
Kansas Geological Survey

High Plains Aquifer Index Well Program: 2017 Annual Report

J. J. Butler, Jr., D. O. Whittemore, E. Reboulet,
S. Knobbe, B. B. Wilson, and G. C. Bohling
Kansas Geological Survey
University of Kansas



Kearny-Finney Index Well

Kansas Geological Survey Open-File Report No. 2018-17
August 2018

GEOHYDROLOGY



The University of Kansas, Lawrence, KS 66047 (785) 864-3965; www.kgs.ku.edu

KANSAS GEOLOGICAL SURVEY
OPEN-FILE REPORT 2018-17

>>>>>>>>> NOT FOR RESALE <<<<<<<<<<<

Disclaimer

The Kansas Geological Survey made a conscientious effort to ensure the accuracy of this report. However, the Kansas Geological Survey does not guarantee this document to be completely free from errors or inaccuracies and disclaims any responsibility or liability for interpretations based on data used in the production of this document or decisions based thereon. This report is intended to make results of research available at the earliest possible date but is not intended to constitute formal publication.

Acknowledgments

We are grateful for the support, assistance, and cooperation of the staff of the Kansas Water Office; the Kansas Department of Agriculture, Division of Water Resources; the managers and staff of Groundwater Management Districts 1, 3, 4, and 5; staff of the Kansas Water Science Center of the United States Geological Survey; and, especially, for the cooperation of the many land owners for making their properties available for installation of the wells. John Woods of the Kansas Geological Survey (KGS) assisted with processing water-level and radar precipitation data, and Julie Tollefson of the KGS edited the report. Diane Knowles of the Kansas Water Office provided instructive comments on the draft report. The State of Kansas Water Plan Fund provides financial support for this project.

Executive Summary

The index well program is directed at developing improved approaches for measuring and interpreting hydrologic responses at the local scale (section to township) in the High Plains aquifer (HPA) in western and south-central Kansas. The program is supported by the Kansas Water Office (KWO) with Water Plan funding as a result of KWO's interest in and responsibility for long-term planning of groundwater resources in western and south-central Kansas. The Kansas Department of Agriculture, Division of Water Resources (DWR), provides assistance, as do Groundwater Management Districts (GMDs) 1, 3, 4, and 5 and the Kansas State University Northwest Research-Extension Center (KSU-NWREC).

The project began with the installation of three monitoring ("index") wells in western Kansas in late summer 2007. Each well has a transducer for continuous monitoring of water levels that is connected to telemetry equipment to allow real-time viewing of well conditions on a publicly accessible website. Since late 2012, wells have been continuously added to the network. The index well network consists of 12 wells with telemetry equipment and real-time data access from the KGS website and 10 wells without telemetry equipment (water-level data downloaded approximately quarterly and displayed on the KGS website). The vision of the index well program is that these wells, and other wells that will be added to the network over time, will be monitored for the long term. Shorter-term monitoring will be done at additional wells (expansion wells); seven expansion wells are monitored in GMD1. A major focus of the program is to use these data for the development of criteria or methods to evaluate the effectiveness of management strategies at the local scale in the HPA in western and south-central Kansas.

This report provides a concise description of conditions as of late winter to early spring of 2018. The majority of the report consists of an update and interpretation of the hydrographs for all of the index wells and the GMD1 expansion wells. In addition, a discussion of the relationships among precipitation (as characterized by radar data), annual water-level changes, and nearby water use at the three original index wells and three additional wells and the implications of those relationships for efforts to moderate water-level declines by pumping reductions are presented.

The major findings of the index well program to date are as follows:

1. Water-level data collected using a pressure transducer and data logger provide a near-continuous record of great practical value that can help in the assessment of the continued viability of the HPA as a source of water for large-scale irrigation.
2. Interpretation of index well hydrographs enables important insights to be drawn concerning hydrogeologic conditions and the long-term viability of the aquifer in the vicinity of the index wells.
3. The annual water-level measurement network data, in conjunction with reliable water-use data, can be used to evaluate the impact of management decisions on the township and larger scale using a new approach developed from water-level responses collected as part of this program.
4. The standardized precipitation index and radar precipitation data are good indicators of the climatic conditions that drive pumping in the High Plains aquifer in Kansas.

In addition to the concise description in this report, these findings are discussed in previous program reports, a recent KGS publication (Whittemore et al., 2018), and scientific journal articles resulting from program work (Butler et al., 2013; Whittemore et al., 2016; Butler et al., 2016; Butler et al., in press).

The focus of activities in 2018 will be on the continuation of monitoring at all program wells; continued analysis of hydrographs from all wells; installation of equipment for real-time monitoring at an existing well near Larned in GMD5; adding telemetry equipment to two existing program wells in GMD3; exploring the possibility of adding additional wells to the network; and further assessment of the relationships among radar precipitation data, annual water-level change, and water use.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgments.....	i
Executive Summary.....	ii
Table of Contents.....	iv
List of Figures.....	vi
List of Tables.....	viii
1. Introduction and Background	1
2. Program History.....	2
3. Overview of Index Well Sites and Monitoring Data.....	5
3.1 GMD1 Index Wells.....	7
3.1.1 Lane County Site.....	8
3.1.2 Scott County Site.....	9
3.1.3 Wallace County Site.....	10
3.1.4 Wichita County Site.....	11
3.2 GMD3 Index Wells.....	12
3.2.1 Cimarron Site.....	14
3.2.2 Haskell County Index Well.....	15
3.2.3 Hugoton Site.....	16
3.2.4 Kearny-Finney Index Well.....	17
3.2.5 Liberal Site.....	19
3.2.6 Rolla Index Well	20
3.2.7 Willis Water Technology Farm Index Well.....	21
3.3 GMD4 Index Wells.....	22
3.3.1 Colby Index Well	24
3.3.2 SD-6 Baalman Index Well.....	25
3.3.3 SD-6 Beckman Index Well.....	26
3.3.4 SD-6 Moss Index Well.....	27
3.3.5 SD-6 Seegmiller Index Well	28
3.3.6 SD-6 Steiger Index Well	29
3.3.7 Sherman County	30
3.3.8 Thomas County.....	31
3.4 GMD5 Index Well	32
3.4.1 Belpre Index Well	33
3.5 Expansion Wells	34
3.5.1 GMD1 Expansion Wells.....	34
3.5.1.1 SC-8 Site – Scott County	36
3.5.1.2 Expansion Site 1 – Scott County	37
3.5.1.3 Expansion Site 2 – Wichita County	38
3.5.1.4 Expansion Site 3 – Wallace County	39
3.5.1.5 Expansion Site 4 – Greeley County	40
3.5.1.6 Expansion Site 5 – Scott County	41
3.5.2 Thomas County Expansion Wells	42
3.5.3 Haskell County Expansion Wells	42
4. Relationships among Water-Level Changes, Water Use, and Climatic Conditions.....	43
4.1 Introduction.....	43

4.2 Radar Precipitation.....	44
4.3 Characterization of Climate with Radar Precipitation Since 2005.....	45
4.4 Correlation of Annual Water Use with Radar Precipitation	46
4.5 Annual Winter Water-Level Measurements.....	49
4.5.1 Water-Level Change in the Groundwater Management Districts.....	49
4.5.2 Water-Level Change in the Thomas, Scott, and Haskell Index Wells.	51
4.6 Correlation of Annual Water Use with Annual Water-Level Change.....	52
4.6.1 Water Use versus Water-Level Change at the Thomas Index Well.....	52
4.6.2 Water Use versus Water-Level Change at the Scott Index Well.....	53
4.6.3 Water Use versus Water-Level Change at the Haskell Index Well.	54
4.6.4 Water Use versus Water-Level Change at the Colby, SC-8, and Belpre Wells.	55
5. Summary of 2017 Accomplishments and Plans for 2018	57
5.1 2017 Accomplishments.....	57
5.2 Planned Activities, 2018	58
6. References	59

List of Figures

Figure 1:	The Kansas portion of the High Plains aquifer, with aquifer and county boundaries shown.....	5
Figure 2:	Map of index wells in GMD1	7
Figure 3:	Lane County index well hydrograph—total data run to 4/13/18	8
Figure 4:	Scott County index well hydrograph—total data run to 4/12/18	9
Figure 5:	Wallace County index well hydrograph—total data run to 4/12/18	10
Figure 6:	Wichita County index well hydrograph—total data run to 4/12/18	11
Figure 7:	Map of index wells in GMD3	13
Figure 8:	Cimarron 210 index well hydrograph—total data run to 2/19/18.....	14
Figure 9:	Haskell County index well hydrograph—total data run to 2/20/18	15
Figure 10:	Hydrographs of Hugoton index wells—total data run to 2/19/18	16
Figure 11:	Aerial view of Kearny-Finney index well, an additional annual program well, and nearby points of diversion.....	17
Figure 12:	Kearny-Finney index well hydrograph—total data run to 2/20/18	18
Figure 13:	Hydrographs of Liberal index wells—total data run to 2/19/18	19
Figure 14:	Rolla 366 index well hydrograph—total data run to 2/19/18	20
Figure 15:	Willis Water Technology Farm index well hydrograph—total data run to 2/20/18.....	21
Figure 16:	Map of index wells in GMD4	23
Figure 17:	Colby index well hydrograph—total data run to 4/11/18.....	24
Figure 18:	Baalman index well hydrograph—total data run to 4/11/18	25
Figure 19:	Beckman index well hydrograph—total data run to 4/11/18	26
Figure 20:	Moss index well hydrograph—total data run to 4/11/18	27
Figure 21:	Seegmiller index well hydrograph—total data run to 4/11/18	28
Figure 22:	Steiger index well hydrograph—total data run to 4/11/18.....	29
Figure 23:	Sherman County index well hydrograph—total data run to 4/12/18.....	30
Figure 24:	Thomas County index well hydrograph—total data run to 4/11/18	31
Figure 25:	Map of GMD5 with Belpre index well	32
Figure 26:	Belpre index well hydrograph—total data run to 2/21/18.....	33
Figure 27:	Map of the GMD1 expansion wells.....	35
Figure 28:	SC-8 well hydrograph—total data run to 4/12/18	36
Figure 29:	GMD1 Expansion Site 1 well hydrograph—total data run to 4/12/18	37
Figure 30:	GMD1 Expansion Site 2 well hydrograph—total data run to 4/12/18.....	38
Figure 31:	GMD1 Expansion Site 3 well hydrograph—total data run to 4/12/18	39
Figure 32:	GMD1 Expansion Site 4 well hydrograph—total data run to 4/12/18.....	40
Figure 33:	GMD1 Expansion Site 5 well hydrograph—total data run to 11/17/17	41
Figure 34:	Percent of normal radar precipitation for Kansas in 2017	44
Figure 35:	Radar precipitation versus time for 2005–2017 for GMDs 4, 1, 3, and 5.....	45
Figure 36:	Correlation of annual total groundwater use with radar precipitation at the Thomas, Scott, and Haskell index wells for 2008–2016	47
Figure 37:	Correlation of annual total groundwater use with radar precipitation at the Colby, SC-8, and Belpre wells for 2008–2016	48

Figure 38: Mean annual water-level change and the radar precipitation for GMDs 4, 1, 3, and 5 during 2005–2017 50

Figure 39: Annual winter water-level changes in the original three index wells and the mean annual changes in the three GMDs in western Kansas in which they are located 51

Figure 40: Correlation of annual water-level change based on transducer measurements in the Thomas County index well with annual water use within a 5 mi radius around the well during 2008–2016 52

Figure 41: Correlation of annual water-level change based on transducer measurements in the Scott County index well with annual water use within a 5 mi radius around the well during 2008–2016 53

Figure 42: Correlation of change in maximum recovery water level based on transducer measurements in the Haskell County index well with annual water use within a 2 mi radius around the well during 2008–2016 54

Figure 43: Correlation of annual water-level change in the Colby, SC-8, and Belpre wells with annual water use within a 1 or 2 mi radius around the wells during 2005–2016 56

List of Tables

Table 1:	Characteristics of the GMD1 index well sites	7
Table 2:	Characteristics of the GMD3 index well sites	12
Table 3:	Characteristics of the GMD4 index well sites	22
Table 4:	Characteristics of the GMD5 index well site	32
Table 5:	Characteristics of the GMD1 expansion well sites.....	34

1 Introduction and Background

Groundwater withdrawals in the Ogallala–High Plains aquifer (henceforth, High Plains aquifer or HPA) in Kansas have resulted in large water-level declines that call into question the viability of the aquifer as a continuing resource for irrigated agriculture (Butler, Stotler, et al., 2013; Buchanan et al., 2015). The index well program, which is a response to this condition, is directed at developing improved approaches for measuring and interpreting hydrologic responses in the HPA at the local (section to township—henceforth, local or subunit) scale to aid in the development of management strategies. The study is supported by the Kansas Water Office (KWO) with Water Plan funding as a result of KWO’s interest in and responsibility for long-term planning of groundwater resources in western and south-central Kansas. The Kansas Department of Agriculture, Division of Water Resources (DWR), provides assistance, as do Groundwater Management Districts (GMDs) 1, 3, 4, and 5 and the Kansas State University Northwest Research-Extension Center (KSU-NWREC).

