Brazos River Alluvium Aquifer Groundwater Availability Model (GAM)

Stakeholder Advisory Meeting #1

College Station, TX January 22, 2014





Outline

Introduction

- The Brazos River Alluvium Aquifer GAM team
- Study Objectives
- General Introduction to the GAM program
- Background
 - Basics of groundwater flow
 - Numerical groundwater modeling and the GAMs
- Brazos River Alluvium Aquifer overview
- Key model aspects
- Request for Data
- GAM schedule



Project Team & Responsibilities



Study Objectives

- Improve the conceptualization of the surface water/groundwater interaction in the Brazos River Alluvium Aquifer
- Provide tool for assessing desired future condition of the aquifer (DFC)/ modeled available groundwater (MAG) that is consistent with joint planning of the underlying aquifers
- Provide groundwater model/tools suitable for eventual conversion to integrated surface water/groundwater model



Groundwater Availability Modeling



Cindy Ridgeway

Contract Manager

Brazos River Alluvium Aquifer Groundwater Availability Model (GAM)

Texas Water Development Board

Texas Water

Development Board



Groundwater Availability Modeling (GAM) Program

- <u>Purpose</u>: to develop tools that can be used to help Groundwater Conservation Districts, Regional Water Planning Groups, and others understand and manage their groundwater resources.
- <u>Public process</u>: you get to see how the model is put together.
- <u>Freely available</u>: models are standardized, thoroughly documented. Reports available over the internet.
- Living tools: periodically updated.







Goal: informed decision-making



Texas Water Development Board

Groundwater Model

Texas Water Development Board



Major Aquifers





Minor Aquifers



GEOSCIENCE & ENGINEERING SOLUTIONS

Texas Water Development Board

Texas Water Code, § 36.1071 (h)

Inform groundwater districts about historical conditions in the aquifer

Management Plan requirement	Aquifer or confining unit	Results
Estimated annual amount of recharge from precipitation to the district	Edwards-Trinity (Plateau) Aquifer	140,509
	Pecos Valley Aquifer	14,115
	Dockum Aquifer	0
Estimated annual volume of water that discharges from	Edwards-Trinity (Plateau) Aquifer	31,222
the aquifer to springs and any surface water body including lakes, streams, and rivers	Pecos Valley Aquifer	9,804
	Dockum Aquifer	0
Estimated annual volume of flow into the district within each aquifer in the district	Edwards-Trinity (Plateau) Aquifer	32,993
	Pecos Valley Aquifer	3,441
	Dockum Aquifer	554



Texas Water Development Board

 Texas Water Code, § 36.108 (d): Assist districts and management areas in determining desired future conditions









 Texas Water Code, § 36.1084 (b): Develop modeled available groundwater based on desired future conditions



Country	Regional Water	ional Water Year						
	Planning Area	Dasin	2010	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060
Hudspeth	Е	Rio Grande	101,429	101,429	101,429	101,429	101,429	101,42



Texas Water Code, § 36.108 (d) (3)

Estimating total recoverable storage for explanatory reports



Texas Water

Development Board



Stakeholder Advisory Forums

- Provide input and data to assist with model development
- Keep updated about progress of the model
- Understand how the groundwater model can, should, and should not be used

Note: TWDB currently doing field work on geometry of river channel. Contact Mark Wentzel for more information <u>mark.wentzel@twdb.texas.gov</u>





Disclaimer

The statements contained in this presentation are my current views and opinions and are not intended to reflect the positions of, or information from, the Texas Water Development Board, nor is it an indication of any official policy position of the Board.





Contact Information

Groundwater Availability Modeling Cindy Ridgeway, P.G. Cindy.Ridgeway@twdb.texas.gov 512-936-2386

Texas Water Development Board 1700 North Congress Avenue P.O. Box 13231 Austin, Texas 78711-3231

Web information:

http://www.twdb.texas.gov/groundwater/models/gam/bzrv/bzrv.asp#saf http://www.twdb.texas.gov/groundwater/index.asp





Outline

Introduction

- The Brazos River Alluvium Aquifer GAM team
- Study Objectives
- General Introduction to the GAM program

Background

- Basics of groundwater flow
- Numerical groundwater modeling and the GAMs
- Brazos River Alluvium Aquifer overview
- Key model aspects
- Request for Data
- GAM schedule





Thanks and credit to Robert Mace at TWDB for many of the slides in this section





What is an aquifer?

 an aquifer is geologic media that can yield economically usable amounts of water.

