# CALIFORNIA GROUNDWATER ELEVATION MONITORING



# BASIN PRIORITIZATION PROCESS June, 2014



# CALIFORNIA GROUNDWATER ELEVATION MONITORING BASIN PRIORITIZATION

### INTRODUCTION

There are 515 alluvial groundwater basins and subbasins (basins) in California. These basins contribute 30 to 46 percent of the California's annual water supply. Statewide, approximately 30 million people, or 80 percent of Californians, live in areas overlying alluvial groundwater basins. At the local level, many municipal, agricultural, and disadvantaged communities rely on groundwater for nearly 100 percent of their water supply needs. Readily available quantities of high quality groundwater has provided long-term economic benefits to California and enabled the Central Valley to become a world leader in agricultural production. However, recent studies have identified the ongoing decline in California's groundwater quality and quantity—highlighting the vulnerability and bringing to question the long-term reliability and sustainability of California's groundwater resources (CWP, 2013; Harter, T., and J. Lund, 2012. ; Kuss, A., et al.; 2012; Scanlon, B. R., et al.; 2012; USGS, 2009; Walker, 2009).

Implementation of consistent data collection and assessment programs, along with application of effective local groundwater management practices, are important components to help minimize groundwater degradation and improve long-term reliability of groundwater resources. Financing groundwater data collection and management is a common challenge that requires alignment of State, regional, and local programs, and the strategic prioritization of resource management actions. Developing a common understanding of these priorities with respect to the California's 515 groundwater basins is an important first step toward the effective application of groundwater resource management practices. Historically, several programs have applied groundwater basin prioritization methods to help focus field investigations, to effectively utilize limited funding resources, and to align agency efforts (<u>SWRCB, 1999</u>; <u>USGS, 2003</u>). More recently, the CASGEM program has developed a process for statewide ranking and prioritizing California's 515 groundwater basins.

# CALIFORNIA STATEWIDE GROUNDWATER ELEVATION MONITORING (CASGEM) PROGRAM

As part of the California's 2009 Comprehensive Water Package, a series of special session bills were passed in part to help ensure a reliable water supply for future generations of Californians. One of the enacted bills was SBx7-6, titled *Groundwater Monitoring*. The SBx7-6 Groundwater Monitoring legislation added Part 2.11 to Division 6 of the California Water Code (§ 10920 et seq.), which established provisions and requirements for local agencies to develop

and conduct groundwater level monitoring programs. In the fall of 2011, Assembly Bill 1152 provided subsequent clarification by amending portions of Sections 10927 and 10933 of the California Water Code (CWC)

The Department of Water Resources (DWR) is implementing the 2009 *Groundwater Monitoring* legislation under the California Statewide Groundwater Elevation Monitoring Program, or CASGEM Program. The overall purpose of CASGEM is to establish a permanent, locally managed program of regular and systematic groundwater level monitoring to track seasonal and long-term trends in groundwater elevations in all of California's 515 alluvial groundwater basins and to make this information readily available to the public. Groundwater basins and subbasins are defined as the 515 alluvial basins or subbasin (basins) outlined in DWR's *California's Groundwater*, Bulletin 118, Update 2003.

As part of the CASGEM Program legislation, and pursuant to the CWC §10933, DWR is required to prioritize California groundwater basins, so as to help identify, evaluate, and determine the need for additional groundwater level monitoring. The CWC directs DWR to consider, to the extent available, all of the data components listed below.

- 1. The population overlying the basin,
- 2. The rate of current and projected growth of the population overlying the basin,
- 3. The number of public supply wells that draw from the basin,
- 4. The total number of wells that draw from the basin,
- 5. The irrigated acreage overlying the basin,
- 6. The degree to which persons overlying the basin rely on groundwater as their primary source of water,
- 7. Any documented impacts on the groundwater within the basin, including overdraft, subsidence, saline intrusion, and other water quality degradation, and
- 8. Any other information determined to be relevant by the department.

This report provides an overview of the CASGEM groundwater basin prioritization results, an explanation of how the basin prioritization results may be used, and a summary of the rationale used in the development of the CASGEM basin prioritization, based on the eight data components listed above.

# **CASGEM Groundwater Basin Prioritization Results**

The CASGEM groundwater basin prioritization was developed as a statewide ranking of groundwater basin importance, with a general focus towards implementation of the CASGEM Program. The priority ranking does not attempt to characterize how these basins are managed and monitored. In addition, evaluation of groundwater basins at a statewide scale does not necessarily capture the local importance of the smaller size or lower-use groundwater basins. For many of California's low-use basins, groundwater provides close to 100 percent of the local urban and agricultural water demands. Thus, when reviewing the CASGEM groundwater basin prioritization results, it is important to recognize the findings are not intended to characterize groundwater management practices or diminish the local importance of the smaller size or

lower-use groundwater basins; rather, they are presented as a statewide assessment of the overall importance of groundwater in meeting urban and agricultural demands, based on the evaluation of the eight required data components specified in the CWC.

The statewide summary of the CASGEM groundwater basin prioritization results are provided in Tables 1 and 2, and in Figure 1. A more detailed listing of the prioritization scoring for all 515 groundwater basins is provided in Appendix A. An explanation of the process for determining basin priority is provided in subsequent sections of this report.

As of May, 2014, the prioritization analysis ranks 43 of the 515 groundwater basins as High Priority, 84 as Medium Priority, 27 as Low Priority, and 361 as Very Low Priority. Groundwater basin prioritization results also indicate that 127 of the highest priority basins (High and Medium Priority) account for 96 percent of California's annual groundwater extraction and 88 percent of the population that overlies these basins.

Basin Driarity	Bacin	Percent of Total			
Ranking	Count	GW Use	Overlying Population		
High	43	69%	47%		
Medium	84	27%	41%		
Low	27	3%	1%		
Very Low	361	1%	11%		
Totals:	515	100%	100%		

# Table 1. Statewide Summary of CASGEM Groundwater Basin Prioritization

The results in Table 1 show that the High Priority groundwater basins account for 69 percent of California's average annual groundwater use and 47 percent of the 2010 population overlying these groundwater basins, while the Medium Priority groundwater basins account for 27 percent of the annual groundwater use and 41 percent of the overlying population. The remaining 388 groundwater basins ranked as Low or Very Low, account for a combined 4 percent of California's groundwater use and 12 percent of the overlying population.

Table 2 lists the number of groundwater basins and their priority by hydrologic region, along with the percentages of groundwater use and population associated with the High and Medium Priority basins. The South Coast Hydrologic Region has the largest number of High and Medium Priority basins (35), followed by the Central Coast (24), and Sacramento River (23) regions. The San Joaquin region has 9 basins groundwater basins (82 percent) ranked as High or Medium Priority. The nine High and Medium Priority Basins account for over 99 percent of the San

Joaquin region's average annual groundwater use and over 99 percent of the population overlying the basin area in the region.

	CASGEM Groundwater Basin Ranking by Range and Hydrologic Region				HR	Percent of Total Groundwater Use and Overlying Population for High & Medium Ranked Basins	
Hydrologic Region	High Ranking Range ≥ 21.08	Medium Ranking Range ≥ 13.42 to < 21.08	Low Ranking Range ≥ 5.75 to < 13.42	Very Low Ranking Range < 5.4	Basin Count	Groundwater Use *	Overlying Population *
North Coast	0	8	2	53	63	82%	62%
San Francisco Bay	0	7	0	26	33	90%	63%
Central Coast	9	15	0	36	60	97%	90%
South Coast	13	22	4	34	73	99%	94%
Sacramento River	5	18	4	61	88	96%	98%
San Joaquin River	7	2	0	2	11	100%	100%
Tulare Lake	7	1	1	10	19	99%	98%
North Lahontan	0	2	3	22	27	12%	55%
South Lahontan	2	4	4	67	77	84%	96%
Colorado River	0	5	9	50	64	82%	61%
Statewide	43	84	27	361	515	96%	88%

Table 2.	CASGEM Groundwater Basin Prioritization Summary.	bv H	vdrolog	ic Region
	Choolen Groundwatch Basin i Hornelation Sammary,	~ ,	,	,

**Note:** \* Estimated percentages are based on total groundwater use and population overlying all alluvial groundwater basins in the hydrologic region.

Figure 1 is a map of California's ten Hydrologic regions and 515 groundwater basins. The individual groundwater basins are color coded from High Priority (orange) to Very Low Priority (light green). Figure 1 shows that many of the groundwater basins within the Central and South Coast regions, and most of the basins within Central Valley, area are ranked as either High or Medium Priority. All of the groundwater basins within the Central Valley portion of the San Joaquin River and Tulare Lake regions are ranked as High Priority. All but five of the groundwater basins in the Central Valley portion of the Sacramento River region are listed as either High or Medium Priority. The North Lahontan, South Lahontan, and Colorado River regions have the lowest number of High and Medium Priority groundwater basins, primarily due to the low groundwater use and population.

As of June 13, 2014, about 60 percent of the High and Medium Priority groundwater basins are fully monitored under the CASGEM Program. An additional 11 percent of High and Medium Priority basins are partially monitored under CASGEM – leaving 29 percent of the High and

Medium Priority basins not monitored under CASGEM. Of the 37 High and Medium Priority basins that have not been fully or partially designated, 35 have a notification in-progress.



Figure 1. Statewide CASGEM Groundwater Basin Prioritization

# Application of CASGEM Groundwater Basin Prioritization

The CASGEM basin prioritization is being used to focus and align limited resources towards the implementation of the CASGEM legislation that requires all groundwater basins to be monitored for seasonal and long-term groundwater elevation trends. Although participation in the CASGEM Program is voluntary, noncompliance with the CASGEM requirements could result in basin monitoring entities and overlying counties being ineligible for a water grant or loan awarded or administered by the State.

<u>High and Medium Priority Basins</u>: CASGEM basin prioritization findings indicate that 127 groundwater basins categorized as High and Medium Priority comprise 96 percent of California's annual groundwater pumping, and include 88 percent of the population overlying alluvial groundwater basin areas. Based on these findings and the limited resources for the CASGEM program, DWR will focus efforts on evaluating the status of groundwater level monitoring in High or Medium Priority groundwater basins where monitoring will have the greatest benefit.

If DWR determines that groundwater levels in all or part of a High or Medium Priority basin are not being monitored, or that a Monitoring Entity has not been designated for the basin or subbasin, then DWR will work cooperatively with local entities to establish a CASGEM monitoring program. If DWR is not able to designate a Monitoring Entity, then CASGEM program will compile a list of the High and Medium priority basins that are not being monitored. That list will be provided to the grants and loans programs at DWR, SWRCB, and DPH and the specific grant programs will determine eligibility for their respective grants with respect to the basin not being monitored under the CASGEM Program, as specified in the Water Code.

Low and Very Low Priority Basins: CASGEM basin prioritization results indicate that many of California's Low and Very Low Priority groundwater basins have few people, limited irrigation, and little to no groundwater use. Although the intent of the CASGEM legislation is to have adequate groundwater level monitoring for all 515 California groundwater basins, CASGEM legislation also prescribes the use of groundwater basin prioritization to help identify, evaluate, and determine the need for additional groundwater level monitoring.

Although the implementation of CASGEM-related groundwater level monitoring requirements will first focus on High and Medium Priority basins due to limited resources, this approach is not intended to diminish the importance of groundwater level monitoring and management in Low or Very Low Priority groundwater basins. Groundwater level monitoring and management in Low and Very Low Priority basins is still encouraged.

Additional Potential Applications of CASGEM Basin Prioritization: The primary application of CASGEM groundwater basin prioritization is to meet the requirements of the CASGEM legislation. However, based on the comprehensive set of data included in the CASGEM basin prioritization effort, the prioritization ranking could also help focus and align limited resources

and assistance to local agencies trying to implement best practices and procedures for groundwater basin management and planning. High and Medium Priority basins would also likely have a greater need and responsibility to implement effective and sustainable groundwater management practices. Similar to previous prioritization efforts related to groundwater quality monitoring and implementation of the groundwater ambient monitoring and assessment program (GAMA), the CASGEM groundwater basin prioritization results could also be used to promote:

- Informed decision making;
- A common vocabulary for communication between agencies
- Groundwater data collection and evaluation based on a common understanding of resource prioritization;
- A mechanism to align the goals, objectives, and priorities for groundwater resource management;
- Improved knowledge and understanding of local, regional, and statewide groundwater issues and concerns; and
- Collaboration and alignment of inter-basin agencies that have basin-wide or regional groundwater management objectives.

# **CASGEM Groundwater Basin Prioritization Process**

The CASGEM basin prioritization process included an initial review and screening of groundwater basins for inclusion in the overall basin prioritization, followed by a more detailed analysis, review, and consideration of the eight data components stipulated in the CASGEM legislation listed below.

- 1. The population overlying the basin,
- 2. The rate of current and projected growth of the population overlying the basin,
- 3. The number of public supply wells that draw from the basin,
- 4. The total number of wells that draw from the basin,
- 5. The irrigated acreage overlying the basin,
- 6. The degree to which persons overlying the basin rely on groundwater as their primary source of water,
- 7. Any documented impacts on the groundwater within the basin, including overdraft, subsidence, saline intrusion, and other water quality degradation, and
- 8. Any other information determined to be relevant by the department.

**Initial Groundwater Basin Screening:** Review of previous efforts by the USGS to prioritize groundwater basins for groundwater quality sampling under the State Water Resource Control Board's GAMA program indicated that high use groundwater basins also commonly include basins having high public supply well density, high municipal groundwater use, and high agricultural groundwater use.

Using an approach similar to the GAMA Program, DWR selected *groundwater reliance* (data component number six listed above) as the primary component for the initial review and screening in the CASGEM groundwater basin prioritization process. Groundwater reliance data was developed in April 2010 using the most recent DWR statewide land and water use information, which estimated California's total annual groundwater use at about more than 13.6 million acre-feet (MAF). Analysis of groundwater reliance included consideration of the total annual volume of groundwater use, the annual volume of groundwater use per acre, and the percent to which groundwater contributes to the overall water supply for the basin.

Initial review of groundwater volume by basin indicated that the top 106 basins using groundwater represent about 97 percent of California's total annual groundwater use (see Figure 2). The 106 high-use basins all use 9,500 acre-feet or more groundwater per year. All of the 106 high-use groundwater basins were subsequently included into the overall groundwater basin prioritization process.

The second step in the initial basin prioritization process was to capture some of the lower-use groundwater basins having documented impacts or other issues that could potentially affect local groundwater supply reliability. In this step, 75 low-use groundwater basins with an estimated use of between 2,000 and 9,500 acre-feet of groundwater per year were further evaluated by DWR Regional Office groundwater staff with respect to documented impacts (data component 7, listed above) and "other" issues (data component 8, listed above). If further review of the 75 low-use groundwater basins identified impacts or other supply reliability issues, these low-use basins were subsequently included in the overall groundwater basin prioritization process.

Figure 2 illustrates the distribution of annual groundwater use by groundwater basin, and illustrates that groundwater basins producing between 2,000 and 9,500 acre-feet of groundwater per year, represent 2.5 percent of California's annual groundwater use. Groundwater basins producing less than 2,000 acre-feet of groundwater per year represent less than 0.5 percent of California's annual groundwater use.

Data for the remaining 319 very low-use groundwater basins with groundwater use of less than 2,000 acre-feet per year were recorded and compiled for potential future analysis; however, if no impacts or issues were documented, these basins were automatically ranked as CASGEM Very Low Priority groundwater basins, meaning the Overall Basin Ranking Score is overridden with a zero. The individual component ranking values will remain for inclusion in other potential data analyses.

**Inclusion of Data Components One through Six**: Following the initial review and screening of groundwater basins based on groundwater reliance, the groundwater data were normalized for further review and ranking. Due to the large variability in the size of the groundwater basins,

the data associated with the first six data components were normalized by basin area to facilitate further basin-to-basin comparisons.

The normalized basin data for each groundwater data component were analyzed by their statistical distribution according to six ranking ranges (Very Low, Low, Moderately Low, Medium, Moderately High, and High). Each of the six data components were assigned a corresponding ranking value from 0 to 5, based on six ranking ranges. For most data components, the Very Low range included all zero values associated with the particular data component. The remaining data were ranked from Low to High, and assigned a value from 1 to 5.

The remaining ranking ranges were selected by endeavoring to evenly distribute the data ranges across the remaining data set, while also taking into account the number of basins and the overall percentage of data set included within each range, the skewed distribution of the data set, and the relative degree of significance associated with the range of data values. For example, a groundwater basin having a Very Low population density was assigned a 0, while basins having a High population density range were assigned a value of 5. Table 3 lists the data component ranges for the first six data components: population density, population growth, public supply well density, total well density, irrigated acreage, and groundwater reliance (volume and percent of total supply met by groundwater). Additional information regarding the data sources and processing methods are provided in the Data Component Sources and Processing section of this report.



#### Figure 2. Distribution of the Annual Volume of Groundwater Use by Groundwater Basin

Once the ranges for each of the first six data components were established, a basin prioritization database tool was developed to evaluate and prioritize groundwater basins based on the cumulative ranking of each data component. The basin prioritization tool allowed for rapid evaluation and prioritization of the basins in graphic and tabular form, and the ability to independently apply weighting factors to each of the eight datasets, if needed. The ability to apply weighting factors allowed for adjustments due to the variable quality of data within each of the data components. Additional information regarding processing for each data component is provided in the *Data Sources and Processing* section of this report.

		Data Components and Ranking Ranges								
		Population		PSW/	Total Well	Irrigated	Groundwate	Groundwater Reliance		
Ranking	Ranking Value	Density	Projected Growth	Density	Density	Acreage	GW Use	% of Total Supply <sup>1</sup>		
		per sqmi	%	per sqmi	per sq. mi	ac/sqmi	ac-ft/acre	%		
Very Low	0	x < 7	x < 0	x = 0	x = 0	x < 1	x < 0.03	x < 0.1		
Low	1	7 ≥ x < 250	0 ≥ x < 6	0 > x < 0.1	0 > x < 2	1 ≥ x < 25	0.03 ≥ x < 0.1	0.1 ≥ x < 20		
Moderately Low	2	250 ≥ x < 1000	6 ≥ x < 15	0.1 ≥ x < 0.25	2 ≥ x < 5	25 ≥ x < 100	0.1 ≥ x < 0.25	20 ≥ x < 40		
Medium	3	1000 ≥ x < 2500	15≥x<25	0.25 ≥ x < 0.5	5 ≥ x < 10	100 ≥ x < 200	0.25 ≥ x < 0.5	40 ≥ x < 60		
Moderately High	4	2500 ≥ x < 4000	25 ≥ x < 40	0.5 ≥ x < 1.0	10 ≥ x < 20	200 ≥ x < 350	0.5 ≥ x < 0.75	60 ≥ x < 80		
High	5	x ≥ 4000	x ≥ 40%	x ≥ 1.0	x≥ 20	x ≥ 350	x ≥ 0.75	x ≥ 80%		

#### Table 3. Data Component Ranking Ranges for CASGEM Groundwater Basin Ranking

Note:

Population growth is percent growth from 2010 to 2030.

<sup>1</sup> Percent of total water supply (groundwater and surface water) that is provided by groundwater.

x = component data value

Inclusion of Data Components Seven and Eight: Data component seven includes groundwater basin impacts associated with overdraft, subsidence, saline intrusion, and other water quality degradation issues. Data Component eight includes any other information determined to be relevant by DWR, such as environmental impacts associated with surface water-groundwater interaction, adjudication, or other known groundwater issues that may justify an increase or decrease in the basin prioritization. Information associated with data components seven and eight were applied to the basin prioritization process by DWR Region office staff through review and consideration of information reported in DWR Bulletin 118, Update 2003, local groundwater management plans, public comments, or other readily available published information.

Based on the relative severity of groundwater basin impacts associated with component seven, an additional ranking value between 1 and 5 was applied to the total groundwater basin ranking value associated with data components one through six. A similar process was used to incorporate information associated with data component eight; however, a negative ranking value of up to -5 was also allowed, as appropriate, to help rectify known issues associated with basin-specific data relating to components one through six. All additional ranking value associated with data components seven and eight required a justification statement by the reviewer to support the change. Only one basin included a negative ranking value associated with data component eight.

### **Data Component Sources and Processing**

Compilation and evaluation of data from multiple sources was required to achieve statewide prioritization of groundwater basins through consideration of data components one through six. Most of these datasets are not collected or stored at the groundwater basin scale, which is needed to facilitate prioritization under the CASGEM legislation. Compiling and evaluating multiple datasets from multiple sources posed a number of challenges; however, the spatial scale and distribution of the data provided a level of accuracy that is considered adequate for a statewide evaluation and prioritization of California groundwater basins. When appropriate, the spatial distribution of the data were normalized or reparsed to achieve better representation at the basin and subbasin scale. Inaccuracies associated with the spatial translation or rescaling of the data were minimized through multiple inspections of the data by DWR staff and comments received from five public workshops held throughout the state in January, 2014. A description of the data sources and evaluation process associated with data components one through six is provided below. A complete listing of the individual ranking values for each data component, along with the overall basin prioritization results, are provided in Appendix A.

**Data Component 1: Population Overlying the Basin**: Population overlying the groundwater basins was derived using 2010 California census data processed by DWR's demographic staff in the Division of Statewide Integrated Water Management. Using GIS methods, the 2010 census data from the various population reporting centers were attributed to the overlying groundwater basins. If groundwater basin boundaries split population reporting centers, the population data was proportionally distributed to the overlying groundwater basins. Due to the variable size of the groundwater basins, the population data was normalized by dividing the total population of a groundwater basin. Confidence with this set of the population data is considered high and no weighting factors were applied.

The 2010 census data estimates California population at about 37 million people, with the average population density of about 242 people per square mile. Although alluvial groundwater basins cover only 38 percent of California's total landmass, approximately 81 percent (30 million) of California's 37 million residents live in areas overlying alluvial groundwater basins. The average population density overlying alluvial groundwater basin areas is about 480 persons per square mile, approximately double the population density for the entire state. Even though roughly 80 percent of California's land area is designated as rural, about 87 percent of the population lives in urban areas.

There are numerous definitions for rural versus urban areas based on population density. Most of these definitions are associated with government assistance or reimbursement programs and come with their own classification system based on population densities. The US Census

Bureau defines an urban area as having a nucleus of 50,000 or more people, and a population density of 1,000 persons per square mile. Analysis of 2000 census data indicates that California's urban population density ranges from 328 to 4,548 persons per square mile and the population density for rural areas ranges from 14 to 35 persons per square mile.

Although the rural versus urban population densities will not always have a direct relationship to the level of groundwater demand, the density ranges were used as a point of reference to help identify a reasonable range of population densities for the groundwater prioritization effort.

The distribution of population density by basin, along with the ranking ranges and values for this data set, are provided in Figure 3 and Table 4. The 2010 census data in Figure 3 shows that all basins with population density of less than seven persons per square mile were assigned a Very Low data ranking range, and a data ranking value of 0 towards the overall basin prioritization. The Very Low data ranking comprises a total of 196 basins, including 85 basins that are estimated to have zero population.

One hundred sixty four basins with a population density of 7 to 250 persons per square mile were assigned a Low data ranking value of 1. Based on an average per capita use of 250 gallons per day per year, 250 persons per square mile equates to about one tenth of an acre-foot per acre of groundwater use per year.

Together, the Very Low and Low ranges represent only nine percent of California's overall population. The remaining dataset ranges (Moderately Low – High), include a total of 155 basins, representing approximately 91 percent of 2010 population overlying alluvial groundwater basins.

Data Component Ranking	Ranking Value	Population Density (persons/sqmile)	Total Number of Basins in Rank	Cumulative Percent of Total 2010 Population incorporated by the Ranking Interval <sup>1</sup>
Very Low	0	x < 7	196	100%
Low	1	7 ≥ x < 250	164	100%
Moderately Low	2	250 ≥ x < 1000	71	91%
Medium	3	1000 ≥ x < 2500	28	73%
Moderately High	4	2500 ≥ x < 4000	26	61%
High	5	x ≥ 4000	30	50%

Notes:

x The basins person per square mile value

<sup>1</sup> Cumulative percentage of the Total 2010 population residing in the basins for each ranking group





**Data Component #2: Projected Population Growth of the Overlying Basin:** Population growth is based on 2010 census data and 2030 population growth projections generated by the Department of Finance and compiled by DWR's demographic staff in the Division of Statewide Integrated Water Management. Confidence in the rate of population growth for overlying groundwater basins is considered high and no weighting factors were applied to the data.

As of the 2010 census, 85 groundwater basins were identified as unpopulated and an additional 185 groundwater basins were recorded to have a population of less than 1,000 people. Evaluation of the population growth rates revealed that many of the groundwater basins having the lowest population also had the highest projected growth, due to the situation where a relatively small increase in population for a low populated basin results in an extremely high rate of growth. For example, Yosemite Valley has an estimated 2010 population of 1,016 people, but due to a 2030 projected population of 3,247 people, the projected rate of growth exceeds 300 percent. In order to reduce the effects of very low populated basins skewing the overall dataset, and in recognition that the slightly higher populated basins tend to have higher statewide significance with respect to groundwater prioritization, all basins with a population of

less than 1,000 were assigned Very Low data ranking, or zero for this particular data component.

For similar reasons, basins with zero population or population densities less than 50 people per square mile were also assigned a Very Low data ranking, or zero for this particular data component. An exception was made for two basins with a population density of less than 50 people per square-mile, but an overall 2010 population of greater than 25,000 people (5-21.52 and 5-22.09). For these two basins, ranking ranges and values were applied according to the breakdown shown in Figure 4 and Table 5. The data ranking values associated with the population growth data were subsequently combined with the data rankings from the other seven data components to create the overall groundwater basin prioritization results.

Figure 4 and Table 5 provide the projected population growth data by basin, along with the breakdown of the various priority ranking ranges and values for this particular dataset, using a scale from 0 to 5. Table 5 shows that 336 groundwater basins were given a population growth ranking of Very Low, and a data ranking value of zero for this particular data component. The criteria for assigning the 336 groundwater basins a zero, or Very Low, ranking with respect to the 2030 projected population growth rate is summarized below.