A major focus of the program is the development of criteria or methods to evaluate the effectiveness of management strategies at the local scale. Changes in water level—or the rate at which the water level is changing—are considered the most direct and unequivocal measures of the impact of management strategies. Because of the economic, social, and environmental importance of water in western and south-central Kansas, the effects of any modifications in patterns of water use need to be evaluated promptly and accurately. The program has focused on identifying and reducing the uncertainties and inaccuracies in estimates of year-to-year changes in water level, so that the effects of management decisions can be assessed as rapidly as possible. In addition, the program has provided valuable information about the mechanisms that control changes in water levels in the vicinity of each well. That information, which is helpful for assessing the impact of management strategies at the local scale, can also provide a check on some of the assumptions incorporated in the groundwater models developed for the HPA in Kansas. The program thus aims to provide accurate and timely information that can complement and enhance the information provided by the annual water-level measurement program.

At the time of this report, monitoring data (hourly frequency) from up to ten full recovery and pumping seasons and one ongoing or completed, depending on location, recovery season have been obtained. With increasing data, the index well program has demonstrated the following:

1. Water-level data collected using a pressure transducer and data logger provide a near-continuous record of great practical value that can help in the assessment of the continued viability of the HPA as a source of water for large-scale irrigation.
2. Interpretation of index well hydrographs enables important practical insights to be drawn concerning hydrogeologic conditions and the long-term viability of the aquifer in the vicinity of the index wells.
3. The annual water-level measurement network data, in conjunction with reliable water-use data, can be used to evaluate the impact of management decisions on the subunit and larger scale using a new approach developed from observed water-level responses as part of this program.
4. The standardized precipitation index and radar precipitation data are good indicators of the climatic conditions that drive pumping in the High Plains aquifer in Kansas.

The index well network was enlarged in 2017 by the installation of real-time monitoring equipment in a well drilled in December 2016 in Sherman County in GMD4 and in an existing well in GMD3 northwest of Garden City in western Finney County near the border with Kearny County. Note that the term “index well” is used here to designate a well at which monitoring is anticipated to continue for many years. There are additional wells, designated here as “expansion wells,” at which monitoring is not likely to continue over the long term because of constraints imposed by well depth (i.e., water level is anticipated to drop below the bottom of the well screen), logistics, or management issues. Both types of wells are considered in this report.

This report provides a concise description of conditions as of late winter to early spring of 2018. The majority of the report consists of an update and interpretation of the hydrographs for all of the index wells and the GMD1 expansion wells. In addition, this report discusses the relationships among precipitation (as characterized by radar data), annual water-level changes, and nearby water use at the three original index wells and three additional wells and the implications of those relationships for efforts to moderate water-level declines by pumping reductions.

2 Program History

The index well program began in late summer 2007 with the installation of three transducer- and telemetry-equipped wells, designed and sited to function as HPA monitoring wells (henceforth, original index wells). One well was installed in each of the three western GMDs, with locations deliberately chosen to represent different water use and hydrogeologic conditions and to take advantage of related past or ongoing studies (stars in fig. 1). The original experimental design envisioned use of the index wells to anchor and calibrate the manual measurements of annual program wells in their vicinity, thus providing more consistency and confidence in the calculation of the water-table surface and its changes in those general areas. However, the scope of the project was quickly expanded to also focus on the mechanisms that control changes in water level in the vicinity of each well. Further information about the characteristics of the original sites and the experimental design can be found in previous annual reports (Young et al., 2007, 2008; Buddemeier et al., 2010).

The demonstrated value of continuous monitoring at the original three index wells led to a significant expansion of the index well network. In the spring of 2012, we started to explore adding a group of wells along the Kansas-Oklahoma border to the network. These wells were in four well nests originally installed by the USGS (National Water-Quality Assessment [NAWQA] program) in 1999 just north of the Oklahoma border. The USGS, which had not used these wells for more than a decade, agreed that the KGS could use the wells for both annual water-level measurements and continuous monitoring. The well nests are located in Seward, Stevens, and Morton counties (green circles along the Kansas-Oklahoma border in fig. 1—from right to left (east to west), Cimarron, Liberal, Hugoton, and Rolla sites). These monitoring locations were important additions to the index well network because they provide valuable information about aquifer responses in the areas of thick saturated intervals in southernmost GMD3.

In the first week of December 2012, we installed transducers in one well at each site and a barometer at the site near Hugoton. The two criteria used to select the well at each site for monitoring were 1) the nature of pumping-induced water-level responses determined from an examination of manual water-level

data collected by the USGS in 1999 and 2000 (McMahon, 2001—fig. 8) and 2) the position of the well within the HPA (the objective was to have a well that would provide information about conditions in the main body of the HPA). All four of these wells have been added to the annual water-level measurement network and, since January 2013, have been measured as part of the annual program.

In early August 2013, we placed transducers in one additional well each at the Hugoton and Liberal sites. In the third week of December 2013, working cooperatively with the USGS, we installed telemetry equipment at the Liberal and Hugoton sites and began to obtain real-time water-level data from the four monitored wells at those sites. The telemetry equipment remained in these wells until late summer 2017 when it was removed because of insufficient funds for the USGS to continue the real-time monitoring. Data from these four sites can now be viewed up to the latest download on the KGS website. Barometers were added to the Rolla and Cimarron sites in February 2014 and November 2015, respectively. The Rolla barometer was removed in early December 2015 because it appeared to be malfunctioning. The Hugoton site barometer was turned off by USGS personnel in November 2015 but was restarted in 2016. The Hugoton and Liberal sites were previously operated cooperatively by the KGS and USGS but, as of late summer 2017, they are now operated solely by the KGS.

In February 2014, the KGS and staff at the KSU-NWREC facility in Colby began to discuss adding the long-time manually measured well at that facility to the index well network. An integrated pressure transducer-datalogger unit was installed in the well in August 2014 shortly before the centennial celebration of the facility. Unlike at the other index wells, the datalogger uses the facility's wi-fi system to communicate with network servers housed at the KGS. In early February 2015, the facility completed running a power cable nearby and installing a wi-fi transmitter. The wi-fi system was successfully tested concurrent with the February 11, 2015, download. However, the integration of the wi-fi system with the transducer-datalogger unit proved challenging. On September 9, 2015, the integration was successfully completed. Continuous measurements are now available on the KGS website.

In the spring of 2014, GMD5 expressed interest in expanding the index well program into its area. KGS and GMD5 staff worked together to identify a monitoring well that was drilled 20 years earlier by the KGS north of Belpre and just south of the Edwards-Pawnee county line. The well is in an area of groundwater-level declines that is of concern to the district. A transducer-datalogger unit and telemetry equipment were installed in July 2014. As described in the 2014 report (Butler et al., 2015), the Belpre data transfers to the KGS network servers could not be automated because of limitations of the telemetry system vendor's website. After considerable efforts to resolve the problems, the decision was made to switch vendors in late summer of 2015. The data have been accessible from the KGS and GMD5 websites since September 18, 2015.

In 2012, collaboration with GMD4 began on the continuous monitoring of water levels at five observation wells within the Sheridan-6 (SD-6) Local Enhanced Management Area (LEMA). As described in previous reports (Butler et al., 2015; Butler, Whittemore, Reboulet et al., 2016), the records from the sensors that were originally in these wells often had anomalous water-level spikes, primarily during the summer, that were coincidental with high temperatures in the datalogger housings. After the decision was made to incorporate these wells into the index well program, the existing monitoring equipment was replaced in the second half of 2015 and early 2016. The existing equipment was replaced with integrated pressure transducer-datalogger units that are similar to those used at all the other index

wells. In late October 2016, telemetry equipment was added to the monitoring well located in the west-central portion of the SD-6 LEMA (Seegmiller well). Real-time data from this well are now accessible from the KGS website. Data from the four other wells in the SD-6 LEMA can be viewed up to the latest download on the KGS website.

In the spring of 2016, we further expanded the program by installing three new wells in Lane, Wallace, and Wichita counties in GMD1. Integrated pressure transducer-datalogger units were placed in the wells in mid-June 2016. Telemetry equipment was installed in the Wallace and Wichita index wells in late July 2016 and in the Lane well in early September 2016. Real-time data from these wells are now accessible from the KGS website.

In the summer of 2016, we converted an existing well on the Willis Water Technology Farm in southern Finney County in GMD3 to an index well. An integrated pressure transducer-datalogger unit and telemetry equipment were added to the well in late July 2016. Real-time data from this well are now accessible on the KGS website.

In late fall of 2016, we further expanded the network by installing a new well in Sherman County southwest of Goodland. An integrated pressure transducer-datalogger unit and telemetry equipment were installed in the well in March 2017. Real-time data from this well are now accessible on the KGS website.

In the summer of 2017, we converted a long-time manually measured existing well northwest of Garden City in western Finney County in GMD3 to an index well (see cover photo). An integrated pressure transducer-datalogger unit and telemetry equipment were added to the well in mid-June 2017. Real-time data from this well are now accessible on the KGS website.

The current state of the index well network is shown in fig. 1. There are now 12 wells in the network with telemetry equipment and real-time data access from the KGS website and 10 wells without telemetry equipment (data downloaded approximately quarterly and displayed on the KGS website). The vast majority of these wells have been added to the annual water-level measurement network and are measured as part of the annual program. In addition, monitoring without telemetry equipment continues in seven expansion wells in GMD1. At least one well will be added to the network in 2018, and we anticipate that telemetry will be added to two of the wells that are currently downloaded quarterly.

**Percent Change in Aquifer Thickness, Predevelopment to Average 2015-2017,
Kansas High Plains Aquifer**




Figure 1—The Kansas portion of the High Plains aquifer, with aquifer and county boundaries shown. Each colored pixel represents one section (1 mi), coded for the degree of groundwater depletion from the beginning of large-scale development to the average of conditions in 2015–2017. The stars indicate the locations of the original three index well site, the triangles indicate additional telemetry-equipped wells, the circles are the index wells without telemetry equipment that are downloaded quarterly, the yellow polygon indicates the Sheridan-6 Local Enhanced Management Area, and the diamond indicates the location of the index well at Larned that will begin acquiring data in the summer of 2018. The plus signs are seven expansion wells that are monitored within GMD1.

