TECHNICAL REPORT NO. 41



A REGIONAL AQUIFER SIMULATION MODEL FOR SOUTHEASTERN WISCONSIN

SOUTHEASTERN WISCONSIN REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION

**INTERAGENCY
AQUIFER MODELING
PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS**

The groundwater model development and initial operation documented in this report was completed under a cooperative work and funding effort involving the following agencies and units of government:

U.S. Geological Survey

Wisconsin Geological and Natural History Survey

University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee

Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission

Participating Water Utilities in theSoutheastern Wisconsin Region
(See listing on inside back cover.)

TECHNICAL REPORT
NUMBER 41

A REGIONAL AQUIFER SIMULATION MODEL FOR SOUTHEASTERN WISCONSIN

Prepared by the

Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission
U.S. Geological Survey
Wisconsin Geological and Natural History Survey
Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources
University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee
and
Participating Water Utilities in Southeastern Wisconsin

June 2005

Inside Region $ 15.00
Outside Region $ 30.00

(This page intentionally left blank)

SOUTHEASTERN WISCONSIN REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION
W239 N1812 ROCKWOOD DRIVE • PO BOX 1607 • WAUKESHA, WI 53187-1607•
TELEPHONE (262) 547-6721
FAX (262) 547-1103

Serving the Counties of: KENOSHA
MILWAUKEE
OZAUKEE
RACINE
WALWORTH
WASHINGTON
WAUKESHA

June 24, 2005

STATEMENT OF THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

This report documents the second of two major groundwater management studies which have been completed for the Southeastern Wisconsin Region: a regional groundwater resources inventory and analysis and the development of a regional groundwater aquifer simulation model. These work efforts represent the first two of the three elements of the planned regional water supply planning program for the Southeastern Wisconsin Region, considering both surface and groundwater systems. The third element is the preparation of a regional water supply plan which will utilize the aquifer model as an important tool.

The groundwater inventory and analysis work was completed and documented over a several-year period, ending in 2001, under a cooperative effort involving the Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission (SEWRPC), the Wisconsin Geological and Natural History Survey (WGNHS) and the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources (WDNR). This work is documented in SEWRPC Technical Report No. 37, *Groundwater Resources of Southeastern Wisconsin*. As the groundwater inventory and analysis project proceeded, the need to address the deeper aquifer system together with the shallow aquifer in an integrated data development and modeling program was raised. A regional aquifer simulation model was proposed to be developed to meet this need. The proposed modeling program was initially described in a document titled *Regional Aquifer Performance Simulation Modeling Program Prospectus* prepared under the guidance of SEWRPC's Technical Advisory Committee on Groundwater Resources, whose membership includes both groundwater users and individuals with technical expertise in this field.

Following informational meetings, support for the prospectus and for funding the program was received from water utilities in the Region that use groundwater as a source of supply and from the participating agencies. Work on the regional aquifer performance simulation modeling program was completed during 2004. The work was carried out cooperatively by the USGS, the WGNHS, the WDNR, the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, and SEWRPC under the guidance of the SEWRPC Technical Advisory Committee on Groundwater Resources.

This new model defines the major aquifers and incorporates major surface water features which allows the model to be used to simulate interactions between the deep and shallow aquifers and between groundwater and surface water systems. The model clearly shows how groundwater use relative to predevelopment conditions has affected water levels in Southeastern Wisconsin.

There are several timely needs for the model. One is determining the zone of contribution, or area of land surface contributing water to a well, for each public water supply in the Region. The WDNR established an objective to accomplish this effort and provided partial support the for modeling program under its source water protection program. This model has allowed that agency and resource managers to define wellhead protection zones for over 200 public wells. For larger wells, the model was adequate for this purpose, but for many of the smaller capacity wells, it serves as the framework for more refined models of specific small areas around communities.

Other anticipated uses of the model include:

- Prediction of long- and short-range water levels in the aquifers,
- Quantification of the exchange of groundwater with Lake Michigan,
- Groundwater quality evaluations—as one tool to help understand the reasons for increases in radium and salinity in deep aquifer wells,
- Preliminary well siting evaluations,
- Water supply facility optimization analyses, and
- Evaluation of groundwater conservation and recharge strategies.

This technical report documents the regional aquifer modeling program in two separate reports which are included herein: 1) *Regional Aquifer Model for Southeastern Wisconsin, Report 1: Data Collection, Conceptual Model Development, Numerical Model Construction, and Model Calibration*, June 1, 2005; and 2) *Simulation of Regional Groundwater Flow in Southeastern Wisconsin, Report 2: Model Results and Interpretation*, June 1, 2005.

The development of the aquifer model documented herein represents an important step in understanding and maintaining the groundwater resources of Southeastern Wisconsin.

Respectfully Submitted,

Philip C. Evenson
Executive Director

(This page intentionally left blank)

Regional Aquifer Model for Southeastern Wisconsin

Report 1:
Data Collection, Conceptual Model Development, Numerical Model Construction, and Model Calibration

By
D.T. Feinstein[1]
T.T. Eaton[2]
D.J. Hart[2]
J.T. Krohelski[1]
K.R. Bradbury[2]

[1]U.S. Geological Survey
[2]Wisconsin Geological and Natural History Survey, University of Wisconsin-Extension

June 1, 2005

Final Administrative Report to the
Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission

(This page intentionally left blank)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

FIGURES

TABLES

(This page intentionally left blank)

1. Abstract

A three-dimensional groundwater flow model was developed to simulate and assess the effects of historical and current well withdrawals on groundwater conditions in the seven-county region of southeastern Wisconsin administered by the Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission (SEWRPC). A steady-state simulation reproduced predevelopment conditions before the onset of large-scale pumping. A transient simulation reproduced the response of water levels and fluxes to gradually increasing withdrawals between 1864 and 2000. The project was initiated in 1999 under the leadership of SEWRPC with the participation of stakeholders from the major municipalities using groundwater in southeastern Wisconsin. The model was constructed cooperatively by the Wisconsin Geological and Natural History Survey (WGNHS) and the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS).

This report documents data collection, conceptual model development, numerical model construction, and model calibration. A second report (Feinstein and others, 2005) presents results for the seven-county study area.

The seven counties in the study area are Kenosha, Milwaukee, Ozaukee, Racine, Walworth, Washington, and Waukesha. Two shallow aquifers underlie this area. The first consists of sand-and-gravel deposits contained in generally fine-grained till. The second, the fractured Silurian dolomite aquifer, is located below the unlithified deposits aquifer in the eastern part of the study area. The deep sandstone aquifer consists of a series of Cambrian and Ordovician sandstone units as well as some dolomite and shale. Over the eastern two-thirds of the seven-county region, the shallow and deep parts of the flow system are separated by the low-permeability Maquoketa Formation. Precambrian basement rocks form the nearly impermeable base of the groundwater flow system.

The USGS groundwater flow model code, MODFLOW (McDonald and Harbaugh 1988), was used to construct the southeastern Wisconsin groundwater flow model. The detailed region of the model is called the nearfield and encompasses the seven-county region as well as Dodge and Jefferson Counties and the eastern half of Rock County. The

rest of the model, called the farfield, is used only to set the appropriate fluxes and heads at the edge of the nearfield.

Newly developed sources of data for the nearfield were used to define the geometry of hydrostratigraphic units, the spatial distribution of hydraulic conductivity in each unit, the geometry and elevation of surface-water bodies, the spatial distribution of recharge rates, and the historical record of well withdrawals. Special attention was paid to the thickening and thinning of dolomite and sandstone units, and to mapping fine-grained and coarse-grained sections of rock as a guide to hydraulic conductivity distribution. We also constructed a surface-water network dense enough to provide discharge points for recharge circulating as shallow groundwater flow, and assembled a comprehensive history of high-capacity well withdrawals from both shallow and deep flow-systems at approximately 10-year intervals from 1864 to 2000.

Model calibration included a comparison of modeled and observed water levels and gaged stream flows to simulated stream gains and losses. Water levels calculated by the calibrated model compared favorably to estimates of predevelopment conditions and to water level changes through time. Simulated stream gains fell within the expected interval (80 to 50 percent of flow duration) for most of the sites in the seven-county region where flow duration was estimated.

The quality of the steady-state and transient calibrations was most sensitive to the horizontal hydraulic conductivities of the unlithified material and the deep sandstone aquifer, to recharge rates, to the vertical hydraulic conductivity of the Maquoketa shale, and to the estimated pumping rates.

2. Introduction

Southeastern Wisconsin (Washington, Ozaukee, Waukesha, Milwaukee, Walworth, Racine, and Kenosha Counties) is one of the most rapidly developing regions of the state, and in 1996 contained about 36 percent of the state's population (SEWRPC and WGNHS, 2002). The economic growth and suburban expansion in this area (Figure 1) have been due, in part, to the abundant water supplies available for public, domestic, and industrial uses. Lake Michigan is the source for about 70 percent of all water used in the region, mainly in the lakeshore counties (Ozaukee, Milwaukee, Racine, and Kenosha), which lie mostly within the Great Lakes drainage basin. Farther inland, Washington, Waukesha, and Walworth Counties are principally in the Mississippi River basin, and because of international limitations on diversion of water out of the Great Lakes basin, rely on groundwater for over 99% of their needs (SEWRPC and WGNHS, 2002). In 1995, about 93 million gallons per day (mgd) of groundwater was withdrawn from the seven-county region for public, domestic, industrial, commercial, and agricultural uses (Ellefson and others, 1997).

Groundwater in the region is withdrawn from three major aquifer systems (SEWRPC and WGNHS, 2002). The shallowest system is composed of unlithified glacial and fluvial sediments of Pleistocene age, hereafter called the sand-and-gravel aquifer These sediments range in lithology from coarse gravel to fine silt, and in thickness from only a few feet to several hundred feet in preglacial bedrock valleys. The sand-and-gravel aquifer is discontinuous in nature because it is interspersed with thick fine-grained till deposits. This aquifer supplies water to domestic wells in many parts of the region, and to municipal and industrial wells where it thickens in the preglacial valleys. Below the sand-and-gravel, fractured dolomite of Silurian and Devonian age is an important source of water over the eastern two thirds of the region. This system, hereafter called the Silurian dolomite aquifer, is absent west of its subcrop in western Waukesha County. To the east, it supplies many domestic and some municipal and industrial wells.

Below the shallow Silurian dolomite aquifer, shales and dolomites of the Ordovician Maquoketa Formation and dolomites of the Sinnipee Group dolomite form an important aquitard that restricts vertical flow. West of the Maquoketa subcrop, dolomites of the Sinnipee Group form a minor aquifer due to weathering at the bedrock surface. Underlying the Sinnipee Group is a thick sequence of rocks dominated by up to hundreds of feet of Ordovician and Cambrian-age sandstones interbedded with lower-conductivity shales and dolomites. This sequence, used mainly for large municipal and industrial supplies, is called the deep sandstone aquifer and is underlain by the crystalline basement.

The regional groundwater flow model incorporates the entire sequence of unlithified and bedrock units below southeastern Wisconsin. The entire stratigraphic sequence (shown as a stratigraphic column in Figure 2a and as a block diagram in Figure 2b) constitutes a single flow system. The shallow part of the flow system occurs in the unlithified deposits and dolomite bedrock units above the Maquoketa shale. The deep part of the flow system, dominated by sandstone, lies below the Maquoketa shale and above the crystalline basement. The Maquoketa shale acts as an aquitard that limits vertical flow between the shallow and deep parts of the flow system.

Since the turn of the century, groundwater use has caused appreciable changes in the shallow and deep parts of the flow system. Concentrated pumping and well interference have drawn down the potentiometric surfaces in the Silurian dolomite and deep sandstone aquifers. Water-level declines, measured in deep monitoring wells over the last 50 years, average between 6 and 10 feet per year. Cones of depression centered on Waukesha County and suburban Chicago have intersected so that pumping in one area can affect water levels in the other area. At the same time, groundwater quality has decreased, with appreciable increases in total dissolved solids and radioactivity in some wells (Aquifer Science and Technology, 1999).

Future management of groundwater resources in southeastern Wisconsin requires a comprehensive understanding of regional hydrogeology and groundwater flow. In 1998, the Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission (SEWRPC) recommended the development and construction of a regional groundwater flow simulation model for use as a tool in regional groundwater management (SEWRPC, 1998). Beginning in 1999, SEWRPC and the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources (WDNR) organized funding of the work through support from local water utilities. The WGNHS and the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS), have worked cooperatively to construct this model focused on the entire seven-county SEWRPC region This groundwater flow simulation is intended to be a regional framework model that can lead to more detailed studies of smaller areas within the region.



Figure 1. Southeastern Wisconsin: model nearfield area. *A-A' and B-B' show trace of cross sections in Figures 6 and 7, respectively.*





Figure 2a. **Hydrostratigraphic sequence for southeastern Wisconsin: lithologic column**
Stratigraphic nomenclature (after Ostrom, 1962) and lithologic column



Figure 2b. Hydrostratigraphic sequence for southeastern Wisconsin: Block diagram of regional hydrostratigraphic framework

Objectives and Scope of the Modeling Program

The groundwater modeling program in southeastern Wisconsin has the following objectives (SEWRPC, 1998):

1. To determine essential hydrogeologic parameters of the regional aquifers by the compilation and analysis of all relevant existing data.
2. To provide a better understanding of groundwater flow in both the shallow and deep parts of the flow system below southeastern Wisconsin.
3. To investigate groundwater flow paths under different use scenarios for purposes of determining wellhead protection areas, understanding well interference, and examining interconnections among different aquifers and between groundwater and surface water.
4. To investigate impacts of groundwater withdrawals from different aquifers and determine major recharge areas for long-term aquifer protection.
5. To permit optimization of the distribution of new wells and pumping schedules to minimize drawdown and well interference, and better manage aquifer resources.
6. To permit determining the interactions between surface water and groundwater for purposes of groundwater resource management; and,
7. To permit the study and future evaluation of groundwater quality changes.

The groundwater modeling program consists of four phases:

(1) Data collection, compilation, and conceptual model development;
(2) Construction and calibration of a three-dimensional regional groundwater flow model;
(3) Compilation of steady-state and transient model results at the regional scale;
(4) Targeted hydrogeologic analyses and scenario testing.

This report summarizes work carried out in phases 1 and 2. A companion report (Feinstein and others, 2005), which provides an overview of model results for the period 1864 to 2000, corresponds to phase 3 of the project. Subsequent studies corresponding to phase 4 will apply the model to optimize future use of the groundwater resource. The WGNHS and USGS have already constructed a demonstration study in Waukesha County that converts a subset of the regional model into a refined inset model capable of addressing local water-supply issues (Eaton, 2004).

Previous Studies

Southeastern Wisconsin has been included in several previous groundwater modeling studies. Regional investigations covering a broad multi-state area include work of the Illinois State Water Survey (Burch 1991) and the USGS. The USGS studied groundwater flow in the Chicago-Milwaukee area (Young and others 1988) and conducted the Northern Midwest Regional Aquifer-System Analysis (RASA) (Mandle and Kontis 1992, Young 1992a,b). Studies limited to southeastern Wisconsin include work conducted by the USGS (Young, 1976) to investigate pumping drawdown in the deep sandstone aquifer. A more recent model over the same area was constructed by Jansen and Rao (1998). These Wisconsin efforts focused on the deep sandstone aquifer as a single aquifer represented by one model layer. This approach simplifies the interaction between the shallow and deep parts of the flow system and neglects the three-dimensional circulation within the Cambrian-Ordovician units of the deep sandstone aquifer.

Recently, the shallow groundwater resources and geology of the region were studied in a cooperative effort between the WGNHS and SEWRPC (SEWRPC and WGNHS, 2002). In conjunction with that baseline study, and in preparation for the model described in this report, a more detailed investigation of the hydrostratigraphy of the deep sandstone aquifer was undertaken by the WGNHS (Eaton and others, 1999) and the USGS (Carlson and Feinstein, 1998). This work built on earlier studies by using the extensive subsurface deep-well database at the WGNHS and available hydraulic testing information to define the geometry (thickness) and hydraulic properties of individual units within the deep sandstone aquifer.

Model Improvements

The groundwater model described in this report represents an important advance over previous models, and is designed both to evaluate regional hydrogeology including the effects of water use, and to provide a framework for more detailed site-specific studies in the future. This model incorporates the following improvements:

- The horizontal grid discretization is much finer than in previous models, allowing more geologic detail;
- The model includes many more vertical layers than previous models, allowing a more realistic depiction of regional hydrostratigraphy and groundwater circulation;
- All major and minor regional aquifers and major and minor regional aquitards are included in a single model, allowing improved simulation of the interaction between, as well as the circulation within, the shallow and deep parts of the flow system;
- Groundwater flow into and out of major surface-water features (lakes, streams, and wetlands) is simulated explicitly;
- The model incorporates new interpretations of the hydraulic properties of aquifers and aquitards.

Acknowledgments

This study was motivated, organized and financed by the Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission and the municipal water utilities in southeastern Wisconsin that support it. Special thanks go to Robert Biebel, Philip Evenson and Brian Barrett as well as the Technical Advisory Committee on Groundwater Resources for guiding the project and contributing many ideas. Committee members included:

Brian S. Barrett, Chairman, BSB Technical Services
Julie A. Anderson, Planning and Development Director, Racine County Planning Division
Douglas S. Cherkauer, Professor of Hydrogeology, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee
Daniel S. Duchniak, General Manager, Waukesha Water Utility
Philip C. Evenson, Secretary, Executive Director, Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission
Francis G. Fuja Water Supply Municipal Engineer, Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources
Ronald G. Hennings Assistant Director Emeritus, Wisconsin Geological and Natural History Survey
James P. Hurley, Assistant Director for Research, University of Wisconsin-Water Resources Institute
John Jansen, Senior Geoscientist, Ruekert & Mielke, Inc.
Marlin P. Johnson, Assoc. Professor Emeritus Depart. Biological Sci., University of Wisconsin-Waukesha
Terrance H. Kiekhaefer Director of Public Works, Water Utility, Vehicle Maintenance, City of West Bend
Thomas J. Krueger, Water and Wastewater Utility Director, Village of Grafton
Michael D. Lemcke, Section Chief, Groundwater Management, Wisconsin Depart. of Natural Resources
George E. Melcher, Director, Kenosha County Department of Planning and Development
Daniel Nase Village Engineer, Village of Germantown
Michael P. Rau, General Manager, We Energies-Water Services
Thomas Rossmiller, Director of Public Works, Village of East Troy
Shuichi Sasaki, Production Manager, Kikkoman Foods, Inc.
Steven H. Schultz, Manager, Water Supply Department, Ruekert & Mielke, Inc.
Mark D. Simon, Water Superintendent, City of Brookfield
Larry R. Wilms Division Engineer-Utilities, City of New Berlin
Constance R. Wilson, Utility Manager, Burlington Water Utility

The authors received important assistance from William Batten, Wisconsin Geological and Natural History, Cheryl Buchwald, U.S. Geological Survey, Doug Carlson, Louisiana State Geological Survey, Charles Dunning, U.S. Geological Survey, Norman Grannemann, U.S. Geological Survey, Scott Meyer, Illinois State Water Survey, James Nicholas, U.S. Geological Survey, Roger Peters, Wisconsin Geological and Natural History Survey, David Saad, U.S. Geological Survey, and Kurt Zeiler, Geomatrix Consultants (formerly with Wisconsin Geological and Natural History Survey).

The able review team included Brian Barrett, BSB Technical Services, Douglas Cherkauer, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, Madeline Gotkowitz, Wisconsin Geological and Natural History Survey, Robert Kay, U.S. Geological Survey, David LePain, Wisconsin Geological and Natural History Survey, and Douglas Walker, Illinois State Water Survey.

3. Approach

The simulation of shallow and deep groundwater flow in southeastern Wisconsin is based on extensive data compilation and some new data collection, combined with numerical model construction.

Data Collection and Compilation

The scope of the regional project included the compilation, synthesis, and re-interpretation of existing geologic and hydrogeologic data from numerous sources. Basic data for the project were obtained from geologic logs and well construction reports on file at the WGNHS, and from long-term records of groundwater levels maintained by the USGS. In addition, the project team undertook an extensive review of previous hydrogeologic studies in southeastern Wisconsin and in neighboring states.

Several recent and concurrent studies in southeastern Wisconsin made important contributions to this regional synthesis:

- an assessment of shallow hydrogeology, groundwater flow, and the configuration of the water table (SEWRPC and WGNHS, 2002);
- a characterization of the hydrostratigraphy of the deep sandstone aquifer in southeastern Wisconsin (Eaton and others, 1999);
- a detailed analysis of hydraulic characteristics of the Maquoketa Formation, an important regional aquitard (Eaton, 2002);
- an evaluation of groundwater recharge based on hydrograph separation and basin characteristics (Cherkauer, 1999, 2001); and,
- Pleistocene geologic mapping for Waukesha County (Clayton, 2001)

Data collection for the groundwater flow model also included the acquisition of new geophysical logs from eleven municipal wells in the area. Geophysical logging is the measurement of physical and chemical properties of the rock formations and borehole fluids using wireline tools in open wells. A typical suite of logs obtained for this project includes natural gamma radiation, single-point resistance, borehole diameter, spontaneous potential, fluid temperature and conductivity, and borehole flow. In three wells, dynamic flowmeter tests (Paillet, 2000) were also conducted to estimate aquifer parameters (Jansen, 2001). Analysis of these flowmeter tests also provided new measurements of hydraulic head in deep wells. Table 1 lists the wells logged during this project and describes the data collected.

After compiling available data, the project team developed a conceptual hydrostratigraphic framework for the study area. This conceptual understanding is based on the synthesis of data sets from WGNHS deep well log records, geographic information system (GIS) coverages, and surface-water records for southeastern Wisconsin.
The data sets include:

- top and bottom surfaces of shallow and deep hydrostratigraphic units;
- maps of location and depth of bedrock valley networks;
- estimates of horizontal and vertical hydraulic conductivity in hydrostratigraphic units based on well pumping data, segregation of coarse-grained and fine-grained well log intervals and observation of regional bedrock weathering;
- digital records of surface-water stages along major streams in the seven-county SEWRPC region as well as parts of three counties immediately to the west.

