

## ABSTRACT OF THE DISSERTATION

### A SPATIAL DECISION SUPPORT SYSTEM FOR BASIN SCALE ASSESSMENT OF IMPROVED MANAGEMENT OF WATER QUANTITY AND QUALITY IN STREAM-AQUIFER SYSTEMS

Challenges in river basin management have intensified over the years, with expanding competition among water demands and emerging environmental concerns, increasing the complexity of the decision making framework. State-of-the-art technology is required for assisting water resource managers and decision makers in gaining a better understanding of the river system and in evaluating management alternatives towards optimal utilization of water resources. The sustainability of irrigated agriculture in alluvial valleys is being threatened by increasing pressures from municipalities to acquire agricultural water rights at elevated prices, degradation of agricultural water sources and lands due to salinization, irrigation-induced non-point source contamination of the stream-aquifer system, and non-beneficial consumption of water. A comprehensive spatial-decision support system (*River GeoDSS*) is developed herein to provide assistance in the development and evaluation of management strategies, including structural rehabilitation, for achieving agricultural sustainability, environmental enhancement, and water conservation in irrigated stream-aquifer systems. The *River GeoDSS* provides a comprehensive treatment of water quantity and quality objectives based on conjunctive surface and groundwater modeling within the complex administrative and legal framework of river basin management.

The *River GeoDSS* provides sophisticated tools that allow accurate system simulations and evaluation of strategies while minimizing the technological burden on the user. A unique characteristic of the *River GeoDSS* is the integration of models, tools, user interfaces and modules, all seamlessly incorporated in a geographic information system (GIS) environment that encourages the user to focus on interpreting and understanding system behavior to better design remediation strategies and solutions. The modeling system integrates the comprehensive river basin management model MODSIM with the 3D numerical groundwater quantity/quality model MODFLOW-MT3DMS. The *River GeoDSS* integrates these existing modules with a new artificial neural networks (ANN) module for natural and irrigation return flow quantity and quality evaluation and salt transport through reservoirs, as well as a new water quality module (WQM) for conservative salt transport modeling of conjunctive use of surface water and groundwater resources in the river basin network. The *River GeoDSS* incorporates Geo-MODSIM, a fully functional implementation of MODSIM within the ArcMap interface to the ArcGIS<sup>TM</sup> geographic information system (ESRI, Inc.). Also incorporated within the *River GeoDSS* is Geo-MODFLOW, a new MODFLOW-MT3DMS results analysis tool in the ArcMap interface. In this research, innovative methodologies are developed for applying ANNs in efficiently coupling surface and groundwater models and carrying out the reservoir salt transport modeling. The WQM's conservative salt transport algorithm, incorporating groundwater contributions within the surface water salinity routing, is fully embedded within the modeling subsystem.

The core *River GeoDSS* is customized to provide comprehensive analysis of alternative solutions to achieving agricultural, environmental, and water savings goals in the Lower Arkansas River Basin in Colorado as a case study for demonstrating the viability of the *River GeoDSS*. The alternatives include basin-scale evaluation of combinations of strategies including (1) aquifer areal recharge (from over irrigation) reduction, (2) canal seepage reduction, (3) improved subsurface drainage under irrigated lands, (4) vertical drainage, and (5) modified reservoir operations, with assurance of physical and administrative compliance. The *River GeoDSS* applied to the Arkansas River Valley allowed comparing benefits and improvements of management strategies, illustrated their potential to reduce waterlogging and soil salinity, salt load to the river, and non-beneficial evapotranspiration in a strategic planning environment.

Enrique Triana  
Civil and Environmental Engineering Department  
Colorado State University  
Fort Collins, CO 80523  
April 2008

## PREFACE

The development of *River GeoDSS*, a spatial-decision support system, originated many years of research at field, regional, and basin scales in the Lower Arkansas River Valley (LARV) in Colorado by Colorado State University (CSU) professors Drs. John Labadie, Timothy Gates, and Luis Garcia. The *River GeoDSS* is designed and developed as a flexible adaptable decision support tool to address water resource system-specific issues. The *River GeoDSS* uses MODSIM, a CSU developed and maintained software, as the main modeling engine. The author actively participated in the development of MODSIM version 8 (MODSIM 8), which gives him an invaluable understanding of the model and its state-of-the-art customization capability, essential in the successful implementation of *River GeoDSS*. The initial application of the *River GeoDSS* is in the LARV, Colorado, where earlier investigations identified the need for a basin-wide alternative evaluation tool in moving towards a pilot program implementation of improved water management and salinity control strategies that were developed at field and regional scales. The Lower Arkansas River (LAR) *GeoDSS* is founded upon an unprecedented effort in extensive field monitoring and data collection and many years of field and regional-scale detailed numerical models development by the CSU research team. The *LAR GeoDSS* application presented herein is a promising starting point to developing a tool that can be utilized to answer many emerging questions that will dictate the future of this irrigated river valley.

