2017 SGMA Annual Report
South American Subbasin (5-021.65)
Sacramento Central Groundwater Authority

March 2018

Prepared by the Sacramento Central Groundwater Authority,
and GEI Consultants, Inc.



Subbasin Location Map

Chapter 1. Executive Summary (§356.2(a))

The 2017 Annual Report for the South American Subbasin has been prepared for submittal to the California State Department of Water Resources (DWR) per **Appendix B. State DWR Notice of Annual Report Requirement**, and in compliance with the Groundwater Sustainability Plan Emergency Regulations provided in **Appendix A. GSP Regulations for Annual Reports**, and included as attached reference table, **Alternative Annual Report Elements Guide**.

E.1 Introduction

The Sacramento Central Groundwater Authority (SCGA) has prepared an Annual Report describing groundwater conditions in the South American Subbasin (see **Figure 1**) for the 2017 Water Year (i.e., inclusive of months October 2016 to September 2017) in support of their pending Alternative Submittal.

The Annual Report is intended for conveying monitoring and water use data to the State DWR on an annual basis to gauge performance of the groundwater subbasin relative to the sustainability goal set forth in a Groundwater Sustainability Plan (GSP) or, for SCGA, the Alternative Submittal. As such, SCGA is including sufficient information to provide interested parties with sufficient background and supporting details to serve as a public communications document for subbasin management and to take the place of historic biennial reporting available on the SCGA website www.scgah2o.org.



Figure 1. South American Subbasin Location Map

Sections of the Annual Report include:

Chapter 1. 2017 Annual Report Introduction: a brief background of SCGA and report purpose in context with Alternative requirements, and changes from past reporting.

Chapter 2. South American Subbasin Monitoring: summary of subbasin monitoring networks, frequency of measurements, and how data is used for groundwater management.

Chapter 3. Groundwater Elevations (§356.2(b)(1)): presentation of monitoring results with groundwater elevation contours for spring and fall monitoring events, and select hydrographs.

Chapter 4. Groundwater Extractions (§356.2(b)(2)): details of reported and estimated volumetric groundwater extractions by land use sector and general location of extractions.

Chapter 5. Surface Water Use (§356.2(b)(3)): summary of reported and estimated volumetric surface water diversions and locations along major rivers.

Chapter 6. Total Water Use (§356.2(b)(4)): tabulated and graphical depictions of total water use by source and sector.

Chapter 7. Change in Groundwater Storage (§356.2(b)(5)): methodology and presentation of changes in groundwater subbasin storage based on spring to spring groundwater elevation differences.

Chapter 8. Progress on Continued Sustainability as Alternative (§356.2(c)): summary of specific management actions taken by SCGA staff and its Board to maintain sustainability of the subbasin.

E.2 Monitoring Findings

Groundwater elevation monitoring for the 2017 Water Year reflects increases in groundwater elevations across the subbasin due to large amounts of rainfall and river recharge. The spring and fall regional contours for 2017 Water Year are shown in **Figure 2** and **Figure 3**, respectively. Subbasin conditions continue to show sustainability in areas of active management, including significant improvements to the Elk Grove cone of depression, identified in the 2006 SCGA Groundwater Management Plan (GMP) as an indicator of basin management and sustainability.



Figure 2 Spring 2017 Groundwater Elevation Contours (ft msl)

The -30 foot elevation contour currently defines the shallow depression located northeast of the original Elk Grove cone of depression. The size and extent of the depression is partially due to the affected area being down gradient of increased pumping for beneficial uses in remediation areas under the direction of USEPA, the Regional Water Quality Control Board, and the Department of Toxic Substance Control, and due to conditions along the subbasin boundary at the Cosumnes River. SCGA believes that these challenges can be addressed through a process of coordination and cooperation, ultimately improving conditions outside of SCGA's jurisdictional control over time.



Figure 3. Fall 2017 Groundwater Elevation Contours (ft msl)

Positive and negative changes in spring 2017 elevations from spring 2015 (SGMA Baseline) conditions are indicated in **Figure 4**. Large positive changes south of the American River near Aerojet's remediation activities appear to be areas recharged due to 2017's high river stage and rainfall events in locations where remediation pumping has been taking place for 30+ years, creating large storage capacities in remediated aquifers.[1] Eastern fringe areas noted as being negative are believed to be an artifact of contouring (i.e., a critical monitoring well was not sounded due to flooding), and points to an area within the subbasin where an additional monitoring well will be identified for addition to the CASGEM program in 2018. The northern extent of this negative storage area is indicating that remediation activities taking place at Aerojet, Boeing, and Kiefer Landfill are continuing to lower groundwater elevations to capture and improve water quality conditions.



Figure 4. Spring 2017-2015 Difference Contours (feet)

[1] See Note 1 in **Table 4. Annual and Cumulative Changes in Storage** for discussion of storage change with and without the spring 2017 increase in groundwater elevations measured in the remediated groundwater area.

E.3 Groundwater Extractions

Total groundwater extractions in the South America Subbasin for the 2017 Water Year are estimated to be **219,193 AF**. **Table 1** summarizes the total water use by sector. Approximate points of groundwater extraction were spatially distributed and colorized according to a grid system to represent the relative pumping across the basin in terms of AF per acre (see **Figure 5**). Areas south of the American River experience some of the highest levels of relative pumping in the basin due to the various remediation pumping operations taking place as a beneficial use to improve and protect groundwater quality.

Table 1. 2017 Water Year Summary of Total Extractions by Sector

Water Sector	2017 WY Total
Municipal	48,529
Agricultural	116,638
Rural Residential	20,766
Remediation	33,260
Total	***219,193***

E.4 Total Surface Water Use

Municipal water purveyors who hold surface water entitlements along the Sacramento and American Rivers divert surface water for retail water service to their customers and often cooperate in wholesale and wheeling agreements to distribute surface water to the maximum extent practicable throughout the region.

Agricultural use of surface water takes place at many diversion locations located primarily in the California Delta and along the Cosumnes River. Since riparian and some agricultural appropriative water rights are difficult to quantify, the Sacramento Integrated Groundwater-Surface Water Model (SacIGSM) is used to estimate agriculture's total surface water use in the South American Subbasin.

A summary of 2017 Water Year surface water use by sector is provided in **Table 2**.



Figure 5. General Location and Rate of Pumping within

Table 2. 2017 Water Year Surface Water Use by Sector

Water Sector	2017 WY Total
Municipal	85,591
Agricultural	31,219
Rural Residential	0
Remediation	0
Total	***116,810***

E.5 Total Water Use

For the 2017 Water Year, the quantification of total water use was completed through reporting of metered water production data from wells, surface water treatment plants, recycled water treatment plants, and from models used to estimate individual agricultural crop water supply requirements. In addition, rural water use was estimated based on standard estimating practices of per capita water use for indoor use and crop estimation for irrigated pasture or landscaping. **Table 3** and **Figure 6** provide a summary of total water use in the South American Subbasin.

Table 3. 2017 Water Year Total Water Use by Sector and Source

Water Use Sector	Water Use (AF/year)		Water Supply Source	Volume (AF/year)
Municipal	135,153		*Groundwater*	185,934
Agriculture	147,857		*Surface Water*	116,810
Rural	20,522		*Recycled Water*	788
Remediation	33,260		*Remediation*	33,260
Total	**336,792**		**Total**	**336,792**



Figure 6. Total Water Use by Sector and Source

E.6 Change in Storage

The calculation of storage change uses measured groundwater elevation data, taking the difference between contours as the portion of the unconfined aquifer that becomes saturated (storage gain) or dewatered (storage loss). Groundwater elevation measurements taken during spring months are used for purposes of change in storage calculations since the aquifer has recovered from the previous year's pumping and the vertical gradient between principle aquifers is at its minimum (i.e., sufficient time has passed allowing the semi-confined and unconfined aquifer piezometric surfaces to equilibrate to within plus or minus 10 to 20 feet). Spring to spring differences on an annual basis consequently provides the change in storage when the aquifer is closer to static conditions, resulting in a value not influenced by localized heavy pumping that may be occurring during the fall measurements.

Year to year changes in storage starting in 2009, using the methodology described above, are presented along with cumulative change in storage since 2005 (SCGA GMP/Alternative Baseline) and since 2015 (SGMA Baseline) in **Table 4**. The hydrograph of storage change since 2005 is shown in **Figure 7**.

Table 4. Annual and Cumulative Changes in Storage

Year	Change in Storage (Ac-Ft)	Cumulative Change in Storage 2005 to 2017 (Ac-Ft)	Cumulative Change in Storage 2015 to 2017 (Ac-Ft)
2005	baseline	0	
2009	42,766	42,766	
2010	(16,046)	26,720	
2011	46,705	73,425	
2012	40,416	113,841	
2013	(16,458)	97,384	
2014	(111,930)	(14,546)	
2015	(58,717)	(73,263)	0
2016	28,833	(44,430)	28,833
2017[1]	189,306	144,876	218,139

[1]Includes higher than expected volume of recharge near Aerojet Remediation site. Removing this data point as an anomaly caused by flooding and soil conditions results in an annual change in storage of **94,782 AF** (vs. **189,306 AF**), a positive **50,353 AF** (vs. **144,876 AF**) of cumulative storage over the 2005 to 2017 time period, and a positive **123,616 AF** (vs. **218,139 AF**) of cumulative storage over the 2015 to 2017 time period.



Figure 7. Annual and Cumulative Change in Storage Hydrograph

E.7 Continued Sustainability

As verification of meeting SCGA's annual sustainability goal, **Figure 8** provides visual agreement that in the 2017 Water Year, groundwater extractions did not exceed the long-term average annual sustainable yield of 273,000 AF/year set forth in the 2000 Water Forum Agreement and the 2006 Central Sacramento County Groundwater Management Plan (GMP) including unforeseen groundwater extractions from remediation occurring in the eastern portion of the subbasin.

Additionally, SCGA has recognized that changed conditions outside the direct control of SCGA and its member agencies are occurring in the subbasin due to remediation, drought, and excessive groundwater pumping in the Cosumnes Subbasin.



Figure 8. Meeting the Long-term Average Annual Sustainable Yield

These conditions beyond the direct control of SCGA and its member agencies are creating challenging conditions for sustainable management; however, actions are already taking place or underway to collect data, and coordinate with affected agencies to develop solutions that address the shared mutual interest in the subbasin's overall sustainability goal and in meeting the spirit of the Water Forum Agreement. SCGA's monthly agendas and presentations in the 2017 Water Year relative to sustainable management and SGMA compliance through the Alternative Submittal process reflect the progress made in initiating these direct actions and coordination activities.

