

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 **Evaluation of groundwater quality and its suitability for drinking and**
8 **agricultural use in Thanjavur city, Tamil Nadu, India**
9

10
11
12
13 R. Nagarajan^{1*}, N.Rajmohan², U. Mahendran³, and S. Senthamilkumar³
14
15
16

17 **¹Dr. R. Nagarajan**

18 Department of Science and Mathematics,
19 School of Engineering and Science,
20 Curtin University of Technology, CDT 250, 98009, Miri, Sarawak,
21 Malaysia. Email : nagarajan@curtin.edu.my; nagageochem@yahoo.com
22
23
24

25
26 **²Dr. N. Rajmohan**

27 Research Engineer
28 Department of waste treatment and conditioning research
29 Commissariat a l'energie atomique (CEA), Centre De Valrho/Marcoule
30 BP 1717F 30207 Bagnols-Sur-Ceze Csdex
31 France. Email : nrmohan_2000@yahoo.com
32
33
34

35 **³Mr. U. Mahendran**

36 Department of Civil Engineering, Periyar Maniammai University, Thanjavur,
37 Tamil Nadu, India.
38
39

40
41 **³Mr. S. Senthamilkumar**

42 Department of Civil Engineering, Periyar Maniammai University, Thanjavur,
43 Tamil Nadu, India.
44
45

46
47 ***Corresponding author: Dr. R. Nagarajan**

48 School of Engineering and Science,
49 Department of Science and Mathematics,
50 Curtin University of Technology,
51 CDT 250, 98009, Miri, Sarawak, Malaysia.
52 Phone :+60 85 443928
53 Fax :+60 85 443838
54 Web : <http://geonagarajan.googlepages.com>
55 Email : nagarajan@curtin.edu.my; nagageochem@yahoo.com
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10 **Evaluation of groundwater quality and its suitability for drinking and**
11 **agricultural use in Thanjavur city, Tamil Nadu, India**
12
13

14 R. Nagarajan^{1*}, N.Rajmohan², U. Mahendran³ and S. Senthamilkumar³
15
16
17

18
19
20 **Abstract**
21

22 As groundwater is a vital source of water for domestic and agricultural activities
23 in Thanjavur city due to lack of surface water resources, groundwater quality and its
24 suitability for drinking and agricultural usage was evaluated. In this study, 102
25 groundwater samples were collected from dug wells and bore wells during March 2008
26 and analyzed for pH, electrical conductivity, temperature, major ions and nitrate. Results
27 suggest that in 90% of groundwater samples, sodium and chloride are predominant cation
28 and anion, respectively, and NaCl and CaMgCl are major water types in the study area.
29 The groundwater quality in the study site is impaired by surface contamination sources,
30 mineral dissolution, ion exchange and evaporation. Nitrate, chloride and sulphate
31 concentrations strongly express the impact of surface contamination sources such as
32 agricultural and domestic activities, on groundwater quality and 13% of samples have
33 elevated nitrate content (> 45 mg/l as NO_3). PHREEQC code and Gibbs plots were
34 employed to evaluate the contribution of mineral dissolution, and suggest that mineral
35 dissolution, especially carbonate minerals, regulates water chemistry. Groundwater
36 suitability for drinking usage was evaluated by WHO and Indian standards and suggests
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5
6 that 34% of samples are not suitable for drinking. Integrated groundwater suitability map
7
8 for drinking purposes was created using drinking water standards based on a concept that
9
10 if the groundwater sample exceeds any one of the standards, it is not suitable for
11
12 drinking. This map illustrates that wells in zones 1, 2, 3 and 4 are not fit for drinking
13
14 purpose. Likewise, irrigational suitability of groundwater in the study region was
15
16 evaluated and results suggest that 20% samples are not fit for irrigation. Groundwater
17
18 suitability map for irrigation was also produced based on salinity and sodium hazards and
19
20 denotes that wells mostly situated in zones 2 and 3 are not suitable for irrigation. Both
21
22 integrated suitability maps for drinking and irrigation usage provide overall scenario
23
24 about the groundwater quality in the study area. Finally, the study concluded that
25
26 groundwater quality is impaired by man made activities and proper management plan is
27
28 necessary to protect valuable groundwater resources in Thanjavur city.
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36

37 **Keywords:** Groundwater quality, suitability maps, contamination, Thanjavur city, South
38
39
40 India
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 **Introduction**
8
9

10
11
12 Due to the ever increasing demand for potable and irrigation water, and
13 inadequacy of available surface water, the importance of groundwater is increasing
14 exponentially everyday. Further, about 80% of the diseases and deaths in the developing
15 countries are related to water contamination (UNESCO 2007). In recent days, Thanjavur
16 city is facing an acute shortage for good drinking water owing to poor quality of
17 groundwater unless good potable water supplied by the municipality. Hence, evaluation
18 of groundwater quality is necessary and immediate task for present and future
19 groundwater quality management in Thanjavur city due to the non-perennial nature of
20 Cauvery River and frequent failure of monsoon. In addition, numerous studies
21 concentrated on groundwater quality monitoring and evaluation for domestic and
22 agricultural activities (Al-Bassam and Al-Rumikhani, 2003; Al-Futaisi et al. 2007;
23 Elampooranan et al. 1999; Elango et al. 1998; Elango et al. 2003; Jeevanandam et al.
24 2006; Pritchard et al. 2008; Rajmohan et al. 1997; Subramani et al. 2005; Sujatha and
25 Rajeswara Reddy 2003). Ma et al. (2009) evaluated water quality and identified the
26 source of water pollution in the Wuwei basin of Shiyang river in northwest China and
27 reported high salinity and nitrate in groundwater. These studies emphasized that
28 groundwater quality monitoring and evaluation is a necessary task to protect valuable
29 groundwater sources and management. Generally, the concentrations of dissolved ions in
30 groundwater are governed by lithology, groundwater flow, nature of geochemical
31 reactions, residence time, solubility of salts and human activities (Bhatt and Saklani
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5
6 1996; Karanth 1987; Nisi et al. 2008; Schot and Wal 1992). Moreover, the groundwater
7
8 quality is mostly affected by either natural geochemical processes such as mineral
9
10 weathering, dissolution/precipitation reactions, ion exchange or various manmade
11
12 activities such as agriculture, sewage disposal, mining and industrial wastes, etc. The
13
14 surface runoff from the agricultural field is one of the main sources for nutrients and
15
16 salinity in the groundwater and occurrence of nitrate and nitrite in the groundwater above
17
18 the permissible limit is not conducive for the drinking purpose (Lee et al. 2003;
19
20 Rajmohan and Elango 2005). Nitrate is resulted mostly by surface contamination sources.
21
22 Nitrate (> 300mg/l) poisoning may result in the death of livestock consuming water
23
24 (Canter 1997). In humans, a condition called methaemoglobinaemia, also known as blue
25
26 baby syndrome results from the ingestion of high concentration of nitrate in its inorganic
27
28 form. Nitrate contamination is strongly related to land-use pattern and reported in several
29
30 studies throughout the world (Ator and Denis 1997; Elhatip et al. 2003; Jeong 2001;
31
32 Kalkhoff 1992; Rajmohan et al. 2009). Further, groundwater with low pH values can
33
34 cause gastrointestinal disorder and this water cannot be used for the drinking purposes
35
36 (Laluraj and Grish Gopinath 2006). Total dissolved solids (TDS) values are also
37
38 considered as an important parameter in determining the usage of water and groundwater
39
40 with high TDS values are not suitable for both irrigation and drinking purposes (Fetters
41
42 1990; Freeze and cherry 1979). Like drinking, groundwater quality is an important
43
44 criterion to decide the water for irrigation activities. Several researchers evaluated the
45
46 suitability of groundwater for irrigation using various parameters e.g. Na%, SAR, RSC,
47
48 Wilcox and USSL classifications, etc. (Al-Bassam and Al-Rumikhani 2003; Al-Futaisi et
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5
6 al. 2007; Elampooranan et al. 1999; Elango et al. 1998; Elango et al. 2003; Jeevanandam
7
8 et al. 2006; Rajmohan et al. 1997; Subramani et al. 2005; Sujatha and Rajeswara Reddy
9
10 2003).

