WEST CRANE AQUIFER TEST SUMMARIES, RICHLAND COUNTY, MONTANA



Jon Reiten and Kevin Chandler

Montana Bureau of Mines and Geology Ground Water Investigation Program



Cover: Jonsson 2 aquifer test, 12/20/2015. Photo by Kevin Chandler, MBMG.

WEST CRANE AQUIFER TEST SUMMARIES, RICHLAND COUNTY, MONTANA

Jon Reiten and Kevin Chandler

Montana Bureau of Mines and Geology Ground Water Investigation Program

February 2021

Montana Bureau of Mines and Geology Open-File Report 737



TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract	1
Introduction	1
Background Hydrogeology	1
Methods	1
Aquifer Test Conditions	4
Test Results	4
References	4
Appendix A: West Crane Aquifer Test Charts	9

FIGURES

Figure 1. Location of the irrigation wells tested in the West Crane aquifer	2
Figure 2. The lithology of the West Crane aquifer varies substantially by location, but in general the most productive gravel deposits are found directly above the Fort Union Formation bedrock and below layers of silty sand and gravel, often interbedded with clay	3
Γ_{i} = 2 Der 1 to fthe emilie to the later set of the feature fraction from the 14 emilie to the	0

Figure 3. Box plots of the aquifer test results show ranges of aquifer properties from the 14 aquifer tests8

TABLES

Table 1. Aquifer test locations and conditions	5
Table 2. Aquifer test results	7

ABSTRACT

The West Crane aquifer, located in Richland County, Montana, occupies a buried valley west of the modern Yellowstone River Valley. This productive aquifer extends for 22 mi from Fox Creek in the north to Burns Creek in the south. Fourteen high-yield irrigation wells capable of pumping 500 to 1,500 gpm were permitted in the aquifer between 2011 and 2020. As part of the permitting process, aquifer tests were conducted on each irrigation well. We analyzed the test data using the Cooper–Jacob method and leaky confined models in AQTESOLV 4.5. The aquifer transmissivity (T) estimates ranged from 4,310 ft2/d to 34,240 ft2/d. Aquifer storage (S) coefficient estimates ranged from 0.0001 to 0.03, in the confined to leaky confined aquifer range. Hydraulic conductivity (K) estimates ranged from 360 to 1,300 ft/d.

INTRODUCTION

We evaluated 14 aquifer tests conducted on irrigation wells completed in the West Crane aquifer in Richland County, Montana as part of a Ground Water Investigation Program (GWIP) project. The purposes of these tests were to estimate specific aquifer properties (such as transmissivity, hydraulic conductivity, aquifer storage, anisotropy, etc.), estimate the degree to which this aquifer is confined, estimate aquifer boundaries (recharge and/or barrier), and evaluate groundwater/surface-water connection. Aquifer properties will be used in development of a numerical groundwater model and to evaluate heterogeneity within the aquifer. The aquifer tests fulfilled the Montana Department of Natural Resources and Conservation (DNRC) requirements for water-rights applications. DNRC requires a 72-hr aquifer test on all water-rights applications for over 35 gpm from groundwater sources.

BACKGROUND HYDROGEOLOGY

The West Crane aquifer is part of the Lower Yellowstone Buried Valley (LYBV) aquifer system underlying the Yellowstone River Valley and valley slopes in Richland County, Montana (fig. 1). Test drilling south of Fox Creek confirmed that the West Crane aquifer continues 22 mi southward to Burns Creek and roughly parallels the Yellowstone River (fig. 1). The sand and gravel filling the base of the buried valley supports well yields from 500 to 1,500 gpm. Sediments overlying the aquifer include interbedded clay, silt, silty clay, silty sand, and glacial till (fig. 2). These overlying sediments form confining and leaky confining layers that can slowly release water to the aquifer (Fetter, 2001). Borehole lithology varies greatly over short distances, and locating the most productive zones in the aquifer usually requires test drilling.

High-yield irrigation wells completed in the West Crane aquifer allow farmers to grow a variety of crops in areas that were previously dryland farmed. Rapid development of the West Crane aquifer has prompted the demand for hydrologic data for proactive aquifer management. This aquifer is currently a Ground Water Investigation Program (GWIP) project that aims to define the aquifer size and its properties, water quality, and development potential.

METHODS

MBMG staff conducted or supervised seven of the aquifer tests and consultants conducted the other seven tests. These tests followed guidelines established by DNRC in the 633 Aquifer Test Data Form (http://dnrc. mt.gov/divisions/water/water-rights/docs/forms/633. xls/view, A comprehensive data collection form for reporting aquifer test information). A DNRC-approved aquifer test requires pumping the production well for 72 hr at a constant rate. Scheduled drawdown measurements outlined in the form are collected from the production well and at least one observation well. The information section of the 633 form includes site and scheduling details needed to evaluate the aquifer test.

Prior to each test, background water levels were collected to determine if the test data needed waterlevel trend corrections before analysis. *In situ* data loggers recorded depth-to-water level measurements every minute. Vented data loggers were used in some of the wells measured. In the cases where non-vented loggers were used, data were corrected for barometric fluctuations using data from a nearby baro-logger. Baro-logger data were also used to correct for barometric efficiency of the wells if needed.



Figure 1. Location of the irrigation wells tested in the West Crane aquifer. Ground Water Information Center identification (GWIC ID) numbers are used to identify the test wells. Information on the well completion, lithology, and aquifer water levels are available online at http://mbmggwic.mtech.edu/.



Figure 2. The lithology of the West Crane aquifer varies substantially by location, but in general the most productive gravel deposits are found directly above the Fort Union Formation bedrock and below layers of silty sand and gravel, often interbedded with clay (leaky confining layers). The leaky confining layers provide additional aquifer storage that is released when pumping from the aquifer gravel. The monitoring wells here are due west of irrigation well 284325 (273794 at 0.27 mi, 296819 at 0.57 mi).

Diesel generators powered submersible test pumps installed in the production wells. McCrometer flow meters plumbed in the center of an 8-ft straight section of the discharge line measured pumping rates. The flow meters were located in the middle of the pipe sections to reduce turbulence from fittings and control valves in the discharge line. Piping discharge water to areas sloping away from the test wells prevented the potential of infiltrating water influencing drawdown measurements.

Well locations were either surveyed using a Leica GPS System RX1250 or altitude and location estimated using Google Earth maps. Water-level data collected during the test were initially analyzed using Excel plots and the Cooper–Jacob method (Cooper, 1946). Cooper–Jacob method results provide an initial estimate of aquifer parameters. The data were then input into AQTESOLV 4.5 software for analyses with different models (Duffield, 2007). Several methods were initially applied, but our understanding of the hydrogeologic conditions allowed us to focus on AQTE-SOLV solutions for leaky confined conditions.

