

1 Accounting for the influence of aquifer heterogeneity on
2 spatial propagation of pumping drawdown

3 Dylan R. Harp and Velimir V. Vesselinov

Computational Earth Science Group

Earth and Environmental Sciences Division

Los Alamos National Laboratory

MS T003, Los Alamos, NM 87544, USA.

4 September 20, 2010

5 **Abstract**

6 It has been previously observed that during a pumping test in heterogeneous me-
7 dia, drawdown data from different time periods collected at a single location produce
8 different estimates of aquifer properties and that Their type-curve inferences are more
9 variable than late-time Cooper-Jacob inferences. This suggests that as the cone of de-
10 pression propagates towards monitoring locations, drawdowns are affected by inter-well
11 factors. After the cone of depression has passed the observation location and quasi-
12 steady state drawdown has been established, convergent aquifer parameters associated
13 with a given scale can be inferred. It has been previously demonstrated theoretically
14 that, at least in idealized scenarios, the effective transmissivity relating the ensemble
15 mean of discharge and head decreases temporally from the arithmetic mean transmis-
16 sivity to a convergent value. It has also been demonstrated numerically and observed

17 in a field case that transmissivity inferences from early-time drawdown data decrease
18 converging to steady-state values. In order to obtain estimates of aquifer properties
19 from highly transient drawdown data using the Theis solution, it is necessary to ac-
20 count for this behavior. We present an approach that utilizes an exponential functional
21 form to represent Theis parameter behavior resulting from the spatial propagation of
22 a cone of depression. This approach allows the use of transient data consisting of
23 early-time drawdown data to obtain late-time convergent Theis parameters consistent
24 with Cooper-Jacob method inferences. We demonstrate the approach on a multi-
25 year dataset consisting of multi-well transient water-level observations due to transient
26 multi-well water-supply pumping. Based on previous research, transmissivities associ-
27 ated with each of the pumping wells are required to converge to a single value, while
28 storativities are allowed to converge to distinct values. The convergent transmissivity
29 parameter provides a first estimate for the effective transmissivity at the inter-well
30 scale, while the distinct values for the late-time convergent storativities provide in-
31 dicators of inter-well connectivity (i.e. connectivity between the observation well and
32 associated pumping well).

33 **1 Introduction**

34 Aquifer property inferences obtained using the Theis type-curve method (*Jacob, 1940*) (Theis
35 method) and the Cooper-Jacob straight-line approximation method (*Cooper and Jacob,*
36 *1946*) (Cooper-Jacob method) at a given location have been observed to differ (*Ramey,*
37 *1982; Butler, 1990*). Theoretical investigations by *Dagan* (1982) utilizing a perturbation
38 expansion approach on idealized scenarios demonstrate that effective hydraulic conductiv-
39 ity (transmissivity in 2D) decreases from the arithmetic mean conductivity to a convergent
40 value over time. More recent numerical and field investigations demonstrate that Theis so-
41 lution parameters (*Theis, 1935*) estimated at a stationary location at various times during

42 a pumping test have been observed to decrease at early times converging to stable values at
43 late-times (*Wu et al.*, 2005; *Straface et al.*, 2007). *Butler* (1990) contributes this characteris-
44 tic of Theis solution parameters to the fact that at early times, while the cone of depression
45 is approaching the observation location, the drawdown is affected by many factors, such as:
46 skin effects; well losses; and aquifer heterogeneities encountered by the cone of depression,
47 complicating the estimation of stable parameters. However, at late times when quasi-steady
48 state conditions have developed (i.e. when pressure gradients have reached steady state but
49 pressures remain transient), the stable parameter estimates are consistent with aquifer prop-
50 erty inferences that would be obtained using the Cooper-Jacob method. This implies that the
51 late-time parameter estimates provide interpreted aquifer properties (as defined by *Sanchez-*
52 *Vila et al.* (2006)) representative of the support scale defined by the distance between the
53 pumping and monitoring wells (*Neuman*, 1990; *Neuman and Di Federico*, 2003).

54 Obtaining variable model parameter inferences indicate the inadequacy of a model to
55 represent a system, as parameters are intended to represent invariant intrinsic properties
56 of the system (homogeneous transmissivity and storativity in the case of the groundwater
57 flow equation). The limitations of applying the Theis solution to model typical pumping
58 tests is not a matter of debate, as its inadequacies are readily apparent by the assumptions
59 required in its derivation (*Theis*, 1935) (e.g. fully penetrating well, infinite lateral extents,
60 homogeneous properties, unperturbed initial conditions, confined aquifer). Recognizing these
61 limitations, the question becomes whether or not the model can be useful. We agree with
62 previous researchers that the Theis solution is useful for obtaining aquifer property inferences
63 that characterize the groundwater transport if late-time drawdown data is used consistent
64 with the Cooper-Jacob method (*Butler*, 1990; *Meier et al.*, 1998; *Sanchez-Vila et al.*, 1999;
65 *Knudby and Carrera*, 2006; *Trincherro et al.*, 2008). As noted by *Butler* (1990) in reference
66 to the use of the Cooper-Jacob method, the advantage of drawing inferences from late-time
67 drawdown data is that the estimated parameters will be independent of the numerous early-

68 time effects that can influence the drawdown at the initial stages of expansion of the cone of
69 depression.

70 Obtaining late-time pumping data at quasi-steady state is not always possible, however,
71 as it may not be feasible to continue a pumping test for a sufficient duration to allow
72 quasi-steady state conditions to develop. Or, in cases where an existing water-supply and
73 water-level elevation dataset is available from a municipal water supply network, quasi-steady
74 state may not be reached due to a high frequency of cycling multiple supply wells on and
75 off to: meet shifting demand; to take advantage of lower cost off-peak electrical rates; and
76 perform well maintenance and/or repair. In this paper, we present an approach that allows
77 convergent parameters to be obtained from transient drawdown data by accounting for the
78 behavior of Theis parameters at early times.

