



TEXAS DEPARTMENT OF WATER RESOURCES

REPORT 262

**ANALYTICAL STUDY OF THE OGALLALA AQUIFER IN
LIPSCOMB COUNTY, TEXAS**

**Projections of Saturated Thickness, Volume of Water in Storage,
Pumpage Rates, Pumping Lifts, and Well Yields**

By

Ann E. Bell and Shelly Morrison

February 1981

TEXAS DEPARTMENT OF WATER RESOURCES

Harvey Davis, Executive Director

TEXAS WATER DEVELOPMENT BOARD

Louis A. Beecherl Jr., Chairman
George W. McCleskey
Glen E. Roney

John H. Garrett, Vice Chairman
W. O. Bankston
Lonnie A. "Bo" Pilgrim

TEXAS WATER COMMISSION

Felix McDonald, Chairman
Joe R. Carroll, Commissioner

Dorsey B. Hardeman, Commissioner

Authorization for use or reproduction of any original material contained in this publication, i.e., not obtained from other sources, is freely granted. The Department would appreciate acknowledgement.

Published and distributed
by the
Texas Department of Water Resources
Post Office Box 13087
Austin, Texas 78711

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
CONCLUSIONS	1
INTRODUCTION	1
PURPOSE AND SCOPE OF STUDY	2
NATURE OF THE OGALLALA AQUIFER	3
General Geology	3
Storage Properties	3
Natural Recharge and Irrigation Recirculation	4
PROCEDURES USED TO OBTAIN PROJECTIONS	4
Hydrologic Data Base	4
Projecting the Depletion of Saturated Thickness	5
Mapping Saturated Thickness, and Calculating Volume of Water in Storage	7
Calculating Pumpage	8
Calculating Pumping Lifts	8
Well-Yield Estimates	9
DISTINCTION BETWEEN PROJECTIONS AND PREDICTIONS	10

TABLES AND MAPS PRESENTING RESULTS OF THE STUDY

SATURATED THICKNESS AND VOLUME OF WATER IN THE OGALLALA AQUIFER	11
Table of Volume of Water in Storage Corresponding to Mapped Saturated-Thickness Intervals, 1974	12
Map Showing Estimated Saturated Thickness, 1974	13
Table of Volume of Water in Storage Corresponding to Mapped Saturated-Thickness Intervals, 1980	14
Map Showing Projected Saturated Thickness, 1980	15

TABLE OF CONTENTS—Continued

	Page
Table of Volume of Water in Storage Corresponding to Mapped Saturated-Thickness Intervals, 1990	16
Map Showing Projected Saturated Thickness, 1990	17
Table of Volume of Water in Storage Corresponding to Mapped Saturated-Thickness Intervals, 2000	18
Map Showing Projected Saturated Thickness, 2000	19
Table of Volume of Water in Storage Corresponding to Mapped Saturated-Thickness Intervals, 2010	20
Map Showing Projected Saturated Thickness, 2010	21
Table of Volume of Water in Storage Corresponding to Mapped Saturated-Thickness Intervals, 2020	22
Map Showing Projected Saturated Thickness, 2020	23
POTENTIAL WELL YIELD OF THE OGALLALA AQUIFER	25
Map Showing Estimated Potential Yield, 1974	27
Map Showing Projected Potential Yield, 1980	28
Map Showing Projected Potential Yield, 1990	29
Map Showing Projected Potential Yield, 2000	30
Map Showing Projected Potential Yield, 2010	31
Map Showing Projected Potential Yield, 2020	32
PUMPING LIFTS IN THE OGALLALA AQUIFER	33
Table of Surface Area Corresponding to Mapped Pumping-Lift Intervals, 1974	34
Map Showing Estimated Pumping Lifts, 1974	35
Table of Surface Area Corresponding to Mapped Pumping-Lift Intervals, 1980	36
Map Showing Projected Pumping Lifts, 1980	37
Table of Surface Area Corresponding to Mapped Pumping-Lift Intervals, 1990	38
Map Showing Projected Pumping Lifts, 1990	39

TABLE OF CONTENTS—Continued

	Page
Table of Surface Area Corresponding to Mapped Pumping-Lift Intervals, 2000	40
Map Showing Projected Pumping Lifts, 2000	41
Table of Surface Area Corresponding to Mapped Pumping-Lift Intervals, 2010	42
Map Showing Projected Pumping Lifts, 2010	43
Table of Surface Area Corresponding to Mapped Pumping-Lift Intervals, 2020	44
Map Showing Projected Pumping Lifts, 2020	45
PUMPAGE FROM THE OGALLALA AQUIFER	47
Table of Pumpage Corresponding to Mapped Decline-Rate Intervals, 1974	48
Map Showing Estimated Rates of Water-Level Decline, 1974	49
Table of Pumpage Corresponding to Mapped Decline-Rate Intervals, 1980	50
Map Showing Projected Rates of Water-Level Decline, 1980	51
Table of Pumpage Corresponding to Mapped Decline-Rate Intervals, 1990	52
Map Showing Projected Rates of Water-Level Decline, 1990	53
Table of Pumpage Corresponding to Mapped Decline-Rate Intervals, 2000	54
Map Showing Projected Rates of Water-Level Decline, 2000	55
Table of Pumpage Corresponding to Mapped Decline-Rate Intervals, 2010	56
Map Showing Projected Rates of Water-Level Decline, 2010	57
Table of Pumpage Corresponding to Mapped Decline-Rate Intervals, 2020	58
Map Showing Projected Rates of Water-Level Decline, 2020	59
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	60
STAFF INVOLVEMENT	60

TABLE OF CONTENTS—Continued

	Page
METRIC CONVERSIONS TABLE	60
SELECTED REFERENCES	61

ANALYTICAL STUDY OF THE OGALLALA AQUIFER IN LIPSCOMB COUNTY, TEXAS

Projections of Saturated Thickness, Volume of Water in Storage, Pumpage Rates, Pumping Lifts, and Well Yields

CONCLUSIONS

The Ogallala aquifer in Lipscomb County contained approximately 15.9 million acre-feet (19.6 km³) of water in 1974. Historical pumpage has exceeded 35,000 acre-feet (0.04 km³) annually, which is approximately one and one-half times the rate of natural recharge to the aquifer in the county. This overdraft is expected to continue, ultimately resulting in reduced well yields, reduced acreage irrigated, and reduced agricultural production.

There is a very uneven distribution of ground water in the county. Some areas have ample ground-water resources to support current usage through the year 2020; whereas, in other areas of the county, ground water is currently in short supply.

To obtain maximum benefits from the remaining ground-water resources, Lipscomb County water users should implement all possible conservation measures so that the remaining ground-water supply is used in the most prudent manner possible and with the least amount of waste.

INTRODUCTION


Lipscomb County is situated in the Northern High Plains of Texas. Lipscomb, the county seat, is located approximately 130 miles (209 km) northeast of Amarillo. The county contains an area of about 934 square miles (2,419 km²) and has a total population of approximately 3,400.

Lipscomb County produces a total farm income of over \$18 million annually (Texas Almanac and State Industrial Guide 1978-79). Leading crops in the county are wheat, grain sorghums, corn, and alfalfa. Livestock feeding accounts for two-thirds of the farm income,

while other agribusinesses, including the sale of irrigation equipment supplies, feed and seed, and fertilizer, also make significant contributions to the total county income.

Ground water is extremely important to the economy of the county inasmuch as most of the crops are irrigated with ground water. Additionally, the water used by rural residents, municipalities, and local industries is mostly ground water.

The principal source of fresh ground water in the county is the Ogallala aquifer. During the past three decades, the withdrawal of ground water has greatly exceeded the natural recharge to the aquifer. If this overdraft continues, the aquifer ultimately will be depleted to the point that it may not be economically feasible to produce water for irrigation.



Location of Lipscomb County, and Extent of the
Ogallala Aquifer in Texas

This is one of numerous planned county studies covering the declining ground-water resource of the Ogallala aquifer in the High Plains of Texas. The report contains maps, charts, and tabulations which reflect estimates of the volume of water in storage in the Ogallala aquifer in Lipscomb County and the projected depletion of this water supply by decade periods through the year 2020. The report also contains estimates of pumpage, pumping lifts, and other data related to current and future water use in the county. However, the report does not attempt to project that portion of the volume of water in underground storage which may be ultimately recoverable.

PURPOSE AND SCOPE OF STUDY

This study resulted from an immediate need for information to illustrate to the High Plains water users that the ground-water supply is being depleted. It is hoped that this study will help persuade the water users to implement all possible conservation measures, so that the remaining ground-water supply will be used in the most prudent manner possible and with the least amount of waste.

The study was also conducted to provide information to local, State, and federal officials for their use in implementing plans to alleviate the water-shortage problem in the High Plains of Texas.

These immediate needs for current information have resulted in a concerted effort by the Texas Department of Water Resources to utilize high-speed computers to conduct evaluation and projection studies of ground-water resources. The results of one of these computer studies is contained in this report.

This report does not represent a detailed ground-water study of the county; rather, the report was prepared using only those data which were readily available in the files of the Texas Department of Water Resources. Information provided for 1974 is considered reliable; however, the projections of future conditions should be used only as a guide to reasonable expectations.

