

CASGEM Groundwater Basin Prioritization Results Sorted by Basin Number									Data Component Ranking Value									Overall Ranking		Impact Comments	Other Information Comments	
Basin count	Basin Number	Basin Name	Sub-Basin Name	Hydrologic Region	DWR Region Office	Basin Area		2010 Population	Population	Population Growth	Public Supply Wells	Total Wells *	Irrigated Acreage	Groundwater Reliance			Impacts	Other Information	Overall Basin Ranking Score ***			Overall Basin Priority
						Acres	Sq. Mile							GW Use **	Percent of Total Supply **	GW Reliance Total						
1	1-1	SMITH RIVER PLAIN		North Coast	NRO	40,446	63.2	24,588	2	2	4	3.75	3	2	5	3.5	0	0	18.3	Medium		
2	1-10	EEL RIVER VALLEY		North Coast	NRO	73,701	115.2	21,558	1	2	2	2.25	4	4	4	4	0	1	16.3	Medium		Shallow basin with strong SW-GW interaction and fishery issues. Useable gw basin storage is estimated at 100,000 af and annual use is estimated at over one-half the total storage.
3	1-11	COVELO ROUND VALLEY		North Coast	NRO	16,396	25.6	1,968	1	5	2	3	4	1	1	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
4	1-12	LAYTONVILLE VALLEY		North Coast	NRO	5,020	7.8	1,167	1	0	3	3.75	3	1	1	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
5	1-13	LITTLE LAKE VALLEY		North Coast	NRO	10,018	15.7	5,993	2	1	0	3.75	4	2	1	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
6	1-14	LOWER KLAMATH RIVER VALLEY		North Coast	NRO	7,026	11.0	806	1	0	5	1.5	2	1	2	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
7	1-15	HAPPY CAMP TOWN AREA		North Coast	NRO	2,771	4.3	759	1	0	0	2.25	1	2	3	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
8	1-16	SEIAD VALLEY		North Coast	NRO	2,243	3.5	132	1	0	4	0.75	1	0	1	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
9	1-17	BRAY TOWN AREA		North Coast	NRO	8,027	12.5	0	0	0	0	0.75	3	0	1	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
10	1-18	RED ROCK VALLEY		North Coast	NRO	8,996	14.1	23	0	0	0	1.5	5	5	5	5	0	0	11.5	Low		
11	1-19	ANDERSON VALLEY		North Coast	NCRO	4,969	7.8	1,297	1	5	5	3.75	3	1	1	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
12	1-2.01	KLAMATH RIVER VALLEY	TULELAKE	North Coast	NRO	85,934	134.3	2,261	1	0	1	0.75	5	5	2	3.5	4	2	17.3	Medium	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.
13	1-2.02	KLAMATH RIVER VALLEY	LOWER KLAMATH	North Coast	NRO	75,333	117.7	41	0	0	0	0.75	3	3	3	3	1	0	7.8	Low	GW Quality issues in refuge area. High temp and high TDS for deep wells.	
14	1-20	GARCIA RIVER VALLEY		North Coast	NCRO	2,242	3.5	119	1	0	0	2.25	3	2	1	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
15	1-21	FORT BRAGG TERRACE AREA		North Coast	NCRO	24,085	37.6	12,517	2	1	5	3.75	2	1	1	0	1	0	0.0	Very Low	The terrace deposits between Ten Mile River and Laguna Point and Alder Creek and Point Arena are susceptible to seawater intrusion. (B-118).	
16	1-22	FAIRCHILD SWAMP VALLEY		North Coast	NRO	3,278	5.1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
17	1-25	PRAIRIE CREEK AREA		North Coast	NRO	20,013	31.3	4	0	0	0	0.75	0	1	5	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
18	1-26	REDWOOD CREEK AREA		North Coast	NRO	1,996	3.1	234	1	0	4	1.5	4	3	5	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
19	1-27	BIG LAGOON AREA		North Coast	NRO	13,343	20.8	2,465	1	3	4	2.25	1	0	5	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
20	1-28	MATTOLE RIVER VALLEY		North Coast	NRO	3,150	4.9	72	1	0	0	0.75	0	1	3	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
21	1-29	HONEYDEW TOWN AREA		North Coast	NRO	2,369	3.7	19	0	0	0	0.75	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
22	1-3	BUTTE VALLEY		North Coast	NRO	79,689	124.5	1,464	1	0	1	1.5	4	5	5	5	2	1	15.5	Medium	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.
23	1-30	PEPPERWOOD TOWN AREA		North Coast	NRO	6,288	9.8	315	1	0	0	0.75	3	2	4	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
24	1-31	WEOTT TOWN AREA		North Coast	NRO	3,653	5.7	364	1	0	4	0.75	2	1	3	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
25	1-32	GARBERVILLE TOWN AREA		North Coast	NRO	2,112	3.3	1,391	2	2	3	3.75	1	1	4	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
26	1-33	LARABEE VALLEY		North Coast	NRO	967	1.5	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
27	1-34	DINSMORES TOWN AREA		North Coast	NRO	2,276	3.6	183	1	0	5	1.5	1	1	5	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
28	1-35	HYAMPOM VALLEY		North Coast	NRO	1,354	2.1	52	1	0	0	2.25	2	2	5	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
29	1-36	HETTENSCHAW VALLEY		North Coast	NRO	846	1.3	5	0	0	0	1.5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
30	1-37	COTTONEVA CREEK VALLEY		North Coast	NCRO	763	1.2	1	0	0	0	1.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
31	1-38	LOWER LAYTONVILLE VALLEY		North Coast	NCRO	2,152	3.4	107	1	0	0	2.25	2	1	1	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
32	1-39	BRANSCOMB TOWN AREA		North Coast	NCRO	1,381	2.2	95	1	0	0	3	1	1	1	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
33	1-4	SHASTA VALLEY	SHASTA VALLEY	North Coast	NRO	52,589	82.2	5,333	1	5	1	2.25	4	5	1	3	1	3	20.3	Medium	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.
34	1-40	TEN MILE RIVER VALLEY		North Coast	NCRO	1,491	2.3	61	1	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
35	1-41	LITTLE VALLEY		North Coast	NCRO	812	1.3	11	1	0	0	1.5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
36	1-42	SHERWOOD VALLEY		North Coast	NCRO	1,150	1.8	13	1	0	0	1.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
37	1-43	WILLIAMS VALLEY		North Coast	NCRO	1,642	2.6	2	0	0	0	2.25	2	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
38	1-44	EDEN VALLEY		North Coast	NCRO	1,376	2.2	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	3	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
39	1-45	BIG RIVER VALLEY		North Coast	NCRO	1,685	2.6	29	1	0	5	1.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
40	1-46	NAVARRO RIVER VALLEY		North Coast	NCRO	770	1.2	36	1	0	0	1.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
41	1-48	GRAVELLY VALLEY		North Coast	NRO	2,974	4.6	6	0	0	5	1.5	0	0	5	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
42	1-49	ANNAPOLIS OHLSON RANCH FM HIGHLANDS		North Coast	NCRO	8,646	13.5	233	1	0	0	2.25	1	1	2	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
43	1-5	SCOTT RIVER VALLEY		North Coast	NRO	63,780	99.7	3,520	1	0	1	2.25	4	5	3	4	0	3	15.3	Medium		GW Basin contributes to surface water flow in the Scott River which supports a threatened/endangered salmon. Adjudicated basin. Currently being reviewed for Public Trust issues regarding GW management.
44	1-50	KNIGHTS VALLEY		North Coast	NCRO	4,086	6.4	102	1	0	0	2.25	4	2	4	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		

CASGEM Groundwater Basin Prioritization Results Sorted by Basin Number									Data Component Ranking Value									Overall Ranking		Impact Comments	Other Information Comments	
Basin count	Basin Number	Basin Name	Sub-Basin Name	Hydrologic Region	DWR Region Office	Basin Area		2010 Population	Population	Population Growth	Public Supply Wells	Total Wells *	Irrigated Acreage	Groundwater Reliance			Impacts	Other Information	Overall Basin Ranking Score ***			Overall Basin Priority
						Acres	Sq. Mile							GW Use **	Percent of Total Supply **	GW Reliance Total						
45	1-51	POTTER VALLEY		North Coast	NCRO	8,237	12.9	1,145	1	0	1	3.75	4	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
46	1-52	UKIAH VALLEY		North Coast	NCRO	37,508	58.6	32,761	2	1	3	3.75	3	2	2	2	0	1	15.8	Medium		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.
47	1-53	SANEL VALLEY		North Coast	NCRO	5,568	8.7	698	1	0	4	3	4	2	3	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
48	1-54.01	ALEXANDER VALLEY	ALEXANDER AREA	North Coast	NCRO	24,464	38.2	2,098	1	0	4	3.75	4	0	1	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
49	1-54.02	ALEXANDER VALLEY	CLOVERDALE AREA	North Coast	NCRO	6,525	10.2	8,297	2	4	5	3.75	4	2	3	0	1	0	0.0	Very Low	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).	
50	1-55.01	SANTA ROSA VALLEY	SANTA ROSA PLAIN	North Coast	NCRO	80,059	125.1	250,375	3	2	5	3.75	3	2	2	2	0	0	18.8	Medium		
51	1-55.02	SANTA ROSA VALLEY	HEALDSBURG AREA	North Coast	NCRO	15,400	24.1	10,515	2	0	5	3.75	4	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
52	1-55.03	SANTA ROSA VALLEY	RINCON VALLEY	North Coast	NCRO	5,549	8.7	21,787	4	3	5	3.75	1	2	3	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
53	1-56	MCDOWELL VALLEY		North Coast	NCRO	1,486	2.3	106	1	0	0	3.75	4	2	3	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
54	1-57	BODEGA BAY AREA		North Coast	NCRO	2,676	4.2	719	1	0	5	3	0	2	5	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
55	1-59	WILSON GROVE FORMATION HIGHLANDS		North Coast	NCRO	86,400	135.0	37,799	2	0	4	3.75	2	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
56	1-6	HAYFORK VALLEY		North Coast	NRO	3,295	5.1	814	1	0	0	3	2	3	5	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
57	1-60	LOWER RUSSIAN RIVER VALLEY		North Coast	NCRO	6,640	10.4	3,754	2	2	5	3	3	2	1	0	1	0	0.0	Very Low	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)	
58	1-61	FORT ROSS TERRACE DEPOSITS		North Coast	NCRO	8,483	13.3	1,075	1	2	4	3	0	1	4	0	1	0	0.0	Very Low	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)	
59	1-62	WILSON POINT AREA		North Coast	NRO	709	1.1	14	1	0	0	0	2	2	5	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
60	1-7	HOOPA VALLEY		North Coast	NRO	3,894	6.1	1,797	2	2	0	2.25	2	1	2	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
61	1-8.01	MAD RIVER VALLEY	MAD RIVER LOWLAND	North Coast	NRO	13,981	21.8	14,204	2	2	1	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
62	1-8.02	MAD RIVER VALLEY	DOWS PRAIRIE SCHOOL AREA	North Coast	NRO	25,570	40.0	23,086	2	1	3	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
63	1-9	EUREKA PLAIN		North Coast	NRO	37,405	58.4	50,231	2	1	1	3	3	2	4	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
64	2-1	PETALUMA VALLEY		San Francisco Bay	NCRO	46,043	71.9	49,915	2	3	3	3.75	3	1	2	1.5	2	0	18.3	Medium	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).	
65	2-10	LIVERMORE VALLEY		San Francisco Bay	NCRO	69,531	108.6	196,658	3	3	3	3.75	2	1	2	1.5	1	0	17.3	Medium	Some areas have boron concentrations exceeding 2 mg/L (B-118 & Sorenson et. al. 1985).	
66	2-11	SUNOL VALLEY		San Francisco Bay	NCRO	16,623	26.0	808	1	0	0	2.25	1	1	3	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
67	2-19	KENWOOD VALLEY		San Francisco Bay	NCRO	5,135	8.0	6,057	2	1	5	3.75	3	1	1	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
68	2-2.01	NAPA-SONOMA VALLEY	NAPA VALLEY	San Francisco Bay	NCRO	45,895	71.7	91,234	3	1	5	3.75	4	3	3	3	1	0	20.8	Medium	Two isolated areas in the Sonoma Valley indicate substantial declines in gw elevations and RWQCB report that 43 underground fuel tank leaks have occurred in the basin (unpublished B-118 data) (Ludhorff & Scalmanini Consulting Engineers, 1999)	
69	2-2.02	NAPA-SONOMA VALLEY	SONOMA VALLEY	San Francisco Bay	NCRO	44,626	69.7	31,275	2	1	3	3.75	4	1	2	1.5	1	0	16.3	Medium	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).	
70	2-2.03	NAPA-SONOMA VALLEY	NAPA-SONOMA LOWLANDS	San Francisco Bay	NCRO	40,455	63.2	58,367	2	0	2	3	2	2	1	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
71	2-22	HALF MOON BAY TERRACE		San Francisco Bay	NCRO	9,189	14.4	19,825	3	3	5	3.75	3	1	3	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
72	2-24	SAN GREGORIO VALLEY		San Francisco Bay	NCRO	1,074	1.7	66	1	0	0	2.25	3	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		

