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The Karoo has been receiving considerable attention since the early 1970’s when uranium mining was at its peak, with numerous research studies being instigated to look at all aspects of uranium mining. It has recently been observed that there seems to be resurgence in uranium exploration in and around the town of Beaufort West. A study on the transport mechanisms of uranium and thorium in fractured-rock aquifers, initiated in the hope of understanding the actual processes controlling radionuclide mobilisation, is reported here.

Hydrochemical investigations of the various boreholes were sampled for water quality in June, 2009. The hydrochemical description is typical of shallow fresh groundwater, changing composition to a more sulphate hydrochemical facies along the flow path. While the geochemistry of groundwater in the study area seems to have minimal effects on uranium concentrations, the low levels of uranium in boreholes sampled suggest the importance of hydrological and lithological variability on the measured concentrations. Nevertheless, the uranium concentration is within the recommended levels as specified in the US-EPA, WHO and SA water quality guidelines and thus poses no immediate threat to the general public. Analysis of pumping and tracer tests, reveals that the fractured-rock aquifer can be highly transmissive and that transport can take place via multiple flow paths having different hydraulic properties. Tracer diffusing into stagnant water zones within fracture asperities and the rock matrix are seen as an important
retardation mechanism, that has implications for remediation should the aquifer be contaminated by radionuclides. In terms of conceptualising flow at a local scale, aperture sizes ranging from (563-828\(\mu\)m) along with high flow velocities (1.90E-03m/s), points to the importance of bedding-plane fractures as conduits of groundwater flow. The groundwater flow has been influenced by dolerite dykes creating compartments isolated from each other, suggesting a highly complex aquifer system. Based on the conceptual model, it is shown that these structures can create unique, site specific flow conditions.

The integration of all available data into the conceptual model provides an effective research tool that can be built upon as a basis for further research.
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### SYMBOLS AND ABBREVIATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A(r)</td>
<td>cross-sectional area of flow ( (L^2) ),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>leakage factor ( (L) ),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>aperture ( (L) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b'</td>
<td>aquitard thickness ( (L) ),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>concentration in the mobile (fracture) zone ([ML^{-3}]),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dh</td>
<td>hydrodynamic dispersion coefficient ([L^2T^{-1}]),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>friction factor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>&lt;1 for smooth walls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>&gt;1 for rough walls.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h (r,t)</td>
<td>change in hydraulic head from ( h(r,0) = 0 ) ( (L) ),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K'</td>
<td>hydraulic conductivity of the aquitard ( (L/t) ),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>hydraulic conductivity ( (L/T) ),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>flow dimension,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Δp</td>
<td>pressure gradient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>pumping rate ( (L^3/t) ),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r</td>
<td>radial distance to the pumping well ( (L) ),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re</td>
<td>Reynolds number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rf</td>
<td>retardation coefficient of fracture surface ([-]),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r_o</td>
<td>distance where straight line intercepts the zero drawdown axis ( (L) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>storativity (dimensionless),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ss</td>
<td>specific storage ( (1/L) ),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Δs</td>
<td>drawdown per log cycle of time ( (L) ),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>transmissivity ( (L^2/t) ),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t</td>
<td>time (in days or minutes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t_o</td>
<td>time, where the straight line intersects zero – drawdown axis ( (T, d) ).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ν</td>
<td>average solute velocity in the fracture ([LT^{-1}])</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W (u, r/B)</td>
<td>leaky artesian well function,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Γ</td>
<td>gamma function.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ψ</td>
<td>friction factor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ε</td>
<td>fracture roughness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Γ</td>
<td>dynamic viscosity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amu</td>
<td>Atomic mass unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BTC</td>
<td>Breakthrough Curve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deff</td>
<td>Effective diffusion coefficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DWA</td>
<td>Department of Water Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC</td>
<td>Electrical conductivity (μS/cm)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESSO</td>
<td>New Jersey Standard Oil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRF</td>
<td>Generalized radial flow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAPE</td>
<td>Mean annual potential evaporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCM</td>
<td>Multi-Channel Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCL</td>
<td>Maximum Contaminant level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPa</td>
<td>Mega Pascal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDA</td>
<td>Minimum detectable activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mSv/a</td>
<td>Millisieverts per annum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mlbs²</td>
<td>Million pounds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mbgs</td>
<td>Meters below ground surface</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRMP</td>
<td>National Radioactive Monitoring Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGA</td>
<td>National Groundwater Archives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ppb</td>
<td>Parts per billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pe</td>
<td>Peclet number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDL</td>
<td>Reference dose level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFDM</td>
<td>Single Fissure Dispersion Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBR</td>
<td>Tweeling Brandwag Renosterkop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US-EPA</td>
<td>United States Environmental Protection Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WRC</td>
<td>Water Research Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHO</td>
<td>World Health Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$UO_2^{2+}$</td>
<td>Uranyl dioxo ion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 1 - INTRODUCTION

1.1 BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT OF THE STUDY

The huge demand for groundwater in South Africa has increased dramatically over the years, especially in certain rural areas of the country. Groundwater is generally considered as a safe and viable option compared to surface water. However, this is not always the case as groundwater can be contaminated by hazardous trace, and more importantly radioactive constituents. The geogenic and anthropogenic contamination of groundwater by heavy metals and radionuclides poses a direct threat to water supplies, while the contamination of surface soils poses an unrealised but equally important threat to groundwater resources. The Water Research Commission (WRC) granted a project to a consortium of researches to develop a sampling and monitoring protocol for radioactive elements in fractured rock environments. The research outcomes are intended to support the implementation of the National Radioactive Monitoring Programme (NRMP) of the Department of Water Affairs (DWA).

The focus of this thesis within the framework is to look at the various transport mechanisms responsible for the mobilisation of radioactive elements in fractured rock aquifer systems. Beaufort West, which is situated at the main Karoo basin, was chosen as a study area because of its anticipated growth within the next few years where there are a seemingly resurgence in uranium exploration and possibly mining south of the town. It is therefore expected that the towns demand will soon exceed the current water supply. Based on the Karoo basin having undergone extensive research in the past, especially as a result of uranium mining, there was a high possibility of potential contamination impact on groundwater in the region.
1.2 RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

The rate of uranium release in oxidised environments is governed by the speciation of uranium in the solid phase. Uranium in particular is very mobile and soluble under oxidising conditions, whereas thorium as a daughter on the other hand is rather immobile and insoluble under similar conditions. As a result, uranium can be a major contaminant in the subsurface, where it can be distributed amongst (1) the dissolved species in pore water, (2) the sorbed species on mineral surfaces, and (3) the discrete uranium – containing mineral phases (Figure 1.1).

The main objectives of this study are thus:

- To address the present knowledge gap with respect to uranium and thorium speciation in groundwater of fractured rock aquifers;
- To identify the main transport mechanisms responsible for their mobilisation in the subsurface environment;
- To apply recent advances to characterise flow regimes in fractured rock aquifer systems, with special reference to tracing the distribution of contaminants in fractured media and
- To conceptualise possible flow dynamics on a local scale.
1.3 PREVIOUS STUDIES

Most research studies relating to uranium in the Karoo basin dealt with using selected trace elements and major ions in subterranean waters as potential indicators for uranium mineralisation (Brunke, 1977; Van der Merwe and de Beer, 2006). Whilst, other studies looked at the importance of geological lineaments and fractures as targets for drilling and abstracting groundwater from fractured rock aquifers (Rose and Conrad, 2007). Vogel et al., (1980) conducted a study in Beaufort West using isotopes of uranium, and other environmental tracers in groundwater as an adjunct to major development of groundwater resources in the area. The emphasis of the above mentioned studies focused primarily on the development and quantification of the water resource and its effective management. However, no studies relating to the actual processes controlling radionuclide mobilisation has been done in the past.
1.4 THESIS STRUCTURE

The following is a brief outline of the structure and content of the thesis. The first chapter contextualises the study by discussing the research objectives upon which, the study is based. Following the introduction a review chapter of local and international literature related to the various components of the study is given. A description of the study area follows where the climate, physiography, geology, and hydrogeology are discussed. The methodology adapted for the study is fieldwork orientated. The importance of which, is to understand the aquifer system in order to conceptualise local flow dynamics. Chapter 4 deals with the results along with the discussions. In the final chapter conclusions are drawn along with some recommendations for future research.
CHAPTER 2 - LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 INTRODUCTION

The fundamental characteristics of fractured rock aquifers lie in their extreme spatial variability of hydraulic conductivity, transmissivity, storativity and hence groundwater flow rate. Thus the need to characterise these aquifers cannot be overemphasised as it will help in solving key issues related to the importance of fractures on groundwater flow and transport, to investigate at what scale fractures become important and, finally, how fractures determine transport, flow velocity and flow direction (National Research Council, 1996). These issues are of great concern as they form the basis of our understanding of how fractured rock aquifers behave. The parallel plate model of groundwater flow has been widely used to understand flow in a single planar fracture (National Research Council, 1996). However, the parallel plate flow represents an idealised case typically studied at a laboratory scale. Fracture flow in nature on the other hand is rather channeled within fractures due to the rough nature of apertures, and the tortuous nature and convolutions of aperture patterns. This chapter will mainly be dealing with the various transport mechanisms such as advection, dispersion, matrix diffusion, decay and sorption with the aim of identifying which processes are more dominant, and under what circumstances. Finally a look at the radionuclides of uranium and thorium and their behavior in fractured rock aquifers is given.

2.1.1 Characterising Fractured Rock Aquifers

According to (Cook, 2003), aquifers can be considered to fall in a continuum between porous media and conduit systems. This is illustrated in Figure 2.1, whereby a classification of fractured rock aquifers is given. Models in general are based on certain assumptions and groundwater models are no exception to this rule. Fractured rock models often assume that fractures are planar and parallel, though seldom the case in reality, but which provide us with a good foundation in understanding groundwater behavior in fractured rocks. It is this very concept of the fracture as planar network of interconnected voids that lead to the analogy with porous media (National Research Council, 1996).
Council, 1996). The characterisation of fractured rock aquifers requires information on both the fractures and their surrounding matrix, with the rock matrix generally being described by its pore size distribution expressed in terms of effective porosity ($\eta$) and hydraulic conductivity ($K$).

Figure 2.1 Classifications of fractured rock aquifers (Cook, 2003).

As has already been pointed out, fractures are not uniformly distributed in formations, and with the complex connectivity of fractures and their wide range of hydraulic properties, convoluted flow paths are bound to exist in fractured rock aquifers. It is thus important when characterising fractured rocks that the orientation, spacing, length, aperture, connectivity and surface roughness measurements be noted (Cook, 2003). Of equal importance is the characteristic of the rock matrix, whereby the measurements of matrix porosity and permeability helps to determine the extent to which fractures are likely to dominate flow. In the case where fractures are open, fracture permeability is likely to exceed matrix permeability and therefore allow groundwater flow to be dominated by fractures. Measurements of matrix diffusion coefficients largely determine the extent to which solutes will be retarded relative to water movement (National Research Council, 1996). Caution needs to be applied when measurements of rock matrix properties are carried out on surface samples as results may be affected by weathering and decompression processes.
2.1.2 Pumping tests in fractured rock aquifers

In groundwater investigations, hydraulic tests are used to obtain estimates of hydraulic conductivity and storativity of the aquifer medium. These properties are useful in determining the advective transport of contaminant plumes and in designing effective groundwater remediation systems. Pumping tests, including constant – rate and step – drawdown tests, are amongst the most common hydraulic test procedures applied in fractured rock aquifers. According to Kruseman and de Ridder, (1991), the principle of a pumping test is to pump water from a borehole and measure discharge and drawdown in observation boreholes at known distances from the pumping borehole. These measurements can then be substituted into appropriate well – flow equations in order to calculate the hydraulic characteristics of the aquifer.

There are other cost effective methods, such as slug and bail tests, permeameter tests, and grain – size analysis, that offer economical ways of obtaining data to estimate aquifer parameters when a pumping test is not feasible. However, scale effects need to be accounted for when using these methods. In the following section some of the methods including (Theis, 1935; Cooper and Jacob, 1946; Hantush and Jacob, 1955; Barker, 1988) for evaluating pumping tests in general and not limited to fractured rock aquifers (assuming equivalent porous media) are given.

2.1.2.1 Theis method (unsteady-state flow)

The first mathematical treatment of unsteady – state domain of Darcian groundwater flow to a borehole in a confined aquifer is credited to Charles Vernon Theis, who published the analytical solution in 1935. Some of the simplifying assumptions that are required for mathematical convenience are listed below (Fetter, 1999):
1. Aquifer is homogenous, isotropic, uniformly thick, and of infinite extent.
2. The potentiometric surface is horizontal initially.
3. Borehole fully penetrates the confined aquifer resulting in horizontal flow to the borehole and flow is laminar (Darcy’s law dictates).
4. Storage within borehole can be neglected.
5. Water is removed from storage and responds instantaneously with declining head.

The solution for predicting drawdown in a borehole at a radial distance from the pumped borehole is known as the Theis equation:

\[
s = \frac{Q}{4\pi T} W(u) \quad \text{Equation 1}
\]

Where,
- \( Q \) = pumping rate \((L^3/t)\),
- \( T \) = transmissivity \((L^2/t)\),
- \( s \) = drawdown \((L)\)

\( W(u) \) in the above equation is termed the well function and is the infinite series part of the analytical solution to the unsteady, radial groundwater flow equation that is approximated by:

\[
W(u) = -0.572\ln u + u - \frac{u^2}{2 \cdot 2!} + \frac{u^3}{3 \cdot 3!} - \frac{u^4}{4 \cdot 4!} + \ldots \quad \text{Equation 2}
\]

This particular well function is a function of \( u \), where:

\[
u = \frac{r^2 s}{4Tt} \quad \text{Equation 3}\]
Where,

\[ r = \text{radial distance to the pumping well (L)}, \]
\[ S = \text{storativity (dimensionless)}, \]
\[ T = \text{transmissivity (L}^2/t), \]
\[ t = \text{time (in days or minutes)} \]

### 2.1.2.2 Cooper – Jacob (Straight-line method)

The Cooper – Jacob method (Cooper and Jacob, 1946), commonly referred to as the straight line method is a simplification of the (Theis, 1935) solution for flow to fully penetrating boreholes in confined aquifers. Cooper – Jacob, (1946) noted that after the pumping borehole has been running for some time, the well function (\( u \)) becomes sufficiently small (< 0.05) and the higher power terms (beyond ln \( u \)) of the infinite series of (equation.2) becomes negligible. The same assumptions apply to the Cooper – Jacob analytical solution as the Theis solution, with the addition of there being “no recharge”. Because recharge affects the slope of the log (time) vs. drawdown curve to flatten as the recharge in the zone of influence of the borehole matches the discharge. For the Cooper – Jacob straight line method, drawdown is plotted with an arithmetic scale on the y – axis versus time plotted with a logarithmic scale on the x – axis. The value of transmissivity and storativity may be calculated by the following equations:

\[ T = \frac{2.3Q}{4\pi\Delta S} \quad \text{Equation 4} \]

and

\[ S = \frac{2.2STto}{r^2} \quad \text{Equation 5} \]

Where,

\[ T = \text{transmissivity (L}^2/t), \]
\[ Q = \text{pumping rate (L}^3/t), \]
\[ \Delta S = \text{drawdown per log cycle of time (L)}, \]
\[ S = \text{storativity (dimensionless)}, \]
For distance-drawdown plots the equations are modified as follows:

\[ T = \frac{2.3Q}{2\pi\Delta S} \]  

Equation 6

\[ S = \frac{2.25Tt_o}{r^2o} \]  

Equation 7

Where,

- \( t = \) time (in days or minutes),
- \( r_o = \) distance at which the straight-line intersects the zero-drawdown axis (L)

The results from the Cooper – Jacob solution and Theis solution are generally comparable; however, the former is much easier to plot in the field and does not involve any curve matching techniques.

