



3725-00047

TRUCKEE CANAL SEEPAGE ANALYSIS IN THE FERNLEY/WADSWORTH AREA

Todd Mihevc
Greg Pohll
Rich Niswonger
Elizabeth Stevick

JANUARY 2002

Publication No. 41176

Prepared by
Division of Hydrologic Sciences
Desert Research Institute
University and Community College System of Nevada

Prepared for
Bureau of Reclamation
Carson City, Nevada

ABSTRACT

Leakage from the Truckee Canal in the greater Fernley area may contribute significant recharge to the aquifer in that area. Previous efforts to quantify recharge from seepage losses were plagued by uncertainty in the measurement techniques. The focus of this investigation was to estimate seepage losses by monitoring surface and subsurface temperatures. Those data are utilized in a numerical simulation that models both energy and fluid flux. The advantage of this technique is that temperatures are fairly easy to measure and they are used as input to the simulation as well as verification of how well the simulation matches the observed conditions. Six monitoring sites were chosen along the Truckee Canal in the Fernley area that reflect a range of saturation potential that was determined by an electrical resistivity survey.

The modeling effort at these six sites produced estimates of seepage losses that varied from a low of 0.6 cm/day to a high of 47.8 cm/day. By applying the seepage rates estimated by the model to the appropriate sections of canal it was estimated that the total annual loss in the Fernley area is 11,187 acre-feet (af) or 1,614 af/y/mi. of canal. This estimate compares fairly well to estimates of seepage losses in this area made by other techniques.

CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	ii
LIST OF FIGURES	iii
LIST OF TABLES.....	v
INTRODUCTION	1
Site Selection	1
Instrumentation	2
Numerical Simulation	3
Boundary Conditions	5
RESULTS	5
Site 1	5
Site 2	10
Site 3	13
Site 4	16
Site 5	19
Site 6	23
Lateral Canal Ponding Experiment/VERIFICATION.....	27
Comparison between the Geophysical Survey and the Modeling at the Instrumented Sites..	42
Estimated Flux	43
Conclusions.....	43
References.....	44
APPENDIX: Temperatures from Thermocouple Arrays at Monitoring Sites along the Truckee Canal	1

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1. Location of the temperature monitoring sites and the saturation potential determined by the geophysical survey along the Truckee Canal. The red zones are areas of high saturation potential, yellow indicates moderate saturation potential, and green indicates low saturation potential.....	2
Figure 2. Example of raw data from TCN 6-9 showing diurnal variation due to high temperature of the near-surface thermocouple wire and the filtered data with the diel variation removed.	3
Figure 3. Generalized model domain used in VS2DH simulations.	5
Figure 4. Location of thermocouples and model grid at Site 1.	6
Figure 5. Measured water and subsurface temperatures at Site 1. TCN 1-11 is the shallowest sensor, TCN 1-10 is intermediate, and TCN 1-9 is the deepest sensor.....	6
Figure 6. Measured and simulated temperatures for TCN 1-11.....	7
Figure 7. Measured and simulated temperatures for TCN 1-10.....	7
Figure 8. Measured and simulated temperatures for TCN 1-9.....	8
Figure 9. Measured and simulated temperatures for TCN 1-3.....	8
Figure 10. Measured and simulated temperatures for TCN 1-2.....	9
Figure 11. Water temperature and flux rate at Site 1 for the modeled time period.....	9
Figure 12. Location of thermocouples and model grid at Site 2.	10
Figure 13. Measured and simulated temperatures for TCN 2-3.....	11
Figure 14. Measured and simulated temperatures for TCN 2-7.....	11

