

GAM RUN 21-020 MAG: MODELED AVAILABLE GROUNDWATER FOR THE GULF COAST AQUIFER SYSTEM IN GROUNDWATER MANAGEMENT AREA 15

Grayson Dowlearn, P.G.
Texas Water Development Board
Groundwater Division
Groundwater Modeling Section
512-475-1552
August 16, 2022



This page is intentionally left blank.

GAM RUN 21-020 MAG: MODELED AVAILABLE GROUNDWATER FOR THE GULF COAST AQUIFER SYSTEM IN GROUNDWATER MANAGEMENT AREA 15

Grayson Dowlearn, P.G.
Texas Water Development Board
Groundwater Division
Groundwater Modeling Section
512-475-1552
August 16, 2022

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

Groundwater Management Area 15 adopted the desired future conditions listed in Table 1 for the Gulf Coast Aquifer System on October 14, 2021. The Carrizo-Wilcox, Queen City, Sparta, and Yegua-Jackson aquifers were declared not relevant by Groundwater Management Area 15 for the purpose of joint planning. Groundwater Management Area 15 submitted model files as part of the Desired Future Conditions Explanatory Report for Groundwater Management Area 15 (Keester and others, 2021), which meet the desired future conditions adopted by the district representatives of Groundwater Management Area 15, to the Texas Water Development Board (TWDB) on December 13, 2021. The TWDB determined that the explanatory report and other materials submitted by the district representatives were administratively complete on April 22, 2022.

The modeled available groundwater values that meet the adopted desired future conditions for the Gulf Coast Aquifer System and its associated aquifers within Groundwater Management Area 15 are summarized by decade from 2020 to 2080 in Table 2 by groundwater conservation district and county. Figure 1 provides the groundwater conservation district and county boundaries within GMA 15. Table 3 provides modeled available groundwater values by decade from 2030 to 2080 summarized by county, regional water planning area, and river basin, for use in the regional water planning process. Figure 2 provides the county, regional water planning area, and river basin boundaries within Groundwater Management Area 15. Modeled available groundwater values fluctuate within Groundwater Management Area 15 over time, ranging from a maximum of 529,006 acre-feet per year in 2030 to a minimum of 522,307 acre-feet per year in 2040. The estimates were extracted from results of a model run using the groundwater availability model for the central portion of the Gulf Coast Aquifer System (Version 1.01; Chowdhury and others, 2004).

August 16, 2022

Page 4 of 21

REQUESTOR:

Mr. Tim Andruss, Chair and Administrator of Groundwater Management Area 15.

DESCRIPTION OF REQUEST:

Mr. Tim Andruss provided the TWDB with the desired future conditions of the Gulf Coast Aquifer System on behalf of Groundwater Management Area (GMA) 15 in a letter dated December 10, 2021. Groundwater conservation district representatives in Groundwater Management Area 15 adopted desired future conditions for the Gulf Coast Aquifer System on October 14, 2021, as described in Resolution No. 2021-01 (Appendix 2 in Keester and others, 2021). The desired future conditions included in Table 1 are average water level drawdowns by county between January 2000 and December 2080 based on the predictive groundwater flow Scenario GMA15_2019_001_v1 (Keester and others, 2021). The predictive simulations were developed from the groundwater availability model for the Gulf Coast Aquifer System (Version 1.01; Chowdhury and others, 2004).

TABLE 1. DESIRED FUTURE CONDITIONS FOR EACH COUNTY WITHIN GROUNDWATER MANAGEMENT AREA 15 EXPRESSED AS AVERAGE DRAWDOWN BETWEEN JANUARY 2000 AND DECEMBER 2080 IN FEET SUBMITTED BY GROUNDWATER MANAGEMENT AREA 15. (ADAPTED FROM SUBMITTED RESOLUTION)

County	Aquifer	Desired future condition
Aransas	Gulf Coast Aquifer System	0
Bee	Gulf Coast Aquifer System	7
Calhoun	Gulf Coast Aquifer System	5
Colorado	Chicot and Evangeline	17
	Jasper	25
De Witt	Gulf Coast Aquifer System	17
Fayette	Gulf Coast Aquifer System	44
Goliad	Chicot	-4
	Evangeline	-2
	Burkeville	7
	Jasper	14
Jackson	Gulf Coast Aquifer System	15
Karnes	Gulf Coast Aquifer System	22
Lavaca	Gulf Coast Aquifer System	18
Matagorda	Chicot and Evangeline	11
Refugio	Gulf Coast Aquifer System	5
Victoria	Gulf Coast Aquifer System	5
Wharton	Chicot and Evangeline	15
Groundwater Management Area 15	Gulf Coast Aquifer System	13

After review of the explanatory report and model files, the TWDB was able to confirm that the submitted model files satisfactorily met the desired future conditions and did not require additional clarifications from Groundwater Management Area 15.

