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CONVERSION FACTORS

For readers who may prefer to use metric units rather than inch-pound units, the conversion factors for the terms in this report are listed below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Multiply</th>
<th>By</th>
<th>To obtain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>acre</td>
<td>0.4047</td>
<td>hectare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acre-foot (acre-ft)</td>
<td>0.001233</td>
<td>cubic hectometer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>foot (ft)</td>
<td>0.3048</td>
<td>meter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>foot per day (ft/d)</td>
<td>0.3048</td>
<td>meter per day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>foot per mile (ft/mi)</td>
<td>0.1894</td>
<td>meter per kilometer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cubic foot per day (ft³/d)</td>
<td>0.02832</td>
<td>cubic meter per day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cubic foot per second (ft³/s)</td>
<td>0.02832</td>
<td>cubic meter per second</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gallon per minute (gal/min)</td>
<td>0.06309</td>
<td>liter per second</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inch (in)</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>millimeter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inch per year (in/yr)</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>millimeter per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mile (mi)</td>
<td>1.609</td>
<td>kilometer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>square mile (mi²)</td>
<td>2.590</td>
<td>square kilometer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

National Geodetic Vertical Datum of 1929 (NGVD of 1929): A geodetic datum derived from a general adjustment of the first-order level nets of both the United States and Canada, formerly called mean sea level. NGVD of 1929 is referred to as sea level in this report.
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ABSTRACT

A system of glacial outwash aquifers lie in the central James Valley in east-central South Dakota. Within this system, the eastern part of the Tulare aquifer, which has an area of approximately 681 square miles, was simulated by means of a numerical ground-water flow model.

The model estimates the yearly average recharge rate for that part of the aquifer lying west of the James River to be approximately 23,000 acre-feet per year. The estimated 1978 yearly average irrigation pumpage rate was 9,800 acre-feet per year. It is expected that, since pumping will reduce discharge from the aquifer through evapotranspiration and flow to the James River, this part of the aquifer would be able to supply irrigation water at recent pumpage rates for an indefinite period. For that part of the aquifer lying east of the river, estimated recharge is 6,800 acre-feet per year. The estimated 1978 yearly average irrigation pumpage rate was 7,200 acre-feet per year. It is estimated that this part of the aquifer would be able to supply irrigation water at 7,200 acre-feet per year for approximately 50 years, at which time excessive drawdown would begin to cause reduced well yields at several locations.

INTRODUCTION

A system of glacial outwash aquifers used for irrigation lie in the central James Valley in east-central South Dakota (fig. 1). The partially water-table glacial outwash aquifer of this study, the eastern part of the Tulare aquifer, is approximately outlined in figure 2 by aquifer model areas A and B.

Agriculture is the major economic base of the study area as it is for most of eastern South Dakota. The soil is for the most part very fertile. The principal restraining factor upon crop production is rainfall which averages only about 18.8 in/yr. The irrigation which is practiced in the area commonly doubles the yield of many crops.

The purpose of this study is to attempt to predict the ability of the aquifer to supply water for irrigation in the future. The main tool used for this purpose is a numerical ground-water flow model. Certain other methods will be mentioned which give less ambitious but useful predictions.

WATER USE

Irrigation use in the study area is presently at least 10 times larger than all municipal and domestic use. Thus the effects of all pumping except that of irrigation have been ignored in the aquifer model of this study. Irrigation use has increased
Figure 1.--Location of study area in east-central South Dakota.
Figure 2.—Location of aquifer model areas.
remarkably in the last 10 years. In 1978, irrigation water-use questionnaires show that 8,173 acre-ft of water was applied in aquifer model area A as shown in figure 2, and 6,029 acre-ft was applied in aquifer model area B. Typical application rates are 8 to 20 inches per irrigation season. The application rate peaks in late summer with more than 50 percent of the total yearly amount occurring in the months of July and August. Almost all application is made by some type of sprinkler system. The center pivot irrigation system, covering a circular-shaped area with a radius of up to one-quarter mile, is the most common means of application.

HYDROGEOLOGY

Most surficial deposits in the study area are the result of glaciation of Pleistocene age and collectively are called drift. This drift can be divided into two major types, till and outwash, that differ greatly in physical and hydrologic characteristics. Till, which was deposited directly from or by glacial ice, is a heterogeneous mixture of silt, sand, gravel, and boulders in a matrix of clay. It is the most abundant glacial deposit in the area. Outwash, which was deposited from or by meltwater streams beyond the margin of active glacial ice, consists primarily of layers of clayey or silty sand and sandy gravel interbedded with layers of sandy and gravelly silt or clay. Beds of well-sorted sand and gravel are contained in the outwash.

The permeability of the till generally ranges from less than 0.001 to about 0.1 ft/d and the permeability of the outwash deposits generally ranges from less than 1 to more than 500 ft/d (Howells and Stephens, 1968).

The aquifer under consideration in this report consists of most of the eastern part of the Tulare aquifer, which itself is a small part of a complex system of outwash aquifers called the Central James aquifer complex by Howells and Stephens (1968). It has been chosen or segmented from the larger complex in such a way as to be fairly isolated hydrologically. Figure 2 shows several small areas near the fixed-head nodes where it is hydrologically connected with other parts of the Tulare aquifer.

The contact between the glacial deposits and older bedrock formations is characterized by the local presence of deeply incised drainage channels buried by overlying drift. In some locations the depth to bedrock may change by more than 300 ft within a horizontal distance of less than one-fourth mile. The location of these channels is not well known because few drill holes are deep enough to reach bedrock. The areal density of all drill holes in the 681-mi² area of the aquifer is approximately 2.3 holes per square mile. A channel draining the southern part of Spink County and presumably connecting with a deep channel headed northward in the extreme northern part of the county can not be located with the present drill hole data.

The surficial deposits in the study area are underlain by bedrock made up mostly of the Pierre Shale of Cretaceous age, which acts as a confining bed that permits the flow of only small amounts of ground water. The Pierre Shale is underlain by the Niobrara Formation and the Codell Sandstone Member of the Carlile Shale both of Cretaceous age. The Niobrara Formation and Codell Sandstone Member are aquifers, and are in contact with the Tulare aquifer in some of the deeper channels. The hydraulic head in these aquifers is usually not appreciably different from the hydraulic head in the surficial aquifers. Because of this fact, the fairly low permeability of these bedrock aquifers, and their apparent limited contact with the Tulare aquifer, the flow between the glacial and bedrock aquifers is ignored in this study.
A reliable delineation of the aquifer of this study is difficult to obtain because of the glacial processes that deposited the outwash making up the aquifer. Because the channels in the bedrock surface sometimes contain outwash, they further complicate the aquifer geometry. Certain areas were test drilled with a large density of wells, perhaps as many as 20 drill holes in a one-fourth square mile area, usually as part of a test program to find a suitable location for an irrigation well. The analysis of such high-density data shows that transmissivity can in some places change by orders of magnitude within a horizontal distance of less than one-half mile. Furthermore, within an area of less than one-fourth square mile, the aquifer can be a water-table aquifer at several locations and confined at several others. In one part of the area the aquifer may be separated by several till layers, at another part of the area have no till breaks, but at still another site within the area be totally absent.

