DOI: 10.48308/ijce.2025.105775

Interdisciplinary Journal of Civil Engineering Shahid Beheshti University

Design and Analysis of Riverbank Filtration Systems Using Linear Systems Response Functions

Authorities:

Saeed Alimohammadi¹, Masoumeh Behrouz²

1. Associate Professor of Civil Engineering, Civil, Water and Environmental Engineering Faculty, Shahid Beheshti University, P.O.Box: 16765-1719, Zip Code: 1658953571, Bahar Blvd., Hakimieh, Tehran, Iran.

2. Assistant Professor of Civil Engineering, Civil, Water and Environmental Engineering Faculty, Shahid Beheshti University, P.O.Box: 16765-1719, Zip Code: 1658953571, Bahar Blvd., Hakimieh, Tehran, Iran.

*Corresponding Author: s_alimohammadi@sbu.ac.ir

Abstract

Riverbank filtration systems offer a useful and reliable method for meeting domestic and industrial demands. In these systems, some wells are constructed in the bank of a river, where the water that flows across porous media into them has a very low pollutant level compared to the river. This study develops a cost-effective optimization model with the objective of minimizing total cost. A simulation model for analyzing these systems is developed as well. In these models, the analytic solutions of the groundwater flow equations and pollutant transport are used. Using the concept of response functions of linear systems, these solutions are generalized in the case of variable pumping. In common RBF systems, the unit pulse response function of drawdown is independent of wells location, and the transient flow equation reaches pseudo steady-state conditions. Two hypothetical example problems are presented, in the first, the design of a system is considered for meeting a given demand. The model solutions give the distance of wells' alignment from river, distance between wells, and wells' pumping rates. The model also outputs the pollutant concentration in the wells. The results of the steady optimization problem reveal that unexpectedly the central well's discharge is greater than the side wells' discharges. The resulting pumping, conveyance, and treatment costs showed that all these three cost terms are important. The sensitivity analysis revealed that all four considered parameters are sensitive with the sensitivity ranking of: T(transmissivity), λ (decay rate), θ (porosity), and R_d (retardation factor). In the second problem, an existing RBF system was analyzed by a simulation model and the variations of the well's concentration were assessed by altering the four sensitive parameters. The proposed models are useful tools for primary design and analysis of RBF systems and assessing the effects of changing parameters in the system behavior.



DOI: 10.48308/ijce.2025.105775

Key words: Riverbank Filtration, Response Function of Linear Systems, Analytic Solution,

Optimization

1. Introduction

Rivers are one of the most important sources of domestic water supplies. Entry of different pollutants such as agricultural, industrial and urban wastewaters into the rivers dramatically compromises their quality. Typically, a great deal of budget is spent for the treatment of river water withdrawals in water treatment plants.

Riverbank filtration (RBF) is one of the efficient methods for pretreatment of river water pollutions. RBF systems are widely used for drinking water providing and treatment in several cities around the world especially in the Europe countries, where they provide a cost-effective and sustainable alternative compare to direct surface water intake and treatment. As illustrated in Fig. 1, in this method, some wells are constructed adjacent to a permanent river, which together have the capacity to meet a given demand. During transport and seepage of water from river to wells through porous media of riverbanks, a considerable level of pollutants can be removed. Although this method is largely classified as physical treatment, in most cases, it removes or reduces most chemical and biological pollutants.



Figure 1: Schematic of an RBF system

Another important feature of RBF systems is its usage in accidents through which dangerous pollutants such as chemical tanks enter into the river. These events have less intense effects on the performance of RBF systems because of relatively long delay for river water reaching wells.

In conventional RBF systems, vertical wells are usually constructed in a straight line parallel to the river line; however, in some situations, use of horizontal (collector) wells increases the discharge rate to wells (Ray et al., 2003).

Most RBF systems are constructed in alluvial sandy aquifers (banks). In addition to enhancing water quality, reduction of water temperature and protection of fish and other aquatic creatures are other advantages of RBF systems. The major elements of an RBF system that must be considered include the number of production wells and their capacities



DOI: 10.48308/ijce.2025.105775

(discharges), distance between the river course and wells' alignment, and distance between wells.

When the desired quantity (discharge) and quality (concentration) are given, the system could be designed with a minimum cost (cost-effective design). As demonstrated in Fig. 2, the system costs include costs of constructing wells and OMR, costs of construction of pipelines and OMR, pumping cost of wells, and water treatment cost.



Figure 2: Component of an RBF system

2. Literature review

It seems that the Glasgow Water Supply Company was the first known firm that developed and used a RBF system in 1810 (Ray et al., 1999). Moser et al. (1990) studied on an aquifer that used two adjacent rivers for a RBF system. Using an advection-dispersion based model, they computed the transfer time from the river to the aquifer, and they concluded that by knowing this delay time, there is enough time to control and prevent river pollution of the pumping wells.

Doussan et al. (1997) assessed the general characteristics of RBF systems in a portion of Seine River in France. They simulated the oxidation and reduction reactions as well as nitrogen transfer reaction, using a numerical model. They reported the importance of the rate of water (discharge), sediment and organic carbon in the quality of transferred water.

Dillon et al. (2001) studied on the potential of the RBF for domestic water supply, considering the removal of microcystins in Murray River in Australia. They briefly reported on the decomposition of cyan bacterial hepatotoxin microcystins in porous media.

In RBF systems, removing organic pollutions is an important task when water is used for domestic purposes. Absorption and colonization of an organic pollutant could reduce its transfer. Kim et al. (2002) used a kinetic model for simulation of fate and transport of dissolved organic pollutants and bacteria. They modeled the porous media using four phases: two colloidal phases, one aquatic phase and a solid phase. The result of this study shows that transfer of pollutants in vicinity of dissolved organic matter is considerably high.



DOI: <u>10.48308/ijce.2025.105775</u>

Schon (2006) studied the RBF systems in Austria and India. He concluded that layout and arrangement of pumping wells based on morphology have considerable effect on the extension of treatment area in wells located on the inside of a meander, and the filtration from riverbank has more sensitivity than wells located outside the meander.

Abdel Fattah et al. (2007) used tracer techniques to trace and evaluate transfer of water through alluvial aquifer in Elpaso, Texas. They conducted several simulations to show the effects of well's locations and its pumping rate on the flow path, travel time, pumping radius of influence, and ratio of the volume of water from river to the volume of water from aquifer. Also, they found that pumping rate has more influence on travel time than distance between well and river.

Shamrukh et al. (2008) investigated the effectiveness of RBF system in Upper Egypt in Nile valley for removing particulates, dissolved solids, and microbial pathogens to produce drinking water, for this purpose they monitored physical, chemical and microbial measurements. They compared water produced with surface and background natural groundwater and with RBF system and proved the effectiveness of RBF technique for potable water supply requiring any further treatment or as pre-treatment for higher water quality in Upper Egypt.

Sandhu et al. (2011) studied on using the operating bank filtration sites in India and investigated potentials of RBF sites based on water problems and hydrogeological suitability. They resulted bank filtrate shown higher quality in RBF water in compared to water from surface or groundwater sources. They investigated the different using and the consequent effect on the quality and quantity of surface and groundwater. They stated the RBF system with an emphasis on the hydrogeological conditions, system capacities and the main water quality improvements. However, they resulted there are some prospects and limitations for the application of bank filtration in India at the existing sites.

