



California CASGEM and Groundwater Sustainability Basin Prioritization - Versions June 2014 and January 2015



The CASGEM Groundwater Basin Prioritization is a statewide ranking of groundwater basin importance that incorporates groundwater reliance and focuses on basins producing greater than 90% of California's annual groundwater. Although the results are a statewide assessment; it is important to recognize the statewide findings are not intended to diminish the local importance of groundwater including in the smaller size or lower-use groundwater basins. Additional information regarding the data sources and processing methods are provided in the "CASGEM Groundwater Basin Prioritization Process" available online at: http://www.water.ca.gov/groundwater/casgem/basin_prioritization.cfm

Basin Subbasin ID	Basin Name	Subbasin Name	Hydrologic Name	Basin - Subbasin Area (acre)	Total Rank Scoring	Final Priority	Population (2010)	Final Population Rank	Population Growth %	Final Population Growth Rank	Total Wells	Final Well Rank (discounted)	Total Public Supply Wells	Final Public Supply Well Rank	Groundwater Volume (Ac-Ft)	% of total water supply supplied by groundwater	% of total water supply supplied by surface water	Final groundwater volume rank	Final % of total water supply supplied by groundwater rank	Final groundwater Reliance rank	Irrigated Acreage	Final Irrigated Acreage Rank	Impact Ranks	Impact Comments	Other Information Rank	Other information Comments	Additional Comments		
1-1	SMITH RIVER PLAIN		North Coast	40,446	18.3	Medium	24,588	2	111%	2	1,462	3.75	34	4	10,000	85%	15%	2	5	3.5	8,383	3					GW use based on B118-03 data. Stable GW levels		
1-10	EEL RIVER VALLEY		North Coast	73,701	16.3	Medium	21,558	1	112%	2	763	2.25	23	2	55,000	77%	23%	4	4	4	33,309	4		1	Shallow basin with strong SW-GW interaction and fishery issues. Useable GW basin storage is estimated at 100,000 ac and annual use is estimated at over one-half the total storage.		GW Use based on B118-03 and DWR Land Use 2012 data		
1-11	COVELO ROUND VALLEY		North Coast	16,396	0.0	Very Low	1,968	1	160%	5	305	3	6	2	918	4%	96%	1	1	0	8,561	4							
1-12	LAYTONVILLE VALLEY		North Coast	5,020	0.0	Very Low	1,167	1	94%	0	170	3.75	3	3	415	10%	90%	1	1	0	1,329	3					GW Use based on B118-03 data		
1-13	LITTLE LAKE VALLEY		North Coast	10,018	0.0	Very Low	5,993	2	107%	1	629	3.75	0	0	2,000	1%	99%	2	1	0	4,190	4					GW Use based on B118-03 data		
1-14	LOWER KLAMATH RIVER VALLEY		North Coast	7,026	0.0	Very Low	806	1	158%	0	48	1.5	18	5	450	22%	78%	1	2	0	428	2					GW Use based on B118-03 data		
1-15	HAPPY CAMP TOWN AREA		North Coast	2,771	0.0	Very Low	759	1	247%	0	30	2.25	0	0	450	40%	60%	2	3	0	1	1					GW Use based on B118-03 data		
1-16	SEAD VALLEY		North Coast	2,243	0.0	Very Low	132	1	158%	0	7	0.75	2	4	21	8%	92%	0	1	0	50	1					GW Use based on B118-03 data		
1-17	BRAY TOWN AREA		North Coast	8,027	0.0	Very Low	0	0	0%	0	3	0.75	0	0	6	5%	95%	0	1	0	1,281	3					GW Use based on B118-03 data		
1-18	RED ROCK VALLEY		North Coast	8,996	11.5	Low	23	0	213%	0	30	1.5	0	0	14,109	90%	10%	5	5	5	5,355	5							
1-19	ANDERSON VALLEY		North Coast	4,969	0.0	Very Low	1,297	1	157%	5	393	3.75	8	5	225	20%	80%	1	1	0	1,094	3							
1-2-01	KLAMATH RIVER VALLEY	TULELAKE	North Coast	85,934	17.3	Medium	2,261	1	102%	0	164	0.75	5	1	75,000	29%	71%	5	2	3.5	56,139	5	4		2	Declining GW levels in lower aquifer. Local GW Quality issues. On-going high volume of GW being extracted associated with surface water cutbacks from Klamath Project and GW transfers associated with Klamath Basin Agreement.		Interstate GW transfer issue. Strong SW-GW interaction and fisheries issues. Potential intra-basin issues associated with increased annual extraction.	GW Use based on Klamath Basin GW Transfers
1-2-02	KLAMATH RIVER VALLEY	LOWER KLAMATH	North Coast	75,333	7.8	Low	41	0	244%	0	17	0.75	0	0	21,424	51%	49%	3	3	3	18,926	3	1					GW Quality issues in refuge area. High temp and high TDS for deep wells.	
1-20	GARCIA RIVER VALLEY		North Coast	2,242	0.0	Very Low	119	1	100%	0	21	2.25	0	0	302	17%	83%	2	1	0	588	3					B118-03 reports sea water intrusion may be a problem due to connection to Pacific Ocean		
1-21	FORT BRAGG TERRACE AREA		North Coast	24,085	0.0	Very Low	12,517	2	100%	1	1,997	3.75	62	5	447	17%	83%	1	1	0	1,240	2	1					The terrace deposits between Ten Mile River and Laguna Point and Alder Creek and Point Area are susceptible to seawater intrusion. (B-118).	
1-22	FAIRCHILD SWAMP VALLEY		North Coast	3,278	0.0	Very Low	0	0	0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%	100%	0	0	0	0	0							
1-25	PRAIRIE CREEK AREA		North Coast	20,013	0.0	Very Low	4	0	50%	0	4	0.75	0	0	2	100%	0%	1	5	0	0	0							
1-26	REDWOOD CREEK AREA		North Coast	1,996	0.0	Very Low	234	1	93%	0	9	1.5	3	4	739	88%	12%	3	5	0	676	4							
1-27	BIG LAGOON AREA		North Coast	13,343	0.0	Very Low	2,465	1	119%	3	138	2.25	18	4	313	100%	0%	0	5	0	6	1							
1-28	MATTOLE RIVER VALLEY		North Coast	3,150	0.0	Very Low	72	1	103%	0	8	0.75	0	0	150	50%	50%	1	3	0	0	0					GW Use based on B118-03 data		
1-29	HONEYDEW TOWN AREA		North Coast	2,369	0.0	Very Low	19	0	89%	0	3	0.75	0	0	1	0%	100%	0	0	0	0	0							
1-3	BUTTE VALLEY		North Coast	79,689	15.5	Medium	1,464	1	106%	0	417	1.5	6	1	72,403	97%	3%	5	5	5	29,324	4	2		1	Some high TDS wells. Declining GW levels over the last 5-years and increases agricultural acreage.		Strong SW-GW interaction and reliance of GW for Meiss Lake wildlife area.	
1-30	PEPPERWOOD TOWN AREA		North Coast	6,288	0.0	Very Low	315	1	110%	0	15	0.75	0	0	1,000	66%	34%	2	4	0	1,010	3					GW Use based on B118-03 data		
1-31	WEDD TOWN AREA		North Coast	3,653	0.0	Very Low	364	1	135%	0	11	0.75	3	4	135	53%	47%	1	3	0	154	2							
1-32	GARBERVILLE TOWN AREA		North Coast	2,112	0.0	Very Low	1,391	2	114%	2	77	3.75	1	3	117	62%	38%	1	4	0	20	1							
1-33	LARABEE VALLEY		North Coast	967	0.0	Very Low	9	0	178%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%	100%	0	0	0	0	0							
1-34	DINSMORES TOWN AREA		North Coast	2,276	0.0	Very Low	183	1	127%	0	9	1.5	4	5	125	87%	13%	1	5	0	8	1					GW Use based on B118-03 data		
1-35	HYAMPOM VALLEY		North Coast	1,354	0.0	Very Low	52	1	212%	0	12	2.25	0	0	201	100%	0%	2	2	5	72	2							
1-36	HETTENSCHAW VALLEY		North Coast	846	0.0	Very Low	5	0	100%	0	6	1.5	0	0	1	0%	100%	0	0	0	680	5						GW Use based on B118-03 data	
1-37	COTTONNEVA CREEK VALLEY		North Coast	763	0.0	Very Low	1	0	100%	0	3	1.5	0	0	0	0%	100%	0	0	0	0	0							
1-38	LOWER LAYTONVILLE VALLEY		North Coast	2,152	0.0	Very Low	107	1	198%	0	32	2.25	0	0	2	1%	99%	1	1	0	150	2							
1-39	BRANSCOMB TOWN AREA		North Coast	1,381	0.0	Very Low	95	1	256%	0	22	3	0	0	1	1%	99%	1	1	0	23	1							
1-4	SHASTA VALLEY	SHASTA VALLEY	North Coast	52,589	20.3	Medium	5,333	1	153%	5	750	2.25	7	1	55,000	15%	85%	5	1	3	26,842	4	1		3	High Nitrates, ASAR, and TDS in portions of the basin. TMDL temperature issues along GW fed rivers.		Strong SW-GW interaction and significant local issues regarding GW mgmt. Basin underflow from Pluto's Cave Basalts and portions of debris flow contribute to surface water flow and low temps in the Shasta River, which supports threatened salmon population.	GW Use based on B118-03 data and Shasta Valley Water Inventory
1-40	TEN MILE RIVER VALLEY		North Coast	1,491	0.0	Very Low	61	1	272%	0	46	3	0	0	0	0%	100%	0	0	0	0	0					B118-03 reports sea water intrusion may be a problem due to connection to Pacific Ocean		
1-41	LITTLE VALLEY		North Coast	812	0.0	Very Low	11	1	100%	0	3	1.5	0	0	0	0%	100%	0	0	0	36	2							
1-42	SHERWOOD VALLEY		North Coast	1,150	0.0	Very Low	13	1	100%	0	7	1.5	0	0	0	0%	100%	0	0	0	0	0							
1-43	WILLIAMS VALLEY		North Coast	1,642	0.0	Very Low	2	0	100%	0	16	2.25	0	0	0	0%	100%	0	0	0	128	2							
1-44	EDEN VALLEY		North Coast	1,376	0.0	Very Low	0	0	0%	0	0	0	0	0	600	55%	45%	3	3	0	381	3							
1-45	BIG RIVER VALLEY		North Coast	1,685	0.0	Very Low	29	1	100%	0	7	1.5	4	5	0	0%	100%	0	0	0	0	0					B118-03 reports sea water intrusion may be a problem due to connection to Pacific Ocean		
1-46	NAVARRO RIVER VALLEY		North Coast	770	0.0	Very Low	36	1	114%	0	5	1.5	0	0	0	0%	100%	0	0	0	0	0					B118-03 reports sea water intrusion may be a problem due to connection to Pacific Ocean		
1-48	GRAVELLY VALLEY		North Coast	2,974	0.0	Very Low	6	0	133%	0	18	1.5	5	5	3	100%	0%	0	5	0	0	0					PubCom - GW Use and percent of water supplied by GW		
1-49	FM HIGHLANDS		North Coast	8,646	0.0	Very Low	233	1	127%	0	76	2.25	0	0	3	33%	67%	1	2	0	138	1							
1-5	SCOTT RIVER VALLEY		North Coast	63,780	15.3	Medium	3,520	1	144%	0	885	2.25	2	1	50,285	48%	52%	5	3	4	34,540	4		3				GW Basin contributes to surface water flow in the Scott River which supports an threatened/endangered salmon. Adjudicated basin. Currently being reviewed for Public Trust issues regarding GW management.	
1-50	KNIGHTS VALLEY		North Coast	4,086	0.0	Very Low	102	1	107%	0	62	2.25	0	0	502	62%	38%	2	4	0	1,727	4							
1-51	POTTER VALLEY		North Coast	8,237	0.0	Very Low	1,145	1	94%	0	363	3.75	1	1	6,045	57%	43%	0	0	0	4,423	4							
1-52	UKIAH VALLEY		North Coast	37,508	15.8	Medium	32,761	2	100%	1	1,689	3.75	29	3	7,500	32%	68%	2	2	2	9,361	3		1				2010 Ukiah Valley Water Supply Assessment expresses concerns regarding SWRCB assertion that all or most of the "groundwater" in the basin is, for legal purposes, underflow from the Russian River and associated tributaries...which support endangered fishery.	
1-53	SANEL VALLEY		North Coast	5,568	0.0	Very Low	698	1	103%	0	104	3	5	4	1,247	60%	40%	2	3	0	2,258	4							
1-54.01	ALEXANDER VALLEY	ALEXANDER AREA	North Coast	24,464	0.0	Very Low	2,098	1	93%	0	1,099	3.75	31	4	642	12%	88%	0	1	0	9,636	4							
1-54.02	ALEXANDER VALLEY	CLOVERDALE AREA	North Coast	6,525	0.0	Very Low	8,297	2	137%	4	592	3.75	16	5	759	59%	41%	2	3	0	2,339	4	1					Elevated Boron detected in 3 of 3 wells (B-118). Site in Southern Cloverdale is on the EPA's Superfund Priority List (MGM Brakes) VOCs detected in GW (EPA 1983).	
1-55.01	SANTA ROSA VALLEY																												

Basin Subbasin ID	Basin Name	Subbasin Name	Hydrologic Name	Basin - Subbasin Area (acre)	Total Rank Scoring	Final Priority	Population (2010)	Final Population Rank	Population Growth %	Final Population Growth Rank	Total Wells	Final Well Rank (discounted)	Total Public Supply Wells	Final Public Supply Well Rank	Groundwater Volume (Ac-Ft)	% of total water supply supplied by groundwater	% of total water supply supplied by surface water	Final groundwater volume rank	Final % of total water supply supplied by groundwater rank	Final groundwater Reliance rank	Irrigated Acreage	Final Irrigated Acreage Rank	Impact Ranks	Impact Comments	Other Information Rank	Other Information Comments	Additional Comments		
1-56	MCDOWELL VALLEY		North Coast	1,486	0.0	Very Low	106	1	100%	0	48	3.75	0	0	307	60%	40%	2	3	0	664	4							
1-57	BODEGA BAY AREA		North Coast	2,676	0.0	Very Low	719	1	106%	0	58	3	6	5	410	100%	0%	2	5	0	0	0					GW Use based on report by Bodega Bay PUD for 1994 - 1999, average. Sea water intrusion possibility due to contact with Pacific Ocean		
1-59	WILSON GROVE FORMATION HIGHLANDS		North Coast	86,400	0.0	Very Low	37,799	2	92%	0	8,422	3.75	92	4	3,417	23%	77%	0	0	0	10,404	2							
1-6	HAYFORK VALLEY		North Coast	3,295	0.0	Very Low	814	1	133%	0	67	3	0	0	1,019	100%	0%	3	5	0	337	2							
1-60	LOWER RUSSIAN RIVER VALLEY		North Coast	6,640	0.0	Very Low	3,754	2	117%	2	188	3	38	5	106	11%	89%	2	1	0	1,219	3	1				Brackish water found in wells near the Russian River from the river mouth to below Duncan Mills (5 to 6 miles). During a period of extremely low streamflow, saline water might extend 10 miles upstream from river mouth to Monte Rio.(B-118).		
1-61	FORT ROSS TERRACE DEPOSITS		North Coast	8,483	0.0	Very Low	1,075	1	115%	2	176	3	13	4	37	67%	33%	1	4	0	0	0	1				Seawater intrusion is not a common problem but it has occurred in localized areas near Point Arena and Iverson Point (DWR 1982). The Terrace deposits between Alder Creek and Point Arena are susceptible to seawater intrusion (DWR 1982, & B-118).		
1-62	WILSON POINT AREA		North Coast	709	0.0	Very Low	14	1	171%	0	0	0	0	0	100	100%	0%	2	5	0	36	2							
1-7	HOOPA VALLEY		North Coast	3,894	0.0	Very Low	1,797	2	110%	2	42	2.25	0	0	338	30%	70%	1	2	0	302	2							
1-8.01	MAD RIVER VALLEY	MAD RIVER LOWLAND	North Coast	13,981	0.0	Very Low	14,204	2	114%	2	375	3	1	1	6,400	20%	80%	0	0	0	1,162	2						1) Changed GW Use from 1664 to 6400 af/yr, based on B118-03 data. 2) Swapped the physical details between .01 and .02 subbasins. Physical details on the basins have always been backward since 2003	
1-8.02	MAD RIVER VALLEY	DOWS PRAIRIE SCHOOL AREA	North Coast	25,570	0.0	Very Low	23,086	2	103%	1	555	3	12	3	2,200	90%	10%	0	0	0	8,347	4						1) Changed GW Use from 5114 to 2200 af/yr based on B118-03. 2) Swapped the physical details between .01 and .02 subbasins. (http://www.water.ca.gov/groundwater/bulletin118/north_coast.cfm).	
1-9	EUREKA PLAIN		North Coast	37,405	0.0	Very Low	50,231	2	106%	1	878	3	5	1	4,600	76%	24%	2	4	0	6,811	3						New LWU data indicates GW use of 11K/yr. Urban GW (6,336 AF) is supplied from outside the basin. Not counted in total.	
