

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

**Introduction to Special Section: The Quest for Sustainability of
Heavily Stressed Aquifers at Regional to Global Scales**

James J. Butler, Jr.^{1,5}, J. Jaime Gomez-Hernandez²,
Debra Perrone³, and David Hyndman⁴

Manuscript prepared for submission to *Water Resources Research*

Original Submission: May 20, 2021
Revised Submission: July 07, 2021

¹Kansas Geological Survey, University of Kansas, Lawrence, KS, USA

²Institute for Water and Environmental Engineering, Universitat Politècnica de València,
Valencia, Spain

³Environmental Studies Program, University of California at Santa Barbara, Santa Barbara, CA,
USA

⁴School of Natural Sciences and Mathematics, University of Texas at Dallas, Dallas, TX, USA

⁵Corresponding author

33 **1. Introduction**

34 Groundwater is a critical resource for drinking water and food production, yet limited
35 management amid intensive use has led to aquifer depletion across the globe (Alley and Alley,
36 2017; Bierkens and Wada, 2019). Efforts to address this depletion have been stymied by an
37 incomplete understanding of aquifer dynamics, data limitations, a mismatch between law and
38 science, along with socio-economic, cultural, and political factors. The AGU Chapman
39 Conference “The Quest for Sustainability of Heavily Stressed Aquifers at Regional to Global
40 Scales” was held in October 2019 at the Universitat Politècnica de València in Spain to address
41 these barriers to progress and explore promising paths forward. Presentations by researchers
42 from the hydrology, law, economics, and social science communities provided the basis for
43 wide-ranging discussions of the most critical data needs; the appropriate scale for aquifer
44 analyses; assessments of supply and demand from local to global scales; and proposals for future
45 directions that incorporate governance, the likely trajectory of anthropogenic stresses, the
46 protection of ecosystems, and the evolution of modeling and analysis tools.

47 The conference’s presentations and discussions prompted the preparation of this special
48 section focused on the prospects for a more sustainable future for the world's heavily stressed
49 aquifers. The special section consists of seventeen papers contributed by conference attendees
50 and others with similar interests. Although these papers only present a partial picture of the
51 topics covered in the conference’s wide-ranging presentations and discussions, they aptly
52 demonstrate the interest of the broader hydrological community in the future of the world’s
53 critically important groundwater resources.

54

55 **2. Summary of Papers**

56 The seventeen papers can be divided into three general categories: assessing or addressing
57 data needs (eight papers), groundwater governance (three papers), and modeling methods and
58 applications from farm to continental scales (six papers). These papers primarily describe
59 conditions in the United States (US), but the conference's presentations and discussions extended
60 far beyond that country.

61 Data Needs

62 Groundwater pumping is the primary driver of aquifer depletion. However, most countries do
63 not have adequate data to quantify the annual pumping stress placed on their aquifers. For
64 example, in the US, only 36% of all irrigation wells are metered; many of the most heavily
65 stressed areas in the central and western US have yet to adopt widespread metering practices
66 (NASS, 2018). The state of Kansas is the most prominent exception with over 95% of its
67 approximately 18,900 irrigation wells metered and subject to regulatory verification (Butler et
68 al., 2016; NASS, 2018). Bohling et al. (2021), Lamb et al. (2021), and Majumdar et al. (2020)
69 use the Kansas pumping data to evaluate how many wells need to be metered, the major
70 influences on pumping volume, and the effectiveness of a new machine learning approach for
71 estimating pumping volumes, respectively. Foster et al. (2020) use the pumping data from a
72 heavily monitored area in the state of Nebraska to assess the effectiveness of remote-sensing
73 methods for estimating irrigation water use and to explore the policy implications of adopting
74 those methods.

75 Recharge is an important but often highly uncertain component of an aquifer's water budget
76 that can be extremely variable in space and time (Healy, 2010). Neely et al. (2021) use remotely
77 sensed surface displacement data to identify possible recharge zones in the Central Valley
78 aquifer in the state of California. Managed aquifer recharge (MAR) is considered an important

79 technology to moderate and reverse the depletion of heavily stressed aquifers in California and
80 elsewhere. Marwaha et al. (2021) present a multi-criteria decision analysis approach, which is
81 supported by flow and transport modeling, to identify locations for MAR that increase the
82 resilience of rural communities that are dependent on groundwater from the Central Valley
83 aquifer.

