

---

# GAM RUN 21-003: HEADWATERS GROUNDWATER CONSERVATION DISTRICT MANAGEMENT PLAN

Jevon Harding, P.G.  
Texas Water Development Board  
Groundwater Division  
Groundwater Availability Modeling Department  
(512) 463-7979  
April 19, 2021



*Jevon Harding*  
4/19/21

*This page is intentionally blank*

---

# GAM RUN 21-003: HEADWATERS GROUNDWATER CONSERVATION DISTRICT MANAGEMENT PLAN

Jevon Harding, P.G.  
Texas Water Development Board  
Groundwater Division  
Groundwater Availability Modeling Department  
(512) 463-7979  
April 19, 2021

## ***EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:***

Texas State Water Code, Section 36.1071, Subsection (h) (Texas Water Code, 2011), states that, in developing its groundwater management plan, a groundwater conservation district shall use groundwater availability modeling information provided by the Executive Administrator of the Texas Water Development Board (TWDB) in conjunction with any available site-specific information provided by the district for review and comment to the Executive Administrator.

The TWDB provides data and information to the Headwaters Groundwater Conservation District in two parts. Part 1 is the Estimated Historical Water Use/State Water Plan dataset report, which will be provided to you separately by the TWDB Groundwater Technical Assistance Department. Please direct questions about the water data report to Mr. Stephen Allen at 512-463-7317 or [stephen.allen@twdb.texas.gov](mailto:stephen.allen@twdb.texas.gov). Part 2 is the required groundwater availability modeling information and this information includes:

1. the annual amount of recharge from precipitation, if any, to the groundwater resources within the district;
2. for each aquifer within the district, the annual volume of water that discharges from the aquifer to springs and any surface-water bodies, including lakes, streams, and rivers; and
3. the annual volume of flow into and out of the district within each aquifer and between aquifers in the district.

The groundwater management plan for the Headwaters Groundwater Conservation District should be adopted by the district on or before November 17, 2021 and submitted to the executive administrator of the TWDB on or before December 17, 2021. The current management plan for the Headwaters Groundwater Conservation District expires on February 15, 2022.

We used two groundwater availability models to estimate the management plan information for the aquifers within the Headwaters Groundwater Conservation District. Information for the Hickory and Ellenburger-San Saba aquifers is from version 1.01 of the groundwater availability model for the minor aquifers of the Llano Uplift area (Shi and others, 2016a and b). Information for the Trinity and Edwards-Trinity (Plateau) aquifers is from version 1.01 of the groundwater availability model for the Edwards-Trinity (Plateau) Aquifer (Anaya and Jones, 2009).

This report replaces the results of GAM Run 16-019 (Jones, 2016), as the approach used for analyzing model results has been since refined to more accurately delineate flows between hydraulically connected units and because of updates to the spatial grid file used to define county, groundwater conservation district, and aquifer boundaries. In addition, this analysis includes results from the final groundwater availability model for the minor aquifers of the Llano Uplift area, whereas only the draft model was available at the time of publication for GAM Run 16-019. Tables 1 through 4 summarize the groundwater availability model data required by statute. Figures 1, 3, and 5 show the area of the models from which the values in the tables were extracted. Figures 2, 4, 6, and 7 provide generalized diagrams of the groundwater flow components provided in Tables 1 through 4. If, after review of the figures, the Headwaters Groundwater Conservation District determines that the district boundaries used in the assessment do not reflect current conditions, please notify the TWDB at your earliest convenience.

### ***METHODS:***

In accordance with the provisions of the Texas State Water Code, Section 36.1071, Subsection (h), the groundwater availability models mentioned above were used to estimate information for the Headwaters Groundwater Conservation District management plan. Water budgets were extracted for the historical model period for the Hickory and Ellenburger-San Saba aquifers (1981-2010) using ZONEBUDGET USG Version 1.00 (Panday and others, 2013). Water budgets were extracted for the historical model period for the Trinity and Edwards-Trinity (Plateau) aquifers (1981-2000) using ZONEBUDGET Version 3.01 (Harbaugh, 2009). The average annual water budget values for recharge, surface-water outflow, inflow to the district, outflow from the district, and the flow between aquifers within the district are summarized in this report.