The *River GeoDSS* final product is a decision support system with core functionality (e.g., the Geo-MODSIM input/output tools, Geo-MODFLOW output display, water quality and artificial neural network modules, and the scenario manager output control) that can be used in any river system with limited case-specific functionality. Customization is necessary to adapt the tool for specific challenges in other basins. The Arkansas River customized version is fully functional for the specific purposes that it was developed for; further improvements and development direction identified during the course of this research are presented.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author wishes to express sincere appreciation to Prof. John Labadie and Prof. Timothy Gates for their invaluable guidance, assistance, and support during the many years of development of this research project. Their continual encouragement and advice played a key role in the success and completion of this work. The author also would like to recognize the input and comments to the research by his committee members, Prof. Luis Garcia and Prof. Charles Anderson.

Special thanks go to Dr. Phil Burkhalter, for his early work and support on the Arkansas River MODFLOW-MT3DMS regional-scale groundwater model, and to Eric Morway for his assistance in working with, analyzing and understanding the behavior and the assumptions of the regional-scale groundwater model. The author acknowledges Marc Baldo's contribution to the water quality module algorithm design and thanks him for the MODSIM training and support in the early stages of this research. Thanks also are extended to all of the members of the CSU Arkansas River Valley Research Team for their dedication and contributions in building the invaluable framework for this research work.

This research was only possible with the funding and cooperation of many agencies interested in improving conditions in the Arkansas River Valley such as: the Colorado Agricultural Experiment Station, the Colorado Water Resources Research Institute, the Southeastern Colorado Water Conservancy District, the Lower Arkansas Valley Water Conservancy District, the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation and many others. The author appreciates the Colorado Division of Water Resources (Division

2) personnel for their unconditional cooperation, data sharing, and help in understanding the administrative complexity of the Arkansas River system.

Finally, thanks to my wife, my parents, my brother and numerous friends, who endured this long process with me, always offering unconditional support and love.

*For my wife Marcela and my sons Mateo and Felipe*



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract of the Dissertation .....	iii
Preface .....	vi
Acknowledgments .....	viii
Table of Contents .....	xi
List of figures.....	xvii
List of Tables.....	xxiii
List of Abbreviations .....	xxiv
CHAPTER 1	
Introduction, Background and Objectives .....	1
Introduction .....	1
Background.....	3
Objectives .....	13
CHAPTER 2	
Literature Review.....	18
River Basin Flow Modeling and Decision Support Systems.....	18
Geographic Information Systems in Water Resources .....	28
Stream-Aquifer Interaction.....	32
artificial neural networks .....	41
Backpropagation Neural Networks .....	42
Radial Basis Networks.....	44
Application of ANN in Water Resources .....	45
Water Quality Modeling.....	49
Ground Water Quality in the Arkansas Valley .....	50
In-Stream Water Quality in the Arkansas Valley.....	51
Aquifer and Stream Water Quality in Colorado.....	52
Reservoir Water Quality Transport Modeling .....	53
CHAPTER 3	
<i>River GeoDSS</i> : Components and Modules .....	56
General <i>River GeoDSS</i> Structure .....	57
Geo-MODSIM.....	60
Geo-MODSIM Data Model .....	61

Geo-MODSIM geometric network.....	61
Geo-MODSIM tools in ArcMap .....	63
Data-model Data Transfer .....	65
Network Types in Geo-MODSIM.....	65
ANN Module in <i>River GeoDSS</i> .....	67
Special Considerations on the ANN Simulation in River GeoDSS .....	68
ANN MATLAB Export Tool .....	69
ANN Priming .....	69
ANN Radial Basis Prediction in River GeoDSS.....	70
Water Quality Module .....	73
Water Quality Module User Interfaces .....	76
Water Quality Data in WQM.....	78
Network Tracing .....	78
Water Quality Module Results in River GeoDSS .....	79
Simulation Scenarios Manager .....	80
Geo-MODFLOW .....	80
Customizable Interfaces and Tools.....	83
Spatial Output Display .....	84

#### CHAPTER 4

ANN Assisted Water Resources Modeling .....	86
Stream-Aquifer Interaction Modeling .....	86
Regional Scale Groundwater Modeling .....	87
Approach .....	89
ANN Development.....	90
ANN-based Stream-Aquifer Modeling Analysis.....	128
Reservoir Water Quality Transport Modeling .....	131
John Martin Reservoir Salt Transport Analysis .....	132
Approach .....	139
ANN Development.....	139
Reservoir Outlet Concentration Modeling Analysis.....	143
The Simulation Challenge.....	145