This study represents a new approach by the Department in making and presenting appraisals of ground-water resources. Consequently, a detailed explanation of the methods and assumptions used in the study is included. A complete set of tabulations and illustrations resulting from this study is presented at the end of the report.

The illustrations were prepared to answer four questions believed to be of prime importance to the Lipscomb County landowners and water users. These questions, and methods by which a set of answers can be obtained from the illustrations, are as follows:

1. Question: How much water is in storage under any given tract of land in the county and what is expected to happen to this water in the future?

Answer: First, determine the approximate location of the tract on the most current (1974) map of saturated thickness. Read the value of the contour line at this location (if midway between two contour lines, take an average of the two). This thickness value can then be converted to the approximate volume of water in storage, in acre-feet per surface acre, by multiplying it by the coefficient of storage of 0.15, or 15 percent. To obtain estimates of what can be expected in the future, the same procedure can be followed by using the maps which illustrate projected saturated thickness in the years 1980, 1990, 2000, 2010, and 2020.

2. Question: What can be expected to happen to well yields if the saturated thickness diminishes as illustrated by the maps?

Answer: Well yields are expected to decline as the aquifer thins; therefore, a map of estimated well yields has been prepared for each year of the study. The landowner need only find the approximate location of his property on the well-yield map that applies to the year in question and read the well-yield estimates directly from the map.

3. Question: With energy cost increasing, pumping lifts (pumping levels) are becoming more and more important. What are the estimates of current pumping lifts and what are they expected to be in the future?

Answer: Contour maps depicting estimated pumping lifts have been prepared for each year of the study. These maps are contoured in feet below land surface. The landowner need only find the approximate location of his property on the map that applies to the year in question to read the pumping-lift estimates.

4. Question: If an all-out effort is made to conserve ground-water resources, how can landowners and water users determine how they are doing compared to the projections in the study?

Answer: Using the maps that show rates of water-level declines, the landowners and water users can determine what the changes in water levels are in their area and what they are projected to be in the future. This can be accomplished by finding the approximate location of their property on the map pertaining to the year in question and by reading the estimates of water-level changes which are recorded in feet. To determine how he is doing from year to year, the landowner or water user can make measurements of depth to water in his own wells or obtain copies of measurements made by the Department or the ground-water district for his area. These measurements can then be compared to the projected values on the map nearest to the year of interest to obtain an estimate of the effectiveness of the conservation efforts.

NATURE OF THE OGALLALA AQUIFER

Because thorough understanding of the Ogallala aquifer is not necessary for the water user, the following discussion of aquifer geology and hydrology is rather general. Readers interested in pursuing the subject in more detail may do so from the numerous reports which have been published on the Ogallala. Many of these publications are included in the list of selected references of this report.

General Geology

Fresh ground water in Lipscomb County is obtained principally from the Ogallala Formation of Pliocene age. Water in the Ogallala Formation is unconfined and is contained in the pore spaces of unconsolidated or partly consolidated sediments.

The Ogallala Formation principally consists of interfingering bodies of fine to coarse sand, gravel, silt, and clay—material eroded from the Rocky Mountains which was carried southeastward and deposited by streams. The earliest sediments, mainly gravel and coarse sand, filled the valleys cut in the pre-Ogallala surface. Pebbles and cobbles of quartz, quartzite, and chert are typical of these early sediments. After filling the valleys,

deposition continued until the entire area that is now the Texas High Plains was covered by sediments from the shifting streams.

The upper part of the formation contains several hard, caliche-cemented, erosionally resistant beds called the "caprock." A wind-blown cover of fine silt, sand, and soil overlies the caprock.

The Ogallala deposits overlie rocks of Permian age. These rocks, principally red shale, serve as a nearly impermeable floor for the aquifer. On a broad scale, the erosional surface at the top of the Permian rocks dips gently (about 10 feet per mile [2m/km]) toward the southeast, similar to the slope of the land surface. In general, however, this pre-Ogallala surface had greater relief than the present land surface. Low hills and wide valleys which contain deep, narrow stream channels are typical features of the Permian erosional surface. Because the Ogallala was deposited on top of this irregular surface, the formation is very thin in some areas and very thick in others. Often this contrast occurs in relatively short distances.

The Canadian River has cut deeply through the Ogallala Formation in the northern part of the Texas High Plains area. The valley effectively separates the formation geographically into two units having little hydraulic interconnection. Erosion has also removed the Ogallala from much of its former extent to the east in Oklahoma, and to the west in New Mexico, and there is only a relatively narrow communication with the Ogallala to the north for a short distance at the Beaver River in the Oklahoma Panhandle. As a result, both the Northern and the Southern High Plains are virtually hydraulically independent of adjacent areas. For this reason, coupled with the scarcity of local rainfall, water that is being withdrawn from the aquifer cannot be replaced quickly by natural recharge and is in effect being mined.

Storage Properties

The coefficient of storage of an aquifer is defined as the volume of water released from or taken into storage per unit surface area of the aquifer per unit change in the component of head normal to that surface. In water-table aquifers such as the Ogallala, the coefficient of storage is nearly equal to the specific yield, which is defined as the quantity of water that a formation will yield under the force of gravity, if it is first saturated and then allowed to drain, the quantity of water being expressed as a percentage of the volume of the material drained.

A coefficient of storage of 15 percent has been selected for use in this study based on past studies and the results of numerous aquifer tests published in Texas Water Development Board Report 98 (Myers, 1969). The following chart shows the volumes of water corresponding to various amounts of aquifer saturated thickness, based on a storage coefficient of 15 percent. These are the approximate amounts of water that would drain from the aquifer material by gravity flow if the entire saturated thickness could be drained.

SATURATED THICKNESS (feet)	VOLUME OF WATER IN STORAGE (acre-feet, per surface acre)
25	3.75
50	7.50
75	11.25
100	15.00
150	22.50
200	30.00
250	37.50
300	45.00
400	60.00
500	75.00

Natural Recharge and Irrigation Recirculation

Recharge is the addition of water to an aquifer by either natural or artificial means. Natural recharge results chiefly from infiltration of precipitation. The Ogallala aquifer in Lipscomb County receives natural recharge by precipitation that falls within the county and in adjoining areas.

The amount and rate of natural recharge from precipitation depend on the amount, distribution, and intensity of the precipitation; the amount of moisture in the soil when the rain or snowmelt begins; and the temperature, vegetative cover, and permeability of the materials at the site of infiltration. Because of the wide variations in these factors, it is difficult to estimate the amount of natural recharge to the ground-water reservoir. Estimates of annual natural recharge to the Ogallala aquifer made by Barnes and others (1949, p. 26-27) indicate only a fraction of an inch. Theis (1937, p. 546-568) suggested less than half an inch, and Havens (1966, p. F1), in a study of the Ogallala in New Mexico, indicated about 0.8 inch (2 cm) per year.

The authors of this report believe that recharge from precipitation may be more than these earlier estimates, due to changes in the soil and land surface that have accompanied large-scale irrigation development in the county. Some of the farming practices which are believed to have altered the recharge rate are: clearing

the land of deep-rooted native vegetation; deep plowing of fields, which eliminates compacted zones in the soil (locally called "hard pans"), and the plowing of playa lake bottoms and sides; bench leveling, contour farming, and terracing; maintaining a generally higher soil moisture condition by application of irrigation water prior to large rains; and increasing the humus level in the root zone by plowing under a large amount of foliage from crops grown under irrigation.

Obtaining a reliable estimate of the present recharge rate is further complicated by the consideration which must be given to irrigation recirculation. A substantial portion of the water pumped from the Ogallala for irrigation percolates back to the aquifer. This does not constitute an additional supply of water, but reduces the net depletion of the aquifer. As with natural recharge, many factors are involved in making estimates of recirculation. Some of these factors are the rate, amount, and type of irrigation application; the soil type and the infiltration rate of the soil profile in the root zone; the amount of moisture in the soil prior to the irrigation application; the type of crop being grown, its root development, and its moisture extraction pattern; and the climatic conditions during and following the irrigation application. Tentative estimates of the actual amounts of recharge and irrigation recirculation in Lipscomb County will be found in a subsequent section on "Calculating Pumpage."

PROCEDURES USED TO OBTAIN PROJECTIONS

Hydrologic Data Base

The Texas Department of Water Resources and the North Plains Ground Water Conservation District No. 2 cooperatively maintain a network of water level observation wells in Lipscomb County. Records from these wells provided the principal data base used in this study. This data base was supplemented in some areas with records from water well drillers' logs collected by both the District and the Department.

The data base included: (1) measurements of the depth to water below land surface, which have been made annually in the wells in the observation network; (2) the dates these measurements were made; and (3) the depth from land surface to the base of the Ogallala aquifer (In many cases, this was identical to the well depth). To facilitate automatic data processing with modern, high-speed computers, the data base also included a unique number for each well and the geographical coordinates of each well location.

Wells chosen from the data base for use in obtaining projections of future conditions were those in which depth to the base of the aquifer could be determined or estimated, and those needed to provide spaced data coverage in the county. Locations of the wells that were selected and used for control are shown on the various maps in this report.