11
12
13 The present study was carried out to evaluate the groundwater quality and its
14
15 suitability for domestic and agricultural activities in Thanjavur city, Tamil Nadu, India as
16
17 the groundwater is the only major source of water for agricultural and domestic purposes
18
19 due to the lack of surface water.
20
21

22 23 24 25 **Study area**

26
27
28 The study region is Thanjavur city, which is located 300 km far from Chennai, in
29
30 the Cauvery Delta Zone of eastern part of Tamil Nadu, India (Fig.1). The city extends
31
32 between North latitudes 10° 8'-10° 48' and east longitudes 79° 09' - 79° 15' with an
33
34 altitude of 59m and it has an average elevation of 2 meters. The study region has an area
35
36 of 36.31 km² and being developed in the adjacent villages. Total population in the study
37
38 site is about 2,26,830 (Census of India, 2001). The Cauvery delta zone has a tropical
39
40 climate and the average annual rainfall in Thanjvur city is 1114 mm. The average
41
42 temperature in this region is varying between 36.6°C and 32.5°C in summer, and between
43
44 23.5°C and 22.8°C during winter, respectively. The most important economic activity of
45
46 this area is agriculture and the major crops are paddy, sugarcane, coconut, plantain, etc.
47
48 The irrigation system mostly feed by groundwater as well as the canal system (Grand
49
50 Anaicut Canal) in this Cauvery delta area. It consists of grand and upper anaicuts across
51
52 the Cauvery River. This great system of canals is covering the whole delta in the districts
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5
6 of Thiruchirapalli and Thanjavur. The total length of the canal exceeds 6000 km and
7
8 400,000 hectares of land are being irrigated.
9

10 11 12 13 **Geology and Hydrogeology** 14

15 Figure 2 illustrates the geology of the study site. The area consists of alluvial
16 flood plain and includes paleo-channel deposits, sandstone, gravels and patches of kankar
17 formations which is belongs to Tertiary to Quaternary age (Tamil Nadu Agricultural
18 University 2002-2004). The study area consists of two distinct formations namely
19 Quaternary alluvial flood plain deposits in the northern part and Miocene sediments in
20 the southern part of the study area. The alluvial thickness ranges from 30m to 400m. The
21 alluvial soil is clayey textured with 40 – 45% of clay fraction particularly
22 montmorillonite, which has good capacity for adsorption and retention of water and plant
23 nutrients (Tamil Nadu Agricultural University 2002-2004). The Cretaceous Formations
24 occur as small patch in South-western sides but not within the study area. These
25 formations have a very thick lateritic cap, consisting of impure argillaceous and
26 calcareous clay. The Pliocene formations are formed to occur on the south eastern side of
27 Thanjavur town overlying the Miocene formations. This formation includes sand,
28 variegated clay and gravel. The water level fluctuates between 10.50m to 23.00m during
29 summer and between 6.15m to 10.90m during winter. Thickness of shallow aquifer
30 ranges from 10 to 30 mts and deep aquifer ranges from 60mts to 120 mts.
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56

57 **Methodology** 58 59 60 61 62 63 64 65

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Thanjavur city was divided into 10 zones based on Panchayat wards for administration purposes. In this study, we have considered same administration zones for groundwater sampling and further discussion. In the study area, 102 bore and dug wells were selected for groundwater sampling based on field survey. Figure 1 shows the groundwater sampling locations and administration zones. Groundwater samples were collected during March 2008 and analyzed for major ions and nitrate. The groundwater samples were collected in 2 Liter HDPE containers pre-washed with 1:1 HCL and rinsed three to four times before sampling using sampling water. Collected samples were transported to laboratory within the same day and stored at 4°C. Samples for laboratory analysis were filtered in the laboratory in the same day through 0.45 µm cellulose membranes prior to the analyses. Groundwater samples for cations analysis were acidified to pH < 2 with several drops of ultra-pure HCl in the laboratory. Groundwater samples were analyzed based on standard methods (APHA 1995). Electrical conductivity (EC) and pH were measured in the field immediately after the collection of the samples using portable field meters. The analyses were carried out in Regional water testing laboratory, TWAD Board, Thanjavur. In the laboratory, Na and K were analyzed by flame photometer, and Ca, Mg, Cl and alkalinity (HCO₃) were estimated by titration. Sulphate and nitrate were analyzed using spectrophotometer. Measurement reproducibility and precision for each analysis were less than 2%. The analytical precision for the total measurements of ions was checked again by calculating the ionic balance errors, and was generally within ±5%.

1
2
3
4
5
6 The geochemical computer code PHREEQC (Parkhurst and Appelo 1999) with
7
8 thermodynamic database PHREEQC and WATEQ4F were used to calculate the
9
10 distribution of aqueous species and mineral saturation indices. In addition, groundwater
11
12 quality data were employed to create integrated groundwater quality maps.
13
14
15
16
17

18 **Results and discussion**

23 **General water chemistry**

24
25
26
27 The hydrochemistry of groundwater for all the zones is given in the table 1 with
28
29 minimum, maximum, mean and standard deviation values. The chemical composition of
30
31 the groundwater samples (n=102) in the study region shows a wide range. The electrical
32
33 conductivity (EC) in the study region is varied from 190 $\mu\text{S}/\text{cm}$ to 6000 $\mu\text{S}/\text{cm}$ with an
34
35 average of 1101 $\mu\text{S}/\text{cm}$ (n=102). The total dissolved solids (TDS) ranged from 133 to
36
37 4200 mg/l with a mean value of 783 mg/l. According to the TDS classification, 29.4% of
38
39 the groundwater samples belong to the brackish type (TDS > 1000mg/l) and the
40
41 remaining comes under fresh water category (TDS < 1000mg/l) (Freeze and Cherry,
42
43 1979). Among the cations, the concentrations of Na, K, Ca, and Mg ions ranged from 18
44
45 to 740, 1-60, 12-240 and 3-154 mg/l with an average value of 133, 8, 67 and 20 mg/l,
46
47 respectively. Cation chemistry indicates that 94% of the samples are Na>Ca>Mg>K,
48
49 while the remaining 6% of samples are Ca>Na>Mg>K. The dissolved anions such as
50
51 alkalinity, Cl, SO₄ and NO₃ lie in between 40 and 688, 28 and 1660, below detection
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5
6 limit (BDL) and 133, and 2 and 176 mg/l with an average value of 196, 204, 44 and 23
7
8 mg/l, respectively. The pH of the groundwater samples in the study area varies from 6 to
9
10 9.6 with an average value of 7.1 which indicates that the dissolved carbonates are
11
12 predominantly in the HCO₃ form (Adams et al. 2001). About 62% of samples show the
13
14 pH variation between 7 and 8.2, indicating an alkaline nature.
15
16
17
18
19

