Call for Projects
Project Information Form (PIF)

A. PROJECT INFORMATION

1. Project Title: Supply Well 23 Replacement Project - Phase I
2. Project Sponsor(s): City of Pismo Beach
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: Conjunctive use 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.

The project meets multiple IRWM Plan objectives: maximize accessibility of water, adequate water supply, water quality improvements to a water system, plan for climate change vulnerabilities of water supply, support local GW management, further local basin management objectives, and support local control.

The project will protect and improve the City's groundwater pumping capacity, allowing the City to rely less on regional and imported supply to meet demand. The new well will reduce the amount of sand and silt entering the water system from a failing well, resulting in improvements to water quality. The City cannot currently meet their demand solely from groundwater, increasing their vulnerability to a shortage if Lopez and SWP deliveries are reduced or interrupted. The ability to pump groundwater when available will help further adaptive management goals of the Northern Cities Management Area (NCMA), enhancing water supply reliability and improving local water resource management.

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 Supply Well 23 Replacement Project facilities have an anticipated useful life of 30-50 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.

The project addresses climate change vulnerabilities as described in the IRWM Plan: drought sensitive water systems, water supply from coastal aquifers, and inability to store carryover supply surpluses.

The project will safeguard and expand the City's access to their groundwater by replacing and relocating failing infrastructure, reducing dependence on the Lopez system and lessening reliance on the SWP. The ability to better manage source of supply in both drought and wet conditions will improve supply reliability, reduce reliance on any single source, and promote adaptive management. Additionally, Well 23's current proximity to the aquifer's groundwater/seawater interface leads to increased sea water intrusion risk. The Well 23 Replacement Project is expected to increase the time before seawater contaminates the well's supply under a future seawater intrusion event.

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

☑ Yes ☐ No If yes, please explain below.

Yes - The City currently receives water from three sources: Lopez Lake, the State Water Project (SWP), and groundwater (Well 23 and Well 5). While the current Well 23 is operational, a 2025 Well Evaluation Report found that Well 23 has significant structural degradation and experiences continued sand infiltration. The report recommended immediate planning for a replacement, as failure is considered imminent. The Supply Well 23 Replacement Project will reduce the City's current risk of losing 720 gpm of pumping capacity and increase overall water supply capacity. On April 30, 2025, San Luis Obispo County Public Works issued a boil water notice after routine testing that detected coliform bacteria in the Zone 3 Lopez distribution system. While several Zone 3 recipients were able to discontinue Lopez deliveries and switch to other sources, the City lacked sufficient groundwater supply and was required to continue to rely on the Lopez system. The establishment of additional groundwater supply will reduce the City's reliance on both the Lopez System during periods of non-compliance or shutdown and the SWP during periods of reduced availability. During periods of reduced surface water supplies or impacted surface water quality conditions, the Project will provide access to approximately 280 gpm of additional groundwater supply as compared to current

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

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).

Groundwater is an essential component of the City's water supply portfolio. Groundwater Well No. 23, drilled in 1990 with a design capacity of 900 gpm, currently serves as a critical source during periods of high demand and reduced surface water deliveries. In 2013, a condition assessment concluded the well had 10 years of useful life remaining. An additional evaluation in 2025 concluded that well failure is imminent. Since its original design, the well has lost 180 gpm of capacity. Due to persistent sanding issues and the infeasibility of rehabilitation caused by the presence of two casings and multiple previous rehabilitation attempts, the well must be replaced as soon as possible. The City's objective is to replace the failing well to increase reliability and reduce water supply risks. The Well 23 Replacement Project will be conducted in two phases: Phase I – Drilling and Testing, and Phase II – Commissioning. The requested funding from the IRWM is for implementation of Phase I. Phase 1 includes design and specifications development, well drilling procurement, and well drilling/testing.
Phase I and Phase II are scheduled to be completed by December 2026 and early 2028, respectively. The current joint capacity of the failing Well 23 and operational Well 5 is 1270 gpm; however, Well 23 is structurally unstable, intermittently produces sand which shuts down the well and creates operational and maintenance issues, and is susceptible to sudden failure. Replacing Well 23 will reduce the risk of losing 720 gpm of capacity due to well failure and will increase joint capacity to 1550 gpm. This results in a net gain in water supply availability of 280 gpm. This project will safeguard the City's access to their groundwater by replacing and relocating failing infrastructure. The City groundwater pumping will not surpass their legal entitlement.

