

Cuyama Basin Groundwater Sustainability Agency Board of Directors Meeting

July 31, 2024

Meeting Minutes

PRESENT:

Directors

Bantilan, Cory – Chair
Yurosek, Derek – Vice Chair
Albano, Byron – Treasurer
Anselm, Arne – Secretary
Barnett, Rob – Alternate
Burnes, Rick
Elliott, Darcel – Alternate
Jackson, Steve
Reely, Blaine – Alternate
Wooster, Jane
Zenger, Katelyn

Staff

Beck, Jim – Executive Director
Blakslee, Taylor – Assistant Executive Director
Van Lienden, Brian – Woodard & Curran
Hughes, Joe – Legal Counsel
Dominguez, Alex – Legal Counsel

ABSENT:

None

1. Call to Order

Cuyama Basin Groundwater Sustainability Agency (CBGSA) Chair Cory Bantilan called the meeting to order at 2:05 p.m.

2. Roll Call

Mr. Blakslee called roll (shown above) and informed Chair Bantilan that there was a quorum of the Board.

3. Pledge of Allegiance

The pledge of allegiance was led by Chair Bantilan.

4. Meeting Protocols

Mr. Blakslee provided an overview of the meeting protocols.

5. Standing Advisory Committee Meeting Report

Standing Advisory Committee (SAC) Vice Chair Brad DeBranch provided a report on the July 25, 2024 SAC meeting and is included below:

Standing Advisory Committee Report**Meeting Date: July 25th, 2024**

Submitted to the CBGSA Board on July 31st, 2024

By Brad DeBranch, SAC Vice-Chair

The Standing Advisory Committee met on July 25th both in person and by teleconference. Quorum was established by five committee members (four present in-person and one present via teleconference). GSA staff including Taylor Blakslee, Grace Bianchi, and Alex Dominguez were present with additional staff online including Jim Beck, Brian Van Lienden and Ali Taghavi. Public participation was comprised of approximately 10-15 members throughout the ~6.5 hour meeting. The SAC's general feedback and recommendations are summarized below per each item of discussion.

Item 7a – Update on Fault Investigation

Staff provided an overview of the latest fault investigation activities related to the Santa Barbara Cayon and Russell Faults. One committee member requested that staff look at recent oil well drill logs to better understand the geologic formations near the Russell Faults. In connection with the SBCF investigation, staff may consider conducting additional resistivity tests north of Transect Line #1, as the fault line was not observed within the targeted study area.

Item 7b – Update on Cuyama Basin Water Resources Modeling

Staff provided an update on the newest Model v0.30. The SAC was informed by staff that a QC effort is being conducted related to the model, and that new model results would be published by the upcoming Board meeting. Several members of the SAC were concerned that smaller growing operations in the western region around Cottonwood Canyon are not accurately being represented on recent GSA maps showing pumping well locations and groundwater service area operating companies. These committee members requested proper representation of these operations along with de minimis pumpers to ensure they're being modeled appropriately.

Item 7c – Monitoring Network Consulting Contract

The SAC unanimously approved a motion recommending approval of the Provost & Pritchard contract to conduct groundwater monitoring efforts as proposed.

Item 7d – Data Management System Update

Staff provided an update on the Data Management System. Brenton Kelly asked about certain well construction and perforation data being added to existing wells, and was concerned that data gaps continue to exist within the monitoring system.

Item 8a – GSP Component & Schedule

Committee members Jaffe and Adams raised concerns that this GSP update process

has been overbearing in relation to the time spent reviewing the various GSP components.

Item 8b – Project and Management Action Options

There was no formal motion or recommendation made by the SAC. During the discussion comments received from the committee included the desire to add stronger wording to assess water wells going below MTs and to investigate the cause of the problem while determining appropriate action. The SAC received public comment which suggested the GSA should consider other useful tools such as cropping alternatives and vegetation management.

Item 8c – Glidepath Methodology

Committee member Adams was concerned that the GSA’s 2023 reduction goals were not met. Staff confirmed that the 2023 overall allocation target in the CMA was achieved. There were also concerns about the declining groundwater levels in the CMA and that the current glidepath does not protect groundwater levels. Brenton Kelly was concerned with the timing of when we’ll start to see a response in the groundwater conditions and whether all the agreed upon metrics are working.

There was a **motion** that the glidepath be correlated to the groundwater levels in the revised model and that the glidepath be revised with more aggressive reductions earlier in the period and lesser reductions later in the period. The motion passed with 1 “no” vote from Committee member DeBranch.

Item 8d – Basin-Wide Water Management Narrative

There was a **motion** to accept the redlined GSP Section 7.5.2 with the exception that the final sentence related to CCSD be modified to allow for revisiting CCSD water use based on anticipated development. The motion passed unanimously.