Of the leaky confined solutions available in AQTESOLV, Cooley and Case (1973), Moench, case 3 (1985), and Neuman and Witherspoon (1969) were the most appropriate considering the buried valley lithology and the potential for vertical leakage from silty sand, clay-bound gravel, and sand layers above the aquifer (fig. 2). Only one test site (Bradley, 253450 and 302856) has paired shallow and deep observation wells showing a water-table aquifer above the leaky confining layers, but this condition is likely at the other test sites. All test sites have Fort Union Bedrock for the aquifer base; therefore solutions allowing aquifer leakage from below were excluded. Solutions allowing for boundaries or wedge-shaped aquifers were used for sites thought to be near the edges of the buried valley. Assumptions and description of each solution can be found at http://www.aqtesolv.com/ summary of solutions.htm.

AQUIFER TEST CONDITIONS

Aquifer tests are field experiments subject to equipment problems and weather conditions that can alter interpretation of the test results. Issues that resulted in variations from the ideal conditions prescribed in the 633 form are noted in table 1. In several of the tests, constant pumping rates were reported, but the water levels in the wells showed recovery or increased drawdown when the generators failed or when valves were changed to increase the pumping rate. When curve matching, we ignored drawdown data affected by fluctuations in the pumping rate.

TEST RESULTS

The aquifer results displayed in table 2 were selected from various leaky confined solutions using AQTESLOV 4.5. Selection was based on the model fit, aquifer conditions at the test site, and our hydrogeologic understanding of the aquifer. Box and whisker plots of the results show the variability observed in the 14 tests (fig. 3). The aquifer tests results agree with our geologic interpretation, indicating confined to leaky confined aquifer conditions. Barometric efficiencies determined from pre-test water-level data also indicate confining conditions (table 1). Leaky confined storage values typically range from 0.001 to 0.03 (Weight and Sonderegger, 2001). Test storage coefficients (S) ranged from 0.0001 to 0.03, with a median value of 0.0007. Transmissivities (T) ranged from 4,310 ft2/day to 34,240 ft2/day. Nearby barrier boundaries appear to have affected the T values estimated at the Basta 1(296537) and D. Jorgenson (290760) aquifer test sites. Our lithologic mapping places these sites near the aquifer edge (fig. 1). The median aquifer transmissivity is about 24,000 ft²/day. Hydraulic conductivities (K) ranged from 360 ft/day to 1,300 ft/ day. Most K values ranged from 700 ft/day to 1,000 ft/ day. Appendix A includes hydrographs showing background water-level trends and levels during the pumping and recovery periods. Appendix A also includes plots constructed using the Cooper-Jacob method and various leaky confined AQTESOLV solutions.

Table 1. Aquife	r test locatio	ins and conc	litions.													
Well Name GWIC ID	Watershed	Well Type	Distance from PW (ft)	Ground Surface Altitude (ft AMSL)	Total Depth (ft)	Screened Interval (ft)	SWL at Start (ft below mp)	Baro Eff. (%)	Latitude	Longitude	Start Date/Time	Pumping Duration (hr)	Pumping Rate (gal/min)	Drawdown at Test End (ft)	Pumping Rate Variability	Comments
Basta 1	Beef-Garden															
296537		Production		2193	181	171–181	115		47.38126	-104.46094	4/23/18 17:19	72.2	250	43.11	Major	Pump off in middle of test,
			C	1010	007	007 027	0	c	07 700 47	101						uate test data used, site near aquifer edge.
161067		Ubservation	00	C61.7	081	091-071	2	32	41.38142	-104.40093				9.07		l est conauctea by private consultants.
Basta 2	Beef-Garden															
305427		Production		2229	226	206–226	154.04	40	47.3986	-104.45836	12/10/19 9:12	72	750	50.44	Minor	Good test, conducted by
305422		Observation	100		225	210-220	150.71	45	47.39862	-104.4573				2.33		Agri-Industries.
Lange 2	Beef-Garden															
300586		Production		2159	142	122–142	73.6	35	47.44659	-104.42627	2/11/19 9:24	72.00	804	41.28	Minor	Good test, conducted by
300256		Observation	56	2157	139	115-135	69.5	32	47.44644	-104.42624				4		Agri-Inaustries.
Lange 1	Beef-Garden															
296426		Production		2215	223	203–223	127.9		47.45639	-104.42733	11/22/18 10:15	72.00	006	52.77	Very Minor	Good test, conducted by
273806		Observation	146	2215	218	204–214	128.4	25	47.45642	-104.42792				3.08		Agri-Industries.
D Jorgensen 1	Beef-Garden															
290760		Production		2223	230	210–230	139.35		47.45694	-104.40968	12/6/16 14:16	72.0	750	63.94	Minor	Early-time pumping rate 10 % lower,
																steady after 2.5 hours. Site close to aquifer
290815		Observation	74	2221	232	212–232	138.19	15	47.45693	-104.40938				10.98		edge. Good test, supervised by
Ler 1	Dunlap															MBMG.
295397		Production		2114	130	110–130	37.7		47.46811	-104.3952	11/17/17 12:31	37.3	862	50.51	Moderate	Late-time pumping rate fluctuations.
295396		Observation	73	2116	118	108–118	38.6	27	47.46817	-104.3955				3.69		Test ended 1 day early. Fair test,
J Jorgensen 1	Dunlap															Agri-Industries.
303552		Production		2131	260	240–260	155.95		47.5132	-104.3747	10/17/19 8:05	72.1	1420	59.93	Stable	Good test, conducted by
303550		Observation	65	2131	258	248–258	155.35	30	47.5132	-104.3245				7.62		Agri-Industries.
K Jonsson 2	Crane															
284325		Production		2173	223	192–223	110.17	50	47.57191	-104.33065	12/19/15 9:23	72.4	715	60.15	Stable	Good test, conducted by
283134		Observation	112	2173	220	205–215	117.32	50	47.5719	-104.33109				2.72		MBMG.

