Paso Basin Cooperative Committee Meeting

*****Notice of Meeting Cancellation*****

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the Regular Meeting of the Paso Basin Cooperative Committee scheduled for **Wednesday, March 18, 2020 at 4:00 PM** at the City of Paso Robles Council Chambers, 1000 Spring street, Paso Robles, CA **has been canceled.**

For information on future meetings, please visit:

slocounty.ca.gov/pasobasin

1

Presentation Outline

- DWR Regulations and Process
- Groundwater Elevations
- Groundwater Extractions
- Surface Water Use
- Total Water Use
- Change in Groundwater in Storage
- Progress toward Meeting Basin Sustainability

2

DWR Process and Regulations (§ 356.2)

"Each Agency shall submit an annual report to the Department by April 1 of each year following the adoption of the Plan."

3

3

Groundwater Elevations (§ 356.2[b][1])

- Fall 2017 through Fall 2019
- Paso Robles Formation Aquifer
- Seasonal High and Low (Spring and Fall) Contour Maps
- Hydrographs

4

4


Fall 2019
MONTEREY COUNTY
SAN LUIS OBISPO COUNTY
LEGEND
Well providing data for Paso Robles Formation Aquifer
Fall 2019 Groundwater Elevation Contour in feet above mean sea level; dashed where inferred
Inferred Groundwater Flow Direction
Paso Robles Subbasin
All Other Features
County Boundary
City Boundary
Major Road
Watercourse
Waterbody

5


25S/12E-16K05
ELEVATION, IN FEET ABOVE MEAN SEA LEVEL
CALENDAR YEAR
EXPLANATION
GROUNDWATER ELEVATION
MEASUREMENT NOT VERIFIED*
MEASURABLE OBJECTIVE
MINIMUM THRESHOLD
CLIMATE PERIOD CLASSIFICATION
DRY
AVERAGE/ALTERNATING
WET
Reference Point Elevation
Casing
Perforations
(blank when unknown)
Well Depth: 350 feet
Screened Interval: 300-310, 330-340 feet below ground surface
Reference Point Elevation: 669.8 feet above mean sea level

6

27S/13E-28F01



Well Depth: 212 feet
Screened Interval: 118-212 feet below ground surface
Reference Point Elevation: 1072 feet above mean sea level

7

26S/15E-20B04



Well Depth: 461 feet
Screened Interval: 297-461 feet below ground surface
Reference Point Elevation: 1036.36 feet above mean sea level

8

Groundwater Extractions (§ 356.2[b][2])

- Metered Municipal Well Production
- Estimated Agricultural Extraction
- Estimated Rural Domestic and Small Public Water System Extraction

9

9

Total Groundwater Extractions

Water Year	Groundwater Extractions by Water Use Sector			Total (AF)
	Municipal (AF)	PWS and Rural Domestic (AF)	Agriculture (AF)	
2017	4,235	5,060	72,500	81,800
2018	5,029	5,060	71,000	81,100
2019	4,804	5,060	72,200	82,100

10



11

Surface Water Use (§ 356.2[b][3])

- Surface Water Available for Use
- Total Surface Water Use

12

12

Surface Water Use

Surface Water Available for Use

Water Year	Nacimiento Water Project (AF)	State Water Project (AF)	Total Available Surface Water (AF)
2017	6,488	100	6,588
2018	6,488	100	6,588
2019	6,488	100	6,588

Total Surface Water Use

Water Year	Nacimiento Water Project (AF)	State Water Project (AF)	Total Surface Water Use (AF)
2017	1,784	42	**1,826**
2018	2,284	55	**2,339**
2019	1,498	43	**1,541**

13

Total Water Use (§ 356.2[b][4])

- Total Annual Water Use by Source
- Total Annual Water Use by Water Use Sector

14

14

Total Water Use

Water Year	Municipal (AF)		PWS and Rural Domestic (AF)	Agriculture (AF)	Total (AF)
Source:	Groundwater	Surface Water	Groundwater	Groundwater	
2017	4,235	1,826	5,060	72,500	**83,600**
2018	5,029	2,339	5,060	71,000	**83,400**
2019	4,804	1,541	5,060	72,200	**83,600**

15

Change in Groundwater in Storage (§ 356.2[b][5])

- Annual Changes in Groundwater Elevation
- Annual and Cumulative Change in Groundwater in Storage Calculations

16

16


Fall 2016 to Fall 2017
MONTEREY COUNTY
SAN LUIS OBISPO COUNTY
PASO ROBLES
ATASCADERO
Templeton
Creston
Shandon
Whitley Gardens
Cholame
San Miguel
Santa Margarita
LEGEND
Paso Robles Subbasin
Water Level Change, in feet
Fall 2016 to Fall 2017
< -40 feet
-40 to -30 feet
-30 to -20 feet
-20 to -10 feet
-10 to 0 feet
0 to 10 feet
10 to 20 feet
20 to 30 feet
30 to 40 feet
> 40 feet
All Other Features
County Boundary
City Boundary
Major Road
Watercourse
Waterbody

17


Fall 2017 to Fall 2018
MONTEREY COUNTY
SAN LUIS OBISPO COUNTY
PASO ROBLES
ATASCADERO
Templeton
Creston
Shandon
Whitley Gardens
Cholame
San Miguel
Santa Margarita
LEGEND
Paso Robles Subbasin
Water Level Change, in feet
Fall 2017 to Fall 2018
< -40 feet
-40 to -30 feet
-30 to -20 feet
-20 to -10 feet
-10 to 0 feet
0 to 10 feet
10 to 20 feet
20 to 30 feet
30 to 40 feet
> 40 feet
All Other Features
County Boundary
City Boundary
Major Road
Watercourse
Waterbody

18



19

Annual and Cumulative Change in Groundwater in Storage



Water Year	Annual Change (AF)
2017	60,100
2018	6,400
2019	59,700

20

Progress toward Meeting Basin Sustain-ability (§ 356.2[c])

- Emerging Subbasin Conditions:
  - Declining Groundwater Elevations
  - Decline of Groundwater in Storage
- Projects and Management Actions Goals:
  - Reduce Groundwater Pumping
  - Achieve Groundwater Sustainability by 2040

21

21

Projects and Management Actions

- Basin-Wide Management Actions and Projects
  - Amendment #1 to the MOA
  - Extension of Water Neutral New Development Program
  - Paso Basin Aerial Groundwater Mapping Pilot Study

GSI Water Solutions, Inc. 22

22

Projects and Management Actions

- Area-Specific Projects
  - Expand Alluvial Aquifer Monitoring Network and Install New Stream Gages
  - City of Paso Robles Recycled Water Program
  - San Miguel CSD Recycled Water Project
  - Blended Water Project
  - Stormwater Capture and Recharge Projects
    - City of Paso Robles Municipal Stormwater Program
    - SSJWD/EPCWD Stormwater Capture and Recharge Feasibility Study

23

Questions?

24

DRAFT FINAL

Paso Basin Cooperative Committee
and the Groundwater Sustainability Agencies

Paso Robles Subbasin
First Annual Report (2017—2019)

February 26, 2020

Prepared by:
GSI Water Solutions, Inc.
5855 Capistrano Avenue, Suite C, Atascadero, CA 93422

This page intentionally left blank.

Paso Robles Subbasin
First Annual Report (2017–2019)

This report was prepared by the staff of GSI Water Solutions, Inc. under the supervision of professionals whose signatures appear below. The findings or professional opinion were prepared in accordance with generally accepted professional engineering and geologic practice.



Paul A. Sorensen, PG, CHg, CEG
Principal Hydrogeologist
Project Manager

Nathan R. Page, PG
Consulting Hydrogeologist

This page intentionally left blank.

Contents

Tables

Figures

Appendices

This page intentionally left blank.

Abbreviations and Acronyms

AEM	aerial electromagnetic method
AF	acre-feet
AFY	acre-feet per year
AMSL	above mean sea level
BMP	Best Management Practice
CASGEM	California State Groundwater Elevation Monitoring Program
CCR	California Code of Regulations
CDEC	California Data Exchange Center
CDFFP	California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection
CIMIS	California Irrigation Management Information System
COC	constituent of concern
CSA	Community Service Area
CSD	Community Services District
CWWCP	Countywide Water Conservation Program
DWR	California State Department of Water Resources
EPCWD	Estrella-El Pomar-Creston Water District
ETo	reference evapotranspiration
GDE	groundwater dependent ecosystem
GMP	Groundwater Management Plan
gpd/ft	gallons per day per foot
gpm	gallons per minute
GSA	Groundwater Sustainability Agency
GSP	Groundwater Sustainability Plan
GSSI	Geoscience Support Services, Inc.
IDC	IWFM Independent Demand Calculator
ILRP	Irrigated Lands Regulatory Program
InSAR	interferometric synthetic-aperture radar
IWFM	Integrated Water Flow Model
LID	low-impact development
M&A	Montgomery & Associates, Inc.
MOA	memorandum of agreement
NPDES	National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System
NWP	Nacimiento Water Project
PBCC	Paso Basin Cooperative Committee
PWS	public water system
RDI	regulated deficit irrigation
RMS	representative monitoring site
RU	rural domestic unit

S	storage coefficient
SEP	Supplemental Environmental Project
SGMA	Sustainable Groundwater Management Act
SLOFCWCD	County of San Luis Obispo Flood Control and Water Conservation District
SPI	Standardized Precipitation Index
SSJWD	Shandon-San Juan Water District
Subbasin	Paso Robles Area Subbasin of the Salinas Valley Groundwater Basin
SWMP	Stormwater Management Plan
SWRCB	State Water Resources Control Board
SWRP	San Luis Obispo County Stormwater Resource Plan
SWP	State Water Project
TDS	total dissolved solids
USGS	U.S. Geological Survey
WNND	Water Neutral New Development
WY	water year

Annual Report Elements Guide and Checklist

California Code of Regulations – GSP Regulation Sections	Annual Report Elements	Location in Annual Report
Article 7	Annual Reports and Periodic Evaluations by the Agency	
§ 356.2	Annual Reports	
	Each Agency shall submit an annual report to the Department by April 1 of each year following the adoption of the Plan. The annual report shall include the following components for the preceding water year:	
	(a) General information, including an executive summary and a location map depicting the basin covered by the report.	Executive Summary (§356.2[a])
	(b) A detailed description and graphical representation of the following conditions of the basin managed in the Plan:	Section 2.4 Groundwater Elevation Monitoring (§356.2[b])
	(1) Groundwater elevation data from monitoring wells identified in the monitoring network shall be analyzed and displayed as follows:	Section 3 Groundwater Elevations (§356.2[b][1])
	(A) Groundwater elevation contour maps for each principal aquifer in the basin illustrating, at a minimum, the seasonal high and seasonal low groundwater conditions.	Section 3.2 Seasonal High and Low (Spring and Fall) (§356.2[b][1][A])
	(B) Hydrographs of groundwater elevations and water year type using historical data to the greatest extent available, including from January 1, 2015, to current reporting year.	Section 3.3 Hydrographs (§356.2[b][1][B], and Appendix E)
	(2) Groundwater extraction for the preceding water year. Data shall be collected using the best available measurement methods and shall be presented in a table that summarizes groundwater extractions by water use sector, and identifies the method of measurement (direct or estimate) and accuracy of measurements, and a map that illustrates the general location and volume of groundwater extractions.	Section 4 Groundwater Extractions (§356.2[b][2])
	(3) Surface water supply used or available for use, for groundwater recharge or in-lieu use shall be reported based on quantitative data that describes the annual volume and sources for the preceding water year.	Section 5 Surface Water Use (§356.2[b][3])

California Code of Regulations – GSP Regulation Sections	Annual Report Elements	Location in Annual Report
Article 7	Annual Reports and Periodic Evaluations by the Agency	
§ 356.2	Annual Reports	
	(4) Total water use shall be collected using the best available measurement methods and shall be reported in a table that summarizes total water use by water use sector, water source type, and identifies the method of measurement (direct or estimate) and accuracy of measurements. Existing water use data from the most recent Urban Water Management Plans or Agricultural Water Management Plans within the basin may be used, as long as the data are reported by water year.	Section 6 Total Water Use (§356.2[b][4])
	(5) Change in groundwater in storage shall include the following:	Section 7 Change in Groundwater in Storage (§356.2[b][5])
	(A) Change in groundwater in storage maps for each principal aquifer in the basin.	Section 7.1 Annual Changes in Groundwater Elevation (§356.2[b][5][A])
	(B) A graph depicting water year type, groundwater use, the annual change in groundwater in storage, and the cumulative change in groundwater in storage for the basin based on historical data to the greatest extent available, including from January 1, 2015, to the current reporting year.	Section 7.2 Annual and Cumulative Change in Groundwater in Storage Calculations (§356.2[b][5][B])
	(c) A description of progress towards implementing the Plan, including achieving interim milestones, and implementation of projects or management actions since the previous annual report.	Section 8 Progress towards Basin Sustainability (§356.2[c])

Executive Summary (§ 356.2[a])

Introduction

This First Annual Report for the Paso Robles Area Subbasin of the Salinas Valley Groundwater Basin (Paso Robles Subbasin or Subbasin; see Figure 1) has been prepared in accordance with the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA) and Groundwater Sustainability Plan (GSP) Regulations. Pursuant to the California Department of Water Resources (DWR) regulations, a GSP Annual Report must be submitted to DWR by April 1 of each year following the adoption of the GSP.

With the submittal of the adopted Paso Robles Subbasin GSP by the January 31, 2020 deadline, the Groundwater Sustainability Agencies (GSAs) are required to submit an annual report for the preceding Water Year (October 1 through September 30) to DWR by April 1, 2020. Because this is the first GSP Annual Report for the Paso Robles Subbasin, this report documents and updates data from October 1, 2016 (for groundwater production and water use data) or October 1, 2017 (for water level data) through October 31, 2019. The annual report will convey monitoring and water use data to the DWR and to Subbasin stakeholders on an annual basis to gauge performance of the Subbasin relative to the sustainability goals set forth in the GSP.

Sections of the Annual Report include the following:

Section 1. Introduction – Paso Robles Subbasin First Annual Report (2017–2019): a brief background of the formation and activities of the Paso Robles Subbasin GSAs and development and submittal of the GSP.

Section 2. Paso Robles Subbasin Setting and Monitoring Networks: a summary of the Subbasin setting, Subbasin monitoring networks, and ways in which data are used for groundwater management.

Section 3. Groundwater Elevations (§356.2[b][1]): a description of recent monitoring data with groundwater elevation contour maps for spring and fall monitoring events and representative hydrographs.

Section 4. Groundwater Extractions (§356.2[b][2]): compilation of metered and estimated groundwater extractions by land use sector and location of extractions.

Section 5. Surface Water Use (§356.2[b][3]): a summary of reported surface water use.

Section 6. Total Water Use (§356.2[b][4]): a presentation of total water use by source and sector.

Section 7. Change in Groundwater in Storage (§356.2[b][5]): a description of the methodology and presentation of changes in groundwater in storage based on fall to fall groundwater elevation differences.

Section 8. Progress towards Basin Sustainability (§356.2[c]): a summary of management actions taken throughout the Subbasin by GSAs and individual entities towards sustainability of the Subbasin.

Groundwater Elevations

In general, the groundwater elevations observed in the Subbasin during water years 2017 through 2019 reflect slight increases across much of the Subbasin compared with the declines witnessed in water years 2015 and 2016. The increased groundwater elevations are likely due predominantly to above-average rainfall conditions in water years 2017 and 2019. Both positive and negative changes in groundwater elevations from year to year are observed in different parts of the Subbasin, as has been the pattern in the Subbasin for many years. Seasonal trends of slightly higher spring groundwater elevations compared with fall levels continued in each of the water years.

Groundwater Extractions

Total groundwater extractions in the Subbasin for water years 2017, 2018, and 2019 are 81,800 acre-feet (AF), 81,100 AF, and 82,100 AF, respectively. Table ES-1 summarizes the groundwater extractions by water use sector for each water year.

Table ES- 1. Groundwater Extractions by Water Use Sector

Water Year	Groundwater Extractions by Water Use Sector			Total (AF)
	Municipal (AF)	PWS and Rural Domestic (AF)	Agriculture (AF)	
2017	4,235	5,060	72,500	81,800
2018	5,029	5,060	71,000	81,100
2019	4,804	5,060	72,200	82,100
Method of Measure:	Metered	2016 Groundwater Model	Soil-Water Balance Model	
Level of Accuracy:	high	low-medium	medium	

Notes:
AF = acre-feet
PWS = public water systems

Surface Water Use

The Subbasin currently benefits from surface water entitlements from the Nacimiento Water Project (NWP) and the State Water Project (SWP) to supplement municipal groundwater demands in the City of Paso Robles and the community of Shandon, respectively. Locations of communities dependent on groundwater and with access to surface water are shown on Figure 11. There is currently no surface water available for agricultural or recharge project use within the Subbasin. A summary of total actual surface water use by source is provided in Table ES-2.

Table ES- 2. Total Surface Water Use by Source

Water Year	Nacimiento Water Project[1] (AF)	State Water Project[2] (AF)	Total Surface Water Use (AF)
2017	1,784	42	1,826
2018	2,284	55	2,339
2019	1,498	43	1,541

Notes:
[1] Contract annual entitlement to the City of Paso Robles = 6,488 AFY
[2] Contract annual entitlement to CSA 16 = 100 AFY
AF = acre-feet
AFY = acre-feet per year

Total Water Use

For water years 2017, 2018, and 2019, quantification of total water use was completed through reporting of metered water production data from municipal wells, metered surface water use, and from models used to estimate agricultural crop water supply requirements. In addition, rural water use and small commercial public water system use was estimated. Table ES-3 summarizes the total annual water use in the Subbasin by source and water use sector.

Table ES- 3. Total Annual Water Use in the Subbasin by Source and Water Use Sector

Water Year	Municipal (AF)		PWS and Rural Domestic (AF)	Agriculture (AF)	Total (AF)
Source:	Groundwater	Surface Water	Groundwater	Groundwater	
2017	4,235	1,826	5,060	72,500	**83,600**
2018	5,029	2,339	5,060	71,000	**83,400**
2019	4,804	1,541	5,060	72,200	**83,600**
Method of Measure:	Metered	Metered	2016 Groundwater Model	Soil-Water Balance Model	
Level of Accuracy:	high	high	low-medium	medium	

Notes:
AF = acre-feet
PWS = public water systems

Change in Groundwater in Storage

The calculation of change in groundwater in storage in the Subbasin was derived from comparison of fall groundwater elevation contour maps from one year to the next as well as taking the difference between groundwater elevations throughout the Subbasin as the aquifer becomes saturated (storage gain) or dewatered (storage loss). For example, the fall 2016 groundwater elevations were subtracted from the fall 2017 groundwater elevations, resulting in a map depicting the changes in groundwater elevations in the Paso Robles Formation Aquifer that occurred during the 2017 water year. Similar calculations were made for water years 2018 and 2019, resulting in a series of groundwater elevation change maps in the Paso Robles Formation Aquifer.

The groundwater elevation change map for water year 2017 (Figure 12), which was an above-average rainfall year, shows that water levels declined over a large portion of the central and northern areas of the Subbasin, with a minor depression in the City of Paso Robles area and a more pronounced area of decline in the Shandon area. The 2017 map also shows that groundwater elevations increased significantly in the southern highland areas of the Subbasin, in response to the above-average precipitation received in 2017.

The groundwater elevation change map for water year 2018 (Figure 13), which was a below-average rainfall year, shows that water levels declined in the southern, eastern, and northwestern areas of the Subbasin and increased over the central portion of the Subbasin, notably in the Shandon area.

The groundwater elevation change map for water year 2019 (Figure 14), which was an above-average rainfall year, shows that groundwater elevations increased over a large portion of the eastern half of the Subbasin, including a pronounced increase in the Shandon area, and that water levels declined over a large portion of the western half of the Subbasin, notably in the area west of Creston.

The annual changes of groundwater in storage calculated for water years 2017, 2018, and 2019 are presented in Table ES-4.

Table ES- 4. Annual Changes of Groundwater in Storage for Water Years 2017, 2018, and 2019

Water Year	Annual Change in Groundwater in Storage (AF)
2017	60,100
2018	6,400
2019	59,700

Note:
AF = acre-feet

Progress towards Meeting Basin Sustainability

Several projects and management actions are in process or have been recently implemented in the Subbasin to attain sustainability. These projects and actions include capital projects as well as non-structural basin-wide policies intended to reduce or optimize local groundwater use. Some of these projects were described in concept in the GSP; some of the actions described herein are new initiatives designed to make new water supplies available to the Subbasin that may be implemented by project participants to reduce pumping and partially mitigate the degree to which the management actions would be needed. Some of the ongoing efforts include:

- Amendment #1 to the Memorandum of Agreement
- Extension of Water Neutral New Development Program
- Paso Basin Aerial Groundwater Mapping Pilot Study
- Expand the Alluvial Aquifer Monitoring Network and Install New Stream Gages
- City of Paso Robles Recycled Water Program
- San Miguel Community Services District Recycled Water Project
- Blended Water Project
- Stormwater Capture and Recharge Projects

Relative to the most current basin conditions as reported in the GSP, this First Annual Report (2017–2019) indicates an improvement in groundwater conditions throughout the Subbasin, increased groundwater elevations in several of the representative monitoring site (RMS) wells, and a marked increase in total groundwater in storage. It is clear that historical groundwater pumping in excess of the sustainable yield has created challenging conditions for sustainable management. However, actions are already underway to collect data, improve the monitoring and data-collection networks, and coordinate with affected agencies and entities throughout the Subbasin to develop solutions that address the shared mutual interest in the Subbasin's overall sustainability goal.

The above-average rainfall water years of 2017 and 2019 improved groundwater conditions in the Subbasin. Of the 22 RMS wells in the Subbasin groundwater monitoring network, none of the wells exhibit groundwater elevations at or below the minimum threshold established in the GSP. Although the groundwater elevations in some of the RMS wells are continuing to trend downward, several of the RMS wells exhibit recovering groundwater elevations in the past two years. Ten of the 22 RMS wells in the monitoring network have current groundwater elevations greater than the measurable objective for that RMS well.

Groundwater in storage in the Subbasin increased more than 126,000 AF in total over the past three water years. The volume of groundwater extractions in the Subbasin has remained relatively consistent for the past

three years averaging approximately 81,700 AFY, which is slightly less than the average volume of 85,800 AFY of groundwater extractions estimated for 2012–2016. Although groundwater in storage has increased somewhat over the past three water years, groundwater pumping continues to exceed the estimated future sustainable yield and the projects and management actions described in the GSP and in this First Annual Report will be necessary in order to bring the Subbasin into sustainability.

At this time, there are no more recent data available since publication of the GSP to assess any changes in Subbasin subsidence, the interconnectivity of surface water and groundwater, or potential surface water depletion. The potential for impacts to these sustainability indicators will be assessed in future annual reports as data are developed.

Additional time will be necessary to judge the effectiveness and quantitative impacts of the projects and management actions either now underway or in the planning and implementation stage. However, it is clear that the actions in place and as described in this First Annual Report are a good start towards reaching the sustainability goals laid out in the GSP. It is too soon to judge the observed changes in basin conditions against the interim goals outlined in the GSP, but the anticipated effects of the projects and management actions now underway are expected to significantly affect the ability of the Subbasin to reach the necessary sustainability goals.

This page intentionally left blank.

