

CONTENTS

<i>Acknowledgments</i>	ix
Introduction	1
Part I. MAR in the United States	7
1 Trailblazers	9
2 Opportunities and Limits: The Case of the High Plains	17
3 Water Banking in Arizona	26
4 The Gila River Indian Community	41
5 California's San Joaquin Valley: Seeking the Road to Sustainability	50
6 Flood-MAR: The Devil is in the Details	69
7 Florida: Pacesetter for Aquifer Storage and Recovery	82
8 MAR in the Lone Star State	100
9 A Single Resource	112
10 MAR and the Environment	125
Part II. MAR Around the World	143
11 Day Zero and Beyond	145

viii CONTENTS

12	Africa and the Middle East	152
13	Australia	162
14	Europe	169
15	South Asia	183
16	Latin America	195
17	Trend Is Not Destiny	201
	<i>Notes</i>	205
	<i>Index</i>	251

Introduction

Oroville is the tallest dam in the United States, which means it impounds a lot of water. Unlike the stunning concrete colossus that is Hoover Dam, Oroville is an earthen dam that straddles the Feather River like a mountain. Constructing this super-sized dam required transporting 80 million cubic yards of material excavated from enormous piles of hydraulic mining debris—a legacy of the California Gold Rush.¹

Oroville Dam is just one piece of California's State Water Project. Considered one of the engineering Wonders of the World, the project involved more than 700 miles of canals, tunnels, and pipelines to move a river of water to Southern California and other areas of need.²

The biggest challenge was how to get all that water over the Tehachapi Mountains lying between the Central Valley and Southern California. The easiest and obvious solution was to tunnel it in, but that was too risky because of earthquake hazards. The only other solution was to go up and over, resulting in five water lifts. The last one, the highest single water lift in the world, vertically lifts water almost 2,000 feet. *All this* to correct, as Governor Pat Brown put it, “an accident of people and geography.”³

The linchpin of the entire State Water Project depends on Oroville Dam delivering the goods. In his 1968 dedication speech, Governor Ronald Reagan concluded, “I dedicate Oroville Dam and Lake Oroville to the people of California's future, who will benefit for the generations from this giant structure and the water that it impounds.”⁴ There was a tremendous sense of accomplishment on that sunny day in May so long ago. California finally had water security.

It worked. For a while.

For the first quarter century everything went according to plan. Except for a few years, the State Water Project (SWP) met 100 percent of the contractual

2 INTRODUCTION

allocations for municipal use.⁵ But in the early 1990s, recurring problems began. And it happened fast. Only twice in the past 25 years did the SWP meet 100 percent of their allocations—with about half of these years coming in at less than 50 percent. The past quarter century has been a wild ride from better, to worse, to a lot worse, to a little better. In 2021–22, water deliveries almost went belly-up at 5 percent two years in a row.⁶

In the early 2000s, state water managers talked about getting back to “normal” precipitation patterns. This was the transitional period when many hydrologists and climate scientists believed that significant impacts of climate change were out a half century or more. Scary, but at least comfortably in the future. It took them by surprise to realize that this was possibly more than just normal swings of regular old drought. It was suspiciously looking like all those climate change predictions.

Scientists weigh their words carefully. There have always been droughts, particularly in California with its drought-prone Mediterranean climate. Therefore, to jump to the conclusion that this was driven by climate change was not an easy call to make. Then came the Hot Drought.

In the summer of 2011, Lake Oroville was relatively flush with water. By August 2014, the reservoir was experiencing historic lows, with 82 percent of the state in *extreme* or *exceptional* drought conditions. Soil moisture was so low that 100 million trees died.⁷ Governor Jerry Brown declared a state of emergency that didn’t let up for another two years. As the name implies, the Hot Drought was unusually hot. This dual punch of soaring evaporation rates on reservoirs and significantly less mountain snowpack nearly brought the state to its knees.

Sierra snowpack is California’s water lifeline. It is often referred to as the state’s “frozen reservoir” due to its ability to store water and release it gradually throughout the spring and into summer, keeping reservoirs topped-up for the hot, dry, high-water-use months ahead. During the Hot Drought, the snowpack had not only sharply declined, but what there was of it was melting earlier and faster. This meant that reservoirs were filling up in a much more concentrated flood of meltwater, leaving dam operators with no choice but to release a significant amount of all that precious water. The term “snow drought” has entered the water management lexicon to refer to the increasingly common meager snowpacks in the American West. Both the amount of snow and the timing of snowmelt are of considerable concern in the face of climate change.

The drought finally broke in 2016. Then came the *weather whiplash*—also predicted in climate-change models. Over a period of six days in

February 2017, back-to-back atmospheric rivers pummeled the Feather River basin. Oroville Dam came close to failing, requiring the emergency evacuation of 180,000 people living downstream. The rain stopped just in time. Then during the summer of 2021, extreme drought once again gripped the state. Lake Oroville fell to a record 24 percent capacity.