## ***PARAMETERS AND ASSUMPTIONS:***

### ***Hickory and Ellenburger-San Saba aquifers***

- We used version 1.01 of the groundwater availability model for the minor aquifers in the Llano Uplift Region to analyze the Hickory and Ellenburger-San Saba aquifers. See Shi and others (2016a and b) for assumptions and limitations of the model.
- The groundwater availability model for the minor aquifers in the Llano Uplift Region contains eight layers (from top to bottom):
  - Layer 1 — Cretaceous age and younger water-bearing units
  - Layer 2 — Permian and Pennsylvanian age confining units
  - Layer 3 — the Marble Falls Aquifer and equivalent
  - Layer 4 — Mississippian age confining units
  - Layer 5 — the Ellenburger-San Saba Aquifer and equivalent
  - Layer 6 — Cambrian age confining units
  - Layer 7 — the Hickory Aquifer and equivalent, and
  - Layer 8 — Precambrian age confining units
- Individual water budgets for the district were determined for the Ellenburger-San Saba Aquifer (Layer 5) and the Hickory Aquifer (Layer 7). The Marble Falls Aquifer does not occur within the Headwaters Groundwater Conservation District and therefore no groundwater budget values are included for it in this report.
- Water budget terms were averaged for the period 1981 to 2010 (stress periods 2 through 31)
- The model was run with MODFLOW-USG (Panday and others, 2013).

### ***Trinity and Edwards-Trinity (Plateau) aquifers***

- We used version 1.01 of the groundwater availability model for the Edwards-Trinity (Plateau) and Pecos Valley aquifers to analyze the Trinity and Edwards-Trinity (Plateau) aquifers. See Anaya and Jones (2009) for assumptions and limitations of the model.
- The groundwater availability model for the Edwards-Trinity (Plateau) and Pecos Valley aquifers contains two layers. Within Headwaters Groundwater Conservation District, these generally represent the Edwards Group and equivalent limestone hydrostratigraphic units of the Edwards-Trinity (Plateau) Aquifer (Layer 1) and the undifferentiated Trinity Group hydrostratigraphic units or equivalent units of the Trinity Aquifer and the Edwards-Trinity (Plateau) Aquifer (Layer 2).
- Individual water budgets for the district were determined for the Edwards-Trinity (Plateau) Aquifer (Layers 1 and 2, combined) and the Trinity Aquifer (Layer 2). The Pecos Valley Aquifer does not occur within the Headwaters Groundwater Conservation District and therefore no groundwater budget values are included for it in this report.
- Water budget terms were averaged for the period 1981 to 2000 (stress periods 2 through 21)
- The model was run with MODFLOW-96 (Harbaugh and McDonald, 1996).

### ***RESULTS:***

A groundwater budget summarizes the amount of water entering and leaving the aquifer according to the groundwater availability model. Selected groundwater budget components listed below were extracted from the groundwater availability model results for the Hickory, Ellenburger-San Saba, Trinity, and Edwards-Trinity (Plateau) aquifers located within the Headwaters Groundwater Conservation District and averaged over the historical calibration periods, as shown in Tables 1 through 4.

1. Precipitation recharge—the areally distributed recharge sourced from precipitation falling on the outcrop areas of the aquifers (where the aquifer is exposed at land surface) within the district.


2. Surface-water outflow—the total water discharging from the aquifer (outflow) to surface-water features such as streams, reservoirs, and springs.
3. Flow into and out of district—the lateral flow within the aquifer between the district and adjacent counties.
4. Flow between aquifers—the net vertical flow between the aquifer and adjacent aquifers or confining units. This flow is controlled by the relative water levels in each aquifer and aquifer properties of each aquifer or confining unit that define the amount of leakage that occurs.