2-1	PETALUMA VALLEY		San Francisco Bay	46,043	18.3	Medium	49,915	2	123%	3	1,870	3.75	27	3	2,689	26%	74%	1	2	1.5	9,270	3	2				Widespread and serious nitrate contamination affecting shallow wells in the upland area NW of Petaluma. Generally poor quality GW south of Petaluma. Potential for seawater intrusion in tidal reaches. Increasing MTBE contamination.(B-118 unpublished data).		
2-10	LIVERMORE VALLEY		San Francisco Bay	69,531	17.3	Medium	196,658	3	124%	3	4,632	3.75	32	3	5,692	30%	70%	1	2	1.5	6,347	2	1				Some areas have boron concentrations exceeding 2 mg/L (B-118 & Sorenson et. al. 1985).		
2-11	SUNOL VALLEY		San Francisco Bay	16,623	0.0	Very Low	808	1	141%	0	213	2.25	0	0	509	41%	59%	1	3	0	405	1							
2-19	KENWOOD VALLEY		San Francisco Bay	5,135	0.0	Very Low	6,057	2	107%	1	424	3.75	12	5	136	8%	92%	1	1	0	1,093	3							
2-2.01	NAPA-SONOMA VALLEY	NAPA VALLEY	San Francisco Bay	45,895	20.8	Medium	91,234	3	108%	1	3,960	3.75	76	5	20,000	58%	42%	3	3	3	20,510	4	1					GW Use based on data from 2005 Napa Co GW Hydrology report.	
2-2.02	NAPA-SONOMA VALLEY	SONOMA VALLEY	San Francisco Bay	44,626	16.3	Medium	31,275	2	103%	1	2,242	3.75	31	3	2,523	20%	80%	1	2	1.5	15,382	4	1				Brackish water occurs in deposits near San Pablo Bay and along the tidal portions of Sonoma creek. RWQCB reports 43 underground fuel tank leaks have occurred in the basin (unpublished B-118 data) (Ludhorff & Scalmanini, 1999).		
2-2.03	NAPA-SONOMA VALLEY	NAPA-SONOMA LOWLANDS	San Francisco Bay	40,455	0.0	Very Low	58,367	2	99%	0	1,127	3	12	2	1,062	16%	84%	2	1	0	5,159	2							
2-22	HALF MOON BAY TERRACE		San Francisco Bay	9,189	0.0	Very Low	19,825	3	125%	3	1,031	3.75	17	5	603	56%	44%	1	3	0	1,739	3							
2-24	SAN GREGORIO VALLEY		San Francisco Bay	1,074	0.0	Very Low	66	1	100%	0	14	2.25	0	0	0	0%	100%	0	0	0	247	3							
2-26	PESCADERO VALLEY		San Francisco Bay	2,904	0.0	Very Low	571	1	108%	0	76	3	3	4	0	0%	100%	0	0	0	473	3							
2-27	SAND POINT AREA		San Francisco Bay	1,405	0.0	Very Low	43	1	109%	0	2	0.75	3	5	2	70%	30%	1	4	0	0	0							
2-28	ROSS VALLEY		San Francisco Bay	1,763	0.0	Very Low	7,194	4	109%	2	36	3	0	0	0	0%	100%	0	0	0	6	1							
2-29	SAN RAFAEL VALLEY		San Francisco Bay	874	0.0	Very Low	10,153	5	103%	1	155	3.75	0	0	0	0%	100%	0	0	0	0	0							
2-3	SUISUN-FAIRFIELD VALLEY		San Francisco Bay	133,505	0.0	Very Low	136,754	2	145%	5	1,613	2.25	11	1	6,655	28%	72%	0	0	0	11,899	2							
2-30	NOVATO VALLEY		San Francisco Bay	20,519	0.0	Very Low	42,516	3	109%	2	844	3.75	0	0	2,700	46%	54%	0	0	0	3,642	3							
2-31	ARROYO DEL HAMBRE VALLEY		San Francisco Bay	786	0.0	Very Low	3,230	4	81%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%	100%	0	0	0	0	0							
2-32	VISITACION VALLEY		San Francisco Bay	5,827	0.0	Very Low	31,853	4	138%	4	210	3.75	0	0	10	5%	95%	0	1	0	0	0							
2-33	ISLAIS VALLEY		San Francisco Bay	5,937	0.0	Very Low	131,576	5	105%	1	126	3	0	0	0	0%	100%	0	0	0	0	0							
2-35	WESTSIDE		San Francisco Bay	25,386	0.0	Very Low	351,235	5	111%	2	1,761	3.75	22	4	8,564	30%	70%	0	0	0	44	1							
2-36	SAN PEDRO VALLEY		San Francisco Bay	702	0.0	Very Low	5,956	5	92%	0	50	3.75	0	0	0	0%	100%	0	0	0	4	1					PubCom - GW Use and % of water supplied by GW		
2-37	SOUTH SAN FRANCISCO		San Francisco Bay	2,175	0.0	Very Low	38,861	5	105%	1	106	3.75	0	0	0	0%	100%	0	0	0	0	0							
2-38	LOBOS		San Francisco Bay	2,359	0.0	Very Low	59,119	5	97%	0	24	2.25	0	0	0	0%	100%	0	0	0	0	0	1					Limited water quality data but basins beneath the entire San Francisco peninsula are similar (Phillips et.al. 1993). May contain high concentrations of nitrates, chloride, boron and TDS.(B-118)	
2-39	MARINA		San Francisco Bay	2,186	0.0	Very Low	45,294	5	96%	0	26	2.25	0	0	0	0%	100%	0	0	0	0	0	1					Limited water quality data but basins beneath the entire San Francisco peninsula are similar (Phillips et.al. 1993). May contain high concentrations of nitrates, chloride, boron and TDS.(B-118)	
2-4	PITTSBURG PLAIN		San Francisco Bay	11,607	0.0	Very Low	68,898	4	119%	3	1,044	3.75	10	4	1,845	10%	90%	2	1	1	0	0						GW Use based on GWMP. Averaged used	
2-40	DOWNTOWN		San Francisco Bay	7,635	0.0	Very Low	323,721	5	104%	1	336	3.75	0	0	0	0%	100%	0	0	0	0	0	1						Groundwater is subject to high concentrations of nitrates, chloride, boron and TDS (B-118) & (Phillips et.al. 1993).
2-5	CLAYTON VALLEY		San Francisco Bay	17,836	0.0	Very Low	73,287	4	102%	1	828	3.75	3	2	189	15%	85%	1	1	0	29	1							
2-6	YGNACIO VALLEY		San Francisco Bay	15,459	0.0	Very Low	107,878	5	107%	1	1,607	3.75	3	2	131	8%	92%	1	1	0	6	1	1						Hydrographs created from DWR well data indicate groundwater levels have declined gradually over the period of record.(B-118)
2-7	SAN RAMON VALLEY		San Francisco Bay	7,053	0.0	Very Low	30,112	4	112%	2	351	3.75	0	0	33	6%	94%	1	1	0	26	1							
2-8	CASTRO VALLEY		San Francisco Bay	1,821	0.0	Very Low	24,486	5	99%	0	244	3.75	0	0	39	11%	89%	2	1	0	0	0							
2-9.01	SANTA CLARA VALLEY	NILES CONE	San Francisco Bay	57,906	19.8	Medium	321,494	4	107%	1	6,051	3.75	25	3	29,600	60%	40%	4	4	4	914	1	3					GW Use based on B118-03 data. GW percentage is updated based on PubCom	
2-9.02	SANTA CLARA VALLEY	SANTA CLARA	San Francisco Bay	190,235	20.3	Medium	1,633,190	5	115%	2	46,423	3.75	220	4	150,000	69%	31%	5	4	4.5	3	0	1					Areas with elevated mineral levels have been observed in the northern basin (SCVWD 2001). Elevated nitrate in some wells in the southern portion of the Basin (SCVWD).	
2-9.03	SANTA CLARA VALLEY	SAN MATEO PLAIN	San Francisco Bay	37,708	0.0	Very Low	291,899	5	121%	3	2,611	3.75	9	2	1,987	14%	86%	0	0	1	97	1	1					2003 Water Board Study of South Bay GW basins	
2-9.04	SANTA CLARA VALLEY	EAST BAY PLAIN	San Francisco Bay	77,292	14.8	Medium	881,718	5	102%	1	9,892	3.75	4	1	3,350	10%	90%	0	0	1	68	1	2					SFRWQCB (1999) identified 13 locations as areas of major groundwater pollution. Most contamination appears to be restricted to the upper 50 feet of the subsurface. (B-118) & (RWQCB 1999).	

Basin Subbasin ID	Basin Name	Subbasin Name	Hydrologic Name	Basin - Subbasin Area (acre)	Total Rank Scoring	Final Priority	Population (2010)	Final Population Rank	Population Growth %	Final Population Growth Rank	Total Wells	Final Well Rank (discounted)	Total Public Supply Wells	Final Public Supply Well Rank	Groundwater Volume (Ac-Ft)	% of total water supply supplied by groundwater	% of total water supply supplied by surface water	Final groundwater volume rank	Final % of total water supply supplied by groundwater rank	Final groundwater Reliance rank	Irrigated Acreage	Final Irrigated Acreage Rank	Impact Ranks	Impact Comments	Other Information Rank	Other Information Comments	Additional Comments	
3-1	SOQUEL VALLEY		Central Coast	2,515	22.3	High	18,634	5	116%	2	172	3.75	10	5	6,890	63%	37%	5	4	4.5	26	1	1	Water quality degradation, saline intrusion issues.			GW Use based on B118-03 data.	
3-12	SANTA MARIA		Central Coast	184,248	24.0	High	201,759	2	127%	3	1,234	1.5	179	4	138,510	77%	23%	5	4	4.5	115,386	5	4	due to farming practices.				
3-13	CUYAMA VALLEY		Central Coast	242,114	13.8	Medium	1,236	0	101%	0	248	0.75	12	1	69,160	100%	0%	3	5	4	26,023	2	3	Local salinity and TDS impairments in basin (B-118)	3	Declining Groundwater levels of 150-300' over the last 40-50 years (DWR, 1998). Conservation Assessment by TNC (2009) indicates annual GW budget deficit of ~ 28,500 af	GW Use based on B118-03 data.	
3-14	SAN ANTONIO CREEK VALLEY		Central Coast	81,941	15.0	Medium	2,279	1	126%	0	362	1.5	12	1	16,000	100%	0%	2	5	3.5	11,614	2	4	Overdraft, water quality degradation.	2	Santa Barbara Water Element, Table 1, p.10, indicates San Antonio basin overdraft by ~ 9,000 af/yr	GW Use based on B118-03 data and 2009 Santa Barbara Water Element	
3-15	SANTA YNEZ RIVER VALLEY		Central Coast	204,642	17.3	Medium	75,460	1	103%	1	1,854	2.25	108	3	77,114	98%	2%	3	5	4	38,242	3	3	Overdraft has been documented by the county in the past. Also some groundwater quality impairments.				
3-16	GOLETA		Central Coast	9,229	18.8	Medium	47,252	4	108%	1	366	3.75	31	5	3,000	11%	89%	3	1	2	1,083	2		1	Estimated overdraft for the north-central portion of the basin ins estimated at 1,180 af/yr (Santa Barbara Water Conservation Element, 2009)	Overdraft of this basin is not projected to continue as a result of the court judgement in the Wright vs Goleta Water District lawsuit. 5/7/14 - GWD GWMP (2010) indicates ~3000AF of combined GW pumping in the basin. For GWD, it represents 14% of supply.		
3-17	SANTA BARBARA		Central Coast	6,173	0.0	Very Low	63,966	5	98%	0	425	3.75	7	4	1,162	10%	90%	2	1	0	23	1	2	Water Quality Impacts: Saline intrusion, locally high EC, hardness, hydrogen sulfides, and other constituents. (B-118)			5/7/14 - The city used 662AF of GW in 2013 and private pumpers another 500AF (City of SB, WSMR - Jan 2014)	
3-18	CARPINTERIA		Central Coast	8,140	0.0	Very Low	14,561	3	86%	0	98	2.25	9	4	1,387	14%	86%	2	1	0	4,565	5						
3-19	CARRIZO PLAIN		Central Coast	210,896	0.0	Very Low	440	0	116%	0	18	0.75	1	1	91	0%	100%	0	1	0	18,500	2						
3-2	PAJARO VALLEY		Central Coast	88,062	24.8	High	114,282	2	111%	2	3,523	3.75	135	4	67,000	98%	2%	5	5	5	29,650	4	4	PVWMD 2011 Annual Report indicates that Pajaro Valley GW basin remains in significant overdraft, with continuing seawater intrusion and GW storage depletion.			NRO: B118-03 GW use estimate = 67 TAF. Harkins Slugh managed aquifer recharge and recovery facility started operation in 2011 with 250 AF of recharge.	
3-20	ANO NUEVO AREA		Central Coast	2,030	0.0	Very Low	46	1	93%	0	12	1.5	2	4	100	100%	0%	1	5	0	399	3						
3-21	SANTA CRUZ PURISIMA FORMATION		Central Coast	40,166	14.3	Medium	17,693	2	88%	0	1,399	3.75	20	3	15,000	79%	21%	3	4	3.5	531	1		1	Basin comprises the highland area east of Santa Cruz and serves as a forebay to Pajaro, Soquel, and Terrace Basins to the west...which are in various stages of overdraft.			
3-22	SANTA ANA VALLEY		Central Coast	2,724	0.0	Very Low	76	1	105%	0	25	2.25	0	0	1,623	100%	0%	4	5	0	1,486	4						
3-23	UPPER SANTA ANA VALLEY		Central Coast	1,431	0.0	Very Low	5	0	300%	0	0	0	0	0	2	100%	0%	1	5	0	0	0						
3-24	QUIEN SABE VALLEY		Central Coast	4,706	0.0	Very Low	5	0	300%	0	0	0	0	0	1	0%	100%	1	1	0	1,142	3						
3-25	TRES PINOS VALLEY		Central Coast	3,385	0.0	Very Low	48	1	113%	0	34	2.25	5	4	1,806	100%	0%	4	5	0	1,519	4						
3-26	WEST SANTA CRUZ TERRACE		Central Coast	7,863	20.8	Medium	70,336	5	104%	1	419	3.75	4	3	4,036	64%	36%	4	4	4	221	1	2	Water quality degradation	1	Low GW use, but basin at high risk of seawater intrusion due to thin alluvial aquifer and dependency on up-gradient users to maintain positive westward flow conditions (2005, Santa Cruz UWMP).	Potential for seawater intrusion due to reversal of GW gradients to the east. Future use of Live Oak wells (2 mgd) is in jeopardy if drought conditions change gradient and induce seawater intrusion...current conditions are in balance but close.	
3-27	SCOTTS VALLEY		Central Coast	773	0.0	Very Low	3,875	4	101%	1	337	3.75	3	5	285	0%	100%	3	0	0	0	0	4	Overdraft and water quality issues associated with contaminated sites within the basin.				
3-28	SAN BENITO RIVER VALLEY		Central Coast	24,223	0.0	Very Low	101	0	102%	0	46	0.75	7	2	946	100%	0%	1	5	0	795	1						
3-29	DRY LAKE VALLEY		Central Coast	1,416	0.0	Very Low	8	0	150%	0	0	0	0	0	201	100%	0%	2	5	0	125	2						
3-3.01	GILROY-HOLLISTER VALLEY	LAGAS AREA	Central Coast	55,967	25.8	High	91,706	3	113%	2	5,537	3.75	94	5	44,000	90%	10%	5	5	5	36,140	5	2	Nitrate has impacted a significant number of private domestic wells across the Llagas Subbasin due to historic and ongoing sources including agricultural activities and septic systems, Perchlorate is also a problem				
3-3.02	GILROY-HOLLISTER VALLEY	BOLSA AREA	Central Coast	20,912	16.3	Medium	2,935	1	105%	1	229	2.25	3	1	2,200	25%	75%	2	2	2	13,051	5	4	Water quality degradation, overdraft.			2012 Groundwater reports for San BenitoWD show stable GW levels and average pumping of 2,200 per year for Bolsa area.	
3-3.03	GILROY-HOLLISTER VALLEY	HOLLISTER AREA	Central Coast	32,729	17.5	Medium	22,013	2	106%	1	731	3	33	4	14,299	75%	25%	3	4	3.5	14,342	4						
3-3.04	GILROY-HOLLISTER VALLEY	SAN JUAN BAUTISTA AREA	Central Coast	74,305	16.8	Medium	26,150	1	108%	1	790	2.25	57	3	13,530	80%	20%	2	5	3.5	11,313	2	4	Poor water quality due to high TDS.				