Lee et al. (2011) studied on using a radial collector well for taking out a large amount of groundwater in way that haven't seen a deep drawdown at the well's center. They investigated hydraulic interaction between river water and groundwater flow response to pumping the riverbank filtration system in Daesan Myeon, Korea. They performed steady-state and transient simulations to estimate the well yield and well responses to pumping. They also evaluated the effect of well structure on the capacity of RBF well. They resulted increasing the length of horizontal arms increases the amount of induced river water and with increasing pumping rates the effect of well design is more noticeable.

Prasad et al. (2016) presented an optimization model using genetic algorithms for optimal well distance from the river with minimizing the cost of pumping and treatment. The total suspended solids, endosulfan concentrations, and E. coli were considered as water quality parameters. The total suspended used as microbial contamination and considered not to be absorbed in the aquifer, and endosulfan considered undergoing sorption. Also, Sensitivity analysis has been done and resulted the optimal distance significantly affected at lower hydraulic conductivity values and the cost of treatment with increasing in hydraulic conductivity decreased. It was concluded that hydraulic conductivity of the adjoining aquifer



DOI: 10.48308/ijce.2025.105775

plays a dominant role in deciding the optimal distance of pumping wells in a river bank filtration system.

Mustafa et al. (2024) introduces a 3D analytical model utilizing the Green's function approach to analyze the movement of contaminants from the river towards the extraction well within RBF systems. By accounting for the dynamic interaction between river width and the clogging layer, this model offers a more accurate depiction of contaminant transport in three-dimensional water flow scenarios.

Uwimpaye et al. (2025) assessed the suitability of RBF in regions with limited access to clean water, such as Africa, where it has the potential to alleviate water scarcity and enhance water security. This study used various studies, highlighting the principles, applications, and advancements of RBF worldwide. The findings of this research revealed that RBF effectively addresses a broad range of contaminants, including microbial pathogens, organic compounds, heavy metals, and micro-pollutants, through natural processes like adsorption, biodegradation, and filtration.

As presented in the literature review, little attention has been paid to using mathematical (optimization) models in designing and analyzing RBF systems. This study undertook this task. Importantly, attempts were made not to give details of chemical, physical, and biological behavior of pollutants; instead, the governing equations of groundwater flow and contaminant fate and transport were developed here.

Typically, RBF system's extended area is small as compared to the total extension of aquifer. Thus, the aquifer was assumed homogeneous, and hence use of lumped models and analytical solution is reasonable. In the case of inhomogeneous aquifers, the methodology may extend to using numerical methods and distributed models, though the solution of the resulting model is more complicated usually requiring utilization of a simulation-optimization scheme to achieve the desired results.

In addition to aquifer homogeneity, other major assumptions in this study included the following: the river discharge is permanent; river and wells are fully penetrated; the river and adjacent aquifer are hydraulically connected and there is no low permeable layer on the bed of river; groundwater flow in porous media is Darcian and Dupoit assumption is applicable; drawdowns in comparison with the initial saturated layer is small; and the system design life cycle and interest rate are given. The river pollutant is a single species and Fickian, and not in the form of biological species (microorganisms) or NAPL. Hence, the advection-dispersion solute transport equation governs here; the flow and solute transport from the river to aquifer is considered one-dimensional and the linear sorption mechanism has been considered along with the equilibrium chemical reaction. Finally, assuming that the changes in the solute concentration yielded by the solution of the transport equation cause negligible variations in water density, thus the flow equation and solute transport equation can be solved independently (Zheng and Bennet, 2002).



DOI: <u>10.48308/ijce.2025.105775</u>

3. Methodology

3.1. Model Formulation: Steady – State Conditions

3.1.1. Flow Equations

The flow equations of an RBF system in steady-state conditions are derived by combining continuity equation, Darcy's law, and image wells concept. Under steady-state conditions, the total water pumped in wells comes from the river. As demonstrated in Fig. 3, the drawdown at distance r from well pumping equals (McWhorter and Sunada, 1977):

$$s = \frac{Q_w}{2\pi T} Ln \frac{r_i}{r} \tag{1}$$

Where, Qw is constant pumping rate from the well, T represents the aquifer transmissivity, r shows the distance from the river and ri shows the distance from the image well. Also, drawdown in the pumping well is derived by incorporating r=rw in Eq. (1).

Fig. 4 indicates a schematic arrangement of the wells near a permanent river as an RBF system. Using Eq. (1) and assuming that the aquifer behaves as a linear system, the required equation could be derived. The drawdown in each well of the system s(k) equals the sum of drawdowns due to individual well pumping. Thus, with N_w wells, the drawdown s(k) in well k, equals:



Figure 3: Section view of system with major components



(2



Figure 4: A schematic arrangement of wells near a permanent river

Where, s(k,j) is the portion of drawdown in well k due to pumping in well j (j may equal k). From Eq. (1), we have:

$$s(k,j) = \frac{Q(j)}{2\pi T} Ln(\frac{\sqrt{4x^2 + l_{kj}^2}}{l_{kj}})$$
(3)

Where, $Q_w(j)$ is the constant pumping rate in well *j*, l_{kj} represents the distance between wells *k* and *j* (for k=j, $l_{kj}=r_w$, where r_w is the well radius), and *x* denotes the distance between the river and wells' alignment (see Fig. 7).

3.1.2. Solute Transport Equations

The governing equation of the solute transport in porous media with sorption and decay was derived by combining continuity equation; Fick's first and second law, and sorption plus decay mechanism. The resulting equation was a variant of advection-dispersion equation. Assuming linear sorption isotherm and one-dimensional unidirectional flow in homogeneous isotropic porous media and first-order irreversible rate reaction (decay rate), we have (Zheng and Bennet, 2002):

$$R_{d}\frac{\partial C}{\partial t} = D_{x}\frac{\partial^{2}C}{\partial x^{2}} - V_{x}\frac{\partial C}{\partial x} - \lambda C$$
(4)

Where, Rd represents the retardation factor, C is the solute concentration, t shows the time, Dx is dispersion coefficient, Vx denotes seepage velocity in x direction, and λ is the decay rate. From Darcy's law, we have:

$$V_x = \frac{q_x}{\theta} = \frac{K_x}{\theta}i = \frac{K_x}{\theta}\frac{\bar{s}}{x}$$
(5)

Where, q_x is Darcy velocity or groundwater flux in *x* direction, K_x shows the hydraulic conductivity in *x* direction, $\bar{s} = 1/N_w \times \sum_{k=1}^{N_w} s_k$ is the average drawdown of wells, and *x* is the well's distance to the river. The Retardation factor, R_d , is a function of distribution coefficient (K_d) along with the porosity of aquifer (Θ) and bulk density of the aquifer material (ρ_b), as (Zheng and Bennet, 2002):