- Groundwater Basins with zero 2010 population (85 basins)
- Groundwater Basins with a negative 2030 projected population growth (110 basins)
- Groundwater Basins with a positive 2030 growth rate, but with a population of less than 1,000 people (115 basins)
- Groundwater Basins with a positive 2030 growth rate, but a population density less than 50 people per square mile, and a current (2010) population of greater than 25,000 people (2 basins)

Data Component Ranking	Ranking Value	Population Growth (% population growth)	Total Number of Basins in Rank	Cumulative Percent of Total Population Growth incorporated by the Ranking Interval <sup>1</sup>
Very Low	0	x < 0	336	100%
Low	1	0 ≥ x < 6	55	97%
Moderately Low	2	6 ≥ x < 15	36	75%
Medium	3	15 ≥ x < 25	28	42%
Moderately High	4	25 ≥ x < 40	29	22%
High	5	x ≥ 40%	31	9%

# Table 5. Data Component Ranking Ranges for Population Growth

Notes:

Population growth is estimated growth between 2010 and 2030, based on current growth trends Population growth of less than 100% equals negative growth projection

x Population growth percentage less 100 (Example: Population growth of 105%, x=5%)

<sup>1</sup> Cumulative percentage of the projected population residing in the basins for each ranking group

Although, the Very Low data ranking for population growth incorporates a large number of groundwater basins, it represents less than 7 percent of the population overlying groundwater basin areas, while the remaining 179 basins with a ranking of Low to High include over 93 percent of 2010 population overlying groundwater basin areas.



**Data Component #3: The Number of Public Supply Wells that Draw from the Basin:** The number of public supply wells (PSWs) within a groundwater basin is directly related to the number of municipal water users who rely on groundwater, and serves as a key CASGEM data component in evaluating the relative priority of groundwater resources within a basin. Public supply well information was derived from the California Department of Public Health (DPH) Drinking Water Supply Database. The DPH PSW database was filtered to include only active wells within alluvial groundwater basins. The filtered PSW database resulted in about 12,000 active public supply wells over 316 groundwater basins. Due to the variable size of the

groundwater basins, the PSW data was normalized by dividing the total number of PSWs by the basin area to produce a PSW Density (wells per square mile) for each basin. Data confidence is considered high, with a dataset weighting remaining at 100 percent. The data ranking values associated with the PSW data were subsequently combined with the data ranking values from the other seven data components to create the overall groundwater basin prioritization results.

Table 6 and Figure 5 show the distribution of PSW density data by basin, along with the breakdown of the various ranking ranges and data ranking values for this particular dataset, based on a scale of 0 to 5. The data in Figure 5 and Table 6 indicates that 221 basins have zero PSWs and are assigned a Very Low, or zero priority ranking, for this dataset. The dataset with a Low ranking includes 82 basins, while the remaining dataset rankings (Moderately Low to High) include 212 basins representing 92 percent of the 12,000 public supply wells. The breakout for cumulative percent each of the rankings represents of the total PSWs installed in the 515 basins can be viewed in Table 6.

Table 6.	Data Component	Ranking Ranges fo	r Public Supply Well Density
----------	----------------	-------------------	------------------------------

Data Component Ranking	Ranking Value	Well Density (wells per sq. mile)	Total Number of Basins in Rank	Cumulative Percent of Total PSWs incorporated by the Ranking Interval <sup>1</sup>
Very Low	0	x = 0	221	100%
Low	1	0 > x < 0.1	82	99%
Moderately Low	2	0.1 ≥ x < 0.25	53	92%
Medium	3	0.25 ≥ x < 0.5	46	73%
Moderately High	4	0.5 ≥ x < 1.0	63	51%
High	5	x ≥ 1.0	50	19%

Notes:

x PSW per square mile value

<sup>1</sup> Shows the cumulative percentage of the PSW within the basins in each ranking group



Figure 5. Distribution Curve and Ranking Ranges for Public Supply Well Density

**Data Component # 4: The Total Number of Wells that Draw from the Basin:** The number and type of wells that draw groundwater from a basin is indicative of the overall demand and importance of the groundwater resources for the basin. Information associated with the total number of wells was derived from the DWR Well Master database (WellMa). The WellMa database contains approximately 390,000 well locations by township, range, and section as recorded by the well drillers in the submitted Well Completion Reports. Due to the variable size of the groundwater basins, the well data was normalized by dividing the total number of wells by the basin area to produce a total well density (wells per square mile) for each basin.

The level of well log information within the WellMa database is not consistent throughout the state. Data pertaining to well use, well construction, or detailed well location is not available for many groundwater basin areas. Thus, evaluation of the well log data by well type (production versus monitoring wells) and by groundwater basin, was not possible at a statewide scale and the total number of well logs used for the basin prioritization analysis includes all well types (domestic, irrigation, observation, etc.). In highly urbanized groundwater basin areas, the number of total wells will be skewed by high numbers of shallow non-producing observation wells, typically associated with urban-related groundwater clean-up sites.

Because of the inherent deficiencies with the well log database, the confidence and weighting of this dataset was reduced. A data weighting of 75 percent was subsequently applied to the ranking values associated with total well data, prior to combining with the other seven data components to create the overall groundwater basin prioritization results. Figure 6 and Table 7 show the distribution of total well density data by basin, along with the breakdown of the various priority ranking ranges and data ranking values for this particular dataset, based on a scale of 0 to 5.

Data Component Ranking	Ranking Value <sup>2</sup>	Well Density (wells per sq. mile)	Total Number of Basins in Rank	Cumulative Percent of Total Wells incorporated by the Ranking Interval <sup>1</sup>
Very Low	0	x = 0	99	100%
Low	1	0 ≥ x < 2	149	99%
Moderately Low	2	2 ≥ x < 5	52	98%
Medium	3	5 ≥ x < 10	66	92%
Moderately High	4	10 ≥ x < 20	66	79%
High	5	x ≥ 20	83	49%

#### Table 7. Data Component Ranking Ranges for Total Well Density

Notes:

x Wells per square mile value

<sup>1</sup> Cumulative percentage of the wells within the basins in each ranking group

<sup>2</sup> A data weighting of 75 percent was subsequently applied to the ranking values above prior to combining with the other seven data components to create the overall groundwater basin prioritization results

The data in Figure 6 and Table 7 indicates that 99 groundwater basins are estimated to have zero wells and are assigned a Very Low, or zero priority ranking for this dataset, and approximately 149 basins have a total well density between 0 and 2.0 wells per square-mile. Although the Low and Very Low data ranking ranges for total well density includes 248 groundwater basins, the data ranking ranges represent only two percent of the California's total number of well logs. The top two data ranking ranges (High and Moderately High) include 149 basins and 49 percent of the 390,000 well log records submitted to DWR.



#### Figure 6. Distribution Curve and Ranking Ranges for Total Well Density

**Data Component #5: The Irrigated Acreage Overlying the Basin:** Worldwide, almost 60 percent of our planet's freshwater goes towards irrigation uses (USGS, 2000). In California, over nine million acres, or approximately 24 percent of the overlying groundwater basin areas are under irrigated lands. Statewide, agricultural use of groundwater represents about 76 percent of California's average annual groundwater extraction. Evaluation of irrigated acreage overlying the basin includes acreage irrigated by either groundwater or surface water.

Irrigated acreage data was compiled by DWR land and water use staff using the latest land use data and digitally parsed according to Bulletin 118 groundwater basin boundaries using GIS techniques. In areas where DWR land use data was not available, irrigated acreage data was derived from the Department of Conservation Farmland Mapping Program.

Irrigated acreage outside the basin boundaries was not included in the basins calculations and analysis. Due to the variable size of the groundwater basins, irrigated acreage data was normalized by dividing the total irrigated acres by the basin area in square miles.

The ranking values associated with the irrigated acreage data were subsequently combined with the data ranking values from the other seven data components to create the overall groundwater basin prioritization results. Confidence associated with this data set is considered high with a dataset weighting of 100 percent. Figure 7 and Table 8 show the data distribution for density of irrigated acres by basin, along with the breakdown of the various ranking ranges and ranking values for this particular dataset, based on a scale of 0 to 5.

Data Component Ranking	Ranking Value	Density of Irrigated Acres (acres per sq. mile)	Total Number of Basins in Rank	Cumulative Percent of Irrigated Acreage incorporated by the Ranking Interval <sup>1</sup>
Very Low	0	x < 1	209	100%
Low	1	1 ≥ x < 25	71	100%
Moderately Low	2	25 ≥ x < 100	68	99%
Medium	3	100 ≥ x < 200	60	97%
Moderately High	4	200 ≥ x < 350	57	90%
High	5	x ≥ 350	50	69%

### Table 8. Data Component Ranking Ranges for Density of Irrigated Acres

Notes:

Irrigated acres includes groundwater basin areas irrigated with surface water or groundwater or both

x Irrigates Acres per square mile value

<sup>1</sup> Cumulative percentage of the irrigated acreage within the basins in each ranking group

The data in Figure 7 and Table 8 indicates that the Very Low ranking comprises 191 basins (nearly 37 percent) having zero irrigated acreage and another 18 basins (3.5 percent) having less than 1 acre per square mile. Overall, 209 basins were assigned a data ranking value of zero. A Low data ranking was assigned to 139 groundwater basins having between 1.0 to 100 acres of irrigated land per square mile. Although the Low and Very Low ranked basins constitute nearly 68 percent (348) of the groundwater basins, they only comprise approximately three percent of the irrigated acreage overlying California's groundwater basin areas. The 167 groundwater basins within the Medium to High rankings comprise about 97 percent of the irrigated groundwater basin areas.



Figure 7. Distribution Curve and Ranking Ranges for Density of Irrigated Acres

#### Data Component #6: The Degree to Which Persons Overlying the Basin Rely on Groundwater as their Primary Source of Water:

DWR selected groundwater reliance as the primary component for the initial review and screening in the CASGEM groundwater basin prioritization process (see previous section titled: *Initial Groundwater Basin Screening under CASGEM*). Analysis of groundwater reliance included consideration and review of the estimated annual volume of groundwater use and the percent to which groundwater pumping contributes to the overall water supply for the basin. The two data ranking values associated with groundwater reliance (volume and percent of overall supply) were averaged, prior to combining with the seven other data components to create the overall groundwater basin prioritization results.

**Groundwater Reliance by Evaluation of Volume of Use:** Statewide groundwater volume information was estimated using the most recent DWR Land and Water Use (LWU) survey data. Agricultural groundwater use was estimated by compiling statewide irrigated land and water

use data, digitally parsing the data by groundwater basin, and then processing the data using DWR's Agricultural model which incorporates local soils, irrigation methods, irrigated water source, and evapotranspiration data. Urban groundwater use was estimated by applying local per capita groundwater use data reported by public water supply purveyors to the 2010 population estimates for each groundwater basin. Considerable efforts were made by DWR Region staff to verify groundwater use by groundwater basin through the review of aerial photography, local groundwater management plans, Bulletin 118-03 data, public comments, and other readily available sources of information. Because of the additional steps taken to help verify the estimated volume of groundwater use by groundwater basin area, confidence in this dataset is considered acceptable for the intended use, and no weighting factors were applied.

Data Component Ranking	Ranking Value	Groundwater Use Volume (ac-ft per acre)	Total Number of Basins in Rank	Cumulative Percent of Groundwater Use incorporated by the Ranking Interval <sup>1</sup>
Very Low	0	x < 0.03	269	100%
Low	1	0.03 ≥ x < 0.1	51	100%
Moderately Low	2	0.1 ≥ x < 0.25	71	98%
Medium	3	0.25 ≥ x < 0.5	44	91%
Moderately High	4	0.5 ≥ x < 0.75	30	84%
High	5	x ≥ 0.75	50	55%

Table 9. Data Component Ranking Ranges for Groundwater Reliance, as it relates toGroundwater Use in acre-feet per acre

Notes:

x Groundwater Use Acre Feet per acre value

<sup>1</sup> Cumulative percentage of the groundwater use volume within the basins in each ranking group

Table 9 and Figure 8 show the data distribution for the volume of groundwater use by basin, along with the breakdown of the various ranking ranges and values for this particular dataset, based on a scale of 0 to 5. Evaluation of annual groundwater use data indicates 320 groundwater basins fall within the Low and Very Low data ranges have a groundwater use of less than 0.1 acre-feet per acre, and represent approximately two percent of the estimated total groundwater use. Within the moderately high to high ranges, approximately 30 basins have an annual groundwater use between 0.50 and 0.75 acre-feet per acre, and 50 basins have a groundwater use of greater than 0.75 acre-feet per acre. The combined medium and high ranges account for nearly 85 percent of the groundwater use in the 515 basins.

**Groundwater Reliance by Evaluation the Overall Supply Met by Groundwater**: Evaluation of groundwater reliance included an assessment of the percent to which groundwater contributes to the overall water supply for the basin. Similar to the groundwater use data, groundwater

use as a percent of the overall supply was evaluated using the DWR land and water use data compiled by groundwater basin, and assessed by DWR Region land and water use staff. Because of the additional steps taken to help verify the estimated volume of groundwater use by groundwater basin area, confidence in this dataset is considered acceptable for the intended use, and no weighting factors were applied.



# Figure 8. Distribution Curve and Ranking Ranges for Groundwater Reliance, as it relates to Groundwater Use in acre-feet per acre

Figure 9 and Table 10 show the distribution of the groundwater reliance, with respect to the percent that groundwater contributes to the total water supply for the basin, and breakdown the data ranking ranges and values for this dataset, using a scale of 0 to 5. Information in Figure 9 and Table 10 indicates that groundwater contributes to less than 20 percent of the basin's overall water supply in 244 groundwater basins within the Low and Very Low data ranges. In approximately 99 basins, groundwater contributes to between 21 and 60 percent of the basin's overall water supply (Moderately Low to Medium data range), and for 172 basins, groundwater contributes to greater than 61 percent of the basin's overall water supply

(Moderately High to High data range). Basins within the Medium to High ranking ranges also comprise about 61 percent of the statewide annual groundwater extraction.

of rotal water supply met by Groundwater							
Data Component Ranking	Ranking Value	Total Supply Met by Groundwater <sup>2</sup> (%)	Total Number of Basins in Rank	Cumulative Percent of Groundwater Use <sup>1</sup> incorporated by the Ranking Interval			
Very Low	0	x < 0.1	143	100%			
Low	1	0.1 ≥ x < 20	101	100%			
Moderately Low	2	20 ≥ x < 40	45	93%			
Medium	3	40 ≥ x < 60	54	61%			
Moderately High	4	60 ≥ x < 80	37	25%			
High	5	x ≥ 80	135	17%			

Table 10. Data Component Ranking Ranges for Groundwater Reliance, as it relates to Percentof Total Water Supply Met by Groundwater

Notes:

x Basin groundwater use as a percent of Total Water Supply used within the basin

<sup>1</sup> Cumulative percentage of the groundwater use by the basins in each of the ranking groups (ranking group total groundwater use / total groundwater use of the 515 basins \* 100)

<sup>2</sup> Total Supply = Groundwater + Surface Water used in Agriculture and Urban within the basin, Percent = Groundwater / Total Supply used in the basin \* 100



Figure 9. Distribution Curve and Ranking Ranges for Groundwater Reliance, as it relates to Percent of Total Water Supply Met by Groundwater

A listing of the individual ranking values for each data component, along with the overall basin prioritization results, are provided in Appendix A.

The individual ranking values for each data component were combined to establish the total basin ranking score and a final basin ranking of Very Low to High. The final basin ranking score was translated to a final basin ranking by taking the difference between the highest and lowest basin ranking scores and dividing by the four ranking categories (see Table 2).

# REFERENCES

- 1. Harter, T., and J. Lund, 2012. Addressing Nitrate in California's Drinking Water; Report for the State Water Resources Control Board Report to the Legislature. <u>http://groundwaternitrate.ucdavis.edu/files/138956.pdf</u>
- Kuss, A., et al., 2012. Groundwater Storage Estimates in the Central Valley Aquifer Using GRACE Data. http://www.asprs.org/a/publications/proceedings/Sacramento2012/files/Kuss.pdf
- 3. Scanlon, B.R., et al., June 2012. *Groundwater depletion and sustainability of irrigation in the US High Plains and Central Valley*, Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, Vol. 109, No. 24., p. 9320. <u>http://www.pnas.org/content/109/24/9320.full</u>
- 4. Walker, L. 2009. *CV SALTS; Salt and Nitrate Sources Pilot Implementation Study Report, First Draft*. <u>http://www.cvsalinity.org/index.php/component/content/article/18-events/60-admin</u>
- 5. SWRCB, 2000. Hydogeologically Vunerable Areas and High Use Groundwater Basins. http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/gama/docs/hydro\_areas.pdf
- 6. USGS, 2000. Circular 1268: *Estimated Use of Water in the United States*.
- 7. USGS, 2003. Water-Resources Investigations Report 03-4166; *Framework for a Ground-Water Quality Monitoring and Assessment Program for California*. <u>http://pubs.usgs.gov/wri/wri034166/</u>
- 8. USGS, 2009. Professional Paper 1766: *Groundwater Availability of the Central Valley Aquifer*, California. <u>http://pubs.usgs.gov/pp/1766/</u>

# **APPENDIX A**

# CASGEM Basin Prioritization Results Figures and Tables



#### Figure A1. Statewide CASGEM Groundwater Basin Prioritization



Figure A2. Northern Region CASGEM Groundwater Basin Prioritization



#### Figure A3. North Central Region CASGEM Groundwater Basin Prioritization



#### Figure A4. South Central Region CASGEM Groundwater Basin Prioritization



#### Figure A5. Southern Region CASGEM Groundwater Basin Prioritization

	Data Component Ranking Value	Data Components and Ranking Ranges								
Data Component Ranking		Population		DSM/	Total Well	Irrigated	Groundwater Reliance			
		Density	Projected Growth	Density	Density	Acreage	GW Use	% of Total Supply		
		per sqmi	%	per sqmi	per sq. mi	ac/sqmi	ac-ft/acre	%		
Very Low	0	< 7	< 0	= 0	= 0	< 1	< 0.03	< 0.1		
Low	1	≥ 7 to < 250	≥0 to < 6	> 0 to < 0.1	> 0 to < 2	≥ 1 to < 25	≥ 0.03 to < 0.1	≥ 0.1 to < 20		
Moderately Low	2	≥ 250 to < 1000	≥ 6 to < 15	≥ 0.1 to < 0.25	≥ 2 to < 5	≥ 25 to < 100	≥ 0.1 to < 0.25	≥ 20 to < 40		
Medium	3	≥ 1000 to < 2500	≥ 15 to < 25	≥ 0.25 to < 0.5	≥ 5 to < 10	≥ 100 to < 200	≥ 0.25 to < 0.5	≥ 40 to < 60		
Moderately High	4	≥ 2500 to < 4000	≥ 25 to < 40	≥ 0.5 to < 1.0	≥ 10 to < 20	≥ 200 to < 350	≥ 0.5 to < 0.75	≥ 60 to < 80		
High	5	≥ 4000	≥ 40%	≥ 1.0	≥ 20	≥ 350	≥ 0.75	≥ 80%		
Note: Population arouth is percent arouth from 2010 to 2030										

Table A1. Data Component Ranking Ranges for CASGEM Groundwater Basin Ranking

Note: Population growth is percent growth from 2010 to 2030.

Table A2. CASGEM Groundwater Basin Ranking by Hydrologic Region

	CASGEM Groundwater Basin Priority by Ranking Range and Hydrologic Region					Percent of Total Groundwater Use and Overlying Population for High & Medium Ranked Basins	
Hydrologic Region	High priority Ranking Range >19.7	Medium priority Ranking Range 12.6 - 19.6	Low priority Ranking Range 5.5 - 12.5	Very Low priority Ranking Range <5.4	Basin Count	Groundwater Use *	Overlying Population *
North Coast	0	8	2	53	63	82%	62%
San Francisco	0	7	0	26	33	90%	63%
Central Coast	9	15	0	36	60	97%	90%
South Coast	13	22	4	34	73	99%	94%
Sacramento River	5	18	4	61	88	96%	98%
San Joaquin River	7	2	0	2	11	100%	100%
Tulare Lake	7	1	1	10	19	99%	98%
North Lahontan	0	2	3	22	27	12%	55%
South Lahontan	2	4	4	67	77	84%	96%
Colorado River	0	5	9	50	64	82%	61%
Statewide	43	84	27	361	515	96%	88%

Note: \* Estimated percentages are based on total groundwater use and population overlying all alluvial groundwater basins in the hydrologic region.

DWR Regional Office (RO)	CASGEM Groundwater Basin Priority by Ranking Range and DWR Regional Office Area					Percent of Total Groundwater Use and Overlying Population for High & Medium Ranked Basins	
	High priority	Medium priority	Low priority	Very Low priority	Basin Count		
	Ranking Range ≥ 21.08	Ranking Range ≥ 13.42 to < 21.08	Ranking Range ≥ 5.75 to < 13.42	Ranking Range <5.4	count	Groundwater Use *	Overlying Population *
Northern	2	20	8	99	129	84%	72%
North Central	4	17	1	63	85	98%	77%
South Central	21	12	1	28	62	99%	98%
Southern	16	35	17	171	239	95%	92%
Statewide	43	84	27	361	515	96%	88%

# Table A3. CASGEM Groundwater Basin Ranking by DWR Regional Office Area

**Note:** \* Estimated percentages are based on total groundwater use and population overlying all alluvial groundwater basins in the hydrologic region.
									1			_	_								
CASGEM Groundwater Basin Prioritization Results											Data	Compo	onent	Ranking V	alue			Overall	Ranking		
		C, IO C LITT			nesuits									Grou	undwater	Reliance					
			Sorted by Basir	n Number						÷	lls l										
-						Basin	Area			N N	ž		ge		a				Overall	<b>0</b>	
						Dasini	Aica	-		č	2	*	le,		ot	a			Basin	Overall	Impact Com
Desin	<u> </u>			Live a la sia	DWR			2010	Ę	Ē	d	s	Ac	*	f.	ũ		5	Danking	Basin	
Basin	Basin	Basin Name	Sub-Basin Name	Hydrologic	Region			2010	Ę	ti	Sul 1	/el	D	ۍ ۳	* to	lia	s	ati	Kanking	Priority	
count	Number			Region	Office	Acres	Sq. Mile	Population	na,	na,	<u>;;</u>	2	ate	ŝ	ol v	– Ke	t	<u>ي</u> ق	Score ***		
					onice				p d	d d	q	ta	<u>,</u>	2	2 d	ta <	ğ	le je			
									Рс	Рс	Ρſ	Тc	1	6	Pe	10 C	μ	ΞŌ			
1	1-1	SMITH RIVER PLAIN		North Coast	NRO	40,446	63.2	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 2 5	4	4	4	4	0	1	16.3	Medium	
-	1 10					/ 5)/ 01	11012		-	-	-						Ũ	-	-0.0	meanan	
						10.000		1.000		-	_		· .					_			
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	3 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		North Coast	NRO	7,026	11.0	806	1	0	5	1.5	2	1	2	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
		VALLEY																			
7	1-15	HAPPY CAMP TOWN AREA		North Coast	NRO	2,771	4.3	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	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	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		1	North Coast	NCRO	1 969	7 9	1 207	1	5	5	3 75	2	1	1	0	n n	n n	0.0	Very Low	1
12	1_2 01		THIFLAKE	North Coast		9,509 85 024	12/ 2	2 2 2 2 1	1	0	1	0.75	5	5	2	25	1	2	17 2	Medium	Declining GW levels in lower ag
12	1-2.01	NOWATTI NIVER VALLET	JULLARE	North Coast	NINU	03,954	134.3	, 2,201	· ·	0	1	0.75	5	5	۷	5.5	4	2	17.5	weaturn	issues On spins bish using f
1										1	1	1		1			1			1	issues. On-going high volume of
1										1	1	1		1			1			1	associated with surface water cu
1		1			1									1		1	I				Project and gw transfers associa
I									I		1	1					<u> </u>			ļ	Agreement
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
																					for deep wells.
14	1-20	GARCIA RIVER VALLEY		North Coast	NCRO	2.242	3.5	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	5 12.517	2	1	5	3.75	2	1	1	0	1	0	0.0	Very Low	The terrace deposits between Te
						,				_	-		_		_	-	_	-		,	Point and Alder Creek and Point
																					Forme and Alder Creek and Forme
16	1 22			North Coast	NIDO	2 270	E 1		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Variation	seawater Intrusion. (B-118).
10	1-22			North Coast	INRO	3,278	21.2		0	0	0	0.75	0	1	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
1/	1-25			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	3 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	<sup>7</sup> 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	5 1,464	- 1	0	1	1.5	4	5	5	5	2	1	15.5	Medium	Some high TDS wells. Declining (
																					years and increases agricultural
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			North Coast	NRO	967	1 5	; q	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
27	1_3/			North Coast	NRO	2 276	3.6	183	1	0	5	15	1	1	5	0	ů 0	0	0.0	Very Low	
27	1_25			North Coast	NRO	1 35/	2.0	52	1	0	0	2.25	2	2	5	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
20	1 20			North Coost		1,354	2.1	. 52		0	0	2.23	- <u>-</u>	2	0	0	0	0	0.0	VeryLOW	1
29	1-30			North Coast	INKO	846	1.3	5	U	0	0	1.5	5	U	0	U	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
																					TMDL temperature issues along
1		1			1									1		1	I				
1										1	1	1		1			1			1	
1										1	1	1		1			1			1	
21	1_40		1	North Coast	NCPO	1 /01	2.2	£1	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Venulow	1
24	1 /1			North Coast	NCDO	1,491	1.3		1	0	0	1 Г	2	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	VeryLOW	
33	1 42		+	North Coast	NCRO	012	1.3		1	0	0	1.5	2	0	0	0		0	0.0	Very LOW	1
30	1-42			North Coast	NCRO	1,150	1.8	13		0	0	1.5	0	U	0	U	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	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	5 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	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 6	0	0	5	1.5	0	0	5	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
42	1-49	ANNAPOLIS OHLSON RANCH FM	Л	North Coast	NCRO	8,646	13.5	233	1	0	0	2.25	1	1	2	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
I		HIGHLANDS								1	1	1		1			1				
43	1-5	SCOTT RIVER VALLEY	1	North Coast	NRO	63,780	99 7	3.520	1	0	1	2.25	4	5	3	4	0	3	15.3	Medium	1
						00,700		3,320	I <sup>*</sup>	Ĭ	1	5	-	Ĭ	Ĵ	-	Ĭ	Ĵ		caidiii	
1		1			1									1		1	I				
1		1			1									1		1	I				
I										1	1	1		1			1				
I			+		<u> </u>	1	<u> </u>	1	I					1			<u> </u>		ł	+	
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	

omments	Other Information Comments
	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.
equifer. Local GW Quality of gw being extracted cutbacks from Klamath ciated with Klamath Basin	Interstate gw transfer issue. Strong sw-gw interaction and fisheries issues. Potential intra- basin issues associated with increased annual extraction.
rea. High temp and high TDS	
Ten Mile River and Laguna nt Arena are susceptible to	
g GW levels over the last 5- al acreage.	Strong sw-gw interaction and reliance of gw for Meiss Lake wildlife area.
in portions of the basin. ng gw fed rivers.	Strong SW-GW Interaction and significant local issues regarding gw mgmt. Basin underflow from Pluto's Cave Basalts and portions of debris flow contribute to surface water flow and low temps in the Shasta River, which supports threatened salmon population.
	GW Basin contributes to surface water flow in the Scott River which supports an threatened/endangered salmon. Adjudicated basin. Currently being reviewed for Public Trust issues regarding GW management.