Projecting the Depletion of Saturated Thickness

The water-use patterns between 1960 and 1972 as reflected in the changes in water levels in wells measured in the High Plains of Texas were used as the principal data source for developing an aquifer depletion schedule. The depletion schedule generally reflects average precipitation and precipitation distribution in the area for the duration of the study period. Additionally, in developing and applying the depletion schedule, adjustments through time were made to reflect the effects of depletion of the aquifer on its ability to yield water. That is, as the aquifer's saturated thickness decreases, its ability to yield water to wells is reduced, the well yields decline, less water is pumped, and there results a lessened rate of further aquifer depletion.

The aquifer's hydraulics are such that if a well penetrates the total saturated section and the pump is sized to produce the maximum the aquifer will yield, the well yield will decline at a disproportionately greater rate than the reduction in saturated thickness. Actually, the remaining well yield expressed as a percentage of former yield will be only about half of the remaining saturated thickness expressed as a percentage of former thickness. For example, a well with 60 feet (18.3 m) of saturated section and a maximum yield of 900 gallons per minute (56.8 l/s) will probably yield only 225 gallons per minute (14.2 l/s) when the saturated section is reduced to 30 feet (9.1 m).

The depletion schedule for Lipscomb and surrounding counties was developed in the following manner:

1. The records for all water level observation wells for the years 1960 through 1972 in Dallam, Hansford, Hartley, Hemphill, Hutchinson, Lipscomb, Moore, Ochiltree, Roberts, and Sherman Counties were separated from the master file. These counties have similar soil types, cropping patterns, depths to water, saturated thickness, and climatic conditions.

2. These well records were then sorted into groups according to the saturated thickness in each well as of 1966 (the middle year). Each group included records of all wells in a 20-foot (6.1-meter) range of saturated thickness. (Ranges are shown in the tabulation below.)
3. The average decline in water level was calculated for each year for each well group, and these decline values were adjusted to remove the effects of each year's deviation from long-term average precipitation.
4. The average annual decline in water level for the total period (1960-72) was calculated for each well group, incorporating the adjustments for departure from average precipitation.

From the foregoing procedure, the following depletion schedule was developed (no depletion was allowed for areas with 10 feet or less of saturated thickness):

RANGE OF SATURATED THICKNESS (feet)	AVERAGE ANNUAL WATER-LEVEL DECLINE, 1960-72 (feet)
0 to 10	0.00
10 to 20	.50
20 to 40	1.00
40 to 60	1.50
60 to 80	2.00
80 to 100	2.25
100 to 120	2.50
120 to 140	2.75
140 to 160	3.08
160 to 180	2.95
180 to 200	3.04
200 to 220	3.07
220 to 240	2.93
240 to 260	3.15
260 to 280	3.36
280 to 300	3.13
300 to 320	3.27
320 to 340	3.37
340 to 360	3.47
360 to 380	3.57
380 to 400	3.66
400 to 420	3.66
420 to 440	3.50
440 to 460	4.00
460 to 480	4.00

Based on this depletion schedule, a computer program was written to calculate future saturated thickness at individual well sites. The following problem is presented to show the computational procedures used.

Problem: A well has a saturated thickness of 100 feet in 1974 and one wants to project what the saturated thickness will be in this well for every year to the year 2020.

- Factors:
1. The beginning saturated thickness is 110 feet in 1974.
 2. The average decline rate is 2.50 feet per year for wells with saturated sections of 100 to 120 feet.
 3. The average decline rate is 2.25 feet per year for wells with saturated sections of 80 to 100 feet.
 4. The average decline rate is 2.00 feet per year for wells with saturated sections of 60 to 80 feet.

5. The average decline rate is 1.50 feet per year for wells with saturated sections of 40 to 60 feet.
6. The average decline rate is 1.00 foot per year for wells with saturated sections of 20 to 40 feet.
7. The average decline rate is 0.50 foot per year for wells with saturated sections of 10 to 20 feet.
8. The time interval is 1974 through 2020.

The projected saturated thicknesses in the subject well are calculated and shown in the following table:


YEAR	SATURATED THICKNESS, BEGINNING OF YEAR (feet)	AVERAGE DECLINE RATE (feet)	SATURATED THICKNESS, END OF YEAR (feet)
1974	110.00	2.50	107.50
1975	107.50	2.50	105.00
1976	105.00	2.50	102.50
1977	102.50	2.50	100.00
1978	100.00	2.25	97.75
1979	97.75	2.25	95.50
1980	95.50	2.25	93.25
1981	93.25	2.25	91.00
1982	91.00	2.25	88.75
1983	88.75	2.25	86.50
1984	86.50	2.25	84.25
1985	84.25	2.25	82.00
1986	82.00	2.25	79.75
1987	79.75	2.00	77.75
1988	77.75	2.00	75.75
1989	75.75	2.00	73.75
1990	73.75	2.00	71.75
1991	71.75	2.00	69.75
1992	69.75	2.00	67.75
1993	67.75	2.00	65.75
1994	65.75	2.00	63.75
1995	63.75	2.00	61.75
1996	61.75	2.00	59.75
1997	59.75	1.50	58.25
1998	58.25	1.50	56.75
1999	56.75	1.50	55.25
2000	55.25	1.50	53.75
2001	53.75	1.50	52.25
2002	52.25	1.50	50.75
2003	50.75	1.50	49.25
2004	49.25	1.50	47.75
2005	47.75	1.50	46.25
2006	46.25	1.50	44.75
2007	44.75	1.50	43.25
2008	43.25	1.50	41.75
2009	41.75	1.50	40.25
2010	40.25	1.50	38.75

YEAR	SATURATED THICKNESS, BEGINNING OF YEAR (feet)	AVERAGE DECLINE RATE (feet)	SATURATED THICKNESS, END OF YEAR (feet)
2011	38.75	1.00	37.75
2012	37.75	1.00	36.75
2013	36.75	1.00	35.75
2014	35.75	1.00	34.75
2015	34.75	1.00	33.75
2016	33.75	1.00	32.75
2017	32.75	1.00	31.75
2018	31.75	1.00	30.75
2019	30.75	1.00	29.75
2020	29.75	1.00	28.75

Similar computations were made for each of the selected data-control wells in Lipscomb County, and the saturated-thickness values for 1974, 1980, 1990, 2000, 2010, and 2020 were extracted from this data set for use in further calculations and mapping.

Mapping Saturated Thickness, and Calculating Volume of Water in Storage

To obtain estimates of the volume of water in storage in the Ogallala aquifer, an electronic digital computer was used to construct maps which reflect the saturated thickness of the aquifer for those years included in the study. These maps were then refined by the computer to reflect the number of acres corresponding to each range of saturated thickness. The number of acres for each range was multiplied by the saturated thickness in feet for that range and then by the coefficient of storage (0.15 or 15 percent), to yield an estimate of the volume of water in storage in each saturated-thickness range. Totaling these volumes produced an estimate of the volume of water in storage in the county. The current (1974) and projected volume estimates are shown in the following graph:



Estimated Volume of Water in Storage

Preparing a data base and writing the necessary programs for the computer to use in constructing the saturated-thickness maps and in making the necessary calculations is time consuming; however, once the data base is prepared and programs written, the computer can perform in a few hours calculations that would have required many years of manual effort.

A generalized description of the methodology used in mapping and in computing water volume follows: A base map with a scale of 1 inch equals 2 miles (1:125,000) was selected to prepare data for computer processing. All data points (observation wells) were plotted on these base maps by hand and assigned identifying numbers. A machine called a *digitizer* was then used to translate these mapped location data (well locations, county boundaries, etc.) into information processible by the computer. To accomplish this, a latitude and longitude coordinate was recorded on each base map as a central reference point, and all data points and county boundaries were then digitized; that is, measurements were made by the digitizer to reference these data points and boundaries to the initial latitude and longitude coordinate. Then the digitized information was processed by the computer and the maps were re-created by a computer-driven plotter. The computer-plotted image maps were ultimately checked against the hand-constructed maps to verify that the data were plotted accurately.

The assignment of a unique number to each data point (observation well) on the base maps made it possible to machine process the data related to these points and to plot these data back on the maps at the proper location.

To compute the volume of water in storage, the computer was instructed to subdivide the county into squares measuring approximately 0.5 mile (0.8 km). The known saturated-thickness values obtained from the data points were filled into the squares in which the data points were located. Based on these known values, the computer filled in a weighted-average value for each remaining square, taking into consideration all known values within a radius of 7 miles (11 km). After this step was completed, the computer then counted the numbers of squares having equal values, thus obtaining the approximate area in square miles (later converted to acres) corresponding to each range of saturated thickness. As previously stated, the number of acres in each 25-foot (7.6-meter) range of saturated thickness

was multiplied by the corresponding saturated-thickness value and the storage coefficient (0.15 or 15 percent) to obtain the approximate volume of water in acre-feet in that saturated-thickness range.

Although the calculations were made by the computer from information stored in its image field, the data in the image field were printed out in the form of contoured saturated-thickness maps, which are reproduced in this report. Facing each saturated-thickness map in the report is a corresponding tabulation of the approximate volume of water in storage.

Calculating Pumpage

Estimates of current pumpage were obtained in this study by calculating the storage capacity of the dewatered section of the Ogallala aquifer as reflected in changes in the annual depth-to-water measurements made in the water level observation wells. Factors for natural recharge and irrigation recirculation were then added to these volumetric figures to obtain more realistic pumpage estimates.