Table 1. Geophysical logs for municipal wells in Waukesha County obtained for this project

WGNHS ID[1]	WUWN[2]	Owner[3]	Well #[4]	Date logged	Depth logged[5] (ft)	Lithology samples[6]	Natural gamma	Caliper	Resistance	Normal resistivity	Fluid temp.	Fluid cond.	Impeller flowmeter	Heat pulse flowmeter	Video	Dynamic flow[7]	Discrete H2O samples[8]
WK0855	BH413	New Berlin	5	6/12/2000	1667	x	x		x						x		
WK1501U	BH415	New Berlin	7	6/14/1999	1919	x	x		x		x	x			x		
WK1511	BH416	New Berlin	8	5/14/2001	1940	x	x		x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
WK1382	MK401	New Berlin	10	11/9/1998	320	x	x		x								
WK0137	BH443	Pewaukee	2	3/15/2000	949	x	x		x		x	x					
WK1389	LK033	Pewaukee	9	8/16/1999	1390		x	x	x		x	x		x	x		
WK1352	-	Sussex	5	3/29/2000	1240	x	x	x	x		x	x	x	x	x	x	x
WK0007	BH429	Waukesha	3	5/7/2001	1550	x	x	x	x		x	x		x	x		
WK0125	BH431	Waukesha	5	12/16/1999	1890	x	x		x		x	x		x	x		
WK0168	BH432	Waukesha	6	5/3/1999	2050	x	x	x	x		x	x					
WK0887	BH435	Waukesha	9	3/12/2001	2100	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x

[1] ID assigned by WGNHS
[2] Wisconsin Unique Well Number
[3] Water utility
[4] Water utility designation for well
[5] Maximum depth logged (often less than total depth due to obstructions)
[6] Rock cuttings available from WGNHS
[7] Flowmeter logging while well was pumped
[8] Water samples collected using thief sampler from discrete depth intervals

Numerical Model Construction

The regional groundwater flow model of southeastern Wisconsin uses the MODFLOW96 code, originally developed by the USGS (McDonald and Harbaugh, 1988). This finite-difference code can simulate groundwater flow through aquifers and aquitards interacting with surface water in three dimensions under both steady and transient conditions. The code simulates three-dimensional hydraulic head and flux distributions over the entire model domain based on inputs in the form of boundary conditions, aquifer and aquitard geometry, aquifer and aquitard hydraulic properties, pumping rates, and recharge. The model simulates all major current and historic municipal wells in southeastern Wisconsin (using the MODFLOW Well package). The model also simulates flow into and out of major surface-water features in the area (using the MODFLOW River, Drain, and General Head Boundary packages). Use of the graphical user interface Groundwater Vistas (Environmental Simulations Inc., 1998), and GMS (Groundwater Modeling System, Environmental Modeling Systems, Inc., 2000), facilitated model construction, data entry, and visualization of results. The Groundwater Vistas interface also includes graphical representation of stream flux and water levels measured at particular locations in the model that were used in model calibration.

Nearfield and Farfield

The model domain consists of a *nearfield* portion coincident with the seven-county SEWRPC region and parts of three adjoining counties (Dodge, Jefferson, and Rock), and a *farfield* portion extending well into the state of Michigan to the east, into Illinois to the south, into the middle of Wisconsin to the west, and as far as Green Bay to the north (Figure 1). The nearfield is the focus of the model results and is the area of greatest detail in the model. The nearfield extends beyond the seven-county area into Dodge, Jefferson and Rock Counties in order to include the full extent of recharge areas for wells pumping within the SEWRPC region. The hydrogeologic conditions assigned to the farfield ensure that the correct amount of water enters or exits the study area at different depths at different times in response to stresses such as pumping. The database for the tops and bottoms of hydrostratigraphic units in the nearfield was extended to the farfield based on regional studies for Michigan, Illinois, and Wisconsin The distribution of hydraulic conductivity for the farfield is based on previous modeling work conducted by the USGS for the Chicago-Milwaukee model (Young and others, 1988, Young, 1992a). Recharge and surface-water/groundwater interactions are not explicitly modeled in the farfield except in areas immediately adjacent to the nearfield.

The location, stages, and routing of water bodies in the nearfield portion of the model were derived by combining digital hydrography and digital elevation model (DEM) data using a geographic information system (GIS). The 1:100,000-scale hydrography data (USGS, 2001a) contain very detailed location information for streams, lakes, and wetlands. The DEM data (USGS, 2001b) have a grid resolution of 30 meters (98.4 ft) and represent land elevations and surface-water elevations. Using the GIS, hydrography data were subdivided into unique line segments representing the surface-water features in model cells. These line segments were ordered in a downstream direction using a GIS routine, and their elevations within model cells were taken from the DEM, which yielded the stream, lake, and wetland stages used in the nearfield portion of the model.

Model Calibration

Model construction and calibration took place in two stages. First, an initial steady-state model represented predevelopment conditions in the absence of pumping. Second, a transient model corresponding to changing conditions between 1864 and 2000 simulated the effect of pumping on regional water levels. The steady-state and transient models of past conditions are the basis for simulations of future conditions that incorporate expected pumpage. They are also the basis for more detailed inset models (refined models for areas within the existing regional model) that are aimed at helping communities meet projected water demand by optimizing well configurations. A recently completed modeling study that targets the effect of proposed shallow pumping on surface-water bodies near the village of Eagle in Waukesha County demonstrates the inset approach.

Model calibration consisted of repeated comparisons of model outputs to targets of measured water levels and estimated stream flows followed by adjustment of model parameters in order to improve the model fit. Repeated perturbations of hydrologic parameter values generated statistical measures of model sensitivity that guided the calibration process. More detail on model calibration is provided in Section 7 of this report.

Water Use

Groundwater has been a valuable resource in southeastern Wisconsin for more than 100 years. Groundwater usage was quantified by compiling pumping rates for individual high capacity wells that serve as input or "stress" for the transient groundwater flow model. The compilation covers the time-period from 1864 to 2000. It includes pumping rates for 794 high-capacity industrial, agricultural and municipal wells for the entire nearfield model area (the seven SEWRPC counties plus Dodge, Jefferson, and the eastern half of Rock County), and 508 high capacity wells representing pumping centers for the farfield area (northern Illinois, northeast Wisconsin, western Rock County and Dane County).

Pumping data used in the model were compiled from a number of published sources (Chamberlin, 1877; Wiedman and Schultz, 1915; Young, 1976; Lawrence and Ellefson, 1982; Lawrence et al, 1984; Young et al, 1988; Jansen and Rao, 1998) as well as from Wisconsin Department of Natural Resource (WDNR) records and Illinois State Water Survey publications (Visocky, 1997). The pumping history for the seven-county SEWRPC region has been compiled for the 15 periods shown in Table 2.

Although pumping rates for municipal wells were generally available, there are few records of actual pumping rates for industrial and other non-municipal wells. Major industrial pumpage in the greater Milwaukee area was compiled in earlier modeling efforts and those rates were used when and where available. About 10% of the wells represented in the model are industrial and non-municipal wells for which there were no records of pumping rates. Pumping rates for those wells were estimated using pumping-test and pump-capacity data from individual well construction reports on file with the WDNR and WGNHS.

Table 2. Pumping periods and high-capacity well withdrawals from the 7-county SEWRPC area[1].

Period	Span	Withdrawals[2] in million gallons per day		
		Shallow[3]	Deep[4]	Total
1	1864-1880	0.00	0.00	0.00
2	1880-1900	0.01	0.07	0.08
3	1900-1910	0.04	0.64	0.68
4	1910-1920	0.62	3.30	3.92
5	1920-1930	0.89	5.96	6.85
6	1930-1940	1.66	11.07	12.73
7	1940-1945	3.25	15.85	19.10
8	1945-1950	4.18	16.93	21.11
9	1950-1961	5.11	18.02	23.13
10	1961-1965	6.86	18.99	25.85
11	1965-1970	9.79	23.48	33.27
12	1970-1980	12.67	25.38	38.05
13	1980-1985	20.44	30.62	51.06
14	1985-1990	22.84	31.13	53.97
15	1990-2000	30.34	33.52	63.86

[1] Kenosha, Milwaukee, Ozaukee, Racine, Walworth, Washington, and Waukesha Counties.
[2] High-capacity municipal and industrial wells excluding private residential wells.
[3] Unlithified deposits and Silurian aquifers.
[4] Sinnipee Group dolomite and deep sandstone aquifer.

For 623 out of 794 nearfield wells, complete data (pumping rates, open interval elevations, and locations) were available through the USGS and WGNHS databases. The remaining 171 wells from the USGS regional groundwater flow model of the Chicago-Milwaukee area (Young and others, 1988) had pumping records up to 1985 and known locations but no information on their open or screened elevations. Pumping from these wells was assumed to be in the upper part of the deep sandstone aquifer, which is consistent with well construction patterns for the time period 1864 to 1980.

Also included in the model pumping database are the withdrawals from the Milwaukee Metropolitan Sewerage District (MMSD) Deep Tunnel that, since its construction in the early 1990s, intercepts groundwater in the Silurian dolomite underneath Milwaukee County. The withdrawal rate of 2.8 mgd (Rust/Harza, 2002) is applied in the appropriate locations for the 1990-2000 model pumping period.

The pattern of groundwater pumping in the seven-county SEWRPC region has changed over time (Figure 3). Although the deep part of the groundwater system still supplies a majority of the groundwater pumped, use of the shallow part of the flow system is increasing at a similar rate (Figure 3a). A correlation between population increase and groundwater use over time (Figure 3b) were used to implement pumping scenarios in the model based on predicted population growth.

Milwaukee County was the largest consumer of groundwater in the mid-20th century (Figure 4), but today uses relatively little groundwater. Groundwater use from high-capacity wells peaked in Milwaukee County in the 1940s at 12 mgd and then steadily decreased due to increased reliance on water from Lake Michigan. This change was driven by head decreases in the deep sandstone aquifer, as well as lack of capacity and increased susceptibility to contamination in the shallow aquifers.

Waukesha County became the largest consumer of groundwater in the 1960s (Figure 4), and now accounts for more than one-half (36 mgd) of all groundwater withdrawn from the aquifers by high capacity wells in the SEWRPC region. In Waukesha, use of shallow aquifers (Figure 4) was negligible up to the 1960s, but it has since increased so that today approximately one third of total pumpage is from the shallow aquifers. Washington and Ozaukee counties are still mostly dependent on the shallow aquifers. Racine County is more dependent on the deep sandstone aquifer, and Walworth County relies equally on shallow and deep wells. Washington, Ozaukee, Racine, and Walworth counties all use similar amounts of water (5-10 mgd). The amount of groundwater withdrawn in 2000 by Milwaukee and Kenosha Counties is negligible (<1 mgd) when compared to the five other SEWRPC counties.



Figure 3a. **Pumping rates for the entire 7-county SEWRPC region: Shallow and deep high-capacity rates.**



Figure 3b. **Pumping rates for the entire 7-county SEWRPC region: Comparison of high-capacity pumping and population trends.**



Figure 4. Shallow and deep high-capacity pumping rates by county for the model nearfield. *The vertical and horizontal scales are the same for all inset graphs but the limits of the vertical scales have been extended for Waukesha, Milwaukee, Jefferson, and Rock counties. Milwaukee and Kenosha Counties is negligible (<1 mgd) when compared to the five other SEWRPC counties.*

Water use from high-capacity wells in the three counties to the west of the SEWRPC region is also shown in Figure 4. The total groundwater usage rate in Rock County is nearly as large as that used in Waukesha County except that most groundwater in Rock County is withdrawn from thick sand bodies in the sand-and-gravel aquifer near the Rock River. Both Dodge and Jefferson Counties use the deep sandstone aquifer to supply most of their groundwater needs.

In general the regional model does not account for pumping from private residential wells. In most cases domestic wells pump only small amounts of water, and where septic systems are used in unsewered areas they return most of the pumped water to the shallow part of the flow system. There is one area of the model, however, where the presence of a shallow cone of depression owing to pumping from private residential wells requires special input. In southern Ozaukee County over the approximately 60 square-mile area within the boundaries of the town of Mequon, considerable private pumping occurs from the Silurian Group dolomite in sewered areas where ultimately discharge is to surface water rather than to groundwater (see Figure 18). This community, unlike other municipalities along Lake Michigan, relies on groundwater rather than surface water for public supply.

Estimated total pumping in the seven-county region is currently 93 mgd (Ellefson and others, 1997). The flow model withdraws about 64 mgd from municipal and non-municipal wells in this area for the 1990-2000 period (Table 2). An additional 3 mgd in 2000 is attributable to private wells in the city of Mequon. The difference between estimated pumping and simulated pumping occurs because most domestic wells were not simulated. In unsewered areas, private residential pumpage returns as recharge to shallow groundwater via septic systems, and does not represent a net loss to the groundwater system. For 1979, private residential pumpage was estimated to be 23% of total withdrawals (Lawrence and Ellefson, 1982). Most of this pumpage is in unsewered areas, but the exact distribution is not known. Assuming that 8 in10 private residential wells are linked to septic systems about 18% of total withdrawals would then be private residential wells in unsewered areas. That leaves about 82% of total pumping from wells (93 mgd) that does not return flow to the groundwater. Under this assumption, the model should account for about 76 mgd in 2000 rather than nearly 67 mgd. The apparent shortfall is partly due to industrial pumping for which records are unavailable, particularly in Milwaukee County. However, the actual shortfall might not be as large as 9 mgd if the ratio of private residential pumping to total pumping has grown over time with the increased pace of residential development, especially in Waukesha, Washington and Walworth counties.

4. Conceptualization of the Groundwater System

For simulation of groundwater flow, a conceptual model of the system is essential because it forms the basis for numerical model development. A conceptual model is a necessary simplification of the natural system because inclusion of all the complexities of the natural system into a computer model is not feasible. Steps in the development of the conceptual model are:

1) definition of aquifers and aquitards,
2) identification of shallow and deep parts of the flow system,
3) identification of sources and sinks, and
4) identification and delineation of hydrologic boundaries encompassing the area of interest.

Aquifers and Aquitards

The bedrock hydrostratigraphy of southeastern Wisconsin (Eaton and others, 1999) consists of Paleozoic sedimentary units generally thickening to the east. In most places, Pleistocene deposits of till, sand and gravel, or lake sediment cover the bedrock units making bedrock outcrops rare. The basic framework of the hydrostratigraphy is presented in Figure 2. The deep sandstone aquifer, corresponding to Cambrian-Ordovician units, rests on the Precambrian crystalline basement rocks which transmit little water and form the bottom boundary to the aquifer system. In ascending order, the major water-producing units of the deep part of the flow system are sandstones of the Mt. Simon Formation, the Wonewoc Formation and the St. Peter Formation.

Between the Mt. Simon Formation and the Wonewoc Formation lies the Eau Claire Formation, composed of shale and sandstone. A laterally extensive shaly zone within the Eau Claire Formation forms an important aquitard, the Eau Claire aquitard, over much of southern Wisconsin. Rocks of the Trempealeau and Tunnel City Groups, between the Wonewoc and St. Peter Formations, also form a leaky aquitard made up of interbedded sandstone, shale, siltstone and dolomite. Overlying the St. Peter Formation, dolomite of the Sinnipee Group and shale of the Maquoketa Formation together make up a major regional aquitard between deep and shallow aquifers. The Sinnipee Group dolomite at the top of the deep part of the flow system was of particular interest in our hydrostratigraphic conceptualization because its hydraulic properties depend on whether it is overlain by the Maquoketa shale. Where the Maquoketa is present, the Sinnipee Group dolomite acts as an aquitard that limits flow to the underlying deep sandstone aquifer. Where the Maquoketa is absent, the Sinnipee dolomite, constituting the uppermost bedrock unit, is highly weathered, relatively permeable, and is considered an aquifer (Figure 2). Deep wells are generally cased through the Maquoketa shale and open from the Sinnipee Group dolomite to the St. Peter sandstone or lower in the deep part of the flow system. Overlying the Maquoketa shale are shallow aquifers. The Silurian aquifer (predominately dolomite) and the sand-and-gravel aquifer (outwash and alluvial sediments interbedded with till and lacustrine deposits) constitute important shallow sources of public and domestic water supply. The Silurian dolomite and sand-and-gravel aquifers are within the shallow part of the flow system.

The Mt. Simon Formation, which is absent to very thin in parts of Washington County and thickens to over 1,500 ft in northeastern Illinois, dominates the three-dimensional geometry of the deep sandstone aquifer in the study area. Much of this thickening occurs abruptly along a southwest-northeast fault zone across Waukesha County. This feature is commonly called the Waukesha Fault zone, but its geometry and characteristics are poorly understood. In the thickened section of the Mt. Simon, geophysical logs suggest the presence of a fine-grained interval that occurs between about 500 ft and 800 ft below the top of the unit over much of southeastern Wisconsin. The overlying Eau Claire Formation, the Wonewoc Formation, and the Trempealeau-Tunnel City Groups are thin (less than 200 ft thick), relatively planar, and not continuous throughout the study area. In contrast, the St. Peter Formation varies in thickness but is generally continuous. Eaton and others (1999) mapped contact surfaces between the individual formations in southeastern Wisconsin using the subsurface well database at WGNHS. Some of the minor formations in the stratigraphic column (Figure 2a) are thin and discontinuous across the study area. Relatively few well logs suggest the presence of the Devonian or Prairie du Chien Groups, or individual formations of the Trempealeau Group. For the purposes of this SEWRPC model, these units are lumped with the Silurian Group dolomite, the St. Peter Formation, or the Trempealeau-Tunnel City Groups, respectively.

All southeastern Wisconsin sedimentary rocks dip gently to the east and south, and erosion at the bedrock surface has truncated the uppermost units so that the Maquoketa Formation and overlying rocks are only present in the eastern part of the study area. Unlithified Pleistocene materials blanket these rocks at thicknesses of less than 25 ft to over 400 ft in areas where the bedrock surface is incised. Well logs were used to map areas where the glacial material is greater than 200 ft thick (Figure 5). These buried valleys cut down through the shallowest bedrock: the Silurian-Devonian dolomite, the Maquoketa shale and the Sinnipee Group dolomite. Where the Sinnipee Group dolomite is the uppermost bedrock unit in the west, it forms an upper aquifer in the deep part of the flow system Unlithified Pleistocene materials can form aquifers in areas where they are sufficiently thick and dominated by sand and gravel, but are aquitards near Lake Michigan where they are primarily clays and silts.

The buried bedrock valleys are potential sources of recharge to the deep part of the flow system because they form flowpaths for shallow groundwater to move to the Sinnipee Group dolomite and the top of the deep sandstone aquifer with little or no resistance from intervening bedrock units. West-east (Figure 6) and south-north (Figure 7) cross sections near the city of Waukesha show hydrostratigraphy and intersect bedrock valleys. The deep sandstone units (especially the Mt. Simon) thicken east of the Waukesha fault (Figure 6). The sandstone sequence also thickens toward the Illinois Basin (Figure 7).

The Waukesha fault zone is not explicitly included in the model. Exploratory simulations indicated that inserting either a high or low permeability band across the vertical extent of the fault zone trace had a very small influence on model results at the regional scale, and therefore, the fault was not represented by a distinct hydraulic conductivity zone in the model. However, the fault is implicitly present to the degree that it marks a boundary across which appreciable thickening of units (especially the Mt. Simon sandstone) occurs on the downthrown, or eastern, side.



Figure 5. Bedrock valleys in the nearfield. *Bedrock valleys (orange areas) contain more than 200 feet of unlithified material.*





EXPLANATION

- Unlithified (Pleistocene including bedrock valleys)
- Carbonate (Silurian or Sinnipee)
- Shale (Maquoketa)
- Sandstones (St. Peter, Wonewoc, Mt Simon)
- Silty sandstones (Trempealeau/Tunnel City, Eau Claire)
- Precambrian Crystalline Bedrock

Figure 6. Hydrostratigraphy by model layer along east-west section (model row 120). *Trace of section A-A' shown on Figure 1.*
Figure 7. Hydrostratigraphy by model layer along north-south section (model column 87). *Trace of section B-B' shown on Figure 1.*

Shallow and Deep Parts of the Groundwater Flow System

Groundwater can move anywhere in the flow system bounded at the top by the water table and the bottom by the Precambrian crystalline bedrock basement. However, wells are often constructed to specifically pump water from one part of the system. The deep part of the flow system extends from the Precambrian basement to the bottom of the Maquoketa shale and incorporates the deep sandstone aquifer and the Sinnipee Group dolomites. The shallow part of the flow system extends from the top of the Maquoketa shale to the water table and incorporates the Silurian Group dolomite and unlithified deposits. Deep wells are open to units located below the Maquoketa shale, while shallow wells are open to units above the shale. Downward flow between the shallow and deep parts of the flow system, called leakage, is enhanced where the Maquoketa shale is absent, but it also occurs to a lesser extent where the Maquoketa is present under both natural and pumping conditions.

Sources and Sinks

Recharge at the water table is the most important source of water for the groundwater system in southeastern Wisconsin. Some water currently circulating in the groundwater system originated as recent recharge, other parts of the groundwater system contain water that was recharged hundreds or even thousands of years ago. Surface-water bodies such as streams, lakes and wetlands are a second potential source for groundwater, especially when they are in the vicinity of pumping wells. The recharge rate at the land surface varies spatially and depends on factors such as the soil type, the depth to water table, the land slope, and the land cover.

Most of the recharge that reaches the water table circulates as groundwater along shallow flow paths back to the land surface where it discharges as baseflow to streams, lakes, seeps, springs and wetlands. Wells also can function as sinks for groundwater flow. Shallow wells capture some groundwater that would have otherwise discharged to surface-water bodies. Another portion descends to the deep part of the flow system where it follows relatively long flow paths that commonly terminate at deep pumping wells or at regional discharge points beyond the Lake Michigan shoreline. In general, Lake Michigan serves as a regional sink for shallow and deep groundwater, but it can serve as a source for wells or other features such as the MMSD Deep Tunnel underlying Milwaukee.

Boundary Conditions

Boundary conditions represent hydraulic heads or groundwater fluxes at the edges of the model domain or at the intersection of the groundwater system with other systems. The edge of the farfield, equivalent to the edge of the entire model domain (Figure 8), is treated everywhere as a no-flow boundary. Within most of the farfield, the water-table heads at the top of the groundwater system are fixed (Figure 8). These constant head boundary nodes provide a source of water to the farfield region of the model. Previous groundwater studies (Mandle and Kontis, 1992) provide adequate information to define these farfield boundary heads. The inner portion of the farfield defines a region where water-table heads are fixed in the model only along major rivers (Figure 8). This transition zone allows the model to more realistically simulate water level changes with time at the edge of the nearfield.

In the nearfield, the water table is free to fluctuate in response to the interaction of local recharge, water bodies, subsurface properties, and pumping. Internal nearfield boundaries for the groundwater system include lakes, streams, and wetlands (Figure 9). Lake Michigan represents a regional head-dependent boundary (occupying “General Head” cells) set at the long-term low-water datum lake-level average of 577 feet above mean sea level (US Environmental Protection Agency, 2003). Important surface-water features such as the Milwaukee, Menomonee, Root, Rock, and Fox Rivers, their major tributaries, and major lakes are represented by a boundary type that can receive water from or supply water to the subsurface (“River” cells), while minor features such as headwaters of streams, wetlands, ponds, seeps, and agricultural drains are represented by a boundary type that can only receive water (“Drain” cells). More detail on the role of surface-water bodies in the model is provided in Feinstein et al, 2003. High-capacity pumping wells constitute a final internal boundary type in both the model nearfield and model farfield.