DOI: <u>10.48308/ijce.2025.105775</u>

$$R_d = 1 + K_d \frac{\rho_b}{\theta} \tag{6}$$

Interdisciplinary Journal

of Civil Engineering

Shahid Beheshti University

The dispersion coefficient D_x is also a function of longitudinal dispersivity (α_L), groundwater velocity (V_x), and molecular diffusivity (D_*) as:

$$D_x = \alpha_L \times V_x + D_* \approx \alpha_L \times V_x \tag{7}$$

The longitudinal dispersivity, α_L , is a very uncertain parameter (Gelhar, 1993). However, a well-known equation proposed by Neuman (1990) is applied in the case of data inadequacy as a rough estimate:

$$\alpha_L = 0.0175 \ L^{1.46}, \qquad 100 \ m < L < 3500 \ m \qquad (8-a)$$

$$\alpha_L = 0.0169 \quad L^{1.53}, \qquad \qquad L < 100 \quad m$$
 (8-b)

In which, L is the distance between the contaminant source (river in this case) and contaminant exposure (well in this case). As RBF systems are constructed next to the rivers, thus, the Eq. (8-b) is applicable to these systems. Using proper initial and boundary conditions, the analytic solution could be conducted. The initial and boundary conditions in this case are:

$$C(x,0) = 0$$
 $x \ge 0$ initial condition (9)

$$C(0,t) = C_0$$
 $t \ge 0$ boundary condition (10)

$$C(\infty, t) = 0$$
 $t \ge 0$ boundary condition (11)

$$\frac{\partial C(\infty,t)}{\partial x} = 0 \qquad \qquad t \ge 0 \quad boundary \ condition \qquad (12)$$

Where, C_0 is the constant concentration of pollution in the river (*mg/lit*) and *C*(*x*,*t*) represents the (reduced) concentration of leaked water in riverbank at distance *x* after time *t*. The analytical solution for this problem has been given by Batu as (Batu, 2006):

$$C(x,t) = \frac{C_0}{2} \begin{bmatrix} erfc \left[\frac{R_d x - (V_x^2 + 4D_x R_d \lambda)t}{2(D_x R_d t)^{0.5}} \right] \times exp(\frac{(V_x - (V_x^2 + 4D_x R_d \lambda))x}{2D_x}) + \\ erfc \left[\frac{R_d x + (V_x^2 + 4D_x R_d \lambda)t}{2(D_x R_d t)^{0.5}} \right] \times exp(\frac{(V_x + (V_x^2 + 4D_x R_d \lambda))x}{2D_x}) \end{bmatrix}$$
(13)

Under steady-state conditions $(t \rightarrow \infty)$, the above equation is reduced to:

$$C(x) = C_0 \times exp\left[\frac{x(V_x - (V_x^2 + 4D_x R_d \lambda))}{2D_x}\right]$$
(14)

In which, C(x) is the well water concentration at the distance x from the river (*mg/lit*).

Interdisciplinary Journal of Civil Engineering

DOI: 10.48308/ijce.2025.105775

3.2. Optimization Model

Assuming that the river discharge and its pollution concentration as well as wells' pumping rates and the resulting drawdowns are all constant, the steady-state optimization model can be developed. As displayed in Fig. 5, let C_0 be the constant concentration of pollution, x the wells' distance to river, l_{kj} the distance between wells k and j, $Q_w(k)$ the discharge of well k and Q the required demand (Q=Dem). Then, the objective function of this cost-effective problem is:

$$Min \ Z = C_{Inst}^{w} + C_{Pump}^{w} + C_{Inst}^{p} + C_{conv}^{p} + C_{treat}$$
(15)

Where, C_{inst}^{w} is the cost of installing wells (such as construction of wells, casing, pumps purchased, installation, etc.), C_{pump}^{w} represents the pumping cost of the well which is a function of well's discharge ($Q_w(k)$) and well's total lift height (h_k), C_{inst}^{p} denotes the installation costs of pipelines (construction, purchasing, installation, etc.), C_{conv}^{p} is the cost of pipeline's water conveyance which is a function of well's discharge and distance, and finally C_{treat} shows the cost of treatment of water due to residual concentration (pollution) remaining in the well water. Then, C_{inst}^{w} and C_{inst}^{p} represent the operation and maintenance cost since this cost is usually considered as a fraction of the initial capital cost. All costs are considered in equivalent annual form. C_{pump}^{w} equals to:

$$C_{pump}^{w} = \sum_{k=1}^{Nw} C_{pump}^{w} \left(k\right) \tag{16}$$

Where, N_w represents the total number of wells and $C_{pump}^w(k)$ is the annual pumping cost of well k, which is equal to:

$$C_{pump}^{w}(k) = Hour(k) \times UCE \times P_{w}(k)$$
(17)

Where, *UCE* is the unit cost of energy ($\frac{k}{k}$) and $P_w(k)$ is the power utilized for the pump in well *k*. *Hour*(*k*) denotes the hours that pump *k* works in a year. Also,

$$p_w(k) = \gamma \times Q_w(k) \times (h^{ini}(k) + s(k))/\varepsilon$$
(18)

Where, γ is the specific weight of water (9806 N/m³), $h^{ini}(k)$ is the initial lift (distance between ground surface and groundwater table before pumping) of well k, s(k) represents the drawdown in well k in response to pumping of all wells (Eq. (2)), and ε is the pump's overall efficiency.

The conveyance cost equals to:

$$C_{conv}^{p} = UCE \times \sum_{k=1}^{Nw} Q_{w}(k) \times (\Delta H + H_{l}) \times Hour(k)$$
(19)

Where, ΔH is the elevation difference between the collector pipe and pumping house (Fig. 2) and H_l represents the total head loss (friction and local head losses) in pipes. Based on Darcy-

Interdisciplinary Journal of Civil Engineering Shahid Beheshti University

DOI: <u>10.48308/ijce.2025.105775</u>

Weisbach equation, the friction head loss (H^{frc}) is a function of the pipe's length, diameter and discharge. Similarly, the local head loss (H^{loc}) is a function of the pipe's diameter and discharge (Chin, 2012). Thus:

$$H_{l} = \sum_{k=1}^{Nw-1} H_{kj}^{frc} + H_{coll}^{frc} + H_{coll}^{loc}; \quad j = k+1$$
(20)

$$H^{frc} = f \frac{16lQ^2}{\pi^2 D^4}$$
(21)

$$f = \frac{0.25}{\left[\left[log(\frac{k_s}{3.7D}\right] + \frac{5.74}{Re^{0.9}}) \right]^2} \quad \text{(for } 10^{-6} \le \frac{k_s}{D} \le 10^{-2}, \quad 5000 \le \text{Re} \le 10^8\text{)}$$
(22)

$$Re = VD/v = 4Q/(\pi Dv) = 1273240Q/D$$
(23)

$$H_{coll}^{loc} = K \frac{16l_{coll}Q_{coll}^2}{\pi^2 D_{coll}^4}$$
(24)

Where, f is the pipe friction factor, k_s shows the pipe roughness, l is the pipe length, Q denotes the pipe discharge, D indicates the pipe diameter, and Re is the Reynolds number. Equations 21-23 must be written for each pipe (using l_{kj} , Q_{kj} , D_{kj} , f_{kj} , and Re_{kj} for each pipe k-j located between wells k and j, as well as using l_{coll} , Q_{coll} , D_{coll} , f_{coll} , and Re_{coll} for the collector pipe).