79 The proposed approach is demonstrated on a long-term highly-transient drawdown record
80 collected at the Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL) site where the water-level tran-
81 sients result from multi-well municipal water-supply pumping. The pumping regimes are
82 highly transient, cycling diurnally and seasonally, including variations due to maintenance,
83 repair, and shifting supply loads within the network. As a result, the drawdown at monitor-
84 ing wells within the network do not fully attain quasi-steady state as new pressure influences
85 (cones of depression and impression) begin to propagate through the aquifer as the pumping
86 wells cycle on and off (*Harp and Vesselinov, 2010*). The use of a long-term dataset containing
87 multiple pressure influence cycles has certain advantages, such as: reduction of measurement
88 errors; improved characterization of the hydraulic response allowing the refinement of hydro-
89 geologic inferences; and the lack of the expense and coordination of a conventional pumping
90 test. We demonstrate the inference of aquifer properties from this dataset by considering
91 the transient early-time behavior of Theis solution parameters.

92 As the approach presented here utilizes observations, numerical experiments, and analyt-
93 ical investigations of many previous researchers (*Dagan, 1982; Ramey, 1982; Butler, 1990;*

94 *Meier et al.*, 1998; *Sanchez-Vila et al.*, 1999; *Wu et al.*, 2005; *Knudby and Carrera*, 2006;
95 *Straface et al.*, 2007; *Trincherro et al.*, 2008), a review of these bodies of research will be
96 presented in the background section. The proposed approach for accounting aquifer hetero-
97 geneity on Theis parameters will be presented in the methodology section. The approach
98 will be demonstrated on the LANL dataset in the results section.

99 **2 Background**

100 It has been recognized that aquifer property inferences based on the Theis method and
101 Cooper-Jacob method differ (*Ramey*, 1982). This is due to the fact that the inference meth-
102 ods emphasize properties in different regions of the aquifer. The Theis method considers the
103 entire drawdown curve, often leading to an emphasis on the interval of greatest curvature
104 located during early times. As indicated by *Butler* (1990), drawdown at early times can be
105 affected by many factors, including local heterogeneities near the pumping well and well skin
106 and pumping storage affects, creating greater variability in Theis method inferences. The
107 Cooper-Jacob method ignores early times, providing information on the properties of the
108 aquifer within a ring formed by the outward moving front of the cone of depression during
109 the time interval under consideration. At late time, when the Cooper-Jacob approximation
110 is valid, the region included in this ring can be large. *Butler* (1990) demonstrates that the
111 difference between inferences obtained from the Theis and Cooper-Jacob methods depend on
112 the level of aquifer heterogeneity and the distance between the pumping well and the obser-
113 vation location. The inferences become more similar as the level of heterogeneity decreases
114 and the distance increases.

115 *Meier et al.* (1998) explore the use of the Cooper-Jacob approximation to infer effective
116 transmissivity (T_{eff}) from the estimated transmissivity parameter \hat{T} and provide indications
117 of hydraulic connectivity by evaluating the estimated storativity parameter \hat{S} in heteroge-

118 neous aquifers. Consistent with theoretical findings of *Butler (1990)*, *Meier et al. (1998)*
 119 present cases where field data demonstrate that although small-scale (point) estimates of
 120 transmissivity T are highly variable, values of \hat{T} obtained from the Cooper-Jacob method
 121 are relatively constant. Furthermore, *Meier et al. (1998)* demonstrate that corresponding
 122 values of \hat{S} are typically highly variable, even though the storativity in the field is believed
 123 to be relatively constant. *Meier et al. (1998)* investigate this phenomena performing numeri-
 124 cal experiments with heterogeneous transmissivity fields and homogeneous storativity fields,
 125 producing similar values for \hat{T} and variable values for \hat{S} consistent with field cases.

126 The reason for this paradoxical result can be explained by examining the equation for
 127 estimating T from the Cooper-Jacob method; $\hat{T} = 2.3Q/4\pi I$, where Q is a constant pumping
 128 rate and I is the slope of the late-time drawdown with respect to the (base 10) log of time
 129 (i.e. $I = (s_2 - s_1)/(\log t_2 - \log t_1)$, where s is drawdown and t is time). This equation
 130 demonstrates that \hat{T} is dependent on the rate of drawdown decline, which is dependent on
 131 the choice of t_2 and t_1 . Considering only the late-time drawdown where the data approximate
 132 a straight line with respect to log time, in accordance with the Cooper-Jacob method, means
 133 that the \hat{T} will approximate T_{eff} described by the rate of drawdown after the drawdown cone
 134 of depression has passed the monitoring well. Storativity estimates using the Cooper-Jacob
 135 method (defined as $\hat{S} = 2.25Tt_0/r^2$, where r is the distance from the pumping well to the
 136 observation point and t_0 represents the time-axis intercept of a line drawn through the late-
 137 time drawdown), on the other hand, are dependent on the variability of T between the
 138 pumping well and the front of the cone of depression. Although the heterogeneity between
 139 the pumping and monitoring well does not affect the slope of the late-time drawdown used
 140 to determine \hat{T} , it can affect \hat{S} as the time-axis intercept (t_0) is dependent on the arrival of
 141 the cone of depression at the monitoring well. If a region of high T connects the monitoring
 142 well and the pumping well, the value of t_0 will be relatively small and vice-versa. As noted
 143 by *Sanchez-Vila et al. (1999)*, the Cooper-Jacob method interprets an early/late arrival of a

144 drawdown cone of depression as low/high storativity. This explains the high variability of \hat{S}
145 in the presence of T heterogeneity between the pumping well and the monitoring well, even
146 in cases where S is known to be constant.

147 Research by *Meier et al.* (1998) demonstrate from a numerical analysis that \hat{T} estimated
148 from a simulated pumping test (radial flow) is close to T_{eff} for parallel flow for an area of
149 influence for multilognormal stationary (geostatistically homogeneous) T fields (the S field
150 is assumed uniform in all cases). While *Meier et al.* (1998) also demonstrated that this
151 can be true for nonmultigaussian fields, this is not necessarily true in general (*Sanchez-Vila*
152 *et al.*, 1996). Similar to findings by *Butler* (1988), who demonstrated that \hat{S} depends on
153 transmissivities between the pumping well and the front of the cone of depression, *Meier*
154 *et al.* (1998) find that \hat{S} depends on transmissivities between and nearby the well and the
155 observation point.

