6.3 Quantity of Groundwater

An estimate of the volume of groundwater stored in the sand and gravel aquifers in the surficial deposits is 0.4 to 2.4 cubic kilometres. This volume is based on an areal extent of 2,700 square kilometres and a saturated sand and gravel thickness of three metres. The variation in the total volume is based on the value of porosity that is used for the sand and gravel. One estimate of porosity is 5%, which gives the low value of the total volume. The high estimate is based on a porosity of 30% (Ozoray, Dubord and Cowen, 1990).

The adjacent water-level map has been prepared by considering water wells completed in aquifers in the surficial deposits. The map shows the highest level of groundwater in surficial deposits, and this level was used for the calculation of saturated surficial deposits and for calculations of recharge/discharge areas.



Figure 26. Non-Pumping Water-Level Surface in Surficial Deposits

6.4 Recharge/Discharge

The hydraulic relationship between the groundwater in the surficial deposits and the groundwater in the bedrock aquifers is given by the non-pumping water-level surface associated with each of the hydraulic units. Where the water level in the surficial deposits is at a higher elevation than the water level in the bedrock aquifers, there is the opportunity for groundwater to move from the surficial deposits into the bedrock aquifers. This condition would be considered as an area of recharge to the bedrock aquifers and an area of discharge from the surficial deposits. The amount of groundwater that would move from the surficial deposits to the bedrock aquifers is directly related to the vertical permeability of the sediments separating the two aquifers.

When the hydraulic gradient is from the bedrock aquifers to the surficial deposits, the condition is a discharge area from the bedrock aquifers, and a recharge area to the surficial deposits.

6.4.1.1 Surficial Deposits/Upper Bedrock Aquifer(s)

The hydraulic gradient between the surficial deposits and the upper bedrock aquifer(s) has been determined by subtracting the non-pumping water-level surface associated with all water wells completed in upper bedrock aquifer(s) from the non-pumping water-level surface determined for all water wells in the surficial deposits. The recharge classification on the map below includes those areas where the water level in the surficial deposits is more than five metres above the water level in the upper bedrock aquifer(s). The discharge areas are where the water level in the surficial deposits is more than five metres lower than the water level in the bedrock. When the water level in the surficial deposits is between five metres above and five metres below the water level in the bedrock, the area is classified as a transition.

The adjacent map shows that in more than 90% of the County there is a downward hydraulic gradient, recharge to the upper bedrock aquifer(s). Areas where there is an upward hydraulic gradient, or discharge from the bedrock, are very few, and are mainly in the vicinity of lows in the bedrock surface. The remaining parts of the County are areas where there is a transition condition.

Because of the paucity of data, a calculation of the volumes of groundwater entering and leaving the surficial deposits has not been attempted.



Figure 27. Recharge/Discharge Areas between Surficial Deposits and Upper Bedrock Aquifer(s)

6.4.1.2 Bedrock Aquifers

Recharge to the bedrock aquifers within the County takes place from the overlying surficial deposits and from flow in the aquifer from outside the County. The recharge/discharge maps show that generally for most of the County, there is a downward hydraulic gradient from the surficial deposits to the bedrock, i.e. recharge to the bedrock. On a regional basis, calculating the quantity of water involved is not possible because of the complexity of the geological setting and the limited amount of data. However, because of the generally low permeability of the upper bedrock materials, the volume of water is expected to be small.

The hydraulic relationship between the surficial deposits and the *continental* Foremost Aquifer indicates that in the 70% of the County where the *continental* Foremost Aquifer is present, there is a downward hydraulic gradient. Discharge and transition areas for the *continental* Foremost Aquifer and the remainder of the bedrock aquifers present in the County are either in or adjacent to the bedrock lows.



Figure 28. Recharge/Discharge Areas between Surficial Deposits and* continental *Foremost Aquifer

7 POTENTIAL FOR GROUNDWATER CONTAMINATION

The most common sources of contaminants that can impact groundwater originate on or near the ground surface. The contaminant sources can include leachate from landfills, effluent from leaking lagoons or from septic fields, and petroleum products from storage tanks or pipeline breaks. The agricultural activities that generate contaminants include the spreading of fertilizers, pesticides, herbicides and manure. The spreading of highway salt can also degrade groundwater quality.

When activities occur that can or do produce a liquid which could contaminate groundwater, it is prudent (from a hydrogeological point of view) to locate the activities where the risk of groundwater contamination is minimal. Alternatively, if the activities must be located in an area where groundwater can be more easily contaminated, the necessary action must be taken to minimize the risk of groundwater contamination.