### 2.1.2.3 Hantush – Jacob’s method

It is seldom in nature that aquifers are perfectly confined; instead leaky aquifers occur more frequently, which implies that confining layers overlying or underlying a particular aquifer are hardly ever completely impermeable (Kruseman and de Ridder, 1991). Hantush and Jacob, (1955) presented the solution for drawdown in a pumped aquifer that has an impermeable base and a leaky confining unit above. Conceptually, this would be regarded as a four-layered system, from top to bottom, a water table aquifer, a leaky confining unit, a confined aquifer, and extremely low permeability bedrock. During early pumping time, water is coming out of storage from the pumped aquifer and the leaky confining unit. Eventually, the drawdown comes into equilibrium with the leakage through the confining unit from the unstressed aquifer and the system achieves
steady – state. Once equilibrium is reached, the aquitard merely serves as a water 
transmitting medium, and the water contributed from its storage can be neglected 
(Kruseman and de Ridder, 1991). The assumptions and conditions underlying this 
method are:

1. Aquifer is leaky, horizontal flow in stressed aquifer and vertical flow through the 
aquitard.
2. The aquifer is pumped at a constant discharge rate.
3. Pumping well is fully penetrating.
4. Aquitard is overlain by an unconfined aquifer, known as the source bed.
5. Water table in the source bed is initially horizontal and does not fall during 
pumping of the aquifer.
6. Aquifer is compressible, and water drains instantaneously with a declining head.
7. Aquitard is incompressible; no water is released from storage in the aquitard 
when the aquifer is pumped.

The Hantush – Jacob formula for drawdown of a pumped borehole at a constant 
discharge in a leaky aquifer is:

\[ s = \frac{Q}{4\pi T} W \left( u, \frac{r}{b} \right) \]  
Equation 8

\[ u = \frac{r^2 s}{4 T t} \]  
Equation 9

\[ B = \left( \frac{T b}{K} \right)^{1/2} \]  
Equation 10
Where,

\[ Q = \text{pumping rate (L}^3/\text{t}), \]
\[ s = \text{drawdown (L)}, \]
\[ T = \text{transmissivity (L}^2/\text{t}), \]
\[ W(u, r/B) = \text{leaky artesian well function}, \]
\[ r = \text{distance from pumping borehole to observation borehole (L)}, \]
\[ S = \text{storativity (dimensionless)}, \]
\[ t = \text{time (in days or minutes)}, \]
\[ B = \text{leakage factor (L)}, \]
\[ b' = \text{aquitard thickness (L)}, \]
\[ K' = \text{hydraulic conductivity of the aquitard (L/t)}. \]

It is important to take cognisant of the fact that, up until now we have considered steady
state conditions, whereby storage in the aquitard is considered to be negligible. However, when flow is unsteady the effects of aquitard storage cannot be neglected. Two useful methods that accounts for the aquitard storage capacity are the Hantush –
curve fitting method and the Neuman – Witherspoon method (Fetter, 1999).

### 2.1.2.4 Barker’s method

The inherent complexity of flow through fractures makes the use of classical techniques
(Theis and Cooper – Jacob) inaccurate for calculation of aquifer constants (Marechal et
al., 2004). The problem that generally arises when conducting hydraulic tests in
fractured-rock aquifers is being able to choose an appropriate geometry for the fracture
system through which flow occurs. Barker, (1988) proposed a model, commonly referred
to as the generalized radial flow (GRF) model, which is based on the generalization of
the flow dimension to non – integral values. The reason for proposing the GRF model is
that it contains relatively few parameters, making it suitable for data analysis. Secondly,
it is much easier to generalize the dimension of the flow system as it is often difficult to
choose an appropriate dimension (Barker, 1988). The model is usually applied to
aquifers with complex geometry and heterogeneous properties. The GRF model is
based on the following assumptions:
1. Flow is radial and Darcy’s law applies throughout the system.

2. The source is an $n$ – dimensional sphere (projected through three – dimensional space e.g. finite cylinder in two dimensions) with a radius $r_w$ and storage capacity $S_w$.

3. The source has infinitesimal skin which is characterised by a skin factor $S_f$; the head loss across the surface of the source is proportional to $S_f$ and the rate of flow through the surface.

4. Any piezometers in the fracture system have negligible size and storage capacity.

The following equations of the GRF model shows the relationship between cross – sectional area of flow and distance from the source (Walker and Roberts, 2003):

\[
A(r) = \partial_n r^{n-1}
\]

Equation 11

Where the surface area of a unit sphere in $n$ dimension is

\[
\partial_n = b^{3-n} \frac{2\pi^{\frac{n}{2}}}{\Gamma\left(\frac{n}{2}\right)}
\]

Equation 12

Where,

- $A(r)$ = is the cross – sectional area of flow ($L^2$),
- $r$ = radial distance from the borehole ($L$),
- $b$ = is the extent of the zone ($L$),
- $n$ = flow dimension,
- $\Gamma$ = gamma function.

The governing equation for the GRF model is given by:
Where,

\[ h(r,t) = \text{change in hydraulic head from } h(r,0) = 0 \text{ (L)}, \]
\[ K = \text{hydraulic conductivity (L/T)}, \]
\[ S_s = \text{specific storage (1/L)}. \]

The Barker method takes into account the dimension of the flow, which results from the distribution and connectivity of the conductive fractures (Marechal et al., 2004). This theory is a generalization of the Theis theory, which considers radial flow, into a homogeneous, confined and isotropic fractured medium characterised by a hydraulic conductivity \( K_f \) and specific storage \( S_{sf} \). The model introduces the fractional dimension of flow, \( n \), which characterises the variation of flow section according to distance from the pumping borehole. Values of \( n \) generally vary from 0 to 3, whereby \( n = 3 \) indicates spherical flow, \( n = 2 \) cylindrical and linear where \( n = 1 \) (Figure 2.2).
Figure 2.2 Flow dimensions and their practical approach in porous continuum and fractured discontinuum (Black, 1994).
2.1.3 Tracer Tests

Tracer testing can provide insight into groundwater flow characteristics and contaminant transport processes that are not provided by conventional aquifer testing methods. These insights generally complement those gained by conventional methods, and are best suited for assessing water quality issues associated with contaminant migration. Choosing the appropriate tracer can help identify the dominant transport mechanisms. Ideally, one of the tracers should move at the same velocity as the water. The tracer under consideration should not decay, adsorb onto the rock or react with other tracers (i.e. it should be chemically inert) (National Research Council, 1996).

One of the critical issues in planning a tracer test is determining what mass of tracer to inject, and as a result a number of empirical equations have been developed for this purpose (Käss, 1998). The following formula is one of many used to estimate the tracer quantity:

\[
M = Q \cdot L \cdot k \quad (kg)
\]  
Equation 14

Where \( Q \) = discharge or pumping rate of the well (m\(^3\)/s),
\( L \) = distance (km),
\( k \) = coefficient of the tracer

Forced-gradient cross-hole tracer tests, in which tracers are injected into one or more boreholes and recovered by pumping a nearby borehole, provide estimates of effective flow porosity of the aquifer system. Cross-hole tracer tests can also be conducted under natural-gradient conditions (i.e. without pumping) to obtain direct estimates of both ambient groundwater flow velocities and solute dispersivity (longitudinal and transverse) in the aquifer (Käss, 1998). These tests are generally conducted with one or more injection boreholes and several down gradient observation boreholes that are passively sampled for tracers. Single - well tracer tests can also be used, with different rest periods, or times that tracers are allowed to drift in the aquifer before being pumped back, are probably a more practical, though less direct, method of obtaining estimates of
ambient groundwater flow velocities in an aquifer than natural-gradient cross-hole tracer
tests. Both cross-hole and single-well tracer tests should always be conducted by
simultaneously injecting several inert tracers that have different diffusion coefficients so
that the effects of diffusion, advection, and hydrodynamic dispersion can be
distinguished from one another and deconvoluted to obtain more constrained estimates
of transport parameters describing the three processes (National Research Council,
1996). It is also helpful to add reactive tracers to the mixture of nonreactive tracers,
which will provide additional information on diffusion and sorptive processes in retarding
the transport of contaminants in the aquifer. The effect diffusion has on the overall
movement of tracers in the subsurface cannot be underestimated. This is particularly
true for tracers that have large diffusion coefficients as opposed to those with smaller
diffusion coefficients. Extensive diffusive mass transfer between flowing and near
stagnant water in the aquifer will slow the migration of contaminants, but will also make
it much more difficult to remediate the aquifer afterwards once contaminants diffuses
from fractures into the adjacent porous matrix. Maloszewski and Zuber, (1990)
developed the single fissure dispersion model (SFDM) to incorporate sorbable
substances by coupling an instantaneous equilibrium reaction governed by a linear
adsorption isotherm with a nonequilibrium kinetic reaction of the first order. The model is
based on the assumption that the fracture system can be substituted by a single fracture
and accounts for diffusion processes into an adjacent infinitely extended matrix. The
concentration $C$ at the pumping borehole can be expressed in terms of mean residence
time $t_o$, Peclet number, $Pe$, and a third fitting parameter, $a$, that incorporates matrix
diffusion:

$$ C(t) = \frac{a M}{2\pi Q}\sqrt{Pe t_o} \int_0^t \exp \left[ -\frac{Pe(t_o - \tau)}{4t_o \tau} - \frac{(\tau a)^2}{(t - \tau)^2} \right] \frac{d \tau}{\sqrt{t - \tau}} $$

Equation 15

Where $M$ = injected tracer mass

$Q$ = flow rate
The three fitting parameters of the SFDM (a, Pe, $T_0$) combine several physical parameters. For non-reactive tracers the diffusion parameter a is given by (Maloszewski and Zuber, 1990):

\[
a = \frac{\eta \sqrt{D_p}}{2b}
\]

Equation 15.1

Where 2b is the mean fracture aperture (m), $\eta$ the effective matrix porosity (m$^3$/m$^3$) and $D_p$ the pore diffusion coefficient (m$^2$/s). The Peclet number Pe is defined by:

\[
Pe = \frac{vX}{D}
\]

Equation 15.2

Where $v$ is the mean flow velocity, and X is the distance along the flow direction between the injection and extraction borehole (m). The mean travel time $t_0$ of a non-sorbing tracer in the fracture is given by:

\[
t_0 = \frac{X}{v}
\]

Equation 15.3

The relative recovery can be calculated from both, the experimental and theoretical tracer curve as a function of time. According to Käss, (1998), the comparison of the above curves improves the inverse fitting procedure, because it is very sensitive for diffusion processes affecting the tailing of the breakthrough curve. The relative recovery is defined as follows:

\[
RR(t) = \frac{Q}{M} \int_0^t C_f(t') \delta t' / M
\]

Equation 15.4

Where $RR = \text{recovered tracer mass}$

$M = \text{injected tracer mass}$

$Q = \text{flow rate}$
t = DIRAC delta function

cf = tracer concentration in the fracture

The application of the SFDM by Maloszewski et al., (1999) to two multi-tracer tests performed in one of the major cross-fault zones of the Lange Bramke basin (Harz Mountains, Germany), have shown that at least one of the injected tracers should be conservative, otherwise it would not be possible to effectively distinguish sorption from diffusion processes and the influence of diffusion exchange between mobile water in the fractures and immobile water in the rock matrix. This particular model has also been applied successfully in related studies at the Lindau rock tests site (Himmelsbach et al., 1995 and Witthüser et al., 2003).

2.2 TRANSPORT MECHANISMS IN FRACTURED ROCKS

Over the last two decades major efforts have been devoted to the development of realistic theoretical models capable of simulating flow and transport processes in fractured and heterogeneous porous formations (Berkowitz et al., 1999). These models have consequently led to a significantly improved understanding of the dynamics of flow and transport processes. The most common model for flow in a single fracture is the cubic law, in which two parallel plates separated by a constant distance (aperture), represents the fracture being used. This is commonly referred to as the parallel plate model of groundwater flow, considered as a system of one or several planar, parallel fractures in an impermeable rock matrix. The equation for one-dimensional flow between two parallel plates is given by the cubic law (National Research Council, 1996):

\[ Q = \frac{b^3}{12\gamma} \Delta p \]  

Equation 16

Where:

- \( Q \) = volumetric flow rate \((L^3/T)\),
- \( b \) = distance between the plates or the aperture \((L)\),
- \( \Delta p \) = pressure gradient
- \( \gamma \) = dynamic viscosity.
It is normally assumed that fracture walls are smooth and that flow is in the laminar range, although it is not the case in reality (Bear et al., 1993). The influence of fracture roughness on the laminar flow rate was investigated and the following relationship was identified:

\[
\Psi = \frac{96}{\text{Re}} \left[ 1 + 6.0 \left( \frac{\varepsilon}{2b} \right)^{\frac{3}{2}} \right] \quad \text{valid for } \frac{\varepsilon}{b} > 0.0065
\]

Equation 17

Where:
\begin{align*}
\Psi &= \text{friction factor} \\
\text{Re} &= \text{Reynolds number} \\
\varepsilon &= \text{fracture roughness} \\
b &= \text{aperture (L)}
\end{align*}

Generally laminar flow between parallel plates is expressed as:

\[
\Psi = \frac{96}{\text{Re}} f
\]

Equation 18

Where:
\begin{align*}
f &= \text{friction factor} \\
f &= 1 \text{ for smooth walls} \\
f &> 1 \text{ for rough walls.}
\end{align*}

To predict flow in a real fracture with rough walls, the difficulty in applying the cubic law comes about in defining a representative distance between the fracture walls. Equation 16 can be corrected by a friction factor \( f \) to account for the roughness of the fracture surfaces (Witherspoon et al., 1980):

\[
Q = \frac{1}{f} b^3 \Delta p \\
\frac{1}{f} = 12 \gamma
\]

Equation 19

Where:
\begin{align*}
Q &= \text{volumetric flow rate (L}^3/\text{T)} \\
b &= \text{distance between the plates or the aperture (L)} \\
\Delta p &= \text{pressure gradient} \\
\gamma &= \text{dynamic viscosity.} \\
f &= \text{friction factor}
\end{align*}
The validity of this modified cubic law was discussed by Witherspoon et al., (1980) based on their experimental measurements of radial and straight flows through artificially induced tensile fractures in different rock types (granite, basalt and marble) with normal stresses up to 20 MPa and apertures ranging from 250µm down to 4µm. The results showed that the cubic law was found to hold whether the fracture surfaces were open or closed due to asperities or contact points and was independent of the rock type. In that particular investigation \( f \) was allowed to vary between 1.04 and 1.65. Raven and Gale, (1985) made measurements of fluid flow at different normal stresses with natural fractures in granite specimens of different sizes (ranging from 100mm to 294mm in diameter). The results obtained showed that the deviation from the cubic law increased with increasing loading cycles and specimen sizes. These effects are a direct result of the roughness or asperity characteristics of fracture surfaces.