3-30	BITTER WATER VALLEY		Central Coast	32,221	0.0	Very Low	38	0	111%	0	18	0.75	0	0	3,023	100%	0%	0	0	0	2,557	2						
3-31	HERNANDEZ VALLEY		Central Coast	2,865	0.0	Very Low	3	0	300%	0	10	1.5	0	0	0	0%	100%	0	0	0	0	0						
3-32	PEACH TREE VALLEY		Central Coast	9,791	0.0	Very Low	7	0	157%	0	3	0.75	0	0	902	100%	0%	1	5	0	1,193	2						
3-33	SAN CARPOFORO VALLEY		Central Coast	1,054	0.0	Very Low	4	0	100%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%	100%	0	0	0	0	0						
3-34	ARROYO DE LA CRUZ VALLEY		Central Coast	1,028	0.0	Very Low	1	0	300%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%	100%	0	0	0	252	3						
3-35	SAN SIMEON VALLEY		Central Coast	560	0.0	Very Low	9	1	56%	0	0	0	8	5	1,010	10%	90%	5	1	0	158	3					GW Use based on B118-03 data	
3-36	SANTA ROSA VALLEY		Central Coast	3,525	0.0	Very Low	920	1	110%	0	0	0	1	2	5,900	8%	92%	0	0	0	1,196	4					GW Use based on B118-03 data	
3-37	VILLA VALLEY		Central Coast	1,358	0.0	Very Low	21	1	124%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%	100%	0	0	0	461	4						
3-38	CAYUCOS VALLEY		Central Coast	336	0.0	Very Low	3	0	167%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%	100%	0	0	0	15	2						
3-39	OLD VALLEY		Central Coast	1,179	0.0	Very Low	217	1	62%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%	100%	0	0	0	58	2						
3-4.01	SALINAS VALLEY	180/400 FOOT AQUIFER	Central Coast	84,321	24.0	High	55,740	2	99%	0	2,443	3	126	4	130,000	100%	99%	5	5	5	57,746	5	5	Coastal basin with saline intrusion in both 180-Foot and 400 Foot aquifers due to excessive GW pumping			GW Use based on B118-03 data	
3-4.02	SALINAS VALLEY	EAST SIDE AQUIFER	Central Coast	57,452	27.0	High	128,646	3	129%	4	1,587	3	61	4	86,000	100%	0%	5	5	5	35,445	5	3	Overdraft conditions in basin, high TDS and Nitrates exceeding drinking water standards in portions of the basin			GW Use based on B118-03 data	
3-4.04	SALINAS VALLEY	FOREBAY AQUIFER	Central Coast	94,025	17.3	Medium	43,867	2	105%	1	935	2.25	34	2	160,000	100%	0%	5	5	5	60,146	5					GW Use based on B118-03 data	
3-4.05	SALINAS VALLEY	UPPER VALLEY AQUIFER	Central Coast	98,164	15.5	Medium	15,862	1	103%	1	525	1.5	20	2	125,000	100%	0%	5	5	5	51,574	4	1	Poor quality water along the eastern side of subbasin. PSW above MCL for inorganics and Nitrates (B-118).			GW Use based on 2011 MC WMA Annual Report. No data on %GW	
3-4.06	SALINAS VALLEY	PASO ROBLES AREA	Central Coast	597,241	23.3	High	56,077	1	137%	4	440	0.75	132	2	120,215	100%	0%	2	5	3.5	101,763	3	4	Nitrate and TDS impacts to groundwater (B-118)	5	County groundwater ordinance banning further residential development in basin.		
3-4.08	SALINAS VALLEY	SEASIDE AREA	Central Coast	25,903	20.8	Medium	65,899	3	100%	0	902	3.75	29	4	11,135	100%	0%	3	5	4	758	1	5	Seawater intrusion in coastal basin due to excessive pumping				
3-4.09	SALINAS VALLEY	LANGLEY AREA	Central Coast	15,344	18.8	Medium	9,833	2	104%	1	1,136	3.75	71	5	13,000	100%	0%	5	5	5	2,084	2						
3-4.10	SALINAS VALLEY	CORRAL DE TIERRA AREA	Central Coast	22,274	15.0	Medium	7,831	1	122%	3	449	3	21	4	10,000	100%	0%	3	5	4	0	0						
3-40	TORO VALLEY		Central Coast	722	0.0	Very Low	8	1	100%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%	100%	0	0	0	166	3						
3-41	MORRO VALLEY		Central Coast	646	0.0	Very Low	399	2	99%	0	0	0	7	5	0	0%	100%	0	0	0	749	5						
3-42	CHORRO VALLEY		Central Coast	1,547	0.0	Very Low	247	1	99%	0	0	0	1	3	0	0%	100%	0	0	0	1,123	5						
3-43	RINCONADA VALLEY		Central Coast	2,579	0.0	Very Low	11	0	136%	0	0	0	0	0	2	0%	100%	1	1	0	973	4						
3-44	POZO VALLEY		Central Coast	6,852	0.0	Very Low	52	0	96%	0	0	0	9	4	11	2%	98%	1	1	0	504	2						
3-45	HUASNA VALLEY		Central Coast	4,706	0.0	Very Low	55	1	73%	0	2	0.75	0	0	14	1%	99%	0	1	0	580	2						
3-46	RAFAEL VALLEY		Central Coast	2,996	0.0	Very Low	0	0	0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%	100%	0	0	0	0	0						

Basin Subbasin ID	Basin Name	Subbasin Name	Hydrologic Name	Basin - Subbasin Area (acre)	Total Rank Scoring	Final Priority	Population (2010)	Final Population Rank	Population Growth %	Final Population Growth Rank	Total Wells	Final Well Rank (discounted)	Total Public Supply Wells	Final Public Supply Well Rank	Groundwater Volume (Ac-Ft)	% of total water supply supplied by groundwater	% of total water supply supplied by surface water	Final groundwater volume rank	Final % of total water supply supplied by groundwater rank	Final groundwater Reliance rank	Irrigated Acreage	Final Irrigated Acreage Rank	Impact Ranks	Impact Comments	Other Information Rank	Other Information Comments	Additional Comments
3-6	LOCKWOOD VALLEY		Central Coast	59,933	0.0	Very Low	1,171	1	173%	0	446	1.5	15	2	4,565	100%	0%	0	0	0	3,677	2					
3-7	CARMEL VALLEY		Central Coast	5,151	22.8	High	5,086	2	121%	3	331	3.75	20	5	9,500	100%	0%	5	5	5	557	2	1	Excessive pumping of Cal-Am wells caused basin overdraft and Carmel River to dry, leading to court order.	1	SW-GW Interaction Issue. Cal-Am Water Company court ordered to reduce 2/3rds of diversions from Carmel River.	GW use from B118-03 data
3-8	LOS OSOS VALLEY		Central Coast	6,994	22.0	High	13,948	3	99%	0	0	0	25	5	2,100	40%	60%	3	3	3	2,215	4	5	Documented saline intrusion due to "serious" overdraft, also nitrate impairment.	2	Interlocutory Stipulated Judgment against water suppliers and purveyors in basin and proceeding with adjudication. Also add one point due to total well count error for this basin.	GW use from B118-03 data
3-9	SAN LUIS OBISPO VALLEY		Central Coast	12,724	19.5	Medium	18,834	2	108%	1	0	0	56	5	5,000	60%	40%	3	4	3.5	5,211	4	3	Overdraft Conditions	1	While only 18,000 may live in the actual basin, over 45,000 (2010 census) rely on the basin for 2/3rds of their drinking water.	GW use from B118-03 data
4-1	UPPER OJAI VALLEY		South Coast	3,815	0.0	Very Low	616	1	89%	0	7	0.75	1	2	13	1%	99%	1	1	0	1,043	3	5	Groundwater has been documented to contain high levels of boron, sodium chloride, high TDS, sulfate, nitrates, iron, and chlorides (B-118).			
4-10	CONEJO		South Coast	18,848	13.0	Low	96,704	4	115%	2	103	1.5	2	1	2,029	52%	48%	2	3	2.5	1	1	1	Locally high TDS in basin and one well with nitrate levels above MCL (B-118).			
4-11.01	COASTAL PLAIN OF LOS ANGELES	SANTA MONICA	South Coast	31,846	19.3	Medium	465,606	5	121%	3	1,586	3.75	10	2	3,500	42%	58%	2	3	2.5	0	0	3	MTBE contamination has led to significant reduction in groundwater production and locally high TDS.			GW Use based on 2011-12 MWD report
4-11.02	COASTAL PLAIN OF LOS ANGELES	HOLLYWOOD	South Coast	10,108	0.0	Very Low	250,649	5	97%	0	505	3.75	7	3	1,800	42%	58%	2	3	0	0	0	1	MWD lists some TDS and VOC water quality issues.			GW Use based on 2011-12 MWD report
4-11.03	COASTAL PLAIN OF LOS ANGELES	WEST COAST	South Coast	93,795	20.8	Medium	1,195,195	5	106%	1	4,221	3.75	45	3	43,920	42%	58%	3	3	3	0	0	5	Basin in overdraft since 1960's. Adjudicated basin. Saline intrusion problem and a seawater barrier project is in effect to reduce seawater intrusion.			GW Use based on WRD data per 2011 Engineering Report.
4-11.04	COASTAL PLAIN OF LOS ANGELES	CENTRAL	South Coast	180,357	24.8	High	3,052,303	5	111%	2	6,752	3.75	428	5	197,387	42%	58%	5	3	4	0	0	5	Basin was adjudicated in the early 1960's due to overdraft. Several public supply wells are known to be impacted by various water quality issues.			GW Use based on WRD data per 2011 Engineering Report.
4-12	SAN FERNANDO VALLEY		South Coast	145,354	19.8	Medium	1,745,338	5	120%	3	1,909	2.25	102	3	108,500	13%	87%	4	1	2.5	0	0	3	Several public supply wells have shown contamination per Bulletin 118.	1	Basin is adjudicated.	GW Use based on B118-03 data
4-13	SAN GABRIEL VALLEY		South Coast	127,278	21.3	High	1,275,187	5	104%	1	1,587	2.25	404	5	218,696	56%	44%	5	3	4	0	0	3	Superfund sites are present within the basin and other areas with water quality impacts are known.	1	Adjudication (aka Six Basins)	PubCom - Similar issues with WQ in Raymond (4-23) that had a higher "Documented Impacts" value. Made both the same value of 3
4-15	TIERRA REJADA		South Coast	4,611	0.0	Very Low	3,673	2	127%	3	3	0.75	0	0	77	3%	97%	1	1	0	1,598	4	1	Locally high nitrates documented in the basin (B-118).			
4-16	HIDDEN VALLEY		South Coast	2,217	0.0	Very Low	503	1	102%	0	15	1.5	2	4	11	0%	100%	1	1	0	1,271	5					
4-17	LOCKWOOD VALLEY		South Coast	21,841	11.3	Low	241	1	112%	0	35	0.75	1	1	3,500	89%	11%	2	5	3.5	0	0	5	Boron, arsenic, and radioactive uranium in some wells (B-118).			
4-18	HUNGRY VALLEY		South Coast	5,324	0.0	Very Low	2	0	0%	0	0	0	1	2	0	0%	100%	0	0	0	0	0	1	Water is slightly alkaline (B-118).			
4-19	THOUSAND OAKS AREA		South Coast	3,115	0.0	Very Low	17,202	4	103%	1	41	2.25	0	0	242	50%	50%	1	3	0	0	0	5	High TDS, alkalinity, and hardness in the basin (B-118).			
4-2	OJAI VALLEY		South Coast	6,851	18.5	Medium	8,268	2	94%	0	50	1.5	7	4	5,873	97%	3%	5	5	5	2,614	4	2	High nitrates and sulfates reported in the basin. Medium to high levels of nitrates reported in the basin.			
4-20	RUSSELL VALLEY		South Coast	3,087	0.0	Very Low	18,860	4	93%	0	12	1.5	0	0	600	3%	97%	2	1	0	0	0	3	TDS and sulfate exceed MCL for some wells in the basin per Bulletin 118.			GW Use based on B118-03 data
4-22	MALIBU VALLEY		South Coast	615	0.0	Very Low	563	2	100%	0	34	3.75	0	0	0	0%	100%	0	0	0	0	0	5	Saline intrusion, high TDS and chlorides have been documented.			
4-23	RAYMOND		South Coast	26,310	20.8	Medium	223,100	5	112%	2	33	0.75	79	5	59,000	85%	15%	5	5	5	0	0	3	Water quality impacts and a superfund.			GW Use based on watermaster report. PubCom - Similar issues with WQ in San Gabriel (4-13) that had a lower "Documented Impacts" value. Made both the same value of 3.
4-3.01	VENTURA RIVER VALLEY	UPPER VENTURA RIVER	South Coast	7,430	18.3	Medium	15,961	3	83%	0	20	0.75	23	5	4,000	90%	10%	4	5	4.5	1,125	2	3	TDS is known to be high in some parts of the basin (B-118).			GW Use based on 'average' found in CASGEM monitoring plan
4-3.02	VENTURA RIVER VALLEY	LOWER VENTURA RIVER	South Coast	5,312	0.0	Very Low	15,920	3	102%	1	45	2.25	0	0	331	23%	77%	1	2	0	379	2	3	Oil, high sulfates, nitrates, and hydrogen sulfide are documented to be present in the basin.			
4-4.02	SANTA CLARA RIVER VALLEY	OXNARD	South Coast	58,200	26.8	High	235,973	4	122%	3	147	0.75	68	4	77,036	94%	6%	5	5	5	49,616	5	5	Saline intrusion, nitrates, pesticides, and PCBs have impacted some water wells per (B-118).			
4-4.03	SANTA CLARA RIVER VALLEY	MOUND	South Coast	14,846	17.3	Medium	77,886	4	111%	2	126	2.25	2	1	7,330	83%	17%	3	5	4	3,487	3	1	Some primary and secondary inorganic contaminants above the MCL (B-118).			
4-4.04	SANTA CLARA RIVER VALLEY	SANTA PAULA	South Coast	22,899	20.5	Medium	46,816	3	109%	1	79	1.5	13	3	25,940	97%	3%	5	5	5	12,014	4	3	Nitrates can fluctuate significantly in the basin, and above MCL. Other inorganics present above MCL. TDS is known to be high.			GW Use based on 'average' found in CASGEM monitoring plan
4-4.05	SANTA CLARA RIVER VALLEY	FILLMORE	South Coast	20,842	20.8	Medium	16,417	2	116%	2	56	0.75	22	4	44,350	99%	1%	0	0	5	12,720	5	2	Many groundwater quality impairments in the basin; Nitrates problematic during dry periods; High TDS, etc. (B-118). PubCom indicted WQ is localized and being managed			GW Use based on 'average' found in CASGEM monitoring plan
4-4.06	SANTA CLARA RIVER VALLEY	PIRU	South Coast	8,915	21.8	High	2,666	1	129%	4	20	0.75	5	3	12,490	80%	20%	5	5	5	4,977	5	3	GW Quality impacts: nitrates, storm runoff, leaking tanks, etc. (B-118). High Selenium and other inorganics, average TDS was 1450 mg/l (Ventura co 2011 annual GW report)			GW Use based on 'average' found in CASGEM monitoring plan
4-4.07	SANTA CLARA RIVER VALLEY	SANTA CLARA RIVER VALLEY EAST	South Coast	66,417	22.8	High	221,204	3	231%	5	527	2.25	71	4	35,000	15%	85%	4	1	2.5	63	1	5	GW Quality Impacts: Nitrates, TCE, TDS, perchlorates, etc. (B-118)			GW Use based on B118-03 data
4-5	ACTON VALLEY		South Coast	8,300	0.0	Very Low	2,280	1	138%	4	230	3	16	5	1,540	25%	75%	2	2	0	0	0	1	Locally high concentrations of TDS, sulfate, and chloride and two wells in the basin with known concentrations of nitrates exceeding MCL (B-118).			GW Use based on B118-03 data
4-6	PLEASANT VALLEY		South Coast	21,654	22.5	High	69,392	3	126%	3	71	1.5	17	4	18,000	85%	15%	5	5	5	17,309	5	1	PC - Discharge of poor quality GW from dewatering wells and effluent discharge from the wastewater treatment facility into the Arroyo Simi have led to rising water levels in the basin along with higher TDS and Chloride levels.			GW Use based on B118-03 and CASGEM monitoring plan data
4-7	ARROYO SANTA ROSA VALLEY		South Coast	3,747	19.8	Medium	2,211	2	83%	0	6	0.75	5	4	4,246	99%	1%	5	5	5	2,368	5	3	Elevated sulfates, nitrates, and TDS in the basin.(B-118)			
4-8	LAS POSAS VALLEY		South Coast	42,353	22.3	High	39,835	2	118%	2	600	2.25	21	3	38,000	98%	2%	5	5	5	23,416	5	3	TDS is generally high in this basin. PubCom includes reports of subsidence, overdraft and saline intrusion (chloride from adjacent basin?)			GW Use based on 2012 Fox Canyon WMA Reports (tbl 2) GW extraction of East+South+West Las Posas PubCom - 600 wells
4-9	SIMI VALLEY		South Coast	12,192	13.3	Low	98,625	5	108%	1	10	0.75	3	2	2,069	49%	51%	2	3	2.5	96	1	1	VOCS, elevated TDS, and nitrates (B-118)			
5-1.01	GOOSE LAKE	GOOSE VALLEY	Sacramento River	35,966	0.0	Very Low	57	0	121%	0	86	0.75	0	0	8,512	31%	69%	0	0	0	14,360	4					
5-1.02	GOOSE LAKE	FANDANGO VALLEY	Sacramento River	18,439	0.0	Very Low	124	0	90%	0	73	1.5	2	1	4,025	32%	68%	0	0	0	6,830	4					
5-10	AMERICAN VALLEY		Sacramento River	6,799	0.0	Very Low	3,931	2	100%	0	348	3.75	12	5	1,501	15%	85%	2	1	0	2,802	4					
5-11	MOHAWK VALLEY		Sacramento River	18,987	0.0	Very Low	1,375	1	100%	0	344	3	11	3	607	13%	87%	1	1	0	1,469	2					
5-12.01	SIERRA VALLEY	SIERRA VALLEY	Sacramento River	117,680	19.5	Medium	2,196	1	100%	5	561	1.5	16	1	68,188	32%	68%	4	2	3	81,465	5	3	Declining GW Levels and artesian well production along the east and northeast side of the valley. Poor quality water in west-central side of valley (boron, fluoride, arsenic, & sodium).			
