DRAFT REPORT

May 31, 2016

Prepared for: Texas Water Development Board

Conceptual Model Report: Lower Rio Grande Valley Groundwater Transport Model

Prepared by:

MONTGOMERY & ASSOCIATES
Water Resource Consultants

Prepared in association with:

GSI ENVIRONMENTAL

William R. Hutchison
Independent Groundwater Consultant

esi Environmental Simulations Inc.

www.elmontgomery.com 520-881-4912 1550 East Prince Road, Tucson, Arizona 85719

May 31, 2016

CONCEPTUAL MODEL REPORT: LOWER RIO GRANDE VALLEY GROUNDWATER TRANSPORT MODEL

DRAFT

PREPARED FOR

TEXAS WATER DEVELOPMENT BOARD

PREPARED BY

STAFFAN SCHORR
Montgomery & Associates

WILLIAM R. HUTCHISON
Independent Groundwater Consultant

SORAB PANDAY
GSI Environmental, Inc.

JAMES RUMBAUGH
Environmental Simulations, Inc.

Contents

Executive Summary **1**

1 Introduction **3**

2 Overview of study area **6**
2.1 Physiography and Climate 6
2.2 Soils and Vegetation 7
2.3 Geologic Setting 9

3 Previous Studies **11**

4 Hydrogeologic Setting **13**
4.1 Hydrostratigraphy and Layering Framework 14
4.1.1 Chicot Aquifer *16*
4.1.2 Evangeline Aquifer *17*
4.1.3 Burkeville Confining Unit *17*
4.1.4 Jasper Aquifer *17*
4.1.5 Catahoula Confining System *18*
4.1.6 Yegua-Jackson Aquifer *18*
4.2 Groundwater Levels and Flow 19
4.2.1 Distribution of Groundwater Level Measurements *19*
4.2.2 Groundwater Levels and Flow through Time *20*
4.3 Recharge 22
4.3.1 Recharge from Precipitation *23*
4.3.2 Stream Channel Infiltration *24*
4.3.3 Seepage along the Surface Water Delivery System *24*
4.3.4 Deep Percolation of Irrigation Water *25*
4.4 Surface Water Network 26
4.4.1 River and Arroyo Flows *26*
4.4.2 Diversions and Surface Water Use *27*
4.4.3 Lakes, Reservoirs, and Springs *28*
4.5 Hydraulic Properties 28
4.5.1 Transmissivity and Hydraulic Conductivity *30*
4.5.2 Storage Properties *32*
4.6 Potential for Subsidence 33
4.7 Aquifer Discharge 33
4.7.1 Groundwater Withdrawals by Pumping *33*
4.7.2 Discharge to the Rio Grande and Arroyo Colorado *36*
4.7.3 Evapotranspiration *36*
4.7.4 Discharge to the Gulf of Mexico *37*
4.8 Groundwater Quality 37

5 Conceptual Model FOr Groundwater and Salinity 39
5.1 Historical Transient Conditions 40
5.2 Salinity 41

6 Future Improvements 42

7 Acknowledgements 43

8 References Cited 44

9 Acronyms & Abbreviations 48

Tables

Table 4.3.1. Estimated Seepage Loss from Surface Water Delivery System in Lower Rio Grande Valley

Table 4.5.1. Summary of Aquifer Properties for Lower Rio Grande Valley

Table 4.6.1. Annual Estimated Groundwater Pumping in Lower Rio Grande Valley: 1984 through 2013

Table 4.6.2. Recommended Brackish Groundwater Desalination Strategies

Table 4.6.3. Recommended Fresh Groundwater Strategies

Illustrations

Figure 1.0.1. Major Aquifers in Texas

Figure 1.0.2. Minor Aquifers in Texas

Figure 1.0.3. Lower Rio Grande Valley Study Area

Figure 1.0.4. Existing Brackish Groundwater Desalination Plants in Lower Rio Grande Valley

Figure 1.0.5. Recommended Brackish Groundwater Desalination Plants in Lower Rio Grande Valley

Figure 2.0.1. Regional Water Planning Area Boundaries in Lower Rio Grande Valley

Figure 2.0.2. Groundwater Conservation District Boundaries in Lower Rio Grande Valley

Illustrations – continued

Figure 2.0.3. Groundwater Management Area Boundaries in Lower Rio Grande Valley

Figure 2.0.4. Major and Minor Aquifers in Lower Rio Grande Valley

Figure 2.0.5. Previous Study Boundaries in the Lower Rio Grande Valley

Figure 2.1.1. Major Physiographic Features in the Study Area

Figure 2.1.2. Land Surface Elevation in Lower Rio Grande Valley

Figure 2.1.3. Surface Water Features and River Basins in Lower Rio Grande Valley

Figure 2.1.4. Climate Classifications for Lower Rio Grande Valley

Figure 2.1.5. Average Annual Temperature in Lower Rio Grande Valley

Figure 2.1.6. Average Annual Precipitation in Lower Rio Grande Valley

Figure 2.1.7. Average Monthly Precipitation at Selected Rain Gages in Lower Rio Grande Valley

Figure 2.1.8. Annual Precipitation in Lower Rio Grande Valley

Figure 2.1.9. Average Annual Net Lake Evaporation in Lower Rio Grande Valley

Figure 2.2.1. Hydrologic Soil Groups in Lower Rio Grande Valley

Figure 2.2.2. Vegetation Types in Lower Rio Grande Valley

Figure 2.2.3. Average Annual Actual Evapotranspiration in Lower Rio Grande Valley

Figure 2.3.1. General Structural Setting of Lower Rio Grande Valley Region

Figure 2.3.2a. Surficial Geology in Lower Rio Grande Valley

Figure 2.3.2b. Explanation for Surficial Geology in Lower Rio Grande Valley

Figure 4.1.1. Stratigraphic Column Showing Relationship between Gulf Coast Aquifer Units

Figure 4.1.2. Stratigraphic Column Showing Relationships between Catahoula Confining System Unit and Yegua-Jackson Aquifer Unit

Figure 4.1.3. Cross Section of Hydrostratigraphic Units in Lower Rio Grande Valley: Section B

Illustrations – continued

Figure 4.1.4. Hydrogeologic Sections A, B, and C

Figure 4.1.5. Outcrops of Aquifers in Lower Rio Grande Valley Study Area

Figure 4.1.6. Base Elevation Contours, Chicot Aquifer, Lower Rio Grande Valley Study Area

Figure 4.1.7. Thickness of the Chicot Aquifer, Lower Rio Grande Valley Study Area

Figure 4.1.8. Base Elevation Contours, Evangeline Aquifer, Lower Rio Grande Valley Study Area

Figure 4.1.9. Thickness of the Evangeline Aquifer, Lower Rio Grande Valley Study Area

Figure 4.1.10. Base Elevation Contours, Burkeville Confining Unit, Lower Rio Grande Valley Study Area

Figure 4.1.11. Thickness of the Burkeville Confining Unit, Lower Rio Grande Valley Study Area

Figure 4.1.12. Base Elevation Contours, Jasper Aquifer, Lower Rio Grande Valley Study Area

Figure 4.1.13. Thickness of the Jasper Aquifer, Lower Rio Grande Valley Study Area

Figure 4.1.14. Base Elevation Contours, Catahoula Confining System, Lower Rio Grande Valley Study Area

Figure 4.1.15. Thickness of the Catahoula Confining System, Lower Rio Grande Valley Study Area

Figure 4.1.16. Base Elevation Contours, Yegua-Jackson Aquifer, Lower Rio Grande Valley Study Area

Figure 4.1.17. Thickness of the Yegua-Jackson Aquifer, Lower Rio Grande Valley Study Area

Figure 4.2.1. Location of Wells with Groundwater Level Measurements in Chicot Aquifer

Figure 4.2.2. Location of Wells with Groundwater Level Measurements in Evangeline Aquifer

Figure 4.2.3. Location of Wells with Groundwater Level Measurements in Burkeville Confining Unit

Figure 4.2.4. Location of Wells with Groundwater Level Measurements in Jasper Aquifer

Figure 4.2.5. Groundwater Level Elevation Contours for Chicot Aquifer in Lower Rio Grande Valley

Illustrations – continued

Figure 4.2.6. Groundwater Level Elevation Contours for Evangeline Aquifer in Lower Rio Grande Valley

Figure 4.2.7. Groundwater Level Elevation Contours for Jasper Aquifer in Lower Rio Grande Valley

Figure 4.2.8. Locations of Selected Groundwater Level Hydrographs

Figure 4.2.9. Water Level Hydrographs for Selected Wells in the Chicot Aquifer, Lower Rio Grande Valley, Texas

Figure 4.2.10. Water Level Hydrographs for Selected Wells in the Evangeline Aquifer, Lower Rio Grande Valley, Texas

Figure 4.2.11. Water Level Hydrographs for Selected Wells in the Burkeville Aquifer, Lower Rio Grande Valley, Texas

Figure 4.2.12. Water Level Hydrographs for Selected Wells in the Jasper Aquifer, Lower Rio Grande Valley, Texas

Figure 4.3.1. Distribution of Average Annual Recharge in Lower Rio Grande Valley

Figure 4.3.2. Distribution of Recharge as Percentage of Annual Precipitation in Lower Rio Grande Valley

Figure 4.3.3. Irrigation Districts and Canal Networks in Lower Rio Grande Valley, Texas

Figure 4.4.1. Surface Water Features and River Basins in Lower Rio Grande Valley

Figure 4.4.2. Annual Streamflows Gains or Losses between Rio Grande Gages Lower Rio Grande Valley, Texas

Figure 4.4.3. Annual Streamflows along Arroyo Colorado Floodway in Lower Rio Grande Valley

Figure 4.4.4. Annual Diversions from the Rio Grande in Lower Rio Grande Valley

Figure 4.4.5. Annual Contributions to Rio Grande from Rio San Juan Irrigation District in Mexico, Lower Rio Grande Valley

Figure 4.4.6. Surface Water Use in Lower Rio Grande Valley

Figure 4.5.1. Distribution of Estimated Hydraulic Conductivity in Gulf Coast Aquifer Units in Lower Rio Grande Valley

Illustrations – continued

Figure 4.5.2. Distribution of Estimated Hydraulic Conductivity in Catahoula Confining System and Yegua-Jackson Aquifer in Lower Rio Grande Valley

Figure 4.5.3. Histograms of Estimated Hydraulic Conductivity for the Lower Rio Grande Valley Hydrostratigraphic Units

Figure 4.6.1. Annual Groundwater Pumping by County in Lower Rio Grande Valley: 1984 through 2013

Figure 4.6.2. Annual Groundwater Pumping by Water Use Sector in Lower Rio Grande Valley: 1984 through 2013

Figure 4.6.3. Groundwater Withdrawal Wells in Lower Rio Grande Valley, Texas

Figure 4.6.4. Population Density in Lower Rio Grande Valley, Texas

Figure 4.7.1. Total Dissolved Solids Concentrations, Chicot Aquifer, 1940 – 2014

Figure 4.7.2. Total Dissolved Solids Concentrations, Evangeline Aquifer, 1940 – 2014

Figure 4.7.3. Total Dissolved Solids Concentrations, Burkeville Aquifer, 1940 – 2014

Figure 4.7.4. Total Dissolved Solids Concentrations, Jasper Aquifer, 1940 – 2014

Figure 4.7.5. Selected Total Dissolved Solids Hydrographs for Gulf Coast Aquifer in Lower Rio Grande Valley

Figure 5.1.1. Conceptual Groundwater System for Lower Rio Grande Valley

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Gulf Coast Aquifer in the Lower Rio Grande Valley is an important groundwater resource in south Texas. Groundwater use in the valley is expected to increase in response to increased municipal demands. Much of the groundwater in the area is brackish (total dissolved solids [TDS] are greater than 1,000 milligrams per liter [mg/L]), and does not meet drinking water quality standards. To meet the expected municipal demand in the valley, an additional brackish groundwater supply of approximately 24,000 acre-feet per year (AF/yr) will be needed by 2070. Brackish groundwater is currently treated at seven desalination plants for municipal use in the Lower Rio Grande Valley. Additional desalination projects have been recommended in the 2016 Regional Water Plan for Region M.

A numerical groundwater availability model will be developed to simulate changes in groundwater quantity and quality in the Lower Rio Grande Valley aquifer system resulting from increased pumping necessary to meet current and future groundwater demands. A conceptual model must be developed to provide the foundation for construction of a groundwater availability model. This report summarizes the development of the conceptual hydrogeologic model for the Lower Rio Grande Valley groundwater transport model.

The conceptual model described herein provides the hydrogeologic framework and characterization of the groundwater system in the study area. This investigation involved evaluation of information regarding physiography, climate, hydrogeology, groundwater levels and groundwater movement, surface water features, recharge, hydraulic properties for the aquifer units, discharge (including well pumping), and groundwater quality (salinity).

The conceptual model for the Lower Rio Grande Valley groundwater system comprises twelve eastward-dipping hydrostratigraphic units, including (from top to bottom) the Gulf Coast Aquifer, the Catahoula Confining System, and the Yegua-Jackson Aquifer. The flow system is bounded by the Gulf of Mexico on the east and the aquifer extents on the west. The north boundary coincides with a groundwater flow line where no extensive pumping occurs. The south boundary is south of the Rio Grande to encompass portions of the Tamaulipas border region in northeastern Mexico.

The conceptual model includes two hydrogeologic conditions: initial conditions and transient conditions. The transient model period represents historical hydrogeologic conditions from 1984 through 2014. This time period was selected principally based on pumping and groundwater level data availability, and because it includes time before and after the start of brackish groundwater desalination operations in the valley. Initial conditions for the transient model represent conditions prior to 1984.

Regional groundwater movement in the Lower Rio Grande Valley is generally from the west to the east toward the Gulf of Mexico. Groundwater withdrawals by pumping, primarily for irrigation and municipal supply, began in the 1950s resulting in gradual decline in groundwater levels in the valley, except near the Rio Grande and in the northern portions of the valley. Groundwater pumping has generally increased during the transient model period. Water is diverted from the Rio Grande and conveyed to water users throughout the valley via a complex surface water delivery system. A portion of the diverted water recharges the underlying aquifers in the form of canal seepage and deep percolation of excess applied irrigation water. Aquifer recharge also occurs from percolation of precipitation. The Rio Grande has both gaining and losing streamflow conditions along its length within the valley, depending on groundwater conditions in the underlying aquifer units.

Salinity in the groundwater system is an important component of the conceptual model. Salinity in the Lower Rio Grande Valley has been extensive evaluated by the Texas Water Development Board (TWDB) Brackish Resources Aquifer Characterization System (BRACS) program. The distribution of the salinity zones and the relationships between zones is relatively complex, especially at shallow and intermediate depths within the aquifer system. Salinity generally increases with depth in the valley. Concentrations and distribution of TDS in the valley has remained relatively stable through time. However, increased pumping by the recommended brackish groundwater desalination plants and other future groundwater withdrawals could induce movement of brackish groundwater resulting in changes in salinity in areas of the valley.

1 INTRODUCTION

The Texas Water Development Board (TWDB) recognizes nine major aquifers and twenty-one minor aquifers in Texas (George and others, 2011). These aquifers are shown on **Figures 1.0.1 and 1.0.2**. Major aquifer produce large quantities of groundwater over large areas, and minor aquifers produce small quantities of groundwater over large areas or large quantities of groundwater over small areas. Groundwater models developed in Texas through the Groundwater Availability Model (GAM) program have been used in numerous ways to advance groundwater planning and management of the aquifers in the state. When the program began about 15 years ago, one of the program objectives was that the models were living tools that would be updated as data and modeling technology improved.