The application of the aquifer model was made difficult by the heterogeneity of the aquifer. The aquifer model requires the altitude of the top and bottom of the aquifer in each of the model nodes, which were chosen to be the 681 1-mi² sections in figure 2. For each of these 1-mi² nodes, the altitude of the top of the aquifer was chosen to be the average of the aquifer top altitudes from the drill hole data. The same procedure was used for the bottom altitude. Frequently, several different vertically spaced aquifer units, interspersed with low-permeability materials, are present. In this case, the top surface of the uppermost aquifer unit was used for the node's aquifer top altitude and the bottom surface of the lowermost aquifer for the node's aquifer bottom altitude. This procedure would seem to exaggerate the transmissivity of the aquifer in the model, because the thickness of the single aquifer in the model is greater than the total thickness of the aquifer units actually present. This thickness increase can be compensated, however, by reducing the value of the hydraulic conductivity for the node. However, the procedure may cause the aquifer model to give inaccurate results locally because, as the water level declines, it would give the same specific yield and hydraulic conductivity to the interspaced low-permeability materials as to the aquifer materials.

The average altitude of the bedrock beneath the aquifer is approximately 1,190 ft. From existing drill-hole data, the highest bedrock altitude is 1,309 ft and the lowest 845 ft. The average altitude of ground surface is approximately 1,290 ft, giving an average thickness of approximately 100 ft for the surficial deposits. The highest ground surface altitude is 1,304 ft and the lowest 1,235 ft. The average total thickness of the aquifer units is approximately 35 ft and the maximum total thickness from drill-hole data is 173 ft.

The ground surface is very flat. West of the James River, the ground surface slopes approximately northeast toward the James River with an average slope of approximately 7.3 ft/mi. Many of the 1-mi² sections show less than 10 ft of relief. Those that contain small streams or one of the numerous small ponds or marshy areas commonly show more relief. The James River floodplain is typically from 0.1 to 0.3 mi wide, and is flanked by hills that are approximately 25 to 40 ft high.

The water carried in streams in the study area is primarily surface runoff. Stream base flow originating in the study area is very small. Even the James River has a base flow from the aquifer below or in proximity with it which is too small to be measured. The result of this is that without irrigation, the hydrology of the aquifer is simply one of recharge in certain locations, movement of the water downgradient horizontally through the aquifer, and then upward movement through the overburden, whereupon evapotranspiration and a small amount of flow to streams occurs. The
movement of water is from high ground-surface altitude areas, which are probably small depressions, to areas of low ground-surface altitude. These areas of low ground-surface altitude are typically areas adjacent to streams, ponds, or marshy areas. The James River flood plain alone probably receives approximately 20 to 30 percent of the total amount of water evapotranspirated and nearly all of the water discharged to streams. When irrigation effects are considered, some of the recharge water is routed to pumping wells instead of going to low areas for natural discharge. However, the James River flood plain still continues to receive water. It is assumed that drawdown is not sufficient to cause the river to become a source for irrigation water as is sometimes the case with other stream-aquifer systems.

THE AQUIFER MODEL

A generalized conceptualization of the total hydraulic system is depicted in figure 3. Note that the aquifer is only a part of this total system. The model of the aquifer, the main subject of this report, thus simulates only a part of the total hydrologic system. The mathematical procedure in the model used to simulate the aquifer is described by Trescott, Pinder, and Larson (1976), and is based upon the Darcy flow law for the movement of water in porous media and the conservation of the water passing into and out of each of the 1-mi² nodes of the aquifer model. The Trescott, Pinder, and Larson (1976) model was used with several alterations in data output formats. The model uses the implicit finite-difference approximation to the ground-water flow equation. A sparse matrix inversion method known as the strongly implicit procedure was used to solve the approximating equations.

The variables P, E₁, E₂, R, r, D, I, and F are defined briefly by the explanation in figure 3. They are defined more rigorously by their association with the various water flow routes of figure 3. P is the total amount of precipitation that falls into the dashed box. Strictly speaking, it is all water passing into that part of the dashed box which is above ground surface. If water comes from I or P but evaporates before it touches the ground, or passes into the overburden but evapotranspires before reaching the aquifer, it is labeled E₁. Water lost from the box which has come from the aquifer up through the overburden and then evaporates is denoted by E₂. Water going into the stream from the overburden but which has not come from the aquifer is small and included in r. Note that r, which is mostly surface runoff, passes into the stream before leaving the box. Thus ideally the box should intersect surface-water drainage divides at land surface. It is assumed that the flow of water from the box and through the overburden is very small and can be ignored. Aquifer water that discharges through the stream bottom and becomes part of the streamflow is labeled D. Flow I is irrigation water pumped from the aquifer. For the sake of being complete, one could also include the small additional amount of water that is removed from the aquifer for other purposes such as domestic supply. Flow F is water from the aquifer which is leaving the box and going into an adjacent aquifer.

The basic budgetary equation for the aquifer is:

\[ I = R - (F) - (D + E_2) \]  \( (L^3/T) \).  \hspace{1cm} (1)

For model area A, when I is zero, equation (1) becomes

\[ 0.0 = 0.8 - (-0.1) - (0.9) \]  \( \text{(in/yr)} \).
EXPLANATION

P  Precipitation
E₁  Evapotranspiration
E₂  Evapotranspiration of water from aquifer
R  Recharge to aquifer
r  Runoff to stream
D  Discharge from aquifer to stream. (Recharge when D is negative.)
I  Irrigation water pumped from aquifer
F  Loss of water from aquifer to an adjacent aquifer. (Gain when F is negative.)

