

Table of Content

Certificate	i
Declaration	iii
Copyright Transfer Certificate	v
Acknowledgment	vii
Table of Contents	xi
List of Figures	xvii
List of tables	xxv
Preface	xxvii
1. INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Background	1
1.2 Dynamics of River Aquifer Exchanges	3
1.3 Baseflow depletion	4
1.4 Manage Aquifer Recharge as a Potential Solution	6
1.5 Research Motivation	8
1.6 Proposed Framework	9
1.7 Research Objectives	12
1.8 Organization of the Thesis	13
2. LITERATURE REVIEW	15
2.1 Suitable Candidate Areas for MAR to Restore RAE	15
2.1.1 Methodologies for the MAR site selection	15
2.1.2 General objectives of MAR projects	21
2.2 Stream Flow Enhancement through MAR	22
2.3 Assessment of RAE with Integrated SW-GW Model	24
2.3.1 Quantification of RAE	24
2.3.2 Integrated SWAT and MODFLOW Model	26
2.4 The Permissible Aquifer Recharge rate	28
2.5 Research Gaps	29
3. MATERIAL AND METHODOLOGY	31
3.1 Hydrological modelling with SWAT	32
3.1.1 Overland flow phase of the SWAT model	33
3.1.2 Water routing phase of the SWAT Model	34
3.1.3 User Interface and Input/Output	35

3.1.4	Calibration and Validation	36
3.2	GW Modeling: Integrated Method	38
3.2.1	GW flow in saturated media	39
3.2.2	Numerical Modelling with MODFLOW-NWT	40
3.2.3	Integration of SWAT output to MODFLOW	49
3.2.4	Calibration of GW model	51
3.3	Machine Learning Models	54
3.3.1	Artificial Neural Network (ANN)	54
3.3.2	Random Forest	55
3.3.3	Long-Short Term Memory (LSTM)	56
3.3.4	Hyperparameter tuning with Bayesian optimization	57
3.4	Accuracy matrices:	58
3.5	Study Area	58
3.6	Field Visits and Data Collection	61
4.	INTEGRATED ASSESSMENT OF GW DECLINE THROUGH GRAVIMETRIC REMOTE SENSING AND FIELD OBSERVATIONS	63
4.1	Introduction	63
4.2	Datasets used in the study	68
4.2.1	GRACE-TWSA	68
4.2.2	GLDAS outputs	69
4.2.3	Environmental variables	70
4.2.4	Ground-based Measurements	71
4.2.5	Ancillary data	72
4.3	Study Area	73
4.4	Downscaling of GRACE-Derived GWS to HRU-Scale	75
4.4.1	SWAT Model Setup	76
4.4.2	SWAT-Model Calibration	78
4.4.3	Calculation of GWS	80
4.4.4	Spatial Downscaling with ANN	80
4.4.5	Integrated Budgeting of reservoirs in a water cycle	83
4.4.6	GW Sustainability	84
4.5	Results and Discussion	86
4.5.1	HRU-based calculation of GWS	86
4.5.2	Determination of GW Level in the HRUs	93
4.5.3	Mapping the SW and GW Fluxes and GW Sustainability	96

4.6	Summary	97
------------	----------------	-----------

5. QUANTIFYING THE RIVER AQUIFER EXCHANGES IN VARUNA RIVER

	BASIN AMID CLIMATE CHANGE	99
5.1	Introduction	99
5.2	CMIP6 Outputs and its Bias Correction	104
5.3	Modelling the SW Dynamics in VRB	111
5.3.1	Dataset	111
5.3.2	Simulation	113
5.3.3	Calibration and Validation	114
5.4	GW Modelling	116
5.5	Integrated Modelling of SW and GW in VRB	123
5.6	Differential flow gaging (DFG)	124
5.7	Calibrating the GW Model for RAE	125
5.8	Forecasting SW-GW Model of VRB	128
5.9	Results and Discussion	130
5.9.1	Future Weather Anomalies in VRB	130
5.9.2	Natural GW Recharge	141
5.9.3	Dynamics of GW Sustainability Ratio (GSR) in future scenarios	145
5.9.4	Future SW availability and water demand	147
5.9.5	Climate Change Impact on the RAE	149
5.10	Summary	158

