

# PROTECTING THE EDWARDS AQUIFER: A SCIENTIFIC CONSENSUS

## INTRODUCTION

The Edwards Aquifer is an irreplaceable natural resource. The Aquifer provides water for drinking, business, agriculture, and recreation; for essential streamflows for river and estuary ecosystems downstream of the major spring outflows (at Comal, San Marcos, Barton, Hueco, Salado, and elsewhere); and for necessary habitat for over fifty species of plants and animals that live in Central Texas and nowhere else in the world.

There is broad public support to protect and manage the Edwards Aquifer so that it will continue to provide high-quality water for future generations of Texans. Protecting the Aquifer requires public and private action based on sound science. The following statements and recommendations reflect the common views of the undersigned scientists, engineers, and planners. These individuals are familiar with the best scientific information about the Edwards Aquifer.

## FACTUAL BACKGROUND

- 1) The Edwards Aquifer, shown in Figures 1 and 2, currently provides a high-quality source of water whose quantity is limited by rainfall, recharge capacity, and storage capacity.
- 2) The Edwards Aquifer is a karst limestone aquifer. It is characterized by conduits through which water travels rapidly and by a thin to absent soil cover, as shown in Figure 3. These characteristics allow minimal filtration or adsorption of contaminants. Thus the aquifer is particularly vulnerable to contamination from human activities in its watershed.
- 3) While the overall water quality in the Aquifer remains high, scientists have documented occurrences of water quality degradation at wells and springs.
  - Contaminants associated with human activity have been detected at levels above natural background in water from wells and springs, and in water and sediments from creeks that recharge the Aquifer. These contaminants include pesticides, metals, and petroleum hydrocarbons. At times, concentrations have been at levels known to be harmful to aquatic life and human health<sup>1</sup>.
  - Development has increased contaminant and sediment loads in the surface waters that recharge the Aquifer<sup>2</sup>.

## KEY POINTS OF CONSENSUS

- 1) Development in the Edwards Aquifer recharge zone and contributing zone is projected to increase rapidly in the immediate future<sup>3</sup>. We anticipate this development will lead to increased contamination of and withdrawals from the Aquifer.
- 2) Existing rules, regulations, and practices have not been and are not adequate to prevent contamination of the Edwards Aquifer.
- 3) It is neither technically nor economically feasible to prevent contamination of the Edwards Aquifer without limiting the amount of impervious cover in its recharge zone and contributing zone<sup>4</sup>.
- 4) Engineered controls, known also as BMPs, can decrease but not eliminate contamination of the Edwards Aquifer. Even if perfectly maintained, BMPs cannot substitute for limits on impervious cover. While current BMP designs can be improved, no technology will ever be perfect, and improper maintenance degrades the performance of even the best engineered controls.
- 5) An important strategy to prevent contamination of the Edwards Aquifer is to minimize the use, transport, and storage of chemicals and contaminants in its watershed. Measures are needed to protect the Aquifer from contamination by roadway runoff, pipelines, pesticides, herbicides, and the storage and transport of chemicals.
- 6) Pumping from the Edwards Aquifer must be limited to prevent depletion of the Aquifer, cessation of spring flows, local intrusion of "bad water", and extinction of native species.
- 7) The quality of surface water across all of the contributing and recharge zones affects the quality of water in the Edward Aquifer.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

In light of these facts, governments, private corporations, and citizens should:

- 1) Act promptly to direct urban development away from the Edwards Aquifer's recharge and contributing zones through control of infrastructure investment and the use of zoning, conservation easements, and other appropriate planning techniques;
- 2) Institute safeguards that will reduce contamination and the risk of catastrophic events from ongoing activities in the Edwards Aquifer's watershed, and minimize contamination from future development;

- 3) Develop and enforce rules and regulations across both the recharge and contributing zones to strengthen protections of water quality in the Edwards Aquifer;
- 4) Restrict impervious cover in the recharge and contributing zones to levels that will prevent further degradation of water quality;
- 5) Support measures that reduce consumption of water from the Edwards Aquifer and that preserve recharge to the Aquifer; and
- 6) Promote public education, the acquisition of preserves and conservation easements, the protection of recharge features, and other strategies to complement the regulations designed to prevent contamination and overpumping of the Edwards Aquifer.