CASGEM Groundwater Basin Prioritization Results										Data	Comp	onent l	Ranking V	alue			Overall	Ranking			
		CASGEM (	Groundwater Basi	n Prioritizatior	n Results							Data		Grou	indwater	Reliance			overail		-
			Sorted by Basi	n Number						f	ells		a								
Basin count	Basin Number	Basin Name	Sub-Basin Name	Hydrologic Region	DWR Region Office	Basin Acres	Area Sq. Mile	2010 Population	opulation	opulation Grow	ublic Supply We	rotal Wells *	rrigated Acreag	GW Use **	Percent of Total	SW Reliance Total	mpacts	Other nformation	Overall Basin Ranking Score ***	Overall Basin Priority	Impact Com
45	1-51	POTTER VALLEY		North Coast	NCRO	8,237	7 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	3 58.6	32,761	2	1	3	3.75	3	2	2	2	0	1	15.8	Medium	
47	1-53	SANEL VALLEY		North Coast	NCRO	5,568	3 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	4 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	5 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 Southern Cloverdale is on the EPA (MGM Brakes) VOCs detected in a
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	McDOWELL VALLEY	RINCON VALLEY	North Coast	NCRO	5,549	8./	21,/8/	4	3	5	3.75	1	2	3	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
54	1-57	BODEGA BAY AREA		North Coast	NCRO	2.676	5 4.2	719	1	0	5	3.75	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 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	0 10.4	3,754	2	2	5	3	3	2	1	0	1	0	0.0	Very Low	Brackish water found in wells nea the river mouth to below Duncan During a period of extremely low might extend 10 miles upstream Monte Rio (B-118)
58	1-61	FORT ROSS TERRACE DEPOSITS		North Coast	NCRO	8,483	3 13.3	1,075	1	2	4	3	0	1	4	0	1	0	0.0	Very Low	Seawater intrusion is not a comm occurred in localized areas near F Point (DWR 1982). The Terrace d Creek and Point Arena are suscep intrusion (DWR 1982 & B-118)
59	1-62	WILSON POINT AREA		North Coast	NRO	709	9 1.1	. 14	1	0	0	0	2	2	5	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
60	1-7			North Coast	NRO	3,894	1 <u>6.1</u>	1,797	2	2	0	2.25	2	1	2	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
62	1-8.01	MAD RIVER VALLEY	LOWLAND DOWS PRAIRIE	North Coast	NRO	25.57	40.0	23.086	2	2	3	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
			SCHOOL AREA																		
63	1-9			North Coast	NRO	37,405	5 58.4	50,231	2	1	1	3	3	2	4	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	Midaannaad and anniana aituata a
04	2-1			Bay	NCRO	40,043	5 71.5	49,913	2	3	3	3.73	3		2	1.5	2	0	10.5	Mediam	shallow wells in the upland area l Generally poor quality gw south o seawater intrusion in tidal reache contamination.(B-118) unpublish
65	2-10	LIVERMORE VALLEY		San Francisco Bay	NCRO	69,532	l 108.6	196,658	3	3	3	3.75	2	1	2	1.5	1	0	17.3	Medium	Some areas have boron concentr (B-118 & Sorenson et. al. 1985).
66	2-11	SUNOL VALLEY		San Francisco Bav	NCRO	16,623	3 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	5 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	5 71.7	91,234	3	1	5	3.75	4	3	3	3	1	0	20.8	Medium	Two isolated areas in the Sonoma substantial declines in gw elevati that 43 underground fuel tank lea basin (unpublished B-118 data) (L Consulting Engineers 1990)
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 along the tidal portions of Sonorr 43 underground fuel tank leaks h (unpublished B-118 data) (Ludho
70	2-2.03	NAPA-SONOMA VALLEY	NAPA-SONOMA	San Francisco	NCRO	40,455	5 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	9 14.4	19,825	3	3	5	3.75	3	1	3	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	1
72	2-24	SAN GREGORIO VALLEY		San Francisco Bay	NCRO	1,074	1 1.7	66	1	0	0	2.25	3	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	

mments	Other Information Comments
	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 tributarieswhich support endangered fishery.
of 3 wells (B-118). Site in EPA's Superfund Priority List in gw (EPA 1983).	
near the Russian River from	
can Mills (5 to 6 miles). ow streamflow, saline water m from river mouth to	
nmon problem but it has ir Point Arena and Iverson e deposits between Alder ceptible to seawater	
e contamination affecting a NW of Petaluma. h of Petaluma. Potential for ches. Increasing MTBE ished data).	
ntrations exceeding 2 mg/L	
].	
ma Valley indicate ations and RWQCB report leaks have occurred in the ) (Ludhorff & Scalmanini	
its near San Pablo Bay and oma creek. RWQCB reports s have occurred in the basin horff & Scalmanini, 1999).	

CASCERA Communication Design Drive statestion Description											Data	Comn	onent	Ranking V	مبياد			Overall	Ranking		
		CASGEM	Groundwater Basiı	n Prioritization	Results							Data		Gro	indwater	Reliance			Overall	Kanking	_
			Sorted by Basir	n Number						f	ells		e								
Basin count	Basin Number	Basin Name	Sub-Basin Name	Hydrologic Region	DWR Region Office	Basin Acres	Area Sq. Mile	2010 Population	opulation	opulation Grow	ublic Supply W	otal Wells *	rigated Acreag	W Use **	ercent of Total upply **	W Reliance otal	npacts	ther Iformation	Overall Basin Ranking Score ***	Overall Basin Priority	Impact Con
73	2-26	PESCADERO VALLEY		San Francisco	NCRO	2,904	4.5	571	<u> </u>	<b>č</b>	4	3	3	0	<u>ā ā</u> 0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
74	2-27	SAND POINT AREA		Bay San Francisco	NCRO	1,405	2.2	2 43	1	0	5	0.75	0	1	4	0	0	0	0.0	, Very Low	
75	2-28	ROSS VALLEY		Bay San Francisco	NCRO	1,763	2.8	3 7,194	4	2	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
76	2-29	SAN RAFAEL VALLEY		San Francisco	NCRO	874	1.4	10,153	5	1	0	3.75	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
77	2-3	SUISUN-FAIRFIELD VALLEY		San Francisco	NCRO	133,505	208.6	5 136,754	2	5	1	2.25	2	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
78	2-30	NOVATO VALLEY		San Francisco	NCRO	20,519	32.1	42,516	3	2	0	3.75	3	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	Very Low	
80	2-32	VISITACION VALLEY		San Francisco	NCRO	5,827	9.1	31,853	4	4	0	3.75	0	0	1	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	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	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	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	Very Low	
85	2-38	LOBOS		San Francisco Bay	NCRO	2,359	3.7	7 59,119	5	0	0	2.25	0	0	0	0	1	0	0.0	Very Low	Limited water quality data but b San Francisco peninsula are simi May contain high concentration:
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 b San Francisco peninsula are simi May contain high concentrations 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 c chloride, boron and TDS (B-118)
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	2 107,878	5	1	2	3.75	1	1	1	0	1	0	0.0	Very Low	Hydrographs created from DWR groundwater levels have decline
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	pendu orrecoru.(b-118)
92	2-8	CASTRO VALLEY		San Francisco Bay	NCRO	1,821	. 2.8	3 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 increa deeper aquifers since first docur
94	2-9.02	SANTA CLARA VALLEY	SANTA CLARA	San Francisco Bay	NCRO	190,235	297.2	2 1,633,190	5	2	4	3.75	0	5	4	4.5	1	0	20.3	Medium	Areas with elevated mineral leve the northern basin (SCVWD 200 some wells in the southern porti
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 Sout
96	2-9.04	SANTA CLARA VALLEY	EAST BAY PLAIN	San Francisco Bay	NCRO	77,292	120.8	8 881,718	5	1	1	3.75	1	0	0	1	2	0	14.8	Medium	SFRWQCB (1999) identified 13 ld groundwater pollution. Most co restricted to the upper 50 feet o & (RWQCR 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, salin
98	3-12			Central Coast	SKU	2/2 11/	287.5	201,/59	2	3	4	1.5	2 7	2	4	4.5	4	2	24.0	Medium	due to farming practices.
22	2-13	COTAIVIA VALLET		Central Coast	Unc	242,114	5/8.3	1,236	U	U		0.75	2	3	5	4	3	3	13.8	weulum	Local samily and TDS Impairmen

omments	Other Information Comments
t basins beneath the entire milar (Phillips et.al. 1993). ons of nitrates, chloride,	
t basins beneath the entire milar (Phillips et.al. 1993). ons of nitrates, chloride,	
h concentrations of nitrates, 8) & (Phillips et.al. 1993).	
VR well data indicate ined gradually over the	
reased landward and into cumented in the 1920's.(B-	
evels have been observed in 001). Elevated nitrate in ortion of the Basin (SCVWD).	
outh Bay groundwater basins	
B locations as areas of major contamination appears to be t of the subsurface. (B-118)	
line intrusion issues. in. Water quality degradation	
nents 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

								T													
		CASGEM	Groundwater Basi	n Prioritization	n Results						_	Data	Compo	onent	Ranking V	alue			Overall	Ranking	
			Sorted by Basir	Number						_	Ś			Gro	undwater	Reliance					
			Softed by Dash	indinber						Ę	elle		e.								
Basin	Basin	Basin Name	Sub-Basin Name	Hydrologic	DWR Region	Basin	Area	2010	tion	tion Grow	Supply W	/ells *	ed Acreag	ه *	t of Total **	liance	s	ation	Overall Basin Ranking	Overall Basin Priority	Impact Con
count	Number			Region	Office	Acres	Sq. Mile	Population	Popula	Popula	Public 9	Total W	Irrigate	GW Us	Percen	GW Re Total	Impact	Other Inform	Score ***		
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 degrada
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 Also some groundwater quality i
102	3-10	GOLETA		Central Coast	360	5,225	14.4	47,232	4	1	5	3.73	2	5	1	2	0		10.0	Wedium	
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, loo hydrogen sulfides, and other cor
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			Central Coast	SRO	210,896	329.5	440	0	0	1	0.75	2	0	1 F	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	DVMMAD 2011 Appual Report inc
100	3-2	PAJARO VALLET		Central Coast	SCRU	88,002	. 137.0	114,282	. 2	2	4	5.75	4	5	5	5	4	0	24.0	nigii	GW basin remains in significant of seawater intrusion and gw stora
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	
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	5 7.4	5	0	0	0	0	3	1	1	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
112	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
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 issu contaminated sites within the ba
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 3-3.01	GILROY-HOLLISTER VALLEY	LLAGAS AREA	Central Coast	SCRO 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 significan domestic wells across the Llagas and ongoing sources including ag septic systems, Perchlorate is als
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, over
119	3-3.04	GILROY-HOLLISTER VALLEY	SAN JUAN BAUTISTA AREA	Central Coast	SCRO	74,305	116.1	22,013	1	1	3	2.25	2	2	5	3.5	4	0	17.5	Medium	Poor water quality due to high T
121	3-30 3-31	HERNANDEZ VALLEY		Central Coast Central Coast	SCRO	32,222 2,865	50.3 4.5	38 38	0	0	0	0.75	2	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low 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	6 4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
125	3-34			Central Coast	SRO	1,028	1.6		1	0	U 5	0	3	5	1	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	1
120	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	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 intrusic 400-Foot aquifers due to excessi
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, hi exceeding drinking water standa 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 eas above MCL for inorganics and Ni
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 grou

omments	Other Information Comments
adation	Santa Barbara Water Element, Table 1, p.10, indicates San Antonio basin overdraft by ~ 9,000 af/yr
ed by the county in the past. ay impairments.	Estimated overdraft for the north-central portion of the
locally high EC, hardness, constituents.(B-118)	basin ins estimated at 1,180 af/yr (Santa Barbara Water Conservation Element, 2009)
ndicates that Pajaro Valley nt overdraft, with continuing rage depletion.	
	Basin comprises the highland area east of Santa Cruz and serves as a forebay to Pajaro, Soquel, and Terrace Basins to the westwhich are in various stages of overdraft.
	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).
sues associated with basin.	
ant number of private as Subbasin due to historic agricultural activities and also a problem	
erdraft	
TDS	
sion in both 100 Foot and	
sion in both 180-Foot and ssive groundwater pumping	
high TDS and Nitrates dards in portions of the	
eastern side of subbasin. PSW Nitrates (B-118).	
oundwater (B-118)	County groundwater ordinance banning further residential development in basin.

									I			Data	Comn	onent	Panking V	مىراد			Overall	Panking	
CASGEM Groundwater Basin Prioritization Results											Data	Comp	Cue	Natiking v	Dellemen	1		Overall	Kaliking	-	
			Sorted by Basir	n Number						ء	s			Gro	Indwater	Reliance					
			-		1	Basin	A = 0.0		-	Š.	Vel		ge		Б				Overall		
						Basin	Area	_		5	2	*	rea		ot	a		_	Basin	Overall	Impact Con
Pacin	Deale			Hydrologic	DWR			2010	E	Ę	dd	ŝ	Ac	ž	ΤĘ.	ŭ		u	Panking	Basin	
Dasiii	Basin	Basin Name	Sub-Basin Name	Hyurologic	Region		C	2010	Ĕ	ţi	Su	٨e	De la	, v	* t	lia	S	ati		Priority	
count	Number			Region	Office	Acres	Sq. Mile	Population	nla	nla	i.	2	ate	ĩ	b g	Ba –	act	l a E	Score ***	-	
									8	8	e e	ota	rig	≥	up er c	ote 🖉	du	Ę ę			
									<b>•</b>	<b>D</b>		F	-	6	e s	0 F	-	0 5			
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 ba
107	2 4 00			Control Coost	6600	15 244	24.0	0.022	2	1	-	2.75	2	-	-	-	0	0	10.0	Madium	pumping
137	3-4.09			Central Coast	SCRU	15,344	24.0	9,833	2 1	1	5	3.75	2	5	5	5	0	0	18.8	Medium	
138	3-4.10	SALINAS VALLEY	CORRAL DE TIERRA	Central Coast	SCRO	22,274	34.8	7,831	1	3	4	3	0	3	5	4	0	0	15.0	wealum	
120	2.40		AREA	Control Coast	500	722	1 1		1	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Variation	
139	2 /1			Central Coast	SRO	122	1.1	200		0	5	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
1/1	3-41			Central Coast	SRO	1 547	2.0	1 247	1	0	3	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
141	3-42			Central Coast	SRO	2 579	2.4	11	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
1/12	3-43			Central Coast	SRO	6 852	10.7	7 52	0	0	1	0	2	1	1	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
145	3-45			Central Coast	SRO	4 706	7.4	1 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	7 0	0 0	0	0	0.75	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
146	3-47	BIG SPRING AREA		Central Coast	SRO	7.332	11.5	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 basir
						-,		-,	-	-			_	_	_	-	_	-		,	iron and manganese concentrati
148	3-5	CHOLAME VALLEY		Central Coast	SCRO	39.847	62.3	48	0	0	1	0.75	2	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Verv 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	5 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 exce
_						-, -	_	,								-	_	_		-, -	sulfates in the basin. TDS is docu
																					basin and notential for saline int
153	3-6	LOCKWOOD VALLEY		Central Coast	SCRO	59.933	93.6	5 1.171	1	0	2	1.5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Verv 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 we
						,		,												U	overdraft and Carmel River to dr
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 du
																				_	also nitrate impairment.
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
157	4-1	UPPER OJAI VALLEY		South Coast	SRO	3,815	6.0	616	5 1	0	2	0.75	3	1	1	0	5	0	0.0	Very Low	Groundwater has been documer
																					of boron, sodium chloride, high
											_										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
										-	-			-			-				above MCL (B-118).
159	4-11.01	COASTAL PLAIN OF LOS	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
		ANGELES									-			-		-		-			groundwater production and loc
160	4-11.02	COASTAL PLAIN OF LOS	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 w
		ANGELES								-	-			-		-	_	-			
161	4-11.03	COASTAL PLAIN OF LOS	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. A
1		ANGELES			1				1						1			1		1	intrusion problem and a seawate
102	1 1 1 0 4		CENTRAL	Courth Coord	600	100 257	204.0	2 052 202	-	-	-	2 75	-	-	-		-	<u> </u>	24.0	11:25	effect to reduce seawater intrus
162	4-11.04	CUASTAL PLAIN OF LOS	CENTRAL	South Coast	SKO	180,357	281.8	3,052,303	5	2	5	3.75	U	5	3	4	5	U	24.8	нıgh	Basin was adjudicated in the ear
		ANGELES																1			Several public supply wells are k
102	4.12			Courth Coost	600	145.254	227.1	1 745 220	-	2		2.25	0		1	2.5	2	1	10.0	Madium	various water quality issues.
163	4-1Z	SAN FERNANDO VALLEY		South Coast	SRU	145,354	227.1	1,745,338	5	3	3	2.25	0	4	1	2.5	3	1	19.8	wealum	Several public supply wells have
164	4 1 2			South Coast	500	127.270	109.0	1 275 107		1	-	2.25	0	-	2	4	2	1	21.2	High	Bulletin 118.
104	4-13	SAN GADRIEL VALLEY		South Coast	SKU	12/,2/8	198.9	, 1,2/5,18/	5	1	5	2.25	0	5	3	4	3	1	21.3	піgli	properties are present with
165	A 1E			South Coast	500	4 6 1 1	7 2	2 6 7 2	2	2	0	0.75	4	1	1	0	1	0	0.0	Vorulow	locally high nitrates documente
102	4-12			South Coast	350	4,011	1.2	5,0/3	<b>1</b>	3	0	0.75	4	1	1 <sup>1</sup>	0	1 <sup>1</sup>		0.0	VELYLOW	Locally mgn mitates uocumente
166	<i>I</i> _16			South Coast	0.02	2 217	2 5	E02	1	0	л	1 ⊑	E	1	1	0		0	0.0	Very Low	
167	4-10 /_17			South Coast	SPO	2,217	2/1	2/11	1	0	4	0.75	0	2	5	3 5	5	0	11.2		Boron assenic and radioactivo
107	+-T\	LOCKWOOD VALLET		Journ Coast	510	21,041	34.1	241	1	0	1	0.75	0	<i>2</i>	5	5.5			11.5	LUW	
169	⊿_19	HUNGRY VALLEY		South Coast	SRO	5 224	<u>د</u> م	1 7	0	Λ	n	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0.0	Very Low	110). Water is slightly alkaline (R-110)
160	-+-10 /_10			South Coast	SPO	2,524	0.3	17 202	1	1	2	2 25	0	1	2	0	5	0	0.0	Very LOW	High TDS alkalinity and hardney
105	4-13	THOUSAND OAKS AREA		Journ Coast	50	3,115	4.9	, 17,202	4	1	0	2.23	0	1	5	U	5	0	0.0	VEIYLOW	ingit 105, alkannity, and hardines
170	4-2	OJAI VALLEY		South Coast	SRO	6.851	10 7	7 8,268	2	0	4	1.5	4	5	5	5	2	0	18.5	Medium	High nitrates and sulfates report
				could coust		0,001	10.7	0,200		Ŭ	-	1.5	-			Ĵ		Ŭ	_0.5	meanum	to high levels of nitrates reporte
						1												1			to high levels of hitrates reporte
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	Verv Low	TDS and sulfate exceed MCL for
1	0					5,007		_0,000	1	Ĭ	Ĭ			1	1	-	Ē	<u>َ</u> ا		.,	per Bulletin 118

mments	Other Information Comments
basin due to excessive	
in. Wells exceed Federal ations (B-118).	
eeding MCL and high cumented to be high in the ntrusion.	
vells caused groundwater	SW-GW Interaction Issue. Cal-Am Water Company court
dry, leading to court order.	ordered to reduce 2/3rds of diversions from Carmel River.
ue to "serious" overdraft,	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
	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.
ented to contain high levels h TDS, sulfate, nitrates, iron,	
ne well with nitrate levels	
o significant reduction in	
water quality issues.	
. Adjudicated basin. Saline ater barrier project is in usion.	
arly 1960's due to overdraft. known to be impacted by	
e shown contamination per	Basin is adjudicated.
thin the basin and other ts are known.	Adjudication (aka Six Basins)
ed in the basin (B-118).	
e uranium in some wells (B-	
3).	
rted in the basin. Medium ted in the basin.	
r some wells in the basin	

	CASGEM Groundwater Basin Prioritization Results								Data Component Ranking Value Overall Ra							Donking					
	CASGEM Groundwater Basin Prioritization Results											Data	Louh	Creat	Natiking V				Overall	Kaliking	4
			Sorted by Basin	Number						ي ا	lls			Grou	Indwater	Reliance					
	1					Basin	Area			N N	Ne		age		a				Overall	0	
Basin count	Basin Number	Basin Name	Sub-Basin Name	Hydrologic Region	DWR Region Office	Acres	Sq. Mile	2010 Population	Population	Population Gro	Public Supply \	Total Wells *	Irrigated Acrea	GW Use **	Percent of Tot Supply **	GW Reliance Total	Impacts	Other Information	Basin Ranking Score ***	Overall Basin Priority	Impact Co
172	4-22	MALIBU VALLEY		South Coast	SRO	615	5 1.0	563	2	0	0	3.75	0	0	0	0	5	0	0.0	Very Low	Saline intrusion, high TDS and o
173	4-23	RAYMOND		South Coast	SRO	26,310	) 41.1	L 223,100	5	2	5	0.75	0	5	5	5	3	0	20.8	Medium	Water quality impacts and a su
174	4-3.01	VENTURA RIVER VALLEY	UPPER VENTURA RIVER	South Coast	SRO	7,430	11.6	5 15,961	. 3	0	5	0.75	2	4	5	4.5	3	0	18.3	Medium	TDS is known to be high in som
175	4-3.02	VENTURA RIVER VALLEY	LOWER VENTURA RIVER	South Coast	SRO	5,312	2 8.3	3 15,920	3	1	0	2.25	2	1	2	0	3	0	0.0	Very Low	Oil, high sulfates, nitrates, and documented to be present in the second se
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, pestic impacted some water wells per
177	4-4.03	SANTA CLARA RIVER VALLEY	MOUND	South Coast	SRO	14,846	5 23.2	2 77,886	4	2	1	2.25	3	3	5	4	1	0	17.3	Medium	Some primary and secondary ir above the MCL (B-118).
178	4-4.04	SANTA CLARA RIVER VALLEY	SANTA PAULA	South Coast	SRO	22,899	9 35.8	46,816	3	1	3	1.5	4	5	5	5	3	0	20.5	Medium	Nitrates can fluctuate significar MCL. Other inorganics present to be high.
179	4-4.05	SANTA CLARA RIVER VALLEY	FILLMORE	South Coast	SRO	20,842	2 32.6	5 16,417	2	2	4	0.75	5	0	0	5	2	0	20.8	Medium	Many groundwater quality imp Nitrates problematic during dry 118). REH - PubComm indicted
180	4-4.06	SANTA CLARA RIVER VALLEY	PIRU	South Coast	SRO	8,915	5 13.9	2,666	1	4	3	0.75	5	5	5	5	3	0	21.8	High	GW Quality impacts: nitrates, s etc. (B-118). High Selenium and TDS was 1450 mg/l (Ventura co
181	4-4.07	SANTA CLARA RIVER VALLEY	SANTA CLARA RIVER	South Coast	SRO	66,417	7 103.8	3 221,204	3	5	4	2.25	1	4	1	2.5	5	0	22.8	High	GW Quality Impacts: Nitrates, 1 (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 T and two wells in the basin with
183	4-6	PLEASANT VALLEY		South Coast	SRO	21,654	1 33.8	69,392	3	3	4	1.5	5	5	5	5	1	0	22.5	High	PC - Discharge of poor quality C and effluent discharge from the facility into the Arroyo Simi hav in the basin along with higher 1
184	4-7	ARROYO SANTA ROSA VALLEY		South Coast	SRO	3,747	7 5.9	2,211	2	0	4	0.75	5	5	5	5	3	0	19.8	Medium	Elevated sulfates, nitrates, and
185	4-8	LAS POSAS VALLEY		South Coast	SRO	42,353	3 66.2	2 39,835	2	2	3	2.25	5	5	5	5	3	0	22.3	High	TDS is generally high in this bas includes reports of subsidence, intrusion (chloride from adjacie
186	4-9	SIMI VALLEY		South Coast	SRO	12,192	2 19.0	98,625	5	1	2	0.75	1	2	3	2.5	1	0	13.3	Low	VOCs, elevated TDS, and nitrate
187	5-1.01	GOOSE LAKE	GOOSE VALLEY	Sacramento River	NRO	35,966	5 56.2	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	3 124	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	9 10.6	5 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	7 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	9 2,196	1	5	1	1.5	5	4	2	3	3	0	19.5	Medium	Declining GW Levels and artesia the east and northeast side of t water in west-central side of va arconic & codum)
192	5-12.02	SIERRA VALLEY	CHILCOOT	Sacramento River	NRO	7,551	L 11.8	3 308	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	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	4 6,553	2	0	4	3.75	3	4	4	4	1	0	17.8	Medium	Boron exceeds EPA maximum. with Clear Lake.
195	5-15	BIG VALLEY		Sacramento River	NRO	24,212	2 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	5 3.7	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	3 4.5	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	3 10.2	2 2,252	1	5	2	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	

nments	Other Information Comments
nlorides have been	
erfund. e parts of the basin (B-118).	
ydrogen sulfide are e basin.	
des, and PCBs have (B-118).	
tly in the basin, and above	
bove MCL. TDS is known	
periods; High TDS, etc. (B- VQ is localized and being	
orm runoff, leaking tanks, other inorganics, average 2011 annual gw report)	
CE, TDS, perchlorates, etc.	
DS, sulfate, and chloride known concentrations of	
W from dewatering wells wastewater treatment e led to rising water levels DS and Chloride levels.	
IDS in the basin.(B-118)	
n. REH - Pubic Comment overdraft and saline nt basin?)	
s (B-118)	
n well production along	
ne valley. Poor quality ley (boron, fluoride,	
trong GW-SW interaction	

CASGEM Groundwater Basin Prioritization Results									I			Data	Compo	onent F	Ranking Va	alue			Overall	Ranking		
		CASGEIVI	Groundwater Basi	n Prioritizatio	Results									Grou	Indwater	Reliance						
Basin count	Basin Number	Basin Name	Sub-Basin Name	Hydrologic Region	DWR Region Office	Basin Acres	Area Sq. Mile	2010 Population	Population	Population Growth	Public Supply Wells	Total Wells *	Irrigated Acreage	GW Use **	Percent of Total Supply **	GW Reliance Total	Impacts	Other Information	Overall Basin Ranking Score ***	Overall Basin Priority	Impact Comments	Other Information Comments
199	5-19	COLLAYOMI VALLEY		Sacramento	NRO	6,497	10.2	1,513	3 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	9 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	Sacramento River	NRO	68,009	106.3	964	ł 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	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	8 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	2 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 I5. GW- SW interaction is important to maintaining waterfowl refuges. Area is being highlighted as solution area for Delta outflow issuesproposed increase in CU and GW pumping.
206	5-21.53	SACRAMENTO VALLEY	BEND	Sacramento	NRO	21,748	34.0	554	l 1	0	1	2.25	1	1	3	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
207	5-21.54	SACRAMENTO VALLEY	ANTELOPE	Sacramento	NRO	18,696	29.2	6,124	l 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	NRO	27,709	43.3	1,626	5 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 calmon
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	2 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 o 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	NRO	265,312	414.6	38,465	5 1	4	2	3	4	4	1	2.5	0	1	17.5	Medium		GW basin provides underflow to Butte Creek which
213	5-21.60	SACRAMENTO VALLEY	NORTH YUBA	Sacramento	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	NCRO	104,486	163.3	45,014	4 2	1	3	3	4	2	1	1.5	0	0	14.5	Medium		
215	5-21.62	SACRAMENTO VALLEY	SUTTER	Sacramento	NCRO	234,264	366.0	82,125	5 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	5 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
217	5-21.65	SACRAMENTO VALLEY	SOUTH AMERICAN	Sacramento River	NCRO	247,745	387.1	718,113	8 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)	(1999)
218	5-21.66	SACRAMENTO VALLEY	SOLANO	Sacramento River	NCRO	424,832	663.8	119,263	3 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	3 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 porthern Yolo	
220	5-21.68	SACRAMENTO VALLEY	CAPAY VALLEY	Sacramento River	NCRO	24,970	39.0	550	0 1	0	1	3	3	2	3	2.5	1	0	11.5	Low	moderate to high levels of boron.	