The potential for groundwater contamination is based on the concept that the easier it is for a liquid contaminant to move downward, the easier it is for the groundwater to become contaminated. In areas where there is groundwater discharge, liquid contaminants cannot enter the groundwater flow systems to be distributed throughout the area. In groundwater recharge areas, low-permeability materials impede the movement of liquid contaminants downward. Therefore, if the soils develop on a low-permeability parent material of till or clay, the downward migration of a contaminant is slower relative to a high-permeability parent material such as sand and gravel of fluvial origin. Once a liquid contaminant enters the subsurface, the possibility for groundwater contamination increases if it coincides with a higher permeability material within one metre of the land surface.

To determine the nature of the materials on the land surface, the surficial geology map prepared by the Alberta Research Council (Shetsen, 1990) has been reclassified based on the relative permeability. The classification of materials is as follows:

1. high permeability - sand and gravel;
2. moderate permeability - silt, sand with clay, gravel with clay, and bedrock; and
3. low permeability - clay and till.

To identify the areas where sand and gravel can be expected within one metre of the ground surface, all groundwater database records with lithologies were reviewed. From a total of 1,928 records in the area of the County with lithological descriptions, 274 have sand and gravel within one metre of ground level. In the remaining 1,654 records, the first sand and gravel is deeper or not present. This information was gridded to prepare a distribution of where the first sand and gravel deposit could be expected within one metre of ground level.

7.1.1 Risk of Contamination Map

The information from the reclassification of the surficial geology map is the basis for preparing the initial risk map. The depth to the first sand and gravel is then used to modify the initial map and to prepare the final map. The criteria used for preparing the final Risk of Groundwater Contamination map are outlined in the adjacent table.

Surface Permeability	Sand or Gravel Present To Within One Metre Of Ground Surface	Groundwater Contamination Risk
Low	No	Low
Moderate	No	Moderate
High	No	High
Low	Yes	High
Moderate	Yes	High
High	Yes	Very High

Table 5. Risk of Groundwater Contamination Criteria

The Risk of Groundwater Contamination map shows that, in 25% of the County, there is a high or very high risk of the groundwater being contaminated. These areas would be considered the least desirable ones for a development that has a product or by-product that could cause groundwater contamination. However, because the map has been prepared as part of a regional study, the designations are a guide only; detailed hydrogeological studies must be completed at any proposed development site to ensure the groundwater is protected from possible contamination. At all locations, good environmental practices should be exercised in order to ensure that groundwater contamination would not affect groundwater quality.



Figure 29. Risk of Groundwater Contamination

8 RECOMMENDATIONS

The present study has been based on information available from the groundwater database. The database has three problems:

1) the quality of the data;
2) the coordinate system used for the horizontal control; and
3) the distribution of the data.

The quality of the data in the groundwater database is affected by two factors: a) the technical training of the persons collecting the data, and b) the quality control of the data. The possible options to upgrade the database include the creation of a “super” database, which would include only verified data. The level of verification would have to include identifying the water well in the field, obtaining meaningful horizontal coordinates for the water well and the verification of certain parameters such as water level and completed depth. An attempt to update the quality of the entire database is not recommended.

There is a shortage of lithologic information for township 055, range 14, W4M. There is not one control point for the bedrock surface in the entire township. Additional data are required to better define the bedrock surface and aquifers present.

The present analysis has shown that the groundwater flow through the aquifers is more than the amount authorized for diversion by AEP. However, because this analysis is based on a regional study, the results should be considered no more than an indication. It is recommended that a detailed study be completed to assess the volume of groundwater flowing through at least the *continental* Foremost Formation. The study would need to obtain all of the data for individual water wells authorized to divert groundwater from the *continental* Foremost Aquifer, document the quantity of groundwater being diverted, establish the water-level trends, and evaluate the hydraulic parameters for the Aquifer. The best method to analyze the data would be through the use of a computer model study.

One of the main shortages of data for the determination of a groundwater budget is water levels as a function of time. There are only four AEP observation-water-well data sources in the County from which to obtain water levels for the groundwater budget. One method to obtain additional water-level data is to solicit the assistance of the water well owners who are stakeholders in the groundwater resource. In the M.D. of Rocky View, for example, water well owners are being provided with a tax credit if they accurately measure the water level in their water well once per week for a year. A pilot project indicated that approximately five years of records are required to obtain a reasonable data set. The cost of a five-year project involving 50 water wells would be less than the cost of one drilling program that may provide two or three observation water wells.

In general, for the next level of study, the database needs updating. It requires more information from existing water wells, and additional information from new ones.