Alternative Annual Report Elements Guide

California Code of Regulations - GSP Regulation Sections	*Alternative Elements*	*Document which attachment(s) contains the applicable alternative element.*	*Document which section(s), page number(s), or briefly describe why that Alternative element does not apply to the entity.*
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.	Annual Report	Executive Summary (§356.2(a))
	(b) A detailed description and graphical representation of the following conditions of the basin managed in the Plan:	Annual Report	Section 3.2 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:	Annual Report	Chapter 4. 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.	Annual Report	Section 4.2 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.	Annual Report	Section 4.3 Select Hydrographs Including 2015 (§356.2(b)(1)(B))
	(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.	Annual Report	Chapter 5. 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.	Annual Report	Chapter 6. Surface Water Use (§356.2(b)(3))
	(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.	Annual Report	Chapter 7. Total Water Use (§356.2(b)(4))
	(5) Change in groundwater in storage shall include the following:	Annual Report	Chapter 8. Change in Groundwater Storage (§356.2(b)(5))
	(A) Change in groundwater in storage maps for each principal aquifer in the basin.	Annual Report	Section 8.2 Storage Change Contours (§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.	Annual Report	Section 8.2.2. Incremental and Cumulative change in storage 2005 and 2015 (§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.	Annual Report	Chapter 9. Progress on Continued Sustainability as Alternative (§356.2(c))

(Page Intentionally Left Blank)

Table of Contents

Figures

Tables

Appendices

Acronyms

AF – Acre-Feet
AFA – Acre-Feet Annually
AFB – Air Force Base
AF/year – Acre-Feet Annually
Ac-Ft – Acre-Feet

BMO – Basin Management Objective

CASGEM – California State Groundwater Elevation Monitoring Program
CDEC – California Data Exchange Center
CIMIS – California Irrigation Management Information System
CSD – Community Services District

DWR – California State Department of Water Resources

Ft msl – Feet Mean Sea Level

GMP – Groundwater Management Plan
GSP – Groundwater Sustainability Plan

IDC – IWFM Independent Demand Calculator
IGSM – Integrated Groundwater Surface Water Model
IRCTS – Inactive Rancho Cordova Test Site
IWFM – Integrated Water Flow Model

MAF – Millions of Acre-Feet

OHWD – Omochumne Hartnell Water District

SacIGSM – Sacramento IGSM
SCGA – Sacramento Central Groundwater Authority
SCWA – Sacramento County Water Agency
SGMA – Sustainable Groundwater Management Act
SRI – Sacramento River Index

URs – SGMA Undesirable Results

WY – Water Year

(Page Intentionally Left Blank)

Chapter 2. 2017 Annual Report Introduction

The 2017 Annual Report for the South American Subbasin has been prepared by the Sacramento Central Groundwater Authority (SCGA) 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**). As per State DWR's interpretation of the regulations, a basin (or subbasin) with a pending GSP Alternative is required to submit an Annual Report for the preceding Water Year to State Department of Water Resources (DWR) by April 1, 2018 (see **Appendix B. State DWR Notice of Annual Report Requirement**, State DWR, February 1, 2018).

2.1 SCGA Background

SCGA (and its SB 1938 compliant Groundwater Management Plan) was formed to implement the groundwater management element of a regional long-term over-arching sustainable water resources plan known as the Sacramento Water Forum Agreement (January 2000). This Agreement is based on the coequal objectives of providing reliable water supplies for the Sacramento region's economy and protecting and enhancing the environment of the lower American River.

SCGA's jurisdictional boundaries cover the central portion of Sacramento County south of the American River and north of the Cosumnes River (see **Figure 2-1**), and was created through a joint powers agreement (JPA) between the County of Sacramento and the cities of Sacramento, Folsom, Elk Grove and Rancho Cordova. As described in the JPA, those jurisdictions appoint members to the SCGA board to achieve a broad representation of groundwater interests within SCGA's jurisdiction. Members include five (5) water supply agencies, as well as representatives of self-supplied groundwater users/interests including:

1. urban public agencies,
2. commercial/industrial/remediation users,
3. agricultural stakeholder groups and districts,
4. agriculture-residential interests, and
5. conservation landowners.

Since 2006, SCGA has had the responsibility of monitoring groundwater elevations and participating in the state's California Statewide Groundwater Elevation Monitoring (CASGEM) program, recording monthly and annual municipal pumping data, and, beginning in 2011, estimating agricultural and private domestic pumping using satellite imagery to accurately estimate evapotranspiration for input into State DWR's IWFM Demand Calculator (IDC). Total recorded and estimated pumping has been used to compare total basin pumping with the negotiated long-term average sustainable yield of 273,000 AF/year set by the Water Forum and adopted by SCGA. Groundwater elevations have been used to: 1) identify areas of declining groundwater, 2) determine if numerical thresholds (or triggers) have been exceeded, 3) understand the source of identified impacts, and 4) inform the SCGA Board to take actions, if necessary, in accordance with the GMP. To date, the basin has operated sustainably.



Figure 2-1. SCGA GMP and South American Subbasin Boundaries

2.2 Alternative Submittal

SGMA authorizes a groundwater management agency within a basin compliant with the state's CASGEM program to prepare an Alternative to a GSP; the GSP Alternative (Alternative) was submitted to State DWR by January 1, 2017. According to GSP regulations, Alternatives will be evaluated on the same criteria that will be used to assess GSPs.

On December 14, 2016, the SCGA Board approved submission of the Alternative for the South American subbasin to State DWR pursuant to California Water Code § 10733.6. The Alternative was uploaded to State DWR's SGMA Portal on December 30, 2016, for public comment and state review. To date, no decision has been made by State DWR on the adequacy of the Alternative; regardless, State DWR requires the completion of an annual report beginning April 1, 2018 (see **Appendix B. State DWR Notice of Annual Report Requirement**).



Figure 2-2. Alternative Submittal Process Timeline

2.3 Differences between past Biennial Reports and 2017 Annual Report

In addition to meeting State DWR's requirement for an Annual Report as required by GSP Regulations, SCGA is using this first SGMA Annual Report to transition from the historical Biennial Reporting procedure to the new report format. Significant reporting differences include the following:

1. Single year instead of every two years
2. Time series data summarized on a Water Year basis rather than Calendar Year
3. Tracking of surface water diversions
4. Total water use by source and sector rather than just groundwater use by sector
5. Calculating annual and cumulative change in groundwater basin storage
6. Progress reporting on meeting goals of GMP for current Water Year only.

2.4 Organization of Report

The required contents of an Annual Report are provided in the GSP Regulations (§ 356.2), included as **Appendix A. GSP Regulations for Annual Reports**. Organization of the report is meant to follow the regulations where possible to assist in the review of the document. The last chapter and additional appendices include documentation of all monitoring and SCGA Board activities used in the management of the subbasin. The chapters, focusing solely on the South American Subbasin, are briefly described as follows:

Chapter 2. 2017 Annual Report Introduction: a brief background of SCGA and report purpose in context with Alternative requirements, and changes from past reporting.

Chapter 3. South American Subbasin Monitoring: summary of subbasin monitoring networks, frequency of measurements, and how data is used for groundwater management.

Chapter 4. Groundwater Elevations (§356.2(b)(1)): presentation of monitoring results with groundwater elevation contours for spring and fall monitoring events, and select hydrographs.

Chapter 5. Groundwater Extractions (§356.2(b)(2)): details of reported and estimated volumetric groundwater extractions by land use sector and location of extractions.

Chapter 6. Surface Water Use (§356.2(b)(3)): summary of reported and estimated volumetric surface water diversions and locations along major rivers.

Chapter 7. Total Water Use (§356.2(b)(4)): tabulated and graphical depictions of total water use by source and sector.

Chapter 8. Change in Groundwater Storage (§356.2(b)(5)): methodology and presentation of changes in groundwater subbasin storage based on spring to spring groundwater elevation differences.

Chapter 9. Progress on Continued Sustainability as Alternative (§356.2(c)): summary of specific management actions taken by SCGA staff and its Board to maintain sustainability of the subbasin.

(Page Intentionally Left Blank)

Chapter 3. South American Subbasin Monitoring

3.1 Introduction

This chapter provides a brief description of the groundwater management monitoring programs currently taking place and any notable events affecting monitoring activities or the quality of monitoring results in the reported 2017 Water Year.

3.2 Groundwater Elevation Monitoring (§356.2(b))

Bi-annual groundwater elevation monitoring in the South American Subbasin began prior to the 1950's. Much of the monitoring is comprised of field measurements of spring and fall depths to groundwater in active municipal, agriculture, and private domestic wells. The number of wells has reduced from a high of approximately 65 wells in the 1990's to approximately 36 wells in 2017. The attrition of monitoring wells historically stemmed from a combination of well abandonments, urban development, and reduced funding by monitoring agencies. In 2011, the CASGEM program further reduced the number of monitoring wells based on several criteria to improve the overall quality of data being collected.

3.2.1 Groundwater elevation monitoring locations

Monitoring locations used for groundwater elevation reporting for the 2017 Water Year are shown in **Figure 3-1**. Monitoring wells located outside of the subbasin are used for purposes of 1) developing boundary conditions for contouring over the subbasin, 2) understanding the movement direction of subsurface flows across boundaries, and 3) interpreting the effects of nearby extractions and recharge activities to storage in the South American Subbasin.

Multiple monitoring entities exist within the South American Subbasin with SCGA being the responsible CASGEM agency. Other entities may include state and federal agencies, private well owners, and public universities. All measurements uploaded to the CASGEM database are flagged if known data quality issues exist at the time of measurement including, but not limited to, pump running prior to measurement or pump lubricating oil found on top of water column in the well. When and where noted, measurements with these issues are filtered out of the dataset prior to contouring.



Figure 3-1. Fall 2017 Monitoring Well Locations (Red - SCGA CASGEM Wells)

3.2.2 Frequency of monitoring

Monitoring frequencies for the groundwater elevation monitoring network vary from a minimum of bi-annual seasonal spring and fall measurements taken manually each year, to monthly measurements, often taken by private well owners and researchers for various studies. The number of monitoring wells monitored in the spring and fall events can vary depending on when and under what weather conditions the monitoring event occurs. For example, in spring 2017, several CASGEM wells were not monitored within the required window of time due to flooding and inaccessibility.

3.2.3 How data is used for groundwater management

Each CASGEM monitoring event results in data for statewide and local use, and is presented to the SCGA Board twice a year to highlight areas of falling and gaining groundwater elevations. Areas of falling elevations are investigated to identify probable causes and to discuss remedy actions, if needed, with affected member agencies and stakeholder representatives. This data is further used to document changes in measured storage in SCGA's reporting process.

3.2.4 CASGEM participation

In 2011/12, SCGA became a participant in State DWR's CASGEM program. Monitoring wells were selected based on their location, depth, and availability of driller log information identifying screen intervals and lithology. **Table 3-1** includes a summary of the CASGEM wells currently monitored by SCGA. Depths of monitoring wells range from 85 feet to 600 feet below ground surface.

Table 3-1. ***SCGA South American Subbasin CASGEM Wells (February 2012 CASGEM Plan)***

Well No.	State Well Number	Subbasin Name	Reference Point Elevation (feet)	Ground Surface Elevation (feet)	Depth (ft)
SCGA #1	07N05E18C001M	South American	12	12	n/a
SCGA #2	07N05E26P002M	South American	30.7	30	n/a
SCGA #3	07N05E29D001M	South American	17.5	17	170
SCGA #4	07N05E36A001M	South American	43.29	43.29	508
SCGA #5	07N06E08H001M	South American	59.5	58.5	225
SCGA #6	07N06E12A001M	South American	115.5	115	340
SCGA #7	07N06E14Q001M	South American	92	90	300
SCGA #8	07N06E20J001M	South American	59	57	n/a
SCGA #9	07N06E22R002M	South American	70.5	70	210
SCGA #10	08N04E36L001M	South American	6	5	172
SCGA #11	08N05E21H002M	South American	40.5	39.5	72
SCGA #12	08N06E17H001M	South American	73.9	71.9	310
SCGA #13	08N06E20R001M	South American	58.2	57.4	n/a
SCGA #14	08N06E26K001M	South American	114	113	160
SCGA #15	08N06E27H002M	South American	92	91	425
SCGA #16	08N06E27N001M	South American	75.7	75	n/a
SCGA #17	08N06E30C001M	South American	51.5	50	160
SCGA #18	08N06E31F001M	South American	52	51	132
SCGA #19	08N06E34R001M	South American	107.4	106.4	300
SCGA #20	08N07E02N001M	South American	258.6	257.6	600
SCGA #21	08N07E14C001M	South American	255.2	254.2	208
SCGA #22	08N07E31J001M	South American	116.6	115.4	300
SCGA #23	08N07E33E001M	South American	145.5	145.3	130
SCGA #24	09N06E33R001M	South American	74.4	73.2	85
SCGA #27	09N07E02N001M	South American	144.1	144.6	170
SCGA #28	09N07E02G001M	South American	182.36	179.86	101
SCGA #29	10N08E29J001M	South American	387.3	384.8	85

3.3 Additional Monitoring

Additional monitoring occurring in the subbasin includes subsidence, water quality (including contaminant plume migration), and agricultural land use.