SECTION 1: Introduction – Paso Robles Subbasin First Annual Report (2017–2019)

The First Annual Report for the Paso Robles Area Subbasin of the Salinas Valley Groundwater Basin (Paso Robles Subbasin or Subbasin) has been prepared for the Paso Basin Cooperative Committee (PBCC) and the Groundwater Sustainability Agencies (GSAs) in accordance with the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA) and Groundwater Sustainability Plan (GSP) Regulations (§ 356.2. Annual Reports) (see Appendix A, GSP Regulations for Annual Reports). Pursuant to the California Department of Water Resources (DWR) regulations, a GSP Annual Report must be submitted to DWR by April 1 of each year following the adoption of the GSP. With adoption and submittal of the Paso Robles Subbasin GSP by January 31, 2020, the GSAs are required to submit an annual report for the preceding water year (October 1 through September 30) to DWR by April 1, 2020. Because this is the first GSP Annual Report for the Paso Robles Subbasin, this report documents and updates data from October 1, 2016 (for groundwater production and water use data) or October 1, 2017 (for water level data) through October 31, 2019.[1]

1.1 Setting and Background

The Paso Robles Subbasin Groundwater Sustainability Plan was prepared by Montgomery & Associates, Inc. (M&A, 2019), on behalf of and in cooperation with the Paso Basin Cooperative Committee and the Subbasin GSAs. The GSP, and this Annual Report, covers the entire Paso Robles Subbasin (Figure 1). The Subbasin lies in the northern portion of San Luis Obispo County. The majority of the Subbasin comprises gentle flatlands near the Salinas River Valley, ranging in elevation from approximately 450 to 2,400 feet (ft) above mean sea level (AMSL). The Subbasin is drained by the Salinas River and its tributaries, including the Estrella River, Huer Huero Creek, and San Juan Creek. Communities in the Subbasin are the City of Paso Robles and the communities of San Miguel, Creston, and Shandon. Highway 101 is the most significant north-south highway in the Subbasin, with Highways 41 and 46 running east-west across the Subbasin.

The GSP was jointly developed by four GSAs:

- City of Paso Robles GSA
- Paso Basin - County of San Luis Obispo GSA
- San Miguel Community Services District (CSD) GSA
- Shandon - San Juan GSA

The Paso Basin GSAs overlying the Subbasin entered into a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) in September 2017. The purpose of the MOA was to establish a Paso Basin Cooperative Committee (PBCC) to develop a single GSP for the entire Subbasin to be considered for adoption by each GSA and subsequently submitted to DWR for approval. Under the framework of the original MOA, the GSAs engaged the public and coordinated to jointly develop the Paso Robles Subbasin GSP. At its November 20, 2019 meeting, in accordance with the MOA, the PBCC voted unanimously to recommend that the GSAs adopt the GSP and submit it to DWR by the SGMA deadline. Subsequent actions by each GSA resulted in unanimous approval of the GSP and a joint submittal of the GSP to DWR.

[1] The required timeframe of the annual reports, pursuant to the SGMA regulations, is by water year, which is October 1 through September 30 of any water year. However, because the County of San Luis Obispo Groundwater Level Monitoring Program measures water levels in October, the October 2019 measurements, for instance, are utilized to reflect conditions at the end of water year 2019.

The original MOA included provision for automatic termination upon approval of the GSP by DWR. Resolutions adopted by each GSA during the GSP approval process included an amendment to the MOA that removed automatic termination language because the GSAs will continue cooperating on the GSP and its implementation until such time as the long-term governance structure for implementation of the GSP is developed.

Each of the GSAs appointed a representative to the PBCC to coordinate activities among the GSAs during the development of the GSP and the development and submittal of this Annual Report. The GSAs also agreed to designate the County of San Luis Obispo Director of Public Works as the Plan Manager with the authority to submit the GSP and the Annual Report and serve as the point of contact with DWR.

1.2 Organization of This Report

The required contents of an Annual Report are provided in the GSP Regulations (§ 356.2), included as Appendix A. Organization of the report is meant to follow the regulations where possible to assist in the review of the document. The sections are briefly described as follows:

Section 1. Introduction – Paso Robles Subbasin First Annual Report (2017–2019): a brief background of the formation and activities of the Paso Robles Subbasin GSAs and development and submittal of the GSP.

Section 2. Paso Robles Subbasin Setting and Monitoring Networks: a summary of the Subbasin setting, Subbasin monitoring networks, and the ways in which data are used for groundwater management.

Section 3. Groundwater Elevations (§356.2[b][1]): a description of recent monitoring data with groundwater elevation contours for spring and fall monitoring events and representative hydrographs.

Section 4. Groundwater Extractions (§356.2[b][2]): compilation of metered and estimated groundwater extractions by land use sector and location of extractions.

Section 5. Surface Water Use (§356.2[b][3]): a summary of reported surface water use.

Section 6. Total Water Use (§356.2[b][4]): a presentation of total water use by source and sector.

Section 7. Change in Groundwater in Storage (§356.2[b][5]): a description of the methodology and presentation of changes in groundwater in storage based on fall to fall groundwater elevation differences.

Section 8. Progress towards Basin Sustainability (§356.2[c]): a summary of management actions taken throughout the Subbasin by GSAs and individual entities towards sustainability of the Subbasin.

SECTION 2: Paso Robles Subbasin Setting and Monitoring Networks

2.1 Introduction

This section provides a brief description of the basin setting and the groundwater management monitoring programs described in the GSP, as well as any notable events affecting monitoring activities or the quality of monitoring results in the reported 2017–2019 water years. Much of the information reported on in this Annual Report was taken from the GSP prepared by Montgomery & Associates, Inc. (M&A, 2019).

2.2 Subbasin Setting

The Subbasin is a structural trough trending to the northwest filled with terrestrially derived sediments sourced from the surrounding mountains. The Subbasin is surrounded by relatively impermeable geologic formations, sediments with poor water quality, and structural faults. Land surface elevation ranges from approximately 2,000 ft AMSL in the southeast extent of the Subbasin to about 600 ft AMSL in the northwest extent, where the Salinas River exits the Subbasin. Agriculture is the dominant land use. The Subbasin includes the incorporated City of Paso Robles and unincorporated communities of San Miguel, Creston, and Shandon.

The Subbasin is the southernmost portion of the Salinas Valley Groundwater Basin. As originally defined by DWR (2003), the Subbasin was in both San Luis Obispo and Monterey counties. The 2019 DWR basin boundary modification process resulted in a revision of the northern boundary of the Paso Robles Subbasin to be coincident with the San Luis Obispo/Monterey county line, thereby placing the Subbasin entirely within San Luis Obispo County.

The top of the Subbasin is defined by land surface. The bottom of the Subbasin is defined by the base of the Paso Robles Formation. Sediments below the base of the Paso Robles Formation are typically much less permeable than the overlying sediments. Although the bedrock sediments often produce usable quantities of groundwater, the water is generally of poor quality, so they are not considered part of the Subbasin. As described in the GSP, the lateral boundaries of the Subbasin include the following:

- The western boundary is defined by the contact between the sediments in the Subbasin and the sediments of the Santa Lucia Range. A portion of the western boundary is defined by the Rinconada fault system which separates the Paso Robles Subbasin from the Atascadero Area Subbasin.
- The eastern boundary of the Subbasin is defined by the contact between the sediments in the Subbasin and the sediments of the Temblor Range. The San Andreas Fault generally forms the eastern Subbasin boundary.
- The southern boundary of the Subbasin is defined by the contact between the sediments in the Subbasin and the sediments of the La Panza Range. To the southeast, a watershed and groundwater divide separates the Subbasin from the adjacent Carrizo Plain Basin; sedimentary layers are likely continuous across this divide.
- The northern boundary of the Subbasin is defined by the San Luis Obispo/Monterey county line.

Two principal aquifers exist in the Subbasin, including the Alluvial Aquifer and the Paso Robles Formation Aquifer. The Alluvial Aquifer is the youngest aquifer. It is unconfined and consists of predominantly coarse-grained sediments (sand and gravel) deposited along Huer Huero Creek, the Estrella River, and the Salinas River. The Alluvial Aquifer varies in thickness but may be up to 100 ft thick along the channels. Much of the Alluvial Aquifer is characterized by relatively high transmissivity that may exceed 100,000 gallons per day

per foot (gpd/ft). Wells screened in the Alluvial Aquifer can be very productive and may yield over 1,000 gallons per minute (gpm).

The Paso Robles Formation Aquifer underlies the Alluvial Aquifer and outcrops in the Subbasin everywhere outside of the Holocene stream channels. The Paso Robles Formation represents the largest volume of sediments in the Subbasin, with a total thickness up to 3,000 ft in the northern Estrella area and up to 2,000 ft in the Shandon area. The Paso Robles Formation has a thickness of 700 to 1,200 ft throughout most of the Subbasin. It is generally characterized by interbedded, discontinuous lenses of sand and gravel that comprise the most productive strata within the aquifer, separated vertically by comparatively thick zones of fine-grained sediments (silts and clays). Well depths generally range from approximately 200 ft to 1,000 ft or more. As described in the GSP, reported aquifer transmissivity estimates in the Paso Robles Formation range from approximately 1,000 to 9,000 gpd/ft, and well yields range from approximately 150 gpm to 850 gpm.

The primary components of recharge to the Subbasin aquifers are percolation of precipitation and infiltration of surface water from rivers and streams. Natural discharge from the Subbasin aquifers occurs through springs and seeps, evapotranspiration, and discharge to surface water bodies. The most significant component of discharge is pumping of groundwater from wells. The regional direction of groundwater flow is from the southeast to the northwest. As there is no hydrogeologic barrier to flow along the northern boundary of the Subbasin, groundwater exits the Subbasin along that boundary to the adjacent Salinas Valley Basin to the north.

2.3 Precipitation and Climatic Periods

Annual precipitation recorded at the Paso Robles weather station (National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration [NOAA] station 46730) is presented by water year in Figure 2. The long-term average annual precipitation for the period 1925 through 2019 is 14.6 inches per water year, as recorded at the Paso Robles weather station. Climatic periods in the Subbasin have been determined based on analysis of data from the Paso Robles weather station using the Standardized Precipitation Index (SPI), which quantifies deviations from normal precipitation patterns, using a 60-month period for analysis to maintain consistency with previous analyses in the GSP. These climatic periods are categorized according to the following designations: wet, dry, and average/alternating wet and dry (Figure 2). Historical precipitation records are provided in Appendix B.

2.4 Groundwater Elevation Monitoring (§ 356.2[b])

This section provides a brief description of the groundwater management monitoring programs currently in place and any notable events affecting monitoring activities or the quality of monitoring results.

2.4.1 Groundwater Elevation Monitoring Locations

The GSP provided a summary of existing groundwater monitoring efforts currently promulgated under various existing local, state, and federal programs. SGMA requires that monitoring networks be developed to provide sufficient data quality, frequency, and spatial distribution to characterize groundwater and surface water in the Subbasin, and to evaluate changing aquifer conditions in response to GSP implementation. The monitoring network developed in the GSP is intended to support efforts to do the following:

- Monitor changes in groundwater conditions and demonstrate progress toward achieving measurable objectives and minimum thresholds documented in the GSP
- Quantify annual changes in water use
- Monitor impacts to the beneficial uses and users of groundwater

Monitoring networks are developed for each of the five sustainability indicators relevant to the Paso Robles Subbasin:

- Chronic lowering of groundwater levels
- Reduction of groundwater in storage
- Degraded water quality
- Land subsidence
- Depletion of interconnected surface water

Monitoring for the first two sustainability indicators (chronic lowering of water levels and reduction of groundwater in storage) is implemented using the same representative monitoring sites (RMS). The GSP identifies an existing network of 23 RMS wells for water level monitoring. Of these 23 wells, 22 are wells that screen the Paso Robles Formation[2], and one is an Alluvial Aquifer well. These RMS have been monitored biannually, in April and October, for various periods of record. The RMS are displayed in Figure 3, and a summary of information for each of the wells is included in Appendix C.

2.4.2 Monitoring Data Gaps

The GSP noted numerous data gaps in the current RMS network. It should be noted that efforts are continuing during the implementation phase of the GSP to identify existing wells that can be added to the network, or to construct new wells for the network. As a start to this effort, the GSP identified nine additional wells that may be incorporated into the RMS network once the depth and screened aquifer are established. These wells are displayed in Figure 3, and a summary of available well information is included in Appendix D.

2.5 Additional Monitoring

Evaluation of the water quality sustainability indicator is achieved through monitoring of an existing network of supply wells in the Subbasin. Constituents of concern (COCs) identified in the GSP that have the potential to impact suitability of water for public supply or agricultural use include total dissolved solids (TDS), chloride, sulfate, nitrate, boron, and gross alpha radiation.

COCs for drinking water are monitored at public water supply wells (PWS). There are 41 PWSs in the Subbasin. PWSs constitute part of the monitoring network for water quality in the Subbasin. In addition, the GSP identified 28 agricultural supply wells that are monitored for COCs under the Irrigated Lands Regulatory Program (ILRP).

Land subsidence in the Subbasin is monitored using interferometric synthetic-aperture radar (InSAR) data collected using microwave satellite imagery provided by DWR. Available data to date indicate no significant subsidence in the Subbasin that impacts infrastructure. The GSAs will annually assess subsidence using the InSAR data provided by DWR.

A monitoring network to assess the sustainability indicator of groundwater/surface water interconnection is a current data gap that will be addressed during GSP implementation. There is at present only a single Alluvial Aquifer well in the water level monitoring network. This is identified in the GSP as a significant data gap. Additional Alluvial Aquifer wells will need to be established in the monitoring network before groundwater/surface water interaction can be more robustly analyzed.

[2] Since initial establishment of the monitoring well network, two of the 22 Paso Robles Formation Aquifer RMS wells (27S/13E-30N01 and 26S/12E-2607) have become either inactive or inaccessible.

This page intentionally left blank.

SECTION 3: Groundwater Elevations (§ 356.2[b][1])

3.1 Introduction

This section provides a detailed report on groundwater elevations in the Subbasin since spring of 2017, which marked the end of the analyses completed for the GSP. In the future, annual reports will present groundwater elevation updates for the previous water year. However, because of the gap between the end of the GSP analysis and this First Annual Report, five groundwater elevation maps are presented—for fall 2017, spring 2018, fall 2018, spring 2019, and fall 2019.

These maps present the most up-to-date seasonal conditions in the Basin. Most of the data presented characterizes conditions in the Paso Robles Formation Aquifer. Data for the Alluvial Aquifer is too sparse for regional analysis. Monitoring data is reviewed for quality and an appropriate time frame is chosen to provide the highest consistency in the wells used for each reporting period. Data quality is often difficult to ascertain when measurements are taken by other agencies or private well owners, and well construction information may be incomplete or unavailable. This means that a careful review of the data is required prior to uploading to DWR's new Monitoring Network Module (replacing the current CASGEM program) to verify whether measurements are trending consistent with trends of previous years and with the current year's hydrology and level of extractions.

3.1.1 Principal Aquifers

As discussed in Section 2, there are two principal aquifers in the Subbasin. The Paso Robles Formation Aquifer is several hundreds of feet thick, represents the greatest volume of saturated sediments in the Subbasin, and is the aquifer that is most utilized for supply. The Alluvial Aquifer is limited in extent to the active channels of the streams in the Subbasin and is generally less than 100 ft thick.

3.2 Seasonal High and Low (Spring and Fall) (§ 356.2[b][1][A])

The assessment of groundwater elevation conditions in the Subbasin as described in the GSP is largely based on data from the County of San Luis Obispo Flood Control and Water Conservation District (SLOFCWCD) groundwater monitoring program. Groundwater levels are measured by the SLOFCWCD through a network of public and private wells in the Subbasin. Data from many of the wells in the monitoring program are collected subject to confidentiality agreements between the SLOFCWCD and well owners. Consistent with the terms of such agreements, the well owner information and specific locations for these wells are not published in the GSP and that convention is continued in this Annual Report. To maintain consistency with the GSP and represent conditions that can be easily compared from year to year, this Annual Report used the same set of wells as was used in the GSP. Groundwater level data from approximately 50 to 55 wells are used to create the groundwater elevation contour maps, but the well locations and data points are not shown on the maps to preserve confidentiality. Of these 50 to 55 wells, owners of 23 of the wells have agreed to allow public use of the well data and are therefore used as RMS wells for the purpose of monitoring sustainability indicators. As implementation of the GSP progresses, it is anticipated that additional wells will be added to the data set and that many of the wells with current confidentiality agreements will be modified to allow for public use of the data.

In accordance with the SGMA regulations, the following information is presented based on available data:

- Groundwater elevation contour maps for the seasonal high and seasonal low groundwater conditions for the previous water year. Because the most recent presentation of groundwater conditions described in

the GSP was spring 2017, groundwater elevation contour maps are presented for fall 2017, spring 2018, fall 2018, spring 2019, and fall 2019.

- A map depicting the change in groundwater elevation for the preceding water year. Because the most recent change in groundwater elevation in the GSP represented the period between 1997 and 2017, change in groundwater elevation maps are shown here for the periods fall 2016 to fall 2017, fall 2017 to fall 2018, and fall 2018 to fall 2019 (Section 7.1).
- Hydrographs for wells with publicly available data (Appendix E).

3.2.1 Alluvial Aquifer Groundwater Elevation Contours

Groundwater elevation data for the Alluvial Aquifer are too limited to prepare representative contour maps of the seasonal high and seasonal low groundwater elevations. Figure 4 shows the current (as of 2017) groundwater elevation contours for the Alluvial Aquifer, as shown in the GSP. This map, however, was developed using 2017 data (when available) as well as the most recent data prior to 2017. A reasonable data set of Alluvial Aquifer groundwater elevations specific to years 2018 or 2019 is not available, so the map as presented in the GSP is the most recent map available.

Groundwater elevations range from approximately 1,400 ft AMSL in the southeastern portion of the Subbasin to approximately 600 ft AMSL near San Miguel. Groundwater flow direction in the Alluvial Aquifer generally follows the alignment of the creeks and rivers. Overall, groundwater in the Alluvial Aquifer flows from southeast to northwest across the Subbasin. On a basin-wide scale, the average horizontal hydraulic gradient in the alluvium is about 0.004 feet per foot (ft/ft) from the southeastern portion of the Subbasin to San Miguel.

3.2.2 Paso Robles Formation Aquifer Groundwater Elevation Contours

Seasonal high and low groundwater elevation data for the Subbasin for fall 2017 through fall 2019 for the Paso Robles Formation Aquifer were contoured to assess spatial variations, yearly fluctuations, trends in groundwater conditions, groundwater flow directions, and horizontal groundwater gradients. Contour maps were prepared for the seasonal high groundwater levels, which typically occur in the spring, and the seasonal low groundwater levels, which typically occur in the fall. In general, the spring groundwater data are for April and the fall groundwater data are for October. For consistency with the GSP, the same well data sets were used for contouring; information identifying the owner or detailed location of private wells is not shown on the maps to preserve confidentiality.

Figure 5 presents groundwater elevation contours for fall 2017. Groundwater elevations are higher than 1,250 ft AMSL in the southeast portion of the Subbasin and the regional direction of groundwater flow is from the southeast to northwest. The lowest groundwater elevations are observed in the northern portion of the City of Paso Robles and immediately north of the city, with elevations lower than 500 ft AMSL.

Figures 6 and 7 show contours of groundwater elevations in the Paso Robles Formation Aquifer for spring 2018 and fall 2018, respectively. Overall, groundwater conditions in the Subbasin in the spring and fall of 2018 were similar, with groundwater elevations in the fall generally lower than in the spring, a typical seasonal trend for the Subbasin. Groundwater flow direction is generally to the northwest and west over most of the Subbasin. In general, groundwater flow in the western portion of the Subbasin tends to converge toward areas of low groundwater elevations. These areas of low groundwater elevation are in the area between the City of Paso Robles and the communities of San Miguel and Whitley Gardens. Horizontal groundwater gradients range from approximately 0.002 ft/ft in the southeast portion of the Subbasin to approximately 0.02 ft/ft in the area southeast of Paso Robles.

Figures 8 and 9 show contours of groundwater elevations in the Paso Robles Formation Aquifer for spring 2019 and fall 2019, respectively. As is the overall trend every year in the Subbasin, groundwater conditions in the Subbasin in the spring and fall are similar, with groundwater elevations in the fall generally slightly lower than in the spring. Groundwater flow direction is generally to the northwest and west over most of the Subbasin. In general, groundwater flow in the western portion of the Subbasin tends to converge toward areas of low groundwater elevations.

In general, the groundwater elevations observed in the Subbasin during water years 2017 through 2019 reflect slight increases across portions of the Subbasin, likely due predominantly to above-average rainfall conditions in water years 2017 and 2019. Positive and negative changes in groundwater elevations from year to year are observed in different parts of the Subbasin, as has been observed historically. Seasonal trends of slightly higher spring groundwater elevations compared with fall levels continued in each of the water years.

3.3 Hydrographs (§ 356.2[b][1][B])

Groundwater elevation hydrographs are used to evaluate aquifer behavior over time. Changes in groundwater elevation at a given point in the Subbasin can result from many influencing factors, with all or some occurring at any given time. Factors can include changing hydrologic trends, seasonal variations in precipitation, varying Subbasin extractions, changing inflows and outflows along boundaries, availability of recharge from surface water sources, and influence from localized pumping conditions. Climatic variation can be one of the most significant factors affecting groundwater elevations over time. For this reason, the hydrographs also display periods of climatic variation categorized as wet, dry, or average/alternating wet and dry (see Figure 2).

3.3.1 Hydrographs

Groundwater elevation hydrographs and associated location maps for the 22 wells in the Subbasin monitoring network that are constructed in and extract groundwater from the Paso Robles Formation Aquifer are presented in Appendix E. The groundwater elevation data for the single Alluvial Aquifer RMS is not shown. These hydrographs also include information on well screen interval (if available), reference point elevation, as well as measurable objectives and minimum thresholds for each well that were developed during the preparation of the GSP. Many of the hydrographs illustrate a condition of declining water levels since the late 1990s, although some indicate relative water level stability over the same period.

As described in the GSP, an average of the 2017 non-pumping groundwater levels was selected as the measurable objectives and minimum thresholds are set below those levels. Going forward from 2017, the average of the spring and fall measurements in any one water year will be the benchmark against which trends will be assessed.

Of the 22 RMS hydrographs presented in Appendix E, none of the RMS wells exhibit groundwater elevations at or below the minimum threshold. Although the groundwater elevations in some of the RMS wells are continuing to trend downward, several of the RMS wells exhibit recovering groundwater elevations recently, apparently as a result of the recent years of above-average rainfall. Ten of the 22 RMS wells have current groundwater elevations greater than the measurable objective for that RMS well.

This page intentionally left blank.

SECTION 4: Groundwater Extractions (§ 356.2[b][2])

4.1 Introduction

This section presents the metered and estimated groundwater extractions from the Subbasin for the 2017, 2018, and 2019 water years. The types of groundwater extraction described in this section include municipal (Table 1), agricultural (Table 2), rural domestic (Table 3), and small public water systems (Table 4). Each following subsection includes a description of the method of measurement and a qualitative level of accuracy for each estimate. The level of accuracy is rated on a qualitative scale of low, medium, and high. The annual groundwater extraction volumes for all water use sectors are shown in Table 5.

4.2 Municipal Metered Well Production Data

The municipal groundwater extractions documented in this report are metered data. Metered groundwater pumping extraction data are from the City of Paso Robles, San Miguel CSD, and the County of San Luis Obispo for Community Service Area 16 (CSA 16), providing service to the community of Shandon. The data shown in Table 1 reflect metered data reported by the respective agencies. The accuracy level rating of these metered data is high.