Figure 8. **Boundary conditions in model farfield.** *Model boundary conditions conform to grid discretization, which is coarse on the eastern side of Lake Michigan.*



Figure 9. Represe*ntation of surface water in model nearfield.
Model River cells are 19.5 percent of the nearfield.
Model Drain cells are 30.2 percent of the nearfield.
White areas have no surface-water boundary conditions.

5. Hydraulic Properties of the Groundwater Flow System

Recharge

The most important source of water to the groundwater in southeastern Wisconsin is recharge at the water table. The regional numerical model uses recharge rates estimated from stream baseflow for watersheds in southeastern Wisconsin (Cherkauer, 2001). Combining baseflow separation techniques in small watersheds with a regression technique, Cherkauer (2001) estimated lumped recharge rates for hydrologic basins throughout the seven-county SEWRPC region. This derived pattern of recharge was used in the study area (Figure 10). For the western part of the nearfield that is not covered by the recharge studies, recharge is assigned a single value equal to the average Southeastern Wisconsin rate of 4.5 in/yr.

Hydraulic Conductivity

Development of a regional numerical model requires information on the three-dimensional distribution of hydraulic conductivity across the study area and outlying areas. A summary of initial estimates and calibrated hydraulic conductivity values for all model hydrostratigraphic units is presented in the table in Figure 11. The following discussion describes the process for estimating hydraulic conductivity for three general categories of materials: unlithified materials (sand, silt, and clay); clastic bedrock units (sandstone and siltstone); and carbonate bedrock (dolomite, shale, and limestone).

<u>Unlithified Units</u>

The hydrogeologic properties of unlithified materials are extremely variable and are related to the origin and environment of deposition of the materials. In coordination with a regional shallow groundwater and geologic study (SEWRPC and WGNHS, 2002), new maps were constructed showing the distribution of Pleistocene materials for all counties in southeastern Wisconsin (e.g., Clayton, 2001). These maps illustrate the distribution of shallow Pleistocene materials resulting from different glacial advances and retreats, which deposited coarse sand and gravel (e.g., Kettle Moraine) as well as finer-grained sandy and clay-silt tills. We used data compiled from hydrogeologic testing (Rayne and others 1996, Simpkins 1989, Rodenbeck 1988) to estimate hydraulic conductivity of these sediments, and classified them into three categories: high, moderate, and low horizontal hydraulic conductivity (SEWRPC and WGNHS, 2002). This mapped distribution of estimated horizontal hydraulic conductivity of Pleistocene materials (Figure 12a), developed initially to map groundwater vulnerability (SEWRPC and WGNHS, 2002), was used as input for the uppermost layer representing unlithified materials in the regional flow model.



Figure 10. Recharge rate zonation in model nearfield (from Cherkauer, 2001)

Stratigraphic nomenclature		Initial hydraulic values		Calibrated hydraulic values		Model Structure	Lithology
Group	Formation	Kh (ft/day)	Kv (ft/day)	Kh (ft/day)	Kv (ft/day)		
Quaternary		0.003 - 7	0.001 - 0.1	0.2 - 100	0.005 - 1	Layers 1-2	Sand & gravel, glacial till
Devonian		30	0.03 - 0.1	30	0.03 - 0.1	Layer 4 *	Dolomite
Silurian		1 - 4	0.001 - 0.1	1 - 4	0.001 - 0.1	Layers 5-6	
	Maquoketa	0.0003 - 0.3	0.0001 - 0.001	0.0003 - 0.3	0.000005 - 0.001	Layers 7-8	Shale
Sinnipee	Galena Platteville	0.003 - 0.3	0.0001 - 0.01	0.04 - 0.3	0.0005 - 0.01	Layers 9-10	Dolomite
Ancell	St. Peter	1 - 5	0.001 - 0.1	1.2 - 6	0.0004 - 0.04	Layer 11	Sandstone and dolomite, with interbedded shale and siltstone (leaky aquitards)
Priarie du Chien							
Trempealeau		0.5 - 2	0.0001 - 0.01	0.24 - 2.4	0.00004 - 0.004	Layer 12	
Tunnel city							
Elk Mound	Wonewoc	3 - 7	0.001 - 0.1	2.4 - 8.4	0.0004 - 0.04	Layer 13	
	Eau Clair	0.5 - 2	0.0001 - 0.03	0.6 - 3.6	0.00004 - 0.004	Layer 14	
	Mt. Simon	1 - 5	0.0003 - 0.1	1.2 - 6	0.00012 - 0.04	Layers 15-18	
Precambrian		Not simulated					Metamorphic, igneous

Figure 11. Hydrostratigraphic sequence (after Ostrom, 1962), model layering, and initial and final hydraulic conductivity values assigned to zones within hydrostratigraphic units

* Layer 3 not shown because it represents Pennsylvanian and Mississippian age rocks that are absent in southeastern Wisconsin (but present under Lake Michigan).
** The Sinnipee Group dolomite is an aquitard below the Maquoketa shale and is an aquifer to the west. Where the Maquoketa is present, the upper layer of the Sinnipee Group dolomite is assigned values of Kh=0.04 and Kv=0.0005 ft/day. Where the Maquoketa is absent, the upper layer of the Sinnipee Group dolomite is assigned Kh=0.3 and Kv=0.01 ft/day. For the lower layer of the Sinnipee Group dolomite, Kh and Kv values depend on proximity to the unit's western subcrop.

Hydraulic conductivity of unlithified materials in the deeper parts of buried bedrock valleys is also quite variable (Batten and Conlon, 1993) and was estimated by quantifying the percent of fine-grained material in available well log samples. We estimated vertical hydraulic conductivity (Figure 12b) using a thickness-weighted, harmonic-mean averaging method based on the proportion of fine and coarse material in the Pleistocene section.

We used several different types of analyses to estimate representative values of hydraulic conductivity for each aquifer or aquitard identified in the regional hydrostratigraphy, and to assess the spatial variation of hydraulic conductivity within each unit across southeastern Wisconsin. Many different hydrogeologic investigations have been completed in the bedrock units in southeastern Wisconsin, and data from these studies were compiled into a series of tables and charts (Carlson and Feinstein, 1998).

Deep Sandstone Units

Sandstone-dominated units in southeastern Wisconsin are only found in the deep part of the flow system, and the deep part of the flow system consists primarily of these units. They include relatively pure sandstones (the St. Peter and Wonewoc Formations) and sandstones mixed with siltstone, shale, and dolomite (Trempealeau-Tunnel City Groups, Eau Claire and Mt. Simon Formations). The numerical model incorporates values for multiple horizontal and vertical hydraulic conductivity zones for each of these sandstone units. Several types of analyses were used to estimate their hydraulic conductivity values. First, we calculated an overall estimate of the transmissivity of the deep sandstone aquifer by averaging results of a suite of aquifer tests conducted in southeastern Wisconsin in the early 1950s (Foley and others, 1953). Dividing the average transmissivity by the average thickness of the deep sandstone aquifer (indicated by structure contour maps) yielded an average hydraulic conductivity between 2 and 3 ft/day, which compares favorably not only to the aquifer test by Foley and others (1953), but to the values from later pumping tests and packer tests conducted in southeastern Wisconsin (Nicholas and others, 1987, Young 1992b, Carlson and Feinstein 1998). We then refined the estimate of mean values and ranges of horizontal hydraulic conductivity for each unit in the Cambrian-Ordovician aquifer system from deep well specific-capacity data, using a spreadsheet-based optimization method (Eaton and others, 1999).

These expected values are a good indicator of average hydraulic conductivity for units, but they do not provide information on the spatial heterogeneity within a unit, which is likely a function of the proportion of fine-grained material. We assumed that the hydraulic conductivity of each sandstone formation varies laterally in relation to the percentage of fine-grained material present in the formation. To help quantify the spatial variation, we assembled a fine-material database using hundreds of geologic logs available for the nearfield area. The database includes the elevation of intervals of fine-grained material (silty sandstone, siltstone, shale) in each stratigraphic unit. By plotting the spatial distribution of fine-grained material in each unit, we defined spatial zones where the percentages of fine-grained material were less than, about equal to, or greater than the average for each unit.

Using this zonation, we varied horizontal hydraulic conductivity in inverse proportion to the percentage of fines in each unit. The range of values for each zone preserves both the expected horizontal hydraulic conductivity for each unit and the expected transmissivity for the entire deep sandstone aquifer. The horizontal hydraulic conductivity zonation for a predominately coarse-grained unit, the Wonewoc Formation is shown in Figure 13a. The zonation for a more fine-grained unit, the Eau Claire Formation is shown in Figure 14a. The values assigned to the zones in each figure have been adjusted by the results of the calibration process described in later sections, which indicated that all the values suggested by the above analysis should be increased by a factor equal to 1.2.

No overall estimates of vertical hydraulic conductivity are available for the distinct sandstone units. Using well data on the distribution of fine grained lithologies, we estimated vertical hydraulic conductivity in a similar way as horizontal hydraulic conductivity, except that we calculated a thickness-weighted harmonic mean across coarse and fine-grained intervals. The spatial distribution of values allowed us to define zones that grouped areas of similar vertical hydraulic conductivity for each unit. The zonation of vertical hydraulic conductivity for a predominately coarse-grained unit, the Wonewoc Formation is shown in Figure 13b. The zonation for a more fine-grained unit, the Eau Claire Formation is shown in Figure 14b.

Figures 13 and 14 represent final hydraulic conductivity values after adjustments made as part of the model calibration process. The horizontal hydraulic conductivity values shown in the figures are 1.2 times the initial values derived from the database analysis; the vertical hydraulic conductivity values shown are 0.4 times the initial values.

Where the top of the St Peter sandstone is less than 200 ft from the land surface, the horizontal hydraulic conductivity of the St. Peter Sandstone was assigned a higher value due to weathering, as has been found elsewhere (Runkel and others, 2003). This zone is restricted to the western portions of Jefferson and Dodge counties.



Figure 12. Hydraulic conductivity of unlithified deposits in the nearfield.
a) Horizontal hydraulic conductivity. b) Vertical hydraulic
b) conductivity.



Figure 13. Hydraulic conductivity of Wonewoc Formation in the nearfield. a) Horizontal hydraulic conductivity. b) Vertical hydraulic conductivity.



Figure 14. Hydraulic conductivity of Eau Claire Formation in the nearfield. a) Horizontal hydraulic conductivity. b) Vertical hydraulic conductivity.

Carbonate Bedrock Units

For carbonate-dominated formations such as dolomite of the Sinnipee Group, the Maquoketa shale and the Silurian Group dolomite, the distribution of hydraulic conductivity is related to both the distribution of fine-grained lithologies, and to weathering and the development of fractures. For instance, numerous investigators have reported considerably higher vertical and horizontal hydraulic conductivity values in a weathered zone near the bedrock surface (e.g., Carlson 2000, Stocks 1998) or in zones of bedding-plane (Eaton 2002, Muldoon and others 2001) and vertical fractures (Jansen 1995). A recent re-evaluation of the hydrogeologic attributes of similar Paleozoic strata based on more extensive field data in Minnesota (Runkel and others, 2003) emphasizes the importance of fracture porosity in regional hydrostratigraphy.

The spatial distribution of hydraulic properties in carbonate rocks in southeastern Wisconsin assumes that fractures and dissolution enhance hydraulic conductivity wherever these units constitute the uppermost bedrock formations. The upper 20 ft of the Silurian Group dolomite is considered to have a relatively higher hydraulic conductivity due to weathering (Rovey 1990). A similar weathered high-conductivity zone was mapped in the Sinnipee Group dolomite where it subcrops below unlithified material. In addition, research at field sites in Waukesha County and northern Illinois suggests that the hydraulic conductivity of carbonates is enhanced in proximity to glacial bedrock valleys even at depths greater than 20 ft because of weathering (Eaton 2002, Mills and others, 1998). Zones of enhanced vertical hydraulic conductivity are especially important for controlling the downward leakage from the shallow to the deep parts of the flow system. The estimated extent of such zones of high vertical hydraulic conductivity within the upper parts of the Maquoketa shale and Sinnipee Group dolomite is shown in Figure 15.

Vertical hydraulic conductivity of the Maquoketa shale and Sinnipee Group dolomite were not evaluated on the basis of grain size, but rather through the calibration process discussed in later sections of this report. The joint calibration of the steady state and transient simulations proved very sensitive to the vertical hydraulic conductivity of the shale, and allowed it to be quantified with relative precision.



Figure 15. Vertical hydraulic conductivity in the nearfield.
a) upper layer of Maquoketa shale. b) upper layer of Sinnipee Group dolomite.

Streambed and Lakebed Leakance

The combined effect of hydraulic conductivity and thickness of streambeds and lakebeds controls water movement between groundwater and surface-water features. This effect, called leakance, is expressed as vertical hydraulic conductivity divided by thickness. Field estimates of leakance for the water bodies in southeastern Wisconsin are not available. However, if typical riverbeds are assumed to be several feet thick, riverbed leakances cluster around values of 0.1 to 10 ft/day/ft (Calver, 2001).

In Dane County, Wisconsin, measured riverbed leakances ranged between 1.6 ft/day/ft and 37 ft/day/ft (Krohelski and others, 2000). The value selected for streambed leakance in the southeastern Wisconsin model was 5 ft/day/ft, a value sufficiently high to allow easy communication between groundwater and surface water. Field studies generally show that water bodies such as lakes and wetlands support appreciably smaller leakances than streambeds, and fine sediment accumulation causes lower hydraulic conductivity in the center portion of lakebeds compared to the perimeter (McBride and Pfannkuch, 1975). In line with these field results the model leakance value for lakes are lower than that assigned to streambeds. The value for the outer nodes representing the perimeter of a lake or wetland was set to 0.5 ft/day/ft and the value for inner nodes was set to 0.05 ft/day/ft.

Exchange between groundwater and surface water is also proportional to the width and length of the surface-water body. For each model cell, the area of each stream in contact with the groundwater was estimated on the basis of length information available through the GIS database. Stream widths were estimated from a series of reports on surface-water resources (Ball and others, 1970, Kernen and others, 1965, Poff and others, 1964 and 1968, Poff and Threinen, 1961a, 1961b, 1961c, 1962, 1963, and 1964, Weber and others 1968, 1969).

Storage Parameters

Among the sources of water to pumping wells is elastic storage, that is, storage volume released from compression of bedrock units and expansion of the water in aquifers below the regional Maquoketa aquitard. Additionally, water can come from unconfined storage, which is the drainage of pores in water-table aquifers. Elastic and unconfined storage are both important the aquifers of southeastern Wisconsin.

A series of aquifer tests performed in the 1950s on the deep sandstone aquifer in Milwaukee and Waukesha Counties yielded storage coefficients averaging 0.00039 with a small spread among tests (Foley and others, 1953). The deep aquifer system, including all sandstone, shale, and dolomite layers, has an average thickness of 1500 ft in the areas where the tests were performed, and the specific storage corresponding to the average storage coefficient is 2.6e-7 ft^{-1}. This value was applied to all model units to represent the capacity to release water by elastic storage in the presence of drawdown from pumping.

Whenever pumping produces a decline in the water table, water is released from unconfined storage. To account for this source of water, a specific yield equal to 0.15 was assigned to all the unlithified deposits in the model. This value is an estimated average specific yield for the sand, silt, and clay deposits that constitute the glacial and alluvial deposits (Anderson and Woessner, 1992). To account for the case where dewatering and unconfined conditions could occur in the Silurian, Maquoketa, or Sinnipee units, a specific yield equal to 0.01 was assigned to these carbonate units. This value reflects the predominance of fracture flow in the carbonates. Unconfined conditions can occur in the Silurian Group dolomite where overlying unlithified material is almost or completely absent. It is possible that it can also occur in the deeper Maquoketa or Sinnipee units near the center of the pumping cone of depression where drawdown is greatest. Finally, a specific yield equal to 0.05 was assigned to the units in the Cambrian-Ordovician system below the Sinnipee Group dolomite. This relatively low value for sedimentary aquifers reflects the combination of fracture and porous-medium flow in these units. Dewatering of the sandstone units is only likely to occur in the western portion of the nearfield where the St. Peter sandstone is near the surface and potentially under unconfined conditions.

6. Numerical Model Construction

The steps involved in developing the three-dimensional numerical model were:

1. construction of the finite-difference grid with model layers corresponding to the regional hydrostratigraphic units;
2. input of horizontal and vertical hydraulic conductivities based on data analysis;
3. input of boundary conditions that control surface-water/groundwater interactions;
4. initial calibration of the predevelopment steady-state model to predevelopment water levels and fluxes;
5. input of storage parameters for the transient model;
6. input of pumping wells with their locations and pumping rates into the transient model;
7. calibration of the transient model by matching measured water levels over time to simulated values, then iterating between the predevelopment and transient models to arrive at a common parameter set.

This section of the report discusses numerical model construction. Section 7 of this report discusses model calibration.

We developed the steady state model first. This model simulates flow in the shallow and deep parts of the groundwater system before the system was first stressed by pumping wells around 1864. Prior to developing the more complicated transient model, the steady-state model provided a preliminary understanding of the predevelopment flow system, and allowed us to eliminate numerical instabilities that arise when modeling large complex systems. The heads calculated by the steady-state model represent the estimated head distribution in 1864 and so are used for the initial heads of the transient model. The transient model simulates groundwater flow from the end of the predevelopment time in 1864 until the year 2000. We assume that the physical system represented by the transient model is identical to that represented by the steady state model with the exception of pumping wells. To model transient flow, specific storage and specific yield estimates were added to the steady state input parameters. The pumping rates discussed in Section

3 were discretized into 15 stress periods (Table 2) ranging in length from 5 years to 20 years for a total of 136 years.

Grid and Layering

The entire model domain is shown in Figure 8. The model consists of 205 rows, 166 columns, and 18 layers, totaling 34,030 cells per layer and about 600,000 cells in the entire model. The grid is aligned with the north-south and east-west Wisconsin Transverse Mercator (WTM) coordinate axes in feet. The X- and Y-grid spacing within most of the seven-county SEWRPC region is set to a constant value of 2500 ft. This spacing rapidly increases using an expanding mesh outside the nearfield to a maximum of almost 20 miles at the outer edges of the model domain.

In contrast to previous flow models for this region, this model is fully three-dimensional. The model simulates individual hydrostratigraphic units, both aquifers and aquitards, by either a single model layer or a series of model layers. Due to non-deposition or erosion some of the hydrostratigraphic units are not continuous across the model domain. However, the numerical code used to simulate the flow system, MODFLOW, requires that all layers be present over the entire model domain. Therefore, special provision was made for the model layers where the corresponding hydrostratigraphic units are in fact not present. Using a layer thickness of 1 foot, a high vertical hydraulic conductivity and a low horizontal hydraulic conductivity, these thin model layers are effectively transparent to regional groundwater flow. While they maintain the horizontal head distribution and prevent horizontal flow, thin layers do not obstruct vertical flow. These property distributions in thin layers enable the finite-difference grid structure to accommodate regional flow despite the discontinuous hydrostratigraphy.

Several hydrostratigraphic units are represented by multiple layers in the groundwater model. Because MODFLOW calculates a single value of hydraulic head for each node in a model layer, individual model cells in a layer have no vertical variation in head. However, due to pumping, there are significant vertical head gradients within some hydrostratigraphic units. Representing a hydrostratigraphic unit with several layers allows us to model the vertical head distribution within a single hydrostratigraphic unit. For example, we use four model layers to represent the complex head distribution in the Mt. Simon Formation.

Multiple layers are also used to represent variation in hydraulic properties within a hydrostratigraphic unit. For example, the weathered and fractured upper portions of the carbonate units in the Sinnipee Group dolomite and Silurian Group dolomite aquifer constitute a layer above the unweathered and more competent portions of these units.

Parameter Zonation

The hydraulic conductivity analyses discussed in Section 5 were used to create the input files for the model distribution of horizontal and vertical hydraulic conductivities for the nearfield. The farfield vertical and horizontal hydraulic conductivities were adapted from the previous regional model (Young and others 1988). To represent hydrostratigraphic units and their variation, there are a total of 62 individual horizontal hydraulic conductivity zones and 66 vertical hydraulic conductivity zones. The aquifer storage properties were also zoned but more coarsely. Fewer data were available and the variation of specific storage is much less than that of hydraulic conductivity.

Each hydrostratigraphic unit has several conductivity zones within it to represent the variation of hydraulic conductivity. That variation might be due to weathering, as is the case for the change in vertical hydraulic conductivity in the Sinnipee Group dolomite from 0.01 ft/day in the weathered portion to 0.0005 ft/day in the unweathered portion of this unit (Figure 15b). Hydraulic conductivity zonation changes due to relatively minor lithologic variation in the unit are also included. The horizontal hydraulic conductivity of the Eau Claire Formation increases from 0.6 ft/day in the southern nearfield to 2.4 ft/day in the northern nearfield (Figure 14a). This change represents a slight variation in this unit caused by a higher percentage of fines in the south grading to a lower percentage in the north.

The distribution of storage and specific yield values in the model is less complex than the distribution of hydraulic conductivity. As discussed section 5 of this report, the specific storage is set constant for all the units at a value of $2.6x10^{-7}$ ft^{-1}; it is multiplied by layer thickness in each cell to yield the cell storage coefficient that is input to MODFLOW. The specific yield, the value of storage used in case a model layer becomes unconfined, varies from 0.15 in the unlithified deposits (both sand and till) to 0.05 in the sandstone units to 0.01 in the carbonate units.

A very low specific yield, equal to the specific storage ($2.6x10^{-7}$ ft^{-1}), was assigned to the upper layer of the Sinnipee Group dolomite, model layer 9. This zone was inserted to keep the model from exaggerating the extent of deep unsaturated conditions in the presence of strong vertical gradients. This change is discussed in more detail in a companion report dedicated to model results (Feinstein and others, 2005).

Representation of Surface Water

Surface waters interact with and are connected to groundwater. Multiple MODFLOW packages have been developed to represent the interaction between groundwater and distinct types of water bodies. Packages are modules within the MODFLOW groundwater flow program that control input and output for various aspects of the model such as internal boundary conditions. This model of southeastern Wisconsin uses the General Head Boundary Package, the River Package, and the Drain Package to model various surface-water bodies within the nearfield. The nearfield surface-water boundary conditions are shown in Figure 9.