CASGEM Groundwater Basin Prioritization Results Sorted by Basin Number									Data Component Ranking Value									Overall Ranking		Impact Comments	Other Information Comments		
Basin count	Basin Number	Basin Name	Sub-Basin Name	Hydrologic Region	DWR Region Office	Basin Area		2010 Population	Population	Population Growth	Public Supply Wells	Total Wells *	Irrigated Acreage	Groundwater Reliance			Impacts	Other Information	Overall Basin Ranking Score ***			Overall Basin Priority	
						Acres	Sq. Mile							GW Use **	Percent of Total Supply **	GW Reliance Total							
73	2-26	PESCADERO VALLEY		San Francisco Bay	NCRO	2,904	4.5	571	1	0	4	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
74	2-27	SAND POINT AREA		San Francisco Bay	NCRO	1,405	2.2	43	1	0	5	0.75	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
75	2-28	ROSS VALLEY		San Francisco Bay	NCRO	1,763	2.8	7,194	4	2	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
76	2-29	SAN RAFAEL VALLEY		San Francisco Bay	NCRO	874	1.4	10,153	5	1	0	3.75	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
77	2-3	SUISUN-FAIRFIELD VALLEY		San Francisco Bay	NCRO	133,505	208.6	136,754	2	5	1	2.25	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
78	2-30	NOVATO VALLEY		San Francisco Bay	NCRO	20,519	32.1	42,516	3	2	0	3.75	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
79	2-31	ARROYO DEL HAMBRE VALLEY		San Francisco Bay	NCRO	786	1.2	3,230	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
80	2-32	VISITACION VALLEY		San Francisco Bay	NCRO	5,827	9.1	31,853	4	4	0	3.75	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
81	2-33	ISLAIS VALLEY		San Francisco Bay	NCRO	5,937	9.3	131,576	5	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
82	2-35	WESTSIDE		San Francisco Bay	NCRO	25,386	39.7	351,235	5	2	4	3.75	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
83	2-36	SAN PEDRO VALLEY		San Francisco Bay	NCRO	702	1.1	5,956	5	0	0	3.75	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
84	2-37	SOUTH SAN FRANCISCO		San Francisco Bay	NCRO	2,175	3.4	38,861	5	1	0	3.75	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
85	2-38	LOBOS		San Francisco Bay	NCRO	2,359	3.7	59,119	5	0	0	2.25	0	0	0	0	1	0	0.0	Very Low	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)		
86	2-39	MARINA		San Francisco Bay	NCRO	2,186	3.4	45,294	5	0	0	2.25	0	0	0	0	1	0	0.0	Very Low	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)		
87	2-4	PITTSBURG PLAIN		San Francisco Bay	NCRO	11,607	18.1	68,898	4	3	4	3.75	0	2	1	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low			
88	2-40	DOWNTOWN		San Francisco Bay	NCRO	7,635	11.9	323,721	5	1	0	3.75	0	0	0	0	1	0	0.0	Very Low	Groundwater is subject to high concentrations of nitrates, chloride, boron and TDS (B-118) & (Phillips et.al. 1993).		
89	2-5	CLAYTON VALLEY		San Francisco Bay	NCRO	17,836	27.9	73,287	4	1	2	3.75	1	1	1	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low			
90	2-6	YGNACIO VALLEY		San Francisco Bay	NCRO	15,459	24.2	107,878	5	1	2	3.75	1	1	1	0	1	0	0.0	Very Low	Hydrographs created from DWR well data indicate groundwater levels have declined gradually over the period of record.(B-118)		
91	2-7	SAN RAMON VALLEY		San Francisco Bay	NCRO	7,053	11.0	30,112	4	2	0	3.75	1	1	1	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low			
92	2-8	CASTRO VALLEY		San Francisco Bay	NCRO	1,821	2.8	24,486	5	0	0	3.75	0	2	1	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low			
93	2-9.01	SANTA CLARA VALLEY	NILES CONE	San Francisco Bay	NCRO	57,906	90.5	321,494	4	1	3	3.75	1	4	4	4	3	0	19.8	Medium	Saline water intrusion has increased landward and into deeper aquifers since first documented in the 1920's.(B-118)		
94	2-9.02	SANTA CLARA VALLEY	SANTA CLARA	San Francisco Bay	NCRO	190,235	297.2	1,633,190	5	2	4	3.75	0	5	4	4.5	1	0	20.3	Medium	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).		
95	2-9.03	SANTA CLARA VALLEY	SAN MATEO PLAIN	San Francisco Bay	NCRO	37,708	58.9	291,899	5	3	2	3.75	1	0	0	1.0	1	0	0.0	Very Low	2003 Water Board Study of South Bay groundwater basins		
96	2-9.04	SANTA CLARA VALLEY	EAST BAY PLAIN	San Francisco Bay	NCRO	77,292	120.8	881,718	5	1	1	3.75	1	0	0	1	2	0	14.8	Medium	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)		
97	3-1	SOQUEL VALLEY		Central Coast	SCRO	2,515	3.9	18,634	5	2	5	3.75	1	5	4	4.5	1	0	22.3	High	Water quality degradation, saline intrusion issues.		
98	3-12	SANTA MARIA		Central Coast	SRO	184,248	287.9	201,759	2	3	4	1.5	5	5	4	4.5	4	0	24.0	High	Documented overdraft of basin. Water quality degradation due to farming practices.		
99	3-13	CUYAMA VALLEY		Central Coast	SRO	242,114	378.3	1,236	0	0	1	0.75	2	3	5	4	3	3	13.8	Medium	Local salinity and TDS impairments in basin (B-118)	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	

CASGEM Groundwater Basin Prioritization Results Sorted by Basin Number									Data Component Ranking Value									Overall Ranking		Impact Comments	Other Information Comments	
Basin count	Basin Number	Basin Name	Sub-Basin Name	Hydrologic Region	DWR Region Office	Basin Area		2010 Population	Population	Population Growth	Public Supply Wells	Total Wells *	Irrigated Acreage	Groundwater Reliance			Impacts	Other Information	Overall Basin Ranking Score ***			Overall Basin Priority
						Acres	Sq. Mile							GW Use **	Percent of Total Supply **	GW Reliance Total						
100	3-14	SAN ANTONIO CREEK VALLEY		Central Coast	SRO	81,941	128.0	2,279	1	0	1	1.5	2	2	5	3.5	4	2	15.0	Medium	Overdraft, water quality degradation	Santa Barbara Water Element, Table 1, p.10, indicates San Antonio basin overdraft by ~ 9,000 af/yr
101	3-15	SANTA YNEZ RIVER VALLEY		Central Coast	SRO	204,642	319.8	75,460	1	1	3	2.25	3	3	5	4	3	0	17.3	Medium	Overdraft has been documented by the county in the past. Also some groundwater quality impairments.	
102	3-16	GOLETA		Central Coast	SRO	9,229	14.4	47,252	4	1	5	3.75	2	3	1	2	0	1	18.8	Medium		Estimated overdraft for the north-central portion of the basin ins estimated at 1,180 af/yr (Santa Barbara Water Conservation Element, 2009)
103	3-17	SANTA BARBARA		Central Coast	SRO	6,173	9.6	63,966	5	0	4	3.75	1	2	1	0	2	0	0.0	Very Low	WQ Impacts: Saline intrusion, locally high EC, hardness, hydrogen sulfides, and other constituents.(B-118)	
104	3-18	CARPINTERIA		Central Coast	SRO	8,140	12.7	14,561	3	0	4	2.25	5	2	1	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
105	3-19	CARRIZO PLAIN		Central Coast	SRO	210,896	329.5	440	0	0	1	0.75	2	0	1	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
106	3-2	PAJARO VALLEY		Central Coast	SCRO	88,062	137.6	114,282	2	2	4	3.75	4	5	5	5	4	0	24.8	High	PVWMD 2011 Annual Report indicates that Pajaro Valley GW basin remains in significant overdraft, with continuing seawater intrusion and gw storage depletion.	
107	3-20	ANO NUEVO AREA		Central Coast	SCRO	2,030	3.2	46	1	0	4	1.5	3	1	5	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
108	3-21	SANTA CRUZ PURISIMA FORMATION		Central Coast	SCRO	40,166	62.8	17,693	2	0	3	3.75	1	3	4	3.5	0	1	14.3	Medium		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.
109	3-22	SANTA ANA VALLEY		Central Coast	SCRO	2,724	4.3	76	1	0	0	2.25	4	4	5	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
110	3-23	UPPER SANTA ANA VALLEY		Central Coast	SCRO	1,431	2.2	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
111	3-24	QUIEN SABE VALLEY		Central Coast	SCRO	4,706	7.4	5	0	0	0	0	3	1	1	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
112	3-25	TRES PINOS VALLEY		Central Coast	SCRO	3,385	5.3	48	1	0	4	2.25	4	4	5	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
113	3-26	WEST SANTA CRUZ TERRACE		Central Coast	SCRO	7,863	12.3	70,336	5	1	3	3.75	1	4	4	4	2	1	20.8	Medium	Water quality degradation	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).
114	3-27	SCOTTS VALLEY		Central Coast	SCRO	773	1.2	3,875	4	1	5	3.75	0	3	0	0	4	0	0.0	Very Low	Overdraft and water quality issues associated with contaminated sites within the basin.	
115	3-28	SAN BENITO RIVER VALLEY		Central Coast	SCRO	24,223	37.8	101	0	0	2	0.75	1	1	5	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
116	3-29	DRY LAKE VALLEY		Central Coast	SCRO	1,416	2.2	8	0	0	0	0	2	2	5	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
117	3-3.01	GILROY-HOLLISTER VALLEY	LLAGAS AREA	Central Coast	SCRO	55,967	87.4	91,706	3	2	5	3.75	5	5	5	5	2	0	25.8	High	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	
118	3-3.02	GILROY-HOLLISTER VALLEY	BOLSA AREA	Central Coast	SCRO	20,912	32.7	2,935	1	1	1	2.25	5	2	2	2	4	0	16.3	Medium	Water quality degradation, overdraft	
119	3-3.03	GILROY-HOLLISTER VALLEY	HOLLISTER AREA	Central Coast	SCRO	32,729	51.1	22,013	2	1	4	3	4	3	4	3.5	0	0	17.5	Medium		
120	3-3.04	GILROY-HOLLISTER VALLEY	SAN JUAN BAUTISTA AREA	Central Coast	SCRO	74,305	116.1	26,150	1	1	3	2.25	2	2	5	3.5	4	0	16.8	Medium	Poor water quality due to high TDS	
121	3-30	BITTER WATER VALLEY		Central Coast	SCRO	32,222	50.3	38	0	0	0	0.75	2	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
122	3-31	HERNANDEZ VALLEY		Central Coast	SCRO	2,865	4.5	3	0	0	0	1.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
123	3-32	PEACH TREE VALLEY		Central Coast	SCRO	9,791	15.3	7	0	0	0	0.75	2	1	5	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
124	3-33	SAN CARPOFORO VALLEY		Central Coast	SRO	1,054	1.6	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
125	3-34	ARROYO DE LA CRUZ VALLEY		Central Coast	SRO	1,028	1.6	1	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
126	3-35	SAN SIMEON VALLEY		Central Coast	SRO	560	0.9	9	1	0	5	0	3	5	1	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
127	3-36	SANTA ROSA VALLEY		Central Coast	SRO	3,525	5.5	920	1	0	2	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
128	3-37	VILLA VALLEY		Central Coast	SRO	1,358	2.1	21	1	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
129	3-38	CAYUCOS VALLEY		Central Coast	SRO	336	0.5	3	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
130	3-39	OLD VALLEY		Central Coast	SRO	1,179	1.8	217	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
131	3-4.01	SALINAS VALLEY	180/400 FOOT AQUIFER	Central Coast	SCRO	84,321	131.8	55,740	2	0	4	3	5	5	5	5	5	0	24.0	High	Coastal basin with saline intrusion in both 180-Foot and 400-Foot aquifers due to excessive groundwater pumping	
132	3-4.02	SALINAS VALLEY	EAST SIDE AQUIFER	Central Coast	SCRO	57,452	89.8	128,646	3	4	4	3	5	5	5	5	3	0	27.0	High	Overdraft conditions in basin, high TDS and Nitrates exceeding drinking water standards in portions of the basin	
133	3-4.04	SALINAS VALLEY	FOREBAY AQUIFER	Central Coast	SCRO	94,025	146.9	43,867	2	1	2	2.25	5	5	5	5	0	0	17.3	Medium		
134	3-4.05	SALINAS VALLEY	UPPER VALLEY AQUIFER	Central Coast	SCRO	98,164	153.4	15,862	1	1	2	1.5	4	5	5	5	1	0	15.5	Medium	Poor quality water along the eastern side of subbasin. PSW above MCL for inorganics and Nitrates (B-118).	
135	3-4.06	SALINAS VALLEY	PASO ROBLES AREA	Central Coast	SCRO	597,241	933.2	56,077	1	4	2	0.75	3	2	5	3.5	4	5	23.3	High	Nitrate and TDS impacts to groundwater (B-118)	County groundwater ordinance banning further residential development in basin.