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) Cost Share: Non-State Fund Source	(b) Requested Grant Amount	(c) Other Cost Share (including other State Sources)	(d) Total Cost
(a)	Project Administration	$43,000	0	0	$43,000
(b)	Land Purchase/ Easement	0	0	0	0
(c)	Planning/Design /Engineering /Environmental Documentation	$84,000	$11,000	0	$95,000
(d)	Construction/ Implementation	$990,000	$989,000	0	$1,979,000
(e)	Grand Total (Sum rows (a) through (d) for each	$1,117,000	$1,000,000	0	$2,117,000

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.

Please see the attached cost estimate for the Well 23 Replacement Project - Phase I. Other grant programs were not pursued because the project is relatively small in scale, requires expedited implementation, and does not align well with the timelines of other funding sources. The project will be funded by the City's water enterprise fund.

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	3/2/2026	12/31/2026
(b)	Land Purchase/Easement	6/1/2025	2/27/2026
(c)	Planning/Design/Engineering/Environmental Documentation	3/2/2026	9/2/2026
(d)	Construction/Implementation	9/16/2026	12/31/2026

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

The City is installing a new well to replace the existing Well 23 which continues to produce sand and silt at a capacity reduced by 180 gpm despite recent well modifications and rehabilitation attempts. In 2025, geologists provided the City with an assessment of the existing well, identification of risks for continued operation, options for addressing operational issues, and recommendations for the most feasible path forward (attached as Well 23 Conditions Evaluation TM). The evaluation of Pismo Beach Well 23 found the well to be in poor condition, with significant structural degradation, persistent sanding issues, and evidence of casing damage and voids in the formation. Despite multiple rehabilitation attempts, sanding events continue to disrupt operations and pose a substantial risk of sudden well failure and additional loss of water supply. The well requires unusually high levels of operational intervention and cannot be relied upon as a secure supply source. If the well fails, the City will lose the remaining 720 gpm of Well 23's groundwater capacity. Based on recent video inspection and risk analysis, immediate planning for a replacement well is essential to protect the City's water supply reliability.

The City's water supply is sourced from Lopez Lake, the State Water Project (SWP), and two groundwater wells. Currently, the City relies on water deliveries from the Lopez pipeline for both Lopez and SWP supplies. Increased groundwater production capacity would help during catastrophic interruption of the Lopez pipeline from an earthquake, pipeline failure, and other unplanned outages. On April 30, 2025, a boil water notice was issued by San Luis Obispo County Public Works after routine monitoring identified coliform bacteria in the Zone 3 Lopez distribution system. While other Zone 3 agencies were able to switch to alternative water sources, Pismo Beach had no backup options and had to continue relying on Lopez deliveries. Expanding the City's groundwater resources will help reduce dependence on the Lopez system during water quality incidents and lessen reliance on the SWP. The proposed project is poised to provide an estimated 280 gpm of additional groundwater over the existing Well 23 capacity, improving supply reliability during periods of reduced surface water availability and quality.

Additionally, Well 23's current proximity to the aquifer's groundwater/seawater interface leads to increased sea water intrusion risk. The Well 23 Replacement Project is expected to increase the time before seawater contaminates the well's supply under a future seawater intrusion event.

2. Project Benefits Table:

Table 3 - Project Benefits		
Anticipated Useful Life of Project (years):	**30**	
Primary (Required)		
Type of Benefit Claimed:	Water Supply Reliability	**Benefit Units*:** Other
Secondary (Optional)		
Type of Benefit Claimed:	Water Supply - Groundwater	**Benefit Units*:** Other
Physical Benefits (At project completion or lifetime, as appropriate)		
(a)	**(b)**	**(c)**
Benefit	**Added Physical Benefit Description**	**Quantitative Benefit**
Primary	Prevent loss of groundwater supply capacity	720 GPM
Secondary	Expand the City's groundwater supply capacity and reduce reliance on SWP & Lopez supply.	280 GPM
Qualitative Benefits (For Decision Support Tools, please describe non-physical benefits.)		
The City's ability to rely on groundwater to meet the majority of its demand in the short-term directly impacts the resiliency and reliability of shared local supply (Lopez) and imported supply (SWP), reducing the risk of a water supply shortage in future drought or infrastructure emergency conditions. With greater access to local groundwater supplies, surface water supplies can be preserved. By reducing reliance on the SWP, the City reduces demand and strain on the San Joaquin Delta. Lower reliance on Delta exports helps maintain water quality, protects endangered species, reduces stress on fragile habitats, and contributes to the State-wide goal of "Achieving Reduced Reliance on the Delta and Improved Regional Self-Reliance".		
Comments: [Include narrative on additional benefits, as warranted.]		
When Well 23 fails, the City is positioned to lose 720 gpm of groundwater supply reliability. The Well 23 Replacement Project will enable 1000 gpm of pumping from the new well and a net groundwater supply capacity of 1550 gpm for use when needed. An additional benefit from the Project is an increased ability for the City to meet more of peak demand with groundwater. With current capacity, groundwater production can meet 43% of peak demand; however, if Well 23 fails, this metric drops to 18%. After the new well is constructed, the City can meet 52% of peak demand. For the purposes of the application, changes in capacity are quantified as AFY to meet DWR benefit quantification requirements; however, the City groundwater pumping will not surpass their legal entitlement. Additional benefits also include reduced risk of seawater intrusion on the City's groundwater supply system. Furthermore, moving the well further inland will shift the well's radius of influence and increase the time it takes for contaminated seawater to reach the City's supply wells.		