#### CHAPTER 5

Conjunctive Groundwater and Surface Water Quantity and Quality Modeling Approach in <i>River GeoDSS</i> .....	147
Stream-Aquifer Interaction Modeling Approach.....	147
Basin-Scale Water Quality Modeling .....	148
Conjunctive Surface-Groundwater Quantity and Quality Modeling.....	150
Hydrologic Calibration Tools .....	153
Network Calibration .....	154
Simulation Networks .....	158
Approach and Application Discussion .....	161

## CHAPTER 6

<i>River GeoDSS</i> Framework for the Lower Arkansas River Valley, Colorado.....	163
Spatial-Temporal Database.....	163
geometric network.....	164
Geo-MODSIM Network.....	167
Customized <i>River GeoDSS</i> .....	168
System Model Assembly .....	169
Stream-Aquifer Interaction Predictions in the Geo-MODSIM Network....	193
Reservoir Salt Transport Model .....	194
Simulation Scenario Manager.....	195
Simulation Scenario Analysis Tool.....	197
Model Calibration.....	200
Modeling Underlying Characteristics.....	201
Calibration Results and Analysis .....	203
Model Simulation .....	230
Reservoir Modeling Mode A.....	230
Reservoir Modeling Mode B.....	231
Remarks.....	237

## CHAPTER 7

Evaluation of Basin Scale Improved Water Management Alternatives in the Lower Arkansas River Valley, Colorado .....	240
Description of Improved Management Alternatives.....	242
Canal Seepage Reduction.....	243
Increased Irrigation Efficiency .....	244
Pumping Increase.....	250
Subsurface Drainage Improvement.....	251
Alternatives Modeling Methodology and Implementation .....	252
LAR GeoDSS Simulation Variables .....	252
Stream-Aquifer Interaction .....	254
Reservoir Operational modes .....	255
Management Alternative Comparison and Analysis.....	256
Criteria for Evaluation of Alternatives .....	257
Alternatives Performance Comparison.....	260
Analysis of Stream-Aquifer Results .....	307
Summary of Management Alternatives Modeling.....	313

## CHAPTER 8

Summary and Conclusions .....	316
Future Improvements and Research Ideas.....	324
<i>River GeoDSS</i> Environment.....	324
Implementation of the <i>River GeoDSS</i> in Other GIS Environments.....	324
<i>River GeoDSS</i> Online Interface .....	324
Water Quality Module Expansion .....	325

<i>River GeoDSS</i> Data-Management Tool Improvement and Time Series Database Improvement .....	325
Implementation of Time-Variant Water Rights Tool .....	326
Improvement in the <i>River GeoDSS</i> Network Update .....	326
Lower Arkansas River GeoDSS .....	326
Stream-Aquifer Interaction Modeling Enhancement.....	326
Groundwater Modeling Improvement Using Surface Water Modeling.....	328
Management Alternatives Modeling Improvements .....	329
Time Series Improvements .....	331
Improved Modeling of Water Carrier Structures.....	332
Canal Seepage Losses Simulation Improvements.....	332
Unmeasured Tributary Flow Estimation.....	333
Optimal System Operation to Meet Water Quality Goals .....	333
System Operation under Restricted Operational Policies .....	333
Detailed Modeling of Complex Water Storage Operations .....	334
Refining Water Quality Modeling.....	334
Extending the Modeling to the Arkansas River Head Waters.....	335
References .....	336
Appendix I	
ANN Training Dataset Description .....	I-1
Explanatory Variables.....	I-1
Grouping Area-Based.....	I-1
Area-buffer-Based.....	I-3
MODFLOW-MT3DMS Variables for ANN Training .....	I-13
MODFLOW-MT3DMS River Cells Grouped Variables .....	I-13
All MODFLOW-MT3DMS Cells Grouped Variables.....	I-14
ANN Training Database.....	I-15
ANN Training Dataset Files Description.....	I-16
Appendix II - [Electronic only (cd Attached)]	
ANN Stream-Aquifer Interaction Modeling Performance Evaluation.....	II-1
Aquifer-Arkansas River Interface Modeling .....	II-1
All_Scen_GWR_v8BArk_b Overall and Baseline Predictions Analysis .....	II-1
All_Scen_GWR_v8Ark Overall and Baseline Predictions Analysis.....	II-18
All_Scen_GWR_v8Ark_b ANN Baseline and Scenarios Selected Comparisons .....	II-33
All_Scen_GWR_v8Ark ANN Baseline and Scenarios Selected Comparisons .....	II-41
Aquifer-Tributaries Interface Modeling.....	II-49
All_Scen_GWR_v8BTrib_c Overall and Baseline Predictions Analysis....	II-49
All_Scen_GWR_v8Trib_a Overall and Baseline Predictions Analysis .....	II-60
All_Scen_GWR_v8BTrib_b ANN Baseline and Scenarios Selected Comparisons .....	II-73

