

**NUMERICAL GROUNDWATER MODELING OF
PAHARPUR CANAL CAMMAND AREA,
DERA ISMAIL KHAN, PAKISTAN**



By

ANEELA KHAN

**Department of Earth and Environmental Sciences
Bahria University, Islamabad**

2013

**NUMERICAL GROUNDWATER MODELING OF
PAHARPUR CANAL CAMMAND AREA,
DERA ISMAIL KHAN, PAKISTAN**



A thesis submitted to Bahria University, Islamabad in partial fulfillment of
the requirement for the degree of M.S in Geophysics

ANEELA KHAN

**Department of Earth and Environmental Sciences
Bahria University, Islamabad**

2013

Dedicated to

My Parents with Love and Gratitude

ABSTRACT

The study area Paharpur Canal Command area is located in Dera Ismail Khan District of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa province in Pakistan. The study area falls within longitude $70^{\circ} 55'$ to $71^{\circ} 18'$ East and latitude $31^{\circ} 45'$ to $32^{\circ} 25'$ North. Chashma Barrage is on the northern side of the study area and to the south is the city of Dera Ismail Khan. The eastern boundary is formed by the River Indus where the Paharpur Canal forms the western boundary. Several surveys have been carried out by WAPDA and reports have been written giving information related to the groundwater flow processes and resources in Dera Ismail Khan.

The main objective of this study is to analyze the groundwater flow system in Paharpur Canal Command area. Numerical three dimensional finite difference steady state (for the year 1980) as well as transient (for the year 1980-2010) flow models are prepared for the unconfined aquifers in the study area. The groundwater flow system in the area is modeled using MODFLOW 4.2.

The model development is carried out by defining the conceptual model of the study area from the data collected by the Meteorological Department, the Water and Power Development Authority (WAPDA) and the Indus River System Authority (IRSA). The conceptual model is transformed into a numeric model via MODFLOW.

The grid cell size of the model was taken 200 x 200 m. The area is modeled with a grid of 171 columns and 399 rows with three layers assigned on the basis of the varying hydraulic conductivity values. The upper 100 meters of the unconfined aquifer is modeled. Model area and the layer top elevation are delineated from topographic. The hydraulic conductivity values are determined from the literature review for the alluvial sediment aquifer. Recharge is taken as 7% of the annual rainfall and the evapotranspiration is calculated from the Thornthwaite equation. River Indus is assigned constant head boundary and stream boundary conditions have been applied to the Paharpur canal.

The steady state model is calibrated using observed hydraulic heads from 24 observation wells. The model is calibrated towards groundwater head observations by modifying the hydraulic conductivity using PEST. From the composite sensitivity graph it is inferred that the model is sensitive to changes in the hydraulic conductivity value in the first layer.

The steady state and transient simulation hydraulic heads contour maps shows that the general direction of groundwater flow is from northeast to south. The steady state water

table depth map show water logged regions in the upper and middle parts of the study area. The behavior of the unconfined aquifer under stresses such as pumping has been evaluated. By analyzing the successive time water table depth maps of the transient simulation (from the year 1980-2010) it is concluded that as a result of pumping the depth of the groundwater is increasing across the modeled region. The model has helped to understand the influence of the boundary conditions on the groundwater flow system in the study area.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

First of all I pay my humble thanks to Allah Almighty, who bestowed his blessings in completing my MS research work. I would like to thank my Supervisor Dr. Mohammad Zafar, Head of Department Earth and Environmental Sciences, Bahria University Islamabad, for his support and guidance, and Co-supervisor Dr. Anwar Qadir, Assistant Prof. Bahria University Islamabad, for his excellent guidance, encouragements and laying me on a sound foundation on groundwater modeling. I am very grateful to Prof. Dr. Tehseenullah Khan Bangash for his constructive comments and advice which helped me to come up in right direction of the research work.

My deep gratitude to all my respectable teachers who taught me at BS and MS level. Meteorological Department Islamabad, the Water and Power Development Authority and Indus River System Authority are acknowledged, who provided me with the data for model development. Many thanks to my friends and colleagues for their support and encouragements

Last but not the least gratitude to my parents and siblings for their invaluable support throughout my academic career.

CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	i
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iii
CONTENTS	iv
FIGURES	vii
TABLES	x

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1	Research objectives	2
1.2	Research methodology	2
1.3	Previous work	4

CHAPTER 2

STUDY AREA

2.1	Locality and accessibility of Paharpur Canal Command area	5
2.2	Paharpur Canal	7
2.3	River Indus	7
2.4	Topography	10
2.5	Climate	11
2.6	Drainage	12
2.7	Physiography	13
2.7.1	Active flood plain	13
2.7.2	Meander flood plain	13
2.7.3	Piedmont plain	13
2.8	Geology	14
2.8.1	Consolidated rocks	15
2.8.2	Unconsolidated rocks	15
2.9	Groundwater	17
2.10	Aquifer characteristics	18
2.11	Soils	19

CHAPTER 3

MODEL CONCEPTUALISATION AND DEVELOPMENT

3.1	Groundwater modeling procedure	22
3.2	Data collection	24
3.3	Conceptual model development	25
3.4	Selecting modeling code	26
3.5	MODFLOW	26
3.5.1	MODFLOW limitations	27
3.5.2	MODFLOW packages and program structure	27
3.6	Governing equations of the 3D models	29
3.7	Model design for the Paharpur Canal Command area	30
3.7.1	Creating the model grid	30
3.7.1.1	Orienting the grid	31
3.7.1.2	Assigning the active and inactive cells	31
3.7.2	Assigning the number and the types of layers	33
3.7.3	Physical parameters of the model system	33
3.7.3.1	Initial hydraulic heads	33
3.7.3.2	Recharge	34
3.7.3.3	Potential evapotranspiration	34
3.7.4	Elevation data	34
3.7.5	Hydraulic conductivity	35
3.7.6	Boundary conditions	35

CHAPTER 4

CALIBRATION AND SENSITIVITY ANALYSIS

4.1	Trial and error method	39
4.2	Automated calibration	40
4.3	PEST	40
4.3.1	Working of PEST	40
4.4	Calibration of the steady state groundwater model developed	41
4.5	Evaluation of calibration	42
4.5.1	Scattergrams	43
4.6	Sensitivity analysis	47
4.7	Sensitivity analysis of the steady state model developed	48

4.8	Analysis of the steady state simulation	50
4.8.1	Equipotential head map	50
4.8.2.	Water table depth map	52

CHAPTER 5

NON-STEADY MODEL DEVELOPMENT

5.1	Stress period and time steps	54
5.2	Storage characteristics of the aquifer	55
5.3	Bore holes and observation wells	55
5.3.1	Well package	56
5.4	Analysis of non-steady simulation	56
5.4.1.	Equipotential head maps	56
5.4.2.	Water table depth maps	63
5.4.3	Mass balance	68

	CONCLUSION AND RECOMENDATIONS	75
--	-------------------------------	----

	REFERENCES	77
--	------------	----

	APPENDICES	79
--	------------	----

FIGURES

Figure 1.1.	Flow chart presenting research methodology.	3
Figure 2.1.	Location map showing the study area (WAPDA, 1980).	6
Figure 2.2.	Line diagram of Paharpur Canal System (WAPDA, 1980).	8
Figure 2.3.	Map showing River Indus and its tributaries.	9
Figure 2.4.	Topography of Paharpur Canal Command area (WAPDA, 1980).	14
Figure 2.5.	Meteorological statistics of D. I. Khan presenting temperatures (maximum in red and minimum in blue (30 years average monthly temperature data), precipitation and sunshine hours. Source www.allmetsat.com).	11
Figure 2.6.	Paharpur Canal irrigation system (WAPDA, 1980).	12
Figure 2.7.	Physiography of Paharpur Canal Command area (WAPDA, 1980).	14
Figure 2.8.	Water table depth of Paharpur Canal Command area (WAPDA, 1980).	17
Figure 3.1.	Flow chart showing types of mathematical models (Kresic, 2007).	21
Figure 3.2.	Flow chart showing generalized groundwater modeling procedure (ASTM D5447-93).	23
Figure 3.3.	Overall MODFLOW program structure (McDonald and Harbaugh, 1988).	28
Figure 3.4.	Active and inactive cells in the model domain.	32
Figure 3.5.	Model's layers.	33
Figure 3.6.	3D groundwater model of Paharpur Canal Command area.	37
Figure 4.1.	Trial and error calibration procedure (reproduced from Peters, 1987).	39
Figure 4.2.	Location of the measured wells used for steady state calibration.	44