The step-by-step procedure involved in making pumpage estimates is similar to the procedures used in calculating the estimates of volume of water in storage; therefore, a more general explanation follows.

Change in water level (decline) maps for the aquifer were made by the computer for the years considered. From these maps, the volume of desaturated material was multiplied by the number of acres corresponding to each 0.25-foot (.076-meter) range of decline and then multiplied by the storage coefficient of the aquifer (0.15 or 15 percent), which resulted in an estimate of the volume of water taken from storage for each decline range. Estimates for natural recharge and irrigation recirculation were added to these values to obtain estimates of pumpage.


An attempt was made to obtain a reliable estimate of the natural recharge and recirculation for use in this study. This involved obtaining an estimate of the amount of water required by each of the major crops grown in the area. These values, generally referred to as "duty of water," were obtained from Texas Agricultural Experiment Stations located in the High Plains area. The duty of water figure for each major crop was multiplied by the number of crop acres, and the resulting numbers were added together to yield an estimate of the total crop water demand.

The amount of precipitation which fell just prior to and during the growing season was subtracted from the total water demand estimate. The difference between these values should equal that amount which would have been supplied by irrigation, which will be referred to as irrigation makeup water.

The volume figure represented by the dewatered section was then compared to the volume of water which should have been supplied to crops by irrigation makeup water. In all tests, the volume of water represented by the depletion of the aquifer was considerably less than the makeup water estimate. This difference was attributed to irrigation recirculation and natural recharge.

Various combinations of estimates for natural recharge and recirculation were added to the volume represented by aquifer depletion, in an attempt to obtain comparable values with the makeup water estimated for the test years. One-half inch (1.3 cm) per year of natural recharge added to the volume represented by the depletion of the aquifer, and then adding 10 percent of this for recirculation, most nearly equaled the makeup water estimated in the largest number of instances in Lipscomb County and in adjoining counties with similar conditions.

These amounts were added to the previously calculated storage capacity of the dewatered section to obtain estimates for current (1974) and future pumpage. The following graph shows the current and projected estimates of pumpage:



Estimated Pumpage

Calculating Pumping Lifts

The pumping lift (pumping level) is the depth from land surface to the water level in a pumping well; it is equal to the depth of the static water level plus the drawdown due to pumping. The amount of pumping lift largely determines the amount of energy required to produce the water, and thus strongly affects the pumping costs.

In calculating pumping lifts, procedures were used that are similar to those used in making estimates of the

volume of water in storage and the estimates of pumpage. Again, the computer and original data base were used as previously described.

In making estimates of pumping lifts, it was assumed (1) that the yield of each pumping well is 900 gallons per minute (56.8 l/s) except as limited by the capacity of the aquifer (this conforms with the historical trend of equipping new wells with 8-inch [20-centimeter] or smaller pumps), (2) that the specific well yield is 15 gallons per minute per foot of drawdown (3.1 [l/s]/m), and (3) that once the well yield equals the capacity of the aquifer, the well will continue to be produced at a rate near the capacity of the aquifer until pumping lifts are within 10 feet (3 m) of the base of the aquifer. After that time, it is assumed that the pumping lift will remain constant because of greatly diminished well yields. It should be noted that this 10-foot (3-meter) minimum is somewhat arbitrarily chosen, as one cannot predict accurately the minimum saturated thickness that will be feasible for producing irrigation water under future economic conditions.

The above assumptions restrict the drawdown in wells to a maximum of 60 feet (18.3 m); that is, the maximum well yield of 900 gallons per minute (56.8 l/s) divided by specific well yield of 15 gallons per minute per foot (3.1 [l/s]/m) equals 60 feet (18.3 m) of maximum drawdown.

Based on the above assumptions, pumping lifts were calculated separately for each of the selected data-control wells in the county. The factors involved were the historical and projected saturated-thickness values, the historical and projected static water levels, and the drawdown value assigned to the Lipscomb County area.

In all areas where the aquifer's saturated thickness was 70 feet (21.3 m) or greater (areas where a well, pumped at full capacity, would be drawn down 60 feet [18.3 m] to yield 900 gallons per minute [56.8 l/s]), the computer was instructed to add 60 feet (18.3 m)—the drawdown—to the static water level to determine pumping lift. For a well with a saturated thickness of less than 70 feet (21.3 m), the pumping lift was calculated by subtracting 10 feet (3 m) from the depth of the well (base of the aquifer). These calculations were made for each year of record to be reported (1974, 1980, 1990, 2000, 2010, and 2020) for each well. The pumping-lift values were stored in the computer and printed out in the form of contour maps. Additionally, the surface area corresponding to each interval between the mapped contours was calculated and printed out in tabular form.

Well-Yield Estimates

Estimates of the rate, in gallons per minute, at which the Ogallala aquifer should be capable of yielding water to wells in various areas of the county are presented on maps for each year of record reported (1974, 1980, 1990, 2000, 2010, and 2020). These well-yield estimates are based on capabilities of the aquifer to yield water to irrigation wells of prevailing construction as reflected by the very large number of aquifer tests which have been conducted in various saturated-thickness intervals in the Texas High Plains. The estimates are adjusted to reflect the expected decreases in well yields through time due to the reduced saturated thickness as depletion of the aquifer progresses.

The well-yield estimates are subject to deviations caused by localized geological conditions. The Ogallala is not a homogeneous formation; that is, the silt, clay, sand, and gravel which generally comprise the formation vary from place to place in thickness of layers, layering position, and grain-size sorting. The physical composition of the formation material can drastically affect the ability of the formation to yield water to wells. As an example, in areas where the saturated portion of the formation is comprised of thick beds of coarse and well-sorted grains of sand, the well yields probably will exceed the estimates shown on the maps. In other localized areas, the saturated portion of the formation may be comprised principally of thick beds of silt and clay which can be expected to restrict well yields to less than those shown on the maps.

The following can be used as a general guide in Lipscomb County in estimating well yields based on saturated thickness:

SATURATED THICKNESS (feet)	WELL YIELD (gallons per minute)
Less than 20	Less than 100
20 to 30	100 to 250
30 to 40	250 to 500
40 to 60	500 to 800
60 to 80	800 to 1,000
More than 80	More than 1,000

The maps presented in this report are intended for use as general guidelines only and are not recommended for use in determining water availability when buying and selling specific tracts of land. Inasmuch as the availability of ground water constitutes a large portion of the price of land bought and sold in this area, it is recommended that a qualified ground-water hydrologist be consulted to make appraisals of ground-water conditions when such transactions are contemplated.

DISTINCTION BETWEEN PROJECTIONS AND PREDICTIONS

The actions of the Lipscomb County water user will determine whether the projections of this study come to pass, as the rate of depletion of the ground-water resource is determined by the rate of water use. The authors have not made predictions of what will occur, but have furnished projections based on past trends and presently available information.

There are many unpredictable factors which can influence the future rates of withdrawal of ground water from the Ogallala aquifer for irrigation farming. These factors include: (1) the amounts and distribution of precipitation which will be received in the area in the

future; (2) federal crop acreage controls or the lack of these; (3) the price and demand for food and fiber grown in the area; (4) the cost and availability of energy to produce water from the aquifer; (5) farm labor cost and availability of farm labor; (6) results of continuing research that seeks to develop more frugal water-application methods for irrigation, crops having less water demand, and methods for inducing clouds to yield more water as rain; and (7) most important, the degree to which feasible soil and water conservation measures are employed by the High Plains irrigator. Any of these factors could appreciably influence the rate of use of ground water in the future; however, the projections in this study provide a reasonable set of general expectations on the further depletion of the aquifer.

VOLUME OF WATER IN STORAGE CONTRIBUTING
TO MIXED SATURATED THICKNESS
OF THE OGALLALA AQUIFER

WATER TABLE ELEVATION (feet)	THICKNESS (feet)	MIXED SATURATED THICKNESS (feet)
5000	100	100
4950	150	150
4900	200	200
4850	250	250
4800	300	300
4750	350	350
4700	400	400
4650	450	450
4600	500	500
4550	550	550
4500	600	600
4450	650	650
4400	700	700
4350	750	750
4300	800	800
4250	850	850
4200	900	900
4150	950	950
4100	1000	1000
4050	1050	1050
4000	1100	1100
3950	1150	1150
3900	1200	1200
3850	1250	1250
3800	1300	1300
3750	1350	1350
3700	1400	1400
3650	1450	1450
3600	1500	1500
3550	1550	1550
3500	1600	1600
3450	1650	1650
3400	1700	1700
3350	1750	1750
3300	1800	1800
3250	1850	1850
3200	1900	1900
3150	1950	1950
3100	2000	2000
3050	2050	2050
3000	2100	2100
2950	2150	2150
2900	2200	2200
2850	2250	2250
2800	2300	2300
2750	2350	2350
2700	2400	2400
2650	2450	2450
2600	2500	2500
2550	2550	2550
2500	2600	2600
2450	2650	2650
2400	2700	2700
2350	2750	2750
2300	2800	2800
2250	2850	2850
2200	2900	2900
2150	2950	2950
2100	3000	3000
2050	3050	3050
2000	3100	3100
1950	3150	3150
1900	3200	3200
1850	3250	3250
1800	3300	3300
1750	3350	3350
1700	3400	3400
1650	3450	3450
1600	3500	3500
1550	3550	3550
1500	3600	3600
1450	3650	3650
1400	3700	3700
1350	3750	3750
1300	3800	3800
1250	3850	3850
1200	3900	3900
1150	3950	3950
1100	4000	4000
1050	4050	4050
1000	4100	4100
950	4150	4150
900	4200	4200
850	4250	4250
800	4300	4300
750	4350	4350
700	4400	4400
650	4450	4450
600	4500	4500
550	4550	4550
500	4600	4600
450	4650	4650
400	4700	4700
350	4750	4750
300	4800	4800
250	4850	4850
200	4900	4900
150	4950	4950
100	5000	5000