20 Both EC and chloride have high standard deviation compared to other parameters
21
22 and suggest that water chemistry is not homogeneous in the study region and regulated by
23
24 distinguished processes. Moreover, the nitrate concentration indicates that 13% of
25
26 samples exceed 45 mg/l and 11% of samples lie between 25 and 45 mg/l. The
27
28 concentrations of chloride and nitrate firmly evident the influences of surface
29
30 contamination sources such as agricultural activities (irrigation return flow, fertilizers and
31
32 farm manure) and domestic waste waters (septic tank leakage, sewage water, etc) in the
33
34 study region. However, alkalinity concentration (196 ±129, Mean ± SD) reveals the
35
36 influences of mineral dissolution on water chemistry in the study region.
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 **Processes regulating water quality**

46
47
48
49

50 Zone wise groundwater quality data (Table 1) indicates that zones 2, 3 and 4 have
51
52 high concentrations of major ions, nitrate and EC. Especially, groundwater samples in
53
54 zone 2 extremely affected by surface contamination sources because the average chloride
55
56 (357 mg/l) and nitrate (52 mg/l) concentrations are very high compared to other zones.
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5
6 Regional groundwater quality maps, prepared by GIS, also apparently illustrate that wells
7
8 in the zone 2 contain elevated concentration of TDS, nitrate and Cl (Fig. 3). Like nitrate
9
10 and Cl, similar trend is observed in other major ions and in EC. Further, zones 3 and 4 are
11
12 also express high concentrations of most of the ions next to zone 2. Alkalinity generally
13
14 represents dissolution of carbonate and silicate minerals. However, it is also very high in
15
16 zones 2, 3 and 4 (Table 1). The average concentration of alkalinity in zone 2, 3 and 4 are
17
18 394, 294 and 210 mg/l, respectively. This observation suggests that the water chemistry
19
20 in these zones (2, 3 and 4) could be affected by infiltration of waste water originated from
21
22 surface contaminations sources, which causes dissolution of carbonate and silicate
23
24 minerals indirectly.
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

33 In order to understand the chemical characteristics of groundwater in the study
34
35 region, groundwater samples were plotted in Piper trilinear diagram (Piper 1944) using
36
37 AquaChem software (Fig. 4). Figure 4 displays that groundwater samples are classified as
38
39 various chemical types on the piper diagram. The dominant water types are in the order
40
41 of Na–Cl > Ca-Mg-Cl > Mix CaNaHCO₃ > Ca HCO₃. However, most of the samples are
42
43 clustered in Na–Cl and Ca-Mg-Cl segments. Water types (Ca-Mg-Cl and Na-Cl) suggest
44
45 the mixing of high salinity water, caused from surface contamination sources such as
46
47 irrigation return flow, domestic waste water and septic tank effluents, with existing water
48
49 followed by ion exchange reactions. However, Mixed CaNaHCO₃ and CaHCO₃ water
50
51 types express mineral dissolution and recharge of fresh water. In addition with piper
52
53 diagram, Gibbs plots were also used to gain better insight into hydrochemical processes
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5
6 such as precipitation, rock-water interaction and evaporation on groundwater chemistry
7
8 in the study region (Fig. 5). Gibb's (1970) demonstrated that if TDS is plotted against
9
10 Na/(Na+Ca) this would provide information on the mechanism controlling chemistry of
11
12 waters. Figure 5 display that groundwater samples were plotted mostly in the rock-water
13
14 interaction zone and few samples in the evaporation zone. This observation suggests that
15
16 dissolution of carbonate and silicate minerals are mostly controlled the groundwater
17
18 chemistry in the study region. However, few samples plotted in the evaporation zone
19
20 reveal that surface contamination sources, for example irrigation return flow, seem to be
21
22 affected the groundwater quality in the study region. Both Piper and Gibbs plots suggest
23
24 that water chemistry is regulated by mixing of salinity water, caused by surface
25
26 contamination sources, with existing water, ion exchange reactions, mineral dissolution
27
28 and possibly evaporation.
29
30
31
32
33

34 35 36 37 *Ion exchange process* 38 39 40 41

42 The evolution of groundwater towards a Na-rich type generally occurred by the
43
44 precipitation of calcite and/or cation exchange. In contrast, Ca-Cl type water commonly
45
46 produced by reverse ion exchange reaction ($\text{Na} + \text{Ca-Clay} = \text{Na-Clay} + \text{Ca}$). Both cation
47
48 exchange and reverse ion exchange are encouraged by aquifer materials, especially
49
50 montmorillonite, which leads to the release of Na or Ca into groundwater and adsorption
51
52 of Ca or Na, respectively (Alison et al. 1992; Blake 1989; Cerling et al. 1989; Foster
53
54 1950). As Piper plot indicates the possibility of ion exchange reactions, Schoeller chloro-
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5
6 alkaline indices were employed to understand the ion exchange reactions. The ion
7
8 exchange reactions between the groundwater and its host environment during residence
9
10 or travel can be understood by studying the chloro-alkaline indices, Chloro-alkaline
11
12 indices 1 and 2 (CAI 1 and CAI 2) calculated for the groundwater samples of the study
13
14 region using the following relations (Schoeller 1965, 1967).
15
16
17
18
19

$$20 \quad \text{CAI 1} = \text{Cl}^- - (\text{Na}^+ + \text{K}^+) / \text{Cl}^- \quad (3)$$

$$21 \quad \text{CAI 2} = \text{Cl}^- - (\text{Na}^+ + \text{K}^+) / \text{SO}_4^{2-} + \text{HCO}_3^- + \text{CO}_3^{2-} + \text{NO}_3^- \quad (4)$$

22
23
24 (All values are expressed in meq/l)
25
26
27

28
29 If the indices values are negative, Na^+ and K^+ ions in the aquifer materials are exchanged
30
31 with Mg^{2+} and Ca^{2+} ions in water where as reverse process will give positive value ($\text{Cl} >$
32
33 $\text{Na} + \text{K}$). During this process, the host rocks are the primary sources for dissolved solids
34
35 in the water. Schoeller (1965; 1967) indices indicate that all samples in the study region
36
37 have positive values except few samples, and explain that reverse ion exchange reaction
38
39 is dominant in the study region. But in few sites where the values are negative, suggest
40
41 the influences of normal ion exchange reactions.
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 *Effect of mineral dissolution and surface contamination sources* 49 50 51

52
53 As per the geology, soil information and Gibbs plots, mineral dissolution is one of
54
55 the major process regulates water chemistry in the study region. Dissolution of carbonate
56
57 minerals seems to be largely affected the water chemistry because kankar formation is
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5
6 observed in the study site. Saturation indices (SI) of carbonate (calcite, dolomite),
7
8 sulphate (gypsum, anhydrite) minerals and halite were calculated using PHREEQC.
9
10 Saturation indices of calcite vary between -3 and 1 (Fig. 6) while SI value of dolomite
11
12 ranges from -5 to 2. SI values of sulphate minerals and halite suggest that groundwater
13
14 samples are highly undersaturated with respect to gypsum (SI<-2), anhydrite (SI<-2) and
15
16 halite (SI<-6). This observation reveals that influences of sulphate minerals and halite are
17
18 not significant on groundwater chemistry and there is no known geological information
19
20 about the occurrence of sulphate minerals and halite in the study region. However,
21
22 application of gypsum (fertilizer) in the irrigation field may contribute sulphate content in
23
24 groundwater through irrigation return flow. Likewise, NaCl salt from domestic waste
25
26 water can affect water chemistry by infiltration.
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34

