Sierra Valley Groundwater Basin GSP Annual Report Water Year 2023









### Certification

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

DANIEL B. STEPHENS & ASSOCIATES, INC.

Douglas (Gus) Tolley Project Hydrogeologist gtolley@geo-logic.com 143E Spring Hill Dr. Grass Valley, CA 95945 Tony Morgan VP / Principal Hydrogeologist tmorgan@geo-logic.com 3916 State Street, Garden Suite Santa Barbara, CA 93105

Date signed:





# **Table of Contents**

Certi	ficatio	on	i
1.	Intro	duction	2
2.	Grou	Indwater Elevations	4
3.	Grou	Indwater Extractions	9
4.	Surfa	ace Water Supply	16
5.	Tota	l Water Use	20
6.	Char	nge in Groundwater Storage	21
7.	Prog	ress Towards GSP Implementation	25
	7.1	GSP Implementation Grant Applications and Awards	25
	7.2	DWR Technical Support Services Monitoring Well Request	25
	7.3	Subsidence Monitoring	25
	7.4	Well Flow Meter Standardization	25
	7.5	GDE Monitoring Network	25
	7.6	Irrigation Review & LEPA Irrigation Efficiency Demonstration Program	27
	7.7	Surface Water Management, Recharge, and Pumping Reduction Assessment	27
	7.8	DMS Maintenance	27
8.	Refe	rences	27

# **List of Figures**

Figure 1. Location Map	3
Figure 2. Spring Water Level Contours (Upper Aquifer)	5
Figure 3. Spring Water Level Contours (Lower Aquifer)	6
Figure 4. Fall Water Level Contours (Upper Aquifer)	7
Figure 5. Fall Water Level Contours (Lower Aquifer)	8
Figure 6. SMC Status Example Hydrograph	10
Figure 7. Spring SMC Status (Upper Aquifer)	11
Figure 8. Spring SMC Status (Lower Aquifer)	12
Figure 9. Fall SMC Status (Upper Aquifer)	13
Figure 10. Fall SMC Status (Lower Aquifer)	14





Figure 11. Agricultural Groundwater Extractions	17
Figure 12. Municipal and Industrial Groundwater Extractions	18
Figure 13. Total Groundwater Extractions	19
Figure 14. Change in Groundwater Levels (Upper Aquifer)	22
Figure 15. Change in Groundwater Levels (Lower Aquifer)	23
Figure 16. Groundwater Pumping and Change in Storage	24

## List of Tables

Table 1. Groundwater Extractions	16
Table 2. Surface Water Use	20
Table 3. Total Water Use	21
Table 4. Summary of recent Sierra Valley groundwater sustainability grant applications	26

# List of Appendices

Appendix A. Representative Monitoring Point Hydrographs





# **Acronyms and Abbreviations**

<u>Acronym</u>	Definition
AF	acre-feet
AFY	acre-feet per year
amsl	above mean sea level
Basin	Sierra Valley groundwater basin
CCR	California Code of Regulations
CDFA	California Department of Food and Agriculture
CDFW	California Department of Fish and Wildlife
DBS&A	Daniel B. Stephens & Associates, Inc.
DWR	[CA] Department of Water Resources
ft	feet
GSA	Groundwater Sustainability Agency
GDE	Groundwater Dependent Ecosystem
GSP	Groundwater Sustainability Plan
LWA	Larry Walker Associates
MAR	Managed Aquifer Recharge
MFFR	Middle Fork Feather River
mi	mile
МО	Measurable Objective
MT	Minimum Threshold
PLSS	Public Land Survey System
PMA	Project and Management Action
RMP	Representative Monitoring Point
SGMA	Sustainable Groundwater Management Act
SMC	Sustainable Management Criteria
SVGMD	Sierra Valley Groundwater Management District
SVHSM	Sierra Valley Hydrogeologic System Model
SWRCB	State Water Resources Control Board
TAC	Technical Advisory Committee
WLE	water level elevation
WCR	Well Completion Report
WY	water year



### DRAFT Annual Report WY 2023 Sierra Valley Groundwater Basin

### **Executive Summary**

Water year (WY) 2023 was a wet year for California. Precipitation for WY 2023 in the Sierra Valley groundwater basin (the Basin) totaled 33.32 inches, or approximately 147.4% of the historical average. Average change in observed water levels in the upper and lower aquifers in the Basin from Fall 2022 to Fall 2023 was +9.64 ft and +17.84 ft, respectively. Change in groundwater in storage was estimated to be +24,245 acre-ft (AF) using the Sierra Valley Hydrogeologic System Model (SVHSM). Total groundwater extractions in the Basin totaled 6,172 AF. An estimated 46,179 AF of surface water was used, with approximately 1,527 AF (3%) imported into the Basin from the Little Truckee River diversion. A total of 52,352 AF of water was used beneficially in the basin during WY 2023.

