

Project Information Form (PIF)

A. PROJECT INFORMATION

1. Project Title:	Central Coast Blue
2. Project Sponsor(s):	City of Pismo Beach, City of Grover Beach, City of Arroyo Grande
3. Eligible Applicant Type:	Public Agency ▼
4. IRWM Project Region(s):	San Luis Obispo County

- 5. Does the project provide benefits directly to a Disadvantaged Communities (DAC) and/or Economically Distressed Areas (EDA) (minimum 75% by population or geography)?
 Yes No If yes, please complete D.8 and/or D.9. Show on map if applicable.
- 6. Is the Project Sponsor a Tribe, or does the project provide benefits to a Tribe (minimum 75% by population or geography) as defined by Proposition 1?
 Yes No If yes, please complete D.10. Show on map if applicable.
- 7. Provide project map. Include location of project, project benefit and/or service area, and other applicable information.
- 8. Funding Category:
 DAC Implementation Project
 General Implementation Project
- 9. Project Type: ▼ Other:

Select most applicable project type. See Section II.C. of the 2019 Guidelines for full description of eligible project types. If "Other" is selected, please write in the space provided the proposed project type.

B. SELECTED ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS

- 1. Will the project be included in the IRWM Plan, that will be adopted prior to anticipated Agreement Execution?
 Yes No
- 2. Does the project address a critical need(s) and/or priority(ies) of the IRWM Region as identified in the IRWM Plan?
 Yes No If yes, complete part a:
a. What IRWM Plan goal(s)/objective(s) does the project address? Identify and explain.

See the attached worksheet, titled "Objectives and Climate Change Worksheet".

Central Coast Blue would meet numerous regional water supply benefits by recycling a water resource that is currently discharged into the ocean. This new water resource would provide a sustainable supply that is drought-resistant, reduces reliance on vulnerable surface water sources, augments groundwater supply by injecting water into the aquifer, improves water quality through dilution due to injection of purified water with lower salinity, and create a seawater intrusion barrier to protect basin quality and yield. The project is a regional collaboration between partners, has made outreach and public involvement a critical tenant of its development, and will continue to promote good stewardship. The project achieves regional water supply reliability goals, aligns regional management across multiple agencies, promotes collaboration across multiple agencies, and maximizes stakeholder benefits.

Project Information Form (PIF)

3. Does the project have an expected useful life consistent with Government Code §16727 (generally 15 years)? If not, explain why this requirement is not applicable.

Yes, the facilities associated with Central Coast Blue have a projected life of 30 years.

4. Does the project address and/or adapt to the effects of climate change? Does the project address the climate change vulnerabilities assessed in the IRWM Plan?

Yes No If yes, please explain below.

See the attached worksheet, titled "Objectives and Climate Change Worksheet".

Central Coast Blue addresses many regional climate change vulnerabilities. Since the project recycles wastewater and injects it into the aquifer, it reduces reliance on surface water supplies that are vulnerable to climate change and drought, recharges groundwater, and creates a seawater intrusion barrier against rising sea levels. The more secure and sustainable water supply results in community and economic benefits. A decreased reliance on surface water supply allows for secondary benefits as additional flows can be released for environmental augmentation.

5. Does the project contribute to regional water self-reliance?

Yes No If yes, please explain below.

Phase 1 of the project will inject over 850 AFY of local, drought-resilient supply from treated wastewater that is currently discharged to the ocean. As a result on creating a seawater intrusion barrier, groundwater modeling indicates that the Project Partners could increase pumping by more than the amount injected. The modeling estimates thath roughly 1,200 AFY could be pumped without inducing seawater intrusion when 850 AFY is injected.

If feasible and deemed necessary, Phase 2 of the project will produce an additional 2,700 AFY of water, for a total of more than 3,500 AFY.

Project Information Form (PIF)

6. Does the project provide a benefit that meets at least one of the Statewide Priorities as defined in the 2019 IRWM Grant Program Guidelines?

Yes No If yes, please identify below.