3.3.1 Subsidence monitoring stations

Long-term subsidence monitoring (extensometer) has taken place in the southwest portion of the subbasin along Interstate Route 5. SCGA participated in a recent State DWR program to survey and track ground elevations in the northern portion of the subbasin as shown in **Figure 3-2** by the green colored points.



Figure 3-2. Subsidence Monitoring Locations

3.3.2 Municipal and Remediation groundwater extraction data collection

Municipal and Remediation groundwater extractions provided by well and service area are obtained through requests of metered data from the SCGA member and non-member agencies. Two smaller non-member agencies (i.e., Florin County Water District and Tokay Park) are estimated values based on the regional groundwater model.

3.3.3 IDC Modeling (i.e., data collection including CIMIS and land use/cropping elements)

Monitoring data for IDC model estimation of groundwater extractions for irrigated lands include available CIMIS station data, USDA CropScape Cropland Data for non-Delta areas, and DER land-use data for the Delta (see **Figure 3-3**).



Figure 3-3. Land Use Map

Source: https://nassgeodata.gmu.edu/CropScape/

3.3.4 Groundwater-surface water interconnectedness

SCGA is collaborating in the monitoring of surface water and groundwater interconnectedness at the Cosumnes River near Grantline Road and Highway 99 as shown in **Figure 3-4**, and is in the process of working with Sacramento State interests in monitoring near-levee groundwater elevations along the American River to establish correlations between river stage and groundwater elevations at varying depths. Real-time monitoring data was captured at three locations north of the Cosumnes Corridor for WY 2017 to investigate the level of hydraulic connectivity and groundwater response times from high river stage events.



Figure 3-4. Cosumnes River Real-time Monitoring Location and Hydrographs

Chapter 4. Groundwater Elevations (§356.2(b)(1))

4.1 Introduction

This section provides a detailed report on groundwater elevations for the 2017 reporting water year. 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 because well construction information is often incomplete or not available. This means that a careful review of the data is required prior to uploading to State DWR's CASGEM program (and Water Data Library), and to verify if measurements are trending consistent with previous years and with the current year's hydrology and level of extractions.

In cases where data is questionable, or a single year measurement drastically changes the contours, hydrographs are cited and included with a hyperlink to the state database for further review and consideration by the reader.

4.1.1 Principal aquifers

Ascertaining the depth and screening interval of each monitoring well has not been a requirement for management of the subbasin because aquifer formations are only partially confined in locations where interlaced clay lenses exist between the Laguna and Mehrten Formations (see **Figure 4-1** for conceptual geologic profile).



Figure 4-1. Principal Aquifers (west to east cross-section across subbasin)

4.1.1.2 Discussion of hydraulic communication between aquifers

Because of the semi-confinement separation between aquifers, moderate communication does take place between the upper and lower aquifers, maintaining a small vertical gradient between the two aquifers (see **Figure 4-2** for illustrative example). Used predominantly by private well owners, the upper aquifer has the highest quality water. In areas of municipal pumping, the upper aquifer is protected from upwelling of reduced quality lower aquifer water high in iron and manganese by having municipal wells intentionally extracting groundwater from deeper wells and treating the water prior to customer delivery. During periods of high extractions by either private or public wells, a vertical gradient of up to 10 feet has been measured between the two aquifers.



Figure 4-2. Hydraulic Communication between Principal Aquifers

The dynamic difference in heads between the upper and lower aquifer is best visualized in a contour of model[2] differences across the entire subbasin as shown in **Figure 4-3**. This figure captures fall 2011 conditions after the subbasin has been stressed (i.e., creating the greatest piezometric head difference between the upper and lower aquifers - focusing on those areas where most of the pumping is occurring). Differences are positive near surface water recharge locations where water mounds in the upper aquifer and the lower semi-confined aquifer

[2] 2011 SacIGSM model head values in Layer 1 and Layer 2

responds to pumping activities. Larger differences along the subbasin rim to the east are due to a modeling artifact as the upper aquifer pinches out in some areas and model nodes become dewatered.



Figure 4-3. Upper Aquifer Elevation Minus Lower Aquifer Elevation - Fall 2011 SacIGSM Model Results

Currently, dedicated multiple completion wells that are part of CASGEM only exist in the North American Subbasin. **Figure 4-4** represents the hydrograph for the multiple completion well shown on **Figure 4-3**. The shallow completion is 220 feet deep and the middle completion is

500 feet deep. The trace in elevations shows response in both wells due to regional pumping, maintaining a 5 to 10 foot difference in their piezometric surface.



Figure 4-4. Multiple Completion Well in North American Subbasin Illustrating Piezometric Head Difference Between Upper and Lower Aquifers

4.2 Seasonal High and Low (Spring and Fall) (§356.2(b)(1)(A))

The South American Subbasin experiences periods of high and low extractions based on seasonal irrigation and water demand requirements. In wet years where surface water allocations are high, pumping is reduced in all land use sectors that practice conjunctive use allowing the aquifer to recharge naturally from rainfall, mountain fronts, and adjacent river flows. SCGA member agencies rely on natural in-lieu recharge for sustainable long-term management of the subbasin. Currently, a number of programs have been established to reduce groundwater extractions by importing alternative supplies such as surface water, recycled water, and remediated groundwater, and through the historic conversion of agricultural lands to developed uses with less intensive water demand.

Seasonal highs and lows in groundwater elevations occur primarily in the fall and early spring of each Water Year as shown in **Figure 4-5**. This well is in an area where surface water is the predominant source of supply and best represents the regional behavior of the subbasin over an extended period. Monthly measurements have been taken since 2010, with season highs being recorded in the months of February through May, and seasonal lows through the months of August to December. For purposes of representing a point in time for producing groundwater elevation contours, spring data is focused in the months of March, April, and May, and for fall, the month of October. The wider window of time for spring allows for delays in taking measurements due to flooding and other access issues.



Figure 4-5. Subbasin Hydrograph Illustrating Seasonal High and Low Elevations with Monthly Readings

Source: DWR Groundwater Information Center
http://www.water.ca.gov/waterdatalibrary/groundwater/hydrographs/brr_hydro.cfm?CFGRIDKEY=6168

4.2.2 Seasonal Groundwater Contours

As noted in **Section 4.1.1.2**, the shallow and deep aquifers are hydraulically connected with partial confinement effects occurring at locations and during periods of high extraction/recharge conditions. Elevation data represented in all contour figures includes all monitoring data in the region and does not discriminate between the shallow and deep aquifers.

Groundwater contours for spring and fall 2017 are shown in **Figure 4-6** and **Figure 4-7**, respectively. Each of these figures represents a snapshot in time of the average groundwater elevations throughout the region. Notable in all contour figures are the three cones of depression in the region used as indicators of changing conditions in the North American, South American, and Cosumnes subbasins. Communication between the three subbasins is more apparent along hydraulically disconnected reaches of the major river systems where similar trends are most likely due to subsurface connectivity rather than recharge from surface flows (i.e., American and Cosumnes Rivers).



Figure 4-6. Spring 2017 Groundwater Elevations Contours with Monitoring Wells (ft msl)



Figure 4-7. Fall 2017 Groundwater Elevations Contours with Monitoring Wells (ft msl)

4.3 Select Hydrographs Including 2015 (§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, but are not limited to, 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.

Figure 4-8 provides the historic rainfall and corresponding water year types based on the Sacramento River Index (SRI).[3] Water year classifications are typically the first indicator used to evaluate longer term variations in hydrograph elevations absent other factors indicated above. Water Year 2017 is indicated as being the first wet year after an extended period of dry and below normal years, indicating that groundwater elevations should increase in areas where the extended drought had the greatest effect.



Figure 4-8. Historic Annual Rainfall and Water Year Type

Source: CDEC http://cdec.water.ca.gov/cgi-progs/prevprecip/PRECIPOUT

[3] WY 2017 SRI not published by CDEC at the time of this report. Assumed to be Wet Year based on measured rainfall.

4.3.2 Representative hydrographs

A location map and compilation of all relevant subbasin groundwater elevation hydrographs are included in **Appendix C. South American Subbasin Hydrographs**. Attributes contributing to relevancy incorporate quality of data, extended time series indicating trends, and recent measurements over the 2005 to 2017 time period. Hydrographs included in **Figure 4-9** and **Figure 4-10** are selected based on having Water Years 2016/2017 measurements and uniformity in locations within the subbasin. Each hydrograph includes a standardized elevation axis to allow for direct comparison of the level of change over time. Ground surface elevation, Water Forum solution upper and lower operating thresholds, groundwater level, and water year type are included with each hydrograph to provide the maximum interpretation of performance and sustainability.

The basis and origin for indicated threshold values are described in the 2006 GMP and 2016 Alternative Submittal. The narrower band of threshold values is indicative of areas where basin fluctuations were expected to be lower due to predominant surface water use, distance from regulated rivers, and minimal effects from conjunctive use programs. Broader bands indicate areas of expected fluctuation due to changes in recharge during hydrologically wet and dry periods and the presence of active conjunctive use programs. Hydrographs trending downward below minimum threshold values are seen in several hydrographs and are due to expanded remediation activities (i.e., very little private domestic and municipal pumping occurs in the northeast portion of the subbasin). Expansion includes increased geospatial extents of contaminant plumes and increased annual extraction volumes to contain further plume migration. Lowering of elevations along the Cosumnes River (southeast portion) is primarily due to the drought’s impact on the volume of natural recharge from the Cosumnes River and Deer Creek[4], resulting in a deterioration of the natural barrier/boundary that buffers impacts in the subbasin as a result of increased reliance on groundwater in the Cosumnes Subbasin (see also **Figure 4-6** and **Figure 4-7**).

[4] Decreased flows in Deer Creek have also occurred due to State Regional Water Quality Control Board regulatory reductions in treated wastewater flow discharges from El Dorado Irrigation District that ultimately flow into Deer Creek and the Cosumnes River.



Figure 4-9. South Hydrographs

(Page Intentionally Left Blank)



Figure 4-10. North Hydrographs

(Page Intentionally Left Blank)

Chapter 5. Groundwater Extractions (§356.2(b)(2))

5.1 Introduction

This section presents the metered and estimated groundwater extractions from the South American Subbasin for the 2017 Water Year, and describes the data and methods used to develop the estimate. The types of groundwater extraction described in this section include: municipal, agricultural, rural, and remediation. The monthly detailed pumping values for all sectors are shown in **Table 5-1**.

5.2 Municipal and Metered Well Production Data

The municipal groundwater extractions documented here are primarily metered data; for those without metered data the purveyor's extraction volumes have been estimated from previous years' measurements and/or modeled results.

In preparation for this report, monthly groundwater extraction data requests were sent to participating agencies within SCGA boundaries. All the data shown in **Table 5-2** reflect metered data reported by the respective agencies, with the following exceptions: the community of Courtland, Florin County Water District, and Tokay Park Water District. Florin County Water District and Tokay Park Water District extraction amounts were estimated based on previous modeling efforts using an IGSM platform (SacIGSM). The extraction volumes for Courtland were estimated using the US census (2010) population of 355, and an assumed water-use per capita. Total municipal extractions within the South American Subbasin are estimated to be **48,529 AF** for the 2017 water-year. Note that small Delta communities (i.e., Courtland and Hood) are included with Delta agriculture and rural extractions to maintain a separate accounting for Delta management purposes.