CASGEM Groundwater Basin Prioritization Results Sorted by Basin Number									Data Component Ranking Value									Overall Ranking		Impact Comments	Other Information Comments	
Basin count	Basin Number	Basin Name	Sub-Basin Name	Hydrologic Region	DWR Region Office	Basin Area		2010 Population	Population	Population Growth	Public Supply Wells	Total Wells *	Irrigated Acreage	Groundwater Reliance			Impacts	Other Information	Overall Basin Ranking Score ***			Overall Basin Priority
						Acres	Sq. Mile							GW Use **	Percent of Total Supply **	GW Reliance Total						
136	3-4.08	SALINAS VALLEY	SEASIDE AREA	Central Coast	SCRO	25,903	40.5	65,899	3	0	4	3.75	1	3	5	4	5	0	20.8	Medium	Seawater intrusion in Coastal basin due to excessive pumping.	
137	3-4.09	SALINAS VALLEY	LANGLEY AREA	Central Coast	SCRO	15,344	24.0	9,833	2	1	5	3.75	2	5	5	5	0	0	18.8	Medium		
138	3-4.10	SALINAS VALLEY	CORRAL DE TIERRA AREA	Central Coast	SCRO	22,274	34.8	7,831	1	3	4	3	0	3	5	4	0	0	15.0	Medium		
139	3-40	TORO VALLEY		Central Coast	SRO	722	1.1	8	1	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
140	3-41	MORRO VALLEY		Central Coast	SRO	646	1.0	399	2	0	5	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
141	3-42	CHORRO VALLEY		Central Coast	SRO	1,547	2.4	247	1	0	3	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
142	3-43	RINCONADA VALLEY		Central Coast	SRO	2,579	4.0	11	0	0	0	0	4	1	1	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
143	3-44	POZO VALLEY		Central Coast	SRO	6,852	10.7	52	0	0	4	0	2	1	1	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
144	3-45	HUASNA VALLEY		Central Coast	SRO	4,706	7.4	55	1	0	0	0.75	2	0	1	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
145	3-46	RAFAEL VALLEY		Central Coast	SRO	2,996	4.7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
146	3-47	BIG SPRING AREA		Central Coast	SRO	7,332	11.5	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
147	3-49	MONTECITO		Central Coast	SRO	6,286	9.8	9,885	3	0	4	3.75	1	1	1	0	1	0	0.0	Very Low	Locally high TDS within the basin. Wells exceed Federal iron and manganese concentrations (B-118).	
148	3-5	CHOLAME VALLEY		Central Coast	SCRO	39,847	62.3	48	0	0	1	0.75	2	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low			
149	3-50	FELTON AREA		Central Coast	SCRO	1,155	1.8	3,024	3	1	0	3.75	0	2	4	0	3	0	0.0	Very Low	Overdraft	
150	3-51	MAJORS CREEK		Central Coast	SCRO	364	0.6	53	1	0	0	1.5	5	4	5	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
151	3-52	NEEDLE ROCK POINT		Central Coast	SCRO	479	0.7	66	1	0	0	3.75	5	3	5	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
152	3-53	FOOTHILL		Central Coast	SRO	3,123	4.9	17,543	4	2	5	3.75	1	3	1	0	5	0	0.0	Very Low	USGS documented nitrates exceeding MCL and high sulfates in the basin. TDS is documented to be high in the basin and potential for saline intrusion.	
153	3-6	LOCKWOOD VALLEY		Central Coast	SCRO	59,933	93.6	1,171	1	0	2	1.5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
154	3-7	CARMEL VALLEY		Central Coast	SCRO	5,151	8.0	5,086	2	3	5	3.75	2	5	5	5	1	1	22.8	High	Excessive pumping of Cal-Am wells caused groundwater overdraft and Carmel River to dry, leading to court order.	SW-GW Interaction Issue. Cal-Am Water Company court ordered to reduce 2/3rds of diversions from Carmel River.
155	3-8	LOS OSOS VALLEY		Central Coast	SCRO	6,994	10.9	13,948	3	0	5	0	4	3	3	3	5	2	22.0	High	Documented saline intrusion due to "serious" overdraft, also nitrate impairment.	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.
156	3-9	SAN LUIS OBISPO VALLEY		Central Coast	SCRO	12,724	19.9	18,834	2	1	5	0	4	3	4	3.5	3	1	19.5	Medium	Overdraft Conditions	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.
157	4-1	UPPER OJAI VALLEY		South Coast	SRO	3,815	6.0	616	1	0	2	0.75	3	1	1	0	5	0	0.0	Very Low	Groundwater has been documented to contain high levels of boron, sodium chloride, high TDS, sulfate, nitrates, iron, and chlorides (B-118).	
158	4-10	CONEJO		South Coast	SRO	18,848	29.4	96,704	4	2	1	1.5	1	2	3	2.5	1	0	13.0	Low	Locally high TDS in basin and one well with nitrate levels above MCL (B-118).	
159	4-11.01	COASTAL PLAIN OF LOS ANGELES	SANTA MONICA	South Coast	SRO	31,846	49.8	465,606	5	3	2	3.75	0	2	3	2.5	3	0	19.3	Medium	MTBE contamination has led to significant reduction in groundwater production and locally high TDS.	
160	4-11.02	COASTAL PLAIN OF LOS ANGELES	HOLLYWOOD	South Coast	SRO	10,108	15.8	250,649	5	0	3	3.75	0	2	3	0	1	0	0.0	Very Low	MWD lists some TDS and VOC water quality issues.	
161	4-11.03	COASTAL PLAIN OF LOS ANGELES	WEST COAST	South Coast	SRO	93,795	146.6	1,195,195	5	1	3	3.75	0	3	3	3	5	0	20.8	Medium	Basin in overdraft since 1960's. Adjudicated basin. Saline intrusion problem and a seawater barrier project is in effect to reduce seawater intrusion.	
162	4-11.04	COASTAL PLAIN OF LOS ANGELES	CENTRAL	South Coast	SRO	180,357	281.8	3,052,303	5	2	5	3.75	0	5	3	4	5	0	24.8	High	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.	
163	4-12	SAN FERNANDO VALLEY		South Coast	SRO	145,354	227.1	1,745,338	5	3	3	2.25	0	4	1	2.5	3	1	19.8	Medium	Several public supply wells have shown contamination per Bulletin 118.	Basin is adjudicated.
164	4-13	SAN GABRIEL VALLEY		South Coast	SRO	127,278	198.9	1,275,187	5	1	5	2.25	0	5	3	4	3	1	21.3	High	Superfund sites are present within the basin and other areas with water quality impacts are known.	Adjudication (aka Six Basins)
165	4-15	TIERRA REJADA		South Coast	SRO	4,611	7.2	3,673	2	3	0	0.75	4	1	1	0	1	0	0.0	Very Low	Locally high nitrates documented in the basin (B-118).	
166	4-16	HIDDEN VALLEY		South Coast	SRO	2,217	3.5	503	1	0	4	1.5	5	1	1	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
167	4-17	LOCKWOOD VALLEY		South Coast	SRO	21,841	34.1	241	1	0	1	0.75	0	2	5	3.5	5	0	11.3	Low	Boron, arsenic, and radioactive uranium in some wells (B-118).	
168	4-18	HUNGRY VALLEY		South Coast	SRO	5,324	8.3	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0.0	Very Low	Water is slightly alkaline (B-118).	
169	4-19	THOUSAND OAKS AREA		South Coast	SRO	3,115	4.9	17,202	4	1	0	2.25	0	1	3	0	5	0	0.0	Very Low	High TDS, alkalinity, and hardness in the basin (B-118).	
170	4-2	OJAI VALLEY		South Coast	SRO	6,851	10.7	8,268	2	0	4	1.5	4	5	5	5	2	0	18.5	Medium	High nitrates and sulfates reported in the basin. Medium to high levels of nitrates reported in the basin.	
171	4-20	RUSSELL VALLEY		South Coast	SRO	3,087	4.8	18,860	4	0	0	1.5	0	2	1	0	3	0	0.0	Very Low	TDS and sulfate exceed MCL for some wells in the basin per Bulletin 118.	

CASGEM Groundwater Basin Prioritization Results Sorted by Basin Number									Data Component Ranking Value									Overall Ranking		Impact Comments	Other Information Comments	
Basin count	Basin Number	Basin Name	Sub-Basin Name	Hydrologic Region	DWR Region Office	Basin Area		2010 Population	Population	Population Growth	Public Supply Wells	Total Wells *	Irrigated Acreage	Groundwater Reliance			Impacts	Other Information	Overall Basin Ranking Score ***			Overall Basin Priority
						Acres	Sq. Mile							GW Use **	Percent of Total Supply **	GW Reliance Total						
172	4-22	MALIBU VALLEY		South Coast	SRO	615	1.0	563	2	0	0	3.75	0	0	0	0	5	0	0.0	Very Low	Saline intrusion, high TDS and chlorides have been documented.	
173	4-23	RAYMOND		South Coast	SRO	26,310	41.1	223,100	5	2	5	0.75	0	5	5	5	3	0	20.8	Medium	Water quality impacts and a superfund.	
174	4-3.01	VENTURA RIVER VALLEY	UPPER VENTURA RIVER	South Coast	SRO	7,430	11.6	15,961	3	0	5	0.75	2	4	5	4.5	3	0	18.3	Medium	TDS is known to be high in some parts of the basin (B-118).	
175	4-3.02	VENTURA RIVER VALLEY	LOWER VENTURA RIVER	South Coast	SRO	5,312	8.3	15,920	3	1	0	2.25	2	1	2	0	3	0	0.0	Very Low	Oil, high sulfates, nitrates, and hydrogen sulfide are documented to be present in the basin.	
176	4-4.02	SANTA CLARA RIVER VALLEY	OXNARD	South Coast	SRO	58,200	90.9	235,973	4	3	4	0.75	5	5	5	5	5	0	26.8	High	Saline intrusion, nitrates, pesticides, and PCBs have impacted some water wells per (B-118).	
177	4-4.03	SANTA CLARA RIVER VALLEY	MOUND	South Coast	SRO	14,846	23.2	77,886	4	2	1	2.25	3	3	5	4	1	0	17.3	Medium	Some primary and secondary inorganic contaminants above the MCL (B-118).	
178	4-4.04	SANTA CLARA RIVER VALLEY	SANTA PAULA	South Coast	SRO	22,899	35.8	46,816	3	1	3	1.5	4	5	5	5	3	0	20.5	Medium	Nitrates can fluctuate significantly in the basin, and above MCL. Other inorganics present above MCL. TDS is known to be high.	
179	4-4.05	SANTA CLARA RIVER VALLEY	FILLMORE	South Coast	SRO	20,842	32.6	16,417	2	2	4	0.75	5	0	0	5	2	0	20.8	Medium	Many groundwater quality impairments in the basin; Nitrates problematic during dry periods; High TDS, etc. (B-118). REH - PubComm indicted WQ is localized and being managed	
180	4-4.06	SANTA CLARA RIVER VALLEY	PIRU	South Coast	SRO	8,915	13.9	2,666	1	4	3	0.75	5	5	5	5	3	0	21.8	High	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)	
181	4-4.07	SANTA CLARA RIVER VALLEY	SANTA CLARA RIVER VALLEY EAST	South Coast	SRO	66,417	103.8	221,204	3	5	4	2.25	1	4	1	2.5	5	0	22.8	High	GW Quality Impacts: Nitrates, TCE, TDS, perchlorates, etc. (B-118)	
182	4-5	ACTON VALLEY		South Coast	SRO	8,300	13.0	2,280	1	4	5	3	0	2	2	0	1	0	0.0	Very Low	Locally high concentrations of TDS, sulfate, and chloride and two wells in the basin with known concentrations of nitrates exceeding MCL (B-118).	
183	4-6	PLEASANT VALLEY		South Coast	SRO	21,654	33.8	69,392	3	3	4	1.5	5	5	5	5	1	0	22.5	High	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.	
184	4-7	ARROYO SANTA ROSA VALLEY		South Coast	SRO	3,747	5.9	2,211	2	0	4	0.75	5	5	5	5	3	0	19.8	Medium	Elevated sulfates, nitrates, and TDS in the basin.(B-118)	
185	4-8	LAS POSAS VALLEY		South Coast	SRO	42,353	66.2	39,835	2	2	3	2.25	5	5	5	5	3	0	22.3	High	TDS is generally high in this basin. REH - Pubic Comment includes reports of subsidence, overdraft and saline intrusion (chloride from adjacent basin?)	
186	4-9	SIMI VALLEY		South Coast	SRO	12,192	19.0	98,625	5	1	2	0.75	1	2	3	2.5	1	0	13.3	Low	VOCs, elevated TDS, and nitrates (B-118)	
187	5-1.01	GOOSE LAKE	GOOSE VALLEY	Sacramento River	NRO	35,966	56.2	57	0	0	0	0.75	4	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
188	5-1.02	GOOSE LAKE	FANDANGO VALLEY	Sacramento River	NRO	18,439	28.8	124	0	0	1	1.5	4	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
189	5-10	AMERICAN VALLEY		Sacramento River	NRO	6,799	10.6	3,931	2	0	5	3.75	4	2	1	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
190	5-11	MOHAWK VALLEY		Sacramento River	NRO	18,987	29.7	1,375	1	0	3	3	2	1	1	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
191	5-12.01	SIERRA VALLEY	SIERRA VALLEY	Sacramento River	NRO	117,680	183.9	2,196	1	5	1	1.5	5	4	2	3	3	0	19.5	Medium	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).	
192	5-12.02	SIERRA VALLEY	CHILCOOT	Sacramento River	NRO	7,551	11.8	308	1	0	3	3	3	1	1	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
193	5-13	UPPER LAKE VALLEY		Sacramento River	NRO	7,260	11.3	2,055	1	3	4	3.75	4	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
194	5-14	SCOTTS VALLEY		Sacramento River	NRO	7,320	11.4	6,553	2	0	4	3.75	3	4	4	4	1	0	17.8	Medium	Boron exceeds EPA maximum. Strong GW-SW interaction with Clear Lake.	
195	5-15	BIG VALLEY		Sacramento River	NRO	24,212	37.8	6,344	1	2	2	3.75	3	4	4	4	0	0	15.8	Medium		
196	5-16	HIGH VALLEY		Sacramento River	NRO	2,356	3.7	34	1	0	3	2.25	3	1	4	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
197	5-17	BURNS VALLEY		Sacramento River	NRO	2,873	4.5	2,691	2	4	0	3.75	1	1	2	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
198	5-18	COYOTE VALLEY		Sacramento River	NRO	6,528	10.2	2,252	1	5	2	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		