Montana Bureau of Mines and Geology Open-File Report 737

K Jonsson 1	Crane															
249505		Production		2124	170	150–170	67.12		47.56878	-104.32075	4/10/09 11:13	74.0	006	48.01	Stable	Good test, conducted by
234024		Observation	618	2115	164	154–164	61.38	23	47.56961	-104.31858				0.61		NDMG.
Wyman 1	Crane															
250211		Production		2059	118	97–117	20.37		47.57808	-104.29858	12/6/12 18:13	72.0	1020	28.96	Stable	Good test, conducted by
263799		Observation	82	2060	118	108-118	22.09	22	47.57795	-104.29883				7.49		.DMIDINIO.
234036		ا Observation 2	1252	2052	105	95-105	19.21		47.5781	-104.29351				1.11		
Bradley 1	Bell															
253448		Production		2114	180	164–174	101.36		47.5973	-104.28761	11/13/09 11:40	72.0	800	9.24	Stable	Good test, supervised by MBMG
253450		Observation	106	2114	165	155–165	103.18	38	47.59758	-104.28772				2.36		.DMICINI
C Johnson 1	Bell															
285659		Production		2105	170	150–170	94.28		47.60151	-104.28281	12/17/15 9:30	72.0	630	43.04	Stable	Good test, supervised by MBMG
279891		Observation	153	2102	177	165–175	91.78	12	47.60186	-104.28246				2.36		.DMON
C Johnson 3	Bell															
291010		Production		2103	169	149–169	92.62		47.60316	-104.28247	1/11/17 8:33	8.5	1010	54.86	Minor	Rate dropped near end of
291009		Observation	104	2104	172	160–170	95.75	20	47.60288	-104.28249				3.28		rest. Fair test, conducted by Agri-Industries.
C Johnson 2	Bell															
285476		Production		2104	180	150–180	95.25		47.6053	-104.28241	9/12/16 16:15	16.7	006	20.36	Stable	Good test, conducted by MBMG.

Table 1—Continued.