(Page Intentionally Left Blank)

Table 5-1. 2017 Water Year Total Groundwater Use

	Groundwater Extractions (Acre-Feet)												
	2016			***2017***									
Municipal Water Purveyor	**October**	**November**	**December**	**January**	**February**	**March**	**April**	**May**	**June**	**July**	**August**	**September**	**Total**
Cal AM	1,148	802	787	800	714	826	853	1,515	1,709	1,863	1,877	1,711	**14,607**
City of Sacramento	106	124	177	222	203	221	214	225	195	233	221	213	**2,354**
Elk Grove Water District	304	194	183	184	154	187	211	422	477	553	533	468	**3,870**
Florin County Water District	242	194	128	93	112	154	194	251	306	344	331	298	**2,647**
Fruitridge Vista Water Company	223	171	206	170	159	209	178	248	331	292	332	357	**2,876**
Golden State Water Company	181	512	741	328	204	279	365	293	297	361	346	219	**4,127**
Sacramento County Water Agency	1,317	927	1,023	1,491	1,221	1,529	1,190	1,617	1,926	1,990	2,047	1,606	**17,885**
Tokay Park Water District	14	10	7	7	7	5	8	9	19	25	27	25	**163**
Subtotal	**3,536**	**2,934**	**3,252**	**3,295**	**2,776**	**3,413**	**3,213**	**4,581**	**5,260**	**5,660**	**5,712**	**4,897**	**48,529**
Agricultural and Rural (Non-Delta)													
Agricultural	6,400	-	-	-	-	3,265	3,781	10,823	14,686	19,365	18,325	14,033	**90,678**
Rural Residential - Indoor	55	53	55	56	50	56	54	56	54	56	56	54	**654**
Rural Residential - Outdoor	2,086	-	-	-	-	-	-	4,555	3,806	3,029	2,841	3,551	**19,868**
Subtotal	**8,541**	**53**	**55**	**56**	**50**	**3,321**	**3,835**	**15,434**	**18,546**	**22,449**	**21,221**	**17,638**	**111,199**
Delta Agricultural and Communities													
Courtland	18	15	10	7	8	12	15	19	23	26	25	22	**200**
Hood	3	4	8	2	1	1	2	3	5	5	5	4	**44**
Agriculture and Rural	4,093	-	-		-	2,991	3,742	3,290	1,212	731	3,832	6,068	**25,960**
Subtotal	**4,114**	**19**	**17**	**9**	**10**	**3,005**	**3,759**	**3,313**	**1,240**	**763**	**3,862**	**6,095**	**26,205**
Remediation													
IRCTS	401	382	401	340	380	419	407	409	429	337	366	422	**4,693**
Aerojet (Note 1)	2,165	1,960	2,079	2,162	1,994	2,390	2,243	2,305	2,156	1,941	2,001	2,001	**25,396**
Mather AFB (Note 2)	186	186	186	186	186	186	186	186	186	186	186	186	**2,232**
Kiefer Landfill (Note 3)	41	41	41	41	41	41	41	41	41	41	41	41	**492**
Sacramento Army Depot (Note 3)	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	**18**
Union Pacific Downtown (Note 3)	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	**244**
Union Pacific Curtis Park (Note 3))	16	16	16	16	16	16	16	16	16	16	16	16	**186**
Subtotal	**2,752**	**2,529**	**2,667**	**2,688**	**2,560**	**2,995**	**2,836**	**2,900**	**2,770**	**2,464**	**2,552**	**2,608**	**33,260**
Total	**18,943**	**5,535**	**5,992**	**6,047**	**5,396**	**12,733**	**13,644**	**26,228**	**27,817**	**31,335**	**33,348**	**31,238**	**219,194**

Notes (assumptions used to fill data gaps for unreported values)

1. October, November, and December data are from 2017 (i.e. not 2016)
2. Represents the average extractions for the years 2014-2016 spread equally over 12 months
3. Represents the average extractions for the years 2013-2015 spread equally over 12 months

(Page Intentionally Left Blank)

Table 5-2. 2017 Water Year Municipal Well Production Summary by Water Agency (AF/year)

Water Purveyor	2017 WY Total
Cal Am	14,607
City of Sacramento	2,354
Elk Grove Water Service	3,870
*Florin County WD**	2,647
Fruitridge Vista WC	2,876
Golden State	4,127
SCWA - Zone 41	17,885
*Tokay Park WD**	163
Total	**48,529**

Notes: * Based on model results from the IGSM efforts in SCGA
**Estimated based on population

5.1 Estimate of Agricultural and Rural Residential Extraction

Agricultural demands within the South American Subbasin constitute a sizeable portion of total groundwater use. To estimate agricultural water use, land use data along with climate and soil data were analyzed and processed using a root zone simulation model (IWFM Demand Calculator, IDC) to calculate the applied water for areas utilizing groundwater. Land use data from both USDA (2017) and DWR (2015) were used to determine the appropriate crop categories and associated irrigation sources. Land use types were grouped within several broader crop categories such as field and truck crops, or orchards and vineyards, each with a respective water demand.

Within the subbasin there are upwards of 2,000 rural residential parcels that rely on private domestic groundwater wells for both indoor uses, as well as outdoor irrigation. Outdoor irrigation demands were estimated using the IDC model (see **Appendix D. IDC Update Report**). Indoor demands were estimated using the number of parcels and an assumed household size and daily per capita water use. The resulting groundwater extractions for agriculture and rural residential demands are summarized in **Table 5-3.** Total estimated rural and agricultural pumping for the 2017 Water Year was **137,404 AF.**

Table 5-3. Agriculture and Rural Residential Pumping Estimates (AF/year)

Agricultural and Rural (Non-Delta)	**2017 WY Total**
Agricultural	90,678
Rural Residential - Indoor	654
Rural Residential - Outdoor	19,868
Subtotal	***111,200***
Delta Agricultural and Communities	
Courtland	200
Hood	44
Agriculture and Rural	25,960
Subtotal	***26,204***
Total	**137,404**

5.2 Remediation

Groundwater remediation is a necessary extraction in the South American Subbasin. On-going remediation activities are implemented under various state and federal regulatory programs at several sites within the basin. These regulatory remediation activities protect drinking water quality for human use, and take precedence over the potential risk to groundwater storage and other aquifer impacts resulting from these extractions.

The data presented for 2017 is a combination of reported extractions, and representative values based on previously reported values. Boeing reported monthly extractions for the Inactive Rancho Cordova Test Site (IRCTS) through 2017, as did Aerojet for all their remediation locations. Volumes for the remainder of the remediation sites (Mather AFB, Keifer Landfill, Sacramento Army Depot, Union Pacific Downtown, and Union Pacific Curtis Park) were estimated based on the previous three years of reported data. See **Table 5-1** for monthly groundwater remediation summary for the 2017 Water Year. Total groundwater remediation pumping for the 2017 Water Year totaled **33,260 AF.**

5.3 Total Groundwater Extraction Summary

Total groundwater extractions in the South America Subbasin for the 2017 Water Year are estimated to be **219,193 AF. Table 5-4** summarizes the total water use by sector. Approximate points of extraction were spatially distributed and colorized according to a grid system to represent the relative pumping across the basin in terms of AF per acre (see **Figure 5-1**). Areas south of the American River experience some of the highest levels of relative pumping in the basin due to the various remediation pumping operations taking place to improve and protect water quality.

Table 5-4. 2017 Water Year Summary of Total Extractions by Sector

Water Sector	2017 WY Total
Municipal	48,529
Agricultural	116,638
*Rural Residential**	20,766
Remediation	33,260
Total	***219,193***

*Inclusive of Courtland and Hood



Figure 5-1. General Location and Relative Volume of Groundwater Extractions for the 2017 Water Year (AF/Acre/year)

Chapter 6. Surface Water Use (§356.2(b)(3))

6.1 Introduction

This section addresses the reporting requirement of providing surface water supplies used, or available for use, for groundwater recharge or in-lieu use, and describes the annual volume and sources for the 2017 Water Year. Currently, the subbasin benefits from available surface water entitlements to meet urban and agricultural water demands. Surface water used in-lieu of groundwater pumping from the underlying aquifers provide the highest level of recharge volume, versus spreading basins or direct injection. Approximate locations of many municipal and agricultural diversions contributing surface water to the South American Subbasin are indicated in **Figure 6-1**.

6.1 Surface Water use by Source

Table 6-1 provides a detailed breakdown of major surface water diversions in the South American Subbasin. Municipal water purveyors who hold surface water entitlements along the Sacramento and American Rivers divert surface water for retail water service to their customers and often cooperate in wholesale and wheeling agreements to distribute surface water to the maximum extent practicable throughout the region. For example, a water purveyor's current water year entitlements often exceed the amount delivered to its own customers, allowing for additional wholesale deliveries within the place of use for the given water right. Affordability of treated wholesale surface water is a constraint in making use of the full in-lieu potential of available supplies. The region's commitment to the Water Forum Agreement, General Plan policies, and need for dry year reliability through conjunctive use have worked to increase the region's in-lieu potential over the last 10 years.

Agricultural surface water use along the Cosumnes River is predominantly through unmetered riparian and appropriative water right diversions, and Delta surface water deliveries for agriculture occur at hundreds of points along Delta levees west of Interstate 5. The amount of surface water used by agriculture is estimated within the Delta portion of the subbasin. The amount of surface water used along the Cosumnes is not estimated due to a decreasing reliance on surface water and many farmers opting to use surface water for groundwater recharge to sustain the use of groundwater for drip irrigation technologies.

Environmental uses of surface water to support riparian growth and managed wetlands along the river and stream courses 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 is collected from participating parties.



Figure 6-1. Locations of Surface Water Diversions Along Major Rivers in South American Subbasin

Source: https://waterrightsmaps.waterboards.ca.gov/viewer/index.html?viewer=eWRIMS.eWRIMS_gvh#

Table 6-1. 2017 Water Year Surface Water Use

	Surface Water Use (Acre-Feet)												
	2016			2017									
Municipal - Water Purveyor	**October**	**November**	**December**	**January**	**February**	**March**	**April**	**May**	**June**	**July**	**August**	**September**	**Total**
Cal Am (Note 4)													-
City of Folsom (Note 3)	914	731	482	349	424	582	731	947	1,155	1,297	1,247	1,122	9,982
City of Sacramento - Retail (Note 3)	4,654	3,350	3,122	2,955	2,565	3,164	3,228	5,480	6,498	7,602	7,381	6,412	56,412
Wholesale/Wheeling Deliveries (Note 7)	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	70	425	215	19	732
Elk Grove Water District (Note 4)													-
Florin County Water District (Note 5)													-
Fruitridge Vista Water Company (Note 4)													-
Golden State Water Company (Note 8, 9)	972	286	-	0	0	0	0	597	829	969	966	900	5,519
Rancho Murieta CSD (Note 3)	43	34	22	16	20	27	34	44	54	60	58	52	465
Sacramento Regional Sanitation District (Note 6)													-
Sacramento County Water Agency (Note 4, 8)	1,063	680	452	-	-	-	596	1,668	1,838	2,082	2,043	2,060	12,481
Tokay Park WD (Note 5)													-
Subtotal	**7,646**	**5,083**	**4,079**	**3,320**	**3,008**	**3,775**	**4,590**	**8,737**	**10,443**	**12,435**	**11,909**	**10,564**	**85,591**
Agricultural -Water District													
Omochumne-Hartnell WD (Note 1)													-
North Delta Water Agency (Note 2)	229	-	-	-	-	-	-	2,576	8,223	10,945	6,923	2,323	31,219
Subtotal	**229**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**2,576**	**8,223**	**10,945**	**6,923**	**2,323**	**31,219**
Total	**7,875**	**5,083**	**4,079**	**3,320**	**3,008**	**3,775**	**4,590**	**11,313**	**18,666**	**23,380**	**18,832**	**12,887**	**116,810**

Notes
1. OHWD does not have customers in the traditional sense (i.e., no estimate or metered data available)
2. Represents average estimate of surface water diversions for NDWA Subregion 42 in SACIGSM
3. Surface water amounts estimated based on system operations and service area overlying subbasin
4. Provides retail distribution of purchased surface water (i.e., amount included with wholesale agency)
5. Service area located in City of Sacramento American River POU
6. Wholesale provider for recycled water
7. City of Sacramento wholesales to Fruitridge Vista, and Cal-Am, and wheels “Fazio” CVP water to SCWA
8. Diverts remediated groundwater discharged to American River from Aerojet/Boeing
9. Golden State WC wholesales to SCWA

(Page Intentionally Left Blank)

6.2 Total Surface Water Use by Sector

A summary of surface water by sector is provided in **Table 6-2.** Like agriculture, some minimal riparian surface water uses may be taking place by rural residential parcels contiguous to the Cosumnes River. To remain conservative on groundwater extraction estimates, a zero value is assumed in this report.