CASGEM Groundwater Basin Prioritization Results Sorted by Basin Number									Data Component Ranking Value									Overall Ranking		Impact Comments	Other Information Comments	
Basin count	Basin Number	Basin Name	Sub-Basin Name	Hydrologic Region	DWR Region Office	Basin Area		2010 Population	Population	Population Growth	Public Supply Wells	Total Wells *	Irrigated Acreage	Groundwater Reliance			Impacts	Other Information	Overall Basin Ranking Score ***			Overall Basin Priority
						Acres	Sq. Mile							GW Use **	Percent of Total Supply **	GW Reliance Total						
199	5-19	COLLAYOMI VALLEY		Sacramento River	NRO	6,497	10.2	1,513	1	4	2	3	1	1	4	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
200	5-2.01	ALTURAS AREA	SOUTH FORK PITT RIVER	Sacramento River	NRO	114,164	178.4	4,429	1	0	1	1.5	4	2	2	2	1	0	10.5	Low	Declining GW Levels in some parts of the basin.	
201	5-2.02	ALTURAS AREA	WARM SPRINGS VALLEY	Sacramento River	NRO	68,009	106.3	964	1	0	1	1.5	3	2	2	2	0	1	9.5	Low		40' declining in GW levels since 2000, along the west side of the basin.
202	5-20	BERRYESSA VALLEY		Sacramento River	NCRO	1,375	2.1	0	0	0	0	0.75	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
203	5-21.50	SACRAMENTO VALLEY	RED BLUFF	Sacramento River	NRO	274,489	428.9	28,053	1	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	2	0	16.0	Medium	Some gw quality impairments as per B-118, declining gw levels in west-side subdivision, and very high number of domestic gw use wells.	
204	5-21.51	SACRAMENTO VALLEY	CORNING	Sacramento River	NRO	205,473	321.1	18,852	1	2	1	3	4	5	4	4.5	2	2	19.5	Medium	Continued GW level decline over most of the basin.	This basin is becoming increasing dependent on GW due to uncertain reliability of CVP TCCA surface water supply.
205	5-21.52	SACRAMENTO VALLEY	COLUSA	Sacramento River	NRO	917,793	1,434.1	48,369	1	3	1	2.25	5	2	1	1.5	3	3	19.8	Medium	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.	Increase in housing development along 15. 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.
206	5-21.53	SACRAMENTO VALLEY	BEND	Sacramento River	NRO	21,748	34.0	554	1	0	1	2.25	1	1	3	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
207	5-21.54	SACRAMENTO VALLEY	ANTELOPE	Sacramento River	NRO	18,696	29.2	6,124	1	1	4	3.75	4	5	4	4.5	2	0	20.3	Medium	Nitrate issue in Domestic Wells.	
208	5-21.55	SACRAMENTO VALLEY	DYE CREEK	Sacramento River	NRO	27,709	43.3	1,626	1	0	1	2.25	3	5	2	3.5	1	2	13.8	Medium	Some documented Boron issues along east-side of basin.	Strong SW-GW interaction. GW Basin provides underflow to Mill Creek which supports endangered spring-run salmon.
209	5-21.56	SACRAMENTO VALLEY	LOS MOLINOS	Sacramento River	NRO	33,148	51.8	2,220	1	0	2	2.25	3	2	2	2	1	3	14.3	Medium	Boron issues along east-side of basin.	GW basin provides underflow to Mill Creek which supports endangered spring-run salmon. High sw- gw interaction for much of the western basin.
210	5-21.57	SACRAMENTO VALLEY	VINA	Sacramento River	NRO	124,577	194.7	71,397	2	4	3	3.75	4	5	5	5	0	1	22.8	High		GW from this basin is a key source of sw inflow and serves eastside creeks which have endangered spring run.
211	5-21.58	SACRAMENTO VALLEY	WEST BUTTE	Sacramento River	NRO	181,479	283.6	36,152	1	4	2	3	5	5	2	3.5	2	1	21.5	High	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.	GW serves as a source of underflow to Butte Creek, which has endangered spring-run salmon.
212	5-21.59	SACRAMENTO VALLEY	EAST BUTTE	Sacramento River	NRO	265,312	414.6	38,465	1	4	2	3	4	4	1	2.5	0	1	17.5	Medium		GW basin provides underflow to Butte Creek which supports endangered spring-run salmon.
213	5-21.60	SACRAMENTO VALLEY	NORTH YUBA	Sacramento River	NCRO	103,152	161.2	14,667	1	1	2	2.25	4	4	2	3	0	1	14.3	Medium		Strong SW-GW interaction with Feather and Yuba River
214	5-21.61	SACRAMENTO VALLEY	SOUTH YUBA	Sacramento River	NCRO	104,486	163.3	45,014	2	1	3	3	4	2	1	1.5	0	0	14.5	Medium		
215	5-21.62	SACRAMENTO VALLEY	SUTTER	Sacramento River	NCRO	234,264	366.0	82,125	1	4	2	3	5	4	1	2.5	0	0	17.5	Medium		
216	5-21.64	SACRAMENTO VALLEY	NORTH AMERICAN	Sacramento River	NCRO	340,170	531.5	832,746	3	3	4	3	4	5	2	3.5	1	1	22.5	High	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 groundwater contamination in the basin.	From B118: groundwater levels in southwestern 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).
217	5-21.65	SACRAMENTO VALLEY	SOUTH AMERICAN	Sacramento River	NCRO	247,745	387.1	718,113	3	3	4	3.75	3	3	2	2.5	3	0	22.3	High	From B118: Montgomery Watson (1997) listed seven sites within the subbasin with significant groundwater contamination. From Sac County GWMP: Overall decreasing groundwater level trend over past 50 years (~30ft)	
218	5-21.66	SACRAMENTO VALLEY	SOLANO	Sacramento River	NCRO	424,832	663.8	119,263	1	3	2	3	5	2	1	1.5	0	0	15.5	Medium		
219	5-21.67	SACRAMENTO VALLEY	YOLO	Sacramento River	NCRO	225,718	352.7	194,158	2	3	3	3.75	5	5	2	3.5	2	0	22.3	High	Localized TDS problems preclude using gw for some M&I uses without treatment. Some subsidence in northeast of Davis and in northern Yolo.	
220	5-21.68	SACRAMENTO VALLEY	CAPAY VALLEY	Sacramento River	NCRO	24,970	39.0	550	1	0	1	3	3	2	3	2.5	1	0	11.5	Low	moderate to high levels of boron.	

CASGEM Groundwater Basin Prioritization Results Sorted by Basin Number									Data Component Ranking Value										Overall Ranking		Impact Comments	Other Information Comments
Basin count	Basin Number	Basin Name	Sub-Basin Name	Hydrologic Region	DWR Region Office	Basin Area		2010 Population	Population	Population Growth	Public Supply Wells	Total Wells *	Irrigated Acreage	Groundwater Reliance			Impacts	Other Information	Overall Basin Ranking Score ***	Overall Basin Priority		
						Acres	Sq. Mile							GW Use **	Percent of Total Supply **	GW Reliance Total						
221	5-22.01	SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY	EASTERN SAN JOAQUIN	San Joaquin River	NCRO	707,073	1,104.8	582,662	2	4	3	3	5	4	3	3.5	3	2	25.5	High	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)	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.
222	5-22.02	SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY	MODESTO	San Joaquin River	SCRO	246,518	385.2	294,872	2	3	4	3	4	5	2	3.5	4	0	23.5	High	Water quality degradation due to industrial and agricultural practices	
223	5-22.03	SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY	TURLOCK	San Joaquin River	SCRO	347,146	542.4	197,605	2	3	3	3	5	5	2	3.5	2	0	21.5	High	Groundwater overdraft documented in local GWMP.	
224	5-22.04	SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY	MERCED	San Joaquin River	SCRO	491,255	767.6	173,731	1	4	2	3	5	4	3	3.5	4	0	22.5	High	Overdraft and water quality degradation (MAGPI GWMP).	
225	5-22.05	SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY	CHOWCHILLA	San Joaquin River	SCRO	159,319	248.9	15,820	1	4	2	2.25	5	5	3	4	3	0	21.3	High	Overdraft, subsidence, water quality degradation	
226	5-22.06	SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY	MADERA	San Joaquin River	SCRO	393,429	614.7	116,919	1	5	2	3	5	5	3	4	5	0	25.0	High	Subsidence, critical overdraft, water quality degradation	
227	5-22.07	SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY	DELTA-MENDOTA	San Joaquin River	SCRO	746,697	1,166.7	107,879	1	5	1	2.25	5	4	2	3	2	3	22.3	High	Overdraft issues in basin discussed in San Luis and Delta Mendota Water Authority GWMP	Important agricultural region.
228	5-22.08	SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY	KINGS	Tulare Lake	SCRO	977,030	1,526.6	906,544	2	4	4	3.75	5	5	3	4	0	0	22.8	High		
229	5-22.09	SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY	WESTSIDE	Tulare Lake	SCRO	640,504	1,000.8	27,285	1	1	1	1.5	5	4	2	3	5	5	22.5	High	Subsidence, critical overdraft, saline conditions, subsidence	Additional points added for critical agricultural importance, very high TDS and pesticide contamination issues
230	5-22.10	SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY	PLEASANT VALLEY	Tulare Lake	SCRO	145,782	227.8	34,213	1	3	0	0.75	3	3	5	4	0	0	11.8	Low		
231	5-22.11	SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY	KAWEAH	Tulare Lake	SCRO	446,283	697.3	271,700	2	5	3	3	5	5	2	3.5	5	0	26.5	High	Overdraft, water quality issues.	
232	5-22.12	SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY	TULARE LAKE	Tulare Lake	SCRO	524,539	819.6	125,701	1	4	1	2.25	5	5	3	4	5	0	22.3	High	Subsidence, overdraft, water quality degradation	
233	5-22.13	SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY	TULE	Tulare Lake	SCRO	469,959	734.3	108,660	1	4	2	2.25	5	5	3	4	4	0	22.3	High	Critical aquifer overdraft conditions in basin. High Nitrate and TDS in some locations and some inorganic contamination issues.	
234	5-22.14	SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY	KERN COUNTY	Tulare Lake	SCRO	1,950,113	3,047.1	700,323	1	5	2	1.5	4	4	2	3	5	1	22.5	High	Subsidence, overdraft, water quality degradation	Agricultural importance, large basin which results in low population density.
235	5-22.15	SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY	TRACY	San Joaquin River	NCRO	344,884	538.9	268,175	2	4	3	3	5	1	1	1	1	0	19.0	Medium	Poor water quality throughout the subbasin.(B-118)	
236	5-22.16	SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY	COSUMNES	San Joaquin River	NCRO	280,490	438.3	59,163	1	2	2	3	3	4	4	4	0	0	15.0	Medium		
237	5-23	PANOCH VALLEY		Tulare Lake	SCRO	33,090	51.7	41	0	0	0	0.75	1	0	5	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
238	5-25	KERN RIVER VALLEY		Tulare Lake	SCRO	79,678	124.5	10,364	1	1	4	2.25	1	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
239	5-26	WALKER BASIN CREEK VALLEY		Tulare Lake	SCRO	7,693	12.0	249	1	0	1	3	2	0	1	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
240	5-27	CUMMINGS VALLEY		Tulare Lake	SCRO	10,051	15.7	7,665	2	5	4	3	3	3	5	4	0	1	22.0	High		Adjudicated basin
241	5-28	TEHACHAPI VALLEY WEST		Tulare Lake	SCRO	14,854	23.2	17,313	2	5	5	3.75	1	2	1	1.5	1	1	20.3	Medium	Groundwater quality issues	Adjudicated basin
242	5-29	CASTAC LAKE VALLEY		Tulare Lake	SCRO	3,573	5.6	366	1	0	5	0.75	1	1	5	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
243	5-3	JESS VALLEY		Sacramento River	NRO	6,708	10.5	13	0	0	0	0.75	5	1	1	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
244	5-30	LOWER LAKE VALLEY		Sacramento River	NRO	2,404	3.8	2,694	2	0	5	2.25	1	2	5	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
245	5-31	LONG VALLEY		Sacramento River	NRO	2,799	4.4	194	1	0	0	2.25	3	2	5	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
246	5-35	MCCLOUD AREA		Sacramento River	NRO	21,320	33.3	822	1	0	1	1.5	1	1	3	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
247	5-36	ROUND VALLEY		Sacramento River	NRO	7,266	11.4	27	0	0	0	1.5	4	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
248	5-37	TOAD WELL AREA		Sacramento River	NRO	3,356	5.2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
249	5-38	PONDOSA TOWN AREA		Sacramento River	NRO	2,082	3.3	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
250	5-4	BIG VALLEY		Sacramento River	NRO	92,050	143.8	1,046	1	0	1	1.5	4	3	3	3	3	0	13.5	Medium	Declining GW Levels over much of the basin.	
251	5-40	HOT SPRINGS VALLEY		Sacramento River	NRO	2,404	3.8	12	0	0	0	1.5	4	2	1	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
252	5-41	EGG LAKE VALLEY		Sacramento River	NRO	4,101	6.4	0	0	0	0	0.75	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
253	5-43	ROCK PRAIRIE VALLEY		Sacramento River	NRO	5,740	9.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
254	5-44	LONG VALLEY		Sacramento River	NRO	1,088	1.7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
255	5-45	CAYTON VALLEY		Sacramento River	NRO	1,306	2.0	2	0	0	0	1.5	5	0	1	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		