5. Manage and Prepare for Dry Periods 

7. Will CEQA be completed within 12 months of Final Award?

- Yes
- NA, project is exempt under CEQA
- NA, not a project under CEQA
- NA, project benefits DAC/EDA/Tribe (minimum 75%), or a Tribe is a local project sponsor
- No

8. Will all permits necessary to begin construction be acquired within 12 months of Final Award?

- Yes
- NA, project benefits DAC/EDA/Tribe (minimum 75%), or a Tribe is a local project sponsor
- No

Project Information Form (PIF)

C. WORK PLAN, BUDGET, and SCHEDULE SUMMARY

1. Project Description: Provide a brief project description summarizing major components, objectives, goals, and intended outcomes/benefits (quantitative and qualitative).

Central Coast Blue (Project) is a regional, indirect potable reuse project developed in response to recent droughts that highlighted vulnerabilities in the Central Cost Blue Partners' (cities of Arroyo Grande, Grover Beach, and Pismo Beach) water supply portfolios and the seawater intrusion risks faced by the groundwater basin. The Project will improve the reliability of the community's water supply portfolio by capturing wastewater flows from the Pismo Beach Wastewater Treatment Plant (WWTP), purifying the water, and injecting it into the Northern Cities Management Area of the Santa Maria Groundwater Basin that is an important component of the water supply portfolios for the Central Coast Blue Partners. Central Coast Blue will provide a drought-resistant, sustainable, local water supply for the Central Coast Blue Partners while also improving and protecting the water quality in the basin, therefore enhancing the health of the larger watershed.

Central Coast Blue will increase groundwater recharge and improve groundwater quality through the design, permitting, and construction of an Advanced Water Purification Facility (AWPF), conveyance infrastructure, injection wells, and monitoring wells, to inject purified water into the basin to prevent seawater intrusion. The Project will construct an AWPF that utilizes a process train consisting of ultrafiltration, reverse osmosis, ultraviolet disinfection, and advanced oxidation technologies to treat wastewater to the required level of quality for groundwater injection. The AWPF will be located in Grover Beach at the south end of Huber Street. This site is located between the Pismo Beach WWTP and the South San Luis Obispo Sanitation District WWTP, along the Pismo Beach outfall pipeline. Brine and other residuals generated during Project operations will be discharged to the existing ocean outfall.

The Project protects the community of Oceano, a severely disadvantaged community (SDAC), and Oceano CSD's five production wells by allowing the agency to continue providing clean water to its 7,000 residents. It provides Project Partners the ability to increase groundwater pumping and more fully utilize existing entitlements. The regional Project sets a framework for future sustainable management of the shared groundwater basin and unites five agencies as they manage water collaboratively and holistically.

The Project has been studied and designed with the consideration of a potential Phase 2 of the project. This expansion would treat and inject

2. Budget: Provide cost estimates for each Budget Category listed in the table below. (Required for Pre-Application Material Submittal; not required for Final Application Submittal)

Table 1 - Project Budget					
Category		(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)
		Cost Share: Non-State Fund Source	Requested Grant Amount	Other Cost Share (including other State Sources)	Total Cost
(a)	Project Administration	\$1,240,000	\$0	\$0	\$1,240,000
(b)	Land Purchase/Easement	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
(c)	Planning/Design/Engineering/Environmental Documentation	\$12,280,000	\$0	\$0	\$12,280,000
(d)	Construction/Implementation	\$38,949,000	\$2,000,000	\$0	\$40,949,000
(e)	Grand Total (Sum rows (a) through (d) for each	\$52,469,000	\$2,000,000	\$0	\$54,469,000

Note: Provide information or other documentation to support the cost estimate in a separate attachment. Identify the source of all cost share and other funds. If other funds are not used, describe efforts to obtain other funding and/or why other funding sources were not used.

The cost estimate from the Preliminary Engineering Report is attached, which was developed mid-2021. In addition, the construction cost includes a 10% market adjustment is added to account for current escalation in construction costs and market uncertainty. This cost was escalated to the mid-point of construction (3% per year for 3 years; 2021 to 2024). Non-construction costs were estimated as a percentage of construction costs with 3% for program management, and 30% total for CEQA/permitting, final design, engineering during construction, and construction management.

Project Information Form (PIF)

3. Cost Share Waiver Requested (DAC or EDA)? Yes No If yes, continue below:

Cost Share Waiver Justification: Describe what percentage of the proposed project area encompasses a DAC/EDA, how the community meets the definition of a DAC/EDA, and the need of the DAC/EDA that the project addresses. In order to receive a cost share waiver, the applicant must demonstrate that the project will provide benefits (minimum 25% by population or geography) that address a need of a DAC and/or EDA.

