



BULLETIN 118 · UPDATE 2003

CALIFORNIA'S GROUNDWATER

Cover photograph:

A typical agricultural well with the water discharge pipe and the electric motor that drives the pump.

Inset photograph:

Groundwater recharge ponds in the Upper Coachella Valley near the Whitewater River that use local and imported water.

Recharge ponds are also called spreading basins or recharge basins.



State of California
The Resources Agency
Department of Water Resources

CALIFORNIA'S GROUNDWATER

BULLETIN 118 *Update 2003*

October 2003

GRAY DAVIS
Governor
State of California

MARY D. NICHOLS
Secretary of Resources
The Resources Agency

MICHAEL J. SPEAR
Interim Director
Department of Water Resources

If you need this publication in an alternate form, contact the Department's Office of Water Education at 1-800-272-8869.

Foreword

Groundwater is one of California's greatest natural resources. In an average year, groundwater meets about 30 percent of California's urban and agricultural water demands. In drought years, this percentage increases to more than 40 percent. In 1995, an estimated 13 million Californians, nearly 43 percent of the State's population, were served by groundwater. The demand on groundwater will increase significantly as California's population grows to a projected 46 million by the year 2020. In many basins, our ability to optimally use groundwater is affected by overdraft and water quality impacts, or limited by a lack of data, management, and coordination between agencies.

Over the last few years, California voters and the Legislature have provided significant funding to local agencies for conjunctive use projects, groundwater recharge facilities, groundwater monitoring, and groundwater basin management activities under Proposition 13 and the Local Groundwater Management Assistance Act of 2000. Most recently, the 2002 passage of Proposition 50 will result in additional resources to continue recent progress toward sustaining our groundwater resources through local agency efforts. We are beginning to see significant benefits from these investments.

The State Legislature recognizes the need for groundwater data in making sound local management decisions. In 1999, the Legislature approved funding and directed the Department of Water Resources (DWR) to update the inventory of groundwater basins contained in Bulletin 118 (1975), *California's Ground Water* and Bulletin 118-80 (1980), *Ground Water Basins in California*. In 2001, the Legislature passed AB 599, requiring the State Water Resources Control Board to establish a comprehensive monitoring program to assess groundwater quality in each groundwater basin in the State and to increase coordination among agencies that collect groundwater contamination information. In 2002, the Legislature passed SB 1938, which contains new requirements for local agency groundwater management plans to be eligible for public funds for groundwater projects.

Effective management of groundwater basins is essential because groundwater will play a key role in meeting California's water needs. DWR is committed to assisting local agencies statewide in developing and implementing effective, locally planned and controlled groundwater management programs. DWR is also committed to federal and State interagency efforts and to partnerships with local agencies to coordinate and expand data monitoring activities that will provide necessary information for more effective groundwater management. Coordinated data collection at all levels of government and local planning and management will help to ensure that groundwater continues to serve the needs of Californians.



Michael J. Spear
Interim Director

State of California
Gray Davis, Governor

The Resources Agency
Mary D. Nichols, Secretary for Resources

Department of Water Resources
Michael J. Spear, Interim Director

L. Lucinda Chipponeri
Deputy Director

Peggy Bernardy
Chief Counsel

Stephen Verigin
Acting Chief Deputy Director

Jonas Minton
Deputy Director

Peter Garris
Deputy Director

Vernon T. Glover
Deputy Director

Division of Planning and Local Assistance
Mark Cowin, Chief

Statewide Water Planning Branch
Kamyar Guivetchi, Chief

Conjunctive Water Management Branch
John Woodling, Chief

This Bulletin was prepared under direction of

Doug Osugi

by

Robert Swartz, Senior Engineering Geologist

and

Carl Hauge, Chief Hydrogeologist

Final coordination by

Mary Scruggs and Joe Yun

with assistance from

Tom Hawkins Derick Louie

Tom Lutterman Darby Vickery Ilene Wellman-Barbree Judy Colvin

Data collection, regional information, and basin descriptions provided by Department district offices

Northern District

Dwight Russell, District Chief

William Mendenhall, Chief, Resources Assessment Branch

Toccoy Dudley, Chief, Groundwater Section

Mike Ward, Engineer WR, technical lead

Todd Hillaire Noel Eaves Dan McManus Bill Ehorn Debbie Spangler

Kelley Staton Doti Watkins Charlene Sundermann Bruce Ross

Central District

Karl Winkler, District Chief

Emil Calzascia, Chief, Water Management

Bob Niblack, Chief, Geology and Groundwater Section

Chris Bonds, Engineering Geologist, technical lead

Sandra Maxwell Mark Souverville Tanya Meeth Bill Waggoner Solomon Mesghina

Bill Brewster Anne Roth

San Joaquin District

Paula J. Landis, District Chief

Brian Smith, Chief, Resource Assessment

Ben Igawa, Chief, Groundwater Section

Al Steele, Engineering Geologist, technical lead

Bruce Myers Anna Mancillas Ken Winden Amanda Mayes Noemi Baca

Southern District

Mark Stuart, District Chief

Bob Pierotti, Chief, Groundwater Section

Tim Ross, Engineering Geologist, technical lead

Gary Guacci Richard Lewy Dan Gamon Brian Moniz Randall Davis Jen Wong

Nuna Tersibahian Monica Lee Jeremy Lancaster Tammy Surco Mark Stuhlman

Editorial, design, and production services were provided by

Brenda Main, Supervisor of Technical Publications

Linda Sinnwell, Art Director

Marilee Talley Alice Dyer Xiaojun Li Gretchen Goettl Joanne Pierce

Acknowledgments

Successful completion of this update and continued implementation of this program would not be possible without the dedicated efforts of the Central, Northern, San Joaquin, and Southern District Offices of the California Department of Water Resources. The information in this report is the result of contributions from many local, state, and federal agencies outside DWR. We would like to acknowledge the contributions of the following agencies.

- California Department of Pesticide Regulation
- California Department of Toxic Substances Control
- California Department of Health Services
- California State Water Resources Control Board
- California Regional Water Quality Control Boards
- United States Geological Survey
- United States Bureau of Reclamation

We also wish to thank numerous reviewers who provided valuable comments on the April 2003 public review draft of this bulletin.

Acronyms and abbreviations

AB	Assembly Bill
BMO	Basin management objective
CAS	California Aquifer Susceptibility
CVP	Central Valley Project
DBCP	Dibromochloropropane
DCE	Dichloroethylene
DHS	California Department of Health Services
 DPR	California Department of Pesticide Regulation
DTSC	California Department of Toxic Substances Control
DWR	California Department of Water Resources
DWSAP	Drinking Water Source Assessment Program
EDB	Ethylene dibromide
EC	Electrical conductivity
EMWD	Eastern Municipal Water District
EWMP	Efficient water management
EPA	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
ESA	Federal Endangered Species Act
ET	Evapotranspiration
ETAW	Evapotranspiration of applied water
EWA	Environmental Water Account
GAMA	Groundwater Ambient Monitoring and Assessment
GIS	Geographic information system
GMA	Groundwater Management Agency
gpm	Gallons per minute
GRID	Groundwater Resources Information Database
GRIST	Groundwater Resources Information Sharing Team
H & S	Health and Safety Code
HR	Hydrologic region
ISI	Integrated Storage Investigations
ITF	Interagency Task Force
JPA	Joint powers agreement
maf	Million acre-feet
MCL	Maximum contaminant level
mg/L	Milligrams per liter
MOU	Memorandum of understanding
MTBE	Methyl tertiary-butyl ether
OCWD	Orange County Water District
PAC	Public Advisory Committee
PCE	Tetrachloroethylene
PCA	Possible contaminating activity
PPIC	Public Policy Institute of California
ROD	Record of Decision
RWQCB	Regional Water Quality Control Board
SB	Senate Bill
SGA	Sacramento Groundwater Authority
SVOC	Semi-volatile organic compound
SVWD	Scotts Valley Water District
SWRCB	State Water Resources Control Board

taf Thousand acre-feet
TCE Trichloroethylene
TDS Total dissolved solids
UWMP Urban water management plan
USACE U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
USBR U.S. Bureau of Reclamation
USC United States Code
USGS U.S. Geological Survey
VOC Volatile organic compound
WQCP Water Quality Control Plan

Contents

Contents

Findings	1
Recommendations	7
Introduction	13
History of Bulletin 118	15
The Need for Bulletin 118 Update 2003	16
Report Organization	17
Chapter 1 Groundwater–California’s Hidden Resource	19
California’s Hydrology	20
California’s Water Supply System	24
Recent Groundwater Development Trends	27
The Need for Groundwater Monitoring and Evaluation	28
Chapter 2 Groundwater Management in California	31
How Groundwater is Managed in California	33
Groundwater Management through Authority Granted to Local Water Agencies	33
Local Groundwater Ordinances	36
Adjudicated Groundwater Basins	40
How Successful Have Groundwater Management Efforts Been?	44
Future Groundwater Management in California	49
Chapter 3 Groundwater Management Planning and Implementation	53
Criteria for Evaluating Groundwater Management Plans—Required and Recommended Components ...	54
Required Components of Local Groundwater Management Plans	54
Recommended Components of Groundwater Management Plans	55
Model Groundwater Management Ordinance	62
Chapter 4 Recent Actions Related to Groundwater Management	65
Safe Drinking Water, Clean Water, Watershed Protection and Flood Protection Act of 2000 (Proposition 13)	66
California Bay-Delta Record of Decision	66
Local Groundwater Management Assistance Act of 2000 (AB 303, Water Code Section 10795 et seq.) .	67
Groundwater Quality Monitoring Act of 2001 (AB 599, Water Code Section 10780 et seq.)	67
Water Supply Planning	68
Emergency Assistance to the Klamath Basin	68
Governor’s Drought Panel	68
Sacramento Valley Water Management Agreement	69
Groundwater Management Water Code Amendments	69
Water Security, Clean Drinking Water, Coastal and Beach Protection Act of 2002 (Proposition 50)	69
Chapter 5 The Roles of State and Federal Agencies in California Groundwater Management	71
Local Groundwater Management Assistance from DWR	72
Conjunctive Water Management Program	72

Assistance from Other State and Federal Agencies	75
State Water Resources Control Board and Regional Water Quality Control Boards	75
California Department of Health Services	76
California Department of Pesticide Regulation	76
California Department of Toxic Substances Control	77
California Bay-Delta Authority	78
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency	78
U.S. Geological Survey	78
U.S. Bureau of Reclamation	78
Chapter 6 Basic Groundwater Concepts	79
Origin of Groundwater	80
Occurrence of Groundwater	80
Groundwater and Surface Water Interconnection	81
Physical Properties That Affect Groundwater	83
Aquifer	85
Aquitard	85
Unconfined and Confined Aquifers	87
Groundwater Basin	88
Groundwater Subbasin	90
Groundwater Source Areas	90
Movement of Groundwater	92
Quantity of Groundwater	93
Groundwater Storage Capacity	93
Usable Groundwater Storage Capacity	95
Available Groundwater Storage Capacity	95
Groundwater Budget	95
Change in Groundwater Storage	96
Overdraft	96
Safe Yield	99
Subsidence	100
Conjunctive Management	100
Quality of Groundwater	101
Beneficial Uses	101
Public Drinking Water Supply	101
Agricultural Supply	101
Contaminant Groups	103
Chapter 7 Inventory of California’s Groundwater Information	105
<i>Statewide Groundwater Information</i>	106
Groundwater Basins	106
Groundwater Budgets	106
Active Monitoring	111
Groundwater Quality	112
<i>Regional Groundwater Use</i>	113

<i>North Coast Hydrologic Region</i>	119
Description of the Region	122
Groundwater Development	122
Groundwater Quality	124
Changes from Bulletin 118-80	125
<i>San Francisco Bay Hydrologic Region</i>	129
Description of the Region	131
Groundwater Development	131
Groundwater Quality	132
Changes from Bulletin 118-80	134
<i>Central Coast Hydrologic Region</i>	137
Description of the Region	140
Groundwater Development	140
Groundwater Quality	140
Changes from Bulletin 118-80	142
<i>South Coast Hydrologic Region</i>	145
Description of the Region	148
Groundwater Development	149
Conjunctive Use	149
Groundwater Quality	149
Changes from Bulletin 118 - 80	150
<i>Sacramento River Hydrologic Region</i>	155
Description of the Region	158
Groundwater Development	159
Groundwater Quality	160
Changes from Bulletin 118-80	161
<i>San Joaquin River Hydrologic Region</i>	167
Description of the Region	169
Groundwater Development	169
Conjunctive Use	170
Groundwater Quality	170
Changes from Bulletin 118-80	170
<i>Tulare Lake Hydrologic Region</i>	175
Description of the Region	177
Groundwater Development	177
Groundwater Quality	178
Changes from Bulletin 118-80	180
<i>North Lahontan Hydrologic Region</i>	183
Description of the Region	185
Groundwater Development	186
Groundwater Quality	187
Changes from Bulletin 118-80	188
<i>South Lahontan Hydrologic Region</i>	191
Description of the Region	194
Groundwater Development	194
Groundwater Quality	194
Changes from Bulletin 118-80	196

<i>Colorado River Hydrologic Region</i>	201
Description of the Region	204
Groundwater Development	204
Groundwater Quality	204
Changes from Bulletin 118-80	206
References	209
Glossary	213

Appendices

Appendix A Obtaining Copies of Supplemental Material	224
Appendix B The Right to Use Groundwater in California	225
Appendix C Required and Recommended Components of Local Groundwater Management Plans	230
Appendix D Groundwater Management Model Ordinance	232
Appendix E SWRCB Beneficial Use Designations	239
Appendix F Federal and State MCLs and Regulation Dates for Drinking Water Contaminants	241
Appendix G Development of Current Groundwater Basin/Subbasin Map	245

Tables

Table 1 Groundwater management methods	33
Table 2 Local agencies with authority to deliver water for beneficial uses, which may have authority to institute groundwater management	34
Table 3 Special act districts with groundwater management authority in California	35
Table 4 Counties with ordinances addressing groundwater management	39
Table 5 List of adjudicated basins.....	42
Table 6 Scotts Valley Water District’s Groundwater Monitoring Plan	58
Table 7 Porosity (in percent) of soil and rock types	85
Table 8 Types and boundary characteristics of groundwater basins	88
Table 9 Examples of factors that limit development of a groundwater basin	94
Table 10 Range of TDS values with estimated suitability for agricultural uses	102
Table 11 Range of boron concentrations with estimated suitability on various crops	102
Table 12 Annual agricultural and municipal water demands met by groundwater	113
Table 13 Most frequently occurring contaminants by contaminant group in the North Coast Hydrologic Region	125
Table 14 Modifications since Bulletin 118-80 of groundwater basins in North Coast Hydrologic Region	125
Table 15 North Coast Hydrologic Region groundwater data	127
Table 16 Most frequently occurring contaminants by contaminant group in the San Francisco Bay Hydrologic Region	133
Table 17 Modifications since Bulletin 118-80 of groundwater basins and subbasins in San Francisco Bay Hydrologic Region	134
Table 18 San Francisco Bay Hydrologic Region groundwater data	135
Table 19 Most frequently occurring contaminants by contaminant group in the Central Coast Hydrologic Region	141

Table 20 Modifications since Bulletin 118-80 of groundwater basins and subbasins in Central Coast Hydrologic Region 142

Table 21 Central Coast Hydrologic Region groundwater data 143

Table 22 Most frequently occurring contaminants by contaminant group in the South Coast Hydrologic Region 151

Table 23 Modifications since Bulletin 118-80 of groundwater basins and subbasins in South Coast Hydrologic Region 152

Table 24 South Coast Hydrologic Region groundwater data 153

Table 25 Most frequently occurring contaminants by contaminant group in the Sacramento River Hydrologic Region 161

Table 26 Modifications since Bulletin 118-80 of groundwater basins and subbasins in Sacramento River Hydrologic Region 161

Table 27 Sacramento River Hydrologic Region groundwater data 163

Table 28 Most frequently occurring contaminants by contaminant group in the San Joaquin River Hydrologic Region 171

Table 29 Modifications since Bulletin 118-80 of groundwater basins and subbasins in San Joaquin River Hydrologic Region 172

Table 30 San Joaquin River Hydrologic Region groundwater data 173

Table 31 Most frequently occurring contaminants by contaminant group in the Tulare Lake Hydrologic Region 179

Table 32 Modifications since Bulletin 118-80 of groundwater basins and subbasins in Tulare Lake Hydrologic Region 180

Table 33 Tulare Lake Hydrologic Region groundwater data 181

Table 34 Most frequently occurring contaminants by contaminant group in the North Lahontan Hydrologic Region 188

Table 35 North Lahontan Hydrologic Region groundwater data 189

Table 36 Most frequently occurring contaminants by contaminant group in the South Lahontan Hydrologic Region 196

Table 37 Modifications since Bulletin 118-80 of groundwater basins and subbasins in South Lahontan Hydrologic Region 196

Table 38 South Lahontan Hydrologic Region groundwater data 198

Table 39 Most frequently occurring contaminants by contaminant group in the Colorado River Hydrologic Region 205

Table 40 Modifications since Bulletin 118-80 of groundwater basins in Colorado River Hydrologic Region 206

Table 41 Colorado River Hydrologic Region groundwater data 207

Figures

Figure 1 Shaded relief map of California 21

Figure 2 Mean annual precipitation in California, 1961 to 1990 22

Figure 3 Groundwater basins, subbasins, and hydrologic regions..... 23

Figure 4 Water projects in California 25

Figure 5 Well completion reports filed with DWR from 1987 through 2000..... 27

Figure 6 Well completion reports filed annually from 1987 through 2000 28

Figure 7 Process of addressing groundwater management needs in California 32

Figure 8 Counties with groundwater ordinances..... 37

Figure 9 Scotts Valley Water District’s Groundwater Management Plan monitoring locations..... 60

Figure 10	Broad distribution of grant and loan awardees for 2001 through 2003	74
Figure 11	The Hydrologic Cycle	81
Figure 12	Examples of porosity in sediments and rocks	84
Figure 13	Hydraulic conductivity ranges of selected rocks and sediments	86
Figure 14	Interbedded aquifers with confined and unconfined conditions	87
Figure 15	Groundwater basin near the coast with the aquifer extending beyond the surface basin boundary	89
Figure 16	Significant volcanic groundwater source areas	91
Figure 17	Schematic of total, usable, and available groundwater storage capacity	94
Figure 18	Hydrograph indicating overdraft	97
Figure 19	Photograph of extensometer	100
Figure 20	Groundwater basins and subbasins	108
Figure 21	Basin and subbasin groundwater budget types	109
Figure 22	California’s 10 hydrologic regions	114
Figure 23	Agricultural and urban demand supplied by groundwater in each hydrologic region	115
Figure 24	Regional Water Quality Control Board regions and Department of Water Resources hydrologic regions	117
Figure 25	North Coast Hydrologic Region	120
Figure 26	MCL exceedances in public supply wells in the North Coast Hydrologic Region	124
Figure 27	San Francisco Bay Hydrologic Region	130
Figure 28	MCL exceedances in public supply wells in the San Francisco Bay Hydrologic Region	133
Figure 29	Central Coast Hydrologic Region	138
Figure 30	MCL exceedances in public supply wells in the Central Coast Hydrologic Region	141
Figure 31	South Coast Hydrologic Region	146
Figure 32	MCL exceedances in public supply wells in the South Coast Hydrologic Region	150
Figure 33	Sacramento River Hydrologic Region	156
Figure 34	MCL exceedances in public supply wells in the Sacramento River Hydrologic Region	160
Figure 35	San Joaquin River Hydrologic Region	168
Figure 36	MCL exceedances in public supply wells in the San Joaquin River Hydrologic Region	171
Figure 37	Tulare Lake Hydrologic Region	176
Figure 38	MCL exceedances by contaminant group in public supply wells in the Tulare Lake Hydrologic Region	179
Figure 39	North Lahontan Hydrologic Region	184
Figure 40	MCL exceedances in public supply wells in the North Lahontan Hydrologic Region	187
Figure 41	South Lahontan Hydrologic Region	192
Figure 42	MCL exceedances in public supply wells in the South Lahontan Hydrologic Region	195
Figure 43	Colorado River Hydrologic Region	202
Figure 44	MCL exceedances in public supply wells in the Colorado River Hydrologic Region	205

Sidebars

Box A	Which Bulletin 118 Do You Mean?	16
Box B	Will Climate Change Affect California’s Groundwater?	26
Box C	What About Overdraft?	29
Box D	Basin Management Objectives for Groundwater Management	38
Box E	Adjudication of Groundwater Rights in the Raymond Basin	41
Box F	Managing through a Joint Powers Agreement	45
Box G	Managing a Basin through Integrated Water Management	46

Box H Managing Groundwater Using both Physical and Institutional Solutions 47

Box I Impediments to Conjunctive Management Programs in California 48

Box J Managing Groundwater Quantity and Quality 50

Box K What are Management Objectives? 61

Box L Providing Data: The Internet Makes Groundwater Elevation Data Readily Accessible to the Public 73

Box M Improving Coordination of Groundwater Information 77

Box N One Resource, Two Systems of Law 82

Box O Critical Conditions of Overdraft 98

Box P Focused on Nitrates: Detailed Study of a Contaminant 103

Box Q How Does the Information in This Report Relate to the Recently Enacted
Laws Senate Bill 221 and Senate Bill 610 (2002)? 107

Box R Explanation of Groundwater Data Tables 110

Box S What Happens When an MCL Exceedance Occurs? 112



Findings

Major Findings

1. **Groundwater provides about 30% of the State's water supply in an average year, yet in many basins the amount of groundwater extracted annually is not accurately known.**
 - In some regions, groundwater provides 60% or more of the supply during dry years.
 - Many small- to moderate-sized towns and cities are entirely dependent on groundwater for drinking water supplies.
 - 40% to 50% of Californians rely on groundwater for part of their water supply.
 - In many basins, groundwater use is indirectly estimated by assuming crop evapotranspiration demands and surveying the acreage of each crop type.
2. **Opportunities for local agencies to manage their groundwater resources have increased significantly since the passage of Assembly Bill 3030 in 1992. (Water Code § 10750 et seq.). In the past several years more agencies have developed management programs to facilitate conjunctive use, determine the extent of the resource, and protect water quality.**
 - The act provides the authority for many local agencies to manage groundwater.
 - The act has resulted in more than 200 local agencies adopting groundwater management plans to date.
 - The act encourages regional cooperation in basins and allows private water purveyors to participate in groundwater management through memoranda of understanding with public agencies.
 - Many local agencies are recognizing their responsibility and authority to better manage groundwater resources.
3. **Agencies in some areas have not yet developed groundwater management plans.**
 - Concerns about cooperative management, governance, and potential liabilities have kept some agencies from developing management plans.
 - Development of management programs to maintain a sustainable groundwater supply for local use has not been accomplished throughout the State.
4. **A comprehensive assessment of overdraft in the State's groundwater basins has not been conducted since Bulletin 118-80, but it is estimated that overdraft is between 1 million and 2 million acre-feet annually.**
 - Historical overdraft in many basins is evident in hydrographs that show a steady decline in groundwater levels for a number of years.
 - Other basins may be subject to overdraft in the future if current water management practices are continued.
 - Overdraft can result in increased water production costs, land subsidence, water quality impairment, and environmental degradation.
 - Few basins have detailed water budgets by which to estimate overdraft.
 - While the most extensively developed basins tend to have information, many basins have insufficient data for effective management or the data have not been evaluated.
 - The extent and impacts of overdraft must be fully evaluated to determine whether groundwater will provide a sustainable water supply.
 - Modern computer hardware and software enable rapid manipulation of data to determine basin conditions such as groundwater storage changes or groundwater extraction, but a lack of essential data limits the ability to make such calculations.
 - Adequate statewide land use data for making groundwater extraction estimates are not available in electronic format.

5. **Surface water and groundwater are connected and can be effectively managed as integrated resources.**
 - Groundwater originates as surface water.
 - Groundwater extraction can affect flow in streams.
 - Changes in surface water flow can affect groundwater levels.
 - Legal systems for surface water and groundwater rights can make coordinated management complex.

6. **Groundwater quality and groundwater quantity are interdependent and are increasingly being considered in an integrated manner.**
 - Groundwater quantity and groundwater quality are inseparable.
 - Groundwater in some aquifers may not be usable because of contamination with chemicals, either from natural or human sources.
 - Unmanaged groundwater extraction may cause migration of poor quality water.
 - Monitoring and evaluating groundwater quality provides managers with the necessary data to make sound decisions regarding storage of water in the groundwater basin.
 - State agencies conduct several legislatively mandated programs to monitor different aspects of groundwater quality.
 - California Department of Water Resources (DWR) monitors general groundwater quality in many basins throughout the State for regional evaluation.

7. **Land use decisions affecting recharge areas can reduce the amount of groundwater in storage and degrade the quality of that groundwater.**
 - In many basins, little is known about the location of recharge areas and their effectiveness.
 - Protection and preservation of recharge areas are seldom considered in land use decisions.
 - If recharge areas are altered by paving, channel lining, or other land use changes, available groundwater will be reduced.
 - Potentially contaminating activities can degrade the quality of groundwater and require wellhead treatment or aquifer remediation before use.
 - There is no coordinated effort to inform the public that recharge areas should be protected against contamination and preserved so that they function effectively.

Additional Important Findings

8. **Funding to assist local groundwater management has recently been available in unprecedented amounts.**
 - Proposition 13 (Water Code, § 79000 et seq.) authorized \$230 million in loans and grants for local groundwater programs and projects, almost all of which has been allocated.
 - The Local Groundwater Management Assistance Act of 2000 (Water Code, § 10795) has resulted in more than \$15 million in grants to local agencies in fiscal years 2001, 2002, and 2003.
 - Proposition 50 (Water Code, § 79500 et seq) will provide funding for many aspects of water management, including groundwater management and groundwater recharge projects.
 - Funding for the California Bay-Delta program has provided technical and facilitation assistance to numerous local groundwater planning efforts.

9. **Local governments are increasingly involved in groundwater management.**
 - Twenty-four of the 27 existing county groundwater management ordinances have been adopted since 1990.
 - Most ordinances require the proponents of groundwater export to demonstrate that a proposed project will not cause subsidence, degrade groundwater quality, or deplete the water supply before the county will issue an export permit.
 - While the ordinances generally require a permit for export of groundwater, most do not require a comprehensive groundwater management plan designed to ensure a sustainable water resource for local use.
 - Some local governments are coordinating closely with local water agencies that have adopted groundwater management plans.
 - Many local governments are monitoring and conducting studies in an effort to better understand groundwater resources.

10. **Despite the increased groundwater management opportunities and activities, the extent of local efforts is not well known.**
 - There is no general requirement that groundwater management plans be submitted to DWR, so the number of adopted plans and status of groundwater management throughout the State are not currently known.
 - There are no requirements for evaluating the effectiveness of adopted plans, other than during grant proposal review.
 - No agency is responsible for tracking implementation of adopted plans.
 - Unlike urban water management plans, groundwater management plans are not required to be submitted to DWR, making the information unavailable for preparing the California Water Plan.

11. **Despite the fact that several agencies often overlie each groundwater basin, there are few mechanisms in place to support and encourage agencies to manage the basin cooperatively.**
 - Some local agencies have recognized the benefits of initiating basinwide and regional planning for groundwater management and have recorded many successes.
 - Regional cooperation and coordination depends on the ability of local agencies to fund such efforts.
 - There is no specific State or federal program to fund and support coordination efforts that would benefit all water users in a region and statewide.

12. **The State Legislature has recognized the need to consider water supplies as part of the local land use planning process.**
 - Three bills—Senate Bill 221¹, SB 610², and AB 901³—were enacted in 2001 to improve the assessment of water supplies. The new laws require the verification of sufficient water supply as a condition for approving certain developments and compel urban water suppliers to provide more information on the reliability of groundwater as an element of supply.
 - The Government Code does not specifically require local governments to include a water resources element in their general plans.

¹ Business and Professions Code Section 11010, Government Code Sections 65867.5, 66455.3, and 66473.7.

² Public Resources Code Section 21151.9, Water Code Sections 10631, 10656, 10657, 10910-10912, 10915.

³ Water Code Sections 10610.2, 10631, 10634.

13. **The need to monitor groundwater quality and contamination of groundwater continues to grow.**
 - As opportunities for developing additional surface water supplies become more limited, subsequent growth will increasingly rely on groundwater.
 - Human activities are likely the cause of more than half the exceedances of maximum contaminant levels in public water supply wells.
 - New contaminants are being regulated and standards are becoming more stringent for others, requiring increased monitoring and better management of water quality.

14. **Monitoring networks for groundwater levels and groundwater quality have not been evaluated in all basins to ensure that the data accurately represent conditions in the aquifer(s).**
 - Groundwater levels are monitored in about 10,000 active wells including those basins where most of the groundwater is used.
 - Groundwater levels are not monitored in approximately 200 basins, where population is sparse and groundwater use is generally low.
 - Groundwater quality monitoring networks are most dense near population centers and may not be representative of the basin as a whole.
 - Many of the wells being monitored are not ideally constructed to provide water level or water quality information that is representative of a specific aquifer.
 - Many wells are too deep to monitor changes in the unconfined (water table) portion of basins.

15. **The coordination of groundwater data collection and evaluation by local, State, and federal agencies is improving.**
 - The State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) recently formed the Groundwater Resources Information Sharing Team (GRIST) consisting of several State and federal agencies with groundwater-related programs.
 - DWR established a website in 1996 that has provided water-level data and hydrographs for more than 35,000 active and inactive wells monitored by DWR and cooperating agencies.
 - DWR collects and maintains water level data in part through partnerships with local agency cooperators.
 - DWR staff collaborated with many local, State, and federal agencies in developing this update of Bulletin 118.
 - SWRCB recently formed an interagency task force to develop a comprehensive groundwater quality monitoring program for assessing every groundwater basin in the State as required by the Groundwater Quality Monitoring Act of 2001 (AB 599; Water Code, § 10780 et seq.).
 - Water purveyors have concerns about balancing public access to data with water supply security.

16. **Boundaries of groundwater basins have been determined using the best available geologic and hydrologic information. These boundaries are important in determining the availability of local water supplies.**
 - Basin boundaries were derived primarily by identifying alluvial sediments on geologic maps using the best available information, but are subject to change when new information becomes available.
 - The Water Code requires the use of basin boundaries defined in Bulletin 118 in groundwater management plans and urban water management plans.
 - The location of basin boundaries will become more critical as the demand for water continues to increase.
 - Subbasin boundaries may be delineated for management convenience rather than based on hydrogeologic conditions.

17. **Little is known about the stream-aquifer interaction in many groundwater basins.**
 - Groundwater and surface water are closely linked in the hydrologic cycle.
 - The relationship between streamflow and extraction of groundwater is not fully understood in most basins and is generally not monitored.
 - Groundwater extraction in many basins may affect streamflow.
 - Interaction of groundwater flow and surface water may affect environmental resources in the hyporheic zone.
 - An understanding of stream-aquifer interaction will be essential to evaluating water transfers in many areas of the State.

18. **Although many new wells are built in fractured rock areas, insufficient hydrogeologic information is available to ensure the reliability of groundwater supplies.**
 - Population is increasing rapidly in foothill and mountain areas in which groundwater occurs in fractured rock.
 - The cumulative effect of groundwater development may reduce the yield of individual wells, lower the flow of mountain streams, and impact local habitat.
 - Characterization of groundwater resources in fractured rock areas can be very expensive and complex.
 - Many groundwater users in these areas have no other water supply alternatives.
 - Recent dry years have seen many wells go dry in fractured rock areas throughout the State.
 - Groundwater management in these areas is beginning, but there is insufficient data to support quantitative conclusions about the long-term sustainable yield.

19. **When new wells are built, drillers are required to file a Well Completion Report with DWR. That report contains a lithologic log, the usability of which varies considerably from driller to driller.**
 - The Well Completion Reports are confidential and not available to the public, as stipulated by the Water Code, unless the owner's permission is obtained.
 - The usefulness of the information in Well Completion Reports varies but is not fully realized.
 - Public access to Well Completion Reports would increase understanding of groundwater conditions and issues.
 - There is no provision in the Water Code that requires submission of geophysical logs, which would provide an accurate log of the geologic materials within the aquifer.
 - Geophysical logs would provide a greatly improved database for characterization of aquifers.

Recommendations

Major Recommendations

1. **Local or regional agencies should develop groundwater management plans if groundwater constitutes part of their water supply. Management objectives should be developed to maintain a sustainable long-term supply for multiple beneficial uses. Management should integrate water quantity and quality, groundwater and surface water, and recharge area protection.**
 - Groundwater management in California is a local agency responsibility.
 - In basins where there is more than one management agency, those agencies should coordinate their management objectives and program activities.
 - A water budget should be completed that includes recharge, extraction and change in storage in the aquifer(s).
 - Changes in groundwater quality should be monitored and evaluated.
 - Stakeholders should be identified and included in development of groundwater management plans.

2. **The State of California should continue programs to provide technical and financial assistance to local agencies to develop monitoring programs, management plans, and groundwater storage projects to more efficiently use groundwater resources and provide a sustainable supply for multiple beneficial uses. DWR should:**
 - Post information about projects that have successfully obtained funding through various grant and loan programs.
 - Provide additional technical assistance to local agencies in the preparation of grant and loan applications.
 - Continue outreach efforts to inform the public and water managers of grant and loan opportunities.
 - Participate, when requested, in local efforts to develop and implement groundwater management plans.
 - Continue to assess, develop, and modify its groundwater programs to provide the greatest benefit to local agencies.
 - Develop grant criteria to ensure funding supports local benefits as well as Statewide priorities, such as development of the California Water Plan and meeting Bay-Delta objectives.

3. **DWR should continue to work with local agencies to more accurately define historical overdraft and to more accurately predict future water shortages that could result in overdraft.**
 - A water budget should be developed for each basin.
 - The annual change in storage should be determined for each basin.
 - The amount of annual recharge and discharge, including pumping, should be determined.
 - Changes in groundwater quality that make groundwater unusable or could allow additional groundwater to be used should be included in any evaluation of overdraft.

4. **Groundwater management agencies should work with land use agencies to inform them of the potential impacts various land use decisions may have on groundwater, and to identify, prioritize, and protect recharge areas.**
 - Local planners should consider recharge areas when making land use decisions that could reduce recharge or pose a risk to groundwater quality.
 - Recharge areas should be identified and protected from land uses that limit recharge rates, such as paving or lining of channels.

- Both local water agencies and local governments should pursue education and outreach to inform the public of the location and importance of recharge areas.
 - DWR should inform local agencies of the availability of grant funding and technical assistance that could support these efforts.
5. **DWR should publish a report by December 31, 2004 that identifies those groundwater basins or subbasins that are being managed by local or regional agencies and those that are not, and should identify how local agencies are using groundwater resources and protecting groundwater quality.**
 - Such information will be necessary to confirm whether agencies are meeting the requirements of SB 1938 (Water Code Section 10753.7).
 - Collection and summary of existing groundwater management plans will provide a better understanding of the distribution and coordination of groundwater management programs throughout the State.
 - Successful strategies employed by specific local agencies should be highlighted to assist others in groundwater management efforts.
 - Similarly, the impact of groundwater management ordinances throughout the State should be evaluated to provide a better understanding of the effect of ordinances on groundwater management.
 6. **Water managers should include an evaluation of water quality in a groundwater management plan, recognizing that water quantity and water quality are inseparable.**
 - Local water managers should obtain groundwater quality data from federal, state, and local agencies that have collected such data in their basin.
 - Local agencies should evaluate long-term trends in groundwater quality.
 - Local agencies should work closely with the SWRCB and DWR in evaluating their groundwater basins.
 - Local agencies should establish management objectives and monitoring programs that will maintain a sustainable supply of good quality groundwater.
 7. **Water transfers that involve groundwater (or surface water that will be replaced with groundwater) should be consistent with groundwater management in the source area that will assure the long term sustainability of the groundwater resource.**
 8. **Continue to support coordinated management of groundwater and surface water supplies and integrated management of groundwater quality and groundwater quantity.**
 - Future bond funding should be provided for conjunctive use facilities to improve water supply reliability.
 - Funding for feasibility and pilot studies, in addition to construction of projects will help maximize the potential for conjunctive use.
 - DWR should continue and expand its efforts to form partnerships with local agencies to investigate and develop locally controlled conjunctive use programs.
 9. **Local, State, and federal agencies should improve data collection and analysis to better estimate groundwater basin conditions used in Statewide and local water supply reliability planning. DWR should:**
 - Assist local agencies in the implementation of SB 221, SB 610, and AB 901 to help determine water supply reliability during the local land use planning process.
 - Provide and continue to update information on groundwater basins, including basin boundaries, groundwater levels, monitoring data, aquifer yield, and other aquifer characteristics.

- Identify areas of rapid development that are heavily reliant on groundwater and prioritize monitoring activities in these areas to identify potential impacts on these basins.
 - Evaluate the existing network of wells monitored for groundwater elevations, eliminate wells of questionable value from the network, and add wells where data are needed.
 - Work cooperatively with local groundwater managers to evaluate the groundwater basins of the State with respect to overdraft and its potential impacts, beginning with the most heavily used basins.
 - Expand DWR and local agency monitoring programs to provide a better understanding of the interaction between groundwater and surface water.
 - Work with SWRCB to investigate temporal trends in water quality to identify areas of water quality degradation that should receive additional attention.
 - Estimate groundwater extraction using a land use based method for over 200 basins with little or no groundwater budget information.
 - Integrate groundwater budgets into the California Water Plan Update process.
10. **Increase coordination and sharing of groundwater data among local, State, and federal agencies and improve data dissemination to the public. DWR should:**
- Use the established website to continually update new groundwater basin data collected after the publication of California's Groundwater (Bulletin 118-Update 2003).
 - Publish a summary update of Bulletin 118 every five years coincident with the California Water Plan (Bulletin 160).
 - Publish, in cooperation with SWRCB, a biennial groundwater report that addresses current groundwater quantity and quality conditions.
 - Coordinate the collection and storage of its groundwater quality monitoring data with programs of SWRCB and other agencies to ensure maximum coverage statewide and reduce duplication of effort.
 - Make groundwater basin information more compatible with other Geographic Information System-based resource data to improve local integrated resources planning efforts.
 - Compile data collected by projects funded under grant and loan programs and make data available to the public on the DWR website.
 - Encourage local agency cooperators to submit data to the DWR database.
 - Maximize the accuracy and usefulness of data and develop guidelines for quality assurance and quality control, consistency, and format compatibility.
 - Expand accessibility of groundwater data by the public after considering appropriate security measures.
 - State, federal and local agencies should expand accessibility of groundwater data by the public after considering appropriate security measures.
 - Local agencies should submit copies of adopted groundwater management plans to DWR.

Additional Important Recommendations

11. **Local water agencies and local governments should be encouraged to develop cooperative working relationships at basinwide or regional levels to effectively manage groundwater. DWR should:**
- Provide technical and financial assistance to local agencies in the development of basinwide groundwater management plans.
 - Provide a preference in grant funding for groundwater projects for agencies that are part of a regional or basinwide planning effort.
 - Provide Proposition 50 funding preferences for projects that are part of an integrated regional water management plan.

12. **Groundwater basin boundaries identified in Bulletin 118 should be updated as new information becomes available and the basin becomes better defined. DWR should:**
 - Identify basin boundaries that are based on limited data.
 - List the kind of information that is necessary to better define basin boundaries.
 - Develop a systematic procedure to obtain and evaluate stakeholder input on groundwater basin boundaries.

13. **Improve the understanding of groundwater resources in fractured rock areas of the State.**
 - DWR, in cooperation with local and federal agencies, should conduct studies to determine the amount of groundwater that is available in fractured rock areas, including water quality assessment, identification of recharge areas and amounts, and a water budget when feasible.
 - Local agencies and local governments should conduct studies in their areas to quantify the local demands on groundwater and project future demands.
 - The Legislature should consider expanding the groundwater management authority in the Water Code to include areas outside of alluvial groundwater basins
 - DWR should include information on the most significant fractured rock groundwater sources in future updates of Bulletin 118.

14. **Develop a program to obtain geophysical logs in areas where additional data are needed.**
 - DWR should encourage submission of geophysical logs, when they are conducted, as a part of the Well Completion Report.
 - The geophysical logs would be available for use by public agencies to better understand the aquifer, but would be confidential as stipulated by the Water Code.
 - DWR should seek funding to work with agencies and property owners to obtain geophysical logs of new wells in areas where additional data are needed.
 - Geophysical logs would be used to better characterize the aquifers within each groundwater basin.

15. **Educate the public on the significance of groundwater resources and on methods of groundwater management.**
 - DWR should continue to educate the public on statewide groundwater issues and assist local agencies in their public education efforts.
 - Local agencies should expand their outreach efforts during development of groundwater management plans under AB 3030 and other authority.
 - DWR should develop educational materials to explain how they quantify groundwater throughout the State, as well as the utility and limitations of the information.
 - DWR should continue its efforts to educate individual well owners and small water systems that are entirely dependent on groundwater.

Introduction

Introduction

Groundwater is one of California's greatest natural resources. In an average water supply year, groundwater meets about 30 percent of California's urban and agricultural demand. In drought years, this percentage increases to 40 percent or even higher (DWR 1998). Some cities, such as Fresno, Davis, and Lodi, rely solely on groundwater for their drinking water supply. In 1995, an estimated 13 million Californians (nearly 43 percent of the State's population) used groundwater for at least a portion of their public supply needs (Solley and others 1998). With a projected population of nearly 46 million by the year 2020, California's demand on groundwater will increase significantly. In many basins, our ability to optimally use groundwater is affected by overdraft and water quality, or limited by a lack of data, lack of management, and coordination between agencies.

In the last few years, California has provided substantial funds to local agencies for groundwater management. For example, the nearly \$2 billion Water Bond 2000 (Proposition 13) approved by California voters in March 2000 specifically authorizes funds for two groundwater programs: \$200 million for grants for feasibility studies, project design, and the construction of conjunctive use facilities; and \$30 million for loans for local agency acquisition and construction of groundwater recharge facilities and grants for feasibility studies for recharge projects. Additionally, the Local Groundwater Management Assistance Act of 2000 (AB 303) resulted in \$15 million in fiscal years 2001, 2002, and 2003 for groundwater studies and data collection intended to improve basin and subbasin groundwater management. These projects focus on improving groundwater monitoring, coordinating groundwater basin management, and conducting groundwater studies.

The State Legislature has increasingly recognized the importance of groundwater and the need for monitoring in making sound groundwater management decisions. Significant legislation was passed in 2000, 2001 and 2002. AB 303 authorizes grants to help local agencies develop better groundwater management strategies. AB 599 (2001) requires, for the first time, that the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB), in cooperation with other agencies, develop a comprehensive monitoring program capable of assessing groundwater quality in every basin in the State with the intent of maintaining a safe groundwater supply. SB 610 (2001) and SB 901 (2001) together require urban water suppliers, in their urban water management plans, to determine the adequacy of current and future supplies to meet demands. Detailed groundwater information is required for those suppliers that use groundwater. SB 221 (2001) prohibits approval of certain developments without verification of an available water supply. These bills are significant with respect to groundwater because much of California's new development will rely on groundwater for its supply.

Finally, SB 1938 (2002) was enacted to provide incentives to local agencies for improved groundwater management. The legislation modified the Water Code to require that specific elements be included in a groundwater management plan for an agency to be eligible for certain State funding administered by the Department of Water Resources for groundwater projects. AB 303 is exempt from that requirement.

History of Bulletin 118

DWR has long recognized the need for collection, summary, and evaluation of groundwater data as tools in planning optimal use of the groundwater resource. An example of this is DWR's Bulletin 118 series. Bulletin 118 presents the results of groundwater basin evaluations in California. The Bulletin 118 series was preceded by Water Quality Investigations Report No. 3, *Ground Water Basins in California* (referred to in this bulletin as Report No. 3), published in 1952 by the Department of Public Works, Division of Water Resources (the predecessor of DWR). The purpose of Report No. 3 was to create a base index map of the "more important ground water basins" for carrying out DWR's mandate in Section 229 of the Water Code. Section 229 directed Public Works to:

...investigate conditions of the quality of all waters within the State, including saline waters, coastal and inland, as related to all sources of pollution of whatever nature and shall report thereon to the Legislature and to the appropriate regional water pollution control board annually, and may recommend any steps which might be taken to improve or protect the quality of such waters.

Report No. 3 identified 223 alluvium-filled valleys that were believed to be basins with usable groundwater in storage. A statewide numbering system was created in cooperation with the State Water Pollution Control Board (now the State Water Resources Control Board) based on the boundaries of the nine Regional Water Quality Control Boards. In 1992, Water Code Section 229 was amended, resulting in the elimination of the annual reporting requirements.

In 1975, DWR published Bulletin 118, *California's Ground Water*, (referred to in this report as Bulletin 118-75). Bulletin 118-75 summarized available information from DWR, U.S. Geological Survey, and other agencies for individual groundwater basins to "help those who must make decisions affecting the protection, additional use, and management of the State's ground water resources."

Bulletin 118-75 contains a summary of technical information for 248 of the 461 identified groundwater basins, subbasins, and what were referred to as "areas of potential ground water storage" in California as well as maps showing their location and extent. The Bulletin 118-75 basin boundaries were based on geologic and hydrogeologic conditions except where basins were defined by a court decision.

In 1978, Section 12924 was added to the California Water Code:

The Department shall, in conjunction with other public agencies, conduct an investigation of the State's groundwater basins. The Department shall identify the State's groundwater basins on the basis of geologic and hydrogeologic conditions and consideration of political boundary lines whenever practical. The Department shall also investigate existing general patterns of groundwater pumping and groundwater recharge within such basins to the extent necessary to identify basins which are subject to critical conditions of overdraft.

DWR published the report in 1980 as *Ground Water Basins in California: A Report to the Legislature in Response to Water Code Section 12924* (referred to in this report as Bulletin 118-80). The bulletin included 36 groundwater basins with boundaries different from Bulletin 118-75. The changed boundaries resulted by combining several basins based on geologic or political considerations and by dividing the San Joaquin Valley groundwater basin into many smaller subbasins based primarily on political boundaries. These changes resulted in the identification of 447 groundwater basins, subbasins, and areas of potential groundwater storage. Bulletin 118-80 also identified 11 basins as subject to critical conditions of overdraft.

Box A Which Bulletin 118 Do You Mean?

Mention of an update to Bulletin 118 causes some confusion about which Bulletin 118 the California Department of Water Resources (DWR) has updated. In addition to the statewide Bulletin 118 series (Bulletin 118-75, Bulletin 118-80, and Bulletin 118-03), DWR released several other publications in the 118 series that evaluate groundwater basins in specific areas of the State. Region-specific Bulletin 118 reports are listed below.

- Bulletin 118-1. Evaluation of Ground Water Resources: South San Francisco Bay
Appendix A. Geology, 1967
Volume 1. Fremont Study Area, 1968
Volume 2. Additional Fremont Study Area, 1973
Volume 3. Northern Santa Clara County, 1975
Volume 4. South Santa Clara County, 1981
- Bulletin 118-2. Evaluation of Ground Water Resources: Livermore and Sunol Valleys, 1974
Appendix A. Geology, 1966
- Bulletin 118-3. Evaluation of Ground Water Resources: Sacramento County, 1974
- Bulletin 118-4. Evaluation of Ground Water Resources: Sonoma County
Volume 1. Geologic and Hydrologic Data, 1975
Volume 2. Santa Rosa Plain, 1982
Volume 3. Petaluma Valley, 1982
Volume 4. Sonoma Valley, 1982
Volume 5. Alexander Valley and Healdsburg Area, 1983
- Bulletin 118-5. Bulletin planned but never completed.
- Bulletin 118-6. Evaluation of Ground Water Resources: Sacramento Valley, 1978

The Need for Bulletin 118 Update 2003

Despite California's heavy reliance on groundwater, basic information for many of the groundwater basins is lacking. Particular essential data necessary to provide for both the protection and optimal use of this resource is not available. To this end, the California Legislature mandated in the Budget Act of 1999 that DWR prepare:

...the statewide update of the inventory of groundwater basins contained in Bulletin 118-80, which includes, but is not limited to, the following: the review and summary of boundaries and hydrographic features, hydrogeologic units, yield data, water budgets, well production characteristics, and water quality and active monitoring data; development of a water budget for each groundwater basin; development of a format and procedures for publication of water budgets on the Internet; development of the model groundwater management ordinance; and development of guidelines for evaluating local groundwater management plans.

The information on groundwater basins presented in Bulletin 118 Update 2003 is mostly limited to the acquisition and compilation of existing data previously developed by federal, State, and local water agencies. While this bulletin is a good starting reference for basic data on a groundwater basin, more recent data and more information about the basin may be available in recent studies conducted by local water management agencies. Those agencies should be contacted to obtain the most recent data.

Report Organization

Bulletin 118 Update 2003 includes this report and supplemental material consisting of individual descriptions and a Geographic Information System-compatible map of each of the delineated groundwater basins in California. The basin descriptions will be updated as new information becomes available, and can be viewed or downloaded at <http://www.waterplan.water.ca.gov/groundwater/118index.htm> (Appendix A). Basin descriptions will not be published in hard copy.

This report is organized into the following topics:

- Groundwater is one of California's most important natural resources, and our reliance on it has continued to grow (Chapter 1).
- Groundwater has a complex legal and institutional framework in California that has shaped the groundwater management system in place today (Chapter 2).
- Groundwater management occurs primarily at the local water agency level, but may also be instituted at the local government level. At the request of the Legislature, DWR has developed some recommendations for a model groundwater management ordinance and components for inclusion in a groundwater management plan (Chapter 3).
- Groundwater has had a flurry of activity in the Legislature and at the ballot box in recent years that will affect the way groundwater is managed in California (Chapter 4).
- Groundwater programs with a variety of objectives exist in many State and federal agencies (Chapter 5).
- Groundwater concepts and definitions should be made available to a wide audience (Chapter 6).
- Groundwater basins with a wide range of characteristics and concerns exist in each of California's 10 hydrologic regions (Chapter 7).



Chapter 1

Groundwater – California’s Hidden Resource

Chapter 1

Groundwater – California's Hidden Resource

In 1975, *California's Ground Water – Bulletin 118* described groundwater as “California's hidden resource.” Today, those words ring as true as ever. Because groundwater cannot be directly observed, except under a relatively few conditions such as at a spring or a wellhead, most Californians do not give much thought to the value that California's vast groundwater supply has added to the State. It is unlikely that California could have achieved its present status as the largest food and agricultural economy in the nation and fifth largest overall economy in the world without groundwater resources. Consider that about 43 percent of all Californians obtain drinking water from groundwater. California is not only the single largest user of groundwater in the nation, but the estimated 14.5 million acre-feet (maf) of groundwater extracted in California in 1995 represents nearly 20 percent of all groundwater extracted in the entire United States (Solley and others 1998).

California's Hydrology

California's climate is dominated by the Pacific storm track. Numerous mountain ranges cause orographic lifting of clouds, producing precipitation mostly on the western slopes and leaving a rain shadow on most eastern slopes (Figure 1 and Figure 2). These storms also leave tremendous accumulations of snow in the Sierra Nevada during the winter months. While the average annual precipitation in California is about 23 inches (DWR 1998), the range of annual rainfall varies greatly from more than 140 inches in the northwestern part of the State to less than 4 inches in the southeastern part of the State.

Snowmelt and rain falling in the mountains flow into creeks, streams, and rivers. The average annual runoff in California is approximately 71 maf (DWR 1998). As these flows make their way into the valleys, much of the water percolates into the ground. The vast majority of California's groundwater that is accessible in significant amounts is stored in alluvial groundwater basins. These alluvial basins, which are the subject of this report, cover nearly 40 percent of the geographic area of the State (Figure 3).

This bulletin focuses on groundwater resources, but in reality groundwater and surface water are inextricably linked in the hydrologic cycle. As an example, groundwater may be recharged by spring runoff in streams, but later in the year the base flow of a stream may be provided by groundwater. So, although the land surface is a convenient division for categorizing water resources, it is a somewhat arbitrary one. It is essential that water managers recognize and account for the relationship between groundwater and surface water in their planning and operations.



Figure 1 Shaded relief map of California




Figure 2 Mean annual precipitation in California, 1961 to 1990



Figure 3 Groundwater basins, subbasins and hydrologic regions

California's Water Supply System

The economic success achieved in California could not have been foreseen a century ago. California's natural hydrologic system appeared too limited to support significant growth in population, industry, and agriculture. The limitations revolved around not only the relative aridity of the State, but the geographic, seasonal, and climatic variability that influence California's water supply. Approximately 70 percent of the State's average annual runoff occurs north of Sacramento, while about 75 percent of the State's urban and agricultural water needs are to the south. Most of the State's precipitation falls between October and April with half of it occurring December through February in average years. Yet, the peak demand for this water occurs in the summer months. Climatic variability includes dramatic deviations from average supply conditions by way of either droughts or flooding. In the 20th century alone, California experienced multiyear droughts in 1912–1913, 1918–1920, 1922–1924, 1929–1934, 1947–1950, 1959–1961, 1976–1977, and 1987–1992 (DWR 1998).

California has dealt with the limitations resulting from its natural hydrology and achieved its improbable growth by developing an intricate system of reservoirs, canals, and pipelines under federal, State and local projects (Figure 4). However, a significant portion of California's water supply needs is also met by groundwater. Typically, groundwater supplies about 30 percent of California's urban and agricultural uses. In dry years, groundwater use increases to about 40 percent statewide and 60% or more in some regions.

The importance of groundwater to the State's development may have been underestimated at the beginning of the 20th century. At that time, groundwater was seen largely as just a convenient resource that allowed for settlement in nearly any part of the State, given groundwater's widespread occurrence. Significant artesian flow from confined aquifers in the Central Valley allowed the early development of agriculture. When the Water Commission Act defined the allocation of surface water rights in 1914, it did not address allocation of the groundwater resource. In the 1920s, the development of the deep-well turbine pump and the increased availability of electricity led to a tremendous expansion of agriculture, which used these high-volume pumps and increased forever the significance of groundwater as a component of water supply in California.




Figure 4 Water projects in California

Box B Will Climate Change Affect California's Groundwater?

California's water storage and delivery system can be thought of as including three reservoir systems—the snowpack of the Sierra Nevada, an extensive system of dams, lakes, and conveyance systems for surface water, and finally the aquifers that store groundwater. Precipitation in the form of snow is stored in the Sierra in winter and early spring and under ideal conditions melts in a manner that allows dams to capture the water for use during California's dry season. When snow melts faster, the dams act as flood control structures to prevent high runoff from flooding lowland areas. Water storage and delivery infrastructure—dams and canals—has been designed largely around the historical snowpack, while aquifers have played a less formal and less recognized role.

What will be the effect of climate change on California's water storage system? How will groundwater basins and aquifers be affected?

The latest report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (2001) reaffirms that climate is changing in ways that cannot be accounted for by natural variability and that "global warming" is occurring. Studies by the National Water Assessment Team for the U.S. Global Change Research Program's National Assessment of the Potential Consequences of Climate Variability and Change identify potential changes that could affect water resources systems. For California, these include higher snow levels leading to more precipitation in the form of rain, earlier runoff, a rise in sea level, and possibly larger floods. In addition to affecting the balance between storage and flood control of our reservoirs, such changes in hydrology would affect wildlands, resulting in faunal and floral displacement and resulting in changes in vegetative water consumption. These changes would also affect patterns of both irrigated and dryland farming.