On July 27, 2023 DWR announced that the Sierra Valley GSP was approved. According to the DWR staff report provided with the GSP approval letter, "the Plan includes the required components of a GSP, demonstrates a thorough understanding of the Subbasin based on what appears to be the best available science and information, sets well explained, supported, and reasonable sustainable management criteria to prevent undesirable results as defined in the Plan, and proposes a set of projects and management actions that will likely achieve the sustainability goal defined for the Subbasin." The SVGMD appreciates the thorough review and suggested improvements by DWR staff, and continues its work implementing the GSP and achieving groundwater sustainability in the basin.

The SVGMD was awarded over \$8M in grant funding from DWR, CDFW, and the Plumas Watershed Forum. These funds will be used for GSP implementation, planning and permitting a managed aquifer recharge project in the Badenough-Smithneck Creek area, and agricultural irrigation efficiency improvements and an additional recharge project in the Little Last Chance area (north of Vinton).





### 1. Introduction

The Sierra Valley groundwater basin (the Basin) is comprised of the Sierra Valley subbasin (5-012.01) and Chilcoot subbasin (5-012.02). Both subbasins are managed as a single basin cooperatively by the Sierra Valley Groundwater Management District (SVGMD) and Plumas County, which act as the Groundwater Sustainability Agencies (GSAs) for the Basin. Since its inception in 1980, the SVGMD has monitored groundwater levels and installed flow meters to monitor pumping on all high-capacity wells (those capable of pumping 100 gallons/minute (gpm) or more). Additionally, the District requires permits for constructing new wells or repairing existing wells. New wells may not cause adverse impacts to groundwater in the Basin; new wells are prohibited in a designated area of the Basin where groundwater levels are declining. Similarly, development projects in the Basin that will extract groundwater must obtain a determination by SVGMD that sufficient groundwater is available for the proposed project.

Following the submittal of the Sierra Valley Groundwater Sustainability Plan (GSP) on January 28th, 2022, the GSAs are required to submit an annual report for the preceding water year (October 1 through September 30) to DWR by April 1st (23 CCR §356.2).The annual report provides a summary of hydrologic conditions and water use in the Basin (Figure 1) using observed data from monitoring networks and/or estimated using best available methods. This WY 2023 annual report provides a brief summary of Basin water use and changes in groundwater storage during the period from October 1st, 2022 to September 30th, 2023 and context for conditions relative to sustainable management criteria (SMC).

This document has been prepared in accordance with the requirements for annual reports as identified in the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA). More detailed analysis and discussion of long-term hydrologic trends will be included in the periodic evaluation of the GSP the GSAs are required to perform at least every five years (23 CCR §356.2).

For additional clarification or more detailed information on the basin plan area or conditions, please refer to the Sierra Valley GSP (<u>https://sgma.water.ca.gov/portal/gsp/preview/125</u>). It is important to note that data gaps and missing information continue to be a focus as the GSAs gather additional information for better analysis and decisions.



02/09/2024





### 2. Groundwater Elevations

Groundwater elevation contour maps for the upper and lower aquifers in the spring of 2023 are shown in Figure 2 and Figure 3, respectively, and for the upper and lower aquifers in the fall of 2023 in Figure 4 and Figure 5, respectively. These maps depict the seasonal high (spring) and low (fall) water level elevations for the two principal aquifers (upper and lower) in the Basin. Spring and fall water level elevations are defined as observations within a 50-day period centered on April 1st or October 1st. If a well has multiple observations within this period, then the value collected nearest to April 1st or October 1st is used.

