



S.S. PAPADOPULOS & ASSOCIATES, INC.
ENVIRONMENTAL AND WATER RESOURCE CONSULTANTS

Foundations of Pumping Test Interpretation


1. The Theis model

Christopher J. Neville
S.S. Papadopoulos & Associates, Inc.

Outline


1. The Theis conceptual model
2. Theis analysis
3. Cooper-Jacob analyses
4. Choosing between the Theis and Cooper-Jacob analyses
5. Composite plots

The Theis (1935) conceptual model



Theis Conceptual Model


1. The aquifer



- Darcy's Law valid
- Head always above top of pumped aquifer
- Constant storage properties through time

Theis Conceptual Model


2. The wells



- Fully penetrating
- Infinitesimal diameter
- Constant pumping rate

Theis Conceptual Model

3. Background conditions



- We work in terms of drawdowns.
- Drawdowns are defined as the changes in water levels due only to our pumping.

Summary of assumptions of the Theis conceptual model

The aquifer	
1	Darcy's Law is valid
3	The transmissivity of the aquifer is uniform and isotropic
3	The aquifer is infinite in areal extent
4	The aquifer is perfectly confined by impermeable strata across its top and bottom
5	The potentiometric surface always remains above the top of the aquifer
6	The release of water from storage is instantaneous and governed by linear constitutive relations with uniform properties that remain constant through time
The pumping well	
7	There is a single pumping well
8	The pumping well penetrates the full thickness of the aquifer
9	The pumping well has an infinitesimal diameter
10	The well pumps at a constant rate
The observation wells	
11	The observation wells have infinitesimal diameter
Background conditions	
12	The changes in water levels caused by pumped have been isolated from any background temporal trends

With all of those assumptions, how could the Theis conceptual model be useful?

1. The Theis model is the foundation of all more sophisticated analysis methods. We can make sense of these methods by tracing how each of the primary assumptions of the Theis model are handled.
2. The Theis model provides us with an “ideal” against which we can compare conditions at our site.
3. Usually there is some portion of a pumping test during which the key assumptions of the Theis model are satisfied (Infinite **A**cting **R**adial **F**low).

Mathematics of the Theis solution

Governing equation:

$$S \frac{\partial s}{\partial t} = T \frac{1}{r} \frac{\partial}{\partial r} \left(r \frac{\partial s}{\partial r} \right) \quad ; 0 < r < \infty$$

Boundary conditions:

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow 0} 2\pi r T \frac{\partial s}{\partial r}(r, t) = -Q$$

$Q > 0$ for withdrawal

$$s(\infty, t) = 0$$

Initial conditions:

$$s(r, 0) = 0$$


Analytical solution:

$$s(r, t) = \frac{Q}{4\pi T} \int_{\frac{r^2 S}{4Tt}}^{\infty} \frac{1}{y} \text{EXP}\{-y\} dy$$

$$s(r, t) = \frac{Q}{4\pi T} W(u)$$




$$u = \frac{r^2 S}{4Tt}$$

Theis type curve (Exponential integral)




$$\frac{1}{u} = \frac{4Tt}{r^2 S}$$

Example Theis analysis Gridley, Illinois



Well No. 1 drawdowns



(1) Type-curve analysis

Data:

$$Q = 220 \text{ gpm}$$

$$r = 824 \text{ ft}$$

Match point:


$$u = 1.0, W(u) = 1.0$$

$$t = 4 \text{ min}, s = 2.5 \text{ ft}$$



Results:


$$T = 1340 \text{ ft}^2/\text{day}$$


$$S = 2.2 \times 10^{-5}$$




(2) Computer-assisted methods, visual











(3) Computer-assisted methods, NL-LS



Cooper and Jacob (1945) approximation

For relatively small u :


$$W(u) \cong -0.5772 - \ln\{u\}$$

Error in the Cooper and Jacob (1945) approximation of the Exponential Integral:

$1/u > 10$ ($u < 0.1$): 5.3%

$1/u > 20$ ($u < 0.05$): 2.0%

$1/u > 100$ ($u < 0.01$): 0.25 %



Manipulation of the Cooper-Jacob approximation

$$\begin{aligned}s(r, t) &\cong \frac{Q}{4\pi T} \left[-0.5772 - \ln \left\{ \frac{r^2 S}{4Tt} \right\} \right] \\&= \frac{Q}{4\pi T} \left[\text{EXP}\{-0.5772\} + \ln \left\{ \frac{4Tt}{r^2 S} \right\} \right] \\&= \frac{Q}{4\pi T} \left[\ln \left\{ 4 \text{EXP}\{-0.5772\} \frac{Tt}{r^2 S} \right\} \right] \\&= \frac{Q}{4\pi T} \ln \left\{ 2.246 \frac{Tt}{r^2 S} \right\} \\&= 2.303 \frac{Q}{4\pi T} \log \left\{ 2.246 \frac{Tt}{r^2 S} \right\}\end{aligned}$$


Cooper-Jacob analyses

Cooper and Jacob (1946) recommendations ...