Table 6-2. ***Surface Water Use by Sector***

Water Sector	2017 WY Total
Municipal	85,591
Agricultural	31,219
Rural Residential	0
Remediation	0
Total	***116,810***

(Page Intentionally Left Blank)

Chapter 7. Total Water Use (§356.2(b)(4))

This section describes how the four water resource types, including groundwater, surface water, recycled water, and remediated groundwater, are used to meet environmental, rural, municipal, and agricultural demands within the South American Subbasin. In the context of a water budget, the calculation of total water use requires balancing the quantity of each water resource type to meet the total water demands in the subbasin.

7.1 How Total Water Use Is Measured/Calculated/Estimated from Existing Water Management Plan Or UWMP

Water demands are determined using various methods based on identified applications and available data. For instance, agricultural demands can vary significantly based on crop type, rainfall, and daily ET. For agricultural-residential water users, demands are based on indoor usage, the amount of landscaped area around the home, and the amount of irrigated pasture for parcels that maintain livestock or other farm animals. Municipal water demands are typically based on metered water usage for each of the different residential, commercial, and industrial land use types. Private industry and park district water demands are specific to the type of activity taking place at each site.

For the 2017 Water Year, the quantification of total water use was completed through reporting of metered water production data from wells, surface water treatment plants, recycled water treatment plants, and from models used to estimate individual agricultural crop water supply requirements. In addition, rural water use was estimated based on standard estimating practices of per capita water use for indoor use and crop estimation for irrigated pasture or landscaping.

7.1 Estimated Total Water Use by Sector And Source

Table 7-1 provides a detailed accounting of total water use in the South American Subbasin including surface water, groundwater, and recycled water.

(Page Intentionally Left Blank)

Table 7-1. 2017 Water Year Total Water Use

	Total Water Use												
	2016			2017									
Municipal Water Purveyor	**October**	**November**	**December**	**January**	**February**	**March**	**April**	**May**	**June**	**July**	**August**	**September**	**Total**
Cal Am	1,148	802	787	800	714	826	853	1,515	1,709	1,863	1,877	1,711	**14,607**
City of Folsom	914	731	482	349	424	582	731	947	1,155	1,297	1,247	1,122	**9,982**
City of Sacramento	4,761	3,475	3,299	3,177	2,768	3,387	3,443	5,706	6,762	8,260	7,817	6,644	**59,498**
Elk Grove Water District	304	194	183	184	154	187	211	422	477	553	533	468	**3,870**
Florin County Water District	242	194	128	93	112	154	194	251	306	344	331	298	**2,647**
Fruitridge Vista Water Company	223	171	206	170	159	209	178	248	331	292	332	357	**2,876**
Golden State Water Company	1,153	799	741	328	204	280	365	890	1,125	1,330	1,312	1,118	**9,647**
Rancho Murieta CSD	43	34	22	16	20	27	34	44	54	60	58	52	**465**
Sacramento County Water Agency	2,380	1,607	1,475	1,491	1,221	1,529	1,786	3,285	3,764	4,072	4,089	3,666	**30,366**
Regional San - Recycled Water	44	9	7	8	8	15	33	107	133	158	145	119	**788**
Tokay Park Water District	14	10	7	7	7	5	8	9	19	25	27	25	**163**
Subtotal	**11,226**	**8,026**	**7,339**	**6,624**	**5,792**	**7,203**	**7,836**	**13,426**	**15,837**	**18,252**	**17,767**	**15,581**	**134,908**
Agricultural and Rural (Non-Delta)													
Agricultural	6,400	-	-	-	-	3,265	3,781	10,823	14,686	19,365	18,325	14,033	**90,678**
Rural Residential - Indoor	55	53	55	56	50	56	54	56	54	56	56	54	**654**
Rural Residential - Outdoor	2,086	-	-	-	-	-	-	4,555	3,806	3,029	2,841	3,551	**19,868**
Subtotal	**8,541**	**53**	**55**	**56**	**50**	**3,321**	**3,835**	**15,434**	**18,546**	**22,449**	**21,221**	**17,638**	**111,199**
Delta Ag and Communities													
Courtland	18	15	10	7	8	12	15	19	23	26	25	22	**200**
Hood	3	4	8	2	1	1	2	3	5	5	5	4	**44**
Agriculture and Rural	4,322	-	-	-	-	2,991	3,742	5,866	9,435	11,676	10,755	8,391	**57,179**
Subtotal	**4,343**	**19**	**17**	**9**	**10**	**3,005**	**3,759**	**5,889**	**9,463**	**11,708**	**10,785**	**8,418**	**57,424**
Remediation													
IRCTS	401	382	401	340	380	419	407	409	429	337	366	422	**4,693**
Aerojet	2,165	1,960	2,079	2,162	1,994	2,390	2,243	2,305	2,156	1,941	2,001	2,001	**25,396**
Mather AFB	186	186	186	186	186	186	186	186	186	186	186	186	**2,232**
Kiefer Landfill	41	41	41	41	41	41	41	41	41	41	41	41	**492**
Sacramento Army Depot	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	**18**
Union Pacific Downtown	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	**244**
Union Pacific Curtis Park	16	16	16	16	16	16	16	16	16	16	16	16	**186**
Subtotal	**2,830**	**2,607**	**2,745**	**2,767**	**2,638**	**3,074**	**2,914**	**2,978**	**2,848**	**2,542**	**2,630**	**2,686**	**33,260**
Total	**26,941**	**10,705**	**10,156**	**9,455**	**8,490**	**16,602**	**18,345**	**37,727**	**46,695**	**54,951**	**52,403**	**44,323**	**336,792**

(Page Intentionally Left Blank)

Table 7-2 and **Figure 7-1** provide a summary of total water use in the South American Subbasin. Environmental water, not shown, is recognized as a water use sector for purposes of completing future water budgets as part of SGMA reporting. Environmental water uses are typically not reported due to the difficulty in isolating riparian areas along waterways and distinguishing the differences between agricultural activities and managed wetlands in a regional-scale soil moisture model.

Table 7-2. 2017 Water Year Total Water Use by Sector and Source

Water Use Sector	Water Use (AF/year)		Water Supply Source	Volume (AF/year)
Municipal	135,153		*Groundwater*	185,934
Agriculture	147,857		*Surface Water*	116,810
Rural	20,522		*Recycled Water*	788
Remediation	33,260		*Remediation*	33,260
Total	**336,792**		**Total**	**336,792**



Figure 7-1. Total Water Use by Sector and Source

(Page Intentionally Left Blank)

Chapter 8. Change in Groundwater Storage (§356.2(b)(5))

8.1 Calculating Storage Change Using Groundwater Elevation Data

Storage change in the South American Subbasin alluvial deposits can be estimated using differences in groundwater elevation. Annual storage change in the aquifer is the change in the volume of water contained within the pore spaces of water bearing formations as shown in **Figure 8-1**. Water either fills or drains from the pore spaces, creating a gain or loss in storage, respectively.



Figure 8-1. Pore Space in Water Bearing Formations

The calculation of storage change using measured groundwater elevation data requires taking the difference between contours calculated for the unconfined aquifer (i.e., saturated soil conditions). As described in **Section 4.1.1**, there are two principal aquifers in the subbasin, separated by a semi-confining layer that allows communication to take place. Past modeling has indicated up to 10 feet of difference in the regional piezometric surfaces when the aquifers are under pumping stress, and gradually come back together after the higher extraction periods. The greater the separation, the greater the vertical gradient between the two aquifers, allowing water to move up or down across the semi-confining layer.

Groundwater elevation measurements taken during spring months are used for purposes of change in storage calculations since the aquifer has recovered from the previous year's pumping and the vertical gradient between aquifers is at its minimum (i.e., sufficient time has passed allowing the semi-confined and unconfined aquifer piezometric surfaces to equilibrate). Spring to spring differences on an annual basis provides the change in storage when the aquifer is closer to static conditions, resulting in a value not influenced by localized heavy pumping that may be occurring during the fall measurements.

8.2 Storage Change Contours (§356.2(b)(5)(A))

To calculate the change in storage, the spring contours from the previous year (see **Figure 8-2**) are subtracted from the current year. A strict protocol is followed to generate consistent elevation contours before taking the difference between elevation contours and calculating the difference volume. The difference volume calculated represents a total volume, including aquifer material and water, as illustrated in **Figure 8-1**. The effective soil porosity, or the amount of available void space where water can be stored or dewatered in aquifer materials, is estimated to be 12 percent of the total calculated volume.[5]



Figure 8-2. Spring 2016 Groundwater Elevation Contours (ft msl)

---

[5] Effective porosity is taken from calibrated groundwater surface water model (SacIGSM) aquifer parameter file (SCNPARM.dat), a value within the accepted range for clayey sand soil classifications.

8.2.1 Annual change in storage

The spring difference contours (spring 2017-spring 2016) are generated using contouring software capable of using the grid assigned at the time the contours were generated. The grid used for this subbasin is 100 rows by 100 columns (see **Figure 8-3)** using the exact same extents to allow for this calculation at each grid node. The Kriging computational method is used for assigning elevations to each node. The difference contours are based on a mathematical computation done at each node location.



Figure 8-3. Contour Grid Nodes – Difference 2017-2016

Before calculating the total volume change, the difference contours were isolated to the South American Subbasin (excluding the Delta portion of the subbasin). This is done by cropping the active grid nodes to the subbasin boundaries as shown in **Figure 8-4**.



Figure 8-4. Cropped Difference Contours (2017-2016)

The Delta portion of the subbasin, located in the southwest portion of the subbasin, has historically been characterized as an area of high groundwater that is not influenced by on-going pumping to the east. As an area with ground elevations near sea level and groundwater elevations influenced by surface water bodies and tidal effects in the Sacramento Delta, groundwater is often collected at low spots or behind levees and pumped directly to the river bodies to prevent infrastructure and agricultural damage (i.e., saturation of the root zone). Groundwater extractions for drinking water are minimal with groundwater elevations changing very little over time. As a result, monitoring in this area is limited to a few sentry wells to identify if regional pumping to the east of the Delta is influencing elevations in the Delta portion of the subbasin. The hydrograph of one sentry well is shown in **Figure 8-5**, indicating no significant declines over the past 10+ years.