All_Scen_GWR_v8Trib_a ANN Baseline and Scenarios Selected Comparisons .....	II-84
---	-------

### Appendix III

<i>River GeoDSS</i> User Support .....	III-1
Geo-MODSIM data-model Description .....	III-1
Geometric Network Edges .....	III-2
Geometric Network Nodes .....	III-4
Geo-MODSIM Synchronization Tables.....	III-7
geometric network Processing .....	III-10
Flow Directions .....	III-10
Simple Edges and Water Movement.....	III-11
MODSIM Network Execution Pre-processing.....	III-11
Stream-Aquifer Interaction Grouping Areas .....	III-13
ANN Modeling Files in <i>LAR GeoDSS</i> .....	III-14
ANN predictions in Geo-MODSIM.....	III-17
<i>River GeoDSS</i> Water Quality Import Tool .....	III-18
Geo-MODFLOW Summary Calculation Details .....	III-21

### Appendix IV

Water Quality Modeling Detailed Procedures and Tools .....	IV-1
Water Quality Database .....	IV-1
Network Tracing Algorithm.....	IV-2
Conservative Constituent Routing Calculation.....	IV-5
Inflow Concentrations and Measured Control Points .....	IV-5
Tributaries and River Convergence Modeling.....	IV-6
Water Concentration Calculation.....	IV-7
Implementation of the Water Quality Calibration .....	IV-8
Convergence Criteria .....	IV-12
Tributary Return Flow Special Consideration .....	IV-12
Water Quality Calibration in Calibration Structures.....	IV-14
Calibration in Simulation Runs.....	IV-15

### Appendix V - [Electronic only (cd Attached)]

Lower Arkansas River GeoDSS User Support.....	V-1
Spatial-Temporal Database Description .....	V-1
Time Series Database.....	V-8
CDWR Water Data Bank Codes.....	V-10
NEXRAD Precipitation Processing Notes .....	V-12
Water Quality Data Sources .....	V-13
Concentration and Flow Relationship.....	V-14
Historical Period Behavior Analysis .....	V-15
Regression Equations .....	V-19
SAINT CHARLES RIVER AT VINELAND .....	V-19
HUERFANO RIVER NEAR BOONE .....	V-21

APISHAPA RIVER NEAR FOWLER.....	V-22
CHICO CREEK NEAR PUEBLO CHEMICAL DEPOT .....	V-23
ARKANSAS RIVER AT LA JUNTA .....	V-25
PURGATOIRE RIVER NEAR LAS ANIMAS .....	V-26
ARKANSAS RIVER AT LAMAR.....	V-27
BIG SANDY CREEK NEAR LAMAR .....	V-28
ARKANSAS RIVER NEAR GRANADA.....	V-29
FOUNTAIN CREEK AT PUEBLO .....	V-30
Importing Water Rights from the CDWR Database.....	V-31
Modeling Alternate Points of Diversion (APD) .....	V-38
Modeling Storage Water Diversion.....	V-39
Detailed Gains and Losses Analysis .....	V-40
Calibration with ANN stream-aquifer Interaction Prediction.....	V-40
Surface Water Only Calibration.....	V-50
Water Quality Calibration Detailed Analysis.....	V-59

#### Appendix VI - [Electronic only (cd Attached)]

Modeling Salinity and Waterlogging Management Alternatives in the Lower Arkansas River basin.....	VI-1
Management Alternative Demand Reduction .....	VI-1
Management Alternatives Detailed Analysis.....	VI-4
Reservoir Operational mode A.....	VI-4
Reservoir Operational mode B.....	VI-28