1. If we have drawdown data for a single well for multiple times, we should conduct a *time-drawdown* analysis;
2. If we have drawdown data for multiple wells at a single time, we should conduct a *distance-drawdown* analysis; and
3. If we have drawdown data for multiple wells at a multiple times, we should conduct a *composite* analysis.

Cooper-Jacob Time-Drawdown Analysis

One well, multiple times




Cooper-Jacob Time-Drawdown Analysis

$$s(r, t_1) \cong 2.303 \frac{Q}{4\pi T} \log \left\{ 2.246 \frac{T t_1}{r^2 S} \right\}$$

$$s(r, t_2) \cong 2.303 \frac{Q}{4\pi T} \log \left\{ 2.246 \frac{T t_2}{r^2 S} \right\}$$

$$s(r, t_2) - s(r, t_1) \cong 2.303 \frac{Q}{4\pi T} [\log\{t_2\} - \log\{t_1\}]$$

$$T \cong 2.303 \frac{Q}{4\pi} \frac{[\log\{t_2\} - \log\{t_1\}]}{s(r, t_2) - s(r, t_1)} \leftarrow \left[\frac{1}{\text{SLOPE}} \right]$$




$$SLOPE = \frac{\Delta \text{ drawdown}}{\text{log cycle } t} = \Delta s$$

$$T = 2.303 \frac{Q}{4\pi} \frac{1}{\Delta s}$$

$$S = 2.246 \frac{T t_0}{r^2}$$

Back to Gridley, Illinois




Why use the Cooper-Jacob analysis?

If the Cooper-Jacob method consisted solely of the approximation of the Theis well function, there would now be little motivation for using it.

There are two key features of the Cooper-Jacob analysis.

- The semilog plot has immediate diagnostic value.
 - Data approximate a straight line on a semilog plot → radial flow
- The analysis naturally leads us naturally to focus on later-time data.

Theis type curve




The Theis analysis leads us to a mistaken focus on early time.

There are two important reasons why we should generally avoid focusing on early-time data:

1. Early-time drawdowns are less accurate; and
2. Early-time drawdowns are often affected by “small” things.

a) Inaccuracy of early-time drawdowns



The magnitudes of the early drawdowns are relatively small, so there is bound to be some noise in their measurement.

b) Sensitivity to “small” things

Consider a “nearly flawless” constant-rate test


Specified parameters:

$$T = 1.0 \times 10^{-4} \text{ m}^2/\text{s}$$


$$S = 1.0 \times 10^{-4}$$

$$r = 5.0 \text{ m}$$


Time (minutes)	Pumping rate (m ³ /s)
0-5	1.210×10^{-3}
5-10	9.075×10^{-4}
10→	6.050×10^{-4}



Log-log (Theis) plot




Theis analysis #1




Theis analysis #2

(Answer at the back of the book)



Cooper-Jacob analysis



Focus on
late time


$$T_{est} = 1 \times 10^{-4} \text{ m}^2/\text{s}$$
$$T_{true} = 1 \times 10^{-4} \text{ m}^2/\text{s}$$

**Do we have to choose between the
Theis and Cooper-Jacob analyses?**


No, but ...

Case study

Analysis #1




Analysis #2



Cooper-Jacob analysis: $T = 4.8 \times 10^{-4} \text{ m}^2/\text{s}$

Recall: Theis analysis: $T = 3.2 \times 10^{-5} \text{ m}^2/\text{s}$

Analysis #3



Recall: Theis analysis: $T = 3.2 \times 10^{-5} \text{ m}^2/\text{s}$

Recommendation

We don't have to choose between the Theis and Cooper-Jacob analyses, but it does not make sense to report separate parameter estimates with the two methods. Instead, we should use the methods together to ensure that our interpretations are internally consistent.

Introduction to Derivative Analysis

Recall that a Cooper-Jacob analysis consists of two tasks.

1. Identification of that portion of the response that is consistent with the Theis conceptual model – that is, the sustained interval over which the data fall on a straight line on the semi-log plot.
2. Calculation of the semi-log slope, Δs , of the straight line that is drawn through the appropriate portion of the data.

Bourdet et al. (1983) suggested plotting the slope of the drawdown response directly. They referred to this plot as a derivative plot.

The derivative is defined as:

$$D_t(s) = \frac{\partial s}{\partial (\ln\{t\})}$$

Why is derivative defined with respect to $\ln\{t\}$ and not t ?