35 Saturation indices of carbonate minerals (calcite, dolomite) show that these are
36
37 varying with groundwater zones (Fig. 6). Groundwater samples may be classified into
38
39 three groups: over saturated (SI>0), saturated (SI≤0) and undersaturated (SI<-1). Figure
40
41 6 illustrates that wells located in zones 1, 2 and 3 come under group 1 (SI>0). Wells
42
43 existed in zones 4, 5, 6 and 7 are classified as group 2 (SI≤0) where as wells situated in
44
45 the remaining zone (8, 9 and 10) come under group 3 (SI< -1). The variation of
46
47 carbonate minerals saturation in the study site may be due to three major reasons: 1)
48
49 variation in the occurrence of carbonate minerals, 2) external sources of Ca, Mg and
50
51 alkalinity entering into the groundwater system by recharge process and 3) infiltration of
52
53 waste water, originated from surface contamination sources, enhances the dissolution of
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5
6 carbonate minerals existing in the aquifer materials. In the study region, there is no
7
8 heterogeneity in geological formation, which ruled out the first reason. Moreover, figure
9
10 6 also shows that total dissolved solids (TDS) and calcium behave similarly, and group 1
11
12 followed by group 3 wells have high concentrations compared to group 2. Other major
13
14 ions (Mg, Na, K, Cl and SO₄) also express similar trend like calcium and TDS. However,
15
16 alkalinity and nitrate are contrary to other ions and these are very high in group 1 wells
17
18 compared to groups 2 and 3 wells. These observations suggest that alkalinity in group 1
19
20 wells may be originated from surface contamination sources in addition with carbonate
21
22 mineral dissolution (Adams et al. 2001). Generally, alkalinity can enter the aquifer from
23
24 the dissolution of carbonate minerals, soil CO₂ or from the bacterial degradation of
25
26 organic material (Jeong 2001). In this study site, alkalinity can also come from surface
27
28 contamination sources such as bacterial degradation of organic material, anthropogenic
29
30 CO₂ gas caused from municipal wastes dumped in the unlined dumping sites, oxidation
31
32 of organic materials leaked from old latrines and sewage systems in the study area (Clark
33
34 and Fritz 1997). Hence, the second and third reasons are more reliable for over-saturation
35
36 of groundwater with respect to carbonate minerals in group 1 wells because the
37
38 influences of domestic waste water and irrigation return flow are apparently observed in
39
40 zones 2-4 which enhances saturation of carbonate minerals in the study region.
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51

52 As mentioned earlier, the study region is covered by both urban and agricultural
53
54 activities. The study area is mostly irrigated with paddy crops. Hence, application of
55
56 fertilizers and irrigation return flow may also affect the groundwater quality in the study
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5
6 region. It is strongly observed in potassium, sulphate and nitrate. Generally, potassium is
7
8 retained with aquifer material, especially in clay formation and several studies reported
9
10 very low concentration in groundwater (Sarin et al. 1989; Subba Rao 2002). In the study
11
12 region, potassium is generally less than 8 mg/l (average) except zones 2, 3 and 4 (K > 11
13
14 mg/l, average) (Table 1). This observation suggests that potassium concentration in zones
15
16 2, 3 and 4 is entered into the groundwater system from external sources in addition with
17
18 mineral dissolution because there is no heterogeneity in geology. Like potassium, the
19
20 average sulphate concentration is less than 45 mg/l in the study region except wells in
21
22 zones 1, 2, 3 and 4 where $SO_4 > 60$ mg/l (Table 1). Application of potassium fertilizers
23
24 (Potash (KCl) and NPK (Nitrogen-Phosphorus-Potassium, mixed fertilizer) and gypsum
25
26 seems to be contributed well in potassium and sulphate concentrations in addition with
27
28 domestic waste water (sewage, septic tank effluent, etc). Like potassium and sulphate,
29
30 nitrate also illustrates very large variation with respect to zones (Table 1, Fig. 3). The
31
32 average nitrate is generally less than 16 mg/l except zones 2, 3 and 4 (Table 1). The
33
34 average concentrations in zones 2, 3 and 4 are 52, 51 and 39 mg/l, respectively.
35
36 Generally, nitrate is originated from distinguished processes such as irrigation practice,
37
38 organic material oxidation, soil mineralization, urban contamination, etc (Elhatip et al.
39
40 2003; Jeong 2001; Subba Rao 2002). In the study region, infiltration of domestic waste
41
42 water, septic tank effluents, irrigation return flow, fertilizer (mainly urea) and farm
43
44 manure are the major sources for nitrate in groundwater. [The study area is dominantly
45
46 covered by old settlements, and constructed septic tanks in this settlement area are older](#)
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5
6 than a decade. Hence, leakage of effluent from these septic tanks is one of the major
7
8 sources for nitrogen.
9

10 11 12 **Evaluation of groundwater quality**

13 *Drinking usage*

14
15
16
17
18
19
20 The analytical results have been evaluated to ascertain the suitability of
21
22 groundwater in the study area for domestic and agricultural purposes based on the WHO
23
24 (1993) and Indian Standards (1991) (Table 2). The average values of individual
25
26 parameters of groundwater are within the permissible limit when compared to the WHO
27
28 (1993) and Indian Standard (1991) where as individual samples are having higher
29
30 concentration which have shown in the table by comparing WHO and Indian standards.
31
32 According to the Freeze and Cherry (1979), 70.6% of samples are considered as fresh
33
34 water type. Classification based on Davis and DeWiest (1966), 42% of samples are
35
36 desirable for drinking and 28% of samples are considered as permissible for drinking
37
38 purposes based on TDS (Table 3). Among the cations, sodium is the most dominant
39
40 cation in groundwater. Sodium concentration of more than 50 mg/l, make the water
41
42 unsuitable for domestic use. Hardness is an important criterion for determining the
43
44 usability of water for domestic, drinking and many industrial supplies (Karanth 1987).
45
46 Hardness can be classified as temporary due to carbonate and bicarbonates or permanent
47
48 due to sulphate and chlorides of calcium and magnesium. Total hardness varies between
49
50 50 and 1240 with an average of 239 mg/l. The groundwater with total hardness (TH)
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5
6 value less than 75 mg/l is considered as soft. According to the classification using total
7
8 hardness, 20% of groundwater samples show moderate quality and 75% come under hard
9
10 to very hard category (Table 4). Very low percentage about 4.90% of samples shows
11
12 good quality. Hard water is mainly an aesthetic concern because of the unpleasant taste. It
13
14 also reduces the ability of soap to produce lather, and causes scale formation in pipes and
15
16 on plumbing fixtures. Magnesium is one of the constituents responsible for hardness of
17
18 water. Further, higher magnesium concentration may be cathartic and diuretic (WHO
19
20 1997). Also the values of magnesium combined with sulphate act as laxative to human
21
22 beings. The maximum permissible and highest desirable limit given by the WHO (1993)
23
24 and ISI (1991) is 100 and 30mg/l, respectively. The magnesium ranges between 3 mg/l
25
26 and 154 mg/l with an average of 20 mg/l (n=102, Table 1). Most of the samples are with
27
28 in the permissible limit. Sulphate is one of the least toxic anions, even though
29
30 dehydration is observed at high concentrations. ISI (1991) suggested that highest
31
32 desirable and maximum permissible limit of sulphate is 200 and 400 mg/l, respectively. If
33
34 the limit of sulphate exceeds, it may cause gastro intestinal irritation and laxative effect at
35
36 higher level (WHO 1993). Sulphate values in the study area varies from BDL to 133 mg/l
37
38 with an average of 44 mg/l (n=102, Table 1). Mostly all the samples show the sulphate
39
40 content within the recommended limit.
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51

