

GAM RUN 12-024: PECAN VALLEY GROUNDWATER CONSERVATION DISTRICT MANAGEMENT PLAN

by Shirley C. Wade, Ph.D., P.G.
Texas Water Development Board
Groundwater Resources Division
Groundwater Availability Modeling Section
(512) 936-0883
December 5, 2012



The seal appearing on this document was authorized by Shirley C. Wade, P.G. 525 on December 5, 2012.

This page is intentionally blank

GAM RUN 12-024: PECAN VALLEY GROUNDWATER CONSERVATION DISTRICT MANAGEMENT PLAN

by Shirley C. Wade, Ph.D., P.G.
Texas Water Development Board
Groundwater Resources Division
Groundwater Availability Modeling Section
(512) 936-0883
December 5, 2012

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

Texas State Water Code, Section 36.1071, Subsection (h), 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. Information derived from groundwater availability models that shall be included in the groundwater management plan includes:

- the annual amount of recharge from precipitation to the groundwater resources within the district, if any;
- 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
- the annual volume of flow into and out of the district within each aquifer and between aquifers in the district.

The purpose of this report is to provide Part 2 of a two-part package of information from the TWDB to Pecan Valley Groundwater Conservation District to fulfill the requirements noted above. The groundwater management plan for the Pecan Valley Groundwater Conservation District is due for approval by the executive administrator of the TWDB before April 3, 2014.

This report discusses the methods, assumptions, and results from model runs using the groundwater availability models for the central portion of the Gulf Coast Aquifer and the southern portion of the Carrizo-Wilcox, Queen City, and Sparta aquifers. Tables 1 and 2 summarize the groundwater availability model data required by the statute, and Figures 1 and 2 show the area of the models from which the values in the tables were extracted. This model run replaces the results of GAM Run 08-38. GAM Run 12-024 meets current standards set after the release of GAM Run 08-38. If after review of the figures, Pecan Valley Groundwater Conservation District determines that the district boundaries used in the assessment do not reflect current conditions, please notify the Texas Water Development Board immediately. The TWDB has also approved, for planning purposes, the fully penetrating alternative model for the central portion of the Gulf Coast which is an alternative model that can have water budget information extracted for the district. Please contact the author of this report if a comparison report using this model is desired.

METHODS:

In accordance with the provisions of the Texas State Water Code, Section 36.1071, Subsection (h), the groundwater availability models for the central portion of the Gulf Coast Aquifer and the southern portion of the Carrizo-Wilcox, Queen City, and Sparta aquifers were run for this analysis. Water budgets within Pecan Valley Groundwater Conservation District for 1981 through 1999 were extracted 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, net inter-aquifer flow (upper), and net inter-aquifer flow (lower) for the portions of the aquifers located within the district are summarized in this report.

PARAMETERS AND ASSUMPTIONS:

Gulf Coast Aquifer

- Version 1.01 of the groundwater availability model for the central portion of the Gulf Coast Aquifer was used for this analysis. See Chowdhury and others (2004) and Waterstone and others (2003) for assumptions and limitations of the groundwater availability model.
- The model for the central section of the Gulf Coast Aquifer assumes partially penetrating wells in the Evangeline Aquifer due to a lack of data for aquifer properties in the lower section of the aquifer.

- This groundwater availability model includes four layers, which generally correspond to the aquifers that comprise the Gulf Coast Aquifer system (from top to bottom):
 1. the Chicot Aquifer,
 2. the Evangeline Aquifer,
 3. the Burkeville Confining Unit, and
 4. the Jasper Aquifer including parts of the Catahoula Formation.
- A combined water budget for the district was determined for the four layers listed above.
- The mean absolute error (a measure of the difference between simulated and measured water levels) in the entire model for 1999 is 26 feet, which is 4.6 percent of the hydraulic head drop across the model area (Chowdhury and others, 2004).

Carrizo-Wilcox, Queen City, and Sparta Aquifers

- Version 2.01 of the groundwater availability model for the southern part of the Carrizo-Wilcox, Queen City, and Sparta aquifers was used for this analysis. See Deeds and others (2003) and Kelley and others (2004) for assumptions and limitations of the groundwater availability model for the southern part of the Carrizo-Wilcox, Queen City, and Sparta aquifers.
- This groundwater availability model includes eight layers, which generally correspond to (from top to bottom):
 1. the Sparta Aquifer,
 2. the Weches Confining Unit,
 3. the Queen City Aquifer,
 4. the Reklaw Confining Unit,
 5. the Carrizo Aquifer,
 6. the Upper Wilcox Aquifer,
 7. the Middle Wilcox Aquifer, and
 8. the Lower Wilcox Aquifer.

- Of the eight layers listed above, individual water budgets for the district were determined for the combined layers of the Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer (Layers 5 through 8). The official boundaries for the Sparta Aquifer and the Queen City Aquifer do not extend within the district's boundaries.
- The root mean square error (a measure of the difference between simulated and actual water levels during model calibration) in the groundwater availability model is 33 feet for the Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer for the calibration period (1980 to 1990). The root mean square error is 48 feet for the Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer in the verification period (1991 to 1999) (Kelley and others, 2004). These root mean square errors are between seven and ten percent of the range of measured water levels (Kelley and others, 2004).
- Groundwater in the Carrizo-Wilcox, Queen City, and Sparta aquifers ranges from fresh to brackish in composition (Kelley and others, 2004). Groundwater with total dissolved solids concentrations of less than 1,000 milligrams per liter (mg/l) are considered fresh and total dissolved solids concentrations of 1,000 to 10,000 mg/l are considered brackish.

