

## **IMPORTANT NOTE RE REPORT 1428**

Should the Ms.Word-files for this report ever be required in future, please remember that this report was submitted in 12 separate files. File 1428#3 (the file for Chapter 2) is incorrect in the sense that the figure numbers are incorrect and could not be changed in Word. All have been corrected in the PDF.

Page 2-50 and 2-59, although displaying correct as landscape setting in Word, does not print as that in PDF. The printers were requested to use the Word-format of these two pages in the printing process.

R Sutton

0 7/09/2009

# **METHODS AND GUIDELINES FOR THE LICENSING OF SFRA<sub>s</sub> WITH PARTICULAR REFERENCE TO LOW FLOWS**

Report to the  
**Water Research Commission**

by

**GPW Jewitt, SA Lorentz, MB Gush, S Thornton-Dibb, V Kongo, L Wiles, J Blight,  
SI Stuart-Hill, D Versfeld & K Tomlinson**

School of Bioresources Engineering & Environmental Hydrology

University of KwaZulu-Natal

Scottsville, Pietermaritzburg

2009

Final Report to the Water Research Commission on the project  
*“An Investigation and Formulation of Methods and Guidelines for the Licensing of SFRA<sub>s</sub>  
with Particular Reference to Low Flows”*

**WRC Report No. 1428/1/09  
ISBN 978-1-77005-877-4**

**SEPTEMBER 2009**

**DISCLAIMER**

This report has been reviewed by the Water Research Commission (WRC) and approved for publication. Approval does not signify that the contents necessarily reflect the views and policies of the WRC, nor does mention of trade names or commercial products constitute endorsement or recommendation for use.

## Acknowledgements

This project was born from a realisation that the low flow components used in assessing stream flow reduction activity license applications was in need of review and refinement. By initiating the project, the Water Research Commission (WRC) enabled a process of scientific discussion across several relevant sectors, from which coordinated action for further research as well as governance issues could take place. We are most grateful to the WRC as well as the representatives of the various government departments and research agencies that participated so constructively in this project.

<b>Reference Group</b>	<b>Institution</b>
<b>Members</b>	
Dr R Dube (Chair)	Water Research Commission
Mr J Bosch	CSIR
Dr P Dye	CSIR
Prof C Everson	CSIR
Ms N Fourie	DWAF – SFR + SEA
Mrs W Gush	Secretary
Dr N Lecler	SASRI
Mr SJL Mallory	Water for Africa
Dr C Marais	DWAF – WfW
Mr J Nel	UWC
Prof PJT Roberts	Forestry SA
Prof R Schulze	UKZN – BEEH
Mr N Ward	DWAF – KZN
Mr M Warren	DWAF – SFR + SEA



## **Executive Summary**

### Introduction

This project arose in response to a realisation that the low flow components used in assessing stream flow reduction activity license applications was in need of review and refinement. This was an issue that was raised as a concern in a previous report by Gush et al. (2002) and which became clearer as the tools developed in that project were applied in the assessment of SFRA license applications. Furthermore, there is increasing concern regarding the potential for large scale land use change, and associated potential water resources impacts, driven by various factors, most notably the need to improve livelihood security through improved dryland crop production through methods such as runoff harvesting and conservation agriculture and the recent interest in large-scale biofuel production.

Thus, the aims of this project considered the need to improve the existing modelling tools for hydrological analyses of land use change, but also the need to develop management protocols to utilise these. A Terms of Reference for a solicited project was drawn up by the WRC and subsequently the research contract was awarded to a consortium led by the School of Bioresources Engineering and Environmental Hydrology at the University of KwaZulu-Natal.

### Summary of Project Achievements

The various project aims have been achieved through a number of approaches as detailed below.

The incorporation of an intermediate soil zone and consideration of the hillslope, together with improved evaporation estimates through consideration of canopy resistance using the Granier-Lohammer approach have provided for improved estimates of low flows and the impact of these by forestry with the ACRU model. This improved low flow routines in the model should only be applied when detailed analysis and planning are required as the input parameters of soil depth, hillslope length and canopy conductance are not readily available.

Improvements in national scale estimates of water use by SFRAs and sugar cane have been achieved through the application of the School of Bioresources Engineering and Environmental Hydrology's Quinary Catchments Database. Through the integration of this database with a new software system known as the SFRA Assessment Utility, improved and more spatially representative information regarding rainfall, soils, potential evaporation and baseline vegetation are provided, leading to more spatially explicit estimates of water use with less uncertainty than those previously available.

Consideration of evaporative water use in the form of Green Water Flows may provide a useful approach to the consideration of assessing whether a land use should be considered an SFRA or not. Two approaches to estimating Green Water Flows, one for the measurement of evaporation in the field using a large aperture scintillometer, and another utilising remote sensing data, were assessed for future use as described in Chapter 5. Both these technologies are considered very useful for future assessment of SFRAs. However, a key message is that the tools applied to estimate the water use of SFRAs must match the accuracy required

by the decision-maker to the spatial and temporal scales of the assessment. A framework to guide the decision-maker in this regard and in the consideration of Green Water Flows has been developed and is described in Chapter 4 and in a separate project deliverable, i.e. Guidelines for licensing SFRA. At the inaugural workshop for this project, many stakeholders highlighted a concern that the SFRA assessment procedures used by DWAF were not compatible with those in determining the Reserve, leading to extensive delays in the processing of SFRA license applications. Through the approach described in Chapter 4, the SFRA and Reserve assessment procedures have been aligned. Extensive training of DWAF personnel in these procedures was undertaken as detailed in Appendix III.

One of the most significant areas of uncertainty in estimating the water use of SFRA is the uncertainty associated with the baseline against which SFRA are quantified, whether using national scale WR90 or ACRU based Acocks estimates. This is an area where further research is critical, if uncertainties arising in the estimation of water use by SFRA are to be reduced.

An study of water use by sugar cane highlighted that the use of “exchange ratios” to facilitate a change in land use from sugar cane to forestry or vice versa by a land owner, is problematic and needs far more detailed analysis before being supported as a management tool. Sugar cane was shown to be a significant water use in some inland catchments, but not on the coastal areas.

#### Evaluation of Objectives

The original Terms of Reference for this project listed 11 objectives for this project. Following the inaugural workshop of the project, an additional aim, i.e. the consideration of “Exchange Ratios” as a water resources management tool was added. The following table lists the project objectives together with a brief summary of the project products, and an evaluation of the extent to which these have been met.

Table 1. Summary of project objectives and the extent to which the project has achieved them.