The larger streams and lakes in the nearfield are simulated using the River Package. The streams are routed, that is, the stage elevations of the river cells decrease in all cases as one moves downstream. The interaction between the water bodies and groundwater is controlled by 1) the gradient between the stream or lake-stage elevation and the groundwater elevation, 2) the area of the streambed or lakebed in the model cell, and 3) the streambed or lakebed leakance term (equal to the vertical hydraulic conductivity of the bed divided by its thickness). In this model, the streambed conductance is set large but in agreement with previous estimates of streambed conductance (Krohelski and others, 2000), so that the stream elevations are very nearly equal to the groundwater elevations. This condition is to be expected for the major surface-water bodies. The lakebed leakances are assigned so that most of the exchange with groundwater occurs along the lake perimeter. The river cells representing major streams and lakes constitute 19.5% of the nearfield water-table cells (Figure 9). In areas immediately adjacent to the model nearfield, simulated water bodies correspond to the major streams identified on USGS 7.5 minute quadrangle maps. This portion of the model is called the inner farfield and is identified in Figure 8. In the remainder of the model, called the outer farfield, water bodies are not explicitly simulated.

Lake Michigan is simulated as a general head boundary. The General Head Boundary Package uses an algorithm similar to the River Package to simulate the connection between surface water and the groundwater. The elevation of Lake Michigan was set to a uniform stage of 577 feet (close to long-term average as well as 2003 conditions). The conductance term was set very high so that there is negligible resistance across its bed, and as a result the adjacent simulated groundwater elevation is nearly equal to the stage of Lake Michigan. The use of a separate MODFLOW package for Lake Michigan facilitates the analysis of its influence on the model mass balance.

Initial calibration of the steady state model showed that unreasonably high hydraulic conductivities of unlithified materials were required for model mass balance. As a result small surface-water features could not be represented in the model using the River Package, and aquifers in the model were forced to carry water that would, in reality, discharge to surface water. To correct this deficiency, we used the Drain Package to simulate discharge to the smaller hydrologic features, amounting to 30.2% of nearfield water-table cells (Figure 9). Discharge to these drains together with discharge to surface-water bodies in river cells were compared to observed discharge at selected locations to aid model calibration.

Representation of Pumping History

The pumping rates in high-capacity wells and Mequon private wells are the only time-varying boundary conditions in the model. Groundwater withdrawal from pumping wells represents the largest change in stresses to the actual groundwater flow system over the time period of the transient model from 1864 to 2000. The other boundary conditions are assumed to be constant over time. The pattern of recharge and the surface-water stages are assumed to have not changed from the time of the predevelopment model in 1864 to the last stress period of the transient model in 2000. However, the model automatically updates the flows into and out of the nearfield as a function of the nearfield and farfield pumping through time.

Given the concentration of pumping in Mequon, the loss of the water from the groundwater system, and the possibility that the drawdown cone influences groundwater exchange with Lake Michigan, a set of calculations was performed to estimate the spatial distribution of discharge from hundreds of private residential wells across approximately 60 township-and-range sections. The calculation correlated pumping with census population numbers by section for Mequon in 1970, 1980, 1990, and 2000. A total of 285 model cells cover the area of concern for any model layer. A single fictional well was placed at the center of each 2500 ft by 2500 ft cell to account for all the pumping in the township-and-range sections included within the cell. The fictional well only withdraws water from model layer 5, which represents most of the thickness of the Silurian aquifer in southern Ozaukee County.

The population in Mequon, a suburb north of Milwaukee, was small before 1960 and then increased for each successive decade. The well discharge at a model cell at a time corresponding to the end of a model stress period was equated with the number of people within the cell multiplied by 120 gallons per day per person. This value was selected through a calibration process in which the regional model was used to simulate the spread of the Mequon cone of depression. The model results agreed well with both the extent and depth of the drawdown cone for 2000 and the drawdown trends between 1960 and 2000 at 10 observation wells spread over the town. The average pumping rate for a model cell incorporates not only water withdrawn for household use, but also water fed to fountains, golf courses, and some small industries. The total calculated discharge rate for Mequon based on the value of 120 gallons per day per person was 1.8 mgd for 1960-70, 2.4 mgd for 1970-80, 2.7 mgd for 1980-90, and 3.0 mgd for 1990-2000. These rates, which are added to the values for high-capacity wells shown in Table 2, are high enough to induce some shallow flow from Lake Michigan across the coastline toward the west.

The 794 nearfield and 508 farfield pumping wells along with the Mequon private wells were simulated by the MODFLOW Well Package. For wells that cross multiple model layers, the total discharge in the well is distributed across the layers as a function of their individual transmissivities.

Model Assumptions and Limitations

Construction of a regional flow model on the scale described here requires the adoption of some important simplifying assumptions and limitations, as follows:

- The finest resolution of the regional model is the area of the smallest grid cell. The smallest grid cell size is 2500 ft (~0.5 miles) on a side in the nearfield area. Aquifer and aquitard properties are assumed to be homogeneous within grid cells even though, in reality, much smaller-scale heterogeneity is present. This regional-scale flow model provides a framework for more detailed inset models that will be better able to simulate smaller scale flow.

- The focus of this regional scale groundwater flow model is the seven-county area of southeastern Wisconsin. The actual boundaries of the flow model extend far into Michigan and Illinois, but model data outside the area of southeastern Wisconsin is intended solely to provide appropriate flow boundary conditions to the nearfield area of focus. Therefore, the representation of the far field is much coarser than the near field and no far field results are presented in this report.

- The model assumes steady-state flow in the late 1800s prior to the beginning of extensive pumping in the deep sandstone aquifer. An initial steady-state flow field is required for simulating the transient effects of pumping in the 20th century, and this assumption controls the minimum allowable hydraulic conductivity of the Maquoketa aquitard. Field measurements (Eaton, 2002) suggest that vertical hydraulic conductivity of the Maquoketa aquitard may be lower than values used in this model. Further work is needed to investigate possible transient flow in the deep part of the flow system induced by the ice retreat following Pleistocene glaciation in southeastern Wisconsin.

- The model ignores pumping from most shallow domestic wells. We have neglected domestic pumping, representing on the order of one quarter of the total pumping in the region, because most domestic wells are installed in unsewered areas where the water comes from the shallow flow system and is then returned to the shallow flow system via septic systems. There are however some sewered areas with appreciable domestic pumping. Most notable is the community of Mequon in southern Ozaukee County, where there is a net loss of water to the shallow groundwater system adjacent to Lake Michigan. As discussed in section 3 (water use), special provision was made to estimate pumping within Mequon from the Silurian Group dolomite at different times on the basis of population. In other sewered areas with clusters of private residential wells that tap the Silurian Group dolomite (for example, pockets of eastern Waukesha), the model almost certainly underestimates shallow drawdown. However, the error should be limited to the simulation of local cones of depression in the Silurian Group dolomite, and should have no effect on the drawdown pattern in the deep part of the flow system.

- The eastern boundary of the model domain is a no-flow condition that runs from north to south across the middle of the state of Michigan. However, the exact location of a boundary separating regional groundwater flow systems is unknown. It is possible that under both natural and pumping conditions there is a deep groundwater divide under the state which separates groundwater flow moving west toward Lake Michigan from groundwater flow moving east toward the Michigan Basin. We tested the effect of this boundary by performing a trial simulation in which the no-flow condition was changed from the middle of the state to the eastern coastline of Lake Michigan. The influence on simulated water levels was very small. Therefore, it appears that our uncertainty about the true location of the eastern flow boundary is not an important limitation on the reliability of the model.

- The many active and abandoned deep wells open to both the shallow Silurian Group dolomite aquifer and the deep sandstone aquifer represent important vertical conduits for flow (Foley and others, 1953). We have not attempted to insert these pathways into the model. The calibrated vertical conductivity values of aquitards such as the Maquoketa Shale possibly reflect the regional distribution of these pathways by increasing the effective vertical hydraulic conductivity needed to match transient flow conditions. However, further research is needed to better evaluate how the development of these pathways influences the movement of water between the shallow and deep parts of the flow system.

- The model uses constant recharge rates for the entire period between 1864 and 2000. While it is likely that rates have changed over that time, it is impossible to unravel the competing effects of urbanization and climate variability in such a way to determine if rates have decreased or increased in any given area.

7. Numerical Model Calibration

Numerical groundwater flow models are calibrated by varying input parameters over physically reasonable ranges until the model output approximates observed target values to an acceptable degree. We conducted sensitivity analyses to determine which parameters or groups of parameters had the greatest control on stream flows and hydraulic heads (called water-level targets in following paragraphs) and thus on the target values. The results of the sensitivity analysis guided the choice of parameter values within the framework of our conceptual model until the best match was found between the simulated values and observations.

The steady state model was calibrated first. The transient model was then developed from that initially calibrated version. Both the steady state and transient models were calibrated by iterating between them until a common parameter set yielded an acceptable match to the target heads and base flows for the predevelopment and transient times. During these calibration runs, a total mass balance with less than 1% error was maintained.

Steady-state Predevelopment Calibration

The steady-state model simulation was matched against water-level targets distributed over both the shallow and deep parts of the flow system. The match was evaluated graphically and statistically.

Water-Level Targets

Target values for calibration of the model simulation to predevelopment conditions were derived from several sources. Forty-eight target heads for the water table in the SEWRPC counties were chosen from the water-table map (SEWRPC and WGNHS, 2002) to correspond to upland areas between surface-water bodies. Location in upland areas maximizes the sensitivity of the targets to model hydraulic conductivity and recharge values. If the targets were located adjacent to a surface-water body, their usefulness would be limited because the head in that cell would be constrained principally by the elevation of the surface water. An additional 25 head targets were taken from water table maps for Dodge and Jefferson Counties and water-table well measurements in Rock County. We assumed that the water-table elevation has not changed appreciably since predevelopment. Twenty-eight target values for head in the deep sandstone aquifer within the model nearfield were chosen from a contour plot of predevelopment heads presented in Young and others (1988). An additional 19 deep head targets were taken from well data compiled by Weidman and Schultz (1915).

Evaluation of Goodness of Fit

One way to evaluate the quality of the match between simulated and observed water levels is to plot them together on a graph. Figure 16 is a cross plot that compares the observed to simulated water levels at each target location in the steady-state predevelopment model. The closer a symbol is to the diagonal line, the better the fit. The open symbols show the shallow heads while the shaded symbols show the deep sandstone aquifer heads. Overall, the plot indicates good agreement between target values and simulated values.

Another way to evaluate the calibration is through statistics. Table 3 summarizes the goodness of fit by applying statistical measures to the residuals, the differences between the target and simulated water levels. The residual mean, equal to the sum of all the residuals divided by the number of targets, is a measure of whether the model tends to underestimate (positive residual mean) or overestimate (negative residual mean) observed water levels. The small value of -0.12 feet for all targets shows that the model has little overall bias. However, when the deep sandstone aquifer residuals are separated from residuals corresponding to more shallow units, some bias is present in the subsets. The shallow residual mean is –5.7 feet and the deep sandstone residual mean is 9.1 feet, showing the model overestimates the shallow heads and underestimates the deep heads.

The absolute residual mean is a measure of how much the model varies on average from the targets in either a negative or positive direction. For all targets this average error is 20.2 feet while that of the shallow and deep residuals is 20.5 and 19.8 feet, respectively. To achieve a standard measure of fit that is not dependent on the range of water levels in the target set, the absolute mean of the residuals can be divided by the total range of water levels observed, and expressed as a percentage. Resulting values can be used to assess the goodness of fit (Table 3). For the predevelopment steady-state model, there is a good fit overall: shallow targets by themselves have a good fit (less than 5%) and deep targets have an adequate fit (less than 10%).

Table 3. Calibration statistics for the steady-state predevelopment model: Water Levels.

Statistical Measure	All Targets (ft)	Shallow Targets* (ft)	Deep Targets (ft)
Number Water Levels Observed	120	73	47
Residual mean	-0.12	-5.7	9.1
Absolute residual mean	20.2	20.5	19.8
Minimum Residual	-75.9	-75.9	-70.5
Maximum Residual	96.3	81.0	96.3
Range of Target Values	467.4	467.4	240.0
Absolute residual mean/Range	4.3%	4.4%	8.2%

**Because shallow calibration targets correspond to current rather than predevelopment conditions, calibration statistics for shallow wells were also computed for heads generated by the transient model for the period 1990-2000. This second set of statistics is virtually identical to those reported here since there is little drawdown at the regional scale in the shallow system, especially in the unlithified deposits.*



Figure 16. Cross plot showing the goodness of the fit between the target heads (X-axis) and model calculated heads (Y-axis) for steady-state predevelopment model.

Transient Calibration

The transient model was evaluated using multiple target sets. Simulated results were compared not only to observed water levels, but also to observed water-level trends in response to pumping, to vertical gradients within the deep sandstone aquifer, and to stream base flows.

<u>Water-level Targets</u>

Historical water levels are available from 56 wells in the Wisconsin Groundwater Network (website: wi.water.usgs.gov). Data collected at 9 intervals between 1940 and 2000 provide calibration statistics for the transient calibration. The head in each model layer penetrated by a well was weighted by the transmissivity of the layer to arrive at a single composite water level for the well. The calibration statistics are grouped in Table 4. The absolute residual mean averages 22 ft for all wells over the period of record and 23 ft for deep wells. Given the large range of water levels induced by pumping (on the order of 500 ft for most of the period), this average error is relatively small.

<u>Trend Targets</u>

Of the 56 wells in the Wisconsin Groundwater Network, long records exist for 10 wells that are open to the deep part of the groundwater flow system. The simulated water levels for these deep targets were calculated for the top and bottom model layers intersecting the open interval of the target well and then compared to the measured water levels (Figure 17). In general, the measured trends are close to the top and bottom lines shown on Figure 17. The entire nearfield portion of the deep part of the flow-system shows appreciable decreases in heads over time due to pumping. The model reflects the rate and magnitude of these decreases.

Table 4. Calibration statistics through time for the transient model.

Date	All Wells			Deep Wells		
	Number Water Levels Observed	Residual Mean (ft)	Absolute Residual Mean (ft)	Number Water Levels Observed	Residual Mean (ft)	Absolute Residual Mean (ft)
1940	5	-11.3	13.4	4	-5.2	8.8
1945	10	-8.8	22.0	7	+2.7	19.3
1950	31	-1.2	25.5	19	+4.9	27.8
1965	32	-1.0	21.9	20	+6.3	24.8
1970	35	+0.8	22.7	21	+5.6	25.1
1980	34	-4.6	21.2	22	-0.6	20.2
1985	29	+7.4	23.0	18	+13.4	28.2
1990	29	+4.1	20.1	18	+6.9	22.5
2000	16	+3.9	21.5	9	-0.9	22.8



Figure 17. Observed and simulated water levels in deep observation wells that show appreciable drawdown since 1940.

The red points are the observed water levels over time; the blue lines are the simulated water levels in the uppermost model layer open to the well; the black lines are simulated water levels in the lowest layer open to the well.

Packer Tests

The target set of 56 wells used for the transient calibration was supplemented by packer test data (Figure 18). In these tests, portions of the wells are isolated from the rest of the open interval using packers so that water levels can be recorded in particular formations and intervals. The water-level data shown in Figure 19 are the result of packer testing conducted in 7 deep wells in the early 1980s. Most of the wells are boreholes open from the Sinnipee Group dolomite into the Mt. Simon sandstone, while each packed intervals corresponds to a single interval in the deep sandstone aquifer. The heads in the isolated interval were allowed to come to equilibrium and recorded. The depth of the packers was then changed and the heads from another interval recorded to construct a vertical head profile for the well.

In Figure 19, the observed and modeled 1980 head profiles for the seven wells are compared. A vertical line would indicate no head difference or gradient with depth, and therefore, no vertical flow. A near-horizontal line would indicate a strong vertical gradient. The four wells to the west (left) are all located in areas where the Maquoketa Formation is thin or absent. The similar slopes of the observed and simulated profiles show a high observed and simulated vertical gradient. The profiles in these four wells identify areas of appreciable downward leakage within the deep sandstone aquifer to replenish groundwater flow at the bottom of the flow system. Farther to the east (right) where the Maquoketa Formation is an effective aquitard, the circulation within the deep part of the flow system is largely horizontal except near pumping wells. The model reflects the absence of vertical gradients observed at the three eastern-most well locations.

Flux Targets

In addition to head targets, 14 base flow estimates, eight in the SEWRPC counties and six in Dodge, Jefferson, and Rock Counties, were used for model calibration. Base flow targets are very useful during calibration because they provide a way to determine if the assumed quantity of recharge over a given basin area and the routing of groundwater from the water table to water bodies in that basin is simulated correctly.

The measurements of stream flow that serve as flux targets for the regional model were derived from the USGS stream-gaging network (Figure 18). They were selected because their records were long enough that a statistical analysis could be conducted to estimate baseflow, the amount of stream flow due to groundwater discharge. For this model, baseflow was expected to lie between the Q_{80} (streamflow exceeded 80 percent of the time) and the Q_{50} (streamflow exceeded 50 percent of the time) flow durations. Stream flow records were adjusted to account for surface-water discharge from sewage treatment plants and other sources. In areas dominated by coarse-grained surficial deposits, baseflow commonly tends to approach the Q_{50} streamflow. In more fine-grained areas, baseflow tends to approach the Q_{80} streamflow.

The model-simulated flux is bounded by Q_{80} and Q_{50} values for five of the eight flux targets in the seven-county SEWRPC region (Figure 20) and is close to the Q_{80} in the remaining three cases. Only two of the six flux targets in Dodge, Jefferson, and Rock Counties fall between the Q_{50} and Q_{80} fluxes. Good agreement to flux targets is not expected in these outlying counties because information was not available to provide more than a single average recharge value for this large area. Since the recharge rate determines the amount of baseflow to streams in each basin, the use of a single recharge value results in too much shallow groundwater flow in some of these outlying areas and not enough in others. However, the sum of all the model-calculated fluxes is 810 cubic feet per second (cfs). This simulated overall value meets the calibration criterion because it is bounded by the summed Q_{80} and Q_{50} fluxes for the target streams, equal to 593 and 1526 cfs, respectively.



EXPLANATION

Packer tested well		USGS stream-gaging station	
A	Dousman Well #2	1	Crawfish River at Milford
B	Eagle Well #2	2	Beaverdam River at Beaverdam
C	Lake Geneva Well #1	3	Rock River at Jefferson
D	Mukwonago Well #2	4	Turtle Creek at Carvers Rock near Clinton
E	Bong Recreational Area Well	5	Rock River at Hustiford
F	Greenfield High School Well	6	East Branch of the Rock River near Mayville
G	Zion USGS Well	7	Bark River near Rome
		8	Mukwonago River at Mukwonago
		9	White River near Burlington
		10	Fox River at Watertown Road near Waukesha
		11	North Branch Milwaukee River near Filmore
		12	Menonmonee River at Wauwatosa
		13	Pike River near Racine
		14	Root River at Racine

Figure 18. **Location of packer-tested wells, USGS stream-gaging stations, the Milwaukee Deep Tunnel, and Mequon private wells.**



Figure 19. Comparison of vertical head profiles between observed and modeled heads for packed wells.

The X-axis corresponds to the measured and modeled heads. The Y-axis corresponds to the elevation (feet above sea level) of the measurement in the packer. All packer and head elevations reported in feet above sea level.



Figure 20. Comparison of simulated baseflow to Q80 and Q50 measurements of streamflow.

Sensitivity Analyses

Sensitivity analyses were conducted for both the steady state predevelopment and transient models, first, to determine the crucial inputs to the model, and, second, to aid in calibration. Sensitivities are calculated by varying parameters or groups of parameters and recording the model response in terms of changes in water levels at target locations. In our analyses, the parameters were all varied by 5 percent. The changes in the heads at the target locations due to the parameter change were then recorded and averaged for comparison to other head changes from a different parameter or group of parameters. If a relatively small change in the parameters creates a large head change, that parameter or group of parameters is constrained by the targets and is important for calibration of the model.

Steady-State Analysis

A study was performed to show which parameters most influence the steady-state simulation. Figure 21 shows the relative sensitivities across multiple parameter sets for the predevelopment model. The vertical and horizontal hydraulic conductivities are grouped by hydrostratigraphic unit. The recharge zones are grouped and included as a parameter set to show the importance of recharge to model calibration. In addition to the parameter sensitivities, the contributions to the sensitivities from the shallow and deep aquifers are shown. For example, the horizontal and vertical hydraulic conductivity of the Maquoketa shale has negligible influence on the heads in the shallow aquifers but appreciable influence on those in the deep sandstone aquifer.

Inspection of Figure 21 indicates that the most influential parameters for the steady-state calibration are recharge, the hydraulic conductivity of the Pleistocene (unlithified) deposits, and the hydraulic conductivity of the deep sandstone aquifer units. Calibration of the steady-state model was achieved in large measure for the shallow part of the flow system by varying the unlithified and Silurian Group dolomite conductivities, and for the deep part of the flow system by varying the horizontal sandstone hydraulic conductivities and the vertical Maquoketa and Sinnipee Group dolomite hydraulic conductivities.



Figure 21. **Parameter sensitivities for the steady-state predevelopment model.**

Sensitivities are computed as the ratio of ***Δh****=change in water level at a shallow or deep target to* ***Δp****=change in parameter value, normalized by multiplying the ratio times* ***p****=the original parameter value, then averaged by summing and dividing by the number of targets* ***N****. The absolute value of the sensitivities is in units of feet. The bar lengths correspond to the average absolute sensitivity across parameter sets*

.

A separate analysis (not shown) was conducted on the sensitivity of the results to the 5 ft/day hydraulic conductivity assigned to streambed material, a parameter that in part controls the ease with which baseflow can enter streams. The analysis showed that the model solution has little sensitivity unless the vertical hydraulic conductivity is reduced to unrealistically low levels.

Transient Analysis

A sensitivity analysis was also conducted to reveal model structure and guide calibration in the case of the transient model simulation that incorporates pumping conditions from 1864 to 2000. In addition to the parameter groups in the steady state sensitivity, three additional parameter groups, pumping rates, specific storage, and specific yield were studied in the transient sensitivity analysis (Figure 22).

The most striking result of this analysis is the great importance of pumping rates and specific storage to calibration of the model. In particular, a small change in pumping rates has a very large effect on the model heads, nearly twice that of the next most sensitive parameter group, the horizontal sandstone hydraulic conductivities. This result stresses the importance of good records of pumping rates for creation of regional scale models. Neither the pumping rates nor the specific storage was varied during calibration because the estimates are based on good data sources (well records and aquifer tests, respectively). However, the large sensitivities of the model to the horizontal hydraulic conductivity of shallow and deep units and to the vertical hydraulic conductivity of the Maquoketa Formation meant that these parameters could be adjusted within reasonable ranges to bring simulated water levels closer to observed levels.

Coupling of the steady-state calibration and transient calibration yielded the final parameter inputs for the groundwater model. The average and range of horizontal and vertical hydraulic conductivity for hydrostratigraphic units over the nearfield are shown in Figures 23a and 23b. The bar lengths are proportional to the average hydraulic conductivity values over all zones within a unit. The average is calculated as the geometric mean over the seven-county region. Note that the vertical conductivities of distinct units are compared on a logarithmic scale.