84 Water-storage estimates based on the Gravity Recovery and Climate Experiment (GRACE)
85 satellite mission have revealed the severity of groundwater depletion challenges that face
86 countries across the globe (Rodell et al., 2018). However, studies comparing GRACE water-
87 storage estimates with those based on other information have been limited. Rateb et al. (2020)
88 compare the GRACE water-storage estimates with those derived from water-level monitoring
89 data and regional and global models for 14 major aquifers in the US.

90 Pumping-induced land subsidence has wreaked havoc in coastal regions (e.g., increased salt-
91 water intrusion and flood frequency) and, more generally, with infrastructure across the globe
92 (Hyndman and Hyndman, 2016). A major challenge is identifying where and when irreversible
93 formation compaction will likely occur. Hung et al. (2021) describe a specially constructed well
94 that allows compaction potential to be assessed over multiple vertical intervals and they
95 demonstrate the tool's capabilities with a field application.

96 Groundwater Governance

97 There is no standard approach for management of groundwater resources; regulatory
98 frameworks can vary tremendously between, and even within, countries. For example, in the US,
99 groundwater management is a state responsibility, so adjacent states overlying the same aquifer
100 can have vastly different approaches (Griggs, 2014). A key question is: How are management
101 mechanisms evolving to address the overdrafting of groundwater resources? Rouillard et al.

102 (2021) present a comparative analysis of co-management mechanisms that have been
103 independently developed in France, Spain, and the state of California.

104 Restrictions on groundwater use are common in interconnected stream-aquifer systems.
105 These restrictions are typically applied as part of efforts to protect higher priority surface water
106 users and maintain environmental flows, but defining appropriate implementation strategies is
107 difficult (Bredehoeft, 2011). Young et al. (2021) use agronomic, economic, and hydrologic
108 models to examine the impacts of various strategies for implementing restrictions on
109 groundwater use in aquifers in hydraulic connection with streams.

110 The state of California passed the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act in 2014 to
111 address the widespread depletion of many of the state's aquifers (Water Education Foundation,
112 2015). Managed aquifer recharge is slated to be one of the most important tools for bringing
113 these aquifers to a more sustainable condition. Ulibarri et al. (2021) assess the hydrological,
114 legal, institutional, and operational challenges that threaten the feasibility of the MAR projects
115 proposed to achieve the goals of this new management framework.

116 Modeling Methods and Applications

117 The dominant use of groundwater globally is for irrigated agriculture. In the US, close to
118 70% of the total groundwater pumped is used for this purpose (Dieter et al., 2018), a percentage
119 that is likely reflective of conditions in many countries that depend on groundwater for support
120 of irrigated agriculture. Efforts to address aquifer depletion must therefore consider their
121 potential for success in an agricultural setting. Butler et al. (2020) present a lumped water-
122 balance approach to assess pathways toward sustainability for aquifers supporting irrigated
123 agriculture. Deines et al. (2021) combine a crop model and remote sensing to examine the

124 agronomic and hydrologic impacts of an ongoing groundwater conservation effort utilizing
125 pumping reductions in the High Plains aquifer in Kansas.

126 Continental- to global-scale models are undergoing continual development (Bierkens et al.,
127 2015; Doll et al., 2016). Felfelani et al. (2020) describe the results of incorporating pumping,
128 conjunctive-use, and lateral-flow capabilities into a widely used land surface model. Hartick et
129 al. (2021) present a terrestrial modeling approach that incorporates atmospheric, land surface,
130 and subsurface flow models to assess near-term changes in subsurface storage using a
131 probabilistic methodology similar to that for weather forecasting.