California is not alone. Since 2000, the southwestern US has been experiencing an historic, extended drought, made more severe by the influence of human-caused climate change.⁸ We've all seen the pictures of the bathtub ring around Lake Mead. This gives you a picture of what's happening to the most critical reservoir for the Lower Colorado Basin states, but it doesn't convey the full scale of the problem like the story of St. Thomas does.

On a June morning in 1938, Hugh Lord was the last to leave. The other 500 or so residents of St. Thomas had accepted the fate of their town, along with the government buy-out, and moved on. But Hugh was a stubborn old codger. There was no way the federal government was going to push him out of the place where he'd lived his entire life. And on top of that, those government agents obviously didn't know what they were talking about. Hoover Dam was over *60 miles* away! There was no way on God's green earth the water would ever back up all the way to St. Thomas. And so, on a June morning in 1938, with water lapping over the top steps of his front porch, Hugh set fire to his house as a final act of defiance, then got in his boat and rowed away.⁹

The water kept rising until Lake Mead was 110 miles (180 kilometers) long and St. Thomas was submerged under 60 feet (18 meters) of water. Water levels fluctuated over the following years, several times declining enough to reveal the remains of the town, but the reservoir always recovered. In 2000, Lake Mead was near full capacity, and St. Thomas was once again deep under water.¹⁰

Then everything changed. The town began to reemerge steadily in 2002. Six years later, Las Vegas was so concerned about declining water levels in Lake Mead that the city began constructing its *third straw*—a 3-mile- (5-kilometer) long tunnel through solid rock tapping into the deepest part of the reservoir.¹¹ As the third straw became operational in 2015, St. Thomas was sitting on dry desert floor and has remained that way. If you didn't know better, you would never guess that just 15 years earlier this entire region was deep under water.

The glory days of surface water storage are behind us. Periods of unusually low storage in reservoirs are becoming longer and more severe in the face of

climate change.¹² On a global level, communities and governments are increasingly turning to intentionally recharging aquifers as an alternative approach—a practice known as managed aquifer recharge or MAR.¹³

Managed aquifer recharge captures available water during wet periods, times of low demand, or water that would otherwise be lost, and moves this water underground for later recovery or other benefits. MAR is part of the solution to a host of issues—water shortages, emergency supply, groundwater depletion, land subsidence, seawater intrusion, water quality degradation, streamflow depletion, and endangered groundwater-dependent ecosystems, among others.

Managed aquifer recharge has several advantages compared with dams. Among these are lower capital costs, reduced evaporation losses, and location in proximity to areas with high water demands. A key advantage is that MAR projects are scalable, allowing for staged implementation—often starting as smaller pilot or demonstration projects.¹⁴

Approaches to MAR can be grouped into five categories:

Water spreading uses spreading basins, ponds, and constructed or natural wetlands to recharge an unconfined aquifer.

Recharge wells are commonly used in situations where the target aquifer is deep, confined, or overlain by low permeability layers. It is also practical where economy of space is an important consideration, such as in urban areas.

Bank filtration involves pumping groundwater from aquifers that are hydraulically connected to rivers or lakes. The pumping induces seepage from the surface water body into the aquifer and provides filtration of the water as it flows to the water supply well.

Streambed channel modifications use low technology surface and subsurface impoundments to capture or slow down runoff, which infiltrates through the bed and is extracted down-valley.

Small-scale options recharge aquifers through collection tanks, drywells, or sand filters. A common approach is rainwater harvesting from roof drainage.

A successful MAR project requires several features. Foremost is sufficient demand for recovered water at a cost that can support the project. Other requirements are a source of water for recharge of adequate quality and quantity, a suitable aquifer in which to store and recover the water, sufficient land to harvest and treat water, and the capability to effectively manage the project.¹⁵

These basic requirements seem simple in concept, but in practice they can be challenging and raise key questions. What are the effects of harvesting

water for MAR on downstream flows and environmental conditions? Are we simply robbing Peter to pay Paul? How will climate change affect the sources of water for MAR? Will the enhanced recharge introduce contaminants into groundwater? What are the effects of mixing the recharged water with the ambient groundwater? Who has rights to the water once underground? Can these rights be transferred? How can those who recharge the water be assured of the ability to recover it? What are the possible unintended consequences? We explore these and other questions in a wide variety of settings to enhance understanding of the various approaches to managed aquifer recharge. As a recent review noted, applications of MAR face both growing prospects and growing pains.¹⁶ We examine both.

There's nothing new about intentionally recharging aquifers. As far back as the Warring States period (circa 475–221 BCE), the Chinese dug channels to facilitate the infiltration of surface water into the ground.¹⁷ What is different today is the increasing use, scale, and variety of it.¹⁸

The growth potential for water storage now lies largely underground.

INDEX

Note: Figures are indicated by an italic *f* following the page number.