The concept of channeling also became an increasingly important phenomenon in fractured porous media and was found to have a substantial effect on solute transport in such media (Tsang and Tsang, 1989). The wide range of aperture values in a single fracture gives rise to a very heterogeneous two-dimensional flow system. Thus the whole fracture plane is not uniformly conductive to water and the majority of flow occurs in flow paths of least resistance or more commonly referred to as channels (Tsang and Tsang 1989; Tsang et al., 1991) (Figure 2.3). Abelin et al., (1994) conducted channeling experiments to study the transmissivity and aperture variations in fractures in crystalline rock at the Stripa experimental mine in mid –Sweden. Two types of experiments were designed; however, both tests could not prove the transmissivity or aperture variability with any accuracy as explained below. In the single-hole test no obvious correlation between the observed aperture and the injected flow rate was observed. This was mainly attributed to the rough and undulating fracture surface. In the case of double-hole and tracer tests, the investigated fractures were intersected by other fractures, which basically diverted the flow in a manner similar to a porous medium in radial flow. The observations of the tracer movements lead to the conclusion that there exist dead end channels and that the aperture can be of the order of several hundred µm.
Transport and retardation in a single fracture can occur either by way of advection, hydrodynamic dispersion, matrix diffusion, sorption and decay. The solution of mass transport in fractured rocks with an impermeable matrix is governed by what is known as the advective – dispersion equation (Bear et al., 1993), assuming no advective transport in the rock matrix. The equation is:

\[
R_f \frac{\partial c}{\partial t} = -\nu \frac{\partial c_f}{\partial x} + D_L \frac{\partial^2 c_f}{\partial x^2} + \frac{u_p D_p}{b} \frac{\partial c_p}{\partial y} - \lambda R_f c_f
\]

**Equation 20**

\[
\frac{\partial c_p}{\partial t} = \frac{D_p}{R_p} \frac{\partial c_p}{\partial y^2} - \frac{\lambda c_p}{T_f}
\]

**Equation 21**

Where

- \( R_f \) = retardation coefficient of fracture surface [\( \text{-} \)]
- \( c \) = concentration in the mobile (fracture) zone [ML-3]
- \( \nu \) = average solute velocity in the fracture [LT-1]
- \( Dh \) = hydrodynamic dispersion coefficient [L\(^2\)T-1]
2.2.1 Advection

Advection describes the movement of solutes and suspended matter with the pore water flow velocity. The amount of solute transported is a function of its concentration in the groundwater and the groundwater flow rate. In a saturated medium, this velocity can be calculated from Darcy’s law (Fetter, 1999):

\[
v_x = \frac{K}{\eta_e} \frac{dh}{dl}
\]

Where

- \(v_x\) = average linear velocity (L/T)
- \(K\) = hydraulic conductivity (L/T)
- \(\eta_e\) = effective porosity (dimensionless)
- \(dh\) = hydraulic gradient (L/L)
- \(dl\)

Equation 22

2.2.2 Matrix Diffusion

Matrix diffusion is a transport mechanism by which solutes are transferred from the water-flowing portions of permeable media to the non–flowing portions (matrix) and vice versa through molecular diffusion (Carrera et al., 1998). Diffusion will occur as long as concentration gradients exist, and can be expressed by Fick’s first law in one dimension and under steady state conditions as (Fetter, 1999):

\[
F = -D \frac{dC}{dx}
\]

Where

- \(F\) = mass flux of solute per unit area per unit time
- \(D\) = diffusion coefficient (L^2/T)
- \(C\) = solute concentration (M/L^3)
- \(\frac{dC}{dx}\) = concentration gradient (M/L^4)

Equation 23
Systems in which concentrations are changing with time (unsteady state); Fick’s second law applies (Drever, 1988):

\[
\frac{\partial C}{\partial t} = D \frac{\partial^2 C}{\partial x^2}
\]

Equation 24

Where

\[
\frac{\partial C}{\partial t} = \text{change in concentration with time (M/L}^3/T)\]

The molecular diffusion coefficient in porous media, \( D \), will be small as compared with that in water due to the resistance in the porous medium by the length and tortuosity of the flow paths (Drever, 1988). To account for this effect an effective diffusion coefficient must be used:

\[
D' = \frac{D\phi}{\theta^2}
\]

Equation 25

Where

- \( D' \) = effective diffusion coefficient,
- \( D \) = diffusion coefficient in solution
- \( \phi \) = porosity
- \( \theta \) = tortuosity

The tortuosity factor (\( \tau \)), which is a geometric parameter to account for the increased distance of transport, is expressed as the square of the ratio of the effective path length (\( l_e \)) to the shortest distance \( l \). Hence, \( l_e > l \) for porous media and \( \tau \) is always greater than 1. At a microscale, the pore diffusion coefficient \( D_p \) includes the resistance to diffusion from the pore geometry \( \frac{\delta}{\tau^2} \), where \( \delta \) is the constrictivity of pores, which describe the cross-section variation in pore space and depends on pore and diffusing component sizes.

\[
\tau = \left( \frac{l_e}{l} \right)^2 > 1
\]

Equation 26
Over the last two decades many theoretical and experimental studies have shown the great influence matrix diffusion has on transport (Tsang and Tsang 1989; Tsang et al, 1991; Moreno et al., 1997). It is well documented in the literature that matrix diffusion is an important process for retarding solute transport in fractured rock, by allowing for solute storage within the often-large void space of the matrix. The matrix diffusion coefficient is a key parameter for describing the diffusion process in the rock matrix and the diffusive mass transfer between the fractures and the matrix. Laboratory experiments on rock matrix cores and field tracer tests at a larger scale have often been employed to estimate the matrix diffusion coefficient (e.g. Witthüser et al., 2003, et al., 2006 and Shapiro et al., 2007). Another feature of matrix diffusion is tailing effects observed in breakthrough curves, where solutes take a long time to diffuse out of the matrix. (Figure 2.4) shows an example of breakthrough curves with extensive tailing resulting from matrix diffusion (Bodin et al., 2003).

![Figure 2.4 Tracer concentration curves in a multitracer experiment conducted in Chalk formation (Bodin et al., 2003).](image)
This tailing effect, which is common to both channeling and matrix diffusion effects, emphasises possible problems in the interpretation of tracer experiments. It can be difficult to determine which mechanism the observed tailing represents. Tracer tests conducted by Becker and Shapiro (2000) proved that the tailing effect of breakthrough curves is not always as a result of matrix diffusion processes. It’s been shown that tracers of varying diffusion coefficients produced identical late time breakthrough. This would imply that the tailings were not caused by any purely diffusive transport mechanism rather; this tailing resulted from hydrodynamic transport mechanisms such as advection and dispersion. The above authors hypothesise that this advection-dominated tailing results from the highly heterogeneous spatial and temporal nature of transport in fractured rocks. Based on laboratory experiments from rock matrix cores and field tracer tests to determine diffusion and distribution coefficients Witthüser et al., (2003) have shown that, due to the high matrix porosity of the chalk diffusion controlled tailing can be expected even for short distance tracer tests. A diffusion determined tailing can be identified by a decrease in the concentration of the tailing according to $t^{-1.5}$ as a criterion. This allowed a distinction to be observed between an injection/dispersion and diffusion determined tailing.

### 2.2.3 Mechanical dispersion

Mechanical dispersion describes the macroscopic phenomenon whereby dissolved constituents as well as suspended particulates and colloids are transported with different velocities and in different directions along the flow path as a result of inhomogeneities in porous media and variations in pore water velocity. Dispersion in general is caused by a number of factors including:

1. Pore size – whereby, some pores are larger than others and allow fluid to move faster,
2. Path length – some solute particles travel along longer flow paths to go the same linear distance,
3. Friction in pores – fluids move faster through the centre of pores than along the edges.
Mixing that occurs along and perpendicular to the direction of the flow path is termed longitudinal and transversal dispersion. In the case of an advancing solute front, spreading will occur in directions normal to the direction of flow because at the pore scale the flow path can diverge (Fetter, 1999). This type of mixing in the direction normal to the flow path is called transverse dispersion. Mechanical dispersion due to the preceding factors is equal to the product of the average linear velocity and the dynamic dispersivity ($\alpha$).

\[
\text{Mechanical dispersion} = \alpha_L v_X
\]  
\text{Equation 27}

Dispersion is generally higher in the flow direction (longitudinal) than in the direction perpendicular to the flow (transversal and vertical). It is scale dependent and increases with the scale of measurement, due to the heterogeneous nature of the aquifer material (Berkowitz, 2002). Flow channeling within the fracture is widely recognised to have a huge effect on dispersion (Berkowitz, 2002).

### 2.2.4 Hydrodynamic dispersion

Hydrodynamic dispersion is the flux of solute due to the combined effect of molecular diffusion and mechanical dispersion, described by the following equation (Fetter, 1999):

\[
D_L = \alpha_L v_X + D^*\]
\text{Equation 28}

Where

- $D_L$ = the longitudinal coefficient of hydrodynamic dispersion ($L^2/T$)
- $\alpha_L$ = the dynamic dispersivity (L)
- $v_X$ = the average linear groundwater velocity ($L/T$)
- $D^*$ = the effective molecular diffusion coefficient ($L^2/T$)
The effects of mechanical dispersion are generally much greater than those of molecular diffusion, and except at low groundwater velocities; the contribution of molecular diffusion is almost negligible (Berkowitz, 2002).

### 2.2.5 Sorption

In most cases transport can be strongly affected by interactions between the solutes and the rock minerals. Various kinds of mechanisms can be involved (Bodin et al., 2003):

1. Electrostatic interactions, generally between negatively charged mineral surfaces and cationic species in solution.
2. Electromagnetic interactions (Van Der Waal’s forces).
3. Chemical interactions i.e. chemical bonds between the solute and the grain surface.

Most sorption reactions are considered instantaneous and reversible. Diffusion and sorption reactions play a major role in the retardation of solutes in geological formations. Due to matrix diffusion being a relatively slow mechanism, solute sorption mainly occurs at the fracture surface when flow is fast. For long residence times, sorption reactions mainly occur within the matrix because the available exchange surfaces in the matrix are much more important than those in the fracture (Bodin et al., 2003). The experimental method commonly used to characterise the sorption properties of a rock is the batch technique. It consists of generating an equilibrium condition between a solution of known initial concentration and crushed rocks and calculating the fraction of mass adsorbed at the grain surface. However, sorption parameters inferred from such experiments should be treated with vigilance as rock crushing can increase the surface area available for solute sorption (Bodin et al., 2003). A plot of adsorbed contaminant concentration \( C^* \) fixed on solid surfaces, as a function of contaminant concentration \( C \) in the liquid phase is known as an adsorption isotherm (Figure 2.5). The most common sorption isotherms are linear (Henry), Freundlich and Langmuir (Domenico and Schwartz, 1998).
Linear (Henry) sorption isotherm

A linear relationship between the amount of a solute sorbed onto solid C* and the concentration of the solute C, the adsorption isotherm of C, as a function of C* will plot as a straight line (Figure 2.5). The equation for a linear (Henry) isotherm is given by:

\[ C^* = K_d C \]  
Equation 29

Where

\( C^* \) = mass of solute sorbed per dry unit weight of solid (mg/kg)
\( C \) = concentration of solute in solution in equilibrium with the mass of solute sorbed onto the solid (mg/L)
\( K_d \) = distribution coefficient (L/kg)

Attenuation due to sorption can be described by the retardation equation as follows:

\[ 1 + \frac{B_d}{\theta} K_d = R_f \]  
Equation 30

Where

\( B_d \) = bulk density of the aquifer (M/L^3)
\( \theta \) = volumetric moisture content or porosity for saturated media (dimensionless)

Figure 2.5 Sorption Isotherms (Domenico and Schwartz, 1998)
\( R_f = \) retardation coefficient

This dimensionless retardation factor \( (R_f) \), is a measure of the attenuated transport of a reactive contaminant species compared to the advective behavior of groundwater (Hiscock, 2005). The major drawback associated with this particular isotherm is that there is no limit to the amount of solute that can be sorbed onto the sorbent (Fetter, 1999).

**Freundlich sorption isotherm**

The Freundlich isotherm is a non-linear isotherm and is described as follows (Fetter, 1999):

\[
C^* = KC^N
\]

Equation 31

Where \( K \) and \( N \) are constants.

When \( C \) is plotted as a function \( C^* \) the data will be curvilinear (Figure 2.5), however the data can be linearised by using the following equation:

\[
\log C^* = \log K + N \log C
\]

Equation 32

**Langmuir sorption isotherm**

This isotherm was developed with the concept that the solid surface possesses a finite number of sorption sites. When all the sorption sites are filled, the surface will no longer sorb solute from solution. The equation is given by (Fetter, 1999):

\[
\frac{C}{C^*} = \frac{1}{\alpha \beta} + \frac{C}{\beta}
\]

Equation 33
Where

\[ \alpha = \text{adsorption constant related to the binding energy (L/mg)} \]
\[ \beta = \text{maximum amount of solute that can be absorbed by the solid (mg/kg)} \]

Important to note is that when the Langmuir sorption isotherm is plotted it will give a curved shape that has a distinctive upper limit, referred to as the sorption capacity (Figure 2.5).

### 2.2.6 Decay/Transformation

The rate of decay of a radioactive parent nuclide to a stable daughter product is proportional to the number of atoms, \( n \), present at any time \( t \) (Dickin, 2005). If radionuclides enter the groundwater system the cations and to a lesser degree anions will be subjected to retardation processes on soil surfaces. Furthermore, radionuclides undergo radioactive decay, reducing the concentration in both the dissolved and sorbed phases (Fetter, 1999). Some solutes can also be adsorbed onto the fracture walls and undergo biodegradation reactions. Generally decay reactions obey first order kinetics, given as (Bodin et al., 2003):

\[
\frac{\partial c}{\partial t} = -\lambda c
\]

**Equation 34**

Where

\[ \lambda (T^{-1}) = \text{decay constant (T}^{-1}) \]

The decay constant states the probability that a given atom of a radionuclide will decay within a stated time.
A useful way of referring to the rate of decay of a radionuclide is the half-life, \( t^{1/2} \), which is the time required for half of the parent atoms to decay (Dickin, 2005):

\[
\frac{1}{t^{1/2}} = \frac{\ln 2}{\lambda}
\]

Equation 35

2.3 CHEMICAL PROPERTIES OF URANIUM AND THORIUM

Martin H. Klaproth whilst experimenting with pitchblende in 1789 discovered uranium (Kotz and Treichel, 1999). Uranium is in the actinide series, corresponding to the filling of the 5f electron orbital subshell. When it is refined its a dense silvery white weakly radioactive metal that is slightly softer than steel and has an atomic number of 92 and a relative atomic mass of 238.03 g/mol.

The element is weakly radioactive and contributes to natural background environmental radiation. Thorium was discovered later in 1828 by a Swedish chemist named Jöns Jacob Berzelius (Kotz and Treichel, 1999). It occurs also in the actinium series with an electron configuration of \( 6d^2 \ 7s^2 \) and has a silvery white metallic appearance with an atomic number of 90 and a relative atomic mass of 232.03 g/mol. In groundwater, the weathering of uranium bearing rocks and minerals is the main source of dissolved uranium. Uranium in particular is very mobile and soluble under oxidising conditions, whereas thorium is rather immobile and insoluble under similar conditions (Giammar, 2001). As a result uranium can be a major pollutant in the subsurface, where it occurs predominantly as the uranyl dioxo ion \( (UO_2)^{2+} \).
2.3.1 Modes of Radioactive Decay

Some radioisotopes are known to decay by more than one mechanism. For instance, isotopes in the $^{238}\text{U}$ decay series (as will be shown later) decay by emitting $\alpha$ or $\beta$ particles, with a simultaneous emission of $\gamma$ - radiation (Ivanovich and Harmon, 1982). Naturally occurring uranium is a mixture of three isotopes and contains about 99.27% $^{238}\text{U}$, 0.72% $^{235}\text{U}$ and 0.0054% $^{234}\text{U}$ with each one beginning a cascade of daughter products referred to as a radioactive decay series (Ivanovich and Harmon, 1982). The uranium series is also the longest known series, which ends with the stable isotope of $^{206}\text{Pb}$. $^{238}\text{U}$ is the chief constituent of natural U (99.27%) and is the progenitor of the (4n +2) series of radioactive elements (Ivanovich and Harmon, 1982).

According to Langmuir (1997), there are three modes of radioactive decay, denoted by $\alpha$, $\beta$ and $\gamma$. Alpha $(\alpha)$ particles are identical to the nuclei of helium atoms, with a mass of 4 atomic mass units (1amu = $1.661 \times 10^{-27}$kg) and a charge of +2. Following $\alpha$ decay, the $\alpha$ particle accumulates two electrons from its surrounding environment, thereby balancing its charge and becoming a helium atom ($^4_2\text{He}$). When $\alpha$ - decay occurs, a daughter element is produced along with a $\alpha$ particle and this occurs with the conservation of momentum. Therefore, the newly produced daughter element recoils in the opposite direction from that in which the $\alpha$ particle was emitted. This concept is known as alpha recoil, with recoil distances in water and air being significantly larger than in solids (Langmuir, 1997). Alpha particles have limited penetrating power and can easily be stopped by several sheets of ordinary paper or clothing (Kotz and Treichel, 1999). Beta $(\beta)$ particles are identical to electrons emitted from the nucleus, with a mass of $5.49 \times 10^{-4}$ amu and a charge of -1. The $\beta$ particles are electrons ejected at high speeds from some radioactive nuclei. They are more penetrating than alpha particles and thus require a piece of aluminum to be stopped (Kotz and Treichel, 1999). Gamma rays $(\gamma)$ are electromagnetic radiation with wavelengths shorter than those of X – rays (Langmuir, 1997). Gamma $(\gamma)$ rays have no electrical charge and are not
affected by an electric field. Gamma (γ) radiation is the most penetrating radiation because it passes completely through the human body.

