



EGU General Assembly 2020

1. Pilot site characterization



3. Groundwater flow modeling



Composite medium



Our results show that: (i) hydraulic head for all conceptual models are significantly affected by the uncertainty of k_3 and/or k_5 ,(ii) impact of k_2 and/or k_4 is negligible and (iii) impact of BCs depends on the model.

We find that the sensitivity measures considered convey different yet complementary information. The choice of the conceptual model employed to characterize the lithological reconstruction of the aquifer affects the degree of influence that uncertain parameters can have on modeling results.

Natural springs' protection and probabilistic risk assessment under uncertain conditions

Emanuela Bianchi Janetti, Monica Riva, Alberto Guadagnini

Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Politecnico di Milano, Piazza Leonardo da Vinci 32, 20133 Milano, Italy

CREMONA aquifer is a heavily exploited site in the alluvial Po plain (Northern Italy), its natural high-quality water springs are the main supply to agriculture and a key environmental driver.

The analysis of available sedimentological information allows identifying a set of 5 main geomaterials (facies/classes) which constitute the geological makeup of the system.

Facies volumetric fraction

Clay and silt 37%

- Sand 5%
- Gravel 33%
- Compact conglomerates 15% Fractured conglomerates 10%

Three-dimensional groundwater flow model under steady state regime.

The flow domain size is 23 km (E-W direction) \times 48 km (N-S direction) \times 475 m (depth). Each cell has dimension $100 \text{ m} \times 200 \text{ m} \times 5 \text{ m}.$

The diverse averaging strategies significantly affect the spatial distribution of Y.The domain is (on average) more permeable and less heterogeneous when the arithmetic rather than the geometric mean operator is employed.

Param
Pı
P ₂
P ₃
P ₄
P ₅
P ₆
P ₇

5. Global Sensitivity Analysis

Overlapping Continuum_A

 $S_{p_1,...,p_s} = \frac{V_{p_1,...,p_s}}{V[f]} \qquad S_{p_i}^T = S_{p_i} + \sum_j S_{p_i,p_j} + \sum_{j,k} S_{p_i,p_j,p_k} + \dots + S_{p_i,...,p_N}$ $\operatorname{AMAM}_{p_i} = \frac{1}{|M[f]|} \int_{\Gamma} |M[f] - M[f|p_i]| \rho_{\Gamma_{p_i}} dp_i$



2. Conceptual models

Composite Medium



Uncertain parameters are associated with (i) 5 hydraulic conductivities and (ii) 2 selected boundary conditions

na	ame	Description	Lower bound	Upper bound	Unit		40	
	k _l	Clay and silt conductivity	I 0 ⁻⁸	10-5	m/s	Fac		-
	k ₂	Fine and silty sand conductivity	I 0 ⁻⁷	I 0 ⁻⁴	m/s	cies c	30	
	k ₃	Gravel, sand and gravel conductivity	I 0 ⁻⁴	10-2	m/s	condu		30
	k ₄	Compact conglomerate conductivity	I 0 ⁻⁶	I 0 ⁻³	m/s	ıctivi	10	
	k ₅	Fractured conglomerate conductivity	10-3	I 0 ⁻¹	m/s	_ ty	10	- 34 35
	P6	Total flow rate from northern boundary	4.83	14.47	m³/s	B.C	0	
	P7	River stage	0.0	3.0	m			



What is the probability of spring discharge reduction due to increasing exploitation of the aquifer?

We evaluate this probability, stemming from the combination of the various sources of uncertainty illustrated above, through a Fault Tree Analyses.





[1] Morris, M.D., 1991. Factorial sampling plans for preliminary computational experiments. Technometrics 33, 161-174.; [2] Sobol, I. M., 2001. Global sensitivity indices for nonlinear mathematical models and their Monte Carlo estimates. Math. Comput. Simulat. 55(1-3), 271-280.; [3] Dell'Oca, A., Riva, M., Guadagnini, A., 2017. Moment-based metrics for global sensitivity analysis of hydrological systems. Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. 21, 6219-6234.; [4] Bianchi Janetti, E., Guadagnini, L., Riva, M., Guadagnini, A., 2019. Global sensitivity analyses of multiple conceptual models with uncertain parameters driving groundwater flow in a regional-scale sedimentary aquifer, J. Hydrol., 574, 544-556.





This document and its content is copyright of Emanuela Bianchi Janetti, 2020. All rights reserved.



We analyze the impact of the uncertainty in the conceptual model and model parameters on model outputs (hydraulic heads at 39 target wells) by way of three GSA methodologies: (a) derivative-based, (Morris) (b) variance-based (Sobol') (c) moment based (AMAM indices, Dell'Oca et al., 2017).

6. Probabilistic Risk Assessment

References