71 per centimeter (?mhos/cm) (1?mho=1/1000). 72 Often conversions between ECw and TDS are made, but caution is advised because conversion factors depend 73 both on the salinity level and composition of the water (Stephen R. Grattan2002). 74

For example TDS $(mg/L) = 640 \times ECw (dS/m)$ when $ECw < 5 dS/m TDS (mg/L) = 800 \times ECw (dS/m)$ when ECw > 5 dS/m Sulfate salts do not conduct electricity in the same way as other types of salts Therefore, if water contains large quantities of sulfate salts, the conversion factors are invalid and must be adjusted upward.

$_{78}$ 4 III.

⁷⁹ 5 Salinity Effects on Crops

The primary objective of irrigation is to provide a crop with adequate and timely amounts of water, thus avoiding yield loss caused by extended periods of water stress during stages of crop growth that are sensitive to water shortages. However, during repeated irrigations, the salts in the irrigation water can accumulate in the soil, reducing water available to the crop and hastening the onset of a water shortage. Understanding how this occurs will help suggest ways to counter the effect and reduce the probability of a loss in yield.

The plant extracts water from the soil by exerting an absorptive force greater than that which holds the water 85 to the soil. If the plant cannot make sufficient internal adjustment and exert enough force, it is not able to 86 extract sufficient water and will suffer water stress. This happens when the soil becomes too dry. Salt in the 87 soil-water increases the force the plant must exert to extract water and this additional force is referred to as the 88 osmotic effect or osmotic potential. For example, if two otherwise identical soils are at the same water content 89 but one is salt-free and the other is salty, the plant can extract and use more water from the saltfree soil than 90 from the salty soil. The reasons are not easily explained. Salts have an affinity for water. If the water contains 91 92 salt, more energy per unit of water must be expended by the plant to absorb relatively salt-free water from a 93 relatively salty soil-water solution (Ayers and Westcot 1994).

IV. The acidity or basicity of irrigation water is expressed as pH (< 7.0 acidic; > 7.0 basic). The normal pH range for irrigation water is from 6.5 to 8.4.. High pH's above 8.5 are often caused by high bicarbonate (HCO 3 -) and carbonate (CO 3 2 -) concentrations, known as alkalinity. High carbonates cause calcium and magnesium ions to form insoluble minerals leaving sodium as the dominant ion in solution. As described in the sodium hazard section, this alkaline water could intensify the impact of high SAR water on sodic soil conditions. Excessive bicarbonate concentrates can also be problematic for drip or micro-spray irrigation systems when calcite or scale build up causes

¹⁰¹ 6 Irrigation Water Quality Criteria

¹⁰² 7 b) Sodium Hazard

Although plant growth is primarily limited by the salinity (EC w) level of the irrigation water, the application 103 of water with a sodium imbalance can further reduce yield under certain soil texture conditions. Reductions in 104 water infiltration can occur when irrigation water contains high sodium relative to the calcium and magnesium 105 contents. This condition, termed "sodicity," results from excessive soil accumulation of sodium. Sodic water is 106 not the same as saline water. Sodicity causes swelling and dispersion of soil clays, surface crusting and pore 107 plugging. This degraded soil structure condition in turn obstructs infiltration and may increase runoff. Sodicity 108 causes a decrease in the downward movement of water into and through the soil, and actively growing plants 109 roots may not get adequate water, despite pooling of water on the soil surface after irrigation. 110

The most common measure to assess sodicity in water and soil is called the Sodium Adsorption Ratio (SAR). Sodium adsorption ratio (SAR): is a measure of the suitability of water for use in agricultural irrigation, as determined by the concentrations of solids dissolved in the water. It is also a measure of the sodicity of soil,

The SAR defines sodicity in terms of the relative concentration of sodium (Na) compared to the sum of calcium (Ca) and magnesium (Mg) ions in a sample **??**Bauder.et.al 2012).