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 model results for the aquifers located within the district and averaged over the duration of the calibration and verification portion of the model runs in the district, as shown in Tables 1 and 2.

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

define the amount of leakage that occurs. “Inflow” to an aquifer from an overlying or underlying aquifer will always equal the “Outflow” from the other aquifer.


The information needed for the District’s management plan is summarized in Tables 1 and 2. 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 (Figures 1 and 2).

TABLE 1: SUMMARIZED INFORMATION FOR THE GULF COAST AQUIFER THAT IS NEEDED FOR PECAN VALLEY GROUNDWATER CONSERVATION DISTRICT’S GROUNDWATER MANAGEMENT PLAN. ALL VALUES ARE REPORTED IN ACRE-FEET PER YEAR AND ROUNDED TO THE NEAREST 1 ACRE-FOOT. THESE FLOWS MAY INCLUDE BRACKISH WATERS.

<i>Management Plan requirement</i>	<i>Aquifer or confining unit</i>	<i>Results</i>
Estimated annual amount of recharge from precipitation to the district	Gulf Coast Aquifer	9,832
Estimated annual volume of water that discharges from the aquifer to springs and any surface water body including lakes, streams, and rivers	Gulf Coast Aquifer	9,967
Estimated annual volume of flow into the district within each aquifer in the district	Gulf Coast Aquifer	1,854
Estimated annual volume of flow out of the district within each aquifer in the district	Gulf Coast Aquifer	10,652
Estimated net annual volume of flow between each aquifer in the district	Not Applicable	Not Applicable


TABLE 2: SUMMARIZED INFORMATION FOR THE CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER THAT IS NEEDED FOR PECAN VALLEY GROUNDWATER CONSERVATION DISTRICT'S GROUNDWATER MANAGEMENT PLAN. ALL VALUES ARE REPORTED IN ACRE-FEET PER YEAR AND ROUNDED TO THE NEAREST 1 ACRE-FOOT. THESE FLOWS MAY INCLUDE BRACKISH WATERS.

<i>Management Plan requirement</i>	<i>Aquifer or confining unit</i>	<i>Results</i>
Estimated annual amount of recharge from precipitation to the district	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer	0
Estimated annual volume of water that discharges from the aquifer to springs and any surface water body including lakes, streams, and rivers	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer	0
Estimated annual volume of flow into the district within each aquifer in the district	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer	346
Estimated annual volume of flow out of the district within each aquifer in the district	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer	317
Estimated net annual volume of flow between each aquifer in the district	From the Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer into the Reklaw Formation confining unit	16



gcd boundary date 08.22.12, glfc_c model grid date 10.13.11, county boundary date 02.02.11

FIGURE 1: AREA OF THE GROUNDWATER AVAILABILITY MODEL FOR THE CENTRAL PORTION OF THE GULF COAST AQUIFER FROM WHICH THE INFORMATION IN TABLE 1 WAS EXTRACTED (THE GULF COAST AQUIFER EXTENT WITHIN THE DISTRICT BOUNDARY).



gcd boundary date 08.22.12, qcsp_s model grid date 05.22.12, county boundary date 02.02.11

FIGURE 2: AREA OF THE GROUNDWATER AVAILABILITY MODEL FOR THE SOUTHERN PORTION OF THE CARRIZO-WILCOX, QUEEN CITY, AND SPARTA AQUIFERS FROM WHICH THE INFORMATION IN TABLE 2 WAS EXTRACTED (THE CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER EXTENT WITHIN THE DISTRICT BOUNDARY).

LIMITATIONS

The groundwater model(s) used in completing this analysis is the best available scientific tool that can be used to meet the stated objective(s). 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 historic 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 model 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:

- Chowdhury, Ali. H., Wade, S., Mace, R.E., and Ridgeway, C., 2004, Groundwater Availability Model of the Central Gulf Coast Aquifer System: Numerical Simulations through 1999- Model Report, 114 p.,
http://www.twdb.texas.gov/groundwater/models/gam/glfc_c/TWDB_Recalibration_Report.pdf.
- Deeds, N., Kelley, V., Fryar, D., Jones, T., Whallon, A.J., and Dean, K.E., 2003, Groundwater Availability Model for the Southern Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer: Contract report to the Texas Water Development Board, 452 p.,
http://www.twdb.texas.gov/groundwater/models/gam/czwx_s/CZWX_S_Full_Report.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.
- Kelley, V.A., Deeds, N.E., Fryar, D.G., and Nicot, J.P., 2004, Groundwater availability models for the Queen City and Sparta aquifers: Contract report to the Texas Water Development Board, 867 p.,
http://www.twdb.texas.gov/groundwater/models/gam/qcsp/QCSP_Model_Report.pdf.
- 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.
- Ridgeway, C.K., 2008, GAM Run 08-38: Texas Water Development Board, GAM Run 08-38 Report, 6 p.,
<http://www.twdb.texas.gov/groundwater/docs/GAMruns/GR08-38.pdf>.
- Waterstone Environmental Hydrology and Engineering Inc. and Parsons, 2003, Groundwater availability of the Central Gulf Coast Aquifer: Numerical Simulations to 2050, Central Gulf Coast, Texas Contract report to the Texas Water Development Board, 157 p.