5-12.02	SIERRA VALLEY	CHILCOOT	Sacramento River	7,551	0.0	Very Low	308	1	102%	0	125	3	5	3	300	2%	98%	1	1	0	2,059	3					

Basin Subbasin ID	Basin Name	Subbasin Name	Hydrologic Name	Basin - Subbasin Area (acre)	Total Rank Scoring	Final Priority	Population (2010)	Final Population Rank	Population Growth %	Final Population Growth Rank	Total Wells	Final Well Rank (discounted)	Total Public Supply Wells	Final Public Supply Well Rank	Groundwater Volume (Ac-Ft)	% of total water supply supplied by groundwater	% of total water supply supplied by surface water	Final groundwater volume rank	Final % of total water supply supplied by groundwater rank	Final groundwater Reliance rank	Irrigated Acreage	Final Irrigated Acreage Rank	Impact Ranks	Impact Comments	Other Information Rank	Other Information Comments	Additional Comments
5-13	UPPER LAKE VALLEY		Sacramento River	7,260	0.0	Very Low	2,055	1	123%	3	367	3.75	9	4	5,400	68%	32%	0	0	0	2,880	4				PubCom - Changed irrigated acreage to 254 ac/sq. mi. groundwater use of 0.74 ac-ft/ac. Calculated Volume is 5400 Af-ft, 68% of the total supply coming from GW	
5-14	SCOTTS VALLEY		Sacramento River	7,320	17.8	Medium	6,553	2	97%	0	647	3.75	8	4	5,124	80%	20%	4	4	4	1,525	3	1	Boron exceeds EPA maximum. Some additional WQ issues (inorganics and nitrates), but not significant. Strong GW-SW interaction with Clear Lake.		PubCom - Changed irrigated acreage to 133 ac/sq. mi. GW Use of 0.70 ac-ft/ac, calc Volume is 5124 Af-ft, 80% of the total supply coming from GW.	
5-15	BIG VALLEY		Sacramento River	24,212	15.8	Medium	6,344	1	118%	2	1,091	3.75	4	2	12,832	70%	30%	4	4	4	6,800	3				PubCom - Changed irrigated acreage to 180 ac/sq. mi. GW use of 0.53 ac-ft/ac, calculated Volume is 12,832 Af-ft, 70% of the total supply coming from GW.	
5-16	HIGH VALLEY		Sacramento River	2,356	0.0	Very Low	34	1	150%	0	32	2.25	1	3	94	80%	20%	1	4	0	490	3				PubCom - Changed irrigated acreage to 133 ac/sq. mi. GW use of 0.04 ac-ft/ac, Calculated GW volume is 94 Af-ft, 80% of the total supply coming from GW.	
5-17	BURNS VALLEY		Sacramento River	2,873	0.0	Very Low	2,691	2	139%	4	151	3.75	0	0	160	30%	70%	1	2	0	81	1				PubCom - Changed irrigated acreage to 18.5 ac/sq. mi. GW use of 0.07 ac-ft/ac (.06), volume is 160 Af-ft, 30% of the total supply coming from GW.	
5-18	COYOTE VALLEY		Sacramento River	6,528	0.0	Very Low	2,252	1	172%	5	138	3	2	2	2,464	71%	29%	0	0	0	700	2				PubCom - Changed irrigated acreage to 67 ac/sq. mi. GW use of 0.377 ac-ft/ac, volume is 2464 Af-ft, 71% of the total supply coming from GW.	
5-19	COLLAYOMI VALLEY		Sacramento River	6,497	0.0	Very Low	1,513	1	137%	4	178	3	2	2	649	67%	33%	1	4	0	240	1				PubCom - Changed irrigated acreage to 23 ac/sq. mi. GW use of 0.1 ac-ft/ac, volume is 649 Af-ft, 67% of the total supply coming from GW.	
5-2.01	ALTURAS AREA	SOUTH FORK PITT RIVER	Sacramento River	114,164	10.5	Low	4,429	1	105%	0	714	1.5	9	1	13,260	25%	75%	2	2	2	35,874	4	1	Declining GW Levels in some parts of the basin.			
5-2.02	ALTURAS AREA	WARM SPRINGS VALLEY	Sacramento River	68,009	9.5	Low	964	1	102%	0	257	1.5	10	1	8,097	25%	75%	2	2	2	15,365	3			1	40' declining in GW levels since 2000, along the west side of the basin.	
5-20	BERRYESSA VALLEY		Sacramento River	1,375	0.0	Very Low	0	0	0%	0	2	0.75	0	0	0	0%	100%	0	0	0	0	0					
5-21.50	SACRAMENTO VALLEY	RED BLUFF	Sacramento River	274,489	16.0	Medium	28,053	1	117%	2	5,810	3	74	2	90,000	51%	49%	3	3	3	46,908	3	2	Some GW quality impairments as per B-118, declining GW levels in west-side subdivision, and very high number of domestic GW use wells.		GW Use based on B118-03 and 2003 Tehama Co GW Inventory data	
5-21.51	SACRAMENTO VALLEY	CORNING	Sacramento River	205,473	19.5	Medium	18,852	1	119%	2	4,125	3	28	1	160,000	63%	37%	5	4	4.5	72,909	4	2	Continued GW level decline over most of the basin.	2	This basin is becoming increasing dependent on GW due to uncertain reliability of CVP TCCA surface water supply.	GW Use based on B118-03 and 2003 Tehama Co GW Inventory data
5-21.52	SACRAMENTO VALLEY	COLUSA	Sacramento River	917,793	19.8	Medium	48,369	1	123%	3	9,695	2.25	135	1	172,896	10%	90%	2	1	1.5	572,927	5	3	Severely declining GW levels along the west-side of Glenn Co. Moderately declining GW levels in the Capay area. High TDS shallow aquifer in Maxwell-Williams area.	3	Increase in housing development along I5. GW-SW interaction is important to maintaining waterfowl refuges. Area is being highlighted as solution area for Delta outflow issues...proposed increase in CU and GW pumping.	
5-21.53	SACRAMENTO VALLEY	BEND	Sacramento River	21,748	0.0	Very Low	554	1	102%	0	227	2.25	2	1	1,008	48%	52%	1	3	0	649	1					
5-21.54	SACRAMENTO VALLEY	ANTELOPE	Sacramento River	18,696	20.3	Medium	6,124	1	105%	1	979	3.75	29	4	20,000	73%	27%	5	4	4.5	8,770	4	2	Nitrate issue in domestic wells.		GW Use based on B118-03 and 2003 Tehama Co GW Inventory data	
5-21.55	SACRAMENTO VALLEY	DYE CREEK	Sacramento River	27,709	13.8	Medium	1,626	1	119%	0	371	2.25	4	1	39,000	29%	71%	5	2	3.5	6,097	3	1	Some documented Boron issues along east-side of basin.	2	Strong SW-GW interaction. GW Basin provides underflow to Mill Creek which supports endangered spring-run salmon.	GW Use based on B118-03 and 2003 Tehama Co GW Inventory data
5-21.56	SACRAMENTO VALLEY	LOS MOLINOS	Sacramento River	33,148	14.3	Medium	2,220	1	106%	0	489	2.25	9	2	5,000	30%	70%	2	2	2	6,204	3	1	Boron issues along east-side of basin.	3	GW basin provides underflow to Mill Creek which supports endangered spring-run salmon. High SW-GW interaction for much of the western basin.	GW Use based on 2003 Tehama Co GW Inventory data
5-21.57	SACRAMENTO VALLEY	VINA	Sacramento River	124,577	22.8	High	71,397	2	140%	4	4,295	3.75	62	3	155,000	87%	13%	5	5	5	43,328	4			1	GW from this basin is a key source of SW inflow and serves eastside creeks which have endangered spring run.	GW Use based on B118-03 and 2005 Butte County Inventory data
5-21.58	SACRAMENTO VALLEY	WEST BUTTE	Sacramento River	181,479	21.5	High	36,152	1	136%	4	3,660	3	37	2	150,000	38%	62%	5	2	3.5	116,582	5	2	Declining GW levels within the City of Chico and Durham areas (30-40' decline in mid-aquifer GW levels since 1998). High Nitrates in north and west Chico area. High density of GW contamination plumes surrounding City of Chico.	1	GW serves as a source of underflow to Butte Creek, which has endangered spring-run salmon.	GW Use based on B118-03 and 2005 Butte County Inventory data
5-21.59	SACRAMENTO VALLEY	EAST BUTTE	Sacramento River	265,312	17.5	Medium	38,465	1	132%	4	4,436	3	48	2	186,000	4%	96%	4	1	2.5	144,305	4			1	GW basin provides underflow to Butte Creek which supports endangered spring-run salmon.	GW Use based on B118-03 and 2005 Butte County Inventory data
5-21.60	SACRAMENTO VALLEY	NORTH YUBA	Sacramento River	103,152	14.3	Medium	14,667	1	100%	1	1,334	2.25	17	2	70,000	25%	75%	4	2	3	53,387	4			1	Strong SW-GW interaction with Feather and Yuba River	GW Use based on B118-03 and 2005 Butte County Inventory data
5-21.61	SACRAMENTO VALLEY	SOUTH YUBA	Sacramento River	104,486	14.5	Medium	45,014	2	104%	1	2,086	3	63	3	17,206	9%	91%	2	1	1.5	47,048	4					
5-21.62	SACRAMENTO VALLEY	SUTTER	Sacramento River	234,264	17.5	Medium	82,125	1	132%	4	5,999	3	37	2	175,300	7%	93%	4	1	2.5	187,530	5					GW Use based on B118-03 data
5-21.64	SACRAMENTO VALLEY	NORTH AMERICAN	Sacramento River	340,170	22.5	High	832,746	3	123%	3	9,855	3	346	4	399,000	24%	76%	5	2	3.5	143,312	4	1	From B118: Elevated levels of TDS, chloride, sodium, bicarbonate, boron, fluoride, nitrate, iron manganese, and arsenic may be of concern in some locations (DWR 1997). There are 3 sites with significant GW contamination in the basin.	1	From B118: GW levels in SW Placer County and northern Sacramento County have generally declined with many wells declining at a rate of about one and one-half feet per year for the last 40 years or more (PCWA 1999).	GW Use based on B118-03 data
5-21.65	SACRAMENTO VALLEY	SOUTH AMERICAN	Sacramento River	247,745	22.3	High	718,113	3	127%	3	11,779	3.75	197	4	76,465	27%	73%	3	2	2.5	61,539	3	3	From B118: Montgomery Watson (1997) listed seven sites within the subbasin with significant GW contamination. From Sac County GWMP: Overall decreasing GW level trend over past 50 years (~30ft).			
5-21.66	SACRAMENTO VALLEY	SOLANO	Sacramento River	424,832	15.5	Medium	119,263	1	121%	3	6,790	3	156	2	69,149	10%	90%	2	1	1.5	258,208	5					GW Use based on Yolo County CU Report, 1992. http://www.dcn.davis.ca.us/dcn/projects/conjunctiveuse/index.html
5-21.67	SACRAMENTO VALLEY	YOLO	Sacramento River	225,718	22.3	High	194,158	2	125%	3	7,329	3.75	131	3	200,000	25%	75%	5	2	3.5	128,860	5	2	Localized TDS problems preclude using GW for some M&I uses without treatment. Some subsidence in northeast of Davis and in northern Yolo.			
5-21.68	SACRAMENTO VALLEY	CAPAY VALLEY	Sacramento River	24,970	11.5	Low	550	1	107%	0	501	3	2	1	5,500	40%	60%	2	3	2.5	6,066	3	1	Moderate to high levels of boron.			
5-22.01	SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY	EASTERN SAN JOAQUIN	San Joaquin River	707,073	25.5	High	582,662	2	133%	4	19,176	3	521	3	491,297	43%	57%	4	3	3.5	410,810	5	3	Estimated that 70,000 af/year of overdraft occurs in northeastern San Joaquin County and about 35,000 af/year of overdraft occurs in the Stockton East Water District (B-118) & (USBR 1996). Basin experiencing long term GW overdraft 160,000AF/yr (local GWMP)	2	From B118: as a result of overdraft poor quality groundwater has been moving east along a 16- mile front on the east side of the Delta and has continued to migrate eastward (USACE 2001). Large areas of nitrate contamination are located in the subbasin.	
5-22.02	SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY	MODESTO	San Joaquin River	246,518	23.5	High	294,872	2	127%	3	6,122	3	266	4	226,000	32%	68%	5	2	3.5	116,709	4	4	Water quality degradation due to industrial and agricultural practices			
5-22.03	SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY	TURLOCK	San Joaquin River	347,146	21.5	High	197,605	2	125%	3	9,758	3	202	3	450,000	36%	64%	5	2	3.5	250,852	5	2	Groundwater overdraft documented in local GWMP.		GW Use based on B118-03 data	
5-22.04	SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY	MERCED	San Joaquin River	491,255	22.5	High	173,731	1	137%	4	8,392	3	152	2	364,227	46%	54%	4	3	3.5	279,142	5	4	Overdraft and water quality degradation (MAGPI GWMP).			
5-22.05	SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY	CHOWCHILLA	San Joaquin River	159,319	21.3	High	15,820	1	134%	4	2,203	2.25	26	2	210,976	53%	47%	5	3	4	153,038	5	3	Overdraft, subsidence, water quality degradation			
5-22.06	SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY	MADERA	San Joaquin River	393,429	25.0	High	116,919	1	143%	5	9,100	3	132	2	375,800	58%	42%	5	3	4	238,070	5	5	Subsidence, critical overdraft, water quality degradation			
5-22.07	SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY	DELTA-MENDOTA	San Joaquin River	746,697	22.3	High	107,879	1	149%	5	7,132	2.25	116	1	509,687	37%	63%	4	2	3	470,500	5	2	Overdraft issues in basin discussed in San Luis and Delta Mendota Water Authority GWMP	3	Important agricultural region.	
5-22.08	SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY	KINGS	Tulare Lake	977,030	22.8	High	906,544	2	133%	4	37,841	3.75	781	4	1,055,502	48%	52%	5	3	4	720,852	5					
5-22.09	SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY	WESTSIDE	Tulare Lake	640,504	22.5	High	27,285	1	106%	1	3,790	1.5	8	1	411,534	37%	63%	4	2	3	513,759	5	5	Subsidence, critical overdraft, saline conditions, subsidence	5	Additional points added for critical agricultural importance, very high TDS and pesticide contamination issues	
5-22.10	SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY	PLEASANT VALLEY	Tulare Lake	145,782	11.8	Low	34,213	1	122%	3	358	0.75	0	0	47,383	86%	14%	3	5	4	28,131	3					
5-22.11	SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY	KAWEAH	Tulare Lake	446,283	26.5	High	271,700	2	149%	5	12,092	3	304	3	453,226	38%	62%	5	2	3.5	380,311	5	5	Overdraft, water quality issues.			
5-22.12	SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY	TULARE LAKE	Tulare Lake	524,539	22.3	High	125,701	1	141%	4	5,345	2.25	68	1	504,271	58%	42%	5	3	4	332,240	5	5	Subsidence, overdraft, water quality degradation			

Basin Subbasin ID	Basin Name	Subbasin Name	Hydrologic Name	Basin - Subbasin Area (acre)	Total Rank Scoring	Final Priority	Population (2010)	Final Population Rank	Population Growth %	Final Population Growth Rank	Total Wells	Final Well Rank (discounted)	Total Public Supply Wells	Final Public Supply Well Rank	Groundwater Volume (Ac-Ft)	% of total water supply supplied by groundwater	% of total water supply supplied by surface water	Final groundwater volume rank	Final % of total water supply supplied by groundwater rank	Final groundwater Reliance rank	Irrigated Acreage	Final Irrigated Acreage Rank	Impact Ranks	Impact Comments	Other Information Rank	Other Information Comments	Additional Comments	
5-22.13	SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY	TULE	Tulare Lake	469,959	22.3	High	108,660	1	137%	4	6,355	2.25	170	2	592,823	55%	45%	5	3	4	371,028	5	4	Critical aquifer overdraft conditions in basin. High Nitrate and TDS in some locations and some inorganic contamination issues.				