Figure 3.--Total hydrologic system.
When I is not zero, equation (1) becomes

\[ 0.3 = 0.8 - (-0.1) - (0.6) \text{ (in/yr)}. \]

For the routing of precipitation and irrigation water into runoff r, evapotranspiration \( E_1 \), or recharge \( R \):

\[ P + I = r + E_1 + R \text{ (L}^3/\text{T)}. \] (2)

For area A, when \( I \) is zero, equation (2) becomes

\[ 18.8 + 0.0 = 0.5 + 17.5 + 0.8 \text{ (in/yr)}. \]

When \( I \) is not zero, equation (2) becomes

\[ 18.8 + 0.3 = 0.5 + 17.8 + 0.8 \text{ (in/yr)}. \]

For model area B; \( P, R, \) and \( r \) are the same but \( F \) is 0.0 in/yr; and \( (D + E_2) \) is 0.8 in/yr when \( I = 0 \) and 0.0 in/yr when \( I = 0.8 \) in/yr. These numerical equations express flow in inches of water per year. When multiplied by the area of the aquifer, they give the amount of water flowing in an average one-year period. Precipitation \( P \) is obtained from recorded data and is an average for many years of record, as is runoff \( r \), which is obtained from data on streamflow \( (r + D) \), and using \( D \ll r \). Irrigation \( I \) is known and in the equations above corresponds to the application rate in the area of the aquifer during the year 1978. Recharge \( R \), \( F \), and \( (D + E_2) \) of (1) are all obtained from steady-state model solutions to be discussed later, and could have appreciable error. Using this value for \( R \), (2) can be used to find \( E_1 \). Note that \( R \) is the same with irrigation as without.

Conservation of water in the box gives:

\[ P = r + E_1 + F + (D + E_2) \text{ (L}^3/\text{T)}. \] (3)

None of these equations consider the storage of water and thus apply to steady-state situations only. Nevertheless, they should illuminate considerably the basic mechanisms of the total hydrologic system as depicted by figure 3. Appendices I and II give considerably more information on the budgetary details of this system. The notation used in the appendices is somewhat more elaborate; equations (1), (2), and (3) above correspond to equations (4), (5), and (6) in appendix 1.

For time varying situations (1) becomes

\[ I = R - (F) - (D + E_2) - A S/\Delta t \text{ (L}^3/\text{T)}. \] (4)

where \( A S/\Delta t \) denotes the time rate of change of the amount of water in storage. In the aquifer model of Trescott, Pinder, and Larson (1976), recharge rate \( R_i \) at node \( i \) was assumed to vary with season and \( i \), but to be independent of all other factors (\( \Delta R \) is zero in appendices I and II). Discharge to streamflow \( (D) \) from the aquifer in node \( i \) varies linearly with the hydraulic head \( h_i \), and is zero when \( h_i \) is equal to the elevation of the stream in the node. \( (D) \) is negative when \( h_i \) is below the stream elevation. Evapotranspiration from node \( i \), \( (E_2)_i \), also varies linearly with the hydraulic head \( h_i \) at node \( i \) but is zero when \( h_i \) is a distance \( b_i \) or greater below land surface. The model determines the terms \( F, D + E_2 = \sum (D + E_2)_i \), and \( A S/\Delta t \) in aquifer budget equation (4),
as well as the hydraulic head $h_i$ at each node $i$. The other terms in (4), $I = \Sigma I_i$ and $R = \Sigma R_i$, are parameters for the numerical solution carried out by the model. The $I_i$ are taken from irrigation data and are thus known functions of time. Parameters of the numerical solution which are not known completely are: The $R_i$ which are time dependent, the quantities $b_i$, the rate of increase of $(D + E_2)_i$ with $h_i$, the hydraulic conductivities $k_i$, and also either or both of the specific yield $(S_y)_i$ or storage coefficient $S_i$ at each node $i$. These parameters are adjusted to calibrate the model.

Except for nodes along the James River, discharge to streamflow $(D)_i$ was assumed to be zero. All the nodes along the river have an evapotranspiration $(E_2)_i$ greater than zero, even when the aquifer is stressed by irrigation pumpage which usually occurs at some distance from the river. Because of this situation, the aquifer model cannot distinguish between $(D)_i$ and $(E_2)_i$ for the nodes along the river so that only the lumped value $(D + E_2)_i$ is determined.

**Model Calibration**

Calibration is that process by which a model is altered and the parameters of the model adjusted so that it can best simulate certain variables of a physical system. In this study, these variables were the hydraulic heads $h_i$ at those nodes $i$ of the aquifer model where observation-well data existed. In model areas A and B of figure 2, 108 and 58 nodes respectively had measured observation well data for $h_i$, usually as a function of time. Aquifer discharge $D$ to streamflow, present as measured data in many studies and of considerable value to the calibration procedure, was too small to measure in this study. Estimates of evaporation $E_2$ from increased crop yield are very inaccurate and therefore of limited use for improving calibration.

Figure 3 was taken as a suitable conceptualization of the total hydrologic system. The budgetary equations (1)-(4), as well as those in the appendices, were used as an additional framework or conceptualization of the total hydrologic system. In addition, the recharge rate $R_i$ into node $i$ was assumed to be independent of all factors except time and node number $i$. $(S_y)_i$ and $S_i$ were assumed to be the same for all $i$. The locations along the aquifer perimeter where $F$ was allowed to be non-zero are shown in figure 2 adjacent to the constant head symbol $\varphi$. As mentioned previously, discharge to streamflow $D$ was assumed to be zero for all streams except the James River.

The aquifer was modeled as two areas (see fig. 2), called model areas A and B, for the convenience of data output. Certain nodes along the James River where the two model areas join were shared by both model areas A and B. At these nodes, values for hydraulic head $h$ calculated were approximately the same for the two model areas. This head match was accomplished by choosing the same $b_i$ and rates of increase of $(D + E_2)_i$ with $h_i$, at the river nodes where the model areas join.

The major part of the calibration consisted of varying the parameters $R_i(t)$ where $t$ denotes time, $b_i$, the rate of increase of $(D + E_2)_i$ with $h_i$, $k_i$, $(S_y)_i$, and $S_i$, in such a manner that the goodness of fit of the hydraulic heads $h_i(t)$, produced as dependent variables by the model, with the measured hydraulic heads $h_i(t)$ was maximized. For steady-state calibration, corresponding to steady-state flow, with $R_i$ constant in time and $I_i = 0$, this was done by adjusting the above parameters such that the standard error of estimate

$$S_{err} = \left( \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} w_i (h_i - \bar{h}_i)^2 / \sum_{i=1}^{N} w_i \right)^{1/2}$$

(5)
was minimized. The summation in (5) is over those nodes having a measured hydraulic head \( \hat{h}_i \) only. \( N \) was 108 and 58 for model areas A and B respectively, which were calibrated separately. The \( w_i \) are weights and were given the value 1.0 when \( \hat{h}_i \) was considered to be completely reliable, and 0.5 when less than completely reliable. Time-dependent calibrations, with \( R_i \) and \( I_j \) functions of time \( t \), were done by matching \( h_i(t) \) with \( \hat{h}_i(t) \) at time intervals \( \Delta t \) equal to \((365/12) \) days and 365 days. During each time interval \( \Delta t \), \( R_i(t) \) and \( I_j(t) \neq 0 \) were equal to their time averaged constant values.