Table 1. Municipal Groundwater Extractions

Water Year	Metered Groundwater Extractions			Total (AF)
	City of Paso Robles (AF)	San Miguel CSD (AF)	CSA 16 (AF)	
2017	3,870	295	70	4,235
2018	4,654	325	50	5,029
2019	4,467	289	48	4,804

Notes:
AF = acre-feet
CSA = community service area (County of San Luis Obispo)
CSD = community services district

4.3 Estimate of Agricultural Extraction

Agricultural water use constituted 88 percent of the total anthropogenic groundwater use in the Subbasin in water years 2017-2019. To estimate agricultural water demand, land use data along with climate and soil data were analyzed and processed using the soil-water balance model that was developed for the Paso Robles Groundwater Basin Model Update (GSSI, 2014). Annual land use spatial data sets from San Luis Obispo County were used to determine the appropriate crop categories, distribution, and acreages. Land use types were grouped within seven crop categories, including alfalfa, citrus, deciduous, nursery, pasture, vegetable, and vineyard, each with a respective set of crop water demand coefficients from the San Luis Obispo County Master Water Report[3] (Carollo, 2012). Climate data inputs include precipitation from the Paso Robles Station (NOAA station 46730) and reference evapotranspiration (ETo) data from several private stations in the Subbasin operated by Western Weather Group. Soil water holding capacity data from National Resources Conservation Service soil surveys of San Luis Obispo County were used. The soil-water balance

[3] Vineyard crop coefficients were modified based on discussions with Mark Battany, University of California Extension (GSSI, 2014).

model includes consideration for regulated deficit irrigation (RDI), cover crop, and frost protection water demands for vineyards as well as irrigation system efficiencies (GSSI, 2014).

The soil-water balance model was utilized to estimate agricultural water demands through water year 2016 during completion of the GSP (M&A, 2019). Agricultural water demand for this First Annual Report was estimated for water years 2017, 2018, and 2019 using the soil-water balance model. The resulting estimated groundwater extractions for agricultural demands are summarized in Table 2. The accuracy level rating of these estimated volumes is medium.

Table 2. Estimated Agricultural Irrigation Groundwater Extractions

Water Year	Agricultural Demand (AF)
2017	72,500
2018	71,000
2019	72,200

Note:
AF = acre-feet

4.4 Rural Domestic and Small Public Water System Extraction

Rural domestic and small PWS groundwater extractions in the Subbasin were estimated using the methods described here.

4.4.1 Rural Domestic Demand

As documented in the Paso Robles Groundwater Basin Model Update (GSSI, 2014), the rural domestic water demand was originally estimated as the product of County estimates of rural domestic units (DUs) and a water demand factor of 1.7 AFY per DU, which included small PWS water demand (Fugro, 2002). This factor was subsequently modified to 1.0 AFY/DU in the San Luis Obispo County Master Water Report, not including small PWS demand (Carollo, 2012). Based on further investigation completed for the 2014 groundwater model update, the rural domestic water use factor was refined to 0.75 AFY/DU (GSSI, 2014). To simulate rural water demand over time in the groundwater model, an annual growth rate of 2.25 percent for the rural population was assumed, based on recommendation from the San Luis Obispo County Planning Department (GSSI, 2014). The groundwater model update completed for the GSP (M&A, 2019) used a linear regression projection based on the 2014 model update to estimate rural domestic demand through water year 2016. The projected future water budget presented in the GSP (M&A, 2019) assumes water neutral growth in rural domestic water demand from water year 2016 going forward. Therefore, the rural domestic demand has been held constant at the estimated 2016 water year volume for this annual report. The resulting groundwater extractions for rural domestic demands are summarized in Table 3. The accuracy level rating of these estimated volumes is low-medium.

Table 3. Estimated Rural Domestic Groundwater Extractions

Water Year	Rural Domestic (AF)
2017	3,530
2018	3,530
2019	3,530

Note: AF = acre-feet

4.4.2 Small Public Water System Extractions

The category of small PWSs includes a wide variety of establishments and facilities including small mutual water companies, golf courses, wineries, rural schools, and rural businesses. Various studies over the years used a mix of pumping data and estimates for type-specific water demand rates to estimate small PWS groundwater demand (Fugro, 2002; Todd Engineers, 2009). The 2012 San Luis Obispo County Master Water Report used the County of San Luis Obispo geographic information services mapping to define the distribution and number of commercial systems at the time and applied a single annual factor of 1.5 AFY per system (Carollo, 2012).

For the 2014 model update, actual pumping data were used as available to provide a monthly record over the study period (GSSI, 2014). Groundwater demand for four major golf courses (at the time) in the Subbasin (The Links, Hunter Ranch, Paso Robles, and River Oaks) was estimated using the following factors: ETo data measured in Paso Robles, the crop coefficient for turf grass, monthly rainfall data, and golf course acreage (GSSI, 2014). Water use for wineries was estimated by identifying each winery and its permitted capacity and applying a water use rate of 5 gallons of water per gallon of wine produced. Minor landscaping, wine tasting/restaurant functions, and return flows were also accounted for (GSSI, 2014). Water use for several small commercial/institutional water systems was estimated using water duty factors specific to the water system type (i.e., camp, school, restaurant, and other uses) (GSSI, 2014).

The groundwater model update completed for the GSP (M&A, 2019) used a linear regression projection for the 2014 model update to estimate small PWS demand through water year 2016. The projected future water budget presented in the GSP (M&A, 2019) assumes water neutral growth in small PWS water demand from water year 2016 going forward. Therefore, the small PWS demand has been held constant at the estimated 2016 water year volume for this annual report. The resulting groundwater extractions for small PWS demands are summarized in Table 4. The accuracy level rating of these estimated volumes is low-medium.

Table 4. Estimated Small Public Water System Groundwater Extractions

Water Year	Small PWS (AF)
2017	1,530
2018	1,530
2019	1,530

Note:
AF = acre-feet

4.5 Total Groundwater Extraction Summary

Total groundwater extractions in the Subbasin for water years 2017, 2018, and 2019 are 81,800 AF, 81,100 AF, and 82,100 AF, respectively. Table 5 summarizes the total water use by sector and indicates the method of measure and associated level of accuracy. Approximate points of extraction were spatially distributed and colored according to a grid system to represent the relative pumping across the basin in terms of AF per acre (see Figure 10).

Table 5. Total Groundwater Extractions

Water Year	Groundwater Extractions by Water Use Sector			Total (AF)
	Municipal (AF)	PWS and Rural Domestic (AF)	Agriculture (AF)	
2017	4,235	5,060	72,500	81,800
2018	5,029	5,060	71,000	81,100
2019	4,804	5,060	72,200	82,100
Method of Measure:	Metered	2016 Groundwater Model	Soil-Water Balance Model	
Level of Accuracy:	high	low-medium	medium	

Notes:
AF = acre-feet
PWS = public water systems

SECTION 5: Surface Water Use (§ 356.2[b][3])

5.1 Introduction

This section addresses the reporting requirement of providing surface water supplies used, or available for use, and describes the annual volume and sources for the 2017, 2018, and 2019 water years. The method of measurement and level of accuracy is rated on a qualitative scale. The Subbasin currently benefits from surface water entitlements from the Nacimiento Water Project (NWP) and the State Water Project (SWP) to supplement municipal groundwater demands in the City of Paso Robles and the community of Shandon, respectively. Locations of communities dependent on groundwater and with access to surface water are shown on Figure 11.

5.2 Surface Water Available for Use

Table 6 provides a breakdown of surface water available for municipal use in the Subbasin. There is currently no surface water available for agricultural or recharge project use within the Subbasin.

Table 6. Surface Water Available for Use

Water Year	Nacimiento Water Project[1] (AF)	State Water Project[2] (AF)	Total Available Surface Water (AF)
2017	6,488	100	6,588
2018	6,488	100	6,588
2019	6,488	100	6,588

Notes:
[1] Contract annual entitlement to the City of Paso Robles
[2] Contract annual entitlement to CSA 16
AF = acre-feet

5.3 Total Surface Water Use

A summary of total actual surface water use by source is provided in Table 7. The accuracy level rating of these metered data is high.

Environmental uses of surface water is also recognized but not estimated due to insufficient data to make an estimate of surface water use. It is expected that environmental uses will be quantified in future annual reports as more data become available.

Table 7. Annual Surface Water Use

Water Year	Nacimiento Water Project (AF)	State Water Project (AF)	Total Surface Water Use (AF)
2017	1,784	42	1,826
2018	2,284	55	2,339
2019	1,498	43	1,541

Notes:
AF = acre-feet

SECTION 6: **Total Water Use (§ 356.2[b][4])**

This section summarizes the total annual groundwater and surface water used to meet municipal, agricultural, and rural demands within the Subbasin. For the 2017, 2018, and 2019 water years, the quantification of total water use was completed from reported metered municipal water production and metered surface water delivery, and from models used to estimate agricultural and rural water demand. Table 8 summarizes the total annual water use in the Subbasin by source and water use sector for water years 2017, 2018, and 2019. The method of measurement and a qualitative level of accuracy for each estimate is rated on a qualitative scale of low, medium, and high.

Table 8. Total Annual Water Use by Source and Water Use Sector

Water Year	Municipal (AF)		PWS and Rural Domestic (AF)	Agriculture (AF)	Total (AF)
Source:	Groundwater	Surface Water	Groundwater	Groundwater	
2017	4,235	1,826	5,060	72,500	**83,600**
2018	5,029	2,339	5,060	71,000	**83,400**
2019	4,804	1,541	5,060	72,200	**83,600**
Method of Measure:	Metered	Metered	2016 Groundwater Model	Soil-Water Balance Model	
Level of Accuracy:	high	high	low-medium	medium	

Notes:
AF = acre-feet
PWS = public water systems

SECTION 7: Change in Groundwater in Storage (§ 356.2[b][5])

7.1 Annual Changes in Groundwater Elevation (§ 356.2[b][5][A])

Annual changes in groundwater elevation in the Paso Robles Formation Aquifer for water years 2017, 2018, and 2019 are derived from comparison of fall groundwater elevation contour maps from one year to the next. For example, the fall 2016 groundwater elevations were subtracted from the fall 2017 groundwater elevations resulting in a map depicting the changes in groundwater elevations in the Paso Robles Formation Aquifer that occurred during the 2017 water year (see Figure 12). Similar calculations were made for water years 2018 and 2019 resulting in groundwater elevation change maps in the Paso Robles Formation Aquifer for water year 2018 (Figure 13) and water year 2019 (Figure 14). These groundwater elevation change maps are based on a reasonable and thorough analysis of the currently available data. As stated in Section 3, groundwater elevation data for the Alluvial Aquifer are too limited to prepare annual groundwater elevation contour maps. Therefore, the change in groundwater in storage analysis is limited to the Paso Robles Formation Aquifer for this annual report. As discussed in the GSP, the monitoring network needs to be expanded to more completely assess Subbasin conditions.

The groundwater elevation change map for water year 2017 (Figure 12) shows that water levels declined over a large portion of the central and northern areas of the Subbasin, with a minor depression in the City of Paso Robles area and a more pronounced area of decline in the Shandon area. The 2017 map also shows that groundwater elevations increased significantly in the southern highland areas of the Subbasin in response to the above-average precipitation received in 2017.

The groundwater elevations change map for water year 2018 (Figure 13) shows that water levels declined in the southern, eastern, and northwestern areas of the Subbasin and increased over the central portion of the Subbasin, notably in the Shandon area.

The groundwater elevations change map for water year 2019 (Figure 14) shows that groundwater elevations increased over a large portion of the eastern half of the Subbasin including a pronounced increase in the Shandon area and that water levels declined over a large portion of the western half of the Subbasin, notably in the area west of Creston.

7.2 Annual and Cumulative Change in Groundwater in Storage Calculations (§ 356.2[b][5][B])

The groundwater elevation change maps presented above represent a volume change within the Paso Robles Formation Aquifer for each water year. The volume change depicted on each map represents a total volume, including the volume displaced by the aquifer material and the volume of groundwater stored within the void space of the aquifer. The portion of void space in the aquifer that can be utilized for groundwater storage is represented by the aquifer storage coefficient (S), a unitless factor, which is multiplied by the total volume change to derive the change in groundwater in storage. Based on work completed for the GSP, S is estimated to be 7 percent.[4] The annual changes of groundwater in storage calculated for water years 2017, 2018, and 2019 are presented in Table 9 and the annual and cumulative change in groundwater in storage since 1981 are presented on Figure 15.

[4] Appendix F includes derivation of the storage coefficient from the GSP groundwater model files and a sensitivity analysis.

Table 9. Annual Changes in Groundwater in Storage - Paso Robles Formation Aquifer

Water Year	Annual Change (AF)
2017	60,100
2018	6,400
2019	59,700

Note:
AF = acre-feet

SECTION 8: **Progress toward Basin Sustainability (§ 356.2[c])**

8.1 Introduction

This section describes several projects and management actions that are in process or have been recently implemented in the Subbasin to avoid undesirable results and to attain sustainability. These projects and actions include capital projects and non-structural policies intended to reduce or optimize local groundwater use. Some of these projects were described in concept in the GSP; some of the actions described herein are new initiatives designed to make new water supplies available to the Subbasin that may be implemented by project participants to reduce pumping and partially mitigate the degree to which the management actions would be needed.

As described in the GSP, the need for projects and management actions is based on emerging Subbasin conditions, including the following:

- Groundwater levels are declining in many parts of the Subbasin, indicating that the amount of groundwater pumping is more than the natural recharge.
- Water budgets indicate that the amount of groundwater in storage has been in decline and will continue to decline in the future if there is no net decrease in pumping demand on the Subbasin.

To mitigate declines in groundwater levels in some parts of the Subbasin, achieve the sustainability goal before 2040, and avoid undesirable results as required by SMGA regulations, an overall reduction of groundwater pumping will be needed. A reduction in groundwater pumping can occur as a result of both management actions and projects that develop new water supplies used in lieu of pumping.

This section also provides a brief discussion of land subsidence, potential depletion of interconnected surface waters, and groundwater quality trends that have occurred during water years 2017, 2018, and 2019.

The projects and management actions described in this section will help achieve groundwater sustainability by avoiding undesirable results.

8.2 Implementation Approach

As described in the GSP, because the amount of groundwater pumping in the Subbasin is more than the estimated sustainable yield and groundwater levels are persistently declining in some parts of the Subbasin, the GSAs have already initiated several projects and management actions. It is anticipated that additional new projects and management actions will be implemented in the near future to continue progress towards avoiding or mitigating undesirable results.

Some of the projects and management actions described in this section are Subbasin-wide initiatives and some are area-specific. Generally, the basin-wide management actions apply to all areas of the Subbasin and reflect relatively basic GSP implementation requirements. Area-specific projects have been designed to aid in mitigating persistent water level declines in certain parts of the Subbasin.

8.3 Basin-Wide Management Actions and Projects

8.3.1 Amendment #1 to the MOA

The original five GSAs overlying the original Subbasin entered into a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) in September 2017. Heritage Ranch Community Services District (CSD) was an original party to the MOA but

with basin boundary modification approval by DWR in 2019, Heritage Ranch CSD is no longer part of the Subbasin and has withdrawn from the MOA, leaving four participants. The purpose of the MOA was to establish a committee to develop a single GSP for the entire Subbasin. Furthermore, the GSAs intended to use the MOA as the framework for basin-wide cooperation in management of the Subbasin during the time between adoption of the GSP and approval of the GSP by DWR. As originally written, the MOA would automatically terminate upon DWR's approval of the GSP.

Prior to submittal of the GSP for DWR review and approval, each of the GSAs adopted the GSP pursuant to the terms of the MOA. Each GSA separately adopted resolutions amending the original MOA to remove the automatic termination language because the GSAs agree to continue cooperating on the GSP and its implementation pursuant to the framework established by the MOA until such time as a long-term governance structure is developed. The amendment (Amendment #1) will allow for continued collaboration and cooperation among the GSAs to manage groundwater in the Subbasin and achieve sustainability.

8.3.2 Extension of Water Neutral New Development Program

In October 2015, the County Board of Supervisors established the Countywide Water Conservation Program (CWWCP), which includes the Water Neutral New Development (WNND) program, in response to declining groundwater levels. WNND programs that are being implemented in the Subbasin include:

- The Urban/Rural Water Offset and Rebate Programs
- The Agricultural Offset Program

These programs required new urban/rural development using groundwater from the Subbasin to offset new water use at a 1:1 ratio and limited new or expanded irrigated commercial crop production in areas within the Subbasin except by offset of existing irrigated crop production at a 1:1 ratio either on the same property or on a different property in the Subbasin. The Agricultural Offset Program also identified areas of severe decline in groundwater elevation and further restricted properties overlying these areas from planting new or expanded irrigated crops except for those converting irrigated crops on the same property to a different crop type. The Agricultural Offset Program was originally intended to be a stop-gap measure to avoid further depletion of the Subbasin until SGMA became effective. The ordinances that created the programs included a termination clause that stated the programs in the Subbasin shall expire upon the effective date of a final and adopted GSP.

In June 2019, the Board of Supervisors directed the County of San Luis Obispo Department of Planning and Building to develop recommendations for extending the WNND programs such that there was no gap between the expiration of the programs and any pumping restrictions or controls that may be implemented as part of the GSP. Modification of the Agricultural Offset Program was proposed to occur in several phases, with the first phase starting in November 2019 to avoid the gap. The first phase amendments, adopted on November 5, 2019, did not require environmental review because the changes from the existing ordinance were relatively minor. These items include the following:

- Extend the WNND ordinance expiration dates by two years
- Include a process to add water duty factors to unlisted crops
- Include a water duty factor for supplementally irrigated Dry Cropland and a methodology for determining previous five-year onsite water use
- Include a water duty factor for hemp
- Eliminate off-site offsets
- Require a recorded disclosure form

The County Board of Supervisors anticipates addressing additional items in early 2020, including:

- Re-evaluate the extent of the "red zone," the zone of critical impact in the central portion of the Subbasin
- Update and set the Subbasin boundary map to match the DWR Bulletin 118 boundary
- Establish a registration process for voluntary fallowing of irrigated agricultural lands

Items that will likely be addressed in mid-to-late 2020 are those that could trigger additional environmental review because they have the potential to result in adverse environmental impacts, and as such, more time is needed to complete those amendments. These later-phase items as they pertain to the Subbasin include the following:

- Consider expanding the definition of de minimis use from 5 AFY to 25 AFY per site, considering parcel size
- Consider extending the lookback period beyond five years
- Revisit the Paso Robles Subbasin planning area standards that prohibit general plan amendments and land divisions (to allow for water-neutral housing projects)
- Revisit water offset fees and water usage assumptions
- Discuss allowing off-site offsets

8.3.3 Paso Basin Aerial Groundwater Mapping Pilot Study

In November 2019, the County of San Luis Obispo joined in a pilot study through DWR and Stanford University to conduct aerial groundwater mapping of a large portion of the Subbasin utilizing Aerial Electromagnetic method (AEM). The goal of the pilot study is to acquire survey data to characterize and map subsurface geologic structures as well as the presence and extent of clay, silt, sand, and gravel layers to a depth of approximately 1,000 to 1,400 feet below the ground surface. The study has the potential to enhance our understanding of the groundwater flow within the Subbasin, the interconnectedness of different parts of the Subbasin, and the geologic framework that controls groundwater flow. The study is in line with proposal #3.7 of California's Water Resilience Portfolio (see Section 8.4.1 for additional discussion and detail of the Water Resilience Portfolio) which is specifically intended to support use of aerial electromagnetic surveys, groundwater quality conditions, and well completion reports to identify optimal areas for enhanced recharge and critical connections in aquifer systems.

8.4 Area-Specific Projects

8.4.1 Expand Alluvial Aquifer Monitoring Network and Install New Stream Gages

A significant data gap that was identified in the GSP was the need to expand the network of monitoring wells and stream gages within the Alluvial Aquifer, one of the two principal aquifers in the Subbasin. The existing network of monitoring wells in the Alluvial Aquifer in areas where surface water and groundwater interaction may occur is extremely sparse and surface water flows in the Subbasin are ephemeral. Together, these two factors make it difficult to assess the interconnectivity of surface water and groundwater and to quantify whether any surface water depletion has occurred. There are no available data that establish whether the groundwater and surface water are connected through a continuous saturated zone in any aquifer, although water elevation contour maps of the Paso Robles Formation wells suggest that a continuous saturated zone between the surface water and the Paso Robles Formation aquifer does not exist.

The inability to assess the interconnectivity of the surface water with the underlying aquifers also affects the understanding of the potential impacts of pumping on groundwater dependent ecosystems (GDEs), which

are plant and animal communities that require groundwater to meet some or all of their water needs. GDEs can be associated with areas where there is a direct connection between shallow alluvial water-bearing formations and deeper aquifers. The existing groundwater monitoring program in the Subbasin does not include any nested monitoring wells that can be used to assess the interaction between the surface stream flows, associated Alluvial Aquifer, and the underlying Paso Robles Formation Aquifer.

Per the recommendations set forth in the GSP, *"Definitive data delineating any interconnections between surface water and groundwater or a lack of interconnected surface waters is a data gap that will be addressed during implementation of this GSP."* To address this significant data gap and assess the potential for interconnectivity of the surface water with the principal aquifers of the Subbasin, the four GSAs have submitted a proposal to the State Water Resources Control Board (Board) for the use of Supplemental Environmental Project (SEP) funds that are potentially available as a result of a settlement agreement between the Board and the City of Paso Robles for violations of the City's National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System permit related to wastewater treatment releases.

Through the assistance of the SEP funds, the potential for interconnected surface water within the Alluvial Aquifer will be assessed after data from this expanded network of monitoring wells and stream gages are developed and analyzed. Currently, only two stream gages exist within the Basin. The proposed SEP project intends to expand that network by coupling stream gages with monitoring wells in each of the major drainages across the Subbasin, including the Salinas River, Huer Huero Creek, Estrella River, San Marcos Creek, Shell Creek, San Juan Creek and other smaller surface water drainage features.

The GSAs have identified 10 sites in which additional hydrologic, geologic, and hydrogeologic data are necessary. The overall project goals include the installation of a stream gage and a nested monitoring well at each of the 10 sites. The sites were identified in locations where stream gages coupled with dedicated monitoring wells would provide key data. Monitoring wells would be nested or paired (depending on local conditions and whether existing wells are available and suitable) with a minimum of three wells, or discrete depth intervals, at each site. The discrete intervals are intended to monitor hydrologic conditions within the Alluvial Aquifer, a short distance below the base of the Alluvial Aquifer in the Paso Robles Formation Aquifer and deeper into the Paso Robles Formation Aquifer at depths similar to production wells in the general vicinity of each individual site.

Two of the selected sites, the 13th Street Bridge in Paso Robles and the Airport Road crossing of the Estrella River, have existing U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) stream gages. The other eight sites will require new stream gage installations. GSAs recognize that installing the proposed network of monitoring wells and stream gages at all of the 10 proposed sites will require a significant initial capital investment as well as a commitment of resources and funding for annual operation and maintenance of the sites. Thus, the GSAs intend to implement the proposed monitoring network over time. Under the terms of this proposed grant application, the GSAs intend to complete two or three sites at this time, and install monitoring systems at the remaining sites as funding becomes available.