## LIST OF FIGURES

<i>Number</i>	<i>Page</i>
Figure 2.1 – Stream-aquifer interaction [modified from Alley et al. (1999)] .....	33
Figure 2.3 – Feed-forward neural network example.....	43
Figure 2.4 – Elman NN structure diagram.....	43
Figure 2.5 – Radial Basis Network structure diagram .....	44
Figure 3.1 – DSS structure diagram .....	58
Figure 3.2 – <i>River GeoDSS</i> extension menus .....	59
Figure 3.3 – <i>River GeoDSS</i> Data Management Interface .....	59
Figure 3.4 - Geo-MODSIM data-model in ArcCatalog™ .....	61
Figure 3.6 – Geo-MODSIM main interface and menu items in ArcMap™ .....	63
Figure 3.7 – Geo-MODSIM select features tool in ArcMap™ .....	64
Figure 3.8 – Geo-MODSIM Output Display Tool in ArcMap™ .....	65
Figure 3.9 – Geometric network and MODSIM network interaction diagram .....	67
Figure 3.10 – Neural network Priming Procedure Diagram .....	72
Figure 3.11 – Water Quality Module and MODSIM coupling diagram .....	75
Figure 3.12 – WQM network node user input dialog sample.....	76
Figure 3.13 – WQM Flow-Concentration relationship user dialog sample .....	77
Figure 3.14 – Water Quality modeling preferences and WQ data import user dialog samples .....	77
Figure 3.15 – Water Quality results display in <i>River GeoDSS</i> example .....	79
Figure 3.16 – MODFLOW Flow budget in GMS (Environmental Modeling Systems, Inc) .....	81
Figure 3.17 – Geo-MODFLOW user interface as displayed in ArcMap™ .....	82
Figure 3.18 – Geo-MODFLOW summary display in ArcMap™ .....	83
Figure 3.19 - <i>River GeoDSS</i> spatial results visualization example in ArcMap™ .....	85
Figure 4.1– Regional-scale groundwater modeled areas .....	88
Figure 4.2 – Stream-Aquifer Modeling Grouping Areas in the Lower Arkansas River Valley .....	91
Figure 4.3 – MODFLOW Groundwater flow direction example .....	92
Figure 4.4 – Groundwater flow direction example.....	93
Figure 4.5 – Buffer-Areas for variable aggregation inside the stream-aquifer modeling grouping areas .....	94
Figure 4.6 – ANN training in passes diagram.....	96
Figure 4.7 – Geo-tool user interface for ANN training dataset processing in ArcMap™ .....	98
Figure 4.8 – <i>River GeoDSS</i> climate raster maps from point-based data generation interface.....	99
Figure 4.9 – ANN training dataset preprocessing interface .....	99
Figure 4.10 – ANN training dataset generation user interface .....	101
Figure 4.11 – ANN training dataset pre-processing interface .....	103
Figure 4.12 – ANN training dataset preferences interface .....	104
Figure 4.13 – MATLAB ANN training tool dataset size user-dialog.....	109

Figure 4.16 – ANN training dataset preferences for the Arkansas River stream-aquifer interaction modeling (Dataset_A).....	115
Figure 4.17 – ANN training dataset preferences for Aransas River stream- aquifer interaction modeling (Dataset_B) .....	116
Figure 4.18 – All_Scen_GWR_v8Ark_b ANN training\testing performance .....	118
Figure 4.19 – All_Scen_GWR_v8BArk_b return flow concentration training and validation analysis.....	119
Figure 4.20 – All_Scen_GWR_v8Ark ANN training\testing performance analysis .....	120
Figure 4.21 – Return Flow Concentration predicted by All_Scen_GWR_v8Ark .....	121
Figure 4.22 – All_Scen_GWR_v8BTrib_c return flow prediction performance analysis.....	123
Figure 4.23 – All_Scen_GWR_v8Trib_c return flow concentration prediction performance analysis .....	124
Figure 4.24 – ANN training dataset preferences for aquifer-tributary interaction modeling with Dataset_B.....	125
Figure 4.25 – All_Scen_GWR_v8Trib_a return flow prediction performance analysis.....	126
Figure 4.26 – All_Scen_GWR_v8Trib_a return flow concentration prediction performance analysis .....	127
Figure 4.27 – Flow vs. Concentration at Purgatoire River near Las Animas.....	133
Figure 4.28 – Salt transport in John Martin Reservoir .....	134
Figure 4.29 – Annual Salt Load In/Out John Martin Reservoir.....	135
Figure 4.30 – John Martin net annual change in storage and salt mass .....	135
Figure 4.31– John Martin Reservoir concentration In\Out .....	136
Figure 4.32 – John Martin Reservoir outflow and concentration .....	137
Figure 4.33 – Outlet variables correlations.....	138
Figure 4.34 – John Martin Reservoir salt transport ANN training dataset preferences interface.....	141
Figure 4.35 – ANN training and validation performance summary for the John Martin Reservoir salt transport .....	142
Figure 4.36 – John Martin Reservoir Outlet concentration ANN prediction in testing.....	144
Figure 5.1 – <i>River GeoDSS</i> conjunctive quantity and quality modeling diagram.....	153
Figure 5.2 – Schematics of the calibration structure for a reach in Geo-MODSIM.....	155
Figure 5.3 – Schematics for the most upstream reach calibration structure .....	156
Figure 5.4 – <i>River GeoDSS</i> modeling preferences user interface (calibration mode) .....	156
Figure 5.5 – User interface for selecting simulation mode using calibration results.....	159
Figure 5.6 – Schematics of a calibration structure in simulation.....	160
Figure 6.2 – Diversion return link example.....	168
Figure 6.3 – Spatial Climate variables generator utility interface.....	176
Figure 6.4 – Spatial precipitation interpolated from point-based measurement (location indicated by ★).....	176
Figure 6.5 – Precipitation summary database generation utility interface.....	177
Figure 6.6 – Calibration concentration bounds guide utility interface .....	179
Figure 6.7 – MODSIM Water Rights Extension for the <i>LAR GeoDSS</i> .....	183
Figure 6.8 – System Sink in the <i>LAR GeoDSS</i> network .....	189
Figure 6.9 – Carrier diversion structure diagram.....	191
Figure 6.10 – ANN module MODSIM simulation structure .....	193
Figure 6.11 – Simulation Scenario Manager User Dialog Sample ( <i>LAR GeoDSS</i> ).....	196
Figure 6.12 – Simulation Scenario Manager ANN and groundwater modeling preferences sample.....	198