Basta 1 12 286537 Production 250 gpm 12 285197 Observation Cooley-Case Leaky, no flow barrier at 100 ft 4.310 0.0001 360 A4 Basta 2 State 2 Observation Neuman-Witherspoon Leaky 24,080 0.0008 730 A10 Lange 1 State 2 Observation Neuman-Witherspoon Leaky 19,480 0.003 970 A13 Jongene 1 State 2 State 2 <th>Test Site GWIC ID</th> <th>Well Type</th> <th>Pumping Rate/ Analysis Method</th> <th>Transmissivity (ft²/d)</th> <th>Storage Coefficient</th> <th>Saturated Thickness (ft)</th> <th>Hydraulic Conductivity (ft/d)</th> <th>Appendix A Fig. No.</th>	Test Site GWIC ID	Well Type	Pumping Rate/ Analysis Method	Transmissivity (ft ² /d)	Storage Coefficient	Saturated Thickness (ft)	Hydraulic Conductivity (ft/d)	Appendix A Fig. No.
29637 Production 250 gpm 12 235197 Observation Cooley_Case Leaky, no flow barrier at 100 ft 4,310 0.00010 360 A4 305427 Production 750 gpm 33 33 33 305427 Production Neuman-Witherspoon Leaky 24,080 0.0008 730 A10 Lange 2 300565 Observation 804 gpm 20 30 370 A13 Lange 1 20 20 300 gpm 27 273807 A13 Lange 1 20428 Production 900 gpm 27 273807 A16 Divergeneen1 200760 Production 750 gpm 18 202516 A22 Le 1 295397 Production Cooley_Case Leaky 10.16 7.0 A25 Julorgensen 1 303552 Production Cooley_Case Leaky 18.760 0.014 700 A26 Julorgensen 1 230352 Production 1.420 gpm 29 23353	Basta 1							
295197 Observation Cooleg-Case Leaky, no flow barrier at 100 ft 4,310 0.00010 360 A4 Basta 2 33 305427 Production Neuman-Witherspoon Leaky 24,080 0.0008 730 A10 Jange 2 300586 Production 804 gpm 20 300266 Observation Neuman-Witherspoon Leaky 19,480 0.003 970 A13 Jange 1 - <td>296537</td> <td>Production</td> <td>250 gpm</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>12</td> <td></td> <td></td>	296537	Production	250 gpm			12		
Basis 2 303427 Production 750 gpm 33 305422 Observation Neuman-Witherspoon Leaky 24.080 0.0008 730 A10 Lange 2 300526 Production 804 gpm 20 300256 970 A13 Lange 1 20 300256 Production 900 gpm 27 7 273807 Observation Moench (Case 3) Leaky 24.590 0.03 910 A18 Durogensent 200760 Production 750 gpm 18 200780 420 A22 Left 1 290780 Observation Cooley-Case Leaky, no-flow boundary 100 ft S 7,580 0.0006 420 A22 Left 1 295395 Observation Cooley-Case Leaky 18,780 0.014 700 A26 JJorgensen 1 303552 Production 862 gpm 29 24 303561 0.0002 1,410 A32 Klansson 2 2 22 22 24 24 24 24	295197	Observation	Cooley–Case Leaky, no flow barrier at 100 ft	4,310	0.00010		360	A4
303427 Production 750 gpm 33 305422 Observation Neuman-Witherspoon Leaky 24,080 0.0008 730 A10 300556 Production 804 gpm 20 300256 0.0003 970 A13 200567 Observation Neman-Witherspoon Leaky 19,480 0.003 970 A13 2049426 Production 900 gpm 27 273807 Observation A16 209816 Observation Moench (Case 3) Leaky 24,590 0.03 910 A16 209816 Observation Cocley-Case Leaky, no-flow boundary 100 ft S 7,580 0.0006 420 A22 Ler 1 293936 Observation Cocley-Case Leaky 18,780 0.014 700 A26 Jorgensen 1 303552 Observation Cooley-Case Leaky 25,010 0.0002 1,140 A32 Klonsson 2 283134 Observation Cooley-Case Leaky 32,620 0.0002 1,130 A35 Klonsson	Basta 2							
	305427	Production	750 gpm			33		
Lange 2 300256 Observation Neman-Witherspoon Leaky 19,480 0.003 970 A13 Lange 1 296426 Production 900 gpm 27 273807 Observation Moench (Case 3) Leaky 24,590 0.03 910 A16 DJorgensen1 290816 Observation Moench (Case 3) Leaky 24,590 0.03 910 A16 DJorgensen1 290816 Observation Cooley-Case Leaky 0.01 ft S 7,580 0.0006 420 A22 Ler 1 29536 Observation Cooley-Case Leaky 100 ft S 7,580 0.0006 420 A22 Ler 1 29536 Observation Cooley-Case Leaky 100 ft S 7,580 0.0006 420 A22 Ler 1 29536 Observation Cooley-Case Leaky 18,780 0.014 700 A26 JJorgensen 1 3003552 Production 862 gpm 24 3003550 Observation Cooley-Case Leaky 18,780 0.014 700 A26 JJorgensen 1 3003552 Production 715 gpm 24 284325 Production 715 gpm 29 284314 Observation Cooley-Case Leaky 25,010 0.0002 1.040 A32 KJornsson 1 249056 Production 715 gpm 29 234024 Observation Cooley-Case Leaky 32,620 0.0002 1.040 A37 KJornsson 1 249056 Production 900 gpm 20 234024 Observation Cooley-Case Leaky 22,450 0.021 1.120 A40 Wyman 1 250211 Production 1020 gpm 35 263799 Observation 1 Cooley-Case Leaky 12,660 0.0002 370 A45 240308 Observation 2 Neuman-Witherspoon Leaky 23,370 0.0018 670 Bradiey 1 253484 Production 800 gpm 22 253550 Observation 2 Neuman-Witherspoon Leaky 23,376 0.026 910 A53 CJohnson 1 249036 Deservation 1 Cooley-Case Leaky 30,610 0.002 40 26 27 283409 Observation 1 Cooley-Case Leaky 30,610 0.002 40 26 27 283409 Observation 1 Cooley-Case Leaky 30,610 0.002 40 28 29 29 20 234020 Observation 2 Neuman-Witherspoon Leaky 23,376 0.026 910 A57 CJohnson 1 286569 Production 630 gpm 26 27 29 29 29 29 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20	305422	Observation	Neuman–Witherspoon Leaky	24,080	0.0008		730	A10
300586 Production 804 gpm 20 300256 Observation Neman-Witherspoon Leaky 19,480 0.003 970 A13 Lange 1 296426 Production 900 gpm 27 27307 Observation Moench (Case 3) Leaky 24,590 0.03 910 A16 Durgensent 290760 Production 750 gpm 18 290816 Observation Cooley-Case Leaky, no-flow boundary 100 ft S 7,580 0.0006 420 A22 Ler 1 290396 Observation Cooley-Case Leaky, no-flow boundary 100 ft S 7,580 0.0006 420 A22 Ler 1 295397 Production 862 gpm 27 295396 Observation Cooley-Case Leaky 18,780 0.014 700 A26 JJorgensen 1 303552 Observation Cooley-Case Leaky 25,010 0.0002 1,040 A32 KJonsson 1 Sa3054 Observation 715 gpm 29 283354 Observation Cooley-Case Leaky 2,2620 0.0002 </td <td>Lange 2</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	Lange 2							