- acequias de careo*, 178
- Active Management Areas (AMAs), 28–29, 30*f*, 36–37
- African National Congress, 146
- airborne electromagnetic (AEM) method, 75–77, 76*f*
- Akimel O’otham people, 41
- alfalfa crops, effects of MAR on, 127–28
- algal blooms, 14, 132–33
- American Water Works Association, 55
- Amsterdam Dune Water Machine, 173–74
- ancient canal systems, 178
- Antioch Cave, 108–9
- Apalachicola-Chattahoochee- Flint (ACF) river basin, 98
- aquifers: Cape Flats, 149–50; Eastern Snake Plain Aquifer, 112–16; Edwards Aquifer, 100–105, 102*f*, 108; *Equus* Beds aquifer, 21–23; Floridan aquifer, 83, 85–86, 94–99; Hueco Bolson, 106; Israeli Coastal Aquifer, 159; Potomac Aquifer, 133, 135–36. *See also* High Plains aquifer
- Aquifer Storage and Recovery (ASR): in Arizona, 39; arsenic and, 85–90, 94–99; buffer zone, 83–84, 84*f*; *Equus* Beds aquifer, 21–23; Everglades, 90–97, 91*f*; in Florida, 82–99; in Georgia, 97–99; mercury and, 94–95; Peace River, 89–90; regulatory issues, 86–89; in South Carolina, 97–99; target storage volume, 83–84, 84*f*
- Arizona Department of Environmental Quality, 32–33
- Arizona Department of Water Resources, 32–33, 36, 45
- Arizona v. California* (1963), 30, 43–44
- Arizona Water Banking Authority (AWBA), 34–35, 37, 47
- Arizona Water Resources Research Center, 30*f*, 45
- Arizona Water Settlements Act, 44
- arsenic: Bangladesh, 191–92; *Equus* Beds aquifer, 22; Florida, 85–90, 94, 96–97, 99; Ganges Basin, 185, 189
- Arthur, Jonathan, 86
- Arvin-Edison Water Storage District, 63–64
- Assured Water Supply, 29, 36–38
- Atlantic Ocean, 12, 92, 152–53
- Atlantis, South Africa, 147–49
- atmospheric rivers, 2–3, 73–74, 77–78, 81
- Atomic Energy Commission (AEC), 15–16
- Atotonilco Wastewater Treatment Plant, 199
- attenuation, natural, 97, 99
- attenuation zone, 163
- Australian Centre for International Agricultural Research, 187
- Australian MAR: agricultural applications, 167–68; introduction to, 162–63; mining applications, 166–67; in Perth, 165–66; stormwater harvesting, 163–65

- Babbitt, Bruce, 28–29
 Bachand, Philip, 69
 bacteria, 11, 27, 92–99, 108, 122–23, 148, 159
 bank filtration: defined, 4, 22, 170; in
 Europe, 169–73, 182; in India, 189–90;
 in Mississippi Delta, 122; in Russian
 River, 119–21, 124
 Banks, Harvey O., 54
 Barraginhas dams, 196–97
 basalts, 9, 112, 137, 185–86, 199
 basins: Apalachicola-Chattahoochee- Flint
 (ACF) river basin, 98; Bunker Hill Basin,
 9; closed-basin wetlands, 19; Colorado
 River Basin, 34, 36, 40; groundwater,
 10–12, 56, 60–65, 75, 79–80, 117, 121,
 140; Indo-Gangetic Basin, 185; Indus
 River basin, 193; infiltration, 27–28, 32,
 154, 177; Kern County Subbasin, 65–67;
 Los Angeles Basin, 10; Lower Colorado
 Basin, 3; Murray-Darling Basin, 167–68;
 San Gabriel Basin, 10; spreading basins,
 19, 33
 beaver dams, 127
 Bedke, Scott, 114
 beneficial use, 29, 37, 44–45, 65, 71, 108,
 112, 126, 133
 Ben-Gurion, David, 157
 Bhujal Jankaars (BJs), 187
 Bouwer, Herman, 27–28, 39
 Brazilian MAR, 195–97
 Brown, Jerry, 2, 64
 Brown, Pat, 1
 Brunton, Lucius D., III, 103
 Buena Vista Water Storage District, 62
 buffer zone, 83–84, 84f
 Bunker Hill Basin, 9
 Bureau of Reclamation, 20–21, 48, 50,
 53–57, 63, 112
 Bush, George H. W., 56
 Bush, George W., 93
 CALFED, 57
 California Department of Water Resources
 (DWR), 59–60, 72–73, 117, 128
 California Environmental Quality Act, 59
 California MAR: beginnings of, 9–12;
 drought in, 2; Fresno, 55; Los Angeles,
 9–12, 52–53, 77, 119–21, 124, 169; Pajaro
 Valley net metering, 117–19, 124; Scott
 Valley groundwater pumping, 125–26.
 See also Flood-MAR; San Joaquin Valley
 California Water Code, 71
 California Wild and Scenic Rivers Act, 59
 Cameron, Don, 69–70, 72
 Cape Fear Public Utility Authority
 (CFPUA), 138–40
 Cape Flats aquifer, 149–50
 Cape Town, South Africa MAR: Atlantis,
 147–49; Cape Flats aquifer, 149–50;
 incidental recharge and, 150–51;
 introduction to, 145–47
 carbamazepine, 173
 Center for Western Weather and Water
 Extremes, 78
 Central Arizona Groundwater Replenish-
 ment District (CAGRD), 36, 48
 Central Arizona Project (CAP), 31–40,
 44–49
 Central Arizona Water Conservation
 District, 34
 Central Valley Project (CVP), 50–54, 58
 Central Valley Project Improvement Act
 (CVPPIA), 56
 cesspools, 13, 14
 channels: aquifer recharging through, 108;
 bioswales and, 123; Chinese digging of,
 5; eskers and, 179; flooded ephemeral
 channels, 154; gravel channels, 119; into
 hand-dug wells, 186; infiltration
 channels, 177–78; open, 52; paleochan-
 nels, 153; river channels, 46, 53–54, 79,
 92; salinity base flow and, 148;
 streambed channel modifications, 4;
 stream channels, 32, 131–32
 check dams, 186–88, 196
 Chesapeake Bay, 132–36
 chlorination, 11, 33, 89, 97, 104, 120, 124,
 134, 172–74, 182, 190