* 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.

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?)

Other considered alternatives for Well 23 included: adding an above-ground sand separator, replenishing filter pack and reset annular seal at top of the well liner, sealing upper liner opposite zone of sand invasion, placing a packer on suction inlet to block flow from top of liner, resetting a new liner, pulling liner and patching original casing, extending existing liner to the wellhead, and operational changes. An above-ground sand separator would be a temporary option to mitigate the sanding issue and treat symptoms of the well failure. Any downhole options have the potential risk of sudden and catastrophic well failure, and the City cannot risk implementing these alternatives without first constructing a new, reliable, high capacity well. While a sand separator could help mitigate the sand production issue, it will not prevent a sudden and catastrophic well failure. Given the high risk of losing the existing well and the repeated rehabilitation efforts, the City is moving forward with replacement of Well 23. The requested funding is for Phase I of the Well 23 Replacement Project. This phase is strictly designing and drilling a new well. The cost of well drilling is a relatively fixed cost that is mostly independent of location within the project area.

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.

N/A

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.

Yes - The Well 23 Replacement Project will provide safe, clean, affordable, and accessible water for human consumption, cooking, and sanitary purposes for the City of Pismo Beach's residents.

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.

N/A

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

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 City of Pismo is actively engaged in negotiations for the preferred well site; however, specific details cannot be disclosed at this time due to confidentiality. Concurrently, the City is also evaluating and pursuing alternative well locations.

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	Yes	
Notice of Preparation	Yes	
Draft EIR/MND/ND	Yes	
Public Review	Yes	
Final EIR/MND/ND	Yes	
Adoption of Final EIR/MND/ND	Yes	
Notice of Determination	Yes	

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

Although the Project has separate and independent utility from the Central Coast Blue Project, potential environmental impacts were originally evaluated under the Central Coast Blue Program EIR. Once the well site location is secured, the City anticipates adopting an Addendum tiering off the Program EIR and completing a new Notice of Determination, which are both anticipated to be complete within 3 to 6 months from finalization of the well site.

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.	Well Permit	SLO County Environmental Health	Oct-26
2.	Encroachment Permit	City of Grover Beach	Oct-26
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.	Application will be submitted by well driller upon award of t	N/A
2.	Application will be submitted by well driller upon award of t	N/A
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)

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:

Depending on the final location of the production well, construction activities have the potential to result in direct and indirect effects to federally or state listed threatened or endangered species and their critical habitat, including but not limited to tri-colored blackbird (State threatened), white-tailed kite (State Fully Protected), California red-legged frog (Federally threatened), southwestern pond turtle (Federally proposed threatened), monarch butterfly (Federally proposed threatened), marsh sandwort (Federally and State endangered), salt marsh bird's-beak (Federally and State endangered), and La Graciosa thistle (Federally endangered, State threatened). Once a site for the production well is selected, the City will complete a site-specific Biological Resources Assessment and implement appropriate, species-specific actions based on the results of this assessment (e.g., focused species surveys, avoidance/minimization measures, compensatory mitigation).

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:

N/A

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:

The production well is not expected to result in significant impacts to historical resources because 1) the demolition of structures is not expected to be necessary to accommodate well installation and 2) the well would be small in scale with minor aboveground components that would not introduce visual features that could substantially alter the setting of the surrounding area. However, depending on its final location, ground-disturbing activities during construction could have the potential to damage or destroy known or unknown archaeological resources that may be

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:

N/A

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:

N/A

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:

N/A

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:

N/A

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

☐ Yes ☑ No If yes, please explain:

N/A

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

☐ Yes ☑ No If yes, please explain:

N/A

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

☐ Yes ☑ No If yes, please explain:

N/A