Also, *V* is the pipe water velocity and *v* shows the kinematic viscosity of water (equals $10^{-5} m^2/s$ at $20^{\circ}C$). Note that $Q_{coll} = \sum Q_w(k) = Dem$ and Q_{kj} is related to the pipe *k-j* position in the system. For example, in the 5-well configuration of Fig. 7, by considering that the collector pipe is located back of the well 3, we have $Q_{12}=Q_w(1)$, $Q_{23}=Q_w(1)+Q_w(2)$, $Q_{34}=Q_w(4)+Q_w(5)$, and $Q_{45}=Q_w(5)$. Thus,

$$Q_{kj}$$

 $(j=k+1)$

$$= \begin{cases} Q_{w}(1), & \text{for the first pipe} \\ \sum_{k=1}^{\left[\frac{N_{w}-1}{2}\right]} Q_{w}(k), \text{for the middle pipes between well 1 and well } [(N_{w}-1)/2]; \\ \sum_{k=\left[(N_{w}+1)/2\right]}^{N_{w}} Q_{w}(k), \text{for the middle pipes between well } \left[\frac{N_{w}+1}{2}\right] \text{ and well } N_{w}; \\ Q_{w}(N_{w}), & \text{for the last pipe} \end{cases}$$
(25)

Where, [u] is the integer value of u.

Obviously, the water treatment cost increases by the elevating the water volume (*Dem*) and solute concentration (C), as more chemicals are needed to reduce the concentration up to the



DOI: 10.48308/ijce.2025.105775

standard levels. Thus, this term is a function of the remaining concentration C(x) (as depicted in Eq. (13)) and volume of water that would be treated. $C_{treat} = f_1(C(x), Dem)$ (26)

The main attractive feature of RBF systems is the property of removing large amounts of pollutants in flowing river water. Indeed, most of river water pollutants which enter the aquifer and then wells can be removed through porous media. However, some pollutants remain in the wells from which removing these residual pollutants is necessary to achieve standard levels.

There are various treatment methods for removing residual pollutants in water, and here the disinfection with Chlorine and Chloramine (Wilbert et al. 1999) has been used as a common method of treatment. Cost estimation for Chlorine and/or Chloramine disinfection is based on the amount of chemicals used per day. Chlorine demand is determined from the concentration of nitrite and reduced inorganic transition metals, including chromium, copper, iron, and manganese present in the water (Wilbert et al. 1999). The detailed relations of disinfection by chlorine and ammonia have been given by Wilbert et al. (1999), and its companion, Microsoft Excel file (WaTER). The treatment cost with this method is a multivariate function:

$$C_{treat} = f_2(D, C(x), DCR, AAD, Cl_2Cost, AmmCost)$$
(27)

Where, Q is the production flow rate to be treated (Q=Dem), C(x) represents the pollutant concentration in water, *DCR* denotes the desired chlorine residual, *AAD* is alternative ammonia dose, Cl_2Cost shows the cost of Cl_2 and *AmmCost* indicates the cost of *NH*₄*OH*. The product flow rate (Q) and porous media characteristic (Θ , *S*, *T*) are known, but the pollution concentration in the well water is unknown. The farther the distance to the river, the more the natural the treatment in porous media will be, thus reducing treatment costs. Also, more drawdown in wells increases the pumping cost. Thus, there is an optimum distance which minimizes the total cost of treatment and pumping.

Finally, the required demand (Dem) must be met. Thus,

$$\sum_{k=1}^{N_w} Q_w(k) = Dem$$
⁽²⁸⁾

For a given demand (Q=Dem) and number of wells (N_w), C_{Inst}^w and C_{Inst}^p are constant and do not altering the model result.

3.3. Model Formulation; Transient Conditions

Unlike the steady-state conditions, in transient conditions, here the variability of river discharge and solute concentration, well pumping, and the obtained drawdowns were considered. To develop transient flow and solute transport equations, the concept of linear systems theory was applied. The Cooper-Jacob equation for computing drawdown of wells (Todd and Mays, 2005), the image wells concept for computing river aquifer interaction, and



DOI: 10.48308/ijce.2025.105775

Eq. (12) for computing the solute concentration were used under transient conditions. The linear systems theory was used to derive the required equations in variable pumping as well as variable solute concentration.

3.4. Response Functions of Linear Systems

The linear systems are those whose behavior may be predicted by a linear differential equation. Linear systems have two basic properties which are proportionality and additivity. Indeed, the response function of a linear system is a solution of its governing differential equations. In many situations such as computing drawdown or solute concentration in an aquifer, the governing equation is indeed linear, thus the rules of linear systems can be used in deriving the desired relations.

If a system receives an input of unit value applied instantaneously (a unit impulse) at time τ , the response of the system at a later time *t* is described by the unit impulse response function $u(t-\tau)$. The response to the complete input time function $I(\tau)$ can then be obtained by integrating the response to its constituent impulses", which is called convolution integral (Chow et al. 1988):

$$Q(t) = \int_0^t I(\tau)u(t-\tau)d\tau$$
⁽²⁹⁾

A unit step input response function g(t) is found from (29) with $I(\tau)=1$ for $\tau \ge 0$ as:

$$g(t) = \int_0^t u(t-\tau)d\tau = \int_0^t u(l)dl$$
(30)

Also, the unit pulse response function h(t) equals" (Chow et al. 1988):

$$h(t) = \frac{1}{\Delta t} [g(t) - g(t - \Delta t)]$$
(31)

If Δt set equals unity ($\Delta t = I$), then:

$$h(t) = g(t) - g(t - 1)$$
(32)

Further, for t<0, g(t)=0. The drawdown derived from Theis or Cooper-Jacob equations assuming Q=1 is a unit step response function. If the unit pumping shuts down at the end of t=1, the derived drawdown is unit pulse response function. Fig. 5 displays the unit step and unit pulse response functions of a confined aquifer.

Interdisciplinary Journal of Civil Engineering

DOI: <u>10.48308/ijce.2025.105775</u>



Figure 5: Unit step (g(t)) and unit pulse (h(t)) response functions of a confined aquifer

3.5. Flow Equation, Transient Condition

The flow equation in RBF systems in transient conditions is required for computing drawdown of wells and river seepage to each well. These equations derived by integrating Cooper-Jacob equation, concept of image wells, and unit pulse response function are as follows:

The drawdown in a confined aquifer due to constant well discharge Q may be derived using Cooper-Jacob equation (assuming $u = \frac{r^2 S}{4Tt} < 0.01$),

$$s(t) = \frac{Q_w}{4\pi T} ln(\frac{2.246Tt}{r^2 S})$$
(33)

Where, s(t) represents the drawdown at distance r from the pumping well at time t after the start of pumping, T and S show the aquifer transmissivity and storativity respectively, and t is time passed since beginning of pumping. This equation is linear due to pumping rate Q_w . By setting $Q_w=1$, the derived drawdown is a unit step response function:

$$g_w(t) = \frac{1}{4\pi T} \ln(\frac{2.246Tt}{r^2 S})$$
(34)

Following that, the related unit pulse response function yield is:

$$h_w(t) = g_w(t) - g_w(t-1) = \frac{1}{4\pi T} ln(\frac{t}{t-1})$$
(35)

Note that for t>1, the unit pulse response function $h_w(t)$ is independent of space, i.e. the locations of wells and aquifer storativity. Fig. 6 demonstrates $g_w(t)$ and $h_w(t)$ functions for a confined aquifer with $T=1000 \text{ m}^2/day$ and S=0.01 for different distances from r=1m to r=100 m.