- climate change: Australia and, 162;
Colorado River and, 35; Flood-MAR
coalition and, 73; Florida and, 97;
introduction to, 2–5, 35, 52–53, 67, 73,
97, 107, 110, 154, 157, 162, 178, 195–97;
Israel and, 157; Latin America and, 195,
197; San Joaquin Valley and, 52–53, 67;
South Africa and, 154; Spain and, 178;
Texas and, 107, 110
- coastal plains, 9, 12, 85
- Cochise Conservation and Recharge
Network (CCRN), 131–32
- collection tanks, 4, 192
- Colorado River: Gila River Indian
Community and, 41, 43, 47–48;
imported water from, 10; water banking
in Arizona, 29–31, 34–37, 39–40
- Colorado River Basin, 34, 36, 40
- Columbia River, 15, 112
- Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial
Research Organisation (CSIRO), 168
- Comprehensive Everglades Restoration
Plan (CERP), 93–97
- contamination: carbamazepine, 173; fecal,
191; GenX chemical, 139–40; groundwa-
ter, 12–13, 64, 122–24, 123*f*, 139;
nitrogen pollution, 14, 94, 109, 127, 132,
159; 1,2,3-trichloropropane, 64; per-and
polyfluoroalkyl substances, 80, 97, 123,
135, 138–42; stormwater, 108
- dams: Barraginhas, 196–97; by beavers,
127; check dams, 186–88, 196;
floodwater capture, 10; Friant Dam,
53–54; Grand Coulee Dam, 15; Granite
Reef Diversion Dam, 27–28; High Grand
Falls Dam, 155–56; Hoover Dam, 1, 3;
Oroville Dam, 1–3, 52, 63, 72; Prado
Dam, 79; sand dams, 155–56, 161, 196;
underground dam, 195–96, 202*f*
- data centers, 136–38
- D'Aubuisson, Jean Francois, 169
- Day Zero, 145–47, 149
- Delta Conveyance Project, 53
- Delta-Mendota Canal, 52
- deoxygenation, 88, 96
- desalination, 99, 104, 107, 110, 140, 146,
150–51, 154–57, 160, 164–66, 199, 203
- direct potable reuse, 39, 107, 150, 152–53
- Division of Water Resources (DWR), 22
- Douglas, Marjory Stoneman, 90
- drought: in Brazil, 195; in California, 2; Hot
Drought, 2–3; in India, 183; Millennium
Drought, 164, 167–68; in San Joaquin
Valley, 73; snow drought, 2
- Drought Contingency Plan (DCP), 47–48
- drywells, 4, 38–39, 122–24, 123*f*, 131
- dune filtration, 202*f*; Atlantis and, 148;
Bouwer, Herman and, 27–28; Nether-
lands, The, 173–74
- Dutch MAR, 173–74
- East African MAR, 155–56
- Eastern Snake Plain Aquifer (ESPA),
112–16
- Edward C. Little Water Recycling
Facility, 11
- Edwards Aquifer, 100–105, 102*f*, 108
- electrical resistivity, 75, 77, 119, 196
- El Niño weather pattern, 72
- El Paso water recycling, 106–7
- Endangered Species Act, 103
- environmental interests: Chesapeake Bay,
132–36; data centers, 136–38; GenX
chemical, 139–40; geothermal systems,
138; San Pedro River, 129–32; Scott
Valley groundwater pumping, 125–29;
water positive goals, 137–38; wet-dry
mapping and, 130–32
- Environmental Law Foundation, 126
- Equus* Beds aquifer, 21–23
- European MAR: bank filtration and,
170–73, 182; Finland, 179–82; France,
174–75; Germany, 171–73; infiltration
galleries and, 9, 169; introduction to,
169–71; Netherlands, The, 173–74;
Spain, 175–78; sprinkling infiltration
and, 180–81; Switzerland, 174–75