5-22.14	SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY	KERN COUNTY	Tulare Lake	1,950,113	22.5	High	700,323	1	154%	5	15,015	1.5	577	2	1,041,462	36%	64%	4	2	3	919,821	4	5	Subsidence, overdraft, water quality degradation	1	Agricultural importance, large basin which results in low population density.		
5-22.15	SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY	TRACY	San Joaquin River	344,884	19.0	Medium	268,175	2	133%	4	7,267	3	218	3	19,198	2%	98%	1	1	1	224,284	5	1	Poor water quality throughout the subbasin.(B-118)				
5-22.16	SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY	COSUMNES	San Joaquin River	280,490	15.0	Medium	59,163	1	117%	2	5,539	3	59	2	155,475	77%	23%	4	4	4	82,534	3						
5-23	PANOCHÉ VALLEY		Tulare Lake	33,090	0.0	Very Low	41	0	141%	0	26	0.75	0	0	200	100%	0%	0	5	0	122	1						
5-25	KERN RIVER VALLEY		Tulare Lake	79,678	0.0	Very Low	10,364	1	102%	1	843	2.25	82	4	8,068	100%	0%	0	0	0	2,391	1						
5-26	WALKER BASIN CREEK VALLEY		Tulare Lake	7,693	0.0	Very Low	249	1	126%	0	134	3	1	1	3	1%	99%	0	1	0	348	2						
5-27	CUMMINGS VALLEY		Tulare Lake	10,051	22.0	High	7,665	2	210%	5	171	3	14	4	3,000	100%	0%	3	5	4	2,925	3		1	Adjudicated basin	GW Use based on 2011 Cummings Water Master report		
5-28	TEHACHAPI VALLEY WEST		Tulare Lake	14,854	20.3	Medium	17,313	2	149%	5	533	3.75	27	5	3,500	10%	90%	2	1	1.5	348	1	1	Groundwater quality issues	1	Adjudicated basin	Basin in slight overdraft conditions	
5-29	CASITAC LAKE VALLEY		Tulare Lake	3,573	0.0	Very Low	366	1	137%	0	8	0.75	6	5	87	100%	0%	1	5	0	19	1		1	Adjudicated basin	GW Use based on B118-03 data		
5-3	JESS VALLEY		Sacramento River	6,708	0.0	Very Low	13	0	100%	0	4	0.75	0	0	3	0%	100%	1	1	0	3,947	5						
5-30	LOWER LAKE VALLEY		Sacramento River	2,404	0.0	Very Low	2,694	2	75%	0	33	2.25	4	5	577	97%	3%	2	5	0	70	1					PubCom - Changed irrigated acreage to 18 ac/sq. mi, GW use of 0.24 ac-ft/ac, calculated volume is 577 Af-ft, 97% of the total supply coming from GW	
5-31	LONG VALLEY		Sacramento River	2,799	0.0	Very Low	194	1	121%	0	40	2.25	0	0	532	100%	0%	2	5	0	450	3					PubCom - Changed irrigated acreage to 103 ac/sq. mi, GW use of 0.19 ac-ft/ac, calculated volume is 532 Af-ft, 100% of the total supply coming from GW	
5-35	MCCLLOUD AREA		Sacramento River	21,320	0.0	Very Low	822	1	83%	0	131	1.5	1	1	2,000	49%	51%	1	3	0	37	1					GW Use based on B118-03 data	
5-36	ROUND VALLEY		Sacramento River	7,266	0.0	Very Low	27	0	93%	0	33	1.5	0	0	2,811	45%	55%	0	0	0	2,981	4						
5-37	TOAD WELL AREA		Sacramento River	3,356	0.0	Very Low	0	0	0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%	100%	0	0	0	0	0						
5-38	PONDOSA TOWN AREA		Sacramento River	2,082	0.0	Very Low	0	0	0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%	100%	0	0	0	305	2						
5-4	BIG VALLEY		Sacramento River	92,050	13.5	Medium	1,046	1	101%	0	610	1.5	9	1	35,000	50%	50%	3	3	3	34,129	4	3	Declining GW Levels over much of the basin.				GW Use based on B118-03 data
5-40	HOT SPRINGS VALLEY		Sacramento River	2,404	0.0	Very Low	12	0	150%	0	11	1.5	0	0	300	11%	89%	2	1	0	1,036	4						
5-41	EGG LAKE VALLEY		Sacramento River	4,101	0.0	Very Low	0	0	0%	0	2	0.75	0	0	0	0%	100%	0	0	0	0	0						
5-43	ROCK PRAIRIE VALLEY		Sacramento River	5,740	0.0	Very Low	0	0	0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%	100%	0	0	0	0	0						
5-44	LONG VALLEY		Sacramento River	1,088	0.0	Very Low	0	0	0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%	100%	0	0	0	0	0						
5-45	CAYTON VALLEY		Sacramento River	1,306	0.0	Very Low	2	0	100%	0	10	1.5	0	0	5	0%	100%	0	1	0	1,100	5					GW Use based on B118-03 data	
5-46	LAKE BRITTON AREA		Sacramento River	14,055	0.0	Very Low	84	0	101%	0	30	0.75	3	2	43	17%	83%	0	1	0	55	1						
5-47	GOOSE VALLEY		Sacramento River	4,208	0.0	Very Low	10	0	110%	0	7	0.75	0	0	405	4%	96%	1	1	0	3,269	5						
5-48	BURNEY CREEK VALLEY		Sacramento River	2,352	0.0	Very Low	1,466	2	100%	1	25	2.25	0	0	849	17%	83%	3	1	0	1,690	5						
5-49	DRY BURNEY CREEK VALLEY		Sacramento River	3,074	0.0	Very Low	0	0	0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%	100%	0	0	0	0	0						GW Use based on B118-03 data
5-5	FALL RIVER VALLEY		Sacramento River	54,803	12.8	Low	1,629	1	102%	0	659	2.25	4	1	22,722	29%	71%	3	2	2.5	31,850	5	1	Locally high nitrates. Variable GW level trends with some regions showing declines. Strong SW-GW interaction and GW dependent fisheries. Ecosystem dependent basin (springs, fisheries)				
5-50	NORTH FORK BATTLE CREEK		Sacramento River	12,755	0.0	Very Low	528	1	157%	0	312	3	9	3	3	0%	100%	0	1	0	997	2						
5-51	BUTTE CREEK VALLEY		Sacramento River	3,227	0.0	Very Low	0	0	0%	0	2	0.75	0	0	0	0%	100%	0	0	0	155	2						
5-52	GRAYS VALLEY		Sacramento River	5,440	0.0	Very Low	0	0	0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%	100%	0	0	0	0	0						
5-53	DIXIE VALLEY		Sacramento River	4,866	0.0	Very Low	6	0	133%	0	0	0	0	0	0	4.86E-05	100%	0	0	0	2,796	5						
5-54	ASH VALLEY		Sacramento River	6,008	0.0	Very Low	3	0	100%	0	11	0.75	0	0	2	0%	100%	0	1	0	945	3						
5-56	YELLOW CREEK VALLEY		Sacramento River	2,311	0.0	Very Low	2	0	100%	0	0	0	0	0	1	0%	100%	0	1	0	1,377	5						
5-57	LAST CHANCE CREEK VALLEY		Sacramento River	4,659	0.0	Very Low	0	0	0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%	100%	0	0	0	0	0						
5-58	CLOVER VALLEY		Sacramento River	16,784	0.0	Very Low	0	0	0%	0	9	0.75	0	0	5	1%	99%	0	1	0	7,324	4						GW Use based on well log data.
5-59	GRIZZLY VALLEY		Sacramento River	13,441	0.0	Very Low	0	0	0%	0	8	0.75	0	0	0	0%	100%	0	0	0	0	0						
5-6.01	REDDING AREA	BOWMAN	Sacramento River	78,426	16.0	Medium	7,165	1	155%	5	1,498	3	13	2	16,500	39%	61%	2	2	2	3,384	2	1	Some localized high boron.				GW Use on Tehama Co GW inventory data
5-6.02	REDDING AREA	ROSEWOOD	Sacramento River	46,455	0.0	Very Low	1,009	1	137%	0	442	2.25	0	0	1,450	21%	79%	1	2	0	2,395	2						
5-6.03	REDDING AREA	ANDERSON	Sacramento River	96,857	17.3	Medium	52,937	2	112%	2	3,430	3.75	109	4	63,572	53%	47%	4	3	3.5	12,473	2						
5-6.04	REDDING AREA	ENTERPRISE	Sacramento River	60,862	17.3	Medium	68,627	2	125%	3	2,768	3.75	68	4	8,576	13%	87%	2	1	1.5	7,010	2	1	Strong SW-GW interaction and endangered Sac River salmon runs				
5-6.05	REDDING AREA	MILLVILLE	Sacramento River	65,226	0.0	Very Low	2,640	1	155%	0	807	2.25	2	1	6,842	37%	63%	0	0	0	6,548	2						
5-6.06	REDDING AREA	SOUTH BATTLE CREEK	Sacramento River	33,835	0.0	Very Low	48	0	144%	0	48	0.75	0	0	908	22%	78%	1	2	0	1,444	2						
5-60	HUMBURG VALLEY		Sacramento River	9,979	0.0	Very Low	3,299	1	100%	0	341	3.75	8	4	200	46%	54%	0	3	0	648	2						GW Use based on B118-03 data
5-61	CHROME TOWN AREA		Sacramento River	1,408	0.0	Very Low	6	0	100%	0	4	0.75	0	0	0	0%	100%	0	0	0	0	0						
5-62	ELK CREEK AREA		Sacramento River	1,438	0.0	Very Low	174	1	100%	0	0	0	0	0	13	6%	94%	0	1	0	44	1						
5-63	STONYFORD TOWN AREA		Sacramento River	6,437	0.0	Very Low	183	1	90%	0	61	2.25	5	3	3,512	51%	49%	0	0	0	1,584	3						
5-64	BEAR VALLEY		Sacramento River	9,104	0.0	Very Low	4	0	75%	0	10	0.75	0	0	0	0%	100%	0	0	0	565	2						
5-65	LITTLE INDIAN VALLEY		Sacramento River	1,269	0.0	Very Low	112	1	90%	0	47	3.75	0	0	507	70%	30%	3	4	0	148	2						
5-66	CLEAR LAKE CACHE FORMATION		Sacramento River	29,717	0.0	Very Low	7,960	1	155%	5	144	1.5	3	1	297	18%	82%	0	1	0	177	1						PubCom - Changed irrigated acreage to 3.8 ac/sq. mi, GW use of 0.01 ac-ft/ac, calculated volume is 297 Af-ft, 18% of the total supply coming from GW
5-68	POPE VALLEY		Sacramento River	7,177	0.0	Very Low	110	1	117%	0	54	1.5	0	0	13	1%	99%	2	1	0	2,351	4						
5-69	YOSEMITE VALLEY		San Joaquin River	7,465	0.0	Very Low	1,016	1	320%	5	6	0.75	6	4	242	100%	0%	1										

Basin Subbasin ID	Basin Name	Subbasin Name	Hydrologic Name	Basin - Subbasin Area (acre)	Total Rank Scoring	Final Priority	Population (2010)	Final Population Rank	Population Growth %	Final Population Growth Rank	Total Wells	Final Well Rank (discounted)	Total Public Supply Wells	Final Public Supply Well Rank	Groundwater Volume (Ac-Ft)	% of total water supply supplied by groundwater	% of total water supply supplied by surface water	Final groundwater volume rank	Final % of total water supply supplied by groundwater rank	Final groundwater Reliance rank	Irrigated Acreage	Final Irrigated Acreage Rank	Impact Ranks	Impact Comments	Other Information Rank	Other Information Comments	Additional Comments
5-91	ANTELOPE CREEK		Sacramento River	2,040	0.0	Very Low	3	0	167%	0	3	0.75	0	0	1	1%	99%	0	1	0	339	3					
5-92	BLANCHARD VALLEY		Sacramento River	2,221	0.0	Very Low	0	0	0%	0	2	0.75	0	0	1	1%	99%	0	1	0	138	2					GW Use based on well log data.
5-93	NORTH FORK CACHE CREEK		Sacramento River	3,474	0.0	Very Low	0	0	0%	0	1	0.75	0	0	0	0%	100%	0	0	0	0	0					PubCom - No reliance on GW, No Irr Ac, etc. - Basin is actually a reservoir and its classification as a GW basin is under review
5-94	MIDDLE CREEK		Sacramento River	705	0.0	Very Low	10	1	60%	0	16	3	0	0	402	92%	8%	4	5	0	96	2					PubCom - Changed irrigated acreage to 87 ac/sq. mi, GW use of 0.57 ac-ft/ac, calculated volume is 402 Af-ft, 92% of the total supply coming from GW
5-95	MEADOW VALLEY		Sacramento River	5,734	0.0	Very Low	387	1	98%	0	176	3	1	2	148	13%	87%	1	1	0	344	2					
6-1	SURPRISE VALLEY		North Lahontan	228,460	8.8	Low	1,127	0	102%	0	557	0.75	2	1	33,307	36%	64%	2	2	2	49,199	3	2				Declining GW Levels and GW Quality issues (sodium sulfate, high TDS, and thermal waters) in various portions of the basin.
6-10	ADORE LAKE VALLEY		South Lahontan	39,978	0.0	Very Low	4	0	125%	0	2	0.75	0	0	200	100%	0%	0	5	0	0	0					
6-100	SECRET VALLEY		North Lahontan	33,680	0.0	Very Low	26	0	108%	0	31	0.75	0	0	5,406	50%	50%	0	0	0	2,813	2					GW Use based on B118-03 data
6-101	BULL FLAT		North Lahontan	18,151	0.0	Very Low	2	0	350%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%	100%	0	0	0	0	0					
6-104	LONG VALLEY		North Lahontan	46,836	0.0	Very Low	141	0	70%	0	128	0.75	0	0	423	9%	91%	0	1	0	1,085	1		3			Groundwater Exports to Reno are being evaluated. Long Valley Creek is a major source of recharge to Honey Lake GW Basin. Long Valley also provides underflow to Cold Spring Valley.
6-105	SUNKARD VALLEY		North Lahontan	4,517	0.0	Very Low	0	0	0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%	100%	0	0	0	0	0					
6-106	LITTLE ANTELOPE VALLEY		North Lahontan	2,491	0.0	Very Low	0	0	0%	0	3	0.75	0	0	0	0%	100%	0	0	0	658	3					
6-107	SWEETWATER FLAT		North Lahontan	4,747	0.0	Very Low	0	0	0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%	100%	0	0	0	89	1					
6-108	OLYMPIC VALLEY		North Lahontan	702	0.0	Very Low	471	2	83%	0	8	2.25	4	5	0	0%	100%	0	0	0	0	0					
6-11	LONG VALLEY		South Lahontan	72,028	0.0	Very Low	800	1	118%	0	20	0.75	16	2	87	0%	100%	2	1	0	6,898	2	1				Local impairments from thermal waters and some springs with high TDS, fluoride, boron, and other elements, but water quality suitable overall.
6-12	OWENS VALLEY		South Lahontan	663,458	13.8	Medium	17,664	1	116%	0	1,279	0.75	95	1	140,000	70%	30%	2	4	3	25,560	1	2		5		Actual GW Volume not fully captured due to GW exports out of the basin. GW volume reflects the additional 100K AF of pumping that is exported. GW % is adjusted to reflect the additional pumping.
6-13	BLACK SPRINGS VALLEY		South Lahontan	30,911	0.0	Very Low	0	0	0%	0	3	0.75	0	0	0	0%	100%	0	0	0	0	0					
6-14	FISH LAKE VALLEY		South Lahontan	48,333	6.8	Low	36	0	128%	0	10	0.75	0	0	19,857	97%	3%	3	5	4	3,487	2					
6-15	DEEP SPRINGS VALLEY		South Lahontan	30,048	0.0	Very Low	5	0	540%	0	1	0.75	2	1	912	100%	0%	1	5	0	149	1					
6-16	EUREKA VALLEY		South Lahontan	129,329	0.0	Very Low	10	0	540%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%	100%	0	0	0	0	0					
6-17	SALINE VALLEY		South Lahontan	146,850	0.0	Very Low	0	0	0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%	100%	0	0	0	0	0	5				GW Quality Impairments: High TDS and Fluorides, groundwater is inferior for domestic use. (B-118)
6-18	DEATH VALLEY		South Lahontan	926,496	0.0	Very Low	190	0	123%	0	52	0.75	5	1	1,060	100%	0%	0	5	0	17	1					
6-19	WINGATE VALLEY		South Lahontan	71,755	0.0	Very Low	0	0	0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%	100%	0	0	0	0	0					
6-2	MADELINE PLAINS		North Lahontan	156,152	7.8	Low	151	0	159%	0	231	0.75	0	0	42,400	56%	44%	3	3	3	25,052	3	1				Localized naturally occurring water quality issues (high TDS, nitrates, boron, ASAR, etc)
6-20	MIDDLE AMARGOSA VALLEY		South Lahontan	392,862	0.0	Very Low	230	0	175%	0	64	0.75	8	1	120	100%	0%	0	5	0	0	0	4				Water quality is rated inferior to marginal for domestic purposes due to elevated fluoride and boron contents; however, locally groundwater is of good quality. (B-118)
6-21	LOWER KINGSTON VALLEY		South Lahontan	241,892	0.0	Very Low	0	0	0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%	100%	0	0	0	0	0	5				Groundwater is inferior for domestic or irrigation purposes due to elevated fluoride, chloride, boron, sulfate and TDS (B-118)
6-22	UPPER KINGSTON VALLEY		South Lahontan	178,533	0.0	Very Low	37	0	16%	0	26	0.75	5	1	87	100%	0%	0	5	0	0	0	4				Groundwater is marginal to inferior for domestic or irrigation purposes due to elevated fluoride and TDS (B-118).