												Data (	omno	nont F	2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	مبيله			Overall	Ranking		
		CASGEM (	Groundwater Basir	n Prioritization	Results								Joinpe	Crew		Dellemen	T		Overall	Kariking		
			Sorted by Basin	n Number						ج	s			Grou	nuwater	Reliance	-					
						Desin	A			ž	Ne		ge		-				Overall			
Basin count	Basin Number	Basin Name	Sub-Basin Name	Hydrologic Region	DWR Region Office	Acres	Sq. Mile	2010 Population	opulation	opulation Gro	ublic Supply \	rotal Wells *	rrigated Acrea	3W Use **	<sup>o</sup> ercent of Tot: Supply **	3W Reliance Fotal	mpacts	Other nformation	Basin Ranking Score ***	Overall Basin Priority	Impact Comments	Other Information Comments
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	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	SCRO	491,255	6 767.6	5 173,731	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	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	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	River San Joaquin	SCRO	746,697	7 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	Important agricultural region.
220	F 22.00		KINCC	River	CCDO	077.020	1 5 2 6 6	000 544	2	4	4	2.75	-	-	2	4	0	0	22.0	Llinh	Mendota Water Authority GWMP	
229	5-22.08	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	22.8	High	Subsidence, critical overdraft, saline conditions, subsidence	Additional points added for critical agricultural importance, very high TDS and pesticide contamination
220	5 33 40			Tulana Laba	6600	445 702	227.0	24.242		2	0	0.75	2	2	-		0	0	11.0	1		issues
230	5-22.10			Tulare Lake	SCRO	145,782	227.8	34,213	1	3	0	0.75	3	3	5	2 5	0	0	11.8	LOW	Quardraft water quality issues	
231	5-22.11			Tulare Lake	SCRO	524 530	8196	125 701	1	5 4	3	2 25	5	5	2	3.5	5	0	20.5	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	
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	contamination issues. Subsidence, overdraft, water quality degradation	Agricultural importance, large basin which results in low
235	5-22.15	SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY	TRACY	San Joaquin	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)	population density.
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	PANOCHE 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	3 124.5	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	8 10.5	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	9 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	8 822	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	5 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	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	3 12	0	0	0	1.5	4	2	1	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
252	5-41	EGG LAKE VALLEY		Sacramento	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	NRO	5,740	9.0	0 0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
254	5-44	LONG VALLEY		Sacramento	NRO	1,088	3 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	j 2.0	2	0	0	0	1.5	5	0	1	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		

-													-							- 1.	
		CASGEM	Groundwater Basiı	n Prioritizatior	Results					1	1	Data	Compo	onent	Ranking V	alue			Overall	Ranking	
			Sorted by Basir	n Number						ء	s			Grou	undwater	Reliance					
			,			<b>D</b> s s l s	A	1		Ϋ́	Vel		ge		-				Overall		
						DdSIII	Area			Ğ	ž	*	rea		oti	e,		-	Basin	Overall	Impact Com
Basin	Basin			Hvdrologic	DWR			2010	5	Б	dd	slis	Ac	*	fo *	anc		io	Ranking	Basin	·
count	Number	Basin Name	Sub-Basin Name	Region	Region	Acres	Sa. Mile	Population	ati	ati	Su	Ň	ted	se	∧ t	elie	cts	nat	Score ***	Priority	
				-0 -	Office				Ind	Ind	blid	tal	iga		ppl	tal K	pag	her			
									Ро	Po	Ρu	To	Irr	20	Pe Su	дv То	L L	Ъ			
256	5-46	LAKE BRITTON AREA		Sacramento	NRO	14,055	5 22.0	84	0	0	2	0.75	1	0	1	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
				River							-						-				
257	5-47	GOOSE VALLEY		Sacramento	NRO	4,208	6.6	5 10	0	0	0	0.75	5	1	1	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
258	5-18	BURNEY CREEK VALLEY		Sacramento	NRO	2 352	2 37	1 /66	2	1	0	2.25	5	3	1	0	0	0	0.0	Verylow	
230	J-40	BORNET CREEK VALLET		River	NINO	2,332		1,400	2	1	0	2.25	5	5	1	0	0	0	0.0		
259	5-49	DRY BURNEY CREEK VALLEY		Sacramento	NRO	3,074	4.8	8 0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
				River																	
260	5-5	FALL RIVER VALLEY		Sacramento	NRO	54,803	8 85.6	5 1,629	1	0	1	2.25	5	3	2	2.5	1	0	12.8	Low	Locally high nitrates. Variable gw
				River																	regions showing declines. Strong
																					gw dependent fisheries. Ecosyste
261	5-50	NORTH FORK BATTLE CREEK		Sacramento	NRO	12 755	190	528	1	0	3	3	2	0	1	0	0	0	0.0	Verylow	(springs, fisheries)
201	3-30	NORTH ONR BATTLE CREEK		River	NINO	12,755	15.5	520	1	0	5	5	2	0	1	0	0	0	0.0		
262	5-51	BUTTE CREEK VALLEY		Sacramento	NRO	3,227	7 5.0	0 0	0	0	0	0.75	2	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
				River																	
263	5-52	GRAYS VALLEY		Sacramento	NRO	5,440	8.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
264				River								-	_	-	-						
264	5-53	DIXIE VALLEY		Sacramento	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	NRO	6.008	3 9.4	3	0	0	0	0.75	3	0	1	0	0	0	0.0	Vervlow	
200	551			River		0,000			Ŭ	Ũ	Ű	0.75	5	Ũ	-	°,	Ũ	Ŭ	0.0	10.72011	
266	5-56	YELLOW CREEK VALLEY		Sacramento	NRO	2,311	L 3.6	6 2	0	0	0	0	5	0	1	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
				River																	
267	5-57	LAST CHANCE CREEK VALLEY		Sacramento	NRO	4,659	7.3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
269	E EQ			River	NDO	16 794	26.2		0	0	0	0.75	4	0	1	0	0	0	0.0	Vondow	
200	5-20	CLOVER VALLET		Biver	INKO	10,784	+ 20.2	. 0	0	0	0	0.75	4	0	1	0	0	0	0.0	very Low	
269	5-59	GRIZZLY VALLEY		Sacramento	NRO	13,441	21.0	) 0	0	0	0	0.75	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
				River	-	-,				-	-				_			_		- / -	
270	5-6.01	REDDING AREA	BOWMAN	Sacramento	NRO	78,426	5 122.5	7,165	1	5	2	3	2	2	2	2	1	0	16.0	Medium	Some localized high boron.
				River																	
271	5-6.02	REDDING AREA	ROSEWOOD	Sacramento	NRO	46,455	5 72.6	5 1,009	1	0	0	2.25	2	1	2	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
272	5-6.03			River	NRO	96 857	7 151 3	52 937	2	2	1	3 75	2	4	3	35	0	0	17.3	Medium	
272	5 0.05		ANDENSON	River	NINO	50,057	151.5	52,557	2	2	-	5.75	2	-	5	5.5	0	0	17.5	Wiediam	
273	5-6.04	REDDING AREA	ENTERPRISE	Sacramento	NRO	60,862	2 95.1	. 68,627	2	3	4	3.75	2	2	1	1.5	0	1	17.3	Medium	
				River																	
274	5-6.05	REDDING AREA	MILLVILLE	Sacramento	NRO	65,226	5 101.9	2,640	1	0	1	2.25	2	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
275	5.000			River	NDO	22.025			0	0	0	0.75	_	1	2	0	0	_		Manulau	
275	5-6.06	REDDING AREA		Sacramento	INKU	33,835	52.5	48	0	0	0	0.75	2	1	2	0	0	0	0.0	very Low	
276	5-60	HUMBUG VALLEY	CREEN	Sacramento	NRO	9.979	) 15.6	3.299	1	0	4	3.75	2	0	3	0	0	0	0.0	Verv Low	
				River	-	- ,		-,		-					_			_		- / -	
277	5-61	CHROME TOWN AREA		Sacramento	NRO	1,408	3 2.2	6	0	0	0	0.75	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
				River																	
278	5-62	ELK CREEK AREA		Sacramento	NRO	1,438	3 2.2	174	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
279	5-63	STONYFORD TOWN AREA		Sacramento	NRO	6 437	7 10 1	183	1	0	3	2 25	3	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Vervlow	
275	5 05			River	iiiio	0,437	10.1	. 105	-	Ŭ	5	2.25	5	Ũ	Ũ	Ū	Ū	Ŭ	0.0	Very Low	
280	5-64	BEAR VALLEY		Sacramento	NRO	9,104	14.2	2 4	0	0	0	0.75	2	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
				River																	
281	5-65	LITTLE INDIAN VALLEY		Sacramento	NRO	1,269	2.0	112	1	0	0	3.75	2	3	4	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
202	E CC			River	NDO	20 717		7.060	1	F	1	1 5	1	0	1	0	0	0	0.0	Vondow	
202	5-00			River	INKO	29,717	40.4	7,900	1	5	1	1.5	1	0	1	0	0	0	0.0	very Low	
283	5-68	POPE VALLEY		Sacramento	NCRO	7,177	/ 11.2	110	1	0	0	1.5	4	2	1	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
				River																	
284	5-69	YOSEMITE VALLEY		San Joaquin	SCRO	7,465	5 11.7	1,016	1	5	4	0.75	0	1	5	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
			+	River						-	-							-			ł – – – – – – – – – – – – – – – – – – –
285	5-7	LAKE ALMANOR VALLEY		Sacramento	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	SCRO	4.835	5 76	i n	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Vervlow	1
	5.0			River		4,000	,		Ĩ			Ĩ	Ĩ	Ĩ	Ĭ	Ĭ	Ĩ	Ĩ		, 2000	
287	5-71	VALLECITOS CREEK VALLEY		Tulare Lake	SCRO	15,110	23.6	i 0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	

omments	Other Information Comments
gw level trends with some ong sw-gw interaction and ystem dependent basin	
	Strong SW-GW interaction and endangered Sac River
	salmon runs

									I			Data	Comp	onent	Ranking V	مىباد			Overall	Panking	
		CASGEM G	iroundwater Basi	n Prioritization	Results							Data	Comp	Greek	nalikilig v	Bolionco	I		Overall	Kalikilig	
			Sorted by Basin	n Number						ي ا	ls s			Gro	unuwater	Reliance					
						Basin	Area		-	Š	Ne Ne		age		a				Overall	Quant	
						Dasini		-		Ğ	ž	• *	re		ot	e U		-	Basin	Overall	Impact Con
Basin	Basin			Hydrologic	DWR			2010	5	5	dd	: S	Ac	*	fe *	u u		io.	Ranking	Basin	
count	Number	Basin Name	Sub-Basin Name	Region	Region	Acros	Sa Mila	Population	atio	atio	Su	≥ N	ed	ŝ	/* t		ts	lat	Scoro ***	Priority	
count	Number			Region	Office	Acres	Sq. Wille	Population	n n	n in	ii.	al	gat	Ű	p G	al &	ac	r er	Score		
									g	d d	du	ō	rri	N S	Sup	ot S	Ĕ	lt of			
288	5-8	MOUNTAIN MEADOWS VALLEY		Sacramento	NRO	8,145	12.7	7 0	0	0	0	0.75	4	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
289	5-80	BRITE VALLEY		River Tulare Lake	SCRO	3 181	5.0	68/	1	0	1	3 75	2	1	3	0	0	1	0.0	Very Low	
290	5-82			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	5 774	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	1 779	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	5 1.288	2	5	5	1.5	0	2	5	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
294	5-86	JOSEPH CREEK		Sacramento	NRO	4,458	7.0	) 13	0	0	0	1.5	3	2	3	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
_				River	-	,					-	_	_		-	-	_			-, -	
295	5-87	MIDDLE FORK FEATHER RIVER		Sacramento	NRO	4,342	6.8	3 177	1	0	2	3	1	0	1	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
296	5-88	STONY GORGE RESERVOIR		Sacramento	NRO	1,065	1.7	7 0	0	0	0	0	3	0	1	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
				River																	
297	5-89	SQUAW FLAT		Sacramento	NRO	1,294	2.0	0 0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
				River								_									
298	5-9	INDIAN VALLEY		Sacramento	NRO	29,413	46.0	1,718	1	0	2	3	4	0	1	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
200	- 00	5110140 00554		River		0.010			_		-	0.75		-			-				
299	5-90	FUNKS CREEK		Sacramento	NRO	3,012	4./	/ ·	0	0	0	0.75	1	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
300	5-91	ANTELOPE CREEK		Sacramento	NRO	2,040	3.2	2 3	0	0	0	0.75	3	0	1	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
201	5.02			River	NIDO	2 221	2.5		0	-		0.75	2	0	1	0	0	0		Martillaur	
301	5-92	BLANCHARD VALLEY		Sacramento	NRU	2,221	3.5		0	U	0	0.75	2	0	1	0	0	0	0.0	very Low	
202	E 02	NORTH FORK CACHE CREEK		River	NRO	2 474	E /		0	0	0	0.75	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Vorulow	
302	3-33	NORTH FORK CACHE CREEK		Bivor	NKO	5,474	5.4	*  · ·	0	0	0	0.75	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very LOW	
303	5-94	MIDDI E CREEK		Sacramento	NRO	705	1.1	10	1	0	0	3	2	4	5	0	0	0	0.0	VervLow	
				River						-	-	-	_		-	-	-	-		,	
304	5-95	MEADOW VALLEY		Sacramento	NRO	5,734	9.0	387	1	0	2	3	2	1	1	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
				River	_	-, -										-				-, -	
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 Qu
																					of the basin
306	6-10	ADOBE LAKE VALLEY		South Lahontan	SRO	39,978	62.5	5 4	0	0	0	0.75	0	0	5	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	or the basin.
307	6-100	SECRET VALLEY		North Lahontan	NRO	33,680	52.6	5 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	1 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	2 141	. 0	0	0	0.75	1	0	1	0	0	3	0.0	Very Low	
310	6-105	SLINKARD VALLEY		North Lahontan	NCRO	4,517	7.1	u c	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	) C	0	0	0	0.75	3	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
242	C 407			North Lab	NORO					-	-		-	-	<u> </u>	_		_		Marriel	
312	6-107	SWEETWATER FLAT		North Labortan	NCRO	4,747	7.4	+ C	U	0	0	0	1	0	U	U	U	U	0.0	very Low	
212	6 109			North Labortar	NCDO	707	1 1	1 171	2		F	2.25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Vonulou	
212	0-108			North Lanontan	NCKU	/02	1.1	4/1	2 ×	U	5	2.25	0	U	U	U	Ů	0	0.0	Very LOW	
31/	6-11			South Labortan	SRO	72 028	112 5	800	1	0	2	0.75	2	2	1	0	1	0	0.0	VeryLow	Local impairments from thermal
514	0-11			South Lanontan	51(0	72,020	112.5	5 800	1	0	2	0.75	2	2	1	0	1	0	0.0	Very LOW	with high TDS, fluoride, boron, a
215	6 1 2			South Labortan	CPO	662 459	1 026 7	17 66/	1	0	1	0.75	1	2	1	2	2	E	12.0	Modium	Water quality suitable overall.
515	0-12	OWENS VALLET		South Lanonian	SKU	005,458	1,050.7	17,004	1	0	T	0.75	1	2	4	5	2	5	15.0	Wedium	winter impairments locally due t
1									1		1				1			1		1	
1									1						1			1			
316	6-13	BLACK SPRINGS VALLEY		South Lahontan	SRO	30.911	48.3	3 (	0	0	0	0.75	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Verv Low	
	0					- 5,5 11			1	Ĩ	Ĭ	1	Ĩ	Ĭ		-	Ē			.,	
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	
L						L			I	1			-	1			<u> </u>	<u> </u>			
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	
1								1	<u> </u>						1		<u> </u>	1	J		1

omments	Other Information Comments
	Adjudicated basin
Quality issues (sodium waters) in various portions	
	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.
nal waters and some springs , and other elements, but	
e 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

CASGEM								1			Data	Comp	onent	Ranking V	مىراد			Overall	Ranking		
		CASGEM	Groundwater Basi	n Prioritization	Results				-					Grou	indwater	Reliance			Overall	Natiking	-
			Sorted by Basi	n Number						f	ells		a								
Basin	Basin Number	Basin Name	Sub-Basin Name	Hydrologic Region	DWR Region	Basin	Area	2010 Population	ation	ation Grow	Supply We	Wells *	ted Acreag	se **	nt of Total y **	eliance	ts	nation	Overall Basin Ranking Score ***	Overall Basin Priority	Impact Com
					Office		- 4		Indo	Indo	ublic	otal	rrigat	N N	erce	iW R otal	npac	other	50010		
320	6-17	SALINE VALLEY		South Lahontan	SRO	146,850	) 229.5	5 C	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0.0	Very Low	GW Quality Impairments: High T
321	6-18	DEATH VALLEY		South Lahontan	SRO	926,496	5 1,447.7	/ 190	0	0	1	0.75	1	0	5	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	groundwater is interior for dome
322	6-19	WINGATE VALLEY		South Lahontan	SRO	71,755	5 112.1		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
323	6-2	MADELINE PLAINS		North Lahontan	NRO	156,152	2 244.0	) 151	. 0	0	0	0.75	3	3	3	3	1	0	7.8	Low	Localized naturally occurring wat
324	6-20	MIDDLE AMARGOSA VALLEY		South Lahontan	SRO	392,862	2 613.8	3 230	0 0	0	1	0.75	0	0	5	0	4	0	0.0	Very Low	Water quality is rated inferior to purposes due to elevated fluorid however, locally groundwater is
325	6-21	LOWER KINGSTON VALLEY		South Lahontan	SRO	241,892	2 378.0	) C	0 0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0.0	Very Low	Groundwater is inferior for dome due to elevated fluoride, chloride
326	6-22	UPPER KINGSTON VALLEY		South Lahontan	SRO	178,533	3 279.0	) 37	0	0	1	0.75	0	0	5	0	4	0	0.0	Very Low	(B-118) Groundwater is marginal to infer irrigation purposes due to elevat
327	6-23	RIGGS VALLEY		South Lahontan	SRO	88,274	137.9	) C	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	1181.
328	6-24	RED PASS VALLEY		South Lahontan	SRO	97,088	3 151.7	′ C	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	3 C	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	6 43.5	5 C	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	B C	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
332	6-28	PAHRUMP VALLEY		South Lahontan	SRO	93,747	7 146.5	<b>9</b> 9	0	0	0	0.75	0	2	5	0	2	0	0.0	Very Low	Water levels generally declining NWIS. State of Nevada Departme has documented overdraft and s this basin (http://water.nv.gov/documents
333	6-29	MESQUITE VALLEY		South Lahontan	SRO	89,012	2 139.1	64	0	0	0	0.75	1	1	1	0	3	0	0.0	Very Low	Declining water levels. Locally hip portion of basin makes GW marg domestic uses (B-118)
334	6-3	WILLOW CREEK VALLEY		North Lahontan	NRO	11,698	3 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	0	1	0.75	0	0	5	0	4	0	0.0	Very Low	Basin groundwater is rated marg domestic and irrigational use bea 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	3 144.8	8 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	3 750	0 0	0	1	0.75	0	0	5	0	5	0	0.0	Very Low	Groundwater quality is rated ma domestic and irrigation purposes on 66 analyses showing elevated fluoride, boron, and TDS. Geotra
339	6-34	SILVER LAKE VALLEY		South Lahontan	SRO	35,519	9 55.5	5 C	0 0	0	0	0.75	0	0	0	0	4	0	0.0	Very Low	Groundwater in this basin is rate both domestic and irrigation use concentrations of fluoride, boro
340	6-35	CRONISE VALLEY		South Lahontan	SRO	127,313	3 198.9	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	South Lahontan	SRO	19,457	7 30.4	L C	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	7 16.5	8,845	2	5	1	1.5	0	0	0	0	3	0	0.0	Very Low	Locally high iron and fluoride cor
343	6-37	COYOTE LAKE VALLEY		South Lahontan	SRO	88,735	5 138.6	5 99	0	0	0	0.75	0	0	5	0	4	0	0.0	Very Low	Groundwater quality is rated as i both domestic and irrigation pur levels of fluoride, boron, sodium

omments	Other Information Comments
TDS and Fluorides,	
vater quality issues	
AR, etc) to marginal for domestic	
ride and boron contents;	
is of good quality. (B-118)	
mestic or irrigation purposes ride, boron, sulfate and TDS	
ferior for domestic or	
vated fluoride and TDS (B-	
18).	
ng per B-118 and USGS	
ment of Water Resources	
d subsidence conditions in	
nts/presentations/pahru	
high TDS in southern	
arginal to inferior for both because of elevated fluoride	
narginal to inferior for both ses. This assessment is based ed concentrations of tracker shows many LUST	
ated marginal to inferior for	
ises because of elevated ron, and TDS. (B-118)	
concentrations.(B-118)	
as inferior to marginal for	
ourposes because of elevated im, and TDS. (B-118).	

CASGEM Groundwater Basin Prioritization Results												Data	Compo	onent F	Ranking V	alue			Overall	Ranking		
		CASGEIVI	Sorted by Pasi	n Prioritization	Results					_				Grou	Indwater	Reliance				, in the second se		
			Softed by Basil	n Number						wth	/ells		ge		_				Overall			
Basin count	Basin Number	Basin Name	Sub-Basin Name	Hydrologic Region	DWR Region Office	Basin Acres	Area Sq. Mile	2010 Population	Population	Population Gro	Public Supply <b>W</b>	Total Wells *	Irrigated Acrea	GW Use **	Percent of Tota Supply **	GW Reliance Total	Impacts	Other Information	Basin Ranking Score ***	Overall Basin Priority	Impact Comments	Other Information Comments
344	6-38	CAVES CANYON VALLEY		South Lahontan	SRO	73,542	114.9	88	8 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	1 23,566	5 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 prices 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	3 32,938	8 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	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 MCI	, Basin is adjudicated.
348	6-42	UPPER MOJAVE RIVER VALLEY		South Lahontan	SRO	415,295	648.9	355,338	8 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	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	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	5 480	) 1	0	2	2.25	1	0	3	0	5	0	0.0	Very Low	Court adjudicated basin in overdraft. Groundwater quality	
352	6-46	FREMONT VALLEY		South Lahontan	SRO	336,682	526.1	L 16,883	8 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	
353	6-47	HARPER VALLEY		South Lahontan	SRO	411,827	643.5	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	2 C	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	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	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	5 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	) C	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	5 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	

									I			Data	Comp	onenti	Panking V	مىباد			Overall	Panking	
		CASGEM (	Groundwater Basi	n Prioritization	Results							Data		Grou	indwater	Reliance			Overall	Nariking	
			Sorted by Basin	n Number						чţР	ells		e								
Basin count	Basin Number	Basin Name	Sub-Basin Name	Hydrologic Region	DWR Region Office	Basin Acres	Area Sq. Mile	2010 Population	Population	Population Grov	Public Supply W	Total Wells *	Irrigated Acreag	GW Use **	Percent of Total Supply **	GW Reliance Total	Impacts	Other Information	Overall Basin Ranking Score ***	Overall Basin Priority	Impact Co
362	6-53	SALT WELLS VALLEY		South Lahontan	SRO	29,629	46.3	C	0	0	0	0.75	0	0	0	0	5	0	0.0	Very Low	The groundwater is rated infer because of high TDS content th mg/L to 39,000 mg/L. Other im concentrations of sodium, chlo 1964)
363	6-54	INDIAN WELLS VALLEY		South Lahontan	SRO	383,492	2 599.2	34,837	1	4	1	0.75	0	1	5	3	5	0	14.8	Medium	Overdraft has been documente quality issues with respect to o 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 ranked inferior for domestic us
368	6-6	CARSON VALLEY		North Lahontan	NCRO	10,716	5 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	9 14.6	C	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	4 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	7 28.2	C	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	2 16.3	C	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	3 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	L 56.8	14,743	2	4	3	3	0	3	5	4	0	1	17.0	Medium	
376	6-68	SANTA ROSA FLAT		South Lahontan	SRO	16,861	26.3	C	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	3 17.5	C	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	5 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	5 11.0	C	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	C	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	C	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	7 5.2	C	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	2 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	2 34.2	C	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
386	6-77	GRASS VALLEY		South Lahontan	SRO	10,034	1 15.7	C	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	9 11.4	. C	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
388	6-79	CALIFORNIA VALLEY		South Lahontan	SRO	58,639	9 91.6	C	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
389	6-8	BRIDGEPORT VALLEY		North Lahontan	NCRO	32,545	5 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 2.7	C	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
391	6-81	BUTTE VALLEY		South Lahontan	SRO	8,853	3 13.8	C	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	

nments	Other Information Comments
or for all beneficial uses at ranges from about 4,000 pairments are elevated ide, and boron (DWR	
d since the 1960's. Water erdraft and mixing of	
on the valley floor is	
e and marginal to inferior	
	Strong SW-GW interaction with Martis Creek, as per 2013 GWMP