SATURATED THICKNESS AND VOLUME OF
WATER IN THE OGALLALA AQUIFER

1974

Volume of Water in Storage Corresponding
to Mapped Saturated-Thickness Intervals

(Coefficient of Storage: 15 percent)

<u>MAPPED SATURATED- THICKNESS INTERVAL (feet)</u>	<u>SURFACE AREA (acres)</u>	<u>VOLUME OF WATER IN STORAGE (acre-feet)</u>
25- 50	15,038	83,607
50- 75	14,704	137,431
75- 100	17,126	228,149
100-125	35,709	606,678
125-150	40,377	835,471
150-175	68,075	1,677,394
175-200	124,828	3,513,391
200-225	91,425	2,992,546
225-250	57,331	2,033,879
250-275	50,136	1,971,128
275-300	24,429	1,039,148
300-325	7,026	327,070
325-350	3,871	195,220
350-375	2,314	125,148
375-400	1,823	105,213
TOTAL	<u>554,212</u>	<u>15,871,473</u>



EXPLANATION

•
Well used for control

— 150 —
Line showing approximate saturated thickness of the Ogallala aquifer, in feet.

Interval is 25 feet (7.62m)




1974
Estimated Saturated Thickness


1980

Volume of Water in Storage Corresponding
to Mapped Saturated-Thickness Intervals

(Coefficient of Storage: 15 percent)



<u>MAPPED SATURATED- THICKNESS INTERVAL (feet)</u>	<u>SURFACE AREA (acres)</u>	<u>VOLUME OF WATER IN STORAGE (acre-feet)</u>
25- 50	15,558	85,241
50- 75	14,877	139,792
75-100	21,433	290,282
100-125	33,468	566,913
125-150	41,588	863,854
150-175	63,233	1,557,509
175-200	117,404	3,307,543
200-225	92,118	2,911,451
225-250	58,069	2,059,472
250-275	53,065	2,087,519
275-300	28,192	1,199,380
300-325	7,199	335,191
325-350	3,871	195,082
350-375	2,314	125,099
375-400	1,823	105,161
TOTAL	554,212	15,829,489



EXPLANATION

•
Well used for control

— 150 —

Line showing approximate saturated thickness of the Ogallala aquifer, in feet.

Interval is 25 feet (7.62m)




1980
Projected Saturated Thickness

1990

Volume of Water in Storage Corresponding
to Mapped Saturated-Thickness Intervals

(Coefficient of Storage: 15 percent)

<u>MAPPED SATURATED- THICKNESS INTERVAL (feet)</u>	<u>SURFACE AREA (acres)</u>	<u>VOLUME OF WATER IN STORAGE (acre-feet)</u>
0- 25	6,732	19,589
25- 50	17,819	99,276
50- 75	21,075	204,018
75-100	35,908	469,843
100-125	45,711	774,101
125-150	79,009	1,650,140
150-175	126,037	3,074,572
175-200	83,807	2,340,749
200-225	56,828	1,809,648
225-250	52,358	1,862,869
250-275	16,297	635,663
275-300	5,625	240,575
300-325	3,522	164,105
325-350	2,493	126,030
350-375	652	35,133
TOTAL	<u>553,873</u>	<u>13,506,311</u>



EXPLANATION

●
Well used for control

— 150 —
Line showing approximate saturated
thickness of the Ogallala aquifer, in feet.

Interval is 25 feet (7.62m)




1990
Projected Saturated Thickness

2000

Volume of Water in Storage Corresponding
to Mapped Saturated-Thickness Intervals

(Coefficient of Storage: 15 percent)

<u>MAPPED SATURATED- THICKNESS INTERVAL (feet)</u>	<u>SURFACE AREA (acres)</u>	<u>VOLUME OF WATER IN STORAGE (acre-feet)</u>
0- 25	14,173	35,797
25- 50	21,248	121,182
50- 75	39,019	367,543
75-100	50,729	672,070
100-125	95,963	1,643,410
125-150	130,665	2,686,129
150-175	76,737	1,861,250
175-200	54,902	1,541,754
200-225	48,424	1,529,043
225-250	12,101	426,518
250-275	4,605	180,229
275-300	3,311	142,626
300-325	1,650	77,190
325-350	173	8,731
TOTAL	<u>553,700</u>	<u>11,293,472</u>



EXPLANATION

•
Well used for control

— 150 —

Line showing approximate saturated thickness of the Ogallala aquifer, in feet.

Interval is 25 feet (7.62m)




Projected Saturated Thickness
2000

2010

Volume of Water in Storage Corresponding
to Mapped Saturated-Thickness Intervals

(Coefficient of Storage: 15 percent)

<u>MAPPED SATURATED- THICKNESS INTERVAL (feet)</u>	<u>SURFACE AREA (acres)</u>	<u>VOLUME OF WATER IN STORAGE (acre-feet)</u>
0- 25	20,198	50,996
25- 50	36,405	214,418
50- 75	55,766	526,460
75-100	109,799	1,468,401
100-125	142,077	2,368,816
125-150	74,149	1,524,842
150-175	57,451	1,403,450
175-200	38,537	1,068,103
200-225	9,756	306,547
225-250	4,390	155,233
250-275	2,466	96,369
275-300	1,498	63,148
300-325	173	7,985
TOTAL	552,665	9,254,768



EXPLANATION

●
Well used for control

— 150 —

Line showing approximate saturated thickness of the Ogallala aquifer, in feet.

Interval is 25 feet (7.62m)




2010
Projected Saturated Thickness

2020

Volume of Water in Storage Corresponding
to Mapped Saturated-Thickness Intervals

(Coefficient of Storage: 15 percent)

MAPPED SATURATED- THICKNESS INTERVAL (feet)	SURFACE AREA (acres)	VOLUME OF WATER IN STORAGE (acre-feet)
0- 25	27,979	67,124
25- 50	59,861	340,884
50- 75	116,883	1,129,161
75-100	160,415	2,071,207
100-125	79,512	1,335,011
125-150	59,312	1,223,244
150-175	33,345	794,499
175-200	8,022	224,207
200-225	3,349	106,888
225-250	2,320	82,080
250-275	608	25,523
275-300	394	12,713
TOTAL	552,000	7,412,541



EXPLANATION

●
Well used for control

— 150 —

Line showing approximate saturated thickness of the Ogallala aquifer, in feet.

Interval is 25 feet (7.62m)



2020
Projected Saturated Thickness



Figure 1. Schematic diagram of the structure of the material.

Figure 2. Schematic diagram of the structure of the material.


The structure of the material is shown in Figure 1. The material is composed of a central core and a surrounding layer. The core is made of a material with a high modulus of elasticity, and the surrounding layer is made of a material with a low modulus of elasticity. The structure of the material is shown in Figure 2.

2020
 Journal of Applied Polymer Science

POTENTIAL WELL YIELD OF THE
OGALLALA AQUIFER

POTENTIAL WELL YIELD OF THE

QUALITY NUMBER



EXPLANATION

Potential well yields, in gallons per minute


	less than 100		500-800
	100-250		800-1000
	250-500		more than 1000

0 5 10 Miles

0 4 8 16 Kilometers



1974
Estimated Potential Yield




EXPLANATION

Potential well yields, in gallons per minute

	less than 100		500-800
	100-250		800-1000
	250-500		more than 1000




1980
Projected Potential Yield



EXPLANATION

Potential well yields, in gallons per minute


	less than 100		500-800
	100-250		800-1000
	250-500		more than 1000

0 5 10 Miles

0 4 8 16 Kilometers



1990
Projected Potential Yield




EXPLANATION

Potential well yields, in gallons per minute

	less than 100		500-800
	100-250		800-1000
	250-500		more than 1000



2000
Projected Potential Yield



EXPLANATION

Potential well yields, in gallons per minute


	less than 100		500-800
	100-250		800-1000
	250-500		more than 1000

0 5 10 Miles

0 4 8 16 Kilometers





2010
Projected Potential Yield



EXPLANATION

Potential well yields, in gallons per minute

 less than 100	 500-800
 100-250	 800-1000
 250-500	 more than 1000

0 5 10 Miles

0 4 8 16 Kilometers



2020
Projected Potential Yield

Surface Area Corresponding to Various Pumping Lifts


Surface Area (Acres)	Pumping Lift (Feet)
100,000	100
100,000	150
100,000	200
100,000	250
100,000	300
100,000	350
100,000	400
100,000	450
100,000	500
100,000	550
100,000	600
100,000	650
100,000	700
100,000	750
100,000	800
100,000	850
100,000	900
100,000	950
100,000	1,000

PUMPING LIFTS IN THE OGALLALA AQUIFER

1974

Surface Area Corresponding to Mapped
Pumping-Lift Intervals

<u>MAPPED PUMPING-LIFT INTERVAL (feet)</u>	<u>SURFACE AREA (acres)</u>
25- 50	8,825
50- 75	14,363
75-100	38,579
100-125	122,407
125-150	94,057
150-175	56,998
175-200	56,229
200-225	40,125
225-250	30,867
250-275	24,929
275-300	17,384
300-325	1,228
TOTAL	<u>505,991</u>



EXPLANATION

•
Well used for control

— 200 —
Line showing approximate
pumping lift, in feet.