6. INJECTION-INDUCED ENHANCEMENT OF RIVER AQUIFER

	EXCHANGES IN VRB	161
6.1	Introduction	161
6.2	Response of Injection Well to Stream Flow	164
6.3	Baseflow enhancement ratio (<i>BFER</i>)	166
6.4	Discussions	171
6.4.1	Capture Fraction vs <i>BFER</i>	171
6.4.2	The initial response lag and recession time (t_{ir} and t_{res})	174
6.4.3	Correlation of <i>BFER</i> to aquifer parameters and proximity to river	175
6.4.4	The fate of baseflow restoration using ASR system in VRB	177
6.4.5	Benefit of the GW Model-based Analysis	179
6.5	Summary	181

7. PERMISSIBLE AQUIFER RECHARGE RATES AND ITS SENSITIVITY TOWARDS AQUIFER AND WELL PARAMETERS	183
7.1 Introduction	183
7.2 Permissible Aquifer Recharge RATE (PARR)	185
7.2.1 Analytical Definition	185
7.2.2 Numerical Solution	188
7.3 The Permissible and Recoverable Head	191
7.4 Sensitivity analysis	192
7.4.1 Local Sensitivity of PARR	194
7.4.2 Global Sensitivity Analysis	200
7.5 Discussion	203
7.5.1 PARR and recoverable head	203
7.5.2 PARR in VRB	206
7.6 Summary	209
8. SUITABLE AQUIFER STORAGE AND RECOVERY SITES FOR BASEFLOW RESTORATION	211
8.1 Introduction	211
8.2 Ranking of Sites by TOPSIS	213
8.3 Criteria for Suitable Site Selection	214
8.3.1 Baseflow Enhancement (ΔQ_{bf})	214
8.3.2 Increase in Aquifer Storage	216
8.3.3 Total Cost	216
8.4 Source identification	220
8.4.1 Surplus runoff at subbasin outlets	221
8.4.2 Canal Diversions	224
8.5 Suitable Site Selection	225
8.6 Results and Discussion	228
8.6.1 Suitable MAR sites	228
8.6.2 Best Source of Water for ASR	231
8.7 Advantage of Presented Methodology	234
8.8 Limitation and Future Scope	235
8.9 Summary	236
9. CONCLUSION AND FUTURE SCOPE	237
9.1 Major Finding	238

9.2	Applications	243
9.3	Future Scope	244
	REFERENCE	247
	AUTHOR DETAILS AND PUBLICATIONS	273
	APPENDIX A: ANNUAL AVERAGE WATER BUDGET OF BLOCKS IN THE STUDY AREA	275
	APPENDIX B: FITTED AQUIFER PARAMETERS AFTER PILOT POINT CALIBRATION	276
	APPENDIX C: CALIBRATED RIVER BED CONDUCTIVITIES WITH PSO	281
	APPENDIX D: DECADEAL VARIATIONS OF GSR FOR VRB	282
	APPENDIX E: COMPARISON OF GW DEMAND VS THE SURPLUS RUNOFF VOLUME (RUNOFF VOLUME ABOVE 25% EXCEEDANCE LIMIT)	286
	APPENDIX F: FORECASTED MONTHLY RAE FLUXES	291
	APPENDIX G: FITTED RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN AQUIFER AND WELL PARAMETERS AND PARR	303