The SAR assesses the potential for infiltration problems due to a sodium imbalance in irrigation water. The SAR is mathematically written below by equation 1, where Na, Ca and Mg are the concentrations of these ions in milliequivalents per liter (meq/L). Concentrations of these ions in water samples are typically provided in milligrams per liter (mg/L). To convert Na, Ca, and Mg from mg/L to meq/L, you should divide the concentration by 22.9, 20, and 12.15 respectively. Table (1 T Table (1) show the limit for electrical conductivity (EC) Table (1) show the limit for electrical conductivity (EC)

122 8 Experimental Work

In this study, bring samples of water drainage and river water taken from the region Dujaili located in Wasit 123 Governorate shown in figure 1, was taking samples during the month of December after it was mixing water 124 drainage with river water at different ratios to get water containing salts proportions few For example, has the 125 mixing process (90%) of the river water +10% of the water drainage), as well as mixing (80%) of the river water 126 +20% of the water drainage) and also has the mixing process versa where the mixing (90\% of the water drainage 127 +10% river water), as well as mixing (80% of the water drainage +20% of the water of the river) as shown in 128 table No. 3. the mixing process was in closed containers and was the tests in the laboratory of the College of 129 Agriculture / University of Wasit. and has the test process for these samples by device flame photometer and 130 devices PH and EC as shown in the figure 2, 3, 4 have been conducted l analyzes laboratory for these samples 131 has been tested ions (Na, Ca, Mg) calcium and magnesium were estimated in a manner correction and sodium 132 were appreciated your Flame Photometer, estimated electrical conductivity (EC) and the degree of interaction 133 for sample of water using ECmeter and PH-meter then was calculated value sodium adsorption ratio (SAR) by 134 equation 1. 135

¹³⁶ 9 Results and Discussion

The study results showed that the samples water of percentage (10% drainage + 90% River), (20% drainage + 90% River)137 80% River) located within product (s 1) while water of percentage (30% drainage + 70% River), (40% drainage 138 + 60% River), (80% drainage + 20% River), (70% drainage + 30% River), (60% drainage + 40% River) located 139 within product (s 2) The water of percentage (50% drainage +50% River), (90% drainage +10% River) located 140 within class (s 3) this is according to the system USSL and FAO. Sample water of percentage (10% drainage 141 + 90% River), (20% drainage + 80% River) incident within class (medium). Other ratios located within the 142 third category (high) these category for SAR as for the electrical conductivity sample water of percentage (10% 143 drainage + 90% River), (20% drainage + 80% River) located within the class (C 3) according USSL system, 144 other percentages and located within the class (C 4) according USSL system either by the FAO system it sample 145 water of percentage (10% drainage + 90% River), (20% drainage + 80% River) 30% drainage + 70% River), (40% 146 drainage + 60% River) located within class good other percentage within third class the result tests for sample 147 of water shown in table 3. Figure (5) show percentage of water drainage and EC. Figure (6) show percentage of 148 water drainage and SAR. 149

150 10 Conclusions and Recommendations

151 The increased electrical conductivity lead to increased salt concentration in the water.

152 The interaction pH values ranging between (7.40-7.88).

Results were compared with laboratory salinity U.S (USSL). and Food Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) and found that the ratio favorite mixing process is (10%drainage +90% River) and (20%drainage +80% River) located within ((S1-C3) according to the classification laboratory salinity U.S. While according to the That determine the validity of water for irrigation and agriculture to not depend only on a laboratory tests for irrigation water, but must study other factors affecting determine the validity of water for irrigation and agriculture, including soil (determine characteristics of physical and chemical), type of crop grown and

- 159 the bear saline, and climatic conditions include temperature, amount of precipitation rainfall, wind speed, the
- speed of evaporation, etc.) and management irrigation and drainage in terms of the availability of networks and appropriate irrigation techniques and good and effective drainage networks.



Figure 1:

$$SAR = \frac{Na^{+}_{meql}}{\sqrt{\frac{(Ca^{++}_{meql}) + (Mg^{++}_{meql})}{2}}}$$

161

Figure 2:

 $^{^1 \}odot$ 2013 Global Journals Inc. (US)



Figure 3:



Figure 4: Figure 1 :



Figure 5: Figure 4 Figure 2 :



Figure 6: Figure 3 :



Figure 7: Figure 1 :

Cannon et al (2004): studied Measured and Estimated

Figure 8:

1

Figure 9: Table 1 :