1	To re-analyse, and improve upon, conceptual modelling methods and input data utilised in WRC project K5/1110 (Estimation of stream flow reductions resulting from commercial afforestation in SA). This will entail:	A large part of the research effort in this project was spent on developing an improved conceptualisation of the hydrological processes which influence the generation of low flows and the development of routines which describe these. Focus was on soil water movement in the sub-surface and on improved conceptualisation of evaporation, transpiration and their relationship with root water uptake as detailed in Chapter 3.
a.	<i>Consideration of alternative methods for calculating low flows and selection of the most appropriate one (e.g. driest three months vs. flows below the 75th percentile),</i>	Tools to analyse streamflow at daily, monthly and annual timesteps are available through a software package known as the SFRA Assessment Utility. This allows the user to use the low flow index most applicable to the task at hand. Default options are for annual Flow Duration Curves or exceedance tables based on daily flows.
b.	<i>Use of the latest baseline vegetation descriptors in terms of model input parameters,</i>	A method for aligning output from ACRU modelling baseline estimates with those of the WR2005/Pitman approach is described in Chapter 4.
c.	<i>Use of more detailed catchment descriptor parameters (e.g. soils, rainfall, altitude data) in a distributed form as opposed to a lumped form,</i>	The use of the recently developed Quinary Catchments database allows for better resolution input for all ACRU parameters as described in Chapters 4 and 6. The improved routines for low flow simulation require detailed biophysical input in catchments and catchment delineation can continue from the hillslope scale.
d.	<i>Better accounting for the full storage capacity of the soil profile and the year-to-year carry over of water storage or usage (i.e. annual amounts of water used in evaporation not to be limited by annual rainfall), and</i>	Revised ACRU routines are described in Chapter 3. An additional (intermediate) soil layer has been introduced and options for lateral flow of water within the soil profile have been developed.
e.	<i>The reconsideration of methods used for the derivation of confidence limits from the above project, and the incorporation of these into the proposed guidelines.</i>	This aspect of the project has been dealt with indirectly through the various improvements to the model. A qualitative assessment amongst stakeholders highlighted “moderate-high” confidence that the important impacts of the impact of land use change on the hydrological cycle are known, but low confidence that these are adequately represented and parameterised in the existing hydrological models.
2.	Analyses of different flow components (quickflow, interflow, baseflow & groundwater discharge) to determine how these are affected by afforestation and by dry and wet cycles as well as the determination of the relative importance of the flow components between catchments and the impacts of afforestation on the flow components.	This aspect of the research is described in detail through various forms of analysis of time series from the South African paired catchment experiments. Various hydrograph separation methods are applied and both statistical and graphical analyses were undertaken. An additional output is the development of a suite of statistical models to describe the impact of afforestation in these catchments as an addition to those developed by Scott et al., 2002. Detailed analyses of data from Cathedral Peak and Jonkershoek in particular, but also other catchments have highlighted the relative importance of quickflow and delayed flows in the flow regime as well as the role of the soil as a buffer in delaying catchment response. These findings are reported in Chapter 2 and were used as input to the conceptualisation of the new flow generation routines.
3.	Through these analyses, and with input from related process study research, to improve the simulation of low flows in the ACRU Agrohydrological Modelling System through improved conceptualisation of low flow generation processes and the translation of these into model code.	Improved routines to simulate soil water movement and evaporation and transpiration from forests are described in Chapter 3. The applications of the improved routines to the Weatherley and Two Streams catchments are described. Process studies from available research catchments have highlighted the importance of considering the evaporation and transpiration processes in different vegetation types. Consequently, the Grannie-Lohammer modifications for the Penman-Monteith equation have been incorporated into the ACRU model and model parameter values suggested as described in Chapter 3.



4.	To devise and implement a process whereby research and management needs are pursued in parallel in order to ensure optimal applicability and useability of the products of SFRA related research. This necessitates tours of all the regional DWAF offices in SA which license forestry, to try and identify exactly what the software outputs from this project should look like and how they will most effectively complement the license application procedure.	The research team has maintained close contact with DWAF, their consultants as well the sugar and forestry industries throughout this project. Through these interactions the concerns and requirements of these stakeholders has been considered and tools and recommendations arising from this research have been shaped by them. In addition, the project Reference Group includes representatives from all these groups, as well as other researchers.
5.	To provide a link between researchers involved in hydrological process studies of the effects of land use change on low flows (e.g. WRC Projects K5/1061 [Weatherley] and K5/1284 [Two Streams]), and managers and other Interested and Affected Parties involved in this field. The objective is to demonstrate the value of process-based research and how it complements water resource based legislation and decision-making.	This has been achieved through close collaboration with the CSIR and the consultants to the DWAF SFRA sub-directorate. Model routines have been tested at two of the country's active research catchments. Development of SFRA assessment tools and training in the application of these tools has been undertaken in collaboration with Water For Africa as described in the Capacity Building report in Appendix II. The inclusion of findings from the Weatherley and Two Streams research catchments have highlighted their importance in providing hydrological understanding on which the conceptualisation of the new ACU routines was based. The use of a large aperture scintillometer to estimate dryland sugar-cane described in Chapter 5 use further highlighted the importance of sound field based research.
6	To refine the guidelines for dealing with scale and resolution in the quantification of SFRs developed by Ninham Shand and the University of Stellenbosch.	This is an aspect of the project that has been addressed through the framework described in Chapter 4, although this does not explicitly address the issues raised by the Ninham-Shand study. The application of the revised ACRU model at large spatial scales is described through an application of the model to the "nested" Weatherley_Mooi River catchment system in the Eastern Cape as described in Chapter 5.
7	To provide guidelines for the potential declaration of additional SFRAs (e.g. <i>Jatropha curcas</i> or Bamboo), with recommendations regarding licensing if necessary.	Guidelines for the consideration of other land uses which may eventually be declared SFRAs are provided in Chapter 4. In essence, the guidelines recommend a "Green Water" approach for the identification and declaration of additional SFRAs and a "Blue Water" approach to their regulation. Broad scale tools such as SEBAL or soil water budget based evaporation estimation models are recommended for identification and declaration of SFRAs, while land use sensitive distributed hydrological models are recommended for the regulation of SFRAs at appropriate management scales.
8	To develop and implement in DWAF regional offices, and existing CMAs, a Decision Support System and associated guidelines, to assist in hydrological assessments for the consideration of water use licence applications (for forestry, being the only declared SFRA).	In collaboration with Water for Africa, a methodology for the assessment of SFRAs by DWAF (Regional Offices, SMAs, etc.) has been developed. User guidelines have been established and training undertaken. This aspect is detailed in Appendix III.
9	To ensure the compatibility of Reserve determination methodologies and the results thereof with SFRA and other water use estimates and available hydrological information through consideration of specific months and daily flow records for various assurance of supply levels	A methodology for the consideration of the Reserve when assessing SFRA license applications has been developed and training material in this regard has been developed and delivered through collaboration with the Institute for Water Research, Rhodes University and Water for Africa. The process for consideration of the Reserve is described in Chapter 4 and training in this approach in Appendix III. The SFRA Assessment Utility is a user-friendly software tool that has been developed and is designed to integrate with existing Reserve planning tools and uses a SPATSIM compatible database for storage of SFR information.