A warmer, wetter winter would increase the amount of runoff available for groundwater recharge; however, this additional runoff in the winter would be occurring at a time when some basins, particularly in Northern California, are either being recharged at their maximum capacity or are already full. Conversely, reductions in spring runoff and higher evapotranspiration because of warmer temperatures could reduce the amount of water available for recharge and surface storage.

The extent to which climate will change and the impact of that change are both unknown. A reduced snowpack, coupled with increased seasonal rainfall and earlier snowmelt may require a change in the operating procedures for existing dams and conveyance facilities. Furthermore, these changes may require more active development of successful conjunctive management programs in which the aquifers are more effectively used as storage facilities. Water managers might want to evaluate their systems to better understand the existing snowpack-surface water-groundwater relationship, and identify opportunities that may exist to optimize groundwater and other storage capability under a new hydrologic regime that may result from climate change. If more water was stored in aquifers or in new or reoperated surface storage, the additional water could be used to meet water demands when the surface water supply was not adequate because of reduced snowmelt.

Recent Groundwater Development Trends

While development of California's surface water storage system has slowed significantly, groundwater development continues at a strong pace. A review of well completion reports submitted to the California Department of Water Resources (DWR) provides data on the number and type of water wells drilled in California since 1987. For the 14-year period, DWR received 127,616 well completion reports for water supply wells that were newly constructed, reconditioned, or deepened—an average of 9,115 annually¹. Of these, 82 percent were drilled for individual domestic uses; 14 percent for irrigation; and about 4 percent for a combined group of municipal and industrial uses (Figure 5). Although domestic wells predominate, individual domestic use makes up a small proportion of total groundwater use in the State.




Figure 5 Well completion reports filed with DWR from 1987 through 2000

The most evident influence on the number of wells constructed is hydrologic conditions. The number of wells constructed and modified increases dramatically with drought conditions (Figure 6). The number of wells constructed and modified annually from 1987 through 1992 is more than double the annual totals for 1995 through 2000. Each year from 1987 through 1992 was classified as either dry or critically dry; water years 1995 through 2000 were either above normal or wet, based on measured unimpaired runoff in the Sacramento and San Joaquin valleys. In addition to providing an indication of the growth of groundwater development, well completion reports are a valuable source of information on groundwater basin conditions.

¹ DWR also received an average of 4,225 well completion reports for monitoring, which were not included above because they do not extract groundwater for supply purposes.




Figure 6 Well completion reports filed annually from 1987 through 2000

The Need for Groundwater Monitoring and Evaluation

Some 34 million people called California their home in the year 2000, and a population of nearly 46 million is expected by 2020. The increased population and associated commercial, industrial, and institutional growth will bring a substantially greater need for water. This need will be met in part by improved water use efficiency, opportunities to reoperate or expand California’s surface water system, and increased desalination and recycling of water sources not currently considered usable. This need will also be met by storing and extracting additional groundwater. However, the sustainability of the groundwater resource, both in terms of what is currently used and future increased demand, cannot be achieved without effective groundwater management. In turn, effective groundwater management cannot be achieved without a program of groundwater data collection and evaluation.

Perhaps surprising to many, California does not have a comprehensive monitoring network for evaluating the health of its groundwater resource, including quantity and quality of groundwater. The reasons for this are many with the greatest one being that information on groundwater levels and groundwater quality is primarily obtained by drilling underground, which is relatively expensive. Given that delineated groundwater basins cover about 40 percent of the State’s vast area, the cost of a dedicated monitoring network would be prohibitive. The other important reason for the lack of a comprehensive network is that, as will be discussed later in this report, groundwater is a locally controlled resource. State and federal agencies become involved only when a groundwater issue is directly related to the mission of a particular agency or if a local agency requests assistance. For these and other reasons, California lacks a cohesive, dedicated monitoring network.

Box C What about Overdraft?

Overdraft is the condition of a groundwater basin in which the amount of water withdrawn by pumping over the long term exceeds the amount of water that recharges the basin. Overdraft is characterized by groundwater levels that decline over a period of years and never fully recover, even in wet years. Overdraft can lead to increased extraction costs, land subsidence, water quality degradation, and environmental impacts.

The California Water Plan Update, Bulletin 160-98 (DWR 1998) estimated that groundwater overdraft in California in 1995 was nearly 1.5 million acre-feet annually, with most of the overdraft occurring in the Tulare Lake, San Joaquin River, and Central Coast hydrologic regions. The regional and statewide estimates of overdraft are currently being revised for the 2003 update of Bulletin 160. While these estimates are useful from a regional and statewide planning perspective, the basin water budgets calculated for this update of Bulletin 118 clearly indicate that information is insufficient in many basins to quantify overdraft that has occurred, project future impacts on groundwater in storage, and effectively manage groundwater. Further technical discussion of overdraft is provided in Chapter 6 of this bulletin.

When DWR and other agencies involved in groundwater began to collect data in the first half of the 20th century, it quickly became evident that there were insufficient funds to install an adequate number of monitoring wells to accurately determine changes in the condition of groundwater basins. Consequently, to create a serviceable monitoring network, the agencies asked owners of irrigation or domestic wells for permission to measure water levels and to a lesser extent to monitor water quality. These have been called “wells of opportunity.” In many areas, this approach has led to a network of wells that provide adequate information to gain a general understanding of conditions in the subsurface and to track changes through time. In some areas, groundwater studies were conducted and often included the construction of a monitoring well network. These studies have gradually contributed to a more detailed understanding of some of California’s groundwater basins, particularly the most heavily developed basins.

Given the combination of monitoring wells of opportunity and dedicated monitoring wells, it might be assumed that an adequate monitoring network in California will eventually accumulate. However, several factors contribute to reducing the effectiveness of the monitoring network for data collection and evaluation: (1) The funding for data programs in many agencies, which was generally insufficient in the first place, has been reduced significantly. (2) When private properties change ownership, some new owners rescind permission for agency personnel to enter the property and measure the well. (3) The appropriateness of using these private wells is questionable because they are often screened over long intervals encompassing multiple aquifers in the subsurface, and in some cases construction details for the well are unknown. (4) Some wells with long-term records actually reach the end of their usefulness because the casing collapses or something falls into the well, making it unusable. In some cases, groundwater levels may drop below the well depth. (5) As water quality or water quantity conditions change, the monitoring networks may no longer be adequate to provide necessary data to manage groundwater.

The importance of long-term monitoring networks cannot be overstated. Sound groundwater management decisions require observation of trends in groundwater levels and groundwater quality. Only through these long-term evaluations can the question of sustainability of groundwater be answered. For example, this report contains a summary of groundwater contamination in public water supply wells throughout the State collected from 1994 through 2000. While this provides a “snapshot” of the suitability of the groundwater currently developed for public supply needs, it does not address sustainability of groundwater for public uses. Sustainability can only be determined by observing groundwater quality over time. If conditions worsen, local managers will need to take steps to prevent further harm to groundwater quality. Long-term groundwater records require adequate funding and staff to develop groundwater monitoring networks and to collect, summarize, and evaluate the data.



Chapter 2

Groundwater Management in California

Chapter 2 Groundwater Management in California

Groundwater management, as defined in this report, is the planned and coordinated monitoring, operation, and administration of a groundwater basin or portion of a groundwater basin with the goal of long-term sustainability of the resource. Throughout the history of water management in California, local agencies have practiced an informal type of groundwater management. For example, since the early 20th century, when excess surface water was available, some agencies intentionally recharged groundwater to augment their total water supply. In 1947, the amount of groundwater used was estimated at 9 million to 10 million acre-feet. By the beginning of the 21st century, the amount of groundwater used had increased to an estimated 15 million acre-feet. Better monitoring would provide more accurate information. This increased demand on California’s groundwater resources, when coupled with estimates of population growth, has resulted in a need for more intensive groundwater management.

In 1914, California created a system of appropriating surface water rights through a permitting process (Stats 1913, ch. 586), but groundwater use has never been regulated by the State. Though the regulation of groundwater has been considered on several occasions, the California Legislature has repeatedly held that groundwater management should remain a local responsibility (Sax 2002). Although they are treated differently legally, groundwater and surface water are closely interconnected in the hydrologic cycle. Use of one resource will often affect the other, so that effective groundwater management must consider surface water supplies and uses.

Figure 7 depicts the general process by which groundwater management needs are addressed under existing law. Groundwater management needs are identified at the local water agency level and may be directly resolved at the local level. If groundwater management needs cannot be directly resolved at the local agency level, additional actions such as enactment of ordinances by local governments, passage of laws by the Legislature, or decisions by the courts may be necessary to resolve the issues. Upon implementation, local agencies evaluate program success and identify additional management needs. The State’s role is to provide technical and financial assistance to local agencies for their groundwater management efforts, such as through the Local Groundwater Assistance grant program (see Chapter 4, AB 303).




Figure 7 Process of addressing groundwater management needs in California

How Groundwater is Managed in California

There are three basic methods available for managing groundwater resources in California: (1) management by local agencies under authority granted in the California Water Code or other applicable State statutes, (2) local government groundwater ordinances or joint powers agreements, and (3) court adjudications. Table 1 shows how often each of these methods has been used, and each method is discussed briefly below. No law requires that any of these forms of management be applied in a basin. Management is often instituted after local agencies or landowners recognize a specific groundwater problem. The level of groundwater management in any basin or subbasin is often dependent on water availability and demand.

Table 1 Groundwater management methods

Method	Frequency of use ^a
Local water agencies	<p>Undetermined number of agencies with authority to manage some aspect of groundwater under general powers associated with a particular type of district.</p> <p>Thirteen agencies with specially legislated authority to limit or regulate extraction.</p> <p>Seven agencies with adopted plans under authority from Water Code Section 10750 et seq.^b (AB 255 of 1991).</p> <p>More than 200 agencies with adopted plans under authority from Water Code Section 10750 et seq. (AB 3030 of 1992).</p>
Local groundwater management ordinances	Currently adopted in 27 counties.
Court adjudication	<p>Currently decided in 19 groundwater basins, mostly in Southern California.</p> <p>Three more basins are in court.</p>

a. The numbers for some methods are unknown because reporting to the California Department of Water Resources is not required.

b. Section 10750 *et seq.* was amended in 1992.

Groundwater Management through Authority Granted to Local Water Agencies

More than 20 types of local agencies are authorized by statute to provide water for various beneficial uses. Many of these agencies also have statutory authority to institute some form of groundwater management. For example, a Water Replenishment District (Water Code, § 60000 et seq.) is authorized to establish groundwater replenishment programs and collect fees for that service. A Water Conservation District (Water Code, § 75500 et seq.) can levy groundwater extraction fees. Table 2 lists these and other types of local agencies that deliver water and may have authority to institute some form of groundwater management. Most of these agencies are identified in the Water Code, but their specific authority related to groundwater management varies. The Water Code does not require that the agencies report their activities to the California Department of Water Resources (DWR).

Table 2 Local agencies with authority to deliver water for beneficial uses, which may have authority to institute groundwater management

Local agency	Authority	Number of agencies ^a
Community Services District	Gov. Code § 61000 et seq.	313
County Sanitation District	Health and Safety Code § 4700 et seq.	91
County Service Area	Gov. Code § 25210.1 et seq.	897
County Water Authority	Water Code App. 45.	30
County Water District	Water Code § 30000 et seq.	174
County Waterworks District	Water Code § 55000 et seq.	34
Flood Control and Water Conservation District	Water Code App. 38.	39
Irrigation District	Water Code § 20500 et seq.	97
Metropolitan Water District	Water Code App 109.	1
Municipal Utility District	Pub. Util. Code § 11501 et seq.	5
Municipal Water District	Water Code § 71000 et seq.	40
Public Utility District	Pub. Util. Code § 15501 et seq.	54
Reclamation District	Water Code § 50000 et seq.	152
Recreation and Park District	Pub. Resources Code § 5780 et seq.	110
Resort Improvement District	Pub. Resources Code § 13000 et seq.	-
Resource Conservation District	Pub. Resources Code § 9001 et seq.	99
Water Conservation District	Water Code App. 34; Wat. Code § 74000 et seq.	13
Water District	Water Code § 34000 et seq.	141
Water Replenishment District	Water Code § 60000 et seq.	1
Water Storage District	Water Code § 39000 et seq.	8

a. From State Controller’s Office Special Districts Annual Report, 49th Edition.

Greater authority to manage groundwater has been granted to a small number of local agencies or districts created through special acts of the Legislature. For example, the Sierra Valley Groundwater Basin Act of 1980 (Water Code, App. 119) created the first two groundwater management districts in California. Currently, 13 local agencies have specific groundwater management authority as a result of being special act districts. The specific authority of each agency varies, but they can generally be grouped into two categories. Most of the agencies formed since 1980 have the authority to limit export and even control some in-basin extraction upon evidence of overdraft or the threat of overdraft. These agencies can also generally levy fees for groundwater management activities and for water supply replenishment. Agencies formed prior to 1980 do not have authority to limit extraction from a basin. However, the groundwater users in these areas are generally required to report extractions to the agency, and the agency can levy fees for groundwater management or water supply replenishment. Some of these agencies have effectively used a tiered fee

structure to discourage excessive groundwater extraction in the basin. Table 3 lists the names of special act districts with legislative authority to manage groundwater.

Table 3 Special act districts with groundwater management authority in California

District or agency	Water Code citation ^a	Year agency established in Code ^b
Desert Water Agency	App. 100	1961
Fox Canyon Groundwater Management Agency	App. 121.	1982
Honey Lake Groundwater Management District	App. 129.	1989
Long Valley Groundwater Management District	App. 119.	1980
Mendocino City Community Services District	Section 10700 et seq.	1987
Mono County Tri-Valley Groundwater Management District	App. 128.	1989
Monterey Peninsula Water Management District	App. 118.	1977
Ojai Groundwater Management Agency	App. 131.	1991
Orange County Water District	App. 40.	1933
Pajaro Valley Water Management Agency	App. 124.	1984
Santa Clara Valley Water District	App. 60.	1951
Sierra Valley Groundwater Management District	App. 119.	1980
Willow Creek Groundwater Management Agency	App. 135.	1993

a. From West's Annotated California Codes (1999 update)

b. This represents the year the agency was established in the Water Code. Specific authorities, such as those for groundwater management activities, may have been granted through later amendments.

In 1991, AB 255 (Stats. 1991, Ch. 903) was enacted authorizing local agencies overlying basins subject to critical conditions of overdraft, as defined in DWR's Bulletin 118-80, to establish programs for groundwater management within their service areas. Water Code section 10750 et seq. provided these agencies with the powers of a water replenishment district to raise revenue for facilities to manage the basin for the purposes of extraction, recharge, conveyance, and water quality. Seven local agencies adopted plans under this authority.

The provisions of AB 255 were repealed in 1992 with the passage of AB 3030 (Stats. 1992, Ch. 947). This legislation was significant in that it greatly increased the number of local agencies authorized to develop a groundwater management plan and set forth a common framework for management by local agencies throughout California. AB 3030, which is codified in Water Code section 10750 et seq., provides a systematic procedure to develop a groundwater management plan by local agencies overlying the groundwater basins defined by Bulletin 118-75 (DWR 1975) and updates. Upon adoption of a plan, these agencies could possess the same authority as a water replenishment district to "fix and collect fees and assessments for groundwater management" (Water Code, § 10754). However, the authority to fix and collect these fees and assessments is contingent on receiving a majority of votes in favor of the proposal in a local election (Water Code, § 10754.3). More than 200 agencies have adopted an AB 3030 groundwater management plan. None of these agencies is known to have exercised the authority of a Water Replenishment District.

Water Code section 10755.2 expands groundwater management opportunities by encouraging coordinated plans and by authorizing public agencies to enter into a joint powers agreement or memorandum of understanding with public or private entities that provide water service. At least 20 coordinated plans have been prepared to date involving nearly 120 agencies, including cities and private water companies.

Local Groundwater Ordinances

A second general method of managing groundwater in California is through ordinances adopted by local governments such as cities or counties. Twenty-seven counties have adopted groundwater ordinances, and others are being considered (Figure 8). The authority of counties to regulate groundwater has been challenged, but in 1995 the California Supreme Court declined to review an appeal of a lower court decision *Baldwin v. County of Tehama* (1994) that holds that State law does not occupy the field of groundwater management and does not prevent cities and counties from adopting ordinances to manage groundwater under their police powers. However, the precise nature and extent of the police power of cities and counties to regulate groundwater is uncertain.

The Public Policy Institute of California recently performed a study of California's water transfer market, which included a detailed investigation of the nature of groundwater ordinances by counties in California. The report found that 22 counties had adopted ordinances requiring a permit to export groundwater. In all but three cases, restricting out-of-county uses appears to be the only purpose (Hanak 2003). One ordinance, adopted recently in Glenn County (Box D, "Basin Management Objectives for Groundwater Management"), takes a comprehensive approach by establishing management objectives for the county's groundwater basins. Several other counties in Northern California are considering adopting similar management objective based ordinances.

Ordinances are mostly a recent trend in groundwater management, with 24 of the 27 ordinances enacted since 1990. Local ordinances passed during the 1990s have significantly increased the potential role of local governments in groundwater management. The intent of most ordinances has been to hold project proponents accountable for impacts that may occur as a result of proposed export projects. Because adoption of most of these ordinances is recent, their effect on local and regional groundwater management planning efforts is not yet fully known. However, it is likely that future groundwater development will take place within the constraints of local groundwater management ordinances. Table 4 lists counties with groundwater management ordinances and their key elements.



Figure 8 Counties with groundwater ordinances

Box D Basin Management Objectives for Groundwater Management

Most county groundwater management ordinances require that an export proponent prove the project will not deplete groundwater, cause groundwater quality degradation, or result in land subsidence. Although these factors could be part of any groundwater management plan, these ordinances do not require that a groundwater management plan be developed and implemented.

The only ordinance requiring development and adoption of objectives to be accomplished by management of the basin was adopted by the Glenn County Board of Supervisors in 2000. The action came after a citizens committee spent five years working with stakeholders. The process of developing a groundwater management ordinance for Glenn County began in 1995 when local landowners and county residents became concerned about plans to export groundwater or substitute groundwater for exported surface water. Control of exports was the focus of early ordinance discussions.

After long discussions and technical advice from groundwater specialists, the committee realized that goals and objectives must be identified for effective management of groundwater in the county. What did the county want to accomplish by managing groundwater within the county? What did groundwater management really mean?

The concept of establishing basin management objectives emerged (BMOs). BMOs would establish threshold values for groundwater levels, groundwater quality, and land surface subsidence. When a threshold level is reached, the rules and regulations require that groundwater extraction be adjusted or stopped to prevent exceeding the threshold.

The Glenn County Board of Supervisors has adopted BMOs, which were developed by an advisory committee, for groundwater levels throughout the county. While currently there are 17 BMOs representing the 17 management areas in the county, the goal is to begin managing the entire county in a manner that benefits each of the local agencies and their landowners, as well as landowners outside of an agency boundary. The committee is now developing BMOs for groundwater quality and land surface subsidence.

There is no single set of management objectives that will be successful in all areas. Groundwater management must be adapted to an area's political, institutional, legal, and technical constraints and opportunities. Groundwater management must be tailored to each basin or subbasin's conditions and needs. Even within a single basin, the management objectives may change as more is learned about managing the resource within that basin. Flexibility is the key, but that flexibility must operate within a framework that ensures public participation, monitoring, evaluation, feedback on management alternatives, rules and regulations, and enforcement.

Table 4 Counties with ordinances addressing groundwater management

County	Year enacted	Key elements (refer to ordinances for exemptions and other details)
Butte	1996	Export permit required (extraction & substitute pumping), Water Commission and Technical Advisory Committee, groundwater planning reports (county-wide monitoring program)
Calaveras	2002	Export permit required (extraction & substitute pumping)
Colusa	1998	Export permit required (extraction & substitute pumping)
Fresno	2000	Export permit required (extraction & substitute pumping)
Glenn	1990 rev. 2000	Water Advisory Committee and Technical Advisory Committee, basin management objectives and monitoring network, export permit required (1990)
Imperial	1996	Commission established to manage groundwater, including controlling exports (permit required), overdraft, artificial recharge, and development projects
Inyo	1998	Regulates (1) water transfers pursuant to Water Code Section 1810, (2) sales of water to the City of Los Angeles from within Inyo Co., (3) transfer or transport of water from basins within Inyo County to another basin with the County, and (4) transfers of water from basins within Inyo Co. to any area outside the County.
Kern	1998	Conditional use permit for export to areas both outside county and within watershed area of underlying aquifer in county. Only applies to southeastern drainage of Sierra Nevada and Tehachapi mountains.
Lake	1999	Export permit required (extraction & substitute pumping)
Lassen	1999	Export permit required (extraction & substitute pumping)
Madera	1999	Permit required for export, groundwater banking, and import for groundwater banking purposes to areas outside local water agencies
Mendocino	1995	Mining of groundwater regulated for new developments in Town of Mendocino
Modoc	2000	Export permit required for transfers out of basin
Mono	1988	Permit required for transfers out of basin
Monterey	1993	Water Resources Agency strictly regulates extraction facilities in zones with groundwater problems
Napa	1996	Permits for local groundwater extractions; exemptions for single parcels and agricultural use
Sacramento	1952 rev. 1985	Water Agency established to manage and protect groundwater management zones; replenishment charges
San Benito	1995	Mining groundwater (overdraft) for export prohibited; permit required for off-parcel use, injecting imported water; influence of well pumping restrictions
San Bernardino	2002	Permit required for any new groundwater well within the desert region of the county
San Diego	1991	Provides for mapping of groundwater impacted basins (defined); projects within impacted basins require groundwater investigations
San Joaquin	1996	Export permit required (extraction & substitute pumping)
Shasta	1997	Export permit required (extraction & substitute pumping)
Sierra	1998	Export permit required or for off-parcel use
Siskiyou	1998	Permit required for transfers out of basin
Tehama	1992	Mining groundwater (overdraft) for export prohibited; permit required for off-parcel use; influence of well pumping restrictions
Tuolumne	2001	Export permit required (extraction & substitute pumping)
Yolo	1996	Export permit required (extraction & substitute pumping)

Adjudicated Groundwater Basins

A third general form of groundwater management in California is court adjudication. In some California groundwater basins, as the demand for groundwater exceeded supply, landowners and other parties turned to the courts to determine how much groundwater can rightfully be extracted by each user. The courts study available data to arrive at a distribution of the groundwater that is available each year, usually based on the California law of overlying use and appropriation. This court-directed process can be lengthy and costly. As noted in Table 5, the longest adjudication took 24 years. Many of these cases have been resolved with a court-approved negotiated settlement, called a stipulated judgment. Unlike overlying and non-overlying rights to groundwater, such decisions guarantee to each party a proportionate share of the groundwater that is available each year. The intense technical focus on the groundwater supply and restrictions on groundwater extraction for all parties make adjudications one of the strongest forms of groundwater management in California.

There are 19 court adjudications for groundwater basins in California, mostly in Southern California (see Table 5). Eighteen of the adjudications were undertaken in State Superior Court and one in federal court. For each adjudicated groundwater basin, the court usually appoints a watermaster to oversee the court judgment. In 15 of these adjudications, the court judgment limits the amount of groundwater that can be extracted by all parties based on a court-determined safe yield of the basin. The basin boundaries are also defined by the court. The Santa Margarita Basin was adjudicated in federal court. That decision requires water users to report the amount of surface water and groundwater they use, but groundwater extraction is not restricted.

Most basin adjudications have resulted in either a reduction or no increase in the amount of groundwater extracted. As a result, agencies often import surface water to meet increased demand. The original court decisions provided watermasters with the authority to regulate extraction of the quantity of groundwater; however, they omitted authority to regulate extraction to protect water quality or to prevent the spread of contaminants in the groundwater. Because water quantity and water quality are inseparable, watermasters are recognizing that they must also manage groundwater quality.

Box E Adjudication of Groundwater Rights in the Raymond Basin

The first basin-wide adjudication of groundwater rights in California was in the Raymond Basin in Los Angeles County in 1949 (*Pasadena v. Alhambra*). The first water well in Raymond Basin was drilled in 1881; 20 years later, the number of operating wells grew to about 140. Because of this pumping, the City of Pasadena began spreading water in 1914 to replenish the groundwater, and during the next 10 years the city spread more than 20,000 acre-feet.

Pumping during 1930 through 1937 caused water levels to fall 30 to 50 feet in wells in Pasadena. After attempting to negotiate a reduction of pumping on a cooperative basis, the City of Pasadena, on September 23, 1937, filed a complaint in Superior Court against the City of Alhambra and 29 other pumpers to quiet title to the water rights within Raymond Basin. The court ruled that the city must amend its complaint, making defendants of all entities pumping more than 100 acre-feet per year, and that it was not a simple quiet title suit but, a general adjudication of the water rights in the basin.

In February 1939, a court used the reference procedure under the State Water Code to direct the State Division of Water Resources, Department of Public Works (predecessor to the Department of Water Resources) as referee to review all physical facts pertaining to the basin, determine the safe yield, and ascertain whether there was a surplus or an overdraft. The study took 2-1/2 years to complete and cost more than \$53,000, which was paid by the parties. The resulting Report of Referee submitted to the court in July 1943 found that the annual safe yield of the basin was 21,900 acre-feet but that the actual pumping and claimed rights were 29,400 acre-feet per year.

Most parties agreed to appoint a committee of seven attorneys and engineers to work out a stipulated agreement. In 1944, the court designated the Division of Water Resources to serve as watermaster for the stipulated agreement, which all but one of the parties supported. On December 23, 1944, the judge signed the judgment that adopted the stipulation.

The stipulation provided that (1) the water was taken by each party openly, notoriously, and under a claim of right, which was asserted to be, and was adverse to each and all other parties; (2) the safe yield would be divided proportionally among the parties; and (3) each party's right to a specified proportion of the safe yield would be declared and protected. It also established an arrangement for the exchange of pumping rights among parties.

Based on the stipulation, the court adopted a program of proportionate reductions. In so doing, the court developed the doctrine of mutual prescription, whereby the rights were essentially based on the highest continual amount of pumping during the five years following the beginning of the overdraft, and under conditions of overdraft, all of the overlying and appropriative water users had acquired prescriptive rights against each other, that is, mutual prescription.*

In 1945, one party appealed the judgment, and in 1947, the District Court of Appeals reversed and remanded *Pasadena v. Alhambra*. However, on June 3, 1949, the State Supreme Court overturned the appellate court's decision and affirmed the original judgment. In 1950, the court granted a motion by the City of Pasadena that there be a review of the determination of safe yield, and in 1955, the safe yield and the total decreed rights were increased to 30,622 acre-feet per year. In 1984, watermaster responsibilities were assigned to the Raymond Basin Management Board.

*In *City of Los Angeles v. City of San Fernando* (1975) the California Supreme Court rejected the doctrine of mutual prescription and held that a groundwater basin should be adjudicated based on the correlative rights of overlying users and prior appropriation among non-overlying users. For further discussion, see Appendix B.

Table 5 List of adjudicated basins

Court name	Relationship to DWR Bulletin 118 basin name; county	Basin No.	Filed in court	Final decision	Watermaster and/or website
1—Scott River Stream System	Scott River Valley; Siskiyou	1-5	1970	1980	Two local irrigation districts
2—Santa Paula Basin	Subbasin of Santa Clara River; Ventura	4-4	1991	1996	Three-person technical advisory committee from United Water CD, City of Ventura, and Santa Paula Basin Pumpers Association; www.unitedwater.org
3—Central Basin	Northeast part of Coastal Plain of Los Angeles County Basin; Los Angeles	4-11	1962	1965	DWR—Southern District; www.dpla.water.ca.gov/sd/watermaster/watermaster.html
4—West Coast Basin	Southwest part of Coastal Plain of Los Angeles County Basin; Los Angeles	4-11	1946	1961	DWR—Southern District; www.dpla.water.ca.gov/sd/watermaster/watermaster.html
5—Upper Los Angeles River Area	San Fernando Valley Basin (entire watershed); Los Angeles	4-12	1955	1979	Superior Court appointee
6—Raymond Basin	Northwest part of San Gabriel Valley Basin; Los Angeles	4-13	1937	1944	Raymond Basin Management Board
7—Main San Gabriel Basin	San Gabriel Valley Basin, excluding Raymond Basin; Los Angeles	4-13	1968	1973	Water purveyors and water districts elect a nine-member board; www.watermaster.org/
<i>Puente Narrows, Addendum to Main San Gabriel Basin decision</i>			1972	1972	Two consulting engineers
8—Puente	San Gabriel Valley Basin, excluding Raymond Basin; Los Angeles	4-13	1985	1985	Three consultants
9—Cummings Basin	Cummings Valley Basin; Kern	5-2	1966	1972	Tehachapi-Cummings County Water District; www.tccwd.com/gwm.htm
10—Tehachapi Basin	Tehachapi Valley West Basin and Tehachapi Valley East Basin; Kern	5-28 6-45	1966	1973	Tehachapi-Cummings County Water District; www.tccwd.com/gwm.htm
11—Brite Basin	Brite Valley; Kern	5-80	1966	1970	Tehachapi-Cummings County Water District; www.tccwd.com/gwm.htm

Table 5 List of adjudicated basins (continued)

Court name	Relationship to DWR Bulletin 118 basin name; county	Basin No.	Filed in court	Final decision	Watermaster and/or website
12—Mojave Basin Area Adjudication	Lower, Middle & Upper Mojave River Valley Basins; El Mirage & Lucerne valleys; San Bernardino	6-40, 6-41, 6-42	1990	1996	Mojave Water Agency; www.mojavewater.org/mwa700.htm
13—Warren Valley Basin	Part of Warren Valley Basin; San Bernardino	7-12	1976	1977	Hi-Desert Water District; www.mojavewater.org
14—Chino Basin	Northwest part of Upper Santa Ana Valley Basin; San Bernardino and Riverside	8-2	1978	1978	Nine people, recommended by producers and appointed by the court; www.cbwm.org/
15—Cucamonga Basin	North central part of Upper Santa Ana Valley Basin; San Bernardino	8-2	1975	1978	Not yet appointed, operated as part of Chino Basin
16—San Bernardino Basin Area	Northeast part of Upper Santa Ana Basin; San Bernardino and Riverside	8-2	1963	1969	One representative each from Western Municipal Water District of Riverside County & San Bernardino Valley Municipal Water District
17—Six Basins	Six subbasins in northwest upper Santa Ana Valley; Upper & Lower Claremont Heights, Canyon, Pomona, Live Oak & Ganesha; Los Angeles, Small portions of Upper Claremont Heights and Canyon are in San Bernardino County	4-14, 8-2	1998	1998	Nine-member board representing all parties to the judgment
18—Santa Margarita River watershed	The Santa Margarita River watershed, including 3 groundwater basins: Santa Margarita Valley, Temecula Valley and Cahuilla Valley Basins; San Diego and Riverside.	9-4, 9-5, 9-6	1951	1966	U.S. District Court appointee
19—Goleta	Goleta Central Basin; judgment includes North Basin; Santa Barbara	3-16	1973	1989	No watermaster appointed; the court retains jurisdiction

How Successful Have Groundwater Management Efforts Been?

This chapter describes the opportunities for local agencies to manage their groundwater resources. Many have questioned whether these opportunities have led to an overall successful system of groundwater management throughout California. How successful groundwater management has been throughout the State is a difficult question and cannot be answered at present. While there are many examples of local agency successes (see Box F, “Managing through a Joint Powers Agreement,” Box G, “Managing a Basin through Integrated Water Management,” and Box H, “Managing Groundwater Using both Physical and Institutional Solutions”), there are neither mandates to prepare groundwater management plans nor reporting requirements when plans are implemented, so a comprehensive assessment of local planning efforts is not possible. Additionally, many plans have been adopted only recently, during a period of several consecutive wet years, so many of the plan components are either untested or not implemented.

At a minimum, successful groundwater management should be defined as maintaining and maximizing long-term reliability of the groundwater resource, focused on preventing significant depletion of groundwater in storage over the long term and preventing significant degradation of groundwater quality. A review of some of the groundwater management plans prepared under AB 3030 reveals that some plans are simply brief recitations about continuing the agency’s existing programs. Not all agencies that enacted groundwater management plans under AB 3030 are actively implementing the plan.

Despite this apparent lack of implementation of groundwater management plans prepared under AB 3030, the bill has certainly increased interest in more effective groundwater management. With more than 200 agencies participating in plans and more than 120 of those involved in coordinated plans with other agencies, AB 3030 has resulted in a heightened awareness of groundwater management. Additionally, annual reports published by a few water agencies indicate that they are indeed moving toward better coordination throughout the basin and more effective management of all water supplies. Given the history of groundwater management in California, these seemingly small steps toward better management may actually represent giant strides forward.

More recently, financial incentives have played a large role in driving groundwater management activities. For example, under grant and loan programs resulting from Proposition 13 of 2000 (see description in Chapter 4), local agencies submitted applications proposing a total increase in annual water yield of more than 300,000 acre-feet through groundwater storage projects. Additional projects and programs would be developed with sufficient funding for feasibility and pilot studies. Unfortunately, not enough funding exists for all of the proposed projects, and many other legal and institutional barriers remain (see Box I, “Impediments to Conjunctive Management Programs in California”). It is clear, however, that further incentives would help agencies move ahead more aggressively in their groundwater management planning efforts.

Additional progress in groundwater management is reflected by passage of amendments to the Water Code (§§ 10753.4 and 10795.4 as amended, §§ 10753.7, 10753.8, and 10753.9 as amended and renumbered, and §§ 10753.1 and 10753.7 as added) through SB 1938 of 2002. The amendments require that groundwater management plans include specific components for agencies to be eligible for some public funds for groundwater projects. The provisions of SB 1938 (2001) are fully described in Chapters 3 and 4.

This evaluation of groundwater management success has not really considered ordinances and adjudications. Adjudications have been successful at maintaining the groundwater basin conditions, often restricting pumping for all basin users. In some cases, adjudication provides the necessary framework for more proactive management as well. Ordinances have successfully restricted exports from basins, but have not

Box F Managing through a Joint Powers Agreement

In 1993, representatives from business, environmental, public, and water purveyor interests formed the Sacramento Area Water Forum to develop a plan to protect the region's water resources from the effects of prolonged drought as the demand for water continues to grow. The Water Forum was founded on two co-equal objectives: (1) to provide a reliable and safe water supply for the region's economic health and planned development to the year 2030 and (2) to preserve the fishery, wildlife, recreational and aesthetic values of the lower American River.

After a six-year consensus-based process of education, analysis and negotiation, the participants signed a Water Forum agreement to meet these objectives. The agreement provides a framework for avoiding future water shortages, environmental degradation, groundwater contamination, threats to groundwater reliability, and limits to economic prosperity.

The Sacramento Groundwater Authority (SGA) was formed to fulfill a key Water Forum goal of protecting and managing the north-area groundwater basin. The SGA is a joint powers authority formed for the purpose of collectively managing the region's groundwater resources. This authority permits SGA to make contractual arrangements required to implement a conjunctive use program, and also provides potential partners with the legal and political certainty for entering into long-term agreements.

SGA's regional banking and exchange program is designed to provide long-term supply benefits for local needs, but also will have the potential to provide broader statewide benefits consistent with American River environmental needs. Water stored in Folsom Lake would be conjunctively used with groundwater in order to reduce surface water diversions in dry years and to achieve in-lieu recharge of the basin in wet years. The conjunctive use program participants include 16 water providers in northern Sacramento and southern Placer counties that serve water to more than half a million people.

Two of three implementation phases of the program are complete. In the first phase, program participants identified long-term water supply needs and conducted an inventory of existing infrastructure that could be used to implement the program. In the second phase, SGA completed two pilot banking and exchange projects, demonstrating the technical, legal, and institutional viability of a regional conjunctive use program. In the first pilot study, water agencies worked with the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation and the Sacramento Area Flood Control Agency to bank 2,100 acre-feet of groundwater, providing additional flood storage capacity in Folsom Lake. In the second pilot study, Citrus Heights and Fair Oaks water districts and the city of Sacramento extracted and used 7,143 acre-feet of groundwater, forgoing a portion of their rights to surface water, making this water available to the Environmental Water Account. The third phase of the SGA program is to further solidify the institutional framework and construct facilities to implement a full-scale regional conjunctive use program. These facilities, that will result in an average annual yield of 21,400 acre-feet, are currently under construction, funded in part by a \$21.6 million grant under Proposition 13 of 2000.

Box G Managing a Basin through Integrated Water Management

Orange County Water District (OCWD) was established in 1933 by an uncodified Act (Water Code App. 40) to manage Orange County's groundwater basin and protect the Santa Ana River rights of water users of north-central Orange County. The district manages the groundwater basin, which provides as much as 75 percent of the water supply for its service area. The district strives for a groundwater-based water supply with enough reserves to provide a water supply through drought conditions. An integrated set of water management practices helps achieve this, including the use of recharge, alternative sources, and conservation.

Recharge

The Santa Ana River provides the main natural recharge source for the county's groundwater basin. Increased groundwater use and lower-than-average rainfall during the late 1980s and early 1990s forced the district to rely on an aggressive program to enhance recharge of the groundwater basin. Programs used today to optimize water use and availability include:

- Construction of levees in the river channel to increase infiltration.
- Construction of artificial recharge basins within the forebay.
- Development of an underwater basin cleaning vehicle that removes a clogging layer at the bottom of the recharge basin and extends the time between draining the basin for cleaning by a bulldozer.
- Use of storm water captured behind Prado Dam that would otherwise flow to the ocean.
- Use of imported water from the State Water Project and Colorado River.
- Injection of treated recycled water to form a seawater intrusion barrier.

Alternative Water Use and Conservation

OCWD has successfully used nontraditional sources of water to help satisfy the growing need for water in Orange County. Projects that have added to the effective supply of groundwater are:

- Use of treated recycled water for irrigation and industrial use.
- In-lieu use to reduce groundwater pumping.
- Change to low-flow toilets and showerheads.
- Participation of 70 percent of Orange County hotels and motels in water conservation programs.
- Change to more efficient computerized irrigation.

Since 1975, Water Factory 21 has provided recycled water that meets all primary and secondary drinking water standards set by the California Department of Health Services. OCWD has proposed a larger, more efficient membrane purification project called the Groundwater Replenishment System (GWRS), which is scheduled to begin operating at 70,000 acre-feet per year in 2007. By 2020 the system will annually supply 121,000 acre-feet of high quality water for recharge, for injection into the seawater intrusion barrier, and for direct industrial uses.

This facility will use a lower cost microfiltration and reverse osmosis treatment process that produces water of near distilled quality, which will help reverse the trend of rising total dissolved solids (TDS) in groundwater caused by the recharge of higher TDS-content Santa Ana River and Colorado River waters. The facility will use about half the energy required to import an equivalent amount of water to Orange County from Northern California. The GWRS will be funded, in part, by a \$30 million grant under Proposition 13 of 2000.

Source: Orange County Water District

Box H Managing Groundwater using both Physical and Institutional Solutions

Four agencies share responsibility for groundwater management in Ventura County. Coordination and cooperation between these agencies focus on regular meetings, attendance at each other's board meetings, joint projects, watershed committees, and ongoing personal contacts to discuss water-related issues. The agencies and their areas of responsibility are:

- United Water Conservation District – physical solutions, monitoring, modeling, reporting, administering management plans and adjudication;
- Fox Canyon Groundwater Management Agency – pumping allocations, credits and penalties, abandoned well destruction, data for irrigation efficiency;
- County of Ventura – well permits, well construction regulations, tracking abandoned wells; and
- Calleguas Municipal Water District – groundwater storage of imported water.

In Ventura County 75% to 80% of the extracted groundwater is for agriculture; the remainder is for municipal and industrial use. Seawater intrusion into the aquifers was recognized in the 1940s and was the driving force behind a number of groundwater management projects and policies in the county's groundwater basins. As groundwater issues became more complicated at the end of the 20th century, these groundwater management projects and policies were useful in solving a number of problems.

Physical Solutions

Physical solutions substitute supplemental surface water for groundwater pumping near coastal areas, increase basin recharge, and increase the reliability of imported water. Projects include:

- Winter flood-flow storage for dry season release
- Wells and pipelines to move pumping for drinking water away from the coast
- Diversion structures to supply surface water to spreading grounds and irrigation
- Pipelines to convey surface water to coastal areas
- Las Posas Basin Aquifer Storage and Recovery project

Institutional Solutions

Institutional solutions focus on developing and implementing effective groundwater management programs, reducing pumping demands, tracking groundwater levels and water quality, managing groundwater pumping patterns, and destroying abandoned wells to prevent cross-contamination of aquifers. Solutions include:

- Creation of Fox Canyon Groundwater Management Agency (GMA), which represents each major pumping constituency
- Use of irrigation efficiency (agriculture), water conservation, and alternative sources of water (urban) to reduce pumping by 25%
- Manage outside the GMA area through an AB 3030 plan and a court adjudication
- Limit new permits for wells in specific aquifers to avoid seawater intrusion
- Creation of a program to destroy abandoned wells
- Creation of a database of historical groundwater levels and quality information collected since the 1920s
- Development of a regional groundwater flow model and a regional master plan for groundwater projects
- Creation of an irrigation weather station to assist in irrigation efficiency

Implementation of these physical and institutional management tools has resulted in the reversal of seawater intrusion in key coastal monitoring wells. These same tools are being used to mitigate saline intrusion (not seawater) in two inland basins and to reduce seasonal nitrate problems in the recharge area. Work is being expanded to help reduce loading of agricultural pesticides and nutrients. Without close coordination and cooperation of the county's water-related agencies, municipalities, and landowners, it would have been very difficult to implement most of these solutions. Although such coordination takes time, the investment has paid off in solutions that help provide a sustainable water supply for all water users in Ventura County.

Source: United Water Conservation District

necessarily improved groundwater management. The primary intent of most ordinances is to ensure that proponents of projects are held accountable for potential impacts of the proposed export projects. As studies lead to a better understanding of local water resources, development of pilot export and transfer projects, with appropriate monitoring, may lead to greater certainty in managing groundwater resources. Areas managed under adjudications and ordinances will continue to develop more active management approaches. Population growth and its accompanying increased demand on the resources is a certainty. Most geographic areas in California are not immune to this growth, so strategies for more than just maintaining existing groundwater supply through extraction or export restrictions need to be implemented.

Box I Impediments to Conjunctive Management Programs in California

In 1998 the National Water Research Institute, in cooperation with the Association of Ground Water Agencies and the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California, conducted a workshop to determine the biggest impediments to implementing a cost-effective conjunctive water management program in California.

Since that time, some steps have been taken to overcome those impediments, but several important barriers remain. Workshop participants identified the 10 most significant obstacles:

- 1) Inability of local and regional water management governance entities to build trust, resolve differences (internally and externally), and share control.
- 2) Inability to match benefits and funding burdens in ways that are acceptable to all parties, including third parties.
- 3) Lack of sufficient federal, State, and regional financial incentives to encourage groundwater conjunctive use to meet statewide water needs.
- 4) Legal constraints that impede conjunctive use, regarding storage rights, basin judgments, area of origin, water rights, and indemnification.
- 5) Lack of statewide leadership in the planning and development of conjunctive use programs as part of comprehensive water resources plans, which recognize local, regional, and other stakeholders' interests.
- 6) Inability to address quality difference in "put" versus "take"; standards for injection, export, and reclaimed water; and unforeseeable future groundwater degradation.
- 7) Risk that water stored cannot be extracted when needed because of infrastructure, water quality or water level, politics, and institutional or contractual provisions.
- 8) Lack of assurances to prevent third-party impacts and assurances to increase willingness of local citizens to participate.
- 9) Lack of creativity in developing lasting "win-win" conjunctive use projects, agreements, and programs.
- 10) Supplemental suppliers and basin managers have different roles and expectations in relation to conjunctive use.

[**Editor's note:** The California Department of Water Resources' Conjunctive Water Management program has taken significant steps to overcome several of these impediments, using a combination of California Bay-Delta Authority, DWR, Proposition 13, and AB 303 funds to promote locally planned and controlled conjunctive use programs.]

Future Groundwater Management in California

Trying to predict what will happen with groundwater management in California is difficult given that actions by all of the involved groups—landowners, local governments, local, State, and federal agencies, and the courts—will continue to shape groundwater management in the future. However, the increasing population and its demands on California’s water supply will accelerate the rate at which groundwater management issues become critical and require resolution. Some general conclusions are:

- Groundwater management will continue to be a local responsibility with increasing emphasis on how actions in one part of a basin impact groundwater resources throughout the basin. Regional cooperation and coordination of groundwater management activities will increase.
- As the State’s population continues to grow, the increased reliance on groundwater will keep the topic of groundwater management at the forefront of legislative interest.
- Coordinated management of groundwater and surface water resources, through further development of conjunctive water management programs and projects, will become increasingly important.
- The increased reliance on groundwater in the future will necessitate a more direct link between land use planning, watershed management, floodplain management, and groundwater management plans.
- Current trends indicate that financial incentives in the form of loans and grants are increasing groundwater management planning and implementation at the local level. These successes will only continue at the current pace with increased funding to local agencies.
- Management of groundwater will increasingly include consideration of groundwater quality and groundwater quantity.
- Groundwater will be an important element in the trend toward an integrated water management approach that considers the full range of demand management and supply alternatives.
- Understanding of the relationship of groundwater and surface water and the role of groundwater in the environment will continue to grow.

Box J Managing Groundwater Quantity and Quality

When people hear the words “groundwater monitoring” they may think either of measuring groundwater levels or of analyzing for groundwater quality. In reality, monitoring and management of groundwater quantity and groundwater quality are inseparable components of a management plan.

Although the primary focus of the California Department of Water Resources (DWR) is on groundwater quantity and the measures taken by local agencies to manage supply, management must also consider groundwater quality. Natural or anthropogenic contamination and pumping patterns that are not managed to protect groundwater quality may limit the quantity of groundwater that is available for use in a basin.

Several State programs provide useful data as well as regulatory direction on groundwater quality that managers can use in managing their groundwater supply. One program is the Drinking Water Source Assessment and Protection Program prepared by the California Department of Health Services in response to 1996 amendments to the federal Safe Drinking Water Act. The DWSAP requires water purveyors to assess sources of drinking water, develop zones indicating time of travel of groundwater, and identify potentially contaminating activities around supply wells. The goal is to ensure that the quality of drinking water sources is maintained and protected. Other useful water quality data for groundwater managers is collected by the agencies within the California Environmental Protection Agency, including the State Water Resources Control Board, Department of Pesticide Regulation and the Department of Toxic Substances Control, which are discussed in more detail in Chapter 5. Each of these agencies has a specific statutory responsibility to collect groundwater quality information and protect water quality.

Protection of Recharge Areas

Groundwater recharge areas, and the human activities that can render them unusable, are an example of the need to coordinate land use activities to protect both groundwater quality and quantity. Protection of recharge areas, whether natural or man-made, is necessary if the quantity and quality of groundwater in the aquifer are to be maintained. Existing and potential recharge areas must be protected so that they remain functional, that is they continue to provide recharge to the aquifer and they are not contaminated with chemical or microbial constituents. Land-use practices should be implemented so that neither the quantity nor quality of groundwater is reduced. A lack of protection of recharge areas could decrease the availability of usable groundwater and require the substitution of a more expensive water supply.

Many potentially contaminating activities have routinely been practiced in recharge areas, leading to the presence of contaminants in groundwater. In many areas, groundwater obtained from aquifers now requires remediation. Recent studies in some areas show that recharge areas are contaminated, but down-gradient wells are not, indicating that it is only a matter of time before contaminants in wells reach concentrations that require treatment of the groundwater.

In addition to quality impacts, urban development, consisting of pavement and buildings on former agricultural land, lining of flood control channels, and other land use changes have reduced the capacity of recharge areas to replenish groundwater, effectively reducing the safe yield of some basins.

Box J Managing Groundwater Quantity and Quality (continued)

To ensure that recharge areas continue to replenish high quality groundwater, water managers and land use planners should work together to:

- Identify recharge areas so the public and local zoning agencies are aware of the areas that need protection from paving and from contamination;
- Include recharge areas in zoning categories that eliminate the possibility of contaminants entering the subsurface;
- Standardize guidelines for pre-treatment of the recharge water, including recycled water;
- Build monitoring wells to collect data on changes in groundwater quality that may be caused by recharge; and
- Consider the functions of recharge areas in land use and development decisions.



Chapter 3

Groundwater Management Planning and Implementation

Chapter 3

Groundwater Management Planning and Implementation

The 1990s were a very important decade in the history of groundwater management in California. In 1992, the State Legislature provided an opportunity for more formal groundwater management with the passage of AB 3030 (Water Code § 10750 et seq.). More than 200 agencies have adopted an AB 3030 groundwater management plan. Additionally, 24 of the 27 counties with ordinances related to groundwater management adopted those laws during the 1990s. Plans prepared under AB 3030 certainly brought unprecedented numbers of water agencies into the groundwater management arena, and counties are now heavily involved in groundwater management, primarily through ordinances. However, many plans prepared under AB 3030 have had little or no implementation, and many counties focus primarily on limiting exports rather than on a comprehensive management program. As a result, the California Budget Act of 1999 (Stats. 1999, ch. 50), which authorized this update to Bulletin 118, directed the California Department of Water Resources (DWR) to complete several tasks, including developing criteria for evaluating groundwater management plans and developing a model groundwater management ordinance. This chapter presents the results of these directives. The intent is to provide a framework that will assist local agencies in proactively planning and implementing effective groundwater management programs.

Criteria for Evaluating Groundwater Management Plans—Required and Recommended Components

In 2002, the Legislature passed SB 1938 (Stats 2002, ch 603), which amended Water Code section 10750 et seq to require that groundwater management plans adopted by local agencies include certain components to be eligible for public funds administered by DWR for construction of groundwater projects; the statute applies to funds authorized or appropriated after September 1, 2002. In addition to the required components, DWR worked with representatives from local water agencies to develop a list of additional recommended components that are common to effective groundwater management.

Both the “required” and the “recommended” components are tools that local agencies can use either to institute a groundwater management plan for the first time or to update existing groundwater management plans. These components are discussed below and listed in Appendix C, which can be used as a checklist by local agencies to assess whether their groundwater management plans are addressing these issues.

Required Components of Local Groundwater Management Plans

As of January 1, 2003, amendments to Water Code Section 10750 et seq., resulting from the passage of SB 1938, require new groundwater management plans prepared under section 10750, commonly referred to as AB 3030 plans, to include the first component listed below.

Groundwater management plans prepared under any statutory authority must include components 2 through 7 to be eligible for the award of public funds administered by DWR for the construction of groundwater projects or groundwater quality projects. These requirements apply to funds authorized or appropriated after September 1, 2002. Funds appropriated under Water Code section 10795 et seq. (AB 303 – Local Groundwater Assistance Fund) are specifically excluded.

- 1) Documentation that a written statement was provided to the public “describing the manner in which interested parties may participate in developing the groundwater management plan” (Water Code, § 10753.4 (b)).

- 2) Basin management objectives (BMOs) for the groundwater basin that is subject to the plan (Water Code, § 10753.7 (a)(1)).
- 3) Components relating to the monitoring and management of groundwater levels, groundwater quality, inelastic land surface subsidence, and changes in surface flow and surface water quality that directly affect groundwater levels or quality or are caused by groundwater pumping (Water Code, § 10753.7 (a)(1)).
- 4) A plan by the managing entity to “involve other agencies that enables the local agency to work cooperatively with other public entities whose service area or boundary overlies the groundwater basin” (Water Code, § 10753.7 (a)(2)). A local agency includes “any local public agency that provides water service to all or a portion of its service area” (Water Code, § 10752 (g)).
- 5) Adoption of monitoring protocols (Water Code, § 10753.7 (a)(4)) for the components in Water Code section 10753.7 (a)(1). Monitoring protocols are not defined in the Water Code, but the section is interpreted to mean developing a monitoring program capable of tracking changes in conditions for the purpose of meeting BMOs.
- 6) A map showing the area of the groundwater basin as defined by DWR Bulletin 118 with the area of the local agency subject to the plan as well as the boundaries of other local agencies that overlie the basin in which the agency is developing a groundwater management plan (Water Code, § 10753.7 (a)(3)).
- 7) For local agencies not overlying groundwater basins, plans shall be prepared including the above listed components and using geologic and hydrologic principles appropriate to those areas (Water Code, § 10753.7 (a)(5)).

Recommended Components of Groundwater Management Plans

Although the seven components listed above are required only under certain conditions, they should always be considered for inclusion in any groundwater management planning process. In addition to the required components of a groundwater management plan resulting from the passage of SB 1938, it is recommended that the components listed below be included in any groundwater management plan adopted and implemented by a local managing entity. These additional components were developed in accord with the Budget Act of 1999 and with the assistance of stakeholder groups. The components should be considered and developed for specific application within the basin, subbasin, or agency service area covered by the plan. Additional components will likely be needed in specific areas. The level of detail for each component will vary from agency to agency. None of the suggested data reporting in the components should be construed to require disclosure of information that is confidential under State law. Local agencies should consider both the benefits of public dissemination of information and water supply security in developing reporting requirements.

Manage with the Guidance of an Advisory Committee

The managing entity should establish an advisory committee of interested parties that will help guide the development and implementation of the plan. The committee can benefit management in several ways. First, the committee can bring a variety of perspectives to the management team. As the intent of local groundwater management is to maintain and expand local benefits from the availability of the resource, it makes sense that the intended beneficiaries are a part of the management process. Second, the committee is free to focus on the specifics of groundwater management without being distracted by the many operational activities that the managing entity (such as a water district) must complete. Third, some parties could be negatively impacted by certain groundwater management decisions, and these actions and potential adverse impacts should be a part of the decision-making process to help reduce future conflicts. Finally, the advisory committee helps the managing entity gain the confidence of the local constituency by providing the opportunity for interested parties to participate in the management process.

Many managing entities have already elected to use advisory committees for implementation of their groundwater management plans. The composition of these committees varies widely. Some groups consist entirely of stakeholders, others add local or State government representatives or academic members as impartial third parties, and some have included consultants as technical advisers. Some plans use multiple advisory committees to manage unique subareas. Some plans appoint advisory committees with different objectives, such as one that deals with technical issues and another that deals with policy issues. There is no formula for the composition of an advisory committee because it should ultimately be based on local management needs and should include representation of diverse local interests.

The Tulare Lake Bed Coordinated Management Plan provides an example of the benefit of an advisory committee. The plan includes nine groups of participants, making coordination and communication a complicated issue. To allow for greater communication, an executive committee was established consisting of one voting member from each public agency participating in the plan and one voting member representing a combined group of private landowner plan participants. The committee administers groundwater management activities and programs for the plan (TLBWSD 2002).

Describe the Area to Be Managed under the Plan

The plan should include a description of the physical setting and characteristics of the aquifer system underlying the plan area in the context of the overall basin. The summary should also include a description of historical data, including data related to groundwater levels, groundwater quality, subsidence, and groundwater-surface water interaction; known issues of concern with respect to the above data; and a general discussion of historical and projected water demands and supplies. All of these data are critical to effective groundwater management because they demonstrate the current understanding of the system to be managed and serve as a point of departure for monitoring activities as part of plan implementation.