Figure 22. Parameter sensitivities for the transient model.

*Sensitivities are computed as the ratio of **Δh**=change in water level at a shallow or deep target to **Δp**=change in parameter value, normalized by multiplying the ratio times **p**=the original parameter value, then averaged by summing and dividing by the number of targets **N**. The absolute value of the sensitivities is in units of feet. The bar lengths correspond to the average absolute sensitivity across parameter sets.*

The average values reflect the lithology of each unit, in the sense that relatively pure sandstone units (the St. Peter and Wonewoc) have high hydraulic conductivities while carbonates and shales have lower values. Acceptable calibration required that relatively high hydraulic conductivity values be assigned to the unlithified deposits. This outcome probably reflects the large area and thickness of cells in the model. While local near-surface measurements in areas dominated by till would typically yield horizontal hydraulic conductivity values less than 1 or even 0.1 ft/day, the model calibration suggests there is enough heterogeneous coarse-grained material at different depths within the unlithified section (model layers 1 and 2) to raise the overall average to approximately 3 ft/day. Similar relations between the scale of consideration and the appropriate magnitude of hydraulic conductivity have been observed in many hydrogeologic settings (Bradbury and Muldoon, 1990, Schulze-Makuch and Cherkauer, 1998).



Figure 23a. Central tendency and range of horizontal hydraulic conductivity (ft/day) in 7-county SEWRPC region.

Central tendency, corresponding to bar height, defined by geometric mean of cell values weighted by cell area.



Figure 23b. Central tendency and range of vertical hydraulic conductivity (ft/day) in 7-county SEWRPC region.

Central tendency, corresponding to bar height, defined by geometric mean of cell values weighted by cell area. Note that vertical hydraulic conductivity is plotted on a logarithmic scale.

8. Summary

Through a joint project, the US Geological Survey, the Wisconsin Geological and Natural History Survey, and the Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission have developed and calibrated a numerical groundwater flow model for the seven-county SEWRPC region of southeastern Wisconsin. This report describes model development; a second report describes model results. This new model represents an important advance over previously-constructed groundwater flow models for the region in several respects:

- The model is three-dimensional and fully transient; it simulates groundwater levels from the late 1800s through the present day;
- The model completely links all major groundwater units present in southeastern Wisconsin, and simulates both shallow and deep aquifers
- The model simulates groundwater flow into or out of the major surface-water features present in southeastern Wisconsin
- The model contains an accurate history of groundwater withdrawals in southeastern Wisconsin

The model was developed and calibrated in both steady-state and transient modes. The predevelopment steady-state model provides a good match to the pattern of water levels based on historical measurements from before the onset of the pumping. The transient model calibration closely reproduces observed patterns of drawdown through time across the study area. The models also agree with estimates of baseflow to streams.

Since the model performance is so sensitive to pumping rates, the fit achieved in model calibration is due in part to the detailed analysis used to apportion pumping through time from shallow and deep aquifers across 10 counties in southeastern Wisconsin. The quality of the fit suggests that the recharge and hydraulic conductivity patterns used in the model are reasonable. It also suggests that the model properly routes groundwater from recharge at the water table to surface-water bodies and wells, and it properly partitions groundwater flow between that which circulates within the shallow part of the flow system and that which replenishes the deep sandstone aquifer.

The model provides a tool for simulating regional groundwater flow and regional groundwater withdrawals in southeastern Wisconsin. A companion report (Feinstein and others, 2005) summarizes the results of model simulations from predevelopment to the present day and presents interpretations of the groundwater flow system based on these simulations. The model also provides a framework for more detailed investigations of specific geographic areas and for the construction of smaller, more refined inset models.

9. References Cited

Anderson, M.P. and W.W. Woessner. 1992. *Applied Groundwater Modeling: Simulation of Flow and Advective Transport*, Academic Press, 381 p.

Aquifer Science and Technology (AS&T), 1999. Crestwood [Waukesha] Well Number 9 Water Quality Report. City of Waukesha Water Utility Report, Ruekert and Mielke, Inc., Professional Engineers, 19 p.

Ball, J.R., R.J. Poff and C.W. Threinen. 1970. *Surface Water Resources of Rock County.* Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources, 64 p.

Batten, W.G. and T.D. Conlon. 1993. *Hydrogeology of glacial deposits in a preglacial bedrock valley, Waukesha County, Wisconsin.* U.S. Geological Survey Water-Resources Investigations Report 92-4077. 15 p.

Bradbury, K.R., and Muldoon, M.A., 1990, Hydraulic conductivity determinations in unlithified glacial and fluvial materials, *in* Nielsen, D.M., and Johnson, A.I., eds., Ground Water and Vadose Zone Monitoring, Volume ASTM STP 1053: Philadelphia, American Society for Testing and Materials, p. 138-151.

Burch, S.L. 1991. *The New Chicago Model: a reassessment of the impacts of Lake Michigan allocations on the Cambrian-Ordovician aquifer system in northeastern Illinois*. Illinois State Water Survey Research Report 119, 52 p.

Calver, A. 2001. *Riverbed Permeabilities: Information from Pooled Data*. Ground Water 39(4), p. 546-553.

Carlson, D.A. 2000. *Dependence of conductivities and anisotropies on geologic properties within the near-surface aquifer in Milwaukee, Wisconsin*. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation (Geosciences), University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee.

Carlson, D.A. and D. Feinstein. 1998. *Preliminary model design and literature review for the sandstone aquifer system in southeastern Wisconsin*. Unpublished letter report submitted by the USGS to the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources (reproduced in Eaton and others, in preparation).

Chamberlin, T.C. 1877. *Geology of Eastern Wisconsin*. Geology of Wisconsin: Wisconsin Geological and Natural History Survey, v. 2, pt. 2, p. 93-405.

Cherkauer, D.S. 2001. *Distribution of ground-water recharge in southeastern Wisconsin*. Unpublished final report to Source Water Protection Program, Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources. 31 p.

Cherkauer, D.S. 1999. *Controls on the spatial distribution of ground-water recharge in Washington County, Wisconsin*. Unpublished final report to UWS Ground-water Research Program Project. 45 p.

Clayton, L. 2001. *Pleistocene Geology of Waukesha County, Wisconsin*. Wisconsin Geological and Natural History Survey Bulletin 99, 33 p.

Eaton, T.T., Construction of a groundwater flow model in the area of the Village of Eagle based on refinement of a regional groundwater flow model for southeastern Wisconsin: Wisconsin Geological and Natural History Survey Open-File Report 2004-06.

Eaton, T.T. 2002. *Fracture heterogeneity and hydrogeology of the Maquoketa aquitard, southeastern Wisconsin.* Unpublished Ph.D dissertation (Geology and Geophysics), University of.., Wisconsin-Madison. 211 p.

Eaton, T.T., K.R. Bradbury and T.J. Evans. 1999. *Characterization of the hydrostratigraphy of the deep sandstone aquifer in southeastern Wisconsin.* Final report to the Wisconsin Dept. of Natural Resources, Wisconsin Geological and Natural History Survey Open-File Report 1999-02. 30 p.

Ellefson, B.R., C.H. Fan, and J.L. Ripley. 1997. *Water Use in Wisconsin, 1995.* U.S. Geological Survey Open-File Report 97-356. 1 plate.

Environmental Modeling Systems, Inc. (EMS-I). 2000. Groundwater Modeling System on-line documentation at http://www.ems-i.com/gmshelp/gmsv40help.htm

Environmental Simulations, Inc. 1998. Guide to using Groundwater Vistas, user documentation version 2, 291 p.

Feinstein, D.T, D.J. Hart, J.T. Krohelski, T.T. Eaton, and K.R. Bradbury. 2005. *Regional aquifer model for southeastern Wisconsin, Report 2: Model results and interpretation*. Administrative report to the Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission. 67 p.

Feinstein, D.T., D. Saad, D. Hart, and K. Zeiler. 2003. *Reconciling recharge and discharge in a regional flow model.* Proceedings of MODFLOW and MORE 2003 confererence, September 16-19 2003, Volume 1, International Ground Water Modeling Center (IGWMC), Colorado School of Mines, 437 p.

Foley, F.C., W.C. Walton, and W.J. Drescher. 1953. *Ground-Water Conditions in the Milwaukee-Waukesha Area, Wisconsin*. U.S. Geological Survey Water-Supply Paper 1229. 96 p.

Jansen, J. 2001. *Well rehabilitation methods to reduce elevated total dissolved solid levels in the Cambrian-Ordovician sandstone aquifer of southeastern Wisconsin.* Program and Abstracts: 46th Annual Midwest Ground Water Conference, Madison, Wisconsin, p. 26.

Jansen, J.R. and Rao, M., 1998. *Southeastern Wisconsin sandstone aquifer screening model report*. Bonestroo, Rosene, Anderlik and Associates, Inc. 62 p.

Jansen, J.R. 1995. *Ground water exploration by the combined use of fracture trace analysis and azimuthal resistivity in the Silurian dolomite aquifer of eastern Wisconsin.* Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation (Geosciences), University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, 558 p.

Kernen, L.T., R.J. Poff and C.W. Threinen. 1965. *Surface Water Resources of Dodge County.* Wisconsin Conservation Department, 61 p.

Krohelski, J.T., K.R. Bradbury, R.J. Hunt and S.K. Swanson. 2000. *Numerical simulation of groundwater flow in Dane County, Wisconsin*. Wisconsin Geological and Natural History Survey Bulletin 98. 31 p.

Lawrence, C.L. and B.R. Ellefson. 1982. *Water use in Wisconsin*, 1979. U.S. Geological Survey, Open File Report 82-444. pp. 11-17.

Lawrence, C.L., B.R. Ellefson, and R.D. Cotter. 1984. *Public-supply pumpage in Wisconsin, by aquifer*. U.S. Geological Survey, Open File Report 83-931. pp. 10-40.

Mandle, R.J. and A.L. Kontis. 1992. *Simulation of regional ground-water flow in the Cambrian-Ordovician aquifer system in the northern Midwest, United States.* U.S. Geological Survey Professional Paper 1405-C, 97 p.

McBride, M.S. and Pfannkuch, H.O., 1975, The distribution of seepage within lakebeds: U.S. Geological Survey Journal of Research, Vol 3, No. 5, p. 505-512.

McDonald, M.G. and Harbaugh, A.W., 1988. *A modular three-dimensional finite-difference ground-water flow model*, Techniques of Water-Resources Investigations of the United States Geological Survey. Book 6, Modeling techniques; chapter A1, 576 p.

Mills, P.C., R.T. Kay, T.A. Brown and D.J. Yeskis. 1998. *Areal studies aid protection of ground-water quality in Illinois, Indiana and Wisconsin*. U.S. Geological Survey Water-Resources Investigations Report 98-4143, 12 p.

Muldoon, M. A., J. A. Simo and K.R. Bradbury. 2001. Correlation of hydraulic conductivity with stratigraphy in a fractured-dolomite aquifer, northeastern Wisconsin, USA. Hydrogeology Journal v. 9, no. 6, p.570-583.

Nicholas, J.R., M.G. Sherrill, and H.L. Young. 1987. *Hydrogeology of the Cambrian-Ordovician Aquifer System at a Test Well in Northeastern Illinois*. U.S. Geological Survey Water Resources Investigations Open-File Report 84-4165.

Ostrom, M.E. 1967. *Paleozoic stratigraphic nomenclature for Wisconsin*, Wisconsin Geological and Natural History Survey Circular No.8.

Paillet, F.L., 2000, *Field techniques for estimating aquifer parameters using flow log data*. Ground Water, v. 38, no. 4, p.510-521.

Poff, R.J. and C.W. Threinen. 1961a. *Surface Water Resources of Kenosha County.*

Wisconsin Conservation Department, 38 p.

Poff, R.J. and C.W. Threinen. 1961b. *Surface Water Resources of Racine County*. Wisconsin Conservation Department, 38 p.

Poff, R.J. and C.W. Threinen. 1961c. *Surface Water Resources of Kenosha County*. Wisconsin Conservation Department, 27 p.

Poff, R.J. and C.W. Threinen. 1962. *Surface Water Resources of Washington County*. Wisconsin Conservation Department, 65 p.

Poff, R.J. and C.W. Threinen. 1963. *Surface Water Resources of Waukesha County*. Wisconsin Conservation Department, 67 p.

Poff, R.J. and C.W. Threinen. 1964. *Surface Water Resources of Milwaukee County*. Wisconsin Conservation Department, 39 p.

Poff, R.J., R. Gernay and C.W. Threinen. 1964. *Surface Water Resources of Ozaukee County*. Wisconsin Conservation Department, 50 p.

Poff, R.J., R. Piening and C.W. Threinen. 1968. *Surface Water Resources of Jefferson County*. Wisconsin Conservation Department, 66 p.

Rayne, T.W., K.R. Bradbury and D.M. Mickelson.1996. *Variability of hydraulic conductivity in uniform sandy till, Dane County, Wisconsin*. Wisconsin Geological and Natural History Survey Information Circular 74, 19 p.

Rodenbeck, S.A. 1988. *Merging Pleistocene lithostratigraphy with geotechnical and hydrogeologic data – examples from eastern Wisconsin*. Unpublished M.S. thesis, University of Wisconsin-Madison, 286 p.

Rovey, C.W. 1990. *Stratigraphy and sedimentology of Silurian and Devonian Carbonates, Eastern Wisconsin, with Implications for Ground-Water Discharge into Lake Michigan*. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation (Geosciences), University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee.

Runkel, A.C., R.G. Tipping, E.C. Alexander, Jr., J.A. Green, J.H. Mossler and S.C. Alexander. 2003. *Hydrogeology of the Paleozoic bedrock in southeastern Minnesota*, Minnesota Geological Survey Report of Investigations 61, 105 p.

Rust/Harza. April 2002. *Internal Inspection of the Inline Storage System*. Report submitted to Milwaukee Metropolitan Sewerage District.

Schulze-Makuch, D., and Cherkauer, D.S., 1998. Variations in hydraulic conductivity with scale of measurement during aquifer tests in heterogeneous, porous carbonate rocks: Hydrogeology Journal, v. 6, p. 204-215.

South Eastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission, 1998. *Prospectus for the development of a regional aquifer simulation model in southeastern Wisconsin*. Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission, 33 p.

South Eastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission/Wisconsin Geological and Natural History Survey, 2002. *Groundwater resources of southeastern Wisconsin.* Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission Technical Report 37. 203 p.

Simpkins, W.W. 1989. *Genesis and spatial distribution of variability in the lithostratigraphic, geotechnical, hydrogeological and geochemical properties of the Oak Creek Formation in southeastern Wisconsin*. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation (Geology and Geophysics), University of Wisconsin-Madison. 394 p.

Stocks, D.L., 1998. *Hydrostratigraphy of the Ordovician Sinnipee Group dolomites, eastern Wisconsin*. Unpublished M.S. thesis (Geology and Geophysics), University of Wisconsin-Madison, 192 p.

US Environmental Protection Agency, 2003, Great Lakes Fact Sheet No. 1, The Great Lakes, An Environmental Atlas and Resource Book, at URL http://www.epa.gov/glnpo/atlas/gl-fact1.html

U.S. Geological Survey, 2001a, National Hydrography Dataset: Accessed November 29, 2001 at URL http://nhd.usgs.gov/data.html.

U.S. Geological Survey, 2001b, National Elevation Dataset: Accessed November 29, 2001 at URL http://edcnts12.cr.usgs.gov/ned/default.htm.

Visocky, A.P. 1997. *Water Level Trends and Pumpage in the Deep Bedrock Aquifers in the Chicago Region, 1991-1995*. Illinois State Water Survey Circular 182. 45 p.

Weber, J., R. Poff and C.W. Threinen. 1968. *Surface Water Resources of Sheboygan County*. Wisconsin Conservation Department, 75 p.

Weber, J., P.T. Schultz, L.T. Kernen and C.W.Threinen. 1969. *Surface Water Resources of Fond du Lac County.* Wisconsin Conservation Department, 84 p.

Weidman, S. and A.R. Schultz. 1915. *The Underground and Surface-Water Supplies of Wisconsin.* Wisconsin Geol. and Nat. History Survey Bull. 35, 664 p.

Young, H.L. 1992a. *Summary of Ground-Water Hydrology of the Cambrian-Ordovician Aquifer System in the Northern Midwest, United States*. U.S. Geological Survey Professional Paper 1405-A. p. A40-A50.

Young, H.L. 1992b. *Hydrogeology of the Cambrian-Ordovician Aquifer System in the Northern Midwest, United States*. U.S. Geological Survey Professional Paper 1405-B. 99 p.

Young, H.L., A.J. MacKenzie, and R.J. Mandle. 1988. *Simulation of Ground-Water Flow in the Cambrian-Ordovician Aquifer System in the Chicago-Milwaukee Area of the Northern Midwest*. in Regional Aquifer Systems of the United States, Aquifers of the Midwestern Region, American Water Resources Association. p. 39-72.

Young, H.L. 1976. *Digital-computer model of the sandstone aquifer in southeastern Wisconsin*: Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission Technical Report 16, 42 p.

(This page intentionally left blank)

Simulation of Regional Groundwater Flow in Southeastern Wisconsin

Report 2:
Model Results and Interpretation

By
D.T. Feinstein[1]
D.J. Hart[2]
J.T. Krohelski[1]
T.T. Eaton[2]
K.R. Bradbury[2]

[1]U.S. Geological Survey
[2] Wisconsin Geological and Natural History Survey, University of Wisconsin-Extension

June 1, 2005

Final Administrative Report to the
Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission

(This page intentionally left blank)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

FIGURES

TABLES

(This page intentionally left blank)

1. Abstract

A new groundwater flow model of southeastern Wisconsin demonstrates and helps quantify the effects of long-term pumping on the natural circulation of groundwater. The model focuses on the seven counties that comprise the South East Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission (SEWRPC) region and simulates the evolution of groundwater levels and flows between 1864 and 2000 for the entire flow system extending from unlithified and dolomite deposits at the top of the system to sandstone units in the lower part. Intensive groundwater use has influenced the flow system throughout the seven-county SEWRPC region and beyond its borders. Along with increased drawdown, pumping over time has reduced flow to surface water from groundwater, shifted the location of groundwater divides, increased flow from the shallow to the deep parts of the flow system, and redirected groundwater pathlines. The modeling study yields the following conclusions:

- The major pumping center in southeastern Wisconsin has shifted from the city of Milwaukee to eastern Waukesha County. In response, the center of the cone of depression in the deep part of the flow system has shifted westward about eight miles from Milwaukee to the vicinity of the Village of Elm Grove where deep water levels have dropped about 500 ft since the onset of pumping.

- If historic trends continue, pumping will increase by as much as 40% between 2000 and 2020, and will produce over 100 ft of additional drawdown at the center of the regional cone of depression in the deep part of the flow system (centered in eastern Waukesha County). The simulated additional deep drawdown in the western part of Waukesha County for 2020 is on the order of 25 ft.

- The most important source of water to wells is groundwater that in the absence of pumping would have contributed to inland surface-water bodies within the seven-county SEWRPC region: according to the model this source currently accounts for 71% of combined shallow and deep pumping. Most of the transfer is groundwater that would discharge to surface water under natural conditions but now is rerouted toward wells, while a smaller part is water induced directly from streams and lakes. An unknown amount of this diverted water that discharges from wells is returned in the form of sewer flow from water-treatment plants; sometimes the water is discharged inside and sometimes outside the basin of origin.

- Pumping in southeastern Wisconsin affects groundwater below Lake Michigan. Wells in the sandstone aquifer have reversed the direction of flow in the deep part

of the flow system below the Lake Michigan coastline. Groundwater that once flowed toward Lake Michigan but now moves westward equals about 7% of the groundwater currently extracted in southeastern Wisconsin. The model indicates that a small amount of water is drawn directly from the Lake either as shallow inflow along the coast or as downward percolation through the bottom of the Lake into the deep part of the flow system. The shallow and deep induced flow amounts to 2% of pumping (about 1.6 mgd).

- The remaining sources of water for shallow and deep wells are release of groundwater from storage below the seven-county region and below Lake Michigan (11%) and net groundwater flow into the region mostly from the west (9%). Flow into the region is mostly water moving toward deep wells that would otherwise discharge to surface water located west of the counties under study.

- Between 1864 and 2000, pumping caused a reduction of 8.5% in the rate of direct and indirect discharge of shallow groundwater to Lake Michigan. Most of the reduction is due to decreased groundwater baseflow to streams that discharge to the Lake. This simulated reduction in shallow groundwater contribution to Lake Michigan does not account for the effect of other possible controls on groundwater discharge such as climate change or urbanization nor does it account for return flow to the Lake of some pumped water through the sewer system.

- Downward flow from the shallow to the deep parts of the flow system occurs everywhere in the seven-county study area, but it is most pronounced in the western areas where the Maquoketa shale is absent. Under current conditions about 4% of recharge moves to the deep part of the flow system for the seven-county region, but in areas where the Maquoketa shale is absent (a little less than one fifth of the total area), the proportion climbs to 13%.

- The area contributing water to deep wells has expanded appreciably over time. Between 1864 and 2000, the groundwater divide moved about 9 miles west from Waukesha County into Jefferson County. Long travel paths passing below multiple counties demonstrate the degree to which groundwater is a regional resource.

2. Introduction

This publication is the second of two reports devoted to modeling the groundwater flow system in southeastern Wisconsin. The first entitled “Regional Aquifer Model for Southeastern Wisconsin, Report #1: Data Collection, Conceptual Model Development, Numerical Model Construction, and Model Calibration” describes the construction and calibration of a regional model for southeastern Wisconsin using the MODFLOW code for groundwater flow (McDonald and Harbaugh, 1988). The model has two versions. The first, a steady-state simulation, reproduces natural or predevelopment conditions. The second, a transient simulation, reproduces the response of the system to pumping. By comparing the results of the predevelopment to the transient versions of the model, it is possible to trace changes to the regional groundwater system through time. In this report, these changes are presented in a variety of ways to better understand the workings of the regional flow system.

Under natural conditions groundwater originates as recharge or stream loss, and discharges to surface water bodies such as rivers and lakes. Most groundwater travels along shallow flow paths and discharges to nearby streams, but some penetrates deeper into the groundwater system and travels long distances before discharging upward to large features such as Lake Michigan.

Pumping from wells alters the natural system. With development, groundwater discharges not only to surface-water bodies, but also to wells. As wells are pumped, water levels[1] drop, flow is redirected, and less groundwater discharges to surface water. The magnitude of these changes depends on the evolution of pumping over time, the proximity of wells to surface water, and the depth at which pumping occurs. In particular, deep pumping tends to draw water away from shallow, local flow systems and into longer travel paths that are part of the regional system.