10	To test these products through the application of the guidelines in at least four catchment case studies.	The framework described in Chapter 4 requires a wider range of tools than originally envisaged. Consequently, a wide range of products in addition to ACRU based estimates of SFR have been applied. These include the SEBAL and Penman-Monteith based methods for estimating total evaporation. The application of these in various catchments is described in Chapters 5 and 6 of this report.
11	To improve the research capacity in South Africa in the field of land use hydrology and Integrated Water Resources Management and the skills of water resources managers involved in water use licensing, particularly SFRAS.	Both undergraduate and postgraduate students have made significant input to this project. Training to DWAF personnel responsible for the management of SFRA licensing has been provided. Both of these aspects are detailed in Appendix II.
12	To conduct preliminary investigations into Exchange Ratios, Area Exchanges and Environmental Taxes within the licensing process. These would include considering changes from an SFRA land use to an alternative land use (e.g. sugar cane, kikuyu pasture, tea plantation, etc.), and the trade implications thereof. This task will be complemented by process-based (scintillometer) research into the water use of dryland sugarcane in the KZN midlands.	The usefulness and application of "Exchange Ratios" is discussed in Chapter 4 as part of the framework for the consideration of SFRAs in water resources management and planning. In recent years, the use of large aperture scintillometers has been found to provide for accurate estimation of total evaporation from land surfaces at a range of spatial scales. For full details of the method, the reader is referred to the recent WRC report K5/1335 by Prof Mike Savage and colleagues. The School of BEEH purchased a large aperture scintillometer in 2004. This has been used in several projects, including an MSc project undertaken by Mr Luke Wiles and a PhD project by Mr Victor Kongo (see capacity building report), both of which form part of this research project. In this component, field measurements using the scintillometer to provide estimates of total evaporation as well as soil moisture measurements are utilised to provide improved estimates of water use by sugar cane, a potential SFRA as well as other land uses, in selected sites in KwaZulu-Natal. The scintillometer study and an additional study on the water use of different land uses where the remote sensing technology, SEBAL, is applied are described in Chapter 5.

### Capacity Building

The project team fostered capacity building activities within the University whenever possible. In the end the project served 2 PhDs, 1 Masters, 5 Honours and 2 Others. Seven out of these 10 students were South African Citizens, two African (Kenya and Namibia) and one European (UK). 70% of the students are specialised in Hydrology, the others in Civil Engineering. Full details are provided in Appendix II.



## Table of Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Stream Flow Reduction Activities in the Context of Water Resources Management in South Africa</b> .....	<b>1-1</b>
1.1	History and Current Approaches .....	1-1
1.2	The Significance of Low Flows.....	1-2
1.3	Impacts of Land Uses on the Generation of Low Flows .....	1-3
1.3.1	Consideration of Temporal Scale.....	1-7
1.3.2	Understanding of the influence of commercial afforestation (SFRA) on flow generation .....	1-8
1.3.3	Known shortcomings in the use of the “Gush Tables” .....	1-9
1.3.4	SFRAs and Water Resources Yield.....	1-9
1.3.5	Green and Blue water .....	1-10
1.4	Aims and Outputs of this project .....	1-11
<b>2</b>	<b>Statistical Analyses of the Impacts of Afforestation on Low Flows</b> .....	<b>2-1</b>
2.1	Review: Analyses of Streamflow Time Series with a focus on Low Flows .....	2-1
2.1.1	Smakhtin’s Review of Low Flow Hydrology .....	2-1
2.1.1.1	Low Flow Measures & Indices .....	2-1
2.1.1.2	Flow Indices & Effects of SFRAs .....	2-3
2.1.2	Literature Review: Hydrograph Separation.....	2-4
2.1.2.1	Graphical Techniques .....	2-4
2.1.2.2	Modelling techniques.....	2-4
2.1.2.3	Hydrograph Separation by Tracer Studies.....	2-4
2.1.2.4	Combined Tracer & Hydrograph Methods .....	2-5
2.1.3	Review: Statistical Studies on the Impacts of Afforestation / Deforestation .....	2-5
2.1.3.1	Federer, 1973.....	2-6
2.1.3.2	Douglass and Swank, 1975 .....	2-6
2.1.3.3	Watson et al., 2001 .....	2-6
2.1.3.4	Brown et al., 2005 .....	2-7
2.1.3.5	Shaughnessy et al., 1995.....	2-9
2.1.3.6	Lane et al., 2005.....	2-9
2.1.3.7	Silberstein et al., 2004.....	2-10
2.1.3.8	Andreassin, 2004 .....	2-10
2.1.3.9	Liu et al., 2006.....	2-11
2.1.3.10	Conclusions: Statistical Studies on Paired Catchment Data .....	2-11
2.1.4	Review: Statistical Modelling of Afforestation/Deforestation .....	2-11
2.1.4.1	Andreassin et al., 2002.....	2-12
2.1.4.2	Zhang et al., 1999 .....	2-13
2.1.4.3	Putuhena and Cordery, 2000 .....	2-13
2.1.4.4	Littlewood, 2004 .....	2-13
2.1.4.5	Johityaangkoon et al., 2001 (cited by Silberstein et al., 2004) .....	2-14
2.1.4.6	Bari and Smetten, 2006 .....	2-14
2.1.4.7	Conclusions: Modelling Studies on Paired Catchments .....	2-15
2.1.5	Review: Studies on the South African Paired Catchments.....	2-15
2.1.5.1	The Nänni Curves .....	2-15
2.1.5.2	The Van der Zel Cohort.....	2-16
2.1.5.3	The CSIR Curves .....	2-16
2.1.5.4	Le Maitre and Versfeld, 1997 .....	2-18
2.1.5.5	Gush et al., 2002 .....	2-19
2.1.6	Critique: Measurement Scales; Modelling Scales & Mechanistic Detail .....	2-19
2.1.6.1	Hewlett, 1971 .....	2-19
2.1.6.2	Swank and Johnson, 1994.....	2-20
2.1.6.3	Andreassin, 2004 .....	2-20
2.1.6.4	Brown et al., 2005 .....	2-21
2.1.6.5	Alila et al., undated.....	2-22
2.1.6.6	Dye and Bosch, 2000.....	2-22
2.1.6.7	Young and Jarvis, 2002 .....	2-23
2.1.6.8	Beven, 2001 .....	2-23
2.1.6.9	Conclusions: Critique: Measurement Scales; Modelling Scales & Mechanistic Detail .....	2-24