52 Integrated groundwater suitability map for drinking purposes in the study site is
53
54 created by combining all the quality parameters e.g. TDS, TH, pH, Na, K, Ca, Mg, Cl,
55
56 SO₄ and NO₃ (Figure 7). This map is produced based on the concept that if the
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5
6 groundwater samples exceed the recommended limits (ISI 1991; WHO 1993) of any one
7
8 of the parameters, they are not suitable for drinking usage. In the study region, 34 wells
9
10 (34% in total wells) exceed any one of the drinking water standards recommended by
11
12 WHO (1993) and ISI (1991) which are not suitable for drinking purpose.
13
14

15 16 17 *Irrigational suitability* 18

19
20 In the study region, the surface water facility for irrigation is available only for
21
22 limited time or season due to frequent failure of monsoon. For other season irrigation
23
24 mainly depends on groundwater. Irrigational suitability of groundwater in the study site
25
26 was evaluated by EC, SAR, RSC, USSL classification, Na% and Wilcox diagram. The
27
28 total content of soluble salts such as Na to Ca and Mg and its relative proportion affects
29
30 the suitability of groundwater for irrigation. The EC and Na concentration are important
31
32 in classifying irrigation water. According to Richards (1954), the irrigation water is
33
34 classified into four groups such as low ($EC = <250 \mu\text{S/cm}$), medium ($250 - 750 \mu\text{S/cm}$),
35
36 high ($750 - 2250 \mu\text{S/cm}$), and very high ($2250 - 5000 \mu\text{S/cm}$) salinity. High EC in water
37
38 leads to form saline soil, where as high Na content in water causes alkaline soil. In
39
40 addition, SAR (Sodium Absorption Ratio) and RSC (Residual Sodium Carbonate) are
41
42 used to evaluate the groundwater quality for irrigation. The irrigation water containing a
43
44 high proportion of sodium will increase the exchange of sodium content of the soil,
45
46 affecting the soil permeability, and the texture makes the soil hard to plough and
47
48 unsuitable for seedling emergence (Trivedy and Goel 1984). Features that generally need
49
50 to be considered for evaluation of groundwater suitability for irrigation are salinity,
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5
6 sodium percentage and SAR. The sodium or alkali hazard in the use of water for
7
8 irrigation is expressed by determining the SAR and it was estimated by the equation:
9

$$10 \quad \text{SAR} = \text{Na} / [(\text{Ca} + \text{Mg})/2]^{0.5}$$

11
12
13
14
15
16 Units are expressed in meq/L
17

18
19 The calculated values of SAR in the study area vary between 0.97 and 9.17 (Table
20
21 5). A more detailed analysis, however, with respect to the irrigation suitability of the
22
23 groundwater, was made by plotting the data on the diagram of U.S Salinity laboratory of
24
25 the Department of Agriculture (United States Salinity Laboratory (1954)). According to
26
27 this classification, low-salinity water (<200mg/l) may be used for all types of soils
28
29 (Figure 8). The groundwater of the study area falls into the good to moderate category
30
31 (Figure 8; Table 6). In overall, 76 % of samples fall in C2S1 and C3S1 fields, indicating
32
33 medium to high salinity and low alkalinity water which can be used for irrigation, where
34
35 moderate amount of leaching occurs and moderate permeability with leaching soil.
36
37 Besides, 18% of samples fall in C3S2 field indicating high salinity and medium sodium
38
39 hazard, which restrict its suitability for irrigation. Classification of groundwater based on
40
41 salinity hazard (EC) and SAR is presented in Table 6. It is found that only 5 samples to
42
43 be unsuitable for irrigation purposes. High salinity and medium hazard type of water in
44
45 fine textured soil of high cation exchange capacity, especially under low leaching
46
47 conditions, unless gypsum is present in the soil, presents appreciable sodium hazard. But
48
49 it may be used on coarse textured or organic soils which have good permeability. The
50
51 rating of water samples in relation to salinity and sodium hazard reflects that the high
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5
6 sodium ion concentration in the water at some of the stations may produce harmful levels
7
8 of exchangeable sodium in the soil.
9

10
11 In all natural waters, percent of sodium content is a common parameter to assess
12 its suitability for agricultural purposes (Wilcox 1948). Sodium combines with carbonate
13 can lead to the formation of alkaline soils, while sodium combining with chloride form
14 saline soils. Both these soils do not help for plant growth. Na % was calculated using the
15 following equation.
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

$$Na\% = \frac{Na \times 100}{Ca + Mg + Na + K}$$

23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30 A maximum of 60% sodium in groundwater is allowed for agricultural purposes
31 (Ramakrishna, 1998). Percentage of sodium calculated for groundwater in the study
32 region is plotted against specific conductance in Wilcox diagram (Fig. 9). Figure 9 shows
33 that 45 samples are excellent to good, 32 samples are good to permissible, 19 samples are
34 permissible to doubtful and 6 are doubtful to unsuitable. Residual Sodium Carbonate
35 (RSC) index of water samples in the study site is estimated by the equation
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43

$$RSC = (CO_3^{--} + HCO_3) - (Ca^{++} + Mg^{++}),$$

44
45
46
47
48 Units are expressed in meq/L (Eaton 1950)
49
50
51
52
53
54

55 Lloyd and Heathcote (1985) have classified irrigation water based on RSC as
56 suitable (<1.25), marginal (1.25-2.5) and not suitable (>2.5). According to RSC values,
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5
6 96% of groundwater samples are suitable for irrigation and 3% of samples are marginal
7
8 and the remaining is not suitable for irrigation.
9

10
11
12
13 In overall, groundwater suitability map for irrigational activities for the study
14 region is produced based on irrigational quality parameters such as EC and SAR (Fig.
15 10). This map is created based on the same classification like USSL classification
16 (Excellent (C1S1), Good (C2S1, C3S1), Unsuitable (C3S2), Highly unsuitable (C4S3,
17 C4S2, C5S3)). This image will provide the insight of current groundwater quality
18 scenario and helps to groundwater planners and government sectors for present and future
19 groundwater management.
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31