3 Overview of Index Well Sites and Monitoring Data

This section provides a brief discussion of the hydrographs from the 22 index wells and 6 GMD1 expansion wells currently in operation. The duration of monitoring ranges from more than 10½ years of hourly measurements at the three original index wells to less than a year at the most recently added well. Although pumping occurs sporadically throughout the year, the major drawdown in water level in all of the wells occurs during the summer pumping season when the aquifer is stressed significantly for an extended period. For this study, the pumping season is defined as the period from the first sustained drawdown during the growing season (often, but not always, following the maximum recovered water level) to the first major increase in water level near the end of the growing season. The recovery season (period) is defined as the time between pumping seasons. Since water levels continue to increase throughout the recovery period at most of the index wells, the difference between water levels measured

during the recovery period from one year to the next only provides a measure of the year-to-year change in still-recovering water levels. This year-to-year change in recovering water levels must be used cautiously by managers because it can be affected by a variety of factors that are unrelated to aquifer trends, such as the year-to-year variability in the time between the end of the irrigation season and the annual measurement. More importantly, it *does not* involve the final recovered water level, the elevation to which the water level would rise if the recovery were not interrupted by the next pumping season. Efforts to estimate this final recovered water level, which would provide a reliable basis for managers to assess the impact of changes in water use, through various extrapolation procedures, have proven difficult because of the variety of mechanisms that can affect the recovery process (Stotler et al., 2011).

In the following subsections, the hydrograph and characteristics of each well are discussed. The wells are organized by the GMD in which they are located. In the interest of brevity, unless the well was added to the program in 2017, discussion of each well will be limited to one page. Further information can be found in previous reports and on the KGS website. In previous reports, two tables were presented for most wells: one provided information about the well hydrograph and the local water use and the other provided comparisons between the manual annual water-level measurements and the transducer measurements. Those tables with data from all years of index well operation are now online at www.kgs.ku.edu/HighPlains/OHP/index_program/index.shtml.

3.1 GMD1 Index Wells

Four index wells are located in GMD1 (fig. 2). The Scott well was one of the original index wells, whereas the Lane, Wallace, and Wichita wells were installed in the spring of 2016. Table 1 summarizes the characteristics of these four wells. Further details concerning these wells are given in the 2016 annual report (Butler et al., 2017) and the online appendices for this report (www.kgs.ku.edu/HighPlains/OHP/index_program/index.shtml). Section 3.5.1 discusses GMD1 expansion wells.

Table 1—Characteristics of the GMD1 index well sites.

Site	2018 WL elev. (ft) ^a	2018 Saturated thickness (ft)	Bedrock depth (estimated ft below land surface)	Screened interval (ft below land surface)	2016 Water Use (ac-ft)		
					1 mi radius circle	2 mi radius circle	5 mi radius circle
Lane	2,767.4	33.4	118	105–115	577	1,589	3,605
Scott	2,827.3	83.1	223	215–225	756	2,591	13,923 ^b
Wallace	3,563.7	129.7	394	375–385	1,058	4,560	15,554
Wichita	3,288.4	30.4	190	175–185	248	2,698	9,101

^a 2018 annual tape water-level measurements from WIZARD database (<http://www.kgs.ku.edu/Magellan/WaterLevels/index.html>).

^b Includes 918 ac-ft of municipal water and 355 ac-ft of non-irrigation stock water.




Figure 2—Map of index wells in GMD1. Triangles designate wells with telemetry equipment; data from these wells can be viewed in real time on the KGS website (www.kgs.ku.edu/HighPlains/OHP/index_program/index.shtml).

3.1.1 Lane County Site




Figure 3—Lane County index well hydrograph—total data run to 4/13/18. A water-level elevation of 2,767 ft corresponds to a depth to water of 85 ft below land surface (lsf). The top of the screen is 105 ft below lsf (elevation of 2,747 ft), and the bottom of the aquifer is 118 ft below lsf (elevation of 2,734 ft). The screen terminates 3 ft above the bottom of the aquifer. The 2017 and, to a lesser extent, the 2018 annual water-level measurements appear to be in error.

Major Points

- Very small amplitude fluctuations superimposed on the water levels are likely an indication of a relatively shallow unconfined aquifer overlain by a vadose zone with high air permeability.
- The impact of individual pumping wells is not discernible; the water-level response appears to be a response to regional pumping, rather than a response to pumping at individual wells as at most of the index wells (i.e., response is more integrated in nature).
- After the end of the irrigation season, water levels continue to recover until the start of the next season (water levels never stabilize).
- The maximum water level for 2018 was about 0.15 ft above that of 2017, whereas the minimum water level for 2017 was about 0.18 ft above that of 2016; such year-on-year increases are rare in the index wells in western Kansas.
- Many short-duration spikes appear on the hydrograph; the origin of these spikes is not clear but is likely sensor noise.
- Transducer readings are in good agreement with periodic electric-tape measurements but in poorer agreement with annual measurements.

3.1.2 Scott County Site




Figure 4—Scott County index well hydrograph—total data run to 4/12/18. A water-level elevation of 2,829 ft corresponds to a depth to water of 138.15 ft below Isf. The top of the screen is 215 ft below Isf (elevation of 2,752.15 ft), and the bottom of the aquifer is 223 ft below Isf (elevation of 2,744.15 ft). The screen terminates 2 ft below the bottom of the aquifer. Transducer data has been adjusted for change in position as described in a previous annual report (Butler, Whittemore, Reboulet et al., 2016). Electric-tape measurement plotted below the graph appears to have been a transcription error.

Major Points

- The hydrograph form, the relatively small change and rate of change in water level during each pumping and recovery season (despite at least two high-capacity pumping wells within approximately a half mile of the index well), and the fluctuations superimposed on the water levels are all indications of an unconfined aquifer.
- The impact of individual pumping wells is discernible, indicating that one or more pumping wells are in relatively close proximity to and in good hydraulic connection with the index well.
- After the end of the irrigation season, water levels continue to recover until the start of the next season (water levels never stabilize).
- Each year, the maximum water level is below that of the preceding year, creating a downward stair-stepping pattern.
- Transducer readings are in good agreement with manual measurements except for one anomalous electric-tape measurement.

3.1.3 Wallace County Site




Figure 5—Wallace County index well hydrograph—total data run to 4/12/18. A water-level elevation of 3,565 ft corresponds to a depth to water of 263 ft below Isf. The top of the screen is 375 ft below Isf (elevation of 3,453 ft), and the bottom of the aquifer is 394 ft below Isf (elevation of 3,434 ft). The screen terminates 9 ft above the bottom of the aquifer.

Major Points

- The large amplitude fluctuations superimposed on the water levels, particularly evident during the recovery period, are an indication of unconfined conditions with a relatively deep water table.
- The impact of individual pumping wells is discernible, indicating that one or more pumping wells are in relatively close proximity to and in good hydraulic connection with the index well.
- After the end of the irrigation season, water levels continue to recover until the start of the next season (water levels never stabilize).
- Each year, the maximum water level is below that of the preceding year, creating a downward stair-stepping pattern.
- Transducer readings are in good agreement with manual measurements.

3.1.4 Wichita County Site




Figure 6—Wichita County index well hydrograph—total data run to 4/12/18. A water-level elevation of 3,289 ft corresponds to a depth to water of 159 ft below lsf. The top of the screen is 175 ft below lsf (elevation of 3,273 ft), and the bottom of the aquifer is 190 ft below lsf (elevation of 3,258 ft). The screen terminates 5 ft above the bottom of the aquifer.

Major Points

- The amplitude of the fluctuations superimposed on the water levels are an indication of unconfined conditions; the seasonal variations in the amplitude are produced by seasonal changes in the range over which barometric pressure can vary (smaller range during the summer).
- It is difficult to discern individual pumping and recovery seasons; cannot discern effect of individual wells cutting on and off.
- Transducer readings are in good agreement with manual measurements.

3.2 GMD3 Index Wells

Nine index wells are located in GMD3 (fig. 7). The Haskell index well was one of the original three index wells, while wells at the Cimarron, Hugoton, Liberal, and Rolla sites began monitoring in 2012–2013, the Willis Technology Farm index well began in the summer of 2016, and monitoring at the Kearny-Finney County index well began in the summer of 2017. Table 2 summarizes characteristics of these nine wells. Further details concerning these wells are given in the 2016 annual report (Butler et al., 2017) and the online appendices for this report (www.kgs.ku.edu/HighPlains/OHP/index_program/index.shtml).

Table 2—Characteristics of the GMD3 index well sites.

Site	2018 WL elev. (ft) ^a	2018 Saturated thickness (ft)	Bedrock depth (estimated ft below land surface) ^b	Screened interval (ft below land surface) ^b	2016 Water Use (ac-ft)		
					1 mi radius circle	2 mi radius circle	5 mi radius circle
Cimarron 210	2,474.12	290.1	345	200–210	63	63	9,412
Haskell	2,533.58	128.8	433	420–430	764	5,589	31,845
Hugoton 313 ^{c,i}	2,916.79 ^{c,d}	451.7	635	303–313	1,106	3,230	38,672 ^e
Hugoton 495 ⁱ	2,913.74	448.7	635	485–495			
Kearny-Finney	2,785.48	184.5 ^g	360 ^g	70–266 ^h	1,258	4,786	34,674 ^j
Liberal 160 ^{c,i}	2,690.60 ^{c,d}	445.6	576	140–160	0.02	1,972 ^e	32,486 ^{e,f}
Liberal 436 ⁱ	2,656.92	412.0	576	426–436			
Rolla 366	3,187.53	211.5	399	356–366	269 ^k	1,136 ^k	8,911 ^k
Willis Tech Farm	2,642.41	204.5	502	262–482	1,078	5,681	36,286 ^l

^a 2018 annual tape water-level measurements from WIZARD database.

^b Measurements for the Cimarron, Hugoton, Liberal, and Rolla wells from table 2 in McMahon (2001).

^c Not part of the annual water-level measurement network.

^d 2018 water-level measurements from hand measurements taken 2/19/2018.

^e Includes estimates of water use in Oklahoma based on “permitted” quantities (Liberal: 675 [2 mi circle] and 20,909 [5 mi circle] ac-ft; Hugoton: 17,989 [5 mi circle] ac-ft).

^f Includes 7,304 ac-ft of non-irrigation water for city of Liberal.

^g Based on logs of nearby wells to bedrock.

^h Measurements estimated from borehole camera log.

ⁱ Wells originally on USGS telemetry systems; those systems were removed in 2017 because of a lack of funding.

^j Includes 431 ac-ft of non-irrigation stock water, 220 ac-ft of municipal water, and 37 ac-ft of industrial water.

^k Includes 31 [1 mi circle], 103 [2 mi circle], and 292 [5 mi circle] ac-ft of non-irrigation stock water and 103 ac-ft [5 mi circle] of municipal water.

^l Includes 838 ac-ft of industrial use.




Figure 7—Map of index wells in GMD3. Triangles designate wells with telemetry equipment whereas plus signs designate wells without telemetry equipment. Data from wells with telemetry equipment can be viewed in real time on the KGS website (www.kgs.ku.edu/HighPlains/OHP/index_program/index.shtml); data from wells without telemetry equipment are periodically downloaded (typically quarterly) and posted on the KGS website.

3.2.1 Cimarron Site




Figure 8—Cimarron 210 index well hydrograph—total data run to 2/19/18. A water-level elevation of 2,474 ft corresponds to a depth to water of 55.0 ft below Isf. The top of the 10 ft screen is 200 ft below Isf (elevation of 2,329 ft), and the bottom of the aquifer is 345 ft below Isf (elevation of 2,184 ft). A defined in text.