CASGEM Groundwater Basin Prioritization Results Sorted by Basin Number									Data Component Ranking Value										Overall Ranking		Impact Comments	Other Information Comments
Basin count	Basin Number	Basin Name	Sub-Basin Name	Hydrologic Region	DWR Region Office	Basin Area		2010 Population	Population	Population Growth	Public Supply Wells	Total Wells *	Irrigated Acreage	Groundwater Reliance			Impacts	Other Information	Overall Basin Ranking Score ***	Overall Basin Priority		
						Acres	Sq. Mile							GW Use **	Percent of Total Supply **	GW Reliance Total						
256	5-46	LAKE BRITTON AREA		Sacramento River	NRO	14,055	22.0	84	0	0	2	0.75	1	0	1	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
257	5-47	GOOSE VALLEY		Sacramento River	NRO	4,208	6.6	10	0	0	0	0.75	5	1	1	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
258	5-48	BURNEY CREEK VALLEY		Sacramento River	NRO	2,352	3.7	1,466	2	1	0	2.25	5	3	1	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
259	5-49	DRY BURNEY CREEK VALLEY		Sacramento River	NRO	3,074	4.8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
260	5-5	FALL RIVER VALLEY		Sacramento River	NRO	54,803	85.6	1,629	1	0	1	2.25	5	3	2	2.5	1	0	12.8	Low	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)	
261	5-50	NORTH FORK BATTLE CREEK		Sacramento River	NRO	12,755	19.9	528	1	0	3	3	2	0	1	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
262	5-51	BUTTE CREEK VALLEY		Sacramento River	NRO	3,227	5.0	0	0	0	0	0.75	2	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
263	5-52	GRAYS VALLEY		Sacramento River	NRO	5,440	8.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
264	5-53	DIXIE VALLEY		Sacramento River	NRO	4,866	7.6	6	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
265	5-54	ASH VALLEY		Sacramento River	NRO	6,008	9.4	3	0	0	0	0.75	3	0	1	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
266	5-56	YELLOW CREEK VALLEY		Sacramento River	NRO	2,311	3.6	2	0	0	0	0	5	0	1	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
267	5-57	LAST CHANCE CREEK VALLEY		Sacramento River	NRO	4,659	7.3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
268	5-58	CLOVER VALLEY		Sacramento River	NRO	16,784	26.2	0	0	0	0	0.75	4	0	1	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
269	5-59	GRIZZLY VALLEY		Sacramento River	NRO	13,441	21.0	0	0	0	0	0.75	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
270	5-6.01	REDDING AREA	BOWMAN	Sacramento River	NRO	78,426	122.5	7,165	1	5	2	3	2	2	2	2	1	0	16.0	Medium	Some localized high boron.	
271	5-6.02	REDDING AREA	ROSEWOOD	Sacramento River	NRO	46,455	72.6	1,009	1	0	0	2.25	2	1	2	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
272	5-6.03	REDDING AREA	ANDERSON	Sacramento River	NRO	96,857	151.3	52,937	2	2	4	3.75	2	4	3	3.5	0	0	17.3	Medium		
273	5-6.04	REDDING AREA	ENTERPRISE	Sacramento River	NRO	60,862	95.1	68,627	2	3	4	3.75	2	2	1	1.5	0	1	17.3	Medium	Strong SW-GW interaction and endangered Sac River salmon runs	
274	5-6.05	REDDING AREA	MILLVILLE	Sacramento River	NRO	65,226	101.9	2,640	1	0	1	2.25	2	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
275	5-6.06	REDDING AREA	SOUTH BATTLE CREEK	Sacramento River	NRO	33,835	52.9	48	0	0	0	0.75	2	1	2	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
276	5-60	HUMBUG VALLEY		Sacramento River	NRO	9,979	15.6	3,299	1	0	4	3.75	2	0	3	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
277	5-61	CHROME TOWN AREA		Sacramento River	NRO	1,408	2.2	6	0	0	0	0.75	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
278	5-62	ELK CREEK AREA		Sacramento River	NRO	1,438	2.2	174	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
279	5-63	STONYFORD TOWN AREA		Sacramento River	NRO	6,437	10.1	183	1	0	3	2.25	3	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
280	5-64	BEAR VALLEY		Sacramento River	NRO	9,104	14.2	4	0	0	0	0.75	2	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
281	5-65	LITTLE INDIAN VALLEY		Sacramento River	NRO	1,269	2.0	112	1	0	0	3.75	2	3	4	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
282	5-66	CLEAR LAKE CACHE FORMATION		Sacramento River	NRO	29,717	46.4	7,960	1	5	1	1.5	1	0	1	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
283	5-68	POPE VALLEY		Sacramento River	NCRO	7,177	11.2	110	1	0	0	1.5	4	2	1	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
284	5-69	YOSEMITE VALLEY		San Joaquin River	SCRO	7,465	11.7	1,016	1	5	4	0.75	0	1	5	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
285	5-7	LAKE ALMANOR VALLEY		Sacramento River	NRO	7,152	11.2	2,121	1	0	3	1.5	1	2	3	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
286	5-70	LOS BANOS CREEK VALLEY		San Joaquin River	SCRO	4,835	7.6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
287	5-71	VALLECITOS CREEK VALLEY		Tulare Lake	SCRO	15,110	23.6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		

CASGEM Groundwater Basin Prioritization Results Sorted by Basin Number									Data Component Ranking Value										Overall Ranking		Impact Comments	Other Information Comments
Basin count	Basin Number	Basin Name	Sub-Basin Name	Hydrologic Region	DWR Region Office	Basin Area		2010 Population	Population	Population Growth	Public Supply Wells	Total Wells *	Irrigated Acreage	Groundwater Reliance			Impacts	Other Information	Overall Basin Ranking Score ***	Overall Basin Priority		
						Acres	Sq. Mile							GW Use **	Percent of Total Supply **	GW Reliance Total						
288	5-8	MOUNTAIN MEADOWS VALLEY		Sacramento River	NRO	8,145	12.7	0	0	0	0	0.75	4	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
289	5-80	BRITE VALLEY		Tulare Lake	SCRO	3,181	5.0	684	1	0	4	3.75	2	1	3	0	0	1	0.0	Very Low		Adjudicated basin
290	5-82	CUDDY CANYON VALLEY		Tulare Lake	SCRO	3,308	5.2	2,641	2	4	5	2.25	0	2	5	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
291	5-83	CUDDY RANCH AREA		Tulare Lake	SCRO	4,213	6.6	774	1	0	5	1.5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
292	5-84	CUDDY VALLEY		Tulare Lake	SCRO	3,474	5.4	779	1	0	5	2.25	0	1	5	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
293	5-85	MIL POTRERO AREA		Tulare Lake	SCRO	2,314	3.6	1,288	2	5	5	1.5	0	2	5	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
294	5-86	JOSEPH CREEK		Sacramento River	NRO	4,458	7.0	13	0	0	0	1.5	3	2	3	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
295	5-87	MIDDLE FORK FEATHER RIVER		Sacramento River	NRO	4,342	6.8	177	1	0	2	3	1	0	1	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
296	5-88	STONY GORGE RESERVOIR		Sacramento River	NRO	1,065	1.7	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	1	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
297	5-89	SQUAW FLAT		Sacramento River	NRO	1,294	2.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
298	5-9	INDIAN VALLEY		Sacramento River	NRO	29,413	46.0	1,718	1	0	2	3	4	0	1	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
299	5-90	FUNKS CREEK		Sacramento River	NRO	3,012	4.7	0	0	0	0	0.75	1	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
300	5-91	ANTELOPE CREEK		Sacramento River	NRO	2,040	3.2	3	0	0	0	0.75	3	0	1	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
301	5-92	BLANCHARD VALLEY		Sacramento River	NRO	2,221	3.5	0	0	0	0	0.75	2	0	1	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
302	5-93	NORTH FORK CACHE CREEK		Sacramento River	NRO	3,474	5.4	0	0	0	0	0.75	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
303	5-94	MIDDLE CREEK		Sacramento River	NRO	705	1.1	10	1	0	0	3	2	4	5	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
304	5-95	MEADOW VALLEY		Sacramento River	NRO	5,734	9.0	387	1	0	2	3	2	1	1	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
305	6-1	SURPRISE VALLEY		North Lahontan	NRO	228,460	357.0	1,127	0	0	1	0.75	3	2	2	2	2	0	8.8	Low	Declining GW Levels and GW Quality issues (sodium sulfate, high TDS, and thermal waters) in various portions of the basin.	
306	6-10	ADOBE LAKE VALLEY		South Lahontan	SRO	39,978	62.5	4	0	0	0	0.75	0	0	5	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
307	6-100	SECRET VALLEY		North Lahontan	NRO	33,680	52.6	26	0	0	0	0.75	2	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
308	6-101	BULL FLAT		North Lahontan	NRO	18,151	28.4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
309	6-104	LONG VALLEY		North Lahontan	NRO	46,836	73.2	141	0	0	0	0.75	1	0	1	0	0	3	0.0	Very Low		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.
310	6-105	SLINKARD VALLEY		North Lahontan	NCRO	4,517	7.1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
311	6-106	LITTLE ANTELOPE VALLEY		North Lahontan	NCRO	2,491	3.9	0	0	0	0	0.75	3	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
312	6-107	SWEETWATER FLAT		North Lahontan	NCRO	4,747	7.4	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
313	6-108	OLYMPIC VALLEY		North Lahontan	NCRO	702	1.1	471	2	0	5	2.25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
314	6-11	LONG VALLEY		South Lahontan	SRO	72,028	112.5	800	1	0	2	0.75	2	2	1	0	1	0	0.0	Very Low	Local impairments from thermal waters and some springs with high TDS, fluoride, boron, and other elements, but water quality suitable overall.	
315	6-12	OWENS VALLEY		South Lahontan	SRO	663,458	1,036.7	17,664	1	0	1	0.75	1	2	4	3	2	5	13.8	Medium	Minor impairments locally due to inorganics.	Actual GW Volume not fully captured due to gw exports out of the basin resulting in limited irrigated acres and domestic development. GW volume reflects the additional pumping that is exported
316	6-13	BLACK SPRINGS VALLEY		South Lahontan	SRO	30,911	48.3	0	0	0	0	0.75	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
317	6-14	FISH LAKE VALLEY		South Lahontan	SRO	48,333	75.5	36	0	0	0	0.75	2	3	5	4	0	0	6.8	Low		
318	6-15	DEEP SPRINGS VALLEY		South Lahontan	SRO	30,048	47.0	5	0	0	1	0.75	1	1	5	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
319	6-16	EUREKA VALLEY		South Lahontan	SRO	129,329	202.1	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		

