Santa Cruz Water Commission Aquifer Storage and Recovery Project Phase 1 Investigation Update

#### **City of Santa Cruz Water Department**

October 1, 2018

#### Robert C. Marks, P.G., C.Hg., Principal Hydrogeologist Pueblo Water Resources, Inc.



# Outline

- Phase 1 Feasibility Investigation Status
- Groundwater Modeling
  - Overview
  - Scenario Descriptions
  - Results for Key Scenarios
  - Summary of Key Findings
  - Potential Future Scenarios
- Water Supply Advisory Committee Performance Metrics Update
- Next Steps
- Q & A

### Phase 1 Technical Feasibility Investigation Primary Purposes

- Validate (and refine) WSAC ASR Recon-Study Findings:
  - 1. Per-well injection capacities
  - 2. Geochemical interaction potential
  - 3. Aquifer storage capacities
  - 4. Aquifer hydraulic losses
- Develop information needed to scope and budget Phase 2 ASR Pilot Testing

#### Phase 1 Technical Feasibility Investigation Current Status

- Technical Feasibility Analysis Tasks:
  - 1. ID Existing Wells for ASR Pilot Testing COMPLETE
  - 2. Site-Specific Injection Capacity Analyses COMPLETE
  - 3. Geochemical Interaction Evaluation COMPLETE
  - 4. Phase 2 ASR Pilot Test Work Plans **PARTIALY COMPLETE**
- Groundwater Modeling Tasks
  - 1. New ASR Well Siting Studies COMPLETE
  - 2. Groundwater Modeling **PARTIALY COMPLETE**

#### Phase 1 Technical Feasibility Investigation Current Schedule

Task Name	2016	2016			2017			2018				20	
	Qtr 1	Qtr 2	Qtr 3	Qtr 4	Qtr 1	Qtr 2	Qtr 3	Qtr 4	Qtr 1	Qtr 2	Qtr 3	Qtr 4	Qt
	Jan e	MarApr a Ji	un Jul u e	Oct o e	e Jan e Ma	arApr a Jur	n Jul u ∈	Octo	e Jan e M	arApr a J	un Jul u	e Oct o	e Jan
Technical Feasibility Analyses		-											
T1.1 - Existing Wells Screening													
T1.2 - Site-Specific Injection Capacity Analyses													
T1.3 - Geochemical Interaction Analysis			[	) 									
T1.4 - Pilot ASR Testing Program Development													
Groundwater Modeling		-											
T1.5.1 - Well Siting Study													
T1.5.2.1 - Confluence Model Coordination													
T1.5.2.2 - ASR Model Scenario Development													
T1.5.3 - GW Modeling													

### Groundwater Modeling Study Area Map



## **Groundwater Modeling**

#### Overview

- Two independent models:
  - Santa Margarita Groundwater Basin (SMGB)
  - Santa Cruz Mid-County Groundwater Basin (MGB)
- Both utilize USGS MODFLOW code
- Calibrated against historical based periods of 1985 2015

## **Groundwater Modeling**

- Primary Purpose Validate WSAC Assumptions regarding feasibility of ASR
  - GW Basin Storage Capacities (3 bg combined)
  - Storage Losses (20%)
  - Per-Well Injection Rates (0.3 0.5 mgd avg)

### Model Scenario Development

#### **Confluence is a Bridge Between Models**



#### Confluence Modeling Results: Infrastructure Requirements

		BASE	HI	STORICAL FLO	WS	C	CLIMATE CHANGE			
		ASSUMPTIONS	1. In-Lieu	2. ASR	3. In-Lieu/ ASR	4. In-Lieu	5. ASR	6. In-Lieu/ ASR		
			Direct Felton	Direct Felton	Direct Felton	Direct Felton	Direct Felton	Direct Felton		
Infractructure	Cill	N/A	Diversion	Diversion	Diversion	Diversion	Diversion	Diversion		
& Water	r III		N/A	5.5 mgd	1.5 mgd	N/A	6.0 mgd	2.0 mgd		
Rights			N/A	injection	injection	11/0	injection	injection		
	Drawdown	N/A	4.0 mgd	4.0 mgd	4.0 mgd	4.0 mgd	6.0 mgd	6.5 mgd		
		17/5	extraction	extraction	extraction	extraction	extraction	extraction		
	Worst-									
	Year PS	Historical: 1380	400	0	0	470	0	0		
	Shortage	Clim Chg: 1230	400	0	0	470	0	U		
Water Supply	(mg)									
Reliability	Two-Year									
	PS	Historical: 1850	400	0	0	470	0	0		
	Shortage	Clim Chg: 2310	400	0	0	470	0	0		
	(mg)									