N/A

4. Schedule: Include reasonable estimates of the start and end dates for each Budget Category listed in Table 1 - Project Budget. (Required for Pre-Application Material Submittal; not required for Final Application Submittal)

Table 2 - Project Schedule		
Category	(a) Start Date	(b) End Date
(a) Direct Project Administration	3/1/2022	9/30/2025
(b) Land Purchase/Easement	3/1/2022	9/30/2023
(c) Planning/Design/Engineering/Environmental Documentation	3/1/2022	9/30/2023
(d) Construction/Implementation	10/1/2023	9/30/2025

D. OTHER PROJECT INFORMATION

1. Provide a narrative for project justification. If applicable, include references to supporting documentation such as models, studies, engineering reports, etc. Include any other information that supports the justification for this

Project Information Form (PIF)

project, including how the project can achieve the claimed level of benefits.

In the 1960s, evidence of seawater intrusion was detected and documented by the Department of Water Resources in 1970 in Bulletin No. 63-3 Seawater Intrusion: Pismo-Guadalupe Area. This report identified evidence of elevated chloride concentrations and a hydraulic potential for seawater encroachment to occur in the primary aquifers that the NCMA agencies rely upon for their groundwater supply. The threat of water quality contamination from seawater intrusion and nitrates were the drivers for the construction of the Lopez Dam, which was completed in 1969. Beginning in May 2009, elevated concentrations of total dissolved solids (TDS), chloride, and sodium were detected in the Oceano area, indicating potential seawater intrusion. Since 2009, the NCMA member agencies have reduced municipal groundwater pumping levels to approximately 20% of their groundwater entitlements, as determined in the 2002 Groundwater Management Agreement as part of the Santa Maria Groundwater Basin adjudication process. However, despite pumping far below their entitlements, the Northern Cities Management Area (NCMA) agencies have continued to observe declining groundwater levels, specifically along the coastline.

The water supply portfolio for the Project Partners consists of groundwater and surface water from Lopez Reservoir. The City of Pismo Beach also has imported water from the State Water. Groundwater entitlements account for approximately 41% of the agencies' water supply and would have been able to meet over 60% of demands from 2011-2020 if pumping the full entitlements were available. However, groundwater was only able to meet 15% of demands due to reduced groundwater pumping to avoid seawater intrusion. With increased demand in the NCMA, reduced underflow from the Nipomo Mesa Management Area (NMMA), and changing climatic conditions, groundwater elevations along the coastline have been observed to drop during periods of extended drought. If conditions worsen, seawater will draw toward the freshwater zone of the aquifer, contaminating it with elevated salt concentrations. Meanwhile, storage levels in Lopez Reservoir have dropped to historically low levels and the Low Reservoir Response Plan will result in reduced supplies. Also, State Water Project has had several years of extremely low allocations. To protect local groundwater supplies, the Project Partners and regional stakeholders are advancing Central Coast Blue—a regional recycled water project—to increase groundwater supplies, and secure a sustainable, drought-resistant local water supply. Central Coast Blue will be a critical component of the future drinking water supply portfolio for the project Partners and will help protect against the threat of seawater intrusion into their groundwater supplies during future droughts. The Project will provide communities with a new, locally-controlled and drought-resistant water supply by using a resource that is currently discharged into the ocean. Central Coast Blue is an integral element of the regional water supply solutions to manage and protect water in the Basin for urban and agricultural users.

In 2014, the San Luis Obispo County Regional Recycled Water Strategic Plan, funded by an IRWM planning grant, evaluated regional recycled water projects and identified an indirect potable reuse in the Oceano area as a viable alternative. Pismo Beach and South San Luis Obispo County Sanitation District both completed Recycled Water Facilities Planning Studies in 2015 and 2016, respectively, to explore opportunities and evaluate alternatives for local water reuse projects. Water quality, yield, and seawater intrusion barrier project benefits were evaluated and quantified in the 2017 Phase 1A and 2019 Phase 1B Groundwater Modeling Reports. In 2021, the Final Environmental Impact Report and Preliminary Engineering Report were finalized.