Figure 2.6 The Uranium decay series (modified from Dicken, 2005).

$^{238}\text{U}$ is an alpha emitter with a half-life of $4.51 \times 10^9$ years corresponding to a specific activity of 0.747 disintegrations per minute. The actinium series $(4n+3)$ begins in nature with the radionuclide of $^{235}\text{U}$ and ends with the stable lead isotope $^{207}\text{Pb}$ (Ivanovich and Harmon, 1982). $^{235}\text{U}$ has a half – life of $7.1 \times 10^8$ years and is also an alpha emitter with a very much complex alpha spectrum and a correspondingly complex gamma spectrum (Figure 2.6). $^{232}\text{Th}$ is the third decay series of the three naturally occurring series of radioactive elements and is the longest lived member of the $(4n)$ series with a half – life of $1.4 \times 10^{10}$ years (Figure 2.6). In this particular decay series a significant branch at
Bi$^{212}$ occurs, which undergoes either $\alpha$ or $\beta$ decay. The half–lives of the two decay modes of Bi$^{212}$ are given as $1.15 \times 10^{-4}$ years, indicating the cumulative half–life of both types of decay (Langmuir, 1997).

### 2.3.2 Aqueous Uranium Geochemistry

Uranium occurs naturally in oxidation states 4+, 5+, and 6+, which are usually written as U(IV), U(V) and U(VI) (Langmuir, 1997). However, under environmental conditions, only the tetravalent and hexavalent states are known to be stable. According to (Giammer, 2001), the solubility of uranium in aqueous systems is controlled by three factors, oxidation – reduction potential, pH and dissolved carbonate content. Uranium (VI) is considerably more soluble than uranium (IV) and under reducing conditions uranium (IV) forms complexes with hydroxides or fluorides as the only dissolved species.

A study conducted by Vogel et al., (1999), who evaluated the rate of migration of a uranium deposition front within the Uitenhage aquifer (Cape Province, South Africa), clearly showed that the solubility of uranium in groundwater is very sensitive to changing redox conditions. U$^{238}$ isotopes were employed to study the historical evolution of the reducing barrier. Radium and radon were then used to evaluate the path of migration that the front of the oxygen depletion zone has taken over the past $10^5$ years. Uranium was reduced and found to precipitate as it flowed into the oxygen depleted front. This process is often referred to as roll-front or tongue-type deposits, which is an example of epigenetic deposits (Hobday and Galloway 1999). Coupled with this decrease was a rise in the U$^{234}$/U$^{238}$ activity ratio indicating that the U$^{234}$ isotope has been injected into the water by the process of alpha recoil. In pure water and under oxidising conditions the U(VI) species exists as the soluble uranyl (UO$_2^{2+}$) species along with the U(IV) species or uranous ion and their respective hydrates. The uranous species is insoluble; hence the U(VI) species is most commonly encountered as (UO$_2^{2+}$) and UO$_2$CO$_3$ species under normal groundwater conditions. Under very low pH conditions(<3) and oxidising conditions uranium occurs as the free ion U$^{4+}$ and as UOH$^{3+}$, which is typical of acid mine drainage waters (Figure 2.7). Bain et al., (2001) developed a reactive transport model (MIN3P) to evaluate the potential effects of mine closure on the geochemical evolution in an aquifer down gradient from the Konigstein uranium mine.
located in Saxony, Germany. It was shown that at lower pe values, the reduction of infiltrating dissolved U(VI), the precipitation of uraninite and removal of uranium from solution occurred. The ability of uranium to exist in either its oxidised or reduced state is a function of both the pH and Eh (Figure 2.7).

![Phase diagram of uranium speciation](image)

**Figure 2.7 Phase diagram of uranium speciation (Grainger, 1985).**

The uranyl species normally occurs only at very low pH (<5), however under normal pH conditions (6 – 9) the U(VI) hydroxyl form of $(\text{UO}_2)_3(\text{OH})_5^-$ is the dominant species of $\text{UO}_2\text{CO}_3$ and $\text{UO}_2(\text{CO}_3)_2$ in the presence of dissolved oxygen and carbon dioxide (Figure 2.8). It is important to note that although the speciation of dissolved uranium (VI) is likely to be dominated by hydrolysis and carbonate complexes, sulphate, fluoride and organic ligand complexes may also occur in environmental systems (Giammar, 2001). Amongst the complex uranium ions, uranyl carbonate ions are the most stable and will predominate not only in the bicarbonate, but also in the neutral sulphate, chloride, weakly acidic and weakly alkaline groundwaters. Ivanovich and Harmon, (1982), pointed out that normal groundwaters with pH values of 4.5 – 8 and under
anoxic conditions, uranium will be mobilised as the hydroxyl complex $\text{U(OH)}^5^-$, whereas it is immobile under most anoxic conditions and usually precipitates a uraninite.

Figure 2.8 Speciation of dissolved uranium as a function of pH for $(U) \text{tot} = 5 \mu M$, $1 = 0.1 M$, and $P_{\text{CO}_2} = 10^{-3.5}$ atm. The calculations were made without considering the precipitation of any solid phases (Giammer, 2001).
2.3.3 Water Quality Guidelines

Environmental radiation originates from a number of naturally occurring and anthropogenic sources (WHO, 2005). By far the largest proportion of human exposure to radiation comes from natural and external sources of radiation, including cosmic and terrestrial radiation and from inhalation or ingestion of radioactive materials. The contribution of drinking water to total exposure is typically very small and is largely due to naturally occurring radionuclides in the uranium and thorium decay series. On average our radiation exposure due to all natural background sources amounts to approximately 2.4 mSv/year (WHO, 2005). However, this figure can vary depending on the geographical location by several hundred percent (DWAF, 2002). The (WHO, 1993) guidelines for drinking-water quality recognised uranium as a potential chemical risk but concluded that insufficient data were available to derive a realistic guideline value at the time. The (WHO, 1998) addendum to the guideline incorporated a provisional value of 2 µg/l based on a tolerable daily intake by ingestion of 0.5 µg per kg body weight (soluble uranium). On the basis of currently-available data for sources of uranium in the human diet, WHO has recently revised the standard for drinking water and as a result the (WHO, 2005) guidelines specify a provisional guideline value of 15 µg/l. For comparison purposes the US-EPA in 2006 introduced a maximum contaminant level (MCL) for uranium in drinking water of 30 µg/l. This is applicable to public supplies in the USA. The level set followed an initial proposal of 20 µg/l set in 1991 with the drinking water standard in Canada being the same.

It has been noted that in certain parts of the world, such as the Kerala state in India and the Pocos Del Caldas in Brazil, levels of background radiation are relatively high (WHO, 2005). The levels of exposure for the general population in such areas may be up to 10 times higher than the average background level of 2.4 mSv/year given above. In the case of uranium, chemical toxicity is of more concern than the actual radiological risk of cancer (DWAF, 1996). In recent years, there has been increasing concern that the chemical effects of uranium may also pose a potential hazard to exposed populations. Toxic effects of exposure include nephritis (kidney disease) and other organs at risk from chronic radiological toxicity include the lymph nodes and the bone. A study
conducted by Kurttio et al., (2002) on the renal effects of uranium in drinking water, whereby measurements of uranium concentrations in drinking water and urine of 325 persons using drilled boreholes for drinking purposes showed significantly altered tubular function with uranium concentrations exceeding 300µg/l. This is far above the recommended guideline values given above WHO (15µg/l) and the US-EPA (30µg/l) respectively (U.S. EPA, 2006). From a local perspective the South African water quality guidelines for domestic use are shown in (Table 2.1), along with the radiological dose calculations and water quality evaluation guidelines for domestic water use given in (Table 2.2).

Table 2.1 Effects of uranium-238 on human health (DWAF, 1996).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>U-238(mg/l) (mg/l)</th>
<th>U-238 (Bq/L)</th>
<th>Colour Class</th>
<th>Effects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target water quality range 0 - 0.070</td>
<td>Target water quality range 0 - 0.070</td>
<td>Blue.Ideal (&lt;0.25Bq/l) and Green (0.25 to 0.89 Bq/l)</td>
<td>No Significant risks. Annual cancer risk less than one in four million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.070 - 0.284*</td>
<td>0.89 - 3.6</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Annual risk &lt; one in a million. May potentially be a slight risk of renal toxicity in sensitive individuals where renal functions is impaired, but unlikely to have demonstrable renal toxicity in healthy individuals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.284 - 1.42</td>
<td>3.6 - 18</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>Annual cancer risk less than one in 200 000 but significant risk of chemical toxicity with renal damage</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.4 BEHAVIOUR OF RADIONUCLIDES IN FRACTURED AQUIFERS

Numerous studies dealing with the transport mechanisms of U-Th series radioisotopes have been discussed at length in the literature (Rama and Moore 1984, Folger et al., 1997, Przylibski, 2000 and Wood et al., 2004) to determine exactly which of these mechanisms play a dominant role in aiding the release of radon, which is the daughter isotope of uranium to groundwater. Radon (Rn$^{222}$, half – life 3.84 days) is a colorless, odorless, tasteless, chemically inert, radioactive and volatile noble gas, which is continuously produced in rocks and soils through $\alpha$ - decay of Ra$^{226}$ (Bonnoto and Mello, 2006). Some atoms of Rn$^{222}$ escape from rocks and soils into the surrounding
phases, such as groundwater or air. Most groundwater contains readily detectable quantities of radon, which occur in greater amounts in comparison to the dissolved radium concentration. A simple method for estimating the coefficient of radon emanation from crystalline rocks in the Sudety Mountains (SW Poland) into groundwater was proposed by (Przylibski, 2000). The method took into consideration the important petrophysical factors of the source rock, particularly the content of parent isotopes of radon, the effective porosity and its permeability as this would have a direct influence on the radon concentration in groundwater. The highest values of emanation coefficients (41, 33 and 21%), were obtained in areas of tectonic dislocations (faults) and the lowest ones where rocks are sparsely fissured or cracked just outside the major dislocation zones of (9 and 7%).

The high variability of dissolved Rn$_{222}$ in water of fractured rocks was proposed with a physically based surface area to water volume model (Folger et al., 1997). As with uranium – mineralisation models, alpha recoil along with matrix diffusion from the matrix to the fractures provides the means for Rn$_{222}$ to enter the groundwater system. Rama and Moore, (1984), argued that there is a problem with the basic assumption regarding the release of Rn$_{222}$ and non gaseous isotopes into the groundwater directly and dominantly by recoil mechanisms, and proposes another model to explain the variable Rn$_{222}$ activities in groundwater.

This model relies on the presence of nanopores within the rock, which act as intermediary channels for Rn$_{222}$ transport after being generated predominantly within the solid matrix of the rock itself (Figure 2.9). Wood et al., (2004), state that the above model does not explain how or why these nanopores are formed and does not require the existence of chemical or weathering produced substrates for the accumulation of Rn$_{222}$ precursors. It therefore remains unclear why most of the groundwater should not contain very high activities contrary to observations or why elevated Rn$_{222}$ activities seems to be found more often in water from fractured – rock aquifers rather than primary porosity aquifers, given the similar uranium activity in both rocks. A chemically based model that provides an explanation for the high radon activity in groundwater in fractured rocks was proposed by Wood et al., (2004). In their chemically based model, Ra$_{226}$ (half–life 1601 years) is transported by Fickian diffusion from the matrix to the fracture surface, where it is sorbed on ion exchange minerals formed from weathering of
the fracture surfaces. Due to the fact that Ra\textsuperscript{226} is sorbed on the fracture surface, this sorption removes it from the matrix, thus ensuring an activity gradient towards the fracture and in turn providing a continuous supply of Ra\textsuperscript{226} to the fracture surface (Wood et al., 2004). It is important to note that radium, unlike uranium, is not redox –sensitive and can therefore diffuse readily in oxygen depleted environments typical of matrix blocks between fractures. The decay of radium is what provides Rn\textsuperscript{222} to the adjacent water filled fracture via diffusion and alpha recoil. The fundamental difference between this diffusion/ion exchange model and the other models mentioned thus far is that it predicts the presence of Ra\textsuperscript{226} sorbed on or near the fracture surface without significant amounts of its parent radionuclide U\textsuperscript{238}. The model also provides a mechanism for both chemical and isotopic separation missing in the previous models.

![Diagram](image)

**Figure 2.9** Illustration of how Radon and other U – Th series isotopes enter the nanopores by recoil in approximately equal quantities. Radon diffuses out of the nanopores, while others are adsorbed on the walls of these nanopores (Rama and Moore, 1984).
CHAPTER 3- STUDY AREA

3.1 INTRODUCTION

Historically, uranium mineralisation in the Karoo Basin was first reported in 1964, during the search for onshore oil and gas (Hoadley, 2007). This gave impetus to several international companies developing a keen interest in the Karoo sequences, based on similarities noted with the deposits of the Colorado Plateau in the USA (Cole et al., 1991). By the mid-seventies no less than eleven private companies as well as the former Geological Survey of South Africa and the Nuclear Development Corporation of South Africa (Pty) Ltd were vigorously engaged in uranium exploration and geological studies in the Karoo basin (Cole et al., 1991). Sandstone-hosted uranium was first discovered in the Karoo on the farm Grootfontein, some 20km west of Beaufort West in 1969. Eventually, more than two hundred sandstone–hosted uranium occurrences were discovered of which Ryst Kuil proved to be the most successful (Van der Merwe and de Beer, 2006). Esso Minerals Africa Inc. (ESSO), by far the most committed and successful exploration company active in the Karoo at the time, started their exploration programme in 1974. By 1976, they had located outcropping mineralisation on the farm Ryst Kuil, and following an intense drilling campaign, had defined the extent of an approximately 70km strike length subsurface fluvial sandstone channel and several large, discontinuous, uranium-molybdenum deposits. Most of their effort was focused on the deposits of the “Western Sector” where they established a uranium deposit of 10,997,000 t, containing in excess of 25 Mlbs$^2$ U$_3$O$_8$ at a grade marginally greater than 1,000 ppm (Hoadley, 2007).
3.2 SITE LOCATION

The study area is situated approximately 450 kilometers northeast of Cape Town along the N1 route, which connects Cape Town with cities like Kimberley, Bloemfontein and Johannesburg between 32° 0’ 10” S and 32° 5’ 27” S and 22° 4’40” E and 22° 9’15” E. Immediately north of Beaufort west, the Nuweveld Mountains rises up to a plateau of approximately 1450m above mean sea level. The Nuweveld Mountains are characteristically flat-topped, being capped by thick sheets of erosion-resistant dolerite. Beaufort West lies at the base of the escarpment, which acts as a watershed between the north and south-flowing rivers (Figure 3.1).

Figure 3.1 Location of the study area in Beaufort West.
3.3 CLIMATE AND PHYSIOGRAPHY

Beaufort West falls in a late summer rainfall area (Oct-March) with an average rainfall of 236mm/annum, however this value can increase to 400mm in the high mountainous terrain and as low as 100mm in the flat lying plains. Continuous long term rainfall data for the past thirty eight years was obtained from the Beaufort West municipality and is illustrated in (Figure 3.2). The position of the Beaufort West rain gauge of the Weather Bureau (rain gauge no.00921414) has varied considerably over the past years, and is the only reliable long-term rainfall record available.