- evaporation, 2, 4, 46, 49, 155–56, 160, 166, 179, 191
- evapotranspiration (ET), 74–75, 150
- Everglades: River of Grass, The* (Douglas), 90
- Everglades Agricultural Area (EAA) Reservoir, 94
- facility permit, 32–33
- Finnish MAR, 179–82
- FIRO. *See* forecast-informed reservoir operations
- Flood-MAR: airborne electromagnetic (AEM) method, 75–77, 76f; evapotranspiration and, 74–75; introduction to, 69–72; statewide coalition, 72–75; sweet spots in, 75–77
- floods/flooding: dams and, 10; flash flooding, 108; of meltwater, 2; porous limestone to control, 9
- Florida Aquifer Storage and Recovery (ASR), 82–97
- Florida Department of Environmental Protection (DEP), 88, 96
- Florida Geological Survey, 85
- Floridan aquifer, 83, 85–86, 94–99
- flowmeters, 24
- Forbes* magazine, 61
- forecast-informed reservoir operations (FIRO), 68, 78–79, 81
- French MAR, 174–75
- Fresno, 55
- Fresno Irrigation District, 55
- Fresno Metropolitan Flood Control District, 55
- Friant Dam, 53–54
- Friant-Kern Canal, 54, 63
- Gangetic Plain, India, 189–90
- GenX chemical, 139–40
- Georgia Aquifer Storage and Recovery (ASR), 97–99
- geothermal systems, 138
- German MAR, 171–73
- Gila River Indian Community: brief history, 41–44; Central Arizona Project (CAP) and, 44–49; Colorado River and, 41, 43, 47–48; Drought Contingency Plan and, 47–48; Grijalva, Raúl M. and, 48; importance of, 49; Lewis, Rodney “Rod” B. and, 43–44; MAR and, 46–47; Maricopa people, 41; Pima-Maricopa Irrigation Project, 46; Pima people, 41
- Gila River Water Storage, LLC, 45
- glacial plains, 12, 14, 171
- Goleta Water District, 83
- Gore, Al, 93
- Grand Coulee Dam, 15
- Granite Reef Diversion Dam, 27–28
- granular activated carbon (GAC), 141
- Gravity Recovery and Climate Experiment (GRACE), 193
- Green Revolution, 183
- Grevatt, Peter, 88
- Grijalva, Raúl M., 48
- groundwater: basins, 10–12, 56, 60–65, 75, 79–80, 117, 121, 140; beneficial use of, 29, 37, 44–45, 65, 71, 108, 112, 126, 133; changes in levels, 112–13; contamination, 12–13, 64, 122–24, 123f, 139; depletion, 4, 17–18, 55, 184; irrigation, 17–18, 183–84, 190; Long Island reliance on, 12–14; Los Angeles reliance on, 9–10; native, 33, 84, 106, 134; overdrafting, 10, 26, 52, 56, 64–66, 69–73, 117–18, 176, 190; overextraction, 199; for public supply, 13, 99; pumping of, 4, 13, 14, 58, 125, 138, 185; replenishment, 10, 36, 48, 59, 79–80, 140, 165; saltwater intrusion, 10, 13, 52, 98–99, 102, 133, 190; storage, 37, 44–45, 50, 60–62, 64, 153–54, 193, 195, 201
- Groundwater Conservation Districts (GCDs), 105–6
- groundwater-dependent ecosystems, 4, 126, 129, 142, 163, 167
- Groundwater Management Act, 28–29, 35–36

- Groundwater Recharge Master Plan, 188–89
- Groundwater Replenishment System (GWRS), 80, 140–41
- groundwater savings facility (GSF), 32, 34, 37
- groundwater sustainability agencies (GSAs), 65–66, 74
- Guadalupe River, 101, 107–8

- Habitat Conservation Plan, 105
- haloacetic acids, 89
- Hampton Roads Sanitation District (HRSD), 132–36
- Henifin, Ted, 132
- Henry, Lois, 61
- High Grand Falls Dam, 155–56
- High Plains aquifer: High Plains Artificial Recharge Project, 18–20; High Plains States Groundwater Demonstration Program Act, 20–21; introduction to, 17–18; in Kansas, 21–25; playas, 19–20; Southern High Plains, 17–19, 25, 203; in Texas, 17–21
- Hoover Dam, 1, 3
- Hot Drought, 2–3
- H2Oaks Center, 104–5, 110
- Hueco Bolson aquifer, 106
- Huffman, Jared, 78
- hydraulic barrier, 11

