

Hydrogeological characterisation of crystalline basement aquifers within the Limpopo Province, South Africa

by

Martin Holland

Submitted in the fulfilment of the requirements for the degree Doctor of
Philosophy in the Faculty Natural and Agricultural Sciences

University of Pretoria

Pretoria, South Africa



UNIVERSITEIT VAN PRETORIA
UNIVERSITY OF PRETORIA
YUNIBESITHI YA PRETORIA

February 2011

Acknowledgements

The research was financially supported by the Water Research Commission (WRC) for the period 2007-2010. I would like to express my sincere gratitude to Dr. Shafick Adams from the WRC for his arrangements and support of the Limpopo basement aquifer project. The contribution of the members of the Steering Committee is also gratefully acknowledged. I also want convey my appreciation to the hundreds of rural communities I visited during this research and allowing me to go about my tasks without any objection.

I have received immense support during my research and would like to express my thanks to the following individuals:

- First and foremost, my supervisor, Prof. Kai Witthüser, for his continuous support, amicable mentorship and the main reason I pursued a career in Hydrogeology.
- To my co-supervisor, Prof. Louis Van Rooy, for his support in managing the arrangements of the WRC workshops and research deliverables. In this regard I also need to mention the help of Ms. Melinda de Swardt, the kingpin of the Department of Geology's administration.
- Special thanks to, Mr. Willem Du Toit and Mr. Robert Whitehead from the Limpopo (Department of Water Affairs) regional office, who supported this study fully and provided additional funding, in the form of drilling and geophysics. These individuals are the true 'groundwater hunters' of the Limpopo Province.
- The Limpopo (GRIP) consultants, who does a great job at maintaining and improving on one of the best groundwater datasets in the country, and especially to Mr. Reinhardt Weidemann, for sharing his expertise gained in this challenging hydrogeological environment.
- My colleagues at Water Geosciences Consulting, for the generous time allocations to complete my research, and to Mr. Jude Cobbing for improving on the English phrasing of my thesis.
- Most importantly, I would like to thank my loving wife and children for their belief in me and the sacrifices made during the time it took to complete this research (you are truly my inspiration).
- By far my biggest appreciation goes to my parents, who taught me the morals of life and molded me into the person I am today.
- Finally, I want to express my sincere gratitude to my sister, relatives and friends for your continuous support and encouragement.
- Comments on the manuscript from the external reviewers are greatly appreciated.

"Some people dream of worthy accomplishments, while others stay awake and do them."

- Anon

Hydrogeological characterisation of crystalline basement aquifers within the Limpopo Province, South Africa

by

Martin Holland

Supervisor: Prof. K.T. Witthüser
Co-supervisor: Prof. J.L. Van Rooy
Department: Geology
Degree: PhD Engineering and Environmental Geology

Declaration

I, Martin Holland declare that the thesis, which I hereby submit for the degree Doctor of Philosophy (Engineering and Environmental Geology) at the University of Pretoria, is my own work and has not previously been submitted by me for a degree at this or any other tertiary institution.

Signature: _____

Date: _____

Abstract

Geologically complex crystalline aquifers are distributed extensively in Africa and also underlie large parts of the semi-arid Limpopo Province where some of the greatest groundwater needs in South Africa occur. The importance of these basement aquifers makes it vital to identify high yielding hydrogeological zones that can be targeted for water supply, to sustain areas of high population density with few or no alternative water sources. The biggest challenge is to understand the factors that determine the secondary permeability of these weathered-fractured rock aquifers. The focus of this study was therefore to systematically analyse regional factors that may influence borehole yields and aquifer transmissivities.

The study covered four distinct geological and morpho-structural domains within the Limpopo Province, covering about 23 500 km². The borehole dataset compiled for the study consisted of over 8 000 boreholes contained in the Groundwater Resources Information Project (GRIP) Limpopo database of the South African Department of Water Affairs. Approximately 3 000 of these boreholes have been hydraulically tested and the lithology has been recorded in 1 200 cases. A commonly encountered problem of pumping tests analysis in crystalline aquifers is in choosing an appropriate model that best fits the observed drawdown response. In this thesis modern methods are proposed for the analysis of pumping test data in weathered-fractured rock aquifers and highlight the importance of diagnostic plots, especially derivatives, for the detection of flow regimes and the choice of the correct 'theoretical' model. Based on the classification no single analytical method can be universally applied to crystalline basement aquifers when considering the analysis of pumping test data.