												Data	Comp	onont	Panking V	مىياد			Overall	Panking	1
		CASGEM	Groundwater Basi	n Prioritization	Results								L	Grou	indwater	Reliance			Overall	Nariking	-
			Sorted by Basi	n Number						f	slls		a			Renarice					
					DWR	Basin	Area			n Grow	Na Vid	* *	creage		Total	е		5	Overall Basin	Overall Basin	Impact Com
Basin count	Basin Number	Basin Name	Sub-Basin Name	Hydrologic Region	Region Office	Acres	Sq. Mile	2010 Population	opulation	opulation	ublic Sup	otal Well	rrigated A	SW Use **	ercent of upply **	sW Relian otal	mpacts	)ther nformatic	Ranking Score ***	Priority	
392	6-82	SPRING CANYON VALLEY		South Lahontan	SRO	4,832	2. 7.5	(	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	<u></u>
393	6-84	GREENWATER VALLEY		South Lahontan	SRO	60,260	94.2	(	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	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	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	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	5 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	0.75	5	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
401	6-92	PINE CREEK VALLEY		North Lahontan	NRO	9,526	5 14.9	(	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
402	6-93	HARVEY VALLEY		North Lahontan	NRO	4,503	8 7.0	(	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	0.75	1	0	2	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
404	6-95	DRY VALLEY		North Lahontan	NRO	6,498	3 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	C	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
407	6-98	TULEDAD CANYON VALLEY		North Lahontan	NRO	5,167	8.1	(	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
408	6-99	PAINTERS FLAT		North Lahontan	NRO	6,395	5 10.0	(	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 to for drinking water in fluoride, TD concentrations. Thermal waters a
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
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	
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	0.75	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	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 loc and chloride contents (DWR 197 about 1,000 mg/L southwest of E
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 concer locally.
419	7-18.01	JOHNSON VALLEY	SOGGY LAKE	Colorado River	SRO	77,865	5 121.7	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	Very Low	1
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 of subsidence from overdraft of and TDS (B-118).

omments	Other Information Comments
d the recommended levels	
TDS, and sulfate rs also occur in this basin	
nk problems.	
	Basin is adjudicated.
locally high TDS, fluoride, 975). TDS content reaches of Emerson Lake (MWA	
centrations are impairments	
m 40 to 100 feet. Evidence of basin. Locally high nitrates	Fall 1954 - Fall 2002 Change in GW Storage is estimated at - 460TAF ( Napoli)

		CASCEN		. Duiouiti-otion	Deculto				Ι			Data	Comp	onent	Ranking V	alue			Overall	Ranking	
		CASGEINI	Sorted by Basi	n Prioritization	Results					_	s			Grou	undwater	Reliance					
Basin	Basin	Pacin Nama	Sub Rasin Name	Hydrologic	DWR	Basin	Area	2010	io	ion Growth	upply Well	ells *	d Acreage	*	of Total **	ance		tion	Overall Basin Ranking	Overall Basin	Impact Co
count	Number	Dasin Name	Sub-Dasin Name	Region	Office	Acres	Sq. Mile	Population	Populat	Populat	Public S	Total W	Irrigate	GW Use	Percent Supply	GW Rel Total	Impacts	Other Informa	Score ***	Phoney	
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	3 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	5 2	5	3	0.75	3	4	3	3.5	2	0	19.3	Medium	Nitrates and addition of salts d
425	7-21.02	COACHELLA VALLEY	MISSION CREEK	Colorado River	SRO	48,966	76.5	5 18,974	1	5	2	0.75	0	3	5	4	2	1	15.8	Medium	Radiological and nitrate issues
426	7-21.03	COACHELLA VALLEY	DESERT HOT SPRINGS	Colorado River	SRO	101,862	159.2	22,568	3 1	5	1	0.75	1	0	5	2.5	1	0	12.3	Low	High TDS and declining water le documented for a long period of
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.
428	7-22	WEST SALTON SEA		Colorado River	SRO	106,408	166.3	5,352	2 1	0	0	0.75	0	0	5	0	3	0	0.0	Very Low	Groundwater is marginal to po- irrigation use because of elevat
429	7-24	BORREGO VALLEY		Colorado River	SRO	153,978	240.6	3,853	8 1	0	2	0.75	1	2	5	3.5	5	2	15.3	Medium	Overdraft conditions over 60 ye
430	7-25	OCOTILLO-CLARK VALLEY		Colorado River	SRO	224,416	350.6	5 27	0	0	1	0.75	2	0	1	0.5	3	0	7.3	Low	High TDS, sulfate, chloride, and locally impair groundwater for
431	7-26	TERWILLIGER VALLEY		Colorado River	SRO	8,081	12.6	1,085	5 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	3 0	0	1	1.5	1	1	1	0	3	0	0.0	Very Low	Significant groundwater decline 1950s through early 1970s (B-1
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 margina of elevated levels of fluoride ar
434	7-29	COYOTE WELLS VALLEY		Colorado River	SRO	147,088	229.8	374	ł O	0	1	0.75	0	0	5	0	4	0	0.0	Very Low	Basin is in overdraft (B-118). Th and elevated TDS in some of th basin.
435	7-3	WARD VALLEY		Colorado River	SRO	564,569	882.1	. 22	2 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	7 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	8 1	0	0	0.75	0	3	5	2.5	1	0	0.0	Very Low	Some natural occurrences of el exceed drinking water standard
438	7-32	CHOCOLATE VALLEY		Colorado River	SRO	130,507	203.9	658	8 0	0	0	0.75	0	0	0	0	4	0	0.0	Very Low	Groundwater quality impairme fluoride, boron, and TDS (B-118 were found in nearly all minera
439	7-33	EAST SALTON SEA		Colorado River	SRO	197,043	307.9	1,093	8 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	; <u>c</u>	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	5 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	5 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	5 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	i 7,459	9 1	4	2	0.75	5	1	1	1	1	-2	12.8	Low	Some elevated TDS in groundw unsuitable for domestic or irrig
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, chl TDS concentrations are high (D
446	7-4	RICE VALLEY		Colorado River	SRO	190,622	297.8	23	3 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	2 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	3 1	0	0	0.75	0	0	5	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	

nments	Other Information Comments
e to Colorado River	
the basin (B-118).	Mission Creek GW also supplies drinking water to Desert
vels have been f time in the Desert Hot	
	Basin is adjudicated.
r for domestic and d fluoride, boron, and	
ars. Some wells have been high nitrates.	Most demand for basin is concentrated in north in a small area.
fluoride concentrations omestic and irrigation use.	
s documented in the late 8)	
for domestic use because mineral content.	
ere are local fluoride issues shallower wells in the	
ments or compounds that 5.	
t due to elevated levels of . Elevated fluoride levels analyses of groundwater.	
ter makes water tion purposes.(B-118)	Irrigated acres is almost all surface water. Reduce ranking somewhat due to low gw use
ride, boron, sulfate, and VR 1975).	

		CASCEN	Groundwator Basi	n Prioritization	Poculto							Data	Comp	onent	Ranking V	alue			Overall	Ranking	
		CASGEIVI	Sorted by Basi	n Number	Results					_	s			Gro	undwater	Reliance					
		1	Softed by Basi	in Number	1		-	1		wth	Vella		9		-				Overall		
Basin count	Basin Number	Basin Name	Sub-Basin Name	Hydrologic Region	DWR Region Office	Basin Acres	Area Sq. Mile	2010 Population	Population	Population Gro	Public Supply M	Total Wells *	Irrigated Acrea	GW Use **	Percent of Tota Supply **	GW Reliance Total	Impacts	Other Information	Basin Ranking Score ***	Overall Basin Priority	Impact Con
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 T high (DWR 1975). GW near towr concentrations making water un sodium contents make water ma
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, chlori 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, chlori content levels are high in the ba
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 of reportingly going dry; this is a sn residents and no source of impo groundwaters recharging the ba
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 T for domestic use (DWR 1975). H concentrations, and high sodium groundwater for irrigation use (I
458	7-50	IRON RIDGE AREA		Colorado River	SRO	5,284	8.3	C	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	C	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	C	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 reached 9.0 mg/L, exceeding rec concentration levels of 1.4 mg/L
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 e MCL level (C-118). TDS content i wells near Bristol Lake (DWR 196
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 p domestic and agricultural uses ( concentrations impair for dome concentrations impair agricultur 1979). USGS data shows declinir

mments	Other Information Comments
TDS concentrations are	
vn of Vidal has fluoride	
unusable domestically and	
narginal for irrigation.	
ride, fluoride, and TDS are	
ride, fluoride, and TDS pasin (DWR 1975).	
v documents, some wells are small basin with over 500 ported water. TDS of some pasin 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)
TDS concentrations are high High of boron and TDS Im percentage impair (DWR 1975).	Significant growth in industry (solar), and others. Prison is also a significant user the the GW resources.
er from some wells has ecommended maximum	
/L (B-118, DWK 1984).	
exceeds the recommended is extremely high in some 967).	
s generally unsuitable for (DWR 1979). TDS and F estic use, and B and Na ural use in basin (DWR ing water	

												Data	Comn	onent	Ranking	Value				Overall	Ranking							
							Data	Comp	Gro	undwate	r Polian				Overall	Kaliking												
			Sorted by Basir	n Number						۽	s			910	unuwate	i Kenan	Le											
-					1	Basin	A		-	ž	Ne Ne		ge		<u> </u>					Overall								
Basin	Basin	Basin Name	Sub-Basin Name	Hydrologic	DWR Region	Dasini	Alea -	2010	tion	tion Gro	Supply \	/ells *	d Acrea	* *	t of Tot **	liance		,	ation	Basin Ranking	Basin Priority	Impact Comments Other Information Comments						
count	Number			Region	Office	Acres	Sq. Mile	Population	Popula	Popula	Public 9	Total W	Irrigate	GW Us	Percen	GW Re	Inter	Other	Inform	Score ***	,							
473	8-1	COASTAL PLAIN OF ORANGE		South Coast	SRO	223,222	348.8	2,309,966	5 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	3 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	1 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-	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	2 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 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 Adjudication (Western San Bernardino) from the Newmark Superfund site and with perchlorate						
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. [R-118]						
481	8-2.08	UPPER SANTA ANA VALLEY	SAN TIMOTEO	South Coast	SRO	73,541	114.9	54,169	9 2	5	3	1.5	1	1	4	2.5	3		1	19.0	Medium	Locally high nitrates and salinity (B-118). GAMA reported Parts of the subbasin are adjudicated.						
482	8-2.09	UPPER SANTA ANA VALLEY	TEMESCAL	South Coast	SRO	23,654	37.0	141,436	54	2	3	3	1	5	4	4.5	2		0	19.5	Medium	Groundwater quality impaired by nitrates and inorganics						
483	8-4	ELSINORE		South Coast	SRO	25,873	40.4	60,946	5 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 Study done for Elsinore Basin GW Advisory Committee						
																						the basin (Elsinore Gw AdvisoryComm). Some fluoride impacts to groundwater (B-118). (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	73	4	2	2.25	3	3	5	4	5		1	24.3	High	Basin is in overdraft (MWD). Groundwater quality issues Adjudicated Basin documented in DWR B-118. Pumping has increased some contaminant distribution in the basin.						
485	8-6	HEMET LAKE VALLEY		South Coast	SRO	16.811	26.3	464	1 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	1 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	5 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	1 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	3 1	0	2	3	4	5	5	5	3		1	19.0	Medium	Nitrate problems are widespread (B-118). TDS is alsoLWU data based on DAU does not accurately depictknown to be high in places. During dry years, the basin hasIrrigated Acreage. 2006 Farmland Mapping Data indicateexperienced water level declines up to 20 feet in one yearirrigated acreage is 2,691 and quick GIS estimate by SROper GWMP.indicates irrigated acreage is at least 2,100 acres.						
491	9-11	SANTA MARIA VALLEY		South Coast	SRO	12,379	19.3	16,695	5 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	5 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	5 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	0 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	4 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	74	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	1 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 &						
499	9-19	TIA JUANA		South Coast	SRO	7,448	11.6	50,694	4 5	1	0	2.25	2	0	1	0	5		0	0.0	Very Low	DWR 1967) 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).						

		CASCENA	Froundwator Pasi	n Prioritization	Poculto							Data	Comp	onent	Ranking V	alue			Overall	Ranking	
		CASGEINI	Sorted by Basir	n Prioritization	results					_	s			Grou	undwater	Reliance					
		1	Softed by Dash	Thumber				1		vt	/ell		90		-				Overall		
Basin count	Basin Number	Basin Name	Sub-Basin Name	Hydrologic Region	DWR Region Office	Basin Acres	Area Sq. Mile	2010 Population	opulation	opulation Gro	ublic Supply M	otal Wells *	rigated Acrea	W Use **	ercent of Tota upply **	W Reliance otal	npacts	ther formation	Basin Ranking Score ***	Overall Basin Priority	Impact Col
500	0.2			Courth Cooot	600	2.000			Å	<b>B</b>	L L	<u> </u>	-	0	Sc. P.	<u></u> 5 2	<u> </u>	<u> </u>		Manulau	Leadly bick TDC and some also
500	9-2	SAN MATEO VALLEY		South Coast	SKU	3,005	4.7	554	+ 1	0	4	1.5	3	0	0	0	3	0	0.0	very Low	118)
501	9-22	BATIQUITOS LAGOON VALLEY		South Coast	SRO	745	5 1.2	2,109	3	5	0	1.5	1	0	0	0	4	0	0.0	Very Low	The groundwater in this basin v irrigation because of high chlor for domestic use because of hig concentrations (DWR 1967)
502	9-23	SAN ELIJO VALLEY		South Coast	SRO	888	3 1.4	1,125	5 2	4	0	3	1	0	0	0	5		0.0	Very Low	High TDS limits beneficial uses
503	9-24	PAMO VALLEY		South Coast	SRO	1,514	1 2.4	0	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	6 4.9	168	3 1	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
505	9-27	COTTONWOOD VALLEY		South Coast	SRO	3,871	L 6.0	) 44	ł 1	0	4	1.5	1	0	0	0	0	1	0.0	Very Low	
506	9-28	CAMPO VALLEY		South Coast	SRO	3,569	9 5.6	i 985	5 1	0	4	2.25	2	0	0	0	0	1	0.0	Very Low	
507	9-29	POTRERO VALLEY		South Coast	SRO	2,035	5 3.2	475	5 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	1 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	4 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	3 12.5	4,121	2	1	4	2.25	1	4	5	4.5	2	1	17.8	Medium	Groundwater in SW part of bas domestic and agricultural uses NO3, and TDS concentrations a Use; Cl, B, and TDS are locally h
511	9-5	TEMECULA VALLEY		South Coast	SRO	88,338	3 138.0	219,431	3	5	3	3	2	1	1	1	5	1	23.0	High	Groundwater source is impaire basin due to elevated nitrates, VOCs (B-118)
512	9-6	CAHUILLA VALLEY		South Coast	SRO	18,342	2 28.7	1,993	3 1	3	3	3	2	2	5	3.5	1	1	17.5	Medium	Locally, sulfates and nitrates and (DWR 1975). Nitrate concentration mg/L (Movie 1976).
513	9-7	SAN LUIS REY VALLEY		South Coast	SRO	29,865	5 46.7	43,942	2 2	1	5	3	3	3	1	2	3	0	19.0	Medium	TDS is a concern according to N problems with nitrates, inorgar VOCs. Desalination generally re
514	9-8	WARNER VALLEY		South Coast	SRO	24,150	37.7	185	5 0	0	4	0.75	0	0	0	0	1	0	0.0	Very Low	Groundwater generally suitable
515	9-9	ESCONDIDO VALLEY		South Coast	SRO	2,906	5 4.5	38,593	8 5	1	0	3.75	1	0	1	0	2	0	0.0	Very Low	Local sources of groundwater in as suitable to inferior for dome categorized as inferior typically 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 overal 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

nments	Other Information Comments
ited nitrates in wells (B-	
as rated inferior for de content and marginal h sulfate and TDS	
B-118)	
	Basin area is listed by EPA as a "Sole Source Aquifer" in EPA Region 9. Basin area is listed by EPA as a "Sole Source Aquifer" in EPA Region 9.
n is marginal to inferior for DWR 1967). Mg, SO4, Cl, e locally high for domestic. gh for ag use (DWR 1975).	Basin is federally adjudicated.
l in various parts of the luoride, sulfates, TDS, and	Basin is under Federal adjudication.
high for domestic use ions reach as much as 128	Basin is federally adjudicated.
WD. B-118 indicates ics, radiologicals, and quired in all areas of the	
except for elevated gs	
this basin are categorized tic use. The water contains high nitrate, TDS,	

	CASGEM Groundwater Basin Prioritization Results											Data (	Compo	onent R	anking \	/alue			Overall	Ranking		
	CASGEM Groundwater Basin Prioritization Results Sorted by Overall Basin Score													Grou	ndwater	Reliance						
			Sorted by Overall	Basin Score						۸th	/ells		e		_				Overall			
Basin count	Basin Number	Basin Name	Sub-Basin Name	Hydrologic Region	DWR Region Office	Basin Acres	Area Sq. Mile	2010 Population	Population	Population Grov	Public Supply W	Total Wells *	Irrigated Acreag	GW Use **	Percent of Total Supply **	GW Reliance Total	Impacts	Other Information	Basin Ranking Score ***	Overall Basin Priority	Impact Comments	Other Information Comments
1	3-4.02	SALINAS VALLEY	EAST SIDE AQUIFER	Central Coast	SCRO	57,452	89.8	3 128,646	5 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	
2	4-4.02	SANTA CLARA RIVER VALLEY	OXNARD	South Coast	SRO	58,200	90.9	235,973	8 4	3	4	0.75	5	5	5	5	5	0	26.8	High	Saline intrusion, nitrates, pesticides, and PCBs have	
3	5-22.11	SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY	KAWEAH	Tulare Lake	SCRO	446,283	697.3	3 271,700	2	5	3	3	5	5	2	3.5	5	0	26.5	High	Overdraft, water quality issues.	
4	3-3.01	GILROY-HOLLISTER VALLEY	LLAGAS AREA	Central Coast	SCRO	55,967	87.4	↓ 91,70€	5 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	
5	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.
6	5-22.06	SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY	MADERA	San Joaquin Biver	SCRO	393,429	614.7	7 116,919	9 1	5	2	3	5	5	3	4	5	0	25.0	High	Subsidence, critical overdraft, water quality degradation	
7	4-11.04	COASTAL PLAIN OF LOS ANGELES	CENTRAL	South Coast	SRO	180,357	281.8	3,052,303	8 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.	
8	3-2	PAJARO VALLEY		Central Coast	SCRO	88,062	2 137.6	5 114,282	2 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.	
9	8-2.03	UPPER SANTA ANA VALLEY	RIVERSIDE-	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	
10	8-5	SAN JACINTO		South Coast	SRO	188,623	3 294.7	474,317	7 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
11	3-12	SANTA MARIA		Central Coast	SRO	184,248	8 287.9	201,759	2	3	4	1.5	5	5	4	4.5	4	0	24.0	High	Documented overdraft of basin. Water quality degradatio	n
12	3-4.01	SALINAS VALLEY	180/400 FOOT AQUIFER	Central Coast	SCRO	84,321	131.8	3 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	
13	5-22.02	SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY	MODESTO	San Joaquin Biyer	SCRO	246,518	385.2	2 294,872	2 2	3	4	3	4	5	2	3.5	4	0	23.5	High	Water quality degradation due to industrial and agginultural practices	
14	3-4.06	SALINAS VALLEY	PASO ROBLES AREA	Central Coast	SCRO	597,241	933.2	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
15	8-2.01	UPPER SANTA ANA VALLEY	CHINO	South Coast	SRO	154,693	3 241.7	7 898,653	3 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
16	9-5	TEMECULA VALLEY		South Coast	SRO	88,338	3 138.0	) 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.
17	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		CW from this bosis is a base server of the first
18	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.
19	4-4.07	SANTA CLARA RIVER VALLEY	SANTA CLARA RIVER VALLEY EAST	South Coast	SRO	66,417	103.8	3 221,204	1 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)	
20	3-7	CARMEL VALLEY		Central Coast	SCRO	5,151	8.0	5,086	5 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.
21	5-22.14	SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY	KERN COUNTY	Tulare Lake	SCRO	1,950,113	3,047.1	L 700,323	3 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.
22	5-22.09	SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY	WESTSIDE	Tulare Lake	SCRO	640,504	1,000.8	3 27,285	5 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
23	5-22.04	SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY	MERCED	San Joaquin River	SCRO	491,255	5 767.6	5 173,731	1	4	2	3	5	4	3	3.5	4	0	22.5	High	Overdraft and water quality degradation (MAGPI GWMP).	

	CASGEM Groundwater Basin Prioritization Results											Data C	òmno	nent R	anking \	/alue			Overa	ll Rank	king	
	CASGEM Groundwater Basin Prioritization Results Sorted by Overall Basin Score											Duta C	.ompo	Grou	adwator	Polianco	1		Overa			
	Sorted by Overall Basin Score						÷	lls			Grou	luwatei	Reliance	-								
<u> </u>						Desin	A		-	ž	Ne		ge		-				Overall	_		
Basin count	Basin Number	Basin Name	Sub-Basin Name	Hydrologic Region	DWR Region Office	Acres	Sq. Mile	2010 Population	Population	Population Gro	Public Supply V	Total Wells *	Irrigated Acrea	GW Use **	Percent of Tota Supply **	GW Reliance Total	Impacts	Other Information	Basin Ranking Score **	Ov Bi Pri	verall Basin Fiority	Impact Comments Other Information Comments
24	5-21.64	SACRAMENTO VALLEY	NORTH AMERICAN	Sacramento	NCRO	340,170	531.5	5 832,746	5 3	3	4	3	4	5	2	3.5	1	1	22.5	F	High	From B118: Elevated levels of TDS, chloride, sodium, From B118: groundwater levels in southwestern Placer
				River																		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. 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
25	4-6	PLEASANT VALLEY		South Coast	SRO	21,654	1 33.8	3 69,392	2 3	3	4	1.5	5	5	5	5	1	0	22.5	F	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.
26	5-22.07	SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY	DELTA-MENDOTA	San Joaquin	SCRO	746,697	7 1,166.7	7 107,879	9 1	5	1	2.25	5	4	2	3	2	3	22.3	F	High	Overdraft issues in basin discussed in San Luis and Delta Important agricultural region.
				River																		Mendota Water Authority GWMP
27	5-22.12	SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY	TULARE LAKE	Tulare Lake	SCRO	524,539	819.6	5 125,701	1	4	1	2.25	5	5	3	4	5	0	22.3	F	High	Subsidence, overdraft, water quality degradation
28	5-22.13	SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY	TULE	Tulare Lake	SCRO	469,959	9 734.3	3 108,660	0 1	4	2	2.25	5	5	3	4	4	0	22.3	ŀ	High	Critical aquifer overdraft conditions in basin. High Nitrate and TDS in some locations and some inorganic contamination issues.
29	5-21.65	SACRAMENTO VALLEY	SOUTH AMERICAN	Sacramento River	NCRO	247,745	5 387.2	1 718,113	3 3	3	4	3.75	3	3	2	2.5	3	0	22.3	F	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)
30	5-21.67	SACRAMENTO VALLEY	YOLO	Sacramento River	NCRO	225,718	3 352.7	7 194,158	3 2	3	3	3.75	5	5	2	3.5	2	0	22.3	F	High	Localized TDS problems preclude using gw for some M&I uses without treatment. Some subsidence in northeast of Davis and in northern Yolo.
31	4-8	LAS POSAS VALLEY		South Coast	SRO	42,353	3 66.2	39,835	5 2	2	3	2.25	5	5	5	5	3	0	22.3	ŀ	High	TDS is generally high in this basin. REH - Pubic Comment includes reports of subsidence, overdraft and saline intrusion (chloride from adjacient basin?)
32	3-1	SOQUEL VALLEY		Central Coast	SCRO	2,515	5 3.9	9 18,634	l 5	2	5	3.75	1	5	4	4.5	1	0	22.3	F	High	Water quality degradation, saline intrusion issues.
33	5-27	CUMMINGS VALLEY		Tulare Lake	SCRO	10,051	1 15.7	7 7,665	5 2	5	4	3	3	3	5	4	0	1	22.0	H	High	Adjudicated basin
34	3-8	LOS OSOS VALLEY		Central Coast	SCRO	6,994	10.9	9 13,948	3 3	0	5	0	4	3	3	3	5	2	22.0	F	High	Documented saline intrusion due to "serious" overdraft, also nitrate impairment. Also add one point due to total well count error for this hasin
35	6-42	UPPER MOJAVE RIVER VALLEY		South Lahontan	n SRO	415,295	648.9	355,338	3 2	5	3	0.75	1	2	4	3	5	2	21.8	ŀ	High	Overdraft. Water quality impacts in basin including nitrates, inorganics, and fuel additives, etc. Superfund site within basin.
36	4-4.06	SANTA CLARA RIVER VALLEY	PIRU	South Coast	SRO	8,915	5 13.9	9 2,666	5 1	4	3	0.75	5	5	5	5	3	0	21.8	ŀ	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)
37	6-44	ANTELOPE VALLEY		South Lahontan	n SRO	1,014,596	5 1,585.3	3 398,864	1 2	4	2	1.5	1	1	5	3	5	3	21.5	ŀ	High	Closed basin. Water quality impacts per IRWMP, DWR B- 118, and other sources. Extractions likely exceed natural recharge
38	5-22.03	SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY	TURLOCK	San Joaquin	SCRO	347,146	542.4	197,605	5 2	3	3	3	5	5	2	3.5	2	0	21.5	F	High	Groundwater overdraft documented in local GWMP.
39	5-21.58	SACRAMENTO VALLEY	WEST BUTTE	River Sacramento River	NRO	181,479	283.6	5 36,152	2 1	4	2	3	5	5	2	3.5	2	1	21.5	F	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.
40	5-22.05	SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY	CHOWCHILLA	San Joaquin	SCRO	159,319	248.9	9 15,820	0 1	4	2	2.25	5	5	3	4	3	0	21.3	F	High	Overdraft, subsidence, water quality degradation
41	4-13	SAN GABRIEL VALLEY		South Coast	SRO	127,278	3 198.9	9 1,275,187	7 5	1	5	2.25	0	5	3	4	3	1	21.3	F	High	Superfund sites are present within the basin and other Adjudication (aka Six Basins)
42	8-2.06	UPPER SANTA ANA VALLEY	BUNKER HILL	South Coast	SRO	80,972	2 126.5	5 363,394	4 4	1	5	2.25	2	3	3	3	3	1	21.3	ŀ	High	areas with water quality impacts are known. The Bunker Hill sub-basin is impacted with PCE and TCE Adjudication (Western San Bernardino) from the Newmark Superfund site and with perchlorate from the Crafton-Redlands plume.
43	8-4	ELSINORE		South Coast	SRO	25,873	3 40.4	60,946	5 3	4	4	2.25	1	2	4	3	3	1	21.3	F	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
44	8-1	COASTAL PLAIN OF ORANGE		South Coast	SRO	223,222	2 348.8	2,309,966	5 5	2	4	3.75	0	5	5	5	1	0	20.8	Me	edium	Saline intrusion issues.
1		COUNTY							1	<u> </u>									1			