Q: Why is the derivative with respect to $\ln\{t\}$ and not simply t ?

$$\begin{aligned} s(r, t) &= \frac{Q}{4\pi T} \left[-0.5772 - \ln \left\{ \frac{r^2 S}{4Tt} \right\} \right] \\ &= C + \frac{Q}{4\pi T} \ln\{t\} \end{aligned}$$

ANS: Beyond early times, the drawdown in a “Theis” aquifer is a linear function of $\ln\{t\}$, not t .


Theis solution:


$$D_t(s) = \frac{Q}{4\pi T} \text{EXP} \left\{ -\frac{r^2 S}{4Tt} \right\}$$

C-J approximation:

$$D_t(s) = \frac{Q}{4\pi T} \quad = \text{constant}$$

When the Cooper-Jacob approximation is valid, the data approximate a “plateau” on either a log-log or semilog plot of the derivative.







The “catch” of Derivative Analysis

Numerical differentiation makes data ‘noisier’.


$$D_t(s) = \frac{\partial s}{\partial [\ln\{t\}]} \approx \frac{s_2 - s_1}{\ln\{t_2\} - \ln\{t_1\}}$$

$$D_t(s) \approx \frac{(s_2 \pm \varepsilon) - (s_1 \pm \varepsilon)}{\ln\{t_2\} - \ln\{t_1\}} = \frac{(s_2 - s_1) \pm 2\varepsilon}{\ln\{t_2\} - \ln\{t_1\}}$$

Gridley, Illinois example revisited




Raw derivative




Drawdown data with only a relatively small amount of noise may end up producing “buckshot” derivatives.


Smoothing (1)



Smoothing (2)




Gridley example with smoothed derivative



Cooper-Jacob Distance-Drawdown Analysis

Multiple wells, one time




Cooper-Jacob Distance-Drawdown Analysis

$$s(r_1, t) \cong 2.303 \frac{Q}{4\pi T} \log \left\{ 2.246 \frac{Tt}{r_1^2 S} \right\}$$

$$s(r_2, t) \cong 2.303 \frac{Q}{4\pi T} \log \left\{ 2.246 \frac{Tt}{r_2^2 S} \right\}$$

$$s(r_2, t) - s(r_1, t) \cong 2.303 \frac{Q}{4\pi T} \left[\log \left\{ \frac{1}{r_2^2} \right\} - \log \left\{ \frac{1}{r_1^2} \right\} \right]$$

$$T \cong -2.303 \frac{Q}{2\pi} \frac{[\log\{r_2\} - \log\{r_1\}]}{s(r_2, t) - s(r_1, t)} \leftarrow \left[\frac{1}{\text{SLOPE}} \right]$$



$$SLOPE = \frac{\Delta s}{\Delta \log r}$$


$$T = 2.303 \frac{Q}{2\pi} \frac{1}{\Delta s}$$


Why $Q/2\pi$ and not $Q/4\pi$?

$$S = 2.246 \frac{Tt}{r_0^2}$$

An absolute classic

Grand Island, Nebraska (Wenzel, 1936)





Lines:

1. A
2. B
3. W
4. C
5. D
6. B
7. D
8. SW
9. S
10. N

Each dot represents an observation well


Additional facts about this test:


- Unconfined aquifer
- Initial saturated thickness, $b = 100$ ft
- Constant pumping for 48 hours ($Q = 540$ gpm)

Drawdowns were corrected to account for the reduction in the saturated thickness of the aquifer

$$s_{corr} = s_{obs} - \frac{s_{obs}^2}{2b}$$

Drawdowns at the end of pumping





$$Q = 540 \text{ gpm}$$

$$SLOPE = 3.044 \text{ ft}/\log r$$

$$r_0 = 473.5 \text{ ft}$$

$$T = 12,450 \text{ ft}^2/\text{day}$$

$$S = 0.25$$

Check on the Cooper-Jacob analysis with the Theis solution




TABLE 3.—Coefficients of transmissibility and storage determined from the corrected drawdowns after 48 hours of continuous pumping at 540 gpm during aquifer test near Grand Island, Nebr.

Line	Value of s for $W(u)=4.04$ (ft)	Value of r^2 for $u=0.01$ (ft ²)	Coefficient of transmissibility, T (gpd per ft)	Coefficient of storage, S
A-----	2. 45	5, 800	102, 000	0. 19
B-----	2. 78	3, 700	90, 000	. 26
W-----	2. 50	4, 700	100, 000	. 23
D-----	2. 50	5, 300	100, 000	. 20
C-----	2. 67	3, 800	94, 000	. 265
SW-----	2. 75	3, 600	91, 000	. 27
N-----	2. 50	4, 700	100, 000	. 23

How did we do?

$$T = 12,450 \frac{\text{ft}^2}{\text{day}} = 93,000 \text{ gpd/ft}$$

$$S = 0.25$$

Composite Analysis

Multiple wells, multiple times

Composite Analysis


Recall the parameter u in the Theis solution:

$$\begin{aligned} s(r, t) &= \frac{Q}{4\pi T} W \left(u = \frac{r^2 S}{4Tt} \right) \\ &= \frac{Q}{4\pi T} W \left(u = \frac{S}{4T \left(\frac{t}{r^2} \right)} \right) \end{aligned}$$

Prediction:

Drawdowns observed at different distances from the pumping well should be the same if the values of (t/r^2) are the same.