The Gulf Coast Aquifer in the Lower Rio Grande Valley (LRGV) is an important groundwater resource in south Texas. Groundwater use in the LRGV is expected to increase in response to increased municipal demands. A large portion of the groundwater in the valley is brackish and does not meet drinking water quality standards. Brackish groundwater typically contains total dissolved solids (TDS) concentrations between 1,000 and 10,000 milligrams per liter (mg/L) (Young and others, 2014; USGS, 2013). To meet the expected municipal demand in the valley, an additional brackish groundwater supply of approximately 24,000 acre-feet per year (AF/yr) will be needed by 2070 (Black & Veatch, 2015). Currently, brackish groundwater is treated at seven desalination plants for municipal use in the valley. Total capacity for the existing plants is approximately 22,300 AF/yr (Meyer and others, 2014). An additional 14 desalination projects are recommended in the 2016 Rio Grande (Region M) Regional Water Plan to treat the additional brackish groundwater needed to meet future demands by 2070 (Black & Veatch, 2015).

To facilitate further development of the aquifer, the southern portions of the Gulf Coast Aquifer (GCA) in the LRGV has been studied in recent years to better understand the quantity of groundwater in the aquifer and how groundwater levels might respond to increased pumping or reduced recharge due to drought conditions. This was a critical gap in developing a groundwater model of the system to simulate potential impacts of pumping on groundwater levels and salinity in the region.

The primary objective of this project is to develop a numerical model to simulate impacts of brackish groundwater pumping by the current and recommended future desalination plants in the Lower Rio Grande Valley. The study area is shown on **Figure 1.0.3**. Existing and recommended brackish groundwater desalination plants are shown on **Figures 1.0.4 and 1.0.5**, respectively. This model will build from three primary sources of data and information: (1) the Groundwater Availability Model for the Gulf Coast Aquifer in the Lower Rio Grande Valley (Chowdhury and Mace, 2007), (2) the hydrogeologic framework developed by Young and others (2010), and (3) groundwater quality data from the Brackish Resources Aquifer Characterization System (BRACS) database and the companion report (Meyer and others, 2014). The resulting numerical model developed for this project will provide the means to assess future impacts (both local and regional) from current pumping and projected increases in pumping, including evaluating surface-water impacts, the potential for ground subsidence and changes in groundwater quality that may occur in the area due to long-term withdrawal of groundwater, including the potential for seawater intrusion.

The model for this study will be developed specifically to address the objectives summarized above. The model domain extent and actively simulated aquifers were selected to encompass the current and proposed extractions of interest in the region. The model will be calibrated to observed annual conditions (groundwater levels and flows) from 1984-2014 because of maximum availability of reliable data beginning from 1984. The model will use annually averaged recharge and pumping stresses because of the long-term nature of the objectives (evaluation of impacts of increasing brackish water pumping in the region) and the slow movement of brackish water in an aquifer. The model will be applied to evaluate impacts on groundwater levels and total dissolved solids movement into the future resulting from various pumping scenarios. The predictive simulation time-span for these scenario evaluations will be 50 years (2015 through 2065) to evaluate the resource over a 50-year planning period.

This project is conducted in three phases. Phase 1 is the development of the conceptual hydrogeologic model of the Lower Rio Grande Valley aquifer system in support of the numerical model. Phase 2 is the development and calibration of the numerical groundwater flow and transport model that will be used to evaluate future groundwater conditions in the valley. Phase 3 is the simulation and evaluation of future scenarios of groundwater production, including brackish groundwater desalination operations.

This conceptual model provides the hydrogeologic framework and characterization of the groundwater system in the Lower Rio Grande Valley study area. This investigation involved evaluation of information regarding physiography, climate, hydrogeology, groundwater levels and groundwater movement, surface water features, recharge, hydraulic properties for the aquifer units, discharge (including well pumping), and groundwater quality (salinity).

This report summarizes the conceptual hydrogeologic model developed for the Lower Rio Grande aquifer system for Phase 1 of this project. An overview of the study area is provided in **Chapter 3**. The hydrostratigraphy of the aquifer system in the valley is described in detail in **Chapter 5**. Groundwater inflow and outflow components of in conceptual model are summarized in **Chapter 6**. The information provided in this report will be used to develop the numerical groundwater model in Phase 2 of this project.

2 OVERVIEW OF STUDY AREA

The study area for this investigation is located principally in the Lower Rio Grande Valley in south Texas (**Figure 1.0.3**). The area includes all or portions of Starr, Hidalgo, Willacy, Cameron, Zapata, Jim Hogg, Brooks, and Kenedy counties in Texas in the United States, as well as northeastern portions of the state of Tamaulipas, Mexico. Texas groundwater administrative areas located within the study area are shown on **Figures 2.01 through 2.0.3**. The boundaries for these areas were obtained from TWDB (2016a). The study area extends across portions of two Regional Water Planning Areas (**Figure 2.0.1**): the Rio Grande Region (Region M) and the Coastal Bend Region (Region N). Four Groundwater Conservation Districts (GCD) are located within the study area (**Figure 2.0.2**): Brush Country GCD, Kenedy County GCD, Red Sands GCD, and Starr County GCD. In addition, the study area extends across the southern portions of Groundwater Management Area 16 (**Figure 2.0.3**). The study area was delineated based on hydrologic boundaries, lateral extents of aquifers, and locations of pumping centers. The west boundary is the western extent of the aquifers in the valley where future pumping for desalination operations might occur (Gulf Coast Aquifer and underlying Yegua-Jackson Aquifer). The boundaries of the Gulf Coast and Yegua-Jackson aquifers within the Lower Rio Grande Valley, as delineated by TWDB (2016a), are shown on **Figure 2.0.4**. The east boundary is delineated 10-miles offshore from the coastline to include groundwater flow through the aquifer system and into the Gulf of Mexico. The north boundary is approximately at the location of a groundwater flow line through Jim Hogg, Brooks, and Kenedy counties, and is drawn to avoid major pumping centers. The south boundary extends south of the Rio Grande to simulate potential influence from groundwater pumping in Mexico on groundwater conditions in Texas. This study area extends farther to the north, south, and west than the previous groundwater management area (GAM) developed by Chowdhury and Mace (2007), as shown on **Figure 2.0.5**).

2.1 Physiography and Climate

The Lower Rio Grande Valley area is a broad, flat upland plain extending westward from the Gulf of Mexico to the central portions of Starr County. The Bordas Escarpment marks the western extent of the plain (Baker and Dale, 1964). The area rises from sea level at the gulf to more than 700 feet above mean sea level (amsl) along the Bordas Escarpment in Jim Hogg County (**Figure 2.1.1**). Near the southern portions of the escarpment, the plain slopes generally to the

southeast. Digital elevation model (DEM) datasets (1 arc-second resolution, or 30 meters) were obtained for the study area from United States Geological Survey (USGS) National Elevation Datasets. Land surface elevation in the study area is shown on **Figure 2.1.2**.

Surface water features in the study area are shown on **Figure 2.1.3**. The major river basins in the valley are the Rio Grande Basin and the Nueces-Rio Grande Basin. The Rio Grande flows along the southern margins of the study area and empties into the Gulf of Mexico. The gradient of the river is smaller than the slope of the upland plain to the north, except near the gulf where the river lowland and the upland plain merge into the delta of the Rio Grande (Baker and Dale, 1964).

The climate in the valley varies from subtropical to semi-arid, as shown on **Figure 2.1.4**. Thirty-year averages for precipitation and temperature were computed using climate data obtained from the PRISM Climate Group (Daly and others, 2008). Average annual temperatures range slightly over the study area from about 71 degrees in the north to about 75 degrees in the south, as shown on **Figure 2.1.5**.

Average annual precipitation in the valley increases from about 19 inches in the southwest to about 28 inches in the east along the coast, as shown on **Figure 2.1.6**. Average monthly precipitation for selected rain gage sites cross the valley is shown on **Figure 2.1.7**. Rainfall occurs mostly from thunderstorms in the spring and occasional hurricanes in the late summer and fall. These storms often generate large amounts of rainfall over short periods of time, which results in flooding due to the relatively flat terrain of the region (Black & Veatch, 2015). Total average annual precipitation for the study area for 1980 through 2013 is shown on **Figure 2.1.8**.

Information on net lake evaporation was obtained from the TWDB (2016b) for 1-degree quadrangles in the study area. Net lake evaporation across the valley is shown on **Figure 2.1.9**. Average annual net lake evaporation ranges from about 60 to 65 inches along the coast to about 61 inches in the upland areas.

2.2 Soils and Vegetation

Hydrologic Soil Groups (NRCS, 2007) were classified from SSURGO soils using the National Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) Soil Data Viewer. The NRCS defines Hydrologic Soil Groups as:

> *Hydrologic soil groups are based on estimates of runoff potential. Soils are assigned to one of four groups according to the rate of water infiltration when the soils are not protected by vegetation, are thoroughly wet, and receive precipitation from long-duration storms. The soils in the United States are assigned to four groups (A, B, C, and D) and three dual classes (A/D, B/D, and C/D). The groups are defined as follows: Group A. Soils having a high infiltration rate (low runoff potential) when thoroughly wet. These consist mainly of deep, well drained to excessively drained sands or gravelly sands. These soils have a high rate of water transmission. Group B. Soils having a moderate infiltration rate when thoroughly wet. These consist chiefly of moderately deep or deep, moderately well drained or well drained soils that have moderately fine texture to moderately coarse texture. These soils have a moderate rate of water transmission. Group C. Soils having a slow infiltration rate when thoroughly wet. These consist chiefly of soils having a layer that impedes the downward movement of water or soils of moderately fine texture or fine texture. These soils have a slow rate of water transmission. Group D. Soils having a very slow infiltration rate (high runoff potential) when thoroughly wet. These consist chiefly of clays that have a high shrink-swell potential, soils that have a high water table, soils that have a claypan or clay layer at or near the surface, and soils that are shallow over nearly impervious material. These soils have a very slow rate of water transmission. If a soil is assigned to a dual hydrologic group (A/D, B/D, or C/D), the first letter is for drained areas and the second is for undrained areas. Only the soils that in their natural condition are in group D are assigned to dual classes.*

The hydrologic soil groups in the study area are shown on **Figure 2.2.1**. Moderately fine- to fine-grained soils with moderate to slow infiltration rates occur throughout the majority of the valley. Areas with sands and gravels with high infiltration rates are present in the north in Brooks and Kenedy counties, and areas with clayey soils with very slow infiltration rates occur in the south along the Rio Grande in Hidalgo and Cameron counties and western Starr County.

Savannas are common in the Lower Rio Grande Valley. The most dominant tree species are mesquite, which occurs as scattered individuals or as a canopy species overtopping shrub undergrowth, along with Texas paloverde, and Texas ebony overtopping brush species (Weakley and others, 2000; Chowdhury and Mace, 2007). According to the Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, the dominant vegetation types in the valley are crops, oak and mesquite woodlands, and brush

and grassland areas. Marsh lands occur along the coastal areas and barrier islands. Vegetation types are shown on **Figure 2.2.2**.

Scanlon and others (2012) evaluated evapotranspiration (ET) across the entire Gulf Coast region, including the Lower Rio Grande Valley. The study used thermal imagery and reference ET calculations to determine actual ET throughout the region. Reference ET was estimated using historical climate records from the Texas ET network stations in the region. Annual actual ET in the Lower Rio Grande Valley ranges from approximately 12 inches per year (in/yr) principally in the western portions of the valley (central Jim Hogg County and Hidalgo County) to more than 40 in/yr in areas along the Rio Grande, near the coastline in Cameron and Kenedy counties, and the central Brooks County in the north. Actual ET in the valley is relatively low compared to other Gulf Coast areas to the north due to limited water availability. The distribution of average annual actual evapotranspiration in Lower Rio Grande Valley is shown on **Figure 2.2.3**. Areas with relatively large actual ET rates generally coincide with live oak woodlands in Brooks and Kenedy counties, crop lands in Hidalgo and Cameron counties, and mesquite brush lands along the Rio Grande. Areas with relatively low actual ET rates generally coincide with urban areas and bare crop land in Hidalgo, Jim Hogg, and Willacy counties.

2.3 Geologic Setting

The Lower Rio Grande Valley is underlain by deposits of sand, silt, and clay of nonmarine to marine origin ranging in age from early Tertiary period in western Starr County to the recent near the Rio Grande and the Gulf Coast (65 million years ago to present) (Baker and Dale, 1964). Periodic fluctuations in sea levels and changes in sediment source areas resulted in a heterogeneous assemblage of river, windblown, and lake sediments onto a delta (Galloway, 1977). Coarser-grained fluvial and deltaic sand, silt, and clay predominate in inland areas near the sediment source areas and grade into finer brackish and marine sediments in offshore areas. The formations dip to the east toward the coast and crop out in “belts” parallel to it, with outcrops of the older units present in the western portions of the valley and outcrops of the younger units successively present near the coast (Baker and Dale, 1964).

Subsidence of the basin and a simultaneous rise of the land surface was caused by isostatic adjustment, and resulted in a progressive thickening of the stratigraphic units toward the Gulf. Syn-depositional faulting (growth faults) contributed to additional sediment thickness over short, lateral distances. Major growth faults in

eastern Willacy and Cameron counties extend into the base of the Gulf Coast Aquifer (Ewing, 1991). Growth faults to the west penetrate deeper formations and their potential connection to the Gulf Coast Aquifer is unknown. Structural features have an important control over the oil and gas deep below land surface; however, these faults and folds are less apparent at shallow depths (Baker and Dale, 1964). The regional structural setting of the Lower Rio Grande Valley area is shown on **Figure 2.3.1**. The only identified fault in the valley is the Sam Fordyce Fault, which is not known to affect the quality or movement of groundwater (Bake and Dale, 1964).

Surficial geology in the study area is shown on **Figure 2.3.2a**. Recent alluvium and fluvial deposits cover subcrop areas of older, dipping units in the northern and southern portions of the valley. The dipping geologic units outcrop in the central and eastern portions of the valley. Surficial geology for the study area was obtained from two reports by the USGS. The geology north of the Rio Grande was compiled by the USGS for the Geologic Database of Texas (USGS, 2007), while the geology south of the Rio Grande was described by Page and others (2005). Explanations for the geologic map are included on **Figure 2.3.2b**.

3 PREVIOUS STUDIES

Numerous hydrogeologic studies have been conducted since the 1930s for the Lower Rio Grande Valley area. This investigation relies heavily on the hydrogeologic interpretations and results of Baker and Dale (1964), Young and others (2010), and Meyer and others (2014) for the Gulf Coast Aquifer. Information from Deeds and others (2010) and Knox and others (2007) was used in this study to characterize the hydrostratigraphic framework for the Catahoula Confining System and the Yegua-Jackson Aquifer, which overlain by the Gulf Coast Aquifer.

Young and others (2010) evaluated the hydrostratigraphy of the Gulf Coast Aquifer and developed the hydrostratigraphic sequence used for subsequent TWDB studies of the aquifer system. Most of the hydrostratigraphic framework datasets that were develop for this investigation for unit extents, formation base elevations, and formation thickness were derived from the datasets provided by Young and others (2010) and included in the TWDB geographic information systems (GIS) datasets for framework of the southern and central portions of the Gulf Coast Aquifer.

Meyer and others (2014) compiled data from wells and geophysical well logs for geology, groundwater chemistry, groundwater level and aquifer tests to characterize groundwater conditions in the Gulf Coast Aquifer in the Lower Rio Grande Valley (**Figure 2.0.4**). This information is included in the TWDB BRACS database to facilitate the planning of desalination projects in the region. The study delineated 21 different regions with unique salinity profiles based on TDS concentrations and depth within the aquifer system. The distribution of the salinity zones and relationships between them is relatively complex, with intermingling areas of groundwater with different salinity ranges.

Multiple groundwater models have been constructed since the 1980s for the Gulf Coast Aquifer, including the portions of the Lower Rio Grande Valley (**Figure 2.0.4**). The previous GAM for the project area was developed by the TWDB in 2007 (Chowdhury and Mace, 2007) to assist in estimating groundwater availability and groundwater level responses due to future drought and pumping. The GAM was developed using the finite difference groundwater flow modeling code MODFLOW-96. The model consists of four layers, which represent the four main aquifer units. Grid cells have uniform dimensions of 1-mile by 1-mile. The steady-state model was calibrated to mean annual water level data from 1930

through 1980, and the transient model was calibrated to seasonal water level data from 1980 through 2000. Predictive simulations from 2000 through 2050 were implemented for projected future water demands for drought conditions from the 2001 regional water plans and included drought-of-record recharge conditions. Concerns with the current GAM include the lack of transport modeling capabilities to address water quality concerns, inadequate representation of groundwater-surface water interactions, and coarse model grid cell dimensions.