DIRT



ROCK



What is an aquitard?

- an aquitard is geologic media that can not yield economically usable amounts of water.
- clay, shale, unfractured dense rocks
- Note: can still transmit water, but s l o w l y

aquitard



What is a water table?

- A water table is where the saturated zone meets the vadose (unsaturated) zone.
- A water table occurs where the groundwater is under atmospheric pressure





Same aquifer: unconfined and confined





Groundwater Flow

 Groundwater flows from higher potential energy (head) to lower potential energy





 Hydraulic conductivity – A physical property of the geologic media representing its ability to transmit water (related to permeability and transmissivity)









WELL SORTED Coarse (sand-gravel)

POORLY SORTED Coarse - Fine

WELL SORTED Fine (silt-clay)

Permeability and Hydraulic Conductivity High Low



 Specific yield – The volume of water that an unconfined aquifer releases from storage per unit surface area of aquifer per unit decline in water table elevation.



- Storativity The volume of water that a confined aquifer releases from storage per unit surface area of aquifer per unit decline in head.
 - Much smaller than specific yield



Specific Yield vs. Storativity





From Heath (1983)

Specific Yield vs. Storativity



Groundwater Definitions (cont.)

- Recharge The entry of water to the saturated zone at the water table:
 - Recharge = (precipitation + stream loss) minus (runoff + evapotranspiration).
- Cross-formational flow Groundwater flow between separate geologic formations.
- Stream losses or gains The water that is either lost or gained through the base of the stream or river.



Schematic Cross Section of Groundwater Flow





Definition of a Model

Domenico (1972) defined a model as a representation of reality that attempts to explain the behavior of some aspect of reality and is always **less complex** than the real system it represents

Wang & Anderson (1982) defined a model as a tool designed to represent a **simplified** version of reality



Why Groundwater Flow Models?

- In contrast to surface water, groundwater flow is difficult to observe
- Aquifers are typically complex in terms of spatial extent and hydrogeological characteristics
- A groundwater model provides the only means for integrating available data for the prediction of groundwater flow at the scale of interest



Numerical Flow Model

- A numerical groundwater flow model is the mathematical representation of an aquifer
- It uses basic laws of physics that govern groundwater flow
- In the model domain, the numerical model calculates the hydraulic head at discrete locations (determined by the grid)
- The calculated model heads can be compared to hydraulic heads measured in wells



Modeling Protocol









Outline

Introduction

- The Brazos River Alluvium Aquifer GAM team
- Study Objectives
- General Introduction to the GAM program
- Background
 - Basics of groundwater flow
 - Numerical groundwater modeling and the GAMs

Brazos River Alluvium Aquifer overview

- Key model aspects
- Request for Data
- GAM schedule



Study Area







Regional Water Planning Groups





Groundwater Management Areas





Groundwater Conservation Districts





Topography (Feet above mean sea level)