![Figure 3.2 Long-term annual rainfall for Beaufort West.](image-url)
The mean annual potential evaporation (MAPE) generally exceeds 2400mm/annum, with an average of 2445mm/annum (Woodford and Chevallier, 2002). The average daily temperature variations is 10°C to 25°C with the highest recorded in November to February of 41°C and the lowest from June to August of -5°C to -6 °C (Van der Merwe and de Beer, 2006). The area is reported to be extremely windy with most northwesterly winds attaining maximum speeds during the afternoon. Surface water bodies are made up of two main perennial rivers, the Gamka and Kwagga rivers. In addition to these two perennial rivers there are three main dams, namely the Beaufort West dam, Walker’s dam and the pap dam. These open water bodies are subjected to extreme temperatures ranging from 32°C to as low as -4 °C. The dominant veld type is that of the central upper Karoo (as described by Acocks, 1988) and the upper Nama Karoo. Arid shrublands have developed on the sandstone-derived soils. This vegetation type includes dwarf shrub species and perennial grasses. The river beds and protected cliffs and ravines often contain denser and taller growing shrubs and trees consisting predominantly of Acacia karroo, Euclea undulate, Rhus burchellii and Rhigozum obovatum. Extensive short grasslands occur in places on the plains and flat mountain areas.

3.4 GEOLOGY

The Karoo Basin is a Late Carboniferous–Middle Jurassic retroarc foreland basin developed in front of the Cape Fold Belt (CFB) in relation to subduction of the palaeo-pacific plate underneath the Gondwana plate (Catuneanua, Hancox and Rubidge 1998). These were infilled with up to 12 km of sedimentary strata of the Karoo Supergroup (Figure 3.3). The sedimentary succession reflects changing environments from glacial to deep marine, deltaic, fluvial and aeolian and is subdivided into five main groups, i.e. the Dwyka, Ecca, Beaufort (comprising the Adelaide and Tarkastad subgroups), Stormberg and Drakensberg.
The Beaufort group of the Karoo Supergroup is subdivided into the lower Adelaide and upper Tarkastad subgroups, of which only the former is present in the study area (Figure 3.4). The Adelaide subgroup of late Permian age (i.e. 260 Ma) attains a maximum thickness of 2000m and consists of the older Abrahamskraal and younger Teekloof formations of alternating bluish-grey mudstone and grey very fine to medium grained sandstone (Woodford and Chevallier, 2002). The Abrahamskraal formation represents a high-sinuosity fluvial environment and was deposited mainly by overbank flooding from meandering rivers flowing across an extensive alluvial plain towards the receding Ecca sea. The overlying Teekloof formation differs from the Abrahamskraal formation in the respect that it is dominated by green, grey and maroon mudrocks with minor, laterally accreted channel sandstones (Figure 3.5). The Teekloof formation represents a typical floodplain environment.
Figure 3.4 Simplified geological map of the Beaufort West area.
3.4.1 Stratigraphy

Several upward-fining megacycles, up to 400m thick, have been recognised in the Beaufort group. Each megacycle consists of several sandstones in the lower portion and a mudstone-dominated sequence in the upper portion. From bottom to top, the sandstone-rich parts of the upper three megacycles have been named the Moordenaars sandstone (Moordenaars member), Poortjie member and Oukloof sandstone (Oukloof member). Most of the uranium occurrences are restricted to these three units (Van der Merwe and de Beer, 2006). The lithostratigraphy of the Beaufort group is illustrated in (Figure 3.6). North of the Nuweveld escarpment the Karoo Supergroup has been intruded by dolerite dykes. These dykes have been radiometrically dated between 150 and 190Ma, i.e. Jurassic in age (Johnson et al., 2006).
Figure 3.6 Lithostratigraphic subdivision of the Beaufort Group in the southwestern Karoo (modified from Van der Merwe, A.J. and De Beer, J.H, 2006).
The Karoo dolerites form generally concordant sills varying a few meters up to 900m in thickness, and feeder dykes of less than a meter to several tens of meters thick. The two main dykes in the study area are the east-west trending dyke stretching from the Nuweveld Mountains north of the Gamka dam in an easterly direction cutting across the farms Tweeling, Brandwag and Renosterkop (TBR), and terminating into an interpreted dolerite ring structure on the farm Renosterkop (Rose, 2008). The other east-west trending dyke cuts through the town and is termed the town dyke. The other dykes in the area are the droerivier dyke (i.e. southeast-northwest trending) and the Hansrivier dyke (north-south trending) as shown in (Figure 3.7). The interpreted dolerite ring structure on the farm Renosterkop was described by Woodford and Chevallier, (2002) as saucer-like inclined dolerite sheet. A large part of the area especially in the lower lying regions is covered by calcrete and hardpan deposits, possibly as a result of secondary weathering of the Karoo sediments.

![Figure 3.7 Contact between Hansrivier dolerite dyke and host rock](tape measure as scale).
3.4.2 Uranium mineralisation in the Karoo

The Karoo uranium Province is a typical example of an epigenetic deposit, where the concentration of uranium in the sandstone bodies of the Karoo Sequence was controlled by both sedimentary and geochemical processes (Cole et al., 1991). Most sandstone-type deposits are in fluvial and lacustrine sediments in either continental or marginal marine environments. Where lacustrine rocks dominate, very fine grained organic-rich hosts are more abundant and the uranium deposits may be in part syngenetic. The geochemical environment of mineralisation determines the mineralogy and form of a deposit (Van der Merwe and de Beer., 2006). Uranium mineralisation is almost entirely confined to the fluvial channel sandstone and is best developed in the thicker sandstones. In particular, the possibility of uranium mineralisation is highest where the sandstone (siltstone + mudstone) ratio exceeds 50 (Brunke, 1977). The uranium occurrences within the channel sandstones form discrete pods and lenses, peneconcordant to the bedding. The discrete pods and lenses within channel sandstones are by far the most common uraniferous host rock. It is readily recognised in outcrop areas around Beaufort West, where it occurs as thin surface coatings of dark-brown manganese oxide, locally known as “Koffieklip” (Figure 3.8).

Figure 3.8 Typical outcrop of dark-brown calcareous sandstone (Koffieklip).
(Cole and Wipplinger, 2001) identifies two main styles of mineralisation in the area of interest:

- laminated, non calcareous sandstone containing high molybdenum (Mo) and high uranium (U) values, and
- Carbonate-cemented sandstone containing low (Mo) and high (U) values.

Coffinite \(\text{U(Si}_4\text{O}_{0.9}(\text{OH})_{0.4})\) and uraninite \(\text{UO}_2\) are the primary uraniferous minerals and are associated with carbonaceous debris and sulphides. Both minerals are very fine-grained and commonly intergrown with coal macerals. Yellow and green secondary uranium minerals, which include torbernite, sabugalite and uranium-arsenates, phosphates and silicates, occur along joints, fractures and bedding planes in sandstones. Uraniferous ore-forming fluids presumably derived either from volcanic tuff fragments, which were laid down contemporaneously with the fluvial sediments and/or from detrital material transported from a granitic provenance. There remains much speculation as to which of the two processes are more plausible. In the broader context, the consensus reached amongst workers relating to Karoo geology and the uranium occurrences fits the outline of a sandstone-type uranium model (Cole et al., 1991).
3.5 HYDROGEOLOGY

In general, the sandstone and mudstones of the Beaufort group are characterised by the virtual absence of primary porosity and permeability due to diagenesis. As a result the secondary hydrogeological properties of the rocks, such as the degree, density, continuity and interconnection of fracturing control the occurrence, storage and movement of groundwater (Kotze et al., 1997). According to Botha et al., (1998) Karoo fractured – rocks are multi-layered, highly heterogeneous and isotropic with relatively low and variable permeability. Based on the 1:500 000 hydrogeological map sheet 3122 of Beaufort West it can be seen that fractured-rock aquifers cover most of the study area. A combination of intergranular and fractured-rock aquifers also exist as a result of alluvium and/or deeply weathered Beaufort sediments overlying much younger Karoo sediments. Fractured- rock aquifers also tend to produce higher yielding boreholes in excess of 5l/s, whereas those with dual porosities produce yields of between 0.1 – 0.5l/s (Rose, 2008).

Nhleko and Dondo, (2008), divided the Beaufort west area into three aquifer systems based on aquifer mapping. The top aquifer, extend to a depth of 10m is characterised by weathered intergranular material consisting of primary sandstone, mudstone, siltstone and dolerite. It is postulated that this aquifer is recharged directly by precipitation and surface water sources such as rivers and pans where connectivity exists. The sustainability of this aquifer remains questionable due its low storage capacity. The middle fractured-rock aquifer is characterised mainly by thick sandstone and mudstone with associated dolerite intrusions. The aquifer occurs at a depth of 50m and is regarded as the most extensive aquifer in the study area (Nhleko and Dondo, 2008). Recharge occurs along bedding planes as well as from runoff and leakage albeit at a much slower rate. Due to the large scale connectivity of fractures, the aquifer is highly transmissive. A deeper aquifer exists at a depth of around 80-90m, and due to dolerite intrusions the surrounding sandstone are heavily fractured.
3.5.1 Aquifer properties

(Table 3.1) gives the average horizontal transmissivity and storativity values at the respective localities. Due to the fact that limited data exist to the south of Beaufort west, the current dataset is restricted mainly to the municipal well fields situated to the north of the town. This reflects the areas most extensively explored over the past twenty years (Rose, 2008).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subarea</th>
<th>Transmissivity (T in m²/day)</th>
<th>Storativity (S dimensionless)</th>
<th>Yield (l/s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brandwag east</td>
<td>&gt;200</td>
<td>0.01 - 0.001</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandwag west</td>
<td>&lt;200</td>
<td>0.0001 - 0.00001</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Hoop</td>
<td>30 - 300</td>
<td>0.001 - 0.00001</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Platdoorns</td>
<td>&lt;10 - &gt;200</td>
<td>0.00001</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lemoenfontein</td>
<td>100 - 250</td>
<td>0.0001-0.00001</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town well</td>
<td>40 - &gt;400</td>
<td>0.001 - 0.0001</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Droerivier</td>
<td>&lt;10</td>
<td>0.001 - 0.0001</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hansrivier</td>
<td>&gt;300</td>
<td>0.001 - 0.0001</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunnyside</td>
<td>100 - 360</td>
<td>0.00001 - 0.000001</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to Rose, (2008) there is a strong correlation between borehole yields and transmissivities, whereby areas with high transmissivities >100m²/day is generally associated with borehole yields greater than 5l/s. The influence of dolerite dykes on the yields of boreholes can be seen by the large amount of boreholes drilled in close proximity to these geological structures. Pumping test data from Rose and Conrad, (2007) indicated that boreholes drilled on the farm Hansrivier (south east of Beaufort West) on a contact zone between the dolerite dyke and fractured Teekloof Formation produced sustainable yields in excess of 10l/s.
4.1 INTRODUCTION

An initial hydrocensus of the study area in Beaufort West was conducted from the 6-18\textsuperscript{th} May 2008, to assess the water resources utilisation of the town and its surroundings. This was done by surveying available boreholes in the area and where possible measurements of physico-chemical properties and water levels were taken. Communication with farmers and the local municipality formed an integral part of the hydrocensus, which assisted in determining the historical and current status of groundwater in the area. A follow-up hydrocensus was carried out in June 2009 focusing predominantly to the south of Beaufort West in the vicinity of the proposed new uranium mine, to gain a better understanding of the regional flow and transport processes in Karoo sedimentary rocks with relatively low permeability.

The main focus was to add more groundwater sampling points, especially to the north and south of the study area to form a more comprehensive monitoring network. The concluding fieldwork was undertaken between the 7\textsuperscript{th} and 14\textsuperscript{th} of February 2010, to identify the aquifer boundaries and to characterise the anisotropy of Karoo aquifers by conducting an aquifer and radially-convergent tracer test on the farm Hansrivier. This information was then utilised to conceptualise the flow dynamics and contaminant processes of the system under investigation. The boreholes sampled during the hydrocensus are shown in Appendix A. Figure 4.1 shows the boreholes sampled for major cations/anions, in total 10 additional samples were collected.
Figure 4.1 Map of Beaufort West indicating boreholes sampled for major cations and anions
4.1.1 Description of the Hydrochemical dataset

The water chemistry data was collated from the previous sampling run in 2008 and compared to the present results. The macro – chemical laboratory results were used to construct the various chemical plots. Figure 4.2 shows the piper diagram of boreholes sampled during the May 2008 fieldwork.

The hydrochemical facies shows a Ca-Na-HCO$_3$ type water evolving into a Ca-Mg-SO$_4$-Cl type groundwater. Thus, indicating relatively fresh shallow groundwater with little chemical alteration from recharge to discharge. However, Brandwag.9 has a distinctively different hydrochemical facies Ca-Na-SO$_4$-Cl, probably as a result of its close proximity to the TBR dyke, which cuts across the Brandwag wellfield north of the town. The higher SO$_4^{2-}$ concentration of this sample could also be due to either the dissolution of sulphides from rocks or calcium being removed from the solution, most likely by the precipitation of calcite or by ion exchange reactions (Hounslow, 1995).
Figure 4.3 shows the results for the 2009 sampling run with a reduced number of sampling sites. The major water chemistry is almost identical to the May 2008 sampling run, with most of the samples showing a fresh Ca-HCO$_3$ type facies evolving towards a Ca-SO$_4$ type hydrochemical facies.
4.1.2 Interpretation of the pH-electrical conductivity logs

In the study of flow and transport through fractured rocks, knowledge on the locations of fractures and their hydraulic properties are essential (Doughty and Tsang, 2005). For the delineation of water bearing fractures in fractured rock formations of the Karoo, ph-electrical conductivity (EC) logging with depth was carried out on most of the boreholes visited (Figure 4.4). Two of the boreholes, namely HR.10 and G29936HB were included and later used for both the aquifer and tracer test (Table 4.1).

Table 4.1 Borehole details.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Boreholes</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Depth (m)</th>
<th>Water Level(mbgs)</th>
<th>EC at water table</th>
<th>EC at bottom depth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Longitude</td>
<td>Latitude</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR.10</td>
<td>22.64031</td>
<td>32.39105</td>
<td>27.68</td>
<td>5.36</td>
<td>1572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G29936HB</td>
<td>22.64070</td>
<td>32.39090</td>
<td>38.24</td>
<td>5.65</td>
<td>923</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EC in µS/cm at observed temperature and depth in meters below land surface

Before injection with non-iodated salt commenced, borehole G29936HB situated 41.8 meters from the pumping borehole (HR.10) was circulated using a small diameter pump to a depth of 12m. The circulation process lasted about 30min before a pulse injection using 500g of non-iodated salt dissolved in 5l of site water took place into borehole G29936HB. EC was measured for the duration of the test to pick up any breakthrough at HR.10. Figure 4.5 shows the EC-pH graphs for boreholes HR.10 and G29936HB, respectively.
To verify historical borehole logging data on fracture location at the observation borehole G29936HB, camera logging was also carried out before uranin was injected into borehole G29936HB. Based on the camera logging inspection, it could be seen that multiple fracture zones occur at depths of 14m and 17m, which agrees well with historical data from the National groundwater archives (NGA) of the Department of Water Affairs (DWA). These multiple fracture zones were also visible in one of the EC-pH logs of (Figure 4.5) for borehole HR.10. Borehole G29936HB displays an active flow system on top, indicating low mineralised recently recharged water with more evolved, highly mineralised/stagnant water occurring at the bottom of the borehole. The fracture zone has a higher pH than the host rock, probably due to the exsolution of CO₂ in the
fractures causing precipitation of carbonates and in the process changing the water composition of the fractures to become more alkaline. Vertical, sub-vertical and horizontal (bedding-plane) fractures were also shown on the camera logging inspection, with the latter contributing to the overall transmissivity as shown from the aquifer test data and therefore the strength of the borehole yield. Not all fractures appear to be transmissive, as the majority of fractures occurring at greater depths were closed due to secondary weathering processes.

Figure 4.5 EC-pH profiles for the abstraction (HR.10) and injection (G29936HB) boreholes.