Figure 6.13 – Simulation Scenario Manager batch preferences setting tool.....	198
Figure 6.14 – Single run performance summaries in <i>LAR GeoDSS</i> .....	198
Figure 6.15 – Interface of the simulation scenarios comparison tool in ArcMap.....	200
Figure 6.16 – System-wide result summary plots interface .....	200
Figure 6.17 – Pueblo Reservoir storage content calibration run .....	204
Figure 6.18 – John Martin Reservoir storage content calibration run.....	204
Figure 6.19 – Control points surface drainage areas.....	205
Figure 6.20 – Measured system inflows and outflows at the system source reaches.....	206
Figure 6.21 – Calibrated system gains and losses .....	208
Figure 6.22 – Local gains and losses during calibration for reach ARKLAJCO.....	208
Figure 6.23 – Arkansas River total net return flow comparison for the modeled grouping areas .....	211
Figure 6.24 – Aquifer return flow RMSE per year per grouping area.....	211
Figure 6.25 – Arkansas River Average concentration comparison for modeling grouping areas .....	212
Figure 6.26 – Arkansas River Concentration RMSE per grouping area per year.....	212
Figure 6.27 – Basin-wide Arkansas River stream-aquifer interaction modeling summary .....	213
Figure 6.28 – Tributary total net return flow comparison for the modeled grouping areas ....	214
Figure 6.29 – Tributary aquifer return flow RMSE per year per grouping area .....	215
Figure 6.30 – Tributary Average concentration comparison for modeling grouping areas ....	215
Figure 6.31 – Tributary Concentration RMSE per grouping area per year.....	216
Figure 6.32 – Basin-wide tributary total net return flow summary .....	217
Figure 6.33 – System source reaches inflows without stream-aquifer modeling.....	218
Figure 6.34 – Crooked Arroyo return flow comparison.....	219
Figure 6.35 – Timpas Creek return flow check .....	220
Figure 6.36 – System gains and losses for calibration without stream-aquifer interaction modeling .....	222
Figure 6.37 – ARKLAJCO reach return flow comparison .....	223
Figure 6.38 – ARKROCCO reach return flow comparison .....	224
Figure 6.39 – ARKLASCO reach return flow comparison.....	224
Figure 6.40 – Root Mean Squared Error (RMSE) at the <i>LAR GeoDSS</i> control points .....	226
Figure 6.41 – Average calibrated and measured concentration comparison.....	227
Figure 6.42 – ANN-based John Martin Reservoir water quality transport results.....	229
Figure 6.43 – Pueblo Reservoir storage in Mode B simulation .....	233
Figure 6.44 – John Martin Reservoir simulated storage in Mode B .....	233
Figure 6.45 – Simulated water constituent concentration RMSE summary at the <i>LAR</i> <i>GeoDSS</i> control points .....	236
Figure 6.46 – Average concentration prediction at the <i>LAR GeoDSS</i> control points Mode B (Dataset_B).....	237
Figure 7.1 – Example of the total aquifer recharge volume simulated in MODFLOW .....	249
Figure 7.2 – Management alternatives water demands and canal loss for operational mode A.....	261
Figure 7.3 – Management alternatives water demand shortage for operational mode A.....	262
Figure 7.4 – Management alternatives end-of-simulation system storage in operational mode A.....	264
Figure 7.5 – Colorado-Kansas state line simulated flow in operational mode A for considered Management Alternatives .....	265