Major Points

- The hydrograph form and small response to pumping, despite the nearby (within 0.3 mi) irrigation well, indicate unconfined conditions.
- The relatively small (< 0.2 ft) fluctuations superimposed on the water levels, particularly evident during the recovery periods, indicate an unconfined aquifer with a relatively shallow depth to water.
- After the end of the irrigation season, water levels continue to recover until the start of the next season (water levels never stabilize).
- Sensor failure produced gap (A) in hydrograph record.
- Water use within a 2 mi radius of the well is the lowest of any of the index wells.
- Water level has declined 1.9 ft since January 2000 (decline rate of 0.11 ft/yr).
- Transducer readings are in good agreement with manual measurements.

3.2.2 Haskell County Index Well




Figure 9—Haskell County index well hydrograph—total data run to 2/20/18. A water-level elevation of 2,445 ft corresponds to a depth to water of 392.85 ft below lsf. The top of the screen is 420 ft below lsf (elevation of 2,417.85 ft), and the bottom of the aquifer is 433 ft below lsf (elevation of 2,404.85 ft). The screen terminates 3 ft above the bottom of the aquifer. A sensor failure produced a break in monitoring from January to March 2014.

Major Points

- The hydrograph form and large response (90–120 ft) to pumping, despite the absence of nearby high-capacity wells (closest irrigation well about 0.5 mi away), indicate a confined aquifer.
- After the end of the irrigation season, water levels continue to recover until the start of the next season (water levels never stabilize).
- An increase in minimum water-level elevation after 2013 and large decrease in the rate of decline of the maximum recovered water level after 2013 were produced by court-ordered early (2013 and 2014) and complete (after 2014) cessation of pumping at two nearby irrigation wells (Butler et al., 2017) and complete (after 2014) cessation of pumping at three additional nearby irrigation wells.
- Transducer readings are in reasonable agreement with manual measurements.

3.2.3 Hugoton Site




Figure 10—Hydrographs of Hugoton index wells—total data run to 2/19/18. A water-level elevation of 2,930.0 ft corresponds to a depth to water of 170.0 ft below Isf. For the Hugoton 495 well, the top of the 10 ft screen is 485 ft below Isf (elevation of 2,615 ft). For the Hugoton 313 well, the top of the 10 ft screen is 303 ft below Isf (elevation of 2,797 ft). Bottom of the aquifer is 635 ft below Isf (elevation of 2,465 ft).

Major Points

- Two wells are monitored in a four-well nest.
- Large rapid drops and rises of water level following commencement and cessation of pumping, respectively, are indicative of confined conditions in both monitored intervals.
- Hydrographs indicate both intervals are affected by the same pumping stresses; the larger response in Hugoton 495 shows that that interval is more heavily stressed, while the elevation difference between the water levels indicates that pumping has induced downward flow from the shallower interval.
- After the end of the irrigation season, water levels continue to recover until the start of the next season at both wells (water levels never stabilize).
- The water level in Hugoton 495 has declined 56.3 ft since January 2000 (decline rate of 3.1 ft/yr).
- Transducer readings are in good agreement with manual measurements.

3.2.4 Kearny-Finney Index Well




Figure 11—Aerial view of Kearny-Finney index well, an additional annual program well, and nearby points of diversion. The irrigation canal to the north and west of the index well is the Great Eastern Ditch. Many of the roads into the irrigation circles, such as in the section immediately to the south of the index well, are for servicing petroleum wells.

Figure 11 is an aerial view of the Kearny-Finney index well site (T. 23 S., R. 34 W., 21 DDC 01) at a scale that shows the site of the index well, an additional annual program well, the nearby wells with active water rights, and additional features of the area. The index well (16 inches in diameter) was drilled in the late 1950s to a depth of 300 ft below lsf. Information about the screened interval was not available, so we

used the KGS borehole video logger in March 2017 to identify the top of the screened interval (70 ft below lsf) and the current bottom of the well (266 ft below lsf), which was 34 ft shallower than the reported bottom. The difference in total depth is likely a product of a sizable volume of sediment having moved into the well since installation. The well has been measured in January or late December nearly every year since 1966 and has been part of the annual measurement program since at least 1997.




Figure 12—Kearny-Finney index well hydrograph—total data run to 2/20/18. A water-level elevation of 2,788 ft corresponds to a depth to water of 173 ft below lsf. Nominal bottom of well is 300 ft below lsf (elevation of 2,661 ft), but the well is currently filled with sediments to 266 ft below lsf (elevation of 2,695 ft).

Major Points

- Relatively large amplitude fluctuations superimposed on the water levels are an indication of unconfined conditions.
- After the end of the irrigation season, water levels continue to recover until the start of the next season (water levels never stabilize).
- The water-level elevation has dropped approximately 53 ft since January 2008 (half of that total decline occurred in 2011 and 2012).
- Transducer readings are in good agreement with manual measurements.

3.2.5 Liberal Site




Figure 13—Hydrographs of Liberal index wells—total data run to 2/19/18. The Liberal 436 plot corresponds to the left y-axis. A water-level elevation of 2,664 ft corresponds to a depth to water of 157 ft below Isf. The top of the 10 ft screen is 426 ft below Isf (elevation of 2,395 ft). The Liberal 160 plot corresponds to the right y-axis. A water-level elevation of 2,692 ft corresponds to a depth to water of 129 ft below Isf. The top of the 20 ft screen is 140 ft below Isf (elevation of 2,681 ft). Bottom of the aquifer is 576 ft below Isf (elevation of 2,245 ft). A sensor failed at Liberal 160 well on November 16, 2017. Pre-2017 gaps in hydrograph for Liberal 160 were discussed in a previous report (Butler et al., 2017).

Major Points

- Two wells are monitored in a four-well nest.
- Liberal 436: The hydrograph form and the relatively small (< 0.35 ft) amplitude fluctuations superimposed on water levels indicate confined conditions.
- Liberal 160: The amplitude of the water-level fluctuations in Liberal 160 indicates unconfined conditions.
- The pumping response observed in Liberal 436 is difficult to discern in Liberal 160, indicating little hydraulic connection between the monitoring intervals for the two wells.
- After the end of the irrigation season, water levels in Liberal 436 recover to a near stable value that is generally well below the level at the start of the pumping season; this pattern is an indication of limited lateral flow to the well.
- The water level in Liberal 436 has declined 26.1 ft since January 2000 (decline rate of 1.45 ft/yr).
- Transducer readings are in reasonable agreement with manual measurements.

3.2.6 Rolla Index Well




Figure 14—Rolla 366 index well hydrograph—total data run to 2/19/18. A water-level elevation of 3,188 ft corresponds to a depth to water of 187 ft below Isf. The top of the 10 ft screen is 356 ft below Isf (elevation of 3,019 ft), and the bottom of the aquifer is 399 ft below Isf (elevation of 2,976 ft). Note the suspect 2015 and 2017 annual program measurements.

Major Points

- The hydrograph form and the relatively large (up to 0.7 ft) amplitude fluctuations superimposed on water levels indicate unconfined conditions.
- The impact of individual wells turning on and off is clearly visible on the hydrograph, indicating pumping wells are in relatively close proximity to and in good hydraulic connection with the index well.
- After the end of the irrigation season, water levels continue to recover until the start of the next season (water levels never stabilize).
- There has been little change in minimum water-level elevation over the last three irrigation seasons.
- The water level has declined 9.5 ft since January 2000 (decline rate of 0.53 ft/yr).
- Transducer readings are in good agreement with electric-tape measurements but poorer agreement with annual measurements.

3.2.7 Willis Water Technology Farm Index Well




Figure 15—Willis Water Technology Farm index well hydrograph—total data run to 2/20/18. A water-level elevation of 2,640 ft corresponds to a depth to water of 300 ft below Isf. The top of the 220 ft screen is 262 ft below Isf (elevation of 2,678 ft), and the bottom of the aquifer is 502 ft below Isf (elevation of 2,438 ft). The first electric tape measurement was taken before continuous monitoring began.

Major Points

- The relatively large amplitude fluctuations superimposed on the water levels, particularly evident during the latter stages of the recovery period, indicate unconfined conditions.
- The impact of individual wells turning on and off is clearly visible on the hydrograph, indicating pumping wells are in relatively close proximity to and in good hydraulic connection with the index well.
- At the end of an irrigation season, water levels recover to a near stable value that is generally well below the level at the start of the pumping season; this pattern is an indication of limited lateral flow to the well.
- 2016 water use (2 mi radius circle centered on well) was the highest of any of the index wells.
- Transducer readings are in good agreement with manual measurements except for the 2017 annual measurement.

3.3 GMD4 Index Wells

Eight index wells are located in GMD4, four of which have telemetry equipment that allows real-time viewing of data (fig. 16). The Thomas index well was one of the original three index wells, whereas monitoring at the Colby, the Sheridan-6 (SD-6) LEMA, and Sherman index wells was initiated in 2012, 2014, and 2017, respectively. Table 3 summarizes characteristics of these eight wells. Further details concerning these wells are given in the 2016 Annual Report (Butler et al., 2017) and the online appendices for this report (www.kgs.ku.edu/HighPlains/OHP/index_program/index.shtml).

Table 3—Characteristics of the GMD4 index well sites.

Site	2018 WL elev. (ft) ^a	2018 Saturated thickness (ft)	Bedrock depth (estimated ft below land surface)	Screened interval (ft below land surface)	2016 Water Use (ac-ft)		
					1 mi radius circle	2 mi radius circle	5 mi radius circle
Colby	3,026.4	99.4 ^c	250–300	156–175	634 ^h	2,427 ⁱ	11,552 ^j
SD-6 Baalman	2,711.1 ^k	76.1	262	260–270	661	2,661	15,398 ^d
SD-6 Beckman^{b,l}	2,682.4 ^b				671	2,752 ^g	13,538 ^e
SD-6 Moss^b	2,625.9 ^b	52.9	243	205–245	208	1,866	14,667 ^f
SD-6 Seegmiller	2,740.1	72.1	265	225–265	783	3,130	16,066 ^e
SD-6 Steiger^b	2,849.8 ^b	61.8	177	145–185	240	1,210	11,552
Sherman	3,613.0	142.0	323	310–320	1,988	3,860	12,794
Thomas	2,967.9	64.5	284	274–284	958	2,541	11,804

^a 2018 annual tape water-level measurements from WIZARD database.

^b Not an annually measured index well; 2018 water-level measurements from hand measurements taken 02/12/2018.

^c Based on bedrock depth of 250 ft below lsf.

^d Includes 605 ac-ft of non-irrigation stock water.

^e Includes 526 ac-ft of non-irrigation stock water.

^f Includes 481 ac-ft of non-irrigation stock water and 323 ac-ft of municipal water.

^g Includes 191 ac-ft of non-irrigation stock water.

^h Includes 311 ac-ft of municipal water.

ⁱ Includes 1,238 ac-ft of municipal water and 295 ac-ft of contamination remediation water.

^j Includes 1,394 ac-ft of municipal water and 295 ac-ft of contamination remediation water.

^k Annual measurement on January 3, 2018, clearly in error by more than 3 ft so used average of transducer measurements from 8 a.m. to 4 p.m. on that day.

^l Well construction information not available.




Figure 16—Map of index wells in GMD4. Triangles designate wells with telemetry equipment whereas plus signs designate wells without telemetry equipment. Data from wells with telemetry equipment can be viewed in real time on the KGS website (www.kgs.ku.edu/HighPlains/OHP/index_program/index.shtml); data from wells without telemetry equipment are periodically downloaded (typically quarterly) and posted on the KGS website. Shaded area is the Sheridan-6 LEMA.