This proposed work effort is in line with California Senate Bill 19 (approved September 27, 2019) which is an act to add Section 144 to the California Water Code, relating to water resources. The bill requires DWR to develop a plan to deploy a network of stream gages that includes a determination of funding needs and opportunities for modernizing and reactivating existing gages and deploying new gages. The bill also requires DWR to give priority in the plan to placing or modernizing and reactivating stream gages where lack of data contributes to conflicts in water management or where water can be more effectively managed for multiple benefits.

This proposed project also supports the mandate of Governor Gavin Newsom's Executive Order N-10-19 (April 2019) that directs the state's water agencies to develop a "water resilience portfolio," described as a

set of actions to meet California's water needs. In response, the state agencies developed an inventory and assessment of key aspects of California water, leading to a series of priorities. Among the list of 133 specific priorities, proposal #22.6 is intended to modernize water data systems to inform real-time water management decisions and long-term planning by building on implementation of Senate Bill 19 which requires an assessment of the state's stream gage network.

The amount of money that may be available to fund the project is $240,000.

8.4.2 City of Paso Robles Recycled Water Program

In 2016, the City completed a major upgrade of its Wastewater Treatment Plant to efficiently and effectively remove all harmful pollutants from the wastewater. The City's master plan is to produce tertiary-quality recycled water and distribute it to east Paso Robles, where it may be safely used for irrigation of city parks, golf courses, and vineyards. This will reduce the need to pump groundwater from the Subbasin and will further improve the sustainability of the City's water supply. In 2019, the City completed construction and began operating the recycled water system and is presently designing a major distribution system to deliver recycled water to east Paso Robles. The recycled water distribution system project will be ready for construction in 2020.

The project will use up to 2,200 AFY of disinfected tertiary effluent for in-lieu recharge in the central portion of the Subbasin near and inside the City of Paso Robles. Water that is not used for recycled water purposes can be discharged to Huer Huero Creek with the potential for additional recharge benefits. Infrastructure includes upgraded wastewater treatment plant and pump station, 5.8 miles of pipeline, a storage tank, numerous turnouts, and a discharge to Huer Huero Creek.

The primary benefit from the City's Recycled Water Program is higher groundwater elevations in the central portion of the Subbasin due to in-lieu recharge from the direct use of the recycled water and recharge through Huer Huero Creek.

8.4.3 San Miguel CSD Recycled Water Project

The San Miguel CSD Recycled Water project is currently in the planning and preliminary design phases. This planned project will upgrade the CSD wastewater treatment plant to meet California Code of Regulations (CCR) Title 22 criteria for disinfected secondary recycled water for irrigation use by vineyards. Potential customers include a group of agricultural irrigators on the east side of the Salinas River, and a group of agricultural customers northwest of the wastewater treatment plant. The project could provide between 200 AFY and 450 AFY of additional water supplies. The primary benefit from the CSD's Recycled Water project is higher groundwater elevations in the vicinity of the community of San Miguel due to in-lieu recharge from the direct use of the recycled water.

8.4.4 Blended Water Project

Private entities and individuals are working actively with the City of Paso Robles and numerous agricultural irrigators to develop a project that can bring recycled water to the central portion of the Subbasin. As described above, the City estimates that as much as 2,200 AFY of recycled water will be available, and the volume will likely increase in the future as the City grows. The wastewater treatment plant is designed to process and deliver up to 4,000 AFY.

The goal of the Blended Water Project is to design and construct a pipeline system to connect to the City's Recycled Water Program and convey recycled water into the agricultural areas east of the City. Although there are many ways to utilize the Recycled Water Program water directly, certain challenges exist to make

the water quality of the recycled water attractive to some agricultural users. Blending the recycled water with surplus Nacimiento Water Project water, when available, may mitigate these challenges.

Numerous challenges exist to develop the project, but considerable time and effort has been expended by several private entities as well as City staff to develop this conceptual project. The primary benefit from the Blended Water Project is higher groundwater elevations in the central portion of the Subbasin east of the City of Paso Robles due to reductions in groundwater pumping for irrigation and in-lieu recharge from the direct use of the blended water. Associated benefits may include improved groundwater quality from the use and recharge of high-quality irrigation water.

8.4.5 Stormwater Capture and Recharge Projects

As described in the GSP, stormwater runoff capture projects, including low-impact development (LID) standards for new or retrofitted construction, will be promoted throughout the Subbasin as priority projects to be implemented as described in the San Luis Obispo County Stormwater Resource Plan (SWRP). The SWRP outlines an implementation strategy to ensure valuable, high-priority projects with multiple benefits.

This management action covers two types of stormwater capture activities. The first stormwater management activity is the effort to reduce runoff of rainwater in the urban environment into streets, storm drains, and other sites that discharge water as well as pollutants directly into waterways and the underlying aquifer through infiltration of streamflow recharge. In this way, groundwater quality is protected and improved. Examples of this effort include LID and on-farm recharge of local runoff. The second stormwater capture effort involves direct recharge of storm flows through the capture and diversion of water to recharge locations to help maintain base flows in streams and to replenish aquifer storage.

Two stormwater capture programs are underway in the Paso Robles Subbasin, including the City of Paso Robles's Municipal Stormwater Program and a joint investigation by the Shandon-San Juan Water District (SSJWD) and the Estrella-El Pomar-Creston Water District (EPCWD) to assess the feasibility of developing stormwater capture and recharge in their respective districts.

8.4.5.1 City of Paso Robles Municipal Stormwater Program

The City of Paso Robles currently has a City Watershed Plan in development. This Plan will identify opportunities to capture stormwater, send it through the City's wastewater treatment plant, and add it to the Recycled Water supply. The City of Paso Robles has also developed a Municipal Stormwater Program that includes the development and implementation of a Stormwater Management Plan (SWMP) to reduce or eliminate pollutants in stormwater runoff and non-storm water discharges. The SWMP describes the Best Management Practices (BMPs), measurable goals, and timetables for implementation of the following five minimum control measures:

- Construction Site Stormwater Runoff Control
- Illicit Discharge Detection and Elimination
- Pollution Prevention/Good Housekeeping for Municipal Operations
- Post-Construction Stormwater Runoff Management
- Public Education and Public Participation

Under the program, the City educates and involves the community in stormwater pollution prevention, regulates stormwater run-off from construction sites, investigates non-stormwater discharges, and reduces non-stormwater runoff from municipal operations.

8.4.5.2 SSJWD/EPCWD Stormwater Capture and Recharge Feasibility Study

The SSJWD and EPCWD are jointly funding a study to assess the feasibility and costs associated with capturing stormwater runoff and recharging aquifers within selected areas of their respective districts, including Shell Creek, Navajo Creek, San Juan Creek, and Huer Huero Creek. If feasible and cost effective, the capture and recharge of stormwater will aid in reducing the deficit between pumping and natural recharge in the Subbasin, which will improve the sustainability of the groundwater system. This ongoing investigation focuses on the following key questions:

- Where are the best areas to divert and recharge stormwater that would benefit the Subbasin?
- How much water can potentially be captured?
- What scale is necessary to make the projects meaningful?
- What is the most efficient way to capture and recharge stormwater and what would a typical project concept look like?
- What are the permitting and regulatory requirements for building and operating a stormwater capture and recharge project?
- What would a project or projects cost to design, permit and construct?
- What is the availability of grant funds?

Building on previous County of San Luis Obispo studies of the Huer Huero Creek near the City of Paso Robles (Todd Groundwater, RMC Woodard & Curran, 2017), the joint SSJWD/EPCWD study will be expanded to include the southern reaches of Huer Huero Creek in the Creston area, as well as the Shell, San Juan, and Navajo creeks. Areas within the watershed of these creeks will be assessed to identify the most promising locations for stormwater capture and recharge by considering the following:

- Existing drainage locations overlying or feeding into the Subbasin
- Land surface elevation and slope
- Soils conducive to recharge
- Locations directly overlying the Paso Robles Formation Aquifer
- Proximity to low permeability layers that would impede infiltration
- Proximity to structures
- Potential for impacts caused by ponding stormwater

The results of the study are expected in spring 2020.

8.5 Summary of Progress toward Meeting Subbasin Sustainability

Relative to the basin conditions at the end of the study period as reported in the GSP, this First Annual Report (2017–2019) indicates an improvement in groundwater conditions throughout the Subbasin and a marked increase of total groundwater in storage. It is clear that historical groundwater pumping in excess of the sustainable yield has created challenging conditions for sustainable management. However, actions are already underway to collect data, improve the monitoring and data collection networks, and coordinate with affected agencies and entities throughout the Subbasin to develop solutions that address the shared mutual interest in the Subbasin's overall sustainability goal.

8.5.1 Subsidence

Land subsidence is the lowering of the land surface. As described in the GSP, several human-induced and natural causes of subsidence exist, but the only process applicable to SGMA are those due to lowered ground surface elevations caused by groundwater pumping (M&A, 2019). Historical subsidence can be estimated using Interferometric Synthetic Aperture Radar (InSAR) data provided by DWR. InSAR measures ground elevation using microwave satellite imagery data. The GSP documents minor subsidence in the Subbasin using data provided by DWR depicting the difference in InSAR measured ground surface elevations between June 2015 and June 2018. These data show that subsidence of up to 0.125 feet may have occurred over this three-year period in a few small, isolated areas of the Subbasin (M&A, 2019). This is a minor rate of subsidence and is relatively insignificant and not a major concern for the Subbasin. As of the date of this report, there are no more recent land subsidence datasets available since publication of the GSP. The GSA's will continue to monitor and report annual subsidence as more data become available.

8.5.2 Interconnected Surface Water

Ephemeral surface water flows in the Subbasin make it difficult to assess the interconnectivity of surface water and groundwater and to quantify the degree to which surface water depletion has occurred. Currently, there are no available data that establish connectivity between groundwater and surface water through a continuous saturated zone in any aquifer. As stated in the GSP, water elevation contour maps of the Paso Robles Formation wells may suggest that a continuous saturated zone between the surface water and the Paso Robles Formation aquifer does not exist (M&A, 2019). As of the date of this report, there are no more recent data available since publication of the GSP to assess the interconnectivity of surface water and groundwater or to quantify potential surface water depletion. The potential for interconnected surface water with the alluvial aquifer will be assessed as data are developed and analyzed as discussed in Section 8.4.1.

8.5.3 Groundwater Quality

Although groundwater quality is not a primary focus of SGMA, actions or projects undertaken by GSAs to achieve sustainability cannot degrade water quality to the extent that they would cause undesirable results. As stated in the GSP, groundwater quality in the Subbasin is generally suitable for both drinking water and agricultural purposes (M&A, 2019). Eight constituents of concern (COC's) were identified and discussed in the GSP that have the potential to be impacted by groundwater management activities. These COC's identified in the GSP are salinity (as indicated by electrical conductivity), total dissolved solids (TDS), sodium, chloride, nitrate, sulfate, boron, and gross alpha. For this annual report, concentrations of these eight COC's were analyzed for the water years 2017 through 2019 period using data from the GeoTracker GAMA database (GAMA, 2019) to document any potential changes in Subbasin-wide concentration trends since 2016. All but one of the COC's reviewed show a steady concentration trend since 2016. Gross alpha, the exception, exhibits a slight downward trend since 2016, driven mostly by sampling results from the City of Paso Robles area.

Overall, there are no significant changes to groundwater quality since 2016, as documented in the GSP. Implementation of sustainability projects and/or management actions, as presented in the GSP, in this annual report, or in future reports or GSP updates, are not anticipated to result in degraded groundwater quality in the Subbasin. Any potential changes in groundwater quality will be documented in future annual reports and GSP updates.

8.5.4 Summary of Changes in Basin Conditions

The above-average rainfall water years of 2017 and 2019 improved groundwater conditions in the Subbasin. Groundwater in storage in the Subbasin increased more than 125,000 AF in total over the past three water

years (Section 7.2). The volume of groundwater extractions in the Subbasin has remained relatively consistent for the past several years (averaging approximately 81,700 AFY; Section 4.5) because the known irrigated acreage in the Subbasin has not changed dramatically. Although groundwater in storage has increased somewhat over the past three water years, groundwater pumping continues to exceed the estimated future sustainable yield and the projects and management actions described in the GSP and in this First Annual Report will be necessary in order to bring the Subbasin into sustainability.

8.5.5 Summary of Impacts of Projects and Management Actions

Additional time will be necessary to judge the effectiveness and quantitative impacts of the projects and management actions either now underway or in the planning and implementation stage. However, it is clear that the actions in place and as described in this First Annual Report are a good start towards reaching the sustainability goals laid out in the GSP. It is too soon to judge the observed changes in basin conditions against the interim goals outlined in the GSP, but the anticipated effects of the projects and management actions now underway are expected to significantly affect the ability of the Subbasin stakeholders to reach the necessary sustainability goals.

This page intentionally left blank.

References

California Department of Water Resources (DWR) (2016), California's Groundwater: Bulletin 118 Interim Update.

Carollo, RMC Water and Environment, Water Systems Consulting Inc., 2012. Paso Robles Groundwater Basin Supplemental Supply Options Feasibility Study: unpublished consultant report prepared for San Luis Obispo County Flood Control and Water Conservation District.

Fugro West, Cleath and Associates, (Fugro), 2002. Paso Robles Groundwater Basin Study Phase I: unpublished consultant report prepared for the San Luis Obispo County Flood Control & Water Conservation District.

GAMA. 2019. California Water Boards Groundwater Information System. http://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/gama/gamamap/public/

Geoscience Support Services, Inc. (GSSI), 2014. Paso Robles Groundwater Basin Model Update: unpublished consultant report prepared for the San Luis Obispo County Flood Control and Water Conservation District, December 19, 2014.

Montgomery & Associates, Inc. (M&A), 2019. Paso Robles Subbasin Groundwater Sustainability Plan: prepared for the Paso Robles Subbasin Cooperative Committee and the Groundwater Sustainability Agencies, 739 p.

Todd Engineers, 2009. Evaluation of Paso Robles Groundwater Basin Pumping – Water Year 2006: unpublished consultant report prepared for the San Luis Obispo County Flood Control and Water Conservation District.

Todd Groundwater, RMC Woodard & Curran (Todd). 2017. Paso Robles Basin Recharge Siting Feasibility Study for the Huer Huero Creek: unpublished consultant report prepared for the San Luis Obispo County Flood Control and Water Conservation District.

FIGURES

FIGURE 1

Extent of the Paso Robles Subbasin and Exclusive Groundwater Sustainability Agencies

Paso Robles Subbasin
First Annual Report

MONTEREY COUNTY
KINGS COUNTY
KERN COUNTY
SAN LUIS OBISPO COUNTY
San Miguel
Salinas River
Cholame Creek
Cholame
Whitley Gardens
Estrella River
Shandon
PASO ROBLES
Dry Creek
Huer Huero Creek
San Juan Creek
Shedd Canyon
Templeton
Creston
ATASCADERO
Shell Creek
Navajo Creek
Santa Margarita
MORRO BAY
PACIFIC OCEAN
Los Osos Creek
Stenner Creek
San Luis Obispo Creek
SAN LUIS OBISPO
46
101
41
58
229
1

LEGEND

- Paso Robles Subbasin

Exclusive Groundwater Sustainability Agencies

- San Miguel Community Services District
- City of Paso Robles
- Shandon- San Juan Water District
- Paso Basin - County of San Luis Obispo

All Other Features

- County Boundary
- City Boundary
- Major Road
- Watercourse
- Waterbody

LOCATOR MAP:



N

0 10,000 20,000 30,000
Feet

Date: January 27, 2020
Data Sources: CA DWR, SLO Co., USGS

GSI Water Solutions, Inc.

Document Path: Y:\0824_PasoRobles\Source_Figures\Paso_Robles_Annual_Report\Figure1_Extent_of_Paso_Robles_Subbasin_and_Exclusive_Groundwater_Sustainability_Agencies.mxd



FIGURE 2
Annual Precipitation and Climatic Periods in the Paso Robles Subbasin
Paso Robles Subbasin First Annual Report

P:\Portland\824-Paso Robles\001-GSP Annual Report\Analysis\ClimatePeriods\Grapher\AnnualRpt_SPI_1925_2019_60month_wTitle.grf



FIGURE 3

Groundwater Elevation Monitoring Well Network in the Paso Robles Subbasin

Paso Robles Subbasin
First Annual Report

LEGEND

Wells

- Paso Robles Formation
- Alluvial Aquifer
- Potential Future Monitoring Well

All Other Features

- Paso Robles Subbasin
- County Boundary
- City Boundary
- Major Road
- Watercourse
- Waterbody

N

0 10,000 20,000 30,000
Feet

Date: January 16, 2020
Data Sources: CA DWR, SLO Co., City of Paso Robles, USGS

GSI Water Solutions, Inc.

Document Path: Y:\0824_PasoRobles\Source_Figures\Paso_Robles_Annual_Report\Figure3_Groundwater_Elevation_Monitoring_Well_Network_in_the_Paso_Robles_Subbasin.mxd

FIGURE 4

Alluvial Aquifer Groundwater Elevation Contours

Paso Robles Subbasin
First Annual Report

MONTEREY COUNTY
KINGS COUNTY
KERN COUNTY
SAN LUIS OBISPO COUNTY

600'
625'
650'
1,050'
1,200'
1,400'

San Miguel
Templeton
Whitley Gardens
Cholame
Shandon
Creston
Santa Margarita
PASO ROBLES
ATASCADERO
MORRO BAY
SAN LUIS OBISPO
PACIFIC OCEAN

Salinas River
Cholame Creek
Estrella River
Dry Creek
Huer Huero Creek
San Juan Creek
Shedd Canyon
Stenner Creek
San Luis Obispo Creek
Los Osos Creek
Shell Creek
Navajo Creek

46
41
101
1
229
58

LEGEND

- Alluvial Groundwater Elevation Contour, in feet above mean sea level
- Paso Robles Subbasin

Geologic Alluvial Units

- Qal: Alluvial Deposits

All Other Features

- County Boundary
- City Boundary
- Major Road
- Watercourse
- Waterbody

N

0 10,000 20,000 30,000
Feet

Date: January 16, 2020
Data Sources: CA DWR, SLO Co., Montgomery, USGS

GSI Water Solutions, Inc.

Document Path: Y:\0824_PasoRobles\Source_Figures\Paso_Robles_Annual_Report\Figure4_Alluvial_Aquifer_Groundwater_Elevation_Contours.mxd

FIGURE 5

Paso Robles Formation Aquifer Fall 2017 Groundwater Elevation Contours

Paso Robles Subbasin
First Annual Report

MONTEREY COUNTY
KINGS COUNTY
KERN COUNTY
SAN LUIS OBISPO COUNTY

San Miguel
Cholame
Whitley Gardens
Shandon
Templeton
Creston
Santa Margarita
PASO ROBLES
ATASCADERO
MORRO BAY
SAN LUIS OBISPO
PACIFIC OCEAN

Salinas River
Cholame Creek
Estrella River
Huer Huero Creek
Dry Creek
Shedd Canyon
Shell Creek
Nacimiento River
San Juan Creek
Stenner Creek
San Luis Obispo Creek
Los Osos Creek

46
41
101
1
229
58

750'
700'
600'
550'
800'
650'
500'
850'
900'
950'
1000'
1050'
1100'
1150'
1200'
1250'

LEGEND

- Well providing data for Paso Robles Formation Aquifer
- Fall 2017 Groundwater Elevation Contour in feet above mean sea level; dashed where inferred
- Inferred Groundwater Flow Direction
- Paso Robles Subbasin

All Other Features

- County Boundary
- City Boundary
- Major Road
- Watercourse
- Waterbody

N

0 10,000 20,000 30,000
Feet

Date: January 16, 2020
Data Sources: CA DWR, SLO Co., USGS

GSI Water Solutions, Inc.

Document Path: Y:\0824_PasoRobles\Source_Figures\Paso_Robles_Annual_Report\Figure5_Paso_Robles_Formation_Aquifer_Fall_2017_Groundwater_Elevation_Contours.mxd

FIGURE 6

Paso Robles Formation Aquifer Spring 2018 Groundwater Elevation Contours

Paso Robles Subbasin
First Annual Report

MONTEREY COUNTY
KINGS COUNTY
KERN COUNTY
SAN LUIS OBISPO COUNTY

San Miguel
Cholame
Whitley Gardens
Shandon
Templeton
Creston
Santa Margarita
PASO ROBLES
ATASCADERO
MORRO BAY
SAN LUIS OBISPO
PACIFIC OCEAN

Salinas River
Cholame Creek
Estrella River
Huer Huero Creek
Dry Creek
Shedd Canyon
Shell Creek
Nacimiento River
San Juan Creek
Santa Margarita Lake
Salmon Creek
San Luis Obispo Creek
Los Osos Creek

800'
750'
700'
550'
1100'
1050'
600'
650'
850'
900'
950'
1000'
1150'
1200'

46
41
101
1
229
58

LEGEND

- Well providing data for Paso Robles Formation Aquifer
- Spring 2018 Groundwater Elevation Contour in feet above mean sea level; dashed where inferred
- Inferred Groundwater Flow Direction
- Paso Robles Subbasin

All Other Features

- County Boundary
- City Boundary
- Major Road
- Watercourse
- Waterbody

N

0 10,000 20,000 30,000
Feet

Date: January 16, 2020
Data Sources: CA DWR, SLO Co., USGS

GSI Water Solutions, Inc.

Document Path: Y:\0824_PasoRobles\Source_Figures\Paso_Robles_Annual_Report\Figure6_Paso_Robles_Formation_Aquifer_Spring_2018_Groundwater_Elevation_Contours.mxd

FIGURE 7

Paso Robles Formation Aquifer Fall 2018 Groundwater Elevation Contours

Paso Robles Subbasin
First Annual Report

MONTEREY COUNTY
KINGS COUNTY
KERN COUNTY
SAN LUIS OBISPO COUNTY

San Miguel
Cholame
Whitley Gardens
Shandon
Templeton
Creston
Santa Margarita
PASO ROBLES
ATASCADERO
MORRO BAY
SAN LUIS OBISPO
PACIFIC OCEAN

Salinas River
Cholame Creek
Estrella River
Huer Huero Creek
Dry Creek
Shedd Canyon
Shell Creek
Nacimiento River
San Juan Creek
Stenner Creek
San Luis Obispo Creek
Los Osos Creek

-800'
-750'
-700'
600'
550'
550'
650'
700'
750'
800'
850'
900'
950'
1000'
1100'
1050'
1100'
1150'
1150'
1200'
1250'
1250'

46
41
101
229
58
1

LEGEND

- Well providing data for Paso Robles Formation Aquifer
- Fall 2018 Groundwater Elevation Contour in feet above mean sea level; dashed where inferred
- Inferred Groundwater Flow Direction
- Paso Robles Subbasin

All Other Features

- County Boundary
- City Boundary
- Major Road
- Watercourse
- Waterbody

N

0 10,000 20,000 30,000
Feet

Date: January 16, 2020
Data Sources: CA DWR, SLO Co., USGS

GSI Water Solutions, Inc.

Document Path: Y:\0824_PasoRobles\Source_Figures\Paso_Robles_Annual_Report\Figure7_Paso_Robles_Formation_Aquifer_Fall_2018_Groundwater_Elevation_Contours.mxd

FIGURE 8

Paso Robles Formation Aquifer Spring 2019 Groundwater Elevation Contours

Paso Robles Subbasin
First Annual Report



LEGEND

- Well providing data for Paso Robles Formation Aquifer
- Spring 2019 Groundwater Elevation Contour in feet above mean sea level; dashed where inferred
- Inferred Groundwater Flow Direction
- Paso Robles Subbasin

All Other Features

- County Boundary
- City Boundary
- Major Road
- Watercourse
- Waterbody

N

0 10,000 20,000 30,000
Feet

Date: January 16, 2020
Data Sources: CA DWR, SLO Co., USGS

GSI Water Solutions, Inc.