4 HYDROGEOLOGIC SETTING

The hydrogeologic setting summarizes the information required for the development of the conceptual groundwater model. This section provides information on the hydro stratigraphic layering framework, groundwater levels and flows, recharge, discharge, groundwater-surface water interactions, aquifer hydraulic properties, and groundwater quality in terms of salinity.

The Lower Rio Grande Valley study area is located over the southern portions of the Gulf Coast Aquifer, a major aquifer that extends from the Texas-Mexico international border in the south to Louisiana and beyond in the north. As described in Meyer and others (2014), sediments of the Gulf Coast Aquifer are Cenozoic in age and were deposited in fluvial-deltaic or shallow marine depositional environments influenced by sediment input, basin subsidence, erosion, sediment compaction and movement, and sea-level fluctuations. Brown and Loucks (2009) identified numerous sedimentary sequences within formations of the Gulf Coast Aquifer containing multiple unconformities. The sequences consist of discontinuous sand, silt, clay, and gravel deposits that have been influenced by syn- and post-depositional growth faults and by movement of salt domes, which occur in parts of the Gulf Coast Aquifer. Formations within the study area were deposited within the Rio Grande embayment (**Figure 2.3.1**), which is a broad structural depression. Accumulation of sediment within the Rio Grande embayment was focused along persistent extrabasinal fluvial axes that extended the coastal margin seaward during the Cenozoic Era (Galloway and others, 2000).

Young and others (2010) described the Gulf Coast Aquifer as the following:

> *The Gulf Coast Aquifer in Texas encompasses all stratigraphic units above the Vicksburg Formation (Ashworth and Hopkins, 1995). The lowermost stratigraphic unit is the Catahoula Formation (including the Frio and Anahuac in the deep subsurface), which is an aquitard everywhere except near the outcrop (Wood et al., 1963). In the overlying Fleming Group, the Oakville Sandstone is approximately equivalent to the Jasper Aquifer and the Lagarto Clay to the Burkeville Aquitard (Wesselman, 1967; Baker, 1979). The Goliad, Willis, and Lissie Formations, which contain most of the fresh-water resources in the Gulf Coast Aquifer (Wood et al., 1963), are the focus of this description. The Goliad Formation is approximately equivalent to the Evangeline Aquifer,*

although the Evangeline includes some underlying Fleming sands locally (Baker, 1979). The Chicot Aquifer comprises all sands between the top of the Evangeline and the land surface (Baker, 1979). Although Pliocene-Pleistocene stratigraphy in the shallow subsurface of the Texas Coastal Plain is complex, the primary components of the Chicot Aquifer are the Willis, Lissie, and Beaumont Formations (Ashworth and Hopkins, 1995). In southeast Texas, the Montgomery and Bentley Formations are approximately equivalent to the Lissie Formation (Baker, 1979; Dutton and Richter, 1990).

The Gulf Coast Aquifer is underlain by the Catahoula Confining System and the Yegua-Jackson Aquifer, which outcrop in the western margins of the study area. The Catahoula Confining System is below the base of the Jasper Aquifer unit of the Gulf Coast Aquifer, and overlies the Yegua-Jackson Aquifer, which is a minor aquifer in Texas. Limited hydrogeologic information is available for the Catahoula Confining System. Deeds and others (2010) describe the Yegua-Jackson Aquifer as comprising intervals of alternating sand- and clay-rich intervals in the Upper Claiborne Group (Yegua and Cook Mountain formations) and the overlying Jackson Group (Caddel, Wellborn, Manning, and Whitsett formations). These units dip toward the modern coastline and were deposited as part of the progressive filling of the Gulf of Mexico basin by sediments from the mountains in northern Mexico, the Rocky Mountains, and other areas of Texas and the western part of the North American continental interior. Sediments of the Yegua-Jackson Aquifer dip more steeply toward the gulf than the current land surface due to gradual subsidence caused by sediment deposition at the edges of the basin. Subsequent sediment deposition has outpaced the slow subsidence; thus, the current shoreline occurs farther toward the center of the Gulf of Mexico than the position of the shoreline that existed during Yegua-Jackson Aquifer deposition.

4.1 Hydrostratigraphy and Layering Framework

Hydrostratigraphy refers to the layering of aquifers and associated confining units of a study area. Hydrostratigraphic units (HSUs) are geologic sub-units with similar hydrogeologic properties or geologic units with distinct hydrogeologic properties. The hydrostratigraphic framework of an aquifer system is the elevation surfaces of the top and bottom of the hydrostratigraphic units in chronostratigraphic order.

The hydrostratigraphy evaluated for the Lower Rio Grande Valley groundwater model comprises hydrogeologic units within the Gulf Coast Aquifer, the Catahoula Confining System, and the Yegua-Jackson Aquifer. The hydrostratigraphy of the Gulf Coast Aquifer for this investigation is based principally on interpretations by Young and others (2010). The Gulf Coast Aquifer comprises following aquifer units, from shallowest to deepest: the Chicot Aquifer, the Evangeline Aquifer, the Burkeville Confining Unit, and the Jasper Aquifer. These aquifer units were further subdivided into subaquifer layers by Young and others (2010) based on chronostratigraphic correlation of geologic formations, as previously described. The stratigraphic column of the Gulf Coast Aquifer is presented on **Figure 4.1.1**. The hydrostratigraphy of the Catahoula Confining System and the Yegua-Jackson Aquifer is based on information provided by Knox and others (2007), Deeds and others (2010), and Young and others (2010). The stratigraphic column of the Catahoula Confining System and the Yegua-Jackson Aquifer is presented on **Figure 4.1.2**.

The hydrostratigraphic framework for the Lower Rio Grande Valley groundwater model is principally based on geospatial datasets developed by Young and others (2010), which are included in the framework datasets for the southern and central portions of the Gulf Coast Aquifer provided by TWDB. These datasets include geospatial information representing unit extents and contacts between hydrostratigraphic units in the project area.

A continuous three-dimensional (3D), volumetric representation of the hydrostratigraphic framework for the Lower Rio Grande Valley aquifer system was prepared using the geologic modeling software Leapfrog® Geo, developed by ARANZ Geo Limited. The Leapfrog geologic model was prepared using the framework geospatial datasets for unit base elevations and extent polylines from Young and others (2010) for the Gulf Coast Aquifer. The unit contacts were verified using well borehole lithologic information from the TWDB BRACS database. The outcrop or subcrop extents of some of the units were adjusted slightly to guide the development of the 3D geologic model. Surficial geology maps and elevation trends inherent in the framework datasets were used to guide the interpolation of the Gulf Coast Aquifer units south of the Rio Grande, which were not included in the Young and others (2010) datasets. The 3D representation for the underlying Catahoula Confining System and the Yegua-Jackson Aquifer were developed based on published cross-sections and descriptions by Knox and others (2007), Deeds and others (2010), and Young and others (2010), and, to a lesser degree, limited well borehole lithologic information from the BRACS database. Due to lack of data, the down-dip gradients of these

units were delineated to be the same as the gradient of the base of the Jasper Aquifer, and down-dip thicknesses were assumed to be the same as the up-dip portions the units.

The hydrostratigraphic framework for the Lower Rio Grande Valley groundwater model is organized into the following layers (from top to bottom): Beaumont, Lissie, and Willis (Chicot Aquifer); Upper Goliad, Lower Goliad, and Upper Lagarto (Evangeline Aquifer); Middle Lagarto (Burkeville Confining Unit); Lower Lagarto, Oakville, and Upper Catahoula (Jasper Aquifer); Catahoula Confining System; and Upper Jackson, Lower Jackson, Upper Yegua, and Lower Yegua (Yegua-Jackson Aquifer). A cross-section of this detailed framework is presented on **Figure 4.1.3**. This detailed aquifer layering framework is likely required for the groundwater transport model in areas where gradients of salinity are high or expected to be high.

Simplified cross-sections showing the Chicot Aquifer, Evangeline Aquifer, Burkeville Confining Unit, Jasper Aquifer, Catahoula Confining System, and Yegua-Jackson Aquifer are presented on **Figure 4.1.4**. These sections were prepared to show the variation in layer structure and relationships between main aquifer units. The sections were intentionally oriented to be either parallel or perpendicular to the trends in the depositional bedding to illustrate the stacking of the generally wedge-shaped aquifer units.

The regional structural dip of the Gulf Coast Aquifer was estimated along a 100-mile-long, northwest-southeast transect line across the southern portions of the valley, based on the hydrostratigraphic framework for this investigation. The regional structural dip is approximately 31 feet per mile at the base of the Chicot Aquifer, 88 feet per mile at the base of the Evangeline Aquifer, 112 feet per mile at the base of the Jasper Aquifer, and approximately 135 feet per mile at the bases of both the Catahoula Confining Unit and the Yegua-Jackson Aquifer. The increase in dip with depth of the aquifer is the result of the increasing thickness of formations coastward.

The outcrop areas of the main aquifer units in the Lower Rio Grande Valley are shown on **Figure 4.1.5**. Each aquifer unit is described in the following sections.

4.1.1 Chicot Aquifer

The Chicot Aquifer includes the Beaumont, Lissie, and Willis formations, and the overlying recent alluvium deposits. This aquifer unit is composed of clay-rich sediments transected by sandy fluvial and deltaic-tributary channel deposits, fine-

grained sand and sandy clay, and several upward-fining successions containing gravely coarse sand. **Figure 2.1.2** shows the land surface elevation (top of the Chicot Aquifer), which ranges from about 750 feet amsl in the northwestern portions of the valley to sea level in the east. The bottom (base) elevations and thickness of the Chicot Aquifer are shown on **Figures 4.1.6 and 4.1.7**, respectively. The bottom elevation of the Chicot Aquifer is about sea level (zero feet amsl) in the central portions of the valley in western Brooks and Hidalgo counties and gradually decreases to about 3,500 feet below mean sea level (bmsl) in the east (**Figure 4.1.6**). The thickness of the Chicot Aquifer is about 3,500 feet in the east and thins to zero to the west (**Figure 4.1.7**).

4.1.2 Evangeline Aquifer

The Evangeline Aquifer includes the Upper Goliad, Middle Goliad, and Upper Lagarto formations. The aquifer unit contains thick sequences of sand with some intervals of sand and clay. The base elevation and thickness of the Evangeline Aquifer are shown on **Figures 4.1.8 and 4.1.9**, respectively. Base elevation of the Evangeline Aquifer ranges from about sea level in the western Jim Hogg and Starr counties to more than 10,000 feet bmsl in the east (**Figure 4.1.8**). The thickness of the Evangeline Aquifer ranges from more than 6,000 feet in the east and thins to zero to the west (**Figure 4.1.9**).

4.1.3 Burkeville Confining Unit

The Burkeville Confining Unit separates the Evangeline and Jasper aquifers, and comprises the Middle Lagarto unit. This unit is composed of silt and clay with isolated sand lenses, and is considered to act as a confining unit (Ryder, 1998; Chowdhury and Mace, 2007). The base elevation and thickness of the Burkeville Confining Unit are shown on **Figures 4.1.10 and 4.1.11**, respectively. Base elevation of the Burkeville Confining Unit ranges from about sea level in the central Jim Hogg and Starr counties to more than 11,500 feet bmsl in the east (**Figure 4.1.10**). The thickness of the Burkeville Confining Unit ranges from more than 1,400 feet in the east and thins to zero to the west (**Figure 4.1.11**).

4.1.4 Jasper Aquifer

The Jasper Aquifer comprises the Lower Lagarto, Oakville, and Upper Catahoula formations. This aquifer unit includes a sandy clay section below to Burkeville Confining Unit and the Oakville sandstone of the Fleming Group. Young and others (2010) grouped the sandy sections (at outcrop areas) of the Upper

Catahoula Formation with the Jasper Aquifer. However, for this investigation, these sections of the Catahoula Formation are grouped with the underlying Catahoula Confining System. The base elevation and thickness of the Jasper Aquifer are shown on **Figures 4.1.12 and 4.1.13**, respectively. Base elevation of the Jasper Aquifer ranges from about 500 feet amsl in the eastern Jim Hogg and Starr counties to more than 13,500 feet bmsl in the east (**Figure 4.1.12**). The thickness of the Jasper Aquifer ranges from more than 2,500 feet in the east and thins to zero to the west (**Figure 4.1.13**).

4.1.5 Catahoula Confining System

The Gulf Coast Aquifer overlies the Catahoula Confining System and the Yegua-Jackson Aquifer. Although most groundwater production in the valley occurs from the Gulf Coast Aquifer, these underlying units are included in this study because the 2016 Regional Water Plan for Region M, prepared by Black & Veatch (2015), recommended a brackish groundwater desalination plant near Rio Grande City. Based on the proposed location of the Rio Grande City desalination plant, pumping would likely occur from the upper portions of the Catahoula Confining System. Limited information is available for characterizing these aquifer units in the Lower Rio Grande Valley study area, especially in the deep, down-dip portions of the aquifer system.

The Catahoula Confining System comprises the Anahuac, Frio, and Vicksburg Formations. This confining unit is a thick sequence of clay-rich sediments, except near the outcrop where sandy sections occur (Wood and others, 1963; Young and others, 2010). The base elevation and thickness of the Catahoula Confining System are shown on **Figures 4.1.14 and 4.1.15**, respectively. Base elevation of the Catahoula Confining System ranges from about 500 feet amsl in the northwestern portions of the valley to more than 16,000 feet bmsl in the east (**Figure 4.1.14**). The thickness of the Catahoula Confining System ranges from more than 2,500 feet in the east and thins to zero to the west (**Figure 4.1.15**).

4.1.6 Yegua-Jackson Aquifer

The Yegua-Jackson Aquifer is composed of the Upper and Lower Jackson, and the Upper and Lower Yegua formations. This aquifer unit contains interbedded sand, silt, and clay (Deeds and others, 2010). The base elevation and thickness of the Yegua-Jackson Aquifer are shown on **Figures 4.1.16 and 4.1.17**, respectively. Base elevation of the Yegua-Jackson Aquifer ranges from about 2,000 feet bmsl in the eastern portions of the valley to more than 19,500 feet bmsl in the east

(**Figure 4.1.16**). The thickness of the Yegua-Jackson Aquifer ranges from more than 3,500 feet in the east and thins to about 2,000 feet to the west (**Figure 4.1.17**). The Yegua-Jackson Aquifer may not be included in the numerical model.

4.2 Groundwater Levels and Flow

Information for well locations, well construction, and groundwater level measurements was obtained from the TWDB groundwater database (TWDB, 2015) and the BRACS database (TWDB, 2016c). For many wells, the BRACS database includes the state identification number for linking to the groundwater database. This identification number was used to remove duplicate wells from the water level dataset. If no state identification number was available, well location coordinates were used to identify duplicate wells for the dataset. Any remaining wells were assumed to be unique wells and were included in the evaluation for this investigation. A total of 2,672 groundwater level measurement records are available from 623 wells located in the Lower Rio Grande Valley study area. The groundwater database provided measurement data for 410 wells and the BRACS database provided measurement data for an additional 213 wells. This conceptual model investigation uses groundwater level measurements collected during winter months (November through February) to evaluate regional annual conditions.

4.2.1 Distribution of Groundwater Level Measurements

Well screen information was compared to the hydrostratigraphic framework (base elevation surfaces) to determine which aquifer unit(s) the wells penetrate. If no information on screened interval was available for a well, the well was assumed to be fully screened to its reported well depth. This comparison resulted in 538 wells having screened intervals completed in a single hydrostratigraphic unit. Of these wells, 263 wells are completed in the Chicot Aquifer, 197 wells are completed in the Evangeline Aquifer, 4 wells are completed in the Burkeville Confining Unit, and 74 wells are completed in the Jasper Aquifer. In addition, 31 wells have screen intervals completed across multiple hydrostratigraphic units. Fifty-four (54) wells are not included in this evaluation because they lack well construction information for determining the aquifer they belong to. TWDB groundwater level data are not available in the study area for the Catahoula Confining System or the Yegua-Jackson Aquifer.

