

Piru Groundwater Subbasin Annual Report Water Year 2021

Submitted to



California Department of
Water Resources

Submitted by



Prepared by



DBS&A
Daniel B. Stephens & Associates, Inc.

a Geo-Logic Company

3916 State Street, Garden Suite
Santa Barbara, CA 93105

www.dbstephens.com

Project# DB21.1412.00

April 1, 2022


Certification

This GSP annual report was prepared in accordance with generally accepted professional hydrogeologic principles and practices. This annual report makes no other warranties, either expressed or implied as to the professional advice or data included in it. This annual report has not been prepared for use by parties or projects other than those named or described herein. It may not contain sufficient information for other parties or purposes.

DANIEL B. STEPHENS & ASSOCIATES, INC.



Douglas (Gus) Tolley, PhD
Staff Hydrogeologist
gtolley@geo-logic.com
143E Spring Hill Dr.
Grass Valley, CA 95945



Tony Morgan, PG, CHG
VP / Principal Hydrogeologist
tmorgan@geo-logic.com
3916 State Street, Garden Suite
Santa Barbara, CA 93105

Date signed: March 28th 2022

Table of Contents

Certification	i
1. Introduction	1
2. Groundwater Elevations	1
3. Groundwater Extractions	3
4. Surface Water Supply	13
5. Total Water Use	13
6. Change in Groundwater Storage	13
7. Progress Towards GSP Implementation	14
7.1 Project #1: Supporting The Cienega Springs Restoration Project as a Drought Refuge	17
7.2 Project #2: Construction of Shallow Monitor Wells at the Cienega Springs Restoration Project Site	18
7.3 Project #3: Construction of Shallow Monitor Wells	18
8. References	19

List of Tables

Table 1. Groundwater Extractions	9
Table 2. Surface Water Use	13
Table 3. Total Water Use	14

List of Figures

Figure 1. Location Map	2
Figure 2. Spring Water Levels Contour Map	4
Figure 3. Fall Water Levels Contour Map	5
Figure 4. Representative Monitoring Point Hydrographs	6
Figure 5. Agricultural Groundwater Extractions	10
Figure 6. Municipal And Industrial Groundwater Extractions	11
Figure 7. Total Groundwater Extractions	12
Figure 8. Change In Groundwater In Storage	15
Figure 9. Groundwater Pumping And Change In Groundwater Storage	16

Acronyms and Abbreviations

<u>Acronym</u>	<u>Definition</u>
AF	acre-feet
AFY	acre-feet per year
Ag	agriculture
amsl	above mean sea level
Basin	Fillmore subbasin of the Santa Clara River Valley basin
CCR	California Code of Regulations
DBS&A	Daniel B. Stephens & Associates, Inc.
DWR	[CA] Department of Water Resources
FPBGSA	Fillmore and Piru Basins Groundwater Sustainability Agency
FT	feet
GSA	Groundwater Sustainability Agency
GSP	Groundwater Sustainability Plan
MO	Measureable Objective
MT	Minimum Threshold
RMP	Representative Monitoring Point
SGMA	Sustainable Groundwater Management Act
SMC	Sustainable Management Criteria
SWRCB	State Water Resources Control Board
United	United Water Conservation District
WLE	water level elevation
WY	water year


Executive Summary

Water year (WY) 2021 was a critically dry year for California. Precipitation for WY 2021 was approximately 23% of the historical average in the Piru Subbasin (the Basin). Due to the lack of recharge entering the aquifer system, groundwater levels in the Basin declined by an average of 34.6 ft from October 2020 to October 2021. Groundwater in storage decreased by an estimated 38,500 acre-ft (AF), although this value is likely overestimated due to lack of data in some portions of the Basin. Groundwater extractions and surface water diversions were 13,361 AF and 3,174 AF, respectively, totaling 16,535 AF of water used beneficially in the basin during WY 2021. In the few months since submission of the groundwater sustainability plan (GSP), progress has been made on supporting the Cienega Springs restoration project as a drought refuge (Project #1 in the GSP) and construction of shallow monitoring wells in the Basin. (Projects #2 and #3 in the GSP).

