Paris – Galt Moraine Hydrogeology

Dave Belanger, M.Sc., P.Geo. Water Supply Program Manager Guelph Water Services



Paris – Galt Moraine Hydrogeology

• Three topics:

- Paris Galt Moraine general geology and hydrogeology setting
- Guelph's Water Supply where does it come from?
- Source Protection and the Clair Maltby Secondary Plan
- High level not Clair-Maltby specific



Paris – Galt Moraine

- How was it formed
- Where is it found?
- Why is it important?



Paris – Galt Moraine

- 130 km long, up to 11 km wide and relief of 30 m
- Formed from continental glaciation -~12,000 yr ago
- Till or recessional moraine – End or terminal moraine





Moraine Formation

- Continental glaciation
- Formed at the leading edge of the glacier
- Hummocky moraines are *"areas of knoband-kettle topography"*
- Outwash Deposits







Arkell Road and Victoria Rd S. – facing Southeast





Clairfields Dr – facing southeast (pre-construction)





Moraine – Geologic Cross Section



- Port Stanley Till silt to sandy matrix
- Maryhill Till silty clay to clay matrix

Guel

• Catfish Creek Till – sandy silt to silt matrix

Significant GW Recharge Areas

- Most important feature of moraines
- SGWRA 15% above average
- Includes Glacial Outwash
- Recharge to shallow groundwater
- Enhance by hummocky terrain
- Supports creeks and wetlands
 Guelph



CITY OF GUELPH - WHERE DO WE GET OUR WATER?

- •Have relied on groundwater to meet water demands since 1879;
- Most water supply comes from wells in the Gasport Formation deep bedrock aquifer and the Arkell Spring Grounds collector system;
- Municipal supply system includes
 25 production wells:
 - 21 wells are in continuous operation;
 - 4 wells are offline due to water quality concerns.
 - Average day demand ~46,000
 m³/day





Guelph Water Supply – Aquifers and Aquitards



Geologic Cross Section





Golder, 2009

Arkell Spring Grounds - Cross Section



Stantec, 2011

Groundwater Flow - Overburden

- Mirrors topography
- Flows from high elevation to and discharges into rivers and creeks
- Shallow groundwater supports creeks, wetlands, ecosystems, etc.
- Similar to shallow bedrock



Groundwater Flow – Deep Bedrock

- Subdued reflection of topography
- Flows from the north-northeast to City production wells
- Deep regional groundwater flow system



Source Protection Program

- Wellhead Protection Areas delineated for each well
- Based on travel time to the well in the aquifer
- Estimated using a 3-D groundwater flow model





Source Protection -Capture Zones

- Tier 3 Water
 Budget Model
- Reverse particle tracking
- Future water demand – 2031 (72,535 m³/day)





Wellhead Protection Area - Quality

- WHPA defined from Capture Zones:
 - WHPA-A 100 m
 - WHPA-B 2 yr Time of Travel
 - WHPA-C 5 yr
 - WHPA-D 25 yr
- Small area of WHPA-C in Clair-Maltby – water quality policies apply





Wellhead Protection Area - Quality

- WHPA defined from Capture Zones:
 - WHPA-A 100 m
 - WHPA-B 2 yr Time of Travel
 - WHPA-C 5 yr
 - WHPA-D 25 yr
- Small area of WHPA-C in Clair-Maltby – water quality policies apply
- Low vulnerability



25yr (WHPA-D)



Wellhead Protection Area - Quantity

- Defined four WHPA-Qs within study area
- Based on combined drawdown of water takings – 2 m contour
- Considered current and future water takings under future land use and drought conditions
- GGET WHPA-Q Significant Risk Level







WHPA-Q Drawdown

- Contour Intervals:
- 0.5 to 1 m -
- 1 to 2 m
- 2 m contour
- 2 to 3 m
- 3 to 5 m
- > 5 m





Water Quantity Threats Assessment

- Water quantity threats – consumptive takings and recharge reduction
- Recharge Reduction -Future buildout of City and Townships
- Future C-M included
- Use to estimate impact on water quantity and water supply
- Ranked threats to develop risk management measures





Risk Ranking

- Municipal wells ranked highest
- Queensdale, Arkell Wells and Dolime Quarry – ranked 1, 2 and 3
- All recharge reduction areas ranked low – 15th out of 24 threats
- Water quantity policies under development



Water Quantity Threat	Greatest % Impact	Rank	Well under Greatest % Impact
Municipal Well Takings	91%	•	Queensdale
Queensdale well	72%	1	Queensdale
Arkell System (Arkell 1, Arkell 6, Arkell 7, Arkell 8, Arkell 14, Arkell 15 wells and artificial recharge and collector system)	53%	2	Arkell 8
Clythe Creek well	32%	4	Clythe Creek
Calico well	24%	5	Calico
Sacco well	22%	6	Sacco
Helmar well	19%	7	Helmar
Smallfield well	19%	8	Smallfield
Carter wells	17%	9	Carter Wells
Water St. well	17%	10	Water St.
Burke well	15%	11	Burke
Membro well	13%	12	Membro
Downey well	12%	13	Downey
University well	7%	16	University
Dean well	4%	17	Dean
Paisley well	2%	18	Paisley
Future Municipal Takings: Hamilton Drive (GET)	<1%	22	-
All Permitted, Non-Municipal Takings	51%	•	Dean
5080-8TAKK2 (River Valley Developments)	50%	3	Membro
All other Permitted, Non-Municipal Takings Inside WHPA-Q except Dewatering, Commercial, and Industrial Permits (32 permits as of 2008)		14	Emma
1245-AB8RMW (Gay Lea Foods)	2%	19	Emma
1381-95ATPY (Nestle Waters)	1%	20	Burke
5448-9FLM5E (Holody Electro Plating)	< 1%	23	-
5736-8QSS7B (Flochem)	<1%	24	
All Recharge Reduction Areas (due to future land use)	9%	15	Burke
All Non-Permitted Takings (WWIS-Domestic)	1%	21	Helmar

Recharge Reduction - Policy Approaches

Policy Approach Themes

Policy Approach

Water Conservation and Efficiency	•	Incentive programs for water conservation and efficiency
Recharge Maintenance	•	Guidelines for groundwater recharge maintenance
	•	Groundwater recharge maintenance where appropriate
	•	Environmental Compliance Approval (ECA) review for stormwater management facilities with LID systems
Growth and Development	•	Update of subwatershed studies
Coordination	•	Water Resource Technical Working Group
Education and Outreach	•	Education and outreach initiatives
	•	Web-based resources as part of EnviroGuide platform
Monitoring	•	Long-term monitoring program of shallow groundwater and surface water systems
Prioritization	•	Prioritization of ECA review and inspection for stormwater management facilities with LID systems

Recharge Reduction Policies

- Source Protection Policies developed with City Water, Planning and Engineering Services
- Consistent with good land use planning in Clair-Maltby
- Maintain high quality recharge to support baseflow in creeks – salt mitigation to prevent quality degradation
- Maintaining baseflow will help sustain municipal water supply
- Proposed monitoring programs to help manage groundwater and surface water resources
- Source Protection Plan, once approved by MECP, is an obligation of the City to implement

Summary

- Paris-Galt Moraine is a major geological feature that supports groundwater recharge areas – hydrological function is important
- Guelph's water supply is derived from deep bedrock wells - not much water originates from the Paris Moraine
- Source Protection Quality Policies C-M not a water quality issue except salt
- Source Protection Quantity Policies Recharge reduction policies developed with Planning and Engineering to protect C-M infiltration function and protect, restore and replenish surface and groundwater resources