Source: DWR Groundwater Information Center
http://www.water.ca.gov/waterdatalibrary/groundwater/hydrographs/brr_hydro.cfm?CFGRIDKEY=5563

The 2017-2016 annual difference contours are shown in **Figure 8-6**. The large recharge cone near the American River in the northeast subbasin, as indicated by the blue dot, is due to 2017 being a very wet year with heavy rainfall, making some monitoring wells inaccessible (i.e., reducing the number of data points in this area), and water from the American River appearing to have recharged an area where remediation pumping has been taking place for 30+ years.

The other factor supporting the mounding effect is the high transmissivity of the soil because of natural channel deposits and disturbed soil from historic mining operations. The combination of remediation (dewatering) and the ability to move water quickly through the soil matrix contributes to the mounding condition and is supported by monthly monitoring data.

The volume of increased storage due to this mounding effect (i.e., calculated as being **94,523 AF**) is included in this year's calculation, but is expected to be pumped down and dispersed in proceeding years (spring 2018) to pre-flood conditions and better defined with additional monitoring data. The monitoring well hydrograph (see **Figure 8-7)** near the remediation confirms the persistence of the mound and already shows groundwater elevations decreasing significantly because of pumping and natural dispersion due to porous and highly transmissive aquifer conditions.

CASGEM wells (SCGA 27, 28, and 29) located in the northeastern tip of the subbasin were removed from all data sets due to the extreme difference in elevation between lower valley measurements of less than 100 ft msl, and foothill measurements of 133 ft, 172 ft, and 370 ft, respectively. Since these wells measure an isolated portion of the subbasin at higher ground and aquifer elevations where little pumping occurs (i.e., experiences little change in elevations as shown in **Figure 8-8**), it is recommended in future reporting that the area be contoured separately to avoid biasing data to the west and along the eastern fringe of the subbasin to the south where different aquifer recharge behaviors occur.



Figure 8-6. 2017 minus 2016 Spring Difference Contours (feet) – Change in Storage



Figure 8-7. Remediation Hydrograph Near American River

Source: DWR Groundwater Information Center
http://www.water.ca.gov/waterdatalibrary/groundwater/hydrographs/brr_hydro.cfm?CFGRIDKEY=9660



Figure 8-8. CASGEM Well SCGA 29 Located in Northeast Subbasin

Source: DWR Groundwater Information Center
http://www.water.ca.gov/waterdatalibrary/groundwater/hydrographs/brr_hydro.cfm?CFGRIDKEY=24653

8.2.2 Incremental and Cumulative change in storage 2005 and 2015 (§356.2(b)(5)(B))

As a pending Alternative subbasin, SCGA is interested in both change in storage since 2005 (i.e., the beginning of SCGA groundwater management), as well as in 2015, SGMA's baseline year. The 2006 GMP recognizes that both negative and positive changes in storage occur over time due to hydrologic variation that influences the amount of natural recharge that occurs and levels of conjunctive use implemented by both municipal and agriculture pumpers.

Year to year changes in storage starting in 2009, using the methodology described in **Section 8.2.1**, are presented along with cumulative change in storage since 2005 (GMP Baseline) and since 2015 (SGMA Baseline) in **Table 8-1**. The location and magnitude of changes in storage occurring over the GMP implementation period is shown in **Figure 8-9**.

Table 8-1. Annual and Cumulative Changes in Storage

Year	Change in Storage (Ac-Ft)	Cumulative Change in Storage 2005 to 2017 (Ac-Ft)	Cumulative Change in Storage 2015 to 2017 (Ac-Ft)
2005	baseline	0	
2009	42,766	42,766	
2010	(16,046)	26,720	
2011	46,705	73,425	
2012	40,416	113,841	
2013	(16,458)	97,384	
2014	(111,930)	(14,546)	
2015	(58,717)	(73,263)	0
2016	28,833	(44,430)	28,833
2017[1]	189,306	144,876	218,139

[1]Includes higher than expected volume of recharge near Aerojet Remediation site. Removing this data point as an anomaly caused by flooding and soil conditions results in an annual increase of **94,782 AF**, a positive **50,353 AF** of cumulative storage over the 2005 to 2017 time period, and a positive **123,616 AF** of cumulative storage over the 2015 to 2017 time period.



Figure 8-9. 2017 minus 2005 Spring Difference Contours (feet) –Historic Change in Storage from 2005 GMP Baseline

Note: Wells shown as red dots represent spring 2017 dataset only

The circled areas shown **Figure 8-9** are noted as areas where additional data could improve the volume calculation. The area along the eastern fringe of the subbasin is known to have minimal pumping taking place by sparsely populated agricultural-residential uses, but could be influenced by pumping within the subbasin where remediation efforts are taking place and by curtailed flows in Deer Creek and the Cosumnes River. The southwestern area near the Delta is an area of known agricultural pumping located and influenced by high groundwater conditions from the Delta. Both circled areas will be evaluated in 2018 for identification of new monitoring wells to establish elevations near wetted portions of the subbasin boundary and areas near the Delta and confluence point of the Mokelumne and Cosumnes Rivers. Meanwhile, changes in storage for these areas are included in the reporting until additional data is collected.

8.2.3 Percent of total storage estimated from past studies

As a point of reference, the total State DWR estimated storage capacity for the subbasin assuming a depth range of 20 feet below ground surface to 310 feet below ground surface is **4,816,000 AF**, as published in Bulletin 118 using information from 1961.[6] The total calculated annual and cumulative change in storage reported in the table below is less than **5 percent** of the total subbasin's storage capacity. The current published storage capacity also appears to limit useable groundwater to the upper Laguna Formation. Storage capacity in the lower Merhten Formation will need to be included in future Bulletin 118 reporting of total storage capacity to account for municipal wells that access this water to meet municipal water demands.

8.3 Annual and Cumulative Storage Change Hydrograph Dating Back To 2005 (§356.2(b)(5)(B))

As a visual check, **Figure 8-10** shows a gradual build-up in storage over the years 2005 to 2013 because of increased use of surface water, water conservation, recycled water, and reuse of remediation water discharged to surface water. In 2014, the region received only **9.14 inches** of rainfall (50% of normal), reducing natural recharge from rainfall and rivers, resulting in losses in storage in areas of groundwater remediation and agricultural irrigation. **Figure 8-11** indicates where these losses in storage occurred, aligning very closely to the locations and pumping rates shown in **Figure 5-1**.

.

[6] See < http://www.water.ca.gov/groundwater/bulletin118/basindescriptions/5-21.65.pdf>



Figure 8-10. Hydrograph Representation of Annual and Cumulative Change in Storage



Figure 8-11. 2014 minus 2013 Spring Difference Contours (feet) – Drought Year Loss in Storage

8.4 SGMA Baseline Storage Comparison

A SGMA baseline comparison between spring 2017 and 2015 results in a net increase in storage over much of the subbasin due to transitioning from dry to above normal hydrologic conditions following the multiple year drought leading up to 2015. The total gain in storage over the two-year period totals **218,139 AF**, as shown in **Figure 8-12**. For purposes of a conservative comparison, an additional calculation is made with the Aerojet mounding effect discussed in **Section 8.2.1** and identified in **Figure 8-6** removed from the data set, resulting in a total 2-year gain in storage of **123,616 AF**, as shown in **Figure 8-13** .



Figure 8-12. 2017 minus 2015 Spring Difference Contours (feet) – SGMA Baseline 2-Year Storage Change



Figure 8-13. Spring (2017-15) Difference Contours (feet) - Aerojet Mounding Effect Removed

(Page Intentionally Left Blank)

Chapter 9. Progress on Continued Sustainability as Alternative (§356.2(c))

9.1 Description of Continued Sustainability Under Alternative Submittal

Relative to the Alternative, the 2017 Annual Report indicates an improvement in groundwater conditions throughout the subbasin and a marked increase in total groundwater storage in the subbasin. This same conclusion holds true relative to the SGMA baseline year of 2015.

9.1.1 Changes from differences shown in Alternative

The wet water year improved conditions along the Cosumnes River and in areas of remediation where reductions in storage were identified in the Alternative. The overall balance of the basin is being maintained through propagation of land and water use policies requiring conjunctive use programs, increased water conservation, conversion of agricultural lands, re-use of remediated groundwater, increased recycled water, and surface water "project" actions along the Cosumnes, Sacramento, and American Rivers, and California Delta (e.g., flash dams, agriculture and urban use of surface water, etc.).

As verification of meeting the annual sustainability goal, **Figure 9-1** provides visual agreement that in the 2017 Water Year, groundwater extractions did not exceed the long-term average annual sustainable yield of **273,000 AF/year** set forth in the 2000 Water Forum Agreement and the 2006 Central Sacramento County Groundwater Management Plan (GMP) including unforeseen groundwater extractions from remediation occurring in the eastern portion of the subbasin.



Figure 9-1. Meeting the Long-term Average Annual Sustainable Yield

9.1.2 Path towards (looking ahead) continued sustainability based on changes shown

SCGA has recognized that changed conditions in the subbasin due to remediation, drought, and excessive groundwater pumping in the Cosumnes Subbasin are creating challenging conditions for sustainable management. That said, actions are already underway to collect data, and coordinate with affected agencies to develop solutions that address the shared mutual interest in the subbasin's overall sustainability goal and in meeting the spirit of the Water Forum Agreement.

9.2 Progress Towards Meeting GMP Goals and Objectives

Active groundwater management within the South American Subbasin began in the mid-1980's with recognition of groundwater protection through the establishment of specific land use policies including urban protection of groundwater through importation of supplemental supplies. These actions and others resulted in a reversal of the historic reliance on groundwater to support growth and economic prosperity. These actions were ultimately memorialized in the 2000 Water Forum Agreement. The Water Forum Agreement contained a Groundwater Element which served as the basis for the formation of SCGA, a stakeholder-driven governance body. Since its formation in 2006, SCGA has successfully managed groundwater within the subbasin. Threshold values set by SCGA in the 2006 GMP for the most part are being met throughout the subbasin. An exception is those areas being influenced by activities that are outside the control of SCGA; these include remediation pumping under the direction of USEPA, the Regional Water Quality Control Board, and the Department of Toxic Substance Control, and conditions along the subbasin boundary at the Cosumnes River. SCGA believes that these challenges can be addressed through a process of coordination and cooperation ultimately improving these conditions over time.

9.2.1 Reporting of significant SCGA actions over reporting period

Table 9-1 provides a summary of the SCGA Board actions based on monthly meetings occurring through the 2017 Water Year. Hyperlinks are provided to view monthly agendas and presentations relative to sustainable management and SGMA compliance through the Alternative Submittal process.