The spatial distribution of groundwater level measurements for the Chicot Aquifer, the Evangeline Aquifer, the Burkeville Confining Unit, and the Jasper

Aquifer are shown on **Figures 4.2.1 through 4.2.4** respectively. The majority of wells with groundwater level measurements for the Chicot Aquifer are located in the southern portions of the valley near the Rio Grande. Most wells penetrating the Evangeline Aquifer are located in Hidalgo County in the central portions of the valley. Wells penetrating both the Chicot and Evangeline aquifers are principally located in the northern portions of the valley. Wells penetrating the Burkeville Confining Unit and Jasper Aquifer are located principally at or near their respective outcrop areas in Starr and Jim Hogg counties.

4.2.2 Groundwater Levels and Flow through Time

Depths to groundwater range from at or near the surface along the coastline and the Rio Grande to about 200 feet in the western portions of the valley. Depths to groundwater range from 20 to 60 feet across most of the central portions of the valley.

The water table surface in the valley generally follows surface topography, with higher groundwater level elevations occurring in the upland areas in the west and northwest (Starr and Jim Hogg counties) and lower groundwater level elevations occurring in the lowland areas in the east towards the coastline.

Contours of regional groundwater level elevation were prepared for three time periods: (1) the early-1980s to represent initial conditions for the groundwater model transient calibration period; (2) the late-1990s to represent conditions immediately prior to the start of desalination operations in the valley; and (3) 2013-2014 to represent conditions at the end of the groundwater model calibration period. Groundwater level elevation contour maps for the Chicot, Evangeline, and Jasper aquifers are shown on **Figures 4.2.5 through 4.2.7**, respectively. Contours were not drawn for the Burkeville Confining Unit, the Catahoula Confining System, and the Yegua-Jackson due to the lack of data or limited spatial distribution of groundwater level measurements for those units.

The groundwater elevation contour maps show that regional groundwater movement in the valley is generally to the east from the upland areas in eastern portions of Starr and Jim Hogg counties towards the Gulf of Mexico in Cameron, Willacy, and Kenedy counties. Although no data exist for the Catahoula and Yegua-Jackson aquifer units, groundwater flow is assumed to be from west to east across the outcrop areas of these units into the Gulf Coast Aquifer system. The highest groundwater level elevations in the valley occur in areas where the Bordas Escarpment arises in the western portions of Star and Jim Hogg counties. In the

Chicot Aquifer, groundwater levels gradually decrease to nearly sea level in central Cameron, Willacy, and Kenedy counties. In the Evangeline Aquifer, hydraulic gradients are steep across the eastern portions of Starr and Jim Hogg counties and flatten substantially in eastern Hidalgo and Brooks counties (**Figure 4.2.6**). The steep hydraulic gradient is probably the result of the decrease in topographic elevations from the Bordas Escarpment toward the coastal plain (Chowdhury and Mace, 2007). Regional groundwater level elevations and movement in northern Mexico within the study area are assumed to be similar to conditions in Texas immediately north of the Rio Grande.

Streamflow losses or gains in different reaches of the Rio Grande are indicated by the shape of groundwater level contours along the river. Contours that bend upstream indicate that groundwater moves away from the river, resulting in losing streamflow conditions (river water infiltrates the channel bed and recharges the underlying aquifer). Contours that bend downstream indicate groundwater moves towards the river, resulting in gaining streamflow conditions (groundwater moves from the underlying aquifer into the river). The Rio Grande switches from a net gaining stream in Starr County to a new losing stream in central Hidalgo County and then switches back to a gaining stream again near Brownsville (Chowdhury and Mace, 2007). The regional groundwater level contours produced for this conceptual model suggest that the river has gaining streamflow in the west and losing streamflow in the east. However, too few data exist to verify this occurrence on a local scale.

Inspection of groundwater level data and results of previous studies suggest that regional hydraulic connections occur between the aquifers in the valley. The similarity of groundwater levels in the Chicot and Evangeline aquifers suggests that the two aquifers are hydraulically connected. Groundwater level elevations are larger in the Evangeline Aquifer than the overlying Chicot Aquifer in southwestern Hidalgo County and western Willacy County (**Figures 4.2.5 and 4.2.6**), which suggests that upward cross-formational flows occur in those areas. Simulation results from the Chowdhury and Mace (2007) groundwater model indicate that cross-formational flows are a substantial component of the total flow in the units of the Gulf Coast Aquifer, especially between the Evangeline and Chicot aquifers. The model results suggests that groundwater in the Chicot Aquifer in the down-dip areas could be composed of large fluxes of older saline water mixed with younger, fresher water. In the relatively small areas where data exist in both the Evangeline and Jasper aquifers, groundwater level contours suggest that a hydraulic connection occurs between the two aquifers, despite the presence of the Burkeville Confining Unit. No groundwater level data exist for

the deep, down-dip portions of the Jasper Aquifer. Simulation results from the groundwater model developed by Chowdhury and Mace (2007) indicate that an upward vertical gradient exists between the Jasper Aquifer and Burkeville Confining Unit in the deep, down-dip portions of the aquifer system near the Gulf of Mexico.

Changes in groundwater levels were assessed using time-series contour maps (**Figures 4.2.5 through 4.2.7**) and hydrographs of groundwater levels from 1980 through 2014. As previously described, solely winter groundwater level elevations were evaluated for this conceptual model. Locations of selected wells with representative groundwater level hydrographs from measurements in the Chicot Aquifer, Evangeline Aquifer, Burkeville Confining Unit, and Jasper Aquifer are shown on **Figure 4.2.8**. The representative groundwater level hydrographs for these units are shown on **Figures 4.2.9 through 4.2.12**. Since the early-1980s, groundwater levels have remained fairly stable through time in the southern portions of the valley along the Rio Grande. Gradual groundwater level declines have occurred throughout most of the valley. In some areas, winter groundwater levels in the Gulf Coast Aquifer units have fluctuated by 10 to 20 feet during the 1980s and 1990s, presumably due principally to long-term variations in pumping from nearby wells and recharge from precipitation. No substantial groundwater level declines have occurred in the Yegua-Jackson Aquifer (George and others, 2011).

4.3 Recharge

Recharge to the Lower Rio Grande Valley aquifer system occurs from (1) percolation of precipitation in the outcrop areas, (2) stream channel infiltration along losing reaches of the Rio Grande and Arroyo Colorado, (3) seepage from the surface water delivery system (such as canals and laterals), and (4) deep percolation of excess irrigation water applied to crop fields in agricultural areas. Percolation of precipitation is the principal recharge mechanism in the valley. Aquifer recharge from Class II injection wells is assumed to be relatively small and is not considered in this investigation. Based on information provided by Meyer and others (2014) regarding Class II injection wells in the valley, most or all of the injection wells are for disposal of fluids associated with oil and gas operations and most injection occurs in hydrostratigraphic units below the Gulf Coast Aquifer. Future brackish groundwater desalination plants will dispose of brine solutions via surface water discharge instead of injection wells (Black & Veatch, 2015). The following sections describe the groundwater recharge mechanisms that occur in the valley.

4.3.1 Recharge from Precipitation

Groundwater recharge from percolation of precipitation is difficult to estimate on a regional scale. Research has been conducted to improve these estimates for the study area. Previous estimates of recharge rates for the Gulf Coast Aquifer vary substantially due to varied hydraulic conductivity, rainfall distribution, evapotranspiration rates, groundwater-surface water interactions, model grid cell size, and occurrence of caliche in outcrop areas (Chowdhury and Mace, 2007). Previous estimates of recharge rates for the aquifer range from at or nearly zero inches per year to 6 in/yr. Chowdhury and Mace (2007) calibrated recharge as a percent of precipitation for the previous groundwater availability model for the Lower Rio Grande Valley area. Calibrated recharge rates for that model ranged from 0.09 to 0.15 in/yr.

More recently, Scanlon and others (2012) used a chloride mass balance approach for estimating regional recharge throughout the Gulf Coast Aquifer, including the Lower Rio Grande Valley. This approach uses information from groundwater chloride data from wells located throughout the Gulf Coast Aquifer region, as well as data for precipitation, soil clay content, and land use. Based on results of the study, estimated recharge rates for the Lower Rio Grande Valley range from approximately 0.02 in/yr in the western portions of the valley to approximately 0.58 in/yr in the northeastern portions of the valley in Kenedy County and in southwestern Cameron County. The spatial distribution of estimated average annual recharge rates for the valley is shown on **Figure 4.3.1**. Estimated average annual recharge rates in the valley range from less than 0.25 percent of precipitation to about 2.2 percent of precipitation. The distribution of recharge represented as percentage of precipitation is shown on **Figure 4.3.2**. Regional recharge estimates based on groundwater chloride data should be considered a lower bound because various processes can add chloride to groundwater but no process can remove chloride from groundwater in the Gulf Coast Aquifer (Scanlon and others, 2012).

Areas outside the TWDB mapped Gulf Coast Aquifer, such as eastern Willacy and Cameron counties in the Lower Rio Grande Valley, were not evaluated for recharge by Scanlon and others (2012). Recharge in this area might be small due to the lack of aquifer shallow groundwater levels

4.3.2 Stream Channel Infiltration

Groundwater level information previously presented in **Section 4.2.2** indicates that the Rio Grande is a losing stream along reaches in southeastern Hidalgo County and Cameron County. Chowdhury and Mace (2007) estimate that water loss from the river ranges from approximately 460 AF/yr per mile in Hidalgo County to approximately 30 AF/yr per mile in Cameron County. Recharge along the Rio Grande was simulated to be approximately 9,800 AF/yr in the calibrated groundwater model by Chowdhury and Mace (2007). Water infiltration from the river likely fluctuates substantially depending on rainfall events, river stage, and changes in interactions between the surface water in the Rio Grande and groundwater in the adjacent aquifers.

No information is available on streamflow losses for the Arroyo Colorado. The arroyo could fluctuate between net gaining and net losing flow conditions due to changes in streamflows and stream stages (Chowdhury and Mace, 2007). Recharge along the Arroyo Colorado was simulated to be 34,900 AF/yr in the calibrated groundwater model by Chowdhury and Mace (2007).

4.3.3 Seepage along the Surface Water Delivery System

A complex network of canals, laterals, pipelines, and resacas (former distributary channels of the Rio Grande) are used to transport water diverted from the Rio Grande to irrigation, municipal, and industrial users in Hidalgo, Cameron, and Willacy counties. Geospatial datasets for the surface water delivery system in the Lower Rio Grande Valley were provided by TWDB for this investigation. The delivery system is shown on **Figure 4.3.3**. The “main delivery system” was approximated using a published map by Fipps (2004) showing the “municipal water supply system”; all other features are classified as “secondary” for this conceptual model. A portion of the water flowing through these delivery structures is lost to seepage. Seepage losses can be substantial and are dependent on the water stage within the structure and the characteristics of the conveyance infrastructure. The main delivery system in the valley includes approximately 798 miles of canals, 123 miles of pipelines, and 76 miles of resacas. In addition, there are approximately 429 miles of canals and 973 miles of pipelines in the secondary and tertiary delivery network (Chowdhury and Mace, 2007).

Fipps (2004) evaluated seepage losses from the municipal water supply network of the Lower Rio Grande Valley. Of the total water delivery system, the portion that conveys water to municipal users includes 92 miles of lined canals, 168 miles

of unlined canals, 25 miles of pipelines, and 377 miles of resacas (**Figure 4.3.3**). Results of that study indicated that total estimated seepage losses ranges from 0.15 to 3.14 gallons per square foot per day for unlined canals and from 0.25 to 4.62 gallons per square foot per day for lined canals. These estimates are based on ponding tests, which might not accurately represent the actual leakage into the groundwater as gates and valves in the blocked section of the canal could also have been leaking during the test. Estimated seepage were calculated by taking the low- and high-end loss rates, assuming parabolic and rectangular shapes for canals with an unknown shape, and then multiplying by the actual dimensions of each canal component (Fipps, 2004). Estimated seepage from the municipal delivery network ranged from 42 to 826 acre-feet per day (AF/day) (16,802 to 301,697 AF/yr).

Following the methodology outlined by Fipps (2004), estimated seepage from the entire surface water delivery network (main, secondary, and tertiary infrastructure) was computed using the reported low- and high-end seepage loss ranges previously described for the municipal delivery network. All canals were assumed to be rectangular in cross-sectional shape. Due to limited information available to accurately determine the geometry of each canal, the reported width of the top of canal was used to represent the width where seepage occurs. The total area of canals was computed by multiplying the total length of each canal type by the average top width of the respective canal type. The low- and high-end seepage loss rates from Fipps (2004) were then used to estimate total seepage from the entire water delivery system in the valley. A summary of estimated annual seepage losses from the entire surface water delivery system is shown in **Table 4.3.1**.

Chowdhury and Mace (2007) briefly summarize results of “cylinder tests” conducted for previous studies along sections of the canal network. Results from 40 cylinder tests provided an average seepage loss rate of 0.03 feet per day (ft/day).

4.3.4 Deep Percolation of Irrigation Water

A portion of irrigation water applied to agricultural fields commonly seeps beyond the root zone of the crops and percolates to the underlying aquifer. This deep percolation of irrigation water is an additional source of recharge to the aquifer system in the Lower Rio Grande Valley. Jorgenson (1975) estimated that as much as 30 percent of irrigation groundwater pumping returned to the Chicot Aquifer (Chowdhury and Mace, 2007).

4.4 Surface Water Network

Surface water features in the Lower Rio Grande Valley area are shown on **Figure 2.3.1**, and summarized in **Section 2.3**. Important features within the valley include the Rio Grande, the Arroyo Colorado, a complex surface water delivery system, and several lakes and reservoirs. The following sections describe the surface water network in the valley.

4.4.1 River and Arroyo Flows

The Rio Grande flows approximately 274 miles across the southern portions of the Lower Rio Grande Valley study area from the Falcon Reservoir dam to the Gulf of Mexico. The river represents the international border between the United States and Mexico (**Figure 2.1.3**). Flows in the river are measured by the International Boundary Water Condition (IBWC) at several streamflow gages along the river in the valley. Daily streamflow data are available from the IBWC for 1958 through 2011. Annual streamflows are shown on **Figure 4.4.1** for three IBWC gages along the river within the valley: (1) 08-4613.00 Rio Grande below Falcon Dam, (2) 08-4692.00 Rio Grande below Anzalduas Dam, and (3) 08-4750.00 Rio Grande near Brownsville. Historical streamflow ranges from 0 to over 6,000,000 AF and generally decreases along the river with the largest decrease in flow near Brownsville. Average annual streamflow is 2,251,195 AF/yr at the Falcon Dam gage, 1,607,551 AF/yr at the Anzalduas Dam gage, and 682,315 AF/yr at the Brownsville gage.

An evaluation of gains and losses for each river reach for each year provides information about spatial and temporal streamflow changes along the river. **Figure 4.4.2** shows the difference in flow between the sequential gages (**Figure 4.4.1**) along the river from 1981 through 2011. Annual streamflows decrease between the Falcon Dam and the Anzalduas Dam and between the Anzalduas Dam and Brownsville in all years, except in 2004 when flows on the river gained between Falcon Dam and Anzalduas Dam. These losses in streamflow are likely due to diversions and, to a lesser degree, channel infiltration.

In addition to the numerous small channels and intermittent streams, the Arroyo Colorado is a major drainage channel that originate from the north of Hidalgo County and ending at Laguna Madre (Chowdhury and Mace, 2007) (**Figure 2.3.1**). Much of the flows in the Arroyo Colorado are formed by irrigation return flows, runoff, and groundwater baseflow. Reaches of the

Arroyo Colorado are generally dry or have flows too low for measurement at the IBWC gages, but experience large discharge during storm events. Streamflows at selected IBWC gages along the Arroyo Colorado are shown on **Figure 4.4.3**. The selected gages include (1) 08-4700.50 Main Floodway south of Weslaco, (2) 08-4701.00 North Floodway west of Mercedes, (3) 08-4703.00 Arroyo Colorado Floodway south of Mercedes, and (4) 08-4704.00 Arroyo Colorado Floodway south of Harlingen.