2.2	Graphical Analyses .....	2-25
2.2.1	Paired Catchments: Topographical, Hydrogeological, and Vegetative Characteristics .....	2-25
2.2.2	Graphical Data Analysis – Methods.....	2-27
2.2.2.1	Long Term Streamflow Deficits Due to Afforestation .....	2-27
2.2.2.2	Effects of Afforestation and Seasonality of Rainfall on Streamflow .....	2-27
2.2.2.3	Effects of Afforestation and Seasonality of Vegetation on Streamflow.....	2-27
2.2.2.4	Effects of Afforestation on Seasonal Streamflow Generation Rates .....	2-28
2.2.2.5	Effects of Afforestation on Low Flows by Regression Analysis .....	2-28
2.2.3	Results – Cathedral Peak .....	2-28
2.2.3.1	Long Term Streamflow Deficits Due to Afforestation .....	2-28
2.2.3.2	Effects of Afforestation and Seasonality of Rainfall on Streamflow .....	2-29
2.2.3.3	Effects of Afforestation and Seasonality of Vegetation on Streamflow.....	2-29
2.2.3.4	Effects of Afforestation on Catchment Wetting and Drying.....	2-30
2.2.3.5	Effects of Afforestation on Low Flows by Regression Analysis .....	2-33
2.2.4	Results – Westfalia .....	2-34
2.2.4.1	Long Term Streamflow Deficits Due to Afforestation .....	2-34
2.2.4.2	Effects of Afforestation and Seasonality of Rainfall on Streamflow .....	2-35
2.2.4.3	Effects of Afforestation and Seasonality of Vegetation on Streamflow.....	2-35
2.2.4.4	Effects of Afforestation on Catchment Wetting and Drying.....	2-36
2.2.4.5	Effects of Afforestation on Low Flows by Regression Analysis .....	2-37
2.2.5	Results – Jonkershoek.....	2-38
2.2.5.1	Effects of Afforestation and Seasonality of Rainfall on Streamflow .....	2-38
2.2.5.2	Effects of Afforestation and Seasonality of Vegetation on Streamflow.....	2-39
2.2.5.3	Effects of Afforestation on Catchment Wetting and Drying.....	2-40
2.2.5.4	Effects of Afforestation on Low Flows by Regression Analysis .....	2-41
2.2.6	Conclusions: Graphical Analysis of Experimental Catchment Data .....	2-42
2.3	Data based modelling.....	2-42
2.3.1	Experimental Sites .....	2-43
2.3.1.1	Cathedral Peak.....	2-43
2.3.1.2	Westfalia.....	2-43
2.3.2	Methods .....	2-44
2.3.2.1	The statistical procedure .....	2-44
2.3.2.2	Data partitioning .....	2-44
2.3.2.3	The regression models.....	2-45
2.3.2.4	Performance measures of the statistical models .....	2-48
2.3.3	Results .....	2-49
2.3.3.1	Cathedral Peak.....	2-49
2.3.3.2	Westfalia.....	2-56
2.3.4	Discussion.....	2-65
<b>3</b>	<b>Modification to ACRU for the Improvement of the Simulation of Low Flows.....</b>	<b>3-1</b>
3.1	Incorporation of an Intermediate Soil Layer in the ACRU Model .....	3-1
3.1.1	Examples of Flow Generation Observations from Experimental Catchments.....	3-2
3.1.2	History of an Intermediate Soil Layer Module Development.....	3-5
3.1.3	Intermediate zone algorithm.....	3-8
3.1.4	Structure of the intermediate layer algorithm .....	3-9
3.1.5	Algorithm Testing .....	3-14
3.1.6	Conclusions.....	3-17
3.2	Additions for Assessment of ET in Forestry.....	3-18
3.2.1	Modelling Canopy Resistance – Basis for New ACRU Routines.....	3-18
3.2.2	Partitioning Transpiration and Evaporation from Soil .....	3-19
3.2.3	Modelling Interception .....	3-20
3.2.4	Modelling Water Extraction from Different Soil Layers .....	3-21
3.3	CASE STUDY – 2STREAMS.....	3-23
3.3.1	General Site Description .....	3-23
3.3.2	Results and Discussion.....	3-26
3.3.3	Conclusions.....	3-32
3.4	Application of the Revised ACRU Model at Management Scales. ....	3-33
3.4.1	Introduction.....	3-33
3.4.2	The Weatherley-Mooi System.....	3-33
3.4.3	Simulation of Weatherley and Mooi River Catchments .....	3-39
3.4.4	Conclusions.....	3-46
<b>4</b>	<b>Approaches to the Consideration of Land Use in Water Resources Management.....</b>	<b>4-1</b>