(

e Not	te $Class$ Table (1) show the	1) show the			
ı)					
	limit for electrical	limit for electrical			
	conductivity (EC)	conductivity (EC)			
С	Excellenation (1) show the conductivity	Table (1) show the limit for elec-			
1	(EC) limit for electrical	trical conductivity (EC)			
С	Good Table (1) show the limit for elec-	Table (1) show the limit for elec-			
2	trical	trical			
	conductivity (EC)	conductivity (EC)			
\mathbf{C}	Unsuited the (1) show the limit for elec-	Table (1) show the limit for elec-			
3	trical	trical			
	conductivity (EC)	conductivity (EC)			
\mathbf{C}	Table (1) show the limit for elec-	Table (1) show the limit for elec-			
4	trical	trical			
	conductivity (EC)	conductivity (EC)			
	C 1 C 2 C 3 C 4	 NoteSlass Table (1) show the limit for electrical conductivity (EC) C ExcellEnable (1) show the conductivity 1 (EC) limit for electrical C Good Table (1) show the limit for elec-2 trical conductivity (EC) C UnsuiEnable (1) show the limit for elec-3 trical conductivity (EC) C Table (1) show the limit for elec-4 trical conductivity (EC) 			

[Note: \bigcirc 2013 Global Journals Inc. (US)]

Figure 10: Table (

	USSL (Richard) 1954					F FAO Ayers and West	cot 1994	
Class	Range (ds/m)			Notes	Class	Range (ds/m)		Note
Low	<	10		S 1	Low	<	3	
Meduim	-18		10	S 2	Meduim	3-9		
High	18-26			S 3	High	9>		
Very high	>	26		S 4				
V.								

Figure 11: Table 2 :

3

No.of sam-	Water river	of	Water drainage	of	of Na(meq/L) Ca+mg(nSeqPL) EC(mmhos/c		os/cħ)PH		
ple									
1	90%		10%		20.07	13	7.87	1.80	7.83
2	80%		20%		28.2	20	8.92	2.10	7.72
3	70%		30%		35.63	17	12.2	2.50	7.4
4	60%		40%		41.46	15	15.13	3.00	7.48
5	50%		50%		44.17	11	18.8	5.50	7.51
6	10%		90%		63	24	18.15	18	7.54
7	20%		80%		57.65	23	17	17.6	7.72
8	30%		70%		52.47	18	17.49	15.6	7.74
9	40%		60%		49.23	17	16.86	14.16	7.68
10	50%		50%		44.17	11	18.8	5.50	7.51
11			Only		69.43	12	28.33	19	7.64
			drainage						
12	Only rive	r			4.96	10	2.21	1.19	7.88

Figure 12: Table 3 :

 $\mathbf{2}$

¹⁶² .1 Global Journals Inc. (US) Guidelines Handbook 2013

- 163 www.GlobalJournals.org
- [Bauder et al. ()], T A Bauder, R M Waskom, P L Sutherland, J G Davis. 2012. (Irrigation Water Quality
 Criteria" no. 0.506)

[Richards ()] Diagnosis and improvement of Saline and Alkali Soils, Agriculture Handbook No. 60, u.s
 Government Printing Office, L A Richards . 1954. Washington, USA.

- 168 [Kang et al. ()] 'Effects of drip irrigation with saline water on waxy maize (Zea mays L. var ceratina Kulesh) in
- North China Plain'. Yaohu Kang , Ming Chen , Shuqin Wan . Agric. Water Manage 2010. 2007. 2009. 97 p.
 10.
- 171 [Cannon et al. ()] 'Measured and Estimated Sodium-Adsorption Ratios for Tongue River and its Tributaries'.
- M R Cannon , David A Nimick , Thomas E Cleasby , Stacy M Kinsey , John H Lambing . Montana and
 Wyoming 2004.
- [Seilsepour and Rashidi ()] 'Modeling of Soil Sodium Adsorption Ratio Based On Soil Electrical Conductivity'.
 Mohsen Seilsepour , Majid Rashidi . NO. 5&6. ARPN Journal of Agricultural and Biological Science 2008. 3.
- [Stephen and Grattan ()] Oakland: University of California Division of Agriculture and Natural Resources
 Publication 8066, R Stephen , Grattan . 2002. (Irrigation Water Salinity and Crop Production)
- [Moh Sen Seilsepour et al. ()] 'Prediction of Soil Exchangeable Sodium Percentage Based on Soil Sodium
 Adsorption Ratio'. Majid Moh Sen Seilsepour , Rashidi , Borzoo Ghareei Khabbaz . American-Eurasian
 J. Agric. & Environ. Sci 2009. 5 (1) p. .
- [Ayers and Westcot ()] Water quality for agriculture, R S Ayers , D W Westcot . 1994. (FAO Irrigation And
 Drainage Paper 29 Rev. 1)