4.4.2 Diversions and Surface Water Use

Diversions along the Rio Grande are largely used to transport surface water for municipal, industrial, and agricultural use across Starr, Hidalgo, Willacy, and Cameron counties, and for flood control. The IBWC records total diversion quantities to the United States along six reaches of the Rio Grande and one canal that conveys water to Mexico. Diversion data are available for most years from the 1950s through 2011. Locations of the reaches of reported diversion and the canal, as well as their respective annual diversions, are shown on **Figure 4.4.4**. The Rio Grande diversion discharge data was segmented into the following six reaches in sequential order: (1) Falcon Dam to Rio Grande City, (2) Rio Grande City to Anzalduas Dam, (3) Anzalduas Dam to Progreso, (4) Progreso to San Benito, (5) San Benito to Brownsville, and (6) Brownville to the Gulf of Mexico. In addition to the six reaches, there is a large diversion from the Anzalduas Dam that diverts river water to the Anzalduas Canal which conveys water to the Mexico side of the river. Total diversions from the Rio Grande to the United States from the Falcon Dam to the Gulf of Mexico range from 625,886 AF/yr to 1,524,190 AF/yr, with an average of 974,602 AF/yr. River diversions to Mexico via the Anzalduas Canal range from 37,953 AF/yr to 1,542,843 AF/yr, with an average of 781,582 AF/yr.

In addition to diversions, the IBWC records total contribution quantities to the Rio Grande from the Rio San Juan Irrigation District in Mexico. Contribution data are available for most years from the 1950s through 2011 for two reaches: (1) Falcon Dam to Rio Grande City, and (2) Rio Grande City to Anzalduas Dam. Annual contributions for 1981 through 2011 are shown on **Figure 4.4.5**.

TWDB water use surveys include reported estimates for annual surface water supplies to municipal and industrial users in the valley from 1971 through 2014 (TWDB, 2016d). Surface water use estimates after 2010 were incomplete and not suitable for this evaluation. The surface water use estimates were used to determine the distribution of diverted water between agricultural irrigation,

municipal, and industrial users. Irrigation water supply was assumed to be the difference between total diversion and the sum of estimated municipal and industrial supplies. Based on these estimates, irrigation surface water supply on average accounts for approximately 87 percent of total diversions from the Rio Grande within the valley, municipal supply accounts for approximately 11 percent, and industrial supply accounts for the remaining 2 percent. In recent years, reported municipal surface water supplies have increased to account for approximately 18 to 23 percent of total diversions, which reflects the growing population in the region. The estimated annual distribution of surface water supplies to irrigation, municipal, and industrial users in the valley is shown on **Figure 4.4.6**. Surface water use in Mexico is assumed to be predominantly for irrigation.

4.4.3 Lakes, Reservoirs, and Springs

The Lower Rio Grande Valley area has ten lakes, five reservoirs, and two lagoons (Chowdhury and Mace, 2007) (**Figure 2.3.1**). The lakes occur naturally in shallow depressions and are mostly located in the eastern half of the study area. Many of the lakes are intermittent and are dry during the summers, and may dry up completely during periods of drought. Five man-made reservoirs store water off-channel to the Rio Grande. The Falcon Reservoir is a large reservoir that stores water upstream from the valley. No information is available for the presence of springs, if any, in the valley.

4.5 Hydraulic Properties

The movement and storage of groundwater through an aquifer is dependent on the structural and geological characteristics that are then described through hydraulic parameters. Important aquifer hydraulic parameters include transmissivity, hydraulic conductivity, specific yield, and specific storage. Transmissivity is the rate of groundwater movement under a 1:1 hydraulic gradient through a unit section of an aquifer 1 foot wide and extending the full saturated thickness of the aquifer (Theis, 1935). Transmissivity is a measure of the ability of an aquifer to transmit groundwater and is equal to the product of hydraulic conductivity and saturated aquifer thickness. Units for transmissivity are feet squared per day (ft^2/day). Hydraulic conductivity is the rate of groundwater movement, under a 1:1 hydraulic gradient, through a unit area of aquifer material (Heath, 1989). Units for hydraulic conductivity are ft/day.

Specific yield is the ratio of the volume of water which a saturated porous medium will yield by gravity drainage to the volume of the porous medium (Lohman, 1972). Specific yield is generally applied to unconfined or "water table" aquifers. Specific storage is the volume of water released from or taken into storage per unit volume of the aquifer per unit change in head (units of 1/length) (Lohman, 1972).

Previous studies along with additional analysis using updated well specific capacity data from TWDB and Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ) were used to calculate the hydraulic properties for the Chicot, Evangeline, Burkeville, Jasper, Catahoula, and Yegua- Jackson Aquifers. The previous studies included Chowdhury and Mace (2007) and Deeds and others (2010).

A previous study conducted by Chowdhury and Mace (2007) yielded 774 values of transmissivity and hydraulic conductivity that were derived from specific capacity tests for TCEQ wells that were not screened through multiple aquifers. Transmissivity was derived by using an analytical technique relating transmissivity to specific capacity (Theis, 1963), which was then used with screen lengths of the wells to calculate hydraulic conductivity. Well locations were then imposed onto a 2 ½-minute quadrangle grid. A specific capacity value was determined for each grid cell containing data by averaging the specific capacity values within the cells. The location of the averaged value is at the center of the cell. Well-specific information was not available from the Chowdhury and Mace (2007) datasets due to this gridded-averaging approach. Gridded datasets for the Chowdhury and Mace (2007) study were included in geospatial datasets for the southern Gulf Coast GAM provided by TWDB.

For the current investigation, specific capacity measurements for 78 wells were obtained from the TWDB groundwater database (TWDB, 2015) and merged with the gridded dataset previously developed by Chowdhury and Mace (2007). For the TWDB (2015) measurements obtained from for this investigation, transmissivity values for each well were determined using the same methodology as the Chowdhury and Mace (2007) study previously described. Hydraulic conductivity values were computed by multiplying the transmissivity value by the saturated thickness at the respective well. The saturated thickness at each well was estimated by subtracting the earliest recorded depth to water measurement for the well from the reported bottom depth of the screened interval of the well. After merging the new dataset with the previously developed dataset, each measurement was assigned to an aquifer unit by comparing the unit contact

surfaces from the current hydrostratigraphic framework with the elevations of the screened intervals. Aquifer assignments were not possible for some wells due to the lack of well construction information. The distribution of hydraulic conductivity values for each aquifer unit is shown on **Figures 4.5.1 and 4.5.2**. The vast majority of measurement points used for this investigation are from the gridded-average datasets from the Chowdhury and Mace (2007) study. The majority of available measurements represent the Chicot and Evangeline aquifers.

4.5.1 Transmissivity and Hydraulic Conductivity

Aquifer transmissivity and hydraulic conductivity values from previous studies and current analysis are summarized in **Table 4.5.1**. Wells outside the study area were included in this evaluation to provide a larger set of data points. Histograms for estimated hydraulic conductivity values for each aquifer unit are shown on **Figure 4.5.3**. The hydraulic properties for each aquifer unit are summarized below.

Chicot Aquifer – Transmissivity and hydraulic conductivity values are largest in the Chicot Aquifer compared to the other aquifer units (**Table 4.5.1**). Measured transmissivity values for the Chicot Aquifer range from approximately 37 feet per day (ft^2/day) to 150,000 ft^2/day, with a geometric mean of approximately 503 ft^2/day. Estimated hydraulic conductivity values for the Chicot Aquifer range from approximately 2 ft/day to 5,090 ft/day, with a geometric mean of approximately 28 ft/day. Most available hydraulic property measurements are from wells located in urban areas of Hidalgo and Cameron counties (**Figure 4.5.1**), which are where the majority of the population lives and consumes groundwater. The largest values of hydraulic conductivity occur in the western half of Cameron County and smaller values occur in the southern portions of Hidalgo County. The values also are the closest to having a log-normal distribution (**Figure 4.5.3**).

Evangeline Aquifer – Measured transmissivity values for the Evangeline Aquifer range from approximately 4 ft^2/day to 17,220 ft^2/day, with a geometric mean of approximately 238 ft^2/day. Estimated hydraulic conductivity values for the Evangeline Aquifer range from approximately 0.1 ft/day to 199 ft/day, with a geometric mean of approximately 5 ft/day. The values are more concentrated in central Hidalgo and Brooks counties, with a few points located in all other counties in the valley except for Cameron County (**Figure 4.5.1**). The larger values are generally more concentrated in Hidalgo County while the rest of the values are more distributed throughout the other counties. Measured hydraulic

conductivity values for the Evangeline Aquifer, on average, are much smaller than measured values for the Chicot Aquifer.

Burkeville Confining Unit – Measured transmissivity values for the Burkeville Confining Unit range from approximately 17 ft^2/day to 1,371 ft^2/day, with a geometric mean of approximately 87. Estimated hydraulic conductivity values for the Burkeville Confining Unit range from approximately 0.3 ft/day to 11 ft/day, with a geometric mean of approximately 2 ft/day. The values are generally located on the eastern side of Jim Hogg and Starr counties (**Figure 4.5.1**). The hydraulic conductivity values are substantially smaller than the values for the Chicot and Evangeline aquifers, and the histogram indicates that values are fairly evenly distributed across the range in values (**Figure 4.5.3**).

Jasper Aquifer – Measured transmissivity values for the Jasper Aquifer range from approximately 7 ft^2/day to 9,000 ft^2/day, with a geometric mean of approximately 100 ft^2/day. Estimated hydraulic conductivity values range from approximately 0.07 ft/day to 23 ft/day, with a geometric mean of approximately 1 ft/day. The evenly spread values (**Figure 4.5.3**) are concentrated on the eastern side of Hidalgo county and the southern section of Jim Hogg county (**Figure 4.5.1**). The majority of the hydraulic conductivity values are similar to values for the Burkeville Confining Unit and are smaller than both the Evangeline and Chicot aquifers.

Catahoula Confining System – Measured transmissivity values for the Catahoula Confining System range from approximately 6 ft^2/day to 817 ft^2/day, with a geometric mean of approximately 49 ft^2/day. Estimated hydraulic conductivity values for the Catahoula Confining System range from approximately 0.1 ft/day to 27 ft/day, with a geometric mean of approximately 0.8 ft/day. The measurements are located on the western side of the study area in Jim Hogg and Starr counties with larger values generally more concentrated in Starr County (**Figure 4.5.2**). Most hydraulic conductivity values are smaller than 1 ft/day, except for the values near the Rio Grande River.

Yegua-Jackson Aquifer – Based on a limited number of available data (12 values), measured transmissivity values for the Yegua-Jackson Aquifer within the study area range from approximately 7 ft^2/day to 367 ft^2/day, with a geometric mean of approximately 84 ft^2/day. Estimated hydraulic conductivity values for the Yegua-Jackson Aquifer in the study area range from approximately 0.07 ft/day to 23 ft/day, with a geometric mean of approximately 1.5 ft/day. All the values are concentrated on the west side of Starr County nearing the Rio Grande River

(**Figure 4.5.2**). The values closer to the Rio Grande River tend to be higher than the values farther away.

All the aquifers, except for the Chicot Aquifer, do not show a log-normal distribution for hydraulic conductivity. The overall high variation in hydraulic conductivity suggest high levels of heterogeneity within the aquifers even with the limited datasets for most aquifers units, except for the Chicot and Evangeline aquifers which have a large number of measurements associate with them.

Although more than 800 wells in the valley have measurements of hydraulic properties, there are large areas where data are not available which prevents a comprehensive understanding of hydraulic properties of the aquifer system as a whole. Furthermore, vertical hydraulic conductivity measurements are not available for the aquifer system. Chowdhury and Mace (2007) specified vertical hydraulic conductivity to equal horizontal hydraulic conductivity in the groundwater availability model.

4.5.2 Storage Properties

No measurements of aquifer storage properties are available for the Lower Rio Grande Valley groundwater system. Chowdhury and Mace (2007) specified values for specific yield and specific storage that allowed the model to reproduce measured changes in groundwater levels throughout the valley. Specific yield values for the Chico, Evangeline, Burkeville, and Jasper aquifer units were specified to be 0.005, 0.001, 0.0001, and 0.05, respectively. Specific storage values for the same aquifer units were specified to be 0.000001, 0.000001, 0.00001, and 0.000001 1/feet, respectively. The specific yield values are considered to be low values for the aquifer materials in the valley. Typical specific yields for sedimentary materials range from 0.14 to 0.38 (Freeze and Cherry, 1979). Larger values in the model were unable to reproduce the required fluctuations to match measured water levels (Chowdhury and Mace, 2007).

Deeds and others (2010) specified specific yield and storativity in the Yegua-Jackson groundwater availability model. Specific yield for the Yegua-Jackson Aquifer is specified as 0.15, and storativity of the aquifer ranges from 0.0005 to 0.0045. Specific storage was not specified in the model.

Chowdhury and Mace (2007) included the upper, sandy sections of the Catahoula Formation as part of the Jasper Aquifer near the outcrop area. The specific yield for that portion of the Catahoula unit is specified as 0.05, and the specific storage is specified as 0.000001 1/feet.

4.6 Potential for Subsidence

Land subsidence due to excessive groundwater pumping has not been documented in the Lower Rio Grande Valley study area. A Subsidence District is not present in the study area. Land subsidence will be evaluated during the numerical modeling process if model results indicate large groundwater level drawdown will occur from increased pumping for desalination operations and other groundwater supplies.

4.7 Aquifer Discharge

Aquifer discharge refers to the groundwater exiting a groundwater system. Groundwater discharge mechanisms in the Lower Rio Grande Valley include groundwater pumping withdrawals, groundwater discharge to the Rio Grande and Arroyo Colorado, evapotranspiration, and groundwater movement into the adjacent Gulf of Mexico to the east. The following sections describe the components of groundwater discharge that occur in the valley.

4.7.1 Groundwater Withdrawals by Pumping

Groundwater pumping estimates from annual TWDB water use surveys were obtained for the years 1984 through 2013 (TWDB, 2016d; TWDB 2016e). The water use surveys collect estimates for six sectors: municipal, irrigation, manufacturing, steam-electric generation, livestock, and mining. Total annual groundwater pumping estimates for each county in the Lower Rio Grande Valley are summarized in **Table 4.6.1**. The majority of groundwater pumping in the valley has occurred in Hidalgo County and, to a lesser degree, Cameron County (**Figure 4.6.1**). Although pumping varies from year to year, groundwater pumping in the valley has generally increased since the late-1980s. Total groundwater pumping was approximately 22,000 AF/yr in 1984 and increased to approximately 32,000 AF/yr in 2013. According to the water use surveys, total annual pumping was at a peak rate of approximately 53,000 AF/yr in 2009; however, estimates for Cameron County for that year appear to be anomalously large. The large amount of year-to-year variation in the amount of groundwater pumping is likely a result of occasional drought conditions, which reduce surface water supplies and require existing users to switch to groundwater sources (Chowdhury and Mace, 2007).

Estimated annual groundwater pumping in the valley by water use sector for 1984 and 2013 is shown on **Figure 4.6.2**. Groundwater withdrawals during this time

period occurred predominantly for irrigation and municipal uses during most years until 2002. After 2002, estimates irrigation pumping decreased substantially and municipal pumping increased, according to TWDB water use surveys. This change in pumping trends might be due to changing water demands or inaccurate information in the water use surveys.

Domestic pumping estimates are not included in the TWDB water use surveys. For historical domestic pumping, an estimated pumping rate per domestic well was used based on an assumption used for the 2016 Region M Water Plan by Black & Veatch (2015). The water plan assumed that each domestic well yielded 0.4 AF/yr based on 140 gallons per capita per day and 2.5 people per household, and these wells were assumed to be reported 50 percent of the time. The number of reported domestic wells located within the valley was determined using the TWDB groundwater database. To account for the assumption that the database includes only 50 percent of the domestic wells that are actually present in the valley, the assumed pumping rate per well was doubled to 0.8 AF/yr and applied to each reported domestic well. Estimated annual domestic pumping is relatively small in the valley (**Table 4.6.1 and Figure 4.6.2**).