The GRIP borehole dataset was analysed in conjunction with spatial information to identify the relationship of regional factors such as - geology, hydrology, weathering thickness, topography, geomorphology, neo-tectonic stresses, and structural lineaments - on groundwater occurrence. Geology has a clear influence, with boreholes exploiting alluvial aquifers composed of highly permeable material, and certain rock types such as pegmatite, showing generally higher borehole productivities. Favourable borehole locations from a topographical point of view are predictably along rivers and valleys. Other identified favourable groundwater targets are the metamorphic aureoles of younger granite intrusions. Despite the local importance of the regolith as a recharge and storage mechanism for the underlying fractured bedrock, no correlation between borehole yields and depth of weathering was found. The pattern of lineament and dyke orientations in the different morpho-structural domains led to a more complex conceptual model of groundwater occurrence. This model is inconsistent with the predicted regime based on regional stress field data and suggests that local variations have a strong influence on groundwater occurrence. Due to the complex geological history of the area, it is difficult to link open discontinuities to a distinct recent or past tectonic event. It can be concluded that regional stress field data, as in this case, may not account for local, possibly highly significant, stress field variations. The hydrogeological importance of several factors on groundwater occurrence presented in this study can be used as a working reference for future groundwater development programmes.



Table of contents

1. INTRODUCTION.....	15
1.1. Problem statement	15
1.2. Investigation objectives	18
2. CHARACTERISATION OF CRYSTALLINE BASEMENT AQUIFERS.....	20
2.1. Conceptual framework.....	20
2.1.1. Classical weathered-fractured rock concept.....	20
2.1.2. General flow behaviour.....	22
2.2. Groundwater recharge	23
2.3. Groundwater quality	24
2.3.1. Geochemical studies.....	24
2.4. Groundwater hydraulics.....	25
2.4.1. Aquifer response evaluation.....	25
2.4.2. Aquifer models applicable to crystalline basement aquifers.....	27
2.4.3. Summary of conceptual models	28
2.5. ‘Sustainable’ yield concept.....	35
2.6. Development of groundwater	38
2.6.1. Exploration approaches	39
3. HYDROGEOLOGICAL ASSESSMENT METHODS	41
3.1. Investigation approach.....	41
3.1.1. Hydrogeological overview	42
3.2. Groundwater recharge estimation methods	43
3.2.1. Chloride Mass Balance (CMB)	43
3.2.2. Cumulative rainfall departure method.....	44
3.3. Geochemical investigation methods.....	45
3.3.1. Environmental and radiogenic isotopes	46
3.3.2. Chlorofluorocarbon (CFC) and sulphur hexafluoride (SF6).....	48
3.4. Hydraulic testing.....	51
3.4.1. Step drawdown test and well efficiency.....	51
3.4.2. Identification of characteristic flow regimes (constant discharge test).....	52
3.4.3. Pumping test interpretation	55
3.4.4. Recommending a long term yield for a single borehole.....	56
3.5. Assessment of factors controlling the occurrence of groundwater.....	56
3.5.1. GIS analysis.....	56
3.5.2. Lineament analysis	57
3.5.3. Geophysical methods	58
3.6. Development of a regional conceptual model	58
4. DESCRIPTION OF STUDY AREA	59
4.1. Physiography and climate.....	59
4.1.1. Geomorphology.....	63
4.2. Regional geology.....	64
4.2.1. Description of local geology	66