Figure 4.3.	Scattergram of calculated verses observed heads, before steady state calibration.	45
Figure 4.4.	Scattergram of calculated verses observed heads, steady state calibration.	46
Figure 4.5.	Sensitivity analysis of the hydraulic conductivity values.	49
Figure 4.6.	Steady state simulation result for layer 1 (year 1980). Equipotential contours of 1 m interval.	51
Figure 4.7.	Steady state simulation, water table depth map of layer 1 (year 1980).	52
Figure 5.1.	Generalized division of simulation time into stress periods and time steps in MODFLOW (McDonald and Harbaugh, 1988).	55
Figure 5.2.	Location of the pumping wells for non-steady simulation.	57
Figure 5.3.	Steady state simulation result of layer 1 (year 1980). Equipotential contours of 1 m interval.	58
Figure 5.4.	Non-steady state simulation result of layer 1 (year 1985). Equipotential contours of 1 m interval.	58
Figure 5.5.	Non-steady state simulation result of layer 1 (year 1990). Equipotential contours of 1 m interval.	59
Figure 5.6.	Non-steady state simulation result of layer 1 (year 1995). Equipotential contours of 1 m interval.	59
Figure 5.7.	Non-steady state simulation result of layer 1 (year 2000). Equipotential contours of 1 m interval.	60
Figure 5.8.	Non-steady state simulation result of layer 1 (year 2005). Equipotential contours of 1 m interval.	60
Figure 5.9.	Non-steady state simulation result of layer 1 (year 2010). Equipotential contours of 1 m interval.	61
Figure 5.10.	Showing increase in drawdown as a function of time.	62
Figure 5.11	Steady state simulation, water table depth map (year 1980).	64
Figure 5.12.	Non-steady simulation, water table depth map (year 1985).	64
Figure 5.13.	Non-steady simulation, water table depth map (year 1990).	65
Figure 5.14.	Non-steady simulation, water table depth map (year 1995).	65

Figure 5.15.	Non-steady simulation, water table depth map (year 2000).	66
Figure 5.16.	Non-steady simulation, water table depth map (year 2005).	66
Figure 5.17.	Non-steady simulation, water table depth map (year 2010).	67
Figure 5.18.	Storage in component of mass balance.	69
Figure 5.19.	Constant head in component of mass balance.	69
Figure 5.20.	Stream leakage in component of mass balance.	70
Figure 5.21.	Recharge in component of mass balance.	70
Figure 5.22.	Constant head out component of mass balance.	71
Figure 5.23.	Storage out component of mass balance.	71
Figure 5.24.	Stream leakage out component of mass balance.	72
Figure 5.25.	Evapotranspiration out component of mass balance.	72
Figure 5.26.	Wells out component of mass balance.	73
Figure 5.27.	Total in and out of water in cubic meters in mass balance.	74

TABLES

Table 2.1.	The gross area falling under each plain (WAPDA, 1980).	13
Table 2.2.	Middle to Late Tertiary and Quaternary rocks in the vicinity of D.I. Khan (Hood et al., 1970).	16
Table 2.3.	Sources contributing to the recharge and discharge of the groundwater in the study area (WAPDA, 1980).	18
Table 3.1.	Typical model data requirements.	24
Table 3.2.	Packages used in MODFLOW and their description (Fetter, 1994).	29
Table 3.3.	Lithology, thickness and hydraulic conductivity of the model layers.	35
Table 3.4.	Types of hydrologic boundaries (Anderson and Woessner, 1992).	36