List of Figures

Figure 1.1. The Impact of Rising Demand and Climate Change (A. The projected CO2 emissions Under different Socio-economic Pathways (SSPs) and B. The projected human population growth.)	5
Figure 1.2. MAR projects in the World (Source: https://ggis.un-igrac.org/view/marportal/)	9
Figure 1.3. The framework for suitable site selection of MAR to restore baseflow	10
Figure 3.1. Schematic flow chart for hydrological modeling with SWAT	35
Figure 3.2. Schematic flow chart for Calibration using SUFI-2	38
Figure 3.3. Representative elementary control volume of aquifer media	39
Figure 3.4. GW modeling steps	42
Figure 3.5. An eight-point cross-section is used to compute the depth, width, and wetted perimeter for a stream segment (Prudic et al., 2004)	48
Figure 3.6. Illustration of the Integration of SWAT outputs to MODFLOW. The SWAT outputs and their hydrological variables mapped to the MODFLOW Packages (and their input variables)	50
Figure 3.7. parameter calibration with pilot points in PEST	52
Figure 3.8. Parameter calibration of SFR2 with PSO	53
Figure 3.9. General ANN architecture and modeling process	54
Figure 3.10. Sample architecture of Random Forest and LSTM Model	57
Figure 3.11. The study area and model domains	59
Figure 3.12. The State of RAE in the Varuna River Basin	60
Figure 3.13. Photos during data collection	62
Figure 4.1. Methodology flow chart for the determination of HRU-scale GWS	70

Figure 4.2. Study Area with watershed boundaries and stream network (Top) and Lithology (Bottom). The reservoirs and the subbasins (used for set target ET for calibration) is presented as highlighted texts.	74
Figure 4.3. SWAT Model setup and average results for the simulation period of 14 years (2001-2014)	76
Figure 4.4. Scatter plot of observed and simulated values (ET (Sub ##)- Evapotranspiration (mm/month) for the given subbasin)	79
Figure 4.5. ANN Model used for downscaling.	82
Figure 4.6. Effect of the human interface on the natural GW cycle	85
Figure 4.7. Pearson's correlation between SWAT Parameter and GWS	87
Figure 4.8. Yearly mean values of HRU outputs	89
Figure 4.9. Training and testing accuracy of ANN Models (A1-A4. for downscaling of TWSA from GRACE to GLDAS, B1-B4. For downscaling GWS to HRUs)	90
Figure 4.10. (A1-B1) Normalized mean GWS at GLDAS and HRU scale respectively, (A2-B2) Standard deviation of GWS on GLDAS and HRU-scale respectively, and (A3-B3) monthly GWS trends for GLDAS and HRU scale respectively.	92
Figure 4.11. The monthly mean of downscaled GWS during 2001-2014 (The temporal variation of GWS for HRUs (1-4) and corresponding GWL observation has been presented along with the correlation coefficient (ρ) and monthly rainfall)	94
Figure 4.12. Predicted pre-monsoon (May) and post-monsoon (November) GW levels from 2000 to 2013.	96
Figure 4.13. The GSR values in the study area and the annual average SW and GW budget of some blocks (2001-2013). chart (ET- Evapotranspiration, AqRch- Net recharge to the aquifer, SURF_Q- Surface runoff to the streams, GWSA- GWS Anomalies (-ve means decrease), GWD- total GW extraction, GWdf- GW deficiency (-ve means blocks are	

losing more GW than recharged and vice-versa) and BL- Boundary leakage (+ve means that block has surplus GW and vice-versa)	97
Figure 5.1. R ² scores and RMSE across all scenarios of the LSTM model for bias correction of precipitation.	109
Figure 5.2. R ² scores across all scenarios of the RFR model for bias correction of temperature.	109
Figure 5.3. RMSE scores across all scenarios of the RFR model for bias correction of temperature	110
Figure 5.4. The projected climate variables in VRB (The data has been plotted as annual averages to create smooth plots. The precipitation data is 5-year average data, and temperature data are annual minimum or maximum.)	110
Figure 5.5. Modeled area and discharge measurement locations	111
Figure 5.6. SWAT Model of Lower Mid Ganga Basin	114
Figure 5.7. Scatter plot of observed vs. Simulated variables of the calibrated model (s#: the subbasin number corresponding to the discharge gaging sites, ETs##: subbasin numbers corresponding to the subbasins that have been calibrated with MODIS ET data)	116
Figure 5.8. Lithological characterization of the modeled area	117
Figure 5.9. Lithological fence diagram of the modelled area	118
Figure 5.10. Conceptual model of the VRB with boundary conditions	119
Figure 5.11. observed aquifer properties	121
Figure 5.12. Numerical Model of the study area	122
Figure 5.13. Integrated Model of VRB and GW system	123
Figure 5.14. River cross-section and velocity profile, along with the net loss and gain for each stream segment	125