132 Climate-induced pumping (groundwater extractions driven by climatic conditions) has been
133 demonstrated in previous studies (Whittemore et al., 2016; Russo and Lall, 2017). Precipitation
134 is clearly a major control on pumping schedules, but other climatic factors may also play a role.
135 Nie et al. (2021) use a modified land surface model to explore the influence of precipitation and
136 temperature on simulated and reported pumping from regions across the US.

137 Pumping in interconnected stream-aquifer systems can have large, but often difficult to
138 quantify, impacts on stream flow (Barlow and Leake, 2012). Those impacts are typically lumped
139 together and characterized as stream depletion. Zipper et al. (2021) compare stream depletion
140 estimates obtained using a new approach, analytical depletion functions, with those obtained
141 from a calibrated numerical model of a basin in the High Plains region of the US.

142

143 **3. Concluding Remarks**

144 Aquifers are under severe stress worldwide as a result of large water-budget imbalances
145 created by the excessive pumping of groundwater. Although the challenges posed to irrigation
146 and drinking water supplies by groundwater depletion are immense, they are not insurmountable.

147 The wide-ranging discussions at the Chapman conference in Valencia emphasized some basic
148 principles for guiding efforts to reduce the stress on groundwater resources:

149 1. We must do a much better job of monitoring groundwater withdrawals, as it is difficult to
150 manage or model a quantity that is so poorly known;

151 2. We must better align regulatory and legal frameworks with science; precedence may be a
152 bedrock principle of many legal systems, but it rarely meshes well with the evolution of
153 scientific understanding;

154 3. Multidisciplinary investigations that incorporate the human response to groundwater
155 depletion are critical to reduce the stress on aquifers; those investigations must be firmly
156 grounded in reality if significant progress is to be made;

157 4. New data acquisition and analysis approaches hold great promise to better quantify
158 conditions across a range of scales; in particular, the combination of in-situ data and remote-
159 sensing approaches appears to hold considerable potential; and

160 5. Aquifer modeling cannot be done in isolation, as expertise from multiple disciplines is
161 required to improve the reliability of predictions of what the future holds for the world's
162 aquifers.

163 We hope that this collection of papers will not only capture the excitement we felt during the
164 presentations and discussions in Valencia but also help clarify the impediments to, and
165 opportunities for, charting more sustainable paths for the world's heavily stressed aquifers.

166

167 **Acknowledgments and Data Accessibility**

168 The authors acknowledge financial support from the United States National Science
169 Foundation (NSF), via grant EAR 1542320, to organize the Chapman meeting. Any opinions,

170 findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this material are those of the authors
171 and do not necessarily reflect the views of the NSF.

172 No data sets were used or created in preparation of this Introduction.

173 **References**

- 174 Alley, W. M., & Alley, R. (2017). *High and dry: Meeting the challenges of the world's growing*
175 *dependence on groundwater*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
176 <https://doi.org/10.12987/yale/9780300220384.001.0001>
- 177 Barlow, P. M., & Leake, S. A. (2012). Streamflow depletion by wells—Understanding and
178 managing the effects of groundwater pumping on streamflow. *U.S. Geological Survey*
179 *Circular 1376*, Reston, VA: U.S. Geological Survey.
- 180 Bierkens, M. F. P., Bell, V. A., Burek, P., Chaney, N., Condon, L. E., David, C. H., et al. (2015).
181 Hyper-resolution global hydrological modelling: What is next? *Hydrological Processes*,
182 29(2), 310–320. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hyp.10391>
- 183 Bierkens, M. F. P., & Wada, Y. (2019). Non-renewable groundwater use and groundwater
184 depletion: A review. *Environmental Research Letters*, 14(6), 063002. [https://doi.org/](https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/ab1a5f)
185 [10.1088/1748-9326/ab1a5f](https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/ab1a5f)
- 186 Bohling, G. C., Butler, J. J. Jr., Whittemore, D. O., & Wilson, B. B (2021). Evaluation of data
187 needs for assessments of aquifers supporting irrigated agriculture. *Water Resources*
188 *Research*, 57(4), e2020WR028320. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2020WR028320>
- 189 Bredehoeft, J. (2011). Hydrologic trade-offs in conjunctive use management. *Ground Water*,
190 49(4), 468-475.
- 191 Butler, J. J. Jr., Bohling, G. C., Whittemore, D. O., & Wilson, B. B. (2020). Charting pathways
192 toward sustainability for aquifers supporting irrigated agriculture. *Water Resources*
193 *Research*, 56, e2020WR027961. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2020WR027961>