1. Introduction

The Piru Subbasin (the Basin) is managed with the adjacent Fillmore Subbasin by the Fillmore and Piru Basins Groundwater Sustainability Agency (the Agency). Following the submittal of the Piru Subbasin Groundwater Sustainability Plan (GSP) on January 31, 2020, the Agency is required to submit an annual report for the preceding Water Year (October 1 through September 30) to DWR by April 1 (23 CCR §356.2). These annual reports provide a summary of hydrologic conditions and water use in the Basin (Figure 1) using observed data from monitoring networks and/or estimated using best available methods. This annual report provides a brief summary of Basin water use and changes in groundwater storage during the period from October 1, 2020 to September 30, 2021, and provides context for Basin conditions relative to the sustainable management criteria developed for the Basin. This report has been prepared in accordance with the requirements for annual reports as identified in the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA). More detailed analysis and discussion of long-term hydrologic trends will be included in the periodic evaluation of the GSP the Agency is required to perform at least every five years (23 CCR §356.2).

For additional clarification or more detailed information on the basin plan area or conditions, please refer to the Piru Subbasin GSP. As acknowledged by the Department of Water Resources, it is important to note that there are still some data gaps and missing information as the Agency continues to gather information for better analysis and decisions.



Explanation

 Groundwater Basin Boundary



DBS&A

Daniel B. Stephens & Associates, Inc.

03/23/2022

a Geo-Logic Company

0 2,500 5,000 ft



Piru Subbasin Annual Report
Location Map

2. Groundwater Elevations

Groundwater elevation contour maps for the spring and fall of 2021 are shown in Figure 2 and Figure 3, respectively. These maps depict the seasonal high (spring) and low (fall) water level elevations in the Basin. Spring and fall water level elevations are defined as observations within a four week period centered on April 1st or October 1st. If a well has multiple observations within this period, then the value collected nearest to April 1st or October 1st is used. The Basin is conceptualized as a single aquifer, and therefore subsetting water level data by well screen depth was not required.


Observed spring groundwater elevations (Figure 2) ranged from 504.84 to 649.18 ft above mean sea level (amsl), with an average elevation of 552.07 ft amsl. Fall groundwater elevations (Figure 3) ranged from 495.39 to 623.05 ft amsl, with an average elevation of 537.79 ft amsl. Flow is generally from east to west, but is influenced by recharge along the margins of the valley and drawdown in the vicinity of high-capacity irrigation wells. Observed groundwater elevation changes from October 2020 to October 2021 ranged from -47.25 to -2.55 ft with an average change of -34.6 ft.

Hydrographs for representative monitoring points (RMPs) in the Basin are shown in Figure 4. All groundwater monitoring wells in the Basin showed a decline in groundwater levels over the water year, ranging from -2.55 to -47.25 ft amsl. Excluding well 04N19W36D01S (located approximately 1 mile west-southwest of Cavin), groundwater levels at RMPs are generally near their respective measurable objectives. Water level declines observed at well 04N19W36D01S have been steady since October 2020, with a decline of approximately 35 ft over WY 2021. If the current trend continues water levels in well 04N19W36D01S are projected to drop below the minimum threshold of 496 ft amsl in the summer of 2022.

3. Groundwater Extractions

Groundwater pumpers that produce groundwater from the Basin pay United Water Conservation District (United) an extraction fee based on the number of acre-ft they pump. Prior to 2022, this was reported on a 6-month basis (reporting to United twice per calendar year). Period 1 covered January through June and period 2 covered July through December of each year. A description of the historical groundwater extraction monitoring in the Basin is provided in Section 3.5.1.4 of the Piru Subbasin GSP. In order to better comply with SGMA reporting requirements, the Agency is requesting growers report groundwater extractions on a quarterly (3-month) basis from 2022 onwards.