METHODS:

The TWDB ran the central portion of the Gulf Coast Aquifer System groundwater availability model (Version 1.01; Chowdhury and others, 2004) using the predictive model files submitted with the explanatory report (Keester and others, 2021) to calculate the drawdown and modeled available groundwater values for the Gulf Coast Aquifer System within Groundwater Management Area 15. The submitted predictive model files included the Scenario GMA15_2019_001_v1 (Keester and others, 2021) pumping file and the GAM Run 10-008 Addendum (Wade, 2010) model files extended to the year 2080. Drawdown was calculated for each county and model layer by first excluding model cells that went dry and model cells that fall outside of the official aquifer footprint, and then summing the drawdown (difference between the water levels from January 2000 [initial heads] to December 2080 [stress period 81]) in the remaining cells of each county and dividing by the number of model cells within that county. Drawdown values were compared to the desired future conditions and were determined to fall within the accepted tolerance for Groundwater Management Area 15.

Modeled available groundwater values were determined by extracting pumping rates by decade from the model results using ZONEBUDGET Version 3.01 (Harbaugh, 2009). Annual pumping rates by aquifer are presented from 2020 to 2080 by county and groundwater conservation district, subtotaled by groundwater conservation district, and summed for Groundwater Management Area 15 (Table 2). Annual pumping rates are also presented from 2030 to 2080 by county, river basin, and regional water planning area within Groundwater Management Area 15 for use in regional water planning (Table 3).

Modeled Available Groundwater and Permitting

As defined in Chapter 36 of the Texas Water Code (2011), “modeled available groundwater” is the estimated average amount of water that may be produced annually to achieve a desired future condition. Groundwater conservation districts are required to consider modeled available groundwater, along with several other factors, when issuing permits in order to manage groundwater production to achieve the desired future condition(s). The other factors districts must consider include annual precipitation and production patterns, the estimated amount of pumping exempt from permitting, existing permits, and a reasonable estimate of actual groundwater production under existing permits.

PARAMETERS AND ASSUMPTIONS:

The parameters and assumptions for the modeled available groundwater estimates are described below:

- Version 1.01 of the groundwater availability model for the central portion of the Gulf Coast Aquifer System by Chowdhury and others (2004) was the base model for this analysis. See Chowdhury and others (2004) for assumptions and limitations of the historical calibrated model. Keester and others (2021) constructed a predictive

August 16, 2022

Page 7 of 21

model simulation to extend the base model to 2080 for planning purposes. See Keester and others (2021) for assumptions of the predictive model simulation.

- The model has four layers representing the Chicot aquifer (Layer 1), the Evangeline aquifer (Layer 2), the Burkeville Confining Unit (Layer 3), and the Jasper aquifer and parts of the Catahoula Formation in direct hydrologic communication with the Jasper aquifer (Layer 4). Figures 3 to 6 show the extent of these active model layers within GMA 15.
- Pumping was not modeled in the Burkeville Confining Unit within Colorado, Matagorda, and Wharton counties and as such, this layer is excluded from the modeled available groundwater calculation in these counties.
- Pumping was not modeled in the Jasper aquifer within Matagorda and Wharton counties and as such this layer is excluded from the modeled available groundwater calculations in these counties.
- The model was run with MODFLOW-96 (Harbaugh and McDonald, 1996).
- Pumping volumes are reduced to zero if a cell becomes dry during the predictive model run. For this reason, the modeled available groundwater values from the ZONEBUDGET output may not match the pumping values in the input well file.
- Drawdown averages and modeled available groundwater volumes were calculated based on the extent of the official TWDB aquifer boundary. The most recent TWDB model grid file dated June 26, 2020 (glfc_c_grid_poly062620.csv) was used to determine model cell entity assignment (county, groundwater management area, groundwater conservation district, river basin, regional water planning area).
- Drawdowns for cells that became dry during the simulation were excluded from the drawdown averages. Pumping in dry cells was excluded from the modeled available groundwater calculations.
- To be consistent with Groundwater Management Area 15's assumptions (see Keester and others, 2021), a tolerance of three feet was assumed when comparing desired future conditions to modeled drawdown results for all counties except Goliad County. Goliad County was given a tolerance of ± 17 feet for the Chicot aquifer, ± 36 feet for the Evangeline aquifer, ± 14 feet for the Burkeville Confining Unit, and ± 7 feet for the Jasper aquifer. Goliad County Groundwater Conservation District plans to monitor achievement of their desired future conditions within these tolerances because they rely more heavily on their extensive monitoring program rather than modeled results.

