



1

2

TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM

3 **TO:** Bruce Buel, General Manager, Nipomo Community Services District

4 **FROM:** Joel Degner, Brad Newton

5 **RE:** Groundwater in storage underneath the Nipomo Mesa Management Area as of April
6 2006, 01-0236-00-9100

7 **DATE:** October 11, 2006

8 INTRODUCTION

9 Nipomo Community Services District (NCSD) directed SAIC to (1) determine the amount
10 of groundwater that is in storage within the deep aquifer underneath Nipomo Mesa
11 Management Area (NMMA) based on groundwater elevation data collected April 2006 (2)
12 compare the storage in 2006 to 2000 and (3) compute the above sea level and below sea level
13 volumes of groundwater in storage. The following figures and tables are attached.

14 Table 2: Well Measurements in April 2006

15 Figure 1: Well Locations and NMMA Boundaries

16 Figure 2: NMMA Groundwater Level in 2006

17 Figure 3: NMMA Groundwater Level in 2000

18 Figure 4: Change in storage between 2006 and 2000

19 Figure 5: Water Levels in a Confined Aquifer

20 RESULTS

21 **Table 1: Groundwater in Storage underneath Nipomo Mesa Management Area**

Boundary	Volume of groundwater in storage above sea level (AF)			Volume of groundwater in storage below sea level (AF)
	April 2006	April 2000	2000 (DWR)	2000, 2006
Nipomo Mesa Management Area (Phase III)	121,000	124,000	N/A	790,000
Nipomo Mesa Hydrologic Sub-area (DWR)	96,000	99,000	84,000	720,000

c:\users\lisa\appdata\local\microsoft\windows\temporary internet files\content.outlook\k6kqh2kc\2006-10-11 groundwater in storage - final draft.doc

D
R
A
F
T

To: Bruce Buel, Nipomo Community Services District General Manager
Re: Groundwater in Storage Underneath the Nipomo Mesa as of April 2006
Date: October 9, 2006
Page 2 of 3

1 **METHODOLOGY**

2 *Well Measurements*

3 Groundwater level data originated from the San Luis Obispo County Department of
4 Public Works (SLO DPW) and from NCSO. SLO DPW measures the groundwater levels in
5 monitoring wells in the spring and the fall of each year. Their most recent data are from April
6 2006 and were used in this analysis. NCSO measures the levels in its wells monthly. The NCSO
7 data from April 2006 were used in this analysis. Table 2 lists the data from April 2006 and
8 Figure 1 displays the well locations and the measured groundwater elevations. Well data for
9 April 2000 from SLO DPW and NCSO were also used in this analysis for the comparison of
10 water levels in 2000 and 2006.

11 The groundwater level data were evaluated for accuracy. Well completion records and
12 historical hydrographic records were reviewed to flag data that appeared to be anomalous. Data
13 that did not follow the historical trend in well hydrographs were removed. Data measured from
14 shallow wells were also removed because of concerns that data measured a perched shallow
15 aquifer and did not represent the water level of the deep aquifer that is the subject of this
16 analysis. Table 2 lists the data that were used for the analysis and which data were removed
17 due to data quality concerns.

18 Well locations were based on the California Department of Water Resources (DWR)
19 records for the wells where available and NCSO well data from earlier SAIC study. When the
20 DWR well locations were compared to other available well locations (SLO DPW, USGS) there
21 were small discrepancies in some well locations. Therefore there is some uncertainty in the
22 accuracy of the locations of the measured wells. The well ground surface elevations were based
23 on DWR records and SLO DPW records. Based on the current analysis and previous analysis
24 by SAIC the well elevations are not accurate and could vary +/- 20 feet.

25 *Groundwater Surface Interpolation*

26 The well measurements were interpolated using an inverse distance weighting method
27 in ArcView 9.1 (Power=2, Number of points = 12). The interpolation was based on the data
28 points and was not interpreted based on assumptions related to structural geology. The
29 representation of the groundwater surface in April 2006 and in April 2000 is shown in Figure 2
30 and Figure 3 respectively. In their 2002 report, DWR assumed that the Santa Maria River fault
31 acts as a barrier to groundwater flow. This results in a lower estimate of groundwater in
32 storage and explains the difference between the estimate using only the data points (99,000 AF)
33 and DWR estimates using an interpretation of the structural geology for 2000 (84,000 AF) (See
34 Table 1).

D
R
A
F
T

To: Bruce Buel, Nipomo Community Services District General Manager
Re: Groundwater in Storage Underneath the Nipomo Mesa as of April 2006
Date: October 9, 2006
Page 3 of 3

1 ***Groundwater Volume Estimate***

2 The groundwater volume above sea level as shown in Table 1 was estimated by
3 subtracting sea level surface (elevation equals zero) from the representation of the groundwater
4 surface and subtracting the volume of bedrock above sea level. (The bedrock surface originated
5 from Figure 11: Base of Potential Water-Bearing Sediments (DWR 2002)). The groundwater
6 volume below sea level was estimated by subtracting the bed rock surface from the sea level
7 surface. The total volume of the groundwater was multiplied by the specific yield to estimate
8 the amount of groundwater in storage. The specific yield used was 11.7%, based on the average
9 weighted specific yield for the Nipomo Mesa Hydrologic Sub-area estimated by DWR (DWR
10 2002, pg. 86).

11 The amount of groundwater in storage under the Nipomo Mesa depends on the
12 boundary that is used to describe the Nipomo Mesa. Figure 1 displays the Nipomo Mesa
13 Hydrologic Sub-area (HSA) boundary that the DWR used in its 2002 Report, the NMMA
14 boundary used in Phase III of the Santa Maria Groundwater Adjudication, and the NMMA
15 boundary provide in Exhibit C of the proposed stipulation in the Santa Maria Groundwater
16 Adjudication. For this analysis, the NMMA from Phase III of the trial was used for continuity
17 with previous analysis that SAIC had done in 2003. The storage was also calculated with the
18 HSA to provide a comparison to previous estimates that were made by the DWR (See Table 1).

19 ***Change in Storage Comparison to 2006 and 2000***

20 The groundwater in storage in April 2006 was compared to storage levels in April 2000,
21 by subtracting the groundwater elevation surface in 2006 from 2000 (See Figure 4).

22

D

R

A

F

T