156 *Sanchez-Vila et al.* (1999) verify these conclusions using an analytical approximation to
157 the groundwater flow equation. They demonstrate analytically that \hat{T} is independent of
158 spatial location. They also demonstrate that storativity estimates will provide an indication
159 of the local deviations of T from its large-scale geometric mean (denoted as T_G) representing
160 the equivalent geostatistically homogeneous T field. If T in a specific location is less than T_G ,
161 \hat{S} will be larger than the true value of S and vice-versa. They also show that the geometric
162 mean of \hat{S} values is an unbiased estimator of S .

163 *Knudby and Carrera* (2006) demonstrate that Cooper-Jacob estimates of diffusivity ($\hat{D} =$
164 \hat{T}/\hat{S}) correlate well with indicators of flow and transport connectivity. *Trincherro et al.* (2008)
165 demonstrate that estimated effective porosity (a transport connectivity indicator) depends
166 on a weighted function of actual transmissivity and the interpreted Cooper-Jacob storativity
167 along the flow line.

168 In contrast to *Meier et al.* (1998), *Sanchez-Vila et al.* (1999), *Knudby and Carrera* (2006),
169 and *Trincherro et al.* (2008), *Wu et al.* (2005) explore the effect of the homogeneity assumption

170 of the Theis solution on parameter estimates for the entire drawdown curve (including early
 171 and late time data) for cases with heterogeneous T and S fields. Conceptualizing T and S
 172 as spatial stochastic processes in the equation of flow, *Wu et al.* (2005) derive the mean flow
 173 equation of a heterogeneous aquifer as

$$T_{eff} \nabla^2 \langle h \rangle = S_{eff} \frac{\partial \langle h \rangle}{\partial t} \quad (1)$$

174 where angle brackets indicate ensemble mean, t is time, T_{eff} is the effective transmissivity
 175 defined as

$$T_{eff} = \bar{T} + \frac{\langle T' \nabla h' \rangle}{\nabla \langle h \rangle}, \quad (2)$$

176 and S_{eff} is the effective storativity defined as

$$S_{eff} = \bar{S} + \frac{\langle S' \frac{\partial h'}{\partial t} \rangle}{\frac{\partial \langle h \rangle}{\partial t}}. \quad (3)$$

177 where the over bar and prime denote the spatial mean and perturbation of the variable,
 178 respectively. T_{eff} and S_{eff} are denoted as effective parameters as they will produce the
 179 ensemble mean head $\langle h \rangle$ as a convergent average for a set of realizations of heterogeneity
 180 based on the stochastic parameters $T = \bar{T} + T'$ and $S = \bar{S} + S'$. As indicated by *Wu et al.*
 181 (2005), in order for the ensemble mean head $\langle h \rangle$ to equal the spatially averaged head \bar{h}
 182 of a single realization of heterogeneity, the field must contain an adequate sampling of the
 183 heterogeneity (i.e. the field must be ergodic). As traditional pumping tests typically estimate
 184 T_{eff} and S_{eff} based on one or a small number of point estimates of head, which will not
 185 equal the spatially averaged head in general, \hat{T} and \hat{S} will not provide estimates of effective
 186 properties in an ensemble sense in general.

187 *Wu et al.* (2005) performed numerical experiments using synthetic aquifers with multi-
 188 lognormal heterogeneous T and S fields. They observe that at early time, \hat{T} estimates at

189 different locations are highly variable, while, similar to the findings of *Meier et al.* (1998)
 190 and *Sanchez-Vila et al.* (1999), at large times (when the Cooper-Jacob approximation is
 191 valid) values of \hat{T} converge to a value close to T_G as the cone of depression expands for the
 192 multilognormal fields considered. As the considered transmissivity field is multilognormal,
 193 $T_G = T_{eff}$. In cases where the transmissivity is nonmultigaussian, the significance of \hat{T} is
 194 less certain (*Sanchez-Vila et al.*, 1999), however, we assume that it is a good first estimate of
 195 T_{eff} . In the same analysis, *Wu et al.* (2005) demonstrated that values of \hat{S} do not converge
 196 to a single value, but stabilize relatively quickly to values predominantly dependent on the
 197 heterogeneity between the pumping well and the given monitoring location. Figures 6 and
 198 7 from *Wu et al.* (2005) presenting these results are included in Figure 1 here for reference.

199 Similarities to the numerical results of *Wu et al.* (2005) can be seen in the analytical
 200 investigation by *Dagan* (1982), who utilized a perturbation expansion approach to explore
 201 the temporal behavior of $K_{eff} = -\langle \mathbf{q} \rangle / \nabla \langle h \rangle$, (T_{eff} in 2D), where \mathbf{q} is discharge. He derived
 202 an approximate relation describing the temporal behavior of T_{eff} for the idealized case of
 203 sufficiently small transmissivity variance and average head gradient slowly varying spatially
 204 and temporally in a stationary isotropic field as

$$T_{eff}(t) = e^{\mu_Y} \left[1 + \frac{1}{2} \sigma_Y^2 b_2(t) \right] \quad (4)$$

205 where μ_Y is the mean and σ_Y^2 is the variance of $Y = \ln(T)$ and $b_2(t)$ is a function describing
 206 the temporal dependency of T_{eff} based on the aquifer heterogeneity in 2D, equal to unity
 207 for $t = 0$ and tending to zero as $t \rightarrow \infty$. Recognizing that the limiting cases for equation (4)
 208 are first-order approximations of the arithmetic mean transmissivity T_A ($t = 0$) and T_{eff}
 209 ($t \rightarrow \infty$), $b_2(t)$ can be expressed as

$$b_2(t) = \frac{T_{eff}(t) - T_{eff,c}}{T_A - T_{eff,c}} \quad (5)$$

210 where $T_{eff,c}$ is the late-time convergent T_{eff} . Equation (5) indicates that $b_2(t)$ describes the
211 temporal decline of T_{eff} from T_A to $T_{eff,c}$.