3.3.1 Colby Index Well




Figure 17—Colby index well hydrograph—total data run to 4/11/18. A water-level elevation of 3,029 ft corresponds to a depth to water of 148 ft below Isf. Total depth of the well is 175 ft below Isf (elevation of 3,002 ft). The screened interval extends from 156–175 ft below Isf. The base of the aquifer is estimated to be 250–300 ft below Isf (Butler et al., 2017).

Major Points

- The relatively large amplitude fluctuations superimposed on the water-level record indicate unconfined conditions.
- After the end of the irrigation season, water levels in most years continue to recover until the start of the next season; apparent stabilization of water levels in late winter and early spring of 2017 is likely a product of nearby pumping.
- The maximum recovered water level has declined each year during the monitoring period, giving a distinct stair-step character to the hydrograph.
- Based on annual water-level measurements, the water level has declined approximately 1.1 ft/yr over the monitoring period and a total of 36.6 ft since 1947.
- Transducer readings are in good agreement with manual measurements.

3.3.2 SD-6 Baalman Index Well




Figure 18—Baalman index well hydrograph—total data run to 4/11/18. A water-level elevation of 2,712 ft corresponds to a depth to water of 185 ft below Isf. The top of the 10 ft screen is 260 ft below Isf (elevation of 2,637 ft), and the bottom of the aquifer is 262 ft below Isf (elevation of 2,635 ft). The difference between the electric-tape and transducer measurements in January 2016 was caused by a malfunctioning electric tape.

Major Points

- The hydrograph form and the relatively large amplitude fluctuations superimposed on the water levels, particularly evident during the recovery period, are an indication of unconfined conditions.
- The impact of individual wells turning on and off is clearly visible, indicating pumping wells are in relatively close proximity to and in good hydraulic connection with index well.
- Near the end of the recovery period, water levels appear to be converging on a value that is below the water level at the start of the pumping season; this pattern is often an indication that lateral flow to the well is constrained, which could either be a result of nearby low-permeability units or substantial pumping in the surrounding area that decreased lateral flow to the index well location.
- Since the establishment of the SD-6 LEMA, the water use per irrigated acre has been approximately 0.80 ft (9.6 inches)/acre in the vicinity of the Baalman index well (2 mi radius).
- Transducer readings are in good agreement with periodic electric-tape measurements except for the January 2016 measurement but poor agreement with annual program measurements.

3.3.3 SD-6 Beckman Index Well




Figure 19—Beckman index well hydrograph—total data run to 4/11/18. A water-level elevation of 2,680 ft corresponds to a depth to water of 200.15 ft below lsf. The difference between the electric tape measurement in the summer of 2015 and the hourly measurements from the transducer is thought to be caused by a change in calibration specifications associated with the resumption of monitoring in late October 2014.

Major Points

- The irrigation well adjacent to the Beckman index well does not appear to have been pumped for the last two irrigation seasons; pumping at nearby wells, however, did continue throughout the monitoring period.
- The relatively large amplitude fluctuations superimposed on the water levels, particularly evident during the recovery period, are an indication of unconfined conditions.
- After the end of the irrigation season, water levels continue to recover until the start of the next season (water levels never stabilize).
- Since the establishment of the SD-6 LEMA, the water use per irrigated acre has been approximately 0.76 ft (9.2 in)/acre in the vicinity of the Beckman index well (2 mi radius).
- Transducer readings are in good agreement with manual measurements in the latter half of the monitoring period.

3.3.4 SD-6 Moss Index Well




Figure 20—Moss index well hydrograph—total data run to 4/11/18. A water-level elevation of 2,627 ft corresponds to a depth to water of 191.44 ft below Isf. The top of the 40 ft screen is 205 ft below Isf (elevation of 2,613.4 ft), and the bottom of the aquifer is 243 ft below Isf (elevation of 2,575.4 ft).

Major Points

- The relatively large amplitude fluctuations superimposed on the water levels, particularly evident during the recovery period, are an indication of unconfined conditions.
- After the end of the irrigation season, water levels continue to recover until the start of the next season (water levels never stabilize).
- The minimum water level (2017) is above that of the preceding year (2016) for the first time during the monitoring period.
- Since the establishment of the SD-6 LEMA, the water use per irrigated acre has been approximately 0.88 ft (10.5 in)/acre in the vicinity of the Moss index well (2 mi radius).
- Transducer readings are in good agreement with manual measurements.

3.3.5 SD-6 Seegmiller Index Well




Figure 21—Seegmiller index well hydrograph—total data run to 4/11/18. A water-level elevation of 2,740 ft corresponds to a depth to water of 195.69 ft below Isf. The top of the 40 ft screen is 225 ft below Isf (elevation of 2,710.7 ft), and the bottom of the aquifer is 265 ft below Isf (elevation of 2,670.7 ft).

Major Points

- The hydrograph form and the relatively large amplitude fluctuations superimposed on the water levels, particularly evident during the recovery period, indicate unconfined conditions.
- The impact of individual wells turning on and off is clearly visible on the hydrograph, indicating pumping wells in relatively close proximity to and in good hydraulic connection with index well.
- After the end of the irrigation season, water levels continue to recover until the start of the next season (water levels never stabilize).
- The minimum water level for 2017 was 0.8 ft above that of 2016, the largest increase observed during the monitoring period.
- Since the establishment of the SD-6 LEMA, the water use per irrigated acre has been approximately 0.81 ft (9.7 in)/acre in the vicinity of the Seegmiller index well (2 mi radius).
- Transducer readings are in good agreement with manual measurements.

3.3.6 SD-6 Steiger Index Well




Figure 22—Steiger index well hydrograph—total data run to 4/11/18. A water-level elevation of 2,851 ft corresponds to a depth to water of 116.53 ft below Isf. The top of the 40 ft screen is 145 ft below Isf (elevation of 2,822.5 ft), and the bottom of the aquifer is 177 ft below Isf (elevation of 2,790.5 ft). A and B defined in text.

Major Points

- The fluctuations superimposed on the water levels are an indication of unconfined conditions but are of smaller magnitude than the other index wells in GMD4; this small magnitude typically indicates a relatively shallow depth to water.
- It is difficult to discern individual pumping seasons beyond those marked A and B.
- The effect of individual wells cutting on and off cannot be discerned, consistent with the lack of high-capacity pumping wells within 0.75 miles of index well.
- It is difficult to ascertain a consistent picture of behavior during non-pumping periods; although water levels do not stabilize most years, they may have at the end of the 2017–2018 recovery (the apparent stabilization could be a product of pumping before the start of the irrigation season).
- Since the establishment of the SD-6 LEMA, the water use per irrigated acre has been approximately 0.89 ft (10.6 in)/acre in the vicinity of the Steiger index well (2 mi radius).
- Transducer readings are in good agreement with manual measurements.

3.3.7 Sherman County




Figure 23—Sherman County index well hydrograph—total data run to 4/12/18. A water-level elevation of 3,617 ft corresponds to a depth to water of 177 ft below lsf. The top of the 10 ft screen is 310 ft below lsf (elevation of 3,484 ft), and the bottom of the aquifer is 323 ft below lsf (elevation of 3,471 ft). The well has a 10 ft sump that extends to 330 ft below lsf. The asterisk indicates a single spurious reading; A defined in text.

Major Points

- A detailed interpretation of the hydrograph is not yet possible because the sensor gradually silted up during the monitoring period. The sensor was originally placed 3.2 ft below the top of the sump. The sump, however, completely filled with finer-grained sediments during the monitoring period. Thus, hydrograph responses are not considered reliable until a new sensor was placed in the well 8.6 ft above the top of the screen (301.4 ft below lsf) on 2/13/18 (A on plot). The record acquired with the new sensor shows that the impact of barometric pressure fluctuations is very small, a likely indicator of confined conditions.
- After the end of the irrigation season, water levels continue to recover until the start of the next season (water levels never stabilize).
- The record of manual measurements indicates that the maximum water level attained at the end of the 2017–2018 recovery will be at least 2.75 ft higher than that attained the previous year.
- Agreement between transducer readings and manual measurements varied over the monitoring period; agreement appears good with the new sensor after 2/13/18.
- The sensor removed from the well was thoroughly cleaned and then tested in the laboratory. The sensor performed well, indicating that the responses obtained early in the monitoring period (before the sump filled with fines) were likely reliable measures of the position of the water level in the well.

3.3.8 Thomas County




Figure 24—Thomas County index well hydrograph—total data run to 4/11/18. A water-level elevation of 2,968 ft corresponds to a depth to water of 219.56 ft below Isf. The top of the screen is 274 ft below Isf (elevation of 2,913.6 ft), and the bottom of the aquifer is 284 ft below Isf (elevation of 2,903.6 ft). The screen terminates at the bottom of the aquifer. No water-level data are available from 10/28/17 to 12/11/17 because of failure of sensor and backup sensor.

Major Points

- The hydrograph form, the relatively small change and rate of change in water level during each pumping and recovery season (despite eight high-capacity pumping wells within a mile of the index well), and the relatively large amplitude fluctuations superimposed on water levels indicate unconfined conditions.
- The impact of individual wells turning on and off is clearly visible on the hydrograph, indicating pumping wells in relatively close proximity to and in good hydraulic connection with the index well.
- After the end of the irrigation season, water levels continue to recover until the start of the next season (water levels never stabilize).
- The annual water-level measurement in 2018 was 0.85 ft above that of 2017, only the second time during the monitoring period where there has been a year-on-year increase in water level at this well; such increases indicate years where the net inflow to the area around the well exceeded the pumping.
- 2017 water use was likely the second lowest for the monitoring period.
- Transducer readings are in good agreement with manual measurements.

3.4 GMD5 Index Well

There is currently one index well located in GMD5 (fig. 25) with another at which monitoring with telemetry will start in summer 2018 (Larned). Table 4 summarizes characteristics of the current index well. Further details concerning this well are given in the 2016 annual report (Butler et al., 2017) and the online appendices for this report (www.kgs.ku.edu/HighPlains/OHP/index_program/index.shtml).

Table 4—Characteristics of the GMD5 index well site.

Site	2018 WL elev. (ft) ^a	2018 Saturated thickness (ft)	Bedrock depth (ft below land surface)	Screened interval (ft below land surface)	2016 Water Use (ac-ft)		
					1 mi radius circle	2 mi radius circle	5 mi radius circle
Belpre	2,040.70	135.7–160.7 ^b	175–200 ^b	89–109	706	1,917	13,617

^a 2018 annual tape water-level measurements from WIZARD database (<http://www.kgs.ku.edu/Magellan/WaterLevels/index.html>)

^b Well not drilled to bedrock; depth to bedrock estimated from nearby well logs.




Figure 25—Map of GMD5 with Belpre index well (blue triangle). Data from the Belpre well can be viewed in real time on the KGS website (www.kgs.ku.edu/HighPlains/OHP/index_program/index.shtml). The Larned index (green diamond) well will begin operation in summer 2018.

3.4.1 Belpre Index Well




Figure 26—Belpre index well hydrograph—total data run to 2/21/18. A water-level elevation of 2,040 ft corresponds to a depth to water of 40 ft below Isf. The top of the 20 ft screen is 89 ft below Isf (elevation of 1,991 ft), and the bottom of the screen is 109 ft below Isf (elevation of 1,971 ft). The base of the aquifer is estimated to be 175–200 ft below Isf (elevation of 1,905–1,880 ft). A and B defined in text.