Create a Link Between Management Objectives and Goals and Actions of the Plan

The major goal of any groundwater management plan is to maintain a reliable supply of groundwater for long-term beneficial uses of groundwater in the area covered by the plan. The plan should clearly describe how each of the adopted management objectives helps attain that goal. Further, the plan should clearly describe how current and planned actions by the managing entity help meet the adopted management objectives. The plan will have a greater chance of success by developing an understanding of the relationship between each action, management objectives, and the goal of the groundwater management plan.

For example, prevention of contamination of groundwater from the land surface is a management objective that clearly supports the goal of groundwater sustainability. Management actions that could help support this objective include (1) educating the public through outreach programs that explain how activities at the surface ultimately impact groundwater, (2) developing wellhead protection programs or re-evaluating existing programs, (3) working with the local responsible agency to ensure that permitted wells are constructed, abandoned, and destroyed according to State well standards, (4) investigating whether local conditions necessitate higher standards than those adopted by the local permitting agency for the construction, abandonment, or destruction of wells, and (5) working with businesses engaged in practices that might impact groundwater to reduce the risks of contamination.

The concept of having a management objective is certainly not new. While many existing plans do not clearly include management objectives nor specifically identify actions to achieve objectives, some plans indirectly include these components. As an example, Eastern Municipal Water District's (EMWD) Groundwater Management Plan states that its goal includes maximizing "the use of groundwater for all beneficial uses in such a way as to lower the cost of water supply and to improve the reliability of the total

water supply for all users.” To achieve this goal, EMWD has listed several issues to be addressed. One is the prevention of long-term depletion of groundwater. This can be defined as a management objective even though it is not labeled as such. Where this management objective is currently unmet in the North San Jacinto watershed portion of the plan area, EMWD has identified specific actions to achieve that objective including the reduction of groundwater extraction coupled with pursuing the construction of a pipeline to act as an alternative source of surface water for the impacted area (EMWD 2002).

Describe the Plan Monitoring Program

The groundwater management plan should include a map indicating the locations of any applicable monitoring sites for groundwater levels, groundwater quality, subsidence, stream gaging, and other applicable monitoring. The groundwater management plan should summarize the type of monitoring (for example, groundwater level, groundwater quality, subsidence, streamflow, precipitation, evaporation, tidal influence), type of measurements, and the frequency of monitoring for each location. Site specific monitoring information should be included in each groundwater management plan. The plan should include the well depth, screened interval(s) and aquifer zone(s) monitored and the type of well (public, irrigation, domestic, industrial, monitoring). These components will serve as a tool for the local managing entity to assess the adequacy of the existing monitoring network in tracking the progress of plan activities.

The groundwater management plan developed for the Scotts Valley Water District (SVWD) provides a detailed description of the monitoring program in Santa Cruz County (Todd Engineers 1994) Table 6 is SVWD’s monitoring table, which serves as an example of the level of detail that is useful in a plan (Todd Engineers 2003a). Figure 9 shows the locations and types of monitoring points for each monitoring site. The monitoring table specifies in detail the data available and the planned monitoring. These serve as useful tools for SVWD to visualize the types and distribution of data available for their groundwater management activities. In addition to the minimum types of monitoring, SVWD summarizes other types of data that are relevant to their groundwater management effort.

Describe Integrated Water Management Planning Efforts

Water law in California treats groundwater and surface water as two separate resources with the result that they have largely been managed separately. Such management does not represent hydrologic reality. Recently, managers of a number of resources are becoming increasingly aware of how their planning activities could impact or be impacted by the groundwater system. Because of this, the local managing entity should describe any current or planned actions to coordinate with other land use, zoning, or water management planning entities.

Integrated management is addressed in existing groundwater management plans in several ways, including conjunctively managing groundwater with surface water supplies, recharging water from municipal sewage treatment plants, and working with local planning agencies to provide comments when a project is proposed that could impact the groundwater system.

Examples of planning efforts that should be integrated with groundwater management may include watershed management, protection of recharge areas, agricultural water management, urban water management, flood management, drinking water source assessment and protection, public water system emergency and disaster response, general plans, urban development, agricultural land preservation, and environmental habitat protection or restoration. Another example that may appear insignificant is transportation infrastructure. However, local impacts on smaller aquifers could be significant when landscaping of medians and interchanges requires groundwater pumping for irrigation or when paved areas are constructed over highly permeable sediments that act as recharge zones for the underlying aquifer.

Table 6 Scotts Valley Water District's Groundwater Monitoring Plan

Monitoring type	Location	Measurement type	Date started	Frequency/ maintainer	Notes
Precipitation	El Pueblo Yard	15-minute recording	Feb-85	Daily/District, Monthly/City	Other historic gages:(1) Blair site on Granite Ck. Rd. (Jan. 1975 - Dec. 1980)
	WWTP	5-minute recording	1990	Daily/City	(2) Hacienda Dr. (Jul. 1974 - Mar. 1979) (3) El Pueblo Yard bucket gage (Jan. 1981 - Jan. 1985)
Evaporation	El Pueblo Yard	Pan	Jan-86	Daily/District	Evaporation pan raw data not compiled after July 1990
Evapotranspiration	De Laveaga Park, Santa Cruz	Automated active weather station	Sep-90	California Irrigation Management Information System/Monthly	Data available on-line through CIMIS
Streamflow	Carbonera Ck at Scotts Valley @ Cabonera Way Bridge (#111613000)	15-minute recording	Jan-85	USGS/ Daily	Other historic gages: (1) Carbonera Ck @ Santa Cruz (#11161400) 150 feet upstream from mouth (1974-1976 partial data)
	Bean Ck near Scotts Valley @ Hermon Crossing (#11160430)	15-minute recording	Dec-88	USGS/ Daily	(2) Bean Ck near Felton (#11160320) (1973-1978 partial data), low flows at same location (1983-1988)
Well Inventory	Eagle Creek In Henry Cowell Redwoods State Park	Bucket-Fall, Flow Meter-Spring	Mar-01	Semi-annually/ Todd Engineers	(3) Carbonera Creek @ Glen Canyon (1990-1994?)
	T10S/R01E Sections 6-9, 16-20, 30 and T10S/R02E Sections 1,11-14, 23-26, 36	Over 400 wells: location, log, type, capacity, etc. stored in GIS, and Access database	1950s	Logs from DWR maintained by Todd Engineers	
Groundwater Levels	~34 Santa Margarita aquifer and ~14 Lompico formation wells	Depth to water	1968	Quarterly/ District and cooperators	Data from over 75 wells, as early as 1968, bi-monthly 1983-1989
Pumpage	T10S/R01E Sections 6-9, 16-20, 30 and T10S/R02E Sections 1,11-14, 23-26, 36 District wells in production and on standby	Metered	1975	Monthly/ Scotts Valley Water District, Mt. Hermon Association, Hanson Aggregates West, San Lorenzo Valley Water District	Other historic pumpage data: Manana Woods (1988-1996 partial data)

Table 6 Scotts Valley Water District's Groundwater Monitoring Plan (continued)

Monitoring type	Location	Measurement type	Date started	Frequency/ maintainer	Notes
Groundwater Quality	T10S/R01E Sections 6-9, 16-20, 30 and T10S/R02E Sections 1,11-14,23-26, 36 District wells in production	Title 22 constituents	1963	At least semi-annual/ District and others	Data from over 80 wells, as early as 1963, monitoring frequency similar to groundwater level program
	North Scotts Valley 3 shallow monitoring wells	Metals, nitrogen species, general minerals	Mar-01	Semi-annually/ Todd Engineers	
Surface Water Quality	4 sites on Carbonera and 3 sites on Bean Creek	Grab samples - metals, nitrogen species, general minerals	Mar-01	Semi-annually/ Todd Engineers	
Wastewater Outflows	City of Scotts Valley WWTP @ Lundy Lane	Wastewater outflow volume and effluent quality	1965	Daily/City of Scotts Valley	Plant operational in 1965 (septic systems pre-1965)
Recycled Water Production	Scotts Valley WWTP	Recycled water quantity and quality	2002	At least quarterly/ WWTP	

Source: Todd Engineering 2003a




Figure 9 Scotts Valley Water District's Groundwater Management Plan monitoring locations

Box K What are Management Objectives?

Management objectives are the local managing entity's way of identifying the most important issues in meeting local resource needs; they can be seen as establishing a "value system" for the plan area. There is no fixed set of management objectives for any given plan area. Some of the more commonly recognized management objectives include the monitoring and managing of groundwater levels, groundwater quality, inelastic land subsidence, and changes in streamflow and surface water quality where they impact or are impacted by groundwater pumping. Management objectives may range from being entirely qualitative to strictly quantified.

Each management objective would have a locally determined threshold value associated with it, which can vary greatly. For example, in establishing a management objective for groundwater quality, one area may simply choose to establish an average value of total dissolved solids as the indicator of whether a management objective is met, while another agency may choose to have no constituents exceeding the maximum contaminant level for public drinking water standards. While there is great latitude in establishing management objectives, local managers should remember that the objectives should serve to support the goal of a sustainable supply for the beneficial use of the water in their particular area.

An example of an alternative management objective is Orange County Water District's (OCWD) objective of maintaining available storage space in its management area at 200,000 acre-feet. The objective does not require that groundwater elevations be fixed at any particular location, although managing to this objective would likely have the net benefit of stabilizing water levels. Groundwater storage is a dynamic value, so attempting to meet this management objective is an ongoing challenge. OCWD has implemented many management actions directly aimed at managing the basin to meet this objective.

The Deer Creek and Tule River Authority provides an excellent example of how groundwater management activities can be coordinated with other resources. The authority, in conjunction with the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, has constructed more than 200 acres of recharge basins as part of its Deer Creek Recharge-Wildlife Enhancement Project. When available, the project takes surplus water during winter months and delivers it to the basins, which serve as winter habitat for migrating waterfowl, creating a significant environmental benefit. Most of the water also recharges into the underlying aquifer, thereby benefiting the local groundwater system.

Report on Implementation of the Plan

The managing entity should produce periodic reports—annually or at other frequencies determined by the local managing entity—summarizing groundwater basin conditions and groundwater management activities. For the period since the previous update, the reports should include:

- A summary of monitoring results, including historical trends,
- A summary of actual management actions,
- A summary, supported by monitoring results, of whether management actions are achieving progress in meeting management objectives,
- A summary of proposed management actions, and
- A summary of any plan component changes, including addition or modification of management objectives.

Unfortunately, many plans were prepared in the mid-1990s with little or no follow-up documentation of whether the plan is actually being implemented. This makes it difficult to determine what progress has been achieved in managing the groundwater resource. Periodic reports will serve as a tool for the managing entity to organize its many activities to implement the plan, act as a driving force for plan implementation, and help interested parties understand the progress made by local entities in managing their groundwater resource.

Progress reports on SVWD (Todd Engineers 2002) and EMWD (2002) groundwater management plans serve as excellent examples of the value of such an exercise. Both reports effectively portray the results of management actions: progress toward achieving objectives and specific recommendations for future management actions. An example of reporting on the modification of a management objective for water quality can be found in EMWD's 2000 Annual Report (EMWD 2001). A task force of more than 20 water suppliers and wastewater agencies, including EMWD, worked to update the Regional Water Quality Control Board's Region 5 Basin Plan objectives for nitrogen and total dissolved solids in water, effectively changing EMWD's management objectives for those constituents.

Evaluate the Plan Periodically

The managing entity and advisory committee should re-evaluate the entire plan. Periodic evaluation of the entire management plan is essential to define successes and failures under the plan and identify changes that may be needed. Additionally, re-evaluation of the plan should include assessment of changing conditions in the basin that may warrant modification of the plan or management objectives. Adjustment of components in the plan should occur on an ongoing basis if necessary. The re-evaluation of the plan should focus on determining whether the actions under the plan are meeting the management objectives and whether the management objectives are meeting the goal of sustaining the resource.

While there are several examples of existing groundwater management plans that demonstrate ongoing changes to plan activities, there are no known examples of such an approach to entirely re-evaluate an existing plan. This is likely due in part to the occurrence of several consecutive wet years in the mid- and late-1990s. The abundant surface water supplies reduced the need to actively manage groundwater supplies in many cases. More recent dry conditions and the recent passage of SB 1938 will create an excellent opportunity for managing entities to begin a re-evaluation of existing plans.

Model Groundwater Management Ordinance

As discussed in the previous chapter, ordinances are groundwater management mechanisms enacted by local governments through exercise of their police powers to protect the health and safety of their citizens. In *Baldwin v. Tehama County* (1994), the appellate court declared that State law does not preempt the field of groundwater management.

In the mid- to late-1990s, many counties adopted ordinances that effectively prevented export of groundwater from the county, even though none specifically prohibited export. The intent of each of these ordinances is to sustain groundwater as a viable local resource. To ensure that goal, an export project proponent is required by most of the ordinances to show that the proposed project will not cause depletion of the groundwater, degradation of groundwater quality, or subsidence before a permit to export groundwater can be issued. Although these ordinances do not specifically require threshold limits for each of these potential negative impacts, a project proponent can really only show that these negative effects will not occur if the proponent develops a groundwater management plan.

Many of these ordinances were developed in response to the plans of some agencies or landowners to export groundwater or develop a groundwater substitution project where surface water is exported and groundwater is substituted for local use. In some cases, short-term export actually took place, leading to a number of claims of negative third party impacts. Residents of some counties became concerned because no one knew how much groundwater was available for local use and how much groundwater was available for export. In short, details of the hydrology of the basin, including surface water and groundwater availability, water quality, and the interaction of surface water and groundwater were not known. This lack of detailed knowledge about the operating potential of their groundwater resources led counties to take what they viewed as protective action, which consisted of requiring a permit before anyone could export groundwater from the county.

From the perspective of DWR, groundwater should be managed in a manner that ensures long-term sustainability of the resource for beneficial uses. Those beneficial uses are to be decided by the local stakeholders within the basin. In some areas, there may be an ample supply of water, so groundwater exports or substitution projects are feasible while local beneficial uses of the water supply are maintained. In other areas, limiting exports may be necessary to maintain local beneficial uses. Such determinations can be made only after the data are collected and evaluated and the results are used to develop management objectives for the basin.

While developing both the criteria for evaluating groundwater management plans and the model groundwater management ordinance, DWR staff has borne two principles in mind. First, the goal of groundwater management, whether accomplished by a plan or by an ordinance, is to sustain and often expand a groundwater resource. Second, groundwater management, whether accomplished by a plan or by an ordinance, requires that local agencies address and resolve the same or similar issues within the boundaries of the agencies. To say it in different words, whether it is a plan or an ordinance, good groundwater management should address the same issues and problems and arrive at the same conclusions and solutions to satisfy the needs of the local area. While some areas may allow or promote exports, others may not.

As stated above, the Legislature required a model ordinance as one of the elements of this update of Bulletin 118. The model ordinance is included as Appendix D and can be used by local governments that have identified a need to adopt a groundwater management ordinance. The model is an example of what a local ordinance might include. Local conditions will require some additions, modifications, or deletions. The variety of political, institutional, legal, technical, and economic opportunities and constraints throughout California guarantees that there will be differences to which the model will have to be adapted. Local governments interested in adopting a groundwater management ordinance are encouraged to consider all components included in the model.

Water Code section 10753.7(b)(1)(A) allows an agency to participate in or consent to be subject to a groundwater management plan, a basin-wide management plan, or other integrated regional water management plan in order to meet the funding eligibility requirements that resulted from passage of SB 1938 (2001). A local government that adopts an ordinance should consider whether or not it will have local agencies that do not have their own groundwater management plan, but consent to be managed under the ordinance. If this situation is anticipated, the ordinance should include the required components described in the Water Code so State funding can be pursued.



Chapter 4

Recent Actions Related to Groundwater Management

Chapter 4

Recent Actions Related to Groundwater Management

The past few years have seen significant actions that impact groundwater management in California. Below are several examples of recent actions including legislation, ballot measures, and executive orders that show the State Legislature and the citizens of California clearly recognize the importance of groundwater and its appropriate management in meeting the present and future water supply needs of the State.

Safe Drinking Water, Clean Water, Watershed Protection and Flood Protection Act of 2000 (Proposition 13)

On March 7, 2000, California voters approved a \$1.97-billion general obligation bond known as the Safe Drinking Water, Clean Water, Watershed Protection and Flood Protection Act (Proposition 13). Of the nearly \$2 billion, \$230 million was earmarked for groundwater programs. The act authorizes \$200 million for grants for feasibility studies, project design, and construction of conjunctive use facilities (Water Code, § 79170 et seq.) and \$30 million in loans for local agency acquisition and construction of groundwater recharge facilities and feasibility study grants for projects potentially eligible for the loan program (Water Code, § 79161 et seq.). More than \$120 million have been awarded in grants and loans to local agencies in the first two years of implementation of these programs.

California Bay-Delta Record of Decision

The goal of the California Bay-Delta (formerly CALFED) program is to restore ecosystem health and improve water management in the Bay-Delta system. The program has four primary objectives:

- Provide good water quality for all beneficial uses
- Improve and increase aquatic and terrestrial habitats and improve ecological functions in the Bay-Delta to support sustainable populations of diverse and valuable plant and animal species
- Reduce the mismatch between Bay-Delta water supplies and current and projected beneficial uses dependent on the Bay-Delta system
- Reduce the risk to land use and associated economic activities, water supply, infrastructure, and the ecosystem from catastrophic breaching of Delta levees

The Record of Decision (ROD), released in August 2000, sets forth a 30-year plan to address ecosystem health and water supply reliability problems in the Bay-Delta system. The ROD lays out specific actions and investments over the first seven years to meet program goals. Most important, with respect to groundwater is the California Bay-Delta program's commitment to local groundwater management. The ROD states, "CALFED will work with local governments and affected stakeholders to develop legislation to strengthen AB 3030 and provide technical and financial incentives to encourage more effective basin-wide groundwater management plans..." (CALFED 2000). The ROD encourages basin management that is developed at the subbasin level so that it addresses local needs, but is coordinated at the basin-wide level so that it considers impacts to other users in the basin. The ROD also commits Bay-Delta agencies to "facilitate and fund locally supported, managed, and controlled groundwater and conjunctive use projects with a total of 500,000 acre-feet to 1 million acre-feet (maf) of additional storage capacity by 2007" (CALFED 2000).

Local Groundwater Management Assistance Act of 2000 (AB 303, Water Code Section 10795 et seq.)

The goal of the Local Groundwater Management Assistance Act is to help local agencies better understand how to manage groundwater resources effectively to ensure the safe production, quality, and proper storage of groundwater in the State. The act created the Local Groundwater Assistance Fund, which must be appropriated annually. In three years, more than \$15 million in grants were awarded for 71 projects. Grants went to local agencies for groundwater studies and projects that contribute to basin and subbasin management objectives, including but not limited to groundwater monitoring and groundwater basin management. Grants are available to all geographic areas of the State. This act serves to emphasize that groundwater is recognized as an important local resource and, to the extent that groundwater is properly managed at the local level, serves to benefit all Californians.

Groundwater Quality Monitoring Act of 2001 (AB 599, Water Code Section 10780 et seq.)

Assembly Bill 599, known as the Groundwater Quality Monitoring Act of 2001, set a goal to establish comprehensive groundwater monitoring and increase the availability of information about groundwater quality to the public. The objective of the program is to highlight those basins in which contamination has occurred or is likely to occur and provide information that will allow local managers to develop programs to curtail, treat, or avoid additional contamination. The act required the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB), in coordination with an Interagency Task Force (ITF) and a Public Advisory Committee (PAC), to integrate existing monitoring programs and design new program elements, as necessary, to establish a comprehensive statewide groundwater quality monitoring program.

Through the ITF and PAC, the Comprehensive Groundwater Quality Monitoring Program was developed. The program will seek to:

- Accelerate the monitoring and assessment program already established by the SWRCB,
- Implement monitoring and assessment in accordance with a prioritization of basins/subbasins,
- Increase coordination and data sharing among groundwater agencies, and
- Maintain groundwater data in a single repository to provide useful access by the public while maintaining appropriate security measures.

The Comprehensive Groundwater Quality Monitoring Program is expected to provide the following key benefits:

- A common base communications medium for agencies to utilize and supply groundwater quality data at multiple levels,
- A mechanism to unite local, regional and statewide groundwater programs in a common effort,
- Better understanding of local, regional and statewide water quality issues and concerns that in turn can provide agencies at all levels with better information to deal with the concerns of consumers and consumer advocate groups,
- Groundwater agencies with trend and long-term forecasting information, essential for groundwater management plan preparation and implementation, and
- The motivation for small- and medium-sized agencies to begin or improve their own groundwater monitoring and management programs.

Water Supply Planning

Three bills enacted by the Legislature to improve water supply planning processes at the local level became effective January 1, 2002. In general, the new laws are intended to improve the assessment of water supplies during the local planning process before land use projects that depend on water are approved. The new laws require the verification of sufficient water supplies as a condition for approving developments, and they compel urban water suppliers to provide more information on the reliability of groundwater if used as a supply.

SB 221 (Bus. and Prof. Code, § 11010 as amended; Gov. Code, § 65867.5 as amended; Gov. Code, §§ 66455.3 and 66473.7) prohibits approval of subdivisions consisting of more than 500 dwelling units unless there is verification of sufficient water supplies for the project from the applicable water supplier(s). This requirement also applies to increases of 10 percent or more of service connections for public water systems with less than 500 service connections. The law defines criteria for determining “sufficient water supply,” such as using normal, single-dry, and multiple-dry year hydrology and identifying the amount of water that the supplier can reasonably rely on to meet existing and future planned uses. Rights to extract additional groundwater must be substantiated if used for the project.

SB 610 (Water Code, §§ 10631, 10656, 10910, 10911, 10912, and 10915 as amended; Pub. Resources Code, § 21151.9 as amended) and AB 901 (Water Code, §§ 10610.2 and 10631 as amended; Water Code § 10634) make changes to the Urban Water Management Planning Act to require additional information in Urban Water Management Plans (UWMP) if groundwater is identified as a source available to the supplier. Required information includes a copy of any groundwater management plan adopted by the supplier, proof that the developer or agency has rights to the groundwater, a copy of the adjudication order or decree for adjudicated basins, and if not adjudicated, whether the basin has been identified as being overdrafted or projected to be overdrafted in the most current DWR publication on the basin. If the basin is in overdraft, the UWMP must include current efforts to eliminate any long-term overdraft. A key provision in SB 610 requires that any project subject to the California Environmental Quality Act supplied with water from a public water system be provided a water supply assessment, except as specified in the law. AB 901 requires the plan to include information relating to the quality of existing sources of water available to an urban water supplier over given periods and include the manner in which water quality affects water management strategies and supply reliability.

Emergency Assistance to the Klamath Basin

On May 4, 2001, the Governor proclaimed a State of Emergency in the Klamath Basin in Siskiyou and Modoc counties. The proclamation included disaster assistance of up to \$5 million under authority of the State Natural Disaster Assistance Act. This assistance went directly into constructing wells to extract groundwater for use on cover crops to avoid loss of critical topsoil. The Governor’s proclamation also included \$1 million for a study of the Klamath River Basin to determine the long-term water supply in the California portion of the basin.

Governor’s Drought Panel

The Governor’s Advisory Drought Planning Panel was formed in 2000 to develop a contingency plan to address the impacts of critical water shortages in California. The panel formed with the recognition that critical water shortages may severely impact the health, welfare, and economy of California. Panel recommendations included securing funding for the Local Groundwater Management Assistance Act (described above), continued support of critical groundwater monitoring in basins with inadequate data, and the formation of a technical assistance and education program for “rural homeowners and small domestic water systems relying on self-supplied groundwater” (GADPP 2000).

Sacramento Valley Water Management Agreement

On May 22, 1995, SWRCB adopted the “Water Quality Control Plan for the San Francisco Bay/Sacramento San Joaquin Delta Estuary” (the 1995 WQCP). Following this action, SWRCB initiated a water rights hearing process with the intent of allocating responsibility for meeting the standards of the 1995 WQCP among water right holders in areas tributary to the Delta. The water rights hearing was conducted in phases with all phases being resolved with the exception of Phase 8, which involved water rights holders in the Sacramento Valley.

Proceeding with Phase 8 may have involved litigation and judicial review for years. That extended process could have resulted in adverse impacts to the environment and undermined progress on other statewide water management initiatives. To avoid the consequences of delay, the Sacramento Valley Water Users, DWR, the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation (USBR), and export water users developed the Sacramento Valley Water Management Agreement. The agreement became effective April 20, 2001. At that time SWRCB issued an order staying the Phase 8 hearing for 18 months. The parties negotiated a short-term settlement agreement that obligated DWR and USBR to continue to fully meet the Bay-Delta water quality standards while providing for the development of conjunctive use and system improvement projects by participating upstream water rights holders that would make water available to help meet water quality standards while improving the reliability of local water supplies. SWRCB has subsequently dismissed the Phase 8 proceedings, and work is being undertaken on both short-term and long-term activities included in the Sacramento Valley Water Management Agreement.

Groundwater Management Water Code Amendments

In September 2002, SB 1938 (Water Code, § 10753.4 and § 10795.4 as amended; Water Code, § 10753.7, § 10753.8 and § 10753.9 as amended and renumbered; Water Code, § 10753.1 and § 10753.7 as added) was signed into law. The act amends existing law related to groundwater management by local agencies. The law requires any public agency seeking State funds administered through DWR for the construction of groundwater projects or groundwater quality projects to prepare and implement a groundwater management plan with certain specified components. Prior to this, there were no required plan components. New requirements include establishing basin management objectives, preparing a plan to involve other local agencies in a cooperative planning effort, and adopting monitoring protocols that promote efficient and effective groundwater management. The requirements apply to agencies that have already adopted groundwater management plans as well as agencies that do not overlie groundwater basins identified in Bulletin 118 and its updates when these agencies apply for state funds. The requirements do not apply to funds administered through the AB 303-Local Groundwater Management Assistance Act (Water Code, § 10795 et seq.) or to funds authorized or appropriated prior to September 1, 2002. Further discussion of the requirements is included in Chapter 3 and Appendix C.

Water Security, Clean Drinking Water, Coastal and Beach Protection Act of 2002 (Proposition 50)

California voters approved the Water Security, Clean Drinking Water, Coastal and Beach Protection Act of 2002 (Proposition 50; Water Code, § 79500 et seq.) in the November 2002 elections. The initiative provides for more than \$3.4 billion of funding, subject to appropriation by the Legislature, for a number of land protection and water management activities.

Several chapters of Proposition 50 allocate funds for specified water supply and water quality projects, including:

- Chapter 3 Water Security. Provides \$50 million to protect State, local, and regional drinking water systems from terrorist attack or deliberate acts of destruction or degradation.

- Chapter 4 Safe Drinking Water. Provides \$435 million for grants and loans for infrastructure improvements to meet safe drinking water standards.
- Chapter 5 Clean Water and Water Quality. Provides \$390 million for a number of water quality and environmental improvements.
- Chapter 6 Contaminant and Salt Removal Technologies. Provides \$100 million for desalination of ocean or brackish waters as well as treatment and removal of contaminants.
- Chapter 7 California Bay-Delta program. Provides \$825 million for continuing implementation of all elements of the program.
- Chapter 8 Integrated Regional Water Management. Provides \$500 million for many categories of water management projects that will protect communities from drought, protect and improve water quality, and reduce dependence on imported water supplies.
- Chapter 9 Colorado River. Provides \$70 million for canal-lining projects necessary to reduce water use and to meet commitments related to California's allocation of water from the Colorado River.



Chapter 5

The Roles of State and Federal Agencies in California Groundwater Management

Chapter 5

The Roles of State and Federal Agencies in California Groundwater Management

Even though groundwater management is a local responsibility and mostly voluntary, several State and federal agencies have key roles in California groundwater management. Some of these roles may not be immediately recognized, but because they work toward the goal of maintaining a reliable groundwater supply, they are closely related to groundwater management. Some of the programs available through the California Department of Water Resources (DWR) and other agencies that assist local agencies in managing groundwater resources are described below.

Local Groundwater Management Assistance from DWR

DWR's role in groundwater management begins with the fundamental understanding that groundwater management is locally driven and management programs should respond to local needs and concerns. DWR recognizes that when groundwater is effectively managed at the local level, benefits are realized at a statewide level.

DWR has historically maintained many programs that directly benefit local groundwater management efforts including:

- Providing assistance to local agencies to assess basin hydrogeologic characteristics,
- Assisting local agencies to identify opportunities to develop additional groundwater supply,
- Monitoring groundwater levels and quality,
- Providing watermaster services for court-adjudicated basins,
- Providing standards for well construction and destruction,
- Managing the State's extensive collection of well completion reports, and
- Reviewing proposals and distributing grant funds and low-interest loans for conjunctive use projects, as well as local groundwater management and monitoring programs.

Conjunctive Water Management Program

DWR's Conjunctive Water Management Program consists of a number of integrated efforts to assist local agencies in improving groundwater management and increasing water supply reliability.

One goal of the Integrated Storage Investigations (ISI) Program, an element of the Bay-Delta program, is to increase water supply reliability statewide through the planned, coordinated management and use of groundwater and surface water resources. The effort emphasizes forming working partnerships with local agencies and stakeholders to share technical data and costs for planning and developing locally controlled and managed conjunctive water management projects.

Toward that end, the Conjunctive Water Management Program has:

- Developed a vision in which DWR would assist local agencies throughout the State so that these agencies can effectively manage groundwater resources,
- Adopted a set of working principles to ensure local planning; local control, operation, and management of conjunctive use projects; voluntary implementation of projects; and local benefits from the proposed projects,
- Executed memoranda of understanding with 30 local agency partners and provided technical and financial assistance to study groundwater basins and assess opportunities for conjunctive water management,

- Provided technical assistance in the form of groundwater monitoring, groundwater modeling, and local water management planning, as well as a review of numerous regional and statewide planning efforts on a variety of water issues, and
- Provided facilitation assistance to promote broad stakeholder involvement in regional water management planning processes.

DWR staff review proposals and distribute grants pursuant to the Local Groundwater Management Assistance Act of 2000 (AB 303). To date, DWR has awarded more than \$15 million to local agencies to fund 71 projects dealing with groundwater investigation, monitoring, or management.


With funds provided under Proposition 13, DWR has awarded more than \$170 million in loans and grants for groundwater recharge and storage studies and projects to local agencies throughout the State. Applicant estimates of the water supply reliability increases that will be realized from these projects exceeds 150 thousand acre-feet annually. Recipients of loans and grants must provide progress reports to allow an evaluation of the successes of the various programs. Figure 10 shows the distribution of loan and grant awardees throughout the State.

Both grant programs have active outreach efforts to inform and to assist agencies in preparation of applications. Selection of projects for funding relies in part on input from advisory committees composed of stakeholders from throughout the State.

Box L Providing Data:

The Internet Makes Groundwater Elevation Data Readily Accessible to the Public

In 1996, the California Department of Water Resources (DWR) began providing Internet access to groundwater level data and hydrographs for wells in groundwater basins throughout California. The website, which distributes historical data for more than 35,000 wells monitored by DWR and its many cooperators, has proven very popular, with more than 60,000 visits to date. Options include a form or map interface to locate wells with water level data and the ability to download long-term water levels for specific wells or seasonal measurements for specific areas to create groundwater contour maps. The accessibility of this data makes it a significant resource for local agencies in making sound groundwater management decisions. The address of the site is <http://wdl.water.ca.gov/>.



Wells can be located with a map interface. By clicking on a well, a hydrograph with the latest data available is automatically generated.




Figure 10 Broad distribution of grant and loan awardees for 2001 through 2003

Assistance from Other State and Federal Agencies

Many other State and federal agencies provide groundwater management assistance to local agencies. Some of those roles are described below. For more information on the roles of various agencies in protecting the groundwater resource, see the California Department of Health Services' Drinking Water Source Assessment and Protection Program Document (DHS 2000), California Groundwater Management (Bachman and others 1997), or the individual agency websites.

State Water Resources Control Board and Regional Water Quality Control Boards

<http://www.swrcb.ca.gov> The mission of the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) is to ensure the highest reasonable quality of waters of the State, while allocating those waters to achieve the optimum balance of beneficial uses. In turn, the nine Regional Water Quality Control Boards (RWQCB) develop and enforce water quality objectives and implement plans to protect the beneficial uses of the State's waters, recognizing differences in climate, topography, geology, and hydrology.

SWRCB has many responsibilities regarding the protection of the groundwater resource. One of the more notable is the Groundwater Ambient Monitoring and Assessment (GAMA) Program. GAMA is a recently enacted program that will provide a comprehensive assessment of water quality in water wells throughout the state. GAMA has two main components: the California Aquifer Susceptibility (CAS) Assessment and the Voluntary Domestic Well Assessment Project.

The CAS combines age dating of water and sampling for low-level volatile organic compounds (VOCs), such as methyl tertiary-butyl ether (MTBE), to assess the relative susceptibility of all of approximately 16,000 public supply wells throughout the State. Age dating provides a general assessment of how quickly groundwater is moving through the system, while the sampling of low-level VOCs allows greater reaction time for potential remediation strategies before contaminants reach action levels. Sampling is being conducted by staff from the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) and Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory. The CAS Assessment was developed cooperatively with DHS and DWR.

The Voluntary Domestic Well Assessment Project will provide a previously unavailable sampling of water quality in domestic wells, which will assist in assessing the relative susceptibility of California's groundwater. Because water quality in individual domestic wells is unregulated, the program is voluntary and will focus, as resources permit, on specific areas of the state. Constituents to be analyzed include nitrate, total and fecal coliform bacteria, MTBE, and minerals. Additional constituents will be added in areas with known water quality problems.

Other SWRCB/RWQCB activities related to groundwater protection include developing basin plans that identify existing and potential beneficial uses of marine water, groundwater, and surface waters; regulating the discharge of waste that may affect water quality in California; monitoring of landfills and hazardous waste facilities; establishing standards for the construction and monitoring of underground storage tanks; establishing management plans for control of nonpoint source pollutants; and issuing cleanup and abatement orders that require corrective actions by the responsible party for a surface water or groundwater pollution problem or nuisance.

The Groundwater Quality Monitoring Act of 2001 (AB599, Water Code, § 10780 et seq.) required the SWRCB to develop a comprehensive monitoring program in a report to the Legislature. See Chapter 4 for details.

California Department of Health Services

<http://www.dhs.ca.gov/ps/ddwem> The DHS Drinking Water Program, part of the Division of Drinking Water and Environmental Management, is responsible for DHS implementation of the federal Safe Drinking Water Act, as well as California statutes and regulations related to drinking water. As part of this responsibility, DHS inspects and provides regulatory oversight of approximately 8,500 public water systems (and approximately 16,000 drinking water wells) to assure delivery of safe drinking water to all California consumers.

Public water system operators are required to regularly monitor their drinking water sources for microbiological, chemical and radiological contaminants to show that drinking water supplies meet regulatory requirements (called primary maximum contaminant levels—MCLs). Among these contaminants are approximately 80 specific inorganic and organic chemical contaminants and six radiological contaminants that reflect the natural environment as well as human activities.

Public water system operators also monitor their water for a number of other contaminants and characteristics that deal with the aesthetic properties of drinking water (known as secondary MCLs). They are also required by regulation to analyze for certain unregulated contaminants (to allow DHS to collect information on emerging contaminants, for example), and to report findings of other contaminants that may be detected during routine monitoring. The DHS water quality monitoring database contains the results of analyses since 1984. These data, collected for purposes of regulatory compliance with drinking water laws, also provide an extensive body of information on the quality of groundwater throughout the State.

California Department of Pesticide Regulation

<http://www.cdpr.ca.gov/dprprograms.htm> The California Department of Pesticide Regulation (DPR) protects human health and the environment by regulating pesticide sales and use and by promoting reduced-risk pest management. DPR plays a significant role in monitoring for the presence of pesticides and in preventing further contamination of the groundwater resource.

DPR conducts six types of groundwater monitoring:

- 1) Monitoring for pesticides on a DPR-determined Ground Water Protection List, which lists pesticides with the potential to pollute groundwater;
- 2) Four-section survey monitoring to verify a reported detection and to help determine if a detected pesticide resulted from legal agricultural use;
- 3) Areal extent monitoring to identify the extent of contaminated wells;
- 4) Adjacent section monitoring to identify additional areas sensitive to pesticide movement to groundwater;
- 5) Monitoring to repeatedly sample a network of wells to determine whether pesticide residues are declining; and
- 6) Special project monitoring.

When pesticides are found in groundwater, they are normally regulated in one-square mile areas identified in regulation as sensitive to groundwater pollution. These pesticides are subject to permitting by the county agricultural commissioner and to use restrictions specified in regulation. DPR maintains an extensive database of pesticide sampling in groundwater and reports a summary of annual sampling and detections to the State Legislature.

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

<http://www.dtsc.ca.gov> The California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) has two programs related to groundwater resources protection: the Hazardous Waste Management Program and the Site Mitigation Program. These programs are authorized under Division 20 of the California Health and Safety Code, and implementing regulations are codified in Title 22 of the California Code of Regulations.

A critical element of both programs is maintaining environmental quality and economic vitality through the protection of groundwater resources. This is accomplished through hazardous waste facility permitting and design; oversight of hazardous waste handling, removal, and disposal; oversight of remediation of hazardous substances releases; funding of emergency removal actions involving hazardous substances, including the cleanup of illegal drug labs; cleanup of abandoned hazardous waste sites; oversight of the closure of military bases; and pollution prevention.

If groundwater is threatened or impacted by a hazardous substance release, DTSC provides technical oversight for the characterization and remediation of soil and groundwater contamination. DTSC and the nine RWQCBs coordinate regulatory oversight of groundwater remediation. To ensure site-specific groundwater quality objectives are met, DTSC consults with RWQCB staff and appropriate groundwater basin plans.

Box M Improving Coordination of Groundwater Information

California's groundwater resources are addressed by an array of different State and federal agencies. Each agency approaches groundwater from a unique perspective, based on its individual statutory mandate. As a result, each agency collects different types of groundwater data and information. To facilitate the effective and efficient exchange of groundwater resource information, the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) is coordinating the Groundwater Resources Information Sharing Team (GRIST), which is composed of representatives from various groundwater agencies. Agencies currently participating in GRIST are:

- State Water Resources Control Board
- Department of Health Services
- Department of Water Resources
- Department of Pesticide Regulation
- Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory
- U.S. Geological Survey

One of the tasks of the GRIST is to identify data relevant to California groundwater resources. A listing of the data, along with the appropriate agency contacts and Internet links, will be maintained by SWRCB on the Groundwater Resources Information Database. In addition, to facilitate effective information sharing and communication among stakeholders, groundwater data will be made available on the SWRCB GeoTracker system. GeoTracker is a geographic information system that provides Internet access to environmental data. The centralization of environmental data through GeoTracker will enable more in-depth geospatial and statistical analyses of groundwater data in the future. For more information about GeoTracker, visit the GeoTracker Internet site at <http://geotracker.arsenautlegg.com>.

California Bay-Delta Authority

<http://calwater.ca.gov> The California Bay-Delta program was initiated in 1994 to develop and implement a long-term comprehensive plan that will restore ecological health and improve water management for beneficial uses of the Sacramento-San Joaquin Bay-Delta System. The partnership currently consists of more than 20 State and federal agencies. An important element of the program is to increase storage by developing an additional 500,000 acre-feet to 1.0 million acre-feet of groundwater storage capacity by the year 2007 (CALFED 2000).

Effective January 1, 2003, a newly formed State agency assumed responsibility for overseeing implementation of the Bay-Delta program. The California Bay-Delta Authority provides a permanent governance structure for the collaborative state-federal effort. The authority was established by enactment of Senate Bill 1653 in 2002. The legislation calls for the authority to sunset on January 1, 2006, unless federal legislation has been enacted authorizing the participation of appropriate federal agencies in the authority.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

<http://www.epa.gov/safewater> The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Office of Ground Water and Drinking Water, together with states, tribes, and many partners, protects public health by ensuring safe drinking water and protecting groundwater. The EPA's role in California groundwater is primarily related to protection of the resource and comes in the form of administering several federal programs in close coordination with State agencies such as SWRCB, DHS, and DTSC.

U.S. Geological Survey

<http://ca.water.usgs.gov> USGS has published results of many studies of California groundwater basins. USGS maintains an extensive groundwater level and groundwater quality monitoring network and has compiled this data in a database. The California District is working on cooperative programs with local, State, and other federal agencies. The most notable programs include three regional studies of the San Joaquin-Tulare Basin, the Sacramento River Basin, and the Santa Ana River basin under the National Water Quality Assessment Program. Results were published for the San Joaquin-Tulare Basin in 1995 and the Sacramento River Basin in 2000. The Santa Ana River basin study is in progress.

U.S. Bureau of Reclamation

<http://www.usbr.gov> The U.S. Bureau of Reclamation (USBR) operates the Central Valley Project (CVP), an extensive network of dams, canals, and related facilities that delivers about 7 maf during normal years for agricultural, urban, and wildlife use. USBR's role with respect to groundwater is generally limited to monitoring for impacts to the groundwater systems adjacent to its CVP facilities. Through the cooperative efforts of USBR, DWR, irrigation districts, farmers, and other local entities, groundwater level data have been collected continuously since project conception in the 1930s and 1940s.

In addition to CVP monitoring, USBR monitors groundwater levels to identify potential impacts as a result of two other projects in California. That monitoring includes the Santa Ynez basin as part of the Cachuma Project on the central coast, and the Putah Creek Cone as part of the Solano Project in the southwest Sacramento Valley. Both monitoring efforts are required as part of permitting for the projects.

USBR is planning to implement a groundwater information system to collect and distribute to the public the large volume of historical groundwater level data associated with its projects.



Chapter 6

Basic Groundwater Concepts

Chapter 6

Basic Groundwater Concepts

This chapter presents general concepts relating to the origin, occurrence, movement, quantity, and quality of groundwater. The concepts will be useful in providing the nontechnical reader with a basic understanding of groundwater. For more experienced readers, many topics are discussed specifically as they apply to California or as the terms are used in this report. A glossary of terms is included at the end of this report. For additional reading on basic groundwater concepts see *Basic Ground-Water Hydrology* (Heath 1983).

Origin of Groundwater

Groundwater is a component of the hydrologic cycle (Figure 11), which describes locations where water may occur and the processes by which it moves or is transformed to a different phase. In simple terms, water or one of its forms—water vapor and ice—can be found at the earth’s surface, in the atmosphere, or beneath the earth’s surface. The hydrologic cycle is a continuum, with no beginning or end; however, it is often thought of as beginning in the oceans. Water evaporates from a surface water source such as an ocean, lake, or through transpiration from plants. The water vapor may move over the land and condense to form clouds, allowing the water to return to the earth’s surface as precipitation (rain or snow). Some of the snow will end up in polar ice caps or in glaciers. Most of the rain and snowmelt will either become overland flow in channels or will infiltrate into the subsurface. Some of the infiltrated water will be transpired by plants and returned to the atmosphere, while some will cling to particles surrounding the pore spaces in the subsurface, remaining in the vadose (unsaturated) zone. The rest of the infiltrated water will move gradually under the influence of gravity into the saturated zone of the subsurface, becoming groundwater. From here, groundwater will flow toward points of discharge such as rivers, lakes, or the ocean to begin the cycle anew. This flow from recharge areas to discharge areas describes the groundwater portion of the hydrologic cycle.

The importance of groundwater in the hydrologic cycle is illustrated by considering the distribution of the world’s water supply. More than 97 percent of all earth’s water occurs as saline water in the oceans (Fetter 1988). Of the world’s fresh water, almost 75 percent is in polar ice caps and glaciers, which leaves a very small amount of fresh water readily available for use. Groundwater accounts for nearly all of the remaining fresh water (Alley and others 1999). All of the fresh water stored in the world’s rivers and lakes accounts for less than 1 percent of the world’s fresh water.

Occurrence of Groundwater

Groundwater is the water occurring beneath the earth’s surface that completely fills (saturates) the void space of rocks or sediment. Given that all rock has some open space (voids), groundwater can be found underlying nearly any location in the State. Several key properties help determine whether the subsurface environment will provide a significant, usable groundwater resource. Most of California’s groundwater occurs in material deposited by streams, called alluvium. Alluvium consists of coarse deposits, such as sand and gravel, and finer-grained deposits such as clay and silt. The coarse and fine materials are usually coalesced in thin lenses and beds in an alluvial environment. In this environment, coarse materials such as sand and gravel deposits usually provide the best source of water and are termed aquifers; whereas, the finer-grained clay and silt deposits are relatively poor sources of water and are referred to as aquitards. California’s groundwater basins usually include one or a series of alluvial aquifers with intermingled aquitards. Less frequently, groundwater basins include aquifers composed of unconsolidated marine sediments that have been flushed by fresh water. We include the marine-deposited aquifers in the discussion of alluvial aquifers in this bulletin.




Figure 11 The Hydrologic Cycle

Although alluvial aquifers are most common in California, other groundwater development occurs in fractured crystalline rocks, fractured volcanics, and limestones. For this report, these nonalluvial areas that provide groundwater are referred to as “groundwater source areas,” while the alluvial aquifers are called groundwater basins. Each of these concepts is discussed more fully below.

Groundwater and Surface Water Interconnection

Groundwater and surface water bodies are connected physically in the hydrologic cycle. For example, at some locations or at certain times of the year, water will infiltrate the bed of a stream to recharge groundwater. At other times or places, groundwater may discharge, contributing to the base flow of a stream. Changes in either the surface water or groundwater system will affect the other, so effective management requires consideration of both resources. Although this physical interconnection is well understood in general terms, details of the physical and chemical relationships are the topic of considerable research.

These details are the subject of significant recent investigations into the hyporheic zone, the zone of sand and gravel that forms the channel of a stream. As surface water flows downstream it may enter the gravels in the

Box N One Resource, Two Systems of Law

In California, two distinct legal regimes govern the appropriation of surface water and subterranean streams, and percolating groundwater. The California Water Code requires that water users taking water for beneficial use from surface watercourses and “subterranean streams flowing through known and definite channels” obtain water right permits or licenses from the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) (Water Code § 1200 et seq.). Groundwater classified as percolating groundwater is not subject to the Water Code provisions concerning the appropriation of water, and a water user can take percolating groundwater without having a State-issued water right permit or license. Current Water Code section 1200 is derived from a provision in the Water Commission Act of 1913, which became effective on December 19, 1914.

The SWRCB developed a test to identify groundwater that is in a subterranean stream flowing through a known and definite channel and is therefore subject to the SWRCB’s permitting authority. The physical conditions that must be present in a subterranean stream flowing in a known and definite channel are: (1) a subsurface channel must be present; (2) the channel must have relatively impermeable bed and banks; (3) the course of the channel must be known or capable of being determined by reasonable inference; and (4) groundwater must be flowing in the channel. Whether groundwater is subject to the SWRCB’s permitting authority under this test is a factual determination. Water that does not fit this test is “percolating groundwater” and is not subject to the SWRCB’s permitting authority.

The SWRCB has issued decisions that find that groundwater under the following streams constitutes a “subterranean stream flowing through known and definite channels” and is therefore subject to the SWRCB’s permitting authority (Murphey 2003 pers com):

- Los Angeles River in Los Angeles County
- Sheep Creek in San Bernardino County
- Mission Basin of the San Luis Rey River in San Diego County
- Bonsall Basin of the San Luis Rey River in San Diego County
- Pala Basin of the San Luis Rey River in San Diego County
- Carmel River in Monterey County
- Garrapata Creek in Monterey County
- Big Sur River in Monterey County
- Russian River
- Chorro Creek in San Luis Obispo County
- Morro Creek in San Luis Obispo County
- North Fork Gualala River in Mendocino County

Contact the SWRCB, Division of Water Rights for specific stream reaches and other details of these decisions.

hyporheic zone, mix with groundwater, and re-enter the surface water in the stream channel. The effects of this interchange between surface water and groundwater can change the dissolved oxygen content, temperature, and mineral concentrations of the water. These changes may have a significant effect on aquatic and riparian biota.

Significantly, the physical and chemical interconnection of groundwater and surface water is not well represented in California’s water rights system (see Box N “One Resource, Two Systems of Law”).

Physical Properties That Affect Groundwater

The degree to which a body of rock or sediments will function as a groundwater resource depends on many properties, some of which are discussed here. Two of the more important physical properties to consider are porosity and hydraulic conductivity. Transmissivity is another important concept to understand when considering an aquifer’s overall ability to yield significant groundwater. Throughout the discussion of these properties, keep in mind that sediment size in alluvial environments can change significantly over short distances, with a corresponding change in physical properties. Thus, while these properties are often presented as average values for a large area, one might encounter different conditions on a more localized level. Determination of these properties for a given aquifer may be based on lithologic or geophysical observations, laboratory testing, or aquifer tests with varying degrees of accuracy.

Porosity

The ratio of voids in a rock or sediment to the total volume of material is referred to as porosity and is a measure of the amount of groundwater that may be stored in the material. Figure 12 gives several examples of the types of porosity encountered in sediments and rocks. Porosity is usually expressed as a percentage and can be classified as either primary or secondary. Primary porosity refers to the voids present when the sediment or rock was initially formed. Secondary porosity refers to voids formed through fracturing or weathering of a rock or sediment after it was formed. In sediments, porosity is a function of the uniformity of grain size (sorting) and shape. Finer-grained sediments tend to have a higher porosity than coarser sediments because the finer-grained sediments generally have greater uniformity of size and because of the tabular shape and surface chemistry properties of clay particles. In crystalline rocks, porosity becomes greater with a higher degree of fracturing or weathering. As alluvial sediments become consolidated, primary porosity generally decreases due to compaction and cementation, and secondary porosity may increase as the consolidated rock is subjected to stresses that cause fracturing.

Porosity does not tell the entire story about the availability of groundwater in the subsurface. The pore spaces must also interconnect and be large enough so that water can move through the ground to be extracted from a well or discharged to a water body. The term “effective porosity” refers to the degree of interconnectedness of pore spaces. For coarse sediments, such as the sand and gravel encountered in California’s alluvial groundwater basins, the effective porosity is often nearly equal to the overall porosity. In finer sediments, effective porosity may be low due to water that is tightly held in small pores. Effective porosity is generally very low in crystalline rocks that are not highly fractured or weathered.

While porosity measures the total amount of water that may be contained in void spaces, there are two related properties that are important to consider: specific yield and specific retention. Specific yield is the fractional amount of water that would drain freely from rocks or sediments due to gravity and describes the portion of the groundwater that could actually be available for extraction. The portion of groundwater that is retained either as a film on grains or in small pore spaces is called specific retention. Specific yield and specific retention of the aquifer material together equal porosity. Specific retention increases with decreasing

grain size. Table 7 shows that clays, while having among the highest porosities, make poor sources of groundwater because they yield very little water. Sand and gravel, having much lower porosity than clay, make excellent sources of groundwater because of the high specific yield, which allows the groundwater to flow to wells. Rocks such as limestone and basalt yield significant quantities of groundwater if they are well-weathered and highly fractured.




Figure 12 Examples of porosity in sediments and rocks

Table 7 Porosity (in percent) of soil and rock types

Material	Porosity	Specific yield	Specific retention
Clay	50	2	48
Sand	25	22	2
Gravel	20	19	1
Limestone	20	18	2
Sandstone (semiconsolidated)	11	6	5
Granite	0.1	0.09	0.01
Basalt (young)	11	8	3

Modified from Heath (1983)

Hydraulic Conductivity

Another major property related to understanding water movement in the subsurface is hydraulic conductivity. Hydraulic conductivity is a measure of a rock or sediment's ability to transmit water and is often used interchangeably with the term permeability. The size, shape, and interconnectedness of pore spaces affect hydraulic conductivity (Driscoll 1986).

Hydraulic conductivity is usually expressed in units of length/time: feet/day, meters/day, or gallons/day/square-foot. Hydraulic conductivity values in rocks range over many orders of magnitude from a low permeability unfractured crystalline rock at about 10^{-8} feet/day to a highly permeable well-sorted gravel at greater than 10^4 feet/day (Heath 1983). Clays have low permeability, ranging from about 10^{-3} to 10^{-7} feet/day (Heath 1983). Figure 13 shows hydraulic conductivity ranges of selected rocks and sediments.

Transmissivity

Transmissivity is a measure of the aquifer's ability to transmit groundwater through its entire saturated thickness and relates closely to the potential yield of wells. Transmissivity is defined as the product of the hydraulic conductivity and the saturated thickness of the aquifer. It is an important property to understand because a given area could have a high value of hydraulic conductivity but a small saturated thickness, resulting in limited overall yield of groundwater.

Aquifer

An aquifer is a body of rock or sediment that yields significant amounts of groundwater to wells or springs. In many definitions, the word "significant" is replaced by "economic." Of course, either term is a matter of perspective, which has led to disagreement about what constitutes an aquifer. As discussed previously, coarse-grained sediments such as sands and gravels deposited in alluvial or marine environments tend to function as the primary aquifers in California. These alluvial aquifers are the focus of this report. Other aquifers, such as those found in volcanics, igneous intrusive rocks, and carbonate rocks are described briefly in the section Groundwater Source Areas.

Aquitard

An aquitard is a body of rock or sediment that is typically capable of storing groundwater but does not yield it in significant or economic quantities. Fine-grained sediments with low hydraulic conductivity, such as clays and silts, often function as aquitards. Aquitards are often referred to as confining layers because they retard the vertical movement of groundwater and under the right hydrogeologic conditions confine groundwater that is under pressure. Aquitards are capable of transmitting enough water to allow some flow between adjacent aquifers, and depending on the magnitude of this transfer of water, may be referred to as leaky aquitards.




Figure 13 Hydraulic conductivity ranges of selected rocks and sediments

Unconfined and Confined Aquifers

In most depositional environments, coarser-grained deposits are interbedded with finer-grained deposits creating a series of aquifers and aquitards. When a saturated aquifer is bounded on top by an aquitard (also known as a confining layer), the aquifer is called a confined aquifer (Figure 14). Under these conditions, the water is under pressure so that it will rise above the top of the aquifer if the aquitard is penetrated by a well. The elevation to which the water rises is known as the potentiometric surface. Where an aquifer is not bounded on top by an aquitard, the aquifer is said to be unconfined. In an unconfined aquifer, the pressure on the top surface of the groundwater is equal to that of the atmosphere. This surface is known as the water table, so unconfined aquifers are often referred to as water table aquifers. The arrangement of aquifers and aquitards in the subsurface is referred to as hydrostratigraphy.




Figure 14 Interbedded aquifers with confined and unconfined conditions

With the notable exception of the Corcoran Clay of the Tulare Formation in the San Joaquin Valley and the aquitard in West Coast Basin in Los Angeles County, there are no clearly recognizable regional aquitards in California alluvial basins. Instead, due to the complexity of alluvial environments, it is the cumulative effect of multiple thin lenses of fine-grained sediments that causes increasing confinement of groundwater with increasing depth, creating what is often referred to as a semiconfined aquifer.