Groundwater pumpers are required to self-report groundwater extractions by well to United using one of three methods: domestic multiplier, electrical meter (based on Southern California Edison efficiency testing), or water flow meter. For non-reporters, an estimate from historical usage is



Explanation

- Monitoring Well
- Water Level Contour (ft amsl)
- Groundwater Basin Boundary




Piru Subbasin Annual Report
 Groundwater Elevation Contours
 Spring 2021

Figure 2



DBS&A
 Daniel B. Stephens & Associates, Inc.
 03/23/2022 a Geo-Logic Company





Explanation

- Monitoring Well
- Water Level Contour (ft amsl)
- Groundwater Basin Boundary







Piru Subbasin Annual Report
Groundwater Elevation Contours
 Fall 2021

Figure 3



DBS&A
 Daniel B. Stephens & Associates, Inc.
 03/23/2022 a Geo-Logic Company





Notes:
1. See Figure 2 for well locations






DBS&A
Daniel B. Stephens & Associates, Inc.
03/23/2022 a Geo-Logic Company



Piru Subbasin Annual Report
Representative Monitoring Points
Hydrographs

Figure 4a

DB21.1412.00 C:\Users\1500\Documents\Local_Project_Files\Fillmore-Piru\Annual Reports\Piru\WY2021\GIS\OGZs\Piru Annual Report WY2021.ggz



Notes:
1. See Figure 2 for well locations




DBS&A
Daniel B. Stephens & Associates, Inc.
03/24/2022 a Geo-Logic Company



Piru Subbasin Annual Report
Representative Monitoring Points
Hydrographs

Figure 4b

C:\Users\500\Documents\Local_Project_Files\Fillmore-Piru\Annual Reports\Piru\WY2021\GIS\OGZs\Piru Annual Report WY2021.ggz



Notes:
 1. See Figure 2 for well locations



DBS&A
 Daniel B. Stephens & Associates, Inc.
 03/23/2022 a Geo-Logic Company



Piru Subbasin Annual Report
 Representative Monitoring Points
 Hydrographs


Figure 4c

Table 1. Groundwater Extractions

Sector	Method	GW Extraction Volume (AF)	Accuracy (%)	Range (AF)
Agriculture	Domestic	-	± 20	0 - 0
	Electrical Efficiency	3,057	± 20	2,446 - 3,668
	Water Meter	9,847	± 5	9,355 - 10,340
Agriculture Subtotal		12,904		11,801 - 14,008
Municipal and Industrial	Domestic	21	± 20	17 - 25
	Electrical Efficiency	11	± 20	9 - 13
	Water Meter	425	± 5	404 - 447
Municipal and Industrial Subtotal		457		430 - 485
Total		13,361		12,231 - 14,493

entered in the groundwater production database for accounting and basin volume calculation purposes. For wells with water meters, reporting typically involves filing out a form and submitting an accompanying photograph of the digital totalizer reading. The extent to which “smart meters” or automated (advanced) metering infrastructure (AMI) technology is used by individual well owners to quantify their groundwater production is unknown in the Piru Basin. There is not currently a mechanism by which well owners can automatically report groundwater production from their water meters to United or the Agency. De minimis domestic pumping can be reported to United using a multiplier of 0.2 AF per person per 6-month period with a minimum of 0.5 AF (e.g., if there are 1 or 2 people reporting domestic usage on a well, then 0.5 AF minimum is assessed). De minimis pumpers (extractors) that have a meter on their well discharge have the option of calculating their usage based on the meter reading which may show less than 0.5 AF usage, and are billed based on actual usage.

Estimated groundwater extractions for WY 2021 grouped by water use sector and measurement method are shown in Table 1. Due to the timing of the 6-month measurement and billing cycle described above, reported extractions for period 2 (July - December) of 2021 were not available at the time this annual report was developed. Since this is the only annual report that will have this issue as pumping data is now collected quarterly, development of a detailed approach for filling this data gap was deemed unnecessary. Instead, a simple approach that assumed groundwater extractions for period 2 of 2021 were equal to those in period 1 of 2021 was used. Groundwater pumping within each public land survey (PLSS) section (1 mi²) shows the spatial distribution of agricultural (Figure 5), municipal & industrial (Figure 6) and total (Figure 7) groundwater extractions within the Basin. Groundwater pumping totaled approximately 13,361 AF for agricultural beneficial uses accounted for about 97% of total groundwater extractions for WY 2021.