Major Points

- Small amplitude fluctuations superimposed on water levels indicate unconfined conditions with a relatively shallow depth to water.
- The water-level response to pumping appears to be more integrated than at most of the index wells; given the proximity of nearby pumping wells, this indicates that those wells are extracting water from intervals that are not in good hydraulic connection with the index well.
- After the end of the irrigation season, water levels continue to recover until the start of the next season (water levels never stabilize).
- The numerous upward spikes, such as marked by A, are local recharge events dissipated by lateral flow (Butler et al., 2017).
- The kink in the plot at B was produced by regional recharge events from widespread precipitation, which led to an increase of water level over previous years and a late start to the 2017 pumping season.
- The 2017 pumping season did not start until mid-July, the latest start during the monitoring period.
- The water level has declined 9.82 ft since January 1988 (decline rate of 0.33 ft/yr).
- Transducer readings are in good agreement with manual measurements.

3.5 Expansion Wells

3.5.1 GMD1 Expansion Wells

Six expansion wells in GMD1 (SC-8 and wells 1 through 5) have been operating for at least one year (table 5 and fig. 27). Monitoring at expansion well SC-8 (a former USGS recorder well) began in February 2012, and monitoring at expansion wells 1 through 5 (existing wells; all but wells 4 and 5 were previously used for irrigation) began in late January 2017. The SC-8 well and wells 1–3 are part of the annual cooperative network program. Additional information about the expansion wells can be found in Butler et al. (2017). The expansion wells will not necessarily be permanently monitored; the GMD1 board may move some or all of the sensors to other wells, if the need arises. A barometer has been placed a short distance below Isf at expansion well 3. In addition, monitoring at expansion well 6 began in spring 2018; data from that well will be discussed in future reports.

Table 5—Characteristics of the GMD1 expansion well sites.

Site	2018 WL elev. (ft) ^a	2018 Saturated thickness (ft) ^d	Bedrock depth (estimated ft below land surface) ^d	Screened interval (ft below land surface)	2016 Water Use (ac-ft)		
					1 mi radius circle	2 mi radius circle	5 mi radius circle
SC-8	2,847.4 ^a	84.4	174		317	1,505	9,538 ^l
Site 1	2,930.2 ^a	27.2	195		316 ^e	990 ^e	4,192 ^e
Site 2	3,053.6 ^a	42.6	160		0	278	3,999 ^f
Site 3	3,425.8 ^{a,c}	22.8	220		157	1,761	10,913 ^g
Site 4	3,536.6 ^b	m	m		786	2,444	6,947 ^h
Site 5	2,845.5 ^b	27.5	158		603 ⁱ	2,330 ^j	9,244 ^k

^a 2018 annual tape water-level measurements from WIZARD database.

^b Not an annually measured index well; 2018 water-level measurements from hand measurements taken 2/13/18 (Site 4) and 2/14/2018 (Site 5).

^c Average of two measurements taken one day apart (1/3/18 and 1/4/18).

^d Wells did not have WWC5 forms so values are estimated from nearby wells with WWC5 forms.

^e Includes 115 ac-ft, 297 ac-ft, and 297 ac-ft of non-irrigation stock water for 1 mi, 2 mi, and 5 mi circles, respectively.

^f Includes 55 ac-ft of non-irrigation stock water.

^g Includes 18 ac-ft of municipal water and 41 ac-ft of non-irrigation stock water.

^h Includes 70 ac-ft of industrial water and 133 ac-ft of non-irrigation stock water.

ⁱ Includes 23 ac-ft of non-irrigation stock water.

^j Includes 419 ac-ft of municipal water and 23 ac-ft of non-irrigation stock water.

^k Includes 918 ac-ft of municipal water and 142 ac-ft of non-irrigation stock water.

^l Includes 918 ac-ft of municipal use and 234 ac-ft of non-irrigation stock water.

^m Lack of agreement among nearby WWC5 forms prevented estimation.




Figure 27—Map of the GMD1 expansion wells.

3.5.1.1 SC-8 Site – Scott County




Figure 28—SC-8 well hydrograph—total data run to 4/12/18. A water-level elevation of 2,847 ft corresponds to a depth to water of 89 ft below Isf. Bottom of well is approximately 102 ft below Isf (elevation of 2,835 ft). Transducer measurements have been corrected from earlier reports for an incorrect offset parameter (Butler et al., 2017). A and B defined in text.

Major Points

- The relatively large amplitude fluctuations superimposed on the water levels are an indication of unconfined conditions.
- The large number of upward spikes in the water level, such as the one marked by A, are associated with rainfall events and are likely produced by storm runoff flowing into the well casing; the added water is then dissipated quickly through lateral flow to the aquifer (Butler et al., 2017). On August 15, 2017 (B), openings in the side of the casing at the land surface were sealed by GMD1 staff; large spikes have not been recorded since that time.
- It is difficult to discern the impact of individual wells cutting on and off; water-level responses are much more gradual than would be expected given the nearby pumping wells, an indication of a relatively poor hydraulic connection between the index well and nearby pumping wells.
- The rise in the hydrograph after the 2018 annual measurement is the largest during the monitoring period; the reason for the rise has yet to be determined.
- Transducer readings are in good agreement with manual measurements.

3.5.1.2 Expansion Site 1 – Scott County




Figure 29—GMD1 Expansion Site 1 well hydrograph—total data run to 4/12/18. A water-level elevation of 2,930 ft corresponds to a depth to water of 168 ft below Isf. Bottom of well is 193.2 ft below Isf (elevation of 2,904.8 ft).

Major Points

- Moderate amplitude fluctuations superimposed on the water levels, which are particularly prominent during the recovery period, are an indication of unconfined conditions.
- It is difficult to discern the impact of individual wells cutting on and off.
- After the end of the irrigation season, water levels continue to recover until the start of the next season (water levels never stabilize).
- Maximum water level for 2018 will be above that of 2017.
- Transducer readings are in good agreement with electric-tape measurements after commencement of monitoring but not with 2018 annual program measurement.

3.5.1.3 Expansion Site 2 – Wichita County




Figure 30—GMD1 Expansion Site 2 well hydrograph—total data run to 4/12/18. A water-level elevation of 3,053 ft corresponds to a depth to water of 118 ft below lsf. Bottom of well is 130.9 ft below lsf (elevation of 3,040.1 ft). First electric-tape measurement may be a transcription error.

Major Points

- Relatively small amplitude fluctuations superimposed on the water levels are an indication of a shallow unconfined aquifer.
- It is difficult to discern pumping and recovery seasons; cannot discern effect of individual wells cutting on and off.
- Water level has changed little (1.26 ft) in the last 30 years.
- Transducer readings are in good agreement with manual measurements after the first electric-tape measurement.

3.5.1.4 Expansion Site 3 – Wallace County




Figure 31—GMD1 Expansion Site 3 well hydrograph—total data run to 4/12/18. A water-level elevation of 3,426 ft corresponds to a depth to water of 197 ft below lsf. Bottom of well is 219.9 ft below lsf (elevation of 3,403.1 ft).

Major Points

- Relatively large amplitude fluctuations superimposed on the water levels are an indication of an unconfined aquifer.
- It is difficult to discern pumping and recovery seasons; cannot discern effect of individual wells cutting on and off.
- Water level has declined 3.6 ft in the last 10 years (0.36 ft/yr) and 33.9 ft in the last 30 years (1.13 ft/yr).
- Transducer readings are in good agreement with manual measurements.

3.5.1.5 Expansion Site 4 – Greeley County




Figure 32—GMD1 Expansion Site 4 well hydrograph—total data run to 4/12/18. A water-level elevation of 3,537 ft corresponds to a depth to water of 236 ft below lsf. Bottom of well is 264.5 ft below lsf (elevation of 3,508.5 ft).

Major Points

- Relatively large amplitude fluctuations superimposed on the water levels are an indication of an unconfined aquifer.
- It is difficult to discern the effect of individual wells cutting on and off.
- After the end of the irrigation season, water levels continue to recover until the start of the next season (water levels never stabilize).
- The maximum water level for 2018 will be more than 1.0 ft above that of 2017.
- Transducer readings are in good agreement with manual measurements.

3.5.1.6 Expansion Site 5 – Scott County




Figure 33—GMD1 Expansion Site 5 well hydrograph—total data run to 11/17/17 when battery died. A water-level elevation of 2,846 ft corresponds to a depth to water of 130 ft below lsf. Elevation of well bottom not known.

Major Points

- Moderate amplitude fluctuations superimposed on the water levels are an indication of an unconfined aquifer.
- It is difficult to discern the effect of individual wells cutting on and off.
- The battery died on 11/17/17 so a more detailed interpretation of the hydrograph will be presented in the next report.
- The water level at a nearby annual well has fallen 11.8 ft in the last 10 years (1.18 ft/yr) and 29.1 ft in the last 30 years (0.97 ft/yr).
- Transducer readings are in good agreement with manual measurements.

3.5.2 Thomas County Expansion Wells

As the index well program continues to expand, we must periodically examine the value of continuing to monitor expansion wells. In late 2017, we decided that the information gained from the expansion wells in the vicinity of the Thomas County index well was insufficient to justify continued monitoring. We have therefore ceased monitoring at wells TH7, TH9, TH10, and TH11. See Butler et al. (2017) and earlier reports for a discussion of the hydrographs from those wells.

3.5.3 Haskell County Expansion Wells

We examined the hydrographs from wells in the vicinity of the Haskell well in 2010 and 2017 (Buddemeier et al., 2010; Butler et al., 2017). In both analyses, we found hydrographs that indicated some wells are screened in isolated aquifer compartments. The relatively rapid recovery following the cessation of irrigation pumping, the lack of response to nearby pumping, and the step changes in water level across the pumping periods were determined to be diagnostic indicators of an aquifer unit that is surrounded by low permeability materials (Butler, Stotler, et al., 2013). The major finding of the 2017 assessment of the Haskell County expansion wells was that the permeable interval at the bottom of the HPA in the vicinity of the Haskell index well does not appear to be continuous. This lack of continuity is likely partly responsible for the large drawdowns observed during the pumping season at the Haskell index well.

We will reassess the Haskell County expansion wells in a future report.

4 Relationships among Water-Level Changes, Water Use, and Climatic Conditions

4.1 Introduction

The measurement and interpretation of water-level changes at the index wells have provided an improved understanding of hydrologic responses at the local scale (section to township) in the HPA in western Kansas. In addition, the interpretation of water-level responses at these wells has helped to enhance the understanding of the relationships among water-level change at both local and GMD scales, water use (groundwater pumping), and changes in climatic conditions.

The main driver of water-level changes in the HPA is the amount of water pumped for irrigation. The pumping volume is determined by the number of operating irrigation wells and the amount of water pumped from each well. The major drivers for the per-well amount are the type of crop, the additional water needed for crop growth above that provided by precipitation, and the irrigated area. In addition to the amount, the timing of precipitation relative to crop stage is also important. If the number of irrigation wells, the average mix of crops, and the irrigated area remain relatively constant, and the transmissivity is not near the lower limit for an irrigation well, then the main factor controlling the annual pumping is the meteorological conditions for a given year.

Since 1997, the number of water-right permitted wells (mainly irrigation wells) in the three western GMDs has remained nearly constant. The large increase in the number of points of diversion (wells) occurred during the 1950s through the early 1980s; the increase from 1997 to 2016 ranged from less than a percent to several percent of the current total, depending on the county. For example, the number of unique points of groundwater diversion, both active and inactive, authorized through appropriated and vested groundwater rights in Thomas, Scott, and Haskell counties in 2017 were 1,149, 1,359, and 1,695, respectively. The number of points of diversion currently active that have been added after 1997 were 28, 16, and 0 for these three counties, respectively. Thus, for the last 20+ years, the main driver for water-level changes in the HPA in western Kansas was the amount of pumping from each well.

The relationships among pumping, meteorological conditions, and water-level changes will be explored further in the following sections. The index well program has been the primary driver for improving our understanding of these relationships. That understanding is essential for providing a sound scientific foundation for management of the groundwater resources of the Kansas HPA.