- Idaho Department of Water Resources, 115, 116
- Idaho Water Resource Board (IWRB), 113–16
- incidental recharge, 112, 150–51
- Indian MAR: in Bangladesh, 190–92; bank filtration and, 189–90; check dams and, 186–88, 196; Gangetic Plain, 189–90; Groundwater Recharge Master Plan, 188–89; Indus River basin, 193; introduction to, 183–85; Saurashtra region, 186–87
- Indian Self-Governance Act, 46
- indirect potable reuse, 106, 136
- Indo-Gangetic Basin, 185
- Indo-German Competence Centre for Riverbank Filtration, 190
- Indus River basin, 193
- infiltration basins, 27–28, 32, 154, 177. *See also* spreading basins
- infiltration galleries, 9, 169
- infiltration ponds, 120–21, 154, 173–74, 177, 196–97
- injection wells, 10–11, 14, 19, 32, 38, 46, 79–80, 87, 106, 108, 114, 134, 138, 140, 199
- International Symposium on Managed Aquifer Recharge (ISMAR10), 204
- International Water Management Institute, 154
- Irvine Ranch Company, 9
- Irvine Ranch Water District (IRWD), 62
- Israeli Coastal Aquifer, 159
- Israel MAR, 157–59
- Israel Water Authority, 157

- Jevons, William Stanley, 24
- Jevons Paradox, 24

- Kansas Department of Agriculture, 22
- Kansas Geological Survey, 24
- karst terrain, 100–101, 108
- Kenyan MAR, 155–56
- Kern County, 58–63
- Kern County Subbasin, 65–67
- Kern Fan Groundwater Storage Project, 62
- Kern Water Bank, 59–61
- Kerrville ASR, 83, 107–8
- Kings River, 55, 69–71, 71f
- Kuwaiti MAR, 160

- Lake Mead, 3, 34, 48
- Lake Mendocino, 77–78
- Lake Okeechobee Watershed Restoration Project (LOWRP), 96
- Lake Sonoma, 77
- land subsidence, 4, 12, 36, 50, 53–54, 65–66, 133, 190, 198

- Latin American MAR: Brazil, 195–97;
Mexico, 197–200
- Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, 120
- levees, 52–53, 92
- Lewis, Rodney “Rod” B., 43–44
- Limited Test Ban Treaty, 16
- Livermore Radiation Laboratory, 16
- Llamas, Manuel Ramón, 176
- Local Enhanced Management Areas
(LEMAs), 24
- Long Island MAR, 12–14
- long-term storage credits (LTSCs), 32,
34–35, 38–39, 45–46, 104, 201
- Los Angeles Basin, 10
- Los Angeles County Sanitation
District, 12
- Los Angeles MAR, 9–12
- Lott, Trent, 20–21
- Lower Colorado Basin, 3, 34
- Madera Canal, 54
- Madera Ranch, 56–58
- managed aquifer recharge (MAR):
advantages, 4; in Arizona, 32–33; basic
requirements, 4–5; common objectives,
201–4; defined, 4; dune filtration, 202*f*;
incidental recharge, 112, 150–51;
infiltration galleries, 9, 169; infiltration
ponds, 120–21, 154, 173–74, 177,
196–97; in Long Island, 12–14; original
purpose of, 46; in Pacific Northwest, 15;
rainwater harvesting, 4, 185, 188, 191–92,
202*f*; recharge wells, 4, 10, 13, 39, 84–87,
122, 134–36, 203; sand dams, 155–56,
161, 196; sand filters, 4, 192; soil aquifer
treatment, 27–28, 39, 158–59, 174, 182,
201; in Southern California, 9–12; types
of, 202*f*; underground dam, 202*f*; water
spreading, 4, 9, 27, 158; World War II,
14–16. *See also* bank filtration
- Managed Aquifer Recharge through
Village-level Interventions (MARVI),
187–88
- Megdal, Sharon, 45, 49
- Metropolitan Water District of Southern
California, 12, 63
- Mexican MAR, 197–200
- Mid-Kaweah Groundwater Sustainability
Agency (Mid-Kaweah GSA), 74
- Millennium Drought, 164, 167–68
- mining applications for MAR, 166–67
- Mississippi Delta, 121–22, 121–22, 124
- Mississippi River, 18
- monitoring wells, 11, 87, 90, 99, 134–35, 163
- Mono Lake, 126
- Monterey Agreement, 60–61
- Murray-Darling Basin, 167–68
- Nader, Ralph, 93
- Namibian MAR, 152–54
- National Academies of Sciences, Engineer-
ing, and Medicine, 97
- National Groundwater Recharge Demon-
stration Program Act, 20–21
- National Marine Fisheries Service, 121
- National Research Council, 95
- National Water Carrier, 157
- National Water Commission (CONA-
GUA), 200
- National Water Quality Management
Strategy, 162
- National Water Research Institute
(NWRI), 135
- natural filtration, 27, 119, 169, 173
- Natural Resource Conservation District, 131
- Natural Resources Conservation Service, 69
- Nature Conservancy, The, 131–32
- Netherlands, The, 27–28, 85, 173–74
- net metering, 117–19, 124
- Newsom, Gavin, 53
- nitrogen pollution, 14, 94, 109, 127, 132, 159
- Nixon, Richard, 102
- NOMs (Norma Oficial Mexicana)
standards, 200
- observation wells, 11, 158
- Omaruru Delta (OMDEL) project, 153–54
- Onion Creek aquifer recharge, 108–9