**Individuals who have signed as of August 8, 1997:**

Thomas L. Arsuffi, Aquatic Ecologist, Director, Aquatic Station, Southwest Texas State University  
Dr. Jay Banner, Ph.D., Geologist  
Helen Ballew, M.E.S.  
James A. Bisese, Hydrologist  
Beth Davis, Aquatic Biologist  
Dr. Tom Gardner, Ph.D., Distinguished Professor Of Geosciences, Trinity University  
Ellen Geismar, Aquatic Biologist  
Dr. Alan W. Groeger, Ph.D., Limnologist, Southwest Texas State University  
Robert Hansen, M.A., Biologist  
Dr. David M. Hillis, Ph.D., Professor of Zoology and Institute of Cellular and Molecular Biology, University of Texas at Austin  
Matthew Hollou, Planner  
Dr. Clark Hubbs, Ph. D., Regents Professor Emeritus, University of Texas at Austin  
David A. Johns, Hydrogeologist  
Sean M. Kelly, Geologist  
Dr. Mark Kirkpatrick, Ph.D., Biologist  
Glenn Longley, Ph.D., Director, Edwards Aquifer Research & Data Center, Southwest Texas State University  
Tom Loomis, P.E.  
Dr. Fred Loxsom, Ph.D., Professor of Environmental Physics, Trinity University  
Mike Lyday, M.S., Biologist  
Dr. F. Leo Lynch, Ph.D., Geologist  
Dr. Barbara Mahler, Ph.D., Hydrogeologist  
Dr. James R. Mayer, Ph. D., P. G., Geologist  
Nancy McClintock, Biologist  
John K. Mikels, P.G.  
Todd J. Minchardt, M.A., Chemist  
Shana Norton, M.P. Aff., Enviromental Policy Analyst  
Sylvia R. Pope, Water Resources Planner  
Alisa Remington, Hydrogeologist  
Dr. David Ribble, Ph.D., Professor of Biology  
George Rice, Hydrologist  
Dr. D. Lauren Ross, Ph.D., P.E., Water Resources Engineer  
Dr. Michael Ryan, Ph.D., Professor of Biology, University of Texas at Austin  
Thomas R. Schueler, Executive Director, Center for Watershed Protection  
Raymond M. Slade, Jr., Hydrologist  
William J. Stout, Environmental Quality Specialist  
Dr. John Tauxe, Ph.D., Water Resources Engineer  
Peter C. Van Metre, Hydrologist  
Dr. George Veni, Ph.D., Hydrogeologist  
David Venhuizen, P.E.

## Footnotes

1. Contamination has been particularly well documented in the Barton Springs segment of the Edwards Aquifer. Some of the findings there include:
  - Water samples from one outlet of Barton Springs (Sunken Garden) have shown high levels of lead. The total concentration of lead was 0.024 mg/l in a sample from 1994 (Hauwert and Vickers, 1994). That concentration exceeds the EPA maximum contaminant level for total lead in drinking water, which is 0.015 mg/l.
  - Arsenic is a highly toxic metal that is used in the manufacture of agricultural pesticides and other products, and that is found in roadway runoff. It has been found in Aquifer wells at levels in excess of 0.05 mg/l (Hauwert and Vickers, 1994), which is the EPA maximum contaminant level for arsenic in drinking water.
  - Polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons, or PAHs, are toxic and carcinogenic compounds formed by the breakdown of motor oil and other manmade products. Sediment collected from Barton Springs Pool on April 20, 1995, contained PAHs at concentrations over 6 times greater than those known to be toxic to *Hyallela azteca*, an invertebrate that is common in the Aquifer's springs (City of Austin, 1994; Ingersoll et al., 1996).
  - Total nitrogen concentrations measured in wells in the more urbanized areas of the Barton Springs watershed are typically two to six times higher than in rural areas. Levels of total phosphorus for wells in the urban areas sometimes greatly exceed those in rural areas (Water Resources Data, Texas, 1991 - 1996).
2. Water quality in each of the six streams that recharge the Barton Springs segment of the Edwards Aquifer has been studied (Veenhuis and Slade, 1990). The water quality during base-flow conditions is similar for many of the sites that were sampled, but the water quality of stormflow is much degraded for the sites in developed basins. For example, the highest values for nitrogen, suspended solids, total organic carbon, phosphorus, and fecal bacteria were found in Williamson Creek and two sites in the lower reaches of Barton Creek—the sites that receive runoff from the most developed basins. The stormflow concentrations of contaminants in the lower reaches of Barton Creek exceed the values found in the upper reaches of Barton Creek by several hundred to several thousand percent. Most of the development Barton Creek is limited to the lower reaches. Water-quality data for the other streams reveal similar patterns: water quality degrades with increased development.
3. The population of the Edwards Aquifer region is projected to grow approximately 46% in the 15 years between 1995 and 2010. This figure is based on number of people using public water supplies that take their water from the Barton Springs and San Antonio segments of the Edwards Aquifer. In 1995, that number was estimated at 1,625,384, while in 2010 it is projected to be 2,374,549 (Barton Springs/Edward Aquifer Conservation District, 1997; Texas Water Development Board, 1994, 1996).
4. Impervious cover is defined as the total area of roads, parking lots, sidewalks, rooftops, and other impermeable surfaces of the urban landscape. In effect, it can be considered as the