In some confined aquifers groundwater appears to defy gravity, but that is not the case. When a well penetrates a confined aquifer with a potentiometric surface that is higher than land surface, water will flow naturally to the surface. This is known as artesian flow, and results from pressure within the aquifer. The pressure results when the recharge area for the aquifer is at a higher elevation than the point at which discharge is occurring (Figure 14). The confining layer prevents the groundwater from returning to the surface until the confining layer is penetrated by a well. Artesian flow will discontinue as pressure in the aquifer is reduced and the potentiometric surface drops below the land surface elevation.

Groundwater Basin

A groundwater basin is defined as an alluvial aquifer or a stacked series of alluvial aquifers with reasonably well-defined boundaries in a lateral direction and a definable bottom. Lateral boundaries are features that significantly impede groundwater flow such as rock or sediments with very low permeability or a geologic structure such as a fault. Bottom boundaries would include rock or sediments of very low permeability if no aquifers occur below those sediments within the basin. In some cases, such as in the San Joaquin and Sacramento Valleys, the base of fresh water is considered the bottom of the groundwater basin. Table 8 is a generalized list of basin types and the features that define the basin boundaries.

Table 8 Types and boundary characteristics of groundwater basins

Characteristics of groundwater basins	
Groundwater basin	An aquifer or an aquifer system that is bounded laterally and at depth by one or more of the following features that affect groundwater flow: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rocks or sediments of lower permeability • A geologic structure, such as a fault • Hydrologic features, such as a stream, lake, ocean, or groundwater divide
Types of basins and their boundaries	
Single simple basin	Basin surrounded on all sides by less permeable rock. Higher permeability near the periphery. Clays near the center. Unconfined around the periphery. Confined near the center. May have artesian flow near the center.
Basin open at one or more places to other basins	Many desert basins. Merged alluvial fans. Topographic ridges on fans. Includes some fault-bounded basins.
Basin open to Pacific Ocean	260 basins along the coast. Water-bearing materials extend offshore. May be in contact with sea water. Vulnerable to seawater intrusion.
Single complex basin	Basin underlain or surrounded by older water-bearing materials and water-bearing volcanics. Quantification is difficult because of unknown contacts between different rock types within the basin.
Groundwater in areas of volcanic rocks	Basin concept is less applicable in volcanic rocks. Volcanic rocks are highly variable in permeability.
Groundwater in weathered crystalline rocks (fractured hard rock)—not considered a basin	Small quantities of groundwater. Low yielding wells. Most wells are completed in the crystalline rock and rely on fractures to obtain groundwater.
Political boundaries or management area boundaries	Usually not related to hydrogeologic boundaries. Formed for convenience, usually to manage surface water storage and delivery.

Although only the upper surface of a groundwater basin can be shown on a map, the basin is three-dimensional and includes all subsurface fresh water-bearing material. These boundaries often do not extend straight down, but are dependent on the spatial distribution of geologic materials in the subsurface. In fact, in a few cases near California's coastal areas, aquifers in the subsurface are known to extend beyond the mapped surface of the basin and may actually be exposed under the ocean. Under natural conditions, fresh water flows from these aquifers into the ocean. If groundwater levels are lowered, sea water may flow into the aquifer. This has occurred in Los Angeles, Orange, Ventura, Santa Cruz and Monterey Counties, and some areas around San Francisco Bay. Depiction of a groundwater basin in three dimensions requires extensive subsurface investigation and data evaluation to delineate the basin geometry. Figure 15 is a cross-section showing how a coastal basin might appear in the subsurface.




Figure 15 Groundwater basin near the coast with the aquifer extending beyond the surface basin boundary

Groundwater basin and subbasin boundaries shown on the map included with this bulletin are based on evaluation of the best available information. In basins where many studies have been completed and the basin has been operated for a number of years, the basin response is fairly well understood and the boundaries are fairly well defined. Even in these basins, however, there are many unknowns and changes in boundaries may result as more information about the basin is collected and evaluated. In many other basins where much less is known and understood about the basin, boundaries will probably change as a better understanding of the basin is developed. A procedure for collecting information from all the stakeholders should be developed for use statewide so that agreement on basin boundaries can be achieved.

Groundwater Subbasin

A subbasin is created by dividing a groundwater basin into smaller units using geologic and hydrologic barriers or, more commonly, institutional boundaries (see Table 8). These subbasins are created for the purpose of collecting and analyzing data, managing water resources, and managing adjudicated basins. As the definition implies, the designation of a subbasin boundary is flexible and could change in the future. The limiting rule for a subbasin is that it should not cross over a groundwater basin boundary.

An example of a hydrologic subbasin boundary would be a river or stream that creates a groundwater divide. While hydrologic boundaries may limit groundwater flow in the shallow subsurface, data indicate significant groundwater flow may occur across the boundary at greater depths. In addition, the location of the boundary may change over time if pumping or recharge patterns change. Institutional subbasin boundaries could be based on a political boundary, such as a county line or a water agency service area, or a legally mandated boundary such as a court adjudicated basin.

Groundwater Source Areas

Groundwater in California is also found outside of alluvial groundwater basins. Igneous extrusive (volcanic), igneous intrusive, metamorphic, and sedimentary rocks are all potential sources of groundwater. These rocks often supply enough water for domestic use, but in some cases can also yield substantial quantities. In this report the term groundwater source area is used for rocks that are significant in terms of being a local groundwater source, but do not fit the category of basin or subbasin. The term is not intended to imply that groundwater actually originates in these rocks, but that it is withdrawn from rocks underlying a generally definable area. Because of the increased difficulty in defining and understanding the hydrogeologic properties of these rocks, the limited data available for the areas in which these rocks occur, and the relatively small, though rapidly growing, segment of the population served by these water supplies, they are discussed separately from groundwater basins.

Volcanics

Groundwater in volcanics can occur in fractures that result from cooling or changes in stress in the crust of the Earth, lava tubes, tree molds, weathering surfaces, and porous tuff beds. Additionally, the volcanics could overlie other deposits from an alluvial environment. Flow in the fractures may approach the same velocities as that of surface water, but there is often very limited storage potential for groundwater. The tuff beds can act similarly to alluvial aquifers.

Some of the most productive volcanic rocks in the State include the Modoc Plateau volcanics in the northeast and the Napa-Sonoma volcanics northeast of San Francisco Bay (Figure 16). Wells in Modoc Plateau volcanics are commonly reported to yield between 100 and 1,000 gallons per minute, with some yields of 4,000 gpm (Planert and Williams 1995). Bulletin 118-75 assigned identification numbers to these volcanic rocks throughout the State (for example, Modoc Plateau Recent Volcanic Areas, 1-23). The numbers led some to interpret them as being groundwater basins. In this update, the numbers corresponding to the volcanics are being retired to eliminate this confusion.



Figure 16 Significant volcanic groundwater source areas

Igneous Intrusive, Metamorphic, and Sedimentary Rocks

Groundwater in igneous intrusive, metamorphic, and consolidated sedimentary rocks occurs in fractures resulting from tectonism and expansion of the rock as overburden pressures are relieved. Groundwater is extracted from fractured rock in many of the mountainous areas of the State, such as the Sierra Nevada, the Peninsular Range, and the Coast Ranges. Rocks in these areas often yield only enough supply for individual domestic wells, stock water wells, or small community water systems. Availability of groundwater in such formations can vary widely, even over a distance of a few yards. Areas of groundwater production from consolidated rocks were not defined in previous versions of Bulletin 118 and are not included in this update.

As population grows in areas underlain by these rocks, such as the foothills of the Sierra Nevada and southern California mountains, many new wells are being built in fractured rock. However, groundwater data are often insufficient to accurately estimate the long term reliability of groundwater supplies in these areas. Additional investigation, data evaluation, and management will be needed to ensure future sustainable supplies. The Legislature recognized both the complexity of these areas and the need for management in SB 1938 (2002), which amended the Water Code to require groundwater management plans with specific components be adopted for agencies to be eligible for certain funding administered by DWR for construction of groundwater projects. Water Code section 10753.7(a)(5) states:

Local agencies that are located in areas outside the groundwater basins delineated on the latest edition of the department's groundwater basin and subbasin map shall prepare groundwater management plans incorporating the components in this subdivision, and shall use geologic and hydrologic principles appropriate to those areas.

In carbonate sedimentary rocks such as limestone, groundwater occurs in fractures and cavities formed as a result of dissolution of the rock. Flow in the largest fractures may approach the velocities of surface water, but where these rocks occur in California there is limited storage potential for groundwater. Carbonate rocks occur mostly in Inyo County near the Nevada border (USGS 1995), in the Sierra Nevada foothills, and in some parts of the Sacramento River drainage north of Redding. The carbonates near the Nevada state border in Inyo County are part of a regional aquifer that extends northeastward into Nevada. Springs in Nevada and in the Death Valley region in California are dependent on groundwater flow in this regional aquifer. In other parts of the country, such as Florida, carbonate rocks constitute significant sources of groundwater.

Movement of Groundwater

The movement of groundwater in the subsurface is quite complex, but in simple terms it can be described as being driven by potential energy. At any point in the saturated subsurface, groundwater has a hydraulic head value that describes its potential energy, which is the combination of its elevation and pressure. In an unconfined aquifer, the water table elevation represents the hydraulic head, while in a confined aquifer the potentiometric surface represents the hydraulic head (Figure 14). Water moves in response to the difference in hydraulic head from the point of highest energy toward the lowest. On a regional scale this results in flow of groundwater from recharge areas to discharge areas. In California, pumping depressions around extraction wells often create the discharge points to which groundwater flows. Groundwater may naturally exit the subsurface by flowing into a stream, lake, or ocean, by flowing to the surface as a spring or seep, or by being transpired by plants.

The rate at which groundwater flows is dependent on the hydraulic conductivity and the rate of change of hydraulic head over some distance. In the mid-19th century, Henry Darcy found through his experiments on sand filters that the amount of flow through a porous medium is directly proportional to the difference

between hydraulic head values and inversely proportional to the horizontal distance between them (Fetter 1988). His conclusions extend to flow through aquifer materials. The difference between hydraulic heads divided by the distance between them is referred to as the hydraulic gradient. When combined with the hydraulic conductivity of the porous medium and the cross-sectional area through which the groundwater flows, Darcy's law states:

$$Q = KA(dh/dl) \text{ (volume/time)}$$

Where:

Q = flow discharging through a porous medium

K = hydraulic conductivity (length/time)

A = cross-sectional area (length²)

dh = change in hydraulic head between two points (length)

dl = distance between two points (length)

This version of Darcy's law provides a volumetric flow rate. To calculate the average linear velocity at which the water flows, the result is divided by the effective porosity. The rate of movement of groundwater is very slow, usually less than 1,000 feet per year because of the great amount of friction resulting from movement through the spaces between grains of sand and gravel.

Quantity of Groundwater

Because groundwater is a precious resource, the questions of how much there is and how more can be made available are important. There are many terms and concepts associated with the quantity of groundwater available in a basin, and some controversy surrounding their definition. Some of these include groundwater storage capacity, usable storage capacity, groundwater budget, change in storage, overdraft, and safe yield. This section discusses some of the more common terms used to represent groundwater quantity in California.

Groundwater Storage Capacity

The groundwater storage capacity of an individual basin or within the entire State is one of the questions most frequently asked by private citizens, water resource planners, and politicians alike. Total storage capacity seems easy to understand. It can be seen as how much physical space is available for storing groundwater. The computation of groundwater storage capacity is quite simple if data are available: capacity is determined by multiplying the total volume of a basin by the average specific yield. The total storage capacity is constant and is dependent on the geometry and hydrogeologic characteristics of the aquifer(s) (Figure 17).

Estimates of total groundwater storage capacity in California are staggering. Previous estimates of total storage range from 850 million acre-feet (maf) to 1.3 billion acre-feet (DWR 1975, DWR 1994). However, due to incomplete information about many of the groundwater basins, there has never been an accurately quantified calculation of total storage capacity statewide. Even if such a calculation were possible, the utility of such a number is questionable because total storage capacity might lead to overly optimistic estimates of how much additional groundwater development can contribute to meeting future demands.

Total groundwater storage capacity is misleading because it only takes into account one aspect of the physical character of the basin. Many other factors limit the ultimate development potential of a groundwater basin. These limiting factors may be physical, chemical, economic, environmental, legal, and institutional (Table 9). Some of these factors, such as the economic and institutional ones, can change with time. However, there may remain significant physical and chemical constraints that will limit groundwater development.




Figure 17 Schematic of total, usable, and available groundwater storage capacity

Table 9 Examples of factors that limit development of a groundwater basin

Limiting factor	Examples
Physical	Basin recharge area not adequate to sustain development; pumping too concentrated in a portion of basin; well yields too low for intended use.
Quality	Water quality not suitable for intended use; increased potential for seawater intrusion in coastal areas; upwelling of poorer quality water in deeper parts of basin.
Economic	Excessive costs associated with increased pump lifts and deepening of wells; cost of treating water if it does meet requirements for intended use.
Environmental	Need to maintain groundwater levels for wetlands, stream base flow, or other habitat.
Institutional	Local groundwater management plans or ordinances restricting use; basin adjudication; impacts on surface water rights of others.

Usable Groundwater Storage Capacity

Usable storage capacity is defined as the amount of groundwater of suitable quality that can be economically withdrawn from storage. It is typically computed as the product of the volume of the basin to some basin-specific depth that is considered economically available and the average specific yield of the basin (see Figure 17).

As more groundwater is extracted, groundwater levels may fall below some existing wells, which may then require replacement or deepening. This may be a consideration in management of the basin and will depend on the cost of replacement, the cost of pumping the water from deeper zones, and whether managers are willing to pay that cost. Other impacts that may increase the cost include subsidence and groundwater quality degradation. The usable storage may change because of changes in economic conditions.

Estimates of usable storage represent only the total volume of groundwater assumed to be usable in storage, not what would be available for sustained use on an annual basis. Previous estimates of usable groundwater storage capacity range from 143 to 450 maf (DWR 1975, DWR 1994). Unfortunately, the term “usable storage” is often used to indicate the amount of water that can be used from a basin as a source of long-term annual supply. However, the many limitations associated with total groundwater storage capacity discussed above may also apply to usable storage.

Available Groundwater Storage Capacity

Available storage capacity is defined as the volume of a basin that is unsaturated and capable of storing additional groundwater. It is typically computed as the product of the empty volume of the basin and the average specific yield of the unsaturated part of the basin (see Figure 17). The available storage capacity does not include the uppermost portion of the unsaturated zone in which saturation could cause problems such as crop root damage or increased liquefaction potential. The available storage will vary depending on the amount of groundwater taken out of storage and the recharge. The total groundwater in storage will change inversely as the available storage changes.

Available storage has often been used as a number to represent the potential for additional yield from a particular basin. Unfortunately, many of the limitations that exist in developing existing supply discussed above also limit taking advantage of available storage. Although limitations exist, looking only at available groundwater storage capacity may underestimate the potential for groundwater development. Opportunities to use groundwater already in storage and create additional storage space would be overlooked by this approach.

Groundwater Budget

A groundwater budget is an analysis of a groundwater basin’s inflows and outflows to determine the change in groundwater storage. Alternatively, if the change in storage is known, the value of one of the inflows or outflows could be determined. The basic equation can be expressed as:

$$\text{INFLOWS} - \text{OUTFLOWS} = \text{CHANGE IN STORAGE}$$

Typical inflows include:

- natural recharge from precipitation;
- seepage from surface water channels;
- intentional recharge via ponds, ditches, and injection wells;
- net recharge of applied water for agricultural and other irrigation uses;
- unintentional recharge from leaky conveyance pipelines; and
- subsurface inflows from outside basin boundaries.

Outflows include:

- groundwater extraction by wells;
- groundwater discharge to surface water bodies and springs;
- evapotranspiration; and
- subsurface outflow across basin or subbasin boundaries.

Groundwater budgets can be useful tools to understand a basin, but detailed budgets are not available for most groundwater basins in California. A detailed knowledge of each budget component is necessary to obtain a good approximation of the change in storage. Absence or inaccuracy of one or more parameters can lead to an analysis that varies widely from a positive to a negative change in storage or vice versa. Since much of the data needed requires subsurface exploration and monitoring over a series of years, the collection of detailed field data is time-consuming and expensive. A management plan should develop a monitoring program as soon as possible.

Change in Groundwater Storage

As stated above, a groundwater budget is one potential way of estimating the change in storage in a basin, although it is limited by the accuracy and availability of data. There is a simpler way—by determining the average change in groundwater elevation over the basin, multiplied by the area overlying the basin and the average specific yield (or storativity in the case of a confined aquifer). The time interval over which the groundwater elevation change is determined is study specific, but annual spring-to-spring changes are commonly used. A change in storage calculation does not attempt to determine the volume of water in storage at any time interval, but rather the change from a previous period or baseline condition.

A change in storage calculation is a relatively quick way to represent trends in a basin over time. If change in storage is negligible over a representative period, the basin is in equilibrium under current use. Changes in storage calculations are more often available for a groundwater basin than groundwater budgets because water level measurements are available in many basins. Specific yield and storativity are readily estimated based on knowledge of the hydrogeologic setting and geologic materials or through aquifer pumping tests. Although simple, change in storage calculations have potential sources of error, so it is important to treat change in storage as just one of many tools in determining conditions in a groundwater basin. Well data sets must be carefully evaluated before use in these calculations. Mixing of wells constructed in confined and unconfined portions of the basin and measurement of different well sets over time can result in significant errors.

Although the change in storage calculation is a relatively quick and inexpensive method of observing changes in the groundwater system, the full groundwater budget is preferable. A detailed budget describes an understanding of the physical processes affecting storage in the basin, which the simple change in storage calculation does not. For example, the budget takes into account the relationship between the surface water and the groundwater system. If additional groundwater extraction induced additional infiltration of surface water, the calculated change in storage could be minimal. However, if the surface water is used as a source of supply downstream, the impact of reduced flows could be significant.

Overdraft

Groundwater overdraft is defined as the condition of a groundwater basin or subbasin in which the amount of water withdrawn by pumping exceeds the amount of water that recharges the basin over a period of years, during which the water supply conditions approximate average conditions (DWR 1998). Overdraft can be characterized by groundwater levels that decline over a period of years and never fully recover, even in wet years. If overdraft continues for a number of years, significant adverse impacts may occur, including increased extraction costs, costs of well deepening or replacement, land subsidence, water quality degradation, and environmental impacts.

Despite its common usage, the term overdraft has been the subject of debate for many years. Groundwater management is a local responsibility, therefore, the decision whether a basin is in a condition of overdraft is the responsibility of the local groundwater or water management agency. In some cases local agencies may choose to deliberately extract groundwater in excess of recharge in a basin (known as “groundwater mining”) as part of an overall management strategy. An independent analysis of water levels in such a basin might conclude that the basin is in overdraft. In other cases, where basin management is less active or nonexistent, declining groundwater levels are not considered a problem until levels drop below the depth of many wells in the basin. As a result, overdraft may not be reported for many years after the condition began.

Water quality changes and subsidence may also indicate that a basin has been overdrafted. For example, when groundwater levels decline in coastal aquifers, seawater fills the pore spaces in the aquifer that are vacated by the groundwater, indicating that the basin is being overdrafted. Overdraft has historically led to as much as 30 feet of land subsidence in one area of the State and lesser amounts in other areas.

The word “overdraft” has been used to designate two unrelated types of water shortages. The first is “historical overdraft” similar to the type illustrated in Figure 18, which shows that ground water levels began to decline in the mid 1950s and then leveled off in the mid 1980s, indicating less groundwater extraction or more recharge. The second type of shortage is “projected overdraft” as used in the *California Water Plan Update* (DWR 1998). In reality, this is an estimate of future water shortages based on an assumed management program within the basin, including projected supply and projected demand. If water management practices change in those basins in which a water shortage is projected, the amount of projected shortage will change.




Figure 18 Hydrograph Indicating Overdraft

In some basins or subbasins, groundwater levels declined steadily over a number of years as agricultural or urban use of groundwater increased. In response, managing agencies developed surface water import projects to provide expanded water supplies to alleviate the declining groundwater levels. Increasing groundwater levels, or refilling of the aquifer, demonstrate the effectiveness of this approach in long-term water supply planning. In some areas of the State, the past overdraft is now being used to advantage. When the groundwater storage capacity that is created through historical overdraft is used in coordination with surface water supplies in a conjunctive management program, local and regional water supplies can be augmented.

In 1978 DWR was directed by the legislature to develop a definition of critical overdraft and to identify basins that were in a condition of critical overdraft (Water Code § 12924). The process that was followed and the basins that were deemed to be in a condition of critical overdraft are discussed in Box O, “Critical Conditions of Overdraft.” This update to Bulletin 118 did not include similar direction from the legislature, nor funding to undertake evaluation of the State’s groundwater basins to determine whether they are in a state of overdraft.

Box O Critical Conditions of Overdraft

In 1978 DWR was directed by the legislature to develop a definition of critical overdraft and to identify those basins in a critical condition of overdraft (Water Code §12924). DWR held public workshops around the state to obtain public and water managers’ input on what the definition should include, and which basins were critically overdrafted. Bulletin 118-80, *Ground Water Basins in California* was published in 1980 with the results of that local input. The definition of critical overdraft is:

A basin is subject to critical conditions of overdraft when continuation of present water management practices would probably result in significant adverse overdraft-related environmental, social, or economic impacts.

No time is specified in the definition. Definition of the time frame is the responsibility of the local water managers, as is the definition of significant adverse impacts, which would be related to the local agency’s management objectives.

Eleven basins were identified as being in a critical condition of overdraft. They are:

- | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------------|
| Pajaro Basin | Cuyama Valley Basin |
| Ventura Central Basin | Eastern San Joaquin County Basin |
| Chowchilla Basin | Madera Basin |
| Kings Basin | Kaweah Basin |
| Tulare Lake Basin | Tule Basin |
| Kern County Basin | |

The task was not identified by the Legislature, nor was the funding for this update (2003) sufficient to consult with local water managers and fully re-evaluate the conditions of the 11 critically overdrafted basins. Funding and duration were not sufficient to evaluate additional basins with respect to conditions of critical overdraft.

If a basin lacks existing information, the cost of a thorough evaluation of overdraft conditions in a single basin could exceed \$1 million. In this update of Bulletin 118, DWR has included groundwater budget information for each basin description, where available. In most cases, however, sufficient quantitative information is not available, so conditions of overdraft or critical overdraft were not reported.

While this bulletin does not specifically identify overdrafted basins (other than the 11 basins from Bulletin 118-80), the negative effects of overdraft are occurring or may occur in the future in many basins throughout the State. Declining water levels, diminishing water quality, and subsidence threaten the availability of groundwater to meet current and future demands. A thorough understanding of overdraft can help local groundwater managers minimize the impacts and take advantage of the opportunity created by available groundwater storage capacity. Local groundwater managers and DWR should seek funding and work cooperatively to evaluate the groundwater basins of the State with respect to overdraft and its potential impacts. Beginning with the most heavily used basins and relying to the extent possible on available data collected by DWR and through local groundwater management programs, current or projected conditions of critical overdraft should be identified. If local agencies take the lead in collecting and analyzing data to fully understand groundwater basin conditions, DWR can use the information to update the designations of critically overdrafted basins. This can be a cost effective approach since much of the data needed to update the overdraft designations are the same data that agencies need to effectively manage groundwater.

Safe Yield

Safe yield is defined as the amount of groundwater that can be continuously withdrawn from a basin without adverse impact. Safe yield is commonly expressed in terms of acre-feet per year. Depending on how it is applied, safe yield may be an annual average value, or may be calculated based on changed conditions each year. Although safe yield may be indicated by stable groundwater levels measured over a period of years, a detailed groundwater budget is needed to accurately estimate safe yield. Safe yield has commonly been determined in groundwater basin adjudications.

Proper application of the safe yield concept requires that the value be modified through time to reflect changing practices within the basin. One of the common misconceptions is that safe yield is a static number. That is, once it has been calculated, the amount of water can be extracted annually from the basin without any adverse impacts. An example of a situation in which this assumption could be problematic is when land use changes. In some areas, where urban development has replaced agriculture, surface pavement, storm drains, and sewers have increased runoff and dramatically reduced recharge into the basin. If extraction continued at the predetermined safe yield of the basin, water level decline and other negative impacts could occur.



Figure 19 Photograph of extensometer

An extensometer is a well with a concrete bench mark at the bottom. A pipe extends from the concrete to the land surface. If compaction of the finer sediments occurs, leading to land surface subsidence, the pipe in the well will appear to rise out of the well casing. When this movement is recorded, the data show how much the land surface has subsided.

Subsidence

When groundwater is extracted from some aquifers in sufficient quantity, compaction of the fine-grained sediments can cause subsidence of the land surface. As the groundwater level is lowered, water pressure decreases and more of the weight of the overlying sediments is supported by the sediment grains within the aquifer. If these sediments have not previously been surcharged with an equivalent load, the overlying load will compact them. Compaction decreases the porosity of the sediments and decreases the overall volume of the finer grain sediments, leading to subsidence at the land surface. While the finer sediments within the aquifer system are compacted, the usable storage capacity of the aquifer is not greatly decreased.

Data from extensometers (Figure 19) show that as groundwater levels decline in an aquifer, the land surface falls slightly. As groundwater levels rise, the land surface also rises to its original position. This component of subsidence is called elastic subsidence because it recovers. Inelastic subsidence, the second component of subsidence, is what occurs when groundwater levels decline to the point that the finer sediments are compacted. This compaction is not recoverable.

Conjunctive Management

Conjunctive management in its broadest definition is the coordinated and combined use of surface water and groundwater to increase the overall water supply of a region and improve the reliability of that supply. Conjunctive management may be implemented to meet other objectives as well, including reducing groundwater overdraft and land subsidence, protecting water quality, and improving environmental conditions. Although surface water and groundwater are sometimes considered to be separate resources, they are connected in the hydrologic cycle. By using or storing additional surface water when it is plentiful, and relying more heavily on groundwater during dry periods, conjunctive management can change the timing and location of water so it can be used more efficiently.

Although a specific project or program may be extremely complex, there are several components common to conjunctive management projects. The first is to recharge surplus surface water when it is available to increase groundwater in storage. Recharge may occur through surface spreading, by injection wells, or by reducing groundwater use by substituting surface water. The surplus surface water used for recharge may be local runoff, imported water, stored surface water, or recycled water. The second component is to reduce surface water use in dry years or dry seasons by switching to groundwater. This use of the stored groundwater may take place through direct extraction and use, pumping back to a conveyance facility, or through exchange of another water supply. A final component that should be included is an ongoing monitoring program to evaluate operations and allow water managers to respond to changes in groundwater, surface water, or environmental conditions that could violate management objectives or impact other water users.

Quality of Groundwater

All water contains dissolved constituents. Even rainwater, often described as being naturally pure, contains measurable dissolved minerals and gases. As it moves through the hydrologic cycle, water dissolves and incorporates many constituents. These include naturally occurring and man-made constituents.

Most natural minerals are harmless up to certain levels. In some cases higher mineral content is preferable to consumers for taste. For example, minerals are added to many bottled drinking waters after going through a filtration process. At some level, however, most naturally occurring constituents, along with those introduced by human activities, are considered contaminants. The point at which a given constituent is considered a contaminant varies depending on the intended use of the groundwater and the toxicity level of the constituents.

Beneficial Uses

For this report, water quality is a measure of the suitability of water for its intended use, with respect to dissolved solids and gases and suspended material. An assessment of water quality should include the investigation of the presence and concentration of any individual constituent that may limit the water's suitability for an intended use.

The SWRCB has identified 23 categories of water uses, referred to as beneficial uses. The beneficial use categories and a brief description of each are presented in Appendix E. The actual criteria that are used to evaluate water quality for each of the beneficial uses are determined by the nine Regional Water Quality Control Boards, resulting in a range of criteria for some of the uses. These criteria are published in each of the Regional Boards' Water Quality Control Plans (Basin Plans)¹.

A summary of water quality for all of the beneficial uses of groundwater is beyond the scope of this report. Instead, water quality criteria for two of the most common uses—municipal supply (referred to as public drinking water supply in this report) and agricultural supply—are described below.

Public Drinking Water Supply

Standards for maximum contaminant levels (MCLs) of constituents in drinking water are required under the federal Safe Drinking Water Act of 1974 and its updates. There are primary and secondary standards. Primary standards are developed to protect public health and are legally enforceable. Secondary standards are generally for the protection of aesthetic qualities such as taste, odor, and appearance, and cosmetic qualities, such as skin or tooth discoloration, and are generally non-enforceable guidelines. However, in California secondary standards are legally enforceable for all new drinking water systems and new sources developed by existing public water suppliers (DWR 1997). Under these primary and secondary standards, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency regulates more than 90 contaminants, and the California Department of Health Services regulates about 100. Federal and State primary MCLs are listed in Appendix F.

Agricultural Supply

An assessment of the suitability of groundwater as a source of agricultural supply is much less straightforward than that for public water supply. An evaluation of water supply suitability for use in agriculture is difficult because the impact of an individual constituent can vary depending on many factors, including soil chemical and physical properties, crop type, drainage, and irrigation method. Elevated levels of constituents usually do not result in an area being taken entirely out of production, but may lower crop yields. Management decisions will determine appropriate land use and irrigation methods.

¹ Digital versions of these plans are available online at <http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/plnspols/index.html>

There are no regulatory standards for water applied on agriculture. Criteria for crop water have been provided as guidelines. Many constituents have the potential to negatively impact agriculture, including more than a dozen trace elements (Ayers and Westcot 1985). Two constituents that are commonly considered with respect to agricultural water quality are salinity—expressed as total dissolved solids (TDS)—and boron concentrations.

Increasing salinity in irrigation water inhibits plant growth by reducing a plant's ability to absorb water through its roots (Pratt and Suarez 1996). While the impact will depend on crop type and soil conditions, it is useful to look at the TDS of the applied water as a general assessment tool. A range of values for TDS with their estimated suitability for agricultural uses is presented in Table 10. These ranges are modified from criteria developed for use in the San Joaquin Valley by the San Joaquin Valley Drainage Program. However, they are similar to values presented in Ayers and Westcot (1985).

Table 10 Range of TDS values with estimated suitability for agricultural uses

Range of TDS (mg/L)	Suitability
<500	Generally no restrictions on use
500 – 1,250	Generally slight restrictions on use
1,250 – 2,500	Generally moderate restrictions on use
>2,500	Generally severe restrictions on use

Modified from SJVDP (1990)

TDS = total dissolved solids

High levels of boron can present toxicity problems in plants by damaging leaves. The boron is absorbed through the root system and transported to the leaves. Boron then accumulates during plant transpiration, resulting in leaf burn (Ayers and Westcot 1985). Boron toxicity is highly dependent on a crop's sensitivity to the constituent. A range of values of dissolved boron in irrigation water, with their estimated suitability on various crops is presented in Table 11. These ranges are modified from Ayers and Westcot (1985).

Table 11 Range of boron concentrations with estimated suitability on various crops

Range of dissolved boron (mg/L)	Suitability
<0.5	Suitable on all but most highly boron sensitive crops
0.5 – 1.0	Suitable on most boron sensitive crops
1.0 – 2.0	Suitable on most moderately boron sensitive crops
>2.0	Suitable for only moderately to highly boron tolerant crops

Source: Modified from Ayers and Westcot 1985

Contaminant Groups

Because there are so many potential individual constituents to evaluate, researchers have often summarized contaminants into groups depending on the purpose of the study. Recognizing that there are exceptions to any classification scheme, this update considered groups according to their common sources of contamination—those naturally occurring and those caused by human activities (anthropogenic). Each of these sources includes more than one contaminant group. A listing of the contaminant groups and the individual constituents belonging to those groups, summarized in this report, is included in Appendix F.

Naturally Occurring Sources

In this report, naturally occurring sources include three primary groups: (1) inorganic constituents with primary MCLs, (2) inorganic constituents with secondary MCLs, and (3) radiological constituents. Inorganics primarily include naturally occurring minerals such as arsenic or mercury, although human activities may certainly contribute to observed concentrations. Radiological constituents include primarily naturally occurring constituents such as radon, gross alpha, and uranium. Although radioactivity is not considered a significant contaminant statewide, it can be locally important, particularly in communities in the Sierra Nevada.

Anthropogenic Sources

Anthropogenic contaminants include pesticides, volatile organic compounds (VOCs), and nitrates. Pesticides and VOCs are often grouped together into an organic contaminant group. However, separating the two gives a general idea of which contaminants are primarily from agricultural activities (pesticides) and which are primarily from industrial activities (VOCs). One notable exception to the groupings is dibromochloropropane (DBCP). Even though this compound is a VOC, DBCP is a soil fumigant and is included with pesticides. Nitrates are a surprising anthropogenic class to some observers. Nitrogen is certainly a naturally occurring inorganic constituent. However, because most nitrates are associated with agriculture (see Box P, “Focused on Nitrates: Detailed Study of a Contaminant”) and nitrates are among California’s leading contaminants, it is appropriate to consider them separately from inorganics.

Box P Focused on Nitrates: Detailed Study of a Contaminant

Because water has so many potential uses, the study of water quality means different things to different people. Thomas Harter, a professor at the University of California at Davis, has chosen to focus on nitrates as one of his research interests. Harter’s monitoring network consists of 79 wells on 5 dairies in the San Joaquin Valley.

A common result of dairy activities is the release of nitrogen into the surroundings, which changes to nitrate in groundwater. Nitrates are notorious for their role in interfering with oxygen transport in babies, a condition commonly referred to as “blue baby syndrome.” Nitrates are also of interest because more public supply wells have been closed due to nitrate contamination than from any other contaminant (Bachman and others 1997).

Harter’s study has focused on two primary activities. The first is a meticulous examination of nitrogen at the surface and nitrates in the uppermost 25 feet of the subsurface. This monitoring has been ongoing since 1993, and has shown that a significant amount of nitrate can reach shallow groundwater. The second focus of the study has been to change management practices to reduce the amount of nitrogen available to reach groundwater, along with continued monitoring. This has occurred since 1998. Results of the study are better management practices that significantly reduce the amount of nitrogen available to groundwater. This will help minimize the potential adverse impacts to groundwater quality from nitrates.



Chapter 7

Inventory of California's Groundwater Information

Chapter 7

Inventory of California's Groundwater Information

The groundwater information in this chapter summarizes the available information on statewide and regional groundwater issues. For more detailed information on specific groundwater basins see the supplement to this report that is available on the California Department of Water Resources (DWR) website, <http://www.waterplan.water.ca.gov/groundwater/118index.htm>. See Appendix A for information on accessing individual basin descriptions and the map delineating California's groundwater basins.

Statewide Groundwater Information

There is a large amount of data available for many of the State's most heavily developed groundwater basins. Conversely, there is relatively little data available on groundwater in the undeveloped areas. The information in this report is generally limited to a compilation of the information readily available to DWR staff and may not include the most up-to-date data generated by studies that have been completed recently by water management agencies. For this reason, the collection of additional, more recent data on groundwater basins should be continued and integrated into the basin descriptions. Statewide summaries are included below.

Groundwater Basins

There are currently 431 groundwater basins delineated, underlying about 40 percent of the surface area of the State. Of those, 24 basins are subdivided into a total of 108 subbasins, giving a total of 515 distinct groundwater systems described in this report (Figure 20). Basin delineation methods are described in Appendix G. Additionally, many of the subbasin boundaries were developed or modified with public input, but little physical data. These boundaries should not be considered as precisely defining a groundwater basin boundary; the determination of whether any particular area lies within a groundwater basin boundary should be determined only after detailed local study.

Groundwater basin and subbasin boundaries shown on the map included with this bulletin are based on evaluation of the best available information. In basins where many studies have been completed and the basin has been operated for a number of years, the basin response is fairly well understood and the boundaries are fairly well defined. Even in these basins, however, there are many unknowns and changes in boundaries may result as more information about the basin is collected and evaluated.

Groundwater Budgets

Rather than simply providing all groundwater budget data collected during this update, the budget information was classified into one of three categories indicating the relative level of detail of information available. These categories, types A, B, and C, are discussed in Box R, "Explanation of Groundwater Data Tables." A type A budget indicates that much of the information needed to characterize the groundwater budget for the basin or subbasin was available. DWR staff did not verify these type A budgets, so DWR cannot address the accuracy of the data provided by them. Type B indicates that enough data are available to estimate the groundwater extraction to meet local water use needs. This is useful in understanding the reliance of a particular area on groundwater. Type C indicates a low level of knowledge of any of the budget components for the area.

Figure 21 depicts where these type A, B, and C budgets occur. In general, there is a greater level of understanding (type A or B) in the more heavily developed areas in terms of groundwater use. These include the Central Valley and South Coast. The lowest level of knowledge of groundwater budget data is in the southeast desert area. A discussion of groundwater use in each region is included below.

Box Q How Does the Information in This Report Relate to the Recently Enacted Laws Senate Bill 221 and Senate Bill 610 (2002)?

Recently enacted legislation requires developers of certain new housing projects to demonstrate an available water supply for that development. If a part of that proposed water supply is groundwater, urban water suppliers must provide additional information on the availability of an adequate supply of groundwater to meet the projected demand and show that they have the legal right to extract that amount of groundwater. SB 610 (2002) amended the Water Code to require, among other things, the following information (Section 10631(b)(2)):

For basins that have not been adjudicated, information as to whether the department has identified the basin or basins as overdrafted or has projected that the basin will become overdrafted if present management conditions continue, in the most current official departmental bulletin that characterizes the condition of the groundwater basin, and a detailed description of the efforts being undertaken by the urban water supplier to eliminate the long-term overdraft condition.

The hydrogeologic information contained in the basin descriptions that supplement this update of Bulletin 118 includes only the information that was available in California Department of Water Resources (DWR) files through reference searches and through limited contact with local agencies. Local agencies may have conducted more recent studies that have generated additional information about water budgets and aquifer characteristics. Unless the agency notified DWR, or provided a copy of the recent reports to DWR staff, that recent information has not been included in the basin descriptions. Therefore, although SB 610 refers to groundwater basins identified as overdrafted in Bulletin 118, it would be prudent for local water suppliers to evaluate the potential for overdraft of any basin included as a part of a water supply assessment.

Persons interested in collecting groundwater information in accordance with the Water Code as amended by SB 221 and SB 610 may start with the information in Bulletin 118, but should follow up by consulting the references listed for each basin and contacting local water agencies to obtain any new information that is available. Otherwise, evaluation of available groundwater resources as mandated by SB 221 and SB 610 may not be using the most complete and recent information about water budgets and aquifer characteristics.




Figure 20 Groundwater basins and subbasins




Figure 21 Basin and subbasin groundwater budget types

Box R Explanation of Groundwater Data Tables

A groundwater data table for each hydrologic region is included at the end of each hydrologic region section in Chapter 7. The tables include the following information:

Basin/Subbasin Number. The basin numbering format is x-xxx.xx. The first number in the sequence assigns the basin to one of the nine Regional Water Quality Control Board boundaries. The second number is the groundwater basin number. Any number following the decimal identifies that the groundwater basin has been further divided into subbasins. Reevaluation of available hydrogeologic information resulted in the deletion of some basins and subbasins identified in Bulletins 118-75 and 118-80. Because of this, there are some gaps in the sequence of basin numbers in this report. The methods used for developing the current groundwater basin maps are discussed in Appendix H. The names and numbers of the basins deleted, along with any comments related to their elimination are included in the appropriate region in Chapter 7. Previously unidentified groundwater basins or subbasins that were delineated during this update are assigned new identification numbers that sequentially follow the last number used in Bulletin 118-80 for groundwater basins or subbasins.

Basin or Subbasin Name. Basin names are based on published and unpublished reports, topographic maps, and local terminology. Names of more recently delineated basins or subbasins are based on the principal geographic feature, which in most cases corresponds to the name of a valley. In the case of a subbasin, its formal name should include the name of the basin (for example, Sacramento Valley Groundwater Basin, North American Subbasin). However, both locally and informally, the term subbasin is used interchangeably with basin (for example, North American Basin).

Area. The area for each basin or subbasin is presented in acres rounded to three significant figures (for example, 147,148 acres was rounded to 147,000 acres). The area describes only the upper surface or map view of a basin. The basin underlies the area and may extend beyond the surface expression (discussed in Chapter 6).

Groundwater Budget Type. The type of groundwater budget information available was classified as Type A, B, or C based on the following criteria:

Type A – indicates one of the following: (1) a groundwater budget exists for the basin or enough components from separate studies could be combined to give a general indication of the basin's groundwater budget, (2) a groundwater model exists for the basin that can be used to calculate a groundwater budget, or (3) actual groundwater extraction data exist for the basin.

Type B – indicates that a use-based estimate of groundwater extraction is calculated for the basin. The use-based estimate is determined by calculating the overall use from California Department of Water Resources land use and urban water use surveys. Known surface water supplies are then subtracted from the total demand leaving the rest of the use to be met by groundwater extraction.

Type C – indicates that there are not enough data to provide either an estimate of the basin's groundwater budget or groundwater extraction from the basin.

Well Yields. Maximum and average well yields in gallons per minute (gpm) are reported for municipal supply and agricultural wells where available. Most of the values reported are from initial tests reported during construction of the well, which may not be an accurate indication of the long-term production capacity of the wells.

Box R continued on next page

Box R Explanation of Groundwater Data Tables (continued)

Types of Monitoring. This includes monitoring of both groundwater levels and quality. "Levels" indicate the number of wells actively monitored without consideration of frequency. Most wells are monitored semi-annually, but many are monitored monthly. "Quality" indicates the number of wells monitored for various constituents; these could range from a grab sample taken for a field specific conductance measurement to a full analysis of organic and inorganic constituents. "Title 22" indicates the number of public water system wells that are actively sampled and monitored under the direction of California Department of Health Services (DHS) Title 22 Program.

Total Dissolved Solids. This category includes range and average values of total dissolved solids (TDS). This data primarily represents data from published reports. In some cases, a range of average TDS values is presented.

Active Monitoring

The summary of active monitoring includes wells that are monitored for groundwater elevation or groundwater quality within the delineated groundwater basins as of 1999. Groundwater elevation data collected by DWR and cooperators are available online at <http://wdl.water.ca.gov>. Most of the water quality data are for public supply wells and were provided by the California Department of Health Services (DHS). Other groundwater level and water quality monitoring activities were reported by local agencies during this update. The summary indicates that there are nearly 14,000 wells monitored for groundwater levels, 10,700¹ wells monitored under DHS water quality monitoring program, and 4,700 wells monitored for miscellaneous water quality by other agencies.

¹ These numbers include the wells in basins and subbasins only; throughout the entire state, DHS has responsibility for more than 16,000 public supply wells.

Box S What Happens When an MCL Exceedance Occurs?

All suppliers of domestic water to the public are subject to regulations adopted by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency under the Safe Drinking Water Act (42 U.S.C. 300f et seq.) as well as by the California Department of Health Services under the California Safe Drinking Water Plan Act (Health and Safety Code §§ 116270-116750).

These regulations include primary drinking water standards that establish maximum contaminant levels (MCLs) for inorganic and organic chemicals and radioactivity. MCLs are based on health protection, technical feasibility, and economic factors.

California requires public water systems to sample their drinking water sources, analyze for regulated contaminants, and determine compliance with the MCLs on a regular basis. Sampling frequency depends on the contaminant, type of water source, and previous sampling results; frequency can range from monthly to once every nine years, or none at all if sampling is waived because the source is not vulnerable to the contaminant.

Primary MCLs are enforceable standards. In California, compliance is usually determined at the wellhead or the surface water intake. To meet water quality standards and comply with regulations, a water system with a contaminant exceeding an MCL must notify the public and remove the source from service or initiate a process and schedule to install treatment for removing the contaminant.

Notification requirements reflect the severity of the associated health risks; immediate health concerns prompt immediate notice to consumers. Violations that do not pose a significant health concern may use a less immediate notification process. In addition to consumer notification, a water system is required by statute to notify the local governing body (for example, city council or county board of supervisors) whenever a drinking water well exceeds an MCL, even if the well is taken out of service.

Detections of regulated contaminants (and certain unregulated contaminants) must also be reported to consumers in the water system's annual Consumer Confidence Report.

Groundwater Quality

The summary of water quality relied heavily on data from the DHS Title 22 water quality monitoring program. The assessment consisted of querying the DHS database for active wells that have constituents exceeding the maximum contaminant level (MCL) for drinking water. Summaries of this assessment for each of the State's hydrologic regions (HRs) are discussed in this chapter.

DHS data are the most comprehensive statewide water quality data set available, but this data set should not be used as a sole indicator of the groundwater quality in California. Data from these wells are not necessarily representative of any given basin; it only represents the quality of groundwater where a public water supply is extracted.

The Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC 2001) issued a report that concludes California's groundwater resources face a serious long-term threat from contamination. Despite heavy reliance on groundwater, no comprehensive statewide assessments of groundwater quality were available. In response to the NRDC report, the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) is planning a comprehensive assessment of the State's groundwater quality. This program is discussed in Chapter 4, in the section titled "Groundwater Quality Monitoring Act of 2001 (AB 599)."

Regional Groundwater Use

The importance of groundwater as a resource varies regionally throughout the State. For planning purposes, DWR divides California into 10 hydrologic regions (HRs), which correspond to the State's major drainage areas. HR boundaries are shown in Figure 22. A review of average water year supplies from the California Water Plan (DWR 1998) shows the importance of groundwater as a local supply for agricultural and municipal use throughout the State and in each of California's 10 HRs (Table 12 and Figure 23).

Table 12 Annual agricultural and municipal water demands met by groundwater

Hydrologic region	Total Demand Volume (TAF)	Demand met by Groundwater (TAF)	Demand met by Groundwater (%)
North Coast	1063	263	25
San Francisco Bay	1353	68	5
Central Coast	1263	1045	83
South Coast	5124	1177	23
Sacramento River	8720	2672	31
San Joaquin River	7361	2195	30
Tulare Lake	10556	4340	41
North Lahontan	568	157	28
South Lahontan	480	239	50
Colorado River	4467	337	8

Source: DWR 1998

With more than 80 percent of demand met by groundwater, the Central Coast HR is heavily reliant on groundwater to meet its local needs. The Tulare Lake and South Lahontan HRs meet more than 40 percent of their local demand from groundwater. The South Coast, North Coast, North Lahontan, San Joaquin River, and Sacramento River HRs take between 20 and 40 percent of their supply from groundwater. Groundwater is a relatively minor source of supply in the San Francisco Bay and Colorado River HRs.

Of all the groundwater extracted annually in the state, an estimated 35 percent is produced from the Tulare Lake HR. More than 70 percent of groundwater extraction occurs in the Central Valley (Tulare Lake, San Joaquin River, and Sacramento River HRs combined). Nearly 20 percent is extracted in the highly urbanized South Coast and Central Coast HRs, while less than 10 percent is extracted in the remaining five HRs combined.



Figure 22 California's 10 hydrologic regions




Figure 23 Agricultural and urban demand supplied by groundwater in each hydrologic region

The remainder of this chapter provides a summary of each of the 10 HRs. A basin location map for each HR is followed by a brief discussion of groundwater occurrence and groundwater conditions. A summary tabulation of groundwater information for each groundwater basin within the HR is provided. Greater detail for the data presented in these tables, including a bibliography, is provided in the individual basin/subbasin descriptions in the supplemental report (see Appendix A). Because the groundwater basin numbers are based on the boundaries of the State's nine Regional Water Quality Control Boards (RWQCB), Figure 24 shows the relationship between the Regional Board boundaries and DWR's HR boundaries.

The groundwater basin tabulations give an overview of available data. Where a basin is divided into subbasins, only the information for the subbasins is provided. The data for each subbasin generally come from different sources, so it is inappropriate to sum the data into a larger basin summary. An explanation of each of the data items presented in the summary table is provided in Box R.



Figure 24 Regional Water Quality Control Board regions and Department of Water Resources hydrologic regions

North Coast Hydrologic Region




Figure 25 North Coast Hydrologic Region

Basins and Subbasins of the North Coast Hydrologic Region

Basin/subbasin	Basin name	Basin/subbasin	Basin name
1-1	Smith River Plain	1-42	Sherwood Valley
1-2	Klamath River Valley	1-43	Williams Valley
1-2.01	Tule Lake	1-44	Eden Valley
1-2.02	Lower Klamath	1-45	Big River Valley
1-3	Butte Valley	1-46	Navarro River Valley
1-4	Shasta Valley	1-48	Gravelly Valley
1-5	Scott River Valley	1-49	Annapolis Ohlson Ranch Formation Highlands
1-6	Hayfork Valley	1-50	Knights Valley
1-7	Hoopa Valley	1-51	Potter Valley
1-8	Mad River Valley	1-52	Ukiah Valley
1-8.01	Mad River Lowland	1-53	Sanel Valley
1-8.02	Dows Prairie School Area	1-54	Alexander Valley
1-9	Eureka Plain	1-54.01	Alexander Area
1-10	Eel River Valley	1-54.02	Cloverdale Area
1-11	Covelo Round Valley	1-55	Santa Rosa Valley
1-12	Laytonville Valley	1-55.01	Santa Rosa Plain
1-13	Little Lake Valley	1-55.02	Healdsburg Area
1-14	Lower Klamath River Valley	1-55.03	Rincon Valley
1-15	Happy Camp Town Area	1-56	McDowell Valley
1-16	Seiad Valley	1-57	Bodega Bay Area
1-17	Bray Town Area	1-59	Wilson Grove Formation Highlands
1-18	Red Rock Valley	1-60	Lower Russian River Valley
1-19	Anderson Valley	1-61	Fort Ross Terrace Deposits
1-20	Garcia River Valley	1-62	Wilson Point Area
1-21	Fort Bragg Terrace Area		
1-22	Fairchild Swamp Valley		
1-25	Prairie Creek Area		
1-26	Redwood Creek Area		
1-27	Big Lagoon Area		
1-28	Mattole River Valley		
1-29	Honeydew Town Area		
1-30	Pepperwood Town Area		
1-31	Weott Town Area		
1-32	Garberville Town Area		
1-33	Larabee Valley		
1-34	Dinsmores Town Area		
1-35	Hyampom Valley		
1-36	Hettenshaw Valley		
1-37	Cottoneva Creek Valley		
1-38	Lower Laytonville Valley		
1-39	Branscomb Town Area		
1-40	Ten Mile River Valley		
1-41	Little Valley		

Description of the Region

The North Coast HR covers approximately 12.46 million acres (19,470 square miles) and includes all or portions of Modoc, Siskiyou, Del Norte, Trinity, Humboldt, Mendocino, Lake, and Sonoma counties (Figure 25). Small areas of Shasta, Tehama, Glenn, Colusa, and Marin counties are also within the region. Extending from the Oregon border south to Tomales Bay, the region includes portions of four geomorphic provinces. The northern Coast Range forms the portion of the region extending from the southern boundary north to the Mad River drainage and the fault contact with the metamorphic rocks of the Klamath Mountains, which continue north into Oregon. East of the Klamath terrane along the State border are the volcanic terranes of the Cascades and the Modoc Plateau. In the coastal mountains, most of the basins are along the narrow coastal strip between the Pacific Ocean and the rugged Coast Range and Klamath Mountains and along inland river valleys; alluviated basin areas are very sparse in the steep Klamath Mountains. In the volcanic terrane to the east, most of the basins are in block faulted valleys that once held Pleistocene-age lakes. The North Coast HR corresponds to the boundary of RWQCB 1. Significant geographic features include basin areas such as the Klamath River Basin, the Eureka/Arcata area, Hoopa Valley, Anderson Valley, and the Santa Rosa Plain. Other significant features include Mount Shasta, forming the southern border of Shasta Valley, and the rugged north coastal shoreline. The 1995 population of the entire region was about 606,000, with most being centered along the Pacific Coast and in the inland valleys north of the San Francisco Bay Area.

The northern mountainous portion of the region is rural and sparsely populated, primarily because of the rugged terrain. Most of the area is heavily forested. Some irrigated agriculture occurs in the narrow river valleys, but most occurs in the broader valleys on the Modoc Plateau where pasture, grain and alfalfa predominate. In the southern portion of the region, closer to urban centers, crops like wine grapes, nursery stock, orchards, and truck crops are common.

A majority of the surface water in the North Coast HR goes to environmental uses because of the “wild and scenic” designation of most of the region’s rivers. Average annual precipitation ranges from 100 inches in the Smith River drainage to 29 inches in the Santa Rosa area and about 10 inches in the Klamath drainage; as a result, drought is likely to affect the Klamath Basin more than other portions of the region. Communities that are not served by the area’s surface water projects also tend to experience shortages. Surface water development in the region includes the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation (USBR) Klamath Project, Humboldt Bay Municipal Water District’s Ruth Lake, and U.S. Army Corps of Engineer’s Russian River Project. An important factor concerning water demand in the Klamath Project area is water allocation for endangered fish species in the upper and lower basin. Surface water deliveries for agriculture in 2001, a severe drought year, were only about 20 percent of normal.

Groundwater Development

Groundwater development in the North Coast HR occurs along the coast, near the mouths of some of the region’s major rivers, on the adjacent narrow marine terraces, or in the inland river valleys and basins. Reliability of these supplies varies significantly from area to area. There are 63 groundwater basins/subbasins delineated in the region, two of which are shared with Oregon. These basins underlie approximately 1.022 million acres (1,600 square miles).

Along the coast, most groundwater is developed from shallow wells installed in the sand and gravel beds of several of the region’s rivers. Under California law, the water produced in these areas is considered surface water underflow. Water from Ranney collectors installed in the Klamath River, Rowdy Creek, the Smith

River, and the Mad River supply the towns of Klamath, Smith River and Crescent City in Del Norte County and most of the Humboldt Bay area in Humboldt County. Except on the Mad River, which has continuous supply via releases from Ruth Reservoir, these supplies are dependent on adequate precipitation and flows throughout the season. In drought years when streamflows are low, seawater intrusion can occur causing brackish or saline water to enter these systems. This has been a problem in the town of Klamath, which in 1995 had to obtain community water from a private well source. Toward the southern portion of the region, along the Mendocino coast, the Town of Mendocino typifies the problems related to groundwater development in the shallow marine terrace aquifers. Groundwater supply is limited by the aquifer storage capacity, and surveys done in the Town of Mendocino in the mid-1980s indicate that about 10 percent of wells go dry every year and up to 40 percent go dry during drought years.

Groundwater development in the inland coastal valleys north of the divide between the Russian and Eel Rivers is generally of limited extent. Most problems stemming from reliance on groundwater in these areas is a lack of alluvial aquifer storage capacity. Many groundwater wells rely on hydrologic connection to the rivers and streams of the valleys. The City of Rio Dell has experienced water supply problems in community wells and, as a result, recently developed plans to install a Ranney collector near the Eel River. South of the divide, in the Russian River drainage, a significant amount of groundwater development has occurred on the Santa Rosa Plain and surrounding areas. The groundwater supplies augment surface supplies from the Russian River Project.