212 In contrast to the four field cases discussed by *Meier et al.* (1998) (i.e. Grimsel test
213 site, Switzerland (*Frick*, 1992); El Cabril site, Spain (Bureau de Recherches Géologiques
214 et Minières); Horkheimer Insel site, Germany (*Schad and Teutsch*, 1994); and Columbus
215 Air Force Base, U.S.A. (*Herweijer and Young*, 1991)), *Straface et al.* (2007) observe a lack
216 of similar slope for drawdown vs log time at late times from pumping tests near Montalto
217 Uffugo Scalo, Italy, indicating that the Cooper-Jacob straight-line approximation for late-
218 time drawdown will not be valid in all cases. Based on their analysis of these pumping tests,
219 *Straface et al.* (2007) question the validity of using traditional pumping tests to estimate
220 meaningful hydrogeological parameters, but do suggest that these results can provide quick
221 inexpensive first estimates. Furthermore, they suggest that these first estimates can be useful
222 as starting parameters for a tomographic inversion of the same dataset.

223 *Harp and Vesselinov* (2010) demonstrate an approach to identify and decompose the
224 pressure influences at a monitoring location using the Theis solution. Their approach is
225 demonstrated on the same dataset as in the current research. As the objective of the research
226 in *Harp and Vesselinov* (2010) is the decomposition of pressure influences, attempts are not
227 made to account for early time behavior of the Theis solution parameters, and constant
228 and distinct values are applied to pumping/monitoring well pairs. Therefore, the parameter
229 estimates are not considered representative of the aquifer properties of the aquifer, but are
230 interpreted parameters characterizing the hydraulic response at a monitoring location due to
231 pumping a single well. These interpreted parameters are analogous to parameter estimates
232 that would be obtained from a conventional pumping test analysis.

233 The current research presents an approach to account for Theis parameter behavior to
234 infer aquifer properties considering the extensive body of research presented above. While
235 the current approach is demonstrated on the long-term dataset from the LANL site, pro-

236 viding the decomposition of pressure influences similar to the approach presented in *Harp*
 237 *and Vesselinov* (2010), the current approach could also be applied to a conventional pump-
 238 ing test to more appropriately account for the behavior of the Theis solution parameters.
 239 Furthermore, this could be particularly useful to obtain late time hydrogeologic inferences
 240 from conventional pumping tests that were not conducted for a sufficient length of time to
 241 establish quasi-steady state conditions.

242 **3 Methodology**

243 The Theis solution of the flow equation ($T\nabla^2 h = S\partial h/\partial t$) is defined as

$$s_p(t) = \frac{Q}{4\pi T}W(u) = \frac{Q}{4\pi T}W\left(\frac{r^2 S}{4Tt}\right), \quad (6)$$

244 where $s_p(t)$ is the predicted pumping drawdown at time t since the pumping commenced (i.e.
 245 $h(t) - h(0)$), Q is the pumping rate, T is the transmissivity, $W(u)$ is the negative exponential
 246 integral ($\int_u^\infty e^{-y}/y dy$) referred to as the well function, u is a dimensionless variable, r is radial
 247 distance from the pumping well, and S is the storativity. Multiple pumping wells and variable
 248 rate pumping periods can be included in the Theis solution by employing the principle of
 249 superposition (*Freeze and Cherry, 1979, page 327*) as

$$s_p(t) = \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^{M_i} \frac{Q_{i,j} - Q_{i,j-1}}{4\pi T} W\left(\frac{r_i^2 S}{4T(t - t_{Q_{i,j}})}\right), \quad (7)$$

250 where N is the number of pumping wells (sources), M_i is the number of pumping periods
 251 (i.e. the number of pumping rate changes) for pumping well i , $Q_{i,j}$ is the pumping rate
 252 of the i th well during the j th pumping period, and $t_{Q_{i,j}}$ is the time when the pumping
 253 rate changed at the i th well to the j th pumping period. The drawdown calculated by
 254 equation (7) represents the cumulative influence at a monitoring location of the N pumping

255 wells at distances r_i , $i = 1, \dots, N$ from the monitoring location.

256 Equations (6) and (7) are only valid under the assumption of homogeneity. If a system
257 is homogeneous, then T and S in equations (6) and (7) will be equivalent to T_{eff} and S_{eff} ,
258 respectively. If the system is heterogeneous, this will only be true in an ensemble mean sense.
259 In this case, the Theis solution can be expressed as

$$\langle s_p \rangle(t) = \frac{Q}{4\pi T_{eff}} W(u) = \frac{Q}{4\pi T_{eff}} W\left(\frac{r^2 S_{eff}}{4T_{eff}t}\right) \quad (8)$$

260 which is the solution to equation (1) (Wu *et al.*, 2005), where $\langle s_p \rangle(t)$ is the ensemble mean
261 drawdown due to pumping. Invoking superposition with equation (8), an ensemble mean
262 drawdown equation analogous to equation (7) can be expressed as

$$\langle s_p \rangle(t) = \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^{M_i} \frac{Q_{i,j} - Q_{i,j-1}}{4\pi T_{eff}} W\left(\frac{r_i^2 S_{eff}}{4T_{eff} * (t - t_{Q_{i,j}})}\right). \quad (9)$$

263 As water elevations recorded at monitoring wells in an aquifer system are merely point
264 samples from a single realization of heterogeneity, and not ensemble mean values of multiple
265 realizations or spatial averages of an ergodic field, application of equations (8) and (9) are
266 invalid for cross-hole interference tests. Recognizing this theoretical limitation of applying
267 the Theis solution (or the Cooper-Jacob approximation) to data from heterogeneous aquifers
268 to infer effective properties, researchers have investigated what information is contained in
269 the hydrogeologic parameter estimates (Meier *et al.*, 1998; Sanchez-Vila *et al.*, 1999; Wu
270 *et al.*, 2005; Knudby and Carrera, 2006; Trinchero *et al.*, 2008). We propose that although
271 the Theis solution parameters will not provide precise representations of hydrogeological
272 properties, the analytical framework of the Theis solution can provide initial estimates of
273 the effective transmissivity and indications of connectivity.