percentage of area that is not "green" (Schueler, 1994). It has been demonstrated that a relatively low percentage of impervious cover (10% to 15%) can induce adverse and irreversible changes in the quality of streams. The effects are related to changes in the hydrology, water quality, habitat structure, and biodiversity of the aquatic system (Schueler 1994, 1995, 1996). Further, monitoring studies indicate that urban contaminant loads are directly related to the amount of impervious cover in the watershed. In most models, impervious cover is the key predictive variable used to estimate contaminant loads. Once the percentage of impervious cover exceeds 25%, many streams become "non-supporting" and are characterized by fair to poor water quality, highly unstable channels, and poor biodiversity. Because streams flowing across the recharge zone and contributing zone resupply the Edwards Aquifer as the water infiltrates, maintenance of high water quality in these streams is a major concern.

## References

- Barton Springs/Edwards Aquifer Conservation District. 1997. Draft of Alternate Regional Water Supply Plan. Austin, Texas.
- City of Austin, 1994. Unpublished data.
- Hauwert, N., S. Vickers. 1994. Barton Springs/Edwards Aquifer hydrogeology and groundwater quality. Submitted by the Barton Springs/Edwards Aquifer Conservation District to the Texas Water Development Board. Austin, Texas.
- Ingersoll, C.G., P.S. Haverland, E.L. Brunson, T.J. Canfield, F.J. Dwyer, C.E. Henke, and N.E. Kemble. 1996. Calculation and evaluation of sediment effect concentrations for the amphipod *Hyaella azteca* and the midge *Chironomus riparius*. *Journal of Great Lakes Research* 22: 602-623.
- Schueler, T. 1994. The importance of imperviousness. *Watershed Protection Techniques* 1: 100-111.
- Schueler, T. 1995. Site planning for urban stream protection. Center for Watershed Protection, Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments, Silver Spring, Maryland. 222 pp.
- Schueler, T. 1996. Crafting better urban watershed protection plans. *Watershed Protection Techniques* 2: 329-337.
- Texas Water Development Board. 1994. Consensus Forecast. Austin, Texas.
- Texas Water Development Board. 1996. Draft Texas Water Plan. Austin, Texas.
- Veenhuis, J.E., and R.M. Slade. 1990. Relation between urbanization and water quality of streams in the Austin area, Texas. Water-Resources Investigations Report 90-4107, U.S. Geological Survey.
- Water Resources Data, Texas. 1991 - 1996. Volume 4, Ground Water Data. U.S. Geological Survey.

This document was written in April 1997 in Austin, Texas.




Figure 1. Contributing and Recharge Zones of the Edwards (Balcones Fault Zone) Aquifer. The Contributing Zones are the light-shaded areas to the north and west, and the Recharge Zones are the dark-shaded areas to the south and east.






Figure 2. The Barton Springs segment of the Edwards Aquifer watershed and aquifer. The Contributing and Recharge Zones comprise the watershed; the Recharge and Confinement Zones (including a narrow transition zone between the two) comprise the aquifer. Precipitation falling on the Contributing Zone flows eastward in creeks until it crosses onto the porous Edwards Limestone (Recharge Zone). It then infiltrates into the aquifer through fissures in creekbeds, and flows north as groundwater through conduits dissolved along faults and fractures to discharge at Barton Springs.