4.1	A Green Water Perspective .....	4-3
4.1.1	Blue and Green Water Flows in Water Resources Management .....	4-4
4.1.2	Declaration and Regulation of SFRAs .....	4-6
4.1.3	Exchange Ratios .....	4-6
4.2	The Problems of the “Baseline” .....	4-7
4.2.1	“Baselines” currently used in South Africa .....	4-8
4.2.2	A Way Forward .....	4-9
4.3	Using Green Water Flows in the Declaration and Regulation Of Stream Flow Reduction Activities .....	4-10
4.3.1	Declaration as an SFRA .....	4-10
4.3.2	Regulating Land Use In Terms Of Existing and Propsoed Stream Flow Reduction Legislation .....	4-12
4.4	Water Resources Management and Planning Tools for consideration of Green and Blue water Flows .....	4-14
4.4.1	Integrating Green and Blue Water Flows in Water Resources Management .....	4-15
4.4.2	Difficulties in integrating blue and green water flows .....	4-17
4.5	Recommended Water Resources Management and Planning Tools .....	4-20
<b>5</b>	<b>Tools to Estimate Green Water Flows .....</b>	<b>5-1</b>
5.1	Estimation of the Water Use of Sugar Cane using a Large Aperture Scintillometer .....	5-1
5.1.1	Research Site and Instrumentation Network .....	5-1
5.1.2	Crop Management at the Research Site .....	5-4
5.1.3	The Energy Balance .....	5-4
5.1.3.1	Sensible Heat Flux .....	5-5
5.1.3.2	Latent Heat Flux .....	5-6
5.1.4	Soil water Content .....	5-6
5.1.5	Results - Total Evaporation Estimation from Sugarcane .....	5-7
	Assumptions made in the analysis of results .....	5-7
5.1.5.1	Method of Analysis .....	5-9
5.1.5.2	Summary/Discussion of Results .....	5-10
5.2	Evaporative water use of different land uses in the Thukela river basin assessed from satellite imagery .....	5-17
5.2.1	Introduction .....	5-17
5.2.2	Study area .....	5-19
5.2.3	Climate .....	5-21
5.2.4	Material and methods .....	5-22
5.2.4.1	Field measurements .....	5-23
5.2.4.2	The Surface Energy Balance Algorithm for Land (SEBAL) .....	5-23
5.2.4.3	Monthly ET .....	5-24
5.2.5	Results and discussion .....	5-25
5.2.5.1	Estimating water use of different land uses .....	5-26
5.2.5.2	Monthly ET .....	5-29
5.2.6	Conclusions .....	5-36
<b>6</b>	<b>National Estimates of Water Use by Commercial Afforestation and Sugar Cane .....</b>	<b>6-1</b>
6.1	Quinary Catchment Scale Simulations of Water Use by Different Land Uses .....	6-1
6.1.1	Input Parameters for Commercial Forestry .....	6-3
6.1.2	Input Parameters for Sugar Cane .....	6-4
6.2	The BEEH Streamflow Reduction Activity Assessment Utility .....	6-5
6.3	Results and Conclusions .....	6-8
<b>7</b>	<b>Conclusions and Recommendations for Future Research .....</b>	<b>7-1</b>
<b>8</b>	<b>References .....</b>	<b>8-1</b>

## List of Figures

Figure 1.1	The key water partitioning points in the forest hydrology cycle (Jewitt, 2005).....	1-4
Figure 1.2	Some typical interactions between vegetation and groundwater (after Le Maitre et al., 1999).....	1-6
Figure 2.1	Water yield changes as a result of changes in vegetation cover from Bosch and Hewlett, 1982, Sahin and Hall, 1996 and Stednick, 1996. Results from Bosch and Hewlett and Stednick represent the maximum increase in the first 5 years after treatment for deforestation, regrowth and forest conversion experiments or maximum change in water yield for afforestation experiments. The results from Sahin and Hall are the average increases in water yield in the first 5 years after treatment (Brown et al., 2005). .....	2-7
Figure 2.2	Distribution of water yield changes (scaled to 100% change in cover) a function of mean annual rainfall for the studies shown in Figure 4.2.1 (Brown et al., 2005). .....	2-8
Figure 2.3	Prediction of change in water yield based on the Zhang model compared with results from paired catchment studies for different vegetation types (Brown et al., 2005). .....	2-8
Figure 2.4	Relationship between land cover, mean annual rainfall and mean annual evapotranspiration (Zhang et al., 2001). .....	2-13
Figure 2.5	The relationship between mean annual precipitation, mean annual runoff and the expected reduction in runoff following afforestation with <i>Pinus patula</i> of a grassland catchment (Nänni, 1970). The dashed line represents a complete cessation of surface runoff, a response that Nänni considered impossible. ....	2-15
Figure 2.6	Generalised curves for predicting the percentage reduction in total (annual) flows and low flows as a function of age after 100% afforestation with eucalypts (after Scott and Smith, 1997). .....	2-17
Figure 2.7	Generalised curves for predicting the percentage reduction in total (annual) flows and low flows as a function of age after 100% afforestation with pines (after Scott and Smith, 1997). .....	2-18
Figure 2.8	Map of South Africa illustrating the locations of the experimental catchments referred to in the text in relation to the generalised vegetation types / biomes for the country (after Low and Rebelo, 1996). .....	2-25
Figure 2.9	Cumulative daily streamflow data (mm) for Cathedral Peak catchments IV (control) and II (treated), between 1950 and 1987. The progressive afforestation treatments applied to catchment II are annotated on the figure. Daily rainfall data are also represented on the second (inverse) Y-axis.....	2-28
Figure 2.10	Absolute (mm) differences in monthly streamflow between Cathedral Peak catchments (IV (controlled) minus II (treated)), between 1950 and 1987. The progressive afforestation treatments applied to catchment II are annotated in the figure.....	2-29
Figure 2.11	Relative (%) differences in monthly streamflow between Cathedral Peak catchments (IV (control) and II (treated)), between 1950 and 1987. The progressive afforestation treatments applied to catchment II are annotated on the figure.....	2-30
Figure 2.12	Inter-annual differences in average daily streamflow generation rates for the early part of the wet season (October to January) for the Cathedral Peak catchments (IV (controlled) and II (treated)). .....	2-31
Figure 2.13	Inter-annual differences in average daily streamflow generation rates for the late part of the wet season (January to April) for the Cathedral Peak catchments (IV (controlled) and II (treated)). .....	2-31
Figure 2.14	Inter-annual differences in average daily streamflow generation rates for the early part of the dry season (April to July) for the Cathedral Peak catchments (IV (controlled) and II (treated)). .....	2-32
Figure 2.15	Inter-annual differences in average daily streamflow generation rates for the early part of the dry season (July to October) for Cathedral Peak catchments (IV (controlled) and II (treated)). .....	2-32
Figure 2.16	Effect on the low flow relationship between Cathedral Peak catchments IV (controlled) and II (treated), caused by the progressive introduction of forestry to catchment II. ....	2-33
Figure 2.17	Cumulative daily streamflow data (mm) for Westfalia catchments B (controlled) and D (treated), between 1975 and 1994. The progressive afforestation treatments applied to catchment D are annotated on the figure. Daily rainfall data are also represented on the second (inverse) Y-axis.....	2-34