The information needed for the district's management plan is summarized in Tables 1 through 4. It is important to note that sub-regional water budgets are not exact. This is due to the size of the model cells and the approach used to extract data from the model. To avoid double accounting, a model cell that straddles a political boundary, such as a district or county boundary, is assigned to one side of the boundary based on the location of the centroid of the model cell. For example, if a cell contains two counties, the cell is assigned to the county where the centroid of the cell is located.

**TABLE 1: SUMMARIZED INFORMATION FOR THE HICKORY AQUIFER THAT IS NEEDED FOR THE HEADWATERS GROUNDWATER CONSERVATION DISTRICT'S GROUNDWATER MANAGEMENT PLAN. ALL VALUES ARE REPORTED IN ACRE-FEET PER YEAR AND ROUNDED TO THE NEAREST 1 ACRE-FOOT.**


Management Plan requirement	Aquifer or confining unit	Results
Estimated annual amount of recharge from precipitation to the district	Hickory Aquifer	0
Estimated annual volume of water that discharges from the aquifer to springs and any surface water body including lakes, streams, and rivers	Hickory Aquifer	0
Estimated annual volume of flow into the district within each aquifer in the district	Hickory Aquifer	4,832
Estimated annual volume of flow out of the district within each aquifer in the district	Hickory Aquifer	2,349
Estimated net annual volume of flow between each aquifer in the district	From the Hickory Aquifer to the Mississippian age confining units	15
	From the Hickory Aquifer to the Ellenburger-San Saba Aquifer	213
	From the Hickory Aquifer to the brackish portion of the Ellenburger-San Saba hydrostratigraphic unit	2,113
	Into the Hickory Aquifer from the Cambrian age confining units	4,217
	From the Hickory Aquifer to the brackish portion of the Hickory hydrostratigraphic unit	3,908
	From the Hickory Aquifer to the Precambrian age confining units	411





GCD boundary data = 06.26.2020, county boundary date = 07.03.2019, Inup model grid date = 01.06.2020

**FIGURE 1: AREA OF THE GROUNDWATER AVAILABILITY MODEL FOR THE MINOR AQUIFERS IN THE LLANO UPLIFT REGION FROM WHICH THE INFORMATION IN TABLE 1 WAS EXTRACTED (THE HICKORY AQUIFER EXTENT WITHIN THE DISTRICT BOUNDARY).**




\* Flow from overlying units includes net outflow of 15 AFY to Mississippian age confining units, 213 AFY to the Ellenburger-San Saba Aquifer and 2,113 AFY to the brackish portion of the Ellenburger-San Saba hydrostratigraphic unit and net inflow of 4,217 AFY from the Cambrian age confining units.

*Caveat: This diagram only includes the water budget items provided in Table 1. A complete water budget would include additional inflows and outflows. If the District requires values for additional water budget items, please contact TWDB.*

**FIGURE 2: GENERALIZED DIAGRAM OF THE SUMMARIZED BUDGET INFORMATION FROM TABLE 1, REPRESENTING DIRECTIONS OF FLOW FOR THE HICKORY AQUIFER WITHIN HEADWATERS GROUNDWATER CONSERVATION DISTRICT. FLOW VALUES EXPRESSED IN ACRE-FEET PER YEAR (AFY).**


**TABLE 2: SUMMARIZED INFORMATION FOR THE ELLENBURGER-SAN SABA AQUIFER THAT IS NEEDED FOR THE HEADWATERS GROUNDWATER CONSERVATION DISTRICT'S GROUNDWATER MANAGEMENT PLAN. ALL VALUES ARE REPORTED IN ACRE-FEET PER YEAR AND ROUNDED TO THE NEAREST 1 ACRE-FOOT.**