Source: USGS





Annual Average Precipitation 1981-2010

Source: Oregon State University PRISM Climate Data Group





Annual Average Temperature 1981- 2010

Source: Oregon State University PRISM Climate Data Group











Model Layering



Holocene Alluvium Brazos River Alluviu Quaternary Fluvial terrace deposits Fluvial terrace deposits Pleistocene Beaumont Formation Guif Coast Plocene Willis Sand Guif Coast Miocene Fleming Formation Guif Coast Miocene Fleming Formation Guif Coast Oligocene Catahoula Sandstone Yegua-Jackson Oligocene Catahoula Sandstone Yegua-Jackson Cook Mountain Formation Sparta Sand Sparta Eocene Weches Formation Queen City Sand Queen City Reklaw Formation Carrizo-Wilcox Wilcox Group Carrizo-Wilcox Paleocene Midway Group Taylor Mari Guifian Austin Chalk Guifian Austin Chalk Eagle Ford Group Grayson Mari Grayson Mari Comanchean Fredricksburg Group Fredricksburg Group Fredricksburg Group	ystem	Series	Geologic Unit	Aquifer	Model Layer	
Quaternary Pleistocene Fluvial terrace deposits Pleistocene Beaumont Formation Guif Coast Lissie Formation Lissie Formation Gulf Coast Miocene Fleming Formation Outer Coast Oligocene Catahoula Sandstone Oligocene Catahoula Sandstone Oligocene Catahoula Sandstone Yegua-Jackson Tertiary Yegua Formation Sparta Sand Sparta Eocene Weches Formation Queen City Sand Queen City Reklaw Formation Carrizo Sand Carrizo-Wilcox Paleocene Midway Group Taylor Mari Gulfian Austin Chalk Eagle Ford Group Gomanchean Fredricksburg Group Fredricksburg Group		Holocene	Alluvium	Brazos River Alluvium	1 and 2	
Pleistocene Beaumont Formation Lissie Formation Gulf Coast Pliocene Willis Sand Gulf Coast Miocene Fleming Formation Output Oligocene Catahoula Sandstone Pegua-Jackson Oligocene Catahoula Sandstone Yegua-Jackson Tertiary Jackson Group Yegua-Jackson Eocene Weches Formation Sparta Queen City Sand Queen City Reklaw Formation Carrizo-Wilcox Paleocene Midway Group Paleocene Midway Group Gulfian Austin Chalk Eogle Ford Group Grayson Marl Comanchean Fredricksburg Group	uaternary		Fluvial terrace deposits			
Image: state stat		Pleistocene	Beaumont Formation			
Pliocene Willis Sand Gulf Coast Miocene Fleming Formation Oligocene Catahoula Sandstone Oligocene Catahoula Sandstone Yegua-Jackson Tertiary Jackson Group Yegua-Jackson Eocene Weches Formation Sparta Queen City Sand Queen City Reklaw Formation Carrizo Sand Carrizo-Wilcox Paleocene Midway Group Carrizo-Wilcox Gulfian Austin Chalk Eagle Ford Group Gunanchean Washita Group Grayson Marl Comanchean Fredricksburg Group Fredricksburg Group			Lissie Formation			
Miocene Fleming Formation Oligocene Catahoula Sandstone Oligocene Catahoula Sandstone Oligocene Catahoula Sandstone Jackson Group Yegua-Jackson Yegua Formation Yegua-Jackson Cook Mountain Formation Sparta Sparta Sand Sparta Queen City Sand Queen City Reklaw Formation Carrizo Sand Carrizo Sand Carrizo-Wilcox Paleocene Midway Group Paleocene Midway Group Gulfian Austin Chalk Eagle Ford Group Grayson Marl Comanchean Washita Group Fredricksburg Group Fredricksburg Group		Pliocene	Willis Sand Gulf Coast			
Miocene Fleming Formation Oligocene Catahoula Sandstone Oligocene Catahoula Sandstone Jackson Group Yegua-Jackson Yegua Formation Yegua-Jackson Cook Mountain Formation Sparta Sparta Sand Sparta Queen City Sand Queen City Reklaw Formation Carrizo-Wilcox Wicox Group Paleocene Midway Group Carrizo-Wilcox Paleocene Midway Group Gulfian Austin Chalk Eagle Ford Group Grayson Marl Comanchean Washita Group Fredricksburg Group Fredricksburg Group			Goliad Sand	Guir Coast		
Image: constraint of the state of the s		Miocene	Fleming Formation			
Oligocene Catahoula Sandstone Tertiary Jackson Group Yegua-Jackson Cook Mountain Formation Sparta Sand Sparta Eocene Weches Formation Queen City Reklaw Formation Queen City Sand Queen City Reklaw Formation Carrizo-Wilcox Wilcox Group Paleocene Midway Group Carrizo-Wilcox Paleocene Midway Group Taylor Marl Gulfian Austin Chalk Eagle Ford Group Grayson Marl Grayson Marl Fredricksburg Group Comanchean Washita Group Vashita Group Fredricksburg Group Fredricksburg Group Fredricksburg Group			Oakville Sandstone			