300256 Observation Neman-Witherspoon Leaky 19,480 0.003 970 A13 Large 1 296426 Production 900 gpm 27 273807 Observation Moench (Case 3) Leaky 24,590 0.03 910 A16 Durgemeent 290760 Production 750 gpm 18 290816 Observation Coley-Case Leaky, no-flow boundary 100 ft S 7,580 0.0006 420 A22 Ler1 295397 Production 862 gpm 27 295396 Observation Cooley-Case Leaky 18,780 0.014 700 A25 JJorgensen 1 303552 Production 1,420 gpm 24 303550 Observation Cooley-Case Leaky 25,010 0.0002 1,040 A32 Klomsson 1 2484255 Production 715 gpm 29 20 234024 Observation Cooley-Case Leaky 32,620 0.0002 1,130 A37 Klomsson 1 249506 Production 900 gpm 20 23	300586	Production	804 gpm			20		
Lange 1 296426 Production 900 gpm 27 273807 Observation Meench (Case 3) Leaky 24,590 0.03 910 A16 DJorgensent 290760 Production 750 gpm 18 290816 Observation Cooley-Case Leaky, no-flow boundary 100 ft S 7,580 0.0006 420 A22 Lef 1 295397 Production 862 gpm 27 295396 Observation Cooley-Case Leaky 18,780 0.014 700 A26 JJorgensen 1 303552 Production 1,420 gpm 24 303552 Production Cooley-Case Leaky 25,010 0.0002 1,040 A32 KJonsson 2 284325 Production 715 gpm 29 284325 Production Cooley-Case Leaky 32,620 0.0002 1,130 A37 KJonsson 1 249506 Production 900 gpm 20 284325 Production Cooley-Case Leaky 22,450 0.021 1,120 A40 Wyman 1 250211 Production 1020 gpm 35 263799 Observation 2 Neuman-Witherspoon Leaky 23,370 0.0018 670 Bradley 1 253448 Production 800 gpm 22 253448 Production 800 gpm 22 263448 Production 800 gpm 22 264355 Observation 1 Cooley-Case Leaky 23,370 0.0013 670 Bradley 1 263448 Production 800 gpm 22 264355 Production 800 gpm 22 27 284355 Production 630 gpm 22 28 28448 Production 800 gpm 22 29 263450 Observation 1 Cooley-Case Leaky 23,370 0.0013 670 Bradley 1 263448 Production 800 gpm 22 20 24455 25446 Production 800 gpm 22 20 254550 Observation 2 Neuman-Witherspoon Leaky 23,370 0.0013 670 Bradley 1 265448 Production 800 gpm 22 265450 Observation 2 Neuman-Witherspoon Leaky 23,370 0.0013 670 26 270981 Observation 2 Neuman-Witherspoon Leaky 23,370 0.002 27 28 291010 Production 630 gpm 28 28 291010 Production 900 gpm 9 29 20 20 24 255450 Observation 2 Neuman-Witherspoon Leaky 28,540 0.0001 1,300 A53 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20	300256	Observation	Neman–Witherspoon Leaky	19,480	0.003		970	A13
296426 Production 900 gpm 27 273807 Observation Moench (Case 3) Leaky 24,590 0.03 910 A16 Dubrgensent 290760 Production 750 gpm 18 200760 420 A22 Lef 1 290581 Observation Cooley-Case Leaky, no-flow boundary 100 ft S 7,580 0.0006 420 A22 Lef 1 290589 Observation Cooley-Case Leaky 18,780 0.014 700 A26 JJorgensen 1 303552 Production 1,420 gpm 24 303550 Observation Cooley-Case Leaky 25,010 0.0002 1,040 A32 KJonsson 2 283134 Observation Cooley-Case Leaky 32,620 0.0002 1,130 A37 284056 Production 900 gpm 20 2242450 0.021 1,120 A40 Wyman 1 250211 Production 1020 gpm 35 25 253450 Observation 1 Cooley-Case Leaky 23,370 0.0018	Lange 1							
273807 Observation Moench (Case 3) Leaky 24,590 0.03 910 A16 Durgensent 290760 Production 750 gpm 18 290816 Observation CooleyCase Leaky, no-flow boundary 100 ft S 7,580 0.0006 420 A22 Ler 1 290397 Production 862 gpm 27 295396 0.014 700 A26 JJorgensen 1 303552 Production 1.420 gpm 24 303550 Observation Cooley-Case Leaky 25,010 0.0002 1,040 A32 KJonsson 2 284325 Production 715 gpm 29 283134 Observation Cooley-Case Leaky 22,620 0.0002 1,130 A37 KJonsson 1 249506 Production 900 gpm 20 24400 20 24400 20 24400 20 24400 20 24400 20 24400 20 24400 20 24400 20 24400 20 24400 20 24501 <t< td=""><td>296426</td><td>Production</td><td>900 gpm</td><td></td><td></td><td>27</td><td></td><td></td></t<>	296426	Production	900 gpm			27		
Dorgensen1 200760 Production 750 gpm 18 290816 Observation Cooley-Case Leaky, no-flow boundary 100 ft S 7,580 0.0006 420 A22 Lef 1 - <td< td=""><td>273807</td><td>Observation</td><td>Moench (Case 3) Leaky</td><td>24,590</td><td>0.03</td><td></td><td>910</td><td>A16</td></td<>	273807	Observation	Moench (Case 3) Leaky	24,590	0.03		910	A16
290760 Production 750 gpm 18 200816 Observation Cooley-Case Leaky, no-flow boundary 100 ft S 7,580 0.0006 420 A22 Ler 1 295397 Production 862 gpm 27 295396 Observation Cooley-Case Leaky 18,780 0.014 700 A26 JJorgensen 1 303552 Production 1.420 gpm 24 303550 Observation Cooley-Case Leaky 25,010 0.0002 1.040 A32 KJonsson 2 24 233550 Observation Cooley-Case Leaky 32,620 0.0002 1,130 A37 KJonsson 1 24 20 23340 Observation Cooley-Case Leaky 22,450 0.021 1,120 A40 Wyman 1 250211 Production 900 gpm 20 23370 A45 24036 Observation 1 Cooley-Case Leaky 12,860 0.0002 370 A45 24024 Observation 1 Cooley-Case Leaky 23,370 0.0018	DJorgensen1							
290816 Observation Cooley-Case Leaky, no-flow boundary 100 ft S 7,580 0.0006 420 A22 Ler 1	290760	Production	750 gpm			18		
Ler 1 285397 Production 862 gpm 27 295396 Observation Cooley-Case Leaky 18,780 0.014 700 A26 JJorgensen 1 303552 Production 1,420 gpm 24 303550 Observation Cooley-Case Leaky 25,010 0.0002 1,040 A32 KJonsson 2 Z44 25 Production 715 gpm 29 23 24 24 25 26 0.0002 1,130 A37 KJonsson 1 20 23 24 20 23 20 23 24 20 23 20 23 20 23 20 23 20 23 23 20 23 23 20 23	290816	Observation	Cooley–Case Leaky, no-flow boundary 100 ft S	7,580	0.0006		420	A22
295397 Production 862 gpm 27 295396 Observation Cooley-Case Leaky 18,780 0.014 700 A26 JJorgensen 1 303552 Production 1,420 gpm 24 303550 Observation Cooley-Case Leaky 25,010 0.0002 1,040 A32 KJonsson 2 284325 Production 715 gpm 29 283134 Observation Cooley-Case Leaky 32,620 0.0002 1,130 A37 KJonsson 1 249506 Production 900 gpm 20 234024 Observation Cooley-Case Leaky 22,450 0.021 1,120 A40 Wyman 1 250211 Production 1020 gpm 35 263799 Observation 1 Cooley-Case Leaky 12,860 0.0002 370 A45 234036 Observation 1 Cooley-Case Leaky 12,860 0.0001 1,300 A53 263799 Observation 2 Neuman-Witherspoon Leaky 23,370 0.0018 670 253450 Obse	Ler 1							