Figure 5.15. Simulated vs. calibrated scatter plot for A. observed heads and B. observed stream flow	126
Figure 5.16. A. Boxplot of calibrated Hk values and B. Boxplot of calibrated Ss values	127
Figure 5.17. Precipitation anomalies under IPCC scenarios (Each plot highlights the mean annual precipitation anomaly (in millimeters) at the top and a heatmap representing the spatial distribution of anomalies across different locations and years at the bottom)	134
Figure 5.18. Mean maximum temperature anomalies under IPCC scenarios (Each plot highlights the mean annual maximum temperature anomaly (in C) at the top and a heatmap representing the spatial distribution of anomalies across different locations and years at the bottom)	137
Figure 5.19. Mean minimum temperature anomalies under IPCC scenarios (Each plot highlights the mean annual minimum temperature anomaly (in oC) at the top and a heatmap representing the spatial distribution of anomalies across different locations and years at the bottom)Impact of Climate Change on the Natural Recharge	140
Figure 5.20. A. Annual mean recharge rates and trends for all SSPs; B. Annual mean evapotranspiration rates and trends	142
Figure 5.21. decadal recharge hotspot dynamics among SSPs	145
Figure 5.22. Stacked bar chart of decadal variation in the GSR classes for IPCC scenarios in VRB	146
Figure 5.23. Example Flow Duration Curve and runoff flux corresponding to 25% exceedance limit	148
Figure 5.24. Stacked bar chart of decadal variation in the GSR classes for IPCC scenarios in VRB with MAR	149

Figure 5.25. Contour plot of RAE flux in VRB. The chainage has been taken from the lower-order reaches.	152
Figure 5.26. Variation of annual mean RAE in Varuna River per 20 years for all IPCC scenarios	153
Figure 5.27. Variation of annual mean RAE in Basuhi river per 20 years for all IPCC scenarios	155
Figure 5.28. Variation of annual mean RAE in Morwa river per 20 years for all IPCC scenarios	157
Figure 6.1. Plot of the change in stream flow due to an injection well with screen in Layer 1 (plot A) and Layer 3 (Plot C) as in Map B. Plot C has been enlarged to represent the different parts of the response curve.	165
Figure 6.2. The conceptual response curve of baseflow enhancement	168
Figure 6.3. BFER and BFER for the dry period in VRB	170
Figure 6.4. (A.) plot of stream response due to injection signals, (B.) scatter plot between capture fraction and BFER in VRB along with marginal histograms, (C.) The BFER in VRB plotted for each MODFLOW grid, and (B.) The capture fraction for Varuna River (plotted for each MODFLOW grid)	173
Figure 6.5. The spatial variation of initial response time (t_{ir}) and recession time (t_{res})	174
Figure 6.6. Marginal joint plots between BFER and (A.) Proximity to stream networks, (B.) the recession time (t_{res}), and (C.) the initial response time (t_{ir})	176
Figure 6.7. Marginal joint plots of BFER vs (A.) Storage coefficient (S_s) and (B.) Aquifer Transmissivity (T)	177
Figure 6.8. BFER Dynamics with respect to injection period (A) the BFER for each 5-year injection starting from the year 2021, (B) the cumulative BFER up to 30 years of injection.	178