[1] The term “water levels” in this report always refers to groundwater levels, also known as hydraulic heads. Groundwater levels are specific to locations and depths in the groundwater system; they correspond to the level that water would attain in a hypothetical well open to a specific location and depth. Thus, a groundwater level for the St. Peter Formation refers to the water level that would occur in a well that is open only to the St. Peter. A set of water levels distributed spatially over a single unit corresponds to the unit’s “potentiometric surface”.

Objectives and scope of the modeling program

The southeastern Wisconsin regional groundwater model provides a tool to understand the long-term effect of pumping on the natural groundwater flow system over the seven counties administered by the Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission (SEWRPC). These counties are Kenosha, Milwaukee, Ozaukee, Racine, Walworth, Washington and Waukesha (Figure 1). The results of the modeling effort described in this report form the basis for subsequent studies aimed at anticipating effects of future water use and better managing the linked groundwater/surface-water resource.

Hydrogeologists and hydrologists at the Wisconsin Geological and Natural History Survey (WGNHS) and the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) have performed the work described in this report. The model simulates groundwater conditions over the 7-county SEWRPC region. The model also simulates groundwater conditions under Lake Michigan to the east of the region, and in Dodge, Jefferson, and eastern Rock Counties to the west of the region. The modeling results fall into the following categories:

- Water levels and drawdown through time
- Sources of water to wells
- Shallow groundwater interactions with Lake Michigan before and since pumping began
- The evolution of flow directions and groundwater divides
- Movement of water from the shallow to deep parts of the flow system before and after pumping
- Simulation and visualization of groundwater pathlines.

Model output is presented in figures and tables that demonstrate the regional effects of pumping on the natural system. The results are not intended to simulate local groundwater conditions immediately around an individual well or stream. However, the model incorporates sufficient spatial and temporal detail with respect to



Figure 1. Southeastern Wisconsin. *Area includes the 7 SEWRPC counties (Ozaukee, Milwaukee, Racine, Kenosha, Washington, Waukesha, and Walworth) plus Dodge and Jefferson Counties. It also includes the half of Rock County east of the Rock River. This total area is equivalent to the "***nearfield***" of the regional model.* ***A-A' shows trace of cross section in Figure 2***

geology, hydrology and well placement to examine a wide range of effects in different parts of the seven-county study area at different times.

Key concepts in the context of southeastern Wisconsin

Interpretation of the modeling study depends on several key hydrogeologic concepts summarized here.

<u>SEWRPC region and model nearfield:</u> The SEWRPC region is composed of seven counties in southeastern Wisconsin. However, the groundwater flow system does not follow political boundaries. In particular, there is substantial exchange of groundwater between the seven-county region and areas to the west in Dodge and Jefferson Counties and the east side of Rock County. For this reason, close attention was paid in development of the model not only to the SEWRPC region, but also to the adjacent western counties. Together they constitute the model nearfield shown in Figure 1. In this report, results are sometimes reported for the SEWRPC region alone and sometimes for the entire model nearfield.

<u>Aquifers/aquitards and hydrostratigraphic units:</u> Aquifers are unlithified or lithified deposits that readily transmit water; aquitards do not readily transmit water. Hydrostratigraphic units are unlithified or lithified deposits that form a mappable layer that can be represented in a groundwater flow model. The terms are not used interchangeably. For example, the unlithified deposits in southeastern Wisconsin, mostly glacial in origin, form a continuous hydrostratigraphic unit that lies on top of bedrock. Most of the unlithified deposits in the region are fine-grained till, and are considered aquitards. However, alluvial sediments and outwash bodies within the unlithified deposits form local aquifers (collectively called the “sand-and-gravel aquifer”) that sustain even municipal pumping. Silurian dolomite and local Devonian deposits form the top of the bedrock in the eastern two-thirds of the seven-county region. Known as the “Silurian dolomite aquifer”, these rocks are both a hydrostratigraphic unit and an aquifer because fracturing in the unit is sufficiently widespread to support high-capacity wells in many areas. The underlying Maquoketa shale is a hydrostratigraphic unit and an aquitard;

similarly the Sinnipee Group functions as an aquitard below the shale. However, in places where the Sinnipee Group is not overlain by the Maquoketa shale (in the western part of the 7-county region where they subcrop below the unlithified deposits), it is sufficiently weathered to be considered an aquifer. The principal aquifer in the deep part of the flow system is composed of Cambrian-Ordovician rocks, and is referred to as the "deep sandstone aquifer". The major hydrostratigraphic units that contribute to the deep sandstone aquifer are clean sandstone formations (the St. Peter, the Wonewoc, and parts of the Mt. Simon) and mixed formations consisting of sandstone, siltstone, shale and dolomite (the Trempealeau-Tunnel City Groups, the Eau Claire, and parts of the Mt. Simon).

Shallow and deep parts of groundwater flow system: A major aquitard formed by the Maquoketa shale marks the boundary between the shallow part of the flow system, where groundwater circulates through unlithified deposits and underlying Silurian dolomite, and the deep part of the flow system, where groundwater moves mainly through sandstone and silty Cambrian-Ordovician sandstone units, and to a certain extent through the overlying Sinnipee Group dolomite. Figure 2 shows this configuration for a representative west to east vertical cross section. Where the Maquoketa shale is present, the deep sandstone aquifer is "confined". In this case little flow occurs between the shallow and deep parts of the groundwater system and only the shallow part is in good connection with surface water bodies. Where the Maquoketa shale is absent and the deep part of the flow system is "unconfined", circulation between the shallow and deep parts is enhanced.

Resolution of the model: The dimensions of cells in the finite-difference grid limit the spatial resolution of the groundwater flow model. Although spatial variations in the groundwater system can occur at any scale, from feet to miles, the model does not compute water levels and flows everywhere within the model domain. For the model nearfield, most cells extend 2500 ft from north to south and 2500 ft from east to west. Therefore, model results correspond to average conditions over an approximate half-mile by half-mile area. For example, simulateddrawdown at a particular time due to pumping



Figure 2. Hydrostratigraphic units in model. *Trace corresponds to A-A' in Figure 1. Vertical lines correspond to the spacing of model columns along cross section.*

a specific group of wells represents an average decline in water levels over the area of the cell containing the wells. It does not reflect the presence of a small cone of depression, for example, that might develop around a single well located somewhere within the cell. The vertical resolution of the model also is limited. In general, water levels, drawdowns, and fluxes (where fluxes are defined as the volumetric flow per unit time) correspond to single hydrostratigraphic units or subdivision of units within the flow system.

Transient model simulations require time to be divided into discrete steps, and the length of these steps affects the temporal resolution of the model. The model simulates changes in pumping in steps over periods that average about 10 years. Pumping rates at all wells are constant during each period and represent the average rates calculated from available well records for the period. The model contains 15 such pumping periods between 1864 and 2000. Model output is reported at selected times during and at the end of each period.

<u>Discharge locations</u>: There are two categories of discharge locations (or "sinks") for groundwater in the model. The first includes surface water bodies, such as Lake Michigan, rivers and streams, inland lakes and ponds, wetlands, springs and seeps, agricultural tiles, and the water table itself. The second consists of pumped wells. Some wells extract groundwater from shallow aquifers, some from the deep sandstone aquifer, and some from both parts of the flow system.

<u>Local and regional flow systems in southeastern Wisconsin</u>: When groundwater circulates from the water table to the nearest discharge location, for example a stream, it is part of a local groundwater flow system. When groundwater circulates more deeply so that it flows under discharge locations before arriving at a more distant sink, such as a major river or Lake Michigan, then it is part of a regional groundwater flow system. It is important to note that some groundwater circulating strictly in the shallow part of the flow system can still follow a regional flow path, while groundwater entering the deep part of the flow system can follow local flow paths, especially in areas where the shallow and deep parts of the flow system are in good communication. Where the Maquoketa shale is absent and the Sinnipee dolomite directly underlies glacial deposits, local flow can extend to the units at the top of the deep part of the flow system

Sources of water to wells: The meaning of the phrase "sources of water to wells" can be understood by using an analogy to a person with multiple bank accounts. If he or she transfers money from one bank account to another, it is fair to say that the first account is the source of money for the second although the ultimate source of money for both accounts is the person's income. Similarly, when we say that reduced baseflow to streams and lakes is the primary source of water to pumping wells, we are talking about redistributing the water made available to the groundwater system between different accounts. The ultimate source, the "income", is predominantly recharge to the water table (flow from surface water into the groundwater system is a secondary type of "income"). But since pumping ordinarily does not affect the amount of recharge, it is more useful to talk about what pumping does change - that is, how water is redistributed among each discharge "account" (as well as its effect on the transfer of water from streams and lakes to the subsurface).

Discharge to wells is drawn from four "accounts" of available groundwater (Winter et al., 1998). The first source, and usually the most important, is groundwater *diverted* from surface water, defined as groundwater that would discharge to surface water under natural conditions, but that is rerouted by pumping. One example is diverted baseflow that would otherwise go to streams. The second source is groundwater flow *induced* from surface water, defined as water that is directly removed from surface water and enters the groundwater system due to the effects of pumping. Induced flow from streams and other water bodies usually requires a reversal of hydraulic gradients caused by wells near surface-water bodies, so that the groundwater system gains water instead of yielding it to streams. The third source is *storage release,* defined as the water released from the groundwater reservoir in response to declining water levels resulting from pumping. This source derives either from drainage of pores at the water table or from compression of the aquifer matrix (and expansion of the water) at depth. It is most important at the onset of pumping or after an increase in pumping. The fourth source is *cross-boundary flow*, which refers to changes in flow across the boundaries of the seven-county SEWRPC region caused by pumping within those boundaries. Part of the cross-boundary flow is diverted (that is, groundwater that in the absence of pumping would leave the region) and part is induced (that is, groundwater that enters the region only because pumping is active). For this report, the cross-boundary flow does not include flows from the Lake Michigan side of the study area because they are counted either as part of induced flow from surface water (when water moves directly from the lake to wells) or diverted flow from surface water (when water that would otherwise flow toward the Lake is rerouted toward wells).

Contributing areas: A distinction can be made between sources of water to wells and their “contributing areas”. A contributing area is an area on the land surface where recharge enters the groundwater system and then flows to a well. The distinction between a source of water to wells (for example, a stream that receives less groundwater discharge in the presence of pumping) and a contributing area for wells (for example, a recharge area upgradient of a pumping center with relatively easy circulation from the shallow to deep parts of the flow system) is particularly important to keep in mind when analyzing the interactions of groundwater with Lake Michigan under pumping conditions.

Fate of pumped groundwater: The pumped water that is drawn from the various sources eventually re-enters the water cycle Some water evaporates to the atmosphere after discharge, some returns to inland surface-water bodies as treated effluent from sewage treatment , and some returns as treated effluent to Lake Michigan. However, the location of these return flows are generally different than the locations of natural groundwater discharge. It is possible for the pumped groundwater to be discharged outside the surface-water basin where it originated. In addition, the timing, quality, and temperature of the return flow for water withdrawn by wells are generally different than natural groundwater discharge .

Groundwater and surface-water divides: Groundwater or surface-water divides are imaginary boundaries that separate water that flows toward one discharge location from water that flows to another. In plan view, a divide appears as a line separating two areas of a map. Groundwater divides mark the boundaries of groundwater flow systems. Surface-water divides define watersheds in which all overland runoff contributes to a single surface-water body. Land-surface topography controls the boundary of the watershed. While groundwater flow is influenced by topography, groundwater divides do not necessarily coincide with surface-water divides. This study demonstrates cases where groundwater originating in one surface watershed discharges to a surface-water body (or well) in another surface watershed.

Recharge and vertical flow: Recharge is infiltration at the land surface that percolates to the water table and becomes groundwater flow. The amount of recharge in a period of time that becomes groundwater in an area is its recharge flux. Most groundwater flow originates as recharge (a smaller amount can originate as percolation from surface-water bodies, especially under the influence of pumping). Most groundwater flow circulates from the water table through shallow flow systems and returns to the water table where it discharges to surface-water bodies. However, a portion of the recharge flows to the deep part of the flow system, where it exits from the 7-county study area as cross-boundary flow, circulates back upward to the shallow part of the flow system, or discharges to deep wells.

Travel times and effective porosity: A model solution simulates the water level for each model cell as well as the volume of groundwater that flows across the cell in a unit of time, such as a day. However, although a set of model inputs uniquely determines the water levels and volumetric rates of flow simulated by the model for a given pumping period, it does not uniquely determine the velocity of a groundwater particle moving through the cell for that period. The velocity is undetermined because groundwater does not flow uniformly through the entire volume represented by a model cell. Instead, the same total flow is distributed preferentially through variable conductivity pathways too small to measure or represent in the model. These pathways result from small variations in rock type, the geometry of pore space between sand grains, joints and bedding plane fracture openings, and the degree to which the openings are interconnected. An extra parameter, called the effective porosity, is needed to calculate flow velocities. The values of effective porosity do not affect the model solutions of heads or flows. They only affect the estimation of travel times between points of interest, such as the travel time between the water table and deep wells.

In the nearfield of the model, model cells are 2500 ft on a side and average about 100 ft in thickness. For some hydrogeologic units, such as unlithified sands and silts, variations in hydraulic conductivity within the volume represented by a model cell do not generally give rise to zones of strong preferential flow. For these units effective porosity values equal to 10% or more are appropriate. For other geologic units, such as fractured dolomite and shale, the influence of small preferential flow zones on groundwater velocity is great, and it is appropriate to set effective porosities to 1% or less (Domenico and Schwartz, 1990). For the deep sandstone units in southeastern Wisconsin, there is uncertainty about appropriate values for effective porosity. It is often assumed that flow occurs uniformly through the porous sandstone matrix such that relatively low velocities correspond to relatively high values of effective porosity. However, there is increasing recognition that even in sandstone aquifers, porosity due to fractures can be important and that flow occurs preferentially as well as through the matrix. A recent comprehensive analysis of the hydrogeology of sandstone and other bedrock units in Minnesota (Runkel et al. 2003) emphasizes the importance of relatively rapid flow through secondary or fracture porosity. In southeastern Wisconsin, the influence of fractures on flow through deep sandstone units is unknown. In the face of this uncertainty, a range of low to high effective porosities is used to represent the deep part of the flow system (0.5% to 10%). On the basis of this range of values, a range of travel times to wells is reported.

Acknowledgments

This study was motivated, organized and financed by the Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission and the municipal water utilities in southeastern Wisconsin that support it. Special thanks go to Robert Biebel, Philip Evenson and Brian Barrett as well as the Technical Advisory Committee on Groundwater Resources for guiding the project and contributing many ideas. Committee members included:

Brian S. Barrett, Chairman, BSB Technical Services
Julie A. Anderson, Planning and Development Director, Racine County Planning Division
Douglas S. Cherkauer, Professor of Hydrogeology, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee
Daniel S. Duchniak, General Manager, Waukesha Water Utility
Philip C. Evenson, Secretary, Executive Director, Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission
Francis G. Fuja Water Supply Municipal Engineer, Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources
Ronald G. Hennings Assistant Director Emeritus, Wisconsin Geological and Natural History Survey
James P. Hurley, Assistant Director for Research, University of Wisconsin-Water Resources Institute
John Jansen, Senior Geoscientist, Ruekert & Mielke, Inc.
Marlin P. Johnson, Assoc. Professor Emeritus Depart. Biological Sci., University of Wisconsin-Waukesha
Terrance H. Kiekhaefer Director of Public Works, Water Utility, Vehicle Maintenance, City of West Bend
Thomas J. Krueger, Water and Wastewater Utility Director, Village of Grafton
Michael D. Lemcke, Section Chief, Groundwater Management, Wisconsin Depart. of Natural Resources
George E. Melcher, Director, Kenosha County Department of Planning and Development
Daniel Nase Village Engineer, Village of Germantown
Michael P. Rau, General Manager, We Energies-Water Services
Thomas Rossmiller, Director of Public Works, Village of East Troy
Shuichi Sasaki, Production Manager, Kikkoman Foods, Inc.
Steven H. Schultz, Manager, Water Supply Department, Ruekert & Mielke, Inc.
Mark D. Simon, Water Superintendent, City of Brookfield
Larry R. Wilms Division Engineer-Utilities, City of New Berlin
Constance R. Wilson, Utility Manager, Burlington Water Utility

The authors received important assistance from William Batten, Wisconsin Geological and Natural History, Cheryl Buchwald, U.S. Geological Survey, Doug Carlson, Louisiana State Geological Survey, Charles Dunning, U.S. Geological Survey, Norman Grannemann, U.S. Geological Survey, Scott Meyer, Illinois State Water Survey, James Nicholas, U.S. Geological Survey, Roger Peters, Wisconsin Geological and Natural History Survey, David Saad, U.S. Geological Survey, and Kurt Zeiler, Geomatrix Consultants (formerly with Wisconsin Geological and Natural History Survey).

The able review team included Brian Barrett, BSB Technical Services, Douglas Cherkauer, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, Madeline Gotkowitz, Wisconsin Geological and Natural History Survey, Robert Kay, U.S. Geological Survey, David LePain, Wisconsin Geological and Natural History Survey, and Douglas Walker, Illinois State Water Survey.

3. Effect of pumping on water levels

The groundwater flow model for southeastern Wisconsin simulates groundwater levels before large-scale pumping began, and then the gradual decline in water levels as pumping increased. It accounts for changes in pumping both in the nearfield of the model and in surrounding regions such as northern Illinois.

Predevelopment water levels

Pumping in southeastern Wisconsin began around 1864. Predevelopment water levels represent average conditions up to 1864. The simulated water table configuration in Figure 3a shows predevelopment conditions in the shallow part of the flow system. The contours simulated by the flow model reflect the strong influence of topography and the surface-water network on the variations in the water table.

The water levels in the St. Peter Formation shown in Figure 3b represent predevelopment conditions at the top of the deep sandstone aquifer. Simulated water levels at different elevations within the deep part of the flow system show similar hydraulic gradients. The contours are influenced by topography and surface water where the Maquoketa shale is absent west of its subcrop located in Dodge and western Waukesha and Walworth Counties. Over this area the shallow and deep parts of the flow system are in good communication. East of the Maquoketa subcrop, the potentiometric surface in the deep part of the flow system is more regular and slopes uniformly to the east. In this area the two parts of the flow system are not well connected, so that the deep groundwater discharges over long flow paths to Lake Michigan, rather than to shallow, nearby discharge locations associated with streams and other water bodies.

Drawdown in shallow and deep parts of the flow system

Withdrawals from shallow and deep wells gradually changed the groundwater flow system between 1864 and 2000. In 1950, deep pumping centered on Milwaukee with appreciable shallow pumping along the Rock River in central Rock County (Figure 4a). By 2000, the deep pumping center had moved to central and eastern Waukesha County



Figure 3. **Simulated predevelopment water levels. A. Water table. B. St. Peter Formation.**



Figure 4. Distribution of shallow and deep pumping. A. 1950. B. 2000.
The map for 2000 does not include private wells in southeastern Ozaukee County (city of Mequon) that are present in the model after 1960. They are estimated to discharge 3.0 mgd from the shallow part of the flow system in 2000. The map also does not include the deep sanitary tunnel in Milwaukee County that is present in the model after 1990. It is estimated to discharge about 2.8 mgd from the shallow part of the flow system in 2000.

with appreciable shallow pumping in Rock County, Washington and Ozaukee Counties (Figure 4b). The total high-capacity pumping in the model nearfield (the SEWRPC counties plus Dodge and Jefferson County and eastern Rock County) increased from negligible pumping in 1864, to 37 million gallons per day (mgd) in 1950, to 113 mgd in 2000. Section 3 of Report 1 of this study provides more detail on the distribution of pumping through time and space.

The decline in water levels caused by pumping is different for the shallow and deep parts of the flow system. Pumping from shallow wells in the unlithified sand-and-gravel and Silurian dolomite aquifers generally cause little regional drawdown because local surface-water features (streams, lakes, and wetlands) help to offset the withdrawal. Often the major effect of pumping from these shallow wells is to reduce the amount of groundwater discharge to local surface-water features. At the resolution of the model, simulated drawdown in the Silurian dolomite aquifer occurs mainly in Ozaukee County and parts of eastern Washington, northeastern Waukesha, and northern Milwaukee Counties (Figure 5). Simulated drawdown in the Silurian dolomite between 1864 and 2000 approaches 200 ft around high-capacity wells at the pumping center in central Ozaukee County. The drawdown cone is also relatively deep in southern Ozaukee County where domestic wells in sewered areas do not return discharge to the ground through septic systems, and, therefore, have caused a net loss of water to the Silurian dolomite aquifer. Increased drawdown over time is more dramatic in the deeper parts of the flow system. Changing water levels in the St. Peter Formation show the development of a single drawdown cone.for the deep part of the flow system in southeasten Wisconsin. In 1950, pumping centered in Milwaukee produced a regional cone of depression centered below Milwaukee with maximum drawdown in the St. Peter potentiometric surface exceeding 300 ft (Figure 6a). By 2000, increased pumping especially in Waukesha County, and decreased pumping in Milwaukee County, moved the center of the regional cone of depression approximately 9 miles west with maximum drawdown in the St. Peter approaching 500 ft (Figure 6b). A single regional drawdown cone is evident for both 1950 and 2000 (the model resolution is not sufficient to capture local deviations from the regional pattern associated with individual wells). The cone of depression extends not only to the west below Dodge, Jefferson, and Rock Counties, but also under Lake Michigan to the east. The drawdown patterns are affected not only by pumping in southeastern Wisconsin, but also by pumping outside the model nearfield. The effect of pumping in northeastern Illinois is especially evident in the drawdown contours shown for Racine and Kenosha Counties.

Hydrographs of simulated water levels through time also show the evolution of drawdown at selected locations. Figure 7 shows water levels in the St. Peter Formation at 5 locations along a line from Watertown to Milwaukee, following the approximate regional southeastward dip of the geologic units. Watertown and Oconomowoc are located far from pumping centers and beyond the most westward extent of the Maquoketa shale. At these locations the St. Peter potentiometric surface shows little change from 1864 to 2000. Pewaukee, Elm Grove and Milwaukee are close to pumping centers in areas where the deep sandstone aquifer is confined by the Maquoketa shale. The hydrograph of Milwaukee water levels shows a steep decline from 1864 until about 1950, and then the decline slowed. Simulation results indicate that the rate of decline in Pewaukee and Elm Grove water levels has also slowed, but only slightly. There is still an appreciable downward trend in these areas.



EXPLANATION



Drawdown in feet
Contour intervals are
5, 50, 100, and 150 feet.

Figure 5. Simulated shallow drawdown relative to predevelopment conditions: Silurian dolomite in 2000



Figure 6. Simulated deep drawdown relative to predevelopment conditions: St. Peter Formation. A. 1950. B. 2000.