In early 2022, the project Partners took a Cost Share Agreement to their respective City Councils for approval. The agreement was unanimously approved by all three city councils. The Cost Share Agreement establishes a united approach to reduce their groundwater pumping and describes

2. Project Benefits Table:

Table 3 - Project Benefits	
Anticipated Useful Life of Project (years):	30
Primary (Required)	
Type of Benefit Claimed:	Water Supply - Recycled Water ▼ Benefit Units*: AFY ▼
Secondary (Optional)	
Type of Benefit Claimed:	Water Quality - Groundwater ▼ Benefit Units*: mg/L ▼

Project Information Form (PIF)

Physical Benefits (At project completion or lifetime, as appropriate)		
(a)	(b)	(c)
Benefit	Added Physical Benefit Description	Quantitative Benefit
Primary	Project will recharge recycled water	850
Secondary	Injection of water with low TDS	200
Qualitative Benefits (For Decision Support Tools, please describe non-physical benefits.)		
Establishes a seawater intrusion barrier that will protect the groundwater basin. Sets framework for future sustainable management of the shared groundwater basin.		
Comments: [Include narrative on additional benefits, as warranted.]		
<p>Primary benefit: By treating wastewater that was previously discharged to the ocean, the project would create a new water supply. The quantity is based on the amount of wastewater that is currently discharged from the Pismo Beach Wastewater Treatment Plant (WWTP) and could be treated before being injected into the groundwater aquifer.</p> <p>Secondary benefit: The project's advanced treatment process would produce water with lower TDS than is currently in the groundwater basin. Injection of this water would dilute the higher TDS water in the basin, resulting in improved groundwater quality.</p> <p>Qualitative benefits: The injection of project water would augment existing groundwater, reducing the threat of seawater intrusion which has been detected when groundwater levels in the basin decline. Additionally, the regional project brings three different agencies together to sustainably manage their water supplies, setting a framework for future collaboration.</p> <p>Qualitative benefit: A future Phase 2 expansion is planned which would collect water currently discharged from South San Luis Obispo County Sanitation District's WWTP and increase the quantity of injectable recycled water to over 3,500 AFY.</p>		

- * DWR may require applicant to convert or modify Benefit Claimed and/or Benefit Units. Where applicable, select one of the following units that corresponds to the benefit claimed:
- For water supply produced, saved, or recycled, enter acre-feet per year (AFY)
 - For water quality, enter constituent concentration reduced in mg/L
 - For flood damage reduction, enter inundated acres reduced in acres
 - For habitat improved, restored or protected, enter habitat restored in acres
 - For fishery benefits, enter increased fishery flow rate in cubic feet per second (cfs)
 - For species protection, enter number of species benefited

3. Does the proposed project provide benefits to multiple IRWM regions [or funding areas]? If the project is located in another funding area, please provide the information requested in the 2019 Guidelines, Section 1.A.

Yes No If yes, provide a description of the benefits to the various regions.

Project Information Form (PIF)

4. Provide a narrative on cost considerations. For example, were other alternatives to achieve the same types and amounts of physical benefits as the proposed project evaluated? Provide a justification as to why the project was selected (e.g., if the proposed project is not the lowest cost alternative, why is it the preferred alternative? Are there any other advantages that the proposed project provides from a cost perspective?)

Central Coast Blue Partners have extensively investigated opportunities to improve the reliability of local water supplies and protect existing resources. Both non-recycled and recycled water projects have been analyzed. Recycled water alternatives included non-potable reuse, reservoir augmentation, and satellite treatment. The non-potable reuse options had higher costs and lower yields while the other recycled water options had substantially higher costs. Non-recycled water alternatives considered included the Lopez Lake Spillway Raise Project, Nacimiento Pipeline Extension, Desalination, and additional State Water Project rights. Each alternative had higher costs than Central Coast Blue with the exception of Lopez Lake Spillway Raise Project. However, the potential project yield was lower (565 AFY), the timeline does not address Project Partners immediate supply development needs and the project has limited drought supply benefits since the additional storage associated with raising the spillway would only be available if there was enough precipitation to fill the reservoir.

5. a. Does the project address a contaminant listed in AB 1249?