4.2.2.	Geological timeline of local occurrences	68
4.3.	Structural geology.....	68
4.4.	Hydrogeological description.....	72
4.4.1.	Aquifer systems.....	74
4.4.2.	Borehole data analysis.....	74
4.4.3.	Success rate and yields.....	78
4.4.4.	Transmissivity and recommended borehole yields	79
5.	HYDROGEOLOGICAL CHARACTERISATION OF THE STUDY AREA.....	80
5.1.	Characterisation of groundwater recharge.....	80
5.1.1.	Recharge estimates (Chloride Mass Balance).....	80
5.1.2.	Aquifer response to recharge.....	83
5.2.	Geochemical description	89
5.2.1.	Interpretation of results	89
5.2.2.	Discussion of stable isotope data.....	92
5.2.3.	Groundwater dating.....	93
5.2.4.	Groundwater quality hazards.....	103
5.3.	Pumping test analysis	104
5.3.1.	Aquifer response classification	104
5.3.2.	Hydraulic parameters	112
5.4.	Groundwater sustainability (source vs. resource).....	113
5.4.1.	Source yield.....	114
5.4.2.	Resource yield	115
5.4.3.	High yield test (potential well field).....	117
5.5.	Geological and geomorphologic influence on borehole productivity	125
5.5.1.	Geological setting.....	127
5.5.2.	Weathered layer (regolith) and erosion surfaces.....	129
5.5.3.	Topographic setting and drainages.....	130
5.5.4.	Relationship to dykes	132
5.5.5.	Relationship to lineaments	134
5.5.6.	Field observation (testing the results)	139
5.5.7.	Discussion of results.....	141
6.	CONCLUSION	146
6.1.	Synthesis.....	146
6.2.	Recommendations and suggestions for future investigations.....	147
6.2.1.	Groundwater management	148
7.	REFERENCES.....	149
8.	APPENDIXES	158
	Appendix A - Borehole hydrographs	158
	Appendix B - CRD simulations	159
	Appendix C - Surface topography vs. groundwater level correlation.....	161
	Appendix D - Hierarcial cluster analysis (dendrogram)	162
	Appendix E - Nitrate distribution map.....	162
	Appendix F - Details of pumping tests.....	163



List of tables

Table 3.1. Methods of recognizing observed flow characteristics from hydraulic responses in crystalline basement aquifers.....	54
Table 4.1. Temperature (°C) variations of selected towns and climate stations.....	61
Table 4.2. Rainfall data for selected stations distributed throughout the study area.....	61
Table 4.3. Summary of borehole characteristics in the study area.....	74
Table 4.4. Statistical summary of transmissivities and recommended yields.....	79
Table 5.1. Summary of borehole characteristics in the study area.....	81
Table 5.2. Recharge estimates based on the CMB for selected localities in the study area.....	83
Table 5.3. Summary of short term monitoring groundwater level data for selected stations.....	83
Table 5.4. Recharge estimations based on the CRD method.....	88
Table 5.5. Mean values for the clusters distinguished by the hierarchical cluster analysis (EC in mS/m, all other in mg/l).....	90
Table 5.6. Chemical composition of rainfall within the study area (EC in mS/m, all other in mg/l).....	90
Table 5.7. Chemical composition of rainfall within the study area.....	95
Table 5.8. Potability classification of the area of investigation (EC in mS/m, all other in mg/l).....	103
Table 5.9. Microbiological analyses for all samples collected.....	104
Table 5.10. Most typical diagnostic plots encountered in the Basement aquifers under investigation.....	105
Table 5.11. Summary of selected hydrogeological parameters for the different drawdown behaviours.....	105
Table 5.12. Hydraulic test analysis results (test details is given in Appendix F).....	113
Table 5.13. Comparison of the results for the two constant rates.....	114
Table 5.14. Pumping test in the study area (GRIP dataset).....	115
Table 5.15. Simplified water balance for the Upper Brak River catchment.....	116
Table 5.16. Summary of pumping and observation boreholes of high yield test.....	117
Table 5.17. Results of geological, CCTV and geophysical logging of borehole H11-2593.....	120
Table 5.18. Summary of hydraulic parameters obtained from well field pumping test analysis.....	124
Table 5.19. Determined hydrogeological parameter based on the geology observed during drilling.....	127
Table 5.20. Determined hydrogeological parameter based on the geological setting of boreholes.....	128
Table 5.21. Determined hydrogeological parameter based on the topographic setting of boreholes.....	130
Table 5.22. Influence of proximity to rivers and streams on borehole productivity.....	132
Table 5.23. Transmissivity (m ² /d) of boreholes according to distance to inferred dykes.....	133
Table 5.24. Productivity of boreholes according to distance to inferred lineaments.....	135
Table 5.25. Transmissivity (m ² /d) of boreholes according to distance to inferred lineaments within the Limpopo Plateau.....	136
Table 5.26. Transmissivity (m ² /d) of boreholes according to distance to inferred lineaments within the Letaba Lowveld.....	137
Table 5.27. A summary of drilling results in the Great Letaba Catchment.....	141
Table 5.28. Recommended drilling targets per structural domain.....	143