Tertiary Jackson Group Yegua Formation Yegua-Jackson Cook Mountain Formation Sparta Sand Sparta Sparta Sand Sparta Meches Formation Queen City Sand Queen City Reklaw Formation Carrizo-Wilcox Wilcox Group Paleocene Midway Group Paleocene Midway Group Taylor Marl Gulfian Austin Chalk Eagle Ford Group Grayson Marl Washita Group Fredricksburg Group Comanchean Washita Group Fredricksburg Group		Oligocene	Catahoula Sandstone			
Tertiary Yegua Formation Yegua-Jackson Cook Mountain Formation Sparta Sand Sparta Sparta Sand Queen City Sparta Queen City Sand Queen City Reklaw Formation Queen City Sand Queen City Reklaw Formation Carrizo Sand Carrizo-Wilcox Wilcox Group Paleocene Midway Group Carrizo-Wilcox Milcox Group Taylor Marl Gulfian Austin Chalk Eagle Ford Group Grayson Marl Comanchean Washita Group Fredricksburg Group			Jackson Group	Verue leekeen		
Tertiary Cook Mountain Formation Sparta Sand Sparta Becene Weches Formation Queen City Sand Queen City Reklaw Formation Carrizo-Wilcox Wilcox Group Carrizo-Wilcox Paleocene Midway Group Paleocene Midway Group Gulfian Austin Chalk Eagle Ford Group Grayson Marl Comanchean Washita Group Fredricksburg Group Fredricksburg Group			Yegua Formation	regua-Jackson		
Sparta Sand Sparta Eocene Weches Formation Queen City Sand Queen City Reklaw Formation Carrizo-Wilcox Wilcox Group Paleocene Paleocene Midway Group Paleocene Midway Group Gulfian Austin Chalk Eagle Ford Group Grayson Marl Comanchean Washita Group Fredricksburg Group Fredricksburg Group	Tertiary		Cook Mountain Formation			
Eocene Weches Formation Queen City Sand Queen City Reklaw Formation Carrizo Sand Carrizo Sand Carrizo-Wilcox Wilcox Group Paleocene Midway Group Mavarro Group Taylor Marl Gulfian Austin Chalk Eagle Ford Group Grayson Marl Washita Group Comanchean Fredricksburg Group			Sparta Sand	Sparta		
Queen City Sand Queen City Reklaw Formation Carrizo-Wilcox Carrizo Sand Carrizo-Wilcox Wilcox Group Paleocene Paleocene Midway Group Paleocene Midway Group Taylor Marl Gulfian Austin Chalk Eagle Ford Group Grayson Marl Grayson Marl Comanchean Washita Group		Eocene	Weches Formation		3	
Reklaw Formation Carrizo Sand Carrizo Sand Carrizo-Wilcox Wilcox Group Paleocene Midway Group Paleocene Midway Group Taylor Marl Gulfian Austin Chalk Eagle Ford Group Grayson Marl Comanchean Washita Group Fredricksburg Group			Queen City Sand	Queen City		
Carrizo Sand Carrizo-Wilcox Wilcox Group Paleocene Midway Group Paleocene Midway Group Image: Carrizo-Wilcox Navarro Group Taylor Marl Image: Carrizo-Wilcox Gulfian Austin Chalk Image: Carrizo-Wilcox Cretaceous Gulfian Austin Chalk Eagle Ford Group Grayson Marl Comanchean Washita Group Fredricksburg Group Fredricksburg Group			Reklaw Formation			
Wilcox Group Carrizo-Wilcox Paleocene Midway Group Paleocene Midway Group Taylor Marl Taylor Marl Gulfian Austin Chalk Eagle Ford Group Grayson Marl Comanchean Washita Group Fredricksburg Group Fredricksburg Group			Carrizo Sand			
Paleocene Midway Group Navarro Group Navarro Group Taylor Marl Taylor Marl Gulfian Austin Chalk Eagle Ford Group Grayson Marl Comanchean Washita Group Fredricksburg Group Fredricksburg Group			Wilcox Group	Carrizo-Wilcox		
Cretaceous Gulfian Navarro Group Gulfian Austin Chalk Eagle Ford Group Grayson Marl Comanchean Washita Group Fredricksburg Group Fredricksburg Group		Paleocene	Midway Group			
Cretaceous Gulfian Gulfian Austin Chalk Eagle Ford Group Grayson Marl Comanchean Fredricksburg Group AQUIFER Brazos River Alluvium			Navarro Group			
Gulfian Austin Chalk Eagle Ford Group Grayson Marl Comanchean Washita Group Fredricksburg Group Fredricksburg Group AQUIFER Brazos River Alluvium		Gulfian	Taylor Marl			
Cretaceous Eagle Ford Group Grayson Marl Comanchean Fredricksburg Group AQUIFER Brazos River Alluvium			Austin Chalk			
Grayson Marl Comanchean Fredricksburg Group AQUIFER Brazos River Alluvium	etaceous		Eagle Ford Group			
Comanchean Washita Group Fredricksburg Group AQUIFER Brazos River Alluvium			Grayson Marl			
Comanchean Fredricksburg Group AQUIFER Brazos River Alluvium			Washita Group			
AQUIFER Brazos River Alluvium	C	Comanchean	Fredricksburg Group		1	
AQUIFER Brazos River Alluvium						
Brazos River Alluvium			AQUIFER		Model Layer	
		E	Brazos River Alluvium		1 and 2	
Carrizo-Wilcox Yegua-Jackson	Carri	izo-Wilcox	Vegu Vieen City	Gulf Coas	3	