Table 9-1. ***Summary of SCGA Board Actions - 2017 (Water Year)***

Hyperlink to Board Agendas (by Water Year Months)	Action Categories	SCGA South American Subbasin Actions (SCGA Website)
Oct-2016	SGMA	1) The Board unanimously approved to direct staff to release the Public Draft South American Subbasin Alternative submittal for public review no later than October 12, 2016. 2) Presentation on Draft Alternative Submittal
	Gover-nance	3) OHWD and Rancho Murieta requested clarification on annual contribution amounts 4) Action: Refer discussion on budget matters to the Budget Subcommittee for further discussion and consideration.
Nov-2016	SGMA	5) Status Report - Stakeholder outreach on Alternative submittal by Water Forum. a) Water Forum Presentation b) Consideration of stakeholder requests for comment-related bi-lateral meetings conducted by the Water Forum 6) The Board directed staff to research previous meeting minutes and provide the Board with a compiled history of previous commitments and statements made by the Board regarding Cosumnes River interests; and further directed staff to bring draft language for the issues that have not been previously addressed or committed to for Board review at the December 14, 2016 meeting.
	Governance	7) Discussed need to increase frequency of Board meetings to every month to have the ability to address various SGMA deadlines, and to participate in associated coordination efforts. a) Action: Approve deviation of policy of meeting every odd month to holding Board meetings every 2nd Wednesday of each month. 8) Budget Subcommittee had a workshop to discuss the funding models for SGMA groundwater sustainability programs, which were presented at the 09/21/2016 subcommittee meeting and concerns related to them.
Dec-2016	SGMA	9) Alternative submittal Resolutions a) Recognize the exempt status of the Alternative submittal pursuant to Section 15307 and 15308 (actions for protection of a natural resource and protection of the environment) of the California Environmental Review Act (CEQA) Guidelines (PLER Control No. 2016-00099) i) Res 2016-09 b) Adopt the proposed resolution memorializing the consideration and recognition of the exempt status of the Alternative submittal and approving its submission for the South American subbasin to the SCGA Board Agenda California Department of Water Resources pursuant to California Water Code 10733.6. c) Presentation of Final Alternative Submittal 10) Report back on existing SCGA commitments addressing stakeholder concerns identified in Alternative Submittal Outreach
	Gover-nance	11) JPA Amendment a) Res 2016-10
Jan-2017	SGMA	12) MOU for coordinating SGMA related efforts within the Delta area of the South American Subbasin. a) Action: Executed MOUs with RD 813 and RD 1002 for SGMA efforts in the Delta Area of the South American Subbasin

		13) As part of the stakeholder outreach for the Alternative, issues were identified by interested stakeholders and a request made that a formal commitment on the part of SCGA be made to address these issues. a) SCGA staff continued researching previous meetings and providing the Board with a compiled history of previous commitments and statements by the Board in addressing stakeholder concerns in Alternative Submittal Outreach; Outlining issues not previously addressed or committed to; Identifying ways that these concerns can be addressed going forward. 14) Budget subcommittee meeting on 01/26/2017 discussed SCGA funding for SGMA compliance. SCGA developed an interim funding model to meet the early financial challenges of SGMA compliance. 15) Discussed the need to hire a rate study consultant.
Feb-2017	Governance	16) Budget Status Report a) Budget Presentation 17) Budget subcommittee meeting on 02/23/2017 continued the discussion/workshop of SCGA funding.
Mar-2017	SGMA	18) Presentation on opportunities for groundwater banking in the South American Subbasin (or Central Basin) a) Banking presentation
	Gover-nance	19) Mid-year Budget amendment presentation a) Budget subcommittee meeting on 04/28/2017 to discuss the proposed FY 2017/2018 budget.
	CASGEM	20) March/April CASGEM Monitoring Event
Apr-2017	SGMA	21) SGMA Subcommittee Report a) Fiscal Year Draft Budget Proposal Presentation
	Governance	22) Fiscal Year Audit Report
May-2017	SGMA	23) The City of Elk Grove in conjunction with Cal/EPA's Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment has been engaged in a study of the use of dry wells as a Low Impact Development tool for managing storm water run-off.
	Governance	24) SCGA Budget Subcommittee recommends a reduction in Rancho Murieta CSD's contribution to the fiscal year 2016/2017 budget. a) Recommended Action: Adopt the resolution reducing Rancho Murieta Community Services District's annual contribution for fiscal year 2016/2017. 25) Budget Update presentation
Jun-2017	SGMA	
	Gover-nance	26) Approved FY 2017/2018 budget. a) Budget presentation 27) SCGA Rate Workshop - Phase 1 a) Workshop Outline

Jul-2017	SGMA	28) Presentation on the South County Agricultural Irrigation Project and its relationship to the Water Storage Investment Program. a) Action: Direct the Executive Director to provide a letter of support for the Regional San District's Water Storage Investment Program grant application. 29) Groundwater Elevation Update a) Presentation on the results of the Spring 2017 CASGEM monitoring
	Gover-nance	30) SCGA Rate Workshop Findings a) Findings presentation
Aug-2017	SGMA	31) Staff presented a scoping level of effort on "focus areas" developed through a series of outreach meetings for SCGA Alternative Submittal. a) Focus Area presentation
	Gover-nance	32) Authorized HDR to proceed with Rate Study Phase 2
Sep-2017	Governance	33) Closed Session

(Page Intentionally Left Blank)

Appendices

- **Appendix A. GSP Regulations for Annual Reports**
- **Appendix B. State DWR Notice of Annual Report Requirement**
- **Appendix C. South American Subbasin Hydrographs**
- **Appendix D. IDC Update Report**

(Page Intentionally Left Blank)

Appendix A. GSP Regulations for Annual Reports

§ 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.

Appendix B. State DWR Notice of Annual Report Requirement

STATE OF CALIFORNIA – CALIFORNIA NATURAL RESOURCES AGENCY **EDMUND G. BROWN JR.,** *Governor*

DEPARTMENT OF WATER RESOURCES
1416 NINTH STREET, P.O. BOX 942836
SACRAMENTO, CA 94236-0001
(916) 653-5791

February 1, 2018

Mr. Darrell Eck
Sacramento Central Groundwater Authority
827 7th Street
Sacramento, California 95814

RE: Annual Report Requirement Associated with Groundwater Sustainability Plan Alternative

Dear Mr. Eck,

You are receiving this letter because you submitted a Groundwater Sustainability Plan Alternative (Alternative) to the Department of Water Resources (DWR) on or before January 1, 2017. DWR is in the process of evaluating the Alternative against the criteria established in the Groundwater Sustainability Plan Regulations (Regulations) of the California Code of Regulations (CCR) Title 23, Division 2, Chapter 1.5, Subchapter 2. These regulations were developed by DWR as a required element of the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA) established in September 2014.

While DWR has not yet completed its evaluation or determined Alternative adequacy, the Regulations require an Annual Report to be submitted electronically utilizing the SGMA Portal – Alternative Reporting System (http://sgma.water.ca.gov/portal/#alt) by April 1 of each year. This first Report is due by April 1, 2018. CCR 23 §356.2 outlines what must be included in the Annual Report and the Portal provides guidance on how to submit. All materials submitted through the Portal are publicly accessible. Submittal of this Annual Report does not indicate approval of the Alternative.

If you have any further questions or concerns regarding the Annual Report, please contact Tim Godwin at (916) 651-9223.

Regards,

Trevor Joseph, PG 7827, CHG 871
Supervising Engineering Geologist
SGM Section Chief

(Page Intentionally Left Blank)

Appendix C. South American Subbasin Hydrographs

(Page Intentionally Left Blank)



Subbasin Hydrograph Location Map

(Page Intentionally Left Blank)

382742N1214193W001



382939N1213904W001




SWP-4 / 383009N1214224W001
Ground Surface
Groundwater Level
WF Solution Threshold High
WF Threshold Low
Water Year Above Normal
Water Year Below Normal
Elevation, feet MSL
400
350
300
250
200
150
100
50
0
-50
-100
-150
1/2004
12/2004
12/2005
12/2006
12/2007
12/2008
12/2009
12/2010
12/2011
12/2012
12/2013
12/2014
12/2015
12/2016
12/2017
12/2018
12/2019


383270N1214736W001
Ground Surface
Groundwater Level
WF Solution Threshold High
WF Threshold Low
Water Year Above Normal
Water Year Below Normal
Elevation, feet MSL
400
350
300
250
200
150
100
50
0
-50
-100
-150
1/2004
12/2004
12/2005
12/2006
12/2007
12/2008
12/2009
12/2010
12/2011
12/2012
12/2013
12/2014
12/2015
12/2016
12/2017
12/2018
12/2019

SWP-63 / 383510N1213741W001




383610N1214825W001
Ground Surface
Groundwater Level
WF Solution Threshold High
WF Threshold Low
Water Year Above Normal
Water Year Below Normal
Elevation, feet MSL
400
350
300
250
200
150
100
50
0
-50
-100
-150
1/2004
12/2004
12/2005
12/2006
12/2007
12/2008
12/2009
12/2010
12/2011
12/2012
12/2013
12/2014
12/2015
12/2016
12/2017
12/2018
12/2019


383729N1213638W001
Ground Surface
Groundwater Level
WF Solution Threshold High
WF Threshold Low
Water Year Above Normal
Water Year Below Normal
Elevation, feet MSL
400
350
300
250
200
150
100
50
0
-50
-100
-150
1/2004
12/2004
12/2005
12/2006
12/2007
12/2008
12/2009
12/2010
12/2011
12/2012
12/2013
12/2014
12/2015
12/2016
12/2017
12/2018
12/2019


SCGA-4 / 384202N1213738W001
Ground Surface
Groundwater Level
WF Solution Threshold High
WF Threshold Low
Water Year Above Normal
Water Year Below Normal
Elevation, feet MSL
400
350
300
250
200
150
100
50
0
-50
-100
-150
1/2004
12/2004
12/2005
12/2006
12/2007
12/2008
12/2009
12/2010
12/2011
12/2012
12/2013
12/2014
12/2015
12/2016
12/2017
12/2018
12/2019


SCGA-2 / 384272N1214018W001
Ground Surface
Groundwater Level
WF Solution Threshold High
WF Threshold Low
Water Year Above Normal
Water Year Below Normal
Elevation, feet MSL
400
350
300
250
200
150
100
50
0
-50
-100
-150
1/2004
12/2004
12/2005
12/2006
12/2007
12/2008
12/2009
12/2010
12/2011
12/2012
12/2013
12/2014
12/2015
12/2016
12/2017
12/2018
12/2019

SCGA-3 / 384343N1214615W001




SCGA-8 / 384417N1213354W001
Ground Surface
Groundwater Level
WF Solution Threshold High
WF Threshold Low
Water Year Above Normal
Water Year Below Normal
Elevation, feet MSL
400
350
300
250
200
150
100
50
0
-50
-100
-150
1/2004
12/2004
12/2005
12/2006
12/2007
12/2008
12/2009
12/2010
12/2011
12/2012
12/2013
12/2014
12/2015
12/2016
12/2017
12/2018
12/2019


SCGA-9 / 384425N1213031W001
Ground Surface
Groundwater Level
WF Solution Threshold High
WF Threshold Low
Water Year Above Normal
Water Year Below Normal
Elevation, feet MSL
400
350
300
250
200
150
100
50
0
-50
-100
-150
1/2004
12/2004
12/2005
12/2006
12/2007
12/2008
12/2009
12/2010
12/2011
12/2012
12/2013
12/2014
12/2015
12/2016
12/2017
12/2018
12/2019


SWP-149 / 384468N1212226W001
Ground Surface
Groundwater Level
WF Solution Threshold High
WF Threshold Low
Water Year Above Normal
Water Year Below Normal
Elevation, feet MSL
400
350
300
250
200
150
100
50
0
-50
-100
-150
1/2004
12/2004
12/2005
12/2006
12/2007
12/2008
12/2009
12/2010
12/2011
12/2012
12/2013
12/2014
12/2015
12/2016
12/2017
12/2018
12/2019


SCGA-7 / 384532N1212856W001
Ground Surface
Groundwater Level
WF Solution Threshold High
WF Threshold Low
Water Year Above Normal
Water Year Below Normal
Elevation, feet MSL
400
350
300
250
200
150
100
50
0
-50
-100
-150
1/2004
12/2004
12/2005
12/2006
12/2007
12/2008
12/2009
12/2010
12/2011
12/2012
12/2013
12/2014
12/2015
12/2016
12/2017
12/2018
12/2019