List of figures

Figure 1.1. Study Area.	16
Figure 2.1. Permeability and porosity in basement aquifers (Chilton and Foster, 1995).	21
Figure 2.2. Simplified flow system for crystalline basement terrain (Adapted from Tóth, 1963; Chilton and Foster, 1995).	22
Figure 2.3. Recharge estimates for southern Africa (Xu and Beekman, 2003; Adams et al., 2004).	23
Figure 2.4. Most typical diagnostic plots encountered in hydrogeology (Renard et al., 2009).	26
Figure 2.5. Different modelling approaches for fractured rock aquifers (Kröhn, 1990).	28
Figure 2.6. Depending on the scale of interests a number of fracture flow models can be identified; matrix blocks (A), densely fractured rocks (B), fracture rocks with impermeable matrix (C), and combination of fracture network and matrix blocks (D).	29
Figure 2.7. Schematic illustration of an idealized confined aquifer.	29
Figure 2.8. Schematic illustration of an isotropic leaky confined aquifer.	30
Figure 2.9. Schematic illustration of an unconfined aquifer.	31
Figure 2.10. A fractured block illustrating the double porosity concept (Cinco-Ley, 1996 in Renard, 2005b).	31
Figure 2.11. Different flow phases observed in a single fracture (Van Tonder et al., 2002).	33
Figure 2.12. Flow dimension definition in well testing (Doe, 1991 in Van Tonder et al., 2002).	34
Figure 2.13. Concept of radial flow in 1, 2, 3, and generalization to n dimensions (Renard, 2005b).	35
Figure 2.14. The capture principle and the implications for sustainability and recharge.	36
Figure 2.15. Flow chart of recommended groundwater exploration of basement aquifers (Sami, 2009).	40
Figure 3.1. Overview of the applied hydrogeological assessment approach and methods.	41
Figure 3.2. Summary diagram of the stable isotope composition from precipitation to percolation.	46
Figure 3.3. Atmospheric mixing ratios of CFC-11, CFC-12, and SF ₆ for the southern hemisphere.	48
Figure 3.4. Two cases of groundwater movement by piston-flow in confined aquifers and flow in an open aquifer where different fast flowing water is mixed in the well or spring.	50
Figure 3.5. Illustration of early, intermediate and late periods of pump tests responses (Gringarten 1982 in Leveinen, 2001).	52
Figure 3.6. Flow regime identification tool representing schematically the log-derivative of drawdown as a function of logarithmic time (Ehlig-Economides et al., 1994 in Renard et al., 2009).	53
Figure 3.7. Graphs of the first logarithmic derivative of the drawdown in a borehole for a few types of geometries and boundaries (Van Tonder et al., 2001).	53
Figure 3.8. The geological triangle method (MacDonald et al., 2005).	58
Figure 4.1. Regional surface drainage features, topography and study area.	60
Figure 4.2. Mean annual rainfall map together with selected monthly average charts for selected stations in mm/month.	62
Figure 4.3. The distribution of erosion surfaces in southern Africa (adapted from Partridge, 1998; Taylor and Howard, 1999).	63
Figure 4.4. Terrain morphological zones of the study area.	64
Figure 4.5. Generalised map of the Limpopo Mobile Belt showing the main features and subdivisions (adapted from Boshoff et al., 2006).	65
Figure 4.6. Regional geology of the study area (based on published 1:250 000 map sheets sourced from the Council for Geoscience).	67