274 Recognizing that a dataset containing drawdown outside of the Cooper-Jacob domain
275 will require consideration of the behavior of parameter estimates at early times (as the front

276 of the cone of depression is at short radial distance), we approximate the Theis solution,
 277 defining the estimated pumping drawdown $\hat{s}_p(t)$ as

$$\hat{s}_p(t) = \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^{M_i} \frac{Q_{i,j} - Q_{i,j-1}}{4\pi\hat{T}_i} W \left(\frac{r_i^2 \hat{S}_i}{4\hat{T}_i * (t - t_{Q_{i,j}})} \right), \quad (10)$$

278 where \hat{T}_i and \hat{S}_i are time dependent functions describing the variation in interpreted trans-
 279 missivities and storativities as the cone of depression propagates outward from the pumping
 280 well. In order to provide a general functional form with the intent to capture the temporal
 281 dependence of \hat{T} and \hat{S} for a broad range of heterogeneities and pumping well factors, \hat{T}_i
 282 and \hat{S}_i are defined using an exponential functional form as

$$\hat{T}_i(t) = \hat{T}_{eff} e^{c_{T,i}/(t-t_{Q_{i,j}})} \quad c_T \geq 0, \quad (11)$$

283 and

$$\hat{S}_i(t) = \hat{S}_{a,i} e^{c_{S,i}/(t-t_{Q_{i,j}})}, \quad (12)$$

284 where \hat{T}_{eff} provides the late-time convergent estimate for T_{eff} , $\hat{S}_{a,i}$ provides late-time con-
 285 vergent indications of connectivity between the i th pumping well and the monitoring location
 286 (*Knudby and Carrera, 2006*), and $c_{T,i}$ and $c_{S,i}$ are constants describing the time dependent
 287 slope of the transmissivity and storativity parameters, respectively, associated with the i th
 288 pumping well. Since in most cases, the statistical nature of the heterogeneity will be not
 289 be known with certainty, this ad hoc functional form is assumed reasonable. In idealized
 290 scenarios with known correlation structure, it may be possible to derive these relationships
 291 in an ensemble mean sense. For example, *Dagan (1982)* derives an analytical relationship
 292 describing the temporal behavior of T_{eff} for an exponential autocorrelation.

293 Based on *Dagan (1982)* and *Wu et al. (2005)* (Figure 1), we constrain $c_T \geq 0$, indicating

294 that $\hat{T}(t)$ values from early time portions of drawdown data are expected to be higher than
 295 late time convergent values. This may be explained by the early-time negative correlation
 296 between head and transmissivity (*Wu et al.*, 2005) and/or the existence of high conductivity
 297 inter-well pathways as described by *Herweijer* (1996). Other possible explanations for time-
 298 dependent hydrogeologic parameters are well-bore storage and leakage effects known to exist
 299 at the site (*McLin*, 2005, 2006a,b).

300 Substituting equations (11) and (12) into equation (10) produces

$$\hat{s}_p(t) = \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^{M_i} \frac{Q_{i,j} - Q_{i,j-1}}{4\pi\hat{T}_{eff}e^{cT,i/(t-t_{Q_{i,j}})}} W \left(\frac{r_i^2 \hat{S}_{a,i} e^{cS,i/t-t_{Q_{i,j}}}}{4\hat{T}_{eff}e^{cT,i/(t-t_{Q_{i,j}})} * (t - t_{Q_{i,j}})} \right). \quad (13)$$

301 In order to account for a temporal trend identified in wells R-11 and R-28 not attributable
 302 to pumping (*Harp and Vesselinov*, 2010), we include an additional drawdown term $\hat{s}_t(t)$ as

$$\hat{s}_t(t) = (t - t_o) \times m \quad (14)$$

303 where t_o is the time at the beginning of the pumping record and m is a constant defining
 304 the linear increase in drawdown not attributable to pumping.

305 As the calibration targets in the model inversions presented here are water elevations as
 306 opposed to drawdowns, we define the predicted water elevation $\hat{h}(t)$ at time t as

$$\hat{h}(t) = \hat{h}_o - \hat{s}_p(t) - \hat{s}_t(t) \quad (15)$$

307 where $\hat{h}_o = \hat{h}(0)$ and is defined as the initial predicted water elevation at the monitoring well.
 308 As defined by the Theis solution, \hat{h}_o is the head at the time that a perturbation commences.
 309 As pumping of the regional aquifer began at the LANL site over 50 years ago, it is reasonable
 310 to assume that the influence of the earlier pumping has propagated through the system
 311 and/or dissipated. However, more recent pumping rate changes preceding pressure transient
 312 records at monitoring locations need to be considered. In order to account for residual effects

313 of pumping prior to monitoring, simulations are started in advance of pressure transient
314 records including earlier pumping records. Therefore, \hat{h}_o is not a measured quantity, but
315 predicted at the beginning of the simulations.

316 Model calibration is performed using a Levenberg-Marquardt approach (*Levenberg*, 1944;
317 *Marquardt*, 1963) where the objective function can be defined as

$$\Phi = \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} [h_i(t_j) - \hat{h}_i(t_j)]^2 \quad (16)$$

318 where m is the number of monitoring wells considered, n_i is the number of head observations
319 for the i th monitoring well, and $h_i(t_j)$ are the head observations for the i th monitoring well
320 included as calibration targets where j is an observation time index.

321 The simulation of the drawdowns is performed using the WELLS code (available upon
322 request at <http://www.ees.lanl.gov/staff/monty/>), which implements equation (13). The
323 calibration is performed using *PEST* (*Doherty*, 2004).

324 4 Site Data

325 The regional aquifer beneath the LANL site is a complex stratified hydrogeologic structure
326 which includes unconfined zones (under phreatic conditions near the regional water table) and
327 confined zones (deeper zones) (*Vesselinov*, 2004a,b). The three monitoring wells considered
328 in this analysis are screened near the top of the aquifer with an average screen length of 11
329 meters. The water-supply wells partially penetrate the regional aquifer with screens that
330 also begin near the top of the aquifer, but penetrate deeper with an average screen length
331 of 464 meters. Nevertheless, field tests demonstrate that most of the groundwater supply
332 is produced from a relatively narrow section of the regional aquifer that is about 200-300
333 m below the regional water table (*Los Alamos National Laboratory*, 2008a). Implicit in
334 the use of the Theis solution is the assumption that groundwater flow is confined and two-

335 dimensional. We assume that this is a justifiable assumption here given the small magnitude
336 of observed drawdowns (less than 1 m at the monitoring wells and less than 20 m at the water-
337 supply wells), the relative long distances between supply and monitoring wells compared to
338 the effective aquifer thickness (about 200-300 m).

