

# Overview of Groundwater and Surface Water Investigations – Town of Patagonia Flood and Flow Committee

May 13, 2021

### Hermosa hydrogeological investigations







#### Website:www.south32.net/hermosa/documents



### Where to find new Hermosa documents (cont.)



Q



Who we are Our business Community & society Environment People & careers Investors & media

Our business > Exploration & projects > Hermosa > Hermosa Documents

#### Hermosa Documents

COMMUNITY

	Monthly Fact Sheets	+	
	Our Giving	+	
	Community Newsletter	+	
	Advisory Panel	+	
PUBLIC	PRESENTATIONS		+
ENVIRO	IMENTAL STUDIES AND DATA	$\left( \right)$	+

### **Spring and Seep Catalog update**





#### **Spring and Seep Catalog**

Hermosa Project Area

- Water quality results extended through June sampling in 2020
- Addition of 50 new sites within the Patagonia Mts.
- Site summary pages all include potential impacts to groundwater contributions at the spring/seep from early dewatering
- Site descriptions include date visited, measured flows (when flowing), pH, temperature, and conductance
- Vegetation and wildlife encountered are detailed for each site
- Photographs of wet and dry season conditions are provided for most sites

### **Springs and Seeps: Example Summary Sheet**



	Hermo	sa Projec	t Spring and S	Seep Survey	Sample Sit	e summary	, Patagon	ia, Arizona		
Site ID F6-01		F6-01	Interpretation of Groundwater Age: Mixed source of modern water and deep groundwater.				rn water and dee	p groundwater.		
<b>v</b> atershed		Flu	x Canyon							O a monthe active table with the active m
Monitoring Period 11/2017 - 6/2		17 - 6/2020	Potential Impacts/Effects: Flows observed at this site, during site visits, have ranged from 120 immeasurable (<0.25 gpm) to 4.4 gpm. No changes are predicted at this site.			g site visits, have licted at this site.	ranged from	Sample site identification		
Number of V	/isits		6							
		1	Flows an	d Field Para	meters (pH	, Temp, SC)				
		Dry Seas	on				Wet Seas	on		
Date	Flow (gpm)	pH (s.u.)	Temp (C)	SC (µS/cm)	Date	Flow (gpm)	pH (s.u.)	Temp (C)	SC (µS/cm)	
					11/9/2017	0.12	6.33	13.1	2717	Observed water quality in the field
5/30/2018	0.00	6.48	26.6	2848	11/29/2018	<0.25	6.70	9.7	1122	obool four mater quality in the hold
5/27/2019	1.10	6.59	20.2	2535	12/7/2019	4.41	5.75	13.4	918	
6/10/2020	0.12	6.72	31.1	2610						
	- 		v	Nater Qualit	y Exceedan	ices	· · ·			
		Dry Seas	on				Wet Seas	on		
Date		Pa	arameter		Date		Pa	rameter		
					11/9/2017		Lea	d, zinc, pH		\A/atan autolity a company to that and of a company
5/30/2018		Lea	d, zinc, pH		11/29/2018		Lead, o	admium, zinc		water quality components that are of conce
5/27/2019		Lead, cadmium, zinc			12/7/2019 Lead, Cadmium, copper, zinc, pH			ım, copper, zinc	;, рН	
6/10/2020		Lead, o	admium, zinc							
Iquatic and vater is pres regetation a iillsides. Altl emoryi ). No ind Johnson ncluding bei	Vegetation Su sent in shallow long the drain hough there is n-native annu: grass ( <i>Sorghu</i> etles, boatmer Dry Seas	urvey Findin v pools. Bull age bottom no oversto al rabbitsfo um halepen: n, backswin on Photo	ngs: This site is lo grass (Muhlenbe I. Hopbush (Dodu ry canopy at the ot grass (Polypog se ), have been o mmers, dragonflie (5/30/2018)	ocated in rocky ergia emersleyi onaea viscosa ) site, overstory gon monspelien observed. Aquat es, and damself	and cobbly se ) and riparian and Texas blu trees along th sis ) and invas ic invertebrate lies. No aquat	ction of Flux C obligate rushe lestem ( <i>Schizo</i> e drainage are ive plants, Leh es previously n ic vertebrates Wet Seaso	anyon with s (Juncus s chyrium cirr e dominated mann loveg oted withir have been on Photo	exposed bedroc op.) are dominai atum ) occur on I by Emory oak ( grass ( <i>Eragrostis</i> the Flux Canyo observed. (11/29/2018	ck. Generally, te perimeter n the adjacent ( <i>Quercus</i> : <i>lehmanniana</i> ) n drainage	Plants and wildlife identified at the site
C. Law	i and		1			(M)			The second second	



Photos showing the site during wet and dry seasons

### **Aquifer testing at Hermosa (examples)**





- A total of 11 different aquifer tests have been conducted on various wells at Hermosa conducted from 2017 through 2019
- Aquifer testing has been used to understand the range in permeability of the differing geologic materials (volcanic and sedimentary aquifer units)
- Some tests lasted only a few hours with less than 1 gpm
- The largest of the aquifer tests was at well WW-1, extending for approximately 15 days at 1,950 gpm

#### **Groundwater measurements and model boundaries**





- Measured water levels indicate flow from Patagonia Mts. toward Sonoita Creek
- Groundwater is recharged at high elevations and moves towards the surrounding valleys.
- In some locations, springs have provided some guidance for groundwater elevations
- Opportunities to expand our understanding of hydrogeology south of Hermosa property

#### **Conceptual geologic and groundwater flow model**





HORIZONTAL SCALE

**2 X VERTICAL EXAGGERATION** 

### Numerical groundwater model calibration



Steady State Calibration



Residual Mean	0.235
Absolute Residual Mean	19.30
Residual Std. Deviation	29.68
Sum of Squares	130400
RMS Error	29.68
Number of Observations	148
Range in Observations	1601
Scaled Residual Std. Deviation	0.019
Scaled Absolute Residual Mean	0.012
Scaled RMS Error	0.019
Scaled Residual Mean	0.00015





### **Preliminary Impact Simulation for Exploration Dewatering**

Tascala Canyon



Area of Simulated **Groundwater Rise** (Maximum 20 feet) **Area of Deep Simulated** Simulated Meadow Valiey **Groundwater Declines** discharge (Maximum 1,900 feet) approx. 3,270 gpm Cone of depression Area of focused beneath Gresno Canyon **Minor Simulated Groundwater Declines** Hermosa ada De La Poloma.

SAN RAFAEL VALLEY



# **Questions?**

## askhermosa@south32.net