Figure 7.1. The definition of PARR as per (A) the analytical solutions (modified from Sandilya et al. 2022) and (B) the real field scenario.	186
Figure 7.2. The determination of PARR with simulated heads (The linearity between h and Q for a given injection duration is shown in the figure on the left. The slope of the h vs Q curve depends on the injection duration.)	190
Figure 7.3. Flow chart for the calculation of PARR with MODFLOW simulation.	191
Figure 7.4. The local sensitivity of PARR with aquifer parameters in the (1) confined aquifer and (2) unconfined aquifer (A.linear plot between PARR and Hk; B. linear plot w.r.t Ss or Sy; C. linear plot w.r.t VANI and D. linear plot w.r.t HANI)	196
Figure 7.5. The variation of PARR w.r.t well characteristic in (1) confined aquifer and (2) Unconfined aquifer (A. w.r.t screen location (H_{sc}) (the location of the centroid of the screen is varied from bottom to the saturated thickness of the aquifer) B. w.r.t screen size (L_{sc}) and C. contour plot depicting the combined effect of screen size and location.)	199
Figure 7.6.1A-1B. Sobol Indices S1, ST, and S2 for PARR in the confined aquifer; 2A-2B. Sobol Indices S1, ST, and S2 for PARR in unconfined aquifer	202
Figure 7.7. (a) variation of PARR per unit recoverable head w.r.t injection duration and (b) The injected volume per unit recoverable head corresponding to the PARR.	204
Figure 7.8. PARR values in VRB for Layer 1 (Shallow aquifer)	207
Figure 7.9. PARR values for layer 3 (Deep aquifer)	208
Figure 8.1. Flow chart for the implementation of the TOPSIS method with relevant formulas at each step	213
Figure 8.2. land cost per m^2 in the study area	218
Figure 8.3. Source of water in VRB for MAR	220
Figure 8.4. Runoff corresponding to the 25% exceedance limit at each subbasin outlet	223

Figure 8.5. Flow chart for the ranking of MAR sites	228
Figure 8.6. Ranking of MAR sites in VRB for all the climate scenarios with surplus runoff as the water source (the histogram represents the distribution of MAR sites with relative closeness to the ideal solution (RCIS))	230
Figure 8.7. Ranking of MAR sites in VRB for all the climate scenarios with the canal as a water source (the histogram represents the distribution of MAR sites with relative closeness to the ideal solution (RCIS))	231
Figure 8.8. The boxplot of the Cost/baseflow enhancement percentage for each water source	232
Figure 8.9. 3D scatter plots with decision criteria, each scatter point represents a MAR site	233
Figure 8.10. Entropy weights for all the climate scenarios for A. runoff as the water source and B. canal diversion as the water source	234

List of Tables

Table 4.1. Summary of data used in the study.	72
Table 4.2. Reservoir properties (<i>Source: State Register of Large Dams, Irrigation and Water Resources Department, Uttar Pradesh</i>)	77
Table 4.3. Fitted SWAT Parameters with corresponding sensitivity rank (The method represents the modification performed to the HRU files in each iteration (Replace: Original values have been replaced, Relative: The original values have been multiplied by 1+r where r is the fitted value)	78
Table 4.4. ANN architecture and hyperparameters range (MSE: Mean Squared Error, relu: Rectified Linear Unit)	81
Table 5.1. GCM Models	106
Table 5.2. GCM Models accuracy w.r.t to IMD 2D Gridded data (the bolded font has been used to represent selected models)	107
Table 5.3. Soil properties as per FAO Classification (HYDGRP: Soil hydrologic group based on its infiltration characteristic, SOL_Z: Soil Depth in mm, SOL_BD: Soil Bulk Density, SOL_AWC: Available water content, SOL_K: Saturated hydraulic conductivity, SOL_CBN: Amount of organic carbon in the layer (%), CLAY: Percentage of clay, SILT: Percentage silt in soil, SAND: Sand percentage in soil, ROCK: Percentage of rock mass in soil, SOL_ALB: Moist soil albedo, USLE_K: USLE soil erodibility factor).	112
Table 5.4. SWAT Parameters and their calibrated values. The parameters have been arranged based on their sensitivity in the form of rank. The suffix for the parameters represents the method of changing values during calibration (A:- added by r, R:- multiplied by 1+r, V:- Replaced by r, while r is the fitted value)	115
Table 5.5. The LSTM hyperparameter range for inlet discharge prediction	128
Table 5.6. Accuracy statistics of RFR model used for stage determination (<i>cv-score</i> : - Cross-validation R2, <i>cv_std</i> : - Cross-validation standard deviation)	129

Table 7.1. Hypothetical model conceptualization	193
Table 8.1. Classification of potential sites for MAR	229