4.2 RADIOACTIVITY

Due to budgetary constraints only 15 samples were taken for radioactivity analysis according to the project proposal (Figure 4.6). The limited number of samples still provided a good estimate of whether there is radionuclide contamination in the study area and to what extent it exceeds the natural background levels (Table 4.2). The concentration values of the various uranium isotopes found in nature are 99.3% U$^{238}$, 0.7% U$^{235}$ and 0.01% U$^{234}$. Based on the above concentration values it can be seen that U$^{235}$ (0.7%) is more or less 5% that of U$^{238}$ (99.3%), implying that they are fixed inside the rock lattice in a ratio of 10:1. Therefore, U$^{238}$ and U$^{235}$ should be essentially equal due to their respective percentages. Appendix.B contains all the technical information for the uranium and thorium decay series.
Figure 4.6 Boreholes sampled for radioactivity.
4.2.1 Uranium distribution in groundwater across the study area

The results in Table 4.2 shows that for all the boreholes sampled $\text{U}^{234}$ is approximately between two and three times higher than that of $\text{U}^{238}$, indicating uranium - series disequilibria between these two isotopes. This is mainly due to water-host rock interaction; leading to preferential mobilisation of $\text{U}^{234}$ caused by the alpha recoil of its parent $\text{U}^{238}$ (Figure 4.7). This type of phenomena is normally associated with natural conditions not influenced by mining activities.

![Spectrum indicating the effect of alpha recoil on the $\text{U}^{234}$ isotope.](image)

Figure 4.7 Spectrum indicating the effect of alpha recoil on the $\text{U}^{234}$ isotope.
A brief survey using a variety of isotopes including uranium and other environmental tracers of groundwater at Beaufort West was conducted by Vogel et al., (1980). In their study it was found that $^{234}\text{U}$ was also preferentially leached from the rock, with $^{234}/^{238}\text{U}$ activity ratios being greater than unity. Similarly significant disequilibrium between the $^{238}\text{U}$ and $^{234}\text{U}$ isotopes were found by Reyes and Marques, (2008) in groundwater from a fractured bedrock aquifer in Southern Brazil. It was shown that samples taken from the oxidised part of the aquifer had activity ratios that were inversely related to the uranium concentration. This was possibly due to mixing occurring with the high activity ratio and low uranium content groundwater, which may be pore water old enough to have allowed significant $^{234}\text{U}$ recoil to occur.

Based on the activity ratios given in Table 4.3, it can be seen that all the activity ratios are above unity, which correlate well with the above findings. This is normally the case, whereby higher $^{234}\text{U}$ isotopes are indicative of pre-mining conditions. If however, the $^{234}\text{U}$ is much lower and the activity ratio in the groundwater sample approaches unity then the opposite is true as the host rock is being disturbed through both mining and milling processes, allowing the $^{238}\text{U}$ and $^{234}\text{U}$ to become equally mobile as the groundwater comes into contact with the mined ore body, ultimately resulting in the $^{238}\text{U}$ and $^{234}\text{U}$ activity ratio approaching unity. Theoretically the $^{228}\text{Th}$ daughter isotope should be more leachable than its parent $^{232}\text{Th}$, due to it being very loose in the damaged crystal lattice and thus more likely to undergo alpha recoil. In Table 4.2 it can be seen that the $^{228}\text{Th}$ values are less than that of its parent $^{232}\text{Th}$. A possible explanation could be that the $^{228}\text{Ra}$ and $^{228}\text{Ac}$ daughter isotopes are found in between the two thorium isotopes and might therefore influence the concentration of $^{228}\text{Th}$ in the groundwater. Consideration was initially given to the use of gross alpha and beta measurements for estimating the dose contributions from the radionuclides that were not individually measured. In practice, however, the uncertainties inherent in the determination of gross alpha and beta activity, typically around 20% to 30%, lead to unacceptably large uncertainties in the final dose determinations and were thus not used.
Table 4.2 Radioactivity results of samples taken during 2008-2009 fieldwork.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nuclide</th>
<th>Value (mBq/L)</th>
<th>Unc.</th>
<th>MDA</th>
<th>Value (mBq/L)</th>
<th>Unc.</th>
<th>MDA</th>
<th>Value (mBq/L)</th>
<th>Unc.</th>
<th>MDA</th>
<th>Value (mBq/L)</th>
<th>Unc.</th>
<th>MDA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>238U</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>641</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>234U</td>
<td>554</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>584</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1380</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>230Th</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>226Ra</td>
<td>9.49</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>6.07</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210Pb</td>
<td>39.9</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210Po</td>
<td>-3.4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>-3.2</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>-6.7</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>-4.1</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>235U</td>
<td>5.68</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>6.51</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>227Th</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>6.79</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>232Th</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>223Ra</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>224Ra</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.94</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>238U</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>95.4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>234U</td>
<td>738</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>1100</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>230Th</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>235U</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>8.05</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>227Th</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>232Th</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>5.34</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>223Ra</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>228Th</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>-110</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross alpha</td>
<td>-150</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>1100</td>
<td>-22</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>1100</td>
<td>-440</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>1100</td>
<td>-120</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>1100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross beta</td>
<td>-51</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>1100</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>1100</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>1100</td>
<td>-92</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>1100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. If a measured value (Value column) was recorded, it is reported regardless if the value is less than the minimum detectable activity concentration (MDA column) or even if the value is negative. In the case where a value could not be obtained, a less than MDA (“< MDA”) will be indicated.
2. The reported uncertainty (Unc. column) is quoted at 1 sigma (or coverage factor k = 1). The uncertainty is calculated mainly from counting statistics and it is not the standard deviation obtained from replicate measurements. No uncertainty value is reported of a less than MDA (“< MDA”) is indicated in the Value column.
3. The minimum detectable activity concentration (MDA column) is calculated with a 95% confidence level.
4. A value is reported with 3 significant digits if it is greater than the MDA value and the associated uncertainty will be reported the same precision. If a value is less than the MDA, the value and its associated uncertainty are reported with 2 significant digits regardless their respective magnitudes. A MDA value is always reported with 2 significant digits.
Table 4.3 Activity ratios of uranium isotopes for all the boreholes sampled.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Water sample</th>
<th>Sampling date</th>
<th>pH</th>
<th>T (°C)</th>
<th>$U^{238}$ (mBq/L)</th>
<th>$U^{234}$ (mBq/L)</th>
<th>$U^{234}/U^{238}$ ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aarddorings</td>
<td>31/05/2009</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>95.4</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>2.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blydskap01</td>
<td>16/05/2008</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>554</td>
<td>4.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blydskap02</td>
<td>16/05/2008</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>584</td>
<td>3.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hansrivier 10</td>
<td>1/6/2009</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>2.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hansrivier 12</td>
<td>1/6/2009</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>71.5</td>
<td>2.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hansrivier 13</td>
<td>1/6/2009</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>2.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoenderhok</td>
<td>1/6/2009</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>536</td>
<td>1.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katdoornkuil</td>
<td>31/05/2009</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>1100</td>
<td>3.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olivegrove 3</td>
<td>3/6/2009</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>1.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steenrotsfontein 1</td>
<td>15/05/2008</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>565</td>
<td>2.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steenrotsfontein 2</td>
<td>15/05/2008</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>641</td>
<td>1380</td>
<td>2.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saucyskuil</td>
<td>3/6/2009</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>54.2</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>4.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>12/5/2008</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>2.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schr Fontein 2</td>
<td>17/05/2008</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>2.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tulplaagte 357</td>
<td>31/05/2009</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>738</td>
<td>3.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The South African water quality guidelines for domestic use are shown in Table 4.4. It can be seen that most of the samples fall in Class I (< 0.1mSv/a), indicating good water quality with the exception of 1 sample (Steenrotsfontein 2) falling in Class II (0.1 – 0.250 mSv/a) for the less than one year age group, with marginal water quality and therefore does not pose an immediate risk to people using borehole water for consumption. On average our radiation exposure due to all natural background sources amounts to approximately 2.4mSv/a (WHO, 2005). The recommended reference dose level (RDL) of 0.1mSv/a given by the WHO and adapted by the South African water quality guidelines, is only 5% of the dose from the total natural background, and can therefore be regarded as conservative.
Table 4.4 Radioactive dose results compared to the South African water quality guidelines.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Total mSv/a</th>
<th>Exposure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt; 1 a</td>
<td>1 - 2 a</td>
<td>2 - 7 a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consumption(L/a)</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aardorings</td>
<td>0.039</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>0.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blydskap01</td>
<td>0.155</td>
<td>0.063</td>
<td>0.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blydskap02</td>
<td>0.169</td>
<td>0.067</td>
<td>0.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hansrivier 10</td>
<td>0.069</td>
<td>0.024</td>
<td>0.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hansrivier 12</td>
<td>0.028</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hansrivier 13</td>
<td>0.065</td>
<td>0.024</td>
<td>0.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoenderhok</td>
<td>0.104</td>
<td>0.034</td>
<td>0.027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katdoornkuil</td>
<td>0.140</td>
<td>0.052</td>
<td>0.041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olivegrove 3</td>
<td>0.063</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>0.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steenrotsfontein 1</td>
<td>0.103</td>
<td>0.034</td>
<td>0.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steenrotsfontein 2</td>
<td>0.362</td>
<td>0.116</td>
<td>0.090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saucyskuil</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>0.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>0.176</td>
<td>0.055</td>
<td>0.044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schr Fontein 2</td>
<td>0.103</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td>0.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tulplaatge 357</td>
<td>0.094</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td>0.028</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Class 0 (Ideal water quality): Dose<=0.100mSv/a
Class I (Good water quality): Dose 0.100 - 0.250 mSv/a
Class II (Marginal water quality): Dose 0.250 - 1mSv/a
Class III (Poor water quality): Dose 1 - 5mSv/a
Class IV (Unacceptable water quality): Dose >5mSv/a

The fact that all the samples with the exception of one are within the acceptable range as specified above, could imply that the radioactivity in groundwater is controlled more by the hydrological and lithological settings. This would make sense as past mining activities focused on specific areas, especially to the East and Northwest of Beaufort West. Due to these areas currently undergoing prospecting rights for future mining, no access was allowed and hence no sampling data generated. Furthermore the exact extent and depth of the uranium ore body is also not known due to the mines treating all information relating to mining with confidentiality.
4.3 AQUIFER TESTS

4.3.1 Description of the aquifer test

The flow characteristic method (FC program), which was developed by Van Tonder et al., (2002) along with the software package AQTESOLVE Pro version 4.5, was used to interpret the pumping test data by using automatic curve fitting or manual fitting of late time data. One of the limitations identified in using the FC program was the insensitivity of the data analysis to changes in storativity $S$, leading to potentially large variations of $S$ during the data fitting process with negligible changes in transmissivity $T$ and as a result the value of $S$ was set to 1E-03, with the FC program. AQTESOLVE Pro contains a large variety of methods for the modeling of pumping tests. In order to determine realistic aquifer parameters from pumping test data, the applied analytical solutions/conceptual model (e.g. confined, unconfined, leaky and fractured aquifers) must be representative of the aquifer system under investigation. The value of $S$ was not fixed when using the software package AQTESOLVE Pro version 4.5.

4.3.2 Analysis and interpretation

Diagnostic or qualitative analysis of drawdown data was undertaken to identify component flow geometries during the pumping test. Derivative analysis, in which the derivative of drawdown is plotted against the log of time, was used to characterise the drawdown response and to identify the component flow regimes of the aquifer test. It has been shown that the use of the derivative technique for heterogeneous systems may yield valuable information relating to the characteristics of the aquifer (Raghavan, 2004). The derivative is sensitive to small variations in the rate of pressure change, which may be less obvious in the drawdown versus time plots (Bourdet et al., 1983). As will be shown the derivative method can be exploited to identify well-bore storage, boundaries, leakage, linear flow, unconfined flow and radial flow conditions.
A constant-discharge aquifer test was carried out on 08-02-2010 at the Hansriver site in Beaufort West with the goal of obtaining drawdown data in the pumping and observation boreholes. Only three of the four available boreholes (HR.10, New BH, HR10.1 and G29936HB) were monitored in the aquifer test, as there was no available information on the new borehole drilled by the municipality. The details of the tested boreholes are given in Table 4.5. The pumping test was done over a period of 88 hrs by pumping HR.10 at a rate of 10 l/s, achieving a final drawdown of about 3.59 meters in the abstraction borehole HR.10 and a maximum drawdown of 2.9m and 3m in the observation boreholes HR.10.1 and G29936HB respectively. Water levels during pumping and after pumping stopped (recovery) were recorded in both the pumping borehole and observation boreholes.

### Table 4.5 Selected technical data of the boreholes tested.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HR 10</th>
<th>New BH</th>
<th>HR10.1</th>
<th>G29936HB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coordinates</td>
<td>S32.39105°</td>
<td>S32.39105°</td>
<td>S32.39105°</td>
<td>S32.39090°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E022.64031°</td>
<td>E022.64026°</td>
<td>E022.64043°</td>
<td>E022.64070°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Constant discharge test</td>
<td>08/02/2010</td>
<td>08/02/2010</td>
<td>08/02/2010</td>
<td>08/02/2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diameter (mm)</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elevation (m)</td>
<td>852</td>
<td>825</td>
<td>848</td>
<td>845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depth (mbgs)</td>
<td>27.68</td>
<td>71.3</td>
<td>10.68</td>
<td>38.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance of observation boreholes (m)</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>41.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pump installation depth (m)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Static water level (mbgs)</td>
<td>5.36</td>
<td>5.37</td>
<td>5.61</td>
<td>5.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final drawdown (m)</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geological setting</td>
<td>Fractured Teekloof formation intruded by a Dolerite Dyke</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A plot of displacement versus time for the abstraction and observation boreholes is shown in Figure 4.8. All boreholes exhibit the same behaviour, with the drawdown curves displaying the same shape and the water level recovering to within 85% of the original water level. To get an initial approximation of the transmissivity (T) and storativity (S) values for HR10, the late-time data was fitted with the Cooper-Jacob analytical solution. The T-value determined from the Cooper-Jacob method was 110m²/day, with an S-value of 9.00E-03. Important to note is that two monitoring boreholes and the abstraction borehole were used to compute drawdown and therefore the estimated parameters have a higher confidence level, especially that of storativity.
As shown in Figure 4.8 drawdown in all the boreholes appear to be supported at intermediate times by flow from the rock matrix (double porosity concept) at the position of the fracture, with increasing drawdown towards later time. The water level remained at 7.26mbgs for about an hour of pumping and this could be explained by using the double porosity concept. Initially, most of the water pumped comes from the fractures and the head in the fractures drops rapidly. As pumping continuous, the matrix begins to supply water to the fractures, causing the head in the fractures to stabilise and the head in the matrix to drop. As the heads in the fractures and matrix equalises, both systems produce water to the borehole.
Based on the derivatives and diagnostic plots (Figure 4.9 and Figure 4.10, respectively) it can be seen that the aquifer behaves as a double porosity system, with a characteristic dip in the derivative after well bore storage. The position of the fracture is usually seen, whereby the first derivative (s’) shows a decrease and after the fracture is dewatered the s’ increases again and this occurred at 48 hrs of pumping.

![Figure 4.9 Log-derivative graphs for constant discharge test of HR10.](image)

![Figure 4.10 Semi-log plots for constant rate test of HR10.](image)
The time-drawdown relationship indicates a linear flow for the first 10 minutes, changing to radial flow up to 1000 minutes at intermediate times, before the drawdown increases Figure 4.10. Such behaviour indicates that the test was influenced by a no-flow boundary at late times with a subsequent increase of the slope in a drawdown plot. To obtain more accurate estimates of the aquifer parameters, the time-drawdown data for HR.10, HR.10.1 and G29936HB was fitted with various applicable analytical solutions Figure 4.11 - 4.13.

Figure 4.11 Log-log plot of drawdown vs. time including the derivative for HR.10 fitted with Moench solution (w/spherical blocks).
Figure 4.12 Log-log plot of drawdown vs. time including the derivative fitted with Barker’s solution (Gringarten-Ramey).

Figure 4.13 Log-log plot of drawdown vs. time including the derivative fitted with Barker’s solution (w/spherical blocks)
The methods that gave the best fit after a no-flow boundary was fitted 9m from the abstraction borehole were the Moench (w/spherical blocks) and the Gringarten-Ramey (w/horizontal fracture) methods for fractured rock aquifers. The determined transmissivity and storativity values using the applicable analytical solutions are given in Table 4.6. The transmissivity and storativity values given in the table compares favourably with that of Rose, (2008), who reported T-values greater than 100m$^2$/d for the Beaufort West region.