The parameter estimation procedure described above is in effect a trial-and-error adjustment of the parameters so as to increase the goodness of fit of, in this case, \( h_i(t) \) with \( \hat{h}_i(t) \). In the general trial-and-error approach, the modeler continually adjusts the parameters on the basis of a variety of notions or possible misconceptions that he has about the aquifer. Consequently, the trial-and-error approach is in general very subjective. Steady-state calibrations with \( I = 0 \), using pre-irrigation data, are poor because if \( R_i \), the rate of increase of \( (D + E_o)_i \) with \( h_i \), and \( k_i \), are all multiplied by the same factor, the model gives the same \( h_i \). At present, irrigation effects are still in an early stage and equilibrium, if possible, is still many years away, thus steady-state calibrations are not possible with \( I \neq 0 \) because there is no data for \( h_i \). Time-dependent calibrations tend to be heavily involved with the selection of \( (S_y)_i \), \( S_y \), and the time dependence of \( R_i(t) \), at the expense of the estimation of the other parameters. Nevertheless, it is the author's belief that a fairly reasonable calibration has been achieved considering the difficult circumstances.

**Model Input**

Certain inputs into the model are known from measurement. These are: Land surface altitude and the altitude of the top and bottom of the aquifer, irrigation pumpage \( I_j(t) \), and the measured hydraulic heads \( \hat{h}_i(t) \) at each node \( i \).

Figures 4 and 5 show land surface altitude in feet, above a datum of 1,000 ft above sea level, for aquifer model areas A and B. Figures 6 and 7 show aquifer top altitude, again above a datum of 1,000 ft above sea level. Figures 8 and 9 show aquifer bottom altitude. As explained previously, aquifer top and bottom altitudes, for a particular node, were obtained by taking the average of aquifer top and bottom altitudes from drill hole data in that node. When a node did not have any drill hole data, aquifer top and bottom altitudes were extrapolated from nearby nodes having such data. Figures 10 and 11 show the thickness of the aquifer. The row and column node numbers are along the left and top of each figure. Land surface elevations, figures 4 and 5, are used by the aquifer model to determine the evapotranspiration \( (E_2)_i \) from each node \( i \). \( (E_2)_i \) varies linearly with hydraulic head \( h_i \) and is zero when \( h_i \) is at a distance \( b_i \) or greater below land surface. In some cases, a large low-lying land surface over part of a node has sufficient area to allow significant amounts of evapotranspiration \( (E_2)_i \), but the aquifer top elevation for the node, perhaps obtained from data at a high altitude point within the node, is at an altitude that is above this land surface. For such a node, the aquifer top elevation, figures 6 and 7, would be at a higher altitude than the land surface elevation in figures 4 and 5. A few nodes in the model have low-lying land surface areas for evapotranspiration but, according to available drill-hole data, both the aquifer top and bottom are above the altitude of this land surface. This situation is shown in figure 12, which depicts a single 1-mi^2 node from a side view. In the model, when \( h_i \) shown was greater than the aquifer bottom elevation, the transmissivity of the node was set equal to the hydraulic conductivity of the node \( k_i \) multiplied by the saturated thickness in the usual manner. However, when \( h_i \) fell below the aquifer bottom elevation, the transmissivity was not set to zero but was instead set
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Figure 4.—Altitude of land surface in model area A.
Figure 5.--Altitude of land surface in model area B.
Figure 6.--Altitude of top of aquifer in model area A.
Figure 7.--Altitude of top of aquifer in model area B.
Figure 8.---Altitude of bottom of aquifer in model area A.
Figure 9.--Altitude of bottom of aquifer in model area B.
Figure 10.--Thickness of aquifer in model area A.
Figure 11.--Thickness of aquifer in model area B.
Figure 12.---Model node.
equal to the hydraulic conductivity of the node \( k_j \) multiplied by a thickness of 1.0 ft. This prescription for calculating the transmissivity of the nodes may seem somewhat arbitrary, but it should be remembered that the sediments beneath the aquifers do not have zero hydraulic conductivity but rather a non-zero value much lower than the aquifers. Quite likely at depths below the aquifer bottom elevation, one or more additional aquifers may be present. The transmissivity for the node shown in figure 12 will be calculated as 1.0 ft times the hydraulic conductivity \( k_j \) for the node. This will give a small value for the transmissivity and will thus properly restrict the flow of water from adjacent nodes before discharging as discharge to streamflow \( D \) and evapotranspiration \( E_2 \).

Figures 13 and 14 show the reported quantity of water pumped for irrigation \( I_i \) during the year 1978. Actual use may have been somewhat larger since, as in other years, not all the irrigators responded to the questionnaires which were sent to them. All hydraulic head data used were for the year 1978 or earlier. Figures 15 and 16 show \( h_{ij}, \ i = 1, N \) for \( N = 108 \) and \( N = 58 \), respectively. These \( h_{ij} \) are time averages of hydraulic head for times prior to the onset of irrigation, when available, but in some cases are time averages of more recent hydraulic head data. Note that some of the nodes along the James River are predominant as sinks for the flow of water, and that the gradient of \( h \) can be quite large near the river. Observation-well data for 1968-78, an 11-year period of nearly average total rainfall, show that the hydraulic head decreased as much as 2 to 5 ft in some areas of the southeastern part of aquifer area A and the northern part of aquifer area B. In other areas of the aquifer, where observation-well data for 1968-78 was available, hydraulic head usually declined by smaller amounts. These declines are very small compared with the change that occurs in the hydraulic head as one moves horizontally across the aquifer. The \( h_i \) in figures 15 and 16 were used for steady-state calibration with \( I_i = 0 \), the \( R_i \) constant in time and equal to average yearly recharge rate into node \( i \), and the use of the standard error of estimate in equation (5).

### Model Results

Calibration gave estimates for the parameters \( R_i(t) \), \( b_i \), the rate of increase of \( (D + E_2) \) with \( h_j, k_j, (S_y)_{ij}, \) and \( S_{ij} \), at each node \( i \).