Figure 2.18	Absolute (mm) differences in monthly streamflow between Westfalia catchments (B (controlled) minus D (treated)), between 1975 and 1994. The progressive afforestation treatments applied to catchment D are annotated on the figure. ....	2-35
Figure 2.19	Relative differences in monthly streamflow between Westfalia catchments (B (controlled) and D (treated)), between 1975 and 1994 (%). The progressive afforestation treatments applied to catchment D are annotated on the figure. ....	2-36
Figure 2.20	Differences in wetting-up (October to February) and drying out (March to September) cycles between Westfalia catchments (B (controlled) and D (treated)) for the hydrological years 1976/1977, 1979/1980, 1983/1984 and 1989/1990. ....	2-36
Figure 2.21	Effect on the low flow relationship between Westfalia catchments B (controlled) and D (treated), caused by the progressive introduction of forestry to catchment D. The period being analysed is shown for each regression line (e.g. 75-77 = 1975-1977).....	2-37
Figure 2.22	Absolute (mm) differences in monthly streamflow between Langrivier Catchment (control) and Lambrechtsbos A catchments between 1969 and 1991. ....	2-38
Figure 2.23	Absolute (mm) differences in monthly streamflow between Langrivier Catchment (control) and Lambrechtsbos B catchments between 1969 and 1991. ....	2-38
Figure 2.24	Relative (%) differences in monthly streamflow between the Langrivier catchment (control) and Lambrechtsbos A catchment between 1969 and 1991.....	2-34
Figure 2.25	Relative (%) differences in monthly streamflow between between Langrivier Catchment (control) and Lambrechtsbos B catchment between 1969 and 1991. ....	2-34
Figure 2.26	Differences in wetting-up (March to September) and drying out (October to February) cycles between Langrivier catchment (control) and Lambrechtsbos A and B catchments between 1975 and 1994. ....	2-40
Figure 2.27	a) and b). Effect on the low flow relationship between Langrivier catchment (control) and Lambrechtsbos A and B catchments (respectively) between 1975 and 1994 .....	2-41
Figure 2.28	Partitioning of the streamflow into quickflow and baseflow .....	2-45
Figure 2.29	The $TCA_t$ parameter used to represent afforestation in catchment II, Cathedral Peak. ....	2-47
Figure 2.30	Comparison of daily streamflow data generated by the 37yr non-partitioned statistical model ( ), the 37yr partitioned statistical model ( ) and the ACRU model ( ) (Gush et al. 2002) with observed values ( ) for catchment IV, Cathedral Peak (the control catchment). (Note that the streamflow values are represented on a log scale.) .....	2-53
Figure 2.31	Comparison of the annual differences in streamflow on catchment IV, Cathedral Peak (the control catchment), between observed and simulated values generated by the 37yr-data non-partitioned statistical model ( , mean: $-0.04 \pm 0.021$ ) and partitioned statistical model ( , mean: $-0.03 \pm 0.018$ ), and the ACRU model ( , mean: $-0.12 \pm 0.021$ ) (Gush et al., 2002) across the period of recorded data .....	2-53
Figure 2.32	Comparison of first three years of daily streamflow data generated by the 37yr non-partitioned statistical model ( ), the 37yr partitioned statistical model ( ) and the ACRU-Gush model ( ) with observed values ( ) for catchment II, Cathedral Peak (the afforested catchment). (Note that the streamflow values are represented on a log scale.) .....	2-56
Figure 2.33	Comparison of the annual differences in streamflow on catchment II, Cathedral Peak (the afforested catchment), between observed and simulated values generated by the 37yr-data non-partitioned statistical ( , mean: $-0.05 \pm 0.022$ ) and partitioned statistical model ( , mean: $-0.06 \pm 0.028$ ), and the ACRU model ( , mean: $-0.05 \pm 0.041$ ) (Gush et al., 2002) across the period of recorded data. ....	2-56
Figure 2.34	Partitioning of the streamflow into quickflow and baseflow ( total streamflow; baseflow, $\alpha = 0.995$ ) for catchment B, Westfalia (the control catchment).....	2-57
Figure 2.35	The $TCA_t$ ( ) and $IVCA_t$ ( ) parameters used to represent afforestation and changes in indigenous vegetation cover respectively, in catchment D, Westfalia. ....	2-57
Figure 2.36	Comparison of first three years of daily streamflow data generated by the 22yr non-partitioned statistical model ( ), the 22yr partitioned statistical model ( ) and the ACRU model ( ) (Gush et al., 2002) with observed values ( ) for catchment B, Westfalia (the control catchment). (Note that the streamflow values are represented on a log scale.).....	2-61