CASGEM Groundwater Basin Prioritization Results Sorted by Basin Number									Data Component Ranking Value									Overall Ranking		Impact Comments	Other Information Comments		
Basin count	Basin Number	Basin Name	Sub-Basin Name	Hydrologic Region	DWR Region Office	Basin Area		2010 Population	Population	Population Growth	Public Supply Wells	Total Wells *	Irrigated Acreage	Groundwater Reliance			Impacts	Other Information	Overall Basin Ranking Score ***			Overall Basin Priority	
						Acres	Sq. Mile							GW Use **	Percent of Total Supply **	GW Reliance Total							
320	6-17	SALINE VALLEY		South Lahontan	SRO	146,850	229.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0.0	Very Low	GW Quality Impairments: High TDS and Fluorides, groundwater is inferior for domestic use. (B-118)		
321	6-18	DEATH VALLEY		South Lahontan	SRO	926,496	1,447.7	190	0	0	1	0.75	1	0	5	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
322	6-19	WINGATE VALLEY		South Lahontan	SRO	71,755	112.1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low			
323	6-2	MADLINE PLAINS		North Lahontan	NRO	156,152	244.0	151	0	0	0	0.75	3	3	3	3	1	0	7.8	Low	Localized naturally occurring water quality issues (high TDS, nitrates, boron, ASAR, etc)		
324	6-20	MIDDLE AMARGOSA VALLEY		South Lahontan	SRO	392,862	613.8	230	0	0	1	0.75	0	0	5	0	4	0	0.0	Very Low	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)		
325	6-21	LOWER KINGSTON VALLEY		South Lahontan	SRO	241,892	378.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0.0	Very Low	Groundwater is inferior for domestic or irrigation purposes due to elevated fluoride, chloride, boron, sulfate and TDS (B-118)		
326	6-22	UPPER KINGSTON VALLEY		South Lahontan	SRO	178,533	279.0	37	0	0	1	0.75	0	0	5	0	4	0	0.0	Very Low	Groundwater is marginal to inferior for domestic or irrigation purposes due to elevated fluoride and TDS (B-118).		
327	6-23	RIGGS VALLEY		South Lahontan	SRO	88,274	137.9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low			
328	6-24	RED PASS VALLEY		South Lahontan	SRO	97,088	151.7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low			
329	6-25	BICYCLE VALLEY		South Lahontan	SRO	90,100	140.8	0	0	0	1	0.75	0	0	0	0	3	0	0.0	Very Low	Elevated TDS and fluoride (B-118).		
330	6-26	AVAWATZ VALLEY		South Lahontan	SRO	27,826	43.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low			
331	6-27	LEACH VALLEY		South Lahontan	SRO	61,620	96.3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low			
332	6-28	PAHRUMP VALLEY		South Lahontan	SRO	93,747	146.5	99	0	0	0	0.75	0	2	5	0	2	0	0.0	Very Low	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 ( <a href="http://water.nv.gov/documents/presentations/pahrump.pdf">http://water.nv.gov/documents/presentations/pahrump.pdf</a> )		
333	6-29	MESQUITE VALLEY		South Lahontan	SRO	89,012	139.1	64	0	0	0	0.75	1	1	1	0	3	0	0.0	Very Low	Declining water levels. Locally high TDS in southern portion of basin makes GW marginal to inferior for domestic uses. (B-118)		
334	6-3	WILLOW CREEK VALLEY		North Lahontan	NRO	11,698	18.3	62	0	0	0	1.5	4	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low			
335	6-30	IVANPAH VALLEY		South Lahontan	SRO	200,155	312.7	40	0	0	1	0.75	0	0	5	0	4	0	0.0	Very Low	Basin groundwater is rated marginal to inferior for both domestic and irrigational use because of elevated fluoride and sodium. (B-118)		
336	6-31	KELSO VALLEY		South Lahontan	SRO	257,279	402.0	20	0	0	0	0.75	0	0	5	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low			
337	6-32	BROADWELL VALLEY		South Lahontan	SRO	92,688	144.8	8	0	0	1	0.75	0	0	5	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low			
338	6-33	SODA LAKE VALLEY		South Lahontan	SRO	383,560	599.3	750	0	0	1	0.75	0	0	5	0	5	0	0.0	Very Low	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		
339	6-34	SILVER LAKE VALLEY		South Lahontan	SRO	35,519	55.5	0	0	0	0	0.75	0	0	0	0	4	0	0.0	Very Low	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)		
340	6-35	CRONISE VALLEY		South Lahontan	SRO	127,313	198.9	2	0	0	0	0.75	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low			
341	6-36.01	LANGFORD VALLEY	LANGFORD WELL LAKE	South Lahontan	SRO	19,457	30.4	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low			
342	6-36.02	LANGFORD VALLEY	IRWIN	South Lahontan	SRO	10,557	16.5	8,845	2	5	1	1.5	0	0	0	0	3	0	0.0	Very Low	Locally high iron and fluoride concentrations.(B-118)		
343	6-37	COYOTE LAKE VALLEY		South Lahontan	SRO	88,735	138.6	99	0	0	0	0.75	0	0	5	0	4	0	0.0	Very Low	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).		

CASGEM Groundwater Basin Prioritization Results Sorted by Basin Number									Data Component Ranking Value									Overall Ranking		Impact Comments	Other Information Comments	
Basin count	Basin Number	Basin Name	Sub-Basin Name	Hydrologic Region	DWR Region Office	Basin Area		2010 Population	Population	Population Growth	Public Supply Wells	Total Wells *	Irrigated Acreage	Groundwater Reliance			Impacts	Other Information	Overall Basin Ranking Score ***			Overall Basin Priority
						Acres	Sq. Mile							GW Use **	Percent of Total Supply **	GW Reliance Total						
344	6-38	CAVES CANYON VALLEY		South Lahontan	SRO	73,542	114.9	88	0	0	1	0.75	0	0	0	0	3	0	0.0	Very Low	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).	
345	6-4	HONEY LAKE VALLEY		North Lahontan	NRO	311,741	487.1	23,566	1	0	1	2.25	2	2	2	2	2	2	12.3	Low	GW Quality Issues: High boron, arsenic, ASAR, TDS, and Nitrates between Lichfield 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.	Interstate basin. Local concerns over gw export from Fish Springs Ranch to Reno.
346	6-40	LOWER MOJAVE RIVER VALLEY		South Lahontan	SRO	287,563	449.3	32,938	1	1	2	0.75	1	2	5	3.5	5	1	15.3	Medium	Groundwater basin has been in overdraft. Water quality has been impaired from natural sources, leaking tanks, and superfund sites from military bases.	Basin is adjudicated. USGS reports GW Level declines of 100 ft since the 1930s
347	6-41	MIDDLE MOJAVE RIVER VALLEY		South Lahontan	SRO	212,595	332.2	6,654	1	0	1	0.75	1	2	5	3.5	3	1	11.3	Low	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	Basin is adjudicated.
348	6-42	UPPER MOJAVE RIVER VALLEY		South Lahontan	SRO	415,295	648.9	355,338	2	5	3	0.75	1	2	4	3	5	2	21.8	High	Overdraft. Water quality impacts in basin including nitrates, inorganics, and fuel additives, etc. Superfund site within basin.	Basin is adjudicated (+1). Irrigated Acreage of zero from DAU isn't correct, add +1
349	6-43	EL MIRAGE VALLEY		South Lahontan	SRO	76,292	119.2	10,933	1	4	2	0.75	1	1	5	3	4	0	15.8	Medium	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.	
350	6-44	ANTELOPE VALLEY		South Lahontan	SRO	1,014,596	1,585.3	398,864	2	4	2	1.5	1	1	5	3	5	3	21.5	High	Closed basin. Water quality impacts per IRWMP, DWR B-118, and other sources. Extractions likely exceed natural recharge.	Pending Adjudication, water reliability issues, and renewed subsidence
351	6-45	TEHACHAPI VALLEY EAST		South Lahontan	SRO	24,055	37.6	480	1	0	2	2.25	1	0	3	0	5	0	0.0	Very Low	Court adjudicated basin in overdraft. Groundwater quality issues.	
352	6-46	FREMONT VALLEY		South Lahontan	SRO	336,682	526.1	16,883	1	0	1	0.75	0	1	5	3	5	0	10.8	Low	Basin has naturally high TDS locally and other constituents. Groundwater levels have shown significant decline throughout the basin.	
353	6-47	HARPER VALLEY		South Lahontan	SRO	411,827	643.5	1,634	0	0	1	0.75	1	1	1	1	5	1	9.8	Low	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.	Adjudicated Basin
354	6-48	GOLDSTONE VALLEY		South Lahontan	SRO	28,287	44.2	0	0	0	0	0.75	0	0	0	0	3	0	0.0	Very Low	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.	
355	6-49	SUPERIOR VALLEY		South Lahontan	SRO	121,084	189.2	0	0	0	1	0.75	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
356	6-5.01	TAHOE VALLEY	TAHOE SOUTH	North Lahontan	NCRO	14,814	23.1	25,967	3	0	5	3.75	0	4	5	4.5	2	0	18.3	Medium	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).	
357	6-5.02	TAHOE VALLEY	TAHOE WEST	North Lahontan	NCRO	6,173	9.6	3,110	2	0	5	3.75	0	1	4	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
358	6-5.03	TAHOE VALLEY	TAHOE NORTH	North Lahontan	NCRO	1,931	3.0	3,410	3	0	5	3	0	3	4	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
359	6-50	CUDDEBACK VALLEY		South Lahontan	SRO	95,418	149.1	97	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	3	0	0.0	Very Low	Groundwater quality is ranked marginal to inferior for most beneficial uses due to elevated concentrations of chloride and TDS.	
360	6-51	PILOT KNOB VALLEY		South Lahontan	SRO	139,460	217.9	0	0	0	1	0.75	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
361	6-52	SEARLES VALLEY		South Lahontan	SRO	198,115	309.6	1,651	0	0	0	0.75	0	0	5	0	5	0	0.0	Very Low	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.	

CASGEM Groundwater Basin Prioritization Results Sorted by Basin Number									Data Component Ranking Value									Overall Ranking		Impact Comments	Other Information Comments	
Basin count	Basin Number	Basin Name	Sub-Basin Name	Hydrologic Region	DWR Region Office	Basin Area		2010 Population	Population	Population Growth	Public Supply Wells	Total Wells *	Irrigated Acreage	Groundwater Reliance			Impacts	Other Information	Overall Basin Ranking Score ***			Overall Basin Priority
						Acres	Sq. Mile							GW Use **	Percent of Total Supply **	GW Reliance Total						
362	6-53	SALT WELLS VALLEY		South Lahontan	SRO	29,629	46.3	0	0	0	0	0.75	0	0	0	0	5	0	0.0	Very Low	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)	
363	6-54	INDIAN WELLS VALLEY		South Lahontan	SRO	383,492	599.2	34,837	1	4	1	0.75	0	1	5	3	5	0	14.8	Medium	Overdraft has been documented since the 1960's. Water quality issues with respect to overdraft and mixing of aquifers.	
364	6-55	COSO VALLEY		South Lahontan	SRO	25,684	40.1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
365	6-56	ROSE VALLEY		South Lahontan	SRO	42,709	66.7	10	0	0	1	0.75	0	1	5	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
366	6-57	DARWIN VALLEY		South Lahontan	SRO	44,386	69.4	39	0	0	0	0.75	0	0	5	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
367	6-58	PANAMINT VALLEY		South Lahontan	SRO	260,754	407.4	7	0	0	1	0.75	0	0	5	0	4	0	0.0	Very Low	Water from most wells located on the valley floor is ranked inferior for domestic use and marginal to inferior for irrigation purposes.	
368	6-6	CARSON VALLEY		North Lahontan	NCRO	10,716	16.7	328	1	0	3	2.25	3	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
369	6-61	CAMEO AREA		South Lahontan	SRO	9,349	14.6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
370	6-62	RACE TRACK VALLEY		South Lahontan	SRO	14,184	22.2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
371	6-63	HIDDEN VALLEY		South Lahontan	SRO	18,037	28.2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
372	6-64	MARBLE CANYON AREA		South Lahontan	SRO	10,422	16.3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
373	6-65	COTTONWOOD SPRING AREA		South Lahontan	SRO	3,918	6.1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
374	6-66	LEE FLAT		South Lahontan	SRO	20,380	31.8	0	0	0	0	0.75	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
375	6-67	MARTIS VALLEY		North Lahontan	NCRO	36,381	56.8	14,743	2	4	3	3	0	3	5	4	0	1	17.0	Medium		Strong SW-GW interaction with Martis Creek, as per 2013 GWMP
376	6-68	SANTA ROSA FLAT		South Lahontan	SRO	16,861	26.3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
377	6-69	KELSO LANDER VALLEY		South Lahontan	SRO	11,208	17.5	0	0	0	0	0.75	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
378	6-7	ANTELOPE VALLEY		North Lahontan	NCRO	20,125	31.4	876	1	0	3	2.25	5	0	1	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
379	6-70	CACTUS FLAT		South Lahontan	SRO	7,056	11.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
380	6-71	LOST LAKE VALLEY		South Lahontan	SRO	23,414	36.6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
381	6-72	COLES FLAT		South Lahontan	SRO	2,961	4.6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
382	6-73	WILD HORSE MESA AREA		South Lahontan	SRO	3,337	5.2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
383	6-74	HARRISBURG FLATS		South Lahontan	SRO	25,077	39.2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
384	6-75	WILDROSE CANYON		South Lahontan	SRO	5,182	8.1	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
385	6-76	BROWN MOUNTAIN VALLEY		South Lahontan	SRO	21,862	34.2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
386	6-77	GRASS VALLEY		South Lahontan	SRO	10,034	15.7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
387	6-78	DENNING SPRING VALLEY		South Lahontan	SRO	7,289	11.4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
388	6-79	CALIFORNIA VALLEY		South Lahontan	SRO	58,639	91.6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
389	6-8	BRIDGEPORT VALLEY		North Lahontan	NCRO	32,545	50.9	586	1	0	2	0.75	4	0	1	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
390	6-80	MIDDLE PARK CANYON		South Lahontan	SRO	1,752	2.7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
391	6-81	BUTTE VALLEY		South Lahontan	SRO	8,853	13.8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		