												Data	Comp	onent	Ranking V	alue			Overall	Ranking	
		CASGEM	Groundwater Basi	n Prioritization	n Results									Grou	undwater	Reliance					
			Sorted by Overall	Basin Score						чţ	ells		e								
Basin count	Basin Number	Basin Name	Sub-Basin Name	Hydrologic Region	DWR Region Office	Basin / Acres	Area Sq. Mile	2010 Population	Population	Population Grow	Public Supply W	Total Wells *	Irrigated Acreag	GW Use **	Percent of Total Supply **	GW Reliance Total	Impacts	Other Information	Overall Basin Ranking Score ***	Overall Basin Priority	Impact Con
45	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. A intrusion problem and a seawat
46	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	effect to reduce seawater intrus Two isolated areas in the Sonon substantial declines in gw eleval that 43 underground fuel tank le basin (unpublished B-118 data) Consulting Engineers 1999)
47 48	4-23 3-4.08	RAYMOND SALINAS VALLEY	SEASIDE AREA	South Coast Central Coast	SRO SCRO	26,310 25,903	41.1 40.5	223,100 65,899	5 3	2 0	5 4	0.75 3.75	01	5 3	5 5	5	3 5	0	20.8 20.8	Medium Medium	Water quality impacts and a sup Seawater intrusion in Coastal ba
49	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	pumping Overdraft. Documented impacts (B-118)
50	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 impa Nitrates problematic during dry 118). REH - PubComm indicted V
51	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
52	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 significant MCL. Other inorganics present a to be high
53	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 leve the northern basin (SCVWD 200 some wells in the southern port
54	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 TMDL temperature issues along
55	5-21.54	SACRAMENTO VALLEY	ANTELOPE	Sacramento	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.
56	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
57	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 alo Co. Moderately declining GW le High TDS shallow aquifer in Max
58	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 Bulletin 118.
59	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 increadeper aquifers since first docu
60	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 <sup>-</sup>
61	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 ove
62	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 artesia the east and northeast side of th water in west-central side of val arsenic. & sodium).
63	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 b in some wells (B-118).
64	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
65	7-21.01	COACHELLA VALLEY		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 du imported water. Local areas of e
66	4-11.01	COASTAL PLAIN OF LOS ANGELES	SANTA MONICA	South Coast	SRO	31,846	49.8	465,606	5	3	2	3.75	U	2	3	2.5	3	0	19.3	Medium	groundwater production and loc

omments	Other Information Comments
s. Adjudicated basin. Saline ater barrier project is in usion.	
oma Valley indicate vations and RWQCB report c leaks have occurred in the a) (Ludhorff & Scalmanini	
uperfund.	
basin due to excessive	
cts of nitrates and sulfates.	
pairments in the basin; ry periods; High TDS, etc. (B- d WQ is localized and being	
	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).
intly in the basin, and above t above MCL. TDS is known	
evels have been observed in 001). Elevated nitrate in rtion of the Basin (SCVWD).	
n portions of the basin. ng 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.
s.	
long the west-side of Glenn levels in the Capay area. axwell- Williams area.	Adjudicated basin Increase in housing development along I5. GW- SW interaction is important to maintaining waterfowl refuges. Area is being highlighted as solution area for Delta outflow issuesproposed increase in CU and GW pumping.
ve shown contamination per	Basin is adjudicated.
eased landward and into cumented in the 1920's.(B-	
d TDS in the basin.(B-118)	
ver most of the basin.	This basin is becoming increasing dependent on GW due to uncertain reliability of CVP TCCA surface water supply.
ian well production along the valley. Poor quality valley (boron, fluoride,	
l by nitrates and inorganics	
	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
due to Colorado River f elevated fluoride. o significant reduction in ocally high TDS.	

												Data	Comp	onent	Ranking V	alue			Overall	Ranking	
		CASGEM	Groundwater Basi	n Prioritization	Results							Duta	l	Grou	Indwater	Reliance			overail		
			Sorted by Overall	Basin Score						f	ells		a				-				
Basin count	Basin Number	Basin Name	Sub-Basin Name	Hydrologic Region	DWR Region Office	Basin Acres	Area Sq. Mile	2010 Population	Population	Population Grow	Public Supply We	rotal Wells *	rrigated Acreage	GW Use **	Percent of Total Supply **	GW Reliance Fotal	mpacts	Other nformation	Overall Basin Ranking Score ***	Overall Basin Priority	Impact Con
67	5-22.15	SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY	TRACY	San Joaquin	NCRO	344,884	538.9	268,175	2	4	3	3	5	1	1	1	1	0	19.0	Medium	Poor water quality throughout t
68	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
69	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 M problems with nitrates, inorgani VOCs. Desalination generally rec basin.
70	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 widesprea known to be high in places. Duri experienced water level decline: per GWMP.
71	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	
72	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.
73	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	
74	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	
75	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 report to high levels of nitrates reporte
76	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 shallow wells in the upland area Generally poor quality gw south seawater intrusion in tidal reach contamination.(B-118) unpublisl
77	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	
78	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 contamina
79	6-5.01	TAHOE VALLEY	TAHOE SOUTH	North Lanontan	NCRU	14,814	23.1	. 25,967	3	U	5	3.75	0	4	5	4.5	2	U	18.3	Medium	groundwater supply within its for of 34 production wells unusable wells. (B-118) & (Berghson 2000
80	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 2
81	4-3.01	VENTURA RIVER VALLEY	UPPER VENTURA RIVER	South Coast	SRO	7,430	11.6	5 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
82	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 domestic and agricultural uses (I NO3, and TDS concentrations ar Use; Cl, B, and TDS are locally hi
83	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. S with Clear Lake.
84	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	
85	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	
86	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	Locally, sulfator and alterator and
8/	9-6			South Coast	SKO	18,342	28.7	1,993	1	3	3	3	2	2	5	3.5		1	17.5	ivieaium	(DWR 1975). Nitrate concentrations and nitrates are (DWR 1975). Nitrate concentrations (Mayle 1976).
88	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 Also some groundwater quality i
89	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	
90	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	Dealining Obt laurals 1
91	1-2.01	KLAMATH RIVER VALLEY	TULELAKE	North Coast	NRO	85,934	134.3	2,261	1	0		0.75	5	5	2	3.5	4	2	17.3	Medium	Declining GW levels in lower aqu issues. On-going high volume of associated with surface water cu Project and gw transfers associa

mments	Other Information Comments
the subbasin.(B-118)	
ty (B-118). GAMA reported	Parts of the subbasin are adjudicated.
MWD. B-118 indicates nics, radiologicals, and equired in all areas of the	
ad (B-118). TDS is also ring dry years, the basin has es up to 20 feet in one year	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.
	Basin is adjudicated.
	Estimated overdraft for the north-central portion of the basin ins estimated at 1,180 af/yr (Santa Barbara Water Conservation Element. 2009)
rted in the basin. Medium ted in the basin.	
e contamination affecting ea NW of Petaluma. h of Petaluma. Potential for ches. Increasing MTBE ished data).	
nation in basin	
had a major impact on the service area, resulting in 12 le and the destruction of 2 10).	
24 wells tested (B-118)	
ne parts of the basin (B-118).	
sin is marginal to inferior for (DWR 1967). Mg, SO4, Cl, are locally high for domestic. nigh for ag use (DWR 1975).	Basin is federally adjudicated.
Strong GW-SW interaction	
	GW basin provides underflow to Butte Creek which supports endangered spring-run salmon.
re high for domestic use ations reach as much as 128	Basin is federally adjudicated.
ed by the county in the past. y impairments.	
quifer. Local GW Quality of gw being extracted cutbacks from Klamath iated with Klamath Basin	Interstate gw transfer issue. Strong sw-gw interaction and fisheries issues. Potential intra- basin issues associated with increased annual extraction.

					- II							Data	Comp	onent	Ranking V	alue			Overall	Ranking	
		CASGEM (	Groundwater Basi	n Prioritization	Results									Grou	undwater	Reliance					
			Sorted by Overall	Basin Score						vth	/ells		e		_				Overall		
Basin count	Basin Number	Basin Name	Sub-Basin Name	Hydrologic Region	DWR Region Office	Basin Acres	Area	2010 Population	opulation	opulation Grov	ublic Supply W	rotal Wells *	rrigated Acreag	GW Use **	<sup>2</sup> ercent of Total Supply **	3W Reliance Fotal	mpacts	Other nformation	Basin Ranking Score ***	Overall Basin Priority	Impact Con
92	2-10	LIVERMORE VALLEY		San Francisco	NCRO	69,531	108.6	5 196,658	3	3	3	3.75	2	1	2	1.5	1	0	17.3	Medium	Some areas have boron concent
93	5-6.04	REDDING AREA	ENTERPRISE	Bay Sacramento	NRO	60,862	95.1	68,627	2	3	4	3.75	2	2	1	1.5	0	1	17.3	Medium	(B-118 & Sorenson et. al. 1985).
94	4-4.03	SANTA CLARA RIVER VALLEY	MOUND	River South Coast	SRO	14,846	j 23.2	2 77,886	4	2	1	2.25	3	3	5	4	1	0	17.3	Medium	Some primary and secondary ind
95	6-67	MARTIS VALLEY		North Lahontan	NCRO	36,381	. 56.8	3 14,743	2	4	3	3	0	3	5	4	0	1	17.0	Medium	above the MCL (B-118).
96	3-3.04	GILROY-HOLLISTER VALLEY	SAN JUAN BAUTISTA	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 T
97	1-10	EEL RIVER VALLEY		North Coast	NRO	73,701	. 115.2	2 21,558	1	2	2	2.25	4	4	4	4	0	1	16.3	Medium	
98	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 deposit along the tidal portions of Sonor 43 underground fuel tank leaks (unpublished B-118 data) (Ludho
99	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, over
100	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 levels in west-side subdivision, a
101	5-6.01	REDDING AREA	BOWMAN	Sacramento	NRO	78,426	122.5	5 7,165	1	5	2	3	2	2	2	2	1	0	16.0	Medium	Some localized high boron.
102	6-43	EL MIRAGE VALLEY		South Lahontan	SRO	76,292	119.2	2 10,933	1	4	2	0.75	1	1	5	3	4	0	15.8	Medium	Groundwater levels have decline the basin, some have recovered to inferior for domestic and irrig Some documented VOCs issues
103	7-21.02	COACHELLA VALLEY	MISSION CREEK	Colorado River	SRO	48,966	76.5	5 18,974	1	5	2	0.75	0	3	5	4	2	1	15.8	Medium	Radiological and nitrate issues ir
104	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	
105	5-15	BIG VALLEY		Sacramento	NRO	24,212	37.8	6,344	- 1	2	2	3.75	3	4	4	4	0	0	15.8	Medium	
106	9-15	SAN DIEGO RIVER VALLEY		South Coast	SRO	9,944	15.5	5 45,800	4	1	3	3.75	1	3	1	2	1	0	15.8	Medium	High Nitrates, Iron and Mangane high TDS (>3,000 mg/l) in wester
107	5-21.66	SACRAMENTO VALLEY	SOLANO	Sacramento	NCRO	424,832	663.8	3 119,263	1	3	2	3	5	2	1	1.5	0	0	15.5	Medium	
108	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 eas above MCL for inorganics and N
109	1-3	BUTTE VALLEY		North Coast	NRO	79,689	124.5	5 1,464	1	0	1	1.5	4	5	5	5	2	1	15.5	Medium	Some high TDS wells. Declining (
110	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 has been impaired from natural and superfund sites from militar
111	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 yes
112	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	
113	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	
114	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	]

omments	Other Information Comments
entrations exceeding 2 mg/L	
5].	Strong SW-GW interaction and endangered Sac River
inorganic contaminants	saimon runs
	Strong SW-GW interaction with Martis Creek, as per 2013
n TDS	GWMP
	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
sits near San Pablo Bay and noma creek. RWQCB reports ks have occurred in the basin Ihorff & Scalmanini, 1999).	storage.
verdraft as per B-118, declining gw I, and very high number of	
ined significantly in parts of ed. Water is rated marginal rigation purposes. (B-118). es also.	
s in the basin (B-118).	Mission Creek GW also supplies drinking water to Desert Hot Springs and part of Indio subbasins
	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 tributarieswhich support endangered fishery.
anese treatment is required, tern portion of basin	
eastern side of subbasin. PSW Nitrates (B-118).	
g GW levels over the last 5- al acreage	Strong sw-gw interaction and reliance of gw for Meiss Lake wildlife area
n overdraft. Water quality al sources, leaking tanks, tary bases.	Basin is adjudicated. USGS reports GW Level declines of 100 ft since the 1930s
years. Some wells have been to high nitrates.	Most demand for basin is concentrated in north in a small area.
	GW Basin contributes to surface water flow in the Scott River which supports an threatened/endangered salmon. Adjudicated basin. Currently being reviewed for Public Trust issues regarding GW management.
	Basin is adjudicated.

CASGEM Groundwate					- I.							Data C	Compo	nent F	Ranking V	alue			Overall	Ranking		
		CASGEM	Groundwater Basil	n Prioritization	n Results									Grou	ndwater	Reliance				8	1	
			Sorted by Overall	Basin Score						٨t	ells		a			1						
Basin	Basin	Basin Name	Sub-Basin Name	Hydrologic	DWR Region	Basin	Area	2010	tion	tion Grow	upply We	/ells *	d Acreage	*	t of Total **	iance	5	ation	Overall Basin Ranking	Overall Basin Priority	Impact Comments	Other Information Comments
count	Number			Region	Office	Acres	Sq. Mile	Population	Popula	Popula	Public 9	Total M	Irrigate	GW Us	Percen	GW Re Total	Impact	Other Inform:	Score ***	,		
115	3-14	SAN ANTONIO CREEK VALLEY		Central Coast	SRO	81,941	1 128.0	) 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
116	3-4.10	SALINAS VALLEY	CORRAL DE TIERRA AREA	Central Coast	SCRO	22,274	4 34.8	3 7,831	1	3	4	3	0	3	5	4	0	0	15.0	Medium		
117	6-54	INDIAN WELLS VALLEY		South Lahontan	SRO	383,492	2 599.2	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	
118	2-9.04	SANTA CLARA VALLEY	EAST BAY PLAIN	San Francisco Bay	NCRO	77,292	2 120.8	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) & (DW/CCB 1999)	
119	5-21.61	SACRAMENTO VALLEY	SOUTH YUBA	Sacramento River	NCRO	104,486	6 163.3	3 45,014	2	1	3	3	4	2	1	1.5	0	0	14.5	Medium		
120	8-9	BEAR VALLEY		South Coast	SRO	19,667	7 30.7	7 16,866	2	1	5	3	0	2	3	2.5	1	0	14.5	Medium	Fluoride problems in some wells (B-118).	
121	5-21.60	SACRAMENTO VALLEY	NORTH YUBA	Sacramento River	NCRO	103,152	2 161.2	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
122	3-21	SANTA CRUZ PURISIMA FORMATION		Central Coast	SCRO	40,166	6 62.8	3 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 westwhich are in various stages of overdraft.
123	5-21.56	SACRAMENTO VALLEY	LOS MOLINOS	Sacramento River	NRO	33,148	8 51.8	3 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
124	6-12	OWENS VALLEY		South Lahontan	SRO	663,458	8 1,036.7	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
125	3-13	CUYAMA VALLEY		Central Coast	SRO	242,114	4 378.3	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
126	5-21.55	SACRAMENTO VALLEY	DYE CREEK	Sacramento River	NRO	27,709	9 43.3	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.
127	5-4	BIG VALLEY		Sacramento River	NRO	92,050	0 143.8	3 1,046	1	0	1	1.5	4	3	3	3	3	0	13.5	Medium	Declining GW Levels over much of the basin.	
128	9-1	SAN JUAN VALLEY		South Coast	SRO	16,797	7 26.2	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.	
129	4-9	SIMI VALLEY		South Coast	SRO	12,192	2 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)	
130	4-10	CONEJO		South Coast	SRO	18,848	8 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	
131	7-38	PALO VERDE VALLEY		Colorado River	SRO	74,004	4 115.6	5 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
132	5-5	FALL RIVER VALLEY		Sacramento River	NRO	54,803	3 85.6	5 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	
133	6-4	HONEY LAKE VALLEY		North Lahontan	NRO	311,741	1 487.1	L 23,566	1	0	1	2.25	2	2	2	2	2	2	12.3	Low	springs, tisheries) 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.
134	7-21.03	COACHELLA VALLEY	DESERT HOT SPRINGS	Colorado River	SRO	101,862	2 159.2	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.	
135	5-22.10	SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY	PLEASANT VALLEY	Tulare Lake	SCRO	145,782	2 227.8	3 34,213	1	3	0	0.75	3	3	5	4	0	0	11.8	Low	an alamata da bish lavala af b	
136	5-21.68	SACKAIVIENTO VALLEY	CAPAY VALLEY	Sacramento	NCRO	24,970	J 39.0	550	1	U	1	3	3	2	3	2.5	1	U	11.5	Low	moderate to high levels of boron.	
137	1-18	RED ROCK VALLEY		North Coast	NRO	8,996	6 14.1	1 23	0	0	0	1.5	5	5	5	5	0	0	11.5	Low		

		CASGEM	Groundwater Basi	in Prioritization	Posulte							Data	Comp	onent	Ranking V	alue			Overall	Ranking	
		CASGEINI	Sorted by Overal	ll Basin Score	Results					-	s			Grou	undwater	Reliance					
		1	Solice by Overal		1			1		wth	Vell		ge		-				Overall		
Basin count	Basin Number	Basin Name	Sub-Basin Name	Hydrologic Region	DWR Region Office	Acres	Area Sq. Mile	2010 Population	Population	Population Gro	Public Supply V	Total Wells *	Irrigated Acrea	GW Use **	Percent of Tota Supply **	GW Reliance Total	Impacts	Other Information	Basin Ranking Score ***	Overall Basin Priority	Impact Co
138	6-41	MIDDLE MOJAVE RIVER VALLEY	1	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 impairme and irrigation effluents. Waste also affected groundwater qual
139	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
140	7-5	CHUCKWALLA VALLEY		Colorado River	SRO	608,995	951.6	7,853	8 1	0	1	0.75	1	0	4	2	3	2	10.8	Low	Sulfate, chloride, fluoride, and for domestic use (DWR 1975). I concentrations, and high sodiu groundwater for irrigation use
141	6-46	FREMONT VALLEY		South Lahontan	SRO	336,682	2 526.1	16,883	3 1	0	1	0.75	0	1	5	3	5	0	10.8	Low	Basin has naturally high TDS loc Groundwater levels have show throughout the basin
142	5-2.01	ALTURAS AREA	SOUTH FORK PITT RIVER	Sacramento River	NRO	114,164	178.4	4,429	9 1	0	1	1.5	4	2	2	2	1	0	10.5	Low	Declining GW Levels in some pa
143	6-47	HARPER VALLEY		South Lahontan	SRO	411,827	643.5	1,634	ł O	0	1	0.75	1	1	1	1	5	1	9.8	Low	Extensive chromium issues wel addition, water quality of the b inferior for irrigation and dome concentrations of boron, fluori
144	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 fror of subsidence from overdraft o and TDS (B-118).
145	5-2.02	ALTURAS AREA	WARM SPRINGS	Sacramento River	NRO	68,009	106.3	964	1	0	1	1.5	3	2	2	2	0	1	9.5	Low	
146	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, chlo TDS concentrations are high (D)
147	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 Q sulfate, high TDS, and thermal of the basin
148	7-10	TWENTYNINE PALMS VALLEY		Colorado River	SRO	62,829	98.2	22,113	8 1	2	0	0.75	1	1	5	3	1	0	8.8	Low	Some wells in the basin exceed for drinking water in fluoride, T concentrations. Thermal water (DWR 1984)
149	7-8	BRISTOL VALLEY		Colorado River	SRO	501,834	784.1	27	7 0	0	1	0.75	1	0	5	2.5	3	0	8.3	Low	Fluoride content in some wells MCL level (C-118). TDS content wells near Bristol Lake (DWR 19
150	7-44	NEEDLES VALLEY		Colorado River	SRO	89,101	139.2	4,902	2 1	0	2	0.75	1	0	1	0.5	3	0	8.3	Low	Concentrations of sulfate, chlor content levels are high in the b
151	6-2	MADELINE 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 w (high TDS, nitrates, boron, ASA
152	1-2.02	KLAMATH RIVER VALLEY	LOWER KLAMATH	North Coast	NRO	75,333	8 117.7	41	0	0	0	0.75	3	3	3	3	1	0	7.8	Low	GW Quality issues in refuge are for deep wells.
153	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 locally impair groundwater for
154	6-14	FISH LAKE VALLEY		South Lahontan	SRO	48,333	8 75.5	36	5 0	0	0	0.75	2	3	5	4	0	0	6.8	Low	
155	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	
156	6-18	DEATH VALLEY		South Lahontan	SRO	926,496	5 1,447.7	190	0 0	0	1	0.75	1	0	5	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
157	7-3	WARD VALLEY		Colorado River	SRO	564,569	882.1	. 22	2 0	0	0	0.75	0	0	5	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
158	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	
159	6-20	MIDDLE AMARGOSA VALLEY		South Lahontan	SRO	392,862	613.8	230	0 0	0	1	0.75	0	0	5	0	4	0	0.0	Very Low	Water quality is rated inferior t purposes due to elevated fluori however, locally groundwater i

nments	Other Information Comments
nts for VOCs, salts, nitrates, vater treatment plant have ty. Some nitrates and	Basin is adjudicated.
uranium in some wells (B-	
DS concentrations are high igh of boron and TDS n percentage impair DWR 1975).	Significant growth in industry (solar), and others. Prison is also a significant user the the GW resources.
ally and other constituents. significant decline	
rts of the basin.	
known in Hinkley. In sin is generally marginal to tic uses because of high e, and sodium.	Adjudicated Basin
40 to 100 feet. Evidence basin. Locally high nitrates	Fall 1954 - Fall 2002 Change in GW Storage is estimated at 460TAF (Napoli)
	40' declining in GW levels since 2000, along the west side of the basin.
ride, boron, sulfate, and VR 1975).	
ality issues (sodium vaters) in various portions	
the recommended levels DS, and sulfate also occur in this basin	
exceeds the recommended s extremely high in some 67).	
de, fluoride, and TDS sin (DWR 1975).	
ter quality issues . etc)	
a. High temp and high TDS	
fluoride concentrations omestic and irrigation use.	
e marginal for domestic de and boron contents; of good quality. (B-118)	

r									T			Data	C		Daulinav	(a)a			Quantum	Development	
		CASGEM	Groundwater Basi	n Prioritization	Results						1	Data	Comp	onent	Kanking V	alue	r		Overall	Kanking	4
			Sorted by Overall	Basin Score						۽	s			Gro	undwater	Reliance					
					1	Basin	Area			Ň	Ne		age		a				Overall	0	
Basin count	Basin Number	Basin Name	Sub-Basin Name	Hydrologic Region	DWR Region Office	Acres	Sq. Mile	2010 Population	Population	Population Gro	Public Supply \	Total Wells *	Irrigated Acrea	GW Use **	Percent of Tot Supply **	GW Reliance Total	Impacts	Other Information	Basin Ranking Score ***	Overali Basin Priority	Impact Con
160	6-33	SODA LAKE VALLEY		South Lahontan	SRO	383,560	599.3	3 750	0 0	0	1	0.75	0	0	5	0	5	0	0.0	Very Low	Groundwater quality is rated ma domestic and irrigation purpose on 66 analyses showing elevated fluoride, boron, and TDS. Geotra
161	7-43	CHEMEHUEVI VALLEY		Colorado River	SRO	275,713	430.8	395	6 0	0	0	0.75	0	0	5	0	3	0	0.0	Very Low	Concentrations of sulfate, chlori high (DWR 1975).
162	7-7	CADIZ VALLEY		Colorado River	SRO	272,931	426.5	5 10	0	0	0	0.75	0	0	5	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
163	6-58	PANAMINT VALLEY		South Lahontan	SRO	260,754	407.4	1 7	0	0	1	0.75	0	0	5	0	4	0	0.0	Very Low	Water from most wells located or ranked inferior for domestic use for irrigation purposes.
164	7-37	ARROYO SECO VALLEY		Colorado River	SRO	259,806	405.9	9 6	6 0	0	1	0.75	0	0	5	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
165	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	
166	6-21	LOWER KINGSTON VALLEY		South Lahontan	SRO	241,892	378.0	) C	0 0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0.0	Very Low	Groundwater is inferior for dom due to elevated fluoride, chlorid (B-118)
167	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 domestic and agricultural uses (i concentrations impair for dome concentrations impair agricultur 1979). USGS data shows declinir
168 169	3-19 6-30	CARRIZO PLAIN IVANPAH VALLEY		Central Coast South Lahontan	SRO SRO	210,896 200,155	329.5 312.7	5 <u>440</u> 40	0 0	0	1	0.75	2 0	0	1 5	0	0 4	0	0.0 0.0	Very Low Very Low	Basin groundwater is rated marg domestic and irrigational use be and sodium (R-118)
170	6-52	SEARLES VALLEY		South Lahontan	SRO	198,115	309.6	5 1,651	. 0	0	0	0.75	0	0	5	0	5	0	0.0	Very Low	Water locally beneficial in the no unsuitable for beneficial uses du of fluoride, boron, sodium, chlor Water levels have declined due
171	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	evaporates
172	7-4	RICE VALLEY		Colorado River	SRO	190,622	297.8	3 23	0	0	0	0.75	0	0	5	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
173	7-6	PINTO VALLEY		Colorado River	SRO	184,377	288.1	1 7	0	0	1	0.75	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
174	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 infe irrigation purposes due to elevat 118).
175	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	
176	6-9	MONO VALLEY		South Lahontan	SRO	173,299	270.8	385	6 0	0	1	0.75	0	0	5	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
177	7-1	LANFAIR VALLEY		Colorado River	SRO	158,360	247.4	l 19	0	0	0	0.75	0	0	5	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
178	7-29	COYOTE WELLS VALLEY		Colorado River	SRO	147,088	229.8	3 374	0	0	1	0.75	0	0	5	0	4	0	0.0	Very Low	Basin is in overdraft (B-118). The and elevated TDS in some of the basin.
179	6-17	SALINE VALLEY		South Lahontan	SRO	146,850	229.5	5 O	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0.0	Very Low	GW Quality Impairments: High T groundwater is inferior for dome
180	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 T high (DWR 1975). GW near towr concentrations making water un sodium contents make water ma
181	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	
182	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	
183	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	Very Low	

mments	Other Information Comments
narginal to inferior for both	
ed concentrations of	
racker shows many LUST	
ride, fluoride, and TDS are	
d on the valley floor is se and marginal to inferior	
mostic or irrigation surges	
ide, boron, sulfate and TDS	
s generally unsuitable for (DWR 1979). TDS and F estic use, and B and Na ural use in basin (DWR ing water	
rginal to inferior for both because of elevated fluoride	
north, but generally due to high concentrations oride, sulfate, and TDS. e to pumping for	
ferior for domestic or rated fluoride and TDS (B-	
here are local fluoride issues ne shallower wells in the	
TDS and Fluorides,	
TDS concentrations are vn of Vidal has fluoride unusable domestically and narginal for irrigation.	