Item 8e – Updated Central Management Area Boundary, Management Area Criteria, Operational Boundary and Use of Farm Units

Committee members Gaillard and Adams were both in favor of leaving the CMA as-is, and thought changing back and forth was going to be burden to landowners. Committee member Jaffe expressed concern for those pumpers in close proximity to the CMA boundary. Committee member Lewis was concerned this this model is not accurate enough to make these crucial decisions. Committee member DeBranch expressed support to use the revised CMA boundary and to add in the pumpers within the new boundary. There was one public comment from Anne Myhre that strongly suggested that we rely on the updated science and new groundwater modeling. There was a **motion** to keep the Central Management Area “as-is” based on the previous model results. The motion passed with 1 “no” vote from Committee member DeBranch.

Item 8f – Groundwater Allocations

1. Options for Allocation Implementation Period – Three SAC members including committee members Lewis, Jaffe and Adams were in favor of using 2yr periods and two SAC members including committee members Gaillard & DeBranch were in favor of using 5yr periods. Brenton Kelly was supportive of

a 5 year time period but only with effective adaptive management.

2. Applies to CMA + Farming Units – One SAC member requested that an exception be made for small pumpers. The SAC agreed that the allocations should be inclusive of the CMA plus farming units.

3. Baseline Allocation Amount – A majority of SAC members were supportive of using a historic average to determine the baseline. Committee member Lewis wanted to remain neutral on the matter.

4. Sustainable Yield – Committee member Jaffe provided support for the model. Committee member DeBranch was not comfortable supporting the sustainable yield until after the QC matter is resolved and the final model results are published. Steve Gliessman expressed his concern that the model is a very complicated tool that should be peer reviewed outside of the team that created the model.

5. Allocation Methodology – The SAC was generally supportive of using a historic average to govern the allocation methodology. However, three of the five SAC members including Jaffe, Lewis and Adams wanted to make an exception to exclude smaller pumpers. Two public comments were received that also expressed concern for the smaller pumpers.

6. Carryover – Two SAC members were in favor of some sort of carry over water use and two SAC members were against carryover describing that it won't support recovery of water levels. Two public comments were received that did not support carryover but rather find ways to incentivize growers to cut back water use.

Item 8g – Frequency of Changes to Groundwater Allocations

There was no formal motion or recommendation made by the SAC, but there was general support for some form of quantitative metric to review changes to groundwater allocations outside of the CMA. Committee member DeBranch supported assessing this on an annual basis and Committee members Lewis and Gaillard supported assessing this change every 3 years. There was consensus that 5 years was too long to initiate change.

Item 8h – GSP Draft Chapters

There was general support by the SAC to move revised GSP Chapters 2, 3, 5 & 6 forward for Board review and consideration. No formal action was taken by the SAC.

Item 8i – GSP Amendment Comment Process

There was a **motion** to approve GSP update public review process. The motion passed unanimously.

Respectfully Submitted,
Brad DeBranch

SAC Vice-Chair

CONSENT AGENDA

6-10. Consent Agenda

Chair Bantilan asked if any Directors wanted to move any of the consent items out to discuss in more detail.

MOTION

Director Wooster made a motion to approve the consent agenda item nos. 7-10 without the meeting minutes. The motion was seconded by Director Albano a roll call vote was made and passed.

AYES:	Albano, Anselm, Bantilan, Burnes, Jackson, Reely, Wooster, Yurosek, Zenger
NOES:	None
ABSTAIN:	Barnett
ABSENT:	Elliott

ACTION ITEMS

11. Groundwater Sustainability Plan Implementation

a. Update on Fault Investigation Study

Jim Strandberg provided an update on the Fault Investigation Study on the Santa Barbara Canyon and Russel Faults which is included in the Board packet.

SAC Vice Chair DeBranch provided the feedback from the SAC which is included in the SAC report.

Stakeholder Brenton Kelly asked about the depth of the fault and the northwest line 1 on the figure. Mr. Strandberg responded that there may be an additional fault between MWH and TSS #3 well causing a discrepancy in depth to water.

Stakeholder Ray Shady suggested the Board consider extending the SBCF study line north and south from line 2 using electrode spacing.

Chair Bantilan closed the floor for public comment and opened the floor for Director comments.

Director Jackson asked if the Santa Barbara Canyon is funneling the water recharge into the basin and bringing water into the north part of the fault. Mr. Strandberg responded that approximately 500 of the 3,300 acre-feet of water per year is coming out of the Santa Barbara Canyon and it would flow into the valley, south of the fault and then across the fault.

Chair Bantilan asked if there is an estimated cost to extend the study line and determine the eastern extent of the Santa Barbara Canyon Fault. Mr. Strandberg responded that \$60 thousand dollars would fund a transect that runs north and south of line one.