194 Butler, J. J. Jr., Whittemore, D. O., Wilson, B. B., & Bohling, G. C. (2016). A new approach for
195 assessing the future of aquifers supporting irrigated agriculture. *Geophysical Research*
196 *Letters*, 43, 2004–2010. <https://doi.org/10.1002/2016GL067879>

197 Deines, J. M., Kendall, A. D., Butler, J. J., Basso, B., & Hyndman, D. W. (2021). Combining
198 remote sensing and crop models to assess the sustainability of stakeholder-driven
199 groundwater management in the US high plains aquifer. *Water Resources Research*, 57,
200 e2020WR027756. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2020WR027756>

201 Dieter, C. A., Maupin, M. A., Caldwell, R. R., Harris, M. A., Ivahnenko, T. I., Lovelace, J. K., et
202 al. (2018). Estimated use of water in the United States in 2015, *U.S. Geological Survey*
203 *Circular 1441*, Reston, VA: U.S. Geological Survey.

204 Döll, P., Douville, H., Guntner, A., Müller Schmied, H., & Wada, Y. (2016). Modelling
205 freshwater resources at the global scale: Challenges and prospects. *Surveys in Geophysics*,
206 37(2), 195–221.

207 Felfelani, F., Lawrence, D. M., & Pokhrel, Y. (2020). Representing intercell lateral groundwater
208 flow and aquifer pumping in the community land model. *Water Resources Research*, 56,
209 e2020WR027531. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2020WR027531>

210 Foster, T., Mieno, T., & Brozovic, N. (2020). Satellite-based monitoring of irrigation water use:
211 Assessing measurement errors and their implications for agricultural water management
212 policy. *Water Resources Research*, 56, e2020WR028378.
213 <https://doi.org/10.1029/2020WR028378>

214 Griggs, B. W. (2014). Beyond drought: Water rights in the age of permanent depletion. *Kansas*
215 *Law Review*, 62(5), 1263–1324. <https://doi.org/10.17161/1808.20269>

216 Hartick, C., Furusho-Percot, C., Goergen, K., & Kollet, S. (2021). An interannual probabilistic
217 assessment of subsurface water storage over Europe using a fully coupled terrestrial model.
218 *Water Resources Research*, 57, e2020WR027828. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2020WR027828>

219 Healy, R. W. (2010). *Estimating Groundwater Recharge*. Cambridge, United Kingdom:
220 Cambridge University Press.

221 Hung, W-C., Hwang, C., Sneed, M., Chen, Y-A., Chu, C-H., & Lin, S-H. (2021). Measuring and
222 interpreting multilayer aquifer-system compactions for a sustainable groundwater-system
223 development. *Water Resources Research*, 57, e2020WR028194. [https://doi.org/10.1029/](https://doi.org/10.1029/2020WR028194)
224 [2020WR028194](https://doi.org/10.1029/2020WR028194)

225 Hyndman, Donald W., and Hyndman, David W. (2016). *Natural hazards and disasters*. Cengage
226 Learning.

227 Lamb, S. E., Haacker, E. M. K., & Smidt, S. J. (2021). Influence of irrigation drivers using
228 boosted regression trees: Kansas High Plains. *Water Resources Research*, 57,
229 e2020WR028867. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2020WR028867>

230 Majumdar, S., Smith, R., Butler, J. J. Jr., & Lakshmi, V. (2020). Groundwater withdrawal
231 prediction using integrated multitemporal remote sensing data sets and machine learning.
232 *Water Resources Research*, 56, e2020WR028059. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2020WR028059>

233 Marwaha, N., Kourakos, G., Levintal, E., & Dahlke, H. E. (2021). Identifying agricultural
234 managed aquifer recharge locations to benefit drinking water supply in rural communities.
235 *Water Resources Research*, 57, e2020WR028811. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2020WR028811>

236 National Agricultural Statistics Service. (2018). Table 8 – Irrigation wells used on farms:2018.
237 *2018 Irrigation and Water Management Survey*. U.S. Department of Agriculture.

