Development of a Groundwater-Surface Water Model for the Tule Basin, California

Thomas Harter Nels Ruud, Alec Naugle Gui Marques, Jay Lund, Marion Jenkins

> ThHarter@ucdavis.edu http://groundwater.ucdavis.edu

> > Land, Air, and Water Resources



University of California, Davis

Central Valley Watershed



Project Area Location

Tulare County



Tule Groundwater Basin ~ 2,300 km²

nia, Davis, 2008

Irrigation, Water, and Municipal Districts in Study Area



Friant Division Contractors in Study Area

District	Class 1	Class 2	Total
Delano-Earlimart ID	108,800	74,500	183,300
Lewis Creek WD	N/A (1,450)	N/A (none)	N/A (1,450)
Lindmore ID	33,000	22,000	55,000
Lindsay-Strathmore ID	27,500 (30,000)	none	27,500 (30,000)
Lower Tule River ID	61,200	238,000	299,200
Porterville ID	16,000	30,000	46,000
Saucelito ID	21,200	32,800	54,000
Teapot Dome WD	7,500	none	7,500
Terra Bella ID	29,000	none	29,000

Key Issues

- Quantity of water delivered under renewed contracts
- Water transfers
- Tiered water pricing
- Water conservation measures
- Allocating water to fish and wildlife
- Groundwater Overdraft



Project Objectives

- Develop a conjunctive use groundwater-surface water model for the Tule Groundwater Basin area.
- Create a comprehensive, user-friendly database of the project area hydrology and hydrogeology using GIS
- Develop and assess the response of the groundwater basin to several future conjunctive use management alternatives

Water in California's Central Valley



Interaction of Surface Water Supply, Land-Atmosphere and Unsaturated Zone (LAIUZ), and Groundwater Flow Models

Land-Atmosphere Interface and Surface Water Supply Model: Unsaturated Zone (LAIUZ) Model: surface water evap. landuse / demands surface water channels delivery soil root zone deep vadose zone seepage recharge unconfined aquifer Groundwater Flow Model: aquitard confined aquifer



Surface Water Conveyance Network



Friant-Kern Canal Flow-stns

Campbell-Morelan Frazier Creek Hubbs-Miner Lewis Creek Lower Deer Creek Lower Port SI Lower Tule River Lower White Rive Middle Deer Middle Tule Pioneer Poplar Porter SI Ditch Upper Deer Upper Port SI Upper Tule Upper White Vandalia Woods-Central

Channel Network Implementation



Handling Seepage and Evaporation

Relationship between District Diversions and District Deliveries



Surface Water Deliveries (1970-95): Input



Surface Water Deliveries (1970-95): Output



Annual Channel Seepage from the Tule River



Annual Seepage from the Deer Creek



Annual Seepage from the White River







Major Crop Types / Landuse Areas





Details of Landuse Coverage



LAIUZ: Model Components for Monthly Mass Balance



Recharge and Pumpage Modeling Approach



Lineal (Stream) vs. Diffuse Recharge



Project Area Hydrologic Budget



Average Recharge [mm/yr], 1970 - 2000



Average Pumping [ft/yr], 1970 - 2000



Annual Net Aquifer Recharge



Delano-Earlimart Irrigation District

irrigated acreage (Tulare Co. only): 45K



Lower Tule River Irrigation District

irrigated acreage: 82K



Pixley Irrigation District

irrigated acreage: 52K



Terra Bella Irrigation District

irrigated acreage: 11K



Observed vs. Computed Net Budget



 $\ensuremath{\mathbb{C}}$ Harter, University of California, Davis, 2008

measured groundwater storage change minus calculated water budget (avg. 1970 - 1986)







Major Geomorphic Units and Spatial Pattern of Water Level Observation Wellbores



University of California, Davis, 2008

Distribution of Wells (for Calibration) by District



K Calibration Concept Models

unstructured



regional geology-based



specific yield-regression



soil map K-regression



ornia, Davis, 2008

Typical Target Head Distribution



Calibration Residuals [cm]



Every district has sources and demands.



Economics Driven

- Each district has an agricultural production model of water use.
- A district's sources of water have different economic costs.
- FredSim allocates water to maximize agricultural profits.
- Link to groundwater model: exchange between groundwater "boxes"

FredSim Results

• Results from FredSim include:

- Flows to each district from each source for each year in the model simulation period.
- Reservoir and groundwater levels for each year in the model simulation period.
- Economic costs and benefits to farmers of changes in water allocations and operations.
- Prediction: Higher surface water costs lead to increased groundwater pumping / overdraft

Conclusion

- demonstrate interaction between surface water supply <u>vs</u>. groundwater level
- better understanding of groundwater dynamics
- Estimates of temporal & spatial recharge distribution
- Estimates of temporal & spatial pumping distribution
- planning tool for conjunctive management "whatif" scenarios (=> Fredsim project by Dr. Lund)
- educational/planning resource

http://groundwater.ucdavis.edu