Figure 2.37	Comparison of the annual differences in streamflow on catchment B, Westfalia (the control catchment), between observed and simulated values generated by the 22yr-data non-partitioned statistical model ( , mean: $0.17 \pm 0.156$ ) and partitioned statistical model ( , mean: $0.00 \pm 0.091$ ), and the ACRU model ( , mean: $0.49 \pm 0.161$ ) (Gush et al., 2002) across the period of recorded data. ....	2-61
Figure 2.38	Comparison of first three years of daily streamflow data generated by the 22yr non-partitioned statistical model ( ), the 22yr partitioned statistical model ( ) and the ACRU-Gush model ( ) with observed values ( ) for catchment D, Westfalia (the afforested catchment). (Note that the streamflow values are represented on a log scale.) .....	2-64
Figure 2.39	Comparison of the annual differences in streamflow on catchment D, Westfalia (the afforested catchment), between observed and simulated values generated by the 22yr-data non-partitioned statistical ( , mean: $0.51 \pm 0.426$ ) and partitioned statistical model ( , mean: $1.76 \pm 0.872$ ), and the ACRU model ( , mean: $1.93 \pm 1.117$ ) (Gush et al., 2002) across the period of recorded data. ....	2-64
Figure 3.1	Dominant mechanisms of discharge from the hillslopes at the Weatherley research catchment (Lorentz <i>et al.</i> 2003). ....	3-2
Figure 3.2	Hillslope flow generation mechanisms on the sugar cane hillslope of the W17 research catchment, northern Zululand (from van Zyl and Lorentz, 2003).....	3-4
Figure 3.3	Hillslope flow generation mechanisms on a transect through the Two-Streams research catchment.....	3-5
Figure 3.4	Schematic representation of an intermediate layer showing the progressive accumulation of water at the base of the layer, prior to the onset of lateral and vertical discharge. The water volume is distributed within the layer as an equilibrium retention characteristic. ....	3-6
Figure 3.5	Schematic representation of land segments on a hillslope transect, showing possible linkages between components of the land segment profile. ....	3-9
Figure 3.6	Flow chart of the initialisation process for simulation of the intermediate zone. ....	3-10
Figure 3.7	Flow chart of the intermediate zone response process, developed for ACRU2000. ....	3-11
Figure 3.8	Flow chart of the groundwater response processes, developed for ACRU2000.....	3-12
Figure 3.9	Standard ACRU with coefficient of baseflow response = 0.25 .....	3-15
Figure 3.10	Standard ACRU with coefficient of baseflow response = 0.01 .....	3-15
Figure 3.11	Intermediate layer ACRU with dispersion, $D = 1 \text{ mm}^2 \cdot \text{day}^{-1}$ , response time, $T = 100$ days and macropore response = 0.25.....	3-16
Figure 3.12	Intermediate layer ACRU with dispersion, $D = 2 \text{ mm}^2 \cdot \text{day}^{-1}$ , response time, $T = 10$ days and macropore response = 0.50. ....	3-16
Figure 3.13	Unit response with $D = 1 \text{ mm}^2 \cdot \text{day}^{-1}$ and $T=100$ days. ....	3-17
Figure 3.14	Unit response with $D = 2 \text{ mm}^2 \cdot \text{day}^{-1}$ and $T=10$ days. ....	3-17
Figure 3.15	Flowchart Depicting Integration of Granier-Lohammer Routines for Calculating Total evaporation, into ACRU .....	3-22
Figure 3.16	Location of the “2Streams” catchment near Seven Oaks in KZN.....	3-23
Figure 3.17	Simplified layout of the “2Streams” catchment, showing sub-catchment configuration and position of gauging instruments. ....	3-24
Figure 3.18	Time series of accumulated daily observed vs. simulated streamflow totals (mm) from 2Streams using the old (AAHMS v331) and new (Int. Zone) versions of ACRU. Periods of significant landuse change are indicated.....	3-28
Figure 3.19	Time series, for the entire simulation period, of observed vs. simulated daily streamflow totals (mm) using the old (AAHMS v331) and new (Int. Zone) versions of ACRU. ....	3-29
Figure 3.20	Time series, for the period after the entire catchment had been cleared, of observed vs. simulated daily streamflow totals (mm) using the old (AAHMS v331) and new (Int. Zone) versions of ACRU.....	3-30
Figure 3.21	Illustration of the contributions to Total Evapotranspiration from respective soil horizons as simulated using the new (Int. Zone) version of ACRU for various land cover scenarios. ....	3-31
Figure 3.22	The Weatherley experimental catchment showing the location of instrumentation.....	3-34
Figure 3.23	Double mass plot of the rainfall-runoff relationship at the Weatherley research catchment.....	3-36
Figure 3.24	Topography of the Mooi river basin (after Helmschrot, 2006) .....	3-36
Figure 3.25	Geology of the Mooi river basin (after Helmschrot, 2006). ....	3-37
Figure 3.26	Drainage of the Mooi river basin (after Helmschrot, 2006). ....	3-37

Figure 3.27	Progression of afforestation in the Mooi river basin from 1989 (top), through 1995, 1999 to 2001 (bottom).....	3-38
Figure 3.28	Double mass plot of the rainfall-runoff relationship for the Mooi river basin (1970-2008).....	3-39
Figure 3.29	Simulated Potential Evaptranspiration (ET <sub>o</sub> ), Actual Evapotranspiration (AET) and measured Evapotranspiration (Bowen Ratio Data). ....	3-40
Figure 3.30	Observed (symbols) and simulated (line) daily runoff in the Weatherley research catchment under grassland conditions (2000). ....	3-41
Figure 3.31	Separation of the simulated quickflow, intermediate flow and groundwater components of the daily runoff in the Weatherley research catchment under grassland conditions (2000).....	3-41
Figure 3.32	Observed and simulated cumulative runoff in the Weatherley research catchment under grassland conditions (1998-2002). ....	3-42
Figure 3.33	Observed and simulated runoff at the Weatherley catchment after afforestation in 2002 .....	3-42
Figure 3.34	Drainage and sub-catchment delineation of the Mooi river basin.....	3-43
Figure 3.35	Distribution of L/S ratios for 165 forested sub-catchments in the Mooi basin, showing the position of the Weatherley research catchment L/S ratio (2001).....	3-44
Figure 3.36	Distribution of L/S ratios for 93 forested sub-catchments in the Mooi basin, showing the position of the Weatherley research catchment L/S ratio (2001).....	3-44
Figure 3.37	Observed (symbols) and simulated (line) discharge for a grassed sub-catchment response with D=5, T=1, Mooi river (2001).....	3-45
Figure 3.38	Observed (symbols) and simulated (line) discharge for a grassed sub-catchment response with D=10, T=1, Mooi river (2001).....	3-45
Figure 3.39	Observed (symbols) and simulated (line) discharge for a grassed sub-catchment response with D=1, T=20, Mooi river (2001).....	3-45
Figure 3.40	Observed (symbols) and grouped, simulated (line) daily runoff in the Mooi river (2001). ....	3-46
Figure 3.41	Observed and simulated cumulative runoff in the Mooi river (1998-2006).....	3-46
Figure 4.1	The use of Green Water Flows for assessing candidate SFRA for declaration	4-11
Figure 4.2	The regulatory approach to SFRA	4-13
Figure 4.3	“Quadrant” approach where catchment conditions which can be used to identify green and blue water management options and whether benefits would be derived from further soil water conservation measures (after Calder et al., 2005). ....	4-21
Figure 4.4	The likely impact of different scenarios can be assessed for different months. The model can then be applied to assess the likely impact of increasing the area of the intended free type (or other similar analyses). Areas where the future flow and Reserve FDC intersect may be problematic.....	4-22
Figure 4.5	The impact can be assessed for different levels of assurance of supply. Different levels of assurance of supply for months of interest can be selected and assessed....	4-23
Figure 5.1	Satellite image of the research site illustrating the transect, transmitter, receiver, AWS, and surrounding area (Google Earth, 2006). ....	5-1
Figure 5.2	Cross section showing network of instrumentation (not to scale).....	5-3
Figure 5.3	1 minute sensible heat data for 17 November 2004. ....	5-5
Figure 5.4	Rainfall data from the Two Streams study area at three gauging sites adjacent to the research transect for the period November 1999 to August 2005. ....	5-7
Figure 5.5	Net radiometer on a Bowen ratio system at a nearby site .....	5-9
Figure 5.6	TDR soil water content measurements at 0.3 m for nests 2 to 5 for the period April to September 2005.....	5-10
Figure 5.7	Average daily total evaporation and net radiation data in mm equivalents. ....	5-11
Figure 5.8	Annual summary of energy balance data with polynomial trend lines fitted. ....	5-13
Figure 5.9	Annual summary of primary data (RH, T <sub>a</sub> , and rainfall) with polynomial trend lines fitted to RH and T <sub>a</sub> . ....	5-14
Figure 5.10	Accumulated plot of net radiation, latent heat flux, sensible heat flux, soil heat flux and rainfall.....	5-16
Figure 5.11	Quaternary Catchments in the study area .....	5-19
Figure 5.12	Land uses in the Quaternary Catchments and major towns in the study area .....	5-20
Figure 5.13	Mean annual potential evaporation using A-pan equivalent values as reference .....	5-22
Figure 5.14	Mean Annual Precipitation .....	5-22
Figure 5.15	Altitudinal zones in the basin .....	5-22
Figure 5.16	Major ecological regions .....	5-22