Figures 17 and 18 give the best estimates of the parameters \( R_i \) as determined by all of the calibration used, both steady-state and time-dependent. The recharge rate values shown in units of 0.1 in/yr and represent yearly recharge rate for an average year. For years of heavy rainfall, recharge increases substantially. In years of drought it may be nearly zero. Figures 19 and 20 give the best estimates for the parameters \( k_i \) in units of ft/d, again as determined by both steady-state and time-dependent calibration. The best estimate values for \( b_i \) were from 12 to 22 ft. During time-dependent calibration, the \( (S_y)_{ij} \) and \( S_{ij} \) were varied but were not allowed to vary with \( i \). This would have been necessary if one had tried to simulate the monthly time dependence of each \( h_{ij}(t) \). This was not done, however, so that only a best estimate for a single \( S_y \) and \( S \) was obtained. For aquifer areas A and B, these best estimates were 0.20 and 0.008, and 0.20 and 0.012, respectively.

The remainder of this section presents results produced by the aquifer model using the measured inputs and parameter estimations given above, as well as additional parameter estimations related to the time-dependence of \( R_i(t) \).
Figure 13.--Reported irrigation pumpage for 1978 in model area A.
Figure 14. -- Reported irrigation pumpage for 1978 in model area B.
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Figure 15. --Steady-state potentiometric head from observation-well data in model area A.
Figure 16.--Steady-state potentiometric head from observation-well data in model area B.
Figure 17.--Estimated recharge in model area A.
Figure 18.--Estimated recharge in model area B.
Figure 19.—Estimated hydraulic conductivity in model area A.
Figure 20.--Estimated hydraulic conductivity in model area B.
Figures 21-27 show results for a steady-state model solution with I = 0. Figure 21 shows a contoured surface for hydraulic head made from the \( h_i \) as produced by the model. Figures 22 and 23 show the discrepancy between these \( h_i \) and the \( r_i \) of figures 15 and 16. Figures 22 and 23 are figures 15 and 16 subtracted from the \( h_i \) represented by figure 21. The average discrepancy between \( h_i \) and \( r_i \) was 0.21 ft and 0.88 ft for model areas A and B respectively. \( S_{err} \) of equation (5) was 5.28 ft and 3.52 ft for model areas A and B respectively. Figures 24 and 25 show \((D + E_2)_i\) in units of \( 10^3 \) ft\(^3\)/d (0.16 in/yr over the area of a node). Note that the maximum value of \((D + E_2)_i\) is 95,000 ft\(^3\)/d or 15 in/yr over the area of a node, a value much smaller than the open-pan evaporation rate of 49 in/yr. Figures 26 and 27 show a blank for a confined condition in the aquifer at node i and a 0 when a water-table condition exists.

For model area A: I, R, F, and \((D + E_2)_i\) of (1) had the values 0, 2,768, -271, and 3,037, respectively, again in units of \( 10^3 \) ft\(^3\)/d, or 0, 0.829, -0.081, and 0.905 in/yr over the 527 mi\(^2\) of area A. For model area B: I, R, F, and \((D + E_2)_i\) had the values 0, 811, 23, and 789 in units of \( 10^3 \) ft\(^3\)/d, or 0, 0.762, 0.022, and 0.742 in/yr over the 167 mi\(^2\) of area B. Because the numerical solution of the model is approximate, these values do not satisfy equation (1) exactly. The values for \( R \) are the sum of the values for \( R_i \) shown in figures 17 and 18 with an appropriate change of units.

Crop production in the river nodes tends to be better than in those nodes with \((E_2)_i\) = 0, suggesting that the evapotranspiration rates \((E_2)_i\) into the river nodes are large enough to make a noticeable difference in crop yield. This observation would suggest that the evapotranspiration rates \((E_2)_i\) might be a substantial fraction of the discharges \((D + E_2)_i\).

As mentioned above, figures 24 and 25 show \((D + E_2)_i\). Except for the nodes along the James River, the discharges to streamflow \((D)_i\) are equal to zero, so that for these nodes the values shown are the evapotranspiration \((E_2)_i\) by itself. Summing the discharges \((D + E_2)_i\) for the nodes along the James River from figures 24 and 25 gives a value of 1,610 ft\(^3\)/d, which is approximately 9.6 percent of the average flow of the river upstream 6 mi from the aquifer at Redfield, and approximately 7.8 of the average flow of the river downstream 4 mi from the aquifer at Huron. Stream-gage measurements at Redfield and Huron show no apparent gain in stream base flow between the two stations. However, the measurements are not accurate enough to eliminate the possibility that all of the 1,610 ft\(^3\)/d could be discharge to streamflow \(D\). Thus, the share of the discharges \((D + E_2)_i\), in figures 24 and 25, taken up by \((D)_i\) and \((E_2)_i\) separately is unknown for the nodes along the river.

Time-dependent calibration, with \( R_i \) and \( I_i \) functions of time, was done by matching \( h_i(t) \) with \( h_i(t) \). The hydraulic heads \( h_i(t) \) were determined by the model at times \( t = t_n \) separated by time intervals \( 4t \) equal to 365 days or \((365/12)\) days.