- Opie, John, 17
- Orange County Water District (OCWD),
11–12, 79–80, 106, 140–42
- Oroville Dam, 1–3, 52, 63, 72
- overdrafting, 10, 26, 52, 56, 64–66, 69–73,
117–18, 176, 190
- oxidation-reduction (redox) processes,
86, 88
- Pacific Northwest MAR, 15
- Pajaro Valley net metering, 117–19, 124
- Pajaro Valley Water Management Agency,
117–18
- pathogens, 27–28, 90, 99, 119, 135, 142,
162–65, 170, 174, 189, 192, 199, 203
- Peace River, 89–90
- per-and polyfluoroalkyl substances
(PFAS), 80, 97, 123, 135, 138–42
- Perret, Heber, 56–57
- Pima-Maricopa Irrigation Project
(P-MIP), 46
- playas, 19–20
- Plowshare Program, 15–16
- Potomac Aquifer, 133, 135–36
- Prado Dam, 79
- Public Policy Institute of California, 74
- Pyne, David, 82–83, 87, 165
- rainwater harvesting, 4, 185, 188, 191–92,
199, 202*f*
- Ralph, Marty, 78
- Ranney, Leo, 120
- Reagan, Ronald, 1, 59
- Recharge Development Corporation, 115
- recharge net metering, 117–19, 124
- recharge ponds, 9, 61, 79–80
- recharge wells, 4, 10, 13, 39, 84, 86–87, 122,
134–36, 153, 203
- recycled wastewater, 158, 165–66, 199
- Reisner, Marc, 56–57
- Resnick, Lynda, 60–61
- Resnick, Stewart, 60–61
- reverse osmosis, 11, 99, 134, 140–42,
159, 166
- Rio Grande, 106
- riverbank filtration. *See* bank filtration
- Riverhead Sewage Treatment Plant, 14
- roof drainage, 4, 188, 191–92
- Rook, Johannes J., 174
- Rosedale-Rio Bravo Water Storage District,
62–63
- rule of capture, 105–6, 109, 111
- runoffs: acequias for catching, 178;
channeling of, 186; dams and, 187, 196;
rainfall runoff, 193; recharging of, 9, 55;
of snowmelt, 68, 70; stormwater runoff,
14, 107–8, 119, 122–24, 131–32, 141, 148,
164, 187; streambed channel modifica-
tions, 4; surface runoff, 150, 154
- Russian River, 77, 119–21, 124, 169
- Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta, 52–53
- Safe Drinking Water Act, 86–87
- Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Commu-
nity, 28
- Salt River Project, 26–28, 45
- saltwater intrusion, 10, 13, 52, 98–99, 102,
133, 190
- San Antonio ASR system, 104–6
- San Antonio Water System (SAWS), 104–6
- sand dams, 155–56, 161, 196
- sand filters, 4, 192
- San Gabriel Basin, 10
- San Joaquin River Restoration Program, 54
- San Joaquin Valley: Arvin-Edison Water
Storage District, 63–64; drought in, 73;
Fresno and, 55; Kern County and,
58–63; Kern County Subbasin, 65–67;
Kern Water Bank and, 59–61; Kings
River, 55, 69–71, 71*f*; Madera Ranch
and, 56–58; overview of, 50–54;
Rosedale-Rio Bravo Water Storage
District, 62–63; Sustainable Groundwater
Management Act and, 64–68, 72–75
- San Pedro River, 129–32
- Santiago Creek, 9
- Saudi Arabian MAR, 160
- Scottsdale Water Campus, 38–39