Figure 7.6 – Arkansas River average net return flow within the MODFLOW-MT3DMS modeled region for considered management alternatives .....	267
Figure 7.7 – Coefficient of variation of the Arkansas River net return flow within the MODFLOW-MT3DMS modeled region for considered management alternatives .....	267
Figure 7.8 – Tributaries average net return flow within the MODFLOW-MT3DMS modeled region for considered management alternatives .....	268
Figure 7.9 – Coefficient of variation of the tributaries net return flow within the MODFLOW-MT3DMS modeled region for considered management alternatives....	269
Figure 7.10 – RMSE of the net return flow prediction relative to the baseline for the Arkansas River within the MODFLOW-MT3DMS modeled region for considered management alternatives .....	270
Figure 7.11 – Arkansas River average salt load within the MODFLOW-MT3DMS modeled region for considered management alternatives .....	271
Figure 7.12 – Coefficient of variation of the Arkansas River salt load within the MODFLOW-MT3DMS modeled region for considered management alternatives .....	272
Figure 7.13 – Tributaries average salt load within the MODFLOW-MT3DMS modeled region for considered management alternatives .....	273
Figure 7.14 – Coefficient of variation of the Tributaries salt load within the MODFLOW-MT3DMS modeled region for considered management alternatives .....	273
Figure 7.15 – RMSE of the salt load prediction for the Arkansas River and the tributaries within the MODFLOW-MT3DMS modeled region for considered management alternatives .....	274
Figure 7.16 – Net return flow prediction change relative to the baseline for the Arkansas River within the MODFLOW-MT3DMS modeled region for considered management alternatives .....	276
Figure 7.17 – Comparison of the average change from the baseline of return flow to the Arkansas River for considered management alternatives .....	276
Figure 7.18 – Net return flow prediction change relative to the baseline for the tributaries within the MODFLOW-MT3DMS modeled region for considered management alternatives .....	278
Figure 7.19 – Comparison of the change from the baseline of return flow to the tributaries for the considered management alternatives .....	279
Figure 7.20 – Computed salt load prediction change relative to the baseline for the Arkansas River within the MODFLOW-MT3DMS modeled region for considered management alternatives .....	280
Figure 7.21 – Computed salt load prediction change relative to the baseline for the tributaries within the MODFLOW-MT3DMS modeled region for considered management alternatives .....	281
Figure 7.22 – Basin-wide average predicted net return flow per consider water management alternative .....	283
Figure 7.23 – Coefficient of variation of the basin-wide <i>LAR GeoDSS</i> predicted net return flow for considered management alternatives .....	285
Figure 7.24 – Basin-wide salt loading to the Arkansas River and tributaries predicted by the <i>LAR GeoDSS</i> for considered management alternatives .....	286

Figure 7.25 – Average diverted water concentration per management alternative in operational mode A .....	287
Figure 7.26 – Average water concentration provided to Kansas for considered management alternatives.....	289
Figure 7.27 – Salt loading change at the Colorado-Kansas state border for considered management alternatives.....	289
Figure 7.28 – Salt balance in John Martin Reservoir for operational mode A for considered management alternatives.....	291
Figure 7.29 – John Martin Reservoir water quality transport coefficient in operational mode A for considered management alternatives.....	291
Figure 7.30 – Management alternatives water demand shortage for operational mode B for considered management alternatives .....	297
Figure 7.31 – Management alternatives end-of-simulation system storage in operational mode B.....	299
Figure 7.32 – Alternatives Colorado-Kansas state line flow in operational Mode B for considered management alternatives for considered management alternatives.....	300
Figure 7.33 – Average TDS concentration in diverted flow per water management alternative in operational Mode B.....	302
Figure 7.34 – Average TDS concentration provided to Kansas in operational Mode B for considered management alternatives.....	302
Figure 7.35 – Change in TDS concentration in flows to Kansas between Mode A and Mode B for considered management alternatives.....	303
Figure 7.36 – Salt balance in John Martin Reservoir for operational Mode B for considered management alternatives.....	304
Figure 7.37 – John Martin Reservoir water quality transport coefficient for management alternatives under operational Mode B for considered management alternatives.....	304
Figure 7.38 – MODFLOW Flow Budget components change for 50% areal recharge reduction alternative compared to the baseline.....	309
Figure 7.39 – Aquifer water balance change from the baseline conditions in Rech50 alternative.....	310
Figure 7.40 – MODFLOW Aquifer storage change from the baseline storage in Rech50 alternative.....	311
Figure I-1 – Main stream length example in upstream grouping areas .....	2
Figure I-2 – Area-buffers configuration in grouping area 16.....	4
Figure III-1 – Grouping-areas for ANN stream-aquifer interaction modeling in the Lower Arkansas River .....	14
Figure III-2 – ANNInputs.csv file layout example.....	15
Figure III-3 – ANNWeights.csv file structure diagram .....	16
Figure III-4 – ANNWeights.csv file structure example.....	16
Figure III-5 – ANN preprocessing tools user interface.....	18
Figure III-6 – EC to TDS equations performance example.....	20
Figure IV-1 – WQM database tables sample .....	2
Figure IV-2 – Flowchart of the network tracing algorithm.....	4
Figure IV-3 – Flowchart of the function Check Previous Visit .....	5
Figure V-1 – Geo-Database data sample.....	3
Figure V-2 – Arkansas River basin Digital Elevation Model.....	4
Figure V-3 – Arkansas River Land Use Map .....	5
Figure V-4 – Arkansas River Soil Type Map.....	5