For \( 4t = 365 \) days, figures 28-33 show hydrographs for six observation wells and also aquifer model-calculated values for \( h_i(t) \). Times \( t = t_n \) for the years 1968-78, an eleven-year period of nearly average rainfall and assumed average recharge. The best overall fit of \( h_i(t) \) and \( h(t) \) for a total of 14 observation wells was obtained when the \( (R_i)_{t_n} \), \( n = 1,11 \), for the years 1968-78, had the values of 1.0, 1.2, 1.0, 1.7, 2.1, 1.2, 0.0, 0.0, 0.0, 1.4, and 1.4. Note that the sum of these 11 factors totals 11.0, so that their average value is 1.0. It was assumed that the spatial variation of \( R_i(t) \) was the same each year and as given by figures 17 and 18. The factors above can be approximated by assuming that a certain fraction \( \alpha \) of the excess of precipitation over 18 in for a given year is recharged that same year, and an equal amount the next year. The fraction \( \alpha \), the same for each year, is found by normalization.
Figure 21.--Hydraulic head from a steady-state aquifer model solution with no irrigation.
Figure 22.--Difference between steady-state head from observation-well data and head from model solution with no irrigation in model area A.
Figure 23.—Difference between steady-state head from observation-well data and head from model solution with no irrigation in model area B.
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Figure 24.--Evapotranspiration from a steady-state model solution in model area A.
Figure 25.--Evapotranspiration from a steady-state model solution in model area B.
Figure 26.—Location of water table and artesian areas for the steady-state model solution in model area A.
Figure 27. Location of water table and artesian areas for the steady-state solution in model area B.
Figure 28.--Hydrograph for well 115N63W33DDC and year-end model-calculated hydraulic head values.
Figure 29.—Hydrograph for well 116N61W29DDAA and year-end aquifer model-calculated hydraulic head values.
Figure 30.—Hydrograph for well 115N64W28BBBB and year-end aquifer model-calculated hydraulic head values.
Figure 31.--Hydrograph for well 117N61W16CCCC and year-end aquifer model-calculated hydraulic head values.
Figure 32.—Hydrograph for well 115N65W35ABB and year-end aquifer model-calculated hydraulic head values.
Figure 33.--Hydrograph for well 118N62W35B and year-end model-calculated hydraulic head values.
The $I_i$ as functions of time were determined from reported irrigation ground-water use data. Use in the entire James River basin for the years of 1973-78 was 11,490, 10,858, 13,449, 38,238, 45,168, and approximately 48,000 acre-ft respectively. Dividing these values by the 1978 value and multiplying by 1.2 gives: 0.29, 0.27, 0.37, 0.96, 1.13, and 1.2. The $I_i$ used for the years 1968-78 in the calibration were the $I_i$ of figures 13 and 14 multiplied by 0.0 for the years 1968-72 and the above factors for the years 1973-78. Thus the spatial variation of the $I_i$ was assumed to be the same each year and to be that of the year 1978, an approximation to actual irrigation water use. The factor 1.2 was inserted to compensate for the fact that approximately 70-85% of the irrigators responded to the irrigation water-use questionnaire which was sent to each of them each year. For model area A the year 1978: $I_i, R, F, (D + E_2)I$, and $D/dt$, of (4) had the values 1,170, 3,875, -274, 2,473, and 506 $10^3$ ft$^3$/d respectively. For area B, these values were 863, 1,135, 20, 546, and -294 $10^3$ ft$^3$/d respectively. For area A, the aquifer model gave an average decline in the hydraulic head of 1.1 ft for the 11-year period 1968-78. For area B, the decline was 3.2 ft. The previously described $I = 0$ steady-state solution was assumed for the initial condition of the aquifer at the beginning of the year 1968. Over the period 1968-78, note that $(D + E_2)$ changed from 3,037 to 2,473 and from 789 to 546 $10^3$ ft$^3$/d for model areas A and B.

Time-dependent calibration was also done with $\Delta t = (365/12)$ days. In this case $t_n = [\{365/12\} \text{ days}]_n, n = 1,12$. The $h_i(t_n)$ produced by the aquifer model were compared with $h_i(t_n)$ from observation-well hydrographs. The hydrographs in figures 28-33 show that the hydraulic head can have considerable variation in a 365-day period. The hydrographs for figures 29, 30, and 32 show a sharp low in the months of July or August, probably due to the proximity of one or more irrigation wells. In all of the hydrographs, recharge usually causes the hydraulic head to rise each year between fall and late spring or early summer. In order for the model to reproduce each hydrograph, it would be necessary to meticulously adjust the parameters: $R_i(t_n), R_i, b_i,$ the n dependence of the rate of increase of $(D + E_2)I$ with $h_i$, $S_y$ and $S_j$, for all $i$. It would also be necessary to be sure that $h_i(t_n)$ was correct for each $i$ and $n$. Such meticulous and detailed i dependent calibration was not attempted because it does not significantly increase the ability of the model to make long-term predictions.

The $i$ dependence of the $R_i(t_n)$ was assumed to be that of figures 18 and 19. The $R_i(t_n)$ were set equal to the $R_i$ of those figures multiplied by 0.0, 0.0, 2.0, 5.0, 4.0, 1.0, 0.0, 0.0, 0.0, 0.0, and 0.0 for $n = 1,12$ corresponding roughly to the months of January through December. This n dependence of $R_i(t_n)$ places all recharge in the 4 months of March, April, May, and June, and gave the best fit between observed and model produced heads. The n dependence of the rate of increase of $(E_2)I$ with $h_i$ was set proportional to the monthly pan-evaporation rate. For $n = 1,12$, the rate of increase of $(E_2)I$ with $h_i$ was given by 0.0, 0.0, 0.0, 1.3, 1.7, 2.1, 2.4, 2.0, 1.5, 1.0, 0.0, and 0.0 multiplied by the value used for steady-state calibration. These values are those from steady-state calibration. The $h_i(t_n)$ were set equal to the $h_i$ of figures 13 and 14 multiplied by 0.0, 0.0, 0.0, 0.0, 0.0, 0.0, 2.0, 3.0, 4.0, 3.0, 0.0, 0.0, and 0.0, for $n = 1,12$. This prescription for the $I_i(t_n)$ is approximated from monthly irrigation data and places all irrigation in the 4 months of June through September. With the above prescriptions for $R_i(t_n)$, the rate of increase of $(E_2)I$ with $h_i$, and $I_i(t_n)$, the agreement between $h_i(t_n)$ and $h_i(t_n)$ was in some cases rather poor. From observation-well hydrographs for the years of 1977 and 1978, the maximum yearly variation of the hydraulic head $h_i$ for each of 25 observation wells, was tabulated. The average of these 50 values was 3.0 ft. The average of these values as determined by the model, with $\Delta t = (365/12)$ days, was 2.9 ft. Thus, although individual hydrographs could not usually be matched by the model, their average behavior was duplicated quite well.
The stated purpose of this study is to predict the ability of the aquifer to supply water for irrigation in the future. Steady-state solutions were found or attempted using the \( I_j \) from figures 13 and 14 multiplied by 1.2. As explained previously, this rate should be approximately equal to the actual use rate for the year 1978. The \( R_j \) were taken from figures 17 and 18 and are recharge rates for an average year. For aquifer area A, equation (1) was:

\[
1,170 = 2,768 - (-292) - 1,880 \\
0.349 = 0.829 - (-0.087) - 0.560 \\
I = R - (F) - (D + E_2).
\]

The first equation has the units of \( 10^3 \) ft\(^3\)/d, the second in/yr over the 527-mi\(^2\) area of model area A. Note that \( R \) is substantially larger than \( I \). If we suppose this recharge \( R \) above is correct, then it follows that area A could sustain substantially greater irrigation water pumpage, perhaps even twice as much if wells were located properly. Area A of figure 34 shows a contoured surface made from the \( h_j \) as produced by the model. The average decline in the hydraulic head below that of the steady-state \( I = 0 \) solution was 2.9 ft. Despite the decline in the hydraulic head, the James River flood plain still serves as the major sink for ground-water flow.