- Scott Valley groundwater pumping, 125–29
 Scott Valley Irrigation District, 127
 Scripps Institution of Oceanography, 78
 seismicity, 136
 Self-Help Enterprises, 67
 septic tanks, 13, 14
 sewer systems, 13–14, 140–41, 198
 Shafdan system, 159
 Shah, Tushaar, 189
 Sheridan 6 LEMA project, 24–25
 Sierra Club, 103
 Snake River, 9, 112–14, 113*f*
 snow drought, 2
 snowpack, 2, 78, 114
 soil aquifer treatment (SAT), 27–28, 39, 158–59, 158–59, 174, 182, 201
 soil-moisture sensors, 24–25
 Sonoma Water, 119–20
 South African MAR: Cape Town, 145–50; Namibia, 152–54; Omaruru Delta (OMDEL) project, 153–54
 South Carolina Aquifer Storage and Recovery (ASR), 97–99
 Southern California MAR, 9–12
 Southern High Plains, 17–19, 25, 203
 South Florida Water Management District, 96, 97
 South Platte River, 9
 Spanish MAR, 175–78
 sponge city, 172
 spreading basins, 4, 10, 13–15, 19, 27, 33, 35, 38–39, 46, 58, 63, 79, 106, 114, 122, 124, 131, 140–41, 171–72, 180, 182, 203
 sprinkling infiltration, 180–81
 St. Thomas, Nevada, 3
 State Water Project (SWP), 1–2, 52, 54, 58, 59
 State Water Resources Control Board, 66, 128–29
 stormwater: capture, 10, 55, 65, 119, 121; contaminated, 108; diverting of, 10; harvesting, 163–65, 167, 203; runoff, 14, 107–8, 119, 122–24, 131–32, 141, 148, 164, 187
 streamflow, 4, 78, 125–30, 165
 Sustainable Conservation, 72
 Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA), 64–68, 72–75, 117, 126, 128
 Sustainable Water Initiative for Tomorrow (SWIFT), 133–36
 Swiss MAR, 174–75
 target storage volume, 83–84, 84*f*
 TecH2O Water Resources Learning Center, 107
 Terranova Ranch, 69, 71*f*, 72
 tertiary treated water, 14, 38, 48
 Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ), 109
 Texas MAR: Edwards Aquifer, 100–105, 102*f*, 108; El Paso water recycling, 106–7; future of, 109–11; groundwater law, 105–6; introduction to, 100–103, 102*f*; karst terrain, 100–101, 108; Kerrville ASR, 107–8; Onion Creek ASR, 108–9; rule of capture, 105–6, 109, 111; San Antonio ASR system, 104–5
 Texas Water Development Board, 20
 Texas Water Plan, 17–18
 Thiem, Adolf, 171
 Trans-Texas Canal, 18
 1,2,3-trichloropropane (TCP), 64
 trihalomethanes, 89, 174
 tube wells, 191
 Tulare Irrigation District, 74–75
 tunnels/tunneling, 1, 3, 13, 53
 underground dam, 195–96, 202*f*
 Underground Injection Control (UIC) program, 86–88, 96, 124, 135
 underground reservoirs, 15, 54
 underground storage facilities (USFs), 32
 Underground Transfer (Taming) of Floods for Irrigation (UTFI), 190
 United Arab Emirates MAR, 160
 US Army Corps of Engineers, 15, 25, 49, 77–79, 93

- US Bureau of Reclamation. *See* Bureau of Reclamation
- US Department of Agriculture, 122
- US Department of Justice, 43
- US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), 86, 88
- US Fish and Wildlife Service, 103, 104
- US Geological Survey (USGS), 14, 18, 46, 82, 120, 129–30
- US Supreme Court, 43
- UV radiation, 95

- vadose zone, 27, 39, 122–23, 123*f*

- wastewater: recycled, 158, 165–66, 199; treating of, 38–40; treatment plants, 10–11, 28, 38, 148, 158–59, 165, 172, 199; water banking in Arizona and, 38–40
- water banking in Arizona: Arizona Water Banking Authority, 34–35; Bouwer, Herman and, 27–28, 39; Central Arizona Project (CAP), 31–40; challenges with, 35–37; Colorado River and, 29–31, 34–37, 39–40; future shortage concerns, 37–38; Groundwater Management Act, 28–29, 35–36; introduction to, 26; MAR framework in, 32–33; Salt River Project, 26–28, 45; spreading basins, 33; treated wastewater and, 38–40
- Water Corporation of Western Australia, 165
- Water Replenishment District of Southern California (WRD), 10
- water shortages, 4, 57, 116, 149, 152, 195–200
- water spreading, 4, 9, 27, 158. *See also* spreading basins
- wellfields, 21–23, 82–83, 89, 105, 109, 136, 148
- wells: agricultural, 24; deep well water, 11; downgradient, 106, 165–66; to drain wetlands, 9; drywells, 4, 38–39, 122–24, 123*f*, 131; flowmeters on, 24; injection, 10–11, 14, 19, 32, 38, 46, 79–80, 87, 106, 108, 114, 134, 138, 140, 199; irrigation, 21, 121–22, 131; monitoring, 11, 87, 90, 99, 134–35, 163; observation, 11, 158; recharge wells, 4, 10, 13, 39, 84, 86–87, 122, 134–36, 153, 203; recovery well permit, 33; residential, 50; tube, 191
- wet-dry mapping, 130–32
- Wheeler Ridge-Maricopa Water Storage District, 59
- Whittier Narrows Water Reclamation Plant, 10
- Wichita, Kansas, 21–23
- Wildermuth, Ron, 80
- Wilson, Pete, 56
- Winter, Henry, 43
- World Health Organization (WHO), 145–46
- World War II, 14–16