Presentation to: Austin County Commissioners Waller County Commissioners February 25, 2013

Introduction

- Current and Future Compliance with Bluebonnet GCD
 - Phase 1 Hydrogeology Study and Report (Permit Application)
 - Phase 2 Study Testing Program and Validation
 - Pumping ALWAYS subject to management as data dictate
- Maintain the Aquifer and Land Surface
 - Aquifer will remain full of water
 - □ Water levels will show minimal local/regional declines
 - Minimal effect to land surface elevations due to EP project
- Benefits and Assurances
 - Sustainable, reliable, affordable, quality water for region
 - **Commitment and resources for aquifer monitoring**
 - □ Continually subject to BGCD can be reduced if warranted
 - MUST be provable huge investment for Rosenberg's and Richmond's future

- Permit Application and Requirements BGCD
 - Phase 1 Hydrogeology Study and Report (Permit Application)
 - Based on available data and information (we'll talk about today)
 - (More than) specific required calculations and analyses
 - Must generally comply with certain aquifer conditions 50 years
 - **G** Forms the basis for permitted production
 - □ Forms the basis for Phase 2 testing
 - Phase 2 Hydrogeology Study Specific Field Testing/Validation
 - Drill, log and complete pilot wells and monitoring wells
 - Conduct aquifer (i.e., pumping) tests measure drawdown
 - Detailed analyses storage, permeability, transmissivity
 - Compare to Phase 1 results
 - □ If different BGCD may adjust the permitted production

- Results of Phase 1 Aquifer, Well Owners, Land Protected
 - Basic concepts details submitted to BGCD professionals
 - Location and description of the proposed project
 - How artesian aquifers act
 - Good information from previous studies available
 - Example well diagram
 - Locations of proposed well field and nearby wells
 - **C** Schematic of local Gulf Coast aquifer and wells
 - Aquifer will remain full storage reduction too small to detect
 - Artesian head (i.e., water levels) within the well field
 - Will not significantly affect water levels in local and area wells
 - Aquifer conditions and modeling
 - Selected producing zones separate from most local wells
 - Minimal, if any, subsidence expected due to the EP project
 - Hydrogeologic conditions much different than counties to east
 - □ USGS/TWDB model overstates local compaction of clay layers
 - Historically, subsidence not a concern water levels have declined

Results of Phase 1 – Aquifer, Well Owners, Land Protected
Location and description of the project



- Results of Phase 1 Aquifer, Well Owners, Land Protected
 - How artesian aquifers act
 - Water is derived from a reduction in pressure
 - □ The aquifer is not "mined"



- Results of Phase 1 Aquifer, Well Owners, Land Protected
 - Good information available from previous studies
 - Previous studies are not site-specific



Results of Phase 1 – Aquifer, Well Owners, Land Protected
Preliminary well design based on available hydrogeologic data





- Results of Phase 1 Aquifer, Well Owners, Land Protected
 - Locations of proposed well field and nearby existing wells
 - Target production zones separate from locally tapped zones



- Results of Phase 1 Aquifer, Well Owners, Land Protected
 - Schematic cross section of local Gulf Coast aquifer and wells



- Results of Phase 1 Aquifer, Well Owners, Land Protected
 - Schematic cross section of local Gulf Coast aquifer and wells



- Results of Phase 1 Aquifer, Well Owners, Land Protected
 - Schematic cross section of local Gulf Coast aquifer and wells



- Results of Phase 1 Aquifer, Well Owners, Land Protected
 - Schematic cross section of local Gulf Coast aquifer and wells



- Results of Phase 1 Aquifer, Well Owners, Land Protected
 - Aquifer will remain full and under artesian pressure
 - Storage reduction too small to detect

	Water in	Reduction Due to EP
<u>County</u>	Storage in Evangeline [*]	<u> Pumping 2014 – 2060</u>
Austin	45,400,000 acre-feet	0.06 percent
Waller	49,000,000 acre-feet	0.06 percent
Fort Bend	147,130,000 acre-feet	0.001 percent
TOTAL	241,530,000 acre-feet	0.023 percent

Results of Phase 1 – Aquifer, Well Owners, Land Protected

- Will not significantly affect water levels in local wells
 - Theis Model Used for well spacing and short-term drawdown
 - Artesian heads (i.e., water levels) within the well field



Distance to East of EP-EVGL-3. Feet

Results of Phase 1 – Aquifer, Well Owners, Land Protected

- Will not significantly affect water levels in local wells
 - Aquifer conditions
 - Most local wells completed in shallower zones
 - Numerical Modeling better method for outside well field – 1 to 2 miles and further
 - Selected producing zones separate from most local and area wells



Results of Phase 1 – Aquifer, Well Owners, Land Protected
Will not significantly affect water levels in local wells



- Results of Phase 1 Aquifer, Well Owners, Land Protected
 - Minimal, if any, subsidence expected due to the EP project
 - □ Subsidence is a known concern in the Gulf Coast aquifer
 - Clay layers in Chicot are more susceptible to subsidence than clay layers in the Evangeline
 - Caused by compaction of clay layers as pressure is reduced
 - EP Area
 - Clay in Chicot and Evangeline is approximately 750 feet thick
 - Chicot is relatively thin
 - Simulated maximum water level decline: 260 feet in Evangeline (GAM)
 - Highest Subsidence Area
 - Clay in Chicot and Evangeline is approximately 1,500 feet thick
 - Chicot is relatively thick
 - Water level declines (TWDB Report 289)
 - Chicot: 300 feet
 - Evangeline: 400 feet
 - Thicker Chicot clays, higher historical production, and greater water level declines in areas with measured subsidence
 - EP proposed production area has less clay and smaller potential for regional water-level declines

Results of Phase 1 – Aquifer, Well Owners, Land Protected

- Minimal, if any, subsidence expected due to the EP project
 - USGS/TWDB model overstates local compaction



Figure 76. Simulated and measured 2000 land-surface subsidence in the Houston area of the Ground-Water Availability Model area.

Results of Phase 1 – Aquifer, Well Owners, Land Protected

- Minimal, if any, subsidence expected due to the EP project
 - Historically, subsidence not a concern
 - Water levels have declined
 - High pumping in the past that has declined recently





Conclusions

- There are hundreds of millions of acre-feet of water stored in the Gulf Coast aquifer
- Drawdown due to the proposed production will be limited to the zones where the wells are completed – there will be no discernible effect on shallow wells
- The proposed pumping will not cause appreciable, if any, subsidence in the area
- The proposed production is available under the management plan of the Bluebonnet Groundwater Conservation District

- Summary
 - Will maintain current "health" of aquifer and land surface
 - Will provide resources to BGCD and implement aquifer monitoring
 - Will ALWAYS be subject to BGCD to protect aquifer, wells, water users and land
 - Will provide much needed sustainable, affordable, and high-quality water supplies to the region
 - Is a tremendous investment by and for Rosenberg and Richmond to secure their future – good for their neighbors