CASGEM Groundwater Basin Prioritization Results Sorted by Basin Number									Data Component Ranking Value									Overall Ranking		Impact Comments	Other Information Comments	
Basin count	Basin Number	Basin Name	Sub-Basin Name	Hydrologic Region	DWR Region Office	Basin Area		2010 Population	Population	Population Growth	Public Supply Wells	Total Wells *	Irrigated Acreage	Groundwater Reliance			Impacts	Other Information	Overall Basin Ranking Score ***			Overall Basin Priority
						Acres	Sq. Mile							GW Use **	Percent of Total Supply **	GW Reliance Total						
392	6-82	SPRING CANYON VALLEY		South Lahontan	SRO	4,832	7.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
393	6-84	GREENWATER VALLEY		South Lahontan	SRO	60,260	94.2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
394	6-85	GOLD VALLEY		South Lahontan	SRO	3,234	5.1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
395	6-86	RHODES HILL AREA		South Lahontan	SRO	15,697	24.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
396	6-88	OWL LAKE VALLEY		South Lahontan	SRO	22,402	35.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
397	6-89	KANE WASH AREA		South Lahontan	SRO	5,997	9.4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
398	6-9	MONO VALLEY		South Lahontan	SRO	173,299	270.8	385	0	0	1	0.75	0	0	5	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
399	6-90	CADY FAULT AREA		South Lahontan	SRO	8,015	12.5	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
400	6-91	COW HEAD LAKE VALLEY		North Lahontan	NRO	5,625	8.8	0	0	0	0	0.75	5	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
401	6-92	PINE CREEK VALLEY		North Lahontan	NRO	9,526	14.9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
402	6-93	HARVEY VALLEY		North Lahontan	NRO	4,503	7.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
403	6-94	GRASSHOPPER VALLEY		North Lahontan	NRO	17,665	27.6	0	0	0	0	0.75	1	0	2	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
404	6-95	DRY VALLEY		North Lahontan	NRO	6,498	10.2	2	0	0	0	0.75	1	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
405	6-96	EAGLE LAKE AREA		North Lahontan	NRO	12,700	19.8	41	0	0	0	2.25	0	1	5	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
406	6-97	HORSE LAKE VALLEY		North Lahontan	NRO	3,827	6.0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
407	6-98	TULEMAD CANYON VALLEY		North Lahontan	NRO	5,167	8.1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
408	6-99	PAINTERS FLAT		North Lahontan	NRO	6,395	10.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
409	7-1	LANFAIR VALLEY		Colorado River	SRO	158,360	247.4	19	0	0	0	0.75	0	0	5	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
410	7-10	TWENTYNINE PALMS VALLEY		Colorado River	SRO	62,829	98.2	22,113	1	2	0	0.75	1	1	5	3	1	0	8.8	Low	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).	
411	7-11	COPPER MOUNTAIN VALLEY		Colorado River	SRO	30,540	47.7	6,085	1	5	1	0.75	1	1	3	0	1	0	0.0	Very Low	Locally high TDS and septic tank problems.	
412	7-12	WARREN VALLEY		Colorado River	SRO	23,952	37.4	22,860	2	5	4	0.75	0	2	3	2.5	0	1	15.3	Medium		Basin is adjudicated.
413	7-13.01	DEADMAN VALLEY	DEADMAN LAKE	Colorado River	SRO	89,793	140.3	22	0	0	0	0.75	0	0	5	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
414	7-13.02	DEADMAN VALLEY	SURPRISE SPRING	Colorado River	SRO	29,507	46.1	179	0	0	2	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
415	7-14	LAVIC VALLEY		Colorado River	SRO	103,132	161.1	0	0	0	0	0.75	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
416	7-15	BESSEMER VALLEY		Colorado River	SRO	39,379	61.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
417	7-16	AMES VALLEY		Colorado River	SRO	109,340	170.8	4,540	1	0	1	0.75	0	0	5	0	2	0	0.0	Very Low	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).	
418	7-17	MEANS VALLEY		Colorado River	SRO	15,061	23.5	46	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	2	0	0.0	Very Low	Fluoride, nitrate, and TDS concentrations are impairments locally.	
419	7-18.01	JOHNSON VALLEY	SOGGY LAKE	Colorado River	SRO	77,865	121.7	354	0	0	1	0.75	0	0	5	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
420	7-18.02	JOHNSON VALLEY	UPPER JOHNSON VALLEY	Colorado River	SRO	35,050	54.8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
421	7-19	LUCERNE VALLEY		Colorado River	SRO	148,467	232.0	3,311	1	0	1	0.75	1	1	1	1	4	1	9.8	Low	Water level declines noted from 40 to 100 feet. Evidence of subsidence from overdraft of basin. Locally high nitrates and TDS (B-118).	Fall 1954 - Fall 2002 Change in GW Storage is estimated at 460TAF ( Napoli)

CASGEM Groundwater Basin Prioritization Results Sorted by Basin Number									Data Component Ranking Value										Overall Ranking		Impact Comments	Other Information Comments
Basin count	Basin Number	Basin Name	Sub-Basin Name	Hydrologic Region	DWR Region Office	Basin Area		2010 Population	Population	Population Growth	Public Supply Wells	Total Wells *	Irrigated Acreage	Groundwater Reliance			Impacts	Other Information	Overall Basin Ranking Score ***	Overall Basin Priority		
						Acres	Sq. Mile							GW Use **	Percent of Total Supply **	GW Reliance Total						
422	7-2	FENNER VALLEY		Colorado River	SRO	457,633	715.1	31	0	0	1	0.75	0	0	5	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
423	7-20	MORONGO VALLEY		Colorado River	SRO	7,286	11.4	2,983	2	5	5	3	0	1	5	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
424	7-21.01	COACHELLA VALLEY	INDIO	Colorado River	SRO	299,784	468.4	368,855	2	5	3	0.75	3	4	3	3.5	2	0	19.3	Medium	Nitrates and addition of salts due to Colorado River imported water. Local areas of elevated fluoride.	
425	7-21.02	COACHELLA VALLEY	MISSION CREEK	Colorado River	SRO	48,966	76.5	18,974	1	5	2	0.75	0	3	5	4	2	1	15.8	Medium	Radiological and nitrate issues in the basin (B-118).	Mission Creek GW also supplies drinking water to Desert Hot Springs and part of Indio subbasins
426	7-21.03	COACHELLA VALLEY	DESERT HOT SPRINGS	Colorado River	SRO	101,862	159.2	22,568	1	5	1	0.75	1	0	5	2.5	1	0	12.3	Low	High TDS and declining water levels have been documented for a long period of time in the Desert Hot Springs Subbasin.	
427	7-21.04	COACHELLA VALLEY	SAN GORGONIO PASS	Colorado River	SRO	38,823	60.7	29,540	2	5	3	0.75	1	3	5	4	2	1	18.8	Medium	Basin is in overdraft.	Basin is adjudicated.
428	7-22	WEST SALTON SEA		Colorado River	SRO	106,408	166.3	5,352	1	0	0	0.75	0	0	5	0	3	0	0.0	Very Low	Groundwater is marginal to poor for domestic and irrigation use because of elevated fluoride, boron, and TDS.	
429	7-24	BORREGO VALLEY		Colorado River	SRO	153,978	240.6	3,853	1	0	2	0.75	1	2	5	3.5	5	2	15.3	Medium	Overdraft conditions over 60 years. Some wells have been abandoned or destroyed due to high nitrates.	Most demand for basin is concentrated in north in a small area.
430	7-25	OCOTILLO-CLARK VALLEY		Colorado River	SRO	224,416	350.6	27	0	0	1	0.75	2	0	1	0.5	3	0	7.3	Low	High TDS, sulfate, chloride, and fluoride concentrations locally impair groundwater for domestic and irrigation use.	
431	7-26	TERWILLIGER VALLEY		Colorado River	SRO	8,081	12.6	1,085	1	5	1	3	1	2	1	0	1	0	0.0	Very Low	Locally elevated nitrates (B-118).	
432	7-27	SAN FELIPE VALLEY		Colorado River	SRO	23,573	36.8	188	0	0	1	1.5	1	1	1	0	3	0	0.0	Very Low	Significant groundwater declines documented in the late 1950s through early 1970s (B-118)	
433	7-28	VALLECITO-CARRIZO VALLEY		Colorado River	SRO	122,943	192.1	77	0	0	1	0.75	0	0	5	0	3	0	0.0	Very Low	Groundwater quality is marginal for domestic use because of elevated levels of fluoride and mineral content.	
434	7-29	COYOTE WELLS VALLEY		Colorado River	SRO	147,088	229.8	374	0	0	1	0.75	0	0	5	0	4	0	0.0	Very Low	Basin is in overdraft (B-118). There are local fluoride issues and elevated TDS in some of the shallower wells in the basin.	
435	7-3	WARD VALLEY		Colorado River	SRO	564,569	882.1	22	0	0	0	0.75	0	0	5	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
436	7-30	IMPERIAL VALLEY		Colorado River	SRO	969,017	1,514.1	164,037	1	4	1	0.75	5	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
437	7-31	OROCOPIA VALLEY		Colorado River	SRO	97,214	151.9	2,243	1	0	0	0.75	0	3	5	2.5	1	0	0.0	Very Low	Some natural occurrences of elements or compounds that exceed drinking water standards.	
438	7-32	CHOCOLATE VALLEY		Colorado River	SRO	130,507	203.9	658	0	0	0	0.75	0	0	0	0	4	0	0.0	Very Low	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.	
439	7-33	EAST SALTON SEA		Colorado River	SRO	197,043	307.9	1,093	0	0	0	0.75	2	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
440	7-34	AMOS VALLEY		Colorado River	SRO	131,584	205.6	9	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
441	7-35	OGILBY VALLEY		Colorado River	SRO	135,017	211.0	36	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
442	7-36	YUMA VALLEY		Colorado River	SRO	125,741	196.5	3,146	1	0	1	0.75	3	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
443	7-37	ARROYO SECO VALLEY		Colorado River	SRO	259,806	405.9	6	0	0	1	0.75	0	0	5	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
444	7-38	PALO VERDE VALLEY		Colorado River	SRO	74,004	115.6	7,459	1	4	2	0.75	5	1	1	1	1	-2	12.8	Low	Some elevated TDS in groundwater makes water unsuitable for domestic or irrigation purposes.(B-118)	Irrigated acres is almost all surface water. Reduce ranking somewhat due to low gw use
445	7-39	PALO VERDE MESA		Colorado River	SRO	228,010	356.3	9,231	1	0	1	0.75	3	0	1	0.5	3	0	9.3	Low	Arsenic, selenium, fluoride, chloride, boron, sulfate, and TDS concentrations are high (DWR 1975).	
446	7-4	RICE VALLEY		Colorado River	SRO	190,622	297.8	23	0	0	0	0.75	0	0	5	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
447	7-40	QUIEN SABE POINT VALLEY		Colorado River	SRO	25,489	39.8	112	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
448	7-41	CALZONA VALLEY		Colorado River	SRO	81,708	127.7	1,608	1	0	0	0.75	0	0	5	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		

CASGEM Groundwater Basin Prioritization Results Sorted by Basin Number									Data Component Ranking Value										Overall Ranking		Impact Comments	Other Information Comments
Basin count	Basin Number	Basin Name	Sub-Basin Name	Hydrologic Region	DWR Region Office	Basin Area		2010 Population	Population	Population Growth	Public Supply Wells	Total Wells *	Irrigated Acreage	Groundwater Reliance			Impacts	Other Information	Overall Basin Ranking Score ***	Overall Basin Priority		
						Acres	Sq. Mile							GW Use **	Percent of Total Supply **	GW Reliance Total						
449	7-42	VIDAL VALLEY		Colorado River	SRO	139,577	218.1	10	0	0	1	0.75	0	0	5	0	4	0	0.0	Very Low	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.	
450	7-43	CHEMEHUEVI VALLEY		Colorado River	SRO	275,713	430.8	395	0	0	0	0.75	0	0	5	0	3	0	0.0	Very Low	Concentrations of sulfate, chloride, fluoride, and TDS are high (DWR 1975).	
451	7-44	NEEDLES VALLEY		Colorado River	SRO	89,101	139.2	4,902	1	0	2	0.75	1	0	1	0.5	3	0	8.3	Low	Concentrations of sulfate, chloride, fluoride, and TDS content levels are high in the basin (DWR 1975).	
452	7-45	PIUTE VALLEY		Colorado River	SRO	177,319	277.1	2	0	0	0	0.75	0	0	5	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
453	7-46	CANEBRAKE VALLEY		Colorado River	SRO	5,460	8.5	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
454	7-47	JACUMBA VALLEY		Colorado River	SRO	2,472	3.9	517	1	0	4	1.5	0	2	5	0	5	3	0.0	Very Low	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.	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 Bull 118 boundary)
455	7-48	HELENDALE FAULT VALLEY		Colorado River	SRO	2,637	4.1	9	0	0	0	0.75	0	0	5	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
456	7-49	PIPES CANYON FAULT VALLEY		Colorado River	SRO	3,408	5.3	5	0	0	0	1.5	0	0	5	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
457	7-5	CHUCKWALLA VALLEY		Colorado River	SRO	608,995	951.6	7,853	1	0	1	0.75	1	0	4	2	3	2	10.8	Low	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).	Significant growth in industry (solar), and others. Prison is also a significant user the the GW resources.
458	7-50	IRON RIDGE AREA		Colorado River	SRO	5,284	8.3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
459	7-51	LOST HORSE VALLEY		Colorado River	SRO	17,455	27.3	0	0	0	0	0.75	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
460	7-52	PLEASANT VALLEY		Colorado River	SRO	9,733	15.2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
461	7-53	HEXIE MOUNTAIN AREA		Colorado River	SRO	11,236	17.6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
462	7-54	BUCK RIDGE FAULT VALLEY		Colorado River	SRO	6,974	10.9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
463	7-55	COLLINS VALLEY		Colorado River	SRO	7,121	11.1	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
464	7-56	YAQUI WELL AREA		Colorado River	SRO	15,098	23.6	4	0	0	1	0.75	0	1	5	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
465	7-59	MASON VALLEY		Colorado River	SRO	5,567	8.7	23	0	0	2	0.75	0	1	5	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
466	7-6	PINTO VALLEY		Colorado River	SRO	184,377	288.1	7	0	0	1	0.75	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
467	7-61	DAVIES VALLEY		Colorado River	SRO	3,600	5.6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
468	7-62	JOSHUA TREE		Colorado River	SRO	27,422	42.8	4,951	1	5	3	0.75	0	0	5	0	1	0	0.0	Very Low	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).	
469	7-63	VANDEVENTER FLAT		Colorado River	SRO	6,787	10.6	50	0	0	0	0.75	0	0	5	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
470	7-7	CADIZ VALLEY		Colorado River	SRO	272,931	426.5	10	0	0	0	0.75	0	0	5	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
471	7-8	BRISTOL VALLEY		Colorado River	SRO	501,834	784.1	27	0	0	1	0.75	1	0	5	2.5	3	0	8.3	Low	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).	
472	7-9	DALE VALLEY		Colorado River	SRO	214,650	335.4	1,197	0	0	1	0.75	1	0	5	0	5	0	0.0	Very Low	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	