Document Path: Y:\0824_PasoRobles\Source_Figures\Paso_Robles_Annual_Report\Figure8_Paso_Robles_Formation_Aquifer_Spring_2019_Groundwater_Elevation_Contours.mxd

FIGURE 9

Paso Robles Formation Aquifer Fall 2019 Groundwater Elevation Contours

Paso Robles Subbasin
First Annual Report

MONTEREY COUNTY
KINGS COUNTY
KERN COUNTY
SAN LUIS OBISPO COUNTY

San Miguel
Whitley Gardens
Cholame
Shandon
Creston
Templeton
Santa Margarita

PASO ROBLES
ATASCADERO
MORRO BAY
SAN LUIS OBISPO

PACIFIC OCEAN

Salinas River
Cholame Creek
Estrella River
Dry Creek
Huer Huero Creek
San Juan Creek
Shedd Canyon
Stenner Creek
San Luis Obispo Creek
Los Osos Creek
Shell Creek
Navajo Creek

46
41
101
1
229
58

150'
700'
650'
550'
600'
750'
800'
850'
900'
950'
1000'
1050'
1100'
1150'
1200'
1250'

LEGEND

- Well providing data for Paso Robles Formation Aquifer
- Fall 2019 Groundwater Elevation Contour in feet above mean sea level; dashed where inferred
- Inferred Groundwater Flow Direction
- Paso Robles Subbasin

All Other Features

- County Boundary
- City Boundary
- Major Road
- Watercourse
- Waterbody

N

0 10,000 20,000 30,000
Feet

Date: January 16, 2020
Data Sources: CA DWR, SLO Co., USGS

GSI Water Solutions, Inc.

Document Path: Y:\0824_PasoRobles\Source_Figures\Paso_Robles_Annual_Report\Figure9_Paso_Robles_Formation_Aquifer_Fall_2019_Groundwater_Elevation_Contours.mxd



FIGURE 10

General Locations and Volumes of Groundwater Extraction

Paso Robles Subbasin
First Annual Report

LEGEND

- Paso Robles Subbasin

Total Groundwater Extraction (Average AFY)

- 0.036 - 5.00
- 5.00 - 15.00
- 15.00 - 30.00
- 30.00 - 50.00
- 50.00 - 99.101

All Other Features

- County Boundary
- City Boundary
- Major Road
- Watercourse
- Waterbody

NOTE
AFY: Acre-Feet per Year

N

0 10,000 20,000 30,000
Feet

Date: January 16, 2020
Data Sources: CA DWR, SLO Co., Soil Water Balance Model, USGS

GSI Water Solutions, Inc.

Document Path: Y:\0824_PasoRobles\Source_Figures\Paso_Robles_Annual_Report\Figure10_General_Locations_and_Volumes_of_Groundwater_Extractions.mxd

FIGURE 11

Communities Dependent on Groundwater and with Access to Surface Water

Paso Robles Subbasin
First Annual Report

MONTEREY COUNTY
KINGS COUNTY
KERN COUNTY
SAN LUIS OBISPO COUNTY
San Miguel
Salinas River
Cholame Creek
Cholame
Whitley Gardens
Estrella River
Shandon
PASO ROBLES
Dry Creek
Huer Huero Creek
Templeton
Creston
ATASCADERO
Shedd Canyon
Navajo Creek
San Juan Creek
Shell Creek
Santa Margarita
MORRO BAY
PACIFIC OCEAN
Los Osos Creek
Chimney Creek
San Luis Obispo Creek
SAN LUIS OBISPO
46
41
101
229
58
1

LEGEND

- Nacimiento Water Project Pipeline
- State Water Project Pipeline
- Community Dependent Solely on Groundwater
- Community Served by Groundwater and Nacimiento Water Project
- Community Served by Groundwater and State Water Project
- Paso Robles Subbasin

All Other Features

- County Boundary
- City Boundary
- Major Road
- Watercourse
- Waterbody

N

0 10,000 20,000 30,000
Feet

Date: January 27, 2020
Data Sources: CA DWR, SLO Co., USGS

GSI Water Solutions, Inc.

Document Path: Y:\0824_PasoRobles\Source_Figures\Paso_Robles_Annual_Report\Figure11_Communities_Dependent_on_Groundwater_and_with_Access_to_Surface_Water.mxd

FIGURE 12

Paso Robles Formation Aquifer Change in Groundwater Elevation Fall 2016 to Fall 2017

Paso Robles Subbasin
First Annual Report

MONTEREY COUNTY
KINGS COUNTY
KERN COUNTY
SAN LUIS OBISPO COUNTY
San Miguel
Salinas River
Cholame Creek
Cholame
Whitley Gardens
Estrella River
Shandon
PASO ROBLES
Huer Huero Creek
Dry Creek
San Juan Creek
Shedd Canyon
Templeton
Creston
ATASCADERO
Santa Margarita
Stenner Creek
San Luis Obispo Creek
Los Osos Creek
MORRO BAY
PACIFIC OCEAN
SAN LUIS OBISPO
Salinas Creek
Navajo Creek
41
46
101
229
58
1

LEGEND

Paso Robles Subbasin

Water Level Change, in feet

Fall 2016 to Fall 2017

- < -40 feet
- -40 to -30 feet
- -30 to -20 feet
- -20 to -10 feet
- -10 to 0 feet
- 0 to 10 feet
- 10 to 20 feet
- 20 to 30 feet
- 30 to 40 feet
- > 40 feet

All Other Features

- County Boundary
- City Boundary
- Major Road
- Watercourse
- Waterbody

N

0 10,000 20,000 30,000
Feet

Date: January 16, 2020
Data Sources: CA DWR, SLO Co., USGS

GSI Water Solutions, Inc.

Document Path: Y:\0824_PasoRobles\Source_Figures\Paso_Robles_Annual_Report\Figure12_Paso_Robles_Formation_Aquifer_Change_in_Groundwater_Elevation_Fall_2016_to_Fall_2017.mxd

FIGURE 13

Paso Robles Formation Aquifer Change in Groundwater Elevation Fall 2017 to Fall 2018

Paso Robles Subbasin
First Annual Report

MONTEREY COUNTY
KINGS COUNTY
KERN COUNTY
SAN LUIS OBISPO COUNTY
San Miguel
Salinas River
Cholame Creek
Cholame
Whitley Gardens
Estrella River
Shandon
PASO ROBLES
Dry Creek
Huer Huero Creek
San Juan Creek
Shedd Canyon
Templeton
Creston
ATASCADERO
Santa Margarita
Shell Creek
Navajo Creek
MORRO BAY
PACIFIC OCEAN
Los Osos Creek
Stenner Creek
San Luis Obispo Creek
SAN LUIS OBISPO
46
41
101
229
58
1

LEGEND

- Paso Robles Subbasin

Water Level Change, in feet

Fall 2017 to Fall 2018

- < -40 feet
- -40 to -30 feet
- -30 to -20 feet
- -20 to -10 feet
- -10 to 0 feet
- 0 to 10 feet
- 10 to 20 feet
- 20 to 30 feet
- 30 to 40 feet
- > 40 feet

All Other Features

- County Boundary
- City Boundary
- Major Road
- Watercourse
- Waterbody

N

0 10,000 20,000 30,000
Feet

Date: January 16, 2020
Data Sources: CA DWR, SLO Co., USGS

GSI Water Solutions, Inc.

Document Path: Y:\0824_PasoRobles\Source_Figures\Paso_Robles_Annual_Report\Figure13_Paso_Robles_Formation_Aquifer_Change_in_Groundwater_Elevation_Fall_2017_to_Fall_2018.mxd

FIGURE 14

Paso Robles Formation Aquifer Change in Groundwater Elevation Fall 2018 to Fall 2019

Paso Robles Subbasin
First Annual Report

MONTEREY COUNTY
KINGS COUNTY
KERN COUNTY
SAN LUIS OBISPO COUNTY
San Miguel
Salinas River
Cholame Creek
Cholame
Whitley Gardens
Estrella River
Shandon
PASO ROBLES
Dry Creek
Huer Huero Creek
San Juan Creek
Shedd Canyon
Templeton
Creston
ATASCADERO
Santa Margarita
Salinas River
Navajo Creek
MORRO BAY
PACIFIC OCEAN
Los Osos Creek
Stenner Creek
San Luis Obispo Creek
SAN LUIS OBISPO
41
46
101
229
58
1

LEGEND

Paso Robles Subbasin

Water Level Change, in feet

Fall 2018 to Fall 2019

- < -40 feet
- -40 to -30 feet
- -30 to -20 feet
- -20 to -10 feet
- -10 to 0 feet
- 0 to 10 feet
- 10 to 20 feet
- 20 to 30 feet
- 30 to 40 feet
- > 40 feet

All Other Features

- County Boundary
- City Boundary
- Major Road
- Watercourse
- Waterbody

N

0 10,000 20,000 30,000
Feet

Date: January 16, 2020
Data Sources: CA DWR, SLO Co., USGS

GSI Water Solutions, Inc.

Document Path: Y:\0824_PasoRobles\Source_Figures\Paso_Robles_Annual_Report\Figure14_Paso_Robles_Formation_Aquifer_Change_in_Groundwater_Elevation_Fall_2018_to_Fall_2019.mxd



FIGURE 15

Estimated Annual and Cumulative Change in Groundwater in Storage in the Paso Robles Subbasin

Paso Robles Subbasin First Annual Report

P:\Portland\824-Paso Robles\001-GSP Annual Report\Analysis\ChangeInStorage\GW_CumulativeChangeGWStoragePRannual_1981-2019_wTitle.grf

APPENDICES

This page left blank intentionally.

APPENDIX A

GSP Regulations for Annual Reports

This page left blank intentionally.

§ 356.2. Annual Reports

Each Agency shall submit an annual report to the Department by April 1 of each year following the adoption of the Plan. The annual report shall include the following components for the preceding water year:

(a) General information, including an executive summary and a location map depicting the basin covered by the report.

(b) A detailed description and graphical representation of the following conditions of the basin managed in the Plan:

(1) Groundwater elevation data from monitoring wells identified in the monitoring network shall be analyzed and displayed as follows:

(A) Groundwater elevation contour maps for each principal aquifer in the basin illustrating, at a minimum, the seasonal high and seasonal low groundwater conditions.

(B) Hydrographs of groundwater elevations and water year type using historical data to the greatest extent available, including from January 1, 2015, to current reporting year.

(2) Groundwater extraction for the preceding water year. Data shall be collected using the best available measurement methods and shall be presented in a table that summarizes groundwater extractions by water use sector, and identifies the method of measurement (direct or estimate) and accuracy of measurements, and a map that illustrates the general location and volume of groundwater extractions.

(3) Surface water supply used or available for use, for groundwater recharge or in-lieu use shall be reported based on quantitative data that describes the annual volume and sources for the preceding water year.

(4) Total water use shall be collected using the best available measurement methods and shall be reported in a table that summarizes total water use by water use sector, water source type, and identifies the method of measurement (direct or estimate) and accuracy of measurements. Existing water use data from the most recent Urban Water Management Plans or Agricultural Water Management Plans within the basin may be used, as long as the data are reported by water year.

(5) Change in groundwater in storage shall include the following:

(A) Change in groundwater in storage maps for each principal aquifer in the basin.

(B) A graph depicting water year type, groundwater use, the annual change in groundwater in storage, and the cumulative change in groundwater in storage for the basin based on historical data to the greatest extent available, including from January 1, 2015, to the current reporting year.

(c) A description of progress towards implementing the Plan, including achieving interim milestones, and implementation of projects or management actions since the previous annual report.

Note: Authority cited: Section 10733.2, Water Code.

Reference: Sections 10727.2, 10728, and 10733.2, Water Code.

This page left blank intentionally.

APPENDIX B
Precipitation Data

This page left blank intentionally.

Monthly Precipitation at the Paso Robles Station (NOAA 46730)

(inches)

Source: https://wrcc.dri.edu/cgi-bin/cliMAIN.pl?ca6730

YEAR	JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEP	OCT	NOV	DEC	WY Total
1925	0.34	2.44	2.57	2.01	2.41	0.08	0.09	0.12	0.02	0.17	0.21	1.98	**12.95**
1926	2.13	6.26	0.27	3.52	0.00	0.02	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.25	7.14	0.90	**14.56**
1927	1.84	9.04	1.45	1.27	0.00	0.02	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.33	2.02	1.63	**21.91**
1928	0.23	2.87	2.76	0.37	0.29	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.01	1.82	2.87	**11.50**
1929	1.27	1.65	1.22	0.49	0.00	0.49	0.00	0.00	-----	0.00	0.00	0.24	**9.82**
1930	4.32	1.80	3.00	0.54	1.01	0.04	0.00	0.00	0.04	0.00	1.64	0.16	**10.99**
1931	4.58	1.87	0.39	0.56	2.01	0.93	0.00	0.09	0.00	0.01	1.89	7.04	**12.23**
1932	2.74	3.89	0.50	0.30	0.13	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.04	0.11	1.28	**16.50**
1933	6.05	0.08	0.84	0.22	0.32	0.68	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.64	0.00	4.26	**9.62**
1934	2.06	3.75	0.04	0.00	0.12	0.75	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.56	2.61	2.66	**11.62**
1935	6.23	0.65	4.08	3.41	0.02	0.00	0.00	0.16	0.07	0.18	1.58	1.66	**21.45**
1936	0.61	11.07	1.24	1.52	0.01	0.04	0.25	0.00	0.00	1.93	0.00	6.10	**18.16**
1937	4.59	4.54	5.25	0.16	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.16	0.66	7.40	**22.57**
1938	1.73	12.74	6.77	0.93	0.30	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.41	0.23	0.33	1.45	**31.10**
1939	3.11	1.45	1.58	0.05	0.09	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.43	0.55	0.78	1.29	**8.72**
1940	5.28	5.57	1.13	0.54	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.19	0.13	8.18	**15.14**
1941	4.73	8.16	6.14	2.76	0.19	0.00	0.00	0.02	0.00	1.34	0.70	5.15	**30.50**
1942	2.40	0.76	1.77	3.01	0.15	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.53	1.01	1.64	**15.28**
1943	8.00	1.68	3.63	0.72	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.39	0.12	3.38	**17.21**
1944	1.03	5.96	0.64	0.65	0.13	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.26	2.64	1.09	**12.30**
1945	0.80	4.17	2.76	0.26	0.02	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.09	0.49	3.89	**12.00**
1946	0.31	1.64	3.01	0.05	0.72	0.00	0.26	0.00	0.00	0.19	4.57	2.17	**11.46**
1947	0.56	0.97	1.14	0.13	0.28	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.04	0.32	0.18	0.62	**10.05**
1948	0.00	1.85	3.51	3.50	0.45	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.06	0.00	3.04	**10.43**
1949	1.09	1.95	3.73	0.36	0.38	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.78	2.33	**10.61**
1950	3.05	2.43	1.65	1.00	0.05	0.00	0.68	0.00	0.00	1.24	1.18	2.50	**11.97**
1951	2.50	0.68	0.58	1.11	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.03	0.33	1.91	4.64	**9.82**
1952	5.54	0.20	3.92	1.49	0.03	0.00	0.07	0.00	0.02	0.02	1.76	4.78	**18.15**
1953	1.71	0.00	0.66	1.90	0.06	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.46	0.00	**10.90**
1954	3.06	1.89	3.12	0.64	0.10	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.29	1.51	**11.27**
1955	3.57	1.85	0.37	1.16	1.31	0.00	0.00	0.13	0.00	0.00	1.36	8.14	**11.19**
1956	3.82	0.99	0.01	1.87	1.45	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.07	0.00	0.17	**17.64**
1957	4.77	1.90	0.31	1.63	0.70	0.37	0.00	0.00	0.02	0.60	0.30	3.30	**10.94**
1958	2.93	6.02	6.35	5.22	0.37	0.00	0.00	0.38	1.20	0.00	0.13	0.48	**26.67**
1959	1.69	4.53	0.03	0.44	0.05	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.52	0.00	0.00	0.31	**7.87**
1960	2.42	4.20	0.70	1.40	0.04	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.10	3.63	1.17	**9.07**
1961	1.72	0.20	0.88	0.22	0.74	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.01	1.99	2.59	**8.66**
1962	2.05	8.49	1.98	0.00	0.12	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.79	0.01	2.49	**17.23**
1963	4.41	3.79	2.10	3.32	0.17	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.24	1.00	4.25	0.01	**17.33**
1964	1.87	0.15	1.46	0.68	0.55	0.06	0.00	0.08	0.03	1.05	2.27	2.37	**10.14**
1965	2.50	0.51	1.16	2.48	0.00	0.00	0.04	0.03	0.15	0.00	6.43	3.24	**12.56**
1966	1.17	0.68	0.08	0.00	0.01	0.14	0.08	0.00	0.11	0.00	2.43	8.60	**11.94**
1967	3.93	0.35	3.99	4.41	0.03	0.02	0.00	0.00	0.79	0.14	1.74	1.70	**24.55**
1968	1.19	0.68	1.76	0.70	0.04	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.83	1.14	3.13	**7.95**
1969	13.93	9.12	0.35	1.68	0.06	0.01	0.25	0.00	0.00	0.24	0.44	0.68	**31.50**
1970	3.71	1.66	1.83	0.37	0.00	0.04	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.08	3.14	4.56	**8.97**
1971	1.08	0.24	0.85	0.69	0.21	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.05	0.29	0.88	4.27	**10.90**
1972	1.35	0.30	0.00	0.53	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.03	1.68	4.14	0.85	**7.65**
1973	6.54	6.95	2.60	0.01	0.06	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.61	3.09	1.61	**22.83**
1974	6.39	0.05	4.56	0.91	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.64	0.43	2.33	**17.22**

Monthly Precipitation at the Paso Robles Station (NOAA 46730)

(inches)

Source: https://wrcc.dri.edu/cgi-bin/cliMAIN.pl?ca6730

YEAR	JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEP	OCT	NOV	DEC	WY Total
1975	0.01	4.12	2.81	0.89	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.77	0.03	0.10	**11.24**
1976	0.00	2.61	1.09	0.66	0.00	0.08	0.00	1.02	2.90	0.58	0.55	1.80	**9.26**
1977	1.47	0.03	1.41	0.00	1.71	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.08	0.25	5.25	**7.55**
1978	5.77	7.31	3.10	2.77	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.92	0.00	2.47	1.04	**25.45**
1979	4.70	3.52	2.30	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.06	0.93	0.85	2.31	**14.09**
1980	4.47	8.05	1.88	0.65	0.24	0.00	0.35	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.02	0.44	**19.73**
1981	4.00	1.60	4.52	0.56	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.01	1.44	0.62	**11.14**
1982	2.65	0.88	5.10	3.05	0.00	0.02	0.00	0.00	1.04	0.90	3.98	1.98	**15.81**
1983	5.84	4.53	4.69	3.35	0.05	0.00	0.00	0.52	0.37	1.34	2.07	3.68	**26.21**
1984	0.20	0.24	0.66	0.35	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.38	2.10	3.01	**8.54**
1985	0.52	0.92	2.11	0.19	0.00	0.00	0.02	0.00	0.04	0.40	1.07	0.97	**9.29**
1986	2.11	6.93	4.64	0.32	0.00	0.00	0.03	0.00	0.63	0.02	0.15	0.75	**17.10**
1987	0.88	2.01	3.40	0.14	0.06	0.07	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.50	2.63	2.73	**7.48**
1988	1.94	2.54	0.10	2.02	0.21	0.14	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.29	2.87	**13.81**
1989	0.98	1.59	0.71	0.37	0.07	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.59	0.97	0.22	0.00	**9.47**
1990	3.02	1.48	0.24	0.12	0.66	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.51	0.00	0.14	0.20	**7.22**
1991	0.63	2.17	10.25	0.08	0.03	0.20	0.00	0.10	0.10	0.50	0.16	3.00	**13.90**
1992	1.44	6.09	2.99	0.10	0.00	0.03	0.03	0.00	0.01	0.79	0.00	3.59	**14.35**
1993	9.63	8.31	3.89	0.07	0.01	0.14	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.17	0.86	1.28	**26.43**
1994	1.90	3.37	1.16	0.49	1.05	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.17	0.70	2.32	0.93	**11.45**
1995	11.51	1.42	12.31	0.09	0.44	0.14	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.12	1.92	**29.86**
1996	1.84	6.52	2.03	0.78	0.55	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.78	1.85	5.83	**13.76**
1997	7.93	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.05	0.10	0.07	4.05	3.93	**17.55**
1998	2.99	9.06	2.71	1.90	1.87	0.11	0.00	0.00	0.08	0.21	0.99	0.73	**26.77**
1999	1.84	1.26	2.68	1.19	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.47	0.00	0.71	0.22	**9.37**
2000	3.16	5.89	1.55	1.56	0.05	0.04	0.00	0.00	0.03	1.34	0.05	0.16	**13.21**
2001	4.43	5.14	3.59	0.68	0.00	0.00	0.04	0.00	0.00	0.24	2.81	2.19	**15.43**
2002	0.87	0.33	1.40	0.23	0.25	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.54	4.36	**8.32**
2003	0.00	2.10	1.85	1.70	1.18	0.00	-----	0.03	0.00	0.00	1.36	2.31	**13.76**
2004	0.91	4.31	0.30	0.32	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.11	1.39	6.75	**9.51**
2005	4.81	5.02	3.07	0.76	1.10	0.01	0.00	0.08	0.00	0.02	0.44	2.54	**28.10**
2006	5.78	1.23	4.50	2.74	1.48	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.61	0.28	1.13	**18.73**
2007	0.74	2.98	0.13	0.37	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.31	0.04	0.96	0.00	2.23	**6.59**
2008	8.44	1.83	0.00	0.33	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.14	1.26	1.13	**13.80**
2009	0.91	3.89	1.37	0.17	0.12	0.02	0.00	0.00	0.05	4.04	0.02	3.96	**9.06**
2010	6.09	3.38	0.64	2.71	0.12	0.00	0.03	0.00	0.00	1.06	1.57	7.14	**20.99**
2011	2.07	3.05	5.29	0.28	0.95	0.53	0.00	0.00	0.03	0.90	1.93	0.12	**21.97**
2012	2.38	0.25	2.44	2.60	0.18	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.28	0.75	3.94	**10.80**
2013	1.02	0.28	0.69	0.07	0.15	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.26	0.30	**7.18**
2014	0.00	2.75	1.96	0.85	0.00	0.00	0.03	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	5.48	**6.16**
2015	0.32	2.16	0.10	0.37	0.05	0.00	2.82	0.00	0.05	0.07	1.45	0.89	**12.35**
2016	4.13	0.85	2.92	0.15	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.61	1.46	1.98	**10.46**
2017	9.50	6.44	0.92	1.46	0.24	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.16	0.08	0.22	0.04	**23.77**
2018	2.08	0.25	7.74	0.21	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.28	3.23	1.12	**10.62**
2019	5.30	6.72	3.01	0.08	0.82	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.40	5.22	**20.56**
											Water Year Average (1925 - 2019):		**14.65**

APPENDIX C

Groundwater Level and Groundwater Storage Monitoring Well Network

This page left blank intentionally.