Unsaturated conditions at depth

It is possible for deep pumping below an aquitard to cause locally unsaturated conditions below the aquitard. Under these circumstances, the model simulates a transition to unconfined conditions, producing a second water table in the deep part of the flow system and allowing for release of water from storage by draining of rock pores. Model results suggest that in recent years, the top of the Sinnipee Group dolomite below the Maquoketa shale has become unsaturated under the city of Waukesha pumping center (Figure 8). An unsaturated condition at this depth, depending on how it spreads, could influence the well yields and groundwater geochemistry around deep wells open to the Sinnipee Group, the St. Peter Formation, and below. However, because of the limited resolution of the model layering and because the MODFLOW code does not explicitly simulate unsaturated flow, this interpretation is largely speculative. To confirm the extent of deep unsaturated conditions, it would be necessary to use more specialized flow models constructed at a finer scale and calibrated to water levels collected directly from this area. Appropriate deep wells for such data collection are currently unavailable.

Future drawdowns

The groundwater model is a useful tool for simulating future drawdowns. Future drawdowns depend on future pumping. To arrive at an estimate of minimum future pumping, no change from year 2000 pumping locations or pumping rates was assumed. As a more reasonable approximation of future pumping, the overall trend in nearfield pumping rates was extrapolated beyond 2000 to 2020 (with pumping locations assumed to be unchanged). If present trends continue, pumping in 2010 will be 10-20% greater than 2000 rates, and pumping in 2020 will be 30-40% greater than 2000 rates. Multipliers in those ranges were applied to all pumping, shallow and deep, in the model nearfield for the 2000 to 2010 and 2010 to 2020 periods. Pumping outside the nearfield was fixed at 2000 levels.



Figure 7. Water levels in the deep sandstone aquifer at selected locations. *Curves represent simulated hydraulic heads (in feet above sea level) neart the top of the deep aquifer (St. Peter Formation).*



Figure 8. **Simulated unsaturated conditions in deep part of flow system: Sinnipee Group dolomite in year 2000.**

Model results show the relation between future pumping rates and future drawdowns. Predictive simulations (Table 1) indicate that if overall pumping remains constant at year 2000 rates and locations, little additional drawdown will occur in the deeper part of the flow system over the subsequent 20 years although the cone of depression will continue to spread laterally. As water levels stabilize, less water will be released from storage below the seven-county region. In contrast, if pumping rates at currently active wells continue to rise according to historical trends, then additional drawdown at current pumping centers will be substantial. For example, the model simulates 125 ft of additional drawdown by 2020 in the St. Peter Formation below the Village of Elm Grove. West of the Waukesha County pumping centers, the model simulates 26 ft of additional drawdown at Oconomowoc and 5.5 ft of additional drawdown at Watertown. Under these circumstances the deepening and spread of the cone of depression in the deep sandstone will remove large amounts of groundwater from storage. Model results for historical and future shallow and deep drawdown are available for municipalities throughout the seven-county SEWRPC region. However, it is important to emphasize that the simulated future drawdowns depend on uncertain estimates of future pumping that do not take account of the installation of new wells and changing proportions of withdrawals between shallow and deep wells.

Table 1. Additional drawdown in St. Peter Formation between 2000 and 2020 at selected locations.

Note:

Additional drawdown is calculated for two pumping scenarios.
St. Peter drawdown is representative of conditions in the deep sandstone aquifer.

****

Pumping rates for 2020 sustained at 2000 rates over entire model.

Town*	Simulated 2000 Drawdown Relative to Predevelopment (ft)	Additional 2020 Drawdown Relative to 2000 (ft)
Watertown	12.1	0.1
Oconomowoc	93.9	2.0
Pewaukee	385.7	14.9
Elm Grove	495.6	15.1
Milwaukee	368.5	16.1

****

Pumping rates for 2020 extrapolated from 2000 rates according to trend over model nearfield; elsewhere, pumping sustained at 2000 rates.

Town*	Simulated 2000 Drawdown Relative to Predevelopment (ft)	Additional 2020 Drawdown Relative to 2000 (ft)
Watertown	12.1	5.5
Oconomowoc	93.9	26.3
Pewaukee	385.7	90.7
Elm Grove	495.6	125.0
Milwaukee	368.5	76.6

* Town locations shown on Figure 7.

4. Sources of water to wells

To arrive at a better understanding of the effect of pumping on the groundwater flow system, it is useful to determine and quantify the sources of water that contribute to well discharge. The four sources are: *diverted* flow from surface water, *induced* flow from surface water, *storage release*, and *cross-boundary flow*. The model distinguishes between these sources for different parts of the flow system and shows how pumping diverts water from the natural groundwater and surface-water systems in the seven-county SEWRPC region. In the following discussion the term "sources of water to wells" always refers to exclusively to the changes to natural flows induced by pumping.

Sources to shallow wells in 2000

In year 2000, groundwater discharge to shallow high-capacity wells amounted to more than 29 mgd in the seven-county region. The model for year 2000 also includes 3 mgd attributable to shallow household wells in sewered areas in southern Ozuakee County. Shallow pumping occurs in the unlithified sand-and-gravel deposits and the Silurian dolomite aquifer. According to the model, about 63% of the water extracted from these shallow units was derived from groundwater flow that in the absence of pumping would have discharged to streams and Lake Michigan (Table 2). About 25% was derived directly from water bodies (mostly streams) due to reversed hydraulic gradients at the groundwater-surface-water interface. Storage release, making up the balance (about 12%), is also an important source because even small declines in water-table elevation release appreciable water from storage by drainage of pores. The amount of groundwater contributed to shallow wells from increased cross-boundary flow into the seven-county area is negligible because the direction of shallow flow is controlled more by natural discharge locations than by pumping.

Table 2. Sources of water to shallow wells in 2000. SEWRPC 7-county region only.

	Flux (mgd)	Percent Source
Shallow Pumping in Year 2000	32.50	--------
Groundwater Flow "Diverted" from Surface Water		
Diverted Baseflow to Streams, Lakes, Wetlands	18.84	58.0%
Diverted Shallow Discharge to Lake Michigan	1.51	4.6%
Groundwater Flow "Induced" from Surface Water		
Induced Flow from Streams, Lakes, Wetlands	7.99	24.6%
Induced Flow from Lake Michigan	0.30	0.9%
Shallow Groundwater Storage Release (below 7-County region)	3.73	11.5%
Cross-Boundary Shallow Groundwater Flow		
"Diverted" Lateral Flow Across 7-County Inland Boundaries	0.13	0.4%
Total sources	32.50	100.0%

Explanation: Shallow pumping includes all well discharge from the shallow part of the flow system (composed of unlithified deposits and the Silurian dolomite).

The contribution of municipal and industrial wells is 29.52 mgd, the contribution from private wells in southeastern Ozaukee County (Mequon) is 2.98 mgd.

Recharge is assumed constant between Predevelopment and Year 2000. It is the ultimate source of groundwater under both predevelopment and pumping conditions, but because it is does not change in response to pumping, it is not proper to consider it as a source of water to wells.

Cross boundary flow originates chiefly as diverted base flow and storage release outside the 7-county SEWRPC region.

Sources to deep wells in 2000

In year 2000, high-capacity deep pumping amounted to about 33 mgd in the seven-county region. Deep pumping occurs primarily in the deep sandstone aquifer, but many wells are also open to the Sinnipee Group dolomite. Simulation results indicate that about 68% of the groundwater extracted from these deep units would have discharged to streams and Lake Michigan but instead, because of pumping, flows downward from the shallow to the deep part of the flow system (Table 3). The contribution by induced flow from surface water bodies is small, 4%: it is limited to water derived directly from Lake Michigan because of reversed hydraulic gradients along the coastline. Storage release from below the seven-county region is also a small source of water, 3%, but storage release in the part of the deep sandstone aquifer below Lake Michigan is more important, contributing 8% of deep withdrawals. In contrast to the shallow part of the system, flow across the boundaries of the deep part of the system is a very important source of water to wells. About 18% of the water withdrawn from deep wells originates outside the 7-county region from the north and west. Most of this deep lateral flow occurs below the western boundaries of Washington, Waukesha and Walworth Counties.

Table 3. **Sources of water to deep wells in 2000. SEWRPC 7-county region only.**

	Flux (mgd)	Percent Source
Deep Pumping in Year 2000	33.33	-------
Groundwater Flow "Diverted " from surface water		
Baseflow leaked downward from shallow part of system	19.69	59.1%
Deep discharge toward Lake Michigan	2.84	8.5%
Groundwater flow "Induced" downward from shallow part of system below Lake Michigan	1.30	3.9%
Deep groundwater Storage Release		
Release below Lake Michigan	2.63	7.9%
Release below 7-County region	1.00	3.0%
Cross-Boundary Deep Groundwater Flow		
"Diverted" Lateral Flow Across 7-County Inland Boundaries	2.39	7.2%
"Induced" Lateral Flow Across 7-County Inland Boundaries	3.48	10.4%
Total sources	33.33	100.0%

Explanation: Deep pumping includes all discharge from the deep part of the flow system (composed of the Sinnipee Group dolomite and the deep sandstone units).

Recharge is assumed constant between Predevelopment and Year 2000. It is the ultimate source of groundwater under both predevelopment and pumping conditions, but because it is does not change in response to pumping, it is not proper to consider it as a source of water to wells.

Diverted and induced cross-boundary flow originates chiefly as downward flow and storage release outside the 7-county SEWRPC region.

Water balance for deep part of flow system

Model results illustrate the large effect of pumping on the water balance in the SEWRPC region. Figure 9 shows in detail the various fluxes that provide groundwater to the deep part of the flow system under the seven-county region and contrasts the sources of water before and after pumping. Under predevelopment conditions, water generally flowed out of the deep part of the flow system below southeastern Wisconsin by moving laterally across the inland boundaries of the SEWRPC region as well as across its boundary with Lake Michigan (Figure 9a). This net outward flow was balanced by downward flow from the shallow part of the flow system within the SEWRPC region, replenishing the deep part of the flow system at a rate of about 5 mgd. Most of the flow from above occurred where the Maquoketa shale is absent. These shallow to deep transfers in the western portions of Waukesha and Walworth counties accounted for about three quarters of deep flow. According to model results, about one-quarter of the deep flow originated as downward flow through the Maquoketa shale.

By year 2000, pumping from deep wells had reversed the groundwater flow across three of the four lateral boundaries of the deep part of the flow system (Figure 9b). Along the southern boundary, net groundwater flow out of the 7-county study area increased relative to predevelopment conditions because of large-scale pumping in Illinois. But along its western and northern boundaries, the seven-county region became a net importer of groundwater. Pumping wells have also had a profound effect on the exchange of water between Lake Michigan and the flow system under the SEWRPC region. Model simulations show that before pumping, the deep part of the flow system lost almost 3 mgd to the groundwater system under the lake, but it now receives almost 4 mgd from beneath the lake, representing a net reversal of about 6.5 mgd. Two thirds of the water received from the deep sandstone aquifer extending under the lake originates as storage release. The amount is large because the cone of depression caused by pumping initiated in 1864 continued to spread farther to the east through 2000, causing the deep sandstone aquifer units under even the eastern part of the Lake to compress and release water from storage. The current rate of drawdown under Lake Michigan, combined with the



Figure 9. Water balance (mgd) for deep part of the flow system below seven county region. A. Predevelopment. B. 2000. *Positive fluxes are into deep part of flow system below seven-county region. Negative fluxes are out of deep part of flow system below seven-county region.*

expanding drawdown area under the Lake, accounts for the large release of water from storage east of the study area. The model indicates that under 2000 conditions a relatively small amount of water, 1.30 mgd, is directly drawn through the bottom of Lake Michigan and vertically down to the deep sandstone aquifer.

As pumping increased over time, the vertical flow between the shallow and deep parts of the flow system increased. By the year 2000, simulation results indicate that downward flow had increased from about 5 to 25 mgd. The amount of downward flow was far greater in the areas where the Maquoketa shale is absent, which cover less than 1/5 of the 7-county region, even though most of the pumping occurred (and continues to occur) below where the shale is present.

The 25 mgd of shallow groundwater that flowed downward into the deep part of the flow system in 2000 over the seven-county region is the most important source of water to deep wells, but still accounts for only 4% of the 583 mgd of overall recharge in the region. The fraction of recharge at the water table that eventually reaches the top of the sandstone aquifer is greatest where the Maquoketa is absent. Under predevelopment conditions the model indicates that 3% of recharge leaks to the deep part of the flow system where the Maquoketa is absent, but only 0.3% where it is present. Under 2000 conditions the corresponding values for where the Maquoketa is absent and present increase to 12.8% and 1.9% respectively, showing the strong influence of deep pumping on vertical flow patterns throughout the seven-county region.

Pumping has had a greater effect on stream baseflow in the western than in the eastern part of the study area because the deep part of the flow system is in better communication with shallow rocks where the Maquoketa is absent. According to the model, pumping has caused baseflow to inland water bodies in the 7-county region to decrease from 570 mgd to 532 mgd between 1864 and 2000, equivalent to a reduction of 6.7%. However, where the Maquoketa is absent, the baseflow reduction is from 127 mgd to 113 mgd, a drop of 11%. The baseflow reduction due to pumping does not mean that streamflow has decreased overall. Baseflow is less than half of average annual streamflow in southeastern Wisconsin; surface runoff is generally the more important component. It is possible that historical developments, notably urbanization and climate change, have caused surface runoff and even total streamflow to increase over time despite increased pumping. In addition, return flow of pumped water through sewer outfalls to streams has in some areas offset baseflow reductions due to pumping.

Storage release over time from deep part of flow system

Future water-level trends depend not only on the amount of future pumping, but also on the time necessary for any part of the flow system to adjust to increased pumping. The groundwater system around discharging wells adjusts initially by releasing water from storage as water levels drop. As more water is diverted and/or induced from surface-water bodies, water levels tend to stabilize around pumping centers. It is possible to use the model to calculate the overall response time to stabilize drawdown in southeastern Wisconsin for the shallow and deep parts of the regional flow system. To perform this calculation, year 2000 pumping rates were applied for the entire flow model to background predevelopment conditions, and maintained constant for 200 years. The model indicates that 50% of the long-term drawdown in the shallow part of the flow system over the seven SEWRPC counties occurs within 3 years and 90% within 30 years. The response time of the deep part of the flow system in the study area is even shorter. In the deep rocks, 50% of the long-term drawdown occurs within 2 years and 90% within 15 years. These results imply that in response to a single step increase of pumping across the region, drawdown continues for about 15 to 30 years, after which additional drawdown is small and wells receive relatively little water from storage derived from below the seven-county region.

The flow model simulates how the rate of storage release changes in response to the accumulated changes in pumping that have occurred between 1864 and 2000. The changes in pumping are simulated as series of steps (generally step increases) over periods of five or ten years duration. The model simulation shows that in response to the historical pattern of pumping, the absolute amount of water released from storage in the deep part of the flow system over the 10-county model nearfield did not vary greatly from one period to another (Table 4). However, as total nearfield deep pumping increased from about 4 mgd to over 56 mgd between 1920 and 2000, the proportion of discharge to deep wells derived from storage decreased exponentially, from about 60% in 1920 to 6% in 2000, (Table 4). The important sources of water to deep wells shifted from storage release (due to declining water levels in the vicinity of the wells) to vertical flow from the shallow part of the flow system (some through the Maquoketa shale but most from downward flow west of its subcrop), as well as cross-boundary flow and inflow from under Lake Michigan. As the regional cone of depression has expanded in size, some of the groundwater now moving to deep wells originates as storage release under Lake Michigan at locations far to the east of regional pumping centers. Most, however, originates as shallow groundwater to the west of pumping centers that would have discharged to surface water bodies under natural conditions but is diverted to longer and deeper flow paths in response to deep pumping.

Table 4. Storage release over time in deep part of flow system: entire model nearfield.

Year	Deep nearfield pumping	Storage release below nearfield area	Storage release below Lake Michigan	Total
1920				
Flux (mgd)	3.83	0.78	1.51	2.29
Pct. of deep pumping	-------	20.4%	39.4%	**59.8%**
1950				
Flux (mgd)	22.30	1.58	3.70	5.28
Pct. of deep pumping	-------	7.1%	16.6%	**23.7%**
1980				
Flux (mgd)	37.60	1.50	3.51	5.01
Pct. of deep pumping	-------	4.0%	9.3%	**13.3%**
2000				
Flux (mgd)	56.66	1.05	2.64	3.69
Pct. of deep pumping	-------	1.8%	4.7%	**6.5%**

In the future, deepening cones of depression and accompanying storage release could play a more important role as a source of water to deep wells. If well discharge in southeastern Wisconsin were to be significantly increased, for example on the order of 40% by 2020, then the accelerated drawdown would cause the contribution of storage to increase and account for more than 10% of all groundwater withdrawn by deep wells.

In the unlikely event that all pumping should cease, water levels would recover over time. Based on the model simulations, the time for close to complete recovery to predevelopment levels below the SEWRPC region would be about 100 years for the shallow cones of depression and about 70 years for the regional deep cone of depression.

5. Shallow groundwater interactions with Lake Michigan

Regional pumping has reduced the amount of groundwater discharged to Lake Michigan from unlithified and Silurian/Devonian deposits in the shallow part of the flow system. Under both predevelopment and pumping conditions, simulation results show that groundwater movement across the shallow part of the flow system along the Lake Michigan coastline is almost exclusively toward the lake. However, pumping has decreased the total amount of groundwater discharge to the lake. The decrease appears in two ways. First, pumping reduces the direct discharge of groundwater beneath the coastline to deposits under the lake and ultimately up through the lakebed into the lake itself. Second, pumping reduces indirect groundwater discharge to Lake Michigan. Indirect discharge consists of baseflow to streams that flow into the lake. All streams east of the subcontinental surface-water divide (approximate location shown on Figure 10) flow into Lake Michigan.

The model results provide an estimate of how pumping alone affects groundwater discharge to Lake Michigan. In simulating the effects of pumping on groundwater exchange with the lake, the model ignores any changes in recharge rates over the period between 1864 and 2000. Although the model assumes constant recharge rates throughout this period, there are at least two factors that might have caused long-term changes in recharge: urbanization and climate change. These mechanisms could have decreased recharge in some areas (due to less infiltration through paved areas) and increased recharge in others (due to shorter periods of frozen soil in winter). It is possible, for example, that the simulated decrease in groundwater discharge to Lake Michigan caused by pumping has been offset by increased recharge over at least part of the coastal area.

Another factor neglected by the model is return flow to Lake Michigan from storm and sanitary sewers and from the Deep Tunnel that underlies Milwaukee. Part of the water pumped from the shallow and deep parts of the flow system east of the subcontinental divide is discharged through water-treatment plants to sewers and routed back to the Lake. While this return flow offsets part of the decline in groundwater discharge to the Lake that occurs because of pumping, it also changes the timing, location, and quality of the discharged water relative to natural conditions.

Predevelopment conditions

Under predevelopment conditions, the model indicates that a portion of the water that recharged the shallow groundwater system along the coastline discharged directly to Lake Michigan. This zone of partial discharge to the Lake corresponding to most of Ozaukee County and the eastern fringes of Milwaukee, Racine and Kenosha Counties, is indicated by the combined solid and stippled portions shown on Figure 10. Even within this zone, most groundwater discharged to streams. The model indicates that areas where the recharge circulated to streams (80% of the zone) existed alongside areas where the recharge circulated directly to the lake (20% of the zone). The flow from the latter areas contributed 13.3 mgd of direct groundwater discharge to Lake Michigan (Table 5). West of this zone, *no* groundwater discharged directly to the lake, but instead it flowed only to local surface-water locations or moved downward or moved downward to the deeper parts of the flow system



Figure 10. Areas containing sources of direct shallow groundwater flow to Lake Michigan: Predevelopment and year 2000. *The two zones encompass areas from which recharge to the water table discharges directly to Lake Michigan. The combined hatched and solid zones correspond to predevelopment conditions. The solid zone alone corresponds to 2000 pumping conditions. Some of the groundwater recharged within each zone contributes baseflow to streams rather than direct discharge to the lake. However, no groundwater recharged outside these zones flows directly to the lake.*

Table 5. Effect of pumping on groundwater interactions with Lake Michigan: Ozaukee, Milwaukee, Racine and Kenosha Counties.*

Year	Pumping East of Subcontinental Divide	Direct Discharge to Lake Michigan	Indirect Discharge to Lake Michigan	Total Discharge to Lake Michigan
1864	0.00 mgd	13.27 mgd	144.79 mgd	158.06 mgd
1950	2.57 mgd	12.86 mgd	142.95 mgd	155.81 mgd
Percent Change from 1864		*-3.1%*	*-1.3%*	*-1.4%*
2000	20.18 mgd	11.76 mgd	132.88 mgd	144.64 mgd
Percent Change from 1864		*-11.4%*	*-8.2%*	*-8.5%*

Explanation: Pumping and discharge fluxes refer to shallow part of flow system only. Direct discharge refers to shallow groundwater flow into Lake Michigan. Indirect discharge refers to shallow groundwater flow into surface water bodies east of the subcontinental divide that empty to Lake Michigan.

* The model simulation accounts for effect of pumping on groundwater discharge to Lake Michigan, but it does not account for effects of urbanization and climate change. It also does not account for any flow of pumped water that is discharged to the sewer and deep tunnel system east of the subcontinental divide and is returned to Lake Michigan as storm flow or treated sanitary flow.

In the area between the subcontinental divide and Lake Michigan (Figure 10) the model indicates that groundwater contributed 145 mgd to streams as baseflow. This predevelopment flux eventually was routed to Lake Michigan as stream discharge and, therefore, constituted indirect groundwater discharge to the lake.

Effect of pumping

For year 2000 conditions, the model indicates that pumping from wells reduced the coastline area where there was direct groundwater discharge to Lake Michigan to the zone indicated by the solid pattern in Figure 10. The largest loss of area where groundwater discharged directly to the lake occurred in Ozaukee and northern Milwaukee Counties where pumping from the Silurian aquifer is most active. According to the model, the amount of direct discharge dropped from 13.3 mgd before pumping, to 12.9

mgd in 1950, to 11.8 mgd in 2000 (Table 5). The indirect discharge followed a similar pattern, dropping from 145 mgd before pumping, to 143 mgd in 1950, to 133 mgd in 2000 (Table 5). Overall, the model indicates that combined direct and indirect discharge to Lake Michigan diminished by 8.5% between 1864 and 2000.

6. Groundwater flow directions and groundwater divides

The regional flow model is an important tool for illustrating groundwater flow directions and groundwater divides. Groundwater divides often do not coincide with surface-water divides. In particular, for southeastern Wisconsin, there is no correspondence between groundwater divides in the deep part of the flow system and the subcontinental surface-water divide shown in Figure 10. Note that the surface-water divide is entirely within the seven-county SEWRPC region. In this report, groundwater divides are illustrated using simulated flow arrows that indicate the direction of groundwater flow through the model nearfield.