The situation with model area B is quite different. The sum of the \( R_j \) from figure 18 is \( 811 \times 10^3 \) ft\(^3\)/d or 0.762 in/yr over the 167-mi\(^2\) area of model area B. The sum of the \( I_j \) from figure 14 multiplied by 1.2 is \( 863 \times 10^3 \) ft\(^3\)/d which is greater than recharge \( R \). Clearly, since \( E_2 \) cannot be negative unless \( (D + F) \) is negative and large enough to make up the difference between \( I \) and \( R \), there can be no steady-state solution. An attempted steady-state solution failed. A solution could not be found because the irrigation pumpage was not able to reverse or stop the flow to the nodes along the James River and \( F \) also remained positive, even though drawdown was enough to produce many dry nodes. It follows that the model predicts that model area B will not be able to continue irrigation at 1978 use rates for an indefinite period. A time-dependent model simulation with the \( I_j \) constant and equal to 1.2 times those of figure 14, and the \( R_j \) constant and from figure 18 was carried out for an elapsed time of 50 years beginning with the steady-state \( I = 0 \) solution. At the end of this period, 6 nodes had gone dry. The average decline in hydraulic head during the 50-year period was 13.5 ft. Area B of figure 34 shows a contoured surface made from the \( h_j \) as produced by the model at the end of the 50-year period. The nodes which went dry are denoted by the symbol d. The model thus predicts that although 1978 use rates cannot be continued indefinitely, they should be able to continue, for the most part, for a period of perhaps 50 years. Some decrease in well yield is to be expected during this period however.

**OTHER PREDICTIVE TOOLS**

Equation (4), \( I = R - (F) - (D + E_2) - \Delta S/\Delta t \), expresses the conservation of water in the aquifer. Inflow to the aquifer occurs from recharge \( R \). Evapotranspiration \( E_2 \) removes water from the aquifer. Water provided by recharge \( R \) is a source of water for irrigation \( I \). \( F \) can be negative and also provide water for irrigation \( I \). In this study, recharge \( R \) is approximately independent of \( I \) and the hydraulic head \( h \) in the aquifer. However, \( (D + E_2 + F) \), the rate of loss of water from the aquifer, increases as \( h \) rises. This situation is like that of a barrel with a \( V \) shaped wedge cut in its side and opening.
Figure 34.—Hydraulic head from aquifer model solutions with irrigation at 1978 use rate. Area A is steady-state, area B is 50 years after irrigation pumping.
upwards. Flow $E_2$ leaves the barrel by gushing through the wedge. When the water level $h$ rises above the bottom of the wedge, the flow through the wedge increases rapidly. The barrel furthermore has a hole in its bottom connected by a small pipe to a large tank also containing water. The direction of the flow $D + F$ passing between the barrel and the tank depends upon their relative water levels. Flow $I$ is removed from the barrel for use, and flow $R$ is put into the barrel but cannot be controlled by the user of the water $I$. $R$ is unknown, even the size of the barrel isn't known very accurately since the size of the aquifer and its storage coefficient $S$ and/or specific yield $S_y$ are not known very accurately. The flow $E_2$ leaving through the wedge cannot be measured except with considerable difficulty. The question to be answered is: How fast can water for use be removed from the barrel at a sustained rate? If $D + F$ is ignored because it is small, then it follows that $I$ cannot be larger than $R$ for a sustained period of time. Thus the determination of $R$ is fundamental. It is known that $R$ sometimes increases abruptly during certain times of the year, especially after heavy rainfall. One could obtain a measure of $R$ by comparing its effect upon the change in the water level $h$ in the barrel as compared to the change produced by $I$ which is known. This simple principal would work quite accurately if rates $I$ and $R$ were large compared with the other terms in (4), which could be the case for the sudden removal of water from the barrel and the likewise sudden recharge of water to the barrel. This principle for finding $R$ loses its practicality somewhat when applied to an aquifer because observation-well data frequently cannot provide an accurate enough measure of the relative change in the amount of water in the aquifer. Thus, for example, because of the placement of the observation wells, several months of heavy irrigation pumpage might appear to have lowered the water level more than a recharge period had raised the water level, even though in fact the recharge was greater than the irrigation pumpage.

Notwithstanding this limitation of observation wells, water-level declines, when observed over several years, will tend to level off if irrigation pumpage is going to be sustainable. If no leveling off is evident, and the continued water-level decline apparently would cause reduced well yields, then it may be that the irrigation pumpage will not be sustainable.

RESULTS AND SUMMARY

The purpose of this study has been to predict the ability of the aquifer to supply water for irrigation. The aquifer was divided into two segments, model areas A and B of figure 2. The model obtained an approximate value of 23,000 acre-feet per year (2,768,000 cubic feet per day) for the yearly average recharge rate $R$ to model area A. For area B, a value of 6,800 acre-feet per year (811,000 cubic feet per day) was obtained. These values correspond to 0.83 inch per year and 0.76 inch per year over the 527-square mile and 167-square mile model areas A and B respectively. The recharge rate $R$ is thought to be unaffected by any stress placed on the aquifer due to pumpage, and was independent of the hydraulic head in the aquifer, in the model. According to the model, area A gains an additional inflow ($-F$) of 2,300 to 2,400 acre-feet per year along its perimeter, the smaller value occurring when the yearly average irrigation pumpage rate is zero, and the larger value when the irrigation pumpage rate is 9,800 acre-feet per year, the approximate rate for the year 1978. When area A is supplying irrigation water at the 1978 pumpage rate, the total amount of water coming into the aquifer, $23,000 + 2,400 = 25,400$ acre-feet per year, exceeds the pumpage rate $I = 9,800$ acre-feet per year by $15,600$ acre-feet per year. This excess water is discharged as evapotranspiration and base flow to the James River. These numbers
imply that area A could supply irrigation water at a considerably higher rate than was supplied in 1978, or in other recent years.

For area B, the irrigation pumpage rate \( I \), for 1978, was approximately 7,200 acre-feet per year. This is a higher rate than the 6,800 acre-feet per year obtained by the model for the yearly average recharge rate, \( R \). The model, furthermore, predicts an outflow \( F \) from area B which cannot be reversed by irrigation pumpage. Also, with the 1978 placement of irrigation wells, the model predicts that drawdown in the hydraulic head due to irrigation pumpage cannot reverse or stop the discharge of water to the James River flood plain. It follows that the aquifer in area B is not expected to be able to sustain irrigation pumpage rates as large as were supplied in the year 1978, or other recent years. A time-varying model solution predicts that area B would be able to supply a yearly average pumpage rate of 7,200 acre-feet per year for perhaps as long as 50 years. Some of the irrigation wells, however, would be expected to go dry during this time period.