6-23	RIGGS VALLEY		South Lahontan	88,274	0.0	Very Low	0	0	0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%	100%	0	0	0	0	0					
6-24	RED PASS VALLEY		South Lahontan	97,088	0.0	Very Low	0	0	0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%	100%	0	0	0	0	0					
6-25	BICYCLE VALLEY		South Lahontan	90,100	0.0	Very Low	0	0	0%	0	2	0.75	3	1	0	0%	100%	0	0	0	0	0	3				Elevated TDS and fluoride (B-118).
6-26	AVAWATZ VALLEY		South Lahontan	27,826	0.0	Very Low	0	0	0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%	100%	0	0	0	0	0					
6-27	LEACH VALLEY		South Lahontan	61,620	0.0	Very Low	0	0	0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%	100%	0	0	0	0	0					
6-28	PAHRUMP VALLEY		South Lahontan	93,747	0.0	Very Low	99	0	190%	0	55	0.75	0	0	101	100%	0%	2	5	0	0	0	2				Water levels generally declining per B-118 and USGS NWIS. State of Nevada Department of Water Resources has documented overdraft and subsidence conditions in this basin (http://water.nv.gov/documents/presentations/pahrump.pdf)
6-29	MESQUITE VALLEY		South Lahontan	89,012	0.0	Very Low	64	0	144%	0	58	0.75	0	0	1,675	16%	84%	1	1	0	1,626	1	3				Declining water levels. Locally high TDS in southern portion of basin makes GW marginal to inferior for domestic uses. (B-118)
6-3	WILLOW CREEK VALLEY		North Lahontan	11,698	0.0	Very Low	62	0	156%	0	48	1.5	0	0	6,914	36%	64%	0	0	0	4,946	4					Basin groundwater is rated marginal to inferior for both domestic and irrigation use because of elevated fluoride and sodium.(B-118)
6-30	IVANPAH VALLEY		South Lahontan	200,155	0.0	Very Low	40	0	63%	0	54	0.75	13	1	89	100%	0%	0	5	0	0	0	4				
6-31	KELSO VALLEY		South Lahontan	257,279	0.0	Very Low	20	0	100%	0	16	0.75	0	0	83	100%	0%	0	5	0	0	0					
6-32	BROADWELL VALLEY		South Lahontan	92,688	0.0	Very Low	8	0	113%	0	30	0.75	4	1	65	100%	0%	0	5	0	0	0					
6-33	SODA LAKE VALLEY		South Lahontan	383,560	0.0	Very Low	750	0	106%	0	159	0.75	7	1	94	100%	0%	0	5	0	0	0	5				Groundwater quality is rated marginal to inferior for both domestic and irrigation purposes. This assessment is based on 66 analyses showing elevated concentrations of fluoride, boron, and TDS. Geotracker shows many LUST sites.
6-34	SILVER LAKE VALLEY		South Lahontan	35,519	0.0	Very Low	0	0	0%	0	2	0.75	0	0	0	0%	100%	0	0	0	0	0	4				Groundwater in this basin is rated marginal to inferior for both domestic and irrigation uses because of elevated concentrations of fluoride, boron, and TDS. (B-118)
6-35	CRONISE VALLEY		South Lahontan	127,313	0.0	Very Low	2	0	100%	0	4	0.75	0	0	0	0%	100%	0	0	0	0	0					
6-36.01	LANGFORD VALLEY	LANGFORD WELL LAKE	South Lahontan	19,457	0.0	Very Low	0	0	0%	0	0	0	3	1	0	0%	100%	0	0	0	0	0					
6-36.02	LANGFORD VALLEY	IRWIN	South Lahontan	10,557	0.0	Very Low	8,845	2	145%	5	40	1.5	1	1	0	0%	100%	0	0	0	0	0	3				Locally high iron and fluoride concentrations.(B-118)
6-37	COYOTE LAKE VALLEY		South Lahontan	88,735	0.0	Very Low	99	0	139%	0	3	0.75	0	0	102	100%	0%	0	5	0	0	0	4				Groundwater quality is rated as inferior to marginal for both domestic and irrigation purposes because of elevated levels of fluoride, boron, sodium, and TDS. (B-118).
6-38	CAVES CANYON VALLEY		South Lahontan	73,542	0.0	Very Low	88	0	219%	0	2	0.75	5	1	0	0%	100%	0	0	0	0	0	3				Suitability of groundwater quality is rated inferior for irrigation and suitable to inferior for domestic use (DWR 1964). Historical measurements show TDS content ranging from 622 to 1,272 mg/L with an average of 904 mg/L (DWR 1964).

Basin Subbasin ID	Basin Name	Subbasin Name	Hydrologic Name	Basin - Subbasin Area (acre)	Total Rank Scoring	Final Priority	Population (2010)	Final Population Rank	Population Growth %	Final Population Growth Rank	Total Wells	Final Well Rank (discounted)	Total Public Supply Wells	Final Public Supply Well Rank	Groundwater Volume (Ac-Ft)	% of total water supply supplied by groundwater	% of total water supply supplied by surface water	Final groundwater volume rank	Final % of total water supply supplied by groundwater rank	Final groundwater Reliance rank	Irrigated Acreage	Final Irrigated Acreage Rank	Impact Ranks	Impact Comments	Other Information Rank	Other Information Comments	Additional Comments	
6-4	HONEY LAKE VALLEY		North Lahontan	311,741	12.3	Low	23,566	1	100%	0	2,661	2.25	37	1	50,721	32%	68%	2	2	2	42,746	2	2	GW Quality Issues: High boron, arsenic, ASAR, TDS, and Nitrates between Litchfield and Honey Lake, east of Honey Lake, and north of Herlong area. GW contamination from Herlong Army depot. Increased GW demand associated with prison expansion.	2	Interstate basin. Local concerns over GW export from Fish Springs Ranch to Reno.		
6-40	LOWER MOJAVE RIVER VALLEY		South Lahontan	287,563	15.3	Medium	32,938	1	103%	1	63	0.75	64	2	31,374	99%	1%	2	5	3.5	6,126	1	5	Groundwater basin has been in overdraft. Water quality has been impaired from natural sources, leaking tanks, and superfund sites from military bases.	1	Basin is adjudicated. USGS reports GW Level declines of 100 ft since the 1930s		
6-41	MIDDLE MOJAVE RIVER VALLEY		South Lahontan	212,595	11.3	Low	6,654	1	124%	0	15	0.75	12	1	30,000	86%	14%	2	5	3.5	685	1	3	Groundwater Quality impairments for VOCs, salts, nitrates, and irrigation effluents. Waste water treatment plant have also affected groundwater quality. Some nitrates and fluoride exceed MCL.	1	Basin is adjudicated.	GW Use based on B118-03 data, references MWA for the 1997-1998 water year.	
6-42	UPPER MOJAVE RIVER VALLEY		South Lahontan	415,295	21.8	High	355,338	2	151%	5	163	0.75	172	3	66,748	79%	21%	2	4	3	1,183	1	5	Overdraft. Water quality impacts in basin including nitrates, inorganics, and fuel additives, etc. Superfund site within basin.	2	Basin is adjudicated (+1). Irrigated Acreage adjustment, add +1		
6-43	EL MIRAGE VALLEY		South Lahontan	76,292	15.8	Medium	10,933	1	130%	4	16	0.75	20	2	5,300	100%	0%	1	5	3	462	1	4	Groundwater levels have declined significantly in parts of the basin, some have recovered. Water is rated marginal to inferior for domestic and irrigation purposes. (B-118). Some documented VOCs issues also.			GW Use based from MWA covering for 1997-1998 water year.	
6-44	ANTELOPE VALLEY		South Lahontan	1,014,596	21.5	High	398,864	2	143%	4	4,476	1.5	269	2	90,000	94%	6%	1	5	3	21	1	5	Closed basin. Water quality impacts per IRWMP, DWR B-118, and other sources. Extractions likely exceed natural recharge.	3	Pending Adjudication, water reliability issues, and renewed subsidence		
6-45	TEHACHAPI VALLEY EAST		South Lahontan	24,055	0.0	Very Low	480	1	213%	0	228	2.25	8	2	101	48%	52%	0	3	0	96	1	5	Court adjudicated basin in overdraft. Groundwater quality issues.				
6-46	FREMONT VALLEY		South Lahontan	336,682	10.8	Low	16,883	1	190%	0	203	0.75	19	1	4,584	96%	4%	1	5	3	0	0	5	Basin has naturally high TDS locally and other constituents. Groundwater levels have shown significant decline throughout the basin.				
6-47	HARPER VALLEY		South Lahontan	411,827	9.8	Low	1,634	0	82%	0	95	0.75	24	1	10,000	8%	92%	1	1	1	813	1	5	Extensive chromium issues well known in Hinkley. In addition, water quality of the basin is generally marginal to inferior for irrigation and domestic uses because of high concentrations of boron, fluoride, and sodium.	1	Adjudicated Basin		
6-48	GOLDSTONE VALLEY		South Lahontan	28,287	0.0	Very Low	0	0	0%	0	6	0.75	0	0	0	0%	100%	0	0	0	0	0	3	Groundwater quality in the basin is rated as inferior for irrigation purposes and marginal for domestic use because of elevated concentrations of chloride, fluoride, and TDS.			Mostly Federal land	
6-49	SUPERIOR VALLEY		South Lahontan	121,084	0.0	Very Low	0	0	0%	0	1	0.75	1	1	0	0%	100%	0	0	0	0	0						
6-5.01	TAHOE VALLEY	TAHOE SOUTH	North Lahontan	14,814	18.3	Medium	25,967	3	93%	0	680	3.75	79	5	10,000	90%	10%	4	5	4.5	0	0	2	STPUD reports that MTBE has had a major impact on the groundwater supply within its service area, resulting in 12 of 34 production wells unusable and the destruction of 2 wells. (B-118) & (Berghson 2000).			PubCom - GW volume of 8,285 AF plus a percentage for private pumping, adjusted total wells, PSW, and impacts of MTBE (inc Doc Impact to 2) based on supported district comments	
6-5.02	TAHOE VALLEY	TAHOE WEST	North Lahontan	6,173	0.0	Very Low	3,110	2	79%	0	208	3.75	15	5	591	71%	29%	1	4	0	0	0						
6-5.03	TAHOE VALLEY	TAHOE NORTH	North Lahontan	1,931	0.0	Very Low	3,410	3	78%	0	45	3	4	5	575	62%	38%	3	4	0	0	0						
6-50	CUDDEBACK VALLEY		South Lahontan	95,418	0.0	Very Low	97	0	156%	0	0	0	0	0	240	99%	1%	0	5	0	0	0	3	Groundwater quality is ranked marginal to inferior for most beneficial uses due to elevated concentrations of chloride and TDS.			Mostly Federal land	
6-51	PILOT KNOB VALLEY		South Lahontan	139,460	0.0	Very Low	0	0	0%	0	3	0.75	6	1	0	0%	100%	0	0	0	0	0					Mostly Federal land	
6-52	SEARLES VALLEY		South Lahontan	198,115	0.0	Very Low	1,651	0	101%	0	81	0.75	0	0	400	100%	0%	0	5	0	0	0	5	Water locally beneficial in the north, but generally unsuitable for beneficial uses due to high concentrations of fluoride, boron, sodium, chloride, sulfate, and TDS. Water levels have declined due to pumping for evaporates.				
6-53	SALT WELLS VALLEY		South Lahontan	29,629	0.0	Very Low	0	0	0%	0	1	0.75	0	0	0	0%	100%	0	0	0	0	0	5	The groundwater is rated inferior for all beneficial uses because of high TDS content that ranges from about 4,000 mg/L to 39,000 mg/L. Other impairments are elevated concentrations of sodium, chloride, and boron (DWR 1964).			Mostly Federal land	
6-54	INDIAN WELLS VALLEY		South Lahontan	383,492	14.8	Medium	34,837	1	136%	4	231	0.75	58	1	24,000	100%	0%	1	5	3	0	0	5	Overdraft has been documented since the 1960's. Water quality issues with respect to overdraft and mixing of aquifers.			GW Use based on reports from Indian Wells Valley Co-op.	
6-55	COSO VALLEY		South Lahontan	25,684	0.0	Very Low	0	0	0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%	100%	0	0	0	0	0					Mostly Federal land. China Lake Naval Weapons.	
6-56	ROSE VALLEY		South Lahontan	42,709	0.0	Very Low	10	0	230%	0	10	0.75	2	1	16	100%	0%	1	5	0	0	0						
6-57	DARWIN VALLEY		South Lahontan	44,386	0.0	Very Low	39	0	100%	0	7	0.75	0	0	54	100%	0%	0	5	0	0	0						
6-58	PANAMINT VALLEY		South Lahontan	260,754	0.0	Very Low	7	0	414%	0	11	0.75	4	1	10	100%	0%	0	5	0	0	0	4	Water from most wells located on the valley floor is ranked inferior for domestic use and marginal to inferior for irrigation purposes.			Mostly Federal land	
6-6	CARSON VALLEY		North Lahontan	10,716	0.0	Very Low	328	1	95%	0	114	2.25	6	3	0	0%	100%	0	0	0	2,990	3						
6-61	CAMEO AREA		South Lahontan	9,349	0.0	Very Low	0	0	0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%	100%	0	0	0	0	0					Mostly Federal land	
6-62	RACE TRACK VALLEY		South Lahontan	14,184	0.0	Very Low	0	0	0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%	100%	0	0	0	0	0					Mostly Federal land	
6-63	HIDDEN VALLEY		South Lahontan	18,037	0.0	Very Low	0	0	0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%	100%	0	0	0	0	0					Mostly Federal land	
6-64	MARBLE CANYON AREA		South Lahontan	10,422	0.0	Very Low	0	0	0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%	100%	0	0	0	0	0					Mostly Federal land	
6-65	COTTONWOOD SPRING AREA		South Lahontan	3,918	0.0	Very Low	0	0	0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%	100%	0	0	0	0	0					Mostly Federal land	
6-66	LEE FLAT		South Lahontan	20,380	0.0	Very Low	0	0	0%	0	4	0.75	0	0	0	0%	100%	0	0	0	0	0					Mostly Federal land	
6-67	MARTIS VALLEY		North Lahontan	36,381	17.0	Medium	14,743	2	128%	4	686	3	15	3	9,300	90%	10%	3	5	4	0	0		1	Strong SW-GW interaction with Martis Creek, as per 2013 GWMP	GW Use from 2013 Martis Valley GWMP.		