32 **Summary and Conclusions**

33
34
35
36 Groundwater quality and its suitability for drinking and agricultural use in
37 Thanjavur city is evaluated since groundwater is a major source of water for domestic
38 and agricultural activities in the study site due to lack of surface water resources. For this
39 study, 102 groundwater samples were collected from dug and bore wells during March
40 2008 and analyzed for pH, electrical conductivity, temperature, major ions and nitrate.
41 Results suggest that in 90% of groundwater samples, sodium and chloride are
42 predominant cation and anion, respectively, in the study area. Further, Piper plot also
43 indicates that NaCl and CaMgCl water types are dominant in the study area. Electrical
44 conductivity and chloride concentration show large variations and have high standard
45 deviation, which suggests that water chemistry is not homogenous and regulated by
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5
6 distinguished processes. The groundwater quality in the study site is influenced by
7
8 surface contamination sources, mineral dissolution, ion exchange and evaporation.
9
10 Nitrate and chloride concentrations strongly express the impact of surface contamination
11
12 sources such as agricultural and domestic activities, and 13% of samples have elevated
13
14 nitrate content ($> 45 \text{ mg/l as NO}_3$). Besides, groundwater wells in zones 2, 3 and 4 have
15
16 high concentration of potassium and sulphate, which also evident the impact of surface
17
18 contamination sources especially application of fertilizers and farm manures. Influences
19
20 of mineral dissolution was evaluated by PHREEQC and Gibbs plots and suggests that
21
22 mineral dissolution, especially carbonate minerals, regulate water chemistry. Saturation
23
24 indices of carbonate minerals reveal that recharge of waste water from surface
25
26 contamination sources enhances saturation of carbonate minerals. Chloro alkaline indices
27
28 indicate that reverse ion exchange reaction is a dominance process in the study region.
29
30 Groundwater suitability for drinking usage was evaluated by WHO and Indian standards
31
32 and proposes that 34% of samples are not suitable for drinking. Integrated groundwater
33
34 suitability map for drinking purposes was created using TDS, TH, pH, Na, K, Ca, Mg, Cl,
35
36 SO₄ and NO₃, based on a concept that if the groundwater sample exceeds the
37
38 recommended limit of any one of these parameters, it is not suitable for drinking usage.
39
40 Further, this map illustrates that wells in zones 1, 2, 3 and 4 are not fit for drinking
41
42 purpose. Likewise, irrigational suitability of groundwater in the study region was
43
44 evaluated using quality parameters e.g. EC, SAR, RSC, USSL classification, Na% and
45
46 Wilcox diagram. Result suggests that 20% samples are not fit for irrigation. Groundwater
47
48 suitability map for irrigation was also produced based on salinity and sodium hazard and
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5
6 expresses that wells mostly existed in zones 2 and 3 are not suitable for irrigation. Both
7
8 integrated suitability maps for drinking and irrigation usage give overall scenario about
9
10 the groundwater quality in the study area. Further, these maps will help for people who
11
12 are dedicated to groundwater quality management and planning. In overall, the study
13
14 concluded that groundwater quality is impaired by man made activities and proper
15
16 management plan is necessary to protect valuable groundwater resources in Thanjavur
17
18 city.
19
20
21
22
23
24

25 **Acknowledgements:** The third author is indebted to the Vice-Chancellor, principal, and
26
27 Head of the Civil Department, Periyar Maniyammai University, Thanjavur, India for their
28
29 constant support during his master degree. The author appreciates Dr. M. V. Prasanna,
30
31 Mr. M. Jeevananthanm and Mr.Kannan for their help in preparation of maps.
32
33
34
35
36

37 **References**

- 38
39
40
41
42 Adams, S., Titus, R., Pietersen, K., Tredoux, G., Harris, C., (2001). Hydrochemical
43 characteristics of aquifers near Sutherland in the Western Karoo, South Africa.
44 *Journal of Hydrology*, 241, 91–103.
45
46
47 Al-Bassam, A. M., & Al-Rumikhani, Y. A. (2003). Integrated hydrochemical method of
48 water quality assessment for irrigation in arid areas: application to the Jilh aquifer,
49 Saudi Arabia. *Journal of African Earth Sciences*, 36, 345–356.
50
51
52 Al-Futaisi, A., Rajmohan, N., & Al-Touqi, S. (2007). Groundwater quality monitoring in
53 and around Barka dumping site, Sultanate of Oman. The Second IASTED (The
54 International Association of Science and Technology for Development)
55 *International Conference on Water Resources Management (WRM 2007)*. August
56 20- 22, Honolulu, Hawaii, USA
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 1
2
3
4
5
6 Alison, E.C., Janet, S. H., & Blair, F. J. (1992). The chemical influence of clay minerals
7 on groundwater composition in a lithologically heterogeneous carbonate aquifer. In:
8 Kharaka, Y.K. and Maest, A.S. (Editors), *Proc. 7th Int. Symp. on Water-Rock*
9 *Interaction (WRI7)*, (Vol. 2, pp. 779-782), Utah, USA, Balkema, Rotterdam.
- 10
11
12 APHA (1995). Standard methods for the examination of water and wastewater. 19th edn.
13 *American Public Health Association*, Washington, DC.
- 14
15
16 Ator, S. W., & Denis, J. M. (1997). Relation of nitrogen and phosphorus in ground water
17 to land use in four subunits of the Potomac River Basin. *USGS Water-Resources*
18 *Investigations Report*, 97-4268, Reston, VA: U.S. Geological Survey.
- 19
20
21
22 Bhatt, K. B., & Saklani, S. (1996). Hydrogeochemistry of the Upper Ganges River, India.
23 *J. Geol. Soc. India*, 48, 171-182.
- 24
25
26 Blake, R. (1989). The origin of high sodium bicarbonate waters in the Otway Basin,
27 Victoria, Australia. In: Miles, D. I. (Ed.) *Proceedings of the 6th International*
28 *Symposium on Water-Rock Interaction (WRI-6)*, (pp.83-85).Malvern, England,
29 Balkema, Rotterdam, The Netherlands.
- 30
31
32 Canter, L. W. (1997). *Nitrates in Groundwater*. Lewis publishers, CRC Press
33 Cappuccino.
- 34
35
36 Census of India. (2001). Data from the 2001 Census, including cities, villages and towns.
37 (Provisional), *Census Commission of India*.
- 38
39
40 Cerling, T. E., Pederson, B. L., & Damm, K. L. V. (1989). Sodium calcium ion exchange
41 in the weathering of shales: Implications for global weathering budgets. *Geology*,
42 17, 552–554.
- 43
44
45 Clark, I. & Fritz, P. (1997). *Environmental Isotopes in Hydrogeology*. Lewis Publishers,
46 New York.
- 47
48
49 Davies, S. N., & DeWiest R. J. M. (1966). *Hydrogeology*. Wiley, New York.
- 50
51
52 Eaton, E. M. (1950). Significance in carbonate in irrigation water. *Soil Sci*, 69, 123-133.
- 53
54
55 Elampooranan, T., Rajmohan, N., & Abirami, L. (1999). Hydrochemical studies of
56 Artesian well waters in Cauvery deltaic area, South India. *Indian Journal of*
57 *Environmental Health*, 41(2), 107 – 114.
- 58
59
60 Elango, L., Rajmohan, N., & Gnanasundar, D. (1998). Groundwater quality monitoring in
61 intensively cultivated regions of Tamil Nadu, India. *Proceedings of International*

1
2
3
4
5
6 *Association of Hydrogeologists & International Groundwater Conference*, February
7 8 -13, University of Melbourne, Australia.
8

9
10 Elango, L., Suresh Kumar, S., & Rajmohan, N. (2003). Hydrochemical studies of
11 groundwater in Chengalpet region, South India. *Indian Journal of Environmental*
12 *Protection*, 23(6), 624 – 632.
13

14 Elhatip, H., Afsin, M., Kuscu, L., Dirik, K., Kurmac, A., & Kavurmac, M. (2003).
15 Influences of human activities and agriculture on groundwater quality of Kayseri-
16 Incesu-Dokuzpinar springs, central Anatolian part of Turkey. *Environmental*
17 *Geology*, 44, 490–494.
18
19

20 Fetters, C. W. (1990). *Applied hydrogeology*. CBS Publishers & Distributors. New Delhi,
21 India.
22

23
24 Foster, M. D. (1950). The origin of high sodium bicarbonate waters in the Atlantic and
25 Gulf Coast plains. *Geochim.Cosmochim. Acta*, 1, 33-48.
26

27 Freeze, R. A., & Cherry, J. A., (1979). *Groundwater*, Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs,
28 NJ, 604.
29

30
31 Gibbs, R. J. (1970). Mechanism controlling world water chemistry, *Science*, 170, 1088-
32 1090.
33