4.2 Radar Precipitation

Radar precipitation has been found to be a good indicator of climatic conditions that drive pumping and thus water-level changes in the Kansas HPA (Whittemore, Butler, and Wilson, 2015; Whittemore, Butler, Wilson, and Woods, 2015). The Advanced Hydrologic Prediction Service of the National Weather Service (NWS) provides spatial images and data coverages of radar precipitation for the United States (available at <http://water.weather.gov/precip/>). The radar precipitation data are adjusted using data from a network of precipitation gauges. A brief description of the observation methods that apply to the general Kansas region from the “About NWS Precip Analysis” tab on the above web page was included in a previous project report (Butler et al., 2015). Coverages for radar precipitation are available from the NWS website beginning in 2005.

We now use radar precipitation as the primary metric for characterizing climatic conditions in the Kansas HPA. Figure 34 shows an image of the percent of normal annual precipitation during 2017 from the NWS website. The data are stored as gridded cells with a spatial resolution of approximately 4x4 km; the grid spacing as measured from the data for western Kansas is 2.57 mi north-south and 2.58 mi west-east. Over much of the western third of the state, 2017 annual precipitation exceeded normal precipitation. In addition, the map reveals the substantial spatial variation in precipitation within areas such as climatic divisions or GMDs.




Figure 34—Percent of normal radar precipitation for Kansas in 2017. County lines and the state boundary (bolded) are displayed.

4.3 Characterization of Climate with Radar Precipitation Since 2005

We have found that the sum of the radar precipitation from March to October generally captures the precipitation that drives pumping in support of irrigated agriculture in the Kansas HPA. Figure 35 is a plot of radar precipitation versus time since 2005 for the GMDs currently involved in the index well program. This plot shows that 2017 was the wettest year experienced in GMDs 1 and 4 since 2005 and the second wettest year in GMD3. Precipitation in GMD5 in 2017 was slightly above the average for 2005–2017.




Figure 35—Radar precipitation versus time (blue line) for 2005–2017 for GMDs 4, 1, 3, and 5. Solid black line is the average precipitation for the period.

4.4 Correlation of Annual Water Use with Radar Precipitation

In previous years' index well reports, we have examined the correlations between annual groundwater use and radar precipitation (within selected areas around the wells) for the three original index wells and three additional wells in GMDs 4 (Colby), 1 (SC-8), and 5 (Belpre). In last year's report (Butler et al., 2017), we presented the results of a comprehensive examination of the correlations in which we varied the distance over which the water use was summed and the range and number of months for which the radar precipitation was summed; results were presented for both the nearest point and the spatial mean of the 9-point block of radar precipitation values around the well (see table 40 of Butler et al. [2017] and associated discussion). In this section, we will update those correlations using the 5 mi radius of water use and the 9-point block (60 mi²) for radar precipitation for all of the wells except the Haskell well, for which the 1 mi radius for water use and the nearest point (6.6 mi²) for radar precipitation was used.

Figure 36 shows the correlations for the original three index wells. The correlations for the Thomas and Scott index wells used time ranges for the precipitation summation that essentially spanned the irrigation season. The 2016 value for the Thomas well decreased the strength of that correlation as an R² of 0.85 is obtained for the 2008–2015 time period. The temporal distribution of precipitation in 2016 relative to crop needs may be responsible for this decreased correlation. The clear break in the relationship for the Haskell index well is a product of the decreased water use produced by the court-ordered shutdown of nearby irrigation wells (see section 3.2.2.). A similar break in the relationship is seen for the correlation between annual water use and radar precipitation in the SD-6 LEMA (Whittemore et al., 2018).

Figure 37 shows the correlations for the additional three wells (Colby, SC-8, and Belpre). The Colby well uses a time range for the precipitation summation that essentially spanned the irrigation season, similar to the Thomas and Scott wells. The SC-8 and Belpre wells, however, use a time period that starts in February, indicating that pre-irrigation, which is typically done in an effort to enhance soil moisture, is important enough to affect the correlation.






Figure 36—Correlation of annual total groundwater use with radar precipitation at the Thomas, Scott, and Haskell index wells for 2008–2016.






Figure 37—Correlation of annual total groundwater use with radar precipitation at the Colby, SC-8, and Belpre wells for 2008–2016.

4.5 Annual Winter Water-Level Measurements

Annual winter groundwater levels have been measured in a network of irrigation and other well types in the Kansas HPA for many decades. Before 1997, the USGS and DWR measured the water levels. Starting in January 1997, the KGS took over the cooperative measurements made by the USGS, with DWR continuing its measurements. The KGS then developed additional procedures for measurement, acquisition, and transfer of the data to a relational database (WIZARD). The KGS and DWR now measure water levels in a network of about 1,400 wells (mainly irrigation wells) across the High Plains aquifer. These measurements are typically done in late December and early January.

4.5.1 Water-Level Change in the Groundwater Management Districts

Figure 38 displays the mean annual year-to-year changes in winter water levels during 2005–2017 for the GMDs currently involved in the index well program; these values are based on wells for which measurements were made every winter from 2005 to 2018. The changes have been relatively modest in northwestern and west-central Kansas; the annual water-level changes in GMDs 1 and 4 have fluctuated between +0.4 and -1.4 ft. The annual changes in GMD3 during this period were substantially greater (between +0.05 and -3.5 ft), but the largest annual changes were in GMD5 (between +3.2 and -2.9 ft). Some similarity is evident in the patterns of the water-level changes for the three western GMDs (4, 1, and 3).

The mean annual water-level changes in the four GMDs involved in the index well program generally mimic the variations in radar precipitation (March–Oct. sum), which are also displayed on fig. 38 and discussed in section 4.3. The annual water-level increases in the three western GMDs in 2017 were the largest during the 2005–2017 monitoring period and consistent with the relatively large 2017 radar precipitation values. In contrast, both the annual water-level change and radar precipitation in GMD5 in 2017 were somewhat above average but not close to the maximum values observed for the period.




Figure 38—Mean annual water-level change and the radar precipitation (sum of March–October precipitation) for GMDs 4, 1, 3, and 5 during 2005–2017. The water-level change for a particular year is the water-level difference between the following year and that year for continuously measured wells for 2005–2017 and between the 2018 provisional winter value and the 2017 value. The blue lines represent the water-level change and the red dashed lines the radar precipitation. The ranges in the y-axes for water-level change in the upper two plots are half those of the lower two plots. The ranges in the y-axes for radar precipitation are the same for all four plots.

4.5.2 Water-Level Change in the Thomas, Scott, and Haskell Index Wells

Winter water levels have been measured by steel tape in the original three index wells since January 2008. Figure 39 shows the annual water-level changes for both the tape and transducer values for 2008–2017 along with the mean water-level changes for the GMDs based on the network wells with continuous records for this period (transducer values are for the same time as the annual tape measurements). The annual changes in the Scott index well have been within a relatively narrow range (between -0.1 and -1.5 ft for tape measurements; a total absolute range of 1.4 ft), whereas the changes have been appreciably larger at the Thomas index well (between +1.4 and -2.4 ft for tape measurements; a total absolute range of 3.8 ft), and much greater at the Haskell index well (between +4.0 and -10.2 ft for tape measurements; a total absolute range of 14.2 ft).

The range in the annual water-level changes for the Scott index well is only a little smaller than that for the mean annual water-level change for GMD1 during 2008–2017 (fig. 39). In contrast, the ranges in the annual water-level changes for the Thomas and Haskell index wells are substantially greater than the mean water-level changes for GMDs 4 and 3, respectively. The patterns in the annual water-level changes for the Thomas and Scott index wells, however, are generally similar to the patterns for the mean annual changes for the GMDs. This indicates that these two wells are generally representative of the patterns in regional water-level variations in the GMDs in which they are located.

Although the changes in the water levels in the Haskell index well (the transducer values) showed a decline from 2009 to 2011 followed by a rise from 2011 to 2013 that is similar to the more muted changes for GMD3, the variations in the index well water-level changes from 2013 to 2017 are substantially different from the decline in values for those four years for GMD3. This difference is mainly related to late fall pumping (late November to mid-December 2014) and variations in pumping related to the court-ordered shutdown of nearby irrigation wells (see section 3.2.2.).




Figure 39—Annual winter water-level changes in the original three index wells and the mean annual changes in the three GMDs in western Kansas in which they are located. Note the different y-axis range for Haskell County versus that for Thomas and Scott counties; suspect 2013 tape measurement at the Haskell index well causes the 2012 and 2013 tape water-level change values to be markedly different from those based on the transducer measurements.

4.6 Correlation of Annual Water Use with Annual Water-Level Change

One of the major accomplishments of the index well program has been the discovery of the strong linear relationship between annual water use and annual water-level change in the Kansas HPA and the development of the theoretical support for that relationship. As shown in previous project reports and peer-reviewed publications (e.g., Butler et al., 2015; Butler, Whittemore, Wilson, and Bohling, 2016; Butler et al., in press), this relationship can be used to assess the aquifer response to pumping reductions over a wide range of spatial scales. We have previously examined the correlations between annual water use and annual water-level change for the three original index wells and three additional wells in GMDs 4 (Colby), 1 (SC-8), and 5 (Belpre). In last year's report (Butler et al., 2017), we presented the results of a comprehensive examination of the correlations in which we varied the distance over which the water use was summed and used both manual- and transducer-measured water-level change data (see tables 38–39 of Butler et al. [2017] and associated discussion). In this section, we will update those correlations using the radius of water use that produced the highest correlation for a particular well.

4.6.1 Water Use versus Water-Level Change at the Thomas Index Well

Figure 40 displays the correlation between annual water-level change and annual water use in the vicinity of the Thomas index well for 2008–2016. The pumping reduction for sustainability is 18%, which is considerably smaller than the 27% for all of GMD4 (Whittemore et al., 2018). The average water use is 3.1 in/yr for the 5 mi radius area centered on the well, which is substantially greater than the 1.6 in/yr for all of GMD4. The water use at sustainability (net inflow) is 2.5 in/yr for the 5 mi radius area, which again is substantially greater than the 1.2 in/yr for GMD4. The greater density of water use may have produced a locally depressed water table that induces more lateral groundwater inflow, including, potentially, focused recharge along ephemeral stream valleys 1–2 mi to the north and south of the Thomas well.




Figure 40—Correlation of annual water-level change based on transducer measurements in the Thomas County index well with annual water use within a 5 mi radius around the well during 2008–2016 ($p < 0.0001$).

4.6.2 Water Use versus Water-Level Change at the Scott Index Well

Figure 41 displays the correlation between annual water-level change and annual water use in the vicinity of the Scott index well for 2008–2016. The pumping reduction for sustainability is 39%, which is somewhat larger than the 33% for all of GMD1 (Whittemore et al., 2018). The average water use is 4.0 in/yr for the 5 mi radius area centered on the well, which is substantially greater than the 2.0 in/yr for all of GMD1. The water use at sustainability (net inflow) is 2.4 in/yr for the 5 mi radius area, which again is substantially greater than the 1.3 in/yr for GMD1. As with the Thomas index well, the greater density of water use may have produced a locally depressed water table that induces more lateral groundwater inflow.




Figure 41—Correlation of annual water-level change based on transducer measurements in the Scott County index well with annual water use within a 5 mi radius around the well during 2008–2016 ($p=0.013$).