238 https://www.nass.usda.gov/Publications/AgCensus/2017/Online_Resources/Farm_and_
239 [Ranch_Irrigation_Survey/index.php](https://www.nass.usda.gov/Publications/AgCensus/2017/Online_Resources/Farm_and_Ranch_Irrigation_Survey/index.php)

240 Neely, W. R., Borsa, A. A., Burney, J. A., Levy, M. C., Silverii, F., Sneed, M. (2021).
241 Characterization of groundwater recharge and flow in California’s San Joaquin Valley from
242 InSAR-observed surface deformation. *Water Resources Research*, 57, e2020WR028451.
243 <https://doi.org/10.1029/2020WR028451>

244 Nie, W., Zaitchik, B. F., Rodell, M., Kumar, S. V., Arsenault, K. R., & Badr, H. S. (2021).
245 Irrigation water demand sensitivity to climate variability across the contiguous United States.
246 *Water Resources Research*, 57, e2020WR027738. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2020WR027738>

247 Rateb, A., Scanlon, B. R., Pool, D. R., Sun, A., Zhang, Z., Chen, J., et al. (2020). Comparison of
248 groundwater storage changes from GRACE satellites with monitoring and modeling of major
249 U.S. aquifers. *Water Resources Research*, 56, e2020WR027556. [https://doi.org/](https://doi.org/10.1029/2020WR027556)
250 [10.1029/2020WR027556](https://doi.org/10.1029/2020WR027556)

251 Rodell, M., Famiglietti, J. S., Wiese, D. N., Reager, J. T., Beaulieu, H. K., Landerer, F. W., &
252 Lo, M. H. (2018). Emerging trends in global freshwater availability. *Nature*, 557(7707), 651–
253 659. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-018-0123-1>

254 Rouillard, J., Babbitt, C., Pulido-Velazquez, M., and Rinaudo, J-D. (2021). Transitioning out of
255 open access: A closer look at institutions for management of groundwater rights in France,
256 California, and Spain, *Water Resources Research*, 57, e2020WR028951. [https://doi.](https://doi.org/10.1029/2020WR028951)
257 [org/10.1029/2020WR028951](https://doi.org/10.1029/2020WR028951)

258 Russo, T. A., & Lall, U. (2017). Depletion and response of deep groundwater to climate-induced
259 pumping variability. *Nature Geoscience*, 10(2), 105–108.

260 Ulibarri, N., Escobedo Garcia, N., Nelson, R. L., Cravens, A. E., & McCarty, R. J. (2021).
261 Assessing the feasibility of managed aquifer recharge in California. *Water Resources*
262 *Research*, 57, e2020WR029292. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2020WR029292>

263 Water Education Foundation. (2015). *The 2014 sustainable groundwater management act: A*
264 *handbook to understanding and implementing the law*. Water Education Foundation.
265 <https://www.watereducation.org/publication/2014-sustainable-groundwater-management-act>

266 Whittlemore, D. O., Butler, J. J. Jr., & Wilson, B. B. (2016). Assessing the major drivers of
267 water-level declines: New insights into the future of heavily stressed aquifers. *Hydrological*
268 *Sciences Journal*, 61(1), 134–145. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02626667.2014.959958>

269 Young, R., Foster, T., Mieno, T., Valocchi, A., & Brozovic, N. (2021). Hydrologic-economic
270 trade-offs in groundwater allocation policy design. *Water Resources Research*, 57,
271 e2020WR027941. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2020WR027941>

272 Zipper, S. C., Gleeson, T., Li, Q., & Kerr, B. (2021). Comparing streamflow depletion estimation
273 approaches in a heavily stressed, conjunctively managed aquifer. *Water Resources Research*,
274 57, e2020WR027591. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2020WR027591>

275

276