Observed spring groundwater elevations in the upper aquifer (Figure 2) ranged from 4,856.68 to 5,118.33 ft above mean sea level (amsl), with an average elevation of 4,942.61 ft amsl. Spring groundwater elevations for the lower aquifer (Figure 3) ranged from 4,794.73 to 5,118.33 ft amsl, with an average elevation of 4,893.99 ft amsl. Groundwater elevations in the fall for the upper aquifer (Figure 4) ranged from 4,788.85 to 5,175.01 ft amsl, with an average elevation of 4,934.65 ft amsl. Fall observations from the lower aquifer (Figure 5) showed groundwater elevations ranged from 4,788.85 to 5,099.43 ft amsl, with an average elevation of 4,876.60 ft amsl.

Flow patterns in the Basin are complex and heavily influenced by the spatial distribution of recharge, spatial distribution of aquifer hydraulic properties, location and orientation of faults that act as groundwater flow barriers, and groundwater pumping. On the west side of the Basin flow is generally from south to north, towards the surface water outlet of the Basin located to the northwest, which is the headwaters of the Middle Fork Feather River (MFFR). Flow on the east side of the Basin is generally from the margins of the Basin towards the pumping center located in the vicinity of wells W5 and DMW 7 (see Figure 3 for location or search via the online database management system (DMS) at <u>https://sierra-valley.gladata.com/</u>).

Observed groundwater elevation changes from October 2022 to October 2023 in the upper aquifer ranged from -1.82 to +58.50 ft with an average change of +9.64 ft. For the lower aquifer groundwater elevation changes ranged from -2.20 to +58.50 ft with an average of +17.84 ft.

The reporting metric "SMC Status" was developed to better compare groundwater elevations observed at representative monitoring points (RMP) in the context of their unique SMC. This metric describes groundwater elevations relative to the "operational range" of the well and allows for normalized reporting of groundwater elevations at RMPs. The operational range is





02/09/2024



02/09/2024



02/09/2024



defined as the elevation range between the measurable objective (MO) and minimum threshold (MT) for each RMP. SMC Status was classified into the following categories:

- Near or Above MO: Water levels equal to or greater than 75% of the operational range
- Within Central Operational Range: Water levels within 25% to 75% of operational range
- Near MT: Water levels less than 25% of operational range but above MT
- At or Below MT: Water levels at or below MT

Figure 6 shows an example of this metric applied to the hydrograph of well 22N15E34L006M. Figure 7 and Figure 8 show the spatial distribution of SMC Status for spring water level observations in the upper and lower aquifer, respectively. Fall SMC Status for the upper and lower aquifer is shown in Figure 9 and Figure 10, respectively. Hydrographs for all RMPs can be found in Appendix A.

Groundwater conditions in the spring were near or above the MO for each RMP in both the upper and lower aquifers except for DMW 4i, where water levels were at about 65% of the operational range. Elevated water levels from the spring generally persisted into the fall due to increased recharge from the very wet water year. In the upper aquifer in the fall 75% of RMPs were near or above the MO, 21% were within the central operational range, 4% were near the MT, and 0% of RMPs were at or below the MT. Fall conditions for the lower aquifer showed 62% of RMPs were near or above the MO, 31% were within the central operational range, 0% near the MT, and 8% (1 well) of RMPs were at or below the MT.

It is unclear why water levels in 22N15E08Q001M declined below the minimum threshold, but it is one of three wells in the basin that did not show increases in water levels from Fall 2022 to Fall 2023. The other two wells were 22N15E34L006M and 23N16E36N002M. There did not appear to be a definitive spatial pattern for these declines nor in the SMC Status in the spring or fall nor for the upper or lower aquifer.

### 3. Groundwater Extractions

The Sierra Valley Groundwater Management District (SVGMD) meters all active large-capacity non-municipal wells (defined as wells that produce 100+ gallons per minute or wells with a casing diameter of 6 inches or greater) in the Basin.



DB23.1406.00 C:\Users\500\Sierra Valley GSP Dropbox\Gus Tolley\Sierra Valley GSP\Annual Reports\WY2023\GIS\QGZs\Sierra Valley Annual Report WY2023.qgz















Municipal pumping is measured on a monthly basis by the respective entity and reported to SVGMD. Municipal pumping from Sierra County Water Works District #1 (Calpine) is included in the groundwater extraction volumes presented in this Annual Report despite the wells being located just outside of the Basin boundary and predominantly screened in bedrock. Inclusion or exclusion of annual groundwater extractions from the Calpine wells would not materially change any conclusions due to the relatively small annual extraction volume of approximately 50 acre-ft/yr (AFY).