Source: Table 8, Fiske Technical Memorandum dated 3/8/17

#### Simulated ASR/Recovery Wells SMGB



11

### Simulated ASR/Recovery Wells SMGB

Ē

		Estimated Capacities								
	Target	Injec	ction	Produ	uction					
Well ID	Aquifer	(gpm)	(mgd)	(gpm)	(mgd)					
SV-1	По	150	0.22	750	1.0					
SV-2	Tlo	205	0.30	750	1.0					
SV-3	По	200	0.29	750	1.0					
SV-4	По	435	0.63	750	1.0					
SV-5	По	250	0.36	750	1.0					
SV-6	По	195	0.28	750	1.0					
SV-7	По	205	0.30	750	1.0					
SV-8	По	230	0.33	750	1.0					
SV-9	По	210	0.30	750	1.0					
	Subtotals	2080	3.00	6750	9.0					

#### Simulated ASR/Recovery Wells MCGB



13

### Simulated ASR/Recovery Wells MCGB

		Estimated Capacities							
	Target	Injec	ction	Produ	uction				
Well ID	Aquifer	(gpm)	(mgd)	(gpm)	(mgd)				
HB5	A/AA/Tu	340	0.49	750	1.0				
SC2	AA/Tu	245	0.35	750	1.0				
SC4	A/AA/Tu	375	0.54	750	1.0				
SQ4	AA/Tu	375	0.54	580	0.8				
SQ7	A/AA	375	0.54	750	1.0				
SQ10	A/AA	375	0.54	750	1.0				
	Subtotals	2085	3.00	4330	5.8				

## **Model Scenario Descriptions**

- Scenarios 1 3: Historical Hydrology of 1985 2015
  - In-Lieu Only (Scenario 1)
  - ASR Only (Scenario 2)
  - In-Lieu plus ASR (Scenario 3)
- Scenarios 4 6: Historical Hydrology of 1973 1984
  - In-Lieu Only (Scenario 4)
  - ASR Only (Scenario 5)
  - In-Lieu plus ASR (Scenario 6)
- Scenarios 7 9: Climate Change Hydrology of 2020 2070
  - In-Lieu Only (Scenario 7)
  - ASR Only (Scenario 8)
  - In-Lieu plus ASR (Scenario 9)

## Model Scenarios 4 - 6

- Basic Parameters
  - Historical Climate of 1973 1984 (includes the 1976 – 1977 drought conditions)
  - Distribution of Project Flows Between Basins:
    - Scenario 4 In-Lieu Only: Flows distributed proportionally between basins based on relative In-Lieu demands of each District (SqCWD, SVWD and SLVWD)
    - Scenario 5 ASR Only: 50/50 split distribution of flows between basins
    - Scenario 6 In-Lieu plus ASR: In-Lieu flows distributed proportionally, ASR flows 50/50 split distribution

#### Scenario 4 – In-Lieu Only Results Recharge – Recovery Flows



#### Scenario 4 – In-Lieu Only Simulated Recovery Wells - SMGB



18

#### Scenario 4 – In-Lieu Only Simulated Recovery Wells - MCGB



19

### Scenario 5 – ASR Only Recharge – Recovery Flows

TOTAL INFRASTRUCTURE CAPACITY (MGD) Injection: 5.5 Extraction: 4.0



#### Scenario 5 – ASR Only Simulated ASR Wells - SMGB



21

#### Scenario 5 – ASR Only Simulated ASR Wells - MCGB



22

#### Scenario 6 – In-Lieu plus ASR Recharge – Recovery Flows



#### Scenario 6 – In-Lieu plus ASR Simulated ASR Wells - SMGB



24

#### Scenario 6 – In-Lieu plus ASR Simulated ASR Wells - MCGB



25

#### Groundwater Modeling Interpretation of Results

- Aquifer Storage Capacities Water Budget Results
  - Maximum volumes of storage achieved
- Hydraulic Losses Water Budget Results
  - Increases in outflow
  - Decreases in inflow
- Sustainable Injection Rates Water Level Responses
  - Water levels remain below ground surface
- Basin Impacts Water Budget & Water Levels
  - Net storage depletion
  - Depressed water levels
    - Other pumping wells
    - Coastal MWs

#### Scenarios 4 – 6 Results Cumulative Storage Changes - MCGB



#### Scenarios 4 – 6 Results Cumulative Storage Losses - MCGB



#### Scenarios 4 – 6 Results Sources of Storage Losses - MCGB

F





### Scenarios 4 – 6 Results ASR Well Water Levels - MCGB

F



#### Scenarios 4 – 6 Results ASR Well Water Levels - MCGB

Ę



#### Scenarios 4 – 6 Results Production Well Water Levels - MCGB



### Scenarios 4 – 6 Results Coastal MW Water Levels - MCGB



#### Groundwater Modeling Summary of Key Findings from Scenarios 4-6

- **1.** Aquifer Storage Capacities
  - SMGB ~1.5 bg
  - MCGB ~1.5 bg
  - Combined ~3.0 bg
- 2. Hydraulic Losses
  - SMGB ~15% 20%
  - MCGB ~25% 30%
  - Greater losses for In-Lieu vs ASR