6-68	SANTA ROSA FLAT		South Lahontan	16,861	0.0	Very Low	0	0	0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%	100%	0	0	0	0	0					Mostly Federal land	
6-69	KELSO LANDER VALLEY		South Lahontan	11,208	0.0	Very Low	0	0	0%	0	8	0.75	0	0	0	0%	100%	0	0	0	0	0					Mostly Federal land	
6-7	ANTELOPE VALLEY		North Lahontan	20,125	0.0	Very Low	876	1	100%	0	191	2.25	13	3	64	0%	100%	0	1	0	11,375	5						
6-70	CACTUS FLAT		South Lahontan	7,056	0.0	Very Low	0	0	0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%	100%	0	0	0	0	0					Mostly Federal land	
6-71	LOST LAKE VALLEY		South Lahontan	23,414	0.0	Very Low	0	0	0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%	100%	0	0	0	0	0					Mostly Federal land	
6-72	COLES FLAT		South Lahontan	2,961	0.0	Very Low	0	0	0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%	100%	0	0	0	0	0					Mostly Federal land	
6-73	WILD HORSE MESA AREA		South Lahontan	3,337	0.0	Very Low	0	0	0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%	100%	0	0	0	0	0					Mostly Federal land	
6-74	HARRISBURG FLATS		South Lahontan	25,077	0.0	Very Low	1	0	500%	0	0	0	0	0	4	100%	0%	0	5	0	0	0					Mostly Federal land	
6-75	WILDROSE CANYON		South Lahontan	5,182	0.0	Very Low	1	0	500%	0	0	0	1	2	1	100%	0%	0	5	0	0	0					Mostly Federal land	
6-76	BROWN MOUNTAIN VALLEY		South Lahontan	21,862	0.0	Very Low	0	0	0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%	100%	0	0	0	0	0					Mostly Federal land	
6-77	GRASS VALLEY		South Lahontan	10,034	0.0	Very Low	0	0	0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%	100%	0	0	0	0	0					Mostly Federal land	
6-78	DENNING SPRING VALLEY		South Lahontan	7,289	0.0	Very Low	0	0	0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%	100%	0	0	0	0	0					Mostly Federal land	
6-79	CALIFORNIA VALLEY		South Lahontan	58,639	0.0	Very Low	0	0	0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%	100%	0	0	0	0	0					Mostly Federal land	
6-8	BRIDGEPORT VALLEY		North Lahontan	32,545	0.0	Very Low	586	1	96%	0	68	0.75	8	2	43	0%	100%	0	1	0	16,618	4						
6-80	MIDDLE PARK CANYON		South Lahontan	1,752	0.0	Very Low	0	0	0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%	100%	0	0	0	0	0					Mostly Federal land	
6-81	BUTTE VALLEY		South Lahontan	8,853	0.0	Very Low	0	0	0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%	100%	0	0	0	0	0					Mostly Federal land	

Basin Subbasin ID	Basin Name	Subbasin Name	Hydrologic Name	Basin - Subbasin Area (acre)	Total Rank Scoring	Final Priority	Population (2010)	Final Population Rank	Population Growth %	Final Population Growth Rank	Total Wells	Final Well Rank (discounted)	Total Public Supply Wells	Final Public Supply Well Rank	Groundwater Volume (Ac-Ft)	% of total water supply supplied by groundwater	% of total water supply supplied by surface water	Final groundwater volume rank	Final % of total water supply supplied by groundwater rank	Final groundwater Reliance rank	Irrigated Acreage	Final Irrigated Acreage Rank	Impact Ranks	Impact Comments	Other Information Rank	Other Information Comments	Additional Comments
6-82	SPRING CANYON VALLEY		South Lahontan	4,832	0.0	Very Low	0	0	0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%	100%	0	0	0	0	0				Mostly Federal land	
6-84	GREENWATER VALLEY		South Lahontan	60,260	0.0	Very Low	0	0	0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%	100%	0	0	0	0	0				Mostly Federal land	
6-85	GOLD VALLEY		South Lahontan	3,234	0.0	Very Low	0	0	0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%	100%	0	0	0	0	0				Mostly Federal land	
6-86	RHODES HILL AREA		South Lahontan	15,697	0.0	Very Low	0	0	0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%	100%	0	0	0	0	0				Mostly Federal land	
6-88	OWL LAKE VALLEY		South Lahontan	22,402	0.0	Very Low	0	0	0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%	100%	0	0	0	0	0				Mostly Federal land	
6-89	KANE WASH AREA		South Lahontan	5,997	0.0	Very Low	0	0	0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%	100%	0	0	0	0	0					
6-9	MONO VALLEY		South Lahontan	173,299	0.0	Very Low	385	0	97%	0	13	0.75	4	1	338	94%	6%	0	5	0	0	0				Mostly Federal land	
6-90	CADY FAULT AREA		South Lahontan	8,015	0.0	Very Low	6	0	250%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%	100%	0	0	0	0	0				Mostly Federal land	
6-91	COW HEAD LAKE VALLEY		North Lahontan	5,625	0.0	Very Low	0	0	0%	0	2	0.75	0	0	0	0%	100%	0	0	0	3,287	5				GW Use based on well log and population data	
6-92	PINE CREEK VALLEY		North Lahontan	9,526	0.0	Very Low	0	0	0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%	100%	0	0	0	0	0				GW Use based on well log and population data	
6-93	HARVEY VALLEY		North Lahontan	4,503	0.0	Very Low	0	0	0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%	100%	0	0	0	0	0				GW Use based on well log and population data	
6-94	GRASSHOPPER VALLEY		North Lahontan	17,665	0.0	Very Low	0	0	0%	0	4	0.75	0	0	300	33%	67%	0	2	0	250	1				GW Use based on well log and population data	
6-95	DRY VALLEY		North Lahontan	6,498	0.0	Very Low	2	0	100%	0	4	0.75	0	0	0	0%	100%	0	0	0	104	1					
6-96	EAGLE LAKE AREA		North Lahontan	12,700	0.0	Very Low	41	0	83%	0	177	2.25	0	0	10	100%	0%	1	5	0	0	0					
6-97	HORSE LAKE VALLEY		North Lahontan	3,827	0.0	Very Low	0	0	0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%	100%	0	0	0	1,563	4				GW Use based on well log and population data	
6-98	TULEDAD CANYON VALLEY		North Lahontan	5,167	0.0	Very Low	0	0	0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%	100%	0	0	0	83	1				GW Use based on well log and population data	
6-99	PAINTERS FLAT		North Lahontan	6,395	0.0	Very Low	0	0	0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%	100%	0	0	0	0	0				GW Use based on well log and population data	
7-1	LANFAIR VALLEY		Colorado River	158,360	0.0	Very Low	19	0	74%	0	52	0.75	0	0	122	100%	0%	0	5	0	0	0					
7-10	TWENTYNINE PALMS VALLEY		Colorado River	62,829	8.8	Low	22,113	1	119%	2	154	0.75	0	0	4,026	100%	0%	1	5	3	13	1	1				Some wells in the basin exceed the recommended levels for drinking water in fluoride, TDS, and sulfate concentrations. Thermal waters also occur in this basin (DWR 1984).
7-11	COPPER MOUNTAIN VALLEY		Colorado River	30,540	0.0	Very Low	6,085	1	199%	5	4	0.75	1	1	561	59%	41%	1	3	0	11	1	1				Locally high TDS and septic tank problems.
7-12	WARREN VALLEY		Colorado River	23,952	15.3	Medium	22,860	2	184%	5	3	0.75	33	4	3,180	59%	41%	2	3	2.5	0	0	1		1	Basin is adjudicated.	GW Use from HDWD annual watermaster report
7-13.01	DEADMAN VALLEY	DEADMAN LAKE	Colorado River	89,793	0.0	Very Low	22	0	100%	0	12	0.75	0	0	4	100%	0%	0	5	0	0	0					
7-13.02	DEADMAN VALLEY	SURPRISE SPRING	Colorado River	29,507	0.0	Very Low	179	0	215%	0	0	0	10	2	31	99%	1%	0	5	0	0	0					
7-14	LAVIC VALLEY		Colorado River	103,132	0.0	Very Low	0	0	0%	0	12	0.75	0	0	0	0%	100%	0	0	0	0	0					
7-15	BESSEMER VALLEY		Colorado River	39,379	0.0	Very Low	0	0	0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%	100%	0	0	0	0	0					
7-16	AMES VALLEY		Colorado River	109,340	0.0	Very Low	4,540	1	106%	0	26	0.75	16	1	713	98%	2%	0	5	0	0	0	2				Groundwater in the basin has locally high TDS, fluoride, and chloride contents (DWR 1975). TDS content reaches about 1,000 mg/L southwest of Emerson Lake (MWA 1999).
7-17	MEANS VALLEY		Colorado River	15,061	0.0	Very Low	46	0	196%	0	0	0	0	0	26	100%	0%	0	5	0	0	0	2				Fluoride, nitrate, and TDS concentrations are impairments locally.
7-18.01	JOHNSON VALLEY	SOGGY LAKE	Colorado River	77,865	0.0	Very Low	354	0	71%	0	4	0.75	3	1	248	100%	0%	0	5	0	0	0					
7-18.02	JOHNSON VALLEY	UPPER JOHNSON VALLEY	Colorado River	35,050	0.0	Very Low	0	0	0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%	100%	0	0	0	0	0					
7-19	LUCERNE VALLEY		Colorado River	148,467	9.8	Low	3,311	1	178%	0	32	0.75	22	1	10,000	13%	87%	1	1	1	1,435	1	4		1	Fall 1954 - Fall 2002 Change in GW Storage is estimated at -460TAF (Napoli)	GW Use based on B118-03 data
7-2	FENNER VALLEY		Colorado River	457,633	0.0	Very Low	31	0	68%	0	36	0.75	3	1	112	100%	0%	0	5	0	0	0					
7-20	MORONGO VALLEY		Colorado River	7,286	0.0	Very Low	2,983	2	165%	5	129	3	12	5	654	100%	0%	1	5	0	0	0					
7-21.01	COACHELLA VALLEY	INDIO	Colorado River	299,784	19.3	Medium	368,855	2	183%	5	224	0.75	188	3	200,979	43%	57%	4	3	3.5	74,268	3	2				Nitrates and addition of salts due to Colorado River imported water. Local areas of elevated fluoride.
7-21.02	COACHELLA VALLEY	MISSION CREEK	Colorado River	48,966	15.8	Medium	18,974	1	223%	5	32	0.75	11	2	12,500	100%	0%	3	5	4	0	0	2		1	Mission Creek GW also supplies drinking water to Desert Hot Springs and part of Indio subbasins	GW Use based on IRWM plan
7-21.03	COACHELLA VALLEY	DESERT HOT SPRINGS	Colorado River	101,862	12.3	Low	22,568	1	218%	5	46	0.75	2	1	2,500	100%	0%	0	5	2.5	896	1	1				High TDS and declining water levels have been documented for a long period of time in the Desert Hot Springs Subbasin.
7-21.04	COACHELLA VALLEY	SAN GORGONIO PASS	Colorado River	38,823	18.8	Medium	29,540	2	166%	5	31	0.75	30	3	15,909	93%	7%	3	5	4	138	1	2		1	Basin is adjudicated.	PubCom - GW is mainly for resorts, spas, industry, and possibly some irrigation
7-22	WEST SALTON SEA		Colorado River	106,408	0.0	Very Low	5,352	1	197%	0	2	0.75	0	0	64	100%	0%	0	5	0	0	0	3				Groundwater is marginal to poor for domestic and irrigation use because of elevated fluoride, boron, and TDS.
7-24	BORREGO VALLEY		Colorado River	153,978	15.3	Medium	3,853	1	174%	0	446	0.75	33	2	20,000	100%	0%	2	5	3.5	4,041	1	5		2	Most demand for basin is concentrated in north in a small area.	PubCom - Changed GW% to 100
7-25	OCOTILLO-CLARK VALLEY		Colorado River	224,416	7.3	Low	27	0	137%	0	37	0.75	3	1	3,300	0%	100%	0	1	0.5	10,299	2	3				High TDS, sulfate, chloride, and fluoride concentrations locally impair groundwater for domestic and irrigation use.
7-26	TERWILLIGER VALLEY		Colorado River	8,081	0.0	Very Low	1,085	1	205%	5	188	3	1	1	2,000	16%	84%	2	1	0	229	1	1				Locally elevated nitrates (B-118).
7-27	SAN FELIPE VALLEY		Colorado River	23,573	0.0	Very Low	188	0	161%	0	177	1.5	1	1	155	16%	84%	1	1	0	184	1	3				Significant groundwater declines documented in the late 1950s through early 1970s (B-118)
7-28	VALLECITO-CARRIZO VALLEY		Colorado River	122,943	0.0	Very Low	77	0	209%	0	32	0.75	1	1	176	100%	0%	0	5	0	0	0	3				Groundwater quality is marginal for domestic use because of elevated levels of fluoride and mineral content.
7-29	COYOTE WELLS VALLEY		Colorado River	147,088	0.0	Very Low	374	0	70%	0	5	0.75	9	1	92	100%	0%	0	5	0	0	0	4				Basin is in overdraft (B-118). There are local fluoride issues and elevated TDS in some of the shallower wells in the basin.
7-3	WARD VALLEY		Colorado River	564,569	0.0	Very Low	22	0	318%	0	22	0.75	0	0	94	100%	0%	0	5	0	0	0					
7-30	IMPERIAL VALLEY		Colorado River	969,017	0.0	Very Low	164,037	1	131%	4	111	0.75	5	1	0	0%	100%	0	0	0	621,898	5					
7-31	OROCOPIA VALLEY		Colorado River	97,214	0.0	Very Low	2,243	1	316%	0	4	0.75	0	0	957	94%	6%	3	5	2.5	0	0	1				Some natural occurrences of elements or compounds that exceed drinking water standards.
7-32	CHOCOLATE VALLEY		Colorado River	130,507	0.0	Very Low	658	0	355%	0	4	0.75	0	0	0	0%	100%	0	0	0	0	0	4				Groundwater quality impairment due to elevated levels of fluoride, boron, and TDS (B-118). Elevated fluoride levels were found in nearly all mineral analyses of groundwater.
7-33	EAST SALTON SEA		Colorado River	197,043	0.0	Very Low	1,093	0	84%	0	6	0.75	0	0	0	0%	100%	0	0	0	8,432	2					
7-34	AMOS VALLEY		Colorado River	131,584	0.0	Very Low	9	0	100%	0	0	0	3	1	0	0%	100%	0	0	0	0	0					
7-35	OGILBY VALLEY		Colorado River	135,017	0.0	Very Low	36	0	100%	0	0	0	4	1	3	0%	100%	0	1	0	418	1					
7-36	YUMA VALLEY		Colorado River	125,741	0.0	Very Low	3,146	1	82%	0	3	0.75	8	1	3,412	3%	97%	0	0	0	30,197	3					
7-37	ARROYO SECO VALLEY		Colorado River	259,806	0.0	Very Low	6	0	100%	0	3	0.75	1	1	28	100%	0%	0	5	0	0	0					
7-38	PALO VERDE VALLEY		Colorado River	74,004	12.8	Low	7,459	1																			

Basin Subbasin ID	Basin Name	Subbasin Name	Hydrologic Name	Basin - Subbasin Area (acre)	Total Rank Scoring	Final Priority	Population (2010)	Final Population Rank	Population Growth %	Final Population Growth Rank	Total Wells	Final Well Rank (discounted)	Total Public Supply Wells	Final Public Supply Well Rank	Groundwater Volume (Ac-Ft)	% of total water supply supplied by groundwater	% of total water supply supplied by surface water	Final groundwater volume rank	Final % of total water supply supplied by groundwater rank	Final groundwater Reliance rank	Irrigated Acreage	Final Irrigated Acreage Rank	Impact Ranks	Impact Comments	Other Information Rank	Other Information Comments	Additional Comments
7-42	VIDAL VALLEY		Colorado River	139,577	0.0	Very Low	10	0	150%	0	2	0.75	1	1	6	100%	0%	0	5	0	0	0	4	Fluoride, chloride, sulfate, and TDS concentrations are high (DWR 1975). GW near town of Vidal has fluoride concentrations making water unusable domestically and sodium contents make water marginal for irrigation.			
7-43	CHEMEHUEVI VALLEY		Colorado River	275,713	0.0	Very Low	395	0	94%	0	18	0.75	0	0	94	100%	1.11E-15	0	5	0	0	0	3	Concentrations of sulfate, chloride, fluoride, and TDS are high (DWR 1975).			
7-44	NEEDLES VALLEY		Colorado River	89,101	8.3	Low	4,902	1	90%	0	207	0.75	16	2	2,500	11%	89%	0	1	0.5	3,470	1	3	Concentrations of sulfate, chloride, fluoride, and TDS content levels are high in the basin (DWR 1975).			Majority of basin land use is on AZ side.
7-45	PIUTE VALLEY		Colorado River	177,319	0.0	Very Low	2	0	100%	0	10	0.75	0	0	96	100%	0%	0	5	0	0	0	0				
7-46	CANEBAKE VALLEY		Colorado River	5,460	0.0	Very Low	2	0	100%	0	0	0	0	0	2	100%	0%	1	5	0	0	0	0				
7-47	JACUMBA VALLEY		Colorado River	2,472	0.0	Very Low	517	1	94%	0	14	1.5	2	4	427	100%	0%	2	5	0	0	0	5	According to San Diego County documents, some wells are reportedly going dry; this is a small basin with over 500 residents and no source of imported water. TDS of some groundwaters recharging the basin are high.	3	According to aerial imagery review, GIS, and other docs, approximately 500 acres of crops are irrigated and Bulletin 118 boundary is significantly over exaggerated (incorporating bedrock areas probably 30 percent of which are included in B118 boundary)	
7-48	HELENDALE FAULT VALLEY		Colorado River	2,637	0.0	Very Low	9	0	211%	0	6	0.75	0	0	6	100%	0%	0	5	0	0	0	0				
7-49	PIPES CANYON FAULT VALLEY		Colorado River	3,408	0.0	Very Low	5	0	600%	0	13	1.5	0	0	3	100%	0%	0	5	0	0	0	0				
7-5	CHUCKWALLA VALLEY		Colorado River	608,995	10.8	Low	7,853	1	36%	0	102	0.75	11	1	5,959	75%	25%	0	4	2	422	1	3	Sulfate, chloride, fluoride, and TDS concentrations are high for domestic use (DWR 1975). High of boron and TDS concentrations, and high sodium percentage impair groundwater for irrigation use (DWR 1975).	2	Significant growth in industry (solar), and others. Prison is also a significant user the the GW resources.	