Management Plan requirement	Aquifer or confining unit	Results
Estimated annual amount of recharge from precipitation to the district	Ellenburger-San Saba Aquifer	0
Estimated annual volume of water that discharges from the aquifer to springs and any surface water body including lakes, streams, and rivers	Ellenburger-San Saba Aquifer	0
Estimated annual volume of flow into the district within each aquifer in the district	Ellenburger-San Saba Aquifer	3,967
Estimated annual volume of flow out of the district within each aquifer in the district	Ellenburger-San Saba Aquifer	4,027
Estimated net annual volume of flow between each aquifer in the district	From the Ellenburger-San Saba Aquifer to the Permian & Pennsylvanian age confining units	3
	From the Ellenburger-San Saba Aquifer to the brackish portion of the Marble Falls hydrostratigraphic unit	74
	Into the Ellenburger-San Saba Aquifer from the Mississippian age confining units	551
	From the Ellenburger-San Saba Aquifer to the brackish portion of the Ellenburger-San Saba hydrostratigraphic unit	1,189
	Into the Ellenburger-San Saba Aquifer from the Cambrian age confining units	549
	Into the Ellenburger-San Saba Aquifer from the Hickory Aquifer	213
	Into the Ellenburger-San Saba Aquifer from the Precambrian age confining units	1



GCD boundary data = 06.26.2020, county boundary date =07.03.2019, Inup model grid date = 01.06.2020

**FIGURE 3: AREA OF THE GROUNDWATER AVAILABILITY MODEL FOR THE MINOR AQUIFERS IN THE LLANO UPLIFT REGION FROM WHICH THE INFORMATION IN TABLE 2 WAS EXTRACTED (THE ELLENBURGER-SAN SABA AQUIFER EXTENT WITHIN THE DISTRICT BOUNDARY).**



\* Flow from overlying units includes net outflow of 3 AFY to Permian & Pennsylvanian age confining units and 74 AFY to the Marble Falls Aquifer and net inflow of 551 AFY from the Mississippian age confining units

\*\* Flow from underlying units includes net inflow of 549 AFY from the Cambrian age confining units, 213 AFY from the Hickory Aquifer and 1 AFY from the Precambrian age confining units.

*Caveat: This diagram only includes the water budget items provided in Table 2. A complete water budget would include additional inflows and outflows. If the District requires values for additional water budget items, please contact TWDB.*

**FIGURE 4: GENERALIZED DIAGRAM OF THE SUMMARIZED BUDGET INFORMATION FROM TABLE 2, REPRESENTING DIRECTIONS OF FLOW FOR THE ELLENBURGER-SAN SABA AQUIFER WITHIN HEADWATERS GROUNDWATER CONSERVATION DISTRICT. FLOW VALUES EXPRESSED IN ACRE-FEET PER YEAR (AFY).**


**TABLE 3: SUMMARIZED INFORMATION FOR THE TRINITY AQUIFER THAT IS NEEDED FOR THE HEADWATERS GROUNDWATER CONSERVATION DISTRICT'S GROUNDWATER MANAGEMENT PLAN. ALL VALUES ARE REPORTED IN ACRE-FEET PER YEAR AND ROUNDED TO THE NEAREST 1 ACRE-FOOT.**

Management Plan requirement	Aquifer or confining unit	Results
Estimated annual amount of recharge from precipitation to the district	Trinity Aquifer	21,331
Estimated annual volume of water that discharges from the aquifer to springs and any surface water body including lakes, streams, and rivers.	Trinity Aquifer	18,473
Estimated annual volume of flow into the district within each aquifer in the district	Trinity Aquifer	2,229
Estimated annual volume of flow out of the district within each aquifer in the district	Trinity Aquifer	7,861
Estimated net annual volume of flow between each aquifer in the district	Into the Trinity Aquifer from the Edwards-Trinity (Plateau) Aquifer	5,438