The number of domestic wells has been estimated using two methods:

- Well Completion Reports (WCRs) available from DWR
- County Parcel Coverage with Use Code Indicator and Description

For the first method, some assumptions were made because the well completion reports do not differentiate between inactive and active wells. The number of wells has been assessed based on assumed useful well life of 31 and 40 years. For the second method, county parcel coverage was provided by Sierra and Plumas counties and it identifies 'residential' parcels. Assumptions included counting for one domestic well per residential parcel. Parcels within a public water supply system boundary have been excluded. Comparing the two methods, a preliminary estimate of domestic wells provided about 500 domestic wells active in the basin. The majority of domestic wells are located along the margins of the valley and based on available well log information, typically screened in fractured bedrock. Therefore, estimated domestic groundwater extraction volume was not included in the groundwater or total water use calculations. Using the assumption of 2 AFY of water use (maximum amount to be classified as a de minimis user), the estimated domestic water use is about 1000 af/yr in the valley. This number and the underlying assumptions will need to be further refined during GSP implementation.

Domestic groundwater pumping was not estimated due to the relatively small population in Sierra Valley not served by municipal extractions that are metered. Furthermore, the majority of domestic wells are located along the margins of the valley and based on available well log information, typically screened in fractured bedrock.



Sector	Method	GW Extraction Volume (AF)	Accuracy (%)	Range (AF)
Agriculture	Totalizer	5,526	± 5	5,250 - 5,803
Municipal and Industrial	Totalizer	646	± 5	613 - 678
Total		6,172		5,863 - 6,481

#### Table 1. Groundwater Extractions

Estimated groundwater extractions for WY 2023 grouped by water use sector and measurement method are shown in Table 1. Groundwater pumping within each public land survey system (PLSS) section (1 mi<sup>2</sup>) shows the spatial distribution of agricultural (Figure 11), municipal and industrial (Figure 12), and total (Figure 13) groundwater extractions within the Basin. In total, groundwater pumping equaled 6,172 AF . Agricultural beneficial uses accounted for about 90% of total groundwater extractions for WY 2023.

### 4. Surface Water Supply

Surface water used in the Basin is grouped by source and measurement method and summarized in Table 2. Surface water is sourced from streams that enter Sierra Valley along the margin, releases from Frenchman Reservoir and Lake Davis, and imported water from the Little Truckee River. Observed flow rates for releases from Lake Davis and Frenchman Reservoir, and imports from the Little Truckee River are available from the Sierra Valley Watermaster.

All imported water from the Little Truckee River diversion is used beneficially for agricultural purposes, as are all contract and water right releases from Frenchman Reservoir (diverted from Little Last Chance Creek). Up to 800 AFY is diverted from Big Grizzly Creek (fed by releases from Lake Davis) to flood irrigate the Ramelli Ranch, owned by the Plumas National Forest. Specific diversion data for Ramelli Ranch are not currently available, but reduction of the diversion volume is not common (Joe Hoffman, personal communication).

Flow data for streams entering Sierra Valley are sporadic and diversion volumes are generally not reported. Total diversion volume from ungauged local streams was calculated as the difference between total surface water use estimated using SVHSM and reported inflows from the Little Truckee River diversion, Frenchman Reservoir, and Lake Davis.



**Management District** 

02/10/2024





02/10/2024



#### Table 2. Surface Water Use

Surface Water Source	Method	Annual Volume Used (AF)	Accuracy (%)	Range (AF)
Local Imported Supplies	Weir	1,527	± 5	1,450 - 1,603
	Weir	8,448	± 5	8,025 - 8,870
Local Supplies	Estimated from model results and reported diversion data <sup>1</sup>	35,405	± 20	28,324 - 42,486
	Estimated from previously reported diversions	800	± 33	536 - 800ª
Total		46,180		38,335 - 53,759

1. Total diversion volume from ungauged local streams not estimated in WY 2021 GSP annual report

a. Upper limit established as 800 AFY

Imports from the Little Truckee River diversion totaled approximately 1,527 AF for WY 2023. Contract and water right releases from Frenchman Reservoir and Lake Davis were about 8,448 AF and 800 AF, respectively. Diversions from ungauged streams entering the Basin were estimated to be 35,405 AF. Total volume of surface water used in the Basin during WY 2023 was estimated to be 46,180 AF. Surface water use is uncertain due to lack of flow and diversion data for most streams that enter Sierra Valley, which limits model calibration efforts. Improvement of surface water diversion observations from local streams would help fill this data gap.