Interval is 25 feet (7.62m)



1974
Estimated Pumping Lifts

1980

Surface Area Corresponding to Mapped
Pumping-Lift Intervals

MAPPED
PUMPING-LIFT
INTERVAL
(feet)


SURFACE AREA
(acres)

25- 50
50- 75
75-100
100-125
125-150
150-175
175-200
200-225
225-250
250-275
275-300
300-325
325-350

9,522
15,400
44,300
140,388
109,580
66,843
45,250
32,138
33,318
37,119
16,533
3,368
453

TOTAL

554,212



EXPLANATION


- Well used for control
- 200— Line showing approximate pumping lift, in feet.
- Interval is 25 feet (7.62m)



1980
Projected Pumping Lifts


1990

Surface Area Corresponding to Mapped
Pumping-Lift Intervals



<u>MAPPED PUMPING-LIFT INTERVAL (feet)</u>	<u>SURFACE AREA (acres)</u>
25- 50	7,268
50- 75	12,111
75-100	16,439
100-125	35,803
125-150	129,927
150-175	106,467
175-200	68,520
200-225	46,635
225-250	38,168
250-275	31,272
275-300	34,886
300-325	20,812
325-350	5,099
350-375	453
375-400	352
TOTAL	<u>554,212</u>

1990



EXPLANATION

- Well used for control
- 200— Line showing approximate pumping lift, in feet.
- Interval is 25 feet (7.62m)




1990
Projected Pumping Lifts

2000

Surface Area Corresponding to Mapped
Pumping-Lift Intervals


MAPPED
PUMPING-LIFT
INTERVAL
(feet)

SURFACE AREA
(acres)



25- 50	6,748
50- 75	9,863
75-100	12,285
100-125	17,981
125-150	32,341
150-175	123,722
175-200	99,525
200-225	68,012
225-250	52,718
250-275	36,777
275-300	30,369
300-325	31,817
325-350	24,101
350-375	7,147
375-400	453
400-425	353
TOTAL	554,212

1990



EXPLANATION

●
Well used for control

—200—
Line showing approximate
pumping lift, in feet.


Interval is 25 feet (7.62m)




2000
Projected Pumping Lifts

2010

Surface Area Corresponding to Mapped
Pumping-Lift Intervals



<u>MAPPED PUMPING-LIFT INTERVAL (feet)</u>	<u>SURFACE AREA (acres)</u>
25- 50	6,410
50- 75	9,344
75-100	10,383
100-125	13,306
125-150	19,544
150-175	33,897
175-200	113,601
200-225	95,837
225-250	66,086
250-275	55,479
275-300	38,497
300-325	26,393
325-350	30,469
350-375	27,337
375-400	6,941
400-425	517
425-450	171
TOTAL	554,212



EXPLANATION

●
Well used for control

—200—
Line showing approximate
pumping lift, in feet.


Interval is 25 feet (7.62m)




2010
Projected Pumping Lifts

2020

Surface Area Corresponding to Mapped
Pumping-Lift Intervals



<u>MAPPED PUMPING-LIFT INTERVAL (feet)</u>	<u>SURFACE AREA (acres)</u>
25- 50	6,064
50- 75	8,825
75-100	9,513
100-125	10,543
125-150	15,219
150-175	24,039
175-200	38,396
200-225	102,950
225-250	92,032
250-275	63,818
275-300	58,180
300-325	36,079
325-350	26,662
350-375	30,018
375-400	23,287
400-425	6,168
425-450	2,248
450-475	171
TOTAL	<u>554,212</u>



EXPLANATION

- Well used for control
- 200— Line showing approximate pumping lift, in feet.
- Interval is 25 feet (7.62m)



2020
Projected Pumping Lifts



1000
 1500
 2000

1000
 1500
 2000

2020
 Projected Pumping lift

Pumpage Corresponding to Mapped
Baseline Flow Interval

ESTIMATED PUMPAGE RATE (MGAL/DAY)	PERCENTAGE OF PUMPAGE DURING FLOW INTERVAL	PUMPAGE RATE (MGAL/DAY)	BASELINE FLOW INTERVAL (MGAL/DAY)
1,000	1.00%	10,000	0.00-0.25
1,184	1.18%	11,840	0.25-0.50
1,499	1.49%	14,990	0.50-0.75
2,072	2.07%	20,720	0.75-1.00
3,024	3.02%	30,240	1.00-1.50
4,232	4.23%	42,320	1.50-2.00
5,712	5.71%	57,120	2.00-3.00
7,632	7.63%	76,320	3.00-4.00
10,176	10.18%	101,760	TOTAL


PUMPAGE FROM THE OGALLALA AQUIFER

1974

Pumpage Corresponding to Mapped
Decline-Rate Intervals

MAPPED DECLINE- RATE INTERVAL (feet)	SURFACE AREA (acres)	STORAGE CAPACITY OF DEWATERED SECTION (acre-feet)	ESTIMATED PUMPAGE RATE, INCLUDING NATURAL RECHARGE AND IRRIGATION RECIRCULATION (acre-feet per year)
0.00-0.25	135,007	1,087	7,380
.25- .50	35,553	1,940	3,764
.50- .75	23,120	2,172	3,449
.75-1.00	16,213	2,123	3,078
1.00-1.50	35,648	6,672	8,974
1.50-2.00	37,012	9,717	12,385
2.00-3.00	58,633	22,174	27,079
3.00-4.00	8,997	4,309	5,152
TOTAL	350,183	50,194	71,261

PUMPAGE FROM THE GALAJA AQUIFER



EXPLANATION

•
Well used for control

—1.25—
Line showing approximate rate of decline
in water level, in feet per year.

Interval is variable




1974

Estimated Rates of Water-Level Decline

1980

Pumpage Corresponding to Mapped
Decline-Rate Intervals

MAPPED DECLINE-RATE INTERVAL (feet)	SURFACE AREA (acres)	STORAGE CAPACITY OF DEWATERED SECTION (acre-feet)	ESTIMATED PUMPAGE RATE, INCLUDING NATURAL RECHARGE AND IRRIGATION RECIRCULATION (acre-feet per year)
0.00-0.25	135,869	1,088	7,424
.25- .50	35,547	1,933	3,752
.50- .75	22,265	2,067	3,294
.75-1.00	17,943	2,351	3,408
1.00-1.50	34,437	6,460	8,684
1.50-2.00	36,666	9,587	12,226
2.00-3.00	59,674	22,504	27,490
3.00-4.00	7,782	3,800	4,537
TOTAL	350,183	49,790	70,815



EXPLANATION

•
Well used for control

— 1.25 —
Line showing approximate rate of decline
in water level, in feet per year.

Interval is variable




1980

Projected Rates of Water-Level Decline

1990

Pumpage Corresponding to Mapped
Decline-Rate Intervals



<u>MAPPED DECLINE-RATE INTERVAL (feet)</u>	<u>SURFACE AREA (acres)</u>	<u>STORAGE CAPACITY OF DEWATERED SECTION (acre-feet)</u>	<u>ESTIMATED PUMPAGE RATE, INCLUDING NATURAL RECHARGE AND IRRIGATION RECIRCULATION (acre-feet per year)</u>
0.75-1.00	2,079	303	427
1.00-1.50	19,035	3,552	4,780
1.50-2.00	21,804	5,779	7,356
2.00-3.00	220,719	89,979	109,094
3.00-4.00	157,151	73,405	87,949
TOTAL	420,788	173,018	209,606

1980



EXPLANATION

•
Well used for control

—1.25—
Line showing approximate rate of decline
in water level, in feet per year.

Interval is variable



1990
Projected Rates of Water-Level Decline


2000

Pumpage Corresponding to Mapped
Decline-Rate Intervals

<u>MAPPED DECLINE-RATE INTERVAL (feet)</u>	<u>SURFACE AREA (acres)</u>	<u>STORAGE CAPACITY OF DEWATERED SECTION (acre-feet)</u>	<u>ESTIMATED PUMPAGE RATE, INCLUDING NATURAL RECHARGE AND IRRIGATION RECIRCULATION (acre-feet per year)</u>
0.50-0.75	6,405	593	943
.75-1.00	7,441	974	1,412
1.00-1.50	21,285	3,985	5,359
1.50-2.00	33,917	8,948	11,398
2.00-3.00	260,815	104,150	126,519
3.00-4.00	90,925	42,326	50,726
TOTAL	<u>420,788</u>	<u>160,976</u>	<u>196,357</u>

1990

Projected Rates of Water Level Decline



EXPLANATION

•
Well used for control

—1.25—
Line showing approximate rate of decline
in water level, in feet per year.