Table C-1 – Groundwater Level and Groundwater Storage Monitoring Well Network

Well ID (alt ID)	Well Depth (feet)	Screen Interval(s) (feet bls)	Reference Point Elevation (feet AMSL)	First Year of Data	Last Year of Data	Years Measured	Number of Measurement	Aquifer
18MW-0191[1]	50	10-50	672 (LSE)	2018	2018	<1	1	Qa
25S/12E-16K05 (PASO-0345)	350	300-310, 330-340	669.8	1992	2019	27	56	PR
25S/12E-26L01 (PASO-0205)	400	200-400	719.72	1970	2019	49	107	PR
25S/13E-08L02 (PASO-0195)	270	110-270	1,033.81	2012	2019	7	15	PR
26S/12E-14G01 (PASO-0048)	740	---	789.3	1969	2019	50	121	PR
26S/12E-14G02 (PASO-0017)	840	640-840	787	1993	2019	26	28	PR
26S/12E-14H01 (PASO-0184)	1230	180-?	790	1969	2019	50	48	PR
26S/12E-14K01 (PASO-0238)	1100	---	786	1979	2019	40	84	PR
26S/12E-26E07 (PASO-0124)	400	---	835	1958	2018	60	131	PR
26S/13E-08M01 (PASO-0164)	400	260-400	827.92	2013	2019	6	16	PR
26S/13E-16N01 (PASO-0282)	400	200-400	890.17	2012	2019	7	16	PR
26S/15E-19E01 (PASO-0073)	512	223-512	1,020	1987	2019	32	56	PR
26S/15E-20B04 (PASO-0401)	461	297-461	1,036.36	1984	2019	35	71	PR
26S/15E-29N01 (PASO-0226)	350	---	1,135	1958	2019	61	127	PR
26S/15E-29R01 (PASO-0406)	600	180-600	1,109.5	2012	2019	7	12	PR
26S/15E-30J01 (PASO-0393)	605	195-605	1,123.3	1970	2019	49	83	PR
27S/12E-13N01 (PASO-0223)	295	195-295	972.42	2012	2019	7	15	PR
27S/13E-28F01 (PASO-0243)	212	118-212	1,072	1969	2019	50	108	PR
27S/13E-30F01 (PASO-0355)	310	200-310	1,043.2	2012	2019	7	14	PR
27S/13E-30J01 (PASO-0423)	685	225-685	1,095	2012	2019	7	10	PR
27S/13E-30N01 (PASO-0086)	355	215-235, 275-355	1,086.73	2012	2016	4	6	PR
27S/14E-11R01 (PASO-0392)	630	180-630	1,160.5	1974	2019	45	75	PR
28S/13E-01B01 (PASO-0066)	254	154-254	1,099.93	2012	2019	7	17	PR

NOTES: New alluvial monitoring well information provided by City of Paso Robles; well not included in County database.

"—" = unknown; AMSL – above mean sea level; PR Paso Robles Formation Aquifer; Qa Alluvial Aquifer

This page left blank intentionally.

APPENDIX D
Potential Future Groundwater Monitoring Wells

This page left blank intentionally.

Table D-1 – Potential Future Groundwater Monitoring Wells

Well ID (alt ID)	Well Depth (feet)	Screen Interval(s) (feet bls)	Reference Point Elevation (feet AMSL)	First Year of Data	Last Year of Data	Years Measured (years)	Number of Measurements	Aquifer
25S/12E-20K03 (PASO-0304)	---	---	625	1974	2019	45	86	---
26S/14E-24B01 (PASO-0302)	---	---	1001	1962	2019	57	99	---
26S/15E-33C01 (PASO-0314)	---	---	1095	1973	2019	46	80	---
26S/15E-33Q01 (PASO-0381)	---	---	1102	1973	2019	46	82	---
27S/15E-03E01 (PASO-0277)	---	---	1120.8	1968	2019	51	109	---
27S/14E-24B01 (PASO-0391)	---	---	1180.5	1973	2019	46	74	---
27S/14E-25J01 (PASO-0074)	---	---	1,225.5	1972	2019	47	72	--
27S/14E-29G01 (PASO-0041)	---	---	1201.5	1974	2019	45	78	---
27S/15E-35F01 (PASO-0053)	---	---	1230	1965	2019	54	82	---

NOTES: "—" = unknown

This page left blank intentionally.

APPENDIX E
Hydrographs

This page left blank intentionally.



EXPLANATION

- GROUNDWATER ELEVATION
- MEASUREMENT NOT VERIFIED*
- MEASURABLE OBJECTIVE
- MINIMUM THRESHOLD

CLIMATE PERIOD CLASSIFICATION

DRY | AVERAGE/ALTERNATING | WET



- Reference Point Elevation
- Casing
- Perforations (blank when unknown)



Well Depth: 461 feet
Screened Interval: 297-461 feet below ground surface
Reference Point Elevation: 1036.36 feet above mean sea level

* Measurement reported as not static

HYDROGRAPH OF MEASURED GROUNDWATER ELEVATION FOR 26S/15E-20B04

P:\Portland\824-Paso Robles\001-GSP Annual Report\Analysis\Hydrographs\Grapher\Annual Rpt\Hydr_26S_15E-20B04.grf



EXPLANATION

- GROUNDWATER ELEVATION
- MEASUREMENT NOT VERIFIED*
- MEASURABLE OBJECTIVE
- MINIMUM THRESHOLD

CLIMATE PERIOD CLASSIFICATION

DRY | AVERAGE/ALTERNATING | WET



- Reference Point Elevation
- Casing
- Perforations (blank when unknown)



Well Depth: 295 feet
Screened Interval: 195-295 feet below ground surface
Reference Point Elevation: 972.4 feet above mean sea level

* Measurement reported as not static

HYDROGRAPH OF MEASURED GROUNDWATER ELEVATION FOR 27S/12E-13N01

P:\Portland\824-Paso Robles\001-GSP Annual Report\Analysis\Hydrographs\Grapher\Annual Rpt\Hydr_27S_12E-13N01.grf



EXPLANATION

- GROUNDWATER ELEVATION
- MEASUREMENT NOT VERIFIED*
- MEASURABLE OBJECTIVE
- MINIMUM THRESHOLD

CLIMATE PERIOD CLASSIFICATION

DRY | AVERAGE/ALTERNATING | WET





Well Depth: 212 feet
Screened Interval: 118-212 feet below ground surface
Reference Point Elevation: 1072 feet above mean sea level

* Measurement reported as not static

HYDROGRAPH OF MEASURED GROUNDWATER ELEVATION FOR 27S/13E-28F01

P:\Portland\824-Paso Robles\001-GSP Annual Report\Analysis\Hydrographs\Grapher\Annual Rpt\Hydr_27S_13E-28F01.grf



EXPLANATION

- GROUNDWATER ELEVATION
- MEASUREMENT NOT VERIFIED*
- MEASURABLE OBJECTIVE
- MINIMUM THRESHOLD

CLIMATE PERIOD CLASSIFICATION

DRY | AVERAGE/ALTERNATING | WET





Well Depth: 355 feet
Screened Interval: 215-235, 275-355 feet below ground surface
Reference Point Elevation: 1086.7 feet above mean sea level

* Measurement reported as not static

HYDROGRAPH OF MEASURED GROUNDWATER ELEVATION FOR 27S/13E-30N01

P:\Portland\824-Paso Robles\001-GSP Annual Report\Analysis\Hydrographs\Grapher\Annual Rpt\Hydr_27S_13E-30N01.grf



EXPLANATION

- GROUNDWATER ELEVATION
- MEASUREMENT NOT VERIFIED*
- MEASURABLE OBJECTIVE
- MINIMUM THRESHOLD

CLIMATE PERIOD CLASSIFICATION

DRY | AVERAGE/ALTERNATING | WET





Well Depth: 254 feet
Screened Interval: 154-254 feet below ground surface
Reference Point Elevation: 1099.9 feet above mean sea level

* Measurement reported as not static

HYDROGRAPH OF MEASURED GROUNDWATER ELEVATION FOR 28S/13E-01B01

P:\Portland\824-Paso Robles\001-GSP Annual Report\Analysis\Hydrographs\Grapher\Annual Rpt\Hydr_28S_13E-01B01.grf



EXPLANATION

- GROUNDWATER ELEVATION
- MEASUREMENT NOT VERIFIED*
- MEASURABLE OBJECTIVE
- MINIMUM THRESHOLD

CLIMATE PERIOD CLASSIFICATION

DRY | AVERAGE/ALTERNATING | WET





Well Depth: 630 feet
Screened Interval: 180-630 feet below ground surface
Reference Point Elevation: 1160.5 feet above mean sea level

* Measurement reported as not static

HYDROGRAPH OF MEASURED GROUNDWATER ELEVATION FOR 27S/14E-11R01

P:\Portland\824-Paso Robles\001-GSP Annual Report\Analysis\Hydrographs\Grapher\Annual Rpt\Hydr_27S_14E-11R01.grf



EXPLANATION

- GROUNDWATER ELEVATION
- MEASUREMENT NOT VERIFIED*
- MEASURABLE OBJECTIVE
- MINIMUM THRESHOLD

CLIMATE PERIOD CLASSIFICATION

DRY | AVERAGE/ALTERNATING | WET





Well Depth: 685 feet
Screened Interval: 225-685 feet below ground surface
Reference Point Elevation: 1095 feet above mean sea level

* Measurement reported as not static

HYDROGRAPH OF MEASURED GROUNDWATER ELEVATION FOR 27S/13E-30J01

P:\Portland\824-Paso Robles\001-GSP Annual Report\Analysis\Hydrographs\Grapher\Annual Rpt\Hydr_27S_13E-30J01.grf



EXPLANATION

- GROUNDWATER ELEVATION
- MEASUREMENT NOT VERIFIED*
- MEASURABLE OBJECTIVE
- MINIMUM THRESHOLD

CLIMATE PERIOD CLASSIFICATION

DRY | AVERAGE/ALTERNATING | WET





Well Depth: 310 feet
Screened Interval: 200-310 feet below ground surface
Reference Point Elevation: 1043.2 feet above mean sea level

* Measurement reported as not static

HYDROGRAPH OF MEASURED GROUNDWATER ELEVATION FOR 27S/13E-30F01

P:\Portland\824-Paso Robles\001-GSP Annual Report\Analysis\Hydrographs\Grapher\Annual Rpt\Hydr_27S_13E-30F01.grf



EXPLANATION

- GROUNDWATER ELEVATION
- MEASUREMENT NOT VERIFIED*
- MEASURABLE OBJECTIVE
- MINIMUM THRESHOLD

CLIMATE PERIOD CLASSIFICATION

DRY | AVERAGE/ALTERNATING | WET





Well Depth: 600 feet
Screened Interval: 180-600 feet below ground surface
Reference Point Elevation: 1109.5 feet above mean sea level

* Measurement reported as not static

HYDROGRAPH OF MEASURED GROUNDWATER ELEVATION FOR 26S/15E-29R01

P:\Portland\824-Paso Robles\001-GSP Annual Report\Analysis\Hydrographs\Grapher\Annual Rpt\Hydr_26S_15E-29R01.grf



EXPLANATION

- GROUNDWATER ELEVATION
- MEASUREMENT NOT VERIFIED*
- MEASURABLE OBJECTIVE
- MINIMUM THRESHOLD

CLIMATE PERIOD CLASSIFICATION

DRY | AVERAGE/ALTERNATING | WET



- Reference Point Elevation
- Casing
- Perforations (blank when unknown)



Well Depth: 1230 feet
Screened Interval: 180-1230 feet below ground surface
Reference Point Elevation: 790 feet above mean sea level

* Measurement reported as not static

HYDROGRAPH OF MEASURED GROUNDWATER ELEVATION FOR 26S/12E-14H01

P:\Portland\824-Paso Robles\001-GSP Annual Report\Analysis\Hydrographs\Grapher\Annual Rpt\Hydr_26S_12E-14H01.grf



EXPLANATION

- GROUNDWATER ELEVATION
- MEASUREMENT NOT VERIFIED*
- MEASURABLE OBJECTIVE
- MINIMUM THRESHOLD

CLIMATE PERIOD CLASSIFICATION

DRY | AVERAGE/ALTERNATING | WET





Well Depth: 512 feet
Screened Interval: 223-512 feet below ground surface
Reference Point Elevation: 1020 feet above mean sea level

* Measurement reported as not static

HYDROGRAPH OF MEASURED GROUNDWATER ELEVATION FOR 26S/15E-19E01

P:\Portland\824-Paso Robles\001-GSP Annual Report\Analysis\Hydrographs\Grapher\Annual Rpt\Hydr_26S_15E-19E01.grf



EXPLANATION

- GROUNDWATER ELEVATION
- MEASUREMENT NOT VERIFIED*
- MEASURABLE OBJECTIVE
- MINIMUM THRESHOLD

CLIMATE PERIOD CLASSIFICATION

DRY | AVERAGE/ALTERNATING | WET





Well Depth: 605 feet
Screened Interval: 195-605 feet below ground surface
Reference Point Elevation: 1123.3 feet above mean sea level

* Measurement reported as not static

HYDROGRAPH OF MEASURED GROUNDWATER ELEVATION FOR 26S/15E-30J01

P:\Portland\824-Paso Robles\001-GSP Annual Report\Analysis\Hydrographs\Grapher\Annual Rpt\Hydr_26S_15E-30J01.grf



EXPLANATION

GROUNDWATER ELEVATION

MEASUREMENT NOT VERIFIED*

MEASURABLE OBJECTIVE

MINIMUM THRESHOLD

CLIMATE PERIOD CLASSIFICATION

DRY AVERAGE/ALTERNATING WET



Reference Point Elevation

Casing

Perforations (blank when unknown)



Well Depth: 1100 feet
Screened Interval: unknown
Reference Point Elevation: 786 feet above mean sea level

* Measurement reported as not static

HYDROGRAPH OF MEASURED GROUNDWATER ELEVATION FOR 26S/12E-14K01

P:\Portland\824-Paso Robles\001-GSP Annual Report\Analysis\Hydrographs\Grapher\Annual Rpt\Hydr_26S_12E-14K01.grf



EXPLANATION

- GROUNDWATER ELEVATION
- MEASUREMENT NOT VERIFIED*
- MEASURABLE OBJECTIVE
- MINIMUM THRESHOLD

CLIMATE PERIOD CLASSIFICATION

DRY | AVERAGE/ALTERNATING | WET



- Reference Point Elevation
- Casing
- Perforations (blank when unknown)



Well Depth: 740 feet
Screened Interval: unknown
Reference Point Elevation: 789.3 feet above mean sea level

* Measurement reported as not static

HYDROGRAPH OF MEASURED GROUNDWATER ELEVATION FOR 26S/12E-14G01

P:\Portland\824-Paso Robles\001-GSP Annual Report\Analysis\Hydrographs\Grapher\Annual Rpt\Hydr_26S_12E-14G01.grf



EXPLANATION

- GROUNDWATER ELEVATION
- MEASUREMENT NOT VERIFIED*
- MEASURABLE OBJECTIVE
- MINIMUM THRESHOLD

CLIMATE PERIOD CLASSIFICATION

DRY | AVERAGE/ALTERNATING | WET



- Reference Point Elevation
- Casing
- Perforations (blank when unknown)



Well Depth: 350 feet
Screened Interval: unknown
Reference Point Elevation: 1135 feet above mean sea level

* Measurement reported as not static

HYDROGRAPH OF MEASURED GROUNDWATER ELEVATION FOR 26S/15E-29N01

P:\Portland\824-Paso Robles\001-GSP Annual Report\Analysis\Hydrographs\Grapher\Annual Rpt\Hydr_26S_15E-29N01.grf



EXPLANATION

- GROUNDWATER ELEVATION
- MEASUREMENT NOT VERIFIED*
- MEASURABLE OBJECTIVE
- MINIMUM THRESHOLD

CLIMATE PERIOD CLASSIFICATION

DRY | AVERAGE/ALTERNATING | WET





Well Depth: 840 feet
Screened Interval: 640-840 feet below ground surface
Reference Point Elevation: 787 feet above mean sea level

* Measurement reported as not static

HYDROGRAPH OF MEASURED GROUNDWATER ELEVATION FOR 26S/12E-14G02

P:\Portland\824-Paso Robles\001-GSP Annual Report\Analysis\Hydrographs\Grapher\Annual Rpt\Hydr_26S_12E-14G02.grf



EXPLANATION

- GROUNDWATER ELEVATION
- MEASUREMENT NOT VERIFIED*
- MEASURABLE OBJECTIVE
- MINIMUM THRESHOLD

CLIMATE PERIOD CLASSIFICATION

DRY | AVERAGE/ALTERNATING | WET





Well Depth: 350 feet
Screened Interval: 300-310, 330-340 feet below ground surface
Reference Point Elevation: 669.8 feet above mean sea level

* Measurement reported as not static

HYDROGRAPH OF MEASURED GROUNDWATER ELEVATION FOR 25S/12E-16K05

P:\Portland\824-Paso Robles\001-GSP Annual Report\Analysis\Hydrographs\Grapher\Annual Rpt\Hydr_25S_12E-16K05.grf



EXPLANATION

- GROUNDWATER ELEVATION
- MEASUREMENT NOT VERIFIED*
- MEASURABLE OBJECTIVE
- MINIMUM THRESHOLD

CLIMATE PERIOD CLASSIFICATION

DRY | AVERAGE/ALTERNATING | WET



- Reference Point Elevation
- Casing
- Perforations (blank when unknown)



Well Depth: 400 feet
Screened Interval: 200-400 feet below ground surface
Reference Point Elevation: 719.7 feet above mean sea level

* Measurement reported as not static

HYDROGRAPH OF MEASURED GROUNDWATER ELEVATION FOR 25S/12E-26L01

P:\Portland\824-Paso Robles\001-GSP Annual Report\Analysis\Hydrographs\Grapher\Annual Rpt\Hydr_25S_12E-26L01.grf



EXPLANATION

GROUNDWATER ELEVATION

MEASUREMENT NOT VERIFIED*

MEASURABLE OBJECTIVE

MINIMUM THRESHOLD

CLIMATE PERIOD CLASSIFICATION

DRY AVERAGE/ALTERNATING WET





Well Depth: 270 feet
Screened Interval: 110-270 feet below ground surface
Reference Point Elevation: 1033.8 feet above mean sea level

* Measurement reported as not static

HYDROGRAPH OF MEASURED GROUNDWATER ELEVATION FOR 25S/13E-08L02

P:\Portland\824-Paso Robles\001-GSP Annual Report\Analysis\Hydrographs\Grapher\Annual Rpt\Hydr_25S_13E-08L02.grf



EXPLANATION

- GROUNDWATER ELEVATION
- MEASUREMENT NOT VERIFIED*
- MEASURABLE OBJECTIVE
- MINIMUM THRESHOLD

CLIMATE PERIOD CLASSIFICATION

DRY | AVERAGE/ALTERNATING | WET



- Reference Point Elevation
- Casing
- Perforations (blank when unknown)



Well Depth: 400 feet
Screened Interval: unknown
Reference Point Elevation: 835 feet above mean sea level

* Measurement reported as not static

HYDROGRAPH OF MEASURED GROUNDWATER ELEVATION FOR 26S/12E-26E07

P:\Portland\824-Paso Robles\001-GSP Annual Report\Analysis\Hydrographs\Grapher\Annual Rpt\Hydr_26S_12E-26E07.grf



EXPLANATION

- GROUNDWATER ELEVATION
- MEASUREMENT NOT VERIFIED*
- MEASURABLE OBJECTIVE
- MINIMUM THRESHOLD

CLIMATE PERIOD CLASSIFICATION

DRY | AVERAGE/ALTERNATING | WET



- Reference Point Elevation
- Casing
- Perforations (blank when unknown)



Well Depth: 400 feet
Screened Interval: 260-400 feet below ground surface
Reference Point Elevation: 827.9 feet above mean sea level

* Measurement reported as not static

HYDROGRAPH OF MEASURED GROUNDWATER ELEVATION FOR 26S/13E-08M01

P:\Portland\824-Paso Robles\001-GSP Annual Report\Analysis\Hydrographs\Grapher\Annual Rpt\Hydr_26S_13E-08M01.grf



EXPLANATION

- GROUNDWATER ELEVATION
- MEASUREMENT NOT VERIFIED*
- MEASURABLE OBJECTIVE
- MINIMUM THRESHOLD

CLIMATE PERIOD CLASSIFICATION

DRY | AVERAGE/ALTERNATING | WET



- Reference Point Elevation
- Casing
- Perforations (blank when unknown)



Well Depth: 400 feet
Screened Interval: 200-400 feet below ground surface
Reference Point Elevation: 890.2 feet above mean sea level

* Measurement reported as not static

HYDROGRAPH OF MEASURED GROUNDWATER ELEVATION FOR 26S/13E-16N01

P:\Portland\824-Paso Robles\001-GSP Annual Report\Analysis\Hydrographs\Grapher\Annual Rpt\Hydr_26S_13E-16N01.grf

APPENDIX F
Paso Robles Formation Aquifer Storage Coefficient Derivation and Sensitivity Analysis

This page left blank intentionally.

Paso Robles Formation Aquifer Storage Coefficient Derivation and Sensitivity Analysis

The annual changes in groundwater in storage calculated for water years 2017, 2018, and 2019 in the Paso Robles Formation Aquifer presented in this first annual report are based on a fixed storage coefficient (S) value derived from groundwater modeling and groundwater elevation data presented in the Groundwater Sustainability Plan (GSP) for water year 2016. The derivation of S for the Paso Robles Formation Aquifer and a sensitivity analysis are presented below. It should be noted that while the GSP groundwater model utilizes a spatially variable S (both laterally and vertically) the S value derived here and used in this first annual report is a single average value representing the Paso Robles Formation Aquifer within the Subbasin.

1.1 Derivation of the Storage Coefficient Term

Derivation of S was accomplished through a back calculation using the change in groundwater in storage in the Paso Robles Formation Aquifer determined from the GSP groundwater model for water year 2016 and the total volume change represented by a Paso Robles Formation Aquifer groundwater elevation change map prepared for water year 2016. The change in groundwater in storage for water year 2016 in the Paso Robles Formation Aquifer is -59,459 acre-feet (AF) based on the GSP groundwater model.

The Paso Robles Formation Aquifer groundwater elevation change map for water year 2016 was prepared for this annual report by comparing the fall 2015 groundwater elevation contour map to the fall 2016 groundwater elevation contour map. The fall 2015 groundwater elevations were subtracted from the fall 2016 groundwater elevations resulting in a map depicting the changes in groundwater elevations in the Paso Robles Formation Aquifer that occurred during the 2016 water year (not pictured, but similar to Figures 12, 13, and 14 in this first annual report).

The groundwater elevation change map for water year 2016 represents a total volume change within the Paso Robles Formation Aquifer of -807,490 AF. As described in Section 7.2 of this annual report, this total volume change includes the volume displaced by the aquifer material and the volume of groundwater stored within the void space of the aquifer. The portion of void space in the aquifer that can be utilized for groundwater storage is represented by S. The change in groundwater in storage is equivalent to the product of S and the total volume change, as shown here:

$$Change\ of\ Groundwater\ in\ Storage = S \times Total\ Volume\ Change$$

This equation can be re-arranged and solved for S:

$$S = \frac{Change\ of\ Groundwater\ in\ Storage}{Total\ Volume\ Change} = \frac{-59{,}459\ AF}{-807{,}490\ AF} = 0.07$$

Therefore, based on analysis of data for water year 2016, an average S value for the Paso Robles Formation Aquifer in the Paso Robles Subbasin is 0.07.