August 16, 2022

Page 8 of 21

- Estimates of modeled drawdown and available groundwater from the model simulation were rounded to whole numbers.

RESULTS:

The modeled available groundwater values for the Gulf Coast Aquifer System that achieve the desired future conditions adopted by Groundwater Management Area 15 fluctuate over time, ranging from 529,006 acre-feet per year in 2030 to 522,307 acre-feet per year in 2040. The modeled available groundwater values are summarized by groundwater conservation district and county in Table 2. Table 3 summarizes the modeled available groundwater values by county, river basin, and regional water planning area for use in the regional water planning process.

The Carrizo-Wilcox, Queen City, Sparta, and Yegua-Jackson aquifers were declared not relevant for the purpose of joint planning by Groundwater Management Area 15; therefore, modeled available groundwater values were not calculated for those aquifers.




FIGURE 1. MAP SHOWING GROUNDWATER MANAGEMENT AREA (GMA) 15, GROUNDWATER CONSERVATION DISTRICTS (GCD), COUNTIES, AND THE EXTENT OF ACTIVE MODEL CELLS. (UWCD = UNDERGROUND WATER CONSERVATION DISTRICT)




FIGURE 2. MAP SHOWING GROUNDWATER MANAGEMENT AREA (GMA) 15, REGIONAL WATER PLANNING AREAS, RIVER BASINS, COUNTIES, AND EXTENT OF ACTIVE MODEL CELLS.




FIGURE 3. MAP SHOWING THE ACTIVE MODEL CELLS WITHIN GROUNDWATER MANAGEMENT AREA (GMA) 15 REPRESENTING THE CHICOT AQUIFER IN LAYER 1 OF THE CENTRAL GULF COAST AQUIFER SYSTEM GROUNDWATER AVAILABILITY MODEL.




FIGURE 4. MAP SHOWING THE ACTIVE MODEL CELLS WITHIN GROUNDWATER MANAGEMENT AREA (GMA) 15 REPRESENTING THE EVANGELINE AQUIFER IN LAYER 2 OF THE CENTRAL GULF COAST AQUIFER SYSTEM GROUNDWATER AVAILABILITY MODEL.




FIGURE 5. MAP SHOWING THE ACTIVE MODEL CELLS WITHIN GROUNDWATER MANAGEMENT AREA (GMA) 15 REPRESENTING THE BURKEVILLE CONFINING UNIT IN LAYER 3 OF THE CENTRAL GULF COAST AQUIFER SYSTEM GROUNDWATER AVAILABILITY MODEL.




FIGURE 6. MAP SHOWING THE ACTIVE MODEL CELLS WITHIN GROUNDWATER MANAGEMENT AREA (GMA) 15 REPRESENTING THE JASPER AQUIFER AND CATAHOULA FORMATION IN DIRECT HYDROLOGIC CONNECTION WITH THE JASPER AQUIFER IN LAYER 4 OF THE CENTRAL GULF COAST AQUIFER SYSTEM GROUNDWATER AVAILABILITY MODEL.

TABLE 2. MODELED AVAILABLE GROUNDWATER FOR THE GULF COAST AQUIFER SYSTEM IN GROUNDWATER MANAGEMENT AREA 15 SUMMARIZED BY GROUNDWATER CONSERVATION DISTRICT (GCD) AND COUNTY FOR EACH DECADE BETWEEN 2020 AND 2080. VALUES ARE IN ACRE-FEET PER YEAR. (UWCD = UNDERGROUND WATER CONSERVATION DISTRICT; ND = NO DISTRICT))