295396 Observation Cooley-Case Leaky 18,780 0.014 700 A26 JJorgensen 1 303552 Production 1,420 gpm 24 303550 Observation Cooley-Case Leaky 25,010 0.0002 1,040 A32 KJonsson 2 284325 Production 715 gpm 29 283134 Observation Cooley-Case Leaky 32,620 0.0002 1,130 A37 KJonsson 1 249506 Production 900 gpm 20 234024 Observation Cooley-Case Leaky 22,450 0.021 1,120 A40 Wyman 1 250211 Production 1020 gpm 35 263799 Observation 1 Cooley-Case Leaky 12,860 0.0002 370 A45 234036 Observation 1 Cooley-Case Leaky 12,860 0.0001 1,300 A53 2650211 Production 800 gpm 22 23,370 0.0018 670 Bradley 1 230405 Observation 800 gpm 22 253450	295397	Production	862 gpm			27		
JJorgensen 1 24 303552 Production 1,420 gpm 24 303550 Observation Cooley-Case Leaky 25,010 0.0002 1,040 A32 KJonsson 2 284325 Production 715 gpm 29 233134 Observation Cooley-Case Leaky 32,620 0.0002 1,130 A37 KJonsson 1 249506 Production 900 gpm 20 234024 Observation Cooley-Case Leaky 22,450 0.021 1,120 A40 Wyman 1 250211 Production 1020 gpm 35 234036 Observation 1 Cooley-Case Leaky 12,860 0.0002 370 A45 234036 Observation 1 Cooley-Case Leaky 12,860 0.0001 1,300 A53 243438 Production 1020 gpm 22 23370 0.0018 670 Bradley 1 253448 Production 800 gpm 22 23450 0.0001 1,300 A53 CJohnson 1 Cooley-Case Leaky <td>295396</td> <td>Observation</td> <td>Cooley–Case Leaky</td> <td>18,780</td> <td>0.014</td> <td></td> <td>700</td> <td>A26</td>	295396	Observation	Cooley–Case Leaky	18,780	0.014		700	A26
303552 Production 1,420 gpm 24 303550 Observation Cooley-Case Leaky 25,010 0.0002 1,040 A32 KJonsson 2 284325 Production 715 gpm 29 283134 Observation Cooley-Case Leaky 32,620 0.0002 1,130 A37 KJonsson 1 249506 Production 900 gpm 20 234024 Observation Cooley-Case Leaky 22,450 0.021 1,120 A40 Wyman 1 250211 Production 1020 gpm 35 2370 A45 234036 Observation 1 Cooley-Case Leaky 12,860 0.0002 370 A45 234036 Observation 2 Neuman-Witherspoon Leaky 23,370 0.0018 670 Bradley 1 253458 Production 800 gpm 22 233456 0.0001 1,300 A53 CJohnson 1 285659 Production 630 gpm 26 279891 Observation Cooley-Case Leaky 23,760 0.026	JJorgensen 1							
303550 Observation Cooley-Case Leaky 25,010 0.0002 1,040 A32 KJonsson 2 284325 Production 715 gpm 29 283134 Observation Cooley-Case Leaky 32,620 0.0002 1,130 A37 KJonsson 1 249506 Production 900 gpm 20 234024 Observation Cooley-Case Leaky 22,450 0.021 1,120 A40 Wyman 1 250211 Production 1020 gpm 35 263799 Observation 1 Cooley-Case Leaky 23,370 0.0018 670 Bradley 1 253448 Production 800 gpm 22 253450 0.0001 1,300 A53 CJohnson 1 286659 Production 630 gpm 26 2798891 Observation A630 23,760 0.026 910 A57 CJohnson 3 291010 Production 630 gpm 26 2798891 0.900 gpm 28 291009 A63 2910109 Observation 1.010 gpm	303552	Production	1,420 gpm			24		
KJonsson 2 284325 Production 715 gpm 29 283134 Observation Cooley-Case Leaky 32,620 0.0002 1,130 A37 KJonsson 1 249506 Production 900 gpm 20 2334024 Observation Cooley-Case Leaky 22,450 0.021 1,120 A40 Wyman 1 250211 Production 1020 gpm 35 263799 Observation 1 Cooley-Case Leaky 12,860 0.0002 370 A45 234036 Observation 1 Cooley-Case Leaky 12,860 0.0018 670 670 Bradley 1 2524148 Production 800 gpm 22 22 253450 Observation Neuman-Witherspoon Leaky 28,540 0.0001 1,300 A53 CJohnson 1 285659 Production 630 gpm 26 27 293760 0.026 910 A57 CJohnson 3 291010 Production 1,010 gpm 28 291009 0bservation 1,090 A63 2	303550	Observation	Cooley–Case Leaky	25,010	0.0002		1,040	A32
284325 Production 715 gpm 29 283134 Observation Cooley-Case Leaky 32,620 0.0002 1,130 A37 KJonsson 1 249506 Production 900 gpm 20 234024 Observation Cooley-Case Leaky 22,450 0.021 1,120 A40 Wyman 1 250211 Production 1020 gpm 35 263799 0bservation 1 Cooley-Case Leaky 12,860 0.0002 370 A45 234036 Observation 1 Cooley-Case Leaky 12,860 0.0018 670 Bradley 1 253448 Production 800 gpm 22 253450 Observation Neuman-Witherspoon Leaky 28,540 0.0001 1,300 A53 CJohnson 1 285659 Production 630 gpm 26 27 26 279891 Observation Cooley-Case Leaky 23,760 0.026 910 A57 CJohnson 3 291010 Production 1,010 gpm 28 291009 A63 <	KJonsson 2							
283134 Observation Cooley-Case Leaky 32,620 0.0002 1,130 A37 KJonsson 1 249506 Production 900 gpm 20 234024 Observation Cooley-Case Leaky 22,450 0.021 1,120 A40 Wyman 1 250211 Production 1020 gpm 35 263799 Observation 1 Cooley-Case Leaky 12,860 0.0002 370 A45 234036 Observation 2 Neuman-Witherspoon Leaky 23,370 0.0018 670 670 Bradley 1 22 253448 Production 800 gpm 22 253450 Observation Neuman-Witherspoon Leaky 28,540 0.0001 1,300 A53 CJohnson 1 286659 Production 630 gpm 26 279891 Observation Cooley-Case Leaky 23,760 0.026 910 A57 CJohnson 3 291010 Production 1,010 gpm 28 291009 00servation Moench (Case 3) Leaky 30,610 0.0002 1,090 A63	284325	Production	715 gpm			29		
KJonsson 1 249506 Production 900 gpm 20 234024 Observation Cooley-Case Leaky 22,450 0.021 1,120 A40 Wyman 1 250211 Production 1020 gpm 35 263799 Observation 1 Cooley-Case Leaky 12,860 0.0002 370 A45 234036 Observation 2 Neuman-Witherspoon Leaky 23,370 0.0018 670 Bradley 1 22 253448 Production 800 gpm 22 253450 Observation Neuman-Witherspoon Leaky 28,540 0.0001 1,300 A53 CJohnson 1 285659 Production 630 gpm 26 27991 A57 CJohnson 3 291010 Production 1,010 gpm 28 28 1,090 A63 CJohnson 2 285476 Production 1,010 gpm 28 28 28 28 CJohnson 2 285476 Production 1,010 gpm 28 28 28 28 CJohnson 2 285476 Production 1,010 gpm 28 28 28	283134	Observation	Cooley–Case Leaky	32,620	0.0002		1,130	A37