Director Wooster asked if there are any additional references besides United States Geological Survey (USGS) that indicate the location of the Santa Barbara Fault. Mr. Strandberg responded that it is the only report since 1970, and no one has challenged it.

Director Yurosek asked about the effect of the Russel Fault system on the depth to water on either side of the fault system. Mr. Strandberg responded that the fault is buried under 100 to 200 feet of saturated alluvium, where the water flows across.

Director Yurosek asked what causes salinity to increase across a buried fault. Mr. Strandberg replied that there isn't more information on the increase in salinity across the fault. Mr. Strandberg commented it could be associated with the oil and gas development in that area. He said he assumed it is the geologic features that create oil and gas reserves in that area that cause high total dissolved solids (TDS) and high salinity.

Director Yurosek asked what caused the minimal flow across the Russel Fault system. Mr. Strandberg responded that the geologic features and the gradual hydraulic gradient (from high hydraulic pressure to low hydraulic pressure) causes minimal flow.

Darcel Elliott joined the meeting at 2:40 p.m.

b. Update on Cuyama Basin Water Resources Model

Mr. Beck provided an overview of model presentation progress and review process with the Ad hoc and Standing Advisory committees.

Technical staff Mr. Taghavi provided an overview of the items to be discussed in the model presentation, addressed uncertainty, and assumptions of the model. Mr. Taghavi commented that the committee and stakeholders should consider that the outputs provided are in the context of model uncertainty and an uncertainty analysis will be conducted.

Mr. Blakslee added there was a previous question regarding native land vs idle land and what the trigger is for moving from native to idle. He reported that staff discussed this definition issue with Land IQ and will follow up on this question.

Mr. Van Lienden added that idle land data, collected from Land IQ land use data, was used in the model to represent non-irrigated lands, which are idle in between crop rotations.

Director Albano asked where the old fault stratigraphy information was collected. Mr. Taghavi responded it was collected from USGS's model.

Director Reely asked where the Santa Barbara Canyon Fault was located and if the

Airborne Electromagnetic survey (AEM) data reflected the offset in the fault stratigraphy. Mr. Strandberg responded that staff investigated the distance in between the two transects and DWR invalidated some of the data, so there is a data gap in the AEM dataset for this area.

Mr. Taghavi followed up on the earlier question regarding flow. He commented that the hydraulic gradient is the result of both the water level measurements and the observation wells.

Director Wooster commented on the changes in the evapotranspiration (ET) rates between model update version 0.20 and version 0.30 historical and reported records. She referenced the change in ET rates for the idle land and asked if version 0.30 should be corrected to 0.83 feet per year.

Director Albano asked how the model accounts for water delivered outside farming units compared to the well in which the water was pumped. Mr. Taghavi responded that wells are assigned to service areas and the water use reports from landowners have helped determine water use within a service area. He added Bulletin 118 boundaries were used as the basin boundaries in the model.

Director Yurosek asked if applied water is included as deep percolation. Mr. Taghavi clarified applied water and precipitation are categorized as deep percolation inflows. Mr. Sercan commented that the deep percolation is the model output and additional calculations are done to estimate applied water and precipitation amounts.

Director Albano asked about ET and deep percolation calculations. He commented that deep percolation is the least certain number but is the most important in the model.

Director Jackson asked if vegetation efficiency is included in the model. Mr. Taghavi responded its included and calculated using temperature and ET ranges.

Director Wooster asked if the pumping cap in the Central Management Area (CMA) was based on the 2022 CMA. Mr. Taghavi responded that it is based on 2022 CMA including farming units.

Stakeholder Jim Wegis asked how long it takes for water to percolate to the water table. Mr. Taghavi responded that the only data available/observed is the peaks in water levels; there is not a signature of the time lag between when water is applied and infiltrated in the soil zone.

Stakeholder Guy Lingo asked about the alluvial buildup above the Santa Barbara Canyon Fault. Mr. Strandberg responded it is estimated around 100 feet.

Stakeholder DeBranch asked about the changes in the model from the July 22, 2024 version and the version presented to the Board. Mr. Taghavi responded that the updates were due to continued quality control efforts.

Stakeholder Shady asked about the precision of the alluvial bed and how the resolution can be improved. Mr. Strandberg responded that electrode meter was used for the top 200 feet. The meter spacing between transects could be tighter, but there's bedrock and metal that impacts the reading.

SAC Vice Chair DeBranch provided the SAC report on this item which is provided in the board packet.

In the interest of time, Chair Bantilan deferred agenda items 11c, 12d, and 12g to a subsequent Board meeting

c. Discuss and Take Appropriate Action on Data Management System Update Options

This item was deferred to the September Board meeting.