7-50	IRON RIDGE AREA		Colorado River	5,284	0.0	Very Low	0	0	0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%	100%	0	0	0	0	0	0				
7-51	LOST HORSE VALLEY		Colorado River	17,455	0.0	Very Low	0	0	0%	0	1	0.75	0	0	0	0%	100%	0	0	0	0	0	0				
7-52	PLEASANT VALLEY		Colorado River	9,733	0.0	Very Low	0	0	0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%	100%	0	0	0	0	0	0				
7-53	HEXIE MOUNTAIN AREA		Colorado River	11,236	0.0	Very Low	0	0	0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%	100%	0	0	0	0	0	0				
7-54	BUCK RIDGE FAULT VALLEY		Colorado River	6,974	0.0	Very Low	0	0	0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%	100%	0	0	0	0	0	0				
7-55	COLLINS VALLEY		Colorado River	7,121	0.0	Very Low	11	0	427%	0	0	0	0	0	6	100%	0%	1	5	0	0	0	0				
7-56	YAQUI WELL AREA		Colorado River	15,098	0.0	Very Low	4	0	175%	0	7	0.75	2	1	3	100%	0%	1	5	0	0	0	0				
7-59	MASON VALLEY		Colorado River	5,567	0.0	Very Low	23	0	252%	0	6	0.75	1	2	19	100%	0%	1	5	0	0	0	0				
7-6	PINTO VALLEY		Colorado River	184,377	0.0	Very Low	7	0	300%	0	2	0.75	2	1	0	0%	100%	0	0	0	0	0	0				
7-61	DAVIES VALLEY		Colorado River	3,600	0.0	Very Low	0	0	0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%	100%	0	0	0	0	0	0				Mostly Federal land
7-62	JOSHUA TREE		Colorado River	27,422	0.0	Very Low	4,951	1	173%	5	29	0.75	12	3	773	99%	1%	0	5	0	0	0	1	Fluoride concentration in water from some wells has reached 9.0 mg/L, exceeding recommended maximum concentration levels of 1.4 mg/L (B-118, DWR 1984).			
7-63	VANDEVENTER FLAT		Colorado River	6,787	0.0	Very Low	50	0	78%	0	6	0.75	0	0	16	94%	6%	0	5	0	0	0	0				
7-7	CADIZ VALLEY		Colorado River	272,931	0.0	Very Low	10	0	540%	0	6	0.75	0	0	58	100%	0%	0	5	0	0	0	0				
7-8	BRISTOL VALLEY		Colorado River	501,834	8.3	Low	27	0	174%	0	63	0.75	1	1	5,000	100%	0%	0	5	2.5	943	1	3	Fluoride content in some wells exceeds the recommended MCL level (C-118). TDS content is extremely high in some wells near Bristol Lake (DWR 1967).			GW Used is from Metropolitan WD (1999)
7-9	DALE VALLEY		Colorado River	214,650	0.0	Very Low	1,197	0	98%	0	178	0.75	2	1	1,500	91%	9%	0	5	0	18	1	5	Groundwater quality in basin is generally unsuitable for domestic and agricultural uses (DWR 1979). TDS and F concentrations impair for domestic use, and B and Na concentrations impair agricultural use in basin (DWR 1979). USGS data shows declining water.			
8-1	COASTAL PLAIN OF ORANGE COUNTY		South Coast	223,222	20.8	Medium	2,309,966	5	110%	2	8,534	3.75	200	4	342,000	100%	0%	5	5	5	0	0	1	Saline intrusion issues.			
8-2.01	UPPER SANTA ANA VALLEY	CHINO	South Coast	154,693	23.3	High	898,653	4	112%	2	2,162	2.25	178	4	169,488	53%	47%	5	3	4	25,000	3	3	Locally high nitrates and TDS. PubCom, to include subsidence, historic overdraft, ground fissuring, problems mitigated with OBMP, reduce from 4 to 3.	1	Basin is adjudicated. Pub Com, program of controlled overdraft of 400,000 AF from the Chino Basin through 2030 to control the outflow of poor-quality rising GW	PubCom, Data provided for GW use, Percent supplied by GW, Irrigated Acres, wells, and PSW
8-2.02	UPPER SANTA ANA VALLEY	CUCAMONGA	South Coast	9,574	18.3	Medium	51,001	4	102%	1	26	0.75	17	5	14,400	30%	70%	5	2	3.5	11	1	3	High nitrates reported in 14 of 24 wells tested (B-118)			GW Use and percent supplied by GW is from Cucamonga Valley Water District
8-2.03	UPPER SANTA ANA VALLEY	RIVERSIDE-ARLINGTON	South Coast	58,903	24.5	High	336,884	4	111%	2	1,397	3	47	4	49,148	71%	29%	5	4	4.5	3,583	2	5	Water quality degradation issues known in several public supply wells.			
8-2.04	UPPER SANTA ANA VALLEY	RIALTO-COLTON	South Coast	30,224	18.3	Medium	145,832	4	106%	1	265	2.25	42	4	12,000	52%	48%	3	3	3	32	1	3	Extensive perchlorate contamination in basin.			GW Use based on B118-03 data
8-2.05	UPPER SANTA ANA VALLEY	CAJON	South Coast	23,306	0.0	Very Low	520	1	102%	0	68	0.75	3	1	33	13%	87%	5	1	0.5	60	1	0			GW use may be under reported	
8-2.06	UPPER SANTA ANA VALLEY	BUNKER HILL	South Coast	80,972	21.3	High	363,394	4	104%	1	1,247	2.25	167	5	32,550	60%	40%	3	3	3	3,257	2	3	The Bunker Hill sub-basin is impacted with PCE and TCE from the Newmark Superfund site and with perchlorate from the Crafton-Redlands plume.	1	Adjudication (Western San Bernardino)	PubCom, reported WQ issues and some declining GWL.
8-2.07	UPPER SANTA ANA VALLEY	YUCAIPA	South Coast	25,410	20.8	Medium	65,180	3	106%	1	220	2.25	37	4	8,270	68%	32%	3	4	3.5	1,272	2	5	Overdraft. Documented impacts of nitrates and sulfates. (B-118)			
8-2.08	UPPER SANTA ANA VALLEY	SAN TIMOTEO	South Coast	73,541	19.0	Medium	54,169	2	156%	5	460	1.5	53	3	6,310	75%	25%	1	4	2.5	1,155	1	3	Locally high nitrates and salinity (B-118). GAMA reported upper basin water quality issues.	1	Parts of the subbasin are adjudicated.	
8-2.09	UPPER SANTA ANA VALLEY	TEMESCAL	South Coast	23,654	19.5	Medium	141,436	4	119%	2	445	3	15	3	22,024	79%	21%	5	4	4.5	831	1	2	Groundwater quality impaired by nitrates and inorganics in some wells (B-118).			
8-4	ELSINORE		South Coast	25,873	21.3	High	60,946	3	132%	4	375	2.25	31	4	5,872	72%	28%	2	4	3	286	1	3	High TDS due to Nitrate and Sulfate in some portions of the basin (Elsinore Gw AdvisoryComm). Some fluoride impacts to groundwater (B-118).	1	Study done for Elsinore Basin GW Advisory Committee (Nov. 2012) indicates an average annual GW budget deficit of 1,800 af/yr for the last 11 years. Between 1990 and 2000 cumulative deficit was 19,000 af.	GW Use based on Bulletin 118 and MWD data
8-5	SAN JACINTO		South Coast	188,623	24.3	High	474,317	3	132%	4	2,181	2.25	48	2	91,842	86%	14%	3	5	4	30,430	3	5	Basin is in overdraft (MWD). Groundwater quality issues documented in DWR B-118. Pumping has increased some contaminant distribution in the basin.	1	Adjudicated Basin	
8-6	HEMET LAKE VALLEY		South Coast	16,811	0.0	Very Low	464	1	115%	0	47	0.75	9	3	5	1%	99%	0	1	0	84	1	2	Locally high nitrates and TDS.(B-118)			
8-7	BIG MEADOWS VALLEY		South Coast	14,263	0.0	Very Low	51	0	114%	0	23	0.75	15	4	3	52%	48%	5	3	0	0	0	0				
8-8	SEVEN OAKS VALLEY		South Coast	4,103	0.0	Very Low	7	0	71%	0	0	0	1	2	0	0%	100%	0	0	0	0	0	0				
8-9	BEAR VALLEY		South Coast	19,667	14.5	Medium	16,866	2	102%	1	496	3	46	5	3,500	52%	48%	2	3	2.5	0	0	1	Fluoride problems in some wells (B-118).			GW Use based on Bulletin 118 and Big Bear data
9-1	SAN JUAN VALLEY		South Coast	16,797	13.3	Low	61,131	3	101%	1	194	2.25	11	3	5,500	6%	94%	3	1	2	0	0	2	TDS is generally high, springs with high fluorine, local pesticide contamination, and secondary inorganic contamination (B-118). Desalters used to treat water.			GW Use from MWD in 2004/2005.
9-10	SAN PASQUAL VALLEY		South Coast	4,563	19.0	Medium	968	1	139%	0	110	3	1	2	8,800	100%	0%	5	5	5	1,963	4	3	Nitrate problems are widespread (B-118). TDS is also known to be high in places. During dry years, the basin has experienced water level declines up to 20 feet in one year per GWMP.	1	2006 Farmland Mapping Data indicate irrigated acreage is 2,691 and quick GIS estimate by SRO indicates irrigated acreage is at least 2,100 acres.	GW Use and percent supplied by GW is from San Pasqual Valley GWMP
9-11	SANTA MARIA VALLEY		South Coast	12,379	0.0	Very Low	16,695	2	109%	2	542	3.75	0	0	4	0%	100%	0	1	0	624	2	0				
9-12	SAN DIEGUITO CREEK		South Coast	3,578	0.0	Very Low	3,135	2	111%	2	89	3	0	0	1	0%	100%	2	1	0	976	3	0				Possible WQ issues (historical)
9-13	POWAY VALLEY		South Coast	2,485	0.0	Very Low	16,450	5	116%	2	89	3.75	0	0	4	4%	96%	2	1	0	3	1	0				Possible WQ issues (historical). Seawater intrusion is suspected (DWR 1975).
9-14	MISSION VALLEY		South Coast	7,387	0.0	Very Low	37,066	4	120%	3	307	3.75	0	0	9	4%	96%	2	1	0	0	0	0				
9-15	SAN DIEGO RIVER VALLEY		South Coast	9,944	15.8	Medium	45,800	4	107%	1	339	3.75	4	3	4,000	1%	99%	3	1	2	215	1	1	High Nitrates, Iron and Manganese treatment is required, high TDS (>3,000 mg/l) in western portion of basin			GW Use is estimated from 2007 San Diego Groundwater Basin Report Chapter 4, and from 2001 GW Mgmt Planning Study for Santee-El Monte Basin.

Basin Subbasin ID	Basin Name	Subbasin Name	Hydrologic Name	Basin - Subbasin Area (acre)	Total Rank Scoring	Final Priority	Population (2010)	Final Population Rank	Population Growth %	Final Population Growth Rank	Total Wells	Final Well Rank (discounted)	Total Public Supply Wells	Final Public Supply Well Rank	Groundwater Volume (Ac-Ft)	% of total water supply supplied by groundwater	% of total water supply supplied by surface water	Final groundwater volume rank	Final % of total water supply supplied by groundwater rank	Final groundwater Reliance rank	Irrigated Acreage	Final Irrigated Acreage Rank	Impact Ranks	Impact Comments	Other Information Rank	Other Information Comments	Additional Comments	
9-16	EL CAJON VALLEY		South Coast	7,203	0.0	Very Low	92,314	5	109%	1	369	3.75	0	0	25	4%	96%	2	1	0	11	1	5	High nitrates and TDS have impaired the basin for domestic use and high chlorides make the water marginal to inferior for irrigation uses (B-118).				
9-17	SWEETWATER VALLEY		South Coast	5,949	0.0	Very Low	35,277	4	106%	1	509	3.75	5	4	9	4%	96%	2	1	0	0	0	5	TDS, chloride and sodium content of the groundwater generally exceed the recommended limits for drinking (B-118, & DWR 1986).				
9-18	OTAY VALLEY		South Coast	6,869	0.0	Very Low	39,191	4	108%	1	204	3	0	0	10	2%	98%	2	1	0	83	1	5	Groundwater is marginal to inferior for domestic use in the coastal plain due to high TDS content and suitable in the eastern part of the basin and is marginal to inferior for irrigation due to high chloride concentrations (B-118 & DWR 1967).				
9-19	TIA JUANA		South Coast	7,448	0.0	Very Low	50,694	5	103%	1	87	2.25	0	0	14	1%	99%	0	1	0	305	2	5	Chloride and sulfate exceed MCL in some wells (Izbicki 1985). MCL for aluminum, barium, lead, selenium, and silver concentrations are exceeded individually in some wells (Dudek 1994).				
9-2	SAN MATEO VALLEY		South Coast	3,009	0.0	Very Low	554	1	141%	0	21	1.5	4	4	0	0%	100%	0	0	0	515	3	3	Locally high TDS and some elevated nitrates in wells (B-118)			GW Use based on B118-03 data	
9-22	BATIQUITOS LAGOON VALLEY		South Coast	745	0.0	Very Low	2,109	3	180%	5	5	1.5	0	0	0	0%	100%	0	0	0	6	1	4	The groundwater in this basin was rated inferior for irrigation because of high chloride content and marginal for domestic use because of high sulfate and TDS concentrations (DWR 1967).				
9-23	SAN ELIJO VALLEY		South Coast	888	0.0	Very Low	1,125	2	133%	4	25	3	0	0	0	0%	100%	0	0	0	8	1	5	High TDS limits beneficial uses (B-118)				
9-24	PAMO VALLEY		South Coast	1,514	0.0	Very Low	0	0	0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%	100%	0	0	0	0	0				GW Use may be under reported		
9-25	RANCHITA TOWN AREA		South Coast	3,146	0.0	Very Low	168	1	129%	0	78	3	0	0	0	0%	100%	0	0	0	29	1				GW Use may be under reported		
9-27	COTTONWOOD VALLEY		South Coast	3,871	0.0	Very Low	44	1	145%	0	17	1.5	5	4	0	0%	100%	0	0	0	148	1			1	Basin area is listed by EPA as a "Sole Source Aquifer" in EPA Region 9.	GW Use may be under reported	
9-28	CAMPO VALLEY		South Coast	3,569	0.0	Very Low	985	1	179%	0	55	2.25	5	4	0	0%	100%	0	0	0	310	2			1	Basin area is listed by EPA as a "Sole Source Aquifer" in EPA Region 9.	GW Use may be under reported	
9-29	POTRERO VALLEY		South Coast	2,035	0.0	Very Low	475	1	146%	0	62	3	3	4	0	0%	100%	0	0	0	131	2					GW Use may be under reported	
9-3	SAN ONOFRE VALLEY		South Coast	1,261	0.0	Very Low	3,133	3	292%	5	2	0.75	3	5	1	4%	96%	2	1	0	0	0						
9-32	SAN MARCOS AREA		South Coast	2,144	0.0	Very Low	15,096	5	124%	3	52	3	0	0	4	4%	96%	2	1	0	0	0						Percent water provided by GW is based on B118-03 data
9-4	SANTA MARGARITA VALLEY		South Coast	7,998	17.8	Medium	4,121	2	102%	1	111	2.25	9	4	5,800	93%	7%	4	5	4.5	157	1	2	Groundwater in SW part of basin is marginal to inferior for domestic and agricultural uses (DWR 1967). Mg, SO4, Cl, NO3, and TDS concentrations are locally high for domestic. Use, Cl, B, and TDS are locally high for ag use (DWR 1975).	1	Adjudicated Basin	GW Use id provided by MWD and water master reports	
9-5	TEMECULA VALLEY		South Coast	88,338	23.0	High	219,431	3	148%	5	1,556	3	53	3	3,365	18%	82%	1	1	1	4,800	2	5	Groundwater source is impaired in various parts of the basin due to elevated nitrates, fluoride, sulfates, TDS, and VOCs (B-118).	1	Adjudicated Basin		
9-6	CAHUILLA VALLEY		South Coast	18,342	17.5	Medium	1,993	1	123%	3	406	3	8	3	2,115	100%	0%	2	5	3.5	1,849	2	1	Locally, sulfates and nitrates are high for domestic use (DWR 1975). Nitrate concentrations reach as much as 128 mg/L (Moyle 1976).	1	Adjudicated Basin	GW Use and percent of water supplied by GW is from 2013 Water master report for years 2011-2012	
9-7	SAN LUIS REY VALLEY		South Coast	29,865	19.0	Medium	43,942	2	105%	1	500	3	48	5	14,400	5%	95%	3	1	2	7,830	3	3	TDS is a concern according to MWD. B-118 indicates problems with nitrates, inorganics, radiologicals, and VOCs. Desalination generally required in all areas of the basin.			Groundwater reliance from MWD report online. Percentage of groundwater vs. surface water use is unknown. It is likely that the groundwater reliance percentage is much higher, but no information could be found other than the extraction amount of 14,400 AFY	
9-8	WARNER VALLEY		South Coast	24,150	0.0	Very Low	185	0	78%	0	72	0.75	31	4	0	0%	100%	0	0	0	0	0	1	Groundwater generally suitable except for elevated fluoride contents near hot springs				
9-9	ESCONDIDO VALLEY		South Coast	2,906	0.0	Very Low	38,593	5	104%	1	221	3.75	0	0	10	3%	97%	0	1	0	40	1	2	Local sources of groundwater in this basin are categorized as suitable to inferior for domestic use. The water categorized as inferior typically contains high nitrate, TDS, or sulfate content (DWR 1967).				