Locations of groundwater production wells in the Lower Rio Grande Valley were obtained from the TWDB groundwater database (TWDB, 2015). In addition to well locations, the groundwater database included information for well construction and well use. The well uses were categorized into the following groups: municipal, irrigation, industrial, domestic, and stock. Locations of groundwater production wells located in the Lower Rio Grande Valley study area are shown on **Figure 4.6.2**. The majority of municipal wells and irrigation wells are located in the southern portions of the valley in Hidalgo and Cameron counties, where most urban and agricultural lands exist. Most wells in the northern portions of the valley are stock wells. Domestic wells are mostly located in the central portions of the valley in Hidalgo and Starr counties. Most stock and domestic wells are located in rural areas with population density of less than 100 people per square mile. Population densities from 2000 and 2010 were obtained from the U.S. Census Bureau and are shown on **Figure 4.6.4**.

Very limited information is available for groundwater withdrawals in the portions of the Lower Rio Grande Valley study area located in Mexico. Kelly (2002) reported that estimated groundwater withdrawals for municipal and industrial uses in the Tamaulipas Border Region was approximately 86,000 AF/yr in 2000 and was projected to increase to approximately 380,000 AF/yr by 2020.

No information is available regarding irrigation groundwater pumping, if any occurs in the study area.

Future Groundwater Demands

The 2016 Rio Grande (Region M) Regional Water Plan, developed by Black & Veatch (2015) and adopted by the Rio Grande Regional Water Planning Group, contains information for recommended brackish groundwater desalination (BGD) projects in the study area, located Cameron, Hidalgo, Willacy, and Starr counties). The study area includes portions of two counties (Brooks and Kenedy) that are in Region N Regional Water Planning Area; however, there are no recommended BGD projects in the Region N regional water plan within the study area (HDR Engineering, 2015). Locations of the recommended desalination plants are shown on **Figure 1.0.5**. Information from the 2016 regional water plan regarding the number of wells, average flow per well in gallons per minute (gpm), and total groundwater production (AF/yr) was compiled for each recommended project. The expected yield from a BGD plant is based on a membrane efficiency of approximately 80 percent, and therefore, is less than total groundwater production. **Table 4.6.2** summarizes the total brackish groundwater production by decade for each recommended project. There are a total of 14 recommended BGD plants with the capacity to pump 24,160 AF of groundwater by 2070 for a total yield of 19,300 AF of additional (treated) water supplies. Due principally to cost constraints, current desalination plants in the study area (**Figure 1.0.4**) dispose of brine concentrate, which is the by-product of treatment, into the surface water drainage canal network. This disposal method is assumed to continue into the future. The recommended desalination strategies did not include plans for disposal of desalination concentrate using Class II injection wells (Black &Veatch, 2015).

The 2016 Region M water plan also contains information on the recommended municipal fresh groundwater projects in the study area in three counties (Cameron, Hidalgo, and Starr). No recommended freshwater strategies in the 2016 Region N water plan will occur within the study area. **Table 4.6.3** summarizes the total fresh groundwater production by decade for each recommended project. There are a total of nine recommended projects with the capacity to pump 9,205 AF of groundwater.

4.7.2 Discharge to the Rio Grande and Arroyo Colorado

Limited information is available for groundwater discharge rates to the Rio Grande and Arroyo Colorado. As previously discussed in **Section 4.2.2**, groundwater level elevation contours indicate that groundwater discharges to the Rio Grande in Starr County and the western half of Hidalgo County and supports gaining streamflow conditions in that reach of the river. The groundwater level contours are too regional to identify local groundwater discharges to the Arroyo Colorado. Simulated discharge to the Rio Grande is approximately 20,300 AF/yr and simulated discharge to the Arroyo Colorado is approximately 8,600 AF/yr in the calibrated groundwater model by Chowdhury and Mace (2007).

4.7.3 Evapotranspiration

Evapotranspiration (ET) is the loss of water from a vegetated surface through the combined processes of soil evaporation and plants transpiration (UACE, 2000). Evapotranspiration rates depend on plant density, plant age, depth to groundwater, and available soil moisture from infiltration of precipitation. This study is principally interested in the interaction of plants with groundwater.

Limited information exists regarding groundwater use by native vegetation and crops within the Lower Rio Grande Valley area. Crop ET is an important component of the overall water budget; however, crop water use is likely sustained by applied irrigation water (via surface water diversions and groundwater pumping) because crops in the valley have relatively shallow root depths and the depths to groundwater in the agricultural areas are generally 20 to 60 feet. Vegetation present in the valley includes mesquite, live oak, marsh grass, and salt cedar. Many of these plants have deep root depths and are likely sustained in part by groundwater consumption.

Potential ET was simulated in the groundwater model developed by Chowdhury and Mace (2007) for the Lower Rio Grande Valley. Potential ET rates ranging from 0.000001 ft/day to 0.000034 ft/day were applied to all grid cells in the northern portions of the valley, where dense woodland vegetation is present (**Figure 2.2.2**). A constant root depth of 30 feet was applied to all ET cells. Limited documentation for this component of the model prevents a complete understanding of the methods used for determining the simulated rates and depths. Simulation results indicate that ET rates decreased from approximately 2,500 AF/yr in 1980 to approximately 1,500 AF/yr in 2010, probably due to the

decline in simulated groundwater levels in areas where ET was specified in the model.

4.7.4 Discharge to the Gulf of Mexico

Groundwater flows generally to the east within the valley and discharges to the Gulf of Mexico. Groundwater flow to the Gulf of Mexico was simulated to be on the order of 40,000 AF/yr in the calibrated groundwater model by Chowdhury and Mace (2007).

4.8 Groundwater Quality

Most of the groundwater in the Lower Rio Grande Valley has total dissolved solids concentrations greater than 1,000 mg/L, which does not meet drinking water quality standards (Meyer and others, 2014). Brackish groundwater in the Gulf Coast Aquifer was extensively evaluated by Meyer and others (2014) to facilitate the planning of future groundwater desalination projects. Salinity is a term used to describe the concentration of dissolved inorganic salts in the groundwater (Meyer and others, 2014). Salinity zones were mapped as three-dimensional regions within the aquifer based on the following salinity ranges: freshwater (0 to 1,000 mg/L), slightly saline groundwater (1,000 to 3,000 mg/L), moderately saline groundwater (3,000 to 10,000 mg/L), very saline groundwater (10,000 to 35,000 mg/L), and brine (greater than 35,000 mg/L). In addition to TDS concentrations, the salinity zones were delineated based on depth within the aquifer (shallow, intermediate, and deep). The distribution of the salinity zones and relationships between them is relatively complex, such as moderately to very saline groundwater overlying less saline groundwater or pockets of fresh or very saline groundwater within large zones of deep slightly saline groundwater. However, salinity generally increases with depth in the Gulf Coast Aquifer.

Low-TDS groundwater is generally relatively young, occurs at shallow depths, and is often actively recharged. The majority of saline groundwater occurs in areas with generally stagnant flow conditions at larger depths and is relatively older water (Young and others, 2014). Continuous dissolution of aquifer materials over time might have enriched the mineral content in the groundwater (Weert and others, 2009). Anthropogenic processes, such as percolation of saline irrigation water, and pumping induced salt water intrusion, can also impact groundwater salinity (Young and others, 2014).

This investigation will use TDS to evaluate changes in salinity in the valley. TDS measurement data were obtained from the TWDB database and the BRACS database for 1,247 wells in the study area. The TDS data were assigned to aquifer units using the same aquifer determination methods described in **Section 2.4.1**. The distribution of TDS concentrations for the Chicot, Evangeline, Burkeville, and Jasper aquifer units are shown on **Figures 4.7.1 through 4.7.4**. TDS data are not available from the TWDB database for the Catahoula Confining System and the Yegua-Jackson Aquifer in the study area.

The distributions of TDS concentrations in the Chicot, Evangeline, and Burkeville aquifer units are similar. Groundwater in these aquifer units is slightly too moderately saline in the southern portions of the valley in Hidalgo, Cameron, Starr, and Willacy counties. Freshwater areas occur in the northern portions of the valley in Brooks and Kenedy counties, northern Hidalgo County, and northeastern Starr County. A relatively small number of measurements in the valley indicate the presence of very saline groundwater (greater than 10,000 mg/L) in isolated areas in central Hidalgo County, southern Cameron County, and central Starr County. TDS data for the Burkeville Confining Unit and the Jasper Aquifer are available solely for wells located in vicinity of their respective outcrop areas; thus, the TDS concentrations for the deep, down-dip portions of these units are unknown.

Limited information is known about how cross-formational groundwater flows could impact salinity in the aquifer system. Simulation results from the Chowdhury and Mace (2007) groundwater model indicate that substantial cross-formation flow occurs in the down-dip portions of the aquifer system, especially between the Evangeline and Chicot aquifer. This cross-formational flow could result in deterioration of groundwater quality in the Chicot Aquifer by older saline water mixing with younger, fresher water.

Hydrographs for TDS measurements were used to evaluate changes in salinity in the valley through time. Hydrographs for selected representative wells in the valley are shown on **Figure 4.7.5**. Although slight fluctuations have occurred, TDS concentrations have not changed substantially through time in all areas of the valley.

5 CONCEPTUAL MODEL FOR GROUNDWATER AND SALINITY

The conceptual model for groundwater flow in an aquifer system represents the foundation of a numerical groundwater model. The conceptual model describes the domain of the flow system, groundwater occurrence, groundwater movement, the inflow components and the outflow components.

This conceptual model encompasses the Lower Rio Grande Valley. The northern boundary is a groundwater flow line that transects the central portions of Jim Hogg, Brooks, and Kenedy counties. The southern boundary is about 10 miles south of the Rio Grande and includes portions of northern Mexico. The eastern boundary is 10 miles from the coastline. The western boundary is the western extent of the aquifers in the valley, including the Gulf Coast Aquifer and the upper portions of the Yegua-Jackson Aquifer.

The groundwater system in the conceptual model is a twelve-layer system. Each model layer represents an individual hydrostratigraphic unit. The twelve layers represented in the model include the following, from top to bottom: Beaumont, Lissie, and Willis (Chicot Aquifer); Upper Goliad, Lower Goliad, and Upper Lagarto (Evangeline Aquifer); Middle Lagarto (Burkeville Confining Unit); Lower Lagarto, Oakville, and Upper Catahoula (Jasper Aquifer); Catahoula Confining System; and Yegua-Jackson Aquifer.

Confining units are generally less permeable than aquifers. Groundwater flow and changes in storage principally occur in aquifers. Groundwater movement from one aquifer to another (cross-formational flow) occurs when groundwater level elevations are different in the aquifers. Cross-formational flow can occur through confining units.

The phreatic groundwater level surface (water table) is continuous across the tilted aquifer units within the model domain, which indicates that a regional hydraulic connection occurs between the units, at least at the near surface in the outcrop areas. Regional groundwater movement is generally from the west in upland areas to the east towards the Gulf of Mexico. The Rio Grande is a gaining stream in the west and a losing stream in the east. Groundwater levels throughout most of the model domain have gradually declined over time, except in areas along the Rio Grande and in the northern-most portions of the domain. The

groundwater level declines are likely the result of groundwater pumping and decreased recharge from drought.

Groundwater level elevations in the deep, downdip portions of the aquifer system are assumed to increase with depth, which produces upward cross-formational flows towards and into the Gulf of Mexico. This conceptualization will be tested with the numerical model and a sensitivity analysis will be conducted to evaluate any impacts from uncertainty.

A combination of specified flux and specified head conditions are assumed for the lateral model boundaries. No-flow conditions are assumed for the northern and southern boundaries, which follow groundwater flow lines. Constant head or general head conditions (sea level) will be assigned for the eastern (Gulf of Mexico) boundary. A no-flow condition is assumed for the western boundary; however, sensitivity to this boundary will be assessed during model calibration. The bottom of the model is represented by no-flow or constant head boundary conditions; sensitivity to this boundary will be assessed during model calibration.

5.1 Historical Transient Conditions

The transient model period represents historical hydrogeologic conditions from 1984 through 2014. This time period was selected principally based on pumping and groundwater level data availability. The transient model period includes time before and after the start of brackish groundwater desalination operations in the valley. Initial conditions for the transient model will represent conditions prior to 1984. A schematic diagram of the conceptual hydrogeologic model is shown on **Figure 5.1.1**. Hydrogeologic conditions varied during the transient model period. The variations were due to changes in groundwater pumping and climate.

Groundwater inflow components to the Lower Rio Grande Valley groundwater flow model include: (1) recharge from infiltration of precipitation, (2) recharge from channel infiltration along the river and arroyo, (3) recharge from canal seepage along the surface water delivery system, and (4) recharge from deep percolation of excess irrigation water. Inputs for recharge from infiltration of precipitation will be developed by applying the distribution of recharge as a percentage of precipitation developed by Scanlon and others (2012) to annual average precipitation values for the valley. This input will be scaled, if needed, both spatially and temporally during model calibration to improve the match between measured and simulated groundwater levels. Recharge from percolation

of excess irrigation water might also be scaled during model calibration, if needed to improve model results.

Streamflows in the Rio Grande will be specified at the western boundary based on measured flows from below Falcon Dam. The water will be routed through the river system and infiltration will be dependent on stage in the river, groundwater elevations in the model layers adjacent to the river channel, and channel conductance properties specified in the model. Water diversions will be specified along the Rio Grande and the diverted water will be routed through the surface water delivery system, which comprises diversion points for municipal, industrial, and irrigation users as well as reaches with seepage losses that contribute to aquifer recharge.

Groundwater outflow components to the Lower Rio Grande Valley groundwater flow model include: (1) groundwater withdrawals by pumping, (2) discharge to the river and arroyo, (3) evapotranspiration, and (4) lateral subsurface flow to the Gulf of Mexico. Annual groundwater pumping will distributed to individual wells based county and well use classification. Pumping will be assigned to aquifer units based on the hydrostratigraphic framework and reported depths of screened intervals for each pumping well. Lateral subsurface flows to the Gulf of Mexico will be simulated using constant head of general head boundary conditions along the eastern boundary of the model.

5.2 Salinity

The purpose of the Lower Rio Grande Valley groundwater model is to evaluate impacts on groundwater conditions from desalination operations. Changes in salinity in the groundwater system will be evaluated using TDS concentrations. Distribution of TDS for the groundwater model will be based on measured values and the salinity zones developed by Meyer and others (2014). The distribution of the salinity zones and the relationships between zones is relatively complex, especially at shallow and intermediate depths within the aquifer system. In general, salinity increases with depth in the valley. Concentrations and distribution of TDS in the valley has remained relatively stable through time. However, increased pumping by the recommended brackish groundwater desalination plants and other future groundwater withdrawals could induce movement of brackish groundwater resulting in changes in salinity in areas of the valley. TDS concentrations at the eastern boundary will represent seawater in the Gulf of Mexico.

6 FUTURE IMPROVEMENTS

Uncertainties regarding groundwater-surface water interactions exist due to lack of data and complexities of those interactions. Deep percolation of excess irrigation water is an important component of aquifer recharge in agricultural areas. A detailed valley-wide farm budget analysis would improve the understanding of the amount and timing of this recharge mechanism. One approach would be to use an integrated hydrologic model for dynamically estimating irrigation water requirements and routing soil moisture through the root zone.

Information regarding the flow of water through the surface water delivery system to municipal, industrial, and agricultural users is largely unknown. Currently, the conceptual model for surface water supply is based on total diversions along long reaches of the Rio Grande and reported estimates of surface water use by certain municipal and industrial users. The conceptual model would be improved with more detailed information on specific locations and rates of diversions from the river, flow measurements within the delivery system, and locations and rates of diversion from the delivery system to users. This information would improve the understanding of how surface water is conveyed and used in the valley.

Uncertainties regarding groundwater pumping in the valley exist due to limited reported information. The best available pumping information for the valley is provided in the annual TWDB water use surveys. However, inconsistent or inaccurate information could be reported in the surveys. Furthermore, the distribution of pumping within the valley is uncertain because pumping volumes for individual wells are not reported in the surveys. More reliable pumping information would improve the accuracy of the conceptual model and the associated numerical model.