Explanation

- Extraction Volume (AF)
 - 0 - 500
 - 500 - 1,000
 - 1,000 - 1,500
 - 1,500 - 2,000
- Groundwater Basin Boundary

Notes:

1. Estimated extraction volumes aggregated by public land survey system section.
2. Labels indicate estimated volume from January - July 2021 pumping records in acre-ft (AF).
3. Total may differ from value reported in Table 1 due to rounding.



Piru Subbasin Annual Report
Estimated Agricultural Groundwater Extractions
WY 2021

Figure 5




DBS&A

Daniel B. Stephens & Associates, Inc.

03/28/2022

a Geo-Logic Company



Explanation

- | | | | | |
|------------------------|---------|-----------|-----------|----------------------------|
| Extraction Volume (AF) | 0 - 100 | 100 - 200 | 200 - 300 | Groundwater Basin Boundary |
| | 0 - 100 | 100 - 200 | 300 - 400 | |
| | 0 - 100 | 100 - 200 | 400 - 500 | |

0 2,500 5,000 ft



Notes:

1. Estimated extraction volumes aggregated by public land survey system section.
2. Labels indicate estimated volume from January - July 2021 pumping records in acre-ft (AF).
3. Total may differ from value reported in Table 1 due to rounding.



Piru Subbasin Annual Report
Estimated Municipal and Industrial Groundwater Extractions
WY 2021

Figure 6




DBS&A

Daniel B. Stephens & Associates, Inc.

03/28/2022

a Geo-Logic Company




Explanation

- Extraction Volume (AF)
 - 0 - 500
 - 500 - 1,000
 - 1,000 - 1,500
 - 1,500 - 2,000
- Groundwater Basin Boundary

Notes:

1. Estimated extraction volumes aggregated by public land survey system section.
2. Labels indicate estimated volume from January - July 2021 pumping records in acre-ft (AF).
3. Total may differ from value reported in Table 1 due to rounding.



**Piru Subbasin Annual Report
Estimated Total Groundwater Extractions
WY 2021**

Figure 7



DBS&A
Daniel B. Stephens & Associates, Inc.
03/28/2022 a Geo-Logic Company

Table 2. Surface Water Use

Surface Water Source	Method	Annual Volume Used (AF)	Accuracy (%)	Range (AF)
Local Supplies	Estimated from previously reported diversions	1,701	± 33	1,140 - 2,262
	Water Meter	988	± 5	939 - 1,037
	Weir	485	± 5	461 - 509
Total		3,174		2,540 - 3,808

4. Surface Water Supply

Surface water used in the Basin grouped by source and measurement method is summarized in Table 2. All surface water diversions are used beneficially for agricultural irrigation. Not all diversions for WY 2021 were reported to the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) at the time this report was written. Data gaps were filled by using average historical diversion records that corresponded with the same water year type as WY 2021 (Critical). Total surface water used in the Basin during WY 2021 was estimated to be 3,174 AF.

5. Total Water Use

Total water use in the Basin grouped by water use sector and measurement method is shown in Table 3. Total water volumes used in the Basin during WY 2021 was estimated to be 16,535 AF.

6. Change in Groundwater in Storage

Change in groundwater storage for WY 2021 was estimated using differences in water level elevations from Fall 2020 to Fall 2021. Observed differences in water levels were interpolated to a 65x65 ft (20x20 m) grid using the universal kriging method. Volume was calculated by multiplying the area of each cell by the estimated change in water level and vertically integrated aquifer storage coefficient for each respective cell. The vertically integrated aquifer storage coefficients were calculated as the thickness weighted average of each model grid cell in the United groundwater model, and ranged from 0.09 to 0.15. The total change in storage for the Basin was calculated by summing estimated change in volume for all cells. Since the interpolation area does not cover the entire basin due to the location of the monitoring wells, the total change in storage was scaled by the ratio of the interpolation area to the basin area. This assumes that water level changes in areas on the basin with no observations are similar to those with observations.