Table 4.6 T and S values determined for all boreholes (HR.10, HR.10.1 and G29936HB) using various analytical solutions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Boreholes</th>
<th>Solution</th>
<th>HR10</th>
<th>HR10.1</th>
<th>G29936HB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T (m$^2$/d) S(-)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logan approximation</td>
<td>298  1.00E-03</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>1.00E-03</td>
<td>352  1.00E-03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unconfined Aquifer</td>
<td>Neuman</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>5.00E-01</td>
<td>120  9.90E-03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cooper-Jacob</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>9.00E-03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confined Aquifer (initial estimate)</td>
<td>Moench w/spherical blocks</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>5.00E-02</td>
<td>15   4.89E-03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fractured Aquifer (Double-Porosity)</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>5.00E-02</td>
<td>268  2.20E-03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fractured Aquifer (Single Fracture)</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>5.00E-02</td>
<td>184  3.96E-03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Most probable value</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>3.00E-02</td>
<td>184  3.96E-03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.4 TRACER TESTS

4.4.1 Experimental setup and methodology

On the 10-02-2010 a tracer experiment under radially convergent flow conditions (pumping) were conducted to obtain more constrained aquifer parameters of the area surrounding the dolerite dyke on the farm Hansrivier, Beaufort West (Figure 4.14). The boreholes utilised for the tracer test was HR.10 (pumping) and G29936HB (injection). The experiment consisted of two components i.e. a tracer dilution in the injection borehole using non-iodated salt (NaCl) followed by the addition of the fluorescent dye uranin ($C_{20}H_{10}Na_2O_5$) and recovering it from HR.10. The salt injection process was carried out as a trial run before the actual tracer test with uranin in order to optimise the sampling schedule.

Approximately 20 grams of uranin was dissolved in 500 ml of site water and injected using a low flow pump into borehole G29936HB with 5 l of chase fluid, once the drawdown stabilised (linear gradient). The injection process lasted less than 4 minutes, which can be assumed to be instantaneous with respect to the mean residence time of the tracer (~366 minutes). After the tracer (Dirac pulse) was injected, the borehole column was mixed using a slug/bailer in order for the entire borehole section to be uniform with respect to the tracer solution, thus allowing the tracer to flow in fracture zones to the abstraction borehole (HR.10). The volume of both the tracer and chase fluid were reduced to the smallest possible amount in order to minimise the initial spreading of the tracer plume around the injection borehole. A spectrofluorimeter was installed above the pump and was used to measure the uranin concentration at 2 min intervals. Following the surprisingly fast arrival of the uranin (indicating good fracture connectivity between the boreholes), the sampling interval was reduced to 10s.
4.4.2 Assessment of the Breakthrough Curve (BTC)

Linear groundwater flow velocities were calculated from the tracer test by dividing the distance between the injection point (G29936HB) and the sampling point (HR.10) by the travel time of the tracer. These linear flow velocities are lower than the real velocities along complex tortuous flow paths. The first appearance of the uranin at HR.10 was after approximately 140 seconds ($t_{\text{max}}$), which correspond to a maximal flow velocity ($v_{\text{max}}$) within the fractured dolerite dyke of 0.29m/s. The maximal flow velocity is normally defined the worst, because it is directly connected to the first appearance of the tracer at the sampling site and reduced with the analytical detection limit for the tracer (Käss, 1998). To obviate the above constraint, it is better to report the mean ($v_{\text{mean}}$) or dominant ($v_{\text{dom}}$) flow velocities, which in this instance equate to 0.0036m/s and 0.0112m/s respectively. The mean flow velocity is the ratio of the flow distance (injection – observation borehole) and corresponds to the time ($t_{\text{mean}}$) at which 50% of the recovered tracer mass passed the observation borehole. Whereas the dominant flow velocity,
corresponds to the time ($t_{\text{dom}}$) at which the maximal tracer concentration is observed (Käss, 1998). The breakthrough continued for at least 1.7 days, after which the sampling was stopped as the tracer concentration reached 0.36 ppb, close to the background value of 0.17 ppb. A very good recovery of 70% the injected mass was observed for the dolerite dyke section. The tracer test results are given in Table 4.7 below.

**Table 4.7 Summary of tracer experiment at the Hansrivier dyke area, Beaufort West.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experiment</th>
<th>Hansrivier dyke</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date of injection</td>
<td>10-Feb-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of tracer (g)</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>linear distance (m)</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$Q$ (l/s)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recovered mass (%)</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$t_{\text{max}}$ (s)</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$t_{\text{mean}}$ (s)</td>
<td>11755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$t_{\text{dom}}$ (s)</td>
<td>3750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$v_{\text{max}}$ (m/s)</td>
<td>0.29857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$v_{\text{mean}}$ (m/s)</td>
<td>0.00356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$v_{\text{dom}}$ (m/s)</td>
<td>0.01115</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The tracer-breakthrough curve (BTC) generated by plotting measured tracer concentration at the Hansrivier dyke site versus time is presented in Figure 4.15. The BTC is characterised by a narrow peak and flat extended tailing, indicating dominant advective transport in the fracture(s) with diffuse coupling to the matrix (tailing). Most of the tracer mass was already recovered after 5.5 hrs. As long as the migration of the tracer follows a discrete fracture set connecting both boreholes directly, the dispersion will be small. If the tracer migration however follows several discrete fracture sets intercepting each other, the dispersivities will increase due to interstitial mixing between different fracture sets (Maloszewski et al., 1999). The multiple peaks at intermediate times of the breakthrough curve points to the existence of secondary flow paths within the fracture network, allowing the uranin tracer to travel at different velocities. This can also be seen in the distinct rise of the relative recovery curve.
Figure 4.15 Tracer Breakthrough and recovery curves for the uranin test at HR.10.

4.4.3 Analytical Modeling

The Single Fissure Dispersion Model (SFDM) developed by Maloszewski and implemented in the software Traci95 was used to fit the observed BTC (Käss, 1998). The Traci95 software program was also used for modeling the tracer breakthrough curves and determining the hydraulic properties of the main and secondary flow paths shown in Figure 4.15. The theoretical tracer breakthrough curves were simulated using the best-fit method on the basis of measured concentrations. The parameters of the SFDM obtained by fitting Eq.15 to the tracer concentration measured at HR.10 are summarised in Table 4.8.
Table 4.8 Fitting Parameters of the SFDM \((Pe, t_o, \text{ and } a)\) and derived physical parameters \((2b, \alpha_l, D_{eff}, n_f, \text{ and } v)\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Uranin</th>
<th>Main flow path</th>
<th>Flowpath.1</th>
<th>Flowpath.2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pe</td>
<td>[-]</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>6556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(t_o)</td>
<td>[s]</td>
<td>22003</td>
<td>29027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>[s(^{-0.5})]</td>
<td>0.00097</td>
<td>0.00046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b</td>
<td>[(\mu m)]</td>
<td>828</td>
<td>721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\alpha_l)</td>
<td>[m]</td>
<td>47.5</td>
<td>0.0064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(D_{eff})</td>
<td>[m(^2/s)]</td>
<td>6.46E-12</td>
<td>1.10E-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n_f)</td>
<td>[%]</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>5.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(v)</td>
<td>[m/s]</td>
<td>1.90E-03</td>
<td>1.44E-03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The mean residence time \((t_o)\) and longitudinal dispersivity \((\alpha_l)\) obtained from the BTC, indicating the main flow path Figure 4.16 was 6hrs and 47.5m, respectively. Appendix.C, gives the mean residence time and longitudinal dispersivity for the dataset using a statistical method as a first order estimate. The high longitudinal dispersivity (47.5m) is mainly due to the extensive tailing effect of the BTC. The fracture aperture and porosity shown in Table 4.8 were calculated using the following equations (Maloszewski et al., 1999):

\[
2b = \sqrt{\ln \frac{X}{r_w} \cdot \frac{6 \cdot v \cdot \tau_{f/2} \cdot X^2}{g \cdot t_0 \cdot \Delta H_t}} \quad \text{Equation 36}
\]

\[
nf = \frac{Q \cdot t_0}{\pi \cdot m \cdot X^2} \quad \text{Equation 37}
\]
For the main and secondary flow paths the derived values for the fracture aperture (2b) and fracture porosity (nf) was in the range of (563 - 828µm) and (4.00 – 8.69%).

![Graph](image)

**Figure 4.16 Best_SFDM fit of the observed uranin breakthrough curve (Main flow path).**

While the overall fit of the BTC is good (Figure 4.16), there are obvious deviations from the fitted SFDM at intermediate to late times. This points to the existence of secondary flow paths as mentioned earlier. Interpretation of these deviations can be based on the assumption that the final BTC is a superposition of several BTC’s in each flow path. This can be modeled by applying the multi-channel model (MCM) of the SFDM (Maloszewski et al., 1999). Figure 4.17 and Figure 4.18 are the BTC’s to which the MCM of the SFDM was applied, with the relevant parameters given in Table 4.8 as flowpaths.1 and 2. In general, minor variations of the modeled parameters are observed, with the exception of the Pe and αi values. The MCM gave Pe values, which ranged from 0.8 for the main flow path to 6556 for the secondary flow paths (flow path 1 and 2). This implies that the modeled peaks on the BTC travelled purely by advection, with very small longitudinal dispersivities in the order of (0.0064 – 0.0133) for the secondary flow paths.
Figure 4.17 Best_SFDM fit of the observed BTC (Flowpath.1)

Figure 4.18 Best_SFDM fit of the observed BTC (Flowpath.2)
In order to effectively interpret the BTC’s with respect to matrix diffusion, the tailing effects needed to be characterised. Becker and Shapiro, (2000) have shown that extensive tailing of BTC’s conducted in fracture networks of crystalline rocks are not always an artifact of diffusion processes, but rather an advective-dominated process caused by spatial and temporal heterogeneous transport. A diffusion determined tailing can however, be identified by a decrease in the concentration of the tailing according to $t^{-1.5}$ (Tsang, 1992). From Figure, 4.19 it can be seen that matrix diffusion is indeed evident in the BTC as the data plot on a straight line fitted with $t^{-1.5}$ up to a time of 50 000 seconds. Thereafter the graph displays oscillating peaks that does not seem to fit the straight line section fitted with $t^{-1.5}$. It appears as if there is an underdamp hydraulic pressure response in the abstraction borehole (HR.10), which could be as a result of power fluctuations in the pumping rate, allowing for the retarded release of the tracer from the injection borehole.

Figure 4.19 Log-log plot of the normalised uranin breakthrough curve
The derived effective diffusion coefficient (Deff) for the main flow path equaled 6.46E-12 m²/s, which is in good agreement with laboratory determined values for sandstones (1.69E-11 to 7.10E-11) given by Boving and Grathwohl, (2001).

4.4.4 Conclusion

The tracer test results have confirmed the existence of a good hydraulic connectivity between boreholes HR.10 and G29936HB, situated 41.8m from each other. More importantly it was shown that transport occurred via multiple pathways with different hydraulic properties. The flow velocities of the fractures was in accordance with the cubic law (Equation.16), which states that flow will increase with the cube of the fracture aperture (Witherspoon et al., 1980). Furthermore, tracer diffusing into stagnant water zones within the fracture and the matrix was identified as an important retardation mechanism. Modeling of the experimental data with the multi-channel SFDM captured the overall response of the BTC’s very well and gave satisfactory estimates of the transport parameters. In summary, interpretation of the tracer test in combination with geological information and aquifer tests have resulted in an improved understanding of the physical transport processes at the Hansrivier site.
4.5 FLOW CONCEPTUALISATION

The localised flow dynamics of the Hansrivier dyke and the contaminant transport processes of the groundwater system will form the basis of this discussion. According to McMahon et al., (2000) the conceptual model should be based on a sound understanding of the groundwater flow system in order to represent properly the advective component of contaminant transport and it should identify all source pathway receptor linkages. Based on the results as described in the above sections, a cross-section was developed to summarise the important aquifer parameters. Figure 4.20, shows the extent of the cross-section profile (X-Y) that was drawn perpendicular to the Hansrivier dolerite dyke.

Karoo fractured-rock aquifers associated with dolerite intrusions store water in the interconnected fractures that have developed in the surrounding sediments. Based on field and borehole information the importance of bedding-plane fractures is clearly demonstrated as the dominant permeability in the aquifer system. This can be seen from Figure 4.21 as the main conductive zone connecting boreholes HR.10, HR10.1 and G29936HB, with borehole yields in excess of 10l/s. The dolerite dyke can be regarded as a groundwater barrier, due to the groundwater quality differing on either side of the dyke (EC = >150mS/m East, <100mS/m West) Rose, (2008). The arrows (blue) on the eastern side of the dyke indicates flow within the 3m conductive zone (weathered), which was identified by camera and pH-EC logging. The fractured rock aquifer was further characterised by conducting a pumping and radially convergent tracer test. As mentioned previously the aquifer medium was found to be of dual porosity, with both fractures and matrix supplying the boreholes with groundwater at late times. The fracture aperture (828µm), porosity (4%) and velocity (1.90E-03m/s) is very high, which can mainly be attributed to intense weathering allowing flow to be channeled in flow paths of least resistance. The transmissivity and storativity values obtained from the pumping test were found to be more than adequate for municipal purposes Table 4.6.
In terms of radioactivity uranium-series disequilibria exists in all three boreholes. The activity ratios are all above unity, implying that the groundwater has been in contact with the uranium host-rock (koffieklip), through water rock interaction. This allowed the $^{234}\text{U}$ isotope to be preferentially leached from the crystal lattice by means of alpha recoil. As mentioned previously this is normally associated with natural radioactivity conditions.
In conclusion horizontal bedding-plane fractures are persistent throughout lithological units as seen from the camera logging, and based on the aperture size allow flow to occur along them. Geological contacts and intrusive dykes form low flow boundaries effectively controlling the localised flow direction (West to East) along the strike, based on the water level measurements Figure 4.21. Conceptualising flow although at a very small scale has shown the dynamics of the flow system, and implications for further development of the resources. This information is critical as all these boreholes in conjunction with the municipal wellfield North of Beaufort West, are currently being used to supply the town with water. Therefore the sustainable utilisation of this resource is of fundamental importance for the future development of Beaufort West.
CHAPTER 5 – CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 SUMMARY

The main objective of this study, since its outset, was to assess the various transport mechanisms of radionuclides in fractured-rock aquifers. The review of literature showed the different approaches that are used both locally and in other parts of the world to address this issue. The focal point of the review was to integrate the various components of the study, to meet the objectives upon which this research is based.

The objectives have been achieved. The study identified the various transport mechanisms, namely advection, matrix diffusion, mechanical dispersion, sorption and decay. It provided detail descriptions of each process, and went further to evaluate the effects and controls they have on contaminant transport behavior particularly in fractured rock aquifers. The hydrogeological investigation characterised the heterogeneity of the fractured rock aquifer by sampling for water quality and by conducting various aquifer tests. The hydrochemical description of the groundwater was typical of shallow fresh groundwater, changing composition to a more sulphate hydrochemical facies along the flow path. In terms of radioactivity, although the uranium does not seem to be present in unsafe levels in groundwater throughout the study area, it still remains a concern especially when mining commences, which will ultimately alter the physico-chemical properties of the underlying geology. The considerable heterogeneity of rock types within the Karoo appears to play a role in the varying levels of uranium in the groundwater; however, it is more likely the differing solubility of uranium in the various lithologies (Moordernaars, Poortjie and Oukloof formations) that affects its concentration in the water. The fractured-medium of the aquifer system served as a conduit for groundwater flow as well as storage. The complexity of the aquifer system was further established during the pumping and tracer tests. It was shown that transport took place via multiple flow paths having different hydraulic properties and that the effects of matrix diffusion was evident. Furthermore, the high transmissivity and borehole yields obtained from the pumping test, confirmed the aquifers potential as a major source of water supply that needs to be managed.
sustainably. The conceptualisation of flow at a local scale using all the information and data gathered was utilised to construct a cross-section depicting the main aquifer parameters of the system. Dyke intrusions were looked at as hydraulic boundaries contributing to compartmentalisation of the aquifer and creating unique, site specific flow conditions. Probably of greatest importance is the role of the joints, making up predominantly bedding-planes and sets of interconnected fractures. These have been shown to be persistent, at least on the scale of investigation, with their cumulative effect on flow being considerable.