249506 Production 900 gpm 20 234024 Observation Cooley-Case Leaky 22,450 0.021 1,120 A40 Wyman 1 250211 Production 1020 gpm 35 35 35 263799 Observation 1 Cooley-Case Leaky 12,860 0.0002 370 A45 234036 Observation 2 Neuman-Witherspoon Leaky 23,370 0.0018 670 Bradley 1 253448 Production 800 gpm 22 253450 0.0001 1,300 A53 CJohnson 1 285659 Production 630 gpm 26 279891 Observation Cooley-Case Leaky 23,760 0.026 910 A57 CJohnson 3 291010 Production 1,010 gpm 28 28 28 28 28 28 28 28 28 28 28 28 28 26 28 28 26 28 28 29 1,090 A63 28 28	KJonsson 1							
234024 Observation Cooley–Case Leaky 22,450 0.021 1,120 A40 Wyman 1 250211 Production 1020 gpm 35	249506	Production	900 gpm			20		
Wyman 1 35 250211 Production 1020 gpm 35 263799 Observation 1 Cooley-Case Leaky 12,860 0.0002 370 A45 234036 Observation 2 Neuman-Witherspoon Leaky 23,370 0.0018 670 Bradley 1 253448 Production 800 gpm 22 253450 0bservation 1,300 A53 CJohnson 1 285659 Production 630 gpm 26 26 279891 Observation Cooley-Case Leaky 23,760 0.026 910 A57 CJohnson 3 291010 Production 1,010 gpm 28 28 1,090 A63 CJohnson 2 285476 Production 1,010 gpm 28 1,090 A63 CJohnson 3 291009 Observation Moench (Case 3) Leaky 30,610 0.0002 1,090 A63 CJohnson 2 285476 Production 900 gpm 28 1,090 A63 CJohnson 2 285476 Produc	234024	Observation	Cooley–Case Leaky	22,450	0.021		1,120	A40
250211 Production 1020 gpm 35 263799 Observation 1 Cooley–Case Leaky 12,860 0.0002 370 A45 234036 Observation 2 Neuman–Witherspoon Leaky 23,370 0.0018 670 Bradley 1 253448 Production 800 gpm 22 22 253450 Observation Neuman–Witherspoon Leaky 28,540 0.0001 1,300 A53 CJohnson 1 285659 Production 630 gpm 26 279891 Observation Cooley–Case Leaky 23,760 0.026 910 A57 CJohnson 3 291010 Production 1,010 gpm 28 28 29100 A63 291009 Observation Moench (Case 3) Leaky 30,610 0.0002 1,090 A63 CJohnson 2 28 28 2000 gpm 28 28 2000 gpm 28 26 291009 Observation Moench (Case 3) Leaky 30,610 0.0002 1,090 A63 <	Wyman 1							
263799 Observation 1 Cooley-Case Leaky 12,860 0.0002 370 A45 234036 Observation 2 Neuman-Witherspoon Leaky 23,370 0.0018 670 Bradley 1 253448 Production 800 gpm 22 22 253450 Observation Neuman-Witherspoon Leaky 28,540 0.0001 1,300 A53 CJohnson 1 285659 Production 630 gpm 26 26 279891 Observation Cooley-Case Leaky 23,760 0.026 910 A57 CJohnson 3 291010 Production 1,010 gpm 28 28 1,090 A63 CJohnson 2 285476 Production 1,010 gpm 28 28 1,090 A63 CJohnson 2 285476 Production 900 gpm 28 128 128 128 128 128 128 128 128 128 128 128 128 128 128 128 128 128 128 128 <td>250211</td> <td>Production</td> <td>1020 gpm</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>35</td> <td></td> <td></td>	250211	Production	1020 gpm			35		
234036 Observation 2 Neuman–Witherspoon Leaky 23,370 0.0018 670 Bradley 1	263799	Observation 1	Cooley–Case Leaky	12,860	0.0002		370	A45
Bradley 1 253448 Production 800 gpm 22 253450 Observation Neuman-Witherspoon Leaky 28,540 0.0001 1,300 A53 CJohnson 1 285659 Production 630 gpm 26 26 279891 Observation Cooley-Case Leaky 23,760 0.026 910 A57 CJohnson 3 291010 Production 1,010 gpm 28 28 291009 A63 CJohnson 2 285476 Production 900 gpm 28 28 28 051370 Production 900 gpm 28 28 28 28 28	234036	Observation 2	Neuman–Witherspoon Leaky	23,370	0.0018		670	
253448 Production 800 gpm 22 253450 Observation Neuman-Witherspoon Leaky 28,540 0.0001 1,300 A53 CJohnson 1 285659 Production 630 gpm 26 26 279891 Observation Cooley-Case Leaky 23,760 0.026 910 A57 CJohnson 3 291010 Production 1,010 gpm 28 28 28 28 291009 Observation Moench (Case 3) Leaky 30,610 0.0002 1,090 A63 CJohnson 2 28 </td <td>Bradley 1</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	Bradley 1							
253450 Observation Neuman–Witherspoon Leaky 28,540 0.0001 1,300 A53 CJohnson 1 285659 Production 630 gpm 26 26 279891 Observation Cooley–Case Leaky 23,760 0.026 910 A57 CJohnson 3 291010 Production 1,010 gpm 28 28 291009 Observation Moench (Case 3) Leaky 30,610 0.0002 1,090 A63 CJohnson 2 285476 Production 900 gpm 28 28 28 28 201670 Production 900 gpm 28 28 28 28	253448	Production	800 gpm			22		
CJohnson 1 285659 Production 630 gpm 26 279891 Observation Cooley-Case Leaky 23,760 0.026 910 A57 CJohnson 3 291010 Production 1,010 gpm 28 28 291009 0bservation Moench (Case 3) Leaky 30,610 0.0002 1,090 A63 CJohnson 2 285476 Production 900 gpm 28 28 28 2951470 Production 900 gpm 28 28 28 28 28	253450	Observation	Neuman–Witherspoon Leaky	28,540	0.0001		1,300	A53
285659 Production 630 gpm 26 279891 Observation Cooley-Case Leaky 23,760 0.026 910 A57 CJohnson 3	CJohnson 1							
279891 Observation Cooley–Case Leaky 23,760 0.026 910 A57 CJohnson 3	285659	Production	630 gpm			26		
CJohnson 3 291010 Production 1,010 gpm 28 291009 Observation Moench (Case 3) Leaky 30,610 0.0002 1,090 A63 CJohnson 2 285476 Production 900 gpm 28 28 285476 Production 900 gpm 28 28	279891	Observation	Cooley–Case Leaky	23,760	0.026		910	A57
291010 Production 1,010 gpm 28 291009 Observation Moench (Case 3) Leaky 30,610 0.0002 1,090 A63 CJohnson 2 285476 Production 900 gpm 28 28 091470 Production 900 gpm 28 100 100 100	CJohnson 3							
CJohnson 2 285476 Production 900 gpm 28 205470 Devlation 0 state of the second state	291010 291009	Production Observation	1,010 gpm Moench (Case 3) Leaky	30,610	0.0002	28	1,090	A63
285476 Production 900 gpm 28 285476 Production October 0 control of the second control of the seco	CJohnson 2		· · · · ·					
	285476	Production	900 gpm			28		
Z85476 Production Cooley–Case Leaky recovery 34,240 NA 1,220 A66	285476	Production	Cooley–Case Leaky recovery	34,240	NA		1,220	A66