Figure 5.17	Spatial variation of <i>ET</i> in the Thukela river basin on 1 <sup>st</sup> Aug. 2005 .....	5-25
Figure 5.18	Comparison of LAS and SEBAL with reference <i>ET</i> results in the Potshini catchment .	5-26
Figure 5.19	Estimated daily <i>ET</i> rates of some non-agricultural land uses .....	5-27
Figure 5.20	Estimated daily <i>ET</i> rates of some agricultural land uses including grassland and water bodies .....	5-28
Figure 5.21	Spatial variation of <i>ET</i> in winter and summer season in the study area .....	5-29
Figure 5.22	June 2005 .....	5-30
Figure 5.23	July 2005.....	5-30
Figure 5.24	August 2005.....	5-31
Figure 5.25	April 2006 .....	5-31
Figure 5.26	May 2006 .....	5-32
Figure 5.27	June, 2006 .....	5-32
Figure 5.28	Rainfall and reference <i>ET</i> in the Potshini catchment.....	5-34
Figure 6.1	Commercial afforestation in Quaternary Catchment U20J.....	6-2
Figure 6.2	Commercial afforestation in Quaternary Catchment U20J showing quinary catchments .....	6-2
Figure 6.3	Quinary catchments in which sugarcane is grown and regionalisation of sugarcane in South Africa and Swaziland.....	6-4
Figure 6.4	The user is able to select the Quinary Catchment of interest through a user friendly GUI .....	6-5
Figure 6.5	The area of interest can be selected and “zoomed” into. ....	6-6
Figure 6.6	Daily or monthly time series data for the Quinary catchment and land use under consideration can be shown and exported to .csv files if the user requires. ....	6-6
Figure 6.7	Daily or monthly time series data for the Quinary catchment and land use under consideration can be also be plotted. ....	6-7
Figure 6.8	A summary table of SFR statistics is generated and can be exported in a .csv format ..	6-7
Figure 6.9	Annual or monthly flow duration curves can be plotted for both daily and monthly time-step data. ....	6-8
Figure 6.10	Estimates of annual water use of sugarcane in South Africa and Swaziland. ....	6-9
Figure 6.11	Estimates of water use of sugarcane in South Africa and Swaziland for January (wet season). ....	6-9
Figure 6.12	Estimates of water use of sugarcane in South Africa and Swaziland for August (dry season).....	6-10

## List of Tables

Table 2.1	Summary of Statistical Studies on Paired Catchments .....	2-6
Table 2.2	Summary of Statistical Modelling Studies on Paired Catchments .....	2-12
Table 2.3	Catchment features and historical land-cover changes for catchments IV and II at Cathedral Peak .....	2-26
Table 2.4	Catchment characteristics and historical land-cover changes for catchments B and D at Westfalia .....	2-26
Table 2.5	Catchment characteristics and historical land-cover changes for Lambrechtsbos A & B and Langrivier catchments in Jonkershoek .....	2-27
Table 2.6	Details of the multiple regression models for streamflow derived for Catchment IV, Cathedral Peak (the control). (Note: all regressions have F-test probability values < 0.001 and were taken after removing units with standardised residuals > 4.0) .....	2-50
Table 2.7	Performance of the statistical models relative to the ACRU model (Gush et al., 2002) for the control catchment (IV) at Cathedral Peak .....	2-52
Table 2.8	Details of the multiple regression models for streamflow derived for the afforested catchment (catchment II) at Cathedral Peak. (Note all regressions have F-test probability values < 0.001 and were taken after removing units with standardised residuals > 4.0) .....	2-54
Table 2.9	Prediction performance of the 37yr-data statistical models relative to the ACRU model (Gush et al. 2002) afforested catchment (catchment II) at Cathedral Peak. ....	2-55
Table 2.10	Details of the multiple regression models for streamflow derived for catchment B, Westfalia (the control). Note: all regressions have F-test probability values < 0.001 and were taken after removing units with standardised residuals > 4.0. ....	2-59
Table 2.11	Performance of the statistical models relative to the ACRU model (Gush et al., 2002) for the control catchment (catchment B) at Westfalia.....	2-60
Table 2.12	Details of the multiple regression models for streamflow derived for the afforested catchment (Catchment D) at Westfalia. Note: all regressions have F-test probability values < 0.001 and were taken after removing units with standardised residuals > 4.0. NS = non-significant .....	2-62
Table 2.13	Performance of the 22yr-data statistical models relative to the ACRU model (Gush et al., 2002) for the afforested catchment (catchment D) at Westfalia .....	2-63
Table 3.1	Summary of streamflow generation mechanisms and their occurrence, Zululand W17 research catchment.....	3-4
Table 3.2	Intermediate layer control variables.....	3-13
Table 3.3	Relationships between Environmental State Variables and Parameters Characterising the Response of a Given Crop.....	3-20
Table 3.4	Granier-Lohammer” Parameters for Eucalypts, Pines, and Grass.....	3-21
Table 3.5	Monthly means of daily climatic data for 2Streams .....	3-25
Table 3.6	Description of major land cover changes simulated in this study.....	3-26
Table 3.7	Comparison of statistical results (simulated vs. observed / all flows and low flows) from the two versions of ACRU. ....	3-32
Table 3.8	Areas of L/S groupings for sub-catchments of the Mooi River basin (2001).....	3-44
Table 4.1	A conceptual model of the hydrological response of land use on different aspects of low flow relative to a grassland baseline. ....	4-19
Table 5.1	Gantt chart illustrating the duration of successful instrument data capture .....	5-3
Table 5.2	Areal extent of the QC. ....	5-20
Table 5.3	Land uses in the 13 Quaternary Catchments.....	5-21
Table 5.4	MODIS images used in the study .....	5-24
Table 5.5	Monthly volumes of water use for different land uses in the upper Thukela river basin .....	5-35