Figure 4.7. Aeromagnetic map showing tectonic domains (Adapted from Stettler et al., 1989). Data Source: Council for Geoscience (SA).	69
Figure 4.8. Neo-tectonic stress map of southern Africa (Zoback, 1992). Long axes indicate the orientation of crustal shortening.	69
Figure 4.9. Rose diagram derived from the strikes of all joint planes (left) and faults (right).	70
Figure 4.10. Identified structural domains based on the orientation of regional dykes (Aeromagnetic and published dykes).	71
Figure 4.11. Delineation of the Limpopo Plateau and Letaba Lowveld regions.	73
Figure 4.12. Generalised section of the aquifer systems found in the area of investigation, including photo's of observed geological features.	75
Figure 4.13. Distribution of borehole depths in the Limpopo Plateau and Letaba Lowveld.	76
Figure 4.14. Distribution of groundwater levels in the Limpopo Plateau and Letaba Lowveld.	76
Figure 4.15. Distribution of depth of first water strikes in the Limpopo Plateau and Letaba Lowveld.	77
Figure 4.16. Distribution of depths of weathering plus fracturing in the Limpopo Plateau and Letaba Lowveld.	77
Figure 4.17. Success rate for boreholes contained the GRIP dataset for the study area.	78
Figure 4.18. Distribution of borehole airlift yield in the Limpopo Plateau and Letaba Lowveld.	78
Figure 4.19. Frequency histograms and cumulative distribution of transmissivities [m^2/day] and recommended yield (l/s per day) for the Limpopo Plateau and the Letaba Lowveld.	79
Figure 5.1. Regional recharge map for the Limpopo Province.	80
Figure 5.2. Annual recharge map based on the CMB-method.	82
Figure 5.3. Spatial distribution of monitoring boreholes and selected water level hydrographs for the period Jan-06 to Dec-09 (A3 map) (red lines represent daily water levels while black columns represent monthly rainfall).	84
Figure 5.4. Hydrograph of monitoring station A6N0586 for the period (Jan-06 to Dec-09).	85
Figure 5.5. Hydrograph of monitoring station A9M008 for the period (Jan-06 to Dec-09).	86
Figure 5.6. Hydrograph of long term monitoring station A7N0524 near Mogwadi (1971 to 2009).	86
Figure 5.7. Hydrograph of long term monitoring station A7N0549 near Polokwane (1971 to 2009).	87
Figure 5.8. Annual deviation from the average rainfall, together with the cumulative departure for the 104-year rainfall record of Polokwane.	88
Figure 5.9. Groundwater contour map of two selected areas and derived flow vectors.	89
Figure 5.10. Spatial distribution of the hydrochemical groups identified by the HCA.	91
Figure 5.11. Groundwater and precipitation isotopic compositions, depicted with the GMWL.	92
Figure 5.12. Location isotope groundwater samples.	93
Figure 5.13. Scatter-plot of $\delta^{13}C$ and against ^{14}C for all samples.	94
Figure 5.14. Scatter-plot of $\delta^{13}C$ and against 3H . Also shown are plots of expected exponential model values for $\delta^{13}C$ and 3H showing mean residence time (MRT) (Adapted from, Verhagen, 2000).	94
Figure 5.15. Results of tritium.	95
Figure 5.16. Spatial distribution of CFC samples together with carbon 14 samples.	97
Figure 5.17. Tracer plots comparing CFC-11 and CFC-12 concentrations for southern hemisphere air. The solid lines represent unmixed (piston) flow with selected apparent ages (~ 1985). The dashed line shows one example of binary mixing for the case of water recharged in 1985, 1995 and 2005 diluted with old, CFC-free water.	98
Figure 5.18. CFC-12 and SF6 groundwater data overlaid on the ideal mixing model curves. Samples categorised as upper or lower catchment (quaternary drainage A72A) (Figure 5.16).	99