### 5. Total Water Use

Total water use in the Basin is grouped by water use sector and measurement method and shown in Table 3. Total water volumes used in the Basin during WY 2023 was estimated to be 52,352 AF.

As discussed in Section 4 above, flow data for streams entering Sierra Valley is sporadic and surface water diversion volumes are not well-reported. Therefore, total water use is estimated using the best available data and tools.



#### Table 3. Total Water Use

Sector	Method	Total Annual Volume (AF)	Accuracy (%)	Range (AF)
	Totalizer	5,526	± 5	5,250 - 5,803
	Weir	9,975	± 5	9,475 - 10,473
	Estimated from model			
Agriculture	results and reported	35,405	± 20	28,324 - 42,486
	diversion data <sup>1</sup>			
	Estimated from			
	previously reported	800	± 33	536 - 800ª
	diversions			
Agriculture Subtotal	- 51,706		-	43,585 - 59,562
Municipal and Industrial	Totalizer 646		± 5	613 - 678
Total		52,352		44,198 - 60,240

1. Total diversion volume from ungauged local streams not estimated in WY 2021 GSP annual report

a. Upper limit established as 800 AFY

### 6. Change in Groundwater Storage

Observed changes in water levels from Fall 2022 to Fall 2023 for the upper and lower aquifers are shown in Figure 14 and Figure 15, respectively. Volumetric change in groundwater storage for the Basin was estimated using the Sierra Valley Hydrogeologic System Model (SVHSM).

Total change in groundwater in storage in the Basin over WY 2023 was estimated to be +24,245 AF. A positive change in annual storage is expected due to exceptionally wet conditions for WY 2023.

Figure 16 shows annual groundwater pumping and change in storage, along with cumulative storage since the start of WY 2000. Cumulative storage is reported as the total change in storage relative to October 1st, 1999, which is the beginning of the SVHSM historical simulation period. Through WY 2023, cumulative change in groundwater in storage since WY 2000 is estimated to be -17,468 AF.



02/10/2024



**Management District** 

02/10/2024

DB23.1406.00 C:\Users\500\Sierra Valley GSP Dropbox\Gus Tolley\Sierra Valley GSP\Annual Reports\WY2023\GIS\QGZs\Sierra Valley Annual Report WY2023.ggz



02/10/2024





### 7. Progress Towards GSP Implementation

The Sierra Valley GSP provided seven Tier I (existing) and 12 Tier II (potential) Projects and Management Actions (PMAs) to achieve sustainability goals (see Chapter 4 of the Sierra Valley GSP:

<u>https://www.sierravalleygmd.org/files/e88626a57/Chapter+4+Projects+and+Management+Actions.pdf</u>). The sections below describe actions taken for securing funding, starting, continuing, or completing PMAs identified in the GSP.

### 7.1 GSP Implementation Grant Applications and Awards

Since the WY 2022 GSP Annual Report was submitted, three grant applications totaling \$8,014,577 were awarded to the SVGMD by DWR, CDFW, and the Plumas Watershed Forum to support GSP implementation and groundwater sustainability projects in the basin. A summary of the scope and status of these grants as of February 12th, 2024 is shown in Table 4. The SVGMD is also awaiting determinations on 2023 California Department of Food and Agriculture (CFDA) Multi-benefit Land Repurposing Program grant applications to assess fit with creating multiple benefits while keeping land in production.

### 7.2 DWR Technical Support Services Monitoring Well Request

The SVGMD applied for an additional groundwater monitoring well through the DWR Technical Support Services Program. The location of this new multi-depth completion (nested) monitoring well has not been finalized but is planned to be located approximately 1,200 ft south of the intersection of Highway 49 and Smithneck Road east of Loyalton to support the upcoming managed aquifer recharge (MAR) project funded through a CDFW grant (see Section 7.1 above and Table 4). This new monitoring well is expected to be completed in WY 2025.