Interval is variable




2000
Projected Rates of Water-Level Decline

2010

Pumpage Corresponding to Mapped
Decline-Rate Intervals

MAPPED DECLINE-RATE INTERVAL (feet)	SURFACE AREA (acres)	STORAGE CAPACITY OF DEWATERED SECTION (acre-feet)	ESTIMATED PUMPAGE RATE, INCLUDING NATURAL RECHARGE AND IRRIGATION RECIRCULATION (acre-feet per year)
0.00-0.25	5,195	109	354
.25- .50	6,575	373	712
.50- .75	6,056	573	908
.75-1.00	7,268	964	1,394
1.00-1.50	23,534	4,536	6,068
1.50-2.00	41,878	11,152	14,187
2.00-3.00	292,582	112,307	136,948
3.00-4.00	37,007	17,026	20,425
TOTAL	420,095	147,040	180,996

0002



EXPLANATION

•
Well used for control

— 1.25 —
Line showing approximate rate of decline
in water level, in feet per year.

Interval is variable

0 5 10 Miles

0 4 8 16 Kilometers



2010


Projected Rates of Water-Level Decline

2020

Pumpage Corresponding to Mapped
Decline-Rate Intervals

MAPPED DECLINE-RATE INTERVAL (feet)	SURFACE AREA (acres)	STORAGE CAPACITY OF DEWATERED SECTION (acre-feet)	ESTIMATED PUMPAGE RATE, INCLUDING NATURAL RECHARGE AND IRRIGATION RECIRCULATION (acre-feet per year)
0.00-0.25	5,713	123	395
.25- .50	6,922	391	748
.50- .75	9,690	894	1,428
.75-1.00	8,825	1,166	1,687
1.00-1.50	36,513	6,873	9,234
1.50-2.00	74,054	19,920	25,306
2.00-3.00	246,433	90,277	110,600
3.00-4.00	31,945	14,699	17,633
TOTAL	420,095	134,343	167,031

2010



EXPLANATION

• Well used for control

—1.25—
Line showing approximate rate of decline
in water level, in feet per year.

Interval is variable



2020
Projected Rates of Water-Level Decline

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Special appreciation is expressed to the Lipscomb County landowners and water users for allowing their wells to be measured by Department and Water District personnel. This study could not have been accomplished without their cooperation and the records obtained from their wells.

Special thanks are also expressed to the staff of the North Plains Ground Water Conservation District No. 2, Mr. J.W. Buchanan, manager, for providing records and consultation during the study.

Additionally, appreciation is expressed to several individuals for consultation and for review and comment on the methodology and techniques employed in this study: Mr. Frank A. Rayner, former manager of the High Plains Underground Water Conservation District No. 1; Dr. Donald Reddell, associate professor of Engineering, Texas A&M University; Mr. Leon New, irrigation specialist, Texas Agriculture Extension Service, Lubbock, Texas; Mr. Shelby Newman, superintendent, Texas Agricultural Experiment Station, Stephenville, Texas; Dr. C. C. Reeves, Jr., professor of Geosciences, Texas Tech University; and Dr. James Osborn, former chairman of the Department of Agricultural Economics, Texas Tech University.

STAFF INVOLVEMENT

This report is one of a series of county reports being published under the title "Analytical Study of the Ogallala Aquifer." Former staff member A. Wayne Wyatt was instrumental in initiating the study and coauthored a number of the previously published reports of this series.

The Lipscomb County report was prepared under the supervision of Bernard B. Baker, head of the Ground Water Data Unit in the Texas Department of Water Resources' Data Collection and Evaluation Section, Dr. Tommy R. Knowles, chief. Numerous staff members of this Section assisted the authors in assembling and evaluating data and information. Overall technical

supervision of the Ogallala study is exercised by C. R. Baskin, director, Data and Engineering Services Division. The Department's Information Systems and Services Office, David L. Ferguson, director, provided automated data processing and computational services, and prepared the manuscript copy of tabular and graphical displays.

METRIC CONVERSIONS TABLE

For those readers interested in using the International System (SI) of Units, the metric equivalents of English units of measurement have been given in parenthesis in the text. The English units used in tables of this report may be converted to metric units by the following conversion factors:

MULTIPLY ENGLISH UNITS	BY	TO OBTAIN SI UNITS
inches	2.540	centimeters (cm)
feet	.3048	meters (m)
miles	1.609	kilometers (km)
square miles	2.590	square kilometers (km ²)
gallons	3.785	liters (l)
gallons per minute	.06309	liters per second (l/s)
gallons per minute per foot	.207	liters per second per meter ((l/s)/m)
acres	.4047	square hectometers (hm ²)
acres	.004047	square kilometers (km ²)
acre-feet	1,233.	cubic meters (m ³)
acre-feet	1.233 X 10 ⁻⁶	cubic kilometers (km ³)
million acre-feet	1.233	cubic kilometers (km ³)

SELECTED REFERENCES

- Alexander, W. H., Jr., 1961, Geology and ground-water resources of the Northern High Plains of Texas, progress report no. 1: Texas Board Water Engineers Bull. 6109, 47 p.
- Alexander, W. H., Jr., Broadhurst, W. L., and White, W. N., 1943, Progress report on ground water in the High Plains in Texas: Texas Board Water Engineers duplicated rept., 22 p.
- Baker, C. L., 1915, Geology and underground waters of the northern Llano Estacado: Univ. Texas Bull. 57, 225 p.
- Baker, E. T., Jr., Long, A. T., Jr., Reeves, R. D., and Wood, L. A., 1963, Reconnaissance investigation of the ground-water resources of the Red River, Sulphur River, and Cypress Creek basins, Texas: Texas Water Comm. Bull. 6306, 137 p.
- Barnes, J. R., and others, 1949, Geology and ground water in the irrigated region of the Southern High Plains of Texas, progress report no. 7: Texas Board Water Engineers duplicated rept., 51 p.
- Bell, A. E., and Morrison, S., 1977, Analytical study of the Ogallala aquifer in Hockley County, Texas—projections of saturated thickness, volume of water in storage, pumpage rates, pumping lifts, and well yields: Texas Dept. Water Resources Rept. 214, 63 p.
- Bell, A. E., and Sechrist, A. W., 1970, Playas-Southern High Plains of Texas: Playa Lake Symposium, ICASALS, Texas Tech Univ., Lubbock, Texas, Oct. 1970, Proc., p. 35-39.
- Brand, J. P., 1953, Cretaceous of Llano Estacado of Texas: Univ. Texas, Bur. Econ. Geology Rept. of Inv. 20, 59 p.
- Broadhurst, W. L., Sundstrom, R. W., and Weaver, D. E., 1949, Public water supplies in western Texas: Texas Board Water Engineers duplicated rept., 277 p.
- _____, 1951, Public water supplies in western Texas: U.S. Geol. Survey Water-Supply Paper 1106, 168 p.
- Cronin, J. G., 1961, A summary of the occurrence and development of ground water in the Southern High Plains of Texas: Texas Board Water Engineers Bull. 6107, 110 p.
- Cronin, J. G., 1969, Ground water in the Ogallala Formation in the Southern High Plains of Texas and New Mexico: U.S. Geol. Survey Hydrol. Inv. Atlas HA-330, 9 p.
- Cronin, J. G., Follett, C. R., Shafer, G. H., and Rettman, P. L., 1963, Reconnaissance investigation of the ground-water resources of the Brazos River basin, Texas: Texas Water Comm. Bull. 6310, 163 p.
- Cronin, J. G., and Wells, L. C., 1960, Geology and ground-water resources of Hale County, Texas: Texas Board Water Engineers Bull. 6010, 146 p.
- Dallas Morning News, 1977, Texas Almanac and State Industrial Guide 1978-79: A. H. Belo Corp., 704 p.
- Evans, G. L., and Meade, G. E., 1945, Quaternary of the Texas High Plains in Contributions to geology, 1944: Univ. Texas Pub. 4401, p. 485-507.
- Fenneman, N. M., 1931, Physiography of the western United States: New York, McGraw-Hill Book Co., 534 p.
- Fink, B. E., 1963, Ground-water geology of Triassic deposits, northern part of the Southern High Plains of Texas: High Plains Underground Water Conservation Dist. No. 1, Rept. 163, 79 p.
- Frye, J. C., 1970, The Ogallala Formation—a review: Ogallala Aquifer Symposium, Texas Tech Univ., Lubbock, Texas, 1970, Proc., p. 5-14.
- Frye, J. C., and Leonard, A. B., 1957, Studies of Cenozoic geology along eastern margin of Texas High Plains, Armstrong to Howard Counties: Univ. Texas, Bur. Econ. Geology Rept. of Inv. 32, 62 p.
- Gammon, S. W., and Muse, W. R., 1966, Water-level data from observation wells in the Southern High Plains of Texas: Texas Water Devel. Board Rept. 21, 537 p.
- Gard, Chris, 1958, Ground-water conditions in Carson County, Texas: Texas Board Water Engineers Bull. 5802, 120 p.
- Gillett, P. T., and Janca, I. G., 1965, Inventory of Texas irrigation, 1958 and 1964: Texas Water Comm. Bull. 6515, 317 p.