This conceptual model will be updated, as needed, by additional information acquired through the stakeholder process and the development of the numerical groundwater flow and transport model. The impact of uncertainties described herein will be evaluated via a sensitivity analysis to determine if further data collection is necessary.

7 ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The Lower Rio Grande Valley groundwater modeling team would like to thank the stakeholders for their continued support and participation in the development of the conceptual hydrogeologic model.

Special appreciation goes to the TWDB personnel: Rohit Goswami for his continuous support and guidance through the process and for providing important datasets for the irrigation canal network; John Meyer for providing insight on the BRACS database and for providing geophysical well logs; David Thorkildsen for providing geospatial and model datasets for groundwater availability models for the Gulf Coast Aquifer; and Cindy Ridgeway for her support and leadership during the development of the conceptual model.

8 REFERENCES CITED

Ashworth, J.B., and Hopkins, J., 1995, Aquifers of Texas: Texas Water Development Board Report 345, 69 p.

Baker, E.T., Jr., 1979, Stratigraphic and hydrogeologic framework of part of the coastal plain of Texas: Texas Department of Water Resources Report 236, 43 p.

Baker, R.C., and Dale, O.C., 1964, *Ground-water resources of the Lower Rio Grande Valley Area, Texas*: U.S. Geological Survey Water-Supply Paper 1653, 56 p.

Black & Veatch, 2015, *2016 Rio Grande Regional Water Plan*: Prepared for Texas Water Development Board, prepared in association with Rio Grande Regional (Region M) Water Planning Group (RGRWPG) with administration by Lower Rio Grande Valley Development Council, , December 2015, Volumes I and II. Available online at https://www.twdb.texas.gov/waterplanning/rwp/plans/2016/index.asp.

Brown, L.F., Jr., and Loucks, R.G., 2009, Chronostratigraphy of Cenozoic depositional sequences ad systems tracts: A Wheeler chart of the northwest margin of the Gulf of Mexico Basin: The University of Texas at Austin, Bureau of Economic Geology Report of Investigations No. 273, 28 p. and one plate.

Chowdhury, A., and Mace, R.E., 2007, *Groundwater resource evaluation and availability model of the Gulf Coast Aquifer in the Lower Rio Grande Valley of Texas*: Texas Water Development Board Report 368, June 2007, 119 p.

Daly, C., Halbleib, M., Smith, J.I., Gibson, W.P., Doggett, M.K., Taylor, G.H., Curtis, J., and Pasteris, P.A. 2008. *Physiographically-sensitive mapping of temperature and precipitation across the conterminous United States*. International Journal of Climatology, DOI: 10.1002/joc.1688. Data available online at http://www.prism.oregonstate.edu/.

Deeds, N.E., Yan, T., Singh, A., Jones, T.L., Kelley, V.A., Knox, P.R., Young, S.C., 2010, *Groundwater availability model for the Yegua-Jackson Aquifer*: Prepared for the Texas Water Development Board, 475 p.

Dutton, A.R., and Richter, B.C., 1990, Regional geohydrology of the Gulf Coast Aquifer in Matagorda and Wharton Counties: Development of a numerical model to estimate the impact of water-management strategies: Contract report prepared for Lower Colorado River Authority, Austin, Texas, under Contract IAC (88-89) 0910, 116 p.

Ewing, T.E., 1991. The tectonic framework of Texas: The University of Texas at Austin, Bureau of Economic Geology Report to accompany the Tectonic Map of Texas, 36 p.

Fipps, 2004, The Municipal water supply network of the Lower Rio Grande Valley: *Irrigation District Program*, Irrigation Technology Center, Texas Coorperative Extension – Texas Agricultural Experimental Station, February 5, 2004.

Fipps, G. and Pope, C., 2004, *Irrigation district efficiencies and potential water savings in the Lower Rio Grande Valley of Texas*: http://idea.tamu.edu/documents/report3.pdf.

Galloway, W.E., 1977, *Catahoula Formation of the Texas Coastal Plain, depositional systems, composition, structural development, groundwater flow, history and uranium distribution*: The University of Texas at Austin, Bureau of Economic Geology, Report of Investigation no. 87, 59 p.

Galloway, W.E., Ganey-Curry, P.E., Li, X., and Buffler, R., 2000, Cenozoic depositional history of the Gulf of Mexico Basin: American Association of Petroleum Geologists Bulletin, v. 84, No. 11, pa. 1743-1774.

George, P.G., Mace, R.E., and Petrossian, R., 2011, *Aquifers of Texas*: Texas Water Development Board Report 380, July 2011, 172 p.

HDR Engineering, Inc., 2015, *Executive summary and regional water plan, Coastal Bend Regional Water Planning Area, Region N*: Prepared for Texas Water Development Board, prepared by Coastal Bend Regional Water Planning Group with administration by Nueces River Authority, December 2015. Available online at https://www.twdb.texas.gov/waterplanning/rwp/plans/2016/index.asp.

Heath, R., 1989, Basic ground-water hydrology: U.S. Geological Survey Water Supply Paper 2220, 84p.

Jorgensen, D.G., 1975, Analog model studies of groundwater hydrology in the Houston district, Texas: Texas Water Development Board Report 190, 84 p.

Kelly, Mary E., 2002, *Water Management in the Binational Texas/Mexico Rio Grande/ Rio Bravo Basin*: Yale School of Forestry & Environmental Studies Bulletin 107 (Human Population and Freshwater Resources: U.S. Cases and International Perspectives):115-148.

Knox, P.R., Kelley, V.A., Vreugdenhil, A., Deeds, N., Seni, S., 2007, *Structure of the Yegua-Jackson Aquifer of the Texas Gulf Coast Plain*: Prepared for the Texas Water Development Board, 103 p.

McCoy, T.W., 1990, Evaluation of groundwater resources in the Lower Rio Grande Valley, Texas: Teas Water Development Board, Report 316, 47 p.

Meyer, J.E., Croskrey, A., Wise, M.R., and Kalaswad, S., 2014, *Brackish groundwater in the Gulf Coast Aquifer, Lower Rio Grande Valley, Texas*: Texas Water Development Board Report 383, September 2014, 169 p.

Lohman, S.W., 1972, Groundwater hydraulics: U.S. Geological Survey Professional Paper 708.

National Resources Conservation Service (NRCS), 2007, *Hydrologic Soil Groups*: U.S. Department of Agriculture, NRCS, National Engineering Handbook, Part 630, Chapter 7, 210–VI–NEH, May 2007.

Page, W.R., VanSistine, D.P., and Turner, K.J., 2005, *Preliminary geologic map of southernmost Texas, United States, and parts of Tamaulipas and Nuevo Leon, Mexico: Environmental Health Investigations in the United States-Mexico border region*: U.S. Geological Survey Open-File Report 2005-1409.

Ryder, P.D., 1988, Hydrogeology and pre-development flow in the Texas Gulf Coast Aquifer systems: U.S. Geology Survey Water Resources Investigation Report 87-4248, 109 p.

Scanlon, B.R., Reedy, R., Strassberg, G., Huang, Y., and Senay, G., 2012, *Estimation of groundwater recharge to the Gulf Coast Aquifer in Texas, USA*: Contract Report to Texas Water Development Board, 67 p.

Texas Water Development Board (TWDB), 2015, Groundwater Database: updated September 2, 2015, available online at http://www.twdb.texas.gov/groundwater/data/gwdbrpt.asp.

_____, 2016a, GIS Data: available online at http://www.twdb.texas.gov/mapping/gisdata.asp.

_____, 2016b, Precipitation and Lake Evaporation: available online at http://www.twdb.texas.gov/surfacewater/conditions/evaporation/.

_____, 2016c, Brackish Resources Aquifer Characterization System (BRACS) Database: updated February 10, 2016, available online at http://www.twdb.texas.gov/innovativewater/bracs/database.asp.

_____, 2016d, Historical Groundwater Pumpage: available online at http://www.twdb.texas.gov/waterplanning/waterusesurvey/historical-pumpage.asp.

_____, 2016e, Historical Water Use Estimates: available online at http://www.twdb.texas.gov/waterplanning/waterusesurvey/estimates/index.asp.

Theis, C.V., 1935, The relation between the lowering of the piezometric surface and the rate and duration of discharge of a well using groundwater storage: Transactions of the American Geophysical Union, v. 2, pp. 519-524.

_____, 1963, Estimating the transmissivity of a water-table aquifer from the specific capacity of a well: U.S. Geological Survey Water Supply Paper 1536-I, pp.332-336.

University of Arizona Cooperative Extension (UACE), 2000, Basics of Evaporation and Transpiration: Turf Irrigation Management Series No. 1 (Brochure), The University of Arizona Department of Agriculture.

United States Geological Survey (USGS), 2007, *Geologic database of Texas*: converted 1:250,000 scale maps from the Bureau of Economic Geology of the University of Texas at Austin, available online at https://tnris.org/data-download/#!/statewide.

_____, 2013, National Brackish Groundwater Assessment: U.S. Geological Survey Info Sheet. Available online at http://water.usgs.gov/ogw/gwrp/brackishgw/.

Weakley, A.S., Patterson, K.D., Landaal, S., Pyne, M., and Russo, M.J., 2000, *International classification of ecological communities—Terrestrial vegetation of southeastern United States*, Texas review subset (February 23, 2000): The Nature Conservancy, Chapel Hill, North Carolina.

Weert, F.V., Gun, J.C.D., and Reckman, J., 2009, *Global overview of saline groundwater occurrence and genesis*: International Groundwater Resources Assessment Center Report number GP 2009-1, 107 p.

Wesselman, J.B., 1967, Ground-water resources of Jasper and Newton Counties, Texas: Texas Water Development Board Report 59, 167 p.

Wood, L.A., Gabrysch, R.K., and Marvin, R., 1963, *Reconnaissance investigation of the ground-water resources of the Gulf Coast region, Texas*: Texas Water Commission Bulletin 6305, 114 p.

Young, S.C., Budge, T., Knox, P.R., Kalbous, R., Baker, E., Hamlin, S., Golloway, B., and Deeds, N., 2010, *Hydrostratigraphy of the Gulf Coast Aquifer from the Brazos River to the Rio Grande*: Prepared for Texas Water Development Board, February 2010, 203 p.

Young, S.C., Pinkard, J., Basset, R.L., and Chowdhury, A.H, 2014, *Hydrogeochemical evaluation of the Texas Gulf Coast Aquifer system and implications for developing groundwater availability models*: Prepared for Texas Water Development Board, Final Report #1148301233, April 2014.

9 ACRONYMS & ABBREVIATIONS

AF.....acre-feet
AF/day.....acre-feet per day
AF/yr .....acre-feet per year
amsl .....above mean sea level
BGD .....brackish groundwater desalination (plant/operation)
BRACS.....Brackish Resources Aquifer Characterization System
bmsl.....below mean sea level
DEM.....Digital Elevation Model
ET.....evapotranspiration
ft/day .....feet per day
ft/yr.....feet per year
ft^2/day .....square feet per day
GAM .....Groundwater Availability Model
GCA .....Gulf Coast Aquifer
GCD .....Groundwater Conservation District
GIS .....geographic information systems
GMA .....Groundwater Management Area
gpm.....gallons per minute
HSU.....hydrostratigraphic unit
in/yr .....inches per year
IBWC .....International Boundary Water Commission
LRGV .....Lower Rio Grande Valley
mg/L .....milligrams per liter
NRCS .....National Resources Conservation Service
NWIS.....National Water Information System (USGS)
NWS .....National Weather Service
ºF .....degrees Fahrenheit
PRISM.....Parameter-elevation Regressions on Independent Slopes Model
RWPA .....Regional Water Planning Area
TCEQ .....Texas Commission on Environmental Quality
TDS .....total dissolved solids
TWDB .....Texas Water Development Board
UACE.....University of Arizona Cooperative Extension
USDA.....United States Department of Agriculture
USGS.....United States Geological Survey
3D.....three-dimensional

TABLE 4.3.1. ESTIMATED SEEPAGE LOSS FROM SURFACE WATER DELIVERY SYSTEM IN LOWER RIO GRANDE VALLEY

	SEEPAGE LOSS, in AF/yr		
CANAL TYPE	**Low**	**High**	**Average**
Unlined	17,553	367,437	192,495
Lined	6,993	129,230	68,111
Total	24,546	496,667	260,606

AF/yr = acre-feet per year

TABLE 4.5.1. SUMMARY OF AQUIFER PROPERTIES FOR LOWER RIO GRANDE VALLEY

Aquifer Unit	Transmissivity (ft^2/day)			Hydraulic Conductivity (ft/day)		
	Maximun	Minimum	Geometric mean	Maximum	Minimum	Geometric mean
Chicot	150,000	37.33	503.01	5,090.07	1.57	28.32
Evangeline	17,220	3.79	238.43	199.41	0.09	4.92
Burkeville	1,370.87	17.18	87.23	11.42	0.31	1.57
Jasper	9,000	6.91	99.83	22.82	0.07	1.2
Catahoula	817.39	6.03	48.62	27.25	0.15	0.83
Yegua-Jackson	366.51	6.78	83.88	22.84	0.07	1.51

ft^2/day = square feet per day
ft/day = feet per day

TABLE 4.6.1. ANNUAL ESTIMATED GROUNDWATER PUMPING IN LOWER RIO GRANDE VALLEY: 1984 THROUGH 2013

Water Use Sector	County	1980	1984	1985	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991	1992	1993
Irrigation												
	Brooks	300.0	135.0	250.0	500.0	500.0	500.0	281.0	350.0	725.0	600.0	360.0
	Cameron	0.0	188.0	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	Hidalgo	9000.0	8850.0	9957	0.0	0.0	0	10932.0	20403.0	19795.0	8259.0	12912.0
	Jim Hogg	0.0	450.0	500.0	500.0	500.0	500	120.0	150.0	150.0	150.0	31.0
	Kenedy	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	Starr	0.0	500.0	597	0.0	0.0	0	500.0	434.0	6597.0	2850.0	362.0
	Willacy	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0
	Zapata	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Livestock												
	Brooks	93.0	74.0	67	76.0	79.0	81	80.0	81.0	83	62.0	62.0
	Cameron	454.0	109.0	101	91.0	104.0	75	77.0	88.0	91	145.0	143.0
	Hidalgo	158.0	107.0	94.0	441.0	89.0	361	375.0	401.0	406.0	305.0	306.0
	Jim Hogg	74.0	70.0	66	55.0	50.0	54	54.0	52.0	54	88.0	88.0
	Kenedy	132.0	103.0	86	90.0	103.0	109	108.0	106.0	109	71.0	86.0
	Starr	146.0	148.0	151	136.0	128.0	126	131.0	129.0	133	122.0	125.0
	Willacy	19.0	23.0	23.0	13.0	15.0	16.0	17.0	17.0	18.0	14.0	14.0
	Zapata	73.0	94.0	83.0	81.0	78.0	82.0	81.0	80.0	82.0	45.0	38.0
Manufacturing												
	Brooks	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0
	Cameron	4.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	37	37.0	42.0	41.0	38.0	31.0
	Hidalgo	67.0	49.0	81	401.0	430.0	447	563.0	773.0	428	360.0	304.0
	Jim Hogg	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0
	Kenedy	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0
	Starr	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	Willacy	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	Zapata	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0
Mining												
	Brooks	185.0	158.0	158.0	159.0	176.0	294	260.0	145.0	139.0	139.0	134.0
	Cameron	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	8	8.0	8.0
	Hidalgo	234.0	536.0	586	549.0	614.0	600	586.0	586.0	632	640.0	633.0
	Jim Hogg	0.0	0.0	119	119.0	238.0	217	41.0	41.0	28	28.0	27.0
	Kenedy	6.0	6.0	6.0	6.0	6.0	5.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	1.0	1.0
	Starr	368.0	291.0	282.0	253.0	392.0	382.0	125.0	131.0	234.0	234.0	234.0
	Willacy	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	6	6.0	6.0
	Zapata	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0