34
35
36 Indian Standard Institution. (1991). *Indian Standard Specification for drinking water*,
37 IS:10500, 1–5.
38

39
40 Jeevanandam, M., Kannan, R., Srinivasalu, S., & Rammohan, V. (2006).
41 Hydrogeochemistry and Groundwater Quality Assessment of Lower Part of the
42 Ponnaiyar River Basin, Cuddalore District, South India. *Environmental Monitoring*
43 *and Assessment*, 132(1-3), 263-274.
44

45
46 Jeong, C. H. (2001). Effect of land use and urbanization on hydrochemistry and
47 contamination of groundwater from Taejon area, Korea. *Journal of Hydrology*, 253,
48 194-210.
49

50
51 Kalkhoff, S.J., Detroy, M.G., Cherryholmes, K.L., & Kuzniar, R. L. (1992). Herbicide
52 and nitrate variation in alluvium underlying a cornfield at a site in Iowa County,
53 Iowa: *Water Resources Bulletin*, 28(6), 1001-1011.
54

55
56 Karanth, K. R., (1987). *Groundwater assessment, Development and Managament*. Tata-
57 McGraw-Hill Publication Company Ltd, New Delhi,
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 1
2
3
4
5
6 Laluraj, C. M., & Girish Gopinath. (2006). Assessment on seasonal variation of
7 groundwater quality of phreatic aquifers – A river basin system. *Environmental*
8 *Monitoring and Assessment*, 117, 45-47.
9
- 10 Lee, S. M., Min, K. D., Woo, N. C., Kim, Y. J., & Ahn, C. H. (2003). Statistical models
11 for the assessment of nitrate contamination in urban groundwater using GIS.
12 *Environmental Geology*, 44, 210–221.
13
14
- 15 Lloyd, J. W., & Heathcote, J. A. (1985). *Natural inorganic hydrochemistry in relation to*
16 *groundwater*, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 294.
17
18
- 19 Ma, J., Ding, Z., Wei, G., Zhao, H., & Huang, T. (2009). Sources of water pollution and
20 evolution of water quality in the Wuwei basin of Shiyang River, Northwest China.
21 *Journal of Environmental Management*, 90, 1168-1177.
22
23
- 24 Nisi, B., Buccianti, A., Vaselli, O., Perini, G., Tassi, F., Minissale, A., & Montegrossi, G.
25 (2008). Hydrogeochemistry and strontium isotopes in the Arno River Basin
26 (Tuscany, Italy): Constraints on natural controls by statistical modeling. *Journal of*
27 *Hydrology*, 360, 166–183.
28
29
- 30 Parkhurst, D. L., & Appelo, C. A. J. (1999). User's guide to PHREEQC (version 2)—a
31 computer program for speciation, batch-reaction, one-dimensional transport, and
32 inverse geochemical calculations. *USGS Water-Resources Investigations Report*,
33 99-4259.
34
35
- 36 Piper, A. M. (1944). A graphic procedure in the geochemical interpretation of water
37 analyses. *Am. Geophys. Union Transs.*, 25, 83-90.
38
39
- 40 Pritchard, M., Mkandawire, T., & O'Neill, J.G. (2008). Assessment of groundwater
41 quality in shallow wells within the southern districts of Malawi. *Physics and*
42 *Chemistry of the Earth*, 33, 812-823.
43
44
- 45 Rajmohan, N., Al-Futaisi, A., & Al-Touqi, S. (2009). Geochemical process regulating
46 groundwater quality in a coastal region with complex contamination sources: Barka,
47 Sultanate of Oman. *Environmental Earth Sciences*, DOI 10.1007/s12665-009-0037-
48 1.
49
50
- 51 Rajmohan, N., Elango, L., & Elampooranan, T. (1997). Groundwater quality in Nagai
52 Quaid-E-Milleth District and Karaikal, South India. *Indian Water Resources*
53 *Society*, 17(3–4), 25–30.
54
55
- 56 Rajmohan, N., & Elango, L. (2005). Nutrient chemistry of groundwater in an intensively
57 irrigated region of Southern India. *Environmental Geology*, 47, 820–830.
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 1
2
3
4
5
6 Ramakrishna (1998). *Groundwater*, Hand book, India.
7
8
9 Richards, L. A. (1954). *Diagnosis and improvement of saline and alkali soils*. Agri. Hand
10 book 60, U. S. Dept. of Agriculture, Washington, D.C.
11
12 Sarin, M. M., Krishnaswamy, S., Dilli, K., Somayajulu, B. L. K., & Moore, W. S. (1989).
13 Major-ion chemistry of the Ganga-Brahmaputra river system: Weathering processes
14 and water quality assessment. *Environment Geology*, 48, 1014-1028.
15
16
17 Schoeller, H. (1965). Qualitative evaluation of groundwater resources. In: *Methods and*
18 *techniques of groundwater investigations and development*. UNESCO, pp 54–83.
19
20 Schoeller, H. (1967). *Geochemistry of groundwater. An international guide for research*
21 *and practice*. UNESCO, chap 15, pp 1–18.
22
23
24 Schot, P.P., & Van der Wal, J. (1992). Human impact on regional groundwater
25 composition through intervention in natural flow patterns and changes in land use.
26 *Journal of Hydrology*, 134, 297–313.
27
28
29 Subba Rao, N. (2002). Geochemistry of groundwater in parts of Guntur district, Andhra
30 Pradesh, India. *Environmental Geology*, 41, 552-562.
31
32
33 Subramani, T., Elango, L., & Damodarasamy, S. R. (2005). Groundwater quality and its
34 suitability for drinking and agricultural use in Chithar River Basin, Tamil Nadu,
35 India. *Environmental Geology*, 47, 1099–1110.
36
37
38 Sujatha, D., & Rajeshwara Reddy, B. (2003). Quality characterization of groundwater in
39 the south-eastern part of the Ranga Reddy district, Andhra Pradesh, India.
40 *Environmental Geology*, 44, 579–586.
41
42
43 Tamil Nadu Agricultural University (2002-2004). *Cauvery Delta Zone – Status Paper*.
44 (P88). <http://www.tnau.ac.in/dr/zonepdf/CauveryDeltaZone.pdf>.
45
46
47 Trivedy, R. K., & Goel, P. K. (1984). *Chemical and Biological methods for water*
48 *pollution studies*. Environmental Publication. Karad.
49
50
51 UNESCO. (2007). *UNESCO Water Portal newsletter No. 161: Water-related Diseases*.
52 <http://www.unesco.org/water/news/newsletter/161.shtml>.
53
54
55 United States Salinity Laboratory (1954). *Diagnosis and improvement of saline and*
56 *alkaline soils*. US Department of Agriculture, Washington, DC
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

WHO (World Health Organization). (1993). *Guidelines for drinking water quality, recommendations* (2nd ed). Geneva.

WHO (World Health Organization). (1997). *Guideline for drinking water quality, (2nd ed.2)* Health criteria and other supporting information, World Health organization, Geneva.

Wilcox, L. V. (1948). The quality of water for irrigation, Use *U. S. Dept. of Agriculture, Tech, bull, 962*, Washington, D. C., pp 1-40.