Groundwater Conservation District	County	Portion of Gulf Coast Aquifer System	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Bee GCD	Bee	Total	8,017	8,018	8,020	8,000	8,002	8,003	7,989
Calhoun County GCD	Calhoun	Total	7,611	7,611	7,611	7,611	7,611	7,611	7,611
Coastal Bend GCD	Wharton	Chicot and Evangeline	181,446	181,446	181,446	181,446	181,446	181,446	181,446
Coastal Plains GCD	Matagorda	Chicot and Evangeline	38,892	38,892	38,892	38,892	38,892	38,892	38,892
Colorado County GCD	Colorado	Chicot and Evangeline	71,665	71,665	71,665	71,665	71,665	71,665	71,665
	Colorado	Jasper	918	918	918	918	918	918	918
Colorado County GCD Total	Colorado	Total	72,583						
Evergreen UWCD	Karnes	Total	10,694	10,525	3,404	3,399	3,227	2,952	2,949
Fayette County GCD	Fayette	Total	7,168	7,394	7,683	8,011	8,387	8,660	8,590
Goliad County GCD	Goliad	Chicot	418	421	426	430	432	436	436
	Goliad	Evangeline	4,983	5,044	5,105	5,165	5,225	5,287	5,287
	Goliad	Burkeville	425	451	478	505	532	559	559
	Goliad	Jasper	250	338	427	515	602	690	690
Goliad County GCD Total	Goliad	Total	6,076	6,254	6,436	6,615	6,791	6,972	6,972
Pecan Valley GCD	DeWitt	Total	17,993	17,958	17,912	17,827	17,806	17,784	17,772
Refugio GCD	Refugio	Total	5,858	5,858	5,858	5,858	5,858	5,858	5,858
Texana GCD	Jackson	Total	90,571	90,571	90,571	90,571	90,571	90,571	90,571
Victoria County GCD	Victoria	Total	59,948	59,948	59,948	59,948	59,948	59,948	59,948
Total (GCDs)		Total	506,857	507,058	500,364	500,761	501,122	501,280	501,181

TABLE 2. CONTINUED: MODELED AVAILABLE GROUNDWATER FOR THE GULF COAST AQUIFER SYSTEM IN GROUNDWATER MANAGEMENT AREA 15 SUMMARIZED BY GROUNDWATER CONSERVATION DISTRICT (GCD) AND COUNTY FOR EACH DECADE BETWEEN 2020 AND 2080. VALUES ARE IN ACRE-FEET PER YEAR. (UWCD = UNDERGROUND WATER CONSERVATION DISTRICT; ND = NO DISTRICT))

Groundwater Conservation District	County	Portion of Gulf Coast Aquifer System	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
ND Aransas	Aransas	Total	1,547	1,547	1,547	1,547	1,547	1,547	1,547
ND Bee	Bee	Total	9	9	9	9	9	9	9
ND Lavaca	Lavaca	Total	20,384	20,384	20,379	20,379	20,372	20,368	20,350
ND Refugio	Refugio	Total	8	8	8	8	8	8	8
No District-County Total		Total	21,948	21,948	21,943	21,943	21,936	21,932	21,914
GMA 15 Total		Total	528,805	529,006	522,307	522,704	523,058	523,212	523,095

TABLE 3. MODELED AVAILABLE GROUNDWATER FOR THE GULF COAST AQUIFER SYSTEM IN GROUNDWATER MANAGEMENT AREA 15. RESULTS ARE SUMMARIZED BY COUNTY, REGIONAL WATER PLANNING AREA (RWPA), AND RIVER BASIN FOR EACH DECADE FROM 2030 TO 2080. VALUES ARE IN ACRE-FEET PER YEAR.

County	RWPA	River Basin	Portion of Gulf Coast Aquifer System	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Aransas	N	San Antonio-Nueces	Total	1,547	1,547	1,547	1,547	1,547	1,547
Bee	N	Nueces	Total	26	26	26	26	26	26
	N	San Antonio-Nueces	Total	8,001	8,003	7,983	7,985	7,986	7,972
Calhoun	L	Colorado-Lavaca	Total	5,221	5,221	5,221	5,221	5,221	5,221
	L	Guadalupe	Total	18	18	18	18	18	18
	L	Lavaca-Guadalupe	Total	2,365	2,365	2,365	2,365	2,365	2,365
	L	San Antonio-Nueces	Total	7	7	7	7	7	7
Colorado	K	Brazos-Colorado	Chicot and Evangeline	15,352	15,352	15,352	15,352	15,352	15,352
	K	Colorado	Chicot and Evangeline	20,079	20,079	20,079	20,079	20,079	20,079
	K	Lavaca	Chicot and Evangeline	36,234	36,234	36,234	36,234	36,234	36,234
	K	Brazos-Colorado	Jasper	49	49	49	49	49	49
	K	Colorado	Jasper	273	273	273	273	273	273
	K	Lavaca	Jasper	596	596	596	596	596	596
DeWitt	L	Guadalupe	Total	14,055	14,042	13,966	13,946	13,927	13,917
	L	Lavaca	Total	2,638	2,626	2,620	2,620	2,620	2,620
	L	Lavaca-Guadalupe	Total	298	298	298	298	298	298
	L	San Antonio	Total	967	946	943	942	939	937
Fayette	K	Brazos	Total	19	21	22	24	26	26
	K	Colorado	Total	4,894	5,041	5,196	5,370	5,406	5,392
	K	Lavaca	Total	2,481	2,621	2,793	2,993	3,228	3,172