An ideal example




$$b = 10\text{ m}$$

$$K_H = 1 \times 10^{-5}\text{ m/s} \rightarrow T = 1 \times 10^{-4}\text{ m}^2/\text{s}$$


$$S_s = 1 \times 10^{-5}\text{ m}^{-1} \rightarrow S = 1 \times 10^{-4}$$

$$Q = 5 \times 10^{-4}\text{ m}^3/\text{s}$$

Individual time-drawdown plots



Composite Theis plot




Cooper-Jacob Approximation

$$\begin{aligned}s(r, t) &\cong \frac{Q}{4\pi T} \left[-0.5772 - \ln \left\{ \frac{r^2 S}{4Tt} \right\} \right] \\ &\cong 2.303 \frac{Q}{4\pi T} \log \left\{ 2.246 \frac{T}{S} \frac{t}{r^2} \right\} \\ &\cong 2.303 \frac{Q}{4\pi T} \left[\log \left\{ 2.246 \frac{T}{S} \right\} + \log \left\{ \frac{t}{r^2} \right\} \right]\end{aligned}$$


Prediction:

The drawdowns from multiple observation wells should approximate a single straight line when plotted against the log of (t/r^2) .

Individual time-drawdown plots



Composite Cooper-Jacob plot




Cooper-Jacob Composite Analysis

$$s(r_1, t_1) \cong 2.303 \frac{Q}{4\pi T} \log \left\{ 2.2459 \frac{T t_1}{r_1^2 S} \right\}$$

$$s(r_2, t_2) \cong 2.303 \frac{Q}{4\pi T} \log \left\{ 2.2459 \frac{T t_2}{r_2^2 S} \right\}$$

$$s(r_2, t_2) - s(r_1, t_1) \cong 2.303 \frac{Q}{4\pi T} \left[\log \left\{ \frac{t_2}{r_2^2} \right\} - \log \left\{ \frac{t_1}{r_1^2} \right\} \right]$$

$$T \cong 2.303 \frac{Q}{4\pi} \frac{\left[\log \left\{ \frac{t_2}{r_2^2} \right\} - \log \left\{ \frac{t_1}{r_1^2} \right\} \right]}{s(r, t_2) - s(r, t_1)} \leftarrow \left[\frac{1}{\text{SLOPE}} \right]$$




$$T = 2.303 \frac{Q}{4\pi} \frac{1}{SLOPE}$$


$$S = 2.246 \left(\frac{t}{r^2} \right)_0$$

Case study:

Horkheimer Insel


Neckar Valley, Germany






1 pumping well
15 observation wells

Drawdowns reported in the journal paper (4 of the 15 observation wells)



Authors' analysis approach



Reporting of the analyses


Parameter	LSPT			
Number of tests performed	1			
Number of evaluated drawdown curves	15			
	Min	Mean	Max	CV ^c
Radial distances PW ^a – OW ^b	15.2	40.6	70.6	
Transmissivity for phase two (m ² s ⁻¹)	0.042	0.065	0.13	0.35
Transmissivity for phase three (m ² s ⁻¹)	0.029	0.032	0.035	0.069
Storativity for phase two (-)	0.018	0.035	0.058	0.34
Storativity for phase three (-)	0.026	0.05	0.11	0.37

^a PW is the pumping well.


^b OW is the observation well.

^c CV is the coefficient of variation (standard deviation/mean).

Semi-log composite plot



Cooper-Jacob analysis



Take-home points

1. The Theis model is useful.
2. The Cooper-Jacob method is very useful.

The Cooper-Jacob method is the simplest method of interpretation in our toolkit. This simplicity can be deceptive: the method frequently yields the most reliable estimates of transmissivity. There seems to be little appreciation of its underlying strengths.

The composite plot is an essential visualization approach

- All data are assembled in a single plot.
- The composite plot has immediate diagnostic value.

If the data from one observation well do not plot on the same line as other data, the assumptions of the Theis solution are violated for this well. The observation well may not be located in the pumped aquifer, or may be located in a pocket of material with significantly different properties.

- The analysis yields a single estimate of the transmissivity, consistent with the underlying conceptual model.