Table 2. Aquifer test results.



Figure 3. Box plots of the aquifer test results show the ranges of aquifer properties from the 14 aquifer tests.

REFERENCES

- Cooper, H.H. Jr., and Jacob, C.E., 1946, A generalized graphical method for evaluating formation constants and summarizing well-field history: Transaction, American Geophysical Union, v. 27, no. 4, p. 526–534.
- Fetter, C.W., 2001, Applied Hydrogeology: Upper Saddle River, N.J., Prentice-Hall, 598 p.
- Weight, W.D., and Sonderegger, J.L., 2001, Manual of Applied Field Hydrogeology: New York, Mc-Graw-Hill, 608 p.

APPENDIX A:

WEST CRANE AQUIFER TEST CHARTS



BASTA 1 (296537)

Figure A1. Basta 1 aquifer test background through recovery water levels. No background measurements were collected on the production well. Pump off for about 12 hr.



Figure A2. Basta 1 aquifer test showing Cooper–Jacob solution. Storage coefficient values are unrealistic.



Figure A3. Basta 1 aquifer test showing Cooley–Case leaky confined solution.



Figure A4. Basta 1 aquifer test showing Cooley–Case leaky confined solution with a barrier boundary located 100 ft west.



Figure A5. Basta 1 aquifer test showing Neuman–Witherspoon leaky confined solution.



Figure A6. Basta 1 aquifer test showing Neuman–Witherspoon leaky confined solution with a barrier boundary located 100 ft west.



Figure A8. Basta 2 aquifer test showing Cooper–Jacob solution.



Figure A9. Basta 2 aquifer test showing Neuman–Witherspoon leaky confined solution.



Figure A10. Basta 2 aquifer test showing Cooley–Case leaky confined solution



Figure A11. Lange 2 aquifer test background through recovery water levels. Pumping rate appears to have fluctuated in the last part of the test.



Figure A12. Lange 2 aquifer test showing Cooper–Jacob solution.



Figure A13. Lange 2 aquifer test showing Neuman–Witherspoon solution.



Figure A14. Lange 2 aquifer test background through recovery water levels. Pumping rate appears to have fluctuated in the last part of the test.



Figure A15. Lange 1 aquifer test showing Cooper–Jacob solution.



Figure A16. Lange 1 aquifer test showing Moench (Case 3) leaky confined aquifer solution.



Figure A17. Lange 1 aquifer test showing Neuman–Witherspoon leaky confined aquifer solution.



Figure A18. Lange 1 aquifer test showing Cooley–Case leaky confined aquifer solution.



D. JORGENSEN 1 (290760)

Figure A19. D. Jorgenson 1 aquifer test background through recovery water levels.



Figure A20. D. Jorgenson 1 aquifer test showing Cooper–Jacob confined aquifer solution. Storage coefficient is unrealistic.



Figure A21. D. Jorgenson 1 aquifer test showing Cooley–Case leaky confined aquifer solution.



Figure A22. D. Jorgenson 1 aquifer test showing Cooley–Case leaky confined aquifer solution, with barrier boundary 100 ft to the south.



Figure A23. D. Jorgenson 1 aquifer test showing Neuman–Witherspoon leaky confined aquifer solution, with barrier boundary 100 ft to the south.



Figure A24. Ler 1 aquifer test background through recovery water levels. Pumping rate fluctuated during last part of the test.



Figure A25. Ler 1 aquifer test showing Cooper–Jacob confined aquifer solution.



Figure A26. Ler 1 aquifer test showing Cooley–Case leaky confined aquifer solution.



Figure A27. Ler 1 aquifer test showing Moench (Case 3) leaky confined aquifer solution.



Figure A28. J. Jorgenson 1 aquifer test background through recovery water levels.



Figure A29. J. Jorgenson 1 aquifer test showing Cooper–Jacob confined aquifer solution.



Figure A30. J. Jorgenson 1 aquifer test showing Neuman–Witherspoon leaky confined aquifer solution.



Figure A31. J. Jorgenson 1 aquifer test showing Moench (Case 3) leaky confined aquifer solution.



Figure A32. J. Jorgenson 1 aquifer test showing Cooley–Case leaky confined aquifer solution.



Figure A33. K. Jonsson 2 aquifer test background through recovery water levels. Pump shut down and was restarted after 28 hr of recovery. Test evaluation based on second pumping period.



Figure A34. K. Jonsson 2 aquifer test showing Cooper–Jacob confined aquifer solution.



Figure A35. K. Jonsson 2 aquifer test showing Moench (Case 3) leaky confined aquifer solution.



Figure A36. K. Jonsson 2 aquifer test showing Neuman–Witherspoon leaky confined aquifer solution.



Figure A37. K. Jonsson 2 aquifer test showing Cooley–Case leaky confined aquifer solution.



K. JONSSON 1 (249505)

Figure A38. K. Jonsson 1 aquifer test background through recovery water levels. Pump was off for a short time after the first day of pumping. This did not affect interpretations.



Figure A39. K. Jonsson 1 aquifer test showing Cooper–Jacob confined aquifer solution.



Figure A40. K. Jonsson 1aquifer test showing Cooley–Case leaky confined aquifer solution.



Figure A41. K. Jonsson 1 aquifer test showing Moench (Case 3) leaky confined aquifer solution.



Figure A42. K. Jonsson 1 aquifer test showing Neuman–Witherspoon leaky confined aquifer solution.



WYMAN 1 (250211)

Figure A43. Wyman 1 aquifer test background through recovery water levels.



Figure A44. Wyman 1 aquifer test showing Cooper–Jacob confined aquifer solution.



Figure A45. Wyman 1 aquifer test showing Cooley–Case leaky confined aquifer solution.



Figure A46. Wyman 1 aquifer test showing Moench (Case 3) leaky confined aquifer solution.



Figure A47. Wyman 1 aquifer test observation well 2 showing Cooper–Jacob confined aquifer solution.



Figure A48. Wyman 1 aquifer test observation well 2 showing Neuman–Witherspoon leaky confined aquifer solution.



Figure A49. Wyman 1 aquifer test observation well 2 showing Moench (Case 3) leaky confined aquifer solution.



Figure A50. Wyman 1 aquifer test observation well 2 showing Cooley–Case leaky confined aquifer solution.



Figure A51. Bradley 1 aquifer test background through recovery water levels.



Figure A52. Bradley 1 aquifer test showing Cooper–Jacob confined aquifer solution.



Figure A53. Bradley 1 aquifer test showing Neuman–Witherspoon leaky confined aquifer solution.



Figure A54. Bradley 1 aquifer test showing Cooley–Case leaky confined aquifer solution.



Figure A56. C. Johnson 1 aquifer test showing Cooper–Jacob confined aquifer solution.



Figure A57. C. Johnson 1 aquifer test showing Cooley–Case leaky confined aquifer solution.



Figure A58. C. Johnson 1 aquifer test showing Neuman–Witherspoon leaky confined aquifer solution.



Figure A59. C. Johnson 1 aquifer test showing Moench (Case 3) leaky confined aquifer solution.



Figure A61. C. Johnson 3 aquifer test showing Cooper–Jacob confined aquifer solution.



Figure A62. C. Johnson 3 aquifer test showing Neuman–Witherspoon leaky confined aquifer solution.



Figure A63. C. Johnson 3 aquifer test showing Moench (Case 3) leaky confined aquifer solution.



Figure A64. C. Johnson 2 aquifer test background through recovery water levels.



Figure A65. C. Johnson 2 aquifer test showing Cooper–Jacob confined aquifer recovery solution.



Figure A66. C. Johnson 2 aquifer test showing Cooley–Case leaky confined aquifer recovery solution.



Figure A67. C. Johnson 2 aquifer test showing Moench Case 3 leaky confined aquifer recovery solution.