Yes No If yes, complete parts b and c:

b. Describe how the project helps address the contamination.

N/A

- c. Does the project provide safe drinking water to a small disadvantaged community?

Yes No If yes, provide an explanation on how the project benefits a small disadvantaged community as defined in the 2019 IRWM Guidelines.

Although it does not create a new water supply for the community of Oceano, a severely disadvantaged community, the Project does protect their water supply and Oceano CSD's five production wells by allowing the agency to continue providing clean water to its 7,000 residents. Without Central Coast Blue, Oceano CSD's wells could be contaminated by seawater intrusion before the other NCMA agencies due to their location and proximity to the ocean.

Project Information Form (PIF)

6. Does the project provide safe, clean, affordable, and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking, and sanitary purposes (consistent with AB 685) to meet a specific need(s) of a community?

Yes No If yes, please describe.

The project provides a local, reliable, safe, and clean water supply that also provides reliable supply during extended periods of drought.

7. Does the project employ new or innovative technologies or practices, including decision support tools that support the integration of multiple jurisdictions, including, but not limited to, water supply, flood control, land use, and sanitation?

Yes No If yes, please describe.

The project evaluated an alternative RO technology during a pilot study that was a new proprietary technology and the first of its kind to be tested in the United States. The treatment process chosen for final design (ultrafiltration, reverse osmosis, and ultraviolet advanced oxidation process (UV AOP)) is an innovative and advanced treatment technology and would be applied for the first time in the County. The project also supports the integration of multiple jurisdictions through the collaboration of the three municipal Partners and the creation of a Joint Powers Authority (JPA).

8. If the project provides benefits (75% by population or geography) to a DAC, explain the need of the DAC and how the project will address the described need. Explain how the area/community meets the definition of a DAC.

N/A

Project Information Form (PIF)

9. If the project provides benefits (75% by population or geography) to an EDA, explain the need of the EDA and how the project will address the described need. Explain how the area/community meets the definition of an EDA.

N/A

10. If the project provides benefits (75% by population or geography) to a Tribe or a Tribe is the sponsor of the project, explain the need of the Tribe and how the project will address the described need.

N/A

11. Does the project sponsor have legal access rights, easements, or other access capabilities to the property to implement the project?

- Yes If yes, please describe.
- NA If NA, please describe why physical access to a property is not needed.
- No If no, please provide a clear and concise narrative with a schedule to obtain necessary access.

The Partners have acquired the Advance Water Purification Facility property. Easements that will be required for injection wells and pipelines are currently under negotiation and will be finalized once facility locations are finalized in 2022.

Project Information Form (PIF)

E. ENVIRONMENTAL

1. Please fill out the CEQA Timeline Table below, if applicable:

Table 4 - CEQA Timeline		
CEQA STEP	COMPLETE? (y/n)	ESTIMATED DATE TO COMPLETE
Initial Study	Y	
Notice of Preparation	Y	
Draft EIR/MND/ND	Y	
Public Review	Y	
Final EIR/MND/ND	Y	
Adoption of Final EIR/MND/ND	Y	
Notice of Determination	Y	

a. If additional explanation or justification of the timeline is needed, please describe below (optional).

2. Permit Acquisition Plan:

List all permits needed to complete the project. If the project does not provide benefits to a DAC, EDA, or Tribe (min 75%), all permits needed to begin construction must be acquired within 12 months of Final Award.

No.	Type of Permit	Permitting Agency	Date Acquired or Anticipated
1.	See attachment		
2.			
3.			
4.			
5.			
6.			
n.			

For each permit not yet acquired, describe the following:

No.	a. Actions taken to date (include dates of any key meetings, consultations, submittals, etc.)	b. Any issues or obstacles that may delay acquisition of permit
1.	See attachment	
2.		
3.		
4.		
5.		
n.		