339 Water-level fluctuations (pressure transients) are automatically monitored using pressure
340 transducers. The pressure and water-supply pumping records considered here are collected
341 from 3 monitoring wells (R-11, R-15 and R-28) and the 7 water-supply wells (PM-1, PM-2,
342 PM-3, PM-4, PM-5, O-1, and O-4) located within the LANL site. Figure 2 displays a map
343 of the relative location of the wells. Figure 3 presents the pressure and production records
344 for the monitoring wells and water-supply wells, respectively.

345 The water-level observation data considered here span approximately five years, com-
346 mencing on or shortly after the date of installation of pressure transducers (May 4, 2005 for
347 R-11; December 23, 2004 for R-15; February 14, 2005 for R-28), all terminating on Novem-
348 ber 20, 2009. The barometric pressure fluctuations are removed using constant coefficient
349 methods using 100% barometric efficiency for all monitoring wells (*Los Alamos National Lab-*
350 *oratory*, 2008b). Although the pressure transducers collect observations every 15 minutes,
351 this dataset is reduced to single daily observations by using the earliest recorded measure-
352 ment for each day. Some daily observations have been excluded due to equipment failure.
353 Pumping records for all pumping wells begin on October 9, 2004 and terminate on December
354 31, 2009. The pumping record precedes the water-level calibration data to account for water-
355 level transients due to pumping variations before the water-level data collection commenced.
356 For additional information on the site and dataset, refer to *Harp and Vesselinov* (2010).

357 In the applied computational framework, forward model run times for predicting water
358 elevations at R-11, R-15, and R-28 for approximately four years (from October 8, 2004
359 to November 18, 2008) are each approximately 3 seconds on a 3.0 GHz Intel processor.
360 Inversions initiated with uniform initial parameter values require approximately 600 model

361 runs and, using a single processor, are performed for approximately 1 hour and 40 minutes.

362 5 Results and Discussion

363 Results of calibrations using temporally varying parameters and constant parameters are
364 presented below. In the exponential case, a single value of \hat{T}_{eff} is applied to all pump-
365 ing/monitoring well pairs. Similarly, in the constant case, a single value of \hat{T} is applied to all
366 pumping/monitoring well pairs. Distinct values are allowed for \hat{S}_a and \hat{S} in the exponential
367 and constant cases, respectively. Pumping influences (wells) that the calibration is unable
368 to fingerprint at the monitoring well result in unrealistic parameter values that effectively
369 eliminate the influence of the pumping well (i.e. high \hat{T} and \hat{S}). As these parameter val-
370 ues are not physically meaningful beyond identifying a lack of influence from the associated
371 pumping well, they are not presented below. Therefore, the omission of a pumping well
372 below indicates a lack of identifiable influence at a monitoring well.

373 Figures 4 presents the calibrated drawdowns from the water-supply wells for monitoring
374 wells R-11, R-15, and R-28 for the exponential and constant cases. It is apparent that
375 the exponential case reduces the mismatch in drawdowns for all three wells, with the most
376 significant improvements in R-15, the well with the worst match for the constant case.

377 Figure 5 presents the estimated transmissivity functions (equation (11)) for R-11, R-15,
378 and R-28. The functions are plotted up to around five years to include parameter values
379 used in the model runs. It is apparent that for all three monitoring wells, $\hat{T}(t)$ converges
380 towards a single value, $\hat{T}_{eff} = 10^{3.07}$ m²/d, as constrained by the inversion. The interpreted
381 transmissivity for the constant case ($\hat{T} = 10^{3.27}$ m²/d) is indicated in the figure. It is apparent
382 that this value is fitted to an average value of $\hat{T}(t)$ for the exponential case. This indicates
383 that an overestimate of T_{eff} will be obtained using constant parameters.

384 Figure 6 presents the estimated storativity functions (equation (12)). It is apparent that

385 in general the storativity functions converge quickly to distinct values in accordance with
386 previous research (*Wu et al., 2005; Straface et al., 2007*), providing indications of inter-well
387 connectivity. Physically unrealistic values of storativity are allowed as \hat{S}_a is recognized as
388 a flow connectivity indicator, and does not represent aquifer storativity in an effective or
389 equivalent sense.

390 Table 1 presents the estimated parameters associated with the transmissivity and stora-
391 tivity functions plotted in Figures 5 and 6 for the exponential case and the parameters for
392 the constant case. As constrained in the inversion, all transmissivities converge to a single
393 value for both the exponential and constant cases. For the exponential case, this value can
394 be considered a first estimate of T_{eff} . The larger value obtained for the constant case indi-
395 cates that the calibration has fitted the parameter within the early time variability, thereby
396 overestimating T_{eff} .

397 Values of \hat{S}_a indicate the level of connectivity between the monitoring and pumping well.
398 Large/small values of \hat{S}_a indicate a region of relatively low/high inter-well transmissivity. It
399 is apparent from Figure 6 and Table 1 that the trends in \hat{S}_a can be grouped by the associ-
400 ated pumping well. For instance, convergent values of \hat{S}_a decrease (inter-well connectivity
401 increases) from PM-2 to PM-3 to PM-4 and PM-5. In general, similar trends are apparent
402 for \hat{S} in the constant case as well. However, in the constant case, values for PM-2 are farther
403 from physically realistic values of storativity.

404 A decomposition of the pressure influences from the pumping wells at the monitoring wells
405 also resulted from this research. These results are similar to the decomposition analysis of
406 this dataset presented in *Harp and Vesselinov (2010)* and therefore are not presented here.
407 For instance, the same pumping wells are identified to influence drawdown at the monitoring
408 wells and a lack of a linear temporal trend is identified for R-15 in both cases.