MONTGOMERY & ASSOCIATES

TABLE 4.6.1. ANNUAL ESTIMATED GROUNDWATER PUMPING IN LOWER RIO GRANDE VALLEY: 1984 THROUGH 2013

Water Use Sector	County	1980	1984	1985	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991	1992	1993
Municipal												
	Brooks	1145.0	1535.0	1408	1823.0	1118.0	1210	1383.0	1107.0	1090	1231.0	1197.0
	Cameron	452.0	1516.0	732	1056.0	1195.0	940	1904.0	1742.0	1605	1350.0	1329.0
	Hidalgo	3359.0	5357.0	4348	5355.0	4782.0	5055	5122.0	5739.0	6044	6119.0	5637.0
	Jim Hogg	991.0	695.0	696.0	571.0	497.0	497.0	248.0	584.0	818.0	986.0	815.0
	Kenedy	145.0	106.0	81.0	85.0	80.0	76.0	43.0	43.0	40.0	38.0	38.0
	Starr	663.0	819.0	722	1131.0	1111.0	1023	680.0	827.0	856	686.0	502.0
	Willacy	554.0	19.0	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0
	Zapata	169.0	0.0	51.0	25.0	26.0	29	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Steam Electric Power												
	Brooks	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0
	Cameron	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0
	Hidalgo	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	Jim Hogg	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	Kenedy	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0
	Starr	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0
	Willacy	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	Zapata	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0
Domestic												
	Brooks	76.0	76.0	77	76.8	76.8	77	76.8	76.8	77	76.8	76.8
	Cameron	84.0	86.4	86	86.4	86.4	86	86.4	86.4	86	86.4	86.4
	Hidalgo	238.4	240.0	240.0	240.8	240.8	240.8	240.8	240.8	240.8	240.8	240.8
	Jim Hogg	8.8	10.4	11.2	11.2	12.0	12.0	12.0	12.0	12.0	12.0	12.0
	Kenedy	20.8	20.8	21	20.8	20.8	21	20.8	20.8	21	20.8	20.8
	Starr	147.2	148.0	148	148.8	149.6	150	149.6	152.0	150	152.0	152.0
	Willacy	16.8	17.6	17.6	17.6	17.6	18	17.6	17.6	17.6	17.6	17.6
	Zapata	10.4	10.4	10	11.2	11.2	11	11.2	11.2	11	11.2	11.2

MONTGOMERY & ASSOCIATES

TABLE 4.6.1. ANNUAL ESTIMATED GROUNDWATER PUMPING IN LOWER RIO GRANDE VALLEY: 1984 THROUGH 2013

Water Use Sector	County	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002
Irrigation										
	Brooks	465.0	465.0	465.0	465.0	465.0	465.0	25.0	25.0	243.0
	Cameron	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	6673.0	9409.0	8749.0
	Hidalgo	14895.0	13224.0	8137.0	5783.0	11611.0	12017.0	4458.0	3734.0	3447.0
	Jim Hogg	313.0	313.0	313.0	313.0	313.0	313.0	817.0	758.0	758.0
	Kenedy	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	107.0	107.0	107.0
	Starr	300.0	473.0	434.0	456.0	873.0	628.0	284.0	372.0	470.0
	Willacy	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0
	Zapata	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Livestock										
	Brooks	58	57.0	61.0	63	51.0	54.0	75	146.0	74.0
	Cameron	91	101.0	91.0	109	88.0	127.0	31	28.0	23.0
	Hidalgo	326	342.0	317.0	321.0	268.0	304.0	273	228.0	206.0
	Jim Hogg	69	69.0	76.0	76	58.0	58.0	51	78.0	27.0
	Kenedy	69	64.0	71.0	61	84.0	89.0	90	85.0	77.0
	Starr	106	127.0	173.0	95	104.0	119.0	112	67.0	65.0
	Willacy	9.0	11.0	12.0	12.0	18.0	15.0	15.0	16.0	27.0
	Zapata	51.0	51.0	51.0	51.0	49.0	51.0	47.0	137.0	39.0
Manufacturing										
	Brooks	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0
	Cameron	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	44	0.0	2.0
	Hidalgo	701	779.0	442.0	849	1060.0	452.0	38	13.0	11.0
	Jim Hogg	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0
	Kenedy	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0
	Starr	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	Willacy	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	Zapata	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0
Mining										
	Brooks	127	127.0	127.0	127.0	127.0	127.0	0	0.0	0.0
	Cameron	8	8.0	8.0	8	8.0	8.0	0	0.0	0.0
	Hidalgo	342	253.0	1354.0	1940	1136.0	1136.0	743	718.0	720.0
	Jim Hogg	27	27.0	27.0	27	27.0	27.0	0	0.0	0.0
	Kenedy	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	Starr	235.0	235.0	239.0	239.0	239.0	239.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	Willacy	6	6.0	6.0	6	6.0	6.0	0	0.0	0.0
	Zapata	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0

MONTGOMERY & ASSOCIATES

TABLE 4.6.1. ANNUAL ESTIMATED GROUNDWATER PUMPING IN LOWER RIO GRANDE VALLEY: 1984 THROUGH 2013

Water Use Sector	County	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002
Municipal										
	Brooks	1365	1496.0	1594.0	2525	2792.0	1973.0	1966	1941.0	1806.0
	Cameron	1198	876.0	1432.0	2995	2718.0	2762.0	207	213.0	220.0
	Hidalgo	8041	8641.0	8859.0	7845	7814.0	6252.0	5648	4863.0	5374.0
	Jim Hogg	775.0	683.0	896.0	353.0	834.0	597.0	922.0	1000.0	899.0
	Kenedy	50.0	40.0	50.0	70.0	64.0	105.0	133.0	116.0	133.0
	Starr	711	699.0	721.0	602	466.0	604.0	892	1145.0	1178.0
	Willacy	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	44	44.0	44.0
	Zapata	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	161	167.0	173.0
Steam Electric Power										
	Brooks	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0
	Cameron	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	163	278.0	260.0
	Hidalgo	0.0	16.0	1700.0	719.0	1466.0	684.0	1780.0	1876.0	1506.0
	Jim Hogg	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	Kenedy	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0
	Starr	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0
	Willacy	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0
	Zapata	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0
Domestic										
	Brooks	77	76.8	77.6	78	77.6	77.6	78	77.6	77.6
	Cameron	86	86.4	86.4	86	86.4	86.4	86	86.4	86.4
	Hidalgo	240.8	240.8	240.8	240.8	241.6	241.6	241.6	241.6	241.6
	Jim Hogg	12.0	12.8	12.8	12.8	12.8	12.8	12.8	12.8	12.8
	Kenedy	21	20.8	20.8	21	20.8	20.8	21	20.8	20.8
	Starr	152	152.0	152.0	152	152.0	152.8	153	152.8	152.8
	Willacy	18	17.6	17.6	17.6	17.6	17.6	18	17.6	17.6
	Zapata	11	11.2	11.2	11	11.2	11.2	11	11.2	11.2

TABLE 4.6.1. ANNUAL ESTIMATED GROUNDWATER PUMPING IN LOWER RIO GRANDE VALLEY: 1984 THROUGH 2013

Water Use Sector	County	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Irrigation												
	Brooks	712.0	625.0	627.0	564.0	312.0	654.0	2417.0	803.0	1161.0	751.0	741.0
	Cameron	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	37.0
	Hidalgo	2000.0	1509.0	1663.0	1042.0	1140.0	66.0	1527.0	0.0	0.0	222.0	50.0
	Jim Hogg	500.0	500.0	500.0	500.0	417.0	563.0	0.0	250.0	360.0	292.0	120.0
	Kenedy	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	Starr	278.0	417.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	19.0
	Willacy	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0	15.0
	Zapata	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	300.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0
Livestock												
	Brooks	61	71.0	460.0	449	427.0	328.0	350	292.0	292.0	256	333.0
	Cameron	32	30.0	31.0	52	25.0	28.0	32	65.0	67.0	25	30.0
	Hidalgo	219.0	214.0	294.0	320	301.0	346.0	400.0	336.0	354.0	294	286.0
	Jim Hogg	35	34.0	407.0	408	423.0	346.0	378	317.0	310.0	276	400.0
	Kenedy	62	64.0	528.0	529	433.0	880.0	689	798.0	799.0	716	595.0
	Starr	75	76.0	757.0	794	818.0	793.0	655	1032.0	1102.0	694	820.0
	Willacy	23.0	23.0	94.0	114.0	127.0	100.0	87.0	102.0	102.0	89.0	84.0
	Zapata	48.0	48.0	368.0	380.0	380.0	274.0	274.0	265.0	261.0	220.0	306.0
Manufacturing												
	Brooks	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0
	Cameron	2.0	2.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0
	Hidalgo	14	15.0	8.0	8	8.0	8.0	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0
	Jim Hogg	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0
	Kenedy	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0
	Starr	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.0	12.0	12.0	12.0	12.0	12.0	0.0
	Willacy	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	Zapata	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0
Mining												
	Brooks	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	173.0	175.0	178.0	170.0	15	7.0
	Cameron	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0	23.0	19.0	0	0.0
	Hidalgo	720	722.0	727.0	722	341.0	1467.0	1807	1160.0	1072.0	684	672.0
	Jim Hogg	0	0.0	0.0	30	0.0	76.0	100	39.0	28.0	16	10.0
	Kenedy	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	34.0	47.0	60.0	44.0	2.0	1.0
	Starr	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	245.0	233.0	221.0	189.0	47.0	115.0
	Willacy	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	3.0	11	20.0	15.0	2	0.0
	Zapata	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	192.0	119	45.0	33.0	2	1.0

MONTGOMERY & ASSOCIATES

TABLE 4.6.1. ANNUAL ESTIMATED GROUNDWATER PUMPING IN LOWER RIO GRANDE VALLEY: 1984 THROUGH 2013

Water Use Sector	County	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Municipal												
	Brooks	1630	1587.0	1743.0	1815	1640.0	1793.0	2194	1842.0	1946.0	1825	1589.0
	Cameron	225	221.0	3627.0	5558	7601.0	4922.0	27289	9738.0	9951.0	10277	9745.0
	Hidalgo	5079	5990.0	7254.0	7402	7180.0	9307.0	10045	9429.0	13241.0	12518	13168.0
	Jim Hogg	909.0	907.0	910.0	916.0	902.0	909.0	949.0	158.0	170.0	996.0	994.0
	Kenedy	131.0	123.0	250.0	253.0	82.0	126.0	132.0	79.0	80.0	81.0	78.0
	Starr	1108	1106.0	1188.0	1207	1017.0	1110.0	1197	1308.0	1445.0	1351	805.0
	Willacy	45	50.0	54.0	57	49.0	46.0	334	630.0	1463.0	1375	1291.0
	Zapata	182.0	178.0	189.0	204	169.0	190.0	212.0	235.0	233.0	212	164.0
Steam Electric Power												
	Brooks	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0
	Cameron	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0
	Hidalgo	2266.0	1135.0	1157.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	Jim Hogg	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	Kenedy	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0
	Starr	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0
	Willacy	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0
	Zapata	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0
Domestic												
	Brooks	78	77.6	77.6	78	77.6	77.6	78	77.6	77.6	78	77.6
	Cameron	86	86.4	86.4	86	86.4	86.4	86	86.4	87.2	87	87.2
	Hidalgo	241.6	243.2	243.2	243.2	243.2	243.2	244.8	244.8	244.8	246.4	246.4
	Jim Hogg	12.8	12.8	12.8	12.8	12.8	12.8	12.8	12.8	12.8	12.8	12.8
	Kenedy	21	20.8	20.8	21	20.8	20.8	21	20.8	20.8	21	20.8
	Starr	153	152.8	152.8	153	152.8	152.8	153	152.8	152.8	154	153.6
	Willacy	17.6	17.6	17.6	18	17.6	17.6	17.6	17.6	17.6	18	17.6
	Zapata	11	11.2	11.2	11	11.2	11.2	11	11.2	11.2	11	11.2

Note: Annual pumping values in acre-feet

Source: Annual pumping estimates are from TWDB water use surveys, except for domestic. Domestic pumping was estimated using assumed rate per well and well locations from the TWDB Groundwater Database.
TWDB = Texas Water Development Board

TABLE 4.6.2. RECOMMENDED BRACKISH GROUNDWATER DESALINATION STRATEGIES

Recommended Brackish Groundwater Desalination Strategies

Entity	Project	No. of Wells	Well Depth (feet)	Well Diameter (inches)	Average Flow/Well (gallons/minute)	Project Start (year)	Total Groundwater Pumping, by decade (acre-feet/year)					
							2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
Cameron County												
East Rio Hondo WSC & North Alamo WSC	North Cameron Regional WTP Wellfield Expansion	1	1,000	12	1,100	2020	1,470	1,470	1,470	1,470	1,470	1,470
El Jardin WSC	BGD	1	1,000	6	347	2020	700	700	700	700	700	700
La Feria	Water Well with RO Unit	1	1,000	8	900	2020	1,400	1,400	1,400	1,400	1,400	1,400
Laguna Madre WD	BGD	2	1,000	8	694	2020	2,800	2,800	2,800	2,800	2,800	2,800
Primera	BGD	1	1,000	8	700	2020	1,400	1,400	1,400	1,400	1,400	1,400
Hildalgo County												
McAllen	BGD	3	1,000	8	800	2020	3,360	3,360	3,360	3,360	3,360	3,360
Mission	BGD	3	1,000	8	800	2020	3,360	3,360	3,360	3,360	3,360	3,360
Alamo	BGD	1	1,000	8	700	2020	1,120	1,120	1,120	1,120	1,120	1,120
Sharyland WSC	Well and RO at WTP 2	1	1,000	8	900	2020	1,125	1,125	1,125	1,125	1,125	1,125
Sharyland WSC	Well and RO at WTP 3	1	1,000	8	900	2020	1,125	1,125	1,125	1,125	1,125	1,125
Starr County												
Union WSC (Rio Grande City)	BGD	1	1,000	6	347	2020	700	700	700	700	700	700
Willacy County												
Lyford	BGD	1	1,000	8	1,000	2020	1,400	1,400	1,400	1,400	1,400	1,400
North Alamo WSC	Delta Area RO WTP Expansion	2	1,000	8	1,000	2060	0	0	0	0	2,800	2,800
North Alamo WSC	La Sara RO Plant Expansion	1	1,000	12	1,100	2070	0	0	0	0	0	1,400
						Total Groundwater Production	19,960	19,960	19,960	19,960	22,760	24,160

Source: 2016 Region M Water Plan, Black & Veatch (2015)

Notes:
WSC = Water Supply Corporation
WD = water district
WTP = water treatment plant
RO = reverse osmosis
BGD = brackish groundwater desalination

TABLE 4.6.3. RECOMMENDED FRESH GROUNDWATER STRATEGIES

Recommended Fresh Groundwater Strategies

Entity	Project	County	Project Start (year)	Total Groundwater Pumping, by decade (acre-feet/year)					
				2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
San Benito	Groundwater Supply	Cameron	2020	1,120	1,120	1,120	1,120	1,120	1,120
Military Highway Water Supply Corporation	Expand Existing Groundwater Wells (Cameron County)	Cameron	2020	625	625	625	625	625	625
Cameron County	Groundwater Supply Expansion	Cameron	2020	4,500	4,500	4,500	4,500	4,500	4,500
Alamo	Groundwater Well	Hidalgo	2020	1,100	1,100	1,100	1,100	1,100	1,100
Edcouch	Groundwater Supply	Hidalgo	2020	500	500	500	500	500	500
Hidalgo	Expand Existing Groundwater Wells	Hidalgo	2020	300	300	300	300	300	300
Welasco	Groundwater Blending/ Brackish Groundwater Mixing	Hidalgo	2020	560	560	560	560	560	560
Hidalgo Steam Electric - NRG	Additional Groundwater Wells	Hidalgo	2020	100	100	100	100	100	100
Starr County	Additional Groundwater Wells	Starr	2020	400	400	400	400	400	400
		Total Groundwater Production		9,205	9,205	9,205	9,205	9,205	9,205

Source: 2016 Region M Water Plan, Black & Veatch (2015)