SCGA-1 / 384664N1214774W001




384738N1214249W001
400
350
300
250
200
150
100
50
0
-50
-100
-150
Elevation, feet MSL
Ground Surface
Groundwater Level
WF Solution Threshold High
WF Threshold Low
Water Year Above Normal
Water Year Below Normal
1/2004
12/2004
12/2005
12/2006
12/2007
12/2008
12/2009
12/2010
12/2011
12/2012
12/2013
12/2014
12/2015
12/2016
12/2017
12/2018
12/2019

SCGA-5 / 384756N1213352W001




SCGA-6 / 384798N1212614W001
Ground Surface
Groundwater Level
WF Solution Threshold High
WF Threshold Low
Water Year Above Normal
Water Year Below Normal
Elevation, feet MSL
400
350
300
250
200
150
100
50
0
-50
-100
-150
1/2004
12/2004
12/2005
12/2006
12/2007
12/2008
12/2009
12/2010
12/2011
12/2012
12/2013
12/2014
12/2015
12/2016
12/2017
12/2018
12/2019


SCGA-10 / 385021N1214948W001
Ground Surface
Groundwater Level
WF Solution Threshold High
WF Threshold Low
Water Year Above Normal
Water Year Below Normal
Elevation, feet MSL
400
350
300
250
200
150
100
50
0
-50
-100
-150
1/2004
12/2004
12/2005
12/2006
12/2007
12/2008
12/2009
12/2010
12/2011
12/2012
12/2013
12/2014
12/2015
12/2016
12/2017
12/2018
12/2019

SCGA-22 / 385037N1212467W001




SCGA-23 / 385038N1212203W001
Ground Surface
Groundwater Level
WF Solution Threshold High
WF Threshold Low
Water Year Above Normal
Water Year Below Normal
Elevation, feet MSL
400
350
300
250
200
150
100
50
0
-50
-100
-150
1/2004
12/2004
12/2005
12/2006
12/2007
12/2008
12/2009
12/2010
12/2011
12/2012
12/2013
12/2014
12/2015
12/2016
12/2017
12/2018
12/2019


SCGA-18 / 385047N1213636W001
Ground Surface
Groundwater Level
WF Solution Threshold High
WF Threshold Low
Water Year Above Normal
Water Year Below Normal
Elevation, feet MSL
400
350
300
250
200
150
100
50
0
-50
-100
-150
1/2004
12/2004
12/2005
12/2006
12/2007
12/2008
12/2009
12/2010
12/2011
12/2012
12/2013
12/2014
12/2015
12/2016
12/2017
12/2018
12/2019

SCGA-16 / 385112N1213142W001




SCGA-14 / 385159N1212845W001
Ground Surface
Groundwater Level
WF Solution Threshold High
WF Threshold Low
Water Year Above Normal
Water Year Below Normal
Elevation, feet MSL
400
350
300
250
200
150
100
50
0
-50
-100
-150
1/2004
12/2004
12/2005
12/2006
12/2007
12/2008
12/2009
12/2010
12/2011
12/2012
12/2013
12/2014
12/2015
12/2016
12/2017
12/2018
12/2019


385177N1212619W001
Ground Surface
Groundwater Level
WF Solution Threshold High
WF Threshold Low
Water Year Above Normal
Water Year Below Normal
Elevation, feet MSL
400
350
300
250
200
150
100
50
0
-50
-100
-150
1/2004
12/2004
12/2005
12/2006
12/2007
12/2008
12/2009
12/2010
12/2011
12/2012
12/2013
12/2014
12/2015
12/2016
12/2017
12/2018
12/2019


SCGA-15 / 385190N1213015W001
Ground Surface
Groundwater Level
WF Solution Threshold High
WF Threshold Low
Water Year Above Normal
Water Year Below Normal
Elevation, feet MSL
400
350
300
250
200
150
100
50
0
-50
-100
-150
1/2004
12/2004
12/2005
12/2006
12/2007
12/2008
12/2009
12/2010
12/2011
12/2012
12/2013
12/2014
12/2015
12/2016
12/2017
12/2018
12/2019


SCGA-17 / 385223N1213630W001
Elevation, feet MSL
400
350
300
250
200
150
100
50
0
-50
-100
-150
Ground Surface
Groundwater Level
WF Solution Threshold High
WF Threshold Low
Water Year Above Normal
Water Year Below Normal
1/2004
12/2004
12/2005
12/2006
12/2007
12/2008
12/2009
12/2010
12/2011
12/2012
12/2013
12/2014
12/2015
12/2016
12/2017
12/2018
12/2019


SCGA-13 / 385259N1213355W001
Ground Surface
Groundwater Level
WF Solution Threshold High
WF Threshold Low
Water Year Above Normal
Water Year Below Normal
Elevation, feet MSL
400
350
300
250
200
150
100
50
0
-50
-100
-150
1/2004
12/2004
12/2005
12/2006
12/2007
12/2008
12/2009
12/2010
12/2011
12/2012
12/2013
12/2014
12/2015
12/2016
12/2017
12/2018
12/2019

SCGA-11 / 385343N1214280W001



SCGA-12 / 385469N1213389W001




SCGA-21 / 385541N1211812W001
Ground Surface
Groundwater Level
WF Solution Threshold High
WF Threshold Low
Water Year Above Normal
Water Year Below Normal
Elevation, feet MSL
400
350
300
250
200
150
100
50
0
-50
-100
-150
1/2004
12/2004
12/2005
12/2006
12/2007
12/2008
12/2009
12/2010
12/2011
12/2012
12/2013
12/2014
12/2015
12/2016
12/2017
12/2018
12/2019

385543N1212592W001




385578N1213240W001
Ground Surface
Groundwater Level
WF Solution Threshold High
WF Threshold Low
Water Year Above Normal
Water Year Below Normal
Elevation, feet MSL
400
350
300
250
200
150
100
50
0
-50
-100
-150
1/2004
12/2004
12/2005
12/2006
12/2007
12/2008
12/2009
12/2010
12/2011
12/2012
12/2013
12/2014
12/2015
12/2016
12/2017
12/2018
12/2019


SCGA-20 / 385707N1211868W001
Ground Surface
Groundwater Level
WF Solution Threshold High
WF Threshold Low
Water Year Above Normal
Water Year Below Normal
Elevation, feet MSL
400
350
300
250
200
150
100
50
0
-50
-100
-150
1/2004
12/2004
12/2005
12/2006
12/2007
12/2008
12/2009
12/2010
12/2011
12/2012
12/2013
12/2014
12/2015
12/2016
12/2017
12/2018
12/2019


385784N1214655W001
Ground Surface
Groundwater Level
WF Solution Threshold High
WF Threshold Low
Water Year Above Normal
Water Year Below Normal
Elevation, feet MSL
400
350
300
250
200
150
100
50
0
-50
-100
-150
1/2004
12/2004
12/2005
12/2006
12/2007
12/2008
12/2009
12/2010
12/2011
12/2012
12/2013
12/2014
12/2015
12/2016
12/2017
12/2018
12/2019


SCGA-24 / 385849N1213173W001
Ground Surface
Groundwater Level
WF Solution Threshold High
WF Threshold Low
Water Year Above Normal
Water Year Below Normal
Elevation, feet MSL
400
350
300
250
200
150
100
50
0
-50
-100
-150
1/2004
12/2004
12/2005
12/2006
12/2007
12/2008
12/2009
12/2010
12/2011
12/2012
12/2013
12/2014
12/2015
12/2016
12/2017
12/2018
12/2019


SWP-255 / 385914N1212475W001
Ground Surface
Groundwater Level
WF Solution Threshold High
WF Threshold Low
Water Year Above Normal
Water Year Below Normal
Elevation, feet MSL
400
350
300
250
200
150
100
50
0
-50
-100
-150
1/2004
12/2004
12/2005
12/2006
12/2007
12/2008
12/2009
12/2010
12/2011
12/2012
12/2013
12/2014
12/2015
12/2016
12/2017
12/2018
12/2019


385923N1211621W001
Ground Surface
Groundwater Level
WF Solution Threshold High
WF Threshold Low
Water Year Above Normal
Water Year Below Normal
Elevation, feet MSL
400
350
300
250
200
150
100
50
0
-50
-100
-150
1/2004
12/2004
12/2005
12/2006
12/2007
12/2008
12/2009
12/2010
12/2011
12/2012
12/2013
12/2014
12/2015
12/2016
12/2017
12/2018
12/2019


SCGA-27 / 386578N1211879W001
Ground Surface
Groundwater Level
WF Solution Threshold High
WF Threshold Low
Water Year Above Normal
Water Year Below Normal
Elevation, feet MSL
400
350
300
250
200
150
100
50
0
-50
-100
-150
1/2004
12/2004
12/2005
12/2006
12/2007
12/2008
12/2009
12/2010
12/2011
12/2012
12/2013
12/2014
12/2015
12/2016
12/2017
12/2018
12/2019

SCGA-28 / 386650N1211776W001



Appendix D. IDC Update Report

(Page Intentionally Left Blank)

2017 IDC Update Results Summary

The 2017 update to the Sacramento Central Groundwater Authority (SCGA) IDC Model required updating the annual land-use types, the daily precipitation and reference evapotranspiration (ET_o), executing the model, and then post-processing the results. Pre-existing Excel and Access tools developed by David's Engineering were utilized for packaging the input data and processing the results. The process for the 2017 update varied slightly from previous years in two key ways; 1. The area analyzed was modified to only include the South American Subbasin, as opposed to the broader SCGA boundaries, and 2. Agricultural areas to the west of I-5 were included as Delta agriculture. The analysis on the Delta areas only included an estimation of total groundwater use for irrigated agriculture based on the IDC results from the non-Delta areas, and did not include a full root-zone simulation. The irrigated areas analyzed to the non-Delta irrigated areas were assumed to rely on groundwater, as those parcels served by surface water had already been screened out by the pre-processing tools. For the Delta areas, previous model inputs from the SacIGSM efforts were used to allocate agricultural demands between surface and groundwater sources. The results for 2017 agriculture water use in the South American Subbasin based on the IDC simulation are summarized below. The Delta areas only include the applied groundwater.

Table 1: Annual Summary of Rootzone Moisture Changes by Crop Type (acre -feet)

	Agricultural and Rural (Non-Delta) (acre-feet)						
Land Use	AW	Pr	ETaw	ETpr	DPpr	DPaw	RO
Field and Truck	11,192	6,601	7,978	3,226	2,016	3,520	1,757
Pasture and Hay	59,372	46,608	40,290	27,653	14,961	19,809	6,576
Rural Residential	21,028	25,354	11,897	13,103	6,906	9,146	6,679
Vineyards and Orchards	23,535	18,029	17,810	11,272	5,726	6,022	2,063
Irrigated Land Uses	115,127	96,592	77,975	55,253	29,608	38,497	17,075

	Agricultural (Delta) (acre-feet)
Land Use	AW
Field and Truck	8,720
Pasture and Hay	6,312
Vineyards and Orchards	9,348
Irrigated Land Uses	24,380

Notes:
AW – Applied Water
Pr – Precipitation
ETaw – Evapotranspiration of Applied Water
ETpr – Evapotranspiration of Precipitation
DPpr – Deep Percolation of Precipitation
DPaw - Deep Percolation of Applied Water
RO – Run-off





Figure 1: Root Zone Inflow and Outflows for Non-Delta Areas (in)



Figure 2: Monthly Groundwater Pumping including Delta and Non-Delta