Table 3. Total Water Use

Sector	Method	Total Annual Volume (AF)	Accuracy (%)	Range (AF)
Agriculture	Domestic	0	± 20 %	0 - 0
	Electrical Efficiency	3,057	± 20 %	2,446 - 3,668
	Estimated from previously reported diversions	1,701	± 33 %	1,140 - 2,262
	Water Meter	10,835	± 5 %	10,294 - 11,377
	Weir	485	± 5 %	461 - 509
Agriculture Subtotal		16,078	-	14,341 - 17,816
Municipal and Industrial	Domestic	21	± 20 %	17 - 25
	Electrical Efficiency	11	± 20 %	9 - 13
	Water Meter	425	± 5 %	404 - 447
Municipal and Industrial Subtotal		457	-	430 - 485
Total		16,535		14,771 - 18,301

A map of the change in storage for WY 2021 with contour lines showing water level differences is shown in Figure 8. Estimated total change in storage for WY 2021 is -38,500 AF. This value is likely biased high due to the relatively small area of the Basin covered by water level observations and the assumption that water level changes are consistent for areas with no data. The northern area of the Basin with Piru Creek has likely not experienced the same degree of water level declines as the main portion of the valley. Figure 9 shows annual groundwater pumping and change in storage, along with cumulative storage since WY 2000. Cumulative change in storage is presented as the change in groundwater in storage relative to Basin conditions at the beginning of WY 1998, which is the earliest year that water budgets for the Basin were presented in the GSP (see Figure 2.2-35 of the GSP). Current storage condition relative to WY 1988 is -3,700 AF. Negative change in storage is expected due to critically dry conditions for WY 2021.

7. Progress Towards GSP Implementation

The Piru Subbasin GSP provided seven Projects or Management Actions that the FPBGSA Board of Directors would implement or consider implementing to facilitate the maintenance of sustainable conditions in the basin (see Section 4 of the GSP). Below is a description of activities related to each project that occurred during WY 2021. The FPBGSA has focused its attention on Projects #1-#3 in the two month period since the GSP was submitted to DWR. The remaining Project or Management Actions (Projects #4 - #7 detailed in the GSP) have yet to be discussed by the FPBGSA Board of Directors. These projects or management actions will be considered by the Board of Directors over



Explanation

- Estimated Groundwater Storage Change (AF)
 - 0.6
 - 0.6
- Monitoring Well
- - - Water Level Elevation Change Contour (ft)
- Groundwater Basin Boundary

Notes:

1. Storage change estimated by interpolating changes in observed water levels to a 65 x 65 ft grid and multiplying by the vertically integrated aquifer storage coefficient for each grid cell.
2. Vertically integrated aquifer storage coefficient calculated as the thickness weighted average of aquifer storage coefficients for each model layer used in the United groundwater model.
3. Estimated WY 2021 total groundwater storage change is -38,500 AF.



**Piru Subbasin Annual Report
Change in Groundwater Storage
WY 2021**

Figure 8





DBS&A

Daniel B. Stephens & Associates, Inc.

03/24/2022

a Geo-Logic Company





Notes:

1. Negative GW pumping values indicate extractions from groundwater aquifer.
2. Positive storage values indicate increasing groundwater levels.
3. GW pumping volume estimated for WY 2021.



Piru Subbasin Annual Report
Groundwater Pumping and Change in Storage
WY 2000-2021

Figure 9



DBS&A

Daniel B. Stephens & Associates, Inc.

03/23/2022

a Geo-Logic Company

the next year and it is anticipated that more substantive updates will be included in future Annual Reports.

7.1 Project #1: Supporting The Cienega Springs Restoration Project as a Drought Refuge

Post submittal of the GSP to the California Department of Water Resources (DWR), staff and the consultant team for the Fillmore and Piru Basins Groundwater Sustainability Agency (FPBGSA) have had additional discussions/meetings with representatives from California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) and researchers from University of California, Santa Barbara (UCSB) to further explore how the mitigative actions proposed in the GSP might be implemented. Cienega Springs is located near the up-gradient eastern boundary of the Fillmore subbasin, which results in groundwater conditions in the Piru subbasin strongly influencing hydrologic conditions at the site.