1.2 Sensitivity Analysis

The annual changes in groundwater in storage in the Paso Robles Formation Aquifer calculated for water years 2017, 2018, and 2019 presented in this first annual report are 60,106, 6,398, and 59,682 AF, respectively. These values, calculated using an S value of 0.07, appear reasonable when compared to historical changes in groundwater in storage (see Figure 15 in this first annual report). While the calculated value of S, presented above, is based on sound science and using the best readily available information, it is

necessary to acknowledge that the true value of S in the Paso Robles Formation Aquifer is spatially variable (as indicated in the GSP groundwater model) and ranges in value both above and below the calculated value of 0.07. A sensitivity analysis was performed to demonstrate the range of annual changes in groundwater in storage that result from using a range of S values. Table F1 shows that the annual change in groundwater in storage volumes can range from 27 percent less to 27 percent more than presented in this first annual report based on S values ranging from 0.05 to 0.09. This shows the sensitivity of the S value to determination of annual change in groundwater in storage. However, neither the 27 percent lower nor the 27 percent higher annual change in groundwater in storage volumes seem reasonable when compared to historical changes in groundwater in storage (as shown in Figure 15 in this first annual report). Based on this sensitivity analysis, GSI believes that the calculated value of S (0.07) is reasonable and defensible for the purposes of this first annual report.

Table F 1. Change in Groundwater in Storage Sensitivity Analysis

Water Year	Total Volume of Change (AF)	Change in Groundwater in Storage (AF), based on:								
		S = 0.05		S = 0.06		Calculated S [0.07]	S = 0.08		S = 0.09	
		(AF)	% Diff	(AF)	% Diff	(AF)	(AF)	% Diff	(AF)	% Diff
2017	816,274	43,781	-27%	51,943	-14%	60,106	68,269	14%	76,432	27%
2018	86,885	4,660		5,529		6,398	7,267		8,135	
2019	810,508	43,471		51,577		59,682	67,787		75,892	

notes:

AF = acre-feet, S = storage coefficient, % Diff = percent difference from calculated S

Water Neutral New Development Phase 1.5 Ordinance Amendments

Update to the Paso Basin Cooperative Committee
March 18, 2020

Presented by: Kylie Hensley, County of San Luis Obispo
Department of Planning & Building

1

Background

Overview of land use policies regarding water usage in the unincorporated areas of the Paso Basin

Paso Basin Planning Area Standards

- September 25, 2012 – County Board of Supervisors (Board) adopted amendments to the Land Use Ordinance requiring a 2:1 water offset for discretionary projects and prohibiting land divisions and General Plan Amendments that increase water demand within the Paso Basin.

2

Background

Water Neutral New Development

- August 27, 2013 – Board adopted an Urgency Ordinance requiring a 1:1 water offset for new development dependent on a well and new or expanded irrigated crop production and installation of well meters to be issued a permit.
- October 27, 2015 – Board adopted amendments to the Land Use Ordinance & Building Code to continue requiring a 1:1 water offset for new construction and new irrigated crop production and installation of well meters in the Paso Basin, set to terminate upon the adoption of the GSP.

3

Background

Water Neutral New Development – Agricultural Offsets

- Property owners in the unincorporated areas of the Paso Basin are required to apply for an Agricultural Offset Clearance from the Department of Planning & Building to plant new or expanded irrigated crops to ensure a 1:1 water offset based on average applied water factors.
- Applicants must provide evidence of existing crops.
- Existing crops that qualify to be converted must have been irrigated within the last 5 years.
- One-time 5 AFY exemption for sites without existing irrigation.

4

Background

Water Neutral New Development – Phase 1 Amendments

- November 5, 2019 – Board adopted amendments to the Land Use Ordinance and Building Code to:
  - Extend the termination date for the 1:1 water offset requirement for new construction and new irrigated crops in the Paso Basin to *January 1, 2022* to avoid a gap between GSP adoption and implementation.
  - Disallow off-site water offsets for new irrigated crops.
  - Include a water duty factor for hemp and supplementally irrigated dry croplands and a process to define water duty factors for unlisted crops.

Background

Water Neutral New Development – Phase 1.5 & 2 Amendments

- November 5, 2019 – Board directed staff to bring additional amendments to Land Use Ordinance and Building Code.
  - Phase 1.5 amendments require minor environmental review.
  - Phase 2 amendments require major environmental review.
- February 27, 2020 – County Planning Commission considered Phase 1.5 proposed amendments, directed staff to conduct additional outreach, and continued the item to the April 24, 2020 Planning Commission hearing date. A Board hearing date is not yet scheduled.

Phase 1.5 Proposed Amendments

Minor environmental review required.

1. Update the Paso Robles Groundwater Basin (Paso Basin) Map.
   - Fugro Study Boundary → DWR Bulletin 118 Boundary
2. Update the Area of Severe Decline Map.
   - Incorporate new data and updated hydrologic model
3. Incorporate a fallowing option into the Agricultural Offset Ordinance.
   - Clarify application process to fallow land until January 1, 2022
4. Clarify "de minimis" term in the Agricultural Offset Ordinance.
   - Avoid confusion with the GSP definition (5 AFY commercial vs. 2 AFY domestic)

Phase 2 Proposed Amendments

Major environmental review required.

- Expand 5 AFY one-time exemption to 25 AFY.
- Extend the lookback period for existing crops beyond 5 years.
- Discuss re-allowing off-site agricultural offsets.
- Revisit water offset fees and water usage assumptions for non-agricultural development.
- Revisit the prohibition on new land divisions and General Plan Amendments that increase water demand.

Updating Paso Basin Map

- Changes which properties are subject to:
  - 1:1 water offset requirement for new irrigated commercial crops
  - 1:1 water offset requirement for new construction
  - 2:1 water offset requirement for non-agricultural discretionary permits
  - Prohibitions on General Plan Amendments and land divisions

Paso Basin Map - Current



Paso Basin Map - New



DWR
Bulletin 118
Boundary

COUNTY OF SAN LUIS OBISPO www.slocounty.ca.gov

11

Paso Basin Map - Change



- Green = added
- Orange = removed
- Blue = unaffected
- Purple = irrigated crops

COUNTY OF SAN LUIS OBISPO www.slocounty.ca.gov

12

Paso Basin Map - Change

Change	Area (acres)	Properties	Property Owners
Added	103,287	945	524
Removed	12,112	301	244
Net Change	91,175	644	280
% Change	27%	8%	5%

- Most existing irrigated lands are unaffected by the change.
- Most of added area is native vegetation and rural residences.
- Interactive map: www.slocountywwcp.org/prgwb

13

Updating Area of Severe Decline

- The County Land Use Ordinance defines the Area of Severe Decline as the -50' contour in the Spring Groundwater Elevation Change Map.
- Updates:
  - 1997-2013 monitoring data → 1997-2017 monitoring data
  - Updated hydrologic model
- Changes which properties are subject to:
  - Exclusion from a one-time 5 AFY exemption for new irrigated crop production
  - 2:1 water offset requirement for cannabis activities permits

14

Area of Severe Decline - Current



-50' contour of groundwater elevation change, Spring 1997-Spring 2013 data

15

Area of Severe Decline - New



-50' contour of groundwater elevation change, Spring 1997-Spring 2017 data

16

Area of Severe Decline - Change



- Green = added
- Orange = removed
- Blue = unaffected
- Purple = irrigated crops

17

Area of Severe Decline - Change

Change	Area (acres)	Properties	Property Owners
Added	26,443	455	300
Removed	36,936	1,767	1,437
Net Change	-10,493	-1,312	-1,137
% Change	-14%	-32%	-34%

- Added areas are in Estrella/Whitley Gardens vicinity, along Navarro Creek Road north of Hwy 58, and west of Creston.
- Interactive map: www.slocountywwcp.org/prgwb

18

Fallowing

- Property owners in the unincorporated areas of the Paso Basin may apply for an On-Site Agricultural Offset Clearance to quantify their existing water demand and receive approval to plant new irrigated crops that use the same amount of water or less *before January 1, 2022*.
- Applicants must submit evidence of existing irrigated crop production within the last five years.
- The proposed amendment clarifies that a proposed planting plan is not required to be submitted with the initial application.

"De Minimis"

- Two conflicting definitions:
  - County Land Use Ordinance: 5 AFY commercial irrigation
  - GSP: 2 AFY domestic use
- The proposed amendments would exclude the phrase "de minimis" from the Land Use Ordinance to avoid confusion with the GSP definition.
- The 5 AFY one-time exemption for new irrigated crops would remain in effect, without the "de minimis" label.

Environmental Determination

Phase 1.5 Amendments

- An **addendum to the Supplemental Environmental Impact Report** (SCH 2014081056) certified for the Countywide Water Conservation Program in 2015 is proposed for amendments to Section 22.30.204 Agricultural Offset Requirements and Section 19.07.042 Water Conservation Provisions.
- A Class 8 **Categorical Exemption** is proposed for the amendments to Section 22.94.025 Paso Robles Groundwater Basin Planning Area Standards.

Phase 2 Amendments

- Pending

Public Hearings

Phase 1.5 Amendments

- April 23 – County Planning Commission
- TBD – County Board of Supervisors

Phase 2 Amendments

- TBD – Environmental determination hearing with the County Board of Supervisors

Questions?

Proposed Amendments & Interactive Map available at:
www.slocountywwcp.org/prgwb

For more information, contact:
Kylie Hensley
Department of Planning & Building
khensley@co.slo.ca.us
805-781-4979

COUNTY OF SAN LUIS OBISPO www.slocounty.ca.gov

23

COUNTY OF SAN LUIS OBISPO
DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND BUILDING
STAFF REPORT

Promoting the wise use of land
Helping build great communities

PLANNING COMMISSION

MEETING DATE	CONTACT/PHONE	APPLICANT	FILE NO.
February 27, 2020	Kylie Hensley, Planner I (805) 781-4979 khensley@co.slo.ca.us	County of San Luis Obispo	LRP2020-00002

SUBJECT
Hearing to consider a request by the **County of San Luis Obispo** to amend Title 22 and Title 19 to update the maps of the Paso Robles Groundwater Basin boundary and the Area of Severe Decline to be consistent with the Paso Robles Subbasin Groundwater Sustainability Plan and to incorporate a fallowing option into the Agricultural Offset Program.

RECOMMENDED ACTION
It is recommended that the Planning Commission 1) recommend that the Board adopt the ordinance to approve the amendments to Title 22 and Title 19 to update the maps of the Paso Robles Groundwater Basin boundary and the Area of Severe Decline to be consistent with the Paso Robles Subbasin Groundwater Sustainability Plan and to incorporate a fallowing option into the Agricultural Offset Program.

ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION
An addendum to the Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (SCH 2014081056) certified for the Countywide Water Conservation Program in 2015 was prepared in accordance with the applicable provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act, Public Resources Code Section 21000 et. seq. for amendments to Section 22.30.204 Agricultural Offset Requirements and Section 19.07.042 Water Conservation Provisions.

A Class 8 Categorical Exemption is proposed for the amendments to Section 22.94.025 Paso Robles Groundwater Basin Planning Area Standards.

LAND USE CATEGORY	COMBINING DESIGNATION	ASSESSOR PARCEL NUMBER	SUPERVISOR DISTRICT(S)
Various	Various	Various	1 & 5

PLANNING AREA STANDARDS:
Not Applicable

EXISTING USES:
Various

SURROUNDING LAND USE CATEGORIES AND USES:
Not Applicable

OTHER AGENCY / ADVISORY GROUP INVOLVEMENT:
The project was referred to the Department of Public Works, Department of Agriculture/Weights and Measures

TOPOGRAPHY:	VEGETATION:
Various	Various
PROPOSED SERVICES: Not Applicable	AUTHORIZED FOR PROCESSING DATE: June 18, 2019; amended November 5, 2019

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION MAY BE OBTAINED BY CONTACTING THE DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING & BUILDING AT:
COUNTY GOVERNMENT CENTER γ SAN LUIS OBISPO γ CALIFORNIA 93408 γ (805) 781-5600 γ FAX: (805) 781-1242

PROJECT SUMMARY

The ordinance amendments in Attachments 1 and 2 update the maps of the Paso Robles Groundwater Basin (Paso Basin) and the Area of Severe Decline in the Paso Basin in Title 22 and Title 19 to be consistent with the recently adopted Paso Robles Subbasin Groundwater Sustainability Plan (GSP) and incorporate a fallowing option into the Agricultural Offset Program.

DISCUSSION

Paso Basin Groundwater Management

The Salinas Valley – Paso Robles Area (Paso Basin) is designated as a high-priority, critically overdrafted groundwater basin by the California Department of Water Resources (DWR). The County participates in management of the Paso Basin through a variety of mechanisms, three of which are:

1. The Paso Robles Subbasin Groundwater Sustainability Plan,
2. The Water Neutral New Development Programs in the Paso Basin, and
3. The Paso Robles Groundwater Basin Planning Area Standards.

Groundwater Sustainability Plan (GSP)

On December 17, 2019, the Board of Supervisors adopted the Paso Robles Subbasin Groundwater Sustainability Plan (GSP) in accordance with the requirements of the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA). This document includes the most recent mapping of the basin boundaries and groundwater level contours.

Water Neutral New Development (WNND) Programs

On October 27, 2015, the Board of Supervisors established the following Water Neutral New Development (WNND) Programs in the Paso Basin:

- The Urban/Rural Water Offset and Rebate Programs (Title 19 Building and Construction Ordinance Section 19.07.042); and
- The Agricultural Offset Program (Title 22 Land Use Ordinance Section 22.30.204).

Paso Basin Planning Area Standards

On September 25, 2012, the Board of Supervisors authorized the adoption of planning area standards for the Paso Basin (Section 22.94.025) that require a 2:1 water offset and low-water using landscaping for non-agricultural projects approved through a discretionary land use permit. The planning area standards also prohibit approval of General Plan Amendments that increase water demand and land divisions in the Paso Basin, excluding San Miguel and Shandon and exempting comprehensive Community Plan Updates.

WNND Amendment Phases

On June 18, 2019, the Board of Supervisors authorized amendments to the Water Neutral New Development (WNND) Programs. On November 5, 2019, the Board of Supervisors approved Phase 1 of the WNND amendments and directed staff to bring the remaining amendments that do not require extensive CEQA analysis as Phase 1.5 and to bring amendments that require more extensive CEQA analysis as Phase 2. The phases are summarized below.

Phase 1 (effective December 5, 2019)

- Eliminate off-site agricultural offsets.
- Extend the termination date to January 1, 2022.
- Include a water duty factor for hemp and supplementally irrigated dry cropland.
- Establish a process to determine water duty factors for crops not specified in the ordinance.
- Require a recorded disclosure form instead of a deed restriction.

Phase 1.5 (for review today, see Attachments 1 and 2)

- Update the maps of the Paso Basin and the Area of Severe Decline to be consistent with the Groundwater Sustainability Plan (GSP).
- Create a fallowing registration.

Phase 2 (for review later, pending environmental determination)

For agricultural offsets:

- Expand the definition of the 5 acre-feet per year (AFY) per site one-time exemption to allow 25 AFY per site, considering parcel size.
- Extend the lookback period beyond 5 years.
- Discuss re-allowing off-site offsets.

For non-agricultural (rural/urban) offsets:

- Revisit water offset fees and water usage assumptions.
- Revisit the Paso Basin planning area standards prohibiting land divisions and General Plan Amendments.
- Revisit the 1:1 water offset requirement for the Nipomo Mesa.

WNND Phase 1.5 - Updated Maps

Paso Basin

The existing map of the Paso Basin for the WNND programs (Section 22.30.204) is shown in Figure 1 below. The Paso Basin Planning Area Standards (Section 22.94.025) includes a similar map. This map is based on the 2002 Fugro basin study.



Figure 1: Existing Paso Basin Map

The updated Paso Basin boundary map shown in Figure 2 below is defined by Bulletin 118 for the Salinas Valley – Paso Robles Area from the DWR for the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA). This map is consistent with the Paso Robles Subbasin Groundwater Sustainability Plan (GSP) adopted by the Board of Supervisors on December 17, 2019.



Figure 2: Updated Paso Basin Map

As shown in Figure 3 below, the updated Paso Basin map adds approximately 103,000 acres and removes approximately 12,000 acres from the boundary, for a net increase of about 91,000 acres, primarily in the eastern portion of the basin.



Figure 3: Change in Paso Basin Area

A summary of the differences between the Fugro and Bulletin 118 Paso Basin maps in terms of the number of included acres, properties, and property owners is shown in Table 1 below. With this update, 945 properties (524 owners) that are *not* currently considered to be in the Paso Basin would now be within the basin. 301 properties (244 owners) that *are* currently considered to be in the Paso Basin would be removed. Overall, the changes would be a 27% increase in area, 8% increase in affected properties, and 5% increase in affected property owners.

Table 1: Summary of Changes to the Paso Basin Map

Paso Robles Groundwater Basin			
Change	**Area (acres)**	**Properties**	**Property Owners**
Added	103,287	945	524
Removed	12,112	301	244
Net Change	91,175	644	280
Percent Change	27%	8%	5%

The existing land use within the updated Paso Basin boundary is shown in Figure 4 below, sourced from Figure 3-4 of the GSP. If the proposed ordinance amendments are approved, the areas added to the Paso Basin in the updated map would be subject to the requirements of the WNND Programs and the Paso Basin Planning Area Standards. Nearly all existing irrigated agricultural land in the Paso Basin would be unaffected by the updated basin boundary map. Most of the acres added to the Paso Basin in the updated map are properties in the eastern portion of the basin where the existing land use is native vegetation and rural residential uses without existing irrigated crop production on-site. The Agricultural Offset Ordinance (Section 22.30.204) would prohibit planting new commercial irrigated crops on these properties, (except for a 5 AFY de minimus exemption if the property is not located in the Area of Severe Decline) unless off-site agricultural offsets are re-allowed in the future. Most of the added area is composed of large grazing properties with low residential density that will be minimally impacted by the 1:1 offset requirement for new construction (Section 19.07.042). The Paso Basin Planning Area Standards (Section 22.94.025) would 1) require a 2:1 water offset and low-water using landscaping for projects approved through a discretionary land use permit, and 2) prohibit General Plan Amendments that increase water demand and land divisions in the added areas, excluding San Miguel and Shandon. The Phase 2 WNND Amendments will re-examine the requirements of the 1:1 offset ordinances and the planning area standards.



Figure 4: Existing Land Use in the Paso Basin (GSP Figure 3-4)

Area of Severe Decline

The existing Area of Severe Decline map shown in Figure 5 below is based on the 50' contour of the change in groundwater elevation map prepared by GEI Consultants using Spring 1997 - Spring 2013 monitoring data.



Figure 5: Existing Area of Severe Decline Map

The updated Area of Severe Decline map shown in Figure 6 below is based on the updated change in groundwater elevation map in GSP Figure 5-7, maintaining the 50' change contour as the boundary. The updated map uses monitoring data from Spring 1997 - Spring 2017 and updates to the hydrologic model.



Figure 6: Updated Area of Severe Decline Map

As shown in Figure 7 below, the updated Area of Severe Decline boundary adds over 26,000 acres and removes almost 37,000 acres, for a net decrease of about 10,500 acres. The updated map increases the area of irrigated croplands in the Estrella/Whitley Gardens vicinity east of the City of Paso Robles, removes the spots of land near San Miguel and north of Creston and areas north and south of the City of Paso Robles, expands the area west of Creston, and changes the shape of the boundary near the vineyards along Navarro Creek Road north of Highway 58.



Figure 7: Change in Area of Severe Decline

Table 2 below shows a summary of the changes to the Area of Severe Decline map in terms of the number of acres, properties, and property owners. With this update, 455 properties (300 owners) that are *not* currently considered to be in the Area of Severe Decline would now be within the area. 1,767 properties (1,437 owners) that *are* currently considered to be in the Area of Severe Decline would be removed. Overall, the changes would be a 14% decrease in area, 32% decrease in affected properties, and 34% decrease in affected property owners.

Table 2: Summary of Changes to the Area of Severe Decline Map

Area of Severe Decline			
Change	**Area (acres)**	**Properties**	**Property Owners**
Added	26,443	455	300
Removed	36,936	1,767	1,437
Net Change	-10,493	-1,312	-1,137
Percent Change	-14%	-32%	-34%

The Agricultural Offset Ordinance (Section 22.30.2004) does not allow new commercial irrigated crops to be planted on sites with no existing commercial irrigated crop production within the Area of Severe Decline. The updated map decreases the number of acres and properties subject to this restriction. Based on the existing land uses shown in Figure 4 above, the properties removed from the Area of Severe Decline are a mixture of irrigated croplands, native vegetation (including dry farmed crops), and rural residential use. The added areas are near concentrated vineyard operations in the Estrella/Whitley Gardens vicinity, along Navarro Creek Road north of Highway 58, and the rural area west of Creston. Existing irrigated crop production sites are not affected by the change in the Area of Severe Decline designation. Properties without existing irrigated commercial crop production that are removed from the Area of Severe Decline would qualify for a one-time 5 AFY de minimus exemption when they did not previously. Since the Ag Offset Ordinance was adopted in 2015, only four 5 AFY de minimus applications have been received by the County. Based on this trend, the expansion in areas that qualify for the de minimus exemption is not significant.

WNND Phase 1.5 - Fallowing

The proposed amendments allow applicants for an On-Site Agricultural Offset Clearance to indicate that they are voluntarily fallowing the land or not planting an irrigated crop to postpone the deadline for submitting a proposed planting plan for approval. The Phase 1 WNND Amendments that took effect on December 5, 2019 extended the expiration date for conditionally approved Offset Clearances to the termination date of the ordinance, currently set as January 1st, 2022.

The Agricultural Offset Ordinance is intended to be a temporary management strategy until the GSP is implemented. Chapter 9 of the GSP states:

> *This GSP calls for the GSAs to promote voluntary fallowing of crop land to reduce overall groundwater demand. For example, the GSAs could develop a Subbasin-wide accounting system that tracks landowners who decide to voluntarily fallow their land and cease groundwater pumping or otherwise refrain from using groundwater. If given the opportunity to create a 'place holder' for their ability to pump under regulations adopted by the GSAs, some property owners currently irrigating crops or that might want to irrigate in the future may choose to forego the expense of farming and extracting water if those rights can be accounted for and protected. A regulation would need to be adopted by the GSAs for the metering and reporting program, and the program could include provisions related to land fallowing.*

The specific timing and details of GSP implementation are under development at this time.

ORDINANCE AMENDMENTS

Attachments 1 and 2 show proposed revisions to Title 22 and Title 19 of the County Code. Proposed text marked for deletion has a ~~strikeout~~ and the proposed text to be inserted is underlined. The proposed revisions are described below:

Amendments to Section 22.30.204 Agricultural Offset Requirements



Figure 30-1: Paso Robles Groundwater Basin (Excluding the Atascadero Sub-basin)

Explanation: This change updates the Paso Basin boundary map to be consistent with the GSP.