Before an attempt is made to upgrade the level of interpretation provided in this report and the accompanying maps and groundwater query, it is recommended that all water wells for which water well drilling reports are available be subjected to the following actions:

1. The horizontal location of the water well should be determined within ten metres. The coordinates must be in 10TM NAD 27 or some other system that will allow conversion to 10TM NAD 27 coordinates.
2. A four-hour aquifer test (two hours of pumping and two hours of recovery) should be performed with the water well to obtain a realistic estimate for the transmissivity of the aquifer in which the water well is completed.
3. Water samples should be collected for chemical analysis after 5 and 115 minutes of pumping, and analyzed for major and minor ions.

In addition to the data collection associated with the existing water wells, all available geophysical logs should be interpreted to establish a more accurate spatial definition of individual aquifers.

There is also a need to provide the water well drillers with feedback on the reports they are submitting to the regulatory agencies. The feedback is necessary to allow for a greater degree of uniformity in the reporting process. This is particularly true when trying to identify the bedrock surface. The water well drilling reports should be submitted to the AEP Resource Data Division in an electronic form. The money presently being spent by AEP and Prairie Farm Rehabilitation Administration (PFRA) to transpose the paper form to the electronic form should be used to allow for a technical review of the data and follow-up discussions with the drillers.

An effort should be made to form a partnership with the petroleum industry. The industry spends millions of dollars each year collecting information relative to water wells. Proper coordination of this effort could provide significantly better information from which future regional interpretations could be made. This could be accomplished by the County taking an active role in the activities associated with the construction of lease sites for the drilling of hydrocarbon wells and conducting of seismic programs.

Groundwater is a renewable resource and it must be managed.

9 REFERENCES

Carrigy, M. A. 1971. Lithostratigraphy of the Uppermost Cretaceous (Lance) and Paleocene Strata of the Alberta Plains. Research Council of Alberta. Bulletin 27.

Currie, D. V. and N. Zacharko. 1976. Hydrogeology of the Vermilion Area, Alberta. Alberta Research Council. Report 75-5.

Geoscience Consulting Ltd. March 1976. Evaluation of Water Supply. Two Hills, Alberta. Prepared for Alberta Environment.

Geoscience Consulting Ltd. November 1980. Water Well Test Drilling Program. Two Hills, Alberta. August-September, 1980. Prepared for the Town of Two Hills.

Hackbarth, D. A. 1975. Hydrogeology of the Wainwright Area, Alberta. Earth Sciences Report No. 75-1. Alberta Research Council.

Hydrogeological Consultants Ltd. November 1991. Highland View Farms Ltd. Vegreville Area. 1991 Aquifer Testing Program. NW 27-054-14 W4M. Unpublished Contract Report.

Hydrogeological Consultants Ltd. August 1993. Highland View Farms Ltd. Vegreville Area. 1993 Aquifer Testing Program. NW 26-054-14 W4M. Unpublished Contract Report.

Hydrogeological Consultants Ltd. January 1997. Highland Feeders Limited. Vegreville Area. SW 34-054-14 W4M. 1996 Groundwater Evaluation. Unpublished Contract Report.

Hydrogeological Consultants Ltd. June 1998. Highland Feeders Limited. Vegreville Area. Tp 054, R 14, W4M. 1997 Annual Groundwater Monitoring Report. Unpublished Contract Report.

Hydrogeological Consultants Ltd. Highland Feeders Limited. Vegreville Area. Tp 054, R 14, W4M. 1998 Groundwater Program. Unpublished Contract Report (in progress).

Hydrogeological Consultants Ltd. October 1995. TDI Projects Inc. Alberta Agri Ethanol Ltd. Two Hills Area. 04-055-11 W4M. Groundwater Prognosis. Unpublished Contract Report.

Hydrogeological Consultants Ltd. January 1996. Alberta Agri-Ethanol Co. Ltd. Two Hills Area. 04-055-11 W4M. Groundwater Exploration Phase. Unpublished Contract Report.

Hydrogeological Consultants Ltd. Alberta Agri-Ethanol Co. Ltd. Two Hills Area. Tp 054, R 11 W4M. 1996 Vermilion Lakes Aquifer Investigation. Unpublished Contract Report (in progress).

Mossop, G. and I. Shetsen (co-compilers). 1994. Geological Atlas of the Western Canada Sedimentary Basin. Produced jointly by the Canadian Society of Petroleum Geology, Alberta Research Council, Alberta Energy, and the Geological Survey of Canada.

Osachuk, T. N. Patrick. August 1994. County of Two Hills #21. CAESA Drilling Summary Assessment. PFRA, Earth Sciences Division. Edmonton, AB. Unpublished Report.