GAM Model Specifications

- Three dimensional (MODFLOW-NWT)
- Regional scale (1000's of square miles)
- Grid spacing
 - Maximum 1/8-mile over Brazos River Alluvium
 - Probable increased spacing (≤ 1 -mile) at extents
- Implement
 - recharge
 - groundwater/surface water interaction
 - pumping
- Calibration to observed water levels/fluxes



MODFLOW

- Code developed by the U.S. Geological Survey
- Selected by TWDB for all GAMs
- Handles the relevant processes
- Comprehensive documentation
- Public domain non-proprietary
- Most widely used groundwater model
 - USGS had 12,261 downloads of MODFLOW computer code in 2000
- Supporting interface programs available
 - Groundwater Vistas to be used in all GAMs
- Using MODFLOW-NWT most recent standard version



Outline

Introduction

- The Brazos River Alluvium Aquifer GAM team
- Study Objectives
- General Introduction to the GAM program
- Background
 - Basics of groundwater flow
 - Numerical groundwater modeling and the GAMs
- Brazos River Alluvium Aquifer overview

Key model aspects

- Request for Data
- GAM schedule



Key model aspects

- Hydrostratigraphy
- Hydraulic/storage properties
- Surface water/groundwater interaction
- Groundwater production
- Recharge
- Discharge



Hydrostratigraphy

- Basal structure of aquifer based at least partially on Shah and others (2007)
 - Constrained at lateral extents by land surface elevation
- Top of alluvium defined by land surface
- Shallow portions of underlying aquifers represented by an additional model layer
 - Lateral extent of underlying layer based on natural groundwater divides
 - Thickness and hydraulic properties of underlying layer dependent on properties of underlying aquifers



Hydraulic Properties

- Will evaluate transmissivity estimates from Shah and others (2007)
 - Study has spatial gaps particularly in the northwest and southeast portions of the aquifer
- Potential sources for additional hydraulic property estimates
 - TCEQ public water supply records (1 well)
 - Driller's logs with specific capacity information
 - Will perform 2 to 3 additional aquifer tests



Surface Water/Groundwater Interaction

- The Brazos River Alluvium Aquifer is hydraulically connected to the Brazos River along the entire length of the aquifer
- Will improve the characterization of this interaction
 - Interpret/analyze existing synoptic gain-loss studies
 - Calculate long-term baseflow estimates from gage data
 - Estimate local interaction (including bank storage) at several points along the river
 - Perform WAM simulations to determine whether groundwater model results affect reliability estimates for various rights holders



Groundwater Production

- Groundwater production in the aquifer is primarily for irrigation purposes
- Historical production averages 32,000 Acre Feet per Year
- Future production ranges between 35,000 and 45,000
 Acre Feet per Year
- Assigning pumping to particular wells will be difficult
- Imagery from National Agricultural Statistics Service program may be used to locate irrigated cropland
- Well location from driller's logs and the TWDB groundwater database will be used to estimate (based on size and production capacity) well locations for production
- Will investigate local declines/recoveries to locate pumping centers