Figure 15.	Measured and simulated temperatures for TCN 2-6.....	12
Figure 16.	Measured and simulated temperatures for TCN 2-10.....	12
Figure 17.	Water temperature and flux rate at Site 2 for the modeled time period.....	13
Figure 18.	Location of thermocouples and model grid at Site 3.	13
Figure 19.	Measured and simulated temperatures for TCN 3-4.....	14
Figure 20.	Measured and simulated temperatures for TCN 3-6.....	15
Figure 21.	Measured and simulated temperatures for TCN 3-8.....	15
Figure 22.	Water temperature and flux rate at Site 3 for the modeled time period.....	16
Figure 23.	Location of thermocouples and model grid at Site 4.	17
Figure 24.	Water temperature and measured and simulated temperatures for the thermocouples installed beneath the canal at Site 4.....	17
Figure 25.	Measured and simulated temperatures for TCN 4-9.....	18
Figure 26.	Measured and simulated temperatures for TCN 4-8.....	18
Figure 27.	Measured and simulated temperatures for TCN 4-3.....	19
Figure 28.	Water temperature and flux rate at Site 4 for the modeled time period.....	19
Figure 29.	Location of thermocouples and model grid at Site 5.	20
Figure 30.	Measured and simulated temperatures for TCN 5-5.....	21
Figure 31.	Measured and simulated temperatures for TCN 5-10.....	21
Figure 32.	Measured and simulated temperatures for TCN 5-11.....	22
Figure 33.	Measured and simulated temperatures for TCN 5-4.....	22
Figure 34.	Water temperature and flux rate at Site 5 for the modeled time period.....	23
Figure 35.	Location of thermocouples and model grid at Site 6.	24
Figure 36.	Measured and simulated temperatures for TCN 6-8.....	24
Figure 37.	Measured and simulated temperatures for TCN 6-7.....	25
Figure 38.	Measured and simulated temperatures for TCN 6-6.....	25
Figure 39.	Measured and simulated temperatures for TCN 6-5.....	26
Figure 40.	Measured and simulated temperatures for TCN 6-4.....	26
Figure 41.	Water temperature and flux rate at Site 6 for the modeled time period.....	27
Figure 42.	Location of ponding experiment on a lateral near the Truckee Canal.	27
Figure 43.	Ponding experiment layout and location of instrumentation.	28
Figure 44.	Location of subsurface instruments along section A-A'	29
Figure 45.	Hydraulic boundary conditions and finite element grid for the lateral flow and thermal model.	31
Figure 46.	Thermal boundary conditions and finite element grid for the lateral flow and thermal model.	32
Figure 47.	Varying pond stage used in simulation.	33
Figure 48.	Water temperatures used for simulation at the ponding experiment.	33
Figure 49.	Soil temperature used for simulations at the ponding experiment.....	33
Figure 50.	Simulated versus observed temperatures for thermocouple nest # (a) represents thermocouple nest #1-3 (b) represents nest #1-5.	35
Figure 51.	Simulated versus observed temperatures for thermocouple nest #2 (a) represents thermocouple nest #2-1 (b) represents nest #2-3 (c) represents nest #2-6. ...	36
Figure 52.	Simulated versus observed temperatures for thermocouple nest #4 (a) represents thermocouple nest #4-3 (b) represents nest #4-4 (c) represents nest #4-5. ...	37
Figure 53.	Simulated temperature profile one day after the start of the simulation.....	38
Figure 54.	Simulated temperature profile two days after the start of the simulation.	39

Figure 55.	Simulated temperature profile three days after the start of the simulation.	40
Figure 56.	Simulated temperature profile 3.61 days after the start of the simulation (final time step).....	41
Figure 57.	Simulated and measured seepage rate during the ponding experiment.	42

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1.	Results of the ponding experiment including seepage loss, evaporation, discharge volumes and times, and staff gauge readings.	30
Table 2.	Thermal parameters used in FeFlow (after Jury et al., 1991).	30
Table 3.	Hydraulic parameters and flux rates determined by modeling and saturation potential determined by an electrical resistivity survey at monitoring sites along the Truckee Canal.	42
Table 4.	Estimated volumetric seepage rates within the study area.....	43

INTRODUCTION

Leakage from the Truckee Canal between Wadsworth and East Fernley may make significant contributions to the aquifer in the Fernley area. Previous efforts were plagued by uncertainty in the measurement techniques and poor conceptualization of the subsurface system. Under the guise of the DRI /Washoe County Total Dissolved Solids study (Pohll *et al.*, 2001), substantial resources have been directed towards addressing issues related to possible leakage from the Truckee Canal in the reach between Wadsworth and east Fernley. In particular, two boreholes were drilled adjacent to the canal in early 1999, with the intent of establishing depth to water at these locations. Somewhat surprisingly, water table location exceeded the depth capability of the auger rigs used for this operation (>110 ft). While this information provided new information on the location of the water table in this area, it did not allow a Darcy's Law approach for calculating fluid flux from the canal, necessitating alternate approaches and additional resources for the effort.

The primary objective of this study component was to characterize the fluid flux from the Truckee Canal and adjacent laterals into underlying aquifers. Several methods have been proposed over the past two years. This research incorporated a variation on some of these, wherein thermal-based analysis, a ponding experiment and geophysical techniques were integrated. The focus of these studies was to:

1. Determine potential zones of seepage along the Truckee Canal for proper placement of thermocouple arrays.
2. Use heat pulses as a means to quantify the seepage loss from the Truckee Canal. Multiple thermocouple arrays will be utilized to assess the spatial variability in seepage loss.
3. Perform a ponding experiment along one section of a lateral canal to both determine the seepage loss from the lateral canals and to heat pulse methodology to determine fluid flux.

SITE SELECTION

Several factors dictated where the monitoring site would be located along the Truckee Canal. The main scientific consideration was to locate monitoring sites to cover a range of soil saturation potential described by Mike Widmer (Widmer, 2000), who analyzed resistivity data collected in a geophysical survey by Ehni Enterprises. It was also important to find monitoring sites that had good spatial distribution throughout the town of Fernley. Practical considerations include the ability to get the drilling rig close to the canal to facilitate drilling the angle boreholes under the canal. Figure 1 shows the locations for the monitoring sites and the moisture potential as interpreted by Widmer (Widmer, 2000) using the resistivity survey.