		CACCENA						Data	Comp	onent	Ranking V	alue			Overall	Ranking					
1	CASGEM Groundwater Basin Prioritization Results Sorted by Overall Basin Score									_	S			Gro	undwater	Reliance					1
	1		Softed by Overall	Dasin Score		Desta	A	1		wth	Vella		ge		F				Overall		
Basin count	Basin Number	Basin Name	Sub-Basin Name	Hydrologic Region	DWR Region Office	Acres	Area Sq. Mile	2010 Population	opulation	opulation Gro	ublic Supply V	rotal Wells *	rrigated Acrea	GW Use **	<sup>o</sup> ercent of Tota Supply **	3W Reliance Fotal	mpacts	Other nformation	Basin Ranking Score ***	Overall Basin Priority	Impact Com
184	7-34	AMOS VALLEY		Colorado River	SRO	131,584	4 205.6	; g	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
185	7-32	CHOCOLATE VALLEY		Colorado River	SRO	130,507	7 203.9	658	8 0	0	0	0.75	0	0	0	0	4	0	0.0	Very Low	Groundwater quality impairment fluoride, boron, and TDS (B-118). were found in nearly all mineral a
186	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	
187	6-35	CRONISE VALLEY		South Lahontan	SRO	127,313	8 198.9	2	0	0	0	0.75	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
188	7-36	YUMA VALLEY		Colorado River	SRO	125,741	196.5	3,146	5 1	0	1	0.75	3	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
189	7-28	VALLECITO-CARRIZO VALLEY		Colorado River	SRO	122,943	3 192.1	77	0	0	1	0.75	0	0	5	0	3	0	0.0	Very Low	Groundwater quality is marginal f of elevated levels of fluoride and
190	6-49	SUPERIOR VALLEY		South Lahontan	SRO	121,084	189.2	c C	0	0	1	0.75	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
191	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 loca and chloride contents (DWR 1975 about 1,000 mg/L southwest of Er
192	7-22	WEST SALTON SEA		Colorado River	SRO	106,408	3 166.3	5,352	1	0	0	0.75	0	0	5	0	3	0	0.0	Very Low	Groundwater is marginal to poor irrigation use because of elevated
193	7-14	LAVIC VALLEY		Colorado River	SRO	103,132	2 161.1	. C	0	0	0	0.75	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	100.
194	7-31	OROCOPIA VALLEY		Colorado River	SRO	97,214	151.9	2,243	8 1	0	0	0.75	0	3	5	2.5	1	0	0.0	Very Low	Some natural occurrences of elen
195	6-24	RED PASS VALLEY		South Lahontan	SRO	97,088	3 151.7	, c	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	exceed drinking water standards.
196	6-50	CUDDEBACK VALLEY		South Lahontan	SRO	95,418	3 149.1	. 97	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	3	0	0.0	Very Low	Groundwater quality is ranked ma most beneficial uses due to eleva
197	6-28	PAHRUMP VALLEY		South Lahontan	SRO	93,747	7 146.5	99	0	0	0	0.75	0	2	5	0	2	0	0.0	Very Low	Water levels generally declining p NWIS. State of Nevada Departme has documented overdraft and su this basin (http://water.nv.gov/documents/
198	6-32	BROADWELL VALLEY		South Lahontan	SRO	92,688	3 144.8	8	8 0	0	1	0.75	0	0	5	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	<del>mp pdt)</del>
199	6-25	BICYCLE VALLEY		South Lahontan	SRO	90,100	140.8	C	0	0	1	0.75	0	0	0	0	3	0	0.0	Very Low	Elevated TDS and fluoride (B-118)
200	7-13.01	DEADMAN VALLEY	DEADMAN LAKE	Colorado River	SRO	89,793	3 140.3	22	0	0	0	0.75	0	0	5	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
201	6-29	MESQUITE VALLEY		South Lahontan	SRO	89,012	2 139.1	. 64	0	0	0	0.75	1	1	1	0	3	0	0.0	Very Low	Declining water levels. Locally hig portion of basin makes GW margi domestic uses (B-118)
202	6-37	COYOTE LAKE VALLEY		South Lahontan	SRO	88,735	5 138.6	99	0	0	0	0.75	0	0	5	0	4	0	0.0	Very Low	Groundwater quality is rated as ir both domestic and irrigation purp levels of fluoride, boron, sodium,
203	6-23	RIGGS VALLEY		South Lahontan	SRO	88,274	137.9	C	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
204	1-59	WILSON GROVE FORMATION		North Coast	NCRO	86,400	) 135.0	37,799	2	0	4	3.75	2	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	1
205	7-41	CALZONA VALLEY		Colorado River	SRO	81,708	3 127.7	1,608	8 1	0	0	0.75	0	0	5	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
206	5-25	KERN RIVER VALLEY		Tulare Lake	SCRO	79,678	3 124.5	10,364	1	1	4	2.25	1	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
207	/-18.01	JOHNSON VALLEY	SUGGY LAKE	Colorado River	SRO	77,865	121.7	354	F O	0	1	0.75	0	0	5	0	U	0	0.0	Very Low	
208	6-38	CAVES CANYON VALLEY		South Lahontan	SRO	73,542	2 114.9	88	8 0	0	1	0.75	0	0	0	0	3	0	0.0	Very Low	Suitability of groundwater quality irrigation and suitable to inferior 1964). Historical measurements s from 622 to 1,272 mg/L with an a (DWR 1964)

omments	Other Information Comments
ent due to elevated levels of .8). Elevated fluoride levels al analyses of groundwater.	
nal for domestic use because and mineral content.	
locally high TDS, fluoride, 975). TDS content reaches of Emerson Lake (MWA	
por for domestic and ated fluoride, boron, and	
elements or compounds that rds.	
I marginal to inferior for evated concentrations of	
ng per B-118 and USGS ment of Water Resources d subsidence conditions in	
nts/presentations/pahru	
.18).	
high TDS in southern arginal to inferior for	
as inferior to marginal for purposes because of elevated um, and TDS. (B-118).	
ality is rated inferior for	
ior for domestic use (DWR ts show TDS content ranging an average of 904 mg/L	

									1			Data	C			(a)			Quantum	Deviliere	
CASGEM Groundwater Basin Prioritization Results											-	Data	Comp	onent	Kanking v	alue			Overall	капкіпд	
			Sorted by Overall	Basin Score						ء	s			Grou	undwater	Reliance					
	1	I	·····, · · ·					1		¥	Vel		98		-				Overall		
Basin count	Basin Number	Basin Name	Sub-Basin Name	Hydrologic Region	DWR Region Office	Acres	Area Sq. Mile	2010 Population	Population	Population Gro	Public Supply V	Total Wells *	Irrigated Acrea	GW Use **	Percent of Tota Supply **	GW Reliance Total	Impacts	Other Information	Basin Ranking Score ***	Overall Basin Priority	Impact Com
209	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 with high TDS, fluoride, boron, a water quality suitable overall
210	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	water quality suitable overall.
211	5-6.05	REDDING AREA	MILLVILLE	Sacramento	NRO	65,226	101.9	2,640	1	0	1	2.25	2	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
212	6-27	LEACH VALLEY		South Lahontan	SRO	61,620	96.3	C C	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
213	6-84	GREENWATER VALLEY		South Lahontan	SRO	60,260	94.2	2 C	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
214	3-6	LOCKWOOD VALLEY		Central Coast	SCRO	59,933	93.6	5 1,171	1	0	2	1.5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
215	6-79	CALIFORNIA VALLEY		South Lahontan	SRO	58,639	91.6	6 O	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
216	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	
217	5-6.02	REDDING AREA	ROSEWOOD	Sacramento	NRO	46,455	72.6	1,009	1	0	0	2.25	2	1	2	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
218	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	
219	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	
220	2-2.03	NAPA-SONOMA VALLEY	NAPA-SONOMA	San Francisco Bay	NCRO	40,455	63.2	58,367	2	0	2	3	2	2	1	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
221	6-10	ADOBE LAKE VALLEY		South Lahontan	SRO	39,978	62.5	i 4	0	0	0	0.75	0	0	5	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
222	3-5	CHOLAME VALLEY		Central Coast	SCRO	39,847	62.3	48	0	0	1	0.75	2	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
223	7-15	BESSEMER VALLEY		Colorado River	SRO	39,379	61.5	6 O	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
224	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 Sout
225	1-9 5-1.01	EUREKA PLAIN GOOSE LAKE	GOOSE VALLEY	North Coast Sacramento	NRO NRO	37,405	58.4	50,231	2	1	1	0.75	3	2	4	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
227	6-34	SILVER LAKE VALLEY		River South Lahontan	SRO	35,519	55.5	6 O	0	0	0	0.75	0	0	0	0	4	0	0.0	Very Low	Groundwater in this basin is rate both domestic and irrigation use concentrations of fluoride, boror
228	7-18.02	JOHNSON VALLEY	UPPER JOHNSON	Colorado River	SRO	35,050	54.8	3 C	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
229	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	
230	6-100	SECRET VALLEY		North Lahontan	NRO	33,680	52.6	i 26	0	0	0	0.75	2	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
231	5-23	PANOCHE VALLEY		Tulare Lake	SCRO	33,090	51.7	41	0	0	0	0.75	1	0	5	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
232	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	
233	3-30	BITTER WATER VALLEY		Central Coast	SCRO SRO	32,222	50.3	38	0	0	0	0.75	2	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
234	0-15	BLACK SPRINGS VALLET		South Lanontan	360	50,911	40.5		0	0	0	0.75	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very LOW	
235	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
236	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	
237	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	
238	6-53	SALT WELLS VALLEY		South Lahontan	SRO	29,629	46.3	C	0	0	0	0.75	0	0	0	0	5	0	0.0	Very Low	The groundwater is rated inferio because of high TDS content that mg/L to 39,000 mg/L. Other imp concentrations of sodium, chlori 1964)
239	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	

omments	Other Information Comments
nal waters and some springs , and other elements, but	
	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
uth Bay groundwater basins	
ated marginal to inferior for ises because of elevated ron, and TDS. (B-118)	
nk problems.	
F	
rior for all beneficial uses hat ranges from about 4,000 npairments are elevated oride, and boron (DWR	

<b>r</b>									T				-							- I ·	T
		CASGEM	Groundwater Basi	n Prioritization	Results					-	-	Data	Comp	onent I	Ranking V	alue			Overall	Ranking	_
			Sorted by Overall	Basin Score						_	s			Grou	undwater	Reliance					
			Sorrea by Overall	Basin Score						ŧ	/ell		e		_				Overall		
Basin count	Basin Number	Basin Name	Sub-Basin Name	Hydrologic Region	DWR Region Office	Basin / Acres	Area Sq. Mile	2010 Population	pulation	pulation Gro	blic Supply M	tal Wells *	igated Acrea	V Use **	rcent of Tota pply **	V Reliance tal	pacts	her ormation	Basin Ranking Score ***	Overall Basin Priority	Impact Com
240	5-9	INDIAN VALLEY		Sacramento	NRO	29,413	46.0	) 1,718	<b>8</b> 1	<b>6</b>	2 <b>1</b>	<b>۲</b>	4	<u></u> 0	1 B	0	<u>ع</u> ٥	<u>5</u>	0.0	Very Low	<u> </u>
				River																-	
241	6-48	GOLDSTONE VALLEY		South Lahontan	SRO	28,287	44.2	: C	0	0	0	0.75	0	0	0	0	3	0	0.0	Very Low	Groundwater quality in the basin irrigation purposes and marginal of elevated concentrations of chl
242	6-26	AVAWATZ VALLEY		South Lahontan	SRO	27,826	6 43.5	6 C	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
243	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 f reached 9.0 mg/L, exceeding reco concentration levels of 1.4 mg/L
244	6-55	COSO VALLEY		South Lahontan	SRO	25,684	40.1	. C	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
245	1-8.02	MAD RIVER VALLEY	DOWS PRAIRIE	North Coast	NRO	25,570	40.0	23,086	5 2	1	3	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
246	7-40	QUIEN SABE POINT VALLEY		Colorado River	SRO	25,489	39.8	3 112	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
247	2-35	WESTSIDE		San Francisco Bay	NCRO	25,386	5 39.7	351,235	5	2	4	3.75	1	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
248	6-74	HARRISBURG FLATS		South Lahontan	SRO	25,077	39.2	2 1	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
249	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	-
250	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	
251	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 e fluoride contents near hot spring
252	1-21	FORT BRAGG TERRACE AREA		North Coast	NCRO	24,085	5 37. <del>6</del>	5 12,517	2	1	5	3.75	2	1	1	0	1	0	0.0	Very Low	The terrace deposits between Te Point and Alder Creek and Point /
253	6-45	TEHACHAPI VALLEY EAST		South Lahontan	SRO	24,055	37.6	6 480	) 1	0	2	2.25	1	0	3	0	5	0	0.0	Very Low	Court adjudicated basin in overdi
254	7-27	SAN FELIPE VALLEY		Colorado River	SRO	23,573	36.8	188	8 0	0	1	1.5	1	1	1	0	3	0	0.0	Very Low	Significant groundwater declines
255	6-71	LOST LAKE VALLEY		South Lahontan	SRO	23,414	36.6	5 C	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
256	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	
257	6-88	OWL LAKE VALLEY		South Lahontan	SRO	22,402	35.0	0 0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
258	6-76	BROWN MOUNTAIN VALLEY		South Lahontan	SRO	21,862	2 34.2	2 0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
259	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	
260	5-35	MCCLOUD AREA		Sacramento River	NRO	21,320	33.3	8 822	1	0	1	1.5	1	1	3	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
261	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	Very Low	
262	6-66	LEE FLAT		South Lahontan	SRO	20,380	31.8	s c	0	0	0	0.75	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
263	6-7	ANTELOPE VALLEY		North Lahontan	NCRO	20,125	31.4	876	5 1	0	3	2.25	5	0	1	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
264	1-25	PRAIRIE CREEK AREA		North Coast	NRO	20,013	31.3	8 4	0	0	0	0.75	0	1	5	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
265	6-36.01	LANGFORD VALLEY	LANGFORD WELL LAKE	South Lahontan	SRO	19,457	30.4	¢ С	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
266	5-11	MOHAWK VALLEY		Sacramento River	NRO	18,987	29.7	1,375	5 1	0	3	3	2	1	1	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
267	5-1.02	GOOSE LAKE	FANDANGO VALLEY	Sacramento River	NRO	18,439	28.8	3 124	0	0	1	1.5	4	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
268	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	
269	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	
270	2-5	CLAYTON VALLEY		San Francisco Bay	NCRO	17,836	5 27.9	73,287	4	1	2	3.75	1	1	1	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
271	6-94	GRASSHOPPER VALLEY		North Lahontan	NRO	17,665	5 27.6	i 0	0	0	0	0.75	1	0	2	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
272	7-51	LOST HORSE VALLEY		Colorado River	SRO	17,455	5 27.3	s 0	0	0	0	0.75	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	

omments	Other Information Comments
sin is rated as inferior for nal for domestic use because chloride, fluoride, and TDS.	
er from some wells has ecommended maximum ;/L (B-118, DWR 1984).	
le except for elevated ings	
Ten Mile River and Laguna nt Arena are susceptible to	
erdraft. Groundwater quality	
nes documented in the late 118)	

									1				~								
		CASGEM	Groundwater Basi	n Prioritization	Results							Data	Compo	onent	Ranking V	alue			Overall	Ranking	_
			Sorted by Overall	Basin Score						_	s			Grou	undwater	Reliance					
			Sorted by Overall	Dasin Score						Ŧ	elle		e								
Basin count	Basin Number	Basin Name	Sub-Basin Name	Hydrologic Region	DWR Region Office	Basin Acres	Area Sq. Mile	2010 Population	opulation	opulation Grov	ublic Supply W	otal Wells *	rigated Acreag	W Use **	ercent of Total upply **	W Reliance otal	npacts	ther Iformation	Overall Basin Ranking Score ***	Overall Basin Priority	Impact Com
273	6-68	ςανίτα βώςα εί ατ		South Labortan	SRO	16 861	26.3			<b></b>	<b>A</b>			0	<u> </u>	<u> </u>		0 5	0.0	VeryLow	
275	0-08	SANTA KUSA FLAT		South Lanontan	SRU	10,801	20.5	U	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	very Low	
274	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-2
275	5-58	CLOVER VALLEY		Sacramento	NRO	16,784	26.2	0	0	0	0	0.75	4	0	1	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
				River																	
276	2-11	SUNOL VALLEY		San Francisco	NCRO	16,623	26.0	808	1	0	0	2.25	1	1	3	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
277	1 1 1			Bay North Coast	NRO	16 206	25.6	1.069	1	F	2	2	4	1	1	0	0	0	0.0	Vondow	
277	6-86	RHODES HILL AREA		South Labortan	SRO	15,590	23.0	1,900	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
270	0.00			South Earlontain	5110	15,057	24.5		Ŭ	Ŭ	Ŭ	Ū	Ŭ	Ŭ	0	0	0	Ŭ	0.0	VCI y LOW	
279	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 groundwater levels have declined
280	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	
281	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	
282	7-56	YAQUI WELL AREA		Colorado River	SRO	15,098	3 23.6	4	0	0	1	0.75	0	1	5	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
283	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 concer locally.
284	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	
285	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	
286	5-46	LAKE BRITTON AREA		Sacramento	NRO	14,055	5 22.0	84	0	0	2	0.75	1	0	1	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
287	1-8.01	MAD RIVER VALLEY	MAD RIVER	North Coast	NRO	13,981	. 21.8	14,204	2	2	1	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
288	5-59	GRIZZLY VALLEY		Sacramento River	NRO	13,441	. 21.0	C	0	0	0	0.75	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
289	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	
290	5-50	NORTH FORK BATTLE CREEK		Sacramento	NRO	12,755	5 19.9	528	1	0	3	3	2	0	1	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
291	6-96	EAGLE LAKE AREA		River North Lahontan	NRO	12,700	) 19.8	41	. 0	0	0	2.25	0	1	5	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
202	0_11	SANITA ΜΑΡΙΑ VALLEY		South Coast	SRO	12 370	10.3	16 605	2	2	0	3 75	2	0	1	0	0	0	0.0	VeryLow	
293	6-3	WILLOW CREEK VALLEY		North Lahontan	NRO	11,698	8 18.3	62	0	0	0	1.5	4	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
294	2-4	PITTSBURG PLAIN		San Francisco	NCRO	11,607	/ 18.1	68,898	4	3	4	3.75	0	2	1	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
295	7-53	HEXIE MOUNTAIN AREA		Colorado River	SRO	11,236	5 17.6	C	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
296	6-69	KELSO LANDER VALLEY		South Lahontan	SRO	11,208	8 17.5	C	0	0	0	0.75	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
297	6-6	CARSON VALLEY		North Lahontan	NCRO	10,716	6 16.7	328	1	0	3	2.25	3	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
298	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 cor
299	6-64	MARBLE CANYON AREA		South Lahontan	SRO	10,422	16.3	C	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
300	4-11.02	COASTAL PLAIN OF LOS ANGELES	HOLLYWOOD	South Coast	SRO	10,108	3 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 wa
301	6-77	GRASS VALLEY		South Lahontan	SRO	10,034	15.7	C	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
302	1-13			North Coast	NRO	10,018	15.7	5,993	2	1	0	3.75	4	2	1	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
303	5-60	HUMBUG VALLEY		Sacramento	NRO	9,979	15.6	3,299	1	0	4	3.75	2	0	3	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
304	3-32	ΡΕΔΟΗ ΤΒΕΕ ΜΔΙΤΕΥ		Central Coast	SCRO	9 791	15.3	7	0	0	0	0.75	2	1	5	0	0	0	0.0	VeryLow	
305	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	1
306	6-92	PINE CREEK VALLEY		North Lahontan	NRO	9,526	5 14.9	C	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
307	6-61	CAMEO AREA		South Lahontan	SRO	9,349	14.6	C	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
308	2-22	HALF MOON BAY TERRACE		San Francisco	NCRO	9,189	) 14.4	19,825	3	3	5	3.75	3	1	3	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
309	5-64	BEAR VALLEY		Bay Sacramento	NRO	9,104	4.2	4	0	0	0	0.75	2	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
1	1		1	River	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		1		1	

omments	Other Information Comments
B-118)	
/R well data indicate ned gradually over the	
centrations are impairments	
concentrations.(B-118)	
water quality issues.	

r									T			Data				(a)a			Quarall	Development	
		CASGEM G	Froundwater Basi	n Prioritization	Results							Data	Comp	onent	Ranking V	alue	1	-	Overall	Ranking	_
			Sorted by Overall	Basin Score						ي	s			Gro	undwater	Reliance					
			-		1	Bacin	Area		-	5 A	Vel		age		<del>a</del>				Overall	<b>•</b>	
Basin count	Basin Number	Basin Name	Sub-Basin Name	Hydrologic Region	DWR Region Office	Acres	Sq. Mile	2010 Population	Population	Population Gre	Public Supply \	rotal Wells *	rrigated Acrea	GW Use **	Percent of Tot Supply **	GW Reliance Fotal	mpacts	Other Information	Basin Ranking Score ***	Basin Priority	Impact Con
310	6-81	BUTTE VALLEY		South Lahontan	SRO	8,853	13.8	(	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
311	1-49	ANNAPOLIS OHLSON RANCH FM		North Coast	NCRO	8,646	i 13.5	233	1	0	0	2.25	1	1	2	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
312	1-61	FORT ROSS TERRACE DEPOSITS		North Coast	NCRO	8,483	13.3	1,075	5 1	2	4	3	0	1	4	0	1	0	0.0	Very Low	Seawater intrusion is not a comr occurred in localized areas near Point (DWR 1982). The Terrace of Creek and Point Arena are susce
313	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 TI and two wells in the basin with l nitrates exceeding MCL (B-118).
314	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	······································
315	5-8	MOUNTAIN MEADOWS VALLEY		Sacramento River	NRO	8,145	12.7	C	0	0	0	0.75	4	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
316	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	
317	7-26	TERWILLIGER VALLEY		Colorado River	SRO	8,081	. 12.6	1,085	5 1	5	1	3	1	2	1	0	1	0	0.0	Very Low	Locally elevated nitrates (B-118)
318	1-17	BRAY TOWN AREA		North Coast	NRO	8,027	12.5	(	0	0	0	0.75	3	0	1	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
319	6-90	CADY FAULT AREA		South Lahontan	SRO	8,015	12.5	e	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
320	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	
321	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 c chloride, boron and TDS (B-118)
322	5-12.02	SIERRA VALLEY	CHILCOOT	Sacramento	NRO	7,551	. 11.8	308	8 1	0	3	3	3	1	1	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
323	5-69	YOSEMITE VALLEY		San Joaquin	SCRO	7,465	11.7	1,016	5 1	5	4	0.75	0	1	5	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
324	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 MCI 1985). MCL for aluminum, bariu silver concentrations are exceed wells (Dudek 1994)
325	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	
326	3-47	BIG SPRING AREA		Central Coast	SRO	7,332	11.5	(	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
327	6-78	DENNING SPRING VALLEY		South Lahontan	SRO	7,289	11.4	0	0 0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
328	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	
329	5-36	ROUND VALLEY		Sacramento River	NRO	7,266	5 11.4	27	0	0	0	1.5	4	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
330	5-13	UPPER LAKE VALLEY		Sacramento River	NRO	7,260	11.3	2,055	5 1	3	4	3.75	4	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
331	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 impa domestic use and high chlorides to inferior for irrigation uses (B-:
332	5-68	POPE VALLEY		Sacramento	NCRO	7,177	11.2	110	1	0	0	1.5	4	2	1	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
333	5-7	LAKE ALMANOR VALLEY		Sacramento	NRO	7,152	. 11.2	2,121	. 1	0	3	1.5	1	2	3	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
334	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	
335	6-70	CACTUS FLAT		South Lahontan	SRO	7,056	11.0	C	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	1
336	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	
337	1-14	LOWER KLAMATH RIVER VALLEY		North Coast	NRO	7,026	11.0	806	5 1	0	5	1.5	2	1	2	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
338	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	Very Low	
339	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 infer coastal plain due to high TDS con eastern part of the basin and is n irrigation due to high chloride co DWR 1967)
340	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	

omments	Other Information Comments
mmon problem but it has ar Point Arena and Iverson e deposits between Alder ceptible to seawater ) TDS, sulfate, and chloride h known concentrations of 3).	
·	
8).	
h concentrations of nitrates, 8) & (Phillips et.al. 1993).	
ICL in some wells(Izbicki ium, lead, selenium, and eded individually in some	
paired the basin for es make the water marginal B-118).	
ferior for domestic use in the	
content and suitable in the s marginal to inferior for concentrations (B-118 &	

									I			Dill	<b>6</b>							D	
		CASGEM (	Groundwater Basi	n Prioritization	Results					1		Data	Comp	onent	Ranking V	alue	<b>-</b>	1	Overall	Ranking	-
			Sorted by Overall	Basin Score						2	s			Grou	undwater	Reliance					
L	1				1	Desta	A	1		¥	Vel		ge		-				Overall		
Basin count	Basin Number	Basin Name	Sub-Basin Name	Hydrologic Region	DWR Region Office	Acres	Sq. Mile	2010 Population	opulation	opulation Gro	ublic Supply V	rotal Wells *	rrigated Acrea	GW Use **	Percent of Tota Supply **	GW Reliance Fotal	mpacts	Other nformation	Basin Ranking Score ***	Overall Basin Priority	Impact Con
341	5-10	AMERICAN VALLEY		Sacramento	NRO	6,799	10.6	3,931	2	0	5	3.75	4	2	1	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
342	7-63	VANDEVENTER FLAT		River Colorado River	SRO	6,787	/ 10.6	50	0	0	0	0.75	0	0	5	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
343	5-3	JESS VALLEY		Sacramento	NRO	6,708	8 10.5	13	0	0	0	0.75	5	1	1	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
344	1-60	LOWER RUSSIAN RIVER VALLEY		North Coast	NCRO	6,640	0 10.4	3,754	2	2	5	3	3	2	1	0	1	0	0.0	Very Low	Brackish water found in wells ne the river mouth to below Dunca During a period of extremely low might extend 10 miles upstream Monte Rio (B-118)
345	5-18	COYOTE VALLEY		Sacramento	NRO	6,528	3 10.2	2,252	1	5	2	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
346	1-54.02	ALEXANDER VALLEY	CLOVERDALE AREA	North Coast	NCRO	6,525	5 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 Southern Cloverdale is on the EF (MGM Brakes) VOCs detected in
347	6-95	DRY VALLEY		North Lahontan	NRO	6,498	3 10.2	2	0	0	0	0.75	1	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
348	5-19	COLLAYOMI VALLEY		Sacramento	NRO	6,497	/ 10.2	1,513	1	4	2	3	1	1	4	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
349	5-63	STONYFORD TOWN AREA		Sacramento	NRO	6,437	/ 10.1	. 183	1	0	3	2.25	3	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
350	6-99	PAINTERS FLAT		North Lahontan	NRO	6,395	5 10.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
351 352	1-30 3-49	PEPPERWOOD TOWN AREA MONTECITO		North Coast Central Coast	NRO SRO	6,288 6,286	9.8 9.8	315 9,885	1 3	0	0	0.75	3 1	2 1	4	0	0	0	0.0 0.0	Very Low Very Low	Locally high TDS within the basir
353	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	iron and manganese concentration WQ Impacts: Saline intrusion, lo
																					hydrogen sulfides, and other co
354	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	
355	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	
356	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	
357	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 conter generally exceed the recommen 118. & DWR 1986).
358	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	Very Low	
359	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	Very Low	
360	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	
361	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	
362	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	
363 364	<u>1-53</u> 7-59	SANEL VALLEY MASON VALLEY		North Coast Colorado River	NCRO SRO	5,568 5,567	8 <u>8.7</u> 8.7	698 23	1 0	0	4 2	3 0.75	4	2	3 5	0	0	0	0.0 0.0	Very Low Very Low	
365 366	1-55.03 7-46	SANTA ROSA VALLEY	RINCON VALLEY	North Coast	NCRO SRO	5,549	8.7	21,787	4	3	5	3.75	1	2	3	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
367	5-52	GRAYS VALLEY		Sacramento	NRO	5,440	8.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
368	4-18	HUNGRY VALLEY		River 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)
369	4-3.02	VENTURA RIVER VALLEY	LOWER VENTURA	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 h documented to be present in the
370	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	
371	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	

omments	Other Information Comments
near the Russian River from can Mills (5 to 6 miles). ow streamflow, saline water am from river mouth to	
of 3 wells (B-118). Site in EPA's Superfund Priority List in gw (EPA 1983).	
sin. Wells exceed Federal ations (B-118).	
locally high EC, hardness, constituents.(B-118)	
ended limits for drinking (B-	
8).	
l hydrogen sulfide are the basin.	