DOI: 10.48308/ijce.2025.105775



Figure 6: Unit step response $(g_w(t))$ and unit pulse response $(h_w(t))$ functions for a confined aquifer with T=1000 m^2/day and S=0.01

For variable pumping, $Q_w(t)$, the resulting drawdown, is derived as:

$$s(n) = \sum_{t=1}^{N} h_w(n-t+1)Q_w(t)$$
(36)

This is a form of discrete convolution equation for a linear system (Chow et al., 1988).

When a set of N_w wells exist, each with $Q_w(j,t)$, $j=1, 2, ..., N_w$, by substituting $h_w(n-t+1)$ by $h_w(k, j, n-t+1)$ which is now called "unit response coefficient" of drawdown of wells, the obtained equation is:

$$s(k,n) = \sum_{t=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{Nw} h_w(k,j,n-t+1)Q_w(j,t)$$
(37)

This equation is known as unit response matrix method, which was first introduced in groundwater systems optimization by Maddock (1972). Alimohammadi et al. (2009) later developed general equations for deriving response equations for point, linear, and surface excitations in aquifers.

When there are some sources such as return flows or river leakage, these sources should also be considered. In RBF systems, river leakage exists and thus this river-aquifer interaction must be considered. One approach is using the concept of image wells. Fig. 7 illustrates a series of pumping wells (k,j,...) near a permanent river and its corresponding image wells (k',j',...). The drawdown in well k due to constant pumping (Q_w) in well j based on the concept of image wells and Cooper-Jacob equation equals:

$$s_r(t) = \frac{Q_w}{4\pi T} \left[ln(\frac{2.246Tt}{r^2 S}) - ln(\frac{2.246Tt}{r_i^2 S}) \right] = \frac{Q_w}{2\pi T} ln(\frac{r_i}{r}) = \frac{Q_w}{2\pi T} ln(\frac{L_{kj'}}{L_{kj}}) = Cte.$$
(38)

Interdisciplinary Journal of Civil Engineering Shabid Beheshti University

(39

DOI: 10.48308/ijce.2025.105775

$$L_{kj'} = \begin{cases} 2x, ifj' = k'\\ \sqrt{L_{kj}^2 + 4x^2}, ifj' \neq k' \end{cases}$$

Where, *r* and *r_i* represent the distance from the pumping well and image well, respectively. Also $L_{kj}=r_w$ for k=j. Eq. (38) is the same as Eq. (1). Note that, $s_r(t)$ is independent of time. This condition is known as pseudo steady-state conditions (McWhorter and Sunada, 1977). In Eq. (38), Q_w is constant and the equation is linear due to Q_w . Therefore, the properties of linear systems could be used again in this case. By setting $Q_w=1$, the derived net drawdown is unit step response function as:

$$g_r(t) = \frac{1}{2\pi T} \ln(\frac{L_{kj'}}{L_{kj}}) \tag{40}$$

Also,

$$h_r(t) = \begin{cases} g_r(t), \text{ for } t \le 1\\ 0, \text{ for } t > 1 \end{cases}$$
(41)



Figure. 7: Pumping wells (*k*,*j*,...), and corresponding image wells (*k*',*j*',...)

For a set of N_w wells, we have:

$$g_{r}(k,j,t) = g_{r}(k,j) = \frac{1}{4\pi T} \left[\sum_{j=1}^{N_{w}} ln(\frac{2.246Tt}{L_{kj}^{2}S}) - \sum_{j}^{N_{w}} ln(\frac{2.246Tt}{L_{kj}^{2}S}) \right] = \frac{1}{4\pi T} \left[\sum_{j=1}^{N_{w}} ln(\frac{L_{kj}^{2}}{L_{kj}^{2}}) \right] = \frac{N_{w}}{2\pi T} ln\left(\frac{\prod_{j=1}^{N_{w}} L_{kj}}{\prod_{j=1}^{N_{w}}}\right) \right]$$

$$(42)$$

The equation for net drawdown due to variable pumping rates $Q_w(j,t)$ of N_w wells is obtained as:

$$s_r(k,n) = \sum_{t=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^{Nw} h_r(k,j,n-t+1)Q_w(j,t)$$
(43)



DOI: 10.48308/ijce.2025.105775

Based on Eqs. (41) and (42), it is reduced to:

$$s_{r}(k,t) = \frac{Nw}{2\pi T} ln \left(\frac{\prod_{j'=1}^{Nw} L_{kj'}}{\prod_{j=1}^{Nw} L_{kj}} \right) \sum_{j=1}^{Nw} Q_{w}(j,t)$$
(44)

3.6. Solute Transport Equation-Transient Conditions

The term transient here refers to difference in the river solute concentration. According to Eq. (13), the equation is linear due to constant concentration C_0 . Thus, as with flow equations, in this case, we have:

$$g_{c}(x,t) = \frac{1}{2} \begin{bmatrix} erfc \left[\frac{R_{d}x - (V_{x}^{2} + 4D_{x}R_{d}\lambda)t}{2(D_{x}R_{d}t)^{0.5}} \right] \times exp(\frac{(V_{x} - (V_{x}^{2} + 4D_{x}R_{d}\lambda))x}{2D_{x}}) + erfc \left[\frac{R_{d}x + (V_{x}^{2} + 4D_{x}R_{d}\lambda)t}{2(D_{x}R_{d}t)^{0.5}} \right] \times exp(\frac{(V_{x} + (V_{x}^{2} + 4D_{x}R_{d}\lambda))x}{2D_{x}}) + exp(\frac{(V_{x} + (V_{x}^{2} + 4D_{x}R_{d}\lambda)x}{2D_{x}}) + exp(\frac{(V_{x} + (V_{x}^{2} + 4D_{x}R_{d}\lambda))x}{2D_{x}}) + exp(\frac{(V_{x} + (V_{x}^{2} + 4D_{x}R_{d}\lambda))x}{2D_{x}}) + exp(\frac{(V_{x} + (V_{x}^{2} + 4D_{x}R_{d}\lambda)x}{2D_{x}}) + exp(\frac{(V_{x} + (V_{x}^{2} + 4D_{x}R_$$

$$h_c(x,t) = g_c(x,t) - g_c(x,t-1)$$
(46)

Where, $g_c(x,t)$ is the unit step response function and $h_c(x,t)$ is unit pulse response function or unit response matrix of the river leakage, and:

$$C_c(x,n) = \sum_{t=1}^n h_c(x,n-t+1) \times C_0(t)$$
(47)

Where, $C_c(x,n)$ represents the solute concentration in the well within time period *n*, and $C_0(t)$ is the river solute concentration within time period *t*. Similarly, for well *j* within time period *t*, we have:

$$C_c(x,j,n) = \sum_{t=1}^n h_c(x,j,n-t+1) \times C_0(t)$$
(48)

Where, $h_c(x, j, n-t+1)$ is the unit pulse response function or unit response matrix of the solute concentration for well *j* within time period *n*-*t*+1.