Figure 5.19. CFC-12 and SF6 groundwater data overlaid on the ideal mixing model curves. Selected sites have been labelled.....	100
Figure 5.20. CFC-12 and SF6 groundwater data overlaid on the ideal mixing model curves. Selected sites have been labelled.....	101
Figure 5.21. Cross-section of the hypothetical hydrochemical model for the Merokome River catchment (B81F) (Section line illustrated in Figure 5.16). Based on the CFC and carbon 14 results.	102
Figure 5.22. Diagnostic plots (semi- log, log-log and derivative) of a 48 hour constant rate pumping test fitted with a Theis solution (borehole H16-0206).....	106
Figure 5.23. Diagnostic plots (semi-log) of the recovery data of borehole H16-0206 fitted with a conventional Theis-recovery solution (left) and a Theis solution for the Agarwal plot (right). 107	107
Figure 5.24. Diagnostic plots (semi- log, log-log and derivative) of a 24 hour constant rate pumping test with an unconfined solution (borehole H17-0774).	108
Figure 5.25. Diagnostic plots (semi- log, log-log and derivative) of borehole H17-0774 fitted with a fractured (double porosity) solution.....	108
Figure 5.26. Diagnostic plots (semi- log, log-log and derivative) of a 24 hour constant rate pumping test fitted with a fractured (double porosity) solution (borehole H04-2073).....	109
Figure 5.27. Diagnostic plots (semi-log) of the recovery data of borehole H04-2073 fitted with a conventional Theis-recovery solution (left) and a fractured (double porosity) solution for the Agarwal plot (right).	109
Figure 5.28. Diagnostic plots (semi- log, log-log and derivative) of a 24 hour constant rate pumping test fitted with a leaky aquifer solution (borehole H16-0131).....	110
Figure 5.29. Diagnostic plots (semi- log, log-log and derivative) of a 12 hour constant rate pumping test fitted with a single fracture (Gringarten et al., 1974) model (H03-3269).	111
Figure 5.30. Diagnostic plots (semi- log, log-log and derivative) of borehole H16-0084, indicating reservoir boundaries.....	111
Figure 5.31. Location of pumping tests conducted in the study area.	112
Figure 5.32. Semi logarithmic plot of borehole H14-0279 with two different constant discharge rates.....	114
Figure 5.33. Distribution of drawdown percentage achieved from pumping tests in the study.	115
Figure 5.34. High groundwater potential area in the Upper Brak River catchment.	116
Figure 5.35. Borehole setting of pumping test conducted at the farm Brilliant (Drawdown achieved at the end of constant test is indicated on the map).	118
Figure 5.36. Diagnostic plot (semi- log and derivative) model and the CCTV footage of the inferred higher permeability zone.....	121
Figure 5.37. Diagnostic plot (semi- log and log-log) fitted with a fracture (Barker, 1988) model of pumping borehole (H11-2593) and observation boreholes (H11-2596 and H11-1653).	121
Figure 5.38. Diagnostic plot (semi- log and log-log) fitted with a fracture (Barker, 1988) model of pumping borehole (H11-2593) and observation boreholes (H11-2596 and H11-1653).	122
Figure 5.39. Diagnostic plot (semi- log and log-log) fitted with a fracture (Barker, 1988) model of pumping borehole (H11-2593) and observation boreholes (H11-2596 and H11-1653).	123
Figure 5.40. Diagnostic plot (semi- log and log-log) fitted with a fracture (Barker, 1988) model of pumping borehole (H11-2593) and observation boreholes (H11-2594 and H11-1652).	123
Figure 5.41. Diagnostic plot (semi- log, log-log and derivative) fitted with a fracture (Barker, 1988) model of pumping borehole (H11-2593) and observation borehole (H11-2595).	124
Figure 5.42. Cumulative frequency of transmissivity and recommended yields from boreholes based on the structural domains delineated in section 4.3.	125
Figure 5.43. Spatial distribution of transmissivity obtained from the GRIP dataset.....	126

Figure 5.44. Cumulative frequency distributions showing the influence of various rock types on borehole productivity (number of boreholes in brackets). 127