**TABLE 4: SUMMARIZED INFORMATION FOR THE EDWARDS-TRINITY (PLATEAU) AQUIFER THAT IS NEEDED FOR THE HEADWATERS GROUNDWATER CONSERVATION DISTRICT'S GROUNDWATER MANAGEMENT PLAN. ALL VALUES ARE REPORTED IN ACRE-FEET PER YEAR AND ROUNDED TO THE NEAREST 1 ACRE-FOOT.**


Management Plan requirement	Aquifer or confining unit	Results
Estimated annual amount of recharge from precipitation to the district	Edwards-Trinity (Plateau) Aquifer	26,454
Estimated annual volume of water that discharges from the aquifer to springs and any surface water body including lakes, streams, and rivers.	Edwards-Trinity (Plateau) Aquifer	17,697
Estimated annual volume of flow into the district within each aquifer in the district	Edwards-Trinity (Plateau) Aquifer	8,305
Estimated annual volume of flow out of the district within each aquifer in the district	Edwards-Trinity (Plateau) Aquifer	20,483
Estimated net annual volume of flow between each aquifer in the district	From the Edwards-Trinity (Plateau) Aquifer into the Trinity Aquifer	5,438



GCD boundary data = 06.26.2020, county boundary date =07.03.2019, eddt\_p model grid date = 01.06.2020


**FIGURE 5: AREA OF THE GROUNDWATER AVAILABILITY MODEL FOR THE EDWARDS-TRINITY (PLATEAU) AND PECOS VALLEY AQUIFERS FROM WHICH THE INFORMATION IN TABLES 3 AND 4 WAS EXTRACTED (THE EDWARDS-TRINITY (PLATEAU) AND TRINITY AQUIFER EXTENTS WITHIN THE DISTRICT BOUNDARY).**





*Caveat: This diagram only includes the water budget items provided in Table 3. A complete water budget would include additional inflows and outflows. If the District requires values for additional water budget items, please contact TWDB.*

**FIGURE 6: GENERALIZED DIAGRAM OF THE SUMMARIZED BUDGET INFORMATION FROM TABLE 3, REPRESENTING DIRECTIONS OF FLOW FOR THE TRINITY AQUIFER WITHIN HEADWATERS GROUNDWATER CONSERVATION DISTRICT. FLOW VALUES EXPRESSED IN ACRE-FEET PER YEAR (AFY).**



*Caveat: This diagram only includes the water budget items provided in Table 4. A complete water budget would include additional inflows and outflows. If the District requires values for additional water budget items, please contact TWDB.*

**FIGURE 7: GENERALIZED DIAGRAM OF THE SUMMARIZED BUDGET INFORMATION FROM TABLE 4, REPRESENTING DIRECTIONS OF FLOW FOR THE EDWARDS-TRINITY (PLATEAU) AQUIFER WITHIN HEADWATERS GROUNDWATER CONSERVATION DISTRICT. FLOW VALUES EXPRESSED IN ACRE-Feet PER YEAR (AFY).**

## ***LIMITATIONS:***

The groundwater models used in completing this analysis are the best available scientific tools that can be used to meet the stated objectives. To the extent that this analysis will be used for planning purposes and/or regulatory purposes related to pumping in the past and into the future, it is important to recognize the assumptions and limitations associated with the use of the results. In reviewing the use of models in environmental regulatory decision making, the National Research Council (2007) noted:

*“Models will always be constrained by computational limitations, assumptions, and knowledge gaps. They can best be viewed as tools to help inform decisions rather than as machines to generate truth or make decisions. Scientific advances will never make it possible to build a perfect model that accounts for every aspect of reality or to prove that a given model is correct in all respects for a particular regulatory application. These characteristics make evaluation of a regulatory model more complex than solely a comparison of measurement data with model results.”*

A key aspect of using the groundwater model to evaluate historic groundwater flow conditions includes the assumptions about the location in the aquifer where historic pumping was placed. Understanding the amount and location of historical pumping is as important as evaluating the volume of groundwater flow into and out of the district, between aquifers within the district (as applicable), interactions with surface water (as applicable), recharge to the aquifer system (as applicable), and other metrics that describe the impacts of that pumping. In addition, assumptions regarding precipitation, recharge, and interaction with streams are specific to particular historic time periods.