The optimization model in transient conditions is similar to steady-state model, but using unsteady terms such as $Q_w(k,t)$ and $C_c(x,t)$ instead of $Q_w(k)$ and $C_c(x)$ as well as flow and transport formulation in transient conditions.

4. Results

In this section, two numerical examples have been presented. The first example illustrates the proposed formulation for the design of a hypothetical RBF system. In the design problem, the steady-state conditions, with some critical situations such as river discharge equal to $_7Q_{10}$ (7-day minimum discharge with 10 years return period) and high pollutant concentration could



DOI: 10.48308/ijce.2025.105775

be considered. The second example represents the analysis of an existing RBF system in a 12-month period. Obviously for this example, transient conditions must be considered.

4.1. Example Problem 1, Design of an RBF System

A hypothetical example has been considered here to show how the developed proposed model works in the case of design problems. A small city located next to a relatively large permanent river has been considered. Its municipality has a plan for designing an RBF system as a backup water supply system. The design discharge (required demand) equals 0.5 m³/s. The river's $_7Q_{10}$ discharge is far larger than the design discharge. Five wells have been considered in this plan, with Fig. 7 demonstrating a schematic view of this problem. The radius of wells equals 0.5 m and the distance between the ground surface and static groundwater table equals 10 m. The aquifer's transmissivity and porosity equal 0.01 m²/s and 0.3, respectively. The pumping house is located 20 m away from the collector pipe and in 10 m upper elevation that has required as local network head. Other data of the problem are reported in Tables 1 and 2. Table 2 shows the parameters of disinfection treatment and piping facilities. Based on construction limitations, equal sizes have been considered here for the diameter of all collector pipes of the wells. The entire optimization model formulation and solution have been implemented in Microsoft Excel[®] as a spreadsheet model. Table 3 shows the problem solution results using Solver add-on of Microsoft Excel[®].



Figure 8: A schematic view of the example problem 1

Parameter	Unit	Value
Demand	m ³ /s	0.5
Wells radius	m	0.5
Transmissivity	m ³ /s	0.05
Porosity	-	0.3
Saturated thickness	m	50
Initial Lift	m	10
Initial concentration	Mg/liter	500
Minimum well distance	m	20
Maximum well distance	m	100
Retardation factor	-	20
Decay rate	-	0.000001
Plan duration	Day	7
Unit cost of energy	4/Kwh	0.00714

Table 1: Input parameters

Interdisciplinary Journal of Civil Engineering Shahid Beheshti University

DOI: 10.48308/ijce.2025.105775

Parameter	Units	Value
Residual chloramines	mg/L	3
Alternative chlorine dose	mg/L	6
Alternative ammonia dose	mg/L	2
Cl ₂ needed	mg/L	21.18
Ammonia needed	mg/L	0.99
Cl ₂ unit cost	\$/ton	50
Basis ammonia	Kg/day	172.8
NH ₄ OH unit cost	\$/ton	250
Plant availability	-	0.95
Collector-motor house distance	m	20
Collector-motor house ΔH	m	10
Pipes roughness	m	0.00015
Pipe velocity	m/s	3

Table 2: parameters of disinfection treatment and pumping facilities

Table 3: '	The	problem	solution	brief	results
------------	-----	---------	----------	-------	---------

Well#	1,5	2,4	3
Discharge (l/s)	68.7	97.6	167.3
Drawdown (m)	1.45	2.54	3.54
Distance from center (m)	85.0	22.7	0
Used power (Kw)	9.65	15.01	27.78
Used energy (Mwh)	1.621	2.522	4.667
Pumping cost (\$)	11.577	18.012	33.339
X=36.7 m	α _L =4.18		
C=34.10 mg/lit	$D_x = 0.0008$	876 m2/s	
Pipe diameter=12 in. (0.3048 m)*			
Collector diameter=18 in. (0.4572)			
Total pumping cost= 93 \$			
Total conveyance cost= 91 \$			
Treatment cost=98 \$			
Total cost=281 \$			

*: Equal sizes have been considered here for all pipes' diameter. (1 inch=2.54 cm)

As presented in Table 3, the results of the model show that in this case the well alignment should be located 36.7 *m* away from the river. The wells' discharges and distances are symmetric where $Q_1=Q_5$, $Q_2=Q_4$, $l_{12}=l_{45}$, and $l_{23}=l_{34}$. The central well has more while the side wells have less discharge. Also, the pollutant concentration in wells decreases to 34.1 mg/L from the initial 500 mg/L in the river. Unexpectedly, the discharge of the central well is greater than and that of side wells is less than discharge of other wells. Since both pumping and conveyance costs have been considered here, the conveyance cost (which grows by with distancing off the wells) outweighed the pumping cost (which decreases with farther distance off wells) here. This suggests that if only the pumping cost has been considered, opposite



DOI: 10.48308/ijce.2025.105775

results can be expected. Three cost terms (pumping, conveyance, and treatment) approached each other in this case, suggesting that none of them is ignorable.

4.1.1. Sensitivity Analysis

A local sensitivity analysis has been implemented here for assessing the relative importance of the model parameters. Five parameters including unit cost of energy (*UCE*), retardation factor (R_d), transmissivity (T), porosity (Θ), and decay rate (λ) have been considered. Fig. 9 displays the variations of variable x against the variations of the five above-mentioned parameters. As can be seen, the variations of x versus T are ascending, but for other parameters, they are decreasing. With elevation of T, the value of K has grown (the thickness of the saturated layer was considered constant.). Thus, the seepage or solute transport velocity increases, while for a given concentration, the value of x drops. The variable x is more or less sensitive to all parameters with the sensitivity being greater on the left-hand side (values of parameters that are less than initial values) than on the right-hand side (values of parameters that are greater than the initial values). The sensitivity of T and *UCE* are almost equal but with opposite directions and both are less sensitive than the other three variables. R_d , Θ , and λ revealed similar sensitivity.



Figure 9: Variations of *x* against the variations of five parameters

Fig. 10 illustrates the variations of variable L_{12} against the variations of the five parameters. L_{12} is not sensitive to variations of *T*, but is sensitive to other variables. In this regard, *UCE* is less sensitive than the other three variables indicating the same behavior. Again the sensitivity has been greater on left-hand side.



Figure 10: Variations of *L*₁₂ against the variations of five parameters

Fig. 11 reveals the results of sensitivity analysis for concentration *C*. *C* is sensitive to all parameters especially to *UCE* and *T*. By increasing *UCE*, *x* declines (Fig. 9), thereby augmenting *C*, but by increasing *T*, *x* rises (Fig. 9), thereby lowering *C*. The sensitivity of *C* to R_d , Θ , and λ has been similar, i.e. the variations of these parameters show similar effect on *C*. Increasing *R_d* means lengthening retarding and reducing the solute transport velocity, thereby lessening *C*. Also, increasing Θ means diminished seepage velocity and again lower solute transfer velocity. Finally, increasing λ signifies greater contaminant decay and lower concentration in the wells. To assess this further, Fig. 12 reveals the variations of *C*/*C*₀ against the variations of Θ/Θ_0 , R_d/R_{d0} , and λ/λ_0 where $C_0 = 500 \text{ mg/L}$, $\Theta_0 = 0.3$, $R_{d0} = 20$, and $\lambda_0 = 0.000001$. As can be seen, the variations for R_d/R_{d0} and λ/λ_0 are the same (see Eq. (14)), while for Θ/Θ_0 , there is a little difference with the two other curves.