6 Conclusions

This paper demonstrates an approach to obtain late-time aquifer property inferences consistent with the Cooper-Jacob method from transient datasets collected in heterogeneous aquifers. Such datasets are commonly available from municipal water-supply networks. The utilization of these existing datasets eliminates the expense and coordination necessary to perform dedicated pumping tests at a site. The methodology is motivated by analytical investigations by *Dagan* (1982), numerical experiments by *Wu et al.* (2005), and analysis of field-collected hydrographs by *Straface et al.* (2007). The hydrogeologic inferences are evaluated based on a large body of research into the meaning of late-time aquifer property inferences (*Butler*, 1990; *Neuman*, 1990; *Meier et al.*, 1998; *Sanchez-Vila et al.*, 1999; *Neuman and Di Federico*, 2003; *Wu et al.*, 2005; *Knudby and Carrera*, 2006).

Utilizing this approach on a dataset from the LANL site has indicated that adequate water-level calibrations can be achieved within the constraints of the inversion: a single value of \hat{T}_{eff} is applied to all pumping/monitoring well pairs; $\hat{T}(t)$ decreases towards a constant value; \hat{S}_a is allowed to take distinct values and is allowed to increase or decrease towards convergent values. \hat{T}_{eff} provides an initial estimate of the effective transmissivity at the support scale characterized by the distances between the pumping and observation wells (*Neuman*, 1990; *Neuman and Di Federico*, 2003). In accordance with *Meier et al.* (1998), *Sanchez-Vila et al.* (1999), and *Knudby and Carrera* (2006), \hat{S}_a is recognized as an indicator of inter-well connectivity, indicating the degree in which pumping and monitoring well pairs are hydraulically connected.

Acknowledgments The research was funded through various projects supported by the Environmental Programs Division at the Los Alamos National Laboratory. The authors are thankful for the valuable suggestions and comments provided by Kay Birdsell on draft versions of this paper. The authors are also grateful for constructive comments provided by

434 members of the first authors Ph.D. advisory committee (Bruce Thomson, Gary Weissmann,
435 and John Stormont).

436 **References**

437 Bureau de Recherches Géologiques et Minières (1990), Interpretation of hydraulic tests (pulse
438 tests, slug tests and pumping tests) from the third testing campaign at the cabril site
439 (Spain) (in French), technical report for Spanish Nuclear Waste Management Company.

440 Butler, J. (1988), Pumping tests non-uniform aquifers—the radially symmetric case, *Journal*
441 *of Hydrology*, 101(1/4), 15–30.

442 Butler, J. (1990), The role of pumping tests in site characterization: Some theoretical con-
443 siderations, *Ground Water*, 28(3), 394–402.

444 Cooper, H., and C. Jacob (1946), A generalized graphical method for evaluating formation
445 constants and summarizing well-field history, *Eos Trans. AGU*, 27(4), 526–534.

446 Dagan, G. (1982), Analysis of flow through heterogeneous random aquifers 2. Unsteady flow
447 in confined formations, *Water Resources Research*, 18(5), 1571–1585.

448 Doherty, J. (2004), *PEST Model-Independent Parameter Estimation*, Watermark Numerical
449 Computing, Corinda, Australia.

450 Freeze, R. A., and J. A. Cherry (1979), *Groundwater*, Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs, New
451 Jersey.

452 Frick, U. (1992), Grimsel test site, the Radionuclide Migration Experiment—overview of
453 investigations 1985-1990, *Tech. Rep. Nagra Tech. Rep. 91-04*, Nagra, Wettingen, Switzer-
454 land.

455 Harp, D., and V. Vesselinov (2010), Identification of pumping influences in long-term water-
456 level fluctuations, *Ground Water*, doi:10.1111/j.1745-6584.2010.00725.x, in print, available
457 in Early View.

458 Herweijer, J. (1996), Constraining uncertainty of groundwater flow and transport models
459 using pumping tests, in *Calibration and Reliability in Groundwater Modelling*, pp. 473–
460 482, IAHS Publ., 237.

461 Herweijer, J., and S. Young (1991), Use of detailed sedimentological information for the
462 assessment of aquifer tests and tracer tests in a shallow fluvial aquifer, in *Proceedings of*
463 *the 5th Annual Canadian/American Conference on Hydrogeology: Parameter Identifica-*
464 *tion and Estimation for Aquifer and Reservoir Characterization*, Natl. Water Well Assoc.,
465 Dublin, Ohio.

466 Jacob, C. (1940), On the flow of water in an elastic artesian aquifer, *Trans. Amer. Geophys.*
467 *Union*, 21, 574–586.

468 Knudby, C., and J. Carrera (2006), On the use of apparent hydraulic diffusivity as an
469 indicator of connectivity, *J. of Hydrology*, 329, 377–389.

470 Levenberg, K. (1944), A method for the solution of certain nonlinear problems in least
471 squares, *Q. Appl. Math.*, 2, 164–168.

472 Los Alamos National Laboratory (2008a), Pajarito canyon investigation report, *Tech. Rep.*
473 *LA-UR-085852*, Los Alamos National Laboratory.

474 Los Alamos National Laboratory (2008b), Fate and transport investigations update for
475 chromium contamination from Sandia Canyon, *Tech. rep.*, Environmental Programs Di-
476 rectorate, LANL, Los Alamos, New Mexico, LA-UR-08-4702.

477 Marquardt, D. (1963), An algorithm for least-squares estimation of nonlinear parameters, *J.*
478 *Soc. Ind. Appl. Math.*, 11, 431–441.

479 McLin, S. (2005), Analyses of the PM-2 aquifer test using multiple observation wells, *Tech.*
480 *Rep. LA-14225-MS*, Los Alamos National Laboratory.

481 McLin, S. (2006a), Analyses of sequential aquifer tests from the Guaje well field, *Tech. Rep.*
482 *LA-UR-06-2494*, Los Alamos National Laboratory.

483 McLin, S. (2006b), Analyses of the PM-4 aquifer test using multiple observation wells, *Tech.*
484 *Rep. LA-14252-MS*, Los Alamos National Laboratory.

485 Meier, P., J. Carrera, and X. Sanchez-Vila (1998), An evaluation of Jacob’s method for the
486 interpretation of pumping tests in heterogeneous formations, *Water Resources Research*,
487 34(5), 1011–1025.

488 Neuman, S. (1990), Universal scaling of hydraulic conductivities and dispersivities in geologic
489 media, *Water Resources Research*, 26(8), 1749–1758.