In the north-central part of the North Coast HR, the major groundwater basins include the Klamath River Valley, Shasta Valley, Scott River Valley, and Butte Valley. The Klamath River Valley is shared with Oregon. Of these groundwater basins, Butte Valley has the most stable water supply conditions. The historical annual agricultural surface water supply has been about 20,000 acre-feet. As farming in the valley expanded from the early 1950s to the early 1990s, bringing nearly all the arable land in the valley into production, groundwater was developed to farm the additional acres. It has been estimated that current, fully developed demands are only about 80 percent of the available groundwater supply. By contrast, water supply issues in the other three basins are contingent upon pending management decisions regarding restoration of fish populations in the Klamath River and the Upper Klamath Basin system. The Endangered Species Act (ESA) fishery issues include lake level requirements for two sucker fish species and in-stream flow requirements for coho salmon and steelhead trout. Since about 1905, the Klamath Project has provided surface water to the agricultural community, which in turn has provided water to the wildlife refuges. Since the early 1990s, it has been recognized that surface water in the Klamath Project is over-allocated, but very little groundwater development had occurred. In 2001, which was a severe drought year, USBR delivered a total of about 75,000 acre-feet of water to agriculture in California, about 20 percent of normal. In the Klamath River Groundwater Basin this translated to a drought disaster, both for agriculture and the wildlife refuges. In addition, there were significant impacts for both coho salmon and sucker fisheries in the Klamath River watershed. As a result of the reduced surface water deliveries, significant groundwater development occurred, and groundwater extraction increased from an estimated 6,000 acre-feet in 1997 to roughly 60,000 acre-feet in 2001. Because of the complexity of the basin's water issues, a long-term Klamath Project Operation plan has not yet been finalized. Since 1995, USBR has issued an annual operation plan based on estimates of available supply. The Scott River Valley and Shasta Valley rely to a significant extent on surface water diversions. In most years, surface water supplies the majority of demand, and groundwater extraction supplements supply as needed depending on wet or dry conditions. Discussions are under way to develop strategies to conjunctively use surface water and groundwater to meet environmental, agricultural, and other demands.

Groundwater Quality

Groundwater quality characteristics and specific local impairments vary with regional setting within the North Coast HR. In general, seawater intrusion and nitrates in shallow aquifers are problems in the coastal groundwater basins; high total dissolved solids (TDS) content and general alkalinity are problems in the lake sediments of the Modoc Plateau basins; and iron, boron, and manganese can be problems in the inland basins of Mendocino and Sonoma counties.

Water Quality in Public Supply Wells

From 1994 through 2000, 584 public supply water wells were sampled in 32 of the 63 basins and subbasins in the North Coast HR. Analyzed samples indicate that 553 wells, or 95%, met the state primary Maximum Contaminant Levels (MCL) for drinking water. Thirty-one wells, or 5%, sampled have constituents that exceed one or more MCL. Figure 26 shows the percentage of each contaminant group that exceeded MCLs in the 31 wells.




Figure 26 MCL exceedances in public supply wells in the North Coast Hydrologic Region

Table 13 lists the three most frequently occurring individual contaminants in each of the five contaminant groups and shows the number of wells in the HR that exceeded the MCL for those contaminants.

Table 13 Most frequently occurring contaminants by contaminant group in the North Coast Hydrologic Region

Contaminant group	Contaminant - # of wells	Contaminant - # of wells	Contaminant - # of wells
Inorganics – Primary exceedance	Aluminum – 4	Arsenic – 4	4 tied at 1
Inorganics – Secondary	Manganese – 150	Iron – 108	Copper – 2
Radiological	Radium 228 – 3	Combined RA226 + RA228 – 3	Radium 226 – 1
Nitrates	Nitrate(as NO ₃) – 7	Nitrite(as N) – 1	
VOCs/SVOCs	TCE – 2	3 tied at 1 exceedance	

TCE = Trichloroethylene

VOC = Volatile Organic Compound

SVOC = Semivolatile Organic Compound

Changes from Bulletin 118-80

Since Bulletin 118-80 was published, RWQCB 2 boundary has been modified. This resulted in several basins being reassigned to RWQCB 1. These are listed in Table 14, along with other modifications to North Coast HR.

Table 14 Modifications since Bulletin 118-80 of groundwater basins in North Coast Hydrologic Region

Basin name	New number	Old number
McDowell Valley	1-56	2-12
Knights Valley	1-50	2-13
Potter Valley	1-51	2-14
Ukiah Valley	1-52	2-15
Sanel Valley	1-53	2-16
Alexander Valley	1-54	2-17
Santa Rosa Valley	1-55	2-18
Lower Russian River Valley	1-60	2-20
Bodega Bay Area	1-57	2-21
Modoc Plateau Recent Volcanic Area	deleted	1-23
Modoc Plateau Pleistocene Volcanic Area	deleted	1-24
Gualala River Valley	deleted	1-47
Wilson Grove Formation Highlands	1-59	2-25
Fort Ross Terrace Deposits	1-61	
Wilson Point Area	1-62	

Fort Ross Terrace Deposits (1-61) and Wilson Point Area (1-62) have been defined since B118-80 and are included in this update. Mad River Valley Groundwater Basin (1-8) has been subdivided into two subbasins. Sebastopol Merced Formation (2-25) merged into Basin 1-59 and was renamed Wilson Grove Formation Highlands.

There are a couple of deletions of groundwater basins from Bulletin 118-80. The Modoc Plateau Recent Volcanic Area (1-23) and the Modoc Plateau Pleistocene Volcanic Area (1-24) are volcanic aquifers and were not assigned basin numbers in this bulletin. These are considered to be groundwater source areas as discussed in Chapter 6. Gualala River Valley (1-47) was deleted because the State Water Resources Control Board determined the water being extracted in this area as surface water within a subterranean stream.

Table 15 North Coast Hydrologic Region groundwater data

Basin/Subbasin	Basin Name	Area (acres)	Groundwater Budget Type	Well Yields (gpm)		Types of Monitoring			TDS (mg/L)	
				Maximum	Average	Levels	Quality	Title 22	Average	Range
1-1	SMITH RIVER PLAIN	40,450	B	500	50	7	10	33	164	32 - 496
1-2	KLAMATH RIVER VALLEY									
1-2.01	UPPER KLAMATH LAKE BASIN - Tule Lake	85,930	B	3,380	1,208	40	8	5	721	140 - 2,200
1-2.02	UPPER KLAMATH LAKE BASIN - Lower Klamath	73,330	B	2,600	1,550	4	-	-	-	-
1-3	BUTTE VALLEY	79,700	B	5,000	2,358	28	13	9	310	55 - 1,110
1-4	SHASTA VALLEY	52,640	B	1,200	273	9	15	24	-	-
1-5	SCOTT RIVER VALLEY	63,900	B	3,000	794	6	10	5	258	47 - 1,510
1-6	HAYFORK VALLEY	3,300	B	200	-	-	5	-	-	-
1-7	HOOPA VALLEY	3,900	B	300	-	-	4	-	125	95 - 159
1-8	MAD RIVER VALLEY									
1-8.01	MAD RIVER VALLEY LOWLAND	25,600	B	120	72	4	9	2	184	55 - 280
1-8.02	DOWS PRAIRIE SCHOOL AREA	14,000	B	-	-	-	3	-	-	-
1-9	EUREKA PLAIN	37,400	B	1,200	-	4	4	6	177	97 - 460
1-10	EEL RIVER VALLEY	73,700	B	1,200	-	8	11	29	237	110 - 340
1-11	COVELO ROUND VALLEY	16,400	C	850	193	9	5	29	239	116 - 381
1-12	LAYTONVILLE VALLEY	5,020	A	700	7	4	3	-	149	53 - 251
1-13	LITTLE LAKE VALLEY	10,000	A	1,000	45	7	7	-	340	97 - 1,710
1-14	LOWER KLAMATH RIVER VALLEY	7,030	B	-	-	-	-	-	-	43 - 150
1-15	HAPPY CAMP TOWN AREA	2,770	B	-	-	-	-	17	-	-
1-16	SEIAD VALLEY	2,250	B	-	-	-	2	2	-	-
1-17	BRAY TOWN AREA	8,030	B	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1-18	RED ROCK VALLEY	9,000	B	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1-19	ANDERSON VALLEY	4,970	C	300	30	7	5	7	-	80 - 400
1-20	GARCIA RIVER VALLEY	2,240	C	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1-21	FORT BRAGG TERRACE AREA	24,100	C	75	14	-	-	51	185	26 - 650
1-22	FAIRCHILD SWAMP VALLEY	3,300	B	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1-25	PRAIRIE CREEK AREA	20,000	B	-	-	-	-	1	106	-
1-26	REDWOOD CREEK AREA	2,000	B	-	-	1	0	4	-	102 - 332
1-27	BIG LAGOON AREA	13,400	B	-	-	1	0	31	174	-
1-28	MATTOLE RIVER VALLEY	3,150	B	-	-	-	-	2	-	-
1-29	HONEYDEW TOWN AREA	2,370	B	-	-	-	-	1	-	-
1-30	PEPPERWOOD TOWN AREA	6,290	B	-	-	-	-	1	-	-
1-31	WEOTT TOWN AREA	3,650	B	-	-	-	-	2	-	-
1-32	GARBERVILLE TOWN AREA	2,100	B	-	-	-	-	5	-	-
1-33	LARABEE VALLEY	970	B	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1-34	DINSMORES TOWN AREA	2,300	B	-	-	-	-	3	-	-
1-35	HYAMPOM VALLEY	1,350	B	-	-	-	-	1	-	-
1-36	HETTENSHAW VALLEY	850	B	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1-37	COTTONEVA CREEK VALLEY	760	C	-	-	-	-	-	118	118
1-38	LOWER LAYTONVILLE VALLEY	2,150	C	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1-39	BRANSCOMB TOWN AREA	1,320	C	-	-	-	-	-	130	80 - 179
1-40	TEN MILE RIVER VALLEY	1,490	C	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1-41	LITTLE VALLEY	810	C	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Table 15 North Coast Hydrologic Region groundwater data (continued)

Basin/Subbasin	Basin Name	Area (acres)	Groundwater Budget Type	Well Yields (gpm)		Types of Monitoring			TDS (mg/L)	
				Maximum	Average	Levels	Quality	Title 22	Average	Range
1-42	SHERWOOD VALLEY	1,150	C	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1-43	WILLIAMS VALLEY	1,640	C	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1-44	EDEN VALLEY	1,380	C	-	-	-	-	-	140	140
1-45	BIG RIVER VALLEY	1,690	C	-	-	-	-	2	-	-
1-46	NAVARRO RIVER VALLEY	770	C	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1-48	GRAVELLY VALLEY	3,000	C	-	-	-	-	3	-	-
1-49	ANAPOLIS OHLSON RANCH FOR. HIGHLANDS	8,650	C	36	-	-	0	1	260	260
1-50	KNIGHTS VALLEY	4,090	C	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1-51	POTTER VALLEY	8,240	C	100	-	2	0	1	-	140 - 395
1-52	UKIAH VALLEY									
1-53	SANEL VALLEY	5,570	C	1,250	-	5	8	6	-	174 - 306
1-54	ALEXANDER VALLEY									
1-54.01	ALEXANDER AREA									
1-54.02	CLOVERDALE AREA	6,500	C	-	500	3	-	13	-	130 - 304
1-55	SANTA ROSA VALLEY									
1-55.01	SANTA ROSA PLAIN	80,000	A	1,500	-	43	-	155	-	-
1-55.02	HEALDSBURG AREA	15,400	C	500	-	8	-	28	-	90 - 500
1-55.03	RINCON VALLEY	5,600	C	-	-	2	-	12	-	-
1-56	McDOWELL VALLEY	1,500	C	1,200	-	-	-	-	145	143 - 146
1-57	BODEGA BAY AREA	2,680	A	150	-	-	-	6	-	-
1-59	WILSON GROVE FORMATION HIGHLANDS	81,500	C	-	-	14	-	68	-	-
1-60	LOWER RUSSIAN RIVER VALLEY	6,600	C	500+	-	1	-	32	-	120 - 210
1-61	FORT ROSS TERRACE DEPOSITS	8,490	C	75	27	-	-	13	320	230 - 380
1-62	WILSON POINT AREA	700	B	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

gpm - gallons per minute
 mg/L - milligram per liter
 TDS = total dissolved solids

San Francisco Bay Hydrologic Region




Figure 27 San Francisco Bay Hydrologic Region

Basins and Subbasins of the San Francisco Bay Hydrologic Region

Basin/subbasin	Basin name
2-1	Petaluma Valley
2-2	Napa-Sonoma Valley
2-2.01	Napa Valley
2-2.02	Sonoma Valley
2-2.03	Napa-Sonoma Lowlands
2-3	Suisun-Fairfield Valley
2-4	Pittsburg Plain
2-5	Clayton Valley
2-6	Ygnacio Valley
2-7	San Ramon Valley
2-8	Castro Valley
2-9	Santa Clara Valley
2-9.01	Niles Cone
2-9.02	Santa Clara
2-9.03	San Mateo Plain
2-9.04	East Bay Plain
2-10	Livermore Valley
2-11	Sunol Valley
2-19	Kenwood Valley
2-22	Half Moon Bay Terrace
2-24	San Gregorio Valley
2-26	Pescadero Valley
2-27	Sand Point Area
2-28	Ross Valley
2-29	San Rafael Valley
2-30	Novato Valley
2-31	Arroyo Del Hambre Valley
2-32	Visitacion Valley
2-33	Islais Valley
2-35	Merced Valley
2-36	San Pedro Valley
2-37	South San Francisco
2-38	Lobos
2-39	Marina
2-40	Downtown San Francisco

Description of the Region

The San Francisco Bay HR covers approximately 2.88 million acres (4,500 square miles) and includes all of San Francisco and portions of Marin, Sonoma, Napa, Solano, San Mateo, Santa Clara, Contra Costa, and Alameda counties (Figure 27). The region corresponds to the boundary of RWQCB 2. Significant geographic features include the Santa Clara, Napa, Sonoma, Petaluma, Suisun-Fairfield, and Livermore valleys; the Marin and San Francisco peninsulas; San Francisco, Suisun, and San Pablo bays; and the Santa Cruz Mountains, Diablo Range, Bolinas Ridge, and Vaca Mountains of the Coast Range. While being the smallest in size of the 10 HRs, the region has the second largest population in the State at about 5.8 million in 1995 (DWR 1998). Major population centers include the cities of San Francisco, San Jose and Oakland.

Groundwater Development

The region has 28 identified groundwater basins. Two of those, the Napa-Sonoma Valley and Santa Clara Valley groundwater basins, are further divided into three and four subbasins, respectively. The groundwater basins underlie approximately 896,000 acres (1,400 square miles) or about 30 percent of the entire HR.

Despite the tremendous urban development in the region, groundwater use accounts for only about 5 percent (68,000 acre-feet) of the region's estimated average water supply for agricultural and urban uses, and accounts for less than one percent of statewide groundwater uses.

In general, the freshwater-bearing aquifers are relatively thin in the smaller basins and moderately thick in the more heavily utilized basins. The more heavily utilized basins in this region include the Santa Clara Valley, Napa-Sonoma Valley, and Petaluma Valley groundwater basins. In these basins, the municipal and irrigation wells have average depths ranging from about 200 to 500 feet. Well yields in these basins range from less than 50 gallons per minute (gpm) to approximately 3,000 gpm. In the smaller basins, most municipal and irrigation wells have average well depths in the 100- to 200-foot range. Well yields in the smaller and less utilized basins are typically less than 500 gpm.

Land subsidence has been a significant problem in the Santa Clara Valley Groundwater Basin in the past. An extensive annual monitoring program has been set up within the basin to evaluate changes in an effort to maintain land subsidence at less than 0.01 feet per year (SCVWD 2001). Additionally, groundwater recharge projects have been implemented in the Santa Clara Valley to ensure that groundwater will continue to be a viable water supply in the future.

Groundwater Quality

In general, groundwater quality throughout most of the region is suitable for most urban and agricultural uses with only local impairments. The primary constituents of concern are high TDS, nitrate, boron, and organic compounds.

The areas of high TDS (and chloride) concentrations are typically found in the region's groundwater basins that are situated close to the San Francisco Bay, such as the northern Santa Clara, southern Sonoma, Petaluma, and Napa valleys. Elevated levels of nitrate have been detected in a large percentage of private wells tested within the Coyote Subbasin and Llagas Subbasin of the Gilroy-Hollister Valley Groundwater Basin (in the Central Coast HR) located to the south of the Santa Clara Valley (SCVWD 2001). The shallow aquifer zone within the Petaluma Valley also shows persistent nitrate contamination. Groundwater with high TDS, iron, and boron levels is present in the Calistoga area of Napa Valley, and elevated boron levels in other parts of Napa Valley make the water unfit for agricultural uses. Releases of fuel hydrocarbons from leaking underground storage tanks and spills/leaks of organic solvents at industrial sites have caused minor to significant groundwater impacts in many basins throughout the region. Methyl tertiary-butyl ether (MTBE) and chlorinated solvent releases to soil and groundwater continue to be problematic. Environmental oversight for many of these sites is performed either by local city and county enforcement agencies, the RWQCB, the Department of Toxic Substances Control, and/or the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency.

Water Quality in Public Supply Wells

From 1994 through 2000, 485 public supply water wells were sampled in 18 of the 33 basins and subbasins in the San Francisco Bay HR. Analyzed samples indicate that 410 wells, or 85 percent, met the state primary MCLs for drinking water standards. Seventy-five wells, or 15 percent, have constituents that exceed one or more MCL. Figure 28 shows the percentages of each contaminant group that exceeded MCLs in the 75 wells.

Table 16 lists the three most frequently occurring contaminants in each contaminant group and the number of wells in the HR that exceeded the MCL for those contaminants.




Figure 28 MCL exceedances in public supply wells in the San Francisco Bay Hydrologic Region

Table 16 Most frequently occurring contaminants by contaminant group in the San Francisco Bay Hydrologic Region

Contaminant group	Contaminant - # of wells	Contaminant - # of wells	Contaminant - # of wells
Inorganics	Iron – 57	Manganese – 57	Fluoride – 7
Radiological	Gross Alpha – 2	Radium 226 – 1	
Nitrates	Nitrate (as NO ₃) – 27	Nitrate + Nitrite – 3	Nitrite (as N) – 1
Pesticides	Di(2-Ethylhexyl)phthalate – 4	Heptachlor – 1	
VOCs/SVOCs	PCE – 4	Dichloromethane – 3	TCE – 2 Vinyl Chloride – 2

TCE = Trichloroethylene
 PCE = Tetrachloroethylene
 VOC = Volatile Organic Compound
 SVOC = Semivolatile Organic Compound

Changes from Bulletin 118-80

Since Bulletin 118-80 was published, RWQCB 2 boundary has been modified. This resulted in several basins being reassigned to RWQCB 1. These are listed in Table 17.

Table 17 Modifications since Bulletin 118-80 of groundwater basins in San Francisco Bay Hydrologic Region

Basin name	New number	Old number
McDowell Valley	1-56	2-12
Knights Valley	1-50	2-13
Potter Valley	1-51	2-14
Ukiah Valley	1-52	2-15
Sanel Valley	1-53	2-16
Alexander Valley	1-54	2-17
Santa Rosa Valley	1-55	2-18
Lower Russian River Valley	1-60	2-20
Bodega Bay Area	1-57	2-21

No additional basins were assigned to the San Francisco Bay HR in this revision. However, the Santa Clara Valley Groundwater Basin (2-9) has been subdivided into four subbasins instead of two, and the Napa-Sonoma Valley Groundwater Basin is now three subbasins instead of two.

There are several deletions of groundwater basins from Bulletin 118-80. The San Francisco Sand Dune Area (2-34) was deleted when the San Francisco groundwater basins were redefined in a USGS report in the early 1990s. The Napa-Sonoma Volcanic Highlands (2-23) is a volcanic aquifer and was not assigned a basin number in this bulletin. This is considered to be a groundwater source area as discussed in Chapter 6. Bulletin 118-80 identified seven groundwater basins that were stated to differ from 118-75: Sonoma County Basin, Napa County Basin, Santa Clara County Basin, San Mateo Basin, Alameda Bay Plain Basin, Niles Cone Basin, and Livermore Basin. They were created primarily by combining several smaller basins and subbasins within individual counties. This report does not consider these seven as basins. There is no change in numbering because the basins were never assigned a basin number.

Table 18 San Francisco Bay Hydrologic Region groundwater data

Basin/Subbasin	Basin Name	Area (acres)	Groundwater Budget Type	Well Yields (gpm)			Active Monitoring				TDS (mg/L)	
				Maximum	Average	Levels	Quality	Title 22	Average	Range		
2-1	PETALUMA VALLEY	46,100	C	100	-	16	7	24	347	58-650		
2-2	NAPA-SONOMA VALLEY											
2-2.01	NAPA VALLEY	45,900	A	3,000	223	19	10	23	272	150-370		
2-2.02	SONOMA VALLEY	44,700	C	1,140	516	18	9	35	321	100-550		
2-2.03	NAPA-SONOMA LOWLANDS	40,500	C	300	98	0	6	9	185	50-300		
2-3	SUISUN-FAIRFIELD VALLEY	133,600	C	500	200	21	17	35	410	160-740		
2-4	PITTSBURG PLAIN	11,600	C	-	-	-	-	9	-	-		
2-5	CLAYTON VALLEY	17,800	C	-	-	-	-	48	-	-		
2-6	YGNACIO VALLEY	15,500	C	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		
2-7	SAN RAMON VALLEY	7,060	C	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		
2-8	CASTRO VALLEY	1,820	C	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		
2-9	SANTA CLARA VALLEY											
2-9.01	NILES CONE	57,900	A	3,000	2,000	350	120	20	-	-		
2-9.02	SANTA CLARA	190,000	C	-	-	-	10	234	408	200-931		
2-9.03	SAN MATEO PLAIN	48,100	C	-	-	-	2	14	407	300-480		
2-9.04	EAST BAY PLAIN	77,400	A	1,000	UNK	29	16	7	638	364-1,420		
2-10	LIVERMORE VALLEY	69,500	A	-	-	-	-	36	-	-		
2-11	SUNOL VALLEY	16,600	C	-	-	-	-	2	-	-		
2-19	KENWOOD VALLEY	3,170	C	-	-	-	-	13	-	-		
2-22	HALF MOON BAY TERRACE	9,150	C	-	-	5	-	9	-	-		
2-24	SAN GREGORIO VALLEY	1,070	C	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		
2-26	PESCADERO VALLEY	2,900	C	-	-	3	-	4	-	-		
2-27	SAND POINT AREA	1,400	C	-	-	-	-	6	-	-		
2-28	ROSS VALLEY	1,770	C	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		
2-29	SAN RAFAEL VALLEY	880	C	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		
2-30	NOVATO VALLEY	20,500	C	-	-	-	-	1	-	-		
2-31	ARROYO DEL HAMBRE VALLEY	790	C	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		
2-32	VISITACION VALLEY	880	C	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		
2-33	ISLAIS VALLEY	1,550	C	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		
2-35	MERCED VALLEY	10,400	C	-	-	-	-	10	-	-		
2-36	SAN PEDRO VALLEY	880	C	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		
2-37	SOUTH SAN FRANCISCO	2,170	C	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		
2-38	LOBOS	2,400	A	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		
2-39	MARINA	220	A	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		
2-40	DOWNTOWN SAN FRANCISCO	7,600	C	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		

gpm - gallons per minute

mg/L - milligram per liter

TDS - total dissolved solids

Central Coast Hydrologic Region




Figure 29 Central Coast Hydrologic Region

Basins and Subbasins of Central Coast Hydrologic Region

RegionBasin/ subbasin	Basin name	RegionBasin/ subbasin	Basin name
3-1	Soquel Valley	3-35	San Simeon Valley
3-2	Pajaro Valley	3-36	Santa Rosa Valley
3-3	Gilroy-Hollister Valley	3-37	Villa Valley
3-3.01	Llagas Area	3-38	Cayucos Valley
3-3.02	Bolsa Area	3-39	Old Valley
3-3.03	Hollister Area	3-40	Toro Valley
3-3.04	San Juan Bautista Area	3-41	Morro Valley
3-4	Salinas Valley	3-42	Chorro Valley
3-4.01	180/400 Foot Aquifer	3-43	Rinconada Valley
3-4.02	East Side Aquifer	3-44	Pozo Valley
3-4.04	Forebay Aquifer	3-45	Huasna Valley
3-4.05	Upper Valley Aquifer	3-46	Rafael Valley
3-4.06	Paso Robles Area	3-47	Big Spring Area
3-4.08	Seaside Area	3-49	Montecito
3-4.09	Langley Area	3-50	Felton Area
3-4.10	Corral de Tierra Area	3-51	Majors Creek
3-5	Cholame Valley	3-52	Needle Rock Point
3-6	Lockwood Valley	3-53	Foothill
3-7	Carmel Valley		
3-8	Los Osos Valley		
3-9	San Luis Obispo Valley		
3-12	Santa Maria River Valley		
3-13	Cuyama Valley		
3-14	San Antonio Creek Valley		
3-15	Santa Ynez River Valley		
3-16	Goleta		
3-17	Santa Barbara		
3-18	Carpinteria		
3-19	Carrizo Plain		
3-20	Ano Nuevo Area		
3-21	Santa Cruz Purisima Formation		
3-22	Santa Ana Valley		
3-23	Upper Santa Ana Valley		
3-24	Quien Sabe Valley		
3-25	Tres Pinos Valley		
3-26	West Santa Cruz Terrace		
3-27	Scotts Valley		
3-28	San Benito River Valley		
3-29	Dry Lake Valley		
3-30	Bitter Water Valley		
3-31	Hernandez Valley		
3-32	Peach Tree Valley		
3-33	San Carpofofo Valley		
3-34	Arroyo de la Cruz Valley		

Description of the Region

The Central Coast HR covers approximately 7.22 million acres (11,300 square miles) in central California (Figure 29). This HR includes all of Santa Cruz, Monterey, San Luis Obispo, and Santa Barbara counties, most of San Benito County, and parts of San Mateo, Santa Clara, and Ventura counties. Significant geographic features include the Pajaro, Salinas, Carmel, Santa Maria, Santa Ynez, and Cuyama valleys; the coastal plain of Santa Barbara; and the Coast Range. Major drainages in the region include the Salinas, Cuyama, Santa Ynez, Santa Maria, San Antonio, San Lorenzo, San Benito, Pajaro, Nacimiento, Carmel, and Big Sur Rivers.

Population data from the 2000 Census suggest that about 1.4 million people or about 4 percent of the population of the State live in this HR. Major population centers include Santa Barbara, Santa Maria, San Luis Obispo, Gilroy, Hollister, Morgan Hill, Salinas, and Monterey.

The Central Coast HR has 50 delineated groundwater basins. Within this region, the Gilroy-Hollister Valley and Salinas Valley groundwater basins are divided into four and eight subbasins, respectively. Groundwater basins in this HR underlie about 2.390 million acres (3,740 square miles) or about one-third of the HR.

Groundwater Development

Locally, groundwater is an extremely important source of water supply. Within the region, groundwater accounted for 83 percent of the annual supply used for agricultural and urban purposes in 1995. For an average year, groundwater in the region accounts for about 8.4 percent of the statewide groundwater supply and about 1.3 percent of the total state water supply for agricultural and urban needs. In drought years, groundwater in this region is expected to account for about 7.2 percent of the statewide groundwater supply and about 1.9 percent of the total State water supply for agricultural and urban needs (DWR 1998).

Aquifers are varied and range from large extensive alluvial valleys with thick multilayered aquifers and aquitards to small inland valleys and coastal terraces. Several of the larger basins provide a dependable and drought-resistant water supply to coastal cities and farms.

Conjunctive use of surface water and groundwater is a long-standing practice in the region. Several reservoirs including Hernandez, Twitchell, Lake San Antonio, and Lake Nacimiento are operated primarily for the purpose of groundwater recharge. The concept is to maintain streamflow over a longer period than would occur without surface water storage and thus provide for increased recharge of groundwater. Seawater intrusion is a major problem throughout much of the region. In the Salinas Valley Groundwater Basin, seawater intrusion was first documented in the 1930s and has been observed more than 5 miles inland.

Groundwater Quality

Much of the groundwater in the region is characterized by calcium sulfate to calcium sodium bicarbonate sulfate water types because of marine sedimentary rock in the watersheds. Aquifers intruded by seawater are typically characterized by sodium chloride to calcium chloride, and have chloride concentrations greater than 500 mg/L. In several areas, groundwater exceeds the MCL for nitrate.

Water Quality in Public Supply Wells

From 1994 through 2000, 711 public supply water wells were sampled in 38 of the 60 basins and subbasins in the Central Coast HR. Analyzed samples indicate that 587 wells, or 83 percent, met the state primary MCLs for drinking water. One-hundred-twenty-four wells, or 17 percent, have constituents that exceed one or more MCL. Figure 30 shows the percentages of each contaminant group that exceeded MCLs in the 124 wells.




Figure 30 MCL exceedances in public supply wells in the Central Coast Hydrologic Region

Table 19 lists the three most frequently occurring contaminants in each of the six contaminant groups and shows the number of wells in the HR that exceeded the MCL for those contaminants.

Table 19 Most frequently occurring contaminants by contaminant group in the Central Coast Hydrologic Region

Contaminant group wells	Contaminant - # of wells	Contaminant - # of wells	Contaminant - # of wells
Inorganics – Primary	Antimony – 6	Aluminum – 4	Chromium (Total) – 4
Inorganics – Secondary	Iron – 145	Manganese – 135	TDS – 11
Radiological	Gross Alpha – 15	Radium 226 – 3	Uranium – 3
Nitrates	Nitrate (as NO ₃) – 69	Nitrate + Nitrite – 24	
Pesticides	Heptachlor – 4	Di (2-Ethylhexyl) phthalate – 2	
VOCs/SVOCs	TCE – 3	3 are tied at 2 exceedances	

TCE = Trichloroethylene
 VOC = Volatile Organic Compound
 SVOC = Semivolatile Organic Compound

Changes from Bulletin 118-80

Four new basins have been defined since Bulletin 118-80. They are Felton Area, Majors Creek, Needle Rock Point, and Foothill groundwater basins. Additionally, new subbasins have been broken out in both the Gilroy-Hollister Valley Groundwater Basin (3-3) and the Salinas Valley Groundwater Basin (3-4) (Table 20).

Table 20 Modifications since Bulletin 118-80 of groundwater basins and subbasins in Central Coast Hydrologic Region

Subbasin name	New number	Old number
Llagas Area	3-3.01	3-3
Bolsa Area	3-3.02	3-3
Hollister Area	3-3.03	3-3
San Juan Bautista Area	3-3.04	3-3
180/400 Foot Aquifer	3-4.01	3-4
East Side Aquifer	3-4.02	3-4
Upper Forebay Aquifer	3-4.04	3-4
Upper Valley Aquifer	3-4.05	3-4
Pismo Creek Valley Basin	3-12	3-10
Arroyo Grande Creek Basin	3-12	3-11
Careaga Sand Highlands Basin	3-12 and 3-14	3-48
Felton Area	3-50	
Majors Creek	3-51	
Needle Rock Point	3-52	
Foothill	3-53	

Pismo Creek Valley Basin (3-10) and Arroyo Grande Creek Basin (3-11) have been merged into the Santa Maria River Valley Basin (3-12). Careaga Sand Highlands Basin (3-48) has been merged into the Santa Maria River Valley Basin (3-12) and San Antonio Creek Valley Basin (3-14).

Table 21 Central Coast Hydrologic Region groundwater data

Basin/Subbasin	Basin Name	Area (acres)	Groundwater Budget Type	Well Yields (gpm)		Types of Monitoring				TDS (mg/L)	
				Maximum	Average	Levels	Quality	Title 22	Average	Range	
3-1	SOQUEL VALLEY	2,500	C	1,421	665	6	6	16	482	270-990	
3-2	PAJARO VALLEY	76,800	A	2,000	500	185	185	149	580-910	300-30,000	
3-3	GILROY-HOLLISTER VALLEY										
3-3.01	LLAGAS AREA	55,600	C	-	-	-	-	95	-	-	
3-3.02	BOLSA AREA	21,000	A	-	400	11	<11	3	-	400-1800	
3-3.03	HOLLISTER AREA	32,700	A	-	400	42	<42	35	-	400-1600	
3-3.04	SAN JUAN BAUTISTA AREA	74,300	A	-	400	37	<37	40	-	460-1700	
3-4	SALINAS VALLEY										
3-4.01	180/400 FOOT AQUIFER	84,400	A	-	-	166	218	82	478	223-1,013	
3-4.02	EAST SIDE AQUIFER	57,500	A	-	-	74	67	53	450	168-977	
3-4.04	FOREBAY AQUIFER	94,100	A	-	-	89	91	35	624	300-1,100	
3-4.05	UPPER VALLEY AQUIFER	98,200	A	4,000	-	36	37	17	443	140-3,700	
3-4.06	PASO ROBLES AREA	597,000	A	3,300	-	183	-	58	614	165-3,868	
3-4.08	SEASIDE AREA	25,900	B	3,500	1,000	-	7	24	400	200-900	
3-4.09	LANGLEY AREA	15,400	B	1,570	450	-	-	52	-	52-348	
3-4.10	CHORRAL DE TIERRA AREA	22,300	C	948	450	-	3	26	-	355-679	
3-5	LOCKWOOD VALLEY	39,800	C	3,000	1,000	1	-	1	-	-	
3-6	LOCKWOOD VALLEY	59,900	C	1,500	100	-	-	9	-	-	
3-7	CARMEL VALLEY	5,160	C	1,000	600	50	23	12	260-670	220-1,200	
3-8	LOS OSOS VALLEY	6,990	A	700	230	-	-	10	354	78-33,700	
3-9	SAN LUIS OBISPO VALLEY	12,700	A	600	300	-	-	11	583	278-1,949	
3-12	SANTA MARIA RIVER VALLEY	184,000	A	2,500	1,000	286	10	108	598	139-1,200	
3-13	CUYAMA VALLEY	147,000	A	4,400	1,100	17	2	8	-	206-3,905	
3-14	SAN ANTONIO CREEK VALLEY	81,800	A	-	400	30	-	9	415	129-8,040	
3-15	SANTA YNEZ RIVER VALLEY	204,000	A	1,300	750	163	21	76	507	400-700	
3-16	GOLETA	9,210	A	800	500	49	11	17	755	617-929	
3-17	SANTA BARBARA	6,160	A	625	560	75	36	5	-	217-385	
3-18	CARPINTERIA	8,120	A	500	300	41	41	4	557	317-1,780	
3-19	CARRIZO PLAIN	173,000	C	1,000	500	-	-	1	-	-	
3-20	ANO NUEVO AREA	2,032	C	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	
3-21	SANTA CRUZ PURISIMA FORMATION	40,200	C	200	20	-	-	39	440	380-560	
3-22	SANTA ANA VALLEY	2,720	C	130	-	-	-	-	-	-	
3-23	UPPER SANTA ANA VALLEY	1,430	C	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
3-24	QUIEN SABE VALLEY	4,710	C	122	122	-	-	-	-	-	
3-25	TRES PINOS VALLEY	3,390	C	1,225	-	-	-	3	-	-	
3-26	WEST SANTA CRUZ TERRACE	7,870	C	550	200	-	-	7	480	378-684	
3-27	SCOTT'S VALLEY	774	C	410	100-900	26	7	7	360	100-980	
3-28	SAN BENITO RIVER VALLEY	24,200	C	2,000	-	-	-	3	-	-	
3-29	DRY LAKE VALLEY	1,420	C	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
3-30	BITTER WATER VALLEY	32,200	C	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
3-31	HERNANDEZ VALLEY	2,860	C	160	58	-	-	-	-	-	

Table 21 Central Coast Hydrologic Region groundwater data (continued)

Basin/Subbasin	Basin Name	Area (acres)	Groundwater Budget Type	Well Yields (gpm)		Types of Monitoring			TDS (mg/L)	
				Maximum	Average	Levels	Quality	Title 22	Average	Range
3-32	PEACH TREE VALLEY	9,790	C	117	84	-	-	-	-	-
3-33	SAN CARPOFORO VALLEY	200	C	-	-	-	-	-	-	217-385
3-34	ARROYO DE LA CRUZ VALLEY	750	C	-	-	-	-	-	-	211-381
3-35	SAN SIMEON VALLEY	620	A	170	100	-	-	4	413	46-2,210
3-36	SANTA ROSA VALLEY	4,480	A	708	400	-	-	2	-	298-2,637
3-37	VILLA VALLEY	980	C	-	-	-	-	-	-	260-1,635
3-38	CAYUCOS VALLEY	530	C	166	100	-	-	-	-	815-916
3-39	OLD VALLEY	750	C	335	200	-	-	-	-	346-2,462
3-40	TORO VALLEY	721	C	500	0	-	-	-	-	458-732
3-41	MORRO VALLEY	1,200	C	442	300	-	-	6	1150	469-5,100
3-42	CHORRO VALLEY	3,200	C	700	200	-	-	6	656	60-3,606
3-43	RINCONADA VALLEY	2,580	C	0	0	-	-	-	-	-
3-44	POZO VALLEY	6,840	C	230	100	-	-	5	-	287-676
3-45	HUASNA VALLEY	4,700	C	0	0	-	-	-	-	-
3-46	RAFAEL VALLEY	2,990	C	0	0	-	-	-	-	-
3-47	BIG SPRING AREA	7,320	C	0	0	-	-	-	-	-
3-49	MONTECITO	6,270	A	1,000	750	88	2	4	700	600-1,100
3-50	FELTON AREA	1,160	C	825	244	6	-	2	-	69-400
3-51	MAJORS CREEK	364	C	50	38	-	-	-	-	-
3-52	NEEDLE ROCK POINT	480	C	450	320	-	-	-	-	-
3-53	FOOTHILL	3,120	A	-	-	-	8	7	828	554-1,118

gpm - gallons per minute

mg/L - milligram per liter

TDS -total dissolved solids

South Coast Hydrologic Region




Figure 31 South Coast Hydrologic Region

Basins and Subbasins of the South Coast Hydrologic Region

Basin/subbasin	Basin name	Basin/subbasin	Basin name
4-1	Upper Ojai Valley	8-4	Elsinore
4-2	Ojai Valley	8-5	San Jacinto
4-3	Ventura River Valley	8-6	Hemet Lake Valley
4-3.01	Upper Ventura River	8-7	Big Meadows Valley
4-3.02	Lower Ventura River	8-8	Seven Oaks Valley
4-4	Santa Clara River Valley	8-9	Bear Valley
4-4.02	Oxnard	9-1	San Juan Valley
4-4.03	Mound	9-2	San Mateo Valley
4-4.04	Santa Paula	9-3	San Onofre Valley
4-4.05	Fillmore	9-4	Santa Margarita Valley
4-4.06	Piru	9-5	Temecula Valley
4-4.07	Santa Clara River Valley East	9-6	Coahuila Valley
4-5	Acton Valley	9-7	San Luis Rey Valley
4-6	Pleasant Valley	9-8	Warner Valley
4-7	Arroyo Santa Rosa Valley	9-9	Escondido Valley
4-8	Las Posas Valley	9-10	San Pasqual Valley
4-9	Simi Valley	9-11	Santa Maria Valley
4-10	Conejo Valley	9-12	San Dieguito Creek
4-11	Coastal Plain of Los Angeles	9-13	Poway Valley
4-11.01	Santa Monica	9-14	Mission Valley
4-11.02	Hollywood	9-15	San Diego River Valley
4-11.03	West Coast	9-16	El Cajon Valley
4-11.04	Central	9-17	Sweetwater Valley
4-12	San Fernando Valley	9-18	Otay Valley
4-13	San Gabriel Valley	9-19	Tijuana Basin
4-15	Tierra Rejada	9-22	Batiquitos Lagoon Valley
4-16	Hidden Valley	9-23	San Elijo Valley
4-17	Lockwood Valley	9-24	Pamo Valley
4-18	Hungry Valley	9-25	Ranchita Town Area
4-19	Thousand Oaks Area	9-27	Cottonwood Valley
4-20	Russell Valley	9-28	Campo Valley
4-22	Malibu Valley	9-29	Potrero Valley
4-23	Raymond	9-32	San Marcos Area
8-1	Coastal Plain of Orange County		
8-2	Upper Santa Ana Valley		
8-2.01	Chino		
8-2.02	Cucamonga		
8-2.03	Riverside-Arlington		
8-2.04	Rialto-Colton		
8-2.05	Cajon		
8-2.06	Bunker Hill		
8-2.07	Yucaipa		
8-2.08	San Timoteo		
8-2.09	Temescal		

Description of the Region

The South Coast HR covers approximately 6.78 million acres (10,600 square miles) of the southern California watershed that drains to the Pacific Ocean (Figure 31). The HR is bounded on the west by the Pacific Ocean and the watershed divide near the Ventura-Santa Barbara County line. The northern boundary corresponds to the crest of the Transverse Ranges through the San Gabriel and San Bernardino mountains. The eastern boundary lies along the crest of the San Jacinto Mountains and low-lying hills of the Peninsular Range that form a drainage boundary with the Colorado River HR. The southern boundary is the international boundary with the Republic of Mexico. Significant geographic features include the coastal plain, the central Transverse Ranges, the Peninsular Ranges, and the San Fernando, San Gabriel, Santa Ana River, and Santa Clara River valleys.

The South Coast HR includes all of Orange County, most of San Diego and Los Angeles Counties, parts of Riverside, San Bernardino, and Ventura counties, and a small amount of Kern and Santa Barbara Counties. This HR is divided into Los Angeles, Santa Ana and San Diego subregions, RWQCBs 4, 8, and 9 respectively. Groundwater basins are numbered according to these subregions. Basin numbers in the Los Angeles subregion are preceded by a 4, in Santa Ana by an 8, and in San Diego by a 9. The Los Angeles subregion contains the Ventura, Santa Clara, Los Angeles, and San Gabriel River drainages, Santa Ana encompasses the Santa Ana River drainage, and San Diego includes the Santa Maria River, San Luis Rey River and the San Diego River and other drainage systems.

According to 2000 census data, about 17 million people live within the boundaries of the South Coast HR, approximately 50 percent of the population of California. Because this HR amounts to only about 7 percent of the surface area of the State, this has the highest population density of any HR in California (DWR 1998). Major population centers include the metropolitan areas surrounding Ventura, Los Angeles, San Diego, San Bernardino, and Riverside.

The South Coast HR has 56 delineated groundwater basins. Twenty-one basins are in subregion 4 (Los Angeles), eight basins in subregion 8 (Santa Ana), and 27 basins in subregion 9 (San Diego).

The Los Angeles subregion overlies 21 groundwater basins and encompasses most of Ventura and Los Angeles counties. Within this subregion, the Ventura River Valley, Santa Clara River Valley, and Coastal Plain of Los Angeles basins are divided into subbasins. The basins in the Los Angeles subregion underlie 1.01 million acres (1,580 square miles) or about 40 percent of the total surface area of the subregion.

The Santa Ana subregion overlies eight groundwater basins and encompasses most of Orange County and parts of Los Angeles, San Bernardino, and Riverside counties. The Upper Santa Ana Valley Groundwater Basin is divided into nine subbasins. Groundwater basins underlie 979,000 acres (1,520 square miles) or about 54 percent of the Santa Ana subregion.

The San Diego subregion overlies 27 groundwater basins, encompasses most of San Diego County, and includes parts of Orange and Riverside counties. Groundwater basins underlie about 277,000 acres (433 square miles) or about 11 percent of the surface of the San Diego subregion.

Overall, groundwater basins underlie about 2.27 million acres (3,530 square miles) or about 33 percent of the South Coast HR.

Groundwater Development

Groundwater has been used in the South Coast HR for well over 100 years. High demand and use of groundwater in Southern California has given rise to many disputes over management and pumping rights, with the resolution of these cases playing a large role in the establishment and clarification of water rights law in California. Raymond Groundwater Basin, located in this HR, was the first adjudicated basin in the State. Of the 16 adjudicated basins in California, 11 are in the South Coast HR. Groundwater provides about 23 percent of water demand in normal years and about 29 percent in drought years (DWR 1998).

Groundwater is found in unconfined alluvial aquifers in most of the basins of the San Diego subregion and the inland basins of the Santa Ana and Los Angeles subregions. In some larger basins, typified by those underlying the coastal plain, groundwater occurs in multiple aquifers separated by aquitards that create confined groundwater conditions. Basins range in depth from tens or hundreds of feet in smaller basins, to thousands of feet in larger basins. The thickness of aquifers varies from tens to hundreds of feet. Well yields vary in this HR depending on aquifer characteristics and well location, size, and use. Some aquifers are capable of yielding thousands of gallons per minute to municipal wells.

Conjunctive Use

Conjunctive use of surface water and groundwater is a long-standing practice in the region. At present, much of the potable water used in Southern California is imported from the Colorado River and from sources in the eastern Sierra and Northern California. Several reservoirs are operated primarily for the purpose of storing surface water for domestic and irrigation use, but groundwater basins are also recharged from the outflow of some reservoirs. The concept is to maintain streamflow over a longer period of time than would occur without regulated flow and thus provide for increased recharge of groundwater basins. Most of the larger basins in this HR are highly managed, with many conjunctive use projects being developed to optimize water supply.

Coastal basins in this HR are prone to intrusion of seawater. Seawater intrusion barriers are maintained along the Los Angeles and Orange County sections of the coastal plain. In Orange County, recycled water is injected into the ground to form a mound of groundwater between the coast and the main groundwater basin. In Los Angeles County, imported and recycled water is injected to maintain a seawater intrusion barrier.

Groundwater Quality

Groundwater in basins of the Los Angeles subregion is mainly calcium sulfate and calcium bicarbonate in character. Nitrate content is elevated in some parts of the subregion. Volatile organic compounds (VOCs) have created groundwater impairments in some of the industrialized portions of the region. The San Gabriel Valley and San Fernando Valley groundwater basins both have multiple sites of contamination from VOCs. The main constituents in the contamination plumes are trichloroethylene (TCE) and tetrachloroethylene (PCE). Some of the locations have been declared federal Superfund sites. Contamination plumes containing high concentrations of TCE and PCE also occur in the Bunker Hill Subbasin of the Upper Santa Ana Valley Groundwater Basin. Some of these plumes are also designated as Superfund sites. Perchlorate is emerging as an important contaminant in several areas in the South Coast HR.

Groundwater in basins of the Santa Ana subregion is primarily calcium and sodium bicarbonate in character. Local impairments from excess nitrate or VOCs have been recognized. Groundwater and surface water in the Chino Subbasin of the Santa Ana River Valley Groundwater Basin have elevated nitrate concentrations, partly derived from a large dairy industry in that area. In Orange County, water from the Santa Ana River provides a large part of the groundwater replenishment. Wetlands maintained along the Santa Ana River near the boundary of the Upper Santa Ana River and Orange County Groundwater Basins provide effective removal of nitrate from surface water, while maintaining critical habitat for endangered species.

Groundwater in basins of the San Diego subregion has mainly calcium and sodium cations and bicarbonate and sulfate anions. Local impairments by nitrate, sulfate, and TDS are found. Camp Pendleton Marine Base, in the northwestern part of this subregion, is on the EPA National Priorities List for soil and groundwater contamination by many constituents.

Water Quality in Public Supply Wells

From 1994 through 2000, 2,342 public supply water wells were sampled in 47 of the 73 basins and subbasins in the South Coast HR. Analyzed samples indicate that 1,360 wells, or 58 percent, met the state primary MCLs for drinking water. Nine-hundred-eighty-two wells, or 42 percent, have constituents that exceed one or more MCL. Figure 32 shows the percentages of each contaminant group that exceeded MCLs in the 982 wells.




Figure 32 MCL exceedances in public supply wells in the South Coast Hydrologic Region

Table 22 lists the three most frequently occurring contaminants in each of the six contaminant groups and shows the number of wells in the HR that exceeded the MCL for those contaminants.

Changes from Bulletin 118-80

Several modifications from the groundwater basins presented in Bulletin 118-80 are incorporated in this report (Table 23). The Cajalco Valley (8-3), Jamul Valley (9-20), Las Pulgas Valley (9-21), Pine Valley (9-26), and Tecate Valley (9-30) Groundwater Basins have been deleted in this report because they have thin deposits of alluvium and well completion reports indicate that groundwater production is from underlying fractured bedrock. The Conejo Tierra Rejada Volcanic (4-21) is a volcanic aquifer and was not assigned a basin number in this bulletin. This is considered to be groundwater source area as discussed in Chapter 6.

Table 22 Most frequently occurring contaminants by contaminant group in the South Coast Hydrologic Region

Contaminant group	Contaminant - # of wells	Contaminant - # of wells	Contaminant - # of wells
Inorganics – Primary	Fluoride – 56	Thallium – 13	Aluminum – 12
Inorganics – Secondary	Iron – 337	Manganese – 335	TDS – 36
Radiological	Gross Alpha – 104	Uranium – 40	Radium 226 – 9 Radium 228 – 9
Nitrates	Nitrate (as NO ₃) – 364	Nitrate + Nitrite – 179	Nitrate Nitrogen (NO ₃ -N) – 14
Pesticides	DBCP – 61	Di(2-Ethylhexyl)phthalate – 5	Heptachlor – 2 EDB – 2
VOCs/SVOCs	TCE – 196	PCE – 152	1,2 Dichloroethane – 89

DBCP = Dibromochloropropane
 EDB = Ethylene Dibromide
 VOCs = Volatile Organic Compounds
 SVOCs = Semivolatile Organic Compounds

The Ventura River Valley (4-3), Santa Clara River Valley (4-4), Coastal Plain of Los Angeles (4-11), and Upper Santa Ana Valley (8-2) Groundwater Basins have been divided into subbasins in this report. The extent of the San Jacinto Groundwater Basin (8-5) has been decreased because completion of Diamond Valley Reservoir has inundated the valley. Paloma Valley has been removed because well logs indicate groundwater production is solely from fractured bedrock. The Raymond Groundwater Basin (4-23) is presented as an individual basin instead of being incorporated into the San Gabriel Valley Groundwater Basin (4-13) because it is bounded by physical barriers and has been managed as a separate and individual groundwater basin for many decades. In Bulletin 118-75, groundwater basins in two different subregions were designated the Upper Santa Ana Valley Groundwater Basin (4-14 and 8-2). To alleviate this confusion, basin 4-14 has been divided, with parts of the basin incorporated into the neighboring San Gabriel Valley Groundwater Basin (4-13) and the Chino subbasin of the Upper Santa Ana Valley Groundwater Basin (8-2.01). The San Marcos Area Groundwater Basin (9-32) in central San Diego County is presented as a new basin in this report.