As stated in the GSP, "The primary action being considered by the FPBGSA is to provide supplemental groundwater to the restoration program during multiyear droughts when the shallow groundwater levels decline to below the critical water level. The groundwater would be supplied from an existing production well (if a suitable well can be found or alternatively a newly constructed well) that is extracting water from the deeper hydrostratigraphic units (i.e., not the shallow aquifers). CDFW and the restoration management team would use the water in the manner they deem most beneficial to their restoration program."

The discussions with CDFW to date have focused on:

- Refining the mitigative project description
- Identifying which land parcels in the restoration project area would most benefit from receiving supplemental waters during a drought
- Exploring possible existing deep groundwater wells in proximity to the site that could be used as a water source; and
- Discussing the practicality and potential benefits of including adjacent land parcels owned by The Nature Conservancy (TNC) into the mitigation plan.

Ongoing action items with respect to this management action include:

- Establish communication with TNC to determine their interest in participating in the mitigation program
- Field verification of the operational condition of potential existing wells that are candidates to supply the supplement water
- Contact well/land owners to determine their willingness to allow access to their well(s) and establish terms of an access agreement

- Preparation of a Mitigation Plan that will detail, for example:
 - Triggers for starting and stopping the delivery of the supplemental waters
 - Quantities of supplemental water to be supplied
 - Source(s) of the supplemental water
 - Parties responsible for conveyance of the supplemental water from the source to the desired land parcel
 - Responsible parties for making decisions regarding the beneficial use of the water
 - Cost reimbursement and extraction fee waiver mechanisms for use of existing wells owned by others
 - Vegetative monitoring protocols to document the success of the mitigation program.

In addition, the Mitigation Plan will estimate the cost to the FPBGSA for the implementation of the mitigative actions.

7.2 Project #2: Construction of Shallow Monitor Wells at the Cienega Springs Restoration Project Site

The FPBGSA staff and consultant team have discussed possible locations for the shallow monitor wells on the project site with CDFW personnel. Siting considerations have included access to the desired location(s), future construction/land modification plans associated with the restoration program, proximity of the monitor wells to existing or proposed groundwater extraction wells, and the need or practicality of telemetry on the wells.

Ongoing action items with respect to this management action include:

- Continued discussions with CDFW to refine the monitor well locations in relationship to the land modification plans included in the restoration plan
- Identification of well drilling contractors and soliciting bids
- Coordination of well drilling activities with CDFW restoration managers
- Establishing a funding mechanism to support the collection and analysis of water level measurements and water quality data from the monitor wells.

7.3 Project #3: Construction of Shallow Monitor Wells

The FPBGSA staff and consultant team have discussed possible locations for the shallow monitor wells. Siting considerations have included access to the desired location(s), future construction/land modification plans, proximity existing or proposed groundwater extraction wells, and the terms of the land access agreements and easements.

Ongoing action items with respect to this management action include:

- Continued discussions with land owners to refine the monitor well locations in relationship to the land modification plans (if any)
- Identification of well drilling contractors and soliciting bids
- Coordination of well drilling activities with land owners
- Establishing a funding mechanism to support the collection and analysis of water level measurements and water quality data from the monitor wells

The FPBGSA has focused its attention on Projects #1-#3 in the two month timeframe since the submittal of the GSP to DWR. The remaining Project or Management Actions (Projects #4 - #7 detailed in the GSP) have yet to be discussed by the FPBGSA Board of Directors. These projects or management actions will be considered by the Board of Directors over the next year and it is anticipated that more substantive updates will be included in future Annual Reports.

8. References

Fillmore and Piru Basins Groundwater Sustainability Agency. 2022. Groundwater Sustainability Plan: Fillmore Basin (Final). <https://www.fpbgsa.org/fillmore-draft-gsp/>

United Water Conservation District. 2021. Ventura Regional Groundwater Flow Model Expansion and Updated Hydrogeologic Conceptual Model for the Piru, Fillmore, and Santa Paula Groundwater Basins, Open-File Report 2021-01. Appendix E of the Groundwater Sustainability Plan: Fillmore Basin (Final). <https://www.fpbgsa.org/fillmore-draft-gsp/>