4.6.3 Water Use versus Water-Level Change at the Haskell Index Well

Figure 42 displays the correlation between annual change in the water level at maximum recovery and annual water use in the vicinity of the Haskell index well for 2008–2016. We found that we could not get a good correlation with the annual water-level change, likely because of the impact of late fall pumping, but we could get a good correlation with the maximum recovered water level. The pumping reduction for sustainability is 48%, which is substantially larger than the 31% for all of GMD3 (Whittemore et al., 2018). The average water use is 12.4 in/yr for the 2 mi radius area centered on the well, which is substantially greater than the 4.3 in/yr for all of GMD3. The water use at sustainability (net inflow) is 6.4 in/yr for the 2 mi radius area, which again is substantially greater than the 2.9 in/yr for GMD3. As with the Thomas and Scott index wells, these values indicate that the area of the Haskell well is more heavily pumped than average for GMD3 with a much greater net inflow. In this case, the greater density of water use may have induced upward vertical flow from the underlying Dakota aquifer. In addition, the heavy pumping undoubtedly induced leakage from the thick clay interval overlying the sand unit at the bottom of the HPA in vicinity of the Haskell well.

The water use around the Haskell County index well for 2013–2016 is substantially lower than for 2008–2012. The lower use is related to both the court-ordered shutdown of nearby pumping wells described in section 3.2.2 as well as to the greater than average 2008–2016 precipitation that occurred in 2015 and 2016 (see fig. 36).




Figure 42—Correlation of change in maximum recovery water level based on transducer measurements in the Haskell County index well with annual water use within a 2 mi radius around the well during 2008–2016 ($p=0.0035$). Red points designate values after the court-ordered shutdowns (see section 3.2.2); 2013 and 2014 values are averaged because of equipment failure at the time of the 2013 maximum recovery.

4.6.4 Water Use versus Water-Level Change at the Colby, SC-8, and Belpre Wells

The water-level change versus water use relationship is only statistically significant for the 1 mi radius of water use around the Colby index well (fig. 43). In contrast to conditions in the vicinity of most of the index wells, substantial water is pumped for municipal use in the vicinity of the Colby well. The percent pumping reduction required to attain stable water levels (56%) is the largest of any of the index wells for which relationships have been developed. The average water use is 3.1 in/yr for the 1 mi radius area centered on the well, which is substantially less than that in the vicinity of the Thomas index well (6.3 in/yr for 1 mi radius) but substantially greater than the 1.6 in/yr for all of GMD4. The water use at sustainability (net inflow) is 1.4 in/yr for the 1 mi radius area, which is somewhat greater than the 1.2 in/yr for all of GMD4 but substantially below that in the vicinity of the Thomas index well (4.8 in/yr for 1 mi radius).

The highest correlation for the water-level change versus water use relationship at the SC-8 well is for the 1 mi radius area centered on the well (fig. 43). The percent pumping reduction required to attain stable water levels (25%) is considerably less than that required in the vicinity of the Scott County index well (42% for 1 mi radius) and that required for all of GMD1 (33%). The average water use is 4.6 in/yr for the 1 mi radius area, which is less than that in the vicinity of the Scott index well (5.7 in/yr for 1 mi radius) but substantially greater than the 2.0 in/yr for all of GMD1. The water use at sustainability (net inflow), however, is 3.5 in/yr for the 1 mi radius area, which is similar to that in the vicinity of the Scott index well (3.3 in/yr for 1 mi radius) but much greater than the 1.3 in/yr for all of GMD1.

The highest correlation for the water-level change versus water use relationship at the Belpre well is for the 2 mi radius area centered on the well (fig. 43). The percent pumping reduction required to attain stable water levels (4%) is the smallest reduction required at any of the wells for which relationships have been developed but larger than the 2% required for all of GMD5 for the same period (Whittemore et al., 2018). The average water use is 3.4 in/yr for the 2 mi radius area, which is considerably larger than the 2.4 in/yr for all of GMD5. The water use at sustainability (net inflow) is 3.3 in/yr for the 2 mi radius area, which again is considerably larger than the 2.3 in/yr for all of GMD5.






Figure 43—Correlation of annual water-level change in the Colby, SC-8, and Belpre wells with annual water use within a 1 or 2 mi radius around the wells during 2005–2016.

5 Summary of 2017 Accomplishments and Plans for 2018

5.1 2017 Accomplishments

- Continued collection and processing of data from the 28 wells currently involved in the index well program. Telemetered data from 12 wells have continued to be served on the web. Each well was visited approximately quarterly and downloads from all wells have been used for analysis and presentations.
- Installed sensor and telemetry equipment and initiated monitoring at the new index well drilled in December 2016 southwest of Goodland in GMD4.
- Installed sensor and telemetry equipment and initiated monitoring at an existing well northwest of Garden City in western Finney County in GMD3.
- Installed sensors and initiated monitoring at five GMD1 expansion wells.
- Continued analysis of hydrographs from all wells.
- Continued comparison of transducer data with the results of the annual water-level network.
- Continued an analysis of the utility of climatic indices and radar precipitation data for use in relationships with annual water-level change and water use in the vicinity of the index wells.
- Continued assessment of relationship between precipitation, annual water-level change, and annual water use at the index wells and the GMDs currently involved in the index well program.
- Continued integration of program data into the digital Kansas High Plains Aquifer Atlas (Fross et al., 2012).
- Gave presentations about the index well program to KWO, DWR, and GMD personnel, among others.

5.2 Planned Activities, 2018

- Continue monitoring and processing water-level data from the 28 wells currently involved in the index program. Visit each well quarterly to take manual measurements of water levels and download data from sensors.
- Continue analysis of hydrographs from all wells involved in the program.
- Install sensor and telemetry equipment and initiate monitoring at an existing well near Larned in GMD5.
- Install sensor and initiate monitoring at the sixth GMD1 expansion well.
- Install telemetry equipment for the deep wells at the Hugoton and Liberal sites in GMD3 to resume remote monitoring of water levels at those sites.
- Continue to seek new wells to add to the network. Areas of particular interest are northern Sherman/southern Cheyenne counties in GMD4, Grant and Gray counties in GMD3, and Stafford and Pawnee counties in GMD5.
- Continue assessment of the information that can be acquired from hydrograph inspection.
- Continue assessment of the relationships among climatic indices, radar precipitation data, annual water-level change, and annual water use in the HPA.
- Explore the possibility of establishing well nests in GMD3 with one well in the HPA and one well in the Dakota aquifer.
- Integrate information from drillers' logs in the vicinity of the Thomas and Scott index wells into interpretation of water-level responses in those areas.

6 References

- Buchanan, R. C., Wilson, B. B., Buddemeier, R. R., and Butler, J. J., Jr., 2015, The High Plains aquifer: Kansas Geological Survey Public Information Circular 18, 6 p. Available online at <http://www.kgs.ku.edu/Publications/pic18/index.html>.
- Buddemeier, R. W., Stotler, R., Butler, J. J., Jr., Jin, W., Beeler, K., Reboulet, E., Macfarlane, P. A., Kreitzer, S., Whittemore, D. O., Bohling, G., and Wilson, B. B., 2010, High Plains aquifer calibration monitoring well program: Third year progress report: Kansas Geological Survey Open-File Report 2010-3, 117 p. Available online at http://www.kgs.ku.edu/Hydro/Publications/2010/OFR10_3/index.html.
- Butler, J. J., Jr., Stotler, R. L., Whittemore, D. O., and Reboulet, E. C., 2013, Interpretation of water-level changes in the High Plains aquifer in western Kansas: *Groundwater*, v. 51, p. 180–190.
- Butler, J. J., Jr., Whittemore, D. O., Reboulet, E., Knobbe, S., Wilson, B. B., Stotler, R. L., and Bohling, G. C., 2015, High Plains aquifer index well program: 2014 annual report: Kansas Geological Survey Open-File Report 2015-3, 135 p. Available online at http://www.kgs.ku.edu/Hydro/Publications/2015/OFR15_3/index.html.
- Butler, J. J., Jr., Whittemore, D. O., Reboulet, E., Knobbe, S., Wilson, B. B., Stotler, R. L., and Bohling, G. C., 2016, High Plains aquifer index well program: 2015 annual report: Kansas Geological Survey Open-File Report 2016-4, 179 p. Available online at http://www.kgs.ku.edu/Hydro/Publications/2016/OFR16_4/index.html.
- Butler, J. J., Jr., Whittemore, D. O., Wilson, B. B., and Bohling, G. C., 2016, A new approach for assessing the future of aquifers supporting irrigated agriculture: *Geophysical Research Letters*, v. 43, no. 5, p. 2,004–2,010.
- Butler, J. J., Jr., Whittemore, D. O., Reboulet, E., Knobbe, S., Wilson, B. B., and Bohling, G. C., 2017, High Plains aquifer index well program: 2016 annual report: Kansas Geological Survey Open-File Report 2017-10, 144 p. Available online at http://www.kgs.ku.edu/Hydro/Publications/2017/OFR17_10/index.html.
- Butler, J. J., Jr., Whittemore, D. O., Bohling, G. C., and Wilson, B. B., in press, Sustainability of aquifers supporting irrigated agriculture: A case study of the High Plains aquifer in Kansas: *Water International*.
- Fross, D., Sophocleous, M. A., Wilson, B. B., and Butler, J. J., Jr., 2012, Kansas High Plains Aquifer Atlas: Kansas Geological Survey, available online at http://www.kgs.ku.edu/HighPlains/HPA_Atlas/index.html.
- McMahon, P. B., 2001, Vertical gradients in water chemistry in the Central High Plains aquifer, Southwestern Kansas and Oklahoma Panhandle, 1999: U.S. Geological Survey Water-Resources Investigations Report 01-4028, 47 p.
- Stotler, R., Butler, J. J., Jr., Buddemeier, R. W., Bohling, G. C., Comba, S., Jin, W., Reboulet, E., Whittemore, D. O., and Wilson, B. B., 2011, High Plains aquifer calibration monitoring well program: Fourth year progress report: Kansas Geological Survey Open-File Report 2011-4, 185 p. Available online at http://www.kgs.ku.edu/Hydro/Publications/2011/OFR11_4/index.html.

- Whittemore, D. O., Butler, J. J., Jr., and Wilson, B. B., 2015, Prediction of water-level changes and water use in the High Plains aquifer from radar precipitation: Abstract H14B-04, American Geophysical Union Meeting, San Francisco, California.
- Whittemore, D. O., Butler, J. J., Jr., Wilson, B. B., and Woods, J., 2015, Using radar precipitation to estimate water-level changes and water use in the High Plains aquifer: Governor's Conference on Future of Water in Kansas, Manhattan, Kansas, abstract.
- Whittemore, D. O., Butler, J. J., Jr., and Wilson, B. B., 2016, Assessing the major drivers of water-level declines: New insights into the future of heavily stressed aquifers: *Hydrological Sciences Journal*, v. 61, no. 1, p. 134–145.
- Whittemore, D. O., Butler, J. J., Jr., and Wilson, B. B., 2018, Status of the High Plains aquifer in Kansas: Kansas Geological Survey Technical Series 22, 24 p. Available online at <http://www.kgs.ku.edu/Publications/Bulletins/TS22/index.html>.
- Young, D. P., Buddemeier, R. W., Butler, J. J., Jr., Jin, W., Whittemore, D. O., Reboulet, E., and Wilson, B. B., 2008, High Plains aquifer calibration monitoring well program: Year 2 progress report: Kansas Geological Survey Open-File Report 2008-29, 54 p. Available online at http://www.kgs.ku.edu/Hydro/Publications/2008/OFR08_29/index.html.
- Young, D. P., Buddemeier, R. W., Whittemore, D. O., and Reboulet, E., 2007, High Plains aquifer calibration monitoring well program: Year 1 progress report on well installation and aquifer response: Kansas Geological Survey Open-File Report 2007-30, 44 p. Available online at http://www.kgs.ku.edu/Hydro/Publications/2007/OFR07_30/index.html.