Area A, of figure 34, shows the hydraulic head that would be expected if 1978 irrigation pumpage rates were to be continued indefinitely. The average decline in the hydraulic head shown, below the hydraulic head for no pumpage, is approximately 2.9 feet. Area B, of figure 34, shows the hydraulic head that would be expected if 1978 irrigation pumpage rates were to be continued for a period of 50 years. The average decline in the hydraulic head shown, below the hydraulic head for no pumpage, is approximately 13.5 feet. The 6 model nodes, that would be expected to go dry during this 50-year period, are denoted by the symbol \( d \) in figure 34.

These results are approximate. The predictions for the yearly average recharge rate \( R \), 23,000 and 6,800 acre-feet per year, for model areas A and B, are of primary importance, but are definitely subject to error due to the nature of the modeling process.
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Appendix I

Steady-State Hydrologic Budget

An appropriate and generalized conceptualization, applicable to the total hydrologic system of this study, is shown in figure 3.

In a steady-state budget, storage water is insignificant and is not considered. The variables of figure 3 may be thought of as being the amounts of water (L^3) that flow during an average one-year period. More precisely perhaps, they should be thought of as the amounts of water that flow during a large time period. The hydrologic system should be approximately in a state of equilibrium before the beginning of the period. Irrigation practices, if any, should have begun many years before the beginning of the period and be roughly the same each year, so that drawdowns have stabilized except for yearly fluctuations and changes due to short periods of drought.

With no irrigation, I = 0, the water routing in figure 3 gives:

\[ 0 = R - (D + F) - E_2 \] (1)

and

\[ P = r + E_1 + R \] (2)

where the first equation follows from the conservation of water in the aquifer. Combining (1) and (2) gives:

\[ P = E_1 + E_2 + (r + D + F). \] (3)

Note that conservation of water in the dashed box of figure 3 gives (3) directly. When the system with I = 0 is changed due to irrigation, the values of E_1, E_2, R, r, D, and F change to E_1 + \Delta E_1, E_2 + \Delta E_2, R + \Delta R, r + \Delta r, D + \Delta D, and F + \Delta F respectively. The precipitation P, however, remains the same. Note that this notation is different than in equations (1-3) in the text.

Equations (1), (2), and (3) thus become:

\[ I = (R + \Delta R) - (D + \Delta D + F + \Delta F) - (E_2 + \Delta E_2) \] (4)

\[ (P + I) = (r + \Delta r) + (E_1 + \Delta E_1) + (R + \Delta R) \] (5)

and

\[ P = (E_1 + \Delta E_1) + (E_2 + \Delta E_2) + (r + \Delta r + D + \Delta D + F + \Delta F). \] (6)

Note that (6) does not contain I and, as does (3), follows directly from the conservation of water in the dashed box.

Subtracting (1), (2), and (3) from (4), (5), and (6) gives:

\[ (I - \Delta R) = -(\Delta D + \Delta F + \Delta E_2) \] (7)

\[ I = \Delta r + \Delta E_1 + \Delta R \] (8)
and

$$0 = \Delta E_1 + \Delta E_2 + \Delta r + \Delta D + \Delta F.$$  \hspace{1cm} (9)

From (7), the net increase in water removed from the aquifer due to irrigation, \( I - \Delta R \), is equal to the decrease in water going to \( D, F, \) and \( E_2 \).

For this study, the evapotranspiration increase \( \Delta E_1 \) in (8) is expected to be a major portion of \( I \). The increase in recharge, \( \Delta R \), is relatively small in comparison with \( I \), as is \( \Delta r \). The quantity \( \Delta E_1 / I \) almost certainly exceeds 0.5, but is less than 1.0. Because the irrigation water is applied by sprinklers and usually during times of the growing season when evapotranspiration is high, this quantity could very likely be greater than even 0.95. \( \Delta D, \Delta F, \) and \( \Delta E_2 \) are in effect caused by the lowering of the hydraulic head in the aquifer, due to the net increase in water removed from the aquifer for irrigation, \( I - \Delta R \). Thus, \( \Delta D, \Delta F, \) and \( \Delta E_2 \) are negative.

Rearranging equation (4) gives:

$$I - \Delta R = R - (D + \Delta F + F + \Delta F) - (E_2 + \Delta E_2).$$ \hspace{1cm} (10)

This basic equation states that the net amount of water removed from the aquifer for irrigation \( I - \Delta R \) is equal to aquifer recharge \( R \) less water lost from the aquifer due to discharge to streamflow \( D + \Delta D \) less water lost from the aquifer due to evapotranspiration \( E_2 + \Delta E_2 \). It expresses the steady-state budget for the aquifer, and is found by steady-state solutions of the numerical model. When there is no irrigation \( I, \Delta R, \Delta E_2, \Delta D, \) and \( \Delta F \) are zero.
Appendix II

Time-Dependent Hydrologic Budget

Equation (10) of appendix I is modified for the time-dependent case by including storage water:

\[(I - AR) = R - (D + AD + F + AF) - (E_2 + AE_2) - AS.\] (1)

This equation states that during some time interval \(\Delta t\), the net amount of water removed from the aquifer for irrigation \((I - AR)\) is equal to aquifer recharge \(R\) less water lost from the aquifer due to discharge \((D + AD)\) less water lost to an adjacent aquifer \((F + AF)\) less water lost from the aquifer due to evapotranspiration \((E_2 + AE_2)\) less the change in the water in storage in the aquifer \(AS\). It expresses the time-dependent budget for the aquifer, as is found by time-dependent solutions of the numerical model. When there is no irrigation \(I\), \(AR\), \(AE_2\), \(AD\), and \(AF\) are zero and \(AS\) has a different value than when these quantities are not zero and irrigation is present.

Also, for the aquifer of this study the flow of water to an adjacent aquifer \((F + AF)\) is fairly small compared with the other terms in (10) of appendix I. From the steady-state equation (10) of appendix I with \((F + AF) = 0\), \((I - AR) = R - (D + AD + E_2 + AE_2)\). Because of the geometry of the aquifer and the placement of irrigation wells in the aquifer, it probably is not possible to lower the hydraulic head sufficiently that \((D + AD + E_2 + AE_2)\) is decreased to zero, causing the total amount of recharge water \(R\) to be available for irrigation, i.e. \((I - AR) = R\). It may happen that when irrigation is at a maximum that water is still being lost from the aquifer by discharge to streamflow and evapotranspiration, i.e. \((D + AD + E_2 + AE_2) > 0\). In this case \((I - AR) = R - (D + AD + E_2 + AE_2)\) could be considerably less than \(R\), thus diminishing somewhat the importance of knowing \(R\), and increasing the importance of understanding \(D\) and \(E_2\).