Predevelopment conditions

Prior to development, local topography controlled shallow groundwater flow. The variations in lateral direction of flow and the alteration between upward and downward flow formed many relatively small-scale flow systems that discharged locally. Figure 11a shows flow directions in the unlithified deposits for predevelopment conditions.

Flow directions in the St. Peter Formation are representative of flow in most of the deeper sandstone units. Prior to development, the model shows that topographically-driven flow systems formed in the St. Peter west of the Maquoketa shale, but that regional flow was dominant east of the Maquoketa subcrop. Figure 11b shows flow directions in the St. Peter Formation near the top of the deep sandstone aquifer for predevelopment conditions. A deep groundwater divide separates the area to the west where local flow systems were active (indicated by the variety of arrow directions) with the area to the east where a single regional flow system dominated (indicated by uniform arrow directions). This deep groundwater divide is closely related to the Maquoketa shale subcrop, but it is distant from the subcontinental surface-water divide marking the edge of the Lake Michigan basin. For example the deep groundwater divide is 18 miles west of the subcontinental divide in central Waukesha County. West of the deep divide, St. Peter groundwater interacted with the shallow part of the flow system, while groundwater east of the divide flowed over long distances toward Lake Michigan.



Figure 11. **Flow directions and groundwater divides.** *Red arrows indicate downward flow. Blue arrows indicate upward flow.*

A. Unlithified deposits, Predevelopment
B. St. Peter Formation, Predevelopment
C. St. Peter Formation, 1950.
D. St. Peter Formation, 2000.

Effect of pumping

Pumping has had very little effect on simulated directions of flow in the shallow part of the flow system within the resolution of the model. However, it has moved the location of the regional groundwater divide in the deep part of the system westward almost entirely outside the seven-county region. Figures 11c and 11d show the positions of the divide in 1950 and 2000. In 1950, the regional flow in the deep sandstone aquifer converged on the pumping center under Milwaukee. By 2000, flow paths converge under eastern Waukesha County. The geographical center for the deep part of the flow system is below the Village of Elm Grove in eastern Waukesha County. The location is shown in Figure 7. The regional groundwater divide has moved from Waukesha County westward about 10 miles into Jefferson County, far removed from the edge of the Maquoketa shale and approximately 27 miles from the western edge of the Lake Michigan surface-water basin. This displacement of the divide in response to pumping is directly related to the increase in flow to the deep part of the flow system in areas where the shale is absent.

The flow-direction plots for the St. Peter Formation (Figures 11b, 11c, 11d) also show the changing location of the groundwater divide between a regional groundwater system centered in southeastern Wisconsin and another centered in northern Illinois. The model shows that in 1950 (Figure 11c) the divide was located along the Kenosha/Racine County boundary. Increases in northern Illinois pumping after 1950 moved the boundary north into eastern Racine County, but the development of local cones of depression around Union Grove moved the divide south in western Racine and in Walworth Counties. While northern Illinois pumping decreased overall in the 1990s, the 2000 divide is still north of the 1950 boundary in some places (Figure 11d).

7. Vertical movement between shallow and deep parts of flow system

Under predevelopment conditions flow between the shallow and deep parts of the flow systems was downward over only part of southeastern Wisconsin. In the absence of pumping, the model simulates a regional system in which groundwater first moves downward to the deep part of the flow system under areas encompassed by Washington, Waukesha and Walworth Counties and then moved upward toward the shallow part of the system over most of Milwaukee, Racine and Kenosha Counties (note the pattern of red and blue arrows in Figure 11b). In time, however, increases in pumping caused flow to be downward over the entire seven-county region (Figures 11c and 11d). In this section of the report, the vertical movement of groundwater between the two parts of the flow system is examined in more detail.

Flow to deep sandstone aquifer

The rates of downward groundwater movement simulated by the model vary considerably over different areas of the model nearfield for both predevelopment and pumping conditions. Figure 12 shows the rate of downward flow at different times to the top of the St. Peter Formation as a color flood map. The rates correspond to the downward flux in inches per year. A value greater than 2 inch/yr for an area indicates substantial downward flow. A value of 0.02 inch/yr or less indicates very little downward flow. Where the figures show no color, there is either upward flow or no vertical flow.

Under predevelopment conditions, the model results show that local flow systems extended down to the deep sandstone aquifer in the area west of a line that approximately follows the boundary marking the westernmost edge of the Maquoketa shale. The intermingling of colored and white areas west of this boundary in Figure 12a indicates the presence of many local flow systems in which groundwater moved downward from recharge areas and then upward to adjacent discharge areas. The amount of downward flow decreased eastward across the SEWRPC region across a transition zone straddling the Maquoketa subcrop. In the eastern part of the SEWRPC region, water in the deep part



Figure 12. Downward flow to top of St. Peter Formation. A. Predevelopment. B. 1950. C. 2000. *White areas indicate upward flow or no vertical flow.*

of the flow system moved laterally through the sandstone aquifer and eventually traveled upward toward the regional discharge location, Lake Michigan.

Model simulations show that by 1950 the area of downward flow extended over all of southeastern Wisconsin with locations of substantial vertical flow occurring just west of the edge of the Maquoketa shale (Figure 12b). The simulated flow rates in these areas are 100 to 1000 times greater than the rates below the city of Milwaukee even though the major pumping center was located below the city.

In 2000, two areas of downward flow were prominent within the seven-county region. The first occupied much of northwestern Waukesha County. The second extended from south-central Waukesha County into north-central and northwestern Walworth County. Simulation results also suggest a third area of enhanced downward flow in north-central Jefferson to south-central Dodge Counties (Figure 12c).

Particle Tracking

Numerical particle tracking was used to explore groundwater paths in the region.. Particle tracking simulates the movement of imaginary water particles through the groundwater system. This method assumes advective flow only, so that the particles move at the same rates and directions as the groundwater.

Given the geometry, aquifer, properties, and flow output of the model, it is possible to use particle tracking to visualize groundwater flow from the water table to any shallow or deep destination in the flow system. The method combines the input and output to the MODFLOW model with an associated particle-tracking code called MODPATH (Pollack, 1994). The programs can be used to track particles forward in time from the water table to discharge points or backwards in time from discharge points to the water table. In this study, particle tracking was performed in both ways. First, a circle of particles (radius equal to 500 ft) was inserted around each deep pumping well in each layer penetrated by the well. Each particle represented 2 gpm of pumping so that the number of particles was proportional to the discharge from each penetrated layer. These particles were tracked backwards in time from year 2000 in order to identify zones of contribution at the water table. As the particle moves back in time flow conditions gradually changed such that once a particle has traveled for 136 years it would follow a path determined by pre-development hydraulic gradients. Particles were also released at the water table and tracked forward in time to determine which ones moved to the deep part of the flow system and then traveled to deep wells. The initial flow conditions correspond to year 2000 and the flow system evolves under the assumption that 2000 pumping rates are maintained everywhere.

The particle tracking generates both pathlines and times of travel. However, because the time of travel depends on assumed and uncertain values of effective porosity, it is not possible to predict a single expected time of travel to deep wells from different locations. Instead, a range of times was reported that correspond to the range of effective porosity values listed in Table 6.

Table 6. Assumed Effective Porosity Values for Calculating Travel Times. Minimum values yield relatively high velocities and shorter travel times. Maximum values yield relatively low velocities and longer travel times.

Unit	Assumed minimum values	Assumed maximum values
Unlithified	0.05	0.20
Silurian, Maquoketa, Sinnipee	0.005	0.01
Sandstone aquifer	0.005	0.10

Areas contributing water to deep wells

Groundwater currently being produced by wells in the SEWRPC region often originates many miles from the wells. The areas shaded in Figure 13 identify the historic source locations for water produced by deep wells in the year 2000. The small squares in figure 13 represent land areas one mile on each side, and their color represents relative simulated contribution rates. The gray zones represent areas of relatively low contribution, the blue zones areas of moderate contribution, and the yellow zones areas of high contribution. The pattern is influenced by:

- the location of the predevelopment ground-water divide
- the location of the Maquoketa subcrop and zones of weathered Maquoketa shale east of the subcrop
- the location of high recharge areas in the western part of Waukesha County where glacial sediments are sandy (see Figure 10 in Report 1 of the modeling study)
- the presence of bedrock valleys that extend from Washington County into Waukesha County as well as across Walworth County (see Figure 5, Report 1); the bedrock valleys allow water to move laterally through sandy deposits and then vertically into the top of the sandstone aquifer near pumping centers.

It is significant that no contributing areas to deep wells are found along the coast of Lake Michigan or to the east. Evidently all water currently discharged from deep wells in the 7-county area is derived from inland recharge (rather than from Lake Michigan). Most is derived from western Waukesha County, western Walworth County, and some adjoining areas; the water typically moves many miles along regional flow paths before entering wells. Although Lake Michigan water is not discharging from wells, the Lake still serves as a source of water to wells in the sense that reversed gradients draw water from the Lake into the subsurface where it replenishes groundwater moving toward inland pumping centers.

The travel times between the zones of contribution and the deep wells depend on the assumed values for effective porosity. For minimum values in Table 6, the median time of travel is about 600 years. Ten percent of the flow arrives at deep wells in less than 100 years. Ninety percent of the flow arrives at deep wells in less than 1860 years. For the maximum values in Table 6, the median, ten percent, and ninety percent values are approximately 15-20 times higher. The large uncertainty in the travel times reflects the limits of our knowledge about the degree to which preferential flow in the sandstone units affects ground-water velocities.



Figure 13. **Simulated contributing areas for deep wells for year 2000 conditions.**

Groundwater pathlines

The model results indicate that water currently discharged from deep wells is derived from areas west of the wells. To look more closely at this mechanism, simulated water particles were placed in the sandstone aquifer along the eastern boundary of Waukesha County and tracked backward until they reached the water table. The resulting pathlines shown in Figure 14 demonstrate that recharge to the water table leaked to the deep part of the flow system and moved laterally toward Lake Michigan over hundreds of years before the onset of pumping, then curled back toward the west in response to the reversed gradients induced by pumping. The water now discharging from the wells originated from the west.



Figure 14. Simulated deep flow lines for year 2000 entering Waukesha County from Lake Michigan side

Plots of simulated forward pathlines projected on vertical sections in different parts of the model also help illustrate the workings of the groundwater system in the presence of pumping. Figure 15 shows particle starting locations spaced 2500 ft apart along four west-to-east sections. The particle placement is intended to focus on areas west and east of the edge of the Maquoketa shale from north to south across southeastern Wisconsin. The model simulated particle movement for 500 years assuming sustained year 2000 pumping conditions and low-end effective porosity values. Figure 16 shows particle paths along each of the section lines in Figure 15. The figure only shows pathlines for particles that move more than 2500 ft to either shallow or deep discharge locations.

The particle-tracking results clearly illustrate how groundwater moves from recharge west of the Maquoketa subcrop to wells east of the subcrop. The plots in Figure 16 show the presence of long pathlines (most prominent in the southern-most sections) that begin in the western portion of the model nearfield. Some of the plots also show movement through the Maquoketa shale. These paths are representative of the flow between the shallow and deep parts of the flow system that, under the influence of pumping, occurs even where the deep sandstone aquifer is confined by the aquitard. The travel times over these near-vertical pathlines that begin close to pumping centers are longer than the travel times for groundwater that originates in distant source areas and move laterally through the deep sandstone aquifer to deep wells. From the point of view of time of travel and source-water protection, the distant source areas for deep wells in southeastern Wisconsin are probably more important than source areas that are nearby but underlain by the Maquoketa shale.



Figure 15. Particle release locations for pathlines originating west and east of Maquoketa Shale subcrop. *Particles are released at water table and then pathlines traced from water table to discharge point (surface water body, well, or water table). The groundwater flow system corresponds to 2000 pumping conditions sustained 500 years into the future. Row numbers correspond to the MODFLOW model grid.*



Figure 16. Traces of selected deep pathlines projected on vertical sections
A. southern Dodge/Washington Counties (model row 68 in Figure 14).
B. northern Jefferson/Waukesha Counties (model row 94 in Figure 14).

C.



D.



Figure 16. Traces of selected deep pathlines projected on vertical sections
C. south-central Jefferson/Waukesha Counties (model row 117 in Figure 14).
D. northern Rock/Walworth Counties (model row 147 in Figure 14).

8. Conclusions

The groundwater flow model for southeastern Wisconsin simulates regional groundwater flow and documents the changes to the natural circulation of groundwater and to groundwater interactions with surface water caused by pumping from (mostly high-capacity) wells. The major findings fall into six categories.

Predevelopment conditions:

- Under natural conditions, prior to the onset of pumping, topography, geology and the configuration of the surface-water network controlled groundwater movement. In the shallow part of the flow system, local groundwater discharge to surface-water bodies occurred over the entire seven-county region. The deep part of the flow system was separated into a zone of local circulation in the west and a zone of regional circulation in the east which flowed toward Lake Michigan.

Consequences of regional pumping:

- Regional groundwater pumping has affected flow patterns less in the shallow than in the deep part of the flow system. The center of the shallow regional cone of depression is in Ozaukee County where drawdown in excess of 200 ft corresponds to concentrated pumping from the Silurian aquifer.

- The major pumping center in southeastern Wisconsin has shifted from the city of Milwaukee to the city of Waukesha (Figure 17). In response to this shift, the center of the cone of depression in the deep part of the flow system has shifted westward about eight miles from Milwaukee to near the Village of Elm Grove, where water levels in the deep sandstone units have dropped about 500 ft since the onset of pumping.

- Water currently pumped from deep wells originated hundreds of years ago as recharge to areas west of pumping centers, flowed toward Lake Michigan, and curled back toward wells in response to pumping (Figure 18).

- It is possible that unsaturated conditions exist at depth in the Sinnipee Group dolomite below the city of Waukesha. If unsaturated conditions do exist at this depth and are spreading with continued pumping, it could limit the sustainability of well yields due to increased drawdown and affect well-water quality due to increased potential for oxidation reactions.



Figure 17. **Location of pumping centers and ground-water divides in the deep sandstone aquifer for predevelopment, 1950, and 2000 conditions.**



Figure 18. **3D schematic of flow system in southeastern Wisconsin.**

- If high-capacity pumping is extrapolated according to historic trends it will increase by as much as 40% between 2000 and 2020, producing over 100 ft of additional drawdown at the center of the regional cone of depression for the deep part of the flow system.

Sources of water to wells in the 7-county region for year 2000

- Shallow wells simulated in the region (mostly high-capacity wells plus some domestic wells) currently withdraw about 32.50 mgd. They chiefly derive their water from diverted baseflow or induced flow from streams (83%). Also important are storage release and diversion of water that once flowed toward Lake Michigan.



Figure 19. Sources of water (percent) for *shallow* wells in 2000 within SEWRPC region.

- Deep wells simulated in the region (all high-capacity wells) withdraw 33.33 mgd in 2000. They derive most of their water from downward flow of diverted baseflow. They also produce some water derived from the inland boundaries of the 7-county region and by storage release from rocks below the SEWRPC region and below Lake Michigan. Interactions with Lake Michigan also contribute in two ways: diversion of water that once flowed to the Lake and downward flow out of the lake bottom toward the deep part of the flow system.



Figure 20. Sources of water (percent) for *deep* wells in 2000 within SEWRPC region.

- The combined 2000 pumping from shallow and deep wells in the model is 65.83 mgd. In order of importance, the modeled sources to total pumping in year 2000 are 1) reduced flow to surface water bodies within the SEWRPC region, 2) induced flow from surface water into the groundwater system, 3) reduced groundwater storage, 4) lateral groundwater flow across the inland boundaries of the SEWRPC region, 5) reduced groundwater flow toward Lake Michigan, and 6) groundwater moving from Lake Michigan toward pumping centers.



Figure 21. Sources of water (percent) for *all* wells in 2000 within SEWRPC region.

Interaction of shallow groundwater with Lake Michigan:

- Between 1864 and 2000, pumping caused a reduction of 8.5% in the rate of direct and indirect discharge of shallow groundwater to Lake Michigan. Most of the reduction represents decreased baseflow to streams east of the subcontinental divide. The simulated effect of pumping on streamflow is separate from effects of unknown magnitude attributable to urbanization and climate, and is partly offset by return flow from sewers.

Interaction of deep groundwater with Lake Michigan:

- According to the model, all water currently discharged from deep wells in the 7-county area is derived from inland recharge (rather than from Lake Michigan). Although lake water is not discharging from wells, it still serves as a minor source of water to wells in the sense that reversed gradients draw water from the lake into the subsurface where it replenishes groundwater moving toward inland pumping centers.

Location of contributing areas for deep wells:

- The most important areas where past recharge has circulated to currently active wells are in western Waukesha County. The configuration of these areas is influenced by the distribution of pumping centers, as well as by the location of the Maquoketa subcrop, of high recharge areas, and of bedrock valleys. All the contributing areas lie to the west of pumping centers.

Location of deep groundwater divide:

- Before pumping, the groundwater divide between the zones of local and regional circulation in the deep part of the flow system was already west of the subcontinental divide for surface water (about 18 miles distant in Waukesha County). Pumping has shifted the deep groundwater divide even farther from the lake over time; for example, between 1864 and 2000 the groundwater divide moved about 10 additional miles west from Waukesha County into Jefferson County (Figure 18).

Flow to the deep part of the groundwater system:

- Downward flow between the shallow and deep parts of the flow system occurs everywhere in the 7-county study area, but it is most pronounced in the western areas within the seven-county region where the Maquoketa shale is absent.

- Under current conditions about 4% of groundwater recharged at the water table eventually enters the deep part of the flow system over the seven-county region, but in areas where the Maquoketa shale is absent the proportion is 13%.

- The long travel paths from the water table to deep wells passing below multiple counties demonstrate the degree to which groundwater is a regional resource.

9. Future Work

Applications

The regional flow model described in this report canl be used to simulate future conditions based on scenarios tied to different development and water-use strategies. It can also contribute to a series of studies aimed at optimizing future management of the groundwater resource at both a regional and local scale. Delineation of wellhead protection areas is an important need for regional groundwater protection in southeastern Wisconsin that can be addressed using more detailed, inset versions of the model. These more detailed studies will help determine how best to minimize drawdown by locating wells more efficiently, and how best to balance withdrawals from shallow and deep wells to minimize adverse effects on surface-water bodies. Inset versions of the model targeted to local problems will duplicate many inputs from the regional model, but will require a finer resolution for input and a more advanced treatment of interactions between groundwater and surface water. A “demonstration” inset model has already been constructed to test this methodology and applied to water management problems in southwestern Waukesha County (Eaton, 2004).

Research

Important areas of possible research grow out of the findings and limitations of this modeling project. They include:

- Investigations (specialized saturated/unsaturated flow modeling, geochemical modeling, installation of sealed deep test holes) to determine the degree to which deep unsaturated conditions exist in the Sinnipee Group dolomite and what effect, if any, such conditions have on groundwater chemistry.

- Re-evaluation of hypotheses regarding the cause of geochemical patterns in the deep part of the flow system in light of the changing flow patterns simulated by the model.

- Performance of quantitative studies using data from ongoing aquifer storage and recovery (ASR) projects in eastern Wisconsin to calculate effective porosity values from tracer recovery times, the results of which would help constrain the travel times output by the model particle tracking.

- Close examination of historical streamflow data in southeastern Wisconsin to determine the degree to which climate change has altered recharge rates and affected groundwater interactions with Lake Michigan independently of pumping.

- Investigations of paleohydrogeology related to the advance and retreat of the Wisconsin continental ice-sheet, to evaluate the possibility that lingering hydraulic effects from the ice sheet caused transient flow conditions to occur at depth before the onset of pumping.

- Study of how inhomogeneities at different scales affect the ability of the Maquoketa shale to transfer water between the shallow and deep parts of the flow system.

- Use of the model to evaluate the role that the Waukesha fault system and wells open to multiple aquifers have on vertical movement between the shallow and deep parts of the flow system.

10. References Cited

Domenico, P.A. and F.W. Schwartz. 1990. *Physical and Chemical Hydrogeology*. John Wiley and Sons. p. 26.

Eaton, T.T., Construction of a groundwater flow model in the area of the Village of Eagle based on refinement of a regional groundwater flow model for southeastern Wisconsin: Wisconsin Geological and Natural History Survey Open-File Report 2004-06.

Feinstein, D.T., T.T. Eaton, D.J. Hart, J.T. Krohelski and K.R. Bradbury. 2004. *Regional Aquifer Model for Southeastern Wisconsin. Report 1: Data Collection, Conceptual Model Development, Numerical Model Construction, and Model Calibration*. Administrative Report to the Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission. 85 p.

McDonald, M.G. and Harbaugh, A.W., 1988. *A modular three-dimensional finite-difference ground-water flow model*, Techniques of Water-Resources Investigations of the United States Geological Survey. Book 6, Modeling techniques; chapter A1, 576 p.

Pollock, D.W. *User's Guide for MODPATH/MODPATH-PLOT, Version 3*. 1994. U.S. Geological Survey. Open-File Report 94-464.

Runkel, A.C., R.G. Tipping, E.C. Alexander, Jr., J.A. Green, J.H. Mossler and S.C. Alexander. 2003. *Hydrogeology of the Paleozoic bedrock in southeastern Minnesota*, Minnesota Geological Survey Report of Investigations 61, 105 p.

Winter, T.C., J.W. Harvey, O.L. Franke, and W.M. Alley. 1998. *Ground Water and Surface Water, A Single Resource*. U.S. Geological Survey Circular 1139. 79 p.

(This page intentionally left blank)

REGIONAL AQUIFER MODEL
FOR SOUTHEASTERN WISCONSIN
PARTICIPATING WATER UTILITIES

The water utilities of the following communities participated in providing partial funding for the development and initial operation of the regional groundwater model for Southeastern Wisconsin:

City of Brookfield
City of Burlington
City of Cedarburg
City of Delafield
City of Delavan
City of Hartford
City of Lake Geneva
City of Muskego
City of New Berlin
City of Oconomowoc
City of Pewaukee
City of Waukesha
City of West Bend
Village of Darien
Village of Dousman
Village of Eagle
Village of East Troy
Village of Fontana-on-Geneva Lake
Village of Fredonia
Village of Germantown
Village of Grafton
Village of Hartland
Village of Jackson
Village of Kewaskum
Village of Menomonee Falls
Village of Paddock Lake
Village of Pewaukee
Village of Saukville
Village of Sharon
Village of Slinger
Village of Sussex
Village of Union Grove
Village of Waterford
Town of Bristol
Town of Brookfield

The contributions of these utilities are greatly appreciated.