TABLE 3. CONTINUED: MODELED AVAILABLE GROUNDWATER FOR THE GULF COAST AQUIFER SYSTEM IN GROUNDWATER MANAGEMENT AREA 15. RESULTS ARE SUMMARIZED BY COUNTY, REGIONAL WATER PLANNING AREA (RWPA), AND RIVER BASIN FOR EACH DECADE FROM 2030 TO 2080. VALUES ARE IN ACRE-FEET PER YEAR.

County	RWPA	River Basin	Portion of Gulf Coast Aquifer System	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
	K	Colorado	Chicot and Evangeline	3,219	3,219	3,219	3,219	3,219	3,219
	K	Colorado-Lavaca	Chicot and Evangeline	20,352	20,352	20,352	20,352	20,352	20,352
Refugio	L	San Antonio	Total	329	329	329	329	329	329
	L	San Antonio-Nueces	Total	5,537	5,537	5,537	5,537	5,537	5,537
Victoria	L	Guadalupe	Total	27,611	27,611	27,611	27,611	27,611	27,611
	L	Lavaca	Total	234	234	234	234	234	234
	L	Lavaca-Guadalupe	Total	30,421	30,421	30,421	30,421	30,421	30,421
	L	San Antonio	Total	1,682	1,682	1,682	1,682	1,682	1,682
Wharton	K	Brazos-Colorado	Chicot and Evangeline	50,560	50,560	50,560	50,560	50,560	50,560
	K	Colorado	Chicot and Evangeline	35,934	35,934	35,934	35,934	35,934	35,934
	K	Colorado-Lavaca	Chicot and Evangeline	16,207	16,207	16,207	16,207	16,207	16,207
	K	Lavaca	Chicot and Evangeline	579	579	579	579	579	579
	P	Colorado	Chicot and Evangeline	874	874	874	874	874	874
	P	Colorado-Lavaca	Chicot and Evangeline	14,100	14,100	14,100	14,100	14,100	14,100
	P	Lavaca	Chicot and Evangeline	63,193	63,193	63,193	63,193	63,193	63,193
GMA 15 Total				529,007	522,308	522,705	523,059	523,213	523,096

LIMITATIONS:

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

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

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

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

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

REFERENCES:

Chowdhury, Ali. H., Wade, S., Mace, R.E., and Ridgeway, C., 2004, Groundwater Availability Model of the Central Gulf Coast Aquifer System: Numerical Simulations through 1999- Model Report, 114 p.,

http://www.twdb.texas.gov/groundwater/models/gam/glfc_c/TWDB_Recalibration_Report.pdf.

Harbaugh, A. W., 2009, Zonebudget Version 3.01, A computer program for computing sub-regional water budgets for MODFLOW ground-water flow models, U.S. Geological Survey Groundwater Software.

Harbaugh, A. W., and McDonald, M. G., 1996, User's documentation for MODFLOW-96, an update to the U.S. Geological Survey modular finite-difference groundwater-water flow model: U.S. Geological Survey Open-File Report 96-485, 56 p.

Keester, M., Danielson, V., Donnelly, A., 2021, GMA 15 2021 Joint Planning Desired Future Conditions Explanatory Report, 1047 p.

National Research Council, 2007, Models in Environmental Regulatory Decision Making Committee on Models in the Regulatory Decision Process, National Academies Press, Washington D.C., 287 p., http://www.nap.edu/catalog.php?record_id=11972.

Texas Water Code, 2011, <http://www.statutes.legis.state.tx.us/docs/WA/pdf/WA.36.pdf>.

Wade, S., 2010, GAM Run 10-008 Addendum: Texas Water Development Board, 8 p., <https://www.twdb.texas.gov/groundwater/docs/GAMruns/GR10-08addendum.pdf>