Table 23 Modifications since Bulletin 118-80 of groundwater basins and subbasins in South Coast Hydrologic Region

Basin/subbasin name	Number	Old number	Basin/subbasin name	Number	Old number
Upper Ventura River	4-3.01	4-3	Cajon	8-2.05	8-2
Lower Ventura River	4-3.02	4-3	Bunker Hill	8-2.06	8-2
Oxnard	4-4.02	4-4	Yucaipa	8-2.07	8-2
Mound	4-4.03	4-4	San Timoteo	8-2.08	8-2
Santa Paula	4-4.04	4-4	Temescal	8-2.09	8-2
Fillmore	4-4.05	4-4	Cajalco Valley	deleted	8-3
Piru	4-4.06	4-4	Tijuana Basin	9-19	
Santa Clara River Valley East	4-4.07	4-4	Jamul Valley	deleted	9-20
Santa Monica	4-11.01	4-11	Las Pulgas Valley	deleted	9-21
Hollywood	4-11.02	4-11	Batiquitos Lagoon Valley	9-22	
West Coast	4-11.03	4-11	San Elijo Valley	9-23	
Central	4-11.04	4-11	Pamo Valley	9-24	
Upper Santa Ana Valley	Incorporated into 8-2.01 and 4-13	4-14	Ranchita Town Area	9-25	
Conejo-Tierra Rejada Volcanic	deleted	4-21	Pine Valley	deleted	9-26
Raymond	4-23	4-13	Cottonwood Valley	9-27	
Chino	8-2.01	8-2	Campo Valley	9-28	
Cucamonga	8-2.02	8-2	Potrero Valley	9-29	
Riverside-Arlington	8-2.03	8-2	Tecate Valley	deleted	9-30
Rialto-Colton	8-2.04	8-2	San Marcos Area	9-32	Not previously identified

Table 24 South Coast Hydrologic Region groundwater data

Basin/Subbasin	Basin Name	Area (acres)	Groundwater Budget Type	Well Yields (gpm)		Active Monitoring			TDS (mg/L)	
				Maximum	Average	Levels	Quality	Title 22	Average	Range
4-1	UPPER OJAI VALLEY	3,800	A	200	50	4	-	1	707	438-1,249
4-2	OJAI VALLEY	6,830	A	600	383	24	-	22	640	450-1,140
4-3	VENTURA RIVER VALLEY									
4-3.01	UPPER VENTURA RIVER	7,410	C	-	600	17	-	18	706	500-1,240
4-3.02	LOWER VENTURA RIVER	5,300	A	-	20	-	-	2	-	760-3,000
4-4	SANTA CLARA RIVER VALLEY									
4-4.02	OXNARD	58,000	A	1,600	-	127	127	69	1,102	160-1,800
4-4.03	MOUND	14,800	A	-	700	11	11	4	1,644	1,498-1,908
4-4.04	SANTA PAULA	22,800	A	-	700	60	60	10	1,198	470-3,010
4-4.05	FILLMORE	20,800	A	2,100	700	23	-	10	1,100	800-2,400
4-4.06	PIRU	8,900	A	-	800	19	-	3	1,300	608-2,400
4-4.07	SANTA CLARA RIVER VALLEY EAST	66,200	C	-	-	-	-	62	-	-
4-5	ACTON VALLEY	8,270	A	1,000	140	-	-	7	-	-
4-6	PLEASANT VALLEY	21,600	A	-	1,000	9	-	12	1,110	597-3,490
4-7	ARROYO SANTA ROSA VALLEY	3,740	A	1,200	950	6	-	7	1,006	670-1,200
4-8	LAS POSAS VALLEY	42,200	A	750	-	-	-	24	742	338-1,700
4-9	SIMI VALLEY	12,100	A	-	394	13	-	1	-	1,580
4-10	CONEJO VALLEY	28,900	A	1,000	100	-	-	3	631	335-2,064
4-11	COASTAL PLAIN OF LOS ANGELES									
4-11.01	SANTA MONICA	32,100	C	4,700	-	-	-	12	916	729-1,156
4-11.02	HOLLYWOOD	10,500	A	-	-	5	5	1	-	526
4-11.03	WEST COAST	91,300	A	1,300	-	67	58	33	456	-
4-11.04	CENTRAL	177,000	A	11,000	1,730	302	64	294	453	200-2,500
4-12	SAN FERNANDO VALLEY	145,000	A	3,240	1,220	1,398	2,385	126	499	176-1,116
4-13	SAN GABRIEL VALLEY	154,000	A	4,850	1,000	67	296	259	367	90-4,288
4-15	TIERRA REJADA	4,390	A	1,200	172	4	1	-	-	619-930
4-16	HIDDEN VALLEY	2,210	C	-	-	-	-	1	453	289-743
4-17	LOCKWOOD VALLEY	21,800	A	350	25	-	-	1	-	-
4-18	HUNGRY VALLEY	5,310	C	-	28	-	-	-	<350	-
4-19	THOUSAND OAKS AREA	3,110	C	-	39	2	-	-	1,410	1,200-2,300
4-20	RUSSELL VALLEY	3,100	A	-	25	-	-	-	-	-
4-22	MALIBU VALLEY	613	C	1,060	1,030	-	-	-	-	-
4-23	RAYMOND	26,200	A	3,620	1,880	88	-	70	346	138-780
8-1	COASTAL PLAIN OF ORANGE COUNTY	224,000	A	4,500	2,500	521	411	240	475	232-661
8-2	UPPER SANTA ANA VALLEY									
8-2.01	CHINO	154,000	A	1,500	1,000	12	8	187	484	200-600
8-2.02	CUCAMONGA	9,530	C	4,400	2,115	1	1	21	-	-
8-2.03	RIVERSIDE-ARLINGTON	58,600	A	-	-	11	3	43	-	370-756
8-2.04	RIALTO-COLTON	30,100	A	5,000	545	50	5	41	337	-
8-2.05	CAJON	23,200	C	200	60	-	-	5	-	-
8-2.06	BUNKER HILL	89,600	A	5,000	1,245	398	169	204	-	150-550
8-2.07	YUCAIPA	25,300	A	2,800	206	19	3	45	334	-

Table 24 South Coast Hydrologic Region groundwater data (continued)

Basin/Subbasin	Basin Name	Area (acres)	Groundwater Budget Type	Well Yields (gpm)		Active Monitoring			TDS (mg/L)	
				Maximum	Average	Levels	Quality	Title 22	Average	Range
8-2.08	SAN TIMOTEO	73,100	A	-	-	67	12	36	-	-
8-2.09	TEMESCAL	23,500	C	-	-	2	2	20	753	373-950
8-4	EL SINORE	25,700	C	5,400	-	1	1	18	-	-
8-5	SAN JACINTO	188,000	C	-	-	150	115	56	463	160-12,000
8-6	HEMET LAKE VALLEY	16,700	C	820	196	-	-	9	-	-
8-7	BIG MEADOWS VALLEY	14,200	C	120	34	-	-	8	-	-
8-8	SEVEN OAKS VALLEY	4,080	C	-	-	-	-	1	-	-
8-9	BEAR VALLEY	19,600	A	1,000	500	57	57	52	-	-
9-1	SAN JUAN VALLEY	16,700	C	1,000	-	-	-	8	760	430-12,880
9-2	SAN MATEO VALLEY	2,990	A	-	-	-	-	5	586	490-770
9-3	SAN ONOFRE VALLEY	1,250	A	-	-	-	-	2	-	600-1,500
9-4	SANTA MARGARITA VALLEY	626	A	1,980	-	4	-	-	-	337-9,030
9-5	TEMECULA VALLEY	87,800	C	1,750	-	140	4	67	476	220-1,500
9-6	COAHUILA VALLEY	18,200	C	500	-	2	-	1	-	304-969
9-7	SAN LUIS REY VALLEY	37,000	C	2,000	500	-	-	28	1,258	530-7,060
9-8	WARNER VALLEY	24,000	C	1,800	800	-	-	4	-	263
9-9	ESCONDIDO VALLEY	2,890	C	190	50	-	-	1	-	250-5,000
9-10	SAN PASQUAL VALLEY	4,540	C	1,700	1,000	-	-	2	-	500-1,550
9-11	SANTA MARIA VALLEY	12,300	A	500	36	3	-	2	1,000	324-1,680
9-12	SAN DIEGUITO CREEK	3,560	A	1,800	700	-	-	-	-	2,000
9-13	POWAY VALLEY	2,470	C	200	100	-	-	1	-	610-1,500
9-14	MISSION VALLEY	7,350	C	-	1,000	-	-	-	-	-
9-15	SAN DIEGO RIVER VALLEY	9,890	C	2,000	-	-	-	5	-	260-2,870
9-16	EL CAJON VALLEY	7,160	C	300	50	1	-	2,340	-	-
9-17	SWEETWATER VALLEY	5,920	C	1,500	300	7	7	9	2,114	300-50,000
9-18	OTAY VALLEY	6,830	C	1,000	185	-	-	-	-	500->2,000
9-19	TIJUANA BASIN	7,410	A	2,000	350	-	-	-	-	380-3,620
9-22	BATQUITOS LAGOON VALLEY	741	C	-	-	-	-	-	1,280	788-2,362
9-23	SAN ELIJO VALLEY	883	C	1,800	-	-	-	-	-	1,170-5,090
9-24	PAMO VALLEY	1,500	C	-	-	-	-	-	369	279-455
9-25	RANCHITA TOWN AREA	3,130	C	125	22	-	-	-	-	283-305
9-27	COITONWOOD VALLEY	3,850	C	-	-	-	-	1	-	-
9-28	CAMPO VALLEY	3,550	C	-	<40	-	-	4	-	800
9-29	POTRERO VALLEY	2,020	C	-	-	-	-	4	-	-
9-32	SAN MARCOS VALLEY	2,130	C	60	-	-	-	-	-	500-700

gpm - gallons per minute

mg/L - milligram per liter

TDS - total dissolved solids

Sacramento River Hydrologic Region




Figure 33 Sacramento River Hydrologic Region

Basins and Subbasins of the Sacramento River Hydrologic Region

Basin/subbasins	Basin name	Basin/subbasins	Basin name
5-1	Goose Lake Valley	5-30	Lower Lake Valley
5-1.01	Lower Goose Lake Valley	5-31	Long Valley
5-1.02	Fandango Valley	5-35	Mccloud Area
5-2	Alturas Area	5-36	Round Valley
5-2.01	South Fork Pitt River	5-37	Toad Well Area
5-2.02	Warm Springs Valley	5-38	Pondosa Town Area
5-3	Jess Valley	5-40	Hot Springs Valley
5-4	Big Valley	5-41	Egg Lake Valley
5-5	Fall River Valley	5-43	Rock Prairie Valley
5-6	Redding Area	5-44	Long Valley
5-6.01	Bowman	5-45	Cayton Valley
5-6.02	Rosewood	5-46	Lake Britton Area
5-6.03	Anderson	5-47	Goose Valley
5-6.04	Enterprise	5-48	Burney Creek Valley
5-6.05	Millville	5-49	Dry Burney Creek Valley
5-6.06	South Battle Creek	5-50	North Fork Battle Creek
5-7	Lake Almanor Valley	5-51	Butte Creek Valley
5-8	Mountain Meadows Valley	5-52	Gray Valley
5-9	Indian Valley	5-53	Dixie Valley
5-10	American Valley	5-54	Ash Valley
5-11	Mohawk Valley	5-56	Yellow Creek Valley
5-12	Sierra Valley	5-57	Last Chance Creek Valley
5-12.01	Sierra Valley	5-58	Clover Valley
5-12.02	Chilcoot	5-59	Grizzly Valley
5-13	Upper Lake Valley	5-60	Humbug Valley
5-14	Scotts Valley	5-61	Chrome Town Area
5-15	Big Valley	5-62	Elk Creek Area
5-16	High Valley	5-63	Stonyford Town Area
5-17	Burns Valley	5-64	Bear Valley
5-18	Coyote Valley	5-65	Little Indian Valley
5-19	Collayomi Valley	5-66	Clear Lake Cache Formation
5-20	Berryessa Valley	5-68	Pope Valley
5-21	Sacramento Valley	5-86	Joseph Creek
5-21.50	Red Bluff	5-87	Middle Fork Feather River
5-21.51	Corning	5-88	Stony Gorge Reservoir
5-21.52	Colusa	5-89	Squaw Flat
5-21.53	Bend	5-90	Funks Creek
5-21.54	Antelope	5-91	Antelope Creek
5-21.55	Dye Creek	5-92	Blanchard Valley
5-21.56	Los Molinos	5-93	North Fork Cache Creek
5-21.57	Vina	5-94	Middle Creek
5-21.58	West Butte	5-95	Meadow Valley
5-21.59	East Butte		
5-21.60	North Yuba		
5-21.61	South Yuba		
5-21.62	Sutter		
5-21.64	North American		
5-21.65	South American		
5-21.66	Solano		
5-21.67	Yolo		
5-21.68	Capay Valley		

Description of the Region

The Sacramento River HR covers approximately 17.4 million acres (27,200 square miles). The region includes all or large portions of Modoc, Siskiyou, Lassen, Shasta, Tehama, Glenn, Plumas, Butte, Colusa, Sutter, Yuba, Sierra, Nevada, Placer, Sacramento, El Dorado, Yolo, Solano, Lake, and Napa counties (Figure 33). Small areas of Alpine and Amador counties are also within the region. Geographically, the region extends south from the Modoc Plateau and Cascade Range at the Oregon border, to the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta. The Sacramento Valley, which forms the core of the region, is bounded to the east by the crest of the Sierra Nevada and southern Cascades and to the west by the crest of the Coast Range and Klamath Mountains. Other significant features include Mount Shasta and Lassen Peak in the southern Cascades, Sutter Buttes in the south central portion of the valley, and the Sacramento River, which is the longest river system in the State of California with major tributaries the Pit, Feather, Yuba, Bear and American rivers. The region corresponds approximately to the northern half of RWQCB 5. The Sacramento metropolitan area and surrounding communities form the major population center of the region. With the exception of Redding, cities and towns to the north, while steadily increasing in size, are more rural than urban in nature, being based in major agricultural areas. The 1995 population of the entire region was 2.372 million.

The climate in the northern, high desert plateau area of the region is characterized by cold snowy winters with only moderate precipitation and hot dry summers. This area depends on adequate snowpack to provide runoff for summer supply. Annual precipitation ranges from 10 to 20 inches. Other mountainous areas in the northern and eastern portions of the region have cold wet winters with large amounts of snow, which typically provide abundant runoff for summer supplies. Annual precipitation ranges from 40 to more than 80 inches. Summers are generally mild in these areas. The Coast Range and southern Klamath Mountains receive copious amounts of precipitation, but most of the runoff flows to the coast in the North Coastal drainage. Sacramento Valley comprises the remainder of the region. At a much lower elevation than the rest of the region, the valley has mild winters with moderate precipitation. Annual precipitation varies from about 35 inches in Redding to about 18 inches in Sacramento. Summers in the valley are hot and dry.

Most of the mountainous portions of the region are heavily forested and sparsely populated. Three major national forests (Mendocino, Trinity, and Shasta) make up the majority of lands in the Coast Range, southern Klamath Mountains, and the southern Cascades; these forests and the region's rivers and lakes provide abundant recreational opportunities. In the few mountain valleys with arable land, alfalfa, grain and pasture are the predominant crops. In the foothill areas of the region, particularly adjacent to urban centers, suburban to rural housing development is occurring along major highway corridors. This development is leading to urban sprawl and is replacing the former agricultural production on those lands. In the Sacramento Valley, agriculture is the largest industry. Truck, field, orchard, and rice crops are grown on approximately 2.1 million acres. Rice represents about 23 percent of the total irrigated acreage.

The Sacramento River HR is the main water supply for much of California's urban and agricultural areas. Annual runoff in the HR averages about 22.4 maf, which is nearly one-third of the State's total natural runoff. Major water supplies in the region are provided through surface storage reservoirs. The two largest surface water projects in the region are USBR's Shasta Lake (Central Valley Project) on the upper Sacramento River and Lake Oroville (DWR's State Water Project) on the Feather River. In all, there are more than 40 major surface water reservoirs in the region. Municipal, industrial, and agricultural supplies to the region are about 8 maf, with groundwater providing about 2.5 maf of that total. Much of the remainder of the runoff goes to dedicated natural flows, which support various environmental requirements, including in-stream fishery flows and flushing flows in the Delta.

Groundwater Development

Groundwater provides about 31 percent of the water supply for urban and agricultural uses in the region, and has been developed in both the alluvial basins and the hard rock uplands and mountains. There are 88 basins/subbasins delineated in the region. These basins underlie 5.053 million acres (7,900 square miles), about 29 percent of the entire region. The reliability of the groundwater supply varies greatly. The Sacramento Valley is recognized as one of the foremost groundwater basins in the State, and wells developed in the sediments of the valley provide excellent supply to irrigation, municipal, and domestic uses. Many of the mountain valleys of the region also provide significant groundwater supplies to multiple uses.

Geologically, the Sacramento Valley is a large trough filled with sediments having variable permeabilities; as a result, wells developed in areas with coarser aquifer materials will produce larger amounts of water than wells developed in fine aquifer materials. In general, well yields are good and range from one-hundred to several thousand gallons per minute. Because surface water supplies have been so abundant in the valley, groundwater development for agriculture primarily supplement the surface supply. With the changing environmental laws and requirements, this balance is shifting to a greater reliance on groundwater, and conjunctive use of both supplies is occurring to a greater extent throughout the valley, particularly in drought years. Groundwater provides all or a portion of municipal supply in many valley towns and cities. Redding, Anderson, Chico, Marysville, Sacramento, Olivehurst, Wheatland, Willows, and Williams rely to differing degrees on groundwater. Red Bluff, Corning, Woodland, Davis, and Dixon are completely dependent on groundwater. Domestic use of groundwater varies, but in general, rural unincorporated areas rely completely on groundwater.

In the mountain valleys and basins with arable land, groundwater has been developed to supplement surface water supplies. Most of the rivers and streams of the area have adjudicated water rights that go back to the early 1900s, and diversion of surface water has historically supported agriculture. Droughts and increased competition for supply have led to significant development of groundwater for irrigation. In some basins, the fractured volcanic rock underlying the alluvial fill is the major aquifer for the area. In the rural mountain areas of the region, domestic supplies come almost entirely from groundwater. Although a few mountain communities are supplied in part by surface water, most rely on groundwater. These groundwater supplies are generally quite reliable in areas that have sufficient aquifer storage or where surface water replenishes supply throughout the year. In areas that depend on sustained runoff, water levels can be significantly depleted in drought years and many old, shallow wells can be dewatered. During 2001, an extreme drought year on the Modoc Plateau, many well owners experienced problems with water supply.

Groundwater development in the fractured rocks of the foothills of the southern Cascades and Sierra Nevada is fraught with uncertainty. Groundwater supplies from fractured rock sources are highly variable in terms of water quantity and water quality and are an uncertain source for large-scale residential development. Originally, foothill development relied on water supply from springs and river diversions with flumes and ditches for conveyance that date back to gold mining era operations. Current development is primarily based on individual private wells, and as pressures for larger scale development increase, questions about the reliability of supply need to be addressed. Many existing foothill communities have considerable experience with dry or drought year shortages. In Butte County residents in Cohasset, Forest Ranch, and Magalia have had to rely on water brought up the ridges in tanker trucks. The suggested answer has been the development of regional water supply projects. Unfortunately, the area's development pattern of small, geographically dispersed population centers does not lend itself to the kind of financial base necessary to support such projects.

Groundwater Quality

Groundwater quality in the Sacramento River HR is generally excellent. However, there are areas with local groundwater problems. Natural water quality impairments occur at the north end of the Sacramento Valley in the Redding subbasin, and along the margins of the valley and around the Sutter Buttes, where Cretaceous-age marine sedimentary rocks containing brackish to saline water are near the surface. Water from the older underlying sediments mixes with the fresh water in the younger alluvial aquifer and degrades the quality. Wells constructed in these areas typically have high TDS. Other local natural impairments are moderate levels of hydrogen sulfide in groundwater in the volcanic and geothermal areas in the western portion of the region. In the Sierra foothills, there is potential for encountering uranium and radon-bearing rock or sulfide mineral deposits containing heavy metals. Human-induced impairments are generally associated with individual septic system development in shallow unconfined portions of aquifers or in fractured hard rock areas where insufficient soil depths are available to properly leach effluent before it reaches the local groundwater supply.

Water Quality in Public Supply Wells

From 1994 through 2000, 1,356 public supply water wells were sampled in 51 of the 88 basins and subbasins in the Sacramento River HR. Samples analyzed indicate that 1,282 wells, or 95 percent, met the state primary MCLs for drinking water. Seventy-four wells, or 5 percent, have constituents that exceed one or more MCL. Figure 34 shows the percentages of each contaminant group that exceeded MCLs in the 74 wells.




Figure 34 MCL exceedances in public supply wells in the Sacramento River Hydrologic Region

Table 25 lists the three most frequently occurring contaminants in each of the six contaminant groups and shows the number of wells in the HR that exceeded the MCL for those contaminants.

Table 25 Most frequently occurring contaminants by contaminant group in the Sacramento River Hydrologic Region

Contaminant group	Contaminant - # of wells	Contaminant - # of wells	Contaminant - # of wells
Inorganics – Primary	Cadmium – 4	Chromium (Total) – 3	3 tied at 2
Inorganics – Secondary	Manganese – 221	Iron – 166	Specific Conductance – 3
Radiological	Gross Alpha – 4		
Nitrates	Nitrate (as NO ₃) – 22	Nitrate + Nitrite – 5	Nitrate Nitrogen (NO ₃ -N) – 2
Pesticides	Di(2-Ethylhexyl)phthalate – 4		
VOCs/SVOCs	PCE – 11	TCE – 7	Benzene – 4

PCE = Tetrachloroethylene
TCE = Trichloroethylene
VOC = Volatile Organic Compounds
SVOC = Semivolatile Organic Compound

Changes from Bulletin 118-80

Some modifications from the groundwater basins presented in Bulletin 118-80 are incorporated in this report. These are listed in Table 26.

Table 26 Modifications since Bulletin 118-80 of groundwater basins and subbasins in Sacramento River Hydrologic Region

Basin name	New number	Old number
Fandango Valley	5-1.02	5-39
Bucher Swamp Valley	deleted	5-42
Modoc Plateau Recent Volcanic Areas	deleted	5-32
Modoc Plateau Pleistocene Volcanic Areas	deleted	5-33
Mount Shasta Area	deleted	5-34
Sacramento Valley Eastside Tuscan Formation Highlands	deleted	5-55
Clear Lake Pleistocene Volcanics	deleted	5-67

No additional basins were assigned to the Sacramento River HR in this revision. However, four basins have been divided into subbasins. Goose Lake Valley Groundwater Basin (5-1) has been subdivided into two subbasins, Fandango Valley (5-39) was modified to be a subbasin of Goose Lake Valley. Redding Area Groundwater Basin has been subdivided into six subbasins, Sierra Valley Groundwater Basin has been subdivided into two subbasins, and the Sacramento Valley Groundwater Basin has been subdivided into 18 subbasins.

There are several deletions of groundwater basins from Bulletin 118-80. Bucher Swamp Valley Basin (5-42) was deleted due to a thin veneer of alluvium over rock. Modoc Plateau Recent Volcanic Areas (5-32), Modoc Plateau Pleistocene Volcanic Areas (5-33), Mount Shasta Area (5-34), Sacramento Valley Eastside Tuscan Formation Highlands (5-55), and Clear Lake Pleistocene Volcanics (5-67) are volcanic aquifers and were not assigned basin numbers in this bulletin. These are considered to be groundwater source areas as discussed in Chapter 6.

Table 27 Sacramento River Hydrologic Region groundwater data

Basin/Subbasin	Basin Name	Area (acres)	Groundwater Budget Type	Well Yields (gpm)		Types of Monitoring			TDS (mg/L)	
				Maximum	Average	Levels	Quality	Title 22	Average	Range
5-1	GOOSE LAKE VALLEY	36,000	B	-	400	9	9	-	183	68 - 528
5-1.01	LOWER GOOSE LAKE	18,500	B	2,000	-	3	-	-	-	-
5-1.02	FANDANGO VALLEY	18,500	B	2,000	-	3	-	-	-	-
5-2	ALTURAS AREA	114,000	B	5,000	1,075	9	-	8	357	180 - 800
5-2.01	SOUTH FORK PITT RIVER	68,000	B	400	314	3	-	11	-	-
5-2.02	WARM SPRINGS VALLEY	6,700	B	3,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
5-3	JESS VALLEY	92,000	B	4,000	880	19	9	10	260	141 - 633
5-4	BIG VALLEY	54,800	B	1,500	266	16	7	3	174	115 - 232
5-5	FALL RIVER VALLEY	85,330	B	2,000	589	8	2	13	-	70 - 247
5-6	REDDING AREA	45,320	B	-	-	4	-	-	-	118 - 218
5-6.01	BOWMAN	98,500	B	1,800	46	11	10	69	194	109-320
5-6.02	ROSEWOOD	60,900	B	700	266	11	3	43	-	160 - 210
5-6.03	ANDERSON	67,900	B	500	254	6	5	4	140	-
5-6.04	ENTERPRISE	32,300	B	-	-	0	0	0	360	-
5-6.05	MILLVILLE	7,150	B	-	-	10	4	4	105	53 - 260
5-6.06	SOUTH BATTLE CREEK	8,150	B	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
5-7	LAKE ALMANOR VALLEY	29,400	B	-	-	-	-	9	-	-
5-8	MOUNTAIN MEADOWS VALLEY	6,800	B	40	40	4	4	11	-	-
5-9	INDIAN VALLEY	19,000	B	-	500	1	2	15	248	210 - 285
5-10	AMERICAN VALLEY	117,700	B	1,500	640	34	15	9	312	110 - 1,620
5-11	MOHAWK VALLEY	7,550	B	-	-	15	-	8	-	-
5-12	SIERRA VALLEY	7,260	B	900	302	12	3	6	-	-
5-12.01	SIERRA VALLEY	7,320	B	1,200	171	9	1	9	158	140 - 175
5-12.02	CHILCOOT	24,210	B	1,470	475	49	11	7	535	270 - 790
5-13	UPPER LAKE VALLEY	2,360	B	100	37	5	2	-	598	480 - 745
5-14	SCOTTS VALLEY	2,900	B	-	30	1	5	-	335	280 - 455
5-15	BIG VALLEY	6,530	B	800	446	6	3	3	288	175 - 390
5-16	HIGH VALLEY	6,500	B	1,000	121	10	4	3	202	150 - 255
5-17	BURNS VALLEY	1,400	C	-	-	0	-	0	-	-
5-18	COYOTE VALLEY	266,750	B	1,200	363	30	10	56	207	120 - 500
5-19	COLLAYOMI VALLEY	205,640	B	3,500	977	29	7	30	286	130 - 490
5-20	BERRYESSA VALLEY	918,380	B	5,600	984	98	30	134	391	120 - 1,220
5-21	SACRAMENTO VALLEY	20,770	B	-	275	0	3	9	-	334-360
5-21.50	RED BLUFF	18,710	B	800	575	4	5	22	296	-
5-21.51	CORNING	27,730	B	3,300	890	8	1	3	240	159 - 396
5-21.52	COLUSA	33,170	B	1,000	500	3	3	9	217	-
5-21.53	BEND	125,640	B	3,850	1,212	23	5	69	285	48 - 543
5-21.54	ANTELOPE	181,600	B	4,000	1,833	32	8	36	293	130 - 676
5-21.55	DYE CREEK									
5-21.56	LOS MOLINOS									
5-21.57	VINA									
5-21.58	WEST BUTTE									

Table 27 Sacramento River Hydrologic Region groundwater data (continued)

Basin/Subbasin	Basin Name	Area (acres)	Groundwater Budget Type	Well Yields (gpm)		Types of Monitoring				TDS (mg/L)	
				Maximum	Average	Levels	Quality	Title 22	Average	Range	
5-21.59	EAST BUTTE	265,390	B	4,500	1,019	43	4	44	235	122 - 570	
5-21.60	NORTH YUBA	100,400	C	4,000	-	21	-	32	-	-	
5-21.61	SOUTH YUBA	107,000	C	4,000	1,650	56	-	6	-	-	
5-21.62	SUTTER	234,000	C	-	-	34	-	115	-	-	
5-21.64	NORTH AMERICAN	351,000	A	-	800	121	-	339	300	150 - 1,000	
5-21.65	SOUTH AMERICAN	248,000	C	-	-	105	-	247	221	24-581	
5-21.66	SOLANO	425,000	C	-	-	123	23	136	427	150 - 880	
5-21.67	YOLO	226,000	B	4,000+	1,000	127	20	185	880	480 - 2,060	
5-21.68	CAPAY VALLEY	25,000	C	-	-	11	-	3	-	-	
5-30	LOWER LAKE VALLEY	2,400	B	100	37	-	3	5	568	290 - 1,230	
5-31	LONG VALLEY	2,600	B	100	63	-	-	-	-	-	
5-35	MCCLLOUD AREA	21,320	B	-	380	-	-	1	-	-	
5-36	ROUND VALLEY	7,270	B	2,000	800	2	-	-	-	148 - 633	
5-37	TOAD WELL AREA	3,360	B	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
5-38	PONDOSA TOWN AREA	2,080	B	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
5-40	HOT SPRINGS VALLEY	2,400	B	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
5-41	EGG LAKE VALLEY	4,100	B	-	20	-	-	-	-	-	
5-43	ROCK PRAIRIE VALLEY	5,740	B	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
5-44	LONG VALLEY	1,090	B	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
5-45	CAYTON VALLEY	1,300	B	-	400	-	-	-	-	-	
5-46	LAKE BRITTON AREA	14,060	B	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	
5-47	GOOSE VALLEY	4,210	B	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
5-48	BURNEY CREEK VALLEY	2,350	B	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	
5-49	DRY BURNEY CREEK VALLEY	3,070	B	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
5-50	NORTH FORK BATTLE CREEK VALLEY	12,760	B	-	-	-	-	3	-	-	
5-51	BUTTE CREEK VALLEY	3,230	B	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
5-52	GRAYS VALLEY	5,440	B	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
5-53	DIXIE VALLEY	4,870	B	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
5-54	ASH VALLEY	6,010	B	3,000	2,200	-	-	-	-	-	
5-56	YELLOW CREEK VALLEY	2,310	B	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
5-57	LAST CHANCE CREEK VALLEY	4,660	B	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
5-58	CLOVER VALLEY	16,780	B	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
5-59	GRIZZLY VALLEY	13,400	B	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	
5-60	HUMBUG VALLEY	9,980	B	-	-	-	-	8	-	-	
5-61	CHROME TOWN AREA	1,410	B	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
5-62	ELK CREEK AREA	1,440	B	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
5-63	STONYFORD TOWN AREA	6,440	B	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
5-64	BEAR VALLEY	9,100	B	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
5-65	LITTLE INDIAN VALLEY	1,270	B	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
5-66	CLEAR LAKE CACHE FORMATION	30,000	B	245	52	-	-	4	-	-	
5-68	POPE VALLEY	7,180	C	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	
5-86	JOSEPH CREEK	4,450	B	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	

Table 27 Sacramento River Hydrologic Region groundwater data (continued)

Basin/Subbasin	Basin Name	Area (acres)	Groundwater Budget Type	Well Yields (gpm)		Types of Monitoring			TDS (mg/L)	
				Maximum	Average	Levels	Quality	Title 22	Average	Range
5-87	MIDDLE FORK FEATHER RIVER	4,340	B	-	-	-	-	2	-	-
5-88	STONY GORGE RESERVOIR	1,070	B	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
5-89	SQUAW FLAT	1,300	C	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
5-90	FUNKS CREEK	3,000	C	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
5-91	ANTELOPE CREEK	2,040	B	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
5-92	BLANCHARD VALLEY	2,200	B	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
5-93	NORTH FORK CACHE CREEK	3,470	C	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
5-94	MIDDLE CREEK	700	B	-	75	-	-	1	-	-
5-95	MEADOW VALLEY	5,730	B	-	-	-	-	1	-	-

gpm - gallons per minute

mg/L - milligram per liter

TDS -total dissolved solids

San Joaquin River Hydrologic Region




Figure 35 San Joaquin River Hydrologic Region

Basins and Subbasins of the San Joaquin River Hydrologic Region

Basin/subbasin	Basin name
5-22	San Joaquin Valley
5-22.01	Eastern San Joaquin
5-22.02	Modesto
5-22.03	Turlock
5-22.04	Merced
5-22.05	Chowchilla
5-22.06	Madera
5-22.07	Delta-Mendota
5-22.15	Tracy
5-22.16	Cosumnes
5-69	Yosemite Valley
5-70	Los Banos Creek Valley

Description of the Region

The San Joaquin River HR covers approximately 9.7 million acres (15,200 square miles) and includes all of Calaveras, Tuolumne, Mariposa, Madera, San Joaquin, and Stanislaus counties, most of Merced and Amador counties, and parts of Alpine, Fresno, Alameda, Contra Costa, Sacramento, El Dorado, and San Benito counties (Figure 35). The region corresponds to a portion near the middle of RWQCB 5. Significant geographic features include the northern half of the San Joaquin Valley, the southern part of the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta, the Sierra Nevada and Diablo Range. The region is home to about 1.6 million people (DWR 1998). Major population centers include Merced, Modesto, and Stockton. The Merced area is entirely dependent on groundwater for its supply, as will be the new University of California at Merced campus.

Groundwater Development

The region contains two entire groundwater basins and part of the San Joaquin Valley Groundwater Basin, which continues south into the Tulare Lake HR. The San Joaquin Valley Groundwater Basin is divided into nine subbasins in this region. The basins underlie 3.73 million acres (5,830 square miles) or about 38 percent of the entire HR area.

The region is heavily groundwater reliant. Within the region groundwater accounts for about 30 percent of the annual supply used for agricultural and urban purposes. Groundwater use in the region accounts for about 18 percent of statewide groundwater use for agricultural and urban needs. Groundwater use in the region accounts for 5 percent of the State's overall supply from all sources for agricultural and urban uses (DWR 1998).

The aquifers are generally quite thick in the San Joaquin Valley subbasins, with groundwater wells commonly extending to depths of up to 800 feet. Aquifers include unconsolidated alluvium and consolidated rocks with unconfined and confined groundwater conditions. Typical well yields in the San Joaquin Valley range from 300 to 2,000 gpm with yields of 5,000 gpm possible. The region's only significant basin located outside of San Joaquin Valley is Yosemite Valley. Yosemite Valley Basin supplies water to Yosemite National Park and has substantial well yields.

Conjunctive Use

Since near the beginning of the region's agricultural development, groundwater has been used conjunctively with surface water to meet water needs. Groundwater was and is used when and where surface water is unable to fully meet demands either in time or area. For several decades, this situation was more of an incidental conjunctive use than a formal one. Historical groundwater use has resulted in some land subsidence in the southwest portion of the region.

Groundwater Quality

In general, groundwater quality throughout the region is suitable for most urban and agricultural uses with only local impairments. The primary constituents of concern are TDS, nitrate, boron, chloride, and organic compounds. The Yosemite Valley Groundwater Basin has exceptionally high quality groundwater.

Areas of high TDS content are primarily along the west side of the San Joaquin Valley and in the trough of the valley. The high TDS content of west-side groundwater is due to recharge of streamflow originating from marine sediments in the Coast Range. High TDS content in the trough of the valley is the result of concentration of salts due to evaporation and poor drainage. Nitrates may occur naturally or as a result of disposal of human and animal waste products and fertilizer. Boron and chloride are likely a result of concentration from evaporation near the valley trough. Organic contaminants can be broken into two categories, agricultural and industrial. Agricultural pesticides and herbicides have been detected in groundwater throughout the region, but primarily along the east side of the San Joaquin Valley where soil permeability is higher and depth to groundwater is shallower. The most notable agricultural contaminant is dibromochloropropane (DBCP), a now-banned soil fumigant and known carcinogen once used extensively on grapes and cotton. Industrial organic contaminants include TCE, dichloroethylene (DCE), and other solvents. They are found in groundwater near airports, industrial areas, and landfills.

Water Quality in Public Supply Wells

From 1994 through 2000, 689 public supply water wells were sampled in 10 of the 11 basins and subbasins in the San Joaquin River HR. Samples analyzed indicate that 523 wells, or 76 percent, met the state primary MCLs for drinking water. One-hundred-sixty-six wells, or 24 percent, have constituents that exceed one or more MCL. Figure 36 shows the percentages of each contaminant group that exceeded MCLs in the 166 wells.

Table 28 lists the three most frequently occurring contaminants in each of the six contaminant groups and shows the number of wells in the HR that exceeded the MCL for those contaminants.

Changes from Bulletin 118-80

The subbasins of the San Joaquin Valley, which were delineated as part of the 118-80 update, are given their first numeric designation in this report. Additionally, the Cosumnes Subbasin has been added to the subbasins within the San Joaquin River HR. It is worth noting that the southern portion of the South American Subbasin of the Sacramento Valley Groundwater Basin is also included as part of this HR. The subbasin names and numbers within the region are listed in Table 29.




Figure 36 MCL exceedances in public supply wells in the San Joaquin River Hydrologic Region

Table 28 Most frequently occurring contaminants by contaminant group in the San Joaquin River Hydrologic Region

Contaminant group	Contaminant - # of wells	Contaminant - # of wells	Contaminant - # of wells
Inorganics – Primary	Aluminum – 4	Arsenic – 4	4 tied at 2 exceedances
Inorganics – Secondary	Manganese – 123	Iron – 102	TDS – 9
Radiological	Uranium – 33	Gross Alpha – 26	Radium 228 – 6
Nitrates	Nitrate (as NO ₃) – 23	Nitrate + Nitrite – 6	Nitrate Nitrogen (NO ₃ -N) – 3
Pesticides	DBCP – 44	Di(2-Ethylhexyl)phthalate – 11	EDB – 6
VOCs	PCE – 8	Dichloromethane – 3	TCE – 3

DBCP = Dibromochloropropane
 EDB = Ethylenedibromide
 PCE = Tetrachloroethylene
 TCE = Trichloroethylene
 VOC = Volatile Organic Compound
 SVOC = Semivolatile Organic Compound

Table 29 Modifications since Bulletin 118-80 of groundwater basins and subbasins in San Joaquin Hydrologic Region

Subbasin name	New number	Old number
Eastern San Joaquin	5-22.01	5-22
Modesto	5-22.02	5-22
Turlock	5-22.03	5-22
Merced	5-22.04	5-22
Chowchilla	5-22.05	5-22
Madera	5-22.06	5-22
Delta-Mendota	5-22.07	5-22
Tracy	5-22.15	5-22
Cosumnes	5-22.16	5-22

Table 30 San Joaquin River Hydrologic Region groundwater data

Basin/Subbasin	Basin Name	Area (acres)	Groundwater Budget Type	Well Yields (gpm)		Types of Monitoring			TDS (mg/L)	
				Maximum	Average	Levels	Quality	Title 22	Average	Range
5-22	SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY									
5-22.01	EASTERN SAN JOAQUIN	707,000	A	1,500	-	345	69	540	310	30 - 1,632
5-22.02	MODESTO	247,000	B	4,500	1000-2000	230	15	209	60-500	200-8300
5-22.03	TURLOCK	347,000	B	4,500	1000-2000	307	0	163	200-500	100-8300
5-22.04	MERCED	491,000	B	4,450	1500-1900	378	0	142	200-400	100-3600
5-22.05	CHOWCHILLA	159,000	B	4,750	750-2000	203	0	28	200-500	120-6400
5-22.06	MADERA	394,000	B	4,750	750-2000	378	0	127	200-400	100-6400
5-22.07	DELTA-MENDOTA	747,000	B	5,000	800-2000	816	0	120	770	210-86,000
5-22.15	TRACY	345,000	C	3,000	500-3,000	18	14	183	1,190	210-7,800
5-22.16	COSUMNES	281,000	A	1,500	-	75	13	72	218	140-438
5-69	YOSEMITE VALLEY	7,500	C	1,200	900	0	0	3	54	43-73
5-70	LOS BANOS CREEK VALLEY	4,840	C	-	-	0	0	0	-	-

gpm - gallons per minute
 mg/L - milligram per liter
 TDS -total dissolved solids

Tulare Lake Hydrologic Region



Figure 37 Tulare Lake Hydrologic Region

Basins and Subbasins of Tulare Lake Hydrologic Region

Basin/subbasin	Basin name
5-22	San Joaquin Valley
5-22.08	Kings
5-22.09	Westside
5-22.10	Pleasant Valley
5-22.11	Kaweah
5-22.12	Tulare Lake
5-22.13	Tule
5-22.14	Kern County
5-23	Panoche Valley
5-25	Kern River Valley
5-26	Walker Basin Creek Valley
5-27	Cummings Valley
5-28	Tehachapi Valley West
5-29	Castaic Lake Valley
5-71	Vallecitos Creek Valley
5-80	Brite Valley
5-82	Cuddy Canyon Valley
5-83	Cuddy Ranch Area
5-84	Cuddy Valley
5-85	Mil Potrero Area

Description of the Region

The Tulare Lake HR covers approximately 10.9 million acres (17,000 square miles) and includes all of Kings and Tulare counties and most of Fresno and Kern counties (Figure 37). The region corresponds to approximately the southern one-third of RWQCB 5. Significant geographic features include the southern half of the San Joaquin Valley, the Temblor Range to the west, the Tehachapi Mountains to the south, and the southern Sierra Nevada to the east. The region is home to more than 1.7 million people as of 1995 (DWR, 1998). Major population centers include Fresno, Bakersfield, and Visalia. The cities of Fresno and Visalia are entirely dependent on groundwater for their supply, with Fresno being the second largest city in the United States reliant solely on groundwater.

Groundwater Development

The region has 12 distinct groundwater basins and 7 subbasins of the San Joaquin Valley Groundwater Basin, which crosses north into the San Joaquin River HR. These basins underlie approximately 5.33 million acres (8,330 square miles) or 49 percent of the entire HR area.

Groundwater has historically been important to both urban and agricultural uses, accounting for 41 percent of the region's total annual supply and 35 percent of all groundwater use in the State. Groundwater use in the region represents about 10 percent of the State's overall supply for agricultural and urban uses (DWR 1998).

The aquifers are generally quite thick in the San Joaquin Valley subbasins with groundwater wells commonly exceeding 1,000 feet in depth. The maximum thickness of freshwater-bearing deposits (4,400 feet) occurs at the southern end of the San Joaquin Valley. Typical well yields in the San Joaquin Valley range from 300 gpm to 2,000 gpm with yields of 4,000 gpm possible. The smaller basins in the mountains surrounding the San Joaquin Valley have thinner aquifers and generally lower well yields averaging less than 500 gpm.

The cities of Fresno, Bakersfield, and Visalia have groundwater recharge programs to ensure that groundwater will continue to be a viable water supply in the future. Extensive groundwater recharge programs are also in place in the south valley where water districts have recharged several million acre-feet for future use and transfer through water banking programs.

The extensive use of groundwater in the San Joaquin Valley has historically caused subsidence of the land surface primarily along the west side and south end of the valley.

Groundwater Quality

In general, groundwater quality throughout the region is suitable for most urban and agricultural uses with only local impairments. The primary constituents of concern are high TDS, nitrate, arsenic, and organic compounds.

The areas of high TDS content are primarily along the west side of the San Joaquin Valley and in the trough of the valley. High TDS content of west-side water is due to recharge of stream flow originating from marine sediments in the Coast Range. High TDS content in the trough of the valley is the result of concentration of salts because of evaporation and poor drainage. In the central and west-side portions of the valley, where the Corcoran Clay confining layer exists, water quality is generally better beneath the clay than above it. Nitrates may occur naturally or as a result of disposal of human and animal waste products and fertilizer. Areas of high nitrate concentrations are known to exist near the town of Shafter and other isolated areas in the San Joaquin Valley. High levels of arsenic occur locally and appear to be associated with lakebed areas. Elevated arsenic levels have been reported in the Tulare Lake, Kern Lake and Buena Vista Lake bed areas. Organic contaminants can be broken into two categories, agricultural and industrial. Agricultural pesticides and herbicides have been detected throughout the valley, but primarily along the east side where soil permeability is higher and depth to groundwater is shallower. The most notable agricultural contaminant is DBCP, a now-banned soil fumigant and known carcinogen once used extensively on grapes. Industrial organic contaminants include TCE, DCE, and other solvents. They are found in groundwater near airports, industrial areas, and landfills.

Water Quality in Public Supply Wells

From 1994 through 2000, 1,476 public supply water wells were sampled in 14 of the 19 groundwater basins and subbasins in the Tulare Lake HR. Evaluation of analyzed samples shows that 1,049 of the wells, or 71 percent, met the state primary MCLs for drinking water. Four-hundred-twenty-seven wells, or 29 percent, exceeded one or more MCL. Figure 38 shows the percentages of each contaminant group that exceeded MCLs in the 427 wells.




Figure 38 MCL exceedances by contaminant group in public supply wells in the Tulare Lake Hydrologic Region

Table 31 lists the three most frequently occurring contaminants in each of the six contaminant groups and shows the number of wells in the HR that exceeded the MCL for those contaminants.

Table 31 Most frequently occurring contaminants by contaminant group in the Tulare Lake Hydrologic Region

Contaminant group	Contaminant - # of wells	Contaminant - # of wells	Contaminant - # of wells
Inorganics - Primary	Fluoride – 32	Arsenic – 16	Aluminum – 13
Inorganics - Secondary	Iron – 155	Manganese – 82	TDS – 9
Radiological	Gross Alpha – 74	Uranium – 24	Radium 228 – 8
Nitrates	Nitrate(as NO ₃) – 83	Nitrate + Nitrite – 14	Nitrite(as N) – 3
Pesticides	DBCP – 130	EDB – 24	Di(2-Ethylhexyl)phthalate – 7
VOCs/SVOCs	TCE – 17	PCE – 16	Benzene – 6 MTBE – 6

DBCP = Dibromochloropropane
 EDB = Ethylenedibromide
 TCE = Trichloroethylene
 PCE = Tetrachloroethylene
 VOC = Volatile organic compound
 SVOC = Semivolatile organic compound

Changes from Bulletin 118-80

There are no newly defined basins since Bulletin 118-80. However, the subbasins of the San Joaquin Valley, which were delineated as part of the 118-80 update, are given their first numeric designation in this report (Table 32).

Table 32 Modifications since Bulletin 118-80 of groundwater basins and subbasins in Tulare Lake Hydrologic Region

Subbasin name	New number	Old number
Kings	5-22.08	5-22
Westside	5-22.09	5-22
Pleasant Valley	5-22.10	5-22
Kaweah	5-22.11	5-22
Tulare Lake	5-22.12	5-22
Tule	5-22.13	5-22
Kern County	5-22.14	5-22
Squaw Valley	deleted	5-24
Cedar Grove Area	deleted	5-72
Three Rivers Area	deleted	5-73
Springville Area	deleted	5-74
Templeton Mountain Area	deleted	5-75
Manache Meadow Area	deleted	5-76
Sacator Canyon Valley	deleted	5-77
Rockhouse Meadows Valley	deleted	5-78
Inns Valley	deleted	5-79
Bear Valley	deleted	5-81

Several basins have been deleted from the Bulletin 118-80 report. In Squaw Valley (5-24) all 118 wells are completed in hard rock. Cedar Grove Area (5-72) is a narrow river valley in Kings Canyon National Park with no wells. Three Rivers Area (5-73) has a thin alluvial terrace deposit but 128 of 130 wells are completed in hard rock. Springville Area (5-74) is this strip of alluvium adjacent to Tule River and all wells are completed in hard rock. Templeton Mountain Area (5-75), Manache Meadow Area (5-76), and Sacator Canyon Valley (5-77) are all at the crest of mountains with no wells. Rockhouse Meadows Valley (5-78) is in wilderness with no wells. Inns Valley (5-79) and Bear Valley (5-81) both have all wells completed in hard rock.

Table 33 Tulare Lake Hydrologic Region groundwater data

Basin/Subbasin	Basin Name	Area (acres)	Groundwater Budget Type	Well Yields (gpm)		Types of Monitoring			TDS (mg/L)	
				Maximum	Average	Levels	Quality	Title 22	Average	Range
5-22	SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY									
5-22.08	KINGS	976,000	C	3,000	500-1,500	909	-	722	200-700	40-2000
5-22.09	WESTSIDE	640,000	C	2,000	1,100	960	-	50	520	220-35,000
5-22.10	PLEASANT VALLEY	146,000	B	3,300	-	151	-	2	1,500	1000-3000
5-22.11	KAWEAH	446,000	B	2,500	1,000-2,000	568	-	270	189	35-580
5-22.12	TULARE LAKE	524,000	B	3,000	300-1,000	241	-	86	200-600	200-40,000
5-22.13	TULE	467,000	B	3,000	-	459	-	150	256	200-30,000
5-22.14	KERN COUNTY	1,950,000	A	4,000	1,200-1,500	2,258	249	476	400-450	150-5000
5-23	PANOCH VALLEY	33,100	C	-	-	48	-	-	1,300	394-3530
5-25	KERN RIVER VALLEY	74,000	C	3,650	350	-	-	92	378	253-480
5-26	WALKER BASIN CREEK VALLEY	7,670	C	650	-	-	-	1	-	-
5-27	CUMMINGS VALLEY	10,000	A	150	56	51	-	15	344	-
5-28	TEHACHAPI VALLEY WEST	14,800	A	1,500	454	64	-	19	315	280-365
5-29	CASTAC LAKE VALLEY	3,600	C	400	375	-	-	3	583	570-605
5-71	VALLECITOS CREEK VALLEY	15,100	C	-	-	-	-	0	-	-
5-80	BRITE VALLEY	3,170	A	500	50	-	-	-	-	-
5-82	CUDDY CANYON VALLEY	3,300	C	500	400	-	-	3	693	695
5-83	CUDDY RANCH AREA	4,200	C	300	180	-	-	4	550	480-645
5-84	CUDDY VALLEY	3,500	A	160	135	3	-	3	407	325-645
5-85	MIL POTRERO AREA	2,300	C	3,200	240	7	-	7	460	372-657

gpm - gallons per minute
 mg/L - milligram per liter
 TDS -total dissolved solids

North Lahontan Hydrologic Region




Figure 39 North Lahontan Hydrologic Region

Basins and Subbasins of the North Lahontan Hydrologic Region

Basin/subbasin	Basin name
6-1	Surprise Valley
6-2	Madeline Plains
6-3	Willow Creek Valley
6-4	Honey Lake Valley
6-5	Tahoe Valley
6-5.01	Tahoe Valley South
6-5.02	Tahoe Valley West
6-5.03	Tahoe Valley North
6-6	Carson Valley
6-7	Antelope Valley
6-8	Bridgeport Valley
6-67	Martis (Truckee) Valley
6-91	Cow Head Lake Valley
6-92	Pine Creek Valley
6-93	Harvey Valley
6-94	Grasshopper Valley
6-95	Dry Valley
6-96	Eagle Lake Area
6-97	Horse Lake Valley
6-98	Tuledad Canyon
6-99	Painters Flat
6-100	Secret Valley
6-101	Bull Flat
6-104	Long Valley
6-105	Slinkard Valley
6-106	Little Antelope Valley
6-107	Sweetwater Flat
6-108	Olympic Valley

Description of the Region

The North Lahontan HR covers approximately 3.91 million acres (6,110 square miles) and includes portions of Modoc, Lassen, Sierra, Nevada, Placer, El Dorado, Alpine, Mono, and Tuolumne counties (Figure 39). Reaching south from the Oregon border almost to Mono Lake on the east side of the Sierra, this region encompasses portions of two geomorphic provinces. From Long Valley north, most of the groundwater basins of the region were formed by basin and range block faulting near the western extent of the province. South from Long Valley, most of the basins are in the alpine valleys of the Sierra Nevada or are at the foot of the Sierra along the California-Nevada border where streams and rivers draining the eastern Sierran slopes terminate in desert sinks or lakes. The region corresponds to approximately the northern half of RWQCB 6. Significant geographic features include the Sierra Nevada, the volcanic terrane of the Modoc Plateau, Honey Lake Valley, and Lake Tahoe. The latter two areas are the major population centers in the region. The 1995 population of the entire region was about 84,000 people (DWR, 1998).

The northern portion of the region is rural and sparsely populated. Cattle ranching and associated hay cropping are the predominant land uses in addition to some pasture irrigation. Less than 4 percent of the entire region is irrigated. About 75 percent of the irrigated lands are in Modoc and Lassen counties, and most of the remainder is in Alpine and Mono counties. Much of the southern portion of the region is federally owned and managed as national forest lands where tourism and recreation constitute much of the economic base.

Much of the North Lahontan HR is chronically short of water due to the arid, high desert climate, which predominates in the region. Throughout the northern portion of the region where annual precipitation can be as low as 4 inches, runoff is typically scant and streamflows decrease rapidly during the irrigation season as the snowpack in the higher elevations melts. In the southern portion of the region, annual precipitation ranges from more than 70 inches (mostly snow in the higher elevations of the mountains) to as little as 8 inches in the low elevation valleys. In wet years, surface water can meet much of the agricultural demand, but in dry years, most of the region relies heavily on groundwater to meet water supply needs.

Groundwater Development

There are 24 groundwater basins in the region, one of which is divided into three subbasins. Thirteen of these basins are shared with Nevada and one with Oregon. These basins underlie approximately 1.03 million acres (1,610 square miles) or about 26 percent of the entire region. Although the groundwater basins were delineated based on mapped alluvial fill, much of the groundwater produced in many of them actually comes from underlying fractured rock aquifers. This is particularly true in the volcanic areas of Modoc and Lassen counties where, in many basins, volcanic flows are interstratified with lake sediments and alluvium. Wells constructed in the volcanics commonly produce large amounts of groundwater, whereas wells constructed in fine-grained lake deposits produce less. Because the thickness and lateral extent of the hard rocks outside of the defined basin are generally not known, actual groundwater in storage in these areas is unknown.

Locally, groundwater is an important resource accounting for about 28 percent of the annual supply for agricultural and urban uses. Groundwater use in the region represents less than 1 percent of the State's overall supply for agricultural and urban uses (DWR 1998).

In the northern portion of the region, a sizable quantity of groundwater (nearly 130,000 acre-feet) is extracted annually for agricultural and municipal purposes. Groundwater extracted from the Honey Lake Valley Basin accounts for 41,900 acre-feet of the agricultural supply and 12,000 acre-feet of the municipal supply (based on normalized data from 1990). An additional 3,100 acre-feet is extracted to meet the demands of the Honey Lake Wildlife Area, which provides habitat for several threatened species (Bald Eagle, Sandhill Crane, Bank Swallow, and Peregrine Falcon).

Well yields in the Honey Lake Valley Basin are greatest in alluvial and volcanic deposits. Wells drawing from these deposits may have yields that vary from 10 gpm to more than 2,000 gpm, but drawdown in these cases is generally high. Eight wells in the Honey Lake Wildlife Area have an average yield of between 1,260 and 2,100 gpm. Depths of completed wells in the region range from 20 to 720 feet.

The Honey Lake Valley Basin is very close to exceeding prudent perennial yield, and future development could come at the expense of water for agriculture. A 1987 agreement between DWR, the state of Nevada, and the U.S. Geological Survey resulted in a study of the groundwater flow system in eastern Honey Lake Valley. Upon conclusion of the study in September 1990, a Nevada state engineer ruled that only about 13,000 acre-feet could be safely transferred from the basin.

No major changes in water use are anticipated in the near future in the northern portion of the region. Irrigated agriculture is already constrained by economically available water supplies. A small amount of agricultural expansion is expected but only in areas that can support minor additional groundwater development. Likewise, the modest need for additional municipal and irrigation supplies can be met by minor expansion of present surface systems or by increased use of groundwater.

The principal drainages in the southern portion of the region are the Truckee, Walker and Carson rivers. Water rights in these drainages historically have been heavily contested, and allocations are limited by interstate agreements with Nevada, in-stream environmental requirements, and miscellaneous private rights holders. In the Lake Tahoe Basin, further development is strictly limited because of concerns regarding water quality in the lake. Surface water storage developed in the region's drainages provides urban and agricultural supply to the Reno/Sparks area and to the many smaller communities in the eastern Sierra and at the foot of the mountain slopes. Most communities rely on a combination of surface water and groundwater supply.

In the upper Truckee drainage, the primary groundwater basins underlie the areas around Lake Tahoe and Martis Valley, where the Town of Truckee is located. Both areas use surface water and groundwater for urban and surrounding rural domestic supplies.

Little is known about the small groundwater basins developed along the foot of the eastern Sierra. Most communities overlying these basins are along the streams and rivers flowing down the mountains, and groundwater is extracted from the underlying alluvium. Groundwater augments surface supplies for agricultural purposes and supports municipal and rural domestic supplies.

Groundwater Quality

In basins in the northern portion of the region, groundwater quality ranges widely from excellent to poor. Wells that obtain their water supply from lake deposits can have high concentrations of boron, arsenic, fluoride, nitrate, and TDS. TDS content generally increases toward the central portions of these basins where concentrations have accumulated over time. The groundwater quality along the margins of most of these basins tends to be of much better quality. There is a potential for future groundwater pollution occurring in urban/suburban areas where single-family septic systems have been installed, especially in hard rock areas. Groundwater quality in the alpine basins is good to excellent; but, as in any area where single-family septic systems have been installed, there is potential for degradation of groundwater quality.

Water Quality in Public Supply Wells

From 1994 through 2000, 169 public supply water wells were sampled in 8 of the 26 basins and subbasins in the North Lahontan HR. Evaluation of the analyzed samples indicates that 147 wells, or 87 percent, met the state primary MCLs for drinking water. Twenty-two wells, or 13 percent, have constituents that exceed one or more MCL. Figure 40 shows the percentages of each contaminant group that exceeded MCLs in the 22 wells.




Figure 40 MCL exceedances in public supply wells in the North Lahontan Hydrologic Region

Table 34 lists the three most frequently occurring contaminants in each contaminant group and shows the number of wells in the HR that exceeded the MCL for those contaminants.

Table 34 Most frequently occurring contaminants by contaminant group in the North Lahontan Hydrologic Region

Contaminant group	Contaminant - # of wells	Contaminant - # of wells	Contaminant - # of wells
Inorganics – Primary	Fluoride – 3	Thallium – 3	3 tied at 1 exceedance
Inorganics – Secondary	Iron – 14	Manganese – 13	TDS – 1
Radiological	Gross Alpha – 7	Uranium – 5	Radium 226 – 1
VOCs/SVOCs	1,2 Dichloroethane – 8	TCE – 2	MTBE – 1

TCE = Trichloroethylene
 MTBE = Methyltertiarybutylether
 VOC = Volatile Organic Compound
 SVOC = Semivolatile Organic Compound

Changes from Bulletin 118-80

There are no newly defined basins since Bulletin 118-80. The only delineated areas removed from the list of region basins are the Recent and Pleistocene volcanic areas of the Modoc Plateau, previously numbered 6-102 and 6-103, respectively.