### 7.3 Subsidence Monitoring

[Summary of work requested from McGinley & Associates]

### 7.4 Well Flow Meter Standardization

[Summary of work requested from McGinley & Associates]

### 7.5 GDE Monitoring Network

[Summary of work requested from McGinley & Associates]





#### Table 1. Summary of recent Sierra Valley groundwater sustainability grant applications

FUNDER AND GRANT TITLE	Scope	AMOUNT REQUESTED STATUS AS OF FEBRUARY 13, 2	
California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) Sierra Valley Groundwater Recharge Multi-Benefit Project	The focus is on planning and permitting activities related to the Badenaugh-Smithneck recharge proposal. This includes CEQA compliance, feasibility studies and other actions required for project construction.	\$1,342,577	Awarded and grant agreement fully executed. Work Starting Q1 2024.
Plumas Watershed Forum Sierra Valley Groundwater Recharge and Irrigation Efficiency Project	The focus is on agricultural irrigation efficiency and a recharge project in the Little Last Chance area.	<del>\$1,547,000</del> \$1,222,000	Revised budget submitted to Plumas Watershed Forum 11/14/2023. Awarded and grant agreement fully executed. Work starting Q1 2024.
California Department of Water Resources (DWR) Sierra Valley GSP Implementation and Planning	Funding to assist with all aspects of GSP implementation including data collection and data management, annual reports, five-year updates to the GSP, projects and management actions, and grant administration.	\$5,450,000	Awarded, grant agreement under review





### 7.6 Irrigation Review & LEPA Irrigation Efficiency Demonstration Program

[Summary of work requested from McGinley & Associates]

### 7.7 Surface Water Management, Recharge, and Pumping Reduction Assessment

[Summary of work requested from McGinley & Associates]

### 7.8 DMS Maintenance

The SVGMD has continued to maintain and update the Sierra Valley DMS (<u>Sierra-</u><u>Valley.gladata.com</u>), which provides stakeholders access to all available groundwater data in the subbasin, excluding pumping data, using a user-friendly, map-based web interface. Groundwater levels are typically uploaded on a monthly basis.

### 8. References

- McGinley & Associates. 2022a. Review of Potential Water Supply Augmentation Projects and Management Actions, Sierra Valley, Sierra and Plumas County, California. Technical Report. <u>https://bit.ly/40mglfS</u>
- McGinley & Associates. 2022b. Sierra Valley Groundwater Management Plan 2022 Monitoring Networks Expansion O&M Manual, Sierra Valley, Sierra and Plumas County, California. Technical Report. <u>https://bit.ly/3K9ZoVM</u>
- McGinley & Associates. 2022c. Sierra Valley Irrigation Review & LEPA Irrigation Efficiency Demonstration Program, Sierra Valley, Sierra and Plumas County, California. Technical Report. <u>https://bit.ly/3ILVIjO</u>
- Sierra Valley Groundwater Management District (SVGMD). 2022a. Sierra Valley Subbasin Groundwater Sustainability Plan. <u>https://sgma.water.ca.gov/portal/gsp/preview/125</u>
- Sierra Valley Groundwater Management District (SVGMD). 2022b. DMS Technical Memorandum. Appendix 2-1 of Sierra Valley Subbasin Groundwater Sustainability Plan. <u>https://www.sierravalleygmd.org/files/51e7b778f/Appendix+2-1+DMS+Tech+Memo.pdf</u>
- Sierra Valley Groundwater Management District (SVGMD). 2022c. Sierra Valley Hydrogeologic System Model and Water Budget Report. Appendix 2-7 of Sierra Valley Subbasin Groundwater Sustainability Plan.





https://www.sierravalleygmd.org/files/5e6d7e8c6/Appendix+2-7+SVHSM+Model Water+Budget+Report.pdf

Sierra Valley Groundwater Management District (SVGMD). 2022d. Sierra Valley Groundwater Basin GSP Annual Report Water Year 2021. Technical Report. <u>https://www.sierravalleygmd.org/files/f538cd202/Submitted+Annual+Report+4-1-22.pdf</u>





# Appendix A

# Representative Monitoring Point Hydrographs















23N14E35L001M































# Groundwater Sustainability Agencies Contact Information

#### Sierra Valley Groundwater Management District

PO Box 88 Chilcoot CA 96105 530-414-6831 www.sierravalleygmd.org Plumas County 520 Main Street, Room 309 Quincy, CA 95971 530-283-6170 www.plumascounty.us