Recharge

- Recharge is a critical component of the water balance
- The aquifer is thin, narrow, and unconfined so recharge is important to maintaining water levels under long-term pumping conditions
- Several potential sources of recharge
 - Areal recharge from precipitation
 - Irrigation return flow
 - Lateral and vertical inflow from underlying formations
 - Surface water bodies (Brazos River and tributaries, reservoirs, and oxbow lakes)



Natural Discharge

- The Brazos River is a major discharge avenue for the groundwater in the Brazos River Alluvium Aquifer
- The Brazos River is also a regional discharge boundary for the underlying regional aquifers
- Much of the aquifer has a quite shallow water table, so groundwater evapotranspiration (ET) will be an important portion of the water balance



Outline

Introduction

- The Brazos River Alluvium Aquifer GAM team
- Study Objectives
- General Introduction to the GAM program
- Background
 - Basics of groundwater flow
 - Numerical groundwater modeling and the GAMs
- Brazos River Alluvium Aquifer overview
- Key model aspects
- Request for Data
- GAM schedule



Data Request

- Any un-published data to support the model
 - Geophysical logs
 - Pump tests
 - Water levels
 - Interpreted properties
 - Structural picks
 - Production information
 - Leads for local published reports/data
 - Data request by February 28, 2014

(please contact us if more time is needed)

Tasks and Proposed Schedule









John Ewing, PE 512-425-2070 jewing@intera.com Wade Oliver, PG 512-425-2058 woliver@intera.com

Brazos Alluvium Aquifer GAM -- Stakeholder Advisory Forum #1 College Station, January 22, 2014 Questions and Answers

Question: Have there been any studies on the BRAA before? Answer: Yes, TWDB reports, Hydrostratigraphy by USGS, and County studies

Question: Will water quality be looked at? Answer: Yes, It is not simulated explicitly, but it is evaluated as part of the conceptual model.

Question: Will historical uses be put into the model? Answer: Yes, as part of calibration. Estimating pumping is a critical piece of the conceptual model.

Question: What weight will historical permits hold in the study? Answer: The best information on historical pumping available will be incorporated into the model.

Question: How will surface water/groundwater interaction be estimated? Answer: We will interpret/analyze existing synoptic gain-loss studies, calculate long-term baseflow estimates from gage data, estimate local interaction (including bank storage) at several points along the river, and perform WAM simulations to determine if results from the groundwater model will affect reliability estimates for water rights holders.

Question: What is the source of the historical pumping estimate? Answer: This pumping estimate is from the Water Use Survey, but pumping is typically one of the most difficult aspects of the model to characterize. If you have information relevant to pumping, please provide it to us so that the model contains this information.

Question: Can you set up a project specific FTP site? Answer: Yes, we will do that.

Comment: If you use evapotranspiration in the model, make sure to consider leaching fractions.

Question: Have you used SWAT and can it be used for this study? Answer: Yes, we've used it and information from existing SWAT runs in the basin can inform estimates of recharge and baseflow. We will not be doing new SWAT modeling as part of this study.

Comment: Dr. Munster (Texas A&M) has studies that may be relevant to this aquifer.

Question: Does recharge get through the Ships clay? Answer: We will hopefully know more about that as we begin work on the conceptual model.

Name	Organization
Cindy Ridgeway	Texas Water Development Board
Philip Price	Brazos River Authority
Evan Cook	Brazos River Authority
Robert Thompson	Harris-Galveston Subsidence District & Fort Bend Subsidence District
Bobby Bazan	Post Oak Savannah GCD
David Studt	Brazos Valley GCD
Meredith Earwood	Student
Scooter Radcliffe	Southern Trinity GCD
Andrew Worsley	Southern Trinity GCD
Cynthia Lopez	Brazos Valley GCD
Alan M. Day	Brazos Valley GCD
John Melvin	Brazos Valley Groundwater Rights Association
Wade Oliver	INTERA
John Ewing	INTERA