#### **Groundwater** Modeling

Summary of Key Findings from Scenarios 4 – 6 (con't)

- 3. Sustainable Well Injection Rates
  - SMGB ~0.35 mgd per well avg (3.0 mgd total)
  - MCGB ~0.50 mgd per well avg (3.0 mgd total)
  - Combined total for both basins ~6.0 mgd
- 4. Basin Impacts
  - Beneficial in both basins on Net Basis
  - Potential for negative impacts at nearest prod. wells during City recovery pumping in both basins
  - Potential for coastal water levels to transiently exceed Protective Elevations

#### Groundwater Modeling Potential Future Scenarios

- Additional In-Lieu Recovery Wells
- ASR Only on City-Owned Properties
- Longer "Fill Period" Assumption (e.g. 7 yrs)
- Additional Recharge Volumes Beyond City Needs
- ASR plus Pure Water Soquel
- Additional modeling using different Climate Change scenario
- Others?

#### WSAC ASR Performance Measures Phase 1 Status

	Task	Potential Performance Measures	Findings To Date
1.	1 - Existing Wells Screening	Suitable Existing Wells for Pilot Testing in Target Aquifers do not exist	Satisfied
1. C	2 - Site-Specific Injection apacity Analysis	Results show that avg. Injection Capacity of 250 gpm (+/- 10%) is unrealistic	Satisfied
1. N	3 - Geochemical Interaction Iodeling	Results show that undesirable geochemical interactions are likely	Satisfied
1.	5 - Groundwater Modeling	Results show that target aquifers cannot sustain needed injection or recovery rates or unacceptable hydraulic losses occur	SATISFIED

## **Current Status Summary**

- Phase 1 Investigation is Essentially Complete.
  Ongoing Tasks Include:
  - SMGB Test Well Site Identification Work Plan
  - Climate Change Evaluation
  - Additional Groundwater Modeling Scenarios/Iterations
- WSAC Performance Measures for Phase 1 Satisfied
- No Fatal Flaws Identified
- Phase 2 is Advancing in the MCGB with Beltz 12 Pilot Test

## Next Steps

- Beltz 12 ASR Pilot Test (Phase 2)
- Test Well Site in SMGB (Phase 2)
- Climate Change Scenario Evaluation
- Infrastructure Evaluation
- Additional Modeling

#### Phase 2 ASR Pilot Testing Beltz 12 (Tu/AA/A Aquifers of MCBG)



### Phase 2 ASR Pilot Testing Beltz 12 (Tu/AA/A Aquifers of MCBG)

- Primary Purposes:
  - Determination of sustainable injection/recovery pumping rates
  - Evaluation of well plugging rates/backflushing requirements
  - Determination of local aquifer response to injection/recovery pumping
  - Evaluation of water-quality changes during storage and recovery (focus on DBPs and Mn)

### Phase 2 ASR Pilot Testing Beltz 12 (Tu/AA/A Aquifers of MCBG)

#### • ASR Cycle Test Program:

ASR		I	njectior	ו		Storage	Recovery					
Cycle	Period	Rate	Total Volume		Radius	Period	Period	Rate	Volu	me	Discharge	
No.	(days)	(gpm)	(mg)	(af)	(ft)	(days)	(days)	(gpm)	(mg)	(af)	Location	
1	1	400	0.58	1.77	18	2	1	700	1.01	3.09	Storm Drain	
2	7	400	4.03	12.4	46	14	6	700	6.05	18.6	Storm Drain	
3	30	400	17.3	53.0	96	60	30	400	17.3	53.0	Distribution	
Total Duration (days):			151									
Total Injection Volume (mg):			21.9									
Total R	ecovery '	√olume (	(mg):	24.3								

#### • Project Tasks and Schedule:

		Duration
Task / Activity	Time Period	(months)
CEQA and Permitting	Sep 2018 - Nov 2018	3
Site Preparation	Nov 2018	1
ASR Cycles	Dec 2018 - May 2019	6
Data Analysis and Reporting	Jun 2019 - Jul 2019	2
	Total:	12

### Questions / Discussion

Ē

#### Scenarios 4 – 6 Results Annual Storage Changes - SMGB



#### Scenarios 4 – 6 Results Annual Storage Changes - MCGB



#### Scenarios 4 – 6 Results Cumulative Storage Changes - SMGB



#### Scenarios 4 – 6 Results Cumulative Storage Losses - SMGB



#### Scenarios 4 – 6 Results Sources of Storage Losses - SMGB



#### Scenarios 4 – 6 Results ASR Well Water Levels - SMGB



#### Scenarios 4 – 6 Results ASR Well Water Levels - SMGB



#### Scenarios 4 – 6 Results Production Well Water Levels - SMGB