Figure 5.45. Graphs showing the correlation between transmissivity and depth of weathering and between yield and depth of weathering. 129

Figure 5.46. Cumulative frequency distributions showing the influence of erosion surfaces on borehole productivity (number of boreholes in brackets). 130

Figure 5.47. Typical setting of boreholes in relation to rivers and topography..... 131

Figure 5.48. Frequency histograms and cumulative distribution showing the influence of dykes encountered on transmissivity estimates. 133

Figure 5.49. Box plot of transmissivity and dyke azimuth for both the Limpopo and Letaba regions. The box represents the 25 and 75 % quartiles, while the median is represented by the *horizontal line within the box*. Outliers are *marked by circles and by crosses*. The *vertical lines (whiskers)* connect the smallest and largest non-outliers..... 134

Figure 5.50. Distribution of shear zones, faults and lineaments in the Limpopo Plateau, with the lineament frequency rose diagram showing main structural trends..... 136

Figure 5.51. Box plot of borehole transmissivity in relation to the lineament azimuth in the Limpopo Plateau..... 137

Figure 5.52. Distribution of shear zones dykes, faults and lineaments in the Letaba Lowveld, with the lineament frequency rose diagram showing main structural trends (squares indicate field studies). 138

Figure 5.53. Box plot of borehole transmissivity in relation to the lineament azimuth in the Letaba Lowveld. 138

Figure 5.54. Field study location and the 5 km geophysical profile near Dzumeri village 139

Figure 5.55. Field study location and the 800 m geophysical profile near Bolobedu. 140

Figure 5.56. Stress orientations of southern Africa (Stacey and Wesseloo, 1998)..... 142

Figure 5.57. Conceptualisation of transmissivity values obtained from various borehole settings in the Limpopo basement aquifers (rose diagram indicating mean transmissivities for selected lineament azimuths based on Table 5.25). 144

Figure 5.58. Regional distribution of transmissivity to illustrate the potential productive groundwater areas. 145

List of abbreviations

CRD	Cumulative Rainfall Departure
CFC	Chlorofluorocarbon
CMB	Chloride Mass Balance
CGS	Council for Geoscience
DWA	Department of Water Affairs
DWAF	Department of Water Affairs and Forestry
EC	Electrical Conductivity
SAWS	South African Weather Services
GIS	Geographical Information System
IAEA	International Atomic Energy Agency
GNIP	Global Network of Isotopes
SMOW	Standard Mean Ocean Water
GMWL	Global Meteoric Water Line
LMWL	Local Meteoric Water Line
TU	Tritium Unit
GRF	Generalised Radial Flow
GRIP	Groundwater Resources Information Project
K	Hydraulic Conductivity
MAP	Mean Annual Precipitation
MRT	Mean Residence Time
NGDB	National Groundwater Data Base
NWA	National Water Act (Act 36 of 1998)
S	Storativity
T	Transmissivity
WRC	Water Research Commission
WMA	Water Management Area

Units of measurements

b	aquifer thickness [L]
d	depth to top of pumping well screen [L]
d'	depth to top of observation well screen [L]
l	depth to bottom of pumping well screen [L]
l'	depth to bottom of observation well screen [L]
Q	pumping rate [L ³ /T]
r	radial distance [L]
s	drawdown [L]
t	time (T)
K_z/K_r	vertical to horizontal hydraulic conductivity anisotropy
H_0	initial displacement (head)
a	annum
cm	centimetre
d	day
m/d	hydraulic conductivity
m ² /d	transmissivity
mg/l	milligram per litre
ha	hectare
km ²	square kilometre
ℓ/s	litre per second
N	Population
m	metre
m ³ /s	cubic metre per second
mamsl	metres above mean sea level
m.b.g.l	metres below ground level
Mm ³ /a	million cubic metres per annum
fmol/l	femtomol per litre
pptv	parts per trillion volume
pmol/l	picamol per litre
mmol/l	millimol per litre
mm	millimetre
Ωm	ohm metre
mS/m	milliSiemen per metre