Figure 11: Variations of C against the variations of five parameters

Fig. 13 displays the variations of average drawdown in five wells (s_ave) against the variations of the five parameters. Drawdown is an inverse function of transmissivity (Eq. (1)), thus is more sensitive to

May 2025 Interdisciplinary Journal Volume 1 of Civil Engineering Shahid Beheshti University DOI: 10.48308/ijce.2025.105775 -O-UCE -т θ 100 80 Percentage of change in C(%) 60 40 20 0 -20 -40 -60 -80 -100 -100 -80 -60 -40 -20 0 20 40 60 80 100 Percentage of change in parameters (%)

Issue 1

Figure 12: Variations of C/C_{θ} against the variations of θ/θ_{θ} , Rd/Rd_{θ} , and λ/λ_{θ}

T than to other parameters. In smaller values of parameters, UCE is less sensitive than R_d , Θ , and λ (these are solute transport parameters and are not directly related to drawdown, but they directly affect distance x. Also, because s_{ave} is related to x ($i=s_{ave/x}$ where i is gradient), thus three parameters are indirectly related to s_ave.). However, for larger values, s_ave is relatively less sensitive to UCE, R_d , Θ , and λ .

Fig. 14 indicates the variations of pumping cost against the variations of the five parameters. Except for UCE, other parameters seem to be less sensitive. Since T directly affected the drawdown and thus the required energy, it is more sensitive than the other three parameters (which are transport parameters). Also, Fig. 15 exhibits the variations of conveyance cost against the variations of the five parameters. Except for UCE, other parameters have been insensitive.



Figure 13: Variations of average drawdown in wells against the variations of five parameters

Interdisciplinary Journal of Civil Engineering Shahid Beheshti University

DOI: <u>10.48308/ijce.2025.105775</u>



Figure 14: Variations of pumping cost against the variations of five parameters



Figure 15: Variations of conveyance cost against the variations of five parameters

Since there are several output variables (*x*, *C*, *Costs*, ...), for reaching a conclusion on the sensitivity analysis, a dimensionless parameter defines as:

$$Sens_{p} = \frac{1}{n_{y}} \sum_{y=1}^{n_{y}} \sum_{i=1}^{n_{i}} \left(\frac{\left| \frac{y_{i} - y_{0}}{y_{0}} \right|}{\left| \frac{x_{i} - x_{0}}{x_{0}} \right|} \right)$$
(49)

Where, $Sens_p$ is the sensitivity of parameter p, y_i represents the value of variable y ($y \in \{x, C, s, Cost, ...\}$) corresponding to the value of parameter x_i ($x \in \{UCE, Rd, T, \Theta, \lambda\}$). Table 4 presents the results of computing Eq. (48). According to this table, UCE is a relatively more sensitive while R_d is a relatively less sensitive parameter, but generally all five parameters have been sensitive. Figs. 9-15 are in line with this conclusion.

DOI: 10.48308/ijce.2025.105775

IE	Interdisciplinary Journal of Civil Engineering
	Shahid Beheshti University

Table 4: Sensitivity of five parameters

Parameter	Sensitivity	Rank
UCE	0.69	1
Rd	0.30	5
Т	0.45	2
θ	0.34	4
λ	0.37	3

4.2. Example Problem 2: Analysis of an RBF System

The purpose of this example is showing the ability of the proposed transient formulation in computing the solute concentration in a well next to a river, and the effects of changing parameters on the concentration. A pumping well is located next to a permanent river at distance x = 30 m. The aquifer and transport parameters are similar to example 1 (T=0.05 m^2/s , K=0.001 m/s, $R_d=20$, $\lambda=10^{-5}$, $\Theta=0.3$). In pseudo-steady conditions, the drawdown in the well equals 9 m. Table 5 reports the variations of the concentration of a solute pollutant in the river within a 12-month period (the concentration had been assumed constant through each month). Then, the concentration should be computed in the well water within each period.

Table 5: Concentration of pollution in the river and in the well M_{1} (i) C_{2} (ii) C_{3}

Month (t)	$C_0(t)$	C(t)
1	1000	653.92
2	1300	1008.82
3	1100	928.49
4	800	701.47
5	1000	784.08
6	700	624.83
7	1100	833.29
8	1200	961.33
9	500	520.58
10	1000	736.74
11	800	679.83
12	700	585.67

Using Eq. (45) and considering a computation time step equal to 1 day for greater accuracy, Fig. 16 illustrates the unit step (g_c) and unit pulse (h_c) response functions of the well concentration. Also Fig. 17 reveals the variations of concentration in the river $(C_0(t))$ and in the well (C(t)) in a 12-month period. Attenuation and time lag of concentration in the well's water are clear in the figure.



DOI: <u>10.48308/ijce.2025.105775</u>



Figure 16: unit step (g) and unit pulse (h) response functions of the well's concentration



Figure 17: Variations of concentration in the river $(C_{\theta}(t))$ and in the well (C(t))

In the first example, it was observed that Rd, T, Θ , and λ are sensitive parameters of flow and transport models. Here, the effect of these parameters on the variations of concentration and solute transport is observed. Fig. 18 displays the gc and hc functions for different values of Rd. By increasing Rd (retardation), the solute is more retarded and thus gc and hc functions decline. Fig. 19 shows the solute concentration variations for different values of Rd.

Fig. 20 shows the g_c and h_c functions for different values of *T*. By increasing *T* (increasing seepage velocity), g_c and h_c functions as well as concentration grow. Fig. 21 demonstrates the variations of solute concentration for different values of *T*.

Fig. 22 shows the g_c and h_c functions for different values of Θ . By increasing Θ (decreasing seepage velocity), g_c and h_c functions as well as concentration drop. Fig. 23 exhibits the variations of solute concentration for different values of *T*.

Fig. 24 reveals the g_c and h_c functions for different values of λ . By increasing λ (increasing decay), g_c and h_c functions as well as concentration fall. Fig. 25 indicates the variations of solute concentration for different values of *T*. At relatively large values of λ (say $\lambda = 10^{-5}$), the concentration in the well reaches zero (one method of protecting the well's water is using permeable reactive barriers by nanoparticles with a relatively large λ).