Table 35 North Lahontan Hydrologic Region groundwater data

Basin/Subbasin	Basin Name	Area (acres)	Groundwater Budget Type	Well Yields (gpm)		Types of Monitoring			TDS (mg/L)	
				Maximum	Average	Levels	Quality	Title 22	Average	Range
6-1	SURPRISE VALLEY	228,000	B	2,500	1,383	16	11	4	224	87 - 1,800
6-2	MADELINE PLAINS	156,150	B	-	450	2	6	-	402	81 - 1,790
6-3	WILLOW CREEK VALLEY	11,700	B	-	-	7	4	-	401	90 - 1,200
6-4	HONEY LAKE VALLEY	311,150	B	2,500	784	39	24	49	518	89 - 2,500
6-5	TAHOE VALLEY									
6-5.01	TAHOE SOUTH	14,800	C	4,000	-	6	-	54	-	59 - 206
6-5.02	TAHOE WEST	6,000	C	-	-	-	9	3	103	68 - 128
6-5.03	TAHOE VALLEY NORTH	2,000	C	900	-	-	-	-	141	-
6-6	CARSON VALLEY	10,700	C	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
6-7	ANTELOPE VALLEY	20,100	A	-	-	-	-	12	-	-
6-8	BRIDGEPORT VALLEY	32,500	C	-	-	-	-	6	-	-
6-67	MARTIS VALLEY	35,600	C	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
6-91	COW HEAD LAKE VALLEY	5,600	B	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
6-92	PINE CREEK VALLEY	9,530	B	-	-	-	-	1	-	-
6-93	HARVEY VALLEY	4,500	B	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
6-94	GRASSHOPPER VALLEY	17,670	B	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
6-95	DRY VALLEY	6,500	B	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
6-96	EAGLE LAKE AREA	-	B	-	-	-	4	4	-	-
6-97	HORSE LAKE VALLEY	3,800	B	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
6-98	TULEDAD CANYON	5,200	B	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
6-99	PAINTERS FLAT	6,400	B	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
6-100	SECRET VALLEY	33,680	B	-	-	2	2	-	-	125 - 3,200
6-101	BULL FLAT	18,100	B	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
6-104	LONG VALLEY	46,840	B	-	-	31	4	-	302	127 - 570
6-105	SLINKARD VALLEY	4,500	C	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
6-106	LITTLE ANTELOPE VALLEY	2,500	C	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
6-107	SWEETWATER FLAT	4,700	C	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
6-108	OLYMPIC VALLEY	700	C	600	330	-	-	2	-	-

gpm - gallons per minute
 mg/L - milligram per liter
 TDS -total dissolved solids

South Lahontan Hydrologic Region




Figure 41 South Lahontan Hydrologic Region

Basins and Subbasins of the South Lahontan Hydrologic Region

Basin/subbasin	Basin name	Basin/subbasin	Basin name
6-9	Mono Valley	6-51	Pilot Knob Valley
6-10	Adobe Lake Valley	6-52	Searles Valley
6-11	Long Valley	6-53	Salt Wells Valley
6-12	Owens Valley	6-54	Indian Wells Valley
6-13	Black Springs Valley	6-55	Coso Valley
6-14	Fish Lake Valley	6-56	Rose Valley
6-15	Deep Springs Valley	6-57	Darwin Valley
6-16	Eureka Valley	6-58	Panamint Valley
6-17	Saline Valley	6-61	Cameo Area
6-18	Death Valley	6-62	Race Track Valley
6-19	Wingate Valley	6-63	Hidden Valley
6-20	Middle Amargosa Valley	6-64	Marble Canyon Area
6-21	Lower Kingston Valley	6-65	Cottonwood Spring Area
6-22	Upper Kingston Valley	6-66	Lee Flat
6-23	Riggs Valley	6-68	Santa Rosa Flat
6-24	Red Pass Valley	6-69	Kelso Lander Valley
6-25	Bicycle Valley	6-70	Cactus Flat
6-26	Avawatz Valley	6-71	Lost Lake Valley
6-27	Leach Valley	6-72	Coles Flat
6-28	Pahrump Valley	6-73	Wild Horse Mesa Area
6-29	Mesquite Valley	6-74	Harrisburg Flats
6-30	Ivanpah Valley	6-75	Wildrose Canyon
6-31	Kelso Valley	6-76	Brown Mountain Valley
6-32	Broadwell Valley	6-77	Grass Valley
6-33	Soda Lake Valley	6-78	Denning Spring Valley
6-34	Silver Lake Valley	6-79	California Valley
6-35	Cronise Valley	6-80	Middle Park Canyon
6-36	Langford Valley	6-81	Butte Valley
6-36.01	Langford Well Lake	6-82	Spring Canyon Valley
6-36.02	Irwin	6-84	Greenwater Valley
6-37	Coyote Lake Valley	6-85	Gold Valley
6-38	Caves Canyon Valley	6-86	Rhodes Hill Area
6-40	Lower Mojave River Valley	6-88	Owl Lake Valley
6-41	Middle Mojave River Valley	6-89	Kane Wash Area
6-42	Upper Mojave River Valley	6-90	Cady Fault Area
6-43	El Mirage Valley		
6-44	Antelope Valley		
6-45	Tehachapi Valley East		
6-46	Fremont Valley		
6-47	Harper Valley		
6-48	Goldstone Valley		
6-49	Superior Valley		
6-50	Cuddeback Valley		

Description of the Region

The South Lahontan HR covers approximately 21.2 million acres (33,100 square miles) in eastern California. This region includes about 21 percent of the surface area of California and both the highest (Mount Whitney) and lowest (Death Valley) surface elevations of the contiguous United States. The HR is bounded on the west by the crest of the Sierra Nevada and on the north by the watershed divide between Mono Lake and East Walker River drainages; on the east by Nevada and the south by the crest of the San Gabriel and San Bernardino mountains and the divide between watersheds draining south toward the Colorado River and those draining northward. This HR includes the Owens, Mojave, and Amargosa River systems, the Mono Lake drainage system, and many other internally drained basins. Average annual precipitation is about 7.9 inches, and runoff is about 1.3 maf per year (DWR 1994).

The South Lahontan HR includes Inyo County, much of Mono and San Bernardino counties, and parts of Kern and Los Angeles counties (Figure 41). National forests, national and state parks, military bases and other public lands comprise most of the land in this region. The Los Angeles Department of Water and Power is also a major landowner in the northern part of the HR and controls rights to much of the water draining the eastern Sierra Nevada.

According to 2000 census data, the South Lahontan HR is home to about 530,000 people, or 1.6 percent of the state's population. The major population centers are in the southern part of the HR and include Palmdale, Lancaster, Victorville, Apple Valley, and Hesperia.

Groundwater Development

In this report, 76 groundwater basins are delineated in the South Lahontan HR, and the Langford Valley Groundwater Basin (6-36) is divided into two subbasins. The groundwater basins underlie about 11.60 million acres (18,100 square miles) or about 55 percent of the HR.

Most of the groundwater production is concentrated, along with the population, in basins in the southern part of this region. Groundwater provides 41 percent of water supply for agriculture and urban uses (DWR 1998). Much of this HR is public land with very low population density, within these areas there has been little groundwater development and little is known about the basins.

In most smaller basins, groundwater is found in unconfined alluvial aquifers; however, in some of the larger basins, or near dry lakes, aquifers may be separated by aquitards that cause confined groundwater conditions. Depths of the basins range from tens or hundreds of feet in smaller basins to thousands of feet in larger basins. The thickness of aquifers varies from tens to hundreds of feet. Well yields vary in this region depending on aquifer characteristics and well location, size, and use.

Conjunctive use of surface water and groundwater is practiced in the more heavily pumped basins. Some water used in the southern part of the HR is imported from Northern California by the State Water Project. Some of this imported water is used to recharge groundwater in the Mojave River Valley basins (6-40, 6-41, and 6-42). Surface water and groundwater are exported from the South Lahontan HR to the South Coast HR by the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power.

Groundwater Quality

The chemical character of the groundwater varies throughout the region, but most often is calcium or sodium bicarbonate. Near and beneath dry lakes, sodium chloride and sodium sulfate-chloride water is common. In general, groundwater near the edges of valleys contains lower TDS content than water beneath the central part of the valleys or near dry lakes.

Drinking water standards are most often exceeded for TDS, fluoride, and boron content. The EPA lists 13 sites of contamination in this HR. Of these, three military installations in the Antelope Valley and Mojave River Valley groundwater basins are federal Superfund sites because of VOCs and other hazardous contaminants.

Water Quality in Public Supply Wells

From 1994 through 2000, 605 public supply water wells were sampled in 19 of the 77 basins and subbasins in the South Lahontan HR. Analyzed samples indicate that 506 wells, or 84 percent, met the state primary MCLs for drinking water. Ninety-nine wells, or 16 percent, have constituents that exceed one or more MCL. Figure 42 shows the percentages of each contaminant group that exceeded MCLs in the 99 wells.




Figure 42 MCL exceedances in public supply wells in the South Lahontan Hydrologic Region

Table 36 lists the three most frequently occurring contaminants in each of the six contaminant groups and shows the number of wells in the HR that exceeded the MCL for those contaminants.

Table 36 Most frequently occurring contaminants by contaminant group in the South Lahontan Hydrologic Region

Contaminant group	Contaminant - # of wells	Contaminant - # of wells	Contaminant - # of wells
Inorganics – Primary	Fluoride – 30	Arsenic – 19	Antimony – 5
Inorganics – Secondary	Iron – 82	Manganese – 36	Specific Conductance – 5 TDS – 5
Radiological	Gross Alpha – 18	Uranium – 7	Radium 228 – 2
Dissolved Nitrogen	Nitrate (as NO ₃) – 12	Nitrate + Nitrite–6	Nitrite (as N) – 4
Pesticides	Di(2-Ethylhexyl)phthalate) – 2		
VOCs/SVOCs	MTBE – 2	TCE – 2	Carbon Tetrachloride – 2

TCE = Trichloroethylene
 MTBE = Methyltertiarybutylether
 VOC = Volatile Organic Compound
 SVOC = Semivolatile Organic Compound

Changes from Bulletin 118-80

Several modifications from the groundwater basins presented in Bulletin 118-80 are incorporated in this report (Table 37). Langford Valley Groundwater Basin (6-36) has been divided into two subbasins. Granite Mountain Area (6-59) and Fish Slough Valley (6-60) groundwater basins have been deleted because no information was found concerning wells or groundwater in these basins or because well completion reports indicate that groundwater production is derived from fractured rocks beneath the basin. Furnace Creek Area Groundwater Basin (6-83) has been incorporated into Death Valley Groundwater Basin (6-18), and Butterbread Canyon Valley Groundwater Basin (6-87) has been incorporated into Lost Lake Valley Groundwater Basin (6-71).

Table 37 Modifications since Bulletin 118-80 of groundwater basins and subbasins in South Lahontan Hydrologic Region

Basin/subbasin name	New number	Old number
Langford Well Lake	6-36.01	6-36
Irwin	6-36.02	6-36
Troy Valley	Incorporated into 6-40 and 7-14.	6-39
Granite Mountain Area	Deleted	6-59
Fish Slough Valley	Deleted	6-60
Furnace Creek Area	Deleted – incorporated into 6-18	6-83
Butterbread Canyon Valley	Deleted – incorporated into 6-71	6-87

Troy Valley Groundwater Basin (6-39) has been split at the Pisgah fault, which is a groundwater barrier, and has been incorporated into Lower Mojave River Valley (6-40) and Lavié Valley (7-14) groundwater basins. This change incorporates part of the South Lahontan HR into a basin in the Colorado River HR¹. The Middle Mojave River Valley Groundwater Basin (6-41) has changed boundaries along the north (Harper Valley; 6-47) and east sides (Lower Mojave River Valley; 6-40). The new boundaries are along the Camp Rock-Harper Lake fault zone, Waterman fault, and Helendale fault. Groundwater level elevations indicate that these faults are likely strong barriers to groundwater movement.

The boundary between the Upper Mojave River Valley Groundwater Basin (6-42) and the Lucerne Valley Groundwater Basin (7-19) was changed from the regional surface divide to the southern part of the Helendale fault, which is a groundwater barrier. This change incorporates part of the Colorado Desert HR into a basin in the South Lahontan HR².

¹ The boundaries of the hydrologic regions are defined by surface drainage patterns. In this case, faults impede groundwater flow causing it to flow beneath the surface drainage divide into the adjacent hydrologic region.

² See previous note.

Table 38 South Lahontan Hydrologic Region groundwater data

Basin/Subbasin	Basin Name	Area (acres)	Groundwater Budget Type	Well Yields (gpm)		Types of Monitoring			TDS (mg/L)	
				Maximum	Average	Levels	Quality	Title 22	Average	Range
6-09	MONO VALLEY	173,000	A	800	480	-	-	-	-	2060
6-10	ADOBE LAKE VALLEY	39,800	C	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
6-11	LONG VALLEY	71,800	A	250	90	20	-	5	-	-
6-12	OWENS VALLEY	661,000	A	8,100	1,870	700	7	89	-	300-450,000
6-13	BLACK SPRINGS VALLEY	30,800	C	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
6-14	FISH LAKE VALLEY	48,100	C	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
6-15	DEEP SPRINGS VALLEY	29,900	C	700	390	-	-	-	-	-
6-16	EUREKA VALLEY	129,000	C	-	-	-	-	1	-	-
6-17	SALINE VALLEY	146,000	C	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
6-18	DEATH VALLEY	921,000	C	-	-	28	-	6	-	-
6-19	WINGATE VALLEY	71,400	C	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
6-20	MIDDLE AMARGOSA VALLEY	390,000	C	3,000	2,500	2	-	4	-	-
6-21	LOWER KINGSTON VALLEY	240,000	C	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
6-22	UPPER KINGSTON VALLEY	177,000	C	24	-	-	-	5	-	-
6-23	RIGGS VALLEY	87,700	C	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
6-24	RED PASS VALLEY	96,500	C	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
6-25	BICYCLE VALLEY	89,600	C	710	-	-	12	6	618	508-810
6-26	AVAWATZ VALLEY	27,700	C	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
6-27	LEACH VALLEY	61,300	C	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
6-28	PAHRUMP VALLEY	93,100	C	300	150	-	-	-	-	-
6-29	MESQUITE VALLEY	88,400	C	1,500	1,020	-	-	-	-	-
6-30	IVANPAH VALLEY	199,000	C	600	400	-	-	9	-	-
6-31	KELSO VALLEY	255,000	C	370	290	-	-	-	-	-
6-32	BROADWELL VALLEY	92,100	C	-	-	-	-	1	-	-
6-33	SODA LAKE VALLEY	381,000	C	2,100	1,100	-	-	3	-	-
6-34	SILVER LAKE VALLEY	35,300	C	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
6-35	CRONISE VALLEY	127,000	C	600	340	-	-	-	-	-
6-36	LANGFORD VALLEY	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
6-36.01	LANGFORD WELL LAKE	19,300	C	1,700	410	11	7	3	498	440-568
6-36.02	IRWIN	10,500	C	550	-	40	-	3	528	496-598
6-37	COYOTE LAKE VALLEY	88,200	A	1,740	660	5	-	-	-	300-1000
6-38	CAVES CANYON VALLEY	73,100	A	300	-	4	1	4	-	300-1000
6-40	LOWER MOJAVE RIVER VALLEY	286,000	A	2,700	770	70	21	52	300	-
6-41	MIDDLE MOJAVE RIVER VALLEY	211,000	A	4,000	1,000	74	3	14	500	-
6-42	UPPER MOJAVE RIVER VALLEY	413,000	A	5,500	1,030	120	22	153	500	1105
6-43	EL MIRAGE VALLEY	75,900	A	1,000	230	50	3	21	-	-
6-44	ANTELOPE VALLEY	1,110,000	A	7,500	286	262	10	248	300	200-800
6-45	TEHACHAPI VALLEY EAST	24,000	C	150	31	31	-	9	361	298-405
6-46	FREMONT VALLEY	2,370,000	C	4,000	500	23	-	13	596	350-100,000
6-47	HARPER VALLEY	410,000	A	3,000	725	11	3	19	-	179-2391
6-48	GOLDSTONE VALLEY	28,100	C	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
6-49	SUPERIOR VALLEY	120,000	C	450	100	-	-	-	-	-

Table 38 South Lahontan Hydrologic Region groundwater data (continued)

Basin/Subbasin	Basin Name	Area (acres)	Groundwater Budget Type	Well Yields (gpm)			Types of Monitoring			TDS (mg/L)	
				Maximum	Average	Levels	Quality	Title 22	Average	Range	
6-50	CUDEBACK VALLEY	94,900	C	500	300	-	-	-	-	-	-
6-51	PILOT KNOB VALLEY	139,000	C	-	-	-	-	I	-	-	-
6-52	SEARLES VALLEY	197,000	C	1,000	300	-	-	-	-	-	-
6-53	SALT WELLS VALLEY	29,500	C	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
6-54	INDIAN WELLS VALLEY	382,000	A	3,800	815	116	20	63	312	110-1620	-
6-55	COSO VALLEY	25,600	C	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
6-56	ROSE VALLEY	42,500	C	-	-	-	-	I	-	-	-
6-57	DARWIN VALLEY	44,200	C	130	43	-	-	-	-	-	-
6-58	PANAMINT VALLEY	259,000	C	35	30	-	-	-	-	-	-
6-61	CAMEO AREA	9,310	C	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
6-62	RACE TRACK VALLEY	14,100	C	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
6-63	HIDDEN VALLEY	18,000	C	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
6-64	MARBLE CANYON AREA	10,400	C	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
6-65	COTTONWOOD SPRING AREA	3,900	C	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
6-66	LEE FLAT	20,300	C	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
6-68	SANTA ROSA FLAT	312	C	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
6-69	KELSO LANDER VALLEY	11,200	C	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
6-70	CACTUS FLAT	7,030	C	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
6-71	LOST LAKE VALLEY	23,300	C	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
6-72	COLES FLAT	2,950	C	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
6-73	WILD HORSE MESA AREA	3,320	C	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
6-74	HARRISBURG FLATS	24,900	C	-	-	-	-	I	-	-	-
6-75	WILDROSE CANYON	5,160	C	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
6-76	BROWN MOUNTAIN VALLEY	21,700	C	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
6-77	GRASS VALLEY	9,980	C	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
6-78	DENNING SPRING VALLEY	7,240	C	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
6-79	CALIFORNIA VALLEY	58,300	C	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
6-80	MIDDLE PARK CANYON	1,740	C	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
6-81	BUTTE VALLEY	8,810	C	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
6-82	ANVIL SPRING CANYON VALLEY	4,810	C	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
6-84	GREENWATER VALLEY	59,900	C	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
6-85	GOLD VALLEY	3,220	C	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
6-86	RHODES HILL AREA	15,600	C	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
6-88	OWL LAKE VALLEY	22,300	C	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
6-89	KANE WASH AREA	5,960	C	60	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
6-90	CADY FAULT AREA	7,960	C	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

gpm - gallons per minute
 mg/L - milligram per liter
 TDS -total dissolved solids

Colorado River Hydrologic Region




Figure 43 Colorado River Hydrologic Region

Basins and Subbasins of Colorado River Hydrologic Region

Basin/subbasin	Basin name	Basin/subbasin	Basin name
7-1	Lanfair Valley	7-36	Yuma Valley
7-2	Fenner Valley	7-37	Arroyo Seco Valley
7-3	Ward Valley	7-38	Palo Verde Valley
7-4	Rice Valley	7-39	Palo Verde Mesa
7-5	Chuckwalla Valley	7-40	Quien Sabe Point Valley
7-6	Pinto Valley	7-41	Calzona Valley
7-7	Cadiz Valley	7-42	Vidal Valley
7-8	Bristol Valley	7-43	Chemehuevi Valley
7-9	Dale Valley	7-44	Needles Valley
7-10	Twentynine Palms Valley	7-45	Piute Valley
7-11	Copper Mountain Valley	7-46	Canebrake Valley
7-12	Warren Valley	7-47	Jacumba Valley
7-13	Deadman Valley	7-48	Helendale Fault Valley
7-13.01	Deadman Lake	7-49	Pipes Canyon Fault Valley
7-13.02	Surprise Spring	7-50	Iron Ridge Area
7-14	Lavic Valley	7-51	Lost Horse Valley
7-15	Bessemer Valley	7-52	Pleasant Valley
7-16	Ames Valley	7-53	Hexie Mountain Area
7-17	Means Valley	7-54	Buck Ridge Fault Valley
7-18	Johnson Valley Area	7-55	Collins Valley
7-18.01	Soggy Lake	7-56	Yaqui Well Area
7-18.02	Upper Johnson Valley	7-59	Mason Valley
7-19	Lucerne Valley	7-61	Davies Valley
7-20	Morongo Valley	7-62	Joshua Tree
7-21	Coachella Valley	7-63	Vandeventer Flat
7-21.01	Indio		
7-21.02	Mission Creek		
7-21.03	Desert Hot Springs		
7-21.04	San Gorgonio Pass		
7-22	West Salton Sea		
7-24	Borrego Valley		
7-25	Ocotillo-Clark Valley		
7-26	Terwilliger Valley		
7-27	San Felipe Valley		
7-28	Vallecito-Carrizo Valley		
7-29	Coyote Wells Valley		
7-30	Imperial Valley		
7-31	Orocopia Valley		
7-32	Chocolate Valley		
7-33	East Salton Sea		
7-34	Amos Valley		
7-35	Ogilby Valley		

Description of the Region

The Colorado River HR covers approximately 13 million acres (20,000 square miles) in southeastern California. It is bounded on the east by Nevada and Arizona, the south by the Republic of Mexico, the west by the Laguna, San Jacinto, and San Bernardino mountains, and the north by the New York, Providence, Granite, Old Dad, Bristol, Rodman, and Ord Mountain ranges. An average annual precipitation of 5.5 inches and average annual runoff of only 200,000 acre-feet makes this the most arid HR of California (DWR 1994). Surface runoff drains to many closed basins or to the Colorado River.

This HR includes all of Imperial, most of Riverside, much of San Bernardino, and part of San Diego counties (Figure 43). Many of the alluvial valleys in the region are underlain by groundwater aquifers that are the sole source of water for local communities.

About 533,000 people live within the Colorado River HR (DWR, 1998). The largest population centers are Palm Springs, Palm Desert, Indio, Coachella, and El Centro.

Groundwater Development

The earliest groundwater development in California may have been prehistoric water wells dug by the Cahuilla Indians in Coachella Valley of the Colorado River HR. In this report, 64 groundwater basins/subbasins are delineated in this HR. The Deadman Valley, Johnson Valley Area, and Coachella Valley groundwater basins have been divided into subbasins. Groundwater basins underlie about 8.68 million acres or about 26 percent of this HR.

In the Colorado River HR, groundwater provides about 8 percent of the water supply in normal years for agricultural and urban uses (DWR 1998). In most smaller basins, groundwater is found in unconfined alluvial aquifers. In some of the larger basins, particularly near dry lakes, aquifers may be separated by aquitards that create confined groundwater conditions. Depths of basins range from tens or hundreds of feet in smaller basins and along arms of ephemeral rivers to thousands of feet in larger basins. The thickness of aquifers varies from tens to hundreds of feet. Well yields vary in this region depending on aquifer characteristics and well location, size, and use. Some aquifers are capable of yielding thousands of gallons per minute to municipal wells.

Conjunctive use of surface water and groundwater is a long-standing practice in the region. Water is imported from the Colorado River for irrigation in Imperial, Coachella, and Palo Verde Valleys and from groundwater recharge in Coachella Valley. Water imported from Northern California is used to replenish Warren and Joshua Tree groundwater basins. Many agencies have erected systems of barriers to allow more efficient percolation of ephemeral runoff from surrounding mountains. The concept of utilizing groundwater basins in this sparsely populated HR for storing water that would be pumped during drought years is getting much attention.

Groundwater Quality

The chemical character of groundwater in the Colorado River HR is variable. Cation concentration is dominated by sodium with calcium common and magnesium appearing less often. Bicarbonate is usually the dominant anion, although sulfate and chloride waters are also common. In basins with closed drainages, water character often changes from calcium-sodium bicarbonate near the margins to sodium chloride or chloride-sulfate beneath a dry lake. It is not uncommon for concentrations of dissolved constituents to rise dramatically toward a dry lake where saturation of mineral salts is reached. An example of this is found at Bristol Valley Groundwater Basin, where the mineral halite (sodium chloride) is formed and then mined by

evaporation of groundwater in trenches in Bristol (dry) Lake. The TDS content of groundwater is high in many of the basins in this region. High fluoride content is common; sulfate content occasionally exceeds drinking water standards; and high nitrate content is common, especially in agricultural areas.

Two of the primary challenges in the Colorado River HR are overdraft in the Coachella Valley and leaking underground storage tanks. The EPA has not yet placed any contamination sites in this HR on the Superfund National Priorities List; however, one site is under consideration because of high pesticide levels.

Water Quality in Public Supply Wells

From 1994 through 2000, 314 public supply water wells were sampled in 23 of the 64 basins and subbasins in the Colorado River HR. Analyzed samples indicate that 270 wells, or 86 percent, met the state primary MCLs for drinking water standards. Forty-four wells, or 14 percent, have constituents that exceed one or more MCL. Figure 44 shows the percentages of each contaminant group that exceeded MCLs in the 44 wells.




Figure 44 MCL exceedances in public supply wells in the Colorado River Hydrologic Region

Table 39 lists the three most frequently occurring contaminants in each contaminant group and shows the number of wells in the HR that exceeded the MCL for those contaminants.

Table 39 Most frequently occurring contaminants by contaminant group in the Colorado River Hydrologic Region

Contaminant group	Contaminant - # of wells	Contaminant - # of wells	Contaminant - # of wells
Inorganics – Primary	Fluoride – 17		
Inorganics – Secondary	Iron – 38	Manganese – 26	TDS – 5
Radiological	Radium 228 – 3	Combined RA226 + RA228 – 3	Radium 226 – 1
Nitrates	Nitrate (as NO ₃) – 6	Nitrate + Nitrite – 1	

Changes from Bulletin 118-80

Several modifications from the groundwater basins presented in Bulletin 118-80 are incorporated in this report (Table 40). Jacumba Valley East Groundwater Basin (7-60) has been deleted because of lack of information about groundwater in this basin. The Pinyon Wash Area (7-57) and Whale Peak Area (7-58) groundwater basin names have been deleted because they are now incorporated into other larger basins. Similarly, Clark Valley (7-23) and Ocotillo Valley (7-25) groundwater basins are now the combined Ocotillo-Clark Valley Groundwater Basin (7-25). The Deadman Valley (7-13), Johnson Valley Area (7-18), and Coachella Valley (7-21) groundwater basins have been subdivided into subbasins in this report. The western boundary of Lucerne Valley Groundwater Basin (7-19) has been moved eastward from the HR boundary to the Helendale fault. Groundwater level elevations indicate that this fault is a groundwater barrier and that groundwater flows westward back under the surface divide into the Upper Mojave River Groundwater Basin (6-42). The boundary between Lucerne Valley (7-19) and Johnson Valley Area (7-18) groundwater basins is delineated in this report.

The boundaries of Twentynine Palms Valley (7-10), Copper Mountain Valley (7-11), Warren Valley (7-12), Deadman Lake (7-13), and Ames Valley (7-16) groundwater basins have been redrawn in light of newer groundwater level data. These data indicate that the Pinto Mountain fault is a groundwater barrier. Joshua Tree Groundwater Basin (7-62) is a new basin that has been delineated from parts of Copper Mountain Valley and Twentynine Palms Valley Groundwater Basins because the Pinto Mountain fault is such a strong barrier. Buck Ridge Fault Valley Groundwater Basin (7-54) was presented in Bulletin 118-80 as two unconnected deposits of water-bearing alluvium separated by outcrop of nonwater-bearing rocks. These water-bearing deposits have been designated as separate groundwater basins in this report, with the Buck Ridge Fault Valley Groundwater Basin (7-54) as the northern basin and Vandeventer Flat Groundwater Basin (7-63) presented as the southern basin.

Table 40 Modifications since Bulletin 118-80 of groundwater basins in Colorado River Hydrologic Region

Basin name	New number	Old number
Clark Valley	Delete – combined with 7-25	7-23
Ocotillo-Clark Valley	7-25 (now combined)	7-25
Pinyon Wash Area	Incorporated into 7-56	7-57
Whale Peak Area	Incorporated into 7-28	7-58
Jacumba Valley East	Deleted	7-60
Joshua Tree	7-62 (new)	
Vandeventer Flat	7-63 (new)	

Table 41 Colorado River Hydrologic Region groundwater data

Basin/Subbasin	Basin Name	Area (acres)	Groundwater Budget Type	Well Yields (gpm)		Types of Monitoring			TDS (mg/L)	
				Maximum	Average	Levels	Quality	Title 22	Average	Range
7-1	LANFAIR VALLEY	157,000	C	70	16	-	-	9	515	173-2,260
7-2	FENNER VALLEY	454,000	A	200	100	-	-	4	515	173-2,260
7-3	WARD VALLEY	961,000	A	260	180	-	-	1	-	327-589
7-4	RICE VALLEY	189,000	C	65	-	-	-	-	-	-
7-5	CHUCKWALLA VALLEY	604,000	C	3,900	1,800	12	-	10	-	424
7-6	PINTO VALLEY	183,000	A	1,480	900	-	-	1	-	-
7-7	CADIZ VALLEY	270,000	C	167	66	-	-	-	400	300-3000
7-8	BRISTOL VALLEY	498,000	A	3,000	-	-	-	-	-	300-298,000
7-9	DALE VALLEY	213,000	C	380	275	-	-	2	-	-
7-10	TWENTYNINE PALMS VALLEY	62,400	C	3,000	540	27	-	2	640	-
7-11	COPPER MOUNTAIN VALLEY	30,300	A	2,450	250	2	-	2	-	180-214
7-12	WARREN VALLEY	17,200	A	4,000	350	27	18	17	196	129-269
7-13	DEADMAN VALLEY	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
7-13.01	DEADMAN LAKE	89,200	C	2,000	-	28	3	1	-	311-985
7-13.02	SURPRISE SPRING	29,300	C	1,370	680	26	6	9	177	141-1,050
7-14	LAVIC VALLEY	102,000	C	140	80	-	-	-	-	-
7-15	BESSEMER VALLEY	39,100	C	0	-	-	-	-	-	-
7-16	AMES VALLEY	110,000	C	2,000	-	19	3	11	459	-
7-17	MEANS VALLEY	15,000	C	0	-	1	-	-	-	-
7-18	JOHNSON VALLEY AREA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
7-18.01	SOGGY LAKE	76,800	C	-	-	6	-	1	-	300-2,000
7-18.02	UPPER JOHNSON VALLEY	34,800	C	-	-	-	-	-	-	3,000
7-19	LUCERNE VALLEY	148,000	A	1,000	-	22	9	21	301	200-5,000
7-20	MORONGO VALLEY	7,240	C	600	90	-	-	5	-	-
7-21	COACHELLA VALLEY	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
7-21.01	INDIO	336,000	A	1,880	650	30	-	204	300	-
7-21.02	MISSION CREEK	49,000	A	3,500	715	5	-	15	<500	-
7-21.03	DESERT HOT SPRINGS	101,000	C	2,500	985	10	-	2	-	800-1,000
7-21.04	SAN GORGONIO PASS	38,700	A	1,000	0	17	8	5	-	106-205
7-22	WEST SALTON SEA	106,000	C	540	400	v	-	-	-	-
7-24	BORREGO VALLEY	153,000	A	2,000	0	10	10	25	-	300-2,440
7-25	OCOTILLO-CLARK VALLEY	223,000	C	3,500	1,760	1	-	2	-	-
7-26	TERWILLIGER VALLEY	8,030	C	100	-	-	-	1	-	500
7-27	SAN FELIPE VALLEY	2,340	C	500	30	-	-	1	-	-
7-28	VALLECITO-CARRIZO VALLEY	122,000	C	2,500	260	-	-	1	-	-
7-29	COYOTE WELLS VALLEY	146,000	A	-	-	25	6	9	-	-
7-30	IMPERIAL VALLEY	961,000	A	1,000	-	19	-	45	1088	498-7,280
7-31	OROCOPIA VALLEY	96,500	A	210	165	0	-	1	-	-
7-32	CHOCOLATE VALLEY	130,000	C	0	0	0	0	-	-	-
7-33	EAST SALTON SEA	196,000	C	0	0	1	-	4	-	-
7-34	AMOS VALLEY	130,000	C	100	50	3	-	1	-	-
7-35	OGILBY VALLEY	134,000	C	4,000	50	27	1	3	-	-

Table 41 Colorado River Hydrologic Region groundwater data (continued)

Basin/Subbasin	Basin Name	Area (acres)	Groundwater Budget Type	Well Yields (gpm)		Types of Monitoring			TDS (mg/L)	
				Maximum	Average	Levels	Quality	Title 22	Average	Range
7-36	YUMA VALLEY	3,780	C	100	40	59	0	15	-	-
7-37	ARROYO SECO VALLEY	258,000	C	-	-	2	0	0	-	-
7-38	PALO VERDE VALLEY	73,400	A	-	-	11	-	19	840	658-1,030
7-39	PALO VERDE MESA	226,000	C	2,750	1,650	20	-	13	-	-
7-40	QUIEN SABE POINT VALLEY	25,300	C	25	-	-	-	3	-	-
7-41	CALZONA VALLEY	81,000	C	2,340	500	0	0	0	-	-
7-42	VIDAL VALLEY	138,000	C	1,800	675	-	-	1	-	-
7-43	CHEMEHUEVI VALLEY	273,000	A	0	0	1	0	1	-	-
7-44	NEEDLES VALLEY	88,400	A	1,500	980	34	-	11	-	-
7-45	PIUTE VALLEY	176,000	C	1,500	200	-	-	-	-	-
7-46	CANEBRAKE VALLEY	5,420	C	125	-	-	-	-	-	-
7-47	JACUMBA VALLEY	2,450	A	1,000	-	-	-	3	-	296-6,100
7-48	HELENDALE FAULT VALLEY	2,620	C	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
7-49	PIPES CANYON FAULT VALLEY	3,390	C	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
7-50	IRON RIDGE AREA	5,250	C	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
7-51	LOST HORSE VALLEY	17,300	C	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
7-52	PLEASANT VALLEY	9,670	C	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
7-53	HEXIE MOUNTAIN AREA	11,200	C	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
7-54	BUCK RIDGE FAULT VALLEY	6,930	C	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
7-55	COLLINS VALLEY	7,080	C	1,500	-	-	-	-	-	-
7-56	YAQUI WELL AREA	15,000	C	0	-	-	-	1	-	-
7-59	MASON VALLEY	5,530	C	0	0	0	0	1	-	-
7-61	DAVIES VALLEY	3,570	C	0	0	0	0	-	-	-
7-62	JOSHUA TREE	33,800	A	2,200	1,110	25	5	14	180	117-185
7-63	VANDEVENTER FLAT	6,750	C	50	17	-	-	-	-	-

gpm - gallons per minute
 mg/L - milligram per liter
 TDS - total dissolved solids

References

References

Literature

- Alley WM, Reilly TE, Franke OL. 1999. Sustainability of Ground-water Resources. Denver, CO: U.S. Geological Survey. 79 p.
- Ayers RS, Westcot DW, (Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations). 1985. Water Quality for Agriculture. Rome: Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. xii, 174 p.
- Bachman SB, ... et al. 1997. California Groundwater Management. Sacramento: Groundwater Resources Association of California. xiv, 145 p.
- CALFED Bay-Delta Program. 2000. Programmatic Record of Decision. <http://calwater.ca.gov/Archives/GeneralArchive/RecordOfDecision2000.shtml>
- [DHS] California Department of Health Services. 2000. Drinking Water Source Assessment and Protection (DWSAP) Program. <http://www.dhs.ca.gov/ps/ddwem/dwsap/guidance/maindocument2.htm>.
- [DWR] California Department of Water Resources. 1957. Lake County Investigation. Sacramento: The Department, Division of Resources Planning. Report on Bulletin 14. xiii, 169 p. Jul
- [DWR] California Department of Water Resources. 1963. Northeastern Counties Ground Water Investigation. Sacramento. Bulletin 98. 2 v. Feb
- [DWR] California Department of Water Resources. 1967. Evaluation of Ground Water Resources, South Bay. Sacramento: The Department, Alameda County Water District, and Santa Clara Valley Water District. Bulletin 118-1. 5 v.
- [DWR] California Department of Water Resources. 1974a. Evaluation of Ground Water Resources: Livermore and Sunol Valleys. Sacramento. Bulletin 118-2. xv, 153 p.
- [DWR] California Department of Water Resources. 1974b. Evaluation of Ground Water Resources: Sacramento County. Sacramento. Bulletin 118-3. xiii, 141 p.
- [DWR] California Department of Water Resources. 1975a. California's Ground Water. Sacramento. Bulletin 118. x, 135 p. Sep
- [DWR] California Department of Water Resources. 1975b. Evaluation of Ground Water Resources : Sonoma County. Sacramento: The Department in cooperation with County of Sonoma Water Agency. Bulletin 118-4.
- [DWR] California Department of Water Resources. 1978. Evaluation of Ground Water Resources, Sacramento Valley. Sacramento: The Department and US Geological Survey. Bulletin 118-6. ix, 136 p.
- [DWR] California Department of Water Resources. 1980. Ground Water Basins in California - A report to the Legislature in Response to Water Code Section 12924. Bulletin 118-80. 73 p. Jan 1980
- [DWR] California Department of Water Resources. 1994. California Water Plan Update. Sacramento. Bulletin 160-94. 2 v.
- [DWR] California Department of Water Resources. 1997. Compilation of Federal and State Drinking Water Standards and Criteria. The Department, Division of Local Assistance. Report on Quality Assurance Technical Document 3. Jun
- [DWR] California Department of Water Resources. 1998. California Water Plan Update. Sacramento. Bulletin 160-98. 3 v.

- [DWR] California Department of Water Resources. 2001. Water Facts No. 3 - Adjudicated Groundwater Basins in California. 4 p. Jan 2001
- [DivWR] California Division of Water Resources. 1952. Ground Water Basins in California. Sacramento. Report Number 3, Water Quality Investigations. 44 p.
- [GADPP] California Governor's Advisory Drought Planning Panel. 2000. Critical Water Shortage Contingency Plan. Sacramento: California Dept. of Water Resources. 1 v.
- Driscoll FG. 1986. Groundwater and Wells. St. Paul, Minn.: Johnson Division. xv, 1089 p.
- [EMWD] Eastern Municipal Water District. 2001. Groundwater Management Plan. Perris, CA.
- [EMWD] Eastern Municipal Water District. 2002. Groundwater Management Plan: Progress Report. Perris, CA.
- Fetter CW. 1988. Applied Hydrogeology. Columbus: Merrill Pub. Co. xvi, 592 p.
- Glennon R. 2002. Water Follies: Groundwater Pumping and the Fate of America's Fresh Water. Washington, DC: Island Press. 314 p.
- Heath J. 1993. Compilation of Federal and State Drinking Water Standards and Criteria. Sacramento: California Department of Water Resources. vii, 35 p.
- Heath RC (North Carolina Department of Natural Resources and Community Development). 1983. Basic Ground-Water Hydrology. v, 84 p.
- [NRDC] Natural Resources Defense Council. 2001. California's Contaminated Groundwater - Is the State Minding the Store? 97 p.
- Planert M, Williams JS (US Geological Survey). 1995. Ground Water Atlas of the United States. Reston, Va: US Geological Survey. 28 p.
- [SJVDP] San Joaquin Valley Drainage Program. 1990. A Management Plan for Agricultural Subsurface Drainage and Related Problems on the Westside San Joaquin Valley: Final Report of the San Joaquin Valley Drainage Program. Washington, D.C.: US Dept. of the Interior Bureau of Reclamation, US Fish and Wildlife Service, and US Geological Survey. xiii, 183 p.
- [SCVWD] Santa Clara Valley Water District. 2001. Santa Valley Water District Groundwater Management Plan. 67 p. Jul
- Sax JL. 2002. Review of the Laws Establishing the SWRCB's Permitting Authority Over Appropriations of Groundwater Classified as Subterranean Streams and the SWRCB's Implementation of Those Laws. 92 p. 19 Jan
- Solley WB, Pierce RR, Perlman HA (US Geological Survey). 1998. Estimated use of water in the United States in 1995. US Geological Survey circular; 1200. Denver, Colo: US Geological Survey. Report nr 060790075X. ix, 71 p.
- [TLBWSD] Tulare Lake Basin Water Storage District. 2002. Tulare Lake Bed Coordinated Groundwater Management Plan Annual Report.
- Todd Engineers. 1994. Scotts Valley Water District Groundwater Management Plan.
- Todd Engineers. 2002. Scotts Valley Water District Groundwater Management Plan, 2001-2002 Annual Report; Report to Scotts Valley Water District. Jul

References

Todd Engineers. 2003a. Update on Autumn Groundwater Conditions and AB 303 Management Plan, Memorandum to Scotts Valley Water District. Feb

Todd Engineers. 2003b. Scotts Valley Water District Groundwater Management Plan, 2002-2003 Annual Report; Report to Scotts Valley District. Jul

[USGS] US Geological Survey. 1995. Groundwater of Lower Lake - Middletown Area, Lake County, California. Geological Survey Water Supply Paper 1297.

Personal communication

Murphey, Paul. State Water Resources Control Board, Water Rights Section. 2003. Phone call to Mary Scruggs, DWR via telephone. Aug



Glossary

Glossary

A

acre-foot (af) The volume of water necessary to cover one acre to a depth of one foot; equal to 43,560 cubic feet or 325,851 gallons.

adjudication A case that has been heard and decided by a judge. In the context of an adjudicated groundwater basin, landowners or other parties have turned to the courts to settle disputes over how much groundwater can be extracted by each party to the decision.

alluvial Of or pertaining to or composed of alluvium.

alluvium A general term for clay, silt, sand, gravel, or similar unconsolidated detrital material, deposited during comparatively recent geologic time by a stream or other body of running water, as a sorted or semi sorted sediment in the bed of the stream or on its floodplain or delta, as a cone or fan at the base of a mountain slope.

anthropogenic Of human origin or resulting from human activity.

appropriative right The right to use water that is diverted or extracted by a nonriparian or nonoverlying party for nonriparian or nonoverlying uses. In California, surface water appropriative rights are subject to a statutory permitting process while groundwater appropriation is not.

aquitard A confining bed and/or formation composed of rock or sediment that retards but does not prevent the flow of water to or from an adjacent aquifer. It does not readily yield water to wells or springs, but stores ground water.

aquifer A body of rock or sediment that is sufficiently porous and permeable to store, transmit, and yield significant or economic quantities of groundwater to wells and springs.

aridity A term describing a climate or region in which precipitation is so deficient in quantity or occurs so infrequently that intensive agricultural production is not possible without irrigation.

artesian aquifer A body of rock or sediment containing groundwater that is under greater than hydrostatic pressure; that is, a confined aquifer. When an artesian aquifer is penetrated by a well, the water level will rise above the top of the aquifer.

artesian pressure Hydrostatic pressure of artesian water, often expressed in terms of pounds per square inch; or the height, in feet above the land surface, of a column of water that would be supported by the pressure.

artificial recharge The addition of water to a groundwater reservoir by human activity, such as putting surface water into dug or constructed spreading basins or injecting water through wells.

available groundwater storage capacity The volume of a groundwater basin that is unsaturated and capable of storing groundwater.

average annual runoff The average value of total annual runoff volume calculated for a selected period of record, at a specified location, such as a dam or stream gage.

average year water demand Demand for water under average hydrologic conditions for a defined level of development.

B

basin management objectives (BMOs) See management objectives

beneficial use One of many ways that water can be used either directly by people or for their overall benefit. The State Water Resources Control Board recognizes 23 types of beneficial use with water quality criteria for those uses established by the Regional Water Quality Control Boards.

borehole geophysics The general field of geophysics developed around the lowering of a variety of probes into a boring or well. Borehole logging provides additional information concerning physical, electrical, acoustic, nuclear and chemical aspects of the soils and rock encountered during drilling.

C

community water system A public water system that serves at least 15 service connections used by yearlong residents or regularly serves at least 25 year-long residents (DHS 2000).

confined aquifer An aquifer that is bounded above and below by formations of distinctly lower permeability than that of the aquifer itself. An aquifer containing confined ground water. See artesian aquifer.

conjunctive use The coordinated and planned management of both surface and groundwater resources in order to maximize the efficient use of the resource; that is, the planned and managed operation of a groundwater basin and a surface water storage system combined through a coordinated conveyance infrastructure. Water is stored in the groundwater basin for later and planned use by intentionally recharging the basin during years of above-average surface water supply.

contaminant Any substance or property preventing the use or reducing the usability of the water for ordinary purposes such as drinking, preparing food, bathing washing, recreation, and cooling. Any solute or cause of change in physical properties that renders water unfit for a given use. (Generally considered synonymous with pollutant).

critical conditions of overdraft A groundwater basin in which continuation of present practices would probably result in significant adverse overdraft-related environmental, social, or economic impacts. The definition was created after an extensive public input process during the development of the Bulletin 118-80 report.

D

deep percolation Percolation of water through the ground and beyond the lower limit of the root zone of plants into groundwater.

desalination A process that converts seawater or brackish water to fresh water or an otherwise more usable condition through removal of dissolved solids.

domestic well A water well used to supply water for the domestic needs of an individual residence or systems of four or fewer service connections.

drinking water system See public water system

drought condition Hydrologic conditions during a defined period when rainfall and runoff are much less than average.

drought year supply The average annual supply of a water development system during a defined drought period.

E

electrical conductivity (EC) The measure of the ability of water to conduct an electrical current, the magnitude of which depends on the dissolved mineral content of the water.

effective porosity The volume of voids or open spaces in alluvium and rocks that is interconnected and can transmit fluids.

environmental water Water serving environmental purposes, including instream fishery flow needs, wild and scenic river flows, water needs of fresh-water wetlands, and Bay-Delta requirements.

evapotranspiration (ET) The quantity of water transpired (given off), retained in plant tissues, and evaporated from plant tissues and surrounding soil surfaces.

G

groundwater basin An alluvial aquifer or a stacked series of alluvial aquifers with reasonably well-defined boundaries in a lateral direction and having a definable bottom.

groundwater budget A numerical accounting, the *groundwater equation*, of the recharge, discharge and changes in storage of an aquifer, part of an aquifer, or a system of aquifers.

groundwater in storage The quantity of water in the zone of saturation.

groundwater management The planned and coordinated management of a groundwater basin or portion of a groundwater basin with a goal of long-term sustainability of the resource.

groundwater management plan A comprehensive written document developed for the purpose of groundwater management and adopted by an agency having appropriate legal or statutory authority.

groundwater mining The process, deliberate or inadvertent, of extracting groundwater from a source at a rate in excess of the replenishment rate such that the groundwater level declines persistently, threatening exhaustion of the supply or at least a decline of pumping levels to uneconomic depths.

groundwater monitoring network A series of monitoring wells at appropriate locations and depths to effectively cover the area of interest. Scale and density of monitoring wells is dependent on the size and complexity of the area of interest, and the objective of monitoring.

groundwater overdraft The condition of a groundwater basin in which the amount of water withdrawn by pumping exceeds the amount of water that recharges the basin over a period of years during which water supply conditions approximate average conditions.

groundwater quality See water quality

groundwater recharge facility A structure that serves to conduct surface water into the ground for the purpose of replenishing groundwater. The facility may consist of dug or constructed spreading basins, pits, ditches, furrows, streambed modifications, or injection wells.

groundwater recharge The natural or intentional infiltration of surface water into the zone of saturation.

groundwater source area An area where groundwater may be found in economically retrievable quantities outside of normally defined groundwater basins, generally referring to areas of fractured bedrock in foothill and mountainous terrain where groundwater development is based on successful well penetration through interconnecting fracture systems. Well yields are generally lower in fractured bedrock than wells within groundwater basins.

groundwater storage capacity volume of void space that can be occupied by water in a given volume of a formation, aquifer, or groundwater basin.

groundwater subbasin A subdivision of a groundwater basin created by dividing the basin using geologic and hydrologic conditions or institutional boundaries.

groundwater table The upper surface of the zone of saturation in an unconfined aquifer.

groundwater Water that occurs beneath the land surface and fills the pore spaces of the alluvium, soil, or rock formation in which it is situated. It excludes soil moisture, which refers to water held by capillary action in the upper unsaturated zones of soil or rock.

H

hazardous waste Waste that poses a present or potential danger to human beings or other organisms because it is toxic, flammable, radioactive, explosive or has some other property that produces substantial risk to life.

hydraulic barrier A barrier created by injecting fresh water to control seawater intrusion in an aquifer, or created by water injection to control migration of contaminants in an aquifer.

hydraulic conductivity A measure of the capacity for a rock or soil to transmit water; generally has the units of feet/day or cm/sec.

hydrograph A graph that shows some property of groundwater or surface water as a function of time.

hydrologic cycle The circulation of water from the ocean through the atmosphere to the land and ultimately back to the ocean.

hydrologic region A study area consisting of multiple planning subareas. California is divided into 10 hydrologic regions.

hydrostratigraphy A geologic framework consisting of a body of rock having considerable lateral extent and composing a reasonably distinct hydrologic system.

hyporheic zone The region of saturated sediments beneath and beside the active channel and that contain some proportion of surface water that was part of the flow in the surface channel and went back underground and can mix with groundwater.

I

infiltration The flow of water downward from the land surface into and through the upper soil layers.

infiltration capacity The maximum rate at which infiltration can occur under specific conditions of soil moisture.

in-lieu recharge The practice of providing surplus surface water to historic groundwater users, thereby leaving groundwater in storage for later use.

ISI Integrated Storage Investigations Program, an element of the CALFED Bay Delta initiative.

J

joint powers agreement (JPA) An agreement entered into by two or more public agencies that allows them to jointly exercise any power common to the contracting parties. The JPA is defined in Chapter 5 (commencing with Section 6500) of Division 7 of Title 1 of the California Government Code.

L

land subsidence The lowering of the natural land surface due to groundwater (or oil and gas) extraction.

leaky confining layer A low-permeability layer that can transmit water at sufficient rates to furnish some recharge from an adjacent aquifer to a well.

lithologic log A record of the lithology of the soils, sediments and/or rock encountered in a borehole from the surface to the bottom.

lithology The description of rocks, especially in hand specimen and in outcrop, on the basis of such characteristics as color, mineralogic composition, and grain size.

losing stream A stream or reach of a stream that is losing water by seepage into the ground.

M

management objectives Objectives that set forth the priorities and measurable criteria of local groundwater basin management. For example, one management objective could be to minimize degradation of groundwater quality with a criteria set that groundwater will not be degraded by more than 100 mg/l in terms of TDS.

maximum contaminant level (MCL) The highest drinking water contaminant concentration allowed under federal and State Safe Drinking Water Act regulations.

N

natural recharge Natural replenishment of an aquifer generally from snowmelt and runoff; through seepage from the surface.

nonpoint source Pollution discharged over a wide land area, not from one specific location. These are forms of diffuse pollution caused by sediment, nutrients, etc., carried to lakes and streams by surface runoff.

O

operational yield An optimal amount of groundwater that should be withdrawn from an aquifer system or a groundwater basin each year. It is a dynamic quantity that must be determined from a set of alternative groundwater management decisions subject to goals, objectives, and constraints of the management plan.

ordinance A law set forth by a governmental authority.

overdraft See groundwater overdraft

overlying right Property owners above a common aquifer possess a mutual right to the reasonable and beneficial use of a groundwater resource on land overlying the aquifer from which the water is taken. Overlying rights are correlative (related to each other) and overlying users of a common water source must share the resource on a pro rata basis in times of shortage. A proper overlying use takes precedence over all non-overlying uses.

P

perched groundwater Groundwater supported by a zone of material of low permeability located above an underlying main body of groundwater.

perennial yield The maximum quantity of water that can be annually withdrawn from a groundwater basin over a long period of time (during which water supply conditions approximate average conditions) without developing an overdraft condition.

perforated interval The depth interval where slotted casing or screen is placed in a well to allow entry of water from the aquifer formation.

permeability The capability of soil or other geologic formations to transmit water. See hydraulic conductivity.

pesticide Any of a class of chemicals used for killing insects, weeds or other undesirable entities. Most commonly associated with agricultural activities, but has significant domestic use in California.

point source A specific site from which wastewater or polluted water is discharged into a water body.

pollution (of water) The alteration of the physical, chemical, or biological properties of water by the introduction of any substance into water that adversely affects any beneficial use of water.

porosity The ratio of the voids or open spaces in alluvium and rocks to the total volume of the alluvium or rock mass.

possible contaminating activity (PCA) Human activities that are actual or potential origins of contamination for a drinking water source. PCAs include sources of both microbiological and chemical contaminants that could have an adverse effect upon human health (DHS 2000).

potentiometric surface The surface to which the water in a confined aquifer will rise in a tightly cased well.

prescriptive right rights obtained through the open and notorious adverse use of another's water rights. By definition, adverse use is not use of a surplus, but the use of non-surplus water to the direct detriment of the original rights holder.

primary porosity Voids or open spaces that were present when alluvium and rocks were originally deposited or formed.

public supply well A well used as a part of a public water system.

public water system A system for the provision of water for human consumption through pipes or other constructed conveyances that has 15 or more service connections or regularly serves at least 25 individuals daily at least 60 days out of the year. (DHS 2000).

pueblo right A water right possessed by a municipality which, as a successor of a Spanish or Mexican pueblo, entitled to the beneficial use of all needed, naturally-occurring surface and groundwater of the original pueblo watershed Pueblo rights are paramount to all other claims.

R

recharge Water added to an aquifer or the process of adding water to an aquifer. Ground water recharge occurs either naturally as the net gain from precipitation, or artificially as the result of human influence. See artificial recharge.

recharge basin A surface facility constructed to infiltrate surface water into a groundwater basin.

riparian right A right to use surface water, such right derived from the fact that the land in question abuts upon the banks of streams.

runoff The volume of surface flow from an area.

S

safe yield The maximum quantity of water that can be continuously withdrawn from a groundwater basin without adverse effect.

salinity Generally, the concentration of mineral salts dissolved in water. Salinity may be expressed in terms of a concentration or as electrical conductivity. When describing salinity influenced by seawater, salinity often refers to the concentration of chlorides in the water. See also total dissolved solids.

saline intrusion The movement of salt water into a body of fresh water. It can occur in either surface water or groundwater bodies.

saturated zone The zone in which all interconnected openings are filled with water, usually underlying the unsaturated zone.

seawater intrusion barrier A system designed to retard, cease or repel the advancement of seawater intrusion into potable groundwater supplies along coastal portions of California. The system may be a series of specifically placed injection wells where water is injected to form a hydraulic barrier.

secondary porosity Voids in a rock formed after the rock has been deposited; not formed with the genesis of the rock, but later due to other processes. Fractures in granite and caverns in limestone are examples of secondary openings.

seepage The gradual movement of water into, through or from a porous medium. Also the loss of water by infiltration into the soil from a canal, ditches, laterals, watercourse, reservoir, storage facilities, or other body of water, or from a field.

semi-confined aquifer A semi-confined aquifer or leaky confined aquifer is an aquifer that has aquitards either above or below that allow water to leak into or out of the aquifer depending on the direction of the hydraulic gradient.

service area The geographic area served by a water agency.

specific conductance See electrical conductivity

specific retention The ratio of the volume of water a rock or sediment will retain against the pull of gravity to the total volume of the rock or sediment.

specific yield the ratio of the volume of water a rock or soil will yield by gravity drainage to the total volume of the rock or soil.

spring a location where groundwater flows naturally to the land surface or a surface water body.

stakeholders Any individual or organization that has an interest in water management activities. In the broadest sense, everyone is a stakeholder, because water sustains life. Water resources stakeholders are typically those involved in protecting, supplying, or using water for any purpose, including environmental uses, who have a vested interest in a water-related decision.

stratigraphy The science of rocks. It is concerned with the original succession and age relations of rock strata and their form, distribution, lithologic composition, fossil content, geophysical and geochemical properties—all characters and attributes of rocks as strata—and their interpretation in terms of environment and mode of origin and geologic history.

subsidence See land subsidence

subterranean stream Subterranean streams “flowing through known and definite channels” are regulated by California’s surface water rights system.

surface supply Water supply obtained from streams, lakes, and reservoirs.

sustainability Of, relating to, or being a method of using a resource so that the resource is not depleted or permanently damaged.