A. **Exemptions.** Consideration of an exemption is subject to section 22.30.204 F (Application Contents). The Agricultural Offset Clearance requirements as outlined in this section do not apply to the following activities, unless specified below:

5. For the purpose of new crop production overlying the Paso Robles Groundwater Basin (excluding the Atascadero Sub-basin), as defined by Figure 30-1, sites that do not have any existing crop production and are not within the area of severe decline (50 feet or greater Spring Groundwater Elevation Change 1997-201~~3~~7) as shown in Figure 30-2, may be eligible for a one-time only ~~de minimis~~ exemption. The one-time only ~~de minimis~~ exemption is limited to the establishment of crop production representing a new total of no more than 5.0 AF per year per site. If a one-time only ~~de minimis~~ exemption is granted, the resulting crop production cannot be used as a source of Agricultural Offset Clearance credits in any future application.



Figure 30-2: Paso Robles Groundwater Basin with Area of Severe Decline

Explanation: These changes update the Area of Severe Decline to be consistent with the GSP and remove the term "de minimis". The CA Water Code Sec. 10721 defines a "de minimis" groundwater extractor as "a person who extracts, for domestic purposes, two acre-feet or less per year." Extracting 5 AFY for commercial crop production does not fit within this definition.

F. **Application Contents.** In addition to meeting the application contents of section 22.62.030 (Zoning Clearance), a request for an Agricultural Offset Clearance shall include all of the following:

1. Vicinity of site(s) participating in the requested Agricultural Offset Clearance, including all parcels currently under crop production, and adjacent parcels with same ownership.

2. Identification of specific locations and acreage of current crop type(s).

3. Identification of specific locations and acreage of proposed crop type(s). The applicant may indicate that they are voluntarily fallowing the land or not planting irrigated crops to receive conditional approval to submit a proposed planting plan at a later date. The conditional approval expires with the termination of this ordinance.

4. A current title report or lot book guarantee for all parcels participating in the requested Agricultural Offset Clearance.

Explanation: This change allows applicants for an On-Site Agricultural Offset Clearance to indicate that they are voluntarily fallowing their land or not planting irrigated crops to allow them to verify their available water credits and receive conditional approval to plant irrigated crops that do not exceed the water demand without having to specify a proposed planting plan when they apply.

Amendments to Section 22.94.025 Paso Basin Planning Area Standards





Figure 94-6: Paso Robles Groundwater Basin North County Planning Area

Explanation: These changes update the map of the Paso Basin to be consistent with the GSP, still excluding the San Miguel and Shandon URLs as specified in the original map and clarifies that this map shows the areas affected by the Paso Basin Planning Area Standards.

Amendments to Section 19.07.042 Water Conservation Provisions



Figure 7-1 – Paso Robles Groundwater Basin (Excluding the Atascadero Sub-basin)

[Map of Nipomo Mesa]

Figure 7-~~1~~2 – Nipomo Mesa Water Conservation Area

(5) Los Osos Groundwater Basin: In addition to the requirements in Section 1., 2., and 3. Above, the requirements in subsections (5)a. through (5)j. below shall apply to all new development that uses water from the Los Osos Groundwater Basin shown in Figure 7-~~23~~.

[Map of Los Osos Groundwater Basin]

Figure 7-~~23~~ – Los Osos Groundwater Basin and Prohibition Zone

Explanation: These changes add a map of the Paso Basin with the Bulletin 118 boundary to this section of Title 19 to clarify the areas subject to the water conservation provisions for the Paso Basin and update the figure numbers and references for the following maps in the section. Previously, this section did not include a map of the Paso Basin, although one is referenced.

CEQA REVIEW
An addendum to the Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (SEIR) (SCH 2014081056) certified for the Countywide Water Conservation Program in 2015 was prepared in accordance with the applicable provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act, Public Resources Code Section 21000 et. seq. for the proposed changes to the WNND ordinances (Sections 19.07.042 and 22.30.204).

A Class 8 Categorical Exemption is proposed for the amendments to the Paso Robles Groundwater Basin Planning Area Standards (Section 22.94.025).

AGENCY REVIEW
The Department of Public Works, the Department of Agriculture/Weights and Measures, and County Counsel have reviewed and approved the proposed ordinance changes.

ATTACHMENTS
1. Proposed Ordinance (Redline Version)
2. Proposed Ordinance (Clean Version)
3. Addendum to SEIR
4. Notice of Exemption

ORDINANCE NO._____

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING TITLE 22 AND TITLE 19 OF THE SAN LUIS OBISPO COUNTY CODE, THE LAND USE ORDINANCE AND BUILDING ORDINANCE, BY AMENDING SECTION 22.30.204 AGRICULTURAL OFFSET REQUIREMENTS, SECTION 22.94.025 PASO BASIN PLANNING AREA STANDARDS, AND SECTION 19.07.042 WATER CONSERVATION PROVISIONS

The Board of Supervisors of the County of San Luis Obispo, State of California, ordains as follows:

SECTION 1: Section 22.30.204 of Title 22 of the San Luis Obispo County Code, is hereby amended to read as follows:

Chapter 22.30.204 – New or Expanded Irrigated Crop Production Overlying the Paso Robles Groundwater Basin, Excluding the Atascadero Sub-basin.





Figure 30-1: Paso Robles Groundwater Basin (Excluding the Atascadero Sub-basin)

A. Exemptions. Consideration of an exemption is subject to section 22.30.204 F (Application Contents). The Agricultural Offset Clearance requirements as outlined in this section do not apply to the following activities, unless specified below:

5. For the purpose of new crop production overlying the Paso Robles Groundwater Basin (excluding the Atascadero Sub-basin), as defined by Figure 30-1, sites that do not have any existing crop production and are not within the area of severe decline (50 feet or greater Spring Groundwater Elevation Change 1997-201~~3~~7) as shown in Figure 30-2, may be eligible for a one-time only ~~de minimis~~ exemption. The one-time only ~~de minimis~~ exemption is limited to the establishment of crop production representing a new total of no more than 5.0 AF per year per site. If a one-time only ~~de minimis~~ exemption is granted, the resulting crop production cannot be used as a source of Agricultural Offset Clearance credits in any future application.





Figure 30-2: Paso Robles Groundwater Basin with Area of Severe Decline

F. Application Contents. In addition to meeting the application contents of section 22.62.030 (Zoning Clearance), a request for an Agricultural Offset Clearance shall include all of the following:

1. Vicinity of site(s) participating in the requested Agricultural Offset Clearance, including all parcels currently under crop production, and adjacent parcels with same ownership.

2. Identification of specific locations and acreage of current crop type(s).

3. Identification of specific locations and acreage of proposed crop type(s). The applicant may indicate that they are voluntarily fallowing the land or not planting irrigated crops to receive conditional approval to submit a proposed planting plan at a later date. The conditional approval expires with the termination of this ordinance.

4. A current title report or lot book guarantee for all parcels participating in the requested Agricultural Offset Clearance.

SECTION 2: Section 22.94.025 of Title 22 of the San Luis Obispo County Code, is hereby amended to read as follows:





Figure 94-6: Paso Robles Groundwater Basin North County Planning Area

SECTION 3: Section 19.07.042 of Title 19 of the San Luis Obispo County Code, is hereby amended to read as follows:



Figure 7-1 – Paso Robles Groundwater Basin (Excluding the Atascadero Sub-basin)



Figure 7-~~1~~2 – Nipomo Mesa Water Conservation Area

(5) Los Osos Groundwater Basin: In addition to the requirements in Section 1., 2., and 3. Above, the requirements in subsections (5)a. through (5)j. below shall apply to all new development that uses water from the Los Osos Groundwater Basin shown in Figure 7-~~2~~3.



Figure 7-~~2~~3 – Los Osos Groundwater Basin and Prohibition Zone

SECTION 4: If any section, subsection, clause, phrase or portion of this ordinance is for any reason held to be invalid or unconstitutional by the decision of a court of competent jurisdiction, such decision shall not affect the validity or constitutionality of the remaining portion of this ordinance. The Board of Supervisors hereby declares that it would have passed this ordinance and each section, subsection, clause, phrase or portion thereof irrespective of the fact that any one or more sections, subsections, sentences, clauses, phrases or portions be declared invalid or unconstitutional.

SECTION 5: Before the expiration of 15 days after the adoption of this ordinance by the San Luis Obispo County Board of Supervisors, it shall be published once in a newspaper of general circulation published in the County of San Luis Obispo, State of California, together with the names of the members of the Board of Supervisors voting for and against the ordinance.

SECTION 6: This Ordinance shall become effective thirty (30) days after its enactment by the Board of Supervisors.

SECTION 7: An addendum to the Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (SEIR) (SCH 2014081056) certified for the Countywide Water Conservation Program in 2015 was prepared in accordance with the applicable provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act, Public Resources Code Section 21000 et. seq. for the proposed changes to the WNND ordinances (Sections 19.07.042 and 22.30.204). A Class 8 Categorical Exemption is proposed for the amendments to the Paso Robles Groundwater Basin Planning Area Standards (Section 22.94.025).

SECTION 8: In accordance with Government Code Section 25131, after reading the title of this Ordinance, further reading of the Ordinance in full is waived.

RECOMMENDED at a special meeting of the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission held on the 27th day of February, 2020, and PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Board of Supervisors of the County of San Luis Obispo, State of California, on the_day of__, 2020, by the following roll call to vote, to wit:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

ABSTAINING:

_____

Chairman of the Board of Supervisors

ATTEST:

_____

County Clerk and Ex-Officio Clerk
of the Board of Supervisors
County of San Luis Obispo, State of California

[SEAL]

ORDINANCE CODE PROVISIONS APPROVED

AS TO FORM AND CODIFICATION:

RITA L. NEAL
County Counsel

By: _____
Deputy County Counsel

Dated:_ May 5, 2020

ORDINANCE NO._____

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING TITLE 22 AND TITLE 19 OF THE SAN LUIS OBISPO COUNTY CODE, THE LAND USE ORDINANCE AND BUILDING ORDINANCE, BY AMENDING SECTION 22.30.204 AGRICULTURAL OFFSET REQUIREMENTS, SECTION 22.94.025 PASO BASIN PLANNING AREA STANDARDS, AND SECTION 19.07.042 WATER CONSERVATION PROVISIONS

The Board of Supervisors of the County of San Luis Obispo, State of California, ordains as follows:

SECTION 1: Section 22.30.204 of Title 22 of the San Luis Obispo County Code, is hereby amended to read as follows:

Chapter 22.30.204 – New or Expanded Irrigated Crop Production Overlying the Paso Robles Groundwater Basin, Excluding the Atascadero Sub-basin.



Figure 30-1: Paso Robles Groundwater Basin (Excluding the Atascadero Sub-basin)

A. Exemptions. Consideration of an exemption is subject to section 22.30.204 F (Application Contents). The Agricultural Offset Clearance requirements as outlined in this section do not apply to the following activities, unless specified below:

5. For the purpose of new crop production overlying the Paso Robles Groundwater Basin (excluding the Atascadero Sub-basin), as defined by Figure 30-1, sites that do not have any existing crop production and are not within the area of severe decline (50 feet or greater Spring Groundwater Elevation Change 1997-2017) as shown in Figure 30-2, may be eligible for a one-time only exemption. The one-time only exemption is limited to the establishment of crop production representing a new total of no more than 5.0 AF per year per site. If a one-time only exemption is granted, the resulting crop production cannot be used as a source of Agricultural Offset Clearance credits in any future application.



Figure 30-2: Paso Robles Groundwater Basin with Area of Severe Decline

F. Application Contents. In addition to meeting the application contents of section 22.62.030 (Zoning Clearance), a request for an Agricultural Offset Clearance shall include all of the following:

1. Vicinity of site(s) participating in the requested Agricultural Offset Clearance, including all parcels currently under crop production, and adjacent parcels with same ownership.

2. Identification of specific locations and acreage of current crop type(s).

3. Identification of specific locations and acreage of proposed crop type(s). The applicant may indicate that they are voluntarily fallowing the land or not planting irrigated crops to receive conditional approval to submit a proposed planting plan at a later date. The conditional approval expires with the termination of this ordinance.

4. A current title report or lot book guarantee for all parcels participating in the requested Agricultural Offset Clearance.

SECTION 2: Section 22.94.025 of Title 22 of the San Luis Obispo County Code, is hereby amended to read as follows:



Figure 94-6: Paso Robles Groundwater Basin North County Planning Area

SECTION 3: Section 19.07.042 of Title 19 of the San Luis Obispo County Code, is hereby amended to read as follows:



Figure 7-1 – Paso Robles Groundwater Basin (Excluding the Atascadero Sub-basin)



Figure 7-2 – Nipomo Mesa Water Conservation Area

(5) Los Osos Groundwater Basin: In addition to the requirements in Section 1., 2., and 3. Above, the requirements in subsections (5)a. through (5)j. below shall apply to all new development that uses water from the Los Osos Groundwater Basin shown in Figure 7-3.



Figure 7-3 – Los Osos Groundwater Basin and Prohibition Zone

SECTION 4: If any section, subsection, clause, phrase or portion of this ordinance is for any reason held to be invalid or unconstitutional by the decision of a court of competent jurisdiction, such decision shall not affect the validity or constitutionality of the remaining portion of this ordinance. The Board of Supervisors hereby declares that it would have passed this ordinance and each section, subsection, clause, phrase or portion thereof irrespective of the fact that any one or more sections, subsections, sentences, clauses, phrases or portions be declared invalid or unconstitutional.

SECTION 5: Before the expiration of 15 days after the adoption of this ordinance by the San Luis Obispo County Board of Supervisors, it shall be published once in a newspaper of general circulation published in the County of San Luis Obispo, State of California, together with the names of the members of the Board of Supervisors voting for and against the ordinance.

SECTION 6: This Ordinance shall become effective thirty (30) days after its enactment by the Board of Supervisors.

SECTION 7: An addendum to the Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (SEIR) (SCH 2014081056) certified for the Countywide Water Conservation Program in 2015 was prepared in accordance with the applicable provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act, Public Resources Code Section 21000 et. seq. for the proposed changes to the WNND ordinances (Sections 19.07.042 and 22.30.204). A Class 8 Categorical Exemption is proposed for the amendments to the Paso Robles Groundwater Basin Planning Area Standards (Section 22.94.025).

SECTION 8: In accordance with Government Code Section 25131, after reading the title of this Ordinance, further reading of the Ordinance in full is waived.

RECOMMENDED at a special meeting of the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission held on the 27th day of February, 2020, and PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Board of Supervisors of the County of San Luis Obispo, State of California, on the_____day of_____, 2020, by the following roll call to vote, to wit:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

ABSTAINING:

_____

Chairman of the Board of Supervisors

ATTEST:

_____

County Clerk and Ex-Officio Clerk
of the Board of Supervisors
County of San Luis Obispo, State of California

[SEAL]

ORDINANCE CODE PROVISIONS APPROVED

AS TO FORM AND CODIFICATION:

RITA L. NEAL
County Counsel

By: _____
Deputy County Counsel

Dated:_ May 5, 2020

ADDENDUM TO THE CERTIFIED FINAL SUPPLEMENTAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT FOR THE COUNTYWIDE WATER CONSERVATION PROGRAM
February 2020

A. INTRODUCTION

This document is an Addendum to the Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (FSEIR) prepared for the Countywide Water Conservation Program (State Clearinghouse Number 2014081056). The FSEIR was certified by the County of San Luis Obispo on October 27, 2015, pursuant to County Board of Supervisors Resolution No. 2015-288. The Addendum is intended to bring the existing CEQA documentation up to date as appropriate. Because there are no new significant impacts or mitigation measures as a result of this updated analysis, an Addendum is the appropriate CEQA document.

B. ADDENDUM REQUIREMENTS

The Addendum has been prepared in accordance with the relevant provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) of 1970 (as amended) and the State CEQA Guidelines as implemented by the SSLOCSD. According to §15164(b) of the State CEQA Guidelines, an Addendum to an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) is the appropriate environmental document in instances when "only minor technical changes or additions are necessary or none of the conditions described in Section 15162 calling for the preparation of a subsequent EIR have occurred". Section 15162(a) of the State CEQA Guidelines states that no subsequent Negative Declaration shall be prepared for a project unless the lead agency determines, on the basis of substantial evidence in the light of the whole record, one or more of the following:

> *(1) Substantial changes are proposed in the project which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or Negative Declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects;*
>
> *(2) Substantial changes occur with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or Negative Declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; or*
>
> *(3) New information of substantial importance, which was not known and could*

not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the previous EIR or Negative Declaration was adopted, shows any of the following:

(A) The project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous EIR or Negative Declaration;
(B) Significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the previous EIR or Negative Declaration;
(C) Mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible, and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative; or
(D) Mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the previous EIR or Negative Declaration would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative.

This Addendum does not require circulation because it does not provide significant new information that changes the certified FSEIR in a way that deprives the public of a meaningful opportunity to comment upon a substantial adverse environmental effect of the project or a feasible way to mitigate or avoid such an effect.

This Addendum includes this introduction and a description of the proposed actions addressed in the Addendum as they related to the previously-approved project.

The Board of Supervisors shall consider this Addendum to the Final Supplemental EIR as part of the approval of the updated project.

C. PREVIOUS CEQA DOCUMENTATION

The County Board of Supervisors unanimously certified a Final Supplemental EIR and approved the project on October 27, 2015, pursuant to County Board of Supervisors Resolution No. 2015-288. A Notice of Determination (NOD) was prepared, and there were no legal challenges to the adequacy of the Final Supplemental EIR during the 30-day statute of limitations associated with the NOD, pursuant to CEQA (PRC Section 21167 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15094).

D. REASONS WHY AN ADDENDUM IS APPROPRIATE

Subsequent to the approval of the Countywide Water Conservation Program in October 2015, the County Board of Supervisors directed staff to draft an ordinance updating the maps of the Paso Robles Groundwater Basin (Paso Basin) and the Area of Severe Decline to be consistent with the maps of the Groundwater Sustainability Plan and amending the Agricultural Offset Ordinance to incorporate a fallowing registration. This Addendum incorporates the additional analysis for inclusion in the environmental record. The updated analysis does not materially change the findings and conclusions of the FSEIR, making a Subsequent EIR unnecessary pursuant to Section 15162 of the CEQA guidelines.

E. UPDATED PROJECT ELEMENTS

The updated project description includes a fallowing registry that was not included in the certified Final Supplemental EIR. The updated maps of the Paso Basin and the Area of Severe Decline are shown in Figures 1 and 2 below.



Figure 1: Updated Paso Basin Map



Figure 2: Updated Area of Severe Decline Map

The changes in the Paso Basin map are shown in Table 1 and Figure 3 below.

Table 1: Summary of Changes to the Paso Basin Map

Change	Area (acres)	Properties	Property Owners
Added	103,287	945	524
Removed	12,112	301	244
Net Change	91,175	644	280
Percent Change	27%	8%	5%



Figure 3: Change in Paso Basin Area

The changes in the Area of Severe Decline map is shown in Table 2 and Figure 4 below.

Table 2: Summary of Changes to the Area of Severe Decline Map

Area of Severe Decline			
Change	**Area (acres)**	**Properties**	**Property Owners**
Added	26,443	455	300
Removed	36,936	1,767	1,437
Net Change	-10,493	-1,312	-1,137
Percent Change	-14%	-32%	-34%



Figure 4: Change in Area of Severe Decline

F. UPDATED ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ANALYSIS

The updated Paso Basin map increases the area subject to the WNND Programs by 27% (91,175 acres) but only increases the number of affected property owners by 5%. Most of this added area is composed of large grazing properties with low residential density that will be minimally impacted by the 1:1 offset requirement for new construction. Most of these properties do not have existing irrigated crop production on-site. The Agricultural Offset Program would prohibit planting new commercial irrigated crops on these properties, except for a one-time 5 acre-feet per year (AFY) per site exemption if the property is not located in the Area of Severe Decline without existing irrigation, unless off-site agricultural offsets are re-allowed in the future.

The updated Area of Severe Decline map adds over 26,000 acres and removes almost 37,000 acres, for a net decrease of about 10,500 acres. The properties removed from the Area of Severe Decline are a mixture of irrigated croplands, native vegetation (including dry farmed crops), and rural residential. The added areas are near concentrated vineyard operations in the Estrella/Whitley Gardens vicinity, along Navarro Creek Road north of Highway 58, and the rural area west of Creston. Existing irrigated crop production sites are not affected by the change in the Area of Severe Decline designation. Properties

without existing irrigated commercial crop production that are removed from the Area of Severe Decline qualify for a one-time 5 AFY per site exemption when they did not previously. Since the Ag Offset Ordinance was adopted in 2015, only four 5 AFY exemption applications have been received by the County. Based on this trend, the expansion in areas that qualify for the 5 AFY exemption is not significant in terms of environmental impacts.

The fallowing registration incorporated in the amendment to the Agricultural Offset Program allows farmers the flexibility to stop irrigating without losing the ability to generate water credits to plant new irrigated crops of the same or less water demand in the future. The environmental impact analysis in the certified FSEIR acknowledged that the Agricultural Offset Program could result in the fallowing of agricultural fields. The area of land that could potentially be fallowed does not change by adding a fallowing registration to the Agricultural Offset Program.

The updated maps and inclusion of a fallowing registration does not change the findings or conclusions of the October 15, 2015 Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Report for the Countywide Water Conservation Program (SCH# 2014081056).

G. DETERMINATION

In accordance with Section 15164 of the CEQA Guidelines, the County of San Luis Obispo (County) has determined that this Addendum to the certified FSEIR is necessary to document changes or additions that have occurred in the project description since the FSEIR was originally certified. The County has reviewed and considered the information contained in this Addendum and finds that the preparation of subsequent CEQA analysis that would require public circulation is not necessary.

COUNTY OF SAN LUIS OBISPO
DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING & BUILDING

Notice of Exemption

PLN-1123
3/22/2018

Project Title and No.: Water Neutral New Development Phase 1.5 Amendments; LRP2020-00002, ED20-026

Project Location (Specific address [use APN or description when no situs available]): Paso Robles Groundwater Basin, County of San Luis Obispo	**Project Applicant/Phone No./Email:** County of San Luis Obispo **Applicant Address (Street, City, State, Zip):** See Project Location

Description of Nature, Purpose and Beneficiaries of Project

A request by the County of San Luis Obispo to amend Title 22 Land Use Ordinance Section 22.94.025 Paso Robles Groundwater Basin Planning Area Standards to update the basin map to be consistent with the Paso Robles Sub-basin Groundwater Sustainability Plan.

Name of Public Agency Approving Project: County of San Luis Obispo

Exempt Status: (Check One)

- ☐ Ministerial {Sec. 21080(b)(1); 15268}
- ☐ Declared Emergency {Sec. 21080(b)(3); 15269(a)}
- ☐ Emergency Project {Sec. 21080(b)(4); 15269(b)(c)}
- ☒ Categorical Exemption. {Sec.15308; Class: 8 }
- ☐ Statutory Exemption {Sec.____}
- ☐ General Rule Exemption. {Sec. 15061(b)(3)} (also complete GRE form PLN-1124)
- ☐ Not a Project _____

Reasons why project is exempt: The project qualifies for a Class 8 Categorical Exemption pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15308 because the project is an action taken by a regulatory agency to protect the shared resource of the Paso Robles Groundwater Basin.

Kylie Hensley (khensley@co.slo.ca.us) 805-781-4979

Lead Agency Contact Person **Telephone**

If filed by applicant:
1. Attach certified document of exemption finding
2. Has a notice of exemption been filed by the public agency approving the project? Yes ☐ No ☐

Signature: _____ Date_____

Name: Kylie Hensley Title: Planner

On _____ the project was Approved by:

☐ Board of Supervisors ☐ Subdivision Review Board ☐ Other _____

☐ Planning Commission ☐ Planning Dept Hearing Officer