CASGEM Groundwater Basin Prioritization Results Sorted by Basin Number									Data Component Ranking Value									Overall Ranking		Impact Comments	Other Information Comments	
Basin count	Basin Number	Basin Name	Sub-Basin Name	Hydrologic Region	DWR Region Office	Basin Area		2010 Population	Population	Population Growth	Public Supply Wells	Total Wells *	Irrigated Acreage	Groundwater Reliance			Impacts	Other Information	Overall Basin Ranking Score ***			Overall Basin Priority
						Acres	Sq. Mile							GW Use **	Percent of Total Supply **	GW Reliance Total						
473	8-1	COASTAL PLAIN OF ORANGE COUNTY		South Coast	SRO	223,222	348.8	2,309,966	5	2	4	3.75	0	5	5	5	1	0	20.8	Medium	Saline intrusion issues.	
474	8-2.01	UPPER SANTA ANA VALLEY	CHINO	South Coast	SRO	154,693	241.7	898,653	4	2	4	2.25	3	5	3	4	3	1	23.3	High	Locally high nitrates and TDS. REH, per Pub Com, to include subsidence, historic overdraft, ground fissuring, problems mitigated with OBMP, reduce from 4 to 3.	Basin is adjudicated. REH Pub Com, program of controlled overdraft of 400,000 AF from the Chino Basin though 2030 to control the outflow of poor-quality rising GW
475	8-2.02	UPPER SANTA ANA VALLEY	CUCAMONGA	South Coast	SRO	9,574	15.0	51,001	4	1	5	0.75	1	5	2	3.5	3	0	18.3	Medium	High nitrates reported in 14 of 24 wells tested (B-118)	
476	8-2.03	UPPER SANTA ANA VALLEY	RIVERSIDE-ARLINGTON	South Coast	SRO	58,903	92.0	336,884	4	2	4	3	2	5	4	4.5	5	0	24.5	High	Water quality degradation issues known in several public supply wells.	
477	8-2.04	UPPER SANTA ANA VALLEY	RIALTO-COLTON	South Coast	SRO	30,224	47.2	145,832	4	1	4	2.25	1	3	3	3	3	0	18.3	Medium	Extensive perchlorate contamination in basin.	
478	8-2.05	UPPER SANTA ANA VALLEY	CAJON	South Coast	SRO	23,306	36.4	520	1	0	1	0.75	1	5	1	0.5	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
479	8-2.06	UPPER SANTA ANA VALLEY	BUNKER HILL	South Coast	SRO	80,972	126.5	363,394	4	1	5	2.25	2	3	3	3	3	1	21.3	High	The Bunker Hill sub-basin is impacted with PCE and TCE from the Newmark Superfund site and with perchlorate from the Crafton-Redlands plume.	Adjudication (Western San Bernardino)
480	8-2.07	UPPER SANTA ANA VALLEY	YUCAIPA	South Coast	SRO	25,410	39.7	65,180	3	1	4	2.25	2	3	4	3.5	5	0	20.8	Medium	Overdraft. Documented impacts of nitrates and sulfates. (B-118)	
481	8-2.08	UPPER SANTA ANA VALLEY	SAN TIMOTEO	South Coast	SRO	73,541	114.9	54,169	2	5	3	1.5	1	1	4	2.5	3	1	19.0	Medium	Locally high nitrates and salinity (B-118). GAMA reported upper basin water quality issues.	Parts of the subbasin are adjudicated.
482	8-2.09	UPPER SANTA ANA VALLEY	TEMESCAL	South Coast	SRO	23,654	37.0	141,436	4	2	3	3	1	5	4	4.5	2	0	19.5	Medium	Groundwater quality impaired by nitrates and inorganics in some wells (B-118).	
483	8-4	ELSINORE		South Coast	SRO	25,873	40.4	60,946	3	4	4	2.25	1	2	4	3	3	1	21.3	High	High TDS due to Nitrate and Sulfate in some portions of the basin (Elsinore Gw AdvisoryComm). Some fluoride impacts to groundwater (B-118).	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
484	8-5	SAN JACINTO		South Coast	SRO	188,623	294.7	474,317	3	4	2	2.25	3	3	5	4	5	1	24.3	High	Basin is in overdraft (MWD). Groundwater quality issues documented in DWR B-118. Pumping has increased some contaminant distribution in the basin.	Adjudicated Basin
485	8-6	HEMET LAKE VALLEY		South Coast	SRO	16,811	26.3	464	1	0	3	0.75	1	0	1	0	2	0	0.0	Very Low	Locally high nitrates and TDS (B-118)	
486	8-7	BIG MEADOWS VALLEY		South Coast	SRO	14,263	22.3	51	0	0	4	0.75	0	5	3	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
487	8-8	SEVEN OAKS VALLEY		South Coast	SRO	4,103	6.4	7	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
488	8-9	BEAR VALLEY		South Coast	SRO	19,667	30.7	16,866	2	1	5	3	0	2	3	2.5	1	0	14.5	Medium	Fluoride problems in some wells (B-118).	
489	9-1	SAN JUAN VALLEY		South Coast	SRO	16,797	26.2	61,131	3	1	3	2.25	0	3	1	2	2	0	13.3	Low	TDS is generally high, springs with high fluorine, local pesticide contamination, and secondary inorganic contamination (B-118). Desalters used to treat water.	
490	9-10	SAN PASQUAL VALLEY		South Coast	SRO	4,563	7.1	968	1	0	2	3	4	5	5	5	3	1	19.0	Medium	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.	LWU data based on DAU does not accurately depict irrigated acreage. 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.
491	9-11	SANTA MARIA VALLEY		South Coast	SRO	12,379	19.3	16,695	2	2	0	3.75	2	0	1	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
492	9-12	SAN DIEGUITO CREEK		South Coast	SRO	3,578	5.6	3,135	2	2	0	3	3	2	1	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
493	9-13	POWAY VALLEY		South Coast	SRO	2,485	3.9	16,450	5	2	0	3.75	1	2	1	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
494	9-14	MISSION VALLEY		South Coast	SRO	7,387	11.5	37,066	4	3	0	3.75	0	2	1	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
495	9-15	SAN DIEGO RIVER VALLEY		South Coast	SRO	9,944	15.5	45,800	4	1	3	3.75	1	3	1	2	1	0	15.8	Medium	High Nitrates, Iron and Manganese treatment is required, high TDS (>3,000 mg/l) in western portion of basin	
496	9-16	EL CAJON VALLEY		South Coast	SRO	7,203	11.3	92,314	5	1	0	3.75	1	2	1	0	5	0	0.0	Very Low	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).	
497	9-17	SWEETWATER VALLEY		South Coast	SRO	5,949	9.3	35,277	4	1	4	3.75	0	2	1	0	5	0	0.0	Very Low	TDS, chloride and sodium content of the groundwater generally exceed the recommended limits for drinking (B-118 & DWR 1986).	
498	9-18	OTAY VALLEY		South Coast	SRO	6,869	10.7	39,191	4	1	0	3	1	2	1	0	5	0	0.0	Very Low	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)	
499	9-19	TIA JUANA		South Coast	SRO	7,448	11.6	50,694	5	1	0	2.25	2	0	1	0	5	0	0.0	Very Low	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).	

CASGEM Groundwater Basin Prioritization Results Sorted by Basin Number									Data Component Ranking Value									Overall Ranking		Impact Comments	Other Information Comments	
Basin count	Basin Number	Basin Name	Sub-Basin Name	Hydrologic Region	DWR Region Office	Basin Area		2010 Population	Population	Population Growth	Public Supply Wells	Total Wells *	Irrigated Acreage	Groundwater Reliance			Impacts	Other Information	Overall Basin Ranking Score ***			Overall Basin Priority
						Acres	Sq. Mile							GW Use **	Percent of Total Supply **	GW Reliance Total						
500	9-2	SAN MATEO VALLEY		South Coast	SRO	3,009	4.7	554	1	0	4	1.5	3	0	0	0	3	0	0.0	Very Low	Locally high TDS and some elevated nitrates in wells (B-118)	
501	9-22	BATIQUITOS LAGOON VALLEY		South Coast	SRO	745	1.2	2,109	3	5	0	1.5	1	0	0	0	4	0	0.0	Very Low	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)	
502	9-23	SAN ELIJO VALLEY		South Coast	SRO	888	1.4	1,125	2	4	0	3	1	0	0	0	5		0.0	Very Low	High TDS limits beneficial uses (B-118)	
503	9-24	PAMO VALLEY		South Coast	SRO	1,514	2.4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
504	9-25	RANCHITA TOWN AREA		South Coast	SRO	3,146	4.9	168	1	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
505	9-27	COTTONWOOD VALLEY		South Coast	SRO	3,871	6.0	44	1	0	4	1.5	1	0	0	0	0	1	0.0	Very Low	Basin area is listed by EPA as a "Sole Source Aquifer" in EPA Region 9.	
506	9-28	CAMPO VALLEY		South Coast	SRO	3,569	5.6	985	1	0	4	2.25	2	0	0	0	0	1	0.0	Very Low	Basin area is listed by EPA as a "Sole Source Aquifer" in EPA Region 9.	
507	9-29	POTRERO VALLEY		South Coast	SRO	2,035	3.2	475	1	0	4	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
508	9-3	SAN ONOFRE VALLEY		South Coast	SRO	1,261	2.0	3,133	3	5	5	0.75	0	2	1	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
509	9-32	SAN MARCOS AREA		South Coast	SRO	2,144	3.3	15,096	5	3	0	3	0	2	1	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
510	9-4	SANTA MARGARITA VALLEY		South Coast	SRO	7,998	12.5	4,121	2	1	4	2.25	1	4	5	4.5	2	1	17.8	Medium	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).	Basin is federally adjudicated.
511	9-5	TEMECULA VALLEY		South Coast	SRO	88,338	138.0	219,431	3	5	3	3	2	1	1	1	5	1	23.0	High	Groundwater source is impaired in various parts of the basin due to elevated nitrates, fluoride, sulfates, TDS, and VOCs (B-118).	Basin is under Federal adjudication.
512	9-6	CAHUILLA VALLEY		South Coast	SRO	18,342	28.7	1,993	1	3	3	3	2	2	5	3.5	1	1	17.5	Medium	Locally, sulfates and nitrates are high for domestic use (DWR 1975). Nitrate concentrations reach as much as 128 mg/l (Moyle 1976).	Basin is federally adjudicated.
513	9-7	SAN LUIS REY VALLEY		South Coast	SRO	29,865	46.7	43,942	2	1	5	3	3	3	1	2	3	0	19.0	Medium	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	
514	9-8	WARNER VALLEY		South Coast	SRO	24,150	37.7	185	0	0	4	0.75	0	0	0	0	1	0	0.0	Very Low	Groundwater generally suitable except for elevated fluoride contents near hot springs	
515	9-9	ESCONDIDO VALLEY		South Coast	SRO	2,906	4.5	38,593	5	1	0	3.75	1	0	1	0	2	0	0.0	Very Low	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)	

NOTE: \* Data component values were reduced by 25% due to data confidence, prior to calculating total GW basin ranking value  
 \*\* Sub-fields that are used to determine the overall GW Reliance Total ((GW Use + GW %)/2)  
 \*\*\* Overall Basin Ranking Score = Population + Population Growth + PSW + (Total Wells x .75) + Irr Acreage + (GW Use + GW %)/2 + Impacts + Other