T

total dissolved solids (TDS) a quantitative measure of the residual minerals dissolved in water that remain after evaporation of a solution. Usually expressed in milligrams per liter. See also salinity

toxic Poisonous, relating to or caused by a poison. Toxicity is determined for individual contaminants or for mixtures of contaminants as found in waste discharges.

transmissivity The product of hydraulic conductivity and aquifer thickness; a measure of a volume of water to move through an aquifer. Transmissivity generally has the units of ft²/day or gallons per day/foot. Transmissivity is a measure of the subsurface's ability to transmit groundwater horizontally through its entire saturated thickness and affects the potential yield of wells.

transpiration An essential physiological process in which plant tissues give off water vapor to the atmosphere.

U

unconfined aquifer An aquifer which is not bounded on top by an aquitard. The upper surface of an unconfined aquifer is the water table.

underground stream Body of water flowing as a definite current in a distinct channel below the surface of the ground, usually in an area characterized by joints or fissures. Application of the term to ordinary aquifers is incorrect.

unsaturated zone The zone below the land surface in which pore space contains both water and air.

urban water management plan (UWMP) An UWMP is required for all urban water suppliers having more than 3,000 connections or supplying more than 3,000 acre-feet of water. The plans include discussions on water supply, supply reliability, water use, water conservation, and water shortage contingency and serve to assist urban water suppliers with their long-term water resources planning to ensure adequate water supplies for existing and future demands.

usable storage capacity The quantity of groundwater of acceptable quality that can be economically withdrawn from storage.

V

vadose zone See unsaturated zone

volatile organic compound (VOC) A manmade organic compound that readily vaporizes in the atmosphere. These compounds are often highly mobile in the groundwater system and are generally associated with industrial activities.

W

water quality Description of the chemical, physical, and biological characteristics of water, usually in regard to its suitability for a particular purpose or use.

water table See groundwater table

water year A continuous 12-month period for which hydrologic records are compiled and summarized. Different agencies may use different calendar periods for their water years.

watershed The land area from which water drains into a stream, river, or reservoir.

well completion report A required, confidential report detailing the construction, alteration, abandonment, or destruction of any water well, cathodic protection well, groundwater monitoring well, or geothermal heat exchange well. The reports were called *Water Well Drillers' Report* prior to 1991 and are often referred to as "driller's logs." The report requirements are described in the California Water Code commencing with Section 13750.

WQCP Water Quality Control Plan for the San Francisco Bay/Sacramento San Joaquin Delta Estuary.

Metric Conversions

Quantity	To Convert from Metric Unit	To Customary Unit	Multiply Metric Unit By	To Convert to Metric Unit Multiply Customary Unit By
Length	millimeters (mm)	inches (in)	0.03937	25.4
	centimeters (cm) for snow depth	inches (in)	0.3937	2.54
	meters (m)	feet (ft)	3.2808	0.3048
	kilometers (km)	miles (mi)	0.62139	1.6093
Area	square millimeters (mm ²)	square inches (in ²)	0.00155	645.16
	square meters (m ²)	square feet (ft ²)	10.764	0.092903
	hectares (ha)	acres (ac)	2.4710	0.40469
	square kilometers (km ²)	square miles (mi ²)	0.3861	2.590
Volume	liters (L)	gallons (gal)	0.26417	3.7854
	megaliters	million gallons (10 ⁶)	0.26417	3.7854
	cubic meters (m ³)	cubic feet (ft ³)	36.315	0.028317
	cubic meters (m ³)	cubic yards (yd ³)	1.308	0.76455
	cubic dekameters (dam ³)	acre-feet (ac-ft)	0.8107	1.2335
Flow	cubic meters per second (m ³ /s)	cubic feet per second (ft ³ /s)	35.315	0.028317
	liters per minute (L/mn)	gallons per minute (gal/mn)	0.26417	3.7854
	liters per day (L/day)	gallons per day (gal/day)	0.26417	3.7854
	megaliters per day (ML/day)	million gallons per day (mgd)	0.26417	3.7854
	cubic dekameters per day (dam ³ /day)	acre-feet per day (ac-ft/day)	0.8107	1.2335
Mass	kilograms (kg)	pounds (lbs)	2.2046	0.45359
	megagrams (Mg)	tons (short, 2,000 lb.)	1.1023	0.90718
Velocity	meters per second (m/s)	feet per second (ft/s)	3.2808	0.3048
Power	kilowatts (kW)	horsepower (hp)	1.3405	0.746
Pressure	kilopascals (kPa)	pounds per square inch (psi)	0.14505	6.8948
	kilopascals (kPa)	feet head of water	0.32456	2.989
Specific Capacity	liters per minute per meter drawdown	gallons per minute per foot drawdown	0.08052	12.419
Concentration	milligrams per liter (mg/L)	parts per million (ppm)	1.0	1.0
Electrical Conductivity	microsiemens per centimeter (μS/cm)	micromhos per centimeter	1.0	1.0
Temperature	degrees Celsius (°C)	degrees Fahrenheit (°F)	(1.8X°C)+32	(°F-32)/1.8



Appendices

Appendix A

Obtaining Copies of Supplemental Material

Bulletin 118 Update 2003 includes this report and supplemental material consisting of individual basin descriptions and a GIS-compatible map of each of the delineated groundwater basins in California. The supplemental material will be updated as new information becomes available and can be viewed or downloaded at <http://www.waterplan.water.ca.gov/groundwater/118index.htm>

Appendix B

The Right to Use Groundwater in California

California does not have a statewide management program or statutory permitting system for groundwater. Some local agencies have adopted groundwater ordinances under their police powers, or have adopted groundwater management programs under a variety of statutory authorities.

Prior to a discussion of groundwater management, it is helpful to understand some of the laws governing the right to use groundwater in California. When the Water Commission Act of 1913 (Stats. 1913, Ch. 586) became effective in 1914, appropriative surface water rights became subject to a statutory permitting process. This appropriation procedure can be found in Water Code Section 1200 *et seq.* Groundwater classified as underflow of a surface stream, a “subterranean stream flowing through a known and definite channel,” was made subject to the State permit system. However, most groundwater in California is presumed to be “percolating water,” that is, water in underground basins and groundwater which has escaped from streams. This percolating water is not subject to a permitting process. As a result, most of the body of law governing groundwater use in California today has evolved through a series of court decisions beginning in the early 20th century. Key cases are listed in Table B-1, and some of the most significant are discussed below.

**Table B-1 Significant court cases related to the
right to use groundwater in California**

Case	Issues addressed
Katz v. Walkinshaw, 141 Cal. 116 (1903)	Established Correlative Rights Doctrine. Correlative rights of overlying users, and surplus supply available for appropriation among non-overlying users.
Peabody v. City of Vallejo, 2 Cal. 2d 351 (1935)	Limited riparian rights under the reasonable and beneficial use requirement of the 1928 constitutional amendment; requirement of reasonable and beneficial use.
Pasadena v. Alhambra, 33 Cal. 2d 908 (1949)	First basin adjudication in California; established Doctrine of Mutual Prescription.
Niles Sand and Gravel Co. v. Alameda County Water District, 37 Cal. App. 3d 924 (1974)	Established right to store water underground as a servitude.
Techachapi-Cummings County Water District v. Armstrong, 49 Cal. App. 3d 992 (1975)	Modified the Mutual Prescription Doctrine articulated in Pasadena v. Alhambra. Overlying owners' water rights must be quantified on the basis of current, reasonable and beneficial need, not past use. By analogy to riparian rights, factors to be considered include: the amount of water available, the extent of ownership in the basin, and the nature of projected use.
Los Angeles v. San Fernando, 14 Cal. 3d 199 (1975)	Significantly modified Mutual Prescription Doctrine by disallowing it against public entities (Civil Code section 1007); established pueblo right above overlying owner right; established right to store imported water underground and recapture when needed above the right of overlying landowner.
Wright v. Goleta Water District, 174 Cal. App. 3d 74 (1985)	The unexercised water rights of overlying owners are protected from appropriators; notice and opportunity must be given to overlying owners to resist any interference with their rights.
Hi-Desert County Water District v. Blue Skies Country Club,	Retention of overlying right; no acquisition of prescriptive right by 23 Cal. App. 4th 1723 (1994) overlying owner.
Baldwin v. Tehama County, 31 Cal. App. 4th 166 (1994)	City and County regulation of groundwater through police power. County limitations on export upheld.
City of Barstow v. Mojave Water Agency,	Held that in considering a stipulated physical solution 23 Cal. 4th 1224 (2000) involving equitable apportionment, court must consider correlativerights of parties that did not join the stipulation.

This table modified from Bachman and others 1997

Katz v. Walkinshaw (141 Cal. 116)

In the 1903 decision, *Katz v. Walkinshaw*, the California Supreme Court rejected the English Common Law doctrine of groundwater rights and established the Doctrine of Correlative Rights. Prior to the *Katz* decision, California had followed the doctrine articulated in the 1843 English decision of *Acton v. Blundell* (12 M. & W. 324, 152 Eng. Rep. 1223), which established that landowners enjoyed absolute ownership of groundwater underneath their property. The 1903 decision rejected the English Common Law approach as unsuitable for the “natural conditions” in California, and instead established the Correlative Rights Doctrine analogous to a riparian right. Each overlying landowner was entitled to make reasonable beneficial use of groundwater with a priority equal to all other overlying users. Water in excess of the needs of the overlying owners could be pumped and used on nonoverlying lands on a first-in-time, first-in-right basis under what is known as an appropriative right. An appropriative groundwater right, unlike its surface water counterpart, is not subject to a permitting process. Where overlying owners made full use of available supplies, appropriative rights were extinguished. Where there was insufficient water to meet even the needs of the overlying owners, the court applied the Correlative Rights Doctrine to apportion the available groundwater among the overlying landowners. Figure B-1 depicts the rights to use groundwater established in *Katz v. Walkinshaw*.

City of Pasadena v. City of Alhambra (33 Cal. 2d 908)

The 1949 decision, *Pasadena v. Alhambra*, added significant complexity to the right to use groundwater in California. This decision, involving the adjudication of the Raymond Basin, established the doctrine of mutual prescription. Groundwater levels in the basin had been declining for many years by the time court action was initiated. Most substantial pumpers, both overlying and appropriators, were joined in the action. Previously, appropriators only had a right to water surplus to the needs of overlying users. However, based upon a stipulation by most of the parties, the court in *Pasadena* adopted a program of proportionate reductions. These appropriators had each effectively gained a prescriptive right, similar to that of surface water rights, in which they had taken the water in an open, notorious, and hostile manner for at least five years. Mutual prescription provided groundwater rights to both overlying users and appropriators in depleted groundwater basins by prorating their rights based on the highest continuous amount of pumping during the five years following commencement of the overdraft. All of the users in the Raymond Basin were thus entitled to extract their portion of the court-approved safe yield of the basin.

City of Los Angeles v. City of San Fernando (14 Cal. 3d 199)

In 1975, in *Los Angeles v. San Fernando*, the California Supreme Court significantly limited the Mutual Prescription Doctrine introduced in *Pasadena v. Alhambra*. This opinion had far-reaching impacts on both the right to use groundwater and the practice of conjunctive use of groundwater and surface water to manage a basin. The case began in 1955, when the City of Los Angeles sued the cities of San Fernando, Glendale, Burbank and other pumpers, asserting a prior right to the San Fernando Valley groundwater basins in the northern part of the City of Los Angeles. The court, relying on Civil Code Section 1007, held that public agencies and public utilities cannot lose their groundwater rights by prescription. This holding effectively ruled out any future “mutual prescription” settlements or judgments involving rights held by public entities.

With respect to the native water supply of the San Fernando Basin, the court found that the City of Los Angeles had prior rights to all of this supply pursuant to its “pueblo right.” Pueblo rights are traceable to rights recognized by the Spanish crown and the Mexican government. Under the Spanish/Mexican system, water rights were held in trust by pueblos for the benefit of all of its inhabitants. Under the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo executed by Mexico and the United States in 1848, the municipal successors to Spanish/Mexican pueblos retained their pueblo rights upon the cession of California. In the San Fernando decision, the court confirmed Los Angeles’ pueblo right, finding it superior to the rights of all overlying landowners. While a pueblo right is rare, it is an example of the complexity of the rights to use groundwater in California.




Figure B-1 Rights to groundwater use in full basin established in *Katz v. Walkinshaw*




Figure B-2 Rights to groundwater use in overdrafted basin established in *Los Angeles v. San Fernando*

For the future of conjunctive use of groundwater basins, the court's holding with respect to the rights to available storage space in the Basin is significant. The court upheld the right of public agencies – namely the cities of San Fernando, Los Angeles, Burbank, and Glendale—to recapture the imported water they added to the Basin. The court held that the rights of the respective public agencies to recover such imported water are of equal priority to the City of Los Angeles' pueblo right, and that all such public agency rights are “prior to the rights dependent on ownership of overlying land or based solely upon appropriation of groundwater from the basin.” The court remanded the case, directing the trial court to apportion the safe yield of the Basin accordingly.

The court noted that there did not appear to be any shortage of underground storage space in relation to the demand and, hence, the court did not find it necessary to determine priorities as to the future use of such space. The Judgment issued by the trial court on remand, however, provided: “To the extent of any future spreading or in lieu storage of import water or reclaimed water by Los Angeles, Glendale, Burbank or San Fernando, the party causing said water to be so stored shall have a right to extract an equivalent amount of ground water from the San Fernando Basin.” Pursuant to the Judgment, a court-appointed Watermaster now manages the groundwater extraction and storage rights within the ULARA. Figure B-2 depicts the rights to use groundwater established in *Los Angeles v. San Fernando* in an overdrafted basin where water has been stored.

City of Barstow v. Mojave Water Agency (23 Cal. 4th 1224)

In 2000, the California Supreme Court partially overturned the 1995 adjudication of the Mojave River Basin. The trial court had approved a negotiated settlement (or stipulated agreement) that failed to include a well-by-well determination of water rights. The trial court held the negotiated settlement to be binding on all users in the basin, including some pumpers who had not agreed to the settlement. The lower court decision was based on the doctrine of “equitable apportionment,” in which the available water is shared based on concepts of equity and fairness. The Court of Appeal had partially reversed the lower court, and held that the trial court did not have the authority to ignore California's traditional water rights doctrine giving overlying users a priority right to beneficial and reasonable use of the groundwater. The Court of Appeal affirmed the trial court's negotiated settlement except as it applied to two of the parties. First, the Court of Appeal reversed the holding against a non-negotiating party since the trial court had ignored that party's existing overlying water rights. Secondly, the Court of Appeal reversed the trial court's judgment as it applied to a company, where the negotiated agreement did not give the company a water-allowance equal to its actual water use. The Supreme Court affirmed the Court of Appeal decision, but reversed the judgment applying to the company's water-allowance. The Supreme Court also affirmed that the trial court could not apply the doctrine of equitable apportionment when overlying water users had already established a prior water right. The Court stated that, while the trial court could impose a physical solution (such as the negotiated settlement), the court could not simply ignore affected owners' legal water rights. Equitable apportionment, thus, remains a tool for adjudicating basin groundwater rights, but only if all parties stipulate to its use.

Appendix C

Required and Recommended Components of Local Groundwater Management Plans

Section 10750 et seq. of the Water Code, commonly referred to as Assembly Bill 3030, stipulates certain procedures that must be followed in adopting a groundwater management plan under this section.

Amendments to Section 10750 et seq. added the requirement that new groundwater management plans prepared under Section 10750 et seq. must include component 1 below (SB1938 (Stats 2002, Ch 603)).

In addition, the amendments mandate that if the agency preparing the groundwater management plan intends to apply for funding administered by the California Department of Water Resources (DWR) for groundwater or groundwater quality projects, the agency must prepare and implement a groundwater management plan that includes components 2, 3, 6, 7 and 9 below. DWR recommends that all the components below be included in any groundwater management plan to be adopted and implemented by a local managing entity.

Consideration and development of these components for the specific conditions of the basin to be managed under the plan will help to ensure effective groundwater management. In developing these criteria, DWR recognizes that the goal of a groundwater management plan and the goal of an ordinance to manage groundwater should be the same—assurance of a long-term, sustainable, reliable, good quality groundwater supply. Such efforts can benefit greatly from cooperative management within the basin or region.

None of the suggested data reporting in the components below should be construed as recommending disclosure of information that is confidential under State law.

1. Include documentation that a written statement was provided to the public “describing the manner in which interested parties may participate in developing the groundwater management plan,” which may include appointing a technical advisory committee (Water Code § 10753.4 (b)).
2. Include a plan by the managing entity to “involve other agencies that enables the local agency to work cooperatively with other public entities whose service area or boundary overlies the groundwater basin.” (Water Code § 10753.7 (a)(2)). A local agency includes “any local public agency that provides water service to all or a portion of its service area” (Water Code § 10752 (g)).
3. Provide a map showing the area of the groundwater basin, as defined by DWR Bulletin 118, with the area of the local agency subject to the plan as well as the boundaries of other local agencies that overlie the basin in which the agency is developing a groundwater management plan (Water Code § 10753.7 (a)(3)).
4. Establish an advisory committee of stakeholders (interested parties) within the plan area that will help guide the development and implementation of the plan and provide a forum for resolution of controversial issues.
5. Describe the area to be managed under the plan, including:
 - a. The physical structure and characteristics of the aquifer system underlying the plan area in the context of the overall basin.

- b. A summary of the availability of historical data including, but not limited to, the components in Section 7 below.
 - c. Issues of concern including, but not limited to, issues related to the components in Section 7 below.
 - d. A general discussion of historical and projected water demands and supplies.
6. Establish management objectives (MOs) for the groundwater basin that is subject to the plan. (Water Code § 10753.7 (a)(1)).
 7. Include components relating to the monitoring and management of groundwater levels, groundwater quality, inelastic land surface subsidence, and changes in surface flow and surface water quality that directly affect groundwater levels or quality or are caused by groundwater pumping. (Water Code § 10753.7 (a)(1)). Consider additional components listed in Water Code § 10753.8 (a) through (l).
 8. For each MO, describe how meeting the MO will contribute to a more reliable supply for long-term beneficial uses of groundwater in the plan area, and describe existing or planned management actions to achieve MOs.
 9. Adopt monitoring protocols for the components in Section 7 (Water Code § 10753.7 (a)(4)). Monitoring protocols are not defined in the Water Code, but the section is interpreted to mean developing a monitoring program capable of tracking changes in conditions for the purpose of meeting MOs.
 10. Describe the monitoring program, including:
 - a. A map indicating the general locations of any applicable monitoring sites for groundwater levels, groundwater quality, subsidence stations, or stream gages.
 - b. A summary of monitoring sites indicating the type (groundwater level, groundwater quality, subsidence, stream gage) and frequency of monitoring. For groundwater level and groundwater quality wells, indicate the depth interval(s) or aquifer zone monitored and the type of well (public, irrigation, domestic, industrial, monitoring).
 11. Describe any current or planned actions by the local managing entity to coordinate with other land use, zoning, or water management planning agencies or activities (Water Code § 10753.8 (k), (l)).
 12. Provide for periodic report(s) summarizing groundwater basin conditions and groundwater management activities. The report(s), prepared annually or at other frequencies as determined by the local management agency, should include:
 - a. Summary of monitoring results, including a discussion of historical trends.
 - b. Summary of management actions during the period covered by the report.
 - c. A discussion, supported by monitoring results, of whether management actions are achieving progress in meeting MOs.
 - d. Summary of proposed management actions for the future.
 - e. Summary of any plan component changes, including addition or modification of MOs, during the period covered by the report.
 - f. Summary of actions taken to coordinate with other water management and land use agencies, and other government agencies.
 13. Provide for the periodic re-evaluation of the entire plan by the managing entity.
 14. For local agencies not overlying groundwater basins, plans should be prepared including the above listed components and using geologic and hydrologic principles appropriate to those areas (Water Code § 10753.7 (a)(5)).

Appendix D

Groundwater Management Model Ordinance

In developing this model ordinance, the California Department of Water Resources recognizes that the goal of a groundwater management plan and the goal of an ordinance to manage groundwater should be the same—assurance of a long-term, sustainable, reliable, good quality groundwater supply. Such efforts require cooperative management within the region or sub-region.

Chapter X

Groundwater Management Ordinance

Sections:

X.01 Declaration of Findings

X.02 Purpose

X.03 Declaration of Intent

X.04 Definitions

X.05 Groundwater Management Program

X.06 Management Objectives

X.07 Monitoring Program Network

X.08 Monitoring Frequency

X.09 Changes in Monitoring

X.10 Review of Technical Data

X.11 Data Dissemination

X.12 Actions when MO Noncompliance is Reported

X.13 Regional Coordination

X.14 Integrated Resource Management

X.15 Data Relating to Export and Substitution of Groundwater

X.01 Declaration of Findings - The Board finds that:

- A. The protection of the groundwater resource for its use within the County is of major concern to the residents of the County for the protection of their health, welfare, and safety.
- B. The reliability and sustainability of the groundwater supply for all beneficial uses are of critical importance to the economic, social, and environmental well-being of the County.
- C. A lack of effective groundwater management may have significant negative impacts, including, but not limited to:
 1. Lower groundwater levels leading to additional expenses from:
 - a) Increased energy consumption.
 - b) The need to deepen existing wells.
 - c) The need to build new wells.
 - d) The need to destroy non-functioning wells.
 2. Costly damage to public roads, bridges, canals, and other structures caused by land subsidence.
 3. Reduction of surface and subsurface flows leading to the potential loss of critical riparian and wetland habitat.
 4. Degradation of groundwater quality.

- D. It is essential for management purposes to adopt a monitoring program addressing groundwater levels, groundwater quality, land subsidence, and surface water flow and quality where it directly impacts or is impacted by groundwater.

X.02 Purpose - In support of the findings above, the County has determined that this groundwater management ordinance is necessary to ensure that:

- A. Groundwater continues to be a reliable and sustainable resource.
- B. The extraction of groundwater does not result in significant adverse economic, environmental, or social impacts.
- C. Groundwater quality is protected.
- D. Excessive land surface subsidence from groundwater extraction is prevented.

X.03 Declaration of Intent

- A. The County intends to foster prudent groundwater management practices by establishing a policy that encourages appropriate management of the resource based on recommendations by a committee of stakeholders.
- B. The County intends that its groundwater management activities occur as an open and public process that considers input from all stakeholders in the County.
- C. The County intends to work cooperatively with interested local agencies to further develop and implement joint groundwater management activities.
- D. The County does not intend to regulate, in any manner, the use of groundwater, except as a last resort to protect the groundwater resource.
- E. The County intends to act as an enforcing agency should the local resource become threatened.
- F. The County does not intend to infringe upon the rights of surface water users in the managed area.
- G. The County does not intend to limit other authorized means of managing groundwater within the County.

X.04 Definitions

- A. “Aquifer” means a geologic formation that stores groundwater and transmits and yields significant quantities of water to wells and springs. Significant quantity is an amount that that satisfies local needs and may range from thousands of gallons per minute to less than 5 gpm, depending on rock type and intended use.
- B. “Board” means the Board of Supervisors of the County.
- C. “District” means a district or municipality, located wholly or partially within the boundaries of the County, that is a purveyor of water for agricultural, domestic, or municipal use.
- D. “Enforcement Agency” means the Board as the enforcement agency under this chapter.
- E. “Groundwater” means all water beneath the surface of the earth below the zone of saturation, but does not include subterranean streams flowing in known and definite channels.
- F. “Groundwater Basin” means an aquifer or series of aquifers with a reasonably defined lateral and vertical extent, as defined in Bulletin 118 by Department of Water Resources. “Non-basin areas” are outside defined groundwater basins and contain smaller amounts of groundwater in consolidated sediments or fractured hard rock.
- G. “Groundwater Export” means the conveyance of groundwater outside of the boundaries of the County and outside of the boundaries of any district that is partially within the County.
- H. “Groundwater Substitution” means the voluntary use of an available groundwater supply instead of surface water for the purposes of using the surface water outside the County and outside the boundaries of any district that is partially within the County.

- I. “Land Subsidence” means the lowering of the ground surface caused by the inelastic consolidation of clay beds in the aquifer system.
- J. “Management Objective”(MO) means a condition identified for each subunit to ensure that the groundwater supply is reliable and sustainable. The MOs set acceptable conditions with respect to groundwater levels, groundwater quality, inelastic land surface subsidence, and surface water flows and quality. Compliance with the MO is tracked by a monitoring program and threshold values that are adopted for each Management Objective.
- K. “Recharge” means flow to groundwater storage from precipitation, and infiltration from streams, irrigation, spreading basins, injection wells, and other sources of water.
- L. “Reliability” means having an available, predictable, and usable groundwater supply at any given point in time.
- M. “Stakeholder” means an individual or an entity, such as a water supplier or a county resident, with a permanent interest in the availability of the groundwater resource.
- N. ”Subunit” means any subdivision of a groundwater basin or non-basin area in the County created for the purposes of representation of stakeholders and the establishment of local area management objectives.
- O. “Sustainable” means the groundwater resource is maintained for use by residents in the basin over a prolonged period of time.
- P. “Technical Advisory Committee” means a committee of persons knowledgeable in groundwater management, hydrology, and hydrogeology established for the purpose of providing technical guidance to the Water Advisory Committee.
- Q. “Threshold values” mean the limits established by the WAC for groundwater levels, groundwater quality, land surface subsidence, and surface water flow and quality that are not to be exceeded if the MOs are to be met.
- R. “Water Advisory Committee” (WAC) means a multimember advisory body established for the purpose of aiding the Board in providing effective management of the groundwater resources in the County, and representing all of the subunits that are identified.
- S. “Water Management Entities” means any local agency, or group of agencies, authorized to manage groundwater.

X.05 Groundwater Management Program

- A. The County recognizes that effective groundwater management is key to maintaining a reliable and sustainable resource. For the purposes of establishing an effective groundwater management program, the Board shall appoint a WAC to establish MOs and make recommendations to the Board to ensure that MOs are met.
- B. For purposes of establishing a WAC, the groundwater basins and non-basin areas of the County will be divided into subunits based on hydrogeologic principles and institutional boundaries. These subunits shall be established by the Board based on public input to address the groundwater management needs of the County. The WAC shall consist of members that represent each subunit. Upon establishment of the subunits, the Board shall appoint a member to represent each subunit on the WAC.
- C. The WAC shall have the following responsibilities to the Board:
 - 1. Recommend MOs for each groundwater management subunit.
 - 2. Recommend a groundwater monitoring network for purposes of tracking MOs.
 - 3. Recommend the frequency of monitoring.
 - 4. Propose changes in monitoring.
 - 5. Ensure monitoring data receive technical review.
 - 6. Ensure that monitoring data are made available to the public.

7. Recommend actions to resolve noncompliance with MOs.
- D. For the purposes of providing technical advice to the WAC in carrying out its responsibilities, a technical advisory committee (TAC) shall be established. The TAC shall consist of local experts or a combination of local expertise and technical consultants from private and public organizations that are nominated by the WAC and approved by the Board. Individuals appointed to the TAC should be highly knowledgeable in groundwater management, hydrology, and hydrogeology. The TAC shall review technical data collected by monitoring programs within the County and advise the WAC.

X.06 Management Objectives

- A. To ensure that the County maintains a reliable and sustainable groundwater supply, MOs for groundwater levels, groundwater quality, land subsidence, and surface water flow and quality shall be adopted for each subunit. Threshold values that are not to be exceeded shall be defined for each MO.
- B. Compliance with the MOs will be determined by evaluation of data collected from groundwater level, groundwater quality, land subsidence, and surface water flow and quality monitoring networks. Evaluation of these data with respect to threshold values shall be the basis for determining compliance with the MOs.
- C. Each WAC member shall recommend MOs for their subunit. The WAC shall develop a comprehensive set of recommendations for all subunits, and the Board shall adopt these MOs for the County. MOs may differ from subunit to subunit, but the established MOs shall be consistent with the overall goal of supply reliability for the County.
- D. Groundwater management practices based on the established MOs for one subunit of the County shall not adversely impact adjacent subunits.

X.07 Monitoring Program Network

The WAC shall develop County-wide monitoring programs to collect representative data on groundwater levels, groundwater and surface water quality, land surface subsidence, and stream flow and quality. Each subunit shall propose its own monitoring program, and the WAC shall adopt a comprehensive monitoring program for the County. The data collected, showing current conditions and changes over time as a result of groundwater extraction, shall be evaluated by the WAC in consultation with the TAC. The WAC will recommend policies and actions to ensure that MOs for each subunit are met. The collection and evaluation of the data shall be based on scientifically sound principles, and shall incorporate appropriate quality assurance and quality control protocols.

- A. **Groundwater levels:** The groundwater level monitoring network shall be proposed by the WAC and approved by the Board. The intent of the groundwater level monitoring network is to measure water levels in selected wells that can adequately determine representative conditions in the aquifer system for determination of compliance with the MOs. The network will include selected municipal, domestic, and irrigation wells owned by water districts, private parties, and municipal and industrial water suppliers. Where needed, dedicated monitoring wells may be installed. Participation by well owners will be voluntary.
- B. **Water Quality:** The groundwater quality monitoring network shall be proposed by the WAC and approved by the Board. The intent of the groundwater quality monitoring network is to monitor selected wells that can adequately determine representative groundwater quality conditions in the aquifer system for identification of compliance with the MOs. The network will include selected municipal, domestic, and irrigation wells owned by water districts, private parties, and municipal

and industrial water suppliers. Where needed, dedicated monitoring wells may be installed. Participation by well owners will be voluntary.

- C. Land Subsidence: The land subsidence program and network shall be proposed by the WAC and approved by the Board. The intent of the land subsidence monitoring is to detect land subsidence for determination of compliance with the MOs. The network may include benchmarks that are surveyed for changes in elevation throughout the County, based on the judgment of the WAC of the need for such a program.
- D. Surface Water Flow and Quality: The surface water flow and quality network shall be proposed by the WAC and approved by the Board. The intent of this network is to detect changes in surface water flow or surface water quality that directly affect groundwater levels or quality or are caused by groundwater pumping for evaluation of compliance with MOs.

X.08 Monitoring Frequency

The recommended frequency of collection of data for each of the parameters listed above shall be determined by the WAC. Initially, each parameter should be measured at the frequencies outlined below, unless the WAC notes upon evaluation of existing data that more frequent monitoring or additional analyses are called for.

- A. Groundwater levels should be measured at least three times during the year: one measurement prior to the period of highest groundwater use, one measurement during peak groundwater use, and one measurement following the period of highest groundwater use (approximately the months of _____, _____, and _____).
- B. Groundwater quality measurements of electrical conductivity, temperature, and pH should be obtained at least twice annually during the periods of highest and lowest groundwater use (approximately the months of _____ and _____). Upon evaluation of the data, the WAC may propose analyses for other constituents.
- C. Selected benchmarks in the County land subsidence monitoring network should be surveyed every five years at a minimum. These surveys should be conducted following aquifer recovery and prior to the period of highest groundwater extraction (approximately the month of _____).
- D. Measurement of surface water flow and quality in areas determined to directly affect groundwater levels or quality or that are affected by groundwater pumping shall be obtained at least ___ times per month as long as there are flows in the channel.

X.09 Changes in Monitoring

If evaluation of the groundwater level, groundwater quality, land subsidence, surface water flow, or surface water quality data indicates a need for more or less frequent measurements or analyses, the WAC may propose a change in the monitoring frequency. Similarly, if evaluation of the data indicates that additional monitoring sites are necessary, the WAC may propose an additional or a reduced number of sites for data collection. The Board shall adopt these changes when supported by credible evidence.

X.10 Review of Technical Data

- A. The TAC shall propose and the WAC shall adopt standard methods using scientifically sound principles for review and analysis of the collected data. The TAC will meet, as needed and requested by the WAC, to evaluate the technical data and shall report their findings at appropriate meetings of the WAC. The WAC shall meet at least ___ times per month during the period of maximum groundwater use (months of _____ through _____) and quarterly during the off season (months of _____ through _____), or as necessary.
- B. During the period of highest groundwater use, the WAC meetings will focus on data review and analysis with respect to compliance with the current MOs. During the period of low

groundwater use, the WAC meetings will focus on a review of compliance with MOs for the previous period of high groundwater use and consideration of the need for changes to the MOs.

X.11 Data Dissemination

The WAC, in addition to establishing methods for data collection and evaluation, shall establish methods for data storage and dissemination. The WAC shall disseminate the monitoring data and evaluation reports through public presentations and through a County-maintained groundwater Internet site. At a minimum, the WAC shall publicly present findings from the monitoring program to the Board twice annually.

X.12 Actions when MO Noncompliance is Reported

- A. Action by Technical Advisory Committee.** In the event that the TAC identifies an area that is not in compliance with the MOs, or if noncompliance is reported by any other means, the TAC shall report to the WAC on the regional extent and magnitude of the noncompliance. This information shall also be released to the public no later than ___ days from the time that noncompliance with MOs was identified. The TAC shall then collect all available pertinent hydrologic data, investigate possible causes for noncompliance with MOs, and recommend actions to the WAC to bring the area into compliance. These recommendations shall be made no later than ___ days after the report of noncompliance is released to the public. The TAC shall first make recommendations that focus on correcting the noncompliance through negotiations with all parties in the affected area.
- B. Action by Water Advisory Committee.** The WAC shall act as lead negotiator in re-establishing compliance with the MO. If negotiations with parties in the affected area do not result in timely and positive action to re-establish compliance with MOs for the basin, the WAC may recommend a plan to the Board to modify, reduce or terminate groundwater extraction in the affected area or take other necessary actions. Such a plan will be recommended to the Board only after the WAC has thoroughly reviewed the recommendations of the TAC at a public meeting. The modification, reduction, or termination of groundwater extraction in the affected area shall first be applied to wells involved in any export or substitution programs, and then to other wells if necessary. Domestic wells shall not be considered for any modification, reductions, or termination of groundwater extraction.
- C. Action by Board of Supervisors.** The Board of Supervisors, using its police powers, shall act as the enforcement agency for this ordinance. Any recommendation of the WAC may be appealed to the Board within __ working days.

X.13 Regional Coordination

Management decisions recommended by the WAC and adopted by the Board shall not deleteriously affect groundwater resources in any portions of groundwater basins or non-basin areas that share a common groundwater resource in adjacent counties. To accomplish this goal, the WAC shall meet and coordinate with water management entities outside the County that overlie a common groundwater basin at least twice per year once prior to the period of highest groundwater use and once following the period of highest groundwater use.

X.14 Integrated Resource Management

- A. To ensure integration of planning activities within the County, the WAC shall inform County departments involved with groundwater related activities, including but not limited to Land Use or Zoning, Planning, Public Works, Utilities, and Environmental Health, of all WAC meetings and actions regarding MOs. In turn, these County departments shall take into consideration the

adopted MOs when approving development or zoning changes or construction projects that may rely on or affect groundwater quantity or quality.

- B. To the greatest extent practicable, the WAC should also integrate resource management planning with other agencies within the basin. Resource activities that could benefit from integrated planning with groundwater management include, but are not limited to:
- Groundwater management planning by other agencies—agricultural, municipal, industrial, local government
 - Watershed management plans
 - Urban water management plans
 - Management and disposal of municipal solid waste and municipal sewage
 - Drinking water source assessment and protection programs
 - Public water system emergency and disaster response plans
 - Surface water and groundwater conjunctive management programs
 - Expansion of surface and groundwater facilities
 - Water efficiency programs
 - Water recycling programs
 - Environmental habitat construction or restoration programs
 - Water quality protection programs
 - Recharge programs
 - Transportation infrastructure planning

X.15 Data Relating to Export and Substitution of Groundwater

- A. Districts, persons, or contractors intending to operate a groundwater export or groundwater substitution program shall submit the following data to the WAC ___ working days prior to commencing the program:
1. A description of the project with the total amount of groundwater to be exchanged or substituted
 2. The dates over which the project will take place.
 3. A statement of the anticipated impacts of the project relative to adopted MOs.
 4. A discussion of possible contingencies in the event of MO noncompliance.
 5. A map showing the location of the wells to be used by the program.
 6. A summary of any monitoring program proposed.
 7. All required environmental documentation.
- B. While the program is in operation, the following information shall be provided to the WAC at least ___ times per month:
1. All static and pumping groundwater level measurements made in the pumping well during the period of extraction for the export or substitution program.
 2. The amount of groundwater extracted from each well per week.
 3. Static groundwater level measurements in at least ___ of the most proximal wells to the project pumping wells that can be practicably monitored.
- C. All costs for providing such information to the WAC shall be borne by the project participants.

Note: Although the terms “County” and “Board” are used throughout the model ordinance for clarity, the model could be used by any local government or agency with appropriate authority or powers.

Appendix E

SWRCB Beneficial Use Designations¹

- Agricultural Supply (AGR)** – Uses of water for farming, horticulture, or ranching including, but not limited to irrigation, stock watering, or support of vegetation for ranch grazing.
- Aquaculture (AQUA)** – Uses of water for aquaculture or mariculture operations including, but not limited to, propagation, cultivation, maintenance, or harvesting of aquatic plants and animals for human consumption or bait purposes.
- Cold Freshwater Habitat (COLD)** – Uses of water that support cold water ecosystems including, but not limited to, preservation or enhancement of aquatic saline habitats, vegetation, fish, or wildlife, including invertebrates.
- Estuarine Habitat (EST)** – Uses of water that support estuarine ecosystems including, but not limited to, preservation or enhancement of estuarine habitats, vegetation, fish, shellfish, or wildlife (e.g., estuarine mammals, waterfowl, shorebirds).
- Freshwater Replenishment (FRSH)** – Uses of water for natural or artificial maintenance of surface water quantity or quality (e.g., salinity).
- Groundwater Recharge (GWR)** – Uses of water for natural or artificial recharge of groundwater for purposes of future extraction, maintenance of water quality, or halting of saltwater intrusion into freshwater aquifers.
- Hydropower Generation (POW)** – Uses of water for hydropower generation.
- Industrial Process Supply (PRO)** – Uses of water for industrial activities that depend primarily on water quality.
- Industrial Service Supply (IND)** – Uses of water for industrial activities that do not depend primarily on water quality including, but not limited to, mining, cooling water supply, hydraulic conveyance, gravel washing, fire protection, or oil well repressurization.
- Inland Saline Water Habitat (SAL)** – Uses of water that support inland saline water ecosystems including, but not limited to, preservation or enhancement of aquatic saline habitats, vegetation, fish, or wildlife, including invertebrates.
- Marine Habitat (MAR)** – Uses of water that support marine ecosystems including, but not limited to, preservation or enhancement of marine habitats, vegetation such as kelp, fish, shellfish, or wildlife (e.g., marine mammals, shorebirds).
- Migration of Aquatic Organisms (MIGR)** – Uses of water that support habitats necessary for migration or other temporary activities by aquatic organisms, such as anadromous fish.
- Municipal and Domestic Supply (MUN)** – Uses of water for community, military, or individual water supply systems including, but not limited to, drinking water supply.
- Navigation (NAV)** – Uses of water for shipping, travel, or other transportation by private, military, or commercial vessels.
- Noncontact Water Recreation (REC-2)** – Uses of water for recreational activities involving proximity to water, but not normally involving body contact with water where ingestion of water is reasonably possible. These uses include, but are not limited to, picnicking, sunbathing, hiking, beachcombing, camping, boating, tidepool and marine life study, hunting, sightseeing, or aesthetic enjoyment in conjunction with the above activities.
- Ocean Commercial and Sport Fishing (COMM)** – Uses of water for commercial or recreational collection of fish, shellfish, or other organisms including, but not limited to, uses involving organisms intended for human consumption or bait purposes.

¹ From SWRCB 2000

- Preservation of Biological Habitats of Special Significance (BIOL) – Uses of water that support designated areas or habitats, such as established refuges, parks, sanctuaries, ecological reserves, or Areas of Special Biological Significance (ASBS), where the preservation or enhancement of natural resources requires special protection.
- Rare, Threatened, or Endangered Species (RARE) – Uses of water that support habitats necessary, at least in part, for the survival and successful maintenance or plant or animal species established under State or federal law as rare, threatened or endangered.
- Shellfish Harvesting (SHELL) – Uses of water that support habitats suitable for the collection of filter-feeding shellfish (e.g., clams, oysters, and mussels) for human consumption, commercial, or sports purposes.
- Spawning, Reproduction, and/or Early Development (SPWM) – Uses of water that support high quality aquatic habitats suitable for reproduction and early development of fish.
- Warm Freshwater Habitat (WARM) – Uses of water that support warmwater ecosystems including, but not limited to, preservation or enhancement of aquatic habitats, vegetation, fish, or wildlife, including invertebrates.
- Water Contact Recreation (REC-1) – Uses of water for recreational activities involving body contact with water, where ingestion of water is reasonably possible. These uses include, but are not limited to, swimming, wading, water-skiing, skin and scuba diving, surfing, white water activities, fishing, or use of natural hot springs.
- Wildlife Habitat (WILD) – Uses of water that support terrestrial ecosystems including, but not limited to, preservation and enhancement of terrestrial habitats, vegetation, wildlife (e.g., mammals, birds, reptiles, amphibians, invertebrates), or wildlife water and food sources.

Appendix F Federal and State MCLs and Regulation Dates for Drinking Water Contaminants

Contaminant	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency		California Department of Health Services	
	MCL (mg/L)	Date ^a	MCL (mg/L)	Effective date
Inorganics				
Aluminum	0.05 to 2 ^b	1/91	1 0.2 ^b	2/25/89 9/8/94
Antimony	0.006	7/92	0.006	9/8/94
Arsenic	0.05 0.01	eff: 6/24/77 2001	0.05	77
Asbestos	7 MFL ^c	1/91	7 MFL ^c	9/8/94
Barium	1 2	eff: 6/24/77 1/91	1	77
Beryllium	0.004	7/92	0.004	9/8/94
Cadmium	0.010 0.005	eff: 6/24/77 1/91	0.010 0.005	77 9/8/94
Chromium	0.05 0.1	eff: 6/24/77 1/91	0.05	77
Copper	1.3 ^d	6/91	1 ^b 1.3 ^d	77 12/11/95
Cyanide	0.2	7/92	0.2 0.15	9/8/94 6/12/03
Fluoride	4 2 ^b	4/86 4/86	2	4/98
Lead	0.05 ^e 0.015 ^d	eff: 6/24/77 6/91	0.05 ^e 0.015 ^d	771 2/11/95
Mercury	0.002	eff: 6/24/77	0.002	77
Nickel	Remanded	0.1	9/8/94	
Nitrate	(as N)10	eff: 6/24/77	(as N03) 45	77
Nitrite (as N)	1	1/91	1	9/8/94
Total Nitrate/Nitrite (as N)	10	1/91	10	9/8/94
Selenium	0.01 0.05	eff: 6/24/77 1/91	0.01 0.05	77 9/8/94
Thallium	0.002	7/92	0.002	9/8/94
Radionuclides				
Uranium	30 g/L	12/7/00	20 pCi/L	1/1/89
Combined radium-226 & 228	5 pCi/L	eff: 6/24/77	5 pCi/L	77
Gross Alpha particle activity	15 pCi/L	eff: 6/24/77	15 pCi/L	77
Gross Beta particle activity	dose of 4 millirem/yr	eff: 6/24/77	50 pCi/L ^f	77

Contaminant	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency		California Department of Health Services	
	MCL (mg/L)	Date ^a	MCL (mg/L)	Effective date
Strontium-90	8 pCi/L	eff: 6/24/77 now covered by Gross Beta	8 pCi/L ^f	77
Tritium	20,000 pCi/L	eff: 6/24/77 now covered by Gross Beta	20,000 pCi/L ^f	77
VOCs				
Benzene	0.005	6/87	0.001	2/25/89
Carbon Tetrachloride	0.005	6/87	0.0005	4/4/89
1,2-Dichlorobenzene	0.6	1/91	0.6	9/8/94
1,4-Dichlorobenzene	0.075	6/87	0.005	4/4/89
1,1-Dichloroethane	--	--	0.005	6/24/90
1,2-Dichloroethane	0.005	6/87	0.0005	4/4/89
1,1-Dichloroethylene	0.007	6/87	0.006	2/25/89
cis-1,2-Dichloroethylene	0.07	1/91	0.006	9/8/94
trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene	0.1	1/91	0.01	9/8/94
Dichloromethane	0.005	7/92	0.005	9/8/94
1,3-Dichloropropene	--	--	0.0005	2/25/89
1,2-Dichloropropane	0.005	1/91	0.005	6/24/90
Ethylbenzene	0.7	1/91	0.68 0.7 0.3	2/25/89 9/8/94 6/12/03
Methyl-tert-butyl ether (MTBE)	--	--	0.005 ^b 0.013	1/7/99 5/17/00
Monochlorobenzene	0.1	1/91	0.03 0.07	2/25/89 9/8/94
Styrene	0.1	1/91	0.1	9/8/94
1,1,2,2-Tetrachloroethane	--	--	0.001	2/25/89
Tetrachloroethylene	0.005	1/91	0.005	5/89
Toluene	1	1/91	0.15	9/8/94
1,2,4 Trichlorobenzene	0.07	7/92	0.07	9/8/94
1,1,1-Trichloroethane	0.200	6/87	0.200	2/25/89
1,1,2-Trichloroethane	0.005	7/92	0.032 0.005	4/4/89 9/8/94
Trichloroethylene	0.005	6/87	0.005	2/25/89
Trichlorofluoromethane	--	--	0.15	6/24/90
1,1,2-Trichloro-1,2,2- Trifluoroethane	--	--	1.2	6/24/90
Vinyl chloride	0.002	6/87	0.0005	4/4/89
Xylenes	10	1/91	1.750	2/25/89

Contaminant	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency		California Department of Health Services	
	MCL (mg/L)	Date ^a	MCL (mg/L)	Effective date
SVOC's				
Alachlor	0.002	1/91	0.002	9/8/94
Atrazine	0.003	1/91	0.003 0.001	4/5/89 6/12/03
Bentazon	--	--	0.018	4/4/89
Benzo(a) Pyrene	0.0002	7/92	0.0002	9/8/94
Carbofuran	0.04	1/91	0.018	6/24/90
Chlordane	0.002	1/91	0.0001	6/24/90
Dalapon	0.2	7/92	0.2	9/8/94
Dibromochloropropane	0.0002	1/91	0.0001 0.0002	7/26/89 5/3/91
Di(2-ethylhexyl)adipate	0.4	7/92	0.4	9/8/94
Di(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate	0.006	7/92	0.004	6/24/90
2,4-D	0.10.07	eff: 6/24/77 1/91	0.1 0.07	77 9/8/94
Dinoseb	0.007	7/92	0.007	9/8/94
Diquat	0.02	7/92	0.02	9/8/94
Endothall	0.1	7/92	0.1	9/8/94
Endrin	0.0002 0.002	eff: 6/24/77 7/92	0.0002 0.002	77 9/8/94
Ethylene Dibromide	0.00005	1/91	0.00002 0.00005	2/25/89 9/8/94
Glyphosate	0.7	7/92	0.7	6/24/90
Heptachlor	0.0004	1/91	0.00001	6/24/90
Heptachlor Epoxide	0.0002	1/91	0.00001	6/24/90
Hexachlorobenzene	0.001	7/92	0.001	9/8/94
Hexachlorocyclopentadiene	0.05	7/92	0.05	9/8/94
Lindane	0.004 0.0002	eff: 6/24/77 1/91	0.004 0.0002	77 9/8/94
Methoxychlor	0.1 0.04	eff: 6/24/77 1/91	0.1 0.04 0.03	77 9/8/94 6/12/03
Molinate	--	--	0.02	4/4/89
Oxamyl	0.2	7/92	0.2 0.05	9/8/94 6/12/03
Pentachlorophenol	0.001	1/91	0.001	9/8/94
Picloram	0.5	7/92	0.5	9/8/94
Polychlorinated Biphenyls	0.0005	1/91	0.0005	9/8/94
Simazine	0.004	7/92	0.010 0.004	4/4/89 9/8/94

Contaminant	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency		California Department of Health Services	
	MCL (mg/L)	Date ^a	MCL (mg/L)	Effective date
Thiobencarb	--	--	0.07 0.001 ^b	4/4/89 4/4/89
Toxaphene	0.005 0.003	eff: 6/24/77 1/91	0.005 0.003	77 9/8/94
2,3,7,8-TCDD (Dioxin)	3x10 ⁻⁸	7/92	3x10 ⁻⁸	9/8/94
2,4,5-TP (Silvex)	0.01 0.05	eff: 6/24/77 1/91	0.01 0.05	77 9/8/94
Disinfection Byproducts				
Total trihalomethanes	0.10 0.080	11/29/79 eff: 11/29/83 eff: 1/1/02 ^g	0.10	3/14/83
Total haloacetic acids	0.060	eff: 1/1/02 ^g		
Bromate	0.010	eff: 1/1/02 ^g		
Chlorite	1.0	eff: 1/1/02 ^g		
Treatment Technique				
Acrylamide	TT ^h	1/91	TT ^h	9/8/94
Epichlorohydrin	TT ^h	1/91	TT ^h	9/8/94

Source: <http://www.dhs.ca.gov/ps/ddwem/chemicals/MCL/EPAandDHS.pdf>

- a. "eff." indicates the date the MCL took effect; any other date provided indicates when EPA established (that is, published) the MCL.
- b. Secondary MCL.
- c. MFL = million fibers per liter, with fiber length > 10 microns.
- d. Regulatory Action Level; if system exceeds, it must take certain actions such as additional monitoring, corrosion control studies and treatment, and for lead, a public education program; replaces MCL.
- e. The MCL for lead was rescinded with the adoption of the regulatory action level described in footnote d.
- f. MCLs are intended to ensure that exposure above 4 millirem/yr does not occur.
- g. Effective for surface water systems serving more than 10,000 people; effective for all others 1/1/04.
- h. TT = treatment technique, because an MCL is not feasible.

Federal and State MCLs – updated 05/23/03

Appendix G

Development of Current Groundwater Basin/Subbasin Map

This Bulletin 118 update represents the first time that groundwater basin boundaries have been released as a digital coverage. The basin boundaries for the revised groundwater basin map were primarily defined using geologic contacts and hydrogeologic barriers. Specifically the identification of the groundwater basins was initially based on the presence and areal extent of unconsolidated alluvial sediments identified on 1:250,000 scale, geologic maps published by the California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology. The identified groundwater basin areas were then further evaluated through review of relevant geologic and hydrogeologic reports and well completion reports, and using the basin definition criteria listed in Table 8. Basin boundaries that are specified in each of the court decisions has been used for the boundaries of adjudicated basins.

Well completion reports for wells present in basin areas that were identified from the geologic map were reviewed to identify the depth to the top of the water table and the top of impermeable bedrock. If there was less than 25 feet of permeable material present or if there was no groundwater present within the permeable material, the area was eliminated from the map. The well completion reports were also reviewed to determine if water supply wells located within the delineated basin area were extracting groundwater from the permeable materials underlying the area or from the bedrock beneath the permeable material. If the wells only extracted groundwater from the bedrock, the area was eliminated from the map. This resulted in the elimination of some areas identified as basins in previous Bulletin 118 publications. If there were no wells present in basin areas identified from the geologic map and no other information on the geology underlying these areas, the areas were retained in the current version of the map. Additional hydrogeologic information might or might not verify that these areas should be retained as groundwater basins.

Groundwater basins were delineated and separated from each other by the following restrictions on groundwater flow. For more detail on the types of basins and the flow boundaries of those basins, see Table 8.

Impermeable Bedrock. Impermeable bedrock with lower water yielding capacity. These include consolidated rocks of continental and marine origin and crystalline/or metamorphic rock.

Constrictions in Permeable Materials. A lower permeability material, even with openings that are filled with more permeable stream channel materials, generally forms a basin boundary for practical purposes. While groundwater may flow through the sediment-filled gaps, the flow is restricted to those gaps.

Fault. A fault that crosses permeable materials may form a barrier to groundwater movement if movement along the fault plane has created fine material that impedes groundwater movement or juxtaposed low permeability material adjacent to an aquifer. This is usually indicated by noticeable difference in water levels in wells and/or flow patterns on either side of the fault. Not all faults act as barriers to groundwater flow.

Low Permeability Zone. Areas of clay or other fine-grained material that have significant areal or vertical extent generally form a barrier to groundwater movement within the basin but do not form basin boundaries.

Groundwater Divide. A groundwater divide is generally considered a barrier to groundwater movement from one basin to another for practical purposes. Groundwater divides have noticeably divergent groundwater flow directions on either side of the divide with the water table sloping away from the divide. The location of the divide may change as water levels in either one of the basins change, making such a “divide” less useful. Such a boundary is often used for subbasins.

Adjudicated Basin Boundaries. The basin boundaries established by court order were used for all adjudicated basins. These court-decided boundaries affect the location of natural boundaries of adjoining basins. Some adjudicated basins are represented as subbasins in this bulletin.

Available reports on the geologic and hydrogeologic conditions in the delineated basin areas were also reviewed to determine if there was information that would further define the boundaries of the basin areas. This review resulted in changes to some of the basin boundaries identified in previous versions of Bulletin 118.

Several of the larger groundwater basins were further subdivided into groundwater subbasins in Bulletin 118-80 and additional large groundwater basins were subdivided during this 2003 revision. The subbasin boundaries were also primarily defined using geologic contacts and hydrogeologic divides where possible. If this was not possible, political or institutional boundaries were used.

The hydrogeologic information contained in the basin descriptions that supplement this update of Bulletin 118 includes only the information that was available in California Department of Water Resources (DWR) files through reference searches and through limited contact with local agencies. Local agencies may have conducted more recent studies that have generated additional information about water budgets and aquifer characteristics. Unless the agency notified DWR or provided a copy of the recent reports to DWR staff that recent information has not been included in the basin descriptions. Therefore, although Senate Bill 610 refers to groundwater basins identified as overdrafted in Bulletin 118, it would be prudent for local water suppliers to evaluate the potential for overdraft of any basin included as a part of a water supply assessment.

Persons interested in collecting groundwater information in accordance with the Water Code as amended by SB 221 and SB 610 may start with the information in Bulletin 118, but should follow up by consulting the references listed for each basin and contacting local water agencies to obtain any new information that is available. Otherwise, evaluation of available groundwater resources as mandated by SB 221 and SB 610 may not be using the most complete and recent information about water budgets and aquifer characteristics.

Groundwater basin and subbasin boundaries shown on the map included with this bulletin are based on evaluation of the best available information. In basins where many studies have been completed and the basin has been operated for a number of years, the basin response is fairly well understood and the boundaries are fairly well defined. Even in these basins, however, there are many unknowns and changes in boundaries may result as more information about the basin is collected and evaluated.

In many other basins where much less is known and understood about the basin, boundaries will probably change as a better understanding of the basin is developed. A procedure for collecting information from all the stakeholders should be developed for use statewide so that agreement on basin boundaries can be achieved.