490 Neuman, S., and V. Di Federico (2003), Multifaceted nature of hydrogeologic scaling and its
491 interpretation, *Reviews of Geophysics*, 41(3), doi:10.1029/2003RG000130.

492 Ramey, H. (1982), Well loss function and the skin effect: A review, in *Recent Trends in*
493 *Hydrogeology*, edited by T. Narasiman, pp. 265–271, GSA, Boulder, CO, GSA Spec. Paper
494 189.

495 Sanchez-Vila, X., J. Carrera, and J. Girardi (1996), Scale effects in transmissivity, *Journal of*
496 *Hydrology*, 183, 1–22.

497 Sanchez-Vila, X., P. Meier, and J. Carrera (1999), Pumping tests in heterogeneous aquifers:
498 An analytical study of what can be obtained from their interpretation using Jacob’s
499 method, *Water Resources Research*, 35(4), 943–952.

500 Sanchez-Vila, X., A. Guadagnini, and J. Carrera (2006), Representative hydraulic con-
501 ductivities in saturated groundwater flow, *Reviews of Geophysics*, *44*, RG3002, doi:
502 10.1029/2005RG000169.

503 Schad, H., and G. Teutsch (1994), Effects of investigation scale on pumping test results in
504 heterogeneous porous media, *J. Hydrol.*, *159*, 61–77.

505 Straface, S., T.-C. J. Yeh, J. Zhu, S. Troisi, and C. Lee (2007), Sequential aquifer tests
506 at a well field, Montalto, Uffugo Scalo, Italy, *Water Resources Research*, *43*, W07432,
507 doi:10.1029/2006WR005287.

508 Theis, C. (1935), The relation between the lowering of the piezometric surface and the rate
509 and duration of discharge of a well using ground-water storage, *Eos Trans. AGU*, *16*,
510 519–524.

511 Trinchero, P., X. Sánchez-Vila, and D. Feràndez-Garcia (2008), Point-to-point connectiv-
512 ity, an abstract concept or a key issue for risk assessment studies?, *Advances in Water*
513 *Resources*, *31*, 1742–1753.

514 Vesselinov, V. (2004a), An alternative conceptual model of groundwater flow and transport
515 in saturated zone beneath the pajarito plateau, *Tech. Rep. LA-UR-05-6741*, Los Alamos
516 National Laboratory.

517 Vesselinov, V. (2004b), Logical framework for development and discrimination of alternative
518 conceptual models of saturated groundwater flow beneath the pajarito plateau, *Tech. Rep.*
519 *LA-UR-05-6876*, Los Alamos National Laboratory.

520 Wu, C.-M., T.-C. Yeh, J. Zhu, T. Lee, N. Hsu, C.-H. Chen, and A. Sancho (2005), Traditional
521 analysis of aquifer tests: Comparing apples to oranges?, *Water Resources Research*, *41*,
522 W09402, doi:10.1029/2004WR003717.

Tables

Monitoring Well	Pumping Well	\hat{T}	\hat{T}_{eff}	c_T	\hat{S}	\hat{S}_a	c_S	$m[m/a]$	
		Const.	Exp.	Exp.	Const.	Exp.	Exp.	Const	Exp.
R-11	PM-2	3.27	3.07	168.7	2.19	1.58	-203.6	0.06	0.03
	PM-3			97.4	0.51	0.60	-28.7		
	PM-4			94.5	0.09	0.09	-7.5		
R-15	PM-2			278.1	4.96	1.76	-1205.4	0	0
	PM-3			151.6	0.04	0.48	-116.9		
	PM-4			4.0	0.02	0.02	-3.19		
	PM-5			7.8	0.08	0.05	-4.7		
R-28	PM-2			287.9	3.82	1.06	-433.2	0.04	0.02
	PM-3			33.3	0.19	0.27	-19.4		
	PM-4			29.4	0.08	0.13	-21.3		

Table 1: Parameter estimates from calibrations using exponential functions (Exp.) and constant (Const.) parameters. Transmissivity parameters are presented in units of $\log(m^2/d)$. m is the linear temporal trend parameter.

Figure Captions

Figure 1. Plots of transmissivity and storativity from numerical experiments by *Wu et al.* (2005) demonstrating numerically the temporal behavior of \hat{T} and \hat{S} as a drawdown cone of depression propagates in a synthetic aquifer with multilognormal T and S (open symbols). \hat{T} is normalized by the T_G (T/T_g) and \hat{S} is normalized by the arithmetic average storativity (S/S_A). Vertical lines with closed symbols are averaged values over four areas around the well. T_{eff} and S_{eff} are presented for reference.

Figure 2. Map of monitoring wells (circles) and water-supply wells (stars) included in the analysis. Locations of newly completed and planned monitoring wells are indicated by open diamonds.

Figure 3. Water elevations at monitoring wells and production records for water-supply wells.

Figure 4. Calibrated heads for the exponential (red) and constant (black) cases. The observed heads are presented in gray.

Figure 5. Estimated transmissivity functions for the exponential case. The convergent value of \hat{T}_{eff} and \hat{T} for the constant case are indicated.

Figure 6. Estimated storativity functions for the exponential case.

Figures

Figure 1: Plots of transmissivity and storativity from numerical experiments by *Wu et al.* (2005) demonstrating numerically the temporal behavior of \hat{T} and \hat{S} as a drawdown cone of depression propagates in a synthetic aquifer with multilognormal T and S (open symbols). \hat{T} is normalized by the T_G (T/T_g) and \hat{S} is normalized by the arithmetic average storativity (S/S_A). Vertical lines with closed symbols are averaged values over four areas around the well. T_{eff} and S_{eff} are presented for reference.

Figure 2: Map of monitoring wells (circles) and water-supply wells (stars) included in the analysis. Locations of newly completed and planned monitoring wells are indicated by open diamonds.

Figure 3: Water elevations at monitoring wells and production records for water-supply wells.

Figure 4: Calibrated heads for the exponential (red) and constant (black) cases. The observed heads are presented in gray.

Figure 5: Estimated transmissivity functions for the exponential case. The convergent value of \hat{T}_{eff} and \hat{T} for the constant case are indicated.

Figure 6: Estimated storativity functions for the exponential case.