					Date Commonwet Device Value																
		CASGEMO	Froundwater Basi	Drioritization	Poculte							Data	Compo	onent F	Ranking V	alue			Overall	Ranking	
		CASULIVIC			inesuits									Grou	Indwater	Reliance					1
			Sorted by Overall	Basin Score						국	slis										
					1	Basin	∆rea			Š	Š		å		a				Overall	Overall	
					DW/R				-	Ğ	۲	*	cre	×	Tot	е		Ē	Basin	Basin	Impact Com
Basin	Basin	Basin Namo	Sub Basin Namo	Hydrologic	Pogion			2010	ē	.ē	d n	elle	A b	*	fo *	ian		itio	Ranking	Driority	
count	Number	Basin Name	Sub-Dasin Name	Region	Region	Acres	Sq. Mile	Population	lat	lat	C S	≥	te	Se	_, t	le	cts	L E	Score ***	Phoney	
				-	Office			-	nd	nd	pli	tal	ga	5	pp	ч F tal	ba	or he			
									Ъ	Ъо	Pu	Ê	1	3	Pe	10 L	<u></u>	h d			
372	6-98	TULEDAD CANYON VALLEY		North Lahontan	NRO	5.167	8.1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
• · =						-,			-	-	-	-	_	-	-		-	-		,	
373	2-19	KENWOOD VALLEY		San Francisco	NCRO	5,135	8.0	6.057	2	1	5	3.75	3	1	1	0	0	0	0.0	Vervlow	
070	- 10			Bay		5,255	0.0	0,007	_	-	5	5.75	5	-	-	°,	Ũ	Ű	0.0	10.7 2011	
374	1-12	Ι ΔΥΤΟΝΥΠΤΕ ΥΔΙΤΕΥ		North Coast	NRO	5 020	7.8	1 167	1	0	3	3 75	3	1	1	0	0	0	0.0	Vervlow	
375	1-19			North Coast	NCRO	4,969	7.8	1,107	1	5	5	3.75	3	1	1	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
376	5-53			Sacramento	NRO	4,965	7.6	1,257	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
570	5 55			River	Nilo I	4,000	7.0	0	Ŭ	Ŭ	Ŭ	Ŭ	5	Ŭ	Ũ	Ũ	Ũ	Ŭ	0.0	Very Low	
377	5-70	LOS BANOS CREEK VALLEY		San Joaquin	SCRO	4 835	7.6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Vervlow	
5//	570	LOS DANOS CREEK VALLET		River	Jeno	4,055	7.0	0	Ū	0	Ŭ	0	U	0	0	0	0	Ū	0.0	VCI y LOW	
378	6-82	SPRING CANYON VALLEY		South Labortan	SRO	4 832	75	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	VervLow	
570	0.02			South Earlontair	5110	4,052	7.5	0	Ŭ	Ŭ	Ŭ	Ŭ	Ŭ	Ŭ	Ũ	Ũ	Ũ	Ŭ	0.0	Very Low	
379	6-107	SWEETWATER FLAT		North Labortan	NCRO	4 747	74	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Vervlow	
575	0 107	SWEETWATERTEAT		Lanontan	neno	-,, -,	,	0	Ŭ	Ŭ	Ŭ	Ŭ	-	Ŭ	Ũ	Ũ	Ũ	Ŭ	0.0	Very Low	
380	3-24	OLIIEN SABE VALLEY		Central Coast	SCRO	4 706	74	5	0	0	0	0	3	1	1	0	0	0	0.0	Vervlow	
381	3-45			Central Coast	SRO	4,700	7.4	55	1	0	0	0.75	2	0	1	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
382	5-57			Sacramento	NRO	4,700	7.4		0	0	0	0.75	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
302	5-57	LAST CHANCE CREEK VALLET		Bivor	NILO	4,033	7.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very LOW	
202	A 1E			River	SBO	4 6 1 1	7.2	2 672	2	2	0	0.75	4	1	1	0	1	0	0.0	Vorulow	Locally high nitratos documentos
303	4-15	HERRA REJADA		South Coast	350	4,011	1.2	5,075	2	5	0	0.75	4	1	1	0	1	0	0.0	Very LOW	Locally high hitrates documented
384	6-105			North Labortan	NCRO	4 517	7 1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	VeryLow	
304	0-105	SEINKARD VALLET			Nello	4,517	/.1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very LOW	
205	6.02			North Labortan		4 502	7.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Vondow	
202	0-95	HARVET VALLET			INKO	4,505	7.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
296	F 96			Sacramonto		4 459	7.0	12	0	0	0	1 5	2	2	2	0	0	0	0.0	Variation	
200	2-90	JUSEPH CREEK		Sacramento	INKO	4,458	7.0	15	0	0	0	1.5	5	2	5	0	0	0	0.0	very Low	
207	F 07			River	NIDO	4 2 4 2	6.9	177	1	0	2	2	1	0	1	0	0	0	0.0	Variation	
507	5-67	WIDDLE FORK FEATHER RIVER		Sacramento	INKO	4,542	0.0	1//	1	0	2	5	1	0	1	0	0	0	0.0	Very LOW	
200	F 02			River	CCDO.	4 212		774	1	0	-	1 5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Manulau	
388	5-83			Tulare Lake	SCRU	4,213	6.6	//4	1	0	5	1.5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
389	5-47	GOOSE VALLEY		Sacramento	NRO	4,208	6.6	10	0	0	0	0.75	5	1	1	0	0	0	0.0	very Low	
200	0.0			River	600	4 1 0 2	C 4		0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Manulau	
390	8-8	SEVEN OAKS VALLEY		South Coast	SRU	4,103	6.4	/	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
391	5-41	EGG LAKE VALLEY		Sacramento	NRO	4,101	6.4	0	0	0	0	0.75	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
				River						-	-						-	-			
392	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	
393	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	
									-	-	-		-				-	-			
394	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	
395	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	
			-						-		-	-	-	_			-	-			
396	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	
										_	-		-				_	-			
397	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 documen
																					of boron, sodium chloride, high T
					-							_									and chlorides (B-118)
398	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	
399	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	
										<u> </u>	-		<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u> .		-	<u> </u>			
400	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	
401	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	
402	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	
				<u> </u>						<u> </u>	<u> </u>		.	<u> </u>	-	-	-	+ -			
403	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	
404	5-93	NORTH FORK CACHE CREEK		Sacramento	NRO	3,474	5.4	0	0	0	0	0.75	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
<b></b>	_			River		l						-		<u> </u>							
405	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	
406	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	
<b></b>					.						-	-		<u> </u>							
407	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	<b>I</b>
408	5-37	TOAD WELL AREA		Sacramento	NRO	3,356	5.2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
				River		ļ				<u> </u>		+	ļ	I	ļ	ļ		<u> </u>			<b>I</b>
409	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	
<b></b>					.						-	-		<u> </u>							
410	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	
411	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	8
412	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	

omments	Other Information Comments
ted in the basin (B-118).	
	Aquifer" in EPA Region 9.
pontod to contain high lovels	
gh TDS, sulfate, nitrates, iron,	
	Rasin area is listed by EPA as a "Sole Source
	Aquifer" in EPA Region 9.

<b></b>									1			Data	Comp	onont	Panking V	alua			Overall	Panking	
		CASGEM	Groundwater Basi	in Prioritization	Results							Data	Comp	Creat	Natiking V				Overall	Kaliking	_
			Sorted by Overal	l Basin Score						ي ا	s			Grou	undwater	Reliance	_				
-						Bacin	Aroa		-	ž	Ne		ge		a				Overall		
						Dasiii	Alea	_		Ğ	ž	*	rea		ğ	e		_	Basin	Overall	Impact Con
Basin	Basin			Hydrologic	DWR			2010	5	5	dd	S I	Ac	*	l f *	nc		jo	Ranking	Basin	
count	Number	Basin Name	Sub-Basin Name	Region	Region	Acres	Sa. Mile	Population	ati	atio	Su	Ň	ted	se	∧ t	elia	t;	nat	Score ***	Priority	
					Office	710100	•4	. optimien	n l	orl	ojie	<u>a</u>	gat	1 2	p G	a r	bac	Jer no	50010		
									Pol	Pol	Pul	Tot	Iri	ß	Pel	10 E	<u></u>	li di			
413	6-85	GOLD VALLEY		South Lahontan	SRO	3,234	5.1		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
414	5-51	BUTTE CREEK VALLEY		Sacramento	NRO	3,227	5.0	) C	0	0	0	0.75	2	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
				River																	
415	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	
416	1-28			North Coast	NRO	3,150	4.9	10	1	0	0	0.75	0	1	3	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
417	9-25			South Coast	SRU	3,140	4.9	17 543	1	2	0	2 75	1	2	1	0	U E	0	0.0	Very Low	LISES documented pitrates exce
410	5-35	FOOTHIEL		Central Coast	360	5,125	4.5	17,543	4	2	5	5.75	1	5	1	0	5	0	0.0	Very LOW	sulfates in the basin TDS is door
																					basin and notantial for saling int
419	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 hardne
_	-					-, -	-	, -					_			-				- , -	5 .,
420	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
<u> </u>									<u> </u>												per Bulletin 118.
421	5-49	DRY BURNEY CREEK VALLEY		Sacramento	NRO	3,074	4.8	C C	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
				River								-	_	<u> </u>	-	-	<u> </u>	<u> </u>			
422	5-90	FUNKS CREEK		Sacramento	NRO	3,012	4.7		0	0	0	0.75	1	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
422	0.2			River	600	2.000			1	-	-	4 -	-		0		_	-		Venil	Locally high TDC and some of
423	9-2	SAN WATEU VALLEY		South Coast	SKU	3,009	4./	554	1	U	4	1.5	3	U	U	U	3	0	0.0	very Low	Locally fligh TDS and some eleva
121	3-46	ΒΔΕΔΕΙ ΜΔΙΙΕΥ		Central Coast	SRO	2 996	17	, c	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	VeryLow	118)
425	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	
426	6-72	COLES FLAT		South Lahontan	SRO	2,961	4.6	i c	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
427	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
																					as suitable to inferior for domes
																					categorized as inferior typically
											-		-			-					or sulfate content (DWR 1967).
428	2-26	PESCADERO VALLEY		San Francisco	NCRO	2,904	4.5	5 571	. 1	0	4	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
420	F 17			Bay	NIDO	2 072	4.5	2 0 1	2	4	0	2.75	1	1	2	0	0	-	0.0	Manulau	
429	5-17	BURNS VALLEY		Sacramento	NRO	2,873	4.5	2,691	2	4	0	3.75	1	1	2	0	0	0	0.0	very Low	
430	2-21			River Central Coast	SCRO	2 865	15		0	0	0	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	VeryLow	
430	5-31			Sacramento	NRO	2,805	4.5	194	1	0	0	2.25	3	2	5	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
.01	0.01			River		2,733			-	Ŭ	Ű	2.20	0	_	5	Ŭ	Ű	Ũ	0.0	1017 2011	
432	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	
433	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	
434	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	
435	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	
			-								_	-	-	-	-	-		_			
436	3-43			Central Coast	SRO	2,579	4.0		0	0	0	0	4	1	1	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
437	0-100	LITTLE ANTELOPE VALLEY		North Lanontan	NCRU	2,491	3.9		0	0	0	0.75	3	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	very Low	
438	9-13	ΡΟΨΑΥ ΛΑΙΤΕΥ		South Coast	SRO	2 485	3 9	16.450	5	2	0	3 75	1	2	1	0	0	0	0.0	Vervlow	
439	7-47	JACUMBA VALLEY		Colorado River	SRO	2,403	3.9	517	1	0	4	1.5	0	2	5	0	5	3	0.0	Very Low	According to San Diego County of
						_,							-		-	-		-		,	reportingly going dry: this is a sr
																					residents and no source of impo
																					groundwaters recharging the ba
											-										
440	5-40	HOT SPRINGS VALLEY		Sacramento	NRO	2,404	3.8	12	. 0	0	0	1.5	4	2	1	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
4.4.1	F 20			River	NIDO	2 404	2.0	2.604	2	0	-	2.25	1		F	0	0	0	0.0	Vorulow	
441	5-50	LOWER LAKE VALLEY		Biver	INKU	2,404	3.8	2,094	2 ×	0	5	2.25	1	2 <sup>2</sup>	5	U	0		0.0	Very LOW	
447	1-29	HONEYDEW TOWN AREA		North Coast	NRO	2 360	37	10	0	0	n	0 75	n	n	0	0	n	0	0.0	Verv Low	1
443	2-38	LOBOS		San Francisco	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 b
_				Bav		,	_	, -				_	_			-				- , -	San Francisco península are simi
				,						1				1				1			May contain high concentration
														1							boron and TDS (B-118)
444	5-16	HIGH VALLEY		Sacramento	NRO	2,356	3.7	34	1	0	3	2.25	3	1	4	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	- (
				River								_		1			<u> </u>		ļ		ļ
445	5-48	BURNEY CREEK VALLEY		Sacramento	NRO	2,352	3.7	1,466	2	1	0	2.25	5	3	1	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
440	F 05			River	CODO.	2 21 4		1 200	2		-	1 -	0	-	-	0	0			Vondan	
440 //7	5-05			Sacramento		2,314	3.0	1,288		0	0	1.5	5	2	5 1	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
447	5-50			Piver	MO	2,311	3.0	<u> </u>		0	0	0	5	0	1	0			0.0	VEIYLOW	
1				I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I	1			1	-	1	1	1						1	-		

omments	Other Information Comments
	Adjudicated basin
ceeding MCL and high ocumented to be high in the intrusion.	
ness in the basin (B-118).	
or some wells in the basin	
vated nitrates in wells (B-	
in this basin are categorized estic use. The water y contains high nitrate, TDS, ).	
y documents, some wells are small basin with over 500 ported water. TDS of some 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)
basins beneath the entire	
milar (Phillips et.al. 1993). ons of nitrates, chloride,	

									T			Г	)ata (	Comno	nont C	anking V	مىراد			Overall	Ranking	
		CASGEM	Groundwater Basi	n Prioritization	Results								2010	compt	Grad		Polionee			Overall	Nativitig	1
Sorted by Overall Basin Score										۽	-	s			Groundwater Reliance			_				
———			-		1	D!	A #05		-	¥		Ne.		<u>8</u>		E				Overall		
						Basin	Area			5 C		>	*	rea		ote	<b>a</b> 1			Basin	Overall	Impact Co
Racin	Deale			Hydrologic	DWR			2010	E	Ē		dd	"s	Aci	*	Ť.	ů n Cč		on	Panking	Basin	impact co
Basin	Basin	Basin Name	Sub-Basin Name	Hydrologic	Region	-		2010	tio	tio		Sul	Vel	þ	, v	* to	lia	Ś	ati	Ranking	Priority	
count	Number			Region	Office	Acres	Sq. Mile	Population	ula	ula I		<u>i</u>	2	ate	ŝ	ol d	= Re	act	r r	Score ***		
					••••••				do	d	- 1 - 3	l a	ota	rig.	≥	up t	sta	ğu	fo			
									Ă	Ā	Ċ	ā	Ĕ	<u>-</u>	σ	S P	ΰř	<u> </u>	<u> </u>			
448	1-34	DINSMORES TOWN AREA		North Coast	NRO	2,276	3.6	183	3 1	0		5	1.5	1	1	5	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
449	1-16	SEIAD VALLEY		North Coast	NRO	2,243	3.5	132	2 1	0		4 (	0.75	1	0	1	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
450	1-20	GARCIA RIVER VALLEY		North Coast	NCRO	2,242	3.5	119	9 1	0	(	0	2.25	3	2	1	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
451	5-92	BLANCHARD VALLEY		Sacramento	NRO	2,221	. 3.5	0	0	0		0	0.75	2	0	1	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
				River																		
452	4-16	HIDDEN VALLEY		South Coast	SRO	2,217	3.5	503	3 1	0		4	1.5	5	1	1	0		0	0.0	Very Low	
453	2-39	MARINA		San Francisco	NCRO	2,186	3.4	45,294	<del>ا</del> 5	0		0	2.25	0	0	0	0	1	0	0.0	Very Low	Limited water quality data but l
				Bay																		San Francisco peninsula are sim
																						May contain high concentration
																						boron and TDS (B-118)
454	2-37	SOUTH SAN FRANCISCO		San Francisco	NCRO	2,175	3.4	38,861	5	1	(	0	3.75	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
				Bay																	,	
455	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	
456	9-32	SAN MARCOS AREA		South Coast	SRO	2.144	3.3	15.096	5 5	3	1	0	3	0	2	1	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
457	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	
458	5-38	PONDOSA TOWN AREA		Sacramento	NRO	2.082	3.3	(	0	0	(	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
				River		2,002	0.5		1	Ĩ			- -	-	Ī	-	-				, 10	
459	5-91	ANTELOPE CREEK		Sacramento	NRO	2.040	3.2	3	3 0	0	1	0	0.75	3	0	1	0	0	0	0.0	Vervlow	1
435	5.51			River		2,040	5.2	-			_   `	~   '		5	Ĭ		Ŭ	Ŭ	Ŭ	0.0		
460	9-29	POTRERO VALLEY		South Coast	SRO	2 035	32	475	5 1	0		Δ	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Vervlow	
461	3-20			Central Coast	SCRO	2,035	3.2	475	5 1	0		1	15	3	1	5	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
462	1-26			North Coast	NRO	1 996	3.1	23/	1 1	0		1	1.5	1	3	5	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
463	6-5.03		ΤΔΗΟΕ ΝΟΒΤΗ	North Labortan	NCRO	1,930	3.0	3 410	r <u>1</u> ) 3	0		5	3	0	3	4	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
405	0 5.05				Neno	1,551	. 5.0	3,410	, J	0		5	5	U	5	-	0	Ū	Ū	0.0	VCI y LOW	
464	2-8	CASTRO VALLEY		San Francisco	NCRO	1 821	2.8	24 486	5	0		0	3 75	0	2	1	0	0	0	0.0	VeryLow	
404	2-0	CASINO VALLET		Bay	NCNO	1,021	2.0	24,400	, ,	0			5.75	0	2	1	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
165	2 20	BOSS VALLEY		San Erancisco	NCPO	1 762	20	7 10/	1	2		0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Vorulow	
405	2-20	RO33 VALLET		Sall Flaticisco	NCRO	1,705	2.0	7,194	4	2		0	5	T	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very LOW	
466	6-80			Ddy South Labortan	SPO	1 75 2	27		0	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	VeryLow	
400	0-80	MIDDLE PARK CANTON		South Lanontan	350	1,732	. 2.7	, c	, 0	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very LOW	
467	1 45			North Coast	NCDO	1 695	26	20	1	0		F	1 5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Vondow	
467	1-45			North Coast	NCRO	1,685	2.0	29		0		5	1.5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
468	1-43			North Coast	NCRO	1,642	2.6	24		0		0.	2.25	2	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
469	3-42			Central Coast	SRU	1,547	2.4	247	1	0	-	3	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
470	9-24			South Coast	SRO	1,514	2.4	(	0 0	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
4/1	1-40			North Coast	NCRO	1,491	2.3	61	1	0		0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
472	1-56			North Coast	NCRO	1,486	2.3	106		0		0	3.75	4	2	3	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
473	5-62	ELK CREEK AREA		Sacramento	NRO	1,438	2.2	1/2	+ 1	0		0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
				River						-	_	_	_	-								
474	3-23	UPPER SANTA ANA VALLEY		Central Coast	SCRO	1,431	. 2.2	L	0	0		0	0	0	1	5	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
475	3-29	DRY LAKE VALLEY	+	Central Coast	SCRO	1,416	2.2	8	s 0	0		υ	0	2	2	5	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
476	5-61	CHROME TOWN AREA		Sacramento	NRO	1,408	2.2	e e	0	0		υ	U.75	0	0	0	U	0	U	0.0	Very Low	
			+	River						-	_	_			<u> </u>							
477	2-27	SAND POINT AREA		San Francisco	NCRO	1,405	2.2	43	3 1	0		5 (	0.75	0	1	4	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
			+	Bay					-	-					<u> </u>			-	-	- <u> </u>		
478	1-39	BRANSCOMB TOWN AREA		North Coast	NCRO	1,381	2.2	95	5 1	0		0	3	1	1	1	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
479	1-44	EDEN VALLEY	+	North Coast	NCRO	1,376	2.2	(	0	0		U	0	3	3	3	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
480	5-20	BERRYESSA VALLEY		Sacramento	NCRO	1,375	2.1	0	0	0		0	0.75	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
I				River					<b>I</b>	4	_	_			I							
481	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	
482	1-35	HYAMPOM VALLEY	+	North Coast	NRO	1,354	2.1	52	2 1	0		0	2.25	2	2	5	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
483	5-45	CAYTON VALLEY		Sacramento	NRO	1,306	2.0	2	2 0	0		0	1.5	5	0	1	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
I		-		River					1	4	_				I							8
484	5-89	SQUAW FLAT		Sacramento	NRO	1,294	2.0	0	0	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
				River	ļ				<b>I</b>		_				I							
485	5-65	LITTLE INDIAN VALLEY		Sacramento	NRO	1,269	2.0	112	2 1	0		0	3.75	2	3	4	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
				River					<b>I</b>		_											
486	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	
487	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	
488	3-50	FELTON AREA		Central Coast	SCRO	1,155	1.8	3,024	4 3	1	(	0	3.75	0	2	4	0	3	0	0.0	Very Low	Overdraft
489	1-42	SHERWOOD VALLEY		North Coast	NCRO	1,150	1.8	13	3 1	0	(	0	1.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
490	5-44	LONG VALLEY		Sacramento	NRO	1,088	1.7	(	0 0	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
				River					1													
491	2-24	SAN GREGORIO VALLEY		San Francisco	NCRO	1,074	1.7	66	5 1	0	(	0	2.25	3	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
				Bay																		
492	5-88	STONY GORGE RESERVOIR		Sacramento	NRO	1,065	1.7	(	0 0	0	(	0	0	3	0	1	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
		1		River			1		1	1												1

nments	Other Information Comments
asins beneath the entire ilar (Phillips et.al. 1993). s of nitrates, chloride,	

CASGEM Groundwater Pasin Drightization Posults																					
Sorted by Overall Basin Score									_	6			Grou	undwater	Reliance						
Basin count	Basin Number	Basin Name	Sub-Basin Name	Hydrologic Region	DWR Region Office	Basin Acres	Area Sq. Mile	2010 Population	opulation	opulation Growth	ublic Supply Wells	otal Wells *	rrigated Acreage	3W Use **	ercent of Total upply **	śW Reliance otal	mpacts	)ther nformation	Overall Basin Ranking Score ***	Overall Basin Priority	Impact Com
/193	3-33			Central Coast	SRO	1 05/	1.6	1	0	0	0		-	0	0				0.0	Very Low	
494	3-34			Central Coast	SRO	1,034	1.0	1	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
495	1-33			North Coast	NRO	967	1.5	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
496	9-23	SAN ELUO VALLEY		South Coast	SRO	888	1.4	1.125	2	4	0	3	1	0	0	0	5	Ŭ	0.0	Very Low	High TDS limits beneficial uses (B
497	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	Very Low	
498	1-36	HETTENSHAW VALLEY		North Coast	NRO	846	i 1.3	5	0	0	0	1.5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	
499	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	
500	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	Very Low	
501	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 issue contaminated sites within the ba
502	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	
503	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	
504	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 wa irrigation because of high chlorid for domestic use because of high concentrations (DWR 1967).
505	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	· · ·
506	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	
507	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	
508	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	
509	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	Very Low	
510	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	
511	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 chl documented.
512	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	I
513	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	Į
514	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	<b>I</b>
515	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	

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 overal 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

mments	Other Information Comments
(B-118)	
sues associated with basin.	
was rated inferior for ride content and marginal gh sulfate and TDS	
chlorides have been	