Figure V-5 – Spatial-Temporal Database Sample .....	6
Figure V-6 – NEXRAD Precipitation Data Sample .....	6
Figure V-7 – System reconnaissance report example as displayed in ArcMap.....	7
Figure V-8 – National Weather Service climate data processing tool interface .....	10

## LIST OF TABLES

<i>Number</i>	<i>Page</i>
Table 6.1 – CDWR Gauging Stations Summary .....	171
Table 6.2 - USGS Gauging Stations Summary .....	171
Table 6.3 – Three Digit Structures with Data under Different WD Numbers .....	173
Table 6.4 – Water Quality Measuring Stations Summary .....	178
Table 6.5 – Measured Concentration Limits by Measured Water Body Type.....	180
Table 6.6 – Regression Equation Summary of Irregular Sampling Stations .....	181
Table 6.7 – LARV Modeled APD Links .....	185
Table 6.8 – Original Rights Adjustment and Errors Based on Alternate Diversion Records.....	185
Table 6.9 – <i>LAR GeoDSS</i> -Modeled Storage Water Summary.....	186
Table 6.10 – Carrier Structures Summary (based on diversion records).....	191
Table 6.11 – Manual Diversion Database Entry for Fort Lyon to Create Water Carrier Structure.....	192
Table 6.12 – Calibration Water Shortage Summary.....	203
Table 6.13 – Summary Calibration System Sources Inflows/Outflows .....	207
Table 6.14 – Summary Calibration River Reach Gains and Losses.....	208
Table 6.15 – Net System Source Reaches Inflow Summary .....	218
Table 6.16 – Calibrated Gains and Losses without Stream-Aquifer Interaction Modeling .....	221
Table 6.17 – Calibrated Concentration Statistics per Control Point .....	228
Table 6.18 – John Martin Reservoir Layers Definition and Incremental Cost.....	232
Table 6.19 – Pueblo Reservoir Layers Definition and Incremental Cost.....	232
Table 6.20 – Operational modes Indicators Comparison .....	235
Table 6.21 – Detailed Simulation Gains and Losses per Calibration Reach Mode B with Dataset_B ANN.....	236
Table 7.1 – Simulated Management Alternative Summary.....	257
Table 7.2 – Infeasible Management Alternatives Due to Water Shortages in Operational mode A.....	262
Table 7.3 – Summary Management Alternative Performance for System Operational Mode A .....	295
Table 7.4 – Management Alternatives with Water Shortages in Operational Mode B .....	297
Table 7.5 – Alternatives End-of-Simulation Reservoir Storage (operational Mode B).....	298
Table 7.6 – Summary Management Alternative Performance for System Operational Mode B.....	307
Table V-1 – Modeled Water Rights in the <i>LAR GeoDSS</i> .....	33

## **LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS**

ANN: Artificial Neural Network

CDWR: Colorado Division of Water Resources

CSU: Colorado State University

DSS: Decision Support System

LARV: Lower Arkansas River Valley

LAR: Lower Arkansas River

NRCS: Natural Resource Conservation Service

SDSS: Spatial Decision Support System

USBR: U.S. Bureau of Reclamation

USGS : United States Geological Survey

## LIST OF CD CONTENTS

CD CONTENTS DESCRIPTION

ANN TRAINING FILES

MATLAB FILES AND INTERFACES

DISSERTATION FILES. PDF FILES

APPENDIX II (Electronic Only)

*River GeoDSS* INSTALL (.msi FILE)

LAR GeoDSS SAMPLE FILES

Mode A

Mode B

NEXRAD BATCH PROCESSING FILES