Because the application of the groundwater models was designed to address regional scale questions, the results are most effective on a regional scale. The TWDB makes no warranties or representations related to the actual conditions of any aquifer at a particular location or at a particular time.

It is important for groundwater conservation districts to monitor groundwater pumping and overall conditions of the aquifer. Because of the limitations of the groundwater model and the assumptions in this analysis, it is important that the groundwater conservation districts work with the TWDB to refine this analysis in the future given the reality of how the aquifer responds to the actual amount and location of pumping now and in the future. Historic precipitation patterns also need to be placed in context as future climatic conditions, such as dry and wet year precipitation patterns, may differ and affect groundwater flow conditions.

## **REFERENCES:**

- Anaya, R., and Jones, I. C., 2009, Groundwater availability model for the Edwards-Trinity (Plateau) and Pecos Valley aquifers of Texas: Texas Water Development Board Report 373, 103 p.  
[http://www.twdb.texas.gov/groundwater/models/gam/eddt\\_p/ET-Plateau\\_Full.pdf](http://www.twdb.texas.gov/groundwater/models/gam/eddt_p/ET-Plateau_Full.pdf)
- Harbaugh, A. W., 2009, Zonebudget Version 3.01, A computer program for computing subregional water budgets for MODFLOW ground-water flow models, U.S. Geological Survey Groundwater Software.
- Harbaugh, A. W., and McDonald, M. G., 1996, User's documentation for MODFLOW-96, an update to the U.S. Geological Survey modular finite-difference groundwater-water flow model: U.S. Geological Survey Open-File Report 96-485, 56 p.
- Jones, I., 2016, GAM Run 16-019: Texas Water Development Board, GAM Run 16-019 Report, 15 p., <https://www.twdb.texas.gov/groundwater/docs/GAMruns/GR16-019.pdf>.
- Panday, S., Langevin, C.D., Niswonger, R.G., Ibaraki, M., and Hughes, J.D., 2013, MODFLOW USG version 1: An unstructured grid version of MODFLOW for simulating groundwater flow and tightly coupled processes using a control volume finite-difference formulation: U.S. Geological Survey Techniques and Methods, book 6, chap. A45, 66p., <https://pubs.usgs.gov/tm/06/a45/>.
- National Research Council, 2007, Models in Environmental Regulatory Decision Making Committee on Models in the Regulatory Decision Process, National Academies Press, Washington D.C., 287 p., [http://www.nap.edu/catalog.php?record\\_id=11972](http://www.nap.edu/catalog.php?record_id=11972).
- Shi, J., Boghici, R., Kohlrenken, W., and Hutchison, W.R., 2016a, Conceptual Model Report: Minor Aquifers of the Llano Uplift Region of Texas. Texas Water Development Board Report, 306 p.,  
[http://www.twdb.texas.gov/groundwater/models/gam/llano/Llano\\_Uplift\\_Conceptual\\_Model\\_Report\\_Final.pdf](http://www.twdb.texas.gov/groundwater/models/gam/llano/Llano_Uplift_Conceptual_Model_Report_Final.pdf).
- Shi, J., Boghici, R., Kohlrenken, W., and Hutchison, W.R., 2016b, Numerical Model Report: Minor Aquifers of the Llano Uplift Region of Texas (Marble Falls, Ellenburger-San Saba, and Hickory). Texas Water Development Board Report, 435 p.,  
[http://www.twdb.texas.gov/groundwater/models/gam/llano/Llano\\_Uplift\\_Numerical\\_Model\\_Report\\_Final.pdf](http://www.twdb.texas.gov/groundwater/models/gam/llano/Llano_Uplift_Numerical_Model_Report_Final.pdf).
- Texas Water Code, 2011, <http://www.statutes.legis.state.tx.us/docs/WA/pdf/WA.36.pdf>