1
2
3
4
5
6 **List of Tables**
7
8
9

- 10
11 1. Statistical summary of groundwater quality data in Thanjavur City
12
13 2. Range in concentration of chemical parameters of the study area and
14 compared with WHO and Indian Standards for drinking purposes
15
16 3. Classification of groundwater based on TDS (Davies and DeWiest, 1966)
17
18 4. Classification of the groundwater based on Hardness
19
20 5. Classification of the groundwater quality according to the USDA method
21
22 6. Relation between SAR and EC of the groundwater samples in the study area
23
24
25
26

27 **List of Figures**
28
29
30
31
32

- 33 1. Sampling wells location and zones classification in Thanjavur city
34
35 2. Geology of the study area
36
37 3. Spatial distribution of TDS, Nitrate and chloride in the study region
38
39 4. Piper trilinear diagram shows the chemical character of groundwater samples
40
41 5. Mechanisms controlling groundwater chemistry – Gibbs plots
42
43 6. Variation of selected parameters with respect to well numbers
44
45 7. Integrated groundwater suitability map for drinking in the study region
46
47 8. USSL classification of groundwater samples
48
49 9. Irrigational suitability of groundwater in the study region – Wilcox diagram
50
51 10. Groundwater suitability map for irrigational purposes in the study region
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Table 1 Statistical summary of groundwater quality data in Thanjavur City

	TDS	EC	pH	TH	Ca ²⁺	Mg ²⁺	Na ⁺	K ⁺	NO ₃ ⁻	Alk	Cl ⁻	SO ₄ ²⁻
Zone 1	Min	560	7.2	160	48	5	84	4	2	180	112	33
	Max	1400	7.9	512	152	32	264	12	11	478	352	120
	Mean	977	7.5	310	93	19	169	7	7	299	234	64
	SD	292	0.2	108	35	9	59	3	3	89	81	28
	n	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10
Zone2	Min	504	6.7	88	24	7	92	6	8	120	140	10
	Max	4200	9.6	1240	240	154	740	60	102	688	1660	133
	Mean	1413	7.8	383	104	34	265	17	52	394	357	66
	SD	981	0.7	289	55	39	186	15	35	151	425	39
	n	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12
Zone 3	Min	168	6.5	74	20	6	20	1	5	50	40	8
	Max	2100	7.9	540	180	62	368	32	176	540	504	120
	Mean	1023	7.3	264	89	25	167	11	51	294	226	62
	SD	539	0.5	120	51	16	111	9	49	144	131	37
	n	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10
Zone 4	Min	749	6.2	224	56	19	95	6	17	160	156	28
	Max	1253	7.6	500	131	48	220	16	56	324	384	90
	Mean	1099	6.6	390	104	31	166	11	39	210	304	69
	SD	192	0.5	88	25	10	34	3	12	48	87	25
	n	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10
Zone 5	Min	420	7.1	156	40	12	65	3	8	122	86	23
	Max	805	7.5	170	48	15	174	12	21	160	272	44
	Mean	535	7.4	163	42	13	98	6	16	137	137	33
	SD	160	0.1	6	3	1	46	4	4	13	77	7
	n	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10
Zone 6	Min	308	7.0	120	29	11	46	1	13	76	66	BDL
	Max	721	8.0	186	44	19	144	10	18	160	232	38
	Mean	432	7.4	149	37	14	70	4	15	118	109	18

Table 2. Range in concentration of chemical parameters of the study area and compared with WHO and Indian Standards for drinking purposes

Water quality Parameters	WHO (1993)		Indian standard (IS 10500, 1991)		No. of samples exceed the standards		Concentration in the study area	Undesirable effect produced beyond max allow limit
	Highest accept limit (mg/l)	Max allowable limit	Highest desirable	Max permissible	According to WHO (1993)	According to (ISI 1991)		
TDS	500	1500	500	2000	13, 18, 21, 29, 92	21, 29	133 – 4200 (Avg. 771)	Taste, gastro-intestinal irritation
pH	6.5	8.5	6.5 - 8.5	6.5-9.5	11	11	6 – 10 Avg. 7	Taste effects mucus membrane and water supply system
TH (as CaCO ₃)	100	500	300	600	8, 21, 29	21	50 – 1240 Avg. 239	Encrustation in water supply and adverse effect on domestic use
Ca ²⁺	75	200	75	200	12, 21	12, 21	12 – 1132 Avg. 76	
Mg ²⁺	50	150	30	100	21	21	3 – 154 Avg. 19	
Na ⁺	-	200	-	200	1, 4, 7, 12, 15, 16, 18, 20, 21, 28, 29, 30, 36, 79, 85, 87, 92, 94	1, 4, 7, 12, 15, 16, 18, 20, 21, 28, 29, 30, 36, 79, 85, 87, 92, 94	18 – 748 Avg. 137	
K ⁺	-	12	-	-	13, 15, 18, 20, 21, 28, 29, 30, 36, 40, 92	13, 15, 18, 20, 21, 28, 29, 30, 36, 40, 92	1 – 60 Avg. 8	
NO ₃ ⁻	45	-	45	45	13, 14, 15, 18, 21, 23, 24, 27-29, 32, 40, 41	13, 14, 15, 18, 21, 23, 24, 27-29, 32, 40, 41	2 – 176 Avg. 22	Blue baby diseases in children
Cl ⁻	200	600	250	1000	21	21	28 – 1660 Avg. 199	Salty taste indicates pollution
SO ₄ ²⁻	200	400	200	400**	Nil	Nil	0 – 133 Avg. 44	Cause, gastro-intestinal irritation when Mg and Na sulphate

Units = mg/l, except pH. **upto 400 mg/l if Mg does not exceed 30mg/l

Table 3. Classification of groundwater based on TDS (Davies and DeWiest, 1966)

TDS	Water type	Percentage
Up to 500	Desirable for drinking	42
500–1000	Permissible for drinking	28
<3000	Useful for irrigation	99
>3000	Unfit for drinking and irrigation	1

Table 4. Classification of the groundwater based on Hardness

Total Hardness (as CaCO ₃ , mg/l)	Water classification	Percentage of wells
< 75	Soft	5
75 – 150	Moderately Hard	20
150 – 300	Hard	47
> 300	Very hard	28

Table 5. Classification of the groundwater quality according to the USDA method

	Sodium Hazard	Salinity Hazard			
		Low C1	Medium C2	High C3	Very High C4
Low	S1	5 (4.9%)	40 (39.2%)	36 (35.3%)	0
Medium	S2	0	0	17 (16.7%)	1 (0.98%)
High	S3	0	0	0	2 (1.96%)
Very High	S4	0	0	0	0

Table 6. Relation between SAR and EC of the groundwater samples in the study area

SAR	EC	Water class	Sample Number	Salinity Hazard
<10	250	Excellent	25, 73, 84, 88, 90 (4.90%)	Low
	250-750	Good	11, 26, 43-49, 53, 54, 56-68, 70-72, 74, 75, 80, 81, 83, 86, 91, 93, 98-102 (39.2%)	Medium
			1-10, 12, 14-17, 19, 20, 22-24, 27, 28, 30-42, 50-52, 55, 69, 76-79, 82, 85, 87, 89, 94-97 (51%)	High
>2250	Poor	13, 18, 21, 29, 92 (4.90)	Very High	

Figure 1




Figure 2




Figure 3

[Click here to download Colour Figure: Fig-3.doc](#)

Figure 3




Figure 4
[Click here to download Figure: Fig-4.eps](#)




Figure 5

[Click here to download Figure: Fig-5.eps](#)





Figure 6
[Click here to download Figure: Fig-6.eps](#)




Figure 7

[Click here to download Figure: Fig-7.eps](#)




Figure 8
[Click here to download Figure: Fig-8.eps](#)




Figure 9
[Click here to download Figure: Fig-9.eps](#)




Figure 10
[Click here to download Figure: Fig-10.eps](#)