- Gould, C. N., 1906, The geology and water resources of the eastern portion of the Panhandle of Texas: U.S. Geol. Survey Water-Supply Paper 154, 64 p.
- _____, 1907, The geology and water resources of the western portion of the Panhandle of Texas: U.S. Geol. Survey Water-Supply Paper 191, 70 p.
- Grubb, H. W., 1966, Importance of irrigation water to the economy of the Texas High Plains: Texas Water Devel. Board Rept. 11, 53 p.
- Haragan, D. R., 1970, An investigation of clouds and precipitation for the Texas High Plains: Texas Water Devel. Board Rept. 111, 125 p.
- Havens, J. S., 1966, Recharge studies on the High Plains in Northern Lea County, New Mexico: U.S. Geol. Survey Water-Supply Paper 1819-F, 52 p.
- Hughes, W. F., and Harman, W. L., 1969, Projected economic life of water resources, Subdivision no. 1, High Plains underground water reservoir: Texas A&M Univ. Tech. Mon. 6, 82 p.
- Lang, J. W., and Twichell, Trigg, 1945, Water Resources of the Lubbock district, Texas: Texas Board Water Engineers duplicated rept., 168 p.
- Leggat, E. R., 1952, Geology and ground-water resources of Lynn County, Texas: Texas Board Water Engineers Bull. 5207, 76 p.
- _____, 1954a, Summary of ground-water development in the Southern High Plains, Texas: Texas Board Water Engineers Bull. 5402, 21 p.
- _____, 1954b, Ground-water development in the Southern High Plains of Texas, 1953: Texas Board Water Engineers Bull. 5410, 7 p.
- _____, 1957, Geology and ground-water resources of Lamb County, Texas: Texas Board Water Engineers Bull. 5704, 187 p.
- Long, A. T., Jr., 1961, Geology and ground-water resources of Carson County and part of Gray County, Texas, progress report no. 1: Texas Board Water Engineers Bull. 6102, 45 p.
- Luckey, R. R., and Hofstra, W. E., 1974, Digital model of the Ogallala aquifer of the northern part of the Northern High Plains of Colorado: Colorado Water Conservation Board, Colorado Water Resources Circ. No. 24, 22 p.
- McAddo, G. D., Leggat, E. R., and Long, A. T., 1964, Geology and ground-water resources of Carson County and part of Gray County, Texas, progress report no. 2: Texas Water Comm. Bull. 6402, 30 p.
- Moulder, E. A., and Frazor, D. R., 1957, Artificial-recharge experiments at McDonald well field, Amarillo, Texas: Texas Board Water Engineers Bull. 5701, 34 p.
- Myers, B. N., 1969, Compilation of results of aquifer tests in Texas: Texas Water Devel. Board Rept. 98, 537 p.
- New, Leon, 1968, High Plains irrigation survey: Texas A&M Univ. Ext. Service duplicated rept., 14 p.
- _____, 1969, High Plains irrigation survey: Texas A&M Univ. Ext. Service duplicated rept., 14 p.
- _____, 1970, High Plains irrigation survey: Texas A&M Univ. Ext. Service duplicated rept., 10 p.
- _____, 1971, High Plains irrigation survey: Texas A&M Univ. Ext. Service duplicated rept., 16 p.
- _____, 1972, High Plains irrigation survey: Texas A&M Univ. Ext. Service duplicated rept., 18 p.
- _____, 1973, High Plains irrigation survey: Texas A&M Univ. Ext. Service duplicated rept., 16 p.
- _____, 1974, High Plains irrigation survey: Texas A&M Univ. Ext. Service duplicated rept., 18 p.
- North Plains Ground Water Conservation District No. 2, 1966, Geology and ground-water resources of the North Plains Ground Water Conservation District No. 2: North Plains Ground Water Conservation District No. 2, Progress rept. No. 2, 49 p.
- _____, 1970, Geology and ground-water resources of the North Plains Ground Water Conservation District: North Plains Ground Water Conservation District No. 2, Progress rept. No. 3, 35 p.
- _____, 1973, Geology and ground-water resources of Lipscomb County, Texas: North Plains Ground Water Conservation District No. 2, 31 p.
- Osborn, J. E., Harris, T. R., and Owens, T. R., 1974, Impact of ground water and petroleum on the economy of the Texas High Plains: Texas Tech Univ., Dept. Agr. Econ., 87 p.

- Rayner, F. A., 1965, The ground-water supplies of the Southern High Plains of Texas: Proc. 3rd West Texas Water Conf., Texas Tech Coll., p. 20-42.
- _____, 1973, Taking a new look at the demise of the Ogallala aquifer: Testimony presented to West Texas Citizens Advisory Council on Water Resources public hearing, Lubbock, Texas, October 3, 1973, 16 p.
- Rettman, P. L., and Leggat, E. R., 1966, Ground-water resources of Gaines County, Texas: Texas Water Devel. Board Rept. 15, 186 p.
- Schwiesow, W. F., 1965, Playa lake use and modification in the High Plains, *in* Studies of playa lakes in the High Plains of Texas: Texas Water Devel. Board Rept. 10, p. 1-8.
- Sherrill, D. W., 1958, High Plains irrigation survey: Texas A&M Coll. Ext. Service duplicated rept., 10 p.
- _____, 1959, High Plains irrigation survey: Texas A&M Coll. Ext. Service duplicated rept., 10 p.
- Smith, J. T., 1973, Ground-water resources of Motley and northeastern Floyd Counties, Texas: Texas Water Devel. Board Rept. 165, p. 8.
- Swann, T., 1974, Texas High Plains facts: Lubbock, Water, Inc., 10 p.
- Texas Board Water Engineers, 1960, Reconnaissance investigation of the ground-water resources of the Canadian River basin, Texas: Texas Board Water Engineers Bull. 6016, 33 p.
- Texas Water Development Board, 1971, Inventories of irrigation in Texas, 1958, 1964, and 1969: Texas Water Devel. Board Rept. 127, 232 p.
- Theis, C. V., 1937, Amount of ground-water recharge in the Southern High Plains: Am. Geophys. Union Trans., 18th Ann. Mtg., p. 564-568.
- Thurmond, R. V., 1951, High Plains irrigation survey: Texas A&M Coll. Ext. Service duplicated rept., 4 p.
- White, W. N., Broadhurst, W. L., and Lang, J. W., 1946, Ground water in the High Plains of Texas: U.S. Geol. Survey Water-Supply Paper 889-F, p. 381-420.
- Wyatt, A. W., 1968, Progress report no. 1, A general discussion accompanied by hydrological maps pertaining to the ground-water resources in the South Plains Underground Water Conservation District No. 4: South Plains Underground Water Conservation District No. 4, 24 p.
- Wyatt, A. W., 1975, TWDB High Plains study shows 340 million acre-feet of water in 45-county area *in* Water for Texas: Texas Water Devel. Board pub., V. 5, no. 1, and 2, p. 20-22.
- Wyatt, A. W., and others, 1970, Water-level data from observation wells in the Southern High Plains of Texas, 1965-70: Texas Water Devel. Board Rept. 121, 361 p.
- _____, 1971, Water-level data from observation wells in the Northern Panhandle of Texas: Texas Water Devel. Board Rept. 137, 263 p.
- Wyatt, A. W., Bell, A. E., and Morrison, S., 1976, Analytical study of the Ogallala aquifer in Hale County, Texas—projections of saturated thickness, volume of water in storage, pumpage rates, pumping lifts, and well yields: Texas Water Devel. Board Rept. 200, 63 p.
- _____, 1976, Analytical study of the Ogallala aquifer in Lamb County, Texas—projections of saturated thickness, volume of water in storage, pumpage rates, pumping lifts, and well yields: Texas Water Devel. Board Rept. 204, 63 p.
- _____, 1976, Analytical study of the Ogallala aquifer in Parmer County, Texas—projections of saturated thickness, volume of water in storage, pumpage rates, pumping lifts, and well yields: Texas Water Devel. Board Rept. 205, 63 p.
- _____, 1976, Analytical study of the Ogallala aquifer in Castro County, Texas—projections of saturated thickness, volume of water in storage, pumpage rates, pumping lifts, and well yields: Texas Water Devel. Board Rept. 206, 63 p.
- _____, 1976, Analytical study of the Ogallala aquifer in Bailey County, Texas—projections of saturated thickness, volume of water in storage, pumpage rates, pumping lifts, and well yields: Texas Water Devel. Board Rept. 207, 63 p.
- _____, 1976, Analytical study of the Ogallala aquifer in Crosby County, Texas—projections of saturated thickness, volume of water in storage, pumpage rates, pumping lifts, and well yields: Texas Water Devel. Board Rept. 209, 63 p.
- _____, 1976, Analytical study of the Ogallala aquifer in Floyd County, Texas—projections of saturated thickness, volume of water in storage, pumpage rates, pumping lifts, and well yields: Texas Water Devel. Board Rept. 211, 63 p.

Wyatt, A. W., Bell, A. E., and Morrison, S., 1977, Analytical study of the Ogallala aquifer in Briscoe County, Texas—projections of saturated thickness, volume of water in storage, pumpage rates, pumping lifts, and well yields: Texas Water Devel. Board Rept. 212, 63 p.

Wyatt, A. W., Bell, A. E., and Morrison, S., 1977, Analytical study of the Ogallala aquifer in Deaf Smith County, Texas—projections of saturated thickness, volume of water in storage, pumpage rates, pumping lifts, and well yields: Texas Water Devel. Board Rept. 213, 63 p.