3. Permitting Checklist: This checklist is provided as a courtesy for documentation purposes. Not all permits which may apply are listed. (Required for Pre-Application Material Submittal; not required for Final Application Submittal)

Call for Projects Project Information Form (PIF)

- a. Does the project involve any activities that may affect federally or state listed threatened or endangered species or their critical habitat that are known, or have a potential, to occur on-site, in the surrounding area, or in the service area? (i.e. Federal Endangered Species Act Section 7 Consultation and Incidental Take Authorization and Section 10 Incidental Take Permit, California Endangered Species Act Permit, and/or ESA & CESA Consistency Determination)

Yes No

If yes, please explain:

The Biological Resources Assessment prepared for the project and Section 4.2, Biological Resources, of the Final EIR evaluated potential project impacts to federally listed species and critical habitat. Four federally listed animal species and no federally listed plant species have the potential to occur within the project area. The four federally listed animal species are California red-legged frog (*Rana draytonii*; threatened), southern sea otter (*Enhydra lutris nereis*; threatened); steelhead-south-central California coast distinct population segment (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*; threatened), and tidewater goby (*Eucyclogobius newberryi*; endangered). In addition, the California overwintering population of monarch butterfly (*Danaus plexippus*) is a candidate species for listing under the Endangered Species Act. No federally designated critical habitat is present within the project area. The Final EIR for the project includes a suite of mitigation measures to avoid and minimize impacts to these species, which reduce project impacts to less-than-significant levels.

- b. Would the proposed project work in, over, or under navigable waters of the US or discharge dredged or fill material in waters of the US? (i.e. Rivers & Harbors Act Section 10 Permit and/or Clean Water Act Section 404 Permit)

Yes No

If yes, please explain:

Some components of the project would potentially result in direct impacts to one wetland feature that may potentially be under the jurisdiction of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. Depending on final design, one segment of the proposed water distribution pipelines may traverse this wetland feature, resulting in temporary impacts during construction.

- c. Will the proposed project have the potential to affect historical, archaeological, or cultural resources? (i.e. National Historic Preservation Act and/or State Historic Preservation Officer Consultation)

Yes No

If yes, please explain:

A Cultural Resources Assessment (CRA) was prepared for the project, which recommended a finding of no adverse effect to historic properties. Two known archaeological sites were located within the Area of Potential Effect (APE), but they do not contribute to the overall site eligibility for the National Register of Historic Preservation. The potential for unknown archaeological deposits within the APE is high, so the Final EIR includes mitigation measures to minimize potential impacts, which would reduce project impacts to a less-than-significant level.

- d. Will the proposed project discharge into a water of the US? (i.e. Clean Water Act Section 401 and/or 404 Permit)

Yes No

If yes, please explain:

Arroyo Grande Creek is located approximately 50 feet to the south of the nearest project component and may be indirectly impacted by runoff during construction activities. In addition, the project may temporarily impact waters subject to RWQCB jurisdiction under Section 401 of the Clean Water Act. A jurisdictional delineation will be performed to determine the nature and extent of this impact, and if necessary, permits will be obtained and impacts mitigated pursuant to the mitigation measures outlined in the Final EIR.

- e. Will the proposed project divert the natural flow of a river, stream, or lake? (i.e. Lake or Streambed Alteration Agreement)

Yes No

If yes, please explain:

No diversions are anticipated at this time, and a formal jurisdictional delineation will be conducted to confirm this assumption.

Project Information Form (PIF)

f. Will the proposed project change the bed, channel, or bank of a river, stream, or lake? (i.e. Lake or Streambed Alteration Agreement)

Yes No If yes, please explain:

No changes are anticipated at this time, and a formal jurisdictional delineation will be conducted to confirm this assumption.

g. Will the proposed project use any material from the bed, channel, or bank of a river, stream, or lake? (i.e. Lake or Streambed Alteration Agreement)

Yes No If yes, please explain:

No.

h. Will the proposed project deposit or dispose of debris, waste, or other material containing crumbled, flaked, or ground pavement where it can pass into a river, stream, or lake? (i.e. Lake or Streambed Alteration Agreement)

Yes No If yes, please explain:

No deposits or disposals are anticipated at this time, and a formal jurisdictional delineation will be conducted to confirm this assumption.

i. For water supply projects, do you need to obtain a water right? (Water Rights Permit)

Yes No If yes, please explain:

j. Is the proposed project within the defined coastal zone? (Coastal Development Permit)

Yes No If yes, please explain:

Project will require obtaining CDP permits from the City of Grover Beach, the County of San Luis Obispo, and the California Coastal Commission. Preliminary coordination with these agencies has been initiated.