DOI: <u>10.48308/ijce.2025.105775</u>



Figure 18: g_c and h_c functions of the well's concentration for different values of R_d



Figure 19: Variations of concentration in the well (C(t)) for different values of R_d



Figure 20: g_c and h_c functions of the well's concentration for different values of T



DOI: <u>10.48308/ijce.2025.105775</u>







Figure 22: g_c and h_c functions of the well's concentration for different values of θ



Figure 23: Variations of concentration in the well (C(t)) for different values of θ



DOI: <u>10.48308/ijce.2025.105775</u>



Figure 24: g_c and h_c functions of the well's concentration for different values of λ



Figure 25: Variations of concentration in the well (C(t)) for different values of λ

5. Conclusion

Riverbank Filtration (RBF) systems utilize the natural filtration processes of riverbed and aquifer materials to purify water as it moves from a surface water source to extraction wells. The application of Linear Systems Response Functions in RBF systems enhances their design, management, and operational efficiency, particularly in modeling and predicting groundwater flow and contaminant transport under variable conditions. Clearly, the novelty of this work is as follow:

Using the concept of response functions of linear systems in modeling of contaminant transport in groundwater systems. Linear Systems Response Functions, such as unit pulse response functions, are used to model the drawdown of groundwater table caused by pumping wells, and predicting the solute concentration extending in the aquifer.

In this paper, a comprehensive optimization model for the design of riverbank filtration systems has been developed with the aim of minimizing the total cost of the system, encompassing the locations and pumping rates of wells, as well as the dimensions of other



DOI: <u>10.48308/ijce.2025.105775</u>

system components. This method enables the analytical calculation of the optimal location and pumping rate of wells in the RBF system. A simulation model was also developed for analyzing these systems. In these models, the analytic solutions of the equations of groundwater flow and pollutant transport were used.

The analysis indicated that:

- For t>1, the unit pulse response function of drawdown $h_w(t)$ is independent of locations of wells and aquifer storativity.

- The transient flow equation in RBF systems reaches steady (pseudo steady) conditions. The drawdown in variable pumping for a given transmissivity and distance of wells is only a function of the pumping pattern of wells.

- Solving the steady optimization problem shows that unexpectedly, the discharges of the central and side wells were greater than and smaller than those of other wells. As both pumping and conveyance costs have been considered here, the conveyance cost (which increases with the distance of wells) dominated the pumping cost (which drops with the distance of wells) here, suggesting that if only pumping cost has been considered, opposite results can be expected.

- The sensitivity analysis revealed that UCE (unit cost of energy) is a relatively more sensitive and R_d is relatively less sensitive parameter, but generally all five parameters are sensitive. For four system parameters (other than UCE), the sensitivity ranking was: transmissivity (*T*), decay rate (λ), porosity (Θ), and retardation factor (R_d) (implementing transient model by changing these four parameters confirmed the above-mentioned result).

- The proposed simulation model formulations are useful for assessing the computability of the variations of solute concentration in RBF systems, and the effects of changing parameters in the solute concentration in steady-state and transient conditions.

References

- Abdel-Fattah, A., Langford, R., Schulze-Makuch, D. (2007). Applications of particle-tracking techniques to bank infiltration: a case study from El Paso, Texas, USA.
- Alimohammadi, s., Afshar, A., Marino, M. (2009)." Cyclic storage systems optimization: Semi-Distributed Parameter Approach", Journal of American Water Works Association, 101(2), 90-103.
- Batu, V. (2006). Flow and solute transport modeling in aquifers, CRC Press, Taylor & Francis Group, Boca Raton.
- Chin, D., A. (2012). Water-quality engineering in natural systems: Fate and Transport Processes in the Water Environment, 2nd-Edition, Willy & Sons INC, USA.
- Chow, V.T., Maidment, D.R., Mays, L.W. (1988). Applied hydrology, McGRAW-HILL, U.S.
- Dillon, P. J., Miller, M., Fallowfield, H., Hutson, J. (2001). "The potential of riverbank filtration for drinking water supplies in relation to microsystin removal in brackish aquifers", Journal of Hydrology, 266, 209-221.
- Doussan, C., Poitevin, G., Ledoux, E., Detay, M. (1997). "River bank filtration: modeling of the changes in water chemistry with emphasis on nitrogen species", Journal of Contaminant Hydrology, Volume 25 (1-2), 129-156.



DOI: 10.48308/ijce.2025.105775

Gelhar, L. W. Stochastic subsurface hydrology, Prentice Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, 390 pp.,

1993.

- Kim, S., B., Yavuz Corapcioglu, M. (2002). "Contaminant transport in riverbank filtration in the presence of dissolved organic matter and bacteria: a kinetic approach", Journal of Hydrology, 266, 269–283.
- Lee, E., Hyun, Y., Lee, K., Shin, J. (2012). "Hydraulic analysis of a radial collector well for riverbank filtration near Nakdong River", Journal of Hydrology, 20(3), 575-589.
- Maddock, T. (1972). "Algebraic technological function from a simulation model", Journal of Water Resource Research, 8(1), 129-134.
- McWhorter, D.B., Sunada, D.K. (1978). Ground-Water Hydrology and Hydraulics, Water Resources, Littleton, U.S.A.
- Moser, P., M., Stickler, W., Bertleef, B., Hedin, K. (1990). "Modeling of groundwater pollution by river bank filtration using oxygen-18 data", Groundwater monitoring and management (Proceedings of the Dresden Symposium, March 1987), IAHS Publ. no. 173.
- Mustafa, S., F. Rabah, M. Darwish. (2024). "Modeling contaminant transport in riverbank filtration systems: A three-dimensional analysis with Green's function approach", Ain Shams Engineering Journal., 15 (7).
- Neuman, S. P. (1990). "Universal scaling of hydraulic conductivities and dispersivities in geologic media", Journal of Water Resour. Res., 26, 1749–1758.
- Prasad, K. S. Hari., Ojha, C. S. P., Nirala, R. K., and Sharma, D. (2016). "Optimal Well Location in a River Bank Filtration System: Sensitivity to Aquifer Characteristics and Decay Rate", Journal of Hazardous, Toxic, and Radioactive Waste, © ASCE, 20(3), 04016001-1-04016001-6.
- Ray, C., Melin, G., Linsky, R., B. (2003). River bank filteration Improving source-water quality, Kluwer Academic PublishersU, California, USA.
- Sandhu, C., Grischek, T., Kumar, P., Ray C. (2011). "Potential for riverbank filtration in India", Journal of Clean Technologies and Environmental Policy, 13(2), 295-316.
- Schön, M.(2006). "Systematic comparison of riverbank filtration sites in Austria and India", Thesis, Leopold Franzens University, Faculty of Civil Engineering Sciences, Austria.
- Shamrukh, M., Abdel-wahab, A. (2008). "Riverbank filtration for sustainable water supply: Application to a large-scale facility on the Nile River", Journal of Clean Technologies and Environmental Policy, 10(4), 351-358.
- Todd, D. K., Mays, L. W. (2003). Groundwater Hydrology, John Wiley & Sons, Inc., USA.
- Uwimpaye, F., Twagirayezu, G., Agbamu, I.O. et al. (2025). Riverbank filtration: a frontline treatment method for surface and groundwater—African perspective. Environ Monit Assess 197, 160.
- Wilbert, M. C., Pellegrino, J., Scott, J., Zhang, Q. (1999). Water treatment estimation routine (WATER) User Manual. Water Desalination Research & Development Program Report No. 43, Denver, Colorado and Lower Colorado Regional Office Boulder City, Nevada.

Zheng, C., Bennett, G.D. (2002). Applied Contaminant Transport Modeling, 2nd Edition. WILEY., USA

www.documbase.com/Water-Treatment-Cost-Estimation-Program-USBR.xls.