5.2 RECOMMENDATIONS

The town of Beaufort West has grown dramatically over the past few years with major companies exploring for uranium, reminiscent of the 1970’s when uranium exploration was at its peak in the Karoo. This has led to a huge influx of locals from neighboring towns in search of better jobs. This influx of people has placed a huge demand on the already over-utilised water resource of the town. It is against this backdrop and to large extent the current drought and competing usage for groundwater by farmers that the local municipality decided to drill an additional wellfield on the farm Hansrivier targeting the dolerite dykes to alleviate the pressure on the demand for water. It is quite clear that water in the Karoo is a scarce commodity that needs to be managed sustainably in order for the town of Beaufort West to continue developing its economic sector though mining.

Based on the present study a number of areas for future and further investigation are suggested.

- In the interest of further constraining both the extent of uranium contamination and the characteristics of the various rock types in the region, it is recommended that the DWA implement a monthly sampling campaign of the various boreholes to look at seasonal variations in water quality and groundwater levels.
In order to test the validity of the two controlling factors identified by this study, namely the hydrological and lithological settings in the solubility of uranium. Bulk-rock geochemistry analysis using neutron activation along with optical analysis of thin sections should be carried out to quantify the concentration of uranium in the rock samples and whether or not it correlates with uranium levels in boreholes.

The high flow velocities, concentrations and recovery rates of the tracer used demonstrated the high vulnerability of the groundwater to radionuclide contamination. Therefore the implementation of aquifer protection zones around water supply boreholes (HR10, HR10.1 and G29936HB) is critical, as it is currently being used to augment the current water supply to Beaufort West.

Furthermore the determination of sustainable yields of all the boreholes in the wellfield using the FC-method must be given a high priority and should take into account the hydrological system, concerns and needs of the inhabitants, potential impacts to groundwater quality, and environmental side effects. This will undoubtedly assist the local municipality in effective water resource management and ultimately to make more informed decisions on how to best utilise this dwindling resource.


Department of Water Affairs and Forestry, (2002). *Radioactivity dose calculation and water quality guideline for domestic water use*. Pretoria


## Appendix A – Sampling Boreholes

Table 1 Sampling Boreholes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Borehole ID</th>
<th>X-Coord</th>
<th>Y-Coord</th>
<th>Elev</th>
<th>pH</th>
<th>EC (ms/m)</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lemoenfontien Noord</td>
<td>22.64304</td>
<td>32.29179</td>
<td>889</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>12/5/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tweeling wellfield</td>
<td>22.71901</td>
<td>32.22036</td>
<td>966</td>
<td>6.45</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>12/5/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandwag no:8</td>
<td>22.79169</td>
<td>32.21398</td>
<td>965</td>
<td>7.08</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>12/5/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandwag no:9</td>
<td>22.83581</td>
<td>32.21239</td>
<td>971</td>
<td>6.92</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>12/5/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigrini's Farm no:1</td>
<td>22.85314</td>
<td>32.21669</td>
<td>985</td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>12/5/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigrini's Farm no:2</td>
<td>22.80223</td>
<td>32.23645</td>
<td>958</td>
<td>6.92</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>12/5/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basson family</td>
<td>22.58600</td>
<td>32.35472</td>
<td>937</td>
<td>6.88</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>12/5/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steenrotsfontein no:1</td>
<td>22.56430</td>
<td>32.41827</td>
<td>808</td>
<td>7.13</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>15/5/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steenrotsfontein no:2</td>
<td>22.56389</td>
<td>32.41899</td>
<td>806</td>
<td>7.13</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>15/5/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blydskap no:1</td>
<td>23.13905</td>
<td>32.61653</td>
<td>842</td>
<td>7.07</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>16/5/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blydskap no:2</td>
<td>23.09525</td>
<td>32.60788</td>
<td>831</td>
<td>7.11</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>16/5/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meyerspoort</td>
<td>22.45094</td>
<td>32.68124</td>
<td>811</td>
<td>7.02</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>17/5/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheurfontein no:1</td>
<td>22.55612</td>
<td>32.68570</td>
<td>837</td>
<td>6.99</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>17/5/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheurfontein no:2</td>
<td>22.57533</td>
<td>32.68559</td>
<td>871</td>
<td>7.01</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>17/5/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steenrotsfontein.7</td>
<td>22.53447</td>
<td>-32.39173</td>
<td>815</td>
<td>6.64</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>31/5/2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aardorings</td>
<td>22.56148</td>
<td>-32.64715</td>
<td>838</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>31/5/2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tulpleege</td>
<td>22.65663</td>
<td>-32.65033</td>
<td>874</td>
<td>7.41</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>31/5/2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kardoornkuil</td>
<td>22.75134</td>
<td>-32.70107</td>
<td>866</td>
<td>7.06</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>31/5/2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hansrivier 12</td>
<td>22.60189</td>
<td>-32.39853</td>
<td>833</td>
<td>7.01</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>1/6/2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoenderhok</td>
<td>22.59773</td>
<td>32.36280</td>
<td>841</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>1/6/2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saucyskuil</td>
<td>22.79733</td>
<td>32.53846</td>
<td>847</td>
<td>7.96</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>3/6/2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olivegrove.2</td>
<td>22.56522</td>
<td>-32.50490</td>
<td>822</td>
<td>7.25</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>2/6/2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olivegrove.1</td>
<td>22.56608</td>
<td>-32.39692</td>
<td>813</td>
<td>6.98</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>2/6/2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BH 06</td>
<td>22.53529</td>
<td>-32.39022</td>
<td>813</td>
<td>6.78</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>29/5/2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G936H</td>
<td>22.64042</td>
<td>-32.39102</td>
<td>843</td>
<td>7.57</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>1/6/2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G936 02</td>
<td>22.64055</td>
<td>-32.39103</td>
<td>844</td>
<td>7.64</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>1/6/2009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Appendix.B – Radioactivity Decay Series

## Decay series of Uranium and its daughter products

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Element name</th>
<th>Radionuclide</th>
<th>Atomic weight</th>
<th>Half life</th>
<th>Radiation</th>
<th>Alpha Energy</th>
<th>Abundance (%)</th>
<th>Beta energy (MeV)</th>
<th>Abundance (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$^{238}$U</td>
<td>Uranium</td>
<td>Uranium I</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>$4.468 \times 10^9$ yrs</td>
<td>Alpha</td>
<td>4.195</td>
<td>77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alpha</td>
<td>4.147</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alpha</td>
<td>4.038</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$^{234}$Th</td>
<td>Thorium</td>
<td>Uranium X₁</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>24.1 days</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>0.191</td>
<td>81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>~0.103</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$^{234}$Pa</td>
<td>Protactinium</td>
<td>Uranium X₂</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>1.18 min</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.66 hrs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$^{234}$U</td>
<td>Uranium</td>
<td>Uranium II</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>$2.48 \times 10^5$ yrs</td>
<td>Alpha</td>
<td>4.768</td>
<td>72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.717</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$^{230}$Th</td>
<td>Thorium</td>
<td>Uranium</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>$7.52 \times 10^4$ yrs</td>
<td>Alpha</td>
<td>4.682</td>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ionium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.615</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.476</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.437</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$^{226}$Ra</td>
<td>Radium</td>
<td>Radium</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>1602 yrs</td>
<td>Alpha</td>
<td>4.781</td>
<td>94.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.598</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.191</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$^{222}$Rn</td>
<td>Radon</td>
<td>Radon</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>3.825 days</td>
<td>Alpha</td>
<td>5.486</td>
<td>~100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.983</td>
<td>~0.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix.B – Radioactivity Decay Series (Continuation)

### Decay series of Uranium and its daughter products

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Element name</th>
<th>Radionuclide</th>
<th>Atomic weight</th>
<th>Half life</th>
<th>Radiation</th>
<th>Alpha Energy</th>
<th>Abundance (%)</th>
<th>Beta energy (MeV)</th>
<th>Abundance (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(^{218}\text{Po})</td>
<td>Polonium</td>
<td>Radium A</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>3.05 min</td>
<td>Alpha and Beta</td>
<td>6.11</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(^{214}\text{Pb})</td>
<td>Lead</td>
<td>Radium B</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>26.8 min</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(^{218}\text{At})</td>
<td>Astatine</td>
<td></td>
<td>218</td>
<td>2 sec</td>
<td>Alpha</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(^{214}\text{Bi})</td>
<td>Bismuth</td>
<td>Radium C</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>19.7 min</td>
<td>Alpha and Beta</td>
<td>5.61</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(^{214}\text{Po})</td>
<td>Polonium</td>
<td>Radium C'</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>1.64*10^{-4}</td>
<td>Alpha</td>
<td>7.83</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(^{210}\text{Ti})</td>
<td>Thallium</td>
<td>Radium C''</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>1.32 min</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(^{210}\text{Pb})</td>
<td>Lead</td>
<td>Radium D</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>~22 yrs</td>
<td>Alpha and Beta</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>1.8*10^{-08}</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(^{210}\text{Bi})</td>
<td>Bismuth</td>
<td>Radium E</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>5.02 days</td>
<td>Alpha and Beta</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1.155</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.89</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(^{210}\text{Po})</td>
<td>Polonium</td>
<td>Radium F</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>138.3 days</td>
<td>Alpha</td>
<td>5.305</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(^{206}\text{Hg})</td>
<td>Mercury</td>
<td></td>
<td>206</td>
<td>8.6 min</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(^{206}\text{Ti})</td>
<td>Thallium</td>
<td></td>
<td>206</td>
<td>4.19 min</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(^{206}\text{Pb})</td>
<td>Lead</td>
<td>Radium G</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>Stable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Decay series of Thorium and its daughter products

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Element name</th>
<th>Radionuclide</th>
<th>Atomic weight</th>
<th>Half life</th>
<th>Radiation</th>
<th>Alpha Energy (MeV)</th>
<th>Abundance (%)</th>
<th>Beta energy (MeV)</th>
<th>Abundance (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$^{232}$Th</td>
<td>Thorium</td>
<td>Thorium 232</td>
<td>$1.39 \times 10^{10}$ yrs</td>
<td>Alpha</td>
<td>4.007</td>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alpha</td>
<td>3.952</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alpha</td>
<td>3.882</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$^{228}$Ra</td>
<td>Radium</td>
<td>Mesothorium 1</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>5.75 yrs</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>0.055</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$^{228}$Ac</td>
<td>Actinium</td>
<td>Mesothorium 2</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>6.13 hrs</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$^{228}$Th</td>
<td>Thorium</td>
<td>Radiothorium</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>1.913 yrs</td>
<td>Alpha</td>
<td>5.421</td>
<td>71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alpha</td>
<td>5.338</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alpha</td>
<td>5.208</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alpha</td>
<td>5.173</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alpha</td>
<td>5.137</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$^{224}$Ra</td>
<td>Radium</td>
<td>Thorium X</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>3.64 days</td>
<td>Alpha</td>
<td>5.684</td>
<td>94.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alpha</td>
<td>5.447</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$^{220}$Rn</td>
<td>Radon</td>
<td>Thoron 220</td>
<td>55.6 sec</td>
<td>Alpha</td>
<td>6.296</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$^{216}$Po</td>
<td>Polonium</td>
<td>Thorium A</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>0.145 sec</td>
<td>Alpha</td>
<td>6.777</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$^{212}$Pb</td>
<td>Lead</td>
<td>Thorium B</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>10.64 hrs</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>complex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$^{212}$Bi</td>
<td>Bismuth</td>
<td>Thorium C</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>60.5 min</td>
<td>Beta and Alpha</td>
<td>6.09</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$^{212}$Po</td>
<td>Polonium</td>
<td>Thorium C'</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>$3.04 \times 10^{-7}$ sec</td>
<td>Alpha</td>
<td>8.78</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$^{208}$TI</td>
<td>Thallium</td>
<td>Thorium C&quot;</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>3.1 min</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$^{208}$Pb</td>
<td>Lead</td>
<td>Thorium D</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>stable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This table summarizes the decay series of Thorium and its daughter products, including the radionuclides, atomic weights, half lives, radiation types, alpha and beta energies, and abundances.
Appendix.C – Mean residence time and dispersion length of the dataset using the method of moments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>time [sec]</th>
<th>dt</th>
<th>c [ppb]</th>
<th>M0 = c(t)*dt</th>
<th>M1 = c(t)<em>t</em>dt</th>
<th>M2 = c(t)<em>t^2</em>dt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>10/02/18:20:34</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>10/02/18:20:44</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>10/02/18:20:54</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>10/02/18:21:04</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>2070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>10/02/18:21:14</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>4160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>10/02/18:21:24</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>7000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>10/02/18:21:34</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>10800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>10/02/18:21:44</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>16170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>10/02/18:22:04</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>23680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10/02/18:22:14</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>32400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>10/02/18:22:24</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>44000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>10/02/18:22:34</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>517</td>
<td>56870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>10/02/18:22:44</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>72000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>10/02/18:23:04</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>715</td>
<td>92950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>10/02/18:23:14</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>840</td>
<td>117600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>10/02/18:23:24</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>945</td>
<td>141750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>10/02/18:23:34</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>1104</td>
<td>176640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>10/02/18:23:44</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>1207</td>
<td>205190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>10/02/18:23:54</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>1422</td>
<td>255960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>10/02/18:24:04</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>1615</td>
<td>306850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>10/02/18:24:14</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>1820</td>
<td>364000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>10/02/18:24:24</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>2037</td>
<td>427770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>10/02/18:24:34</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>2310</td>
<td>508200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>10/02/18:24:44</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>2576</td>
<td>592480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>10/02/18:24:54</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>2928</td>
<td>702720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>10/02/18:25:04</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>3225</td>
<td>806250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>10/02/18:25:14</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>3510</td>
<td>912600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>10/02/18:25:24</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>3942</td>
<td>1064340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>10/02/18:25:34</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>4452</td>
<td>1246560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>10/02/18:25:44</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>4785</td>
<td>1387650</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix.C – Mean residence time and dispersion length of the dataset using the method of moments (Continuation)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>time [sec]</th>
<th>dt</th>
<th>c [ppb]</th>
<th>M0 = c(t)*dt</th>
<th>M1 = c(t)<em>t</em>dt</th>
<th>M2 = c(t)<em>t^2</em>dt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>10/02/10-18:25:34</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>5310</td>
<td>1593000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>10/02/10-18:25:44</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>5704</td>
<td>1768240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>10/02/10-18:25:54</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>6208</td>
<td>1986560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>10/02/10-18:26:04</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>6666</td>
<td>2199780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>10/02/10-18:26:14</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>7208</td>
<td>2450720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>10/02/10-18:26:24</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>8015</td>
<td>2805250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>10/02/10-18:26:34</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>8604</td>
<td>3097440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>10/02/10-18:26:44</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>9213</td>
<td>3408810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>10/02/10-18:26:54</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>10146</td>
<td>3855480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>10/02/10-18:27:04</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>11115</td>
<td>4334850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>10/02/10-18:27:14</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>11760</td>
<td>4704000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>10/02/10-18:27:24</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>12792</td>
<td>5244720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>10/02/10-18:27:34</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>13776</td>
<td>5785920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>10/02/10-18:27:44</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>14878</td>
<td>6397540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>10/02/10-18:27:54</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>36.3</td>
<td>15972</td>
<td>7027680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>10/02/10-18:28:04</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>37.4</td>
<td>16830</td>
<td>7573500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>10/02/10-18:28:14</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>18170</td>
<td>8358200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>10/02/10-18:28:24</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>19176</td>
<td>9012720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>10/02/10-18:28:34</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>42.6</td>
<td>20448</td>
<td>9815040</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>