12. Groundwater Sustainability Plan Amendment Components

a. Update on GSP Component Schedule

Mr. Blakslee provided an update on the Groundwater Sustainability Plan (GSP) component schedule and noted that minor changes to the schedule and said the project is still on schedule, but any potential changes or delays to the schedule may result in requiring additional special meetings.

There were no public comments on this item.

b. Discuss and Take Appropriate Action on Project and Management Action Options

Mr. Beck reported that CBGSA staff is looking for Board direction on which projects and management actions in the GSP. Mr. Blakeslee added that the flow meter and flower the Board polled in favor to include flow meter recalibration program and remove rangeland and forest management projects from the 2025 GSP updates.

Mr. Van Lienden provided an update on two new projects being considered for the amended GSP which are (1) flow meter recalibration program, and (2) rangeland and forest management. He reported that the staff recommendation is to not include rangeland and forest management as a project due to uncertain benefits and potential wildlife and air quality impacts from burning land to increase water flow.

There were no objections from the Directors to the list of project and management action options.

There were no public comments on this item.

SAC Vice Chair DeBranch provided the SAC report on this item which is provided in the board packet.

c. Discuss and Take Appropriate Action on Glidepath Methodology

Mr. Van Lienden provided an overview of the glidepath schedule for percent reduction each year in the CMA. He reviewed the potential action options for the glidepath for

Board consideration.

SAC Vice Chair DeBranch provided the SAC report on this item which is included in the board packet.

There were no public comments on this item.

Director Jackson recommended keeping the existing glidepath until there is further discussion on basin-wide groundwater management.

The Board agreed to use the existing glidepath methodology for now.

d. Discuss and Take Appropriate Action on Basin-wide narrative

This item was deferred to the September Board meeting.

e. Discuss and Take Appropriate Action on CMA Criteria and Farming Units

Mr. Beck reviewed the previous CMA Boundary in the 2020 GSP and provided the options for CMA Boundary criteria for Board consideration.

Director Yurosek asked if the two-foot contour was defined in the GSP. Mr. Van Lienden responded that there were two management areas identified in the GSP, the CMA and the Ventucopa management area, but it was decided it was too early to implement pumping allocations.

SAC Vice Chair DeBranch provided the SAC report on this item which is included in the board packet.

Chair Bantilan opened the floor for public comments.

Stakeholder Myhre commented that the new boundary line should be accepted as it was provided by the technical consultants.

Chair Bantilan closed the floor to public comment and opened the floor to Director comments.

Director Jackson commented that the boundary line will cause tensions between landowners and the boundary line could continue to change and said he would like to wait to change the boundary.

Director Albano responded that there is a lot of history between the landowners and the CMA is comprised primarily of two large landowners. He commented it does not make sense to start a clean slate and not include the historical use, and it is not fair to landowners who have been in the area for a while.

Director Reely asked about the hydrographs for Ventucopa and how is that area with respect to measurable objectives and minimum threshold. Mr. Taghavi responded that the Ventucopa varies by season and year, and he is not able to state there are long-term

declines in the Ventucopa area like the CMA.

Director Reely asked if areas in Ventucopa that fell in the two-foot contour have recovered. Mr. Taghavi responded it has recovered, but the two-foot contour is an indication to investigate long-term recovery and groundwater level impacts.

Director Burnes cautioned that the model assumptions for irrigation methods will need to be revisited in future model updates.

Director Albano commented on the uncertainty of the model. He questioned the sustainable yield outside the CMA and he added it would be reckless to make cuts outside the CMA.

Director Wooster commented that the new model boundary should be used, and farming units should be used. She commented that if a person's lease runs out then they should not be included in farming units and the Ventucopa area should not be included.

Chair Bantilan agreed with Director Wooster's comment. Chair Bantilan added that the Ventucopa area should be managed.

Director Barnett commented he is in favor of the updated CMA boundary that the two-foot contour presented should be trusted.

Director Yurosek commented on the two-foot per criteria and said there should be a management plan for the areas within the boundary line including Ventucopa.

Director Albano commented that there should be criteria to opt in and out of farming units. Director Wooster commented that there should be a procedure to exit farming units and a determined length of time in which the management area boundary applies. Mr. Beck commented that it will be difficult to remove a farming unit from the management area since the sustainable yield calculation includes the farming unit area.

Director Albano asked about the allocations for farming units. Mr. Beck commented that the current allocations are for two years.

Director Wooster commented that it does not make sense to keep allocations for one year if the model is updated. Mr. Taghavi responded there are two types of updates, annual updates and every five years. Mr. Beck recommended that the model is updated every five years and then determine if there should be a midterm update depending on new data.

Director Elliott asked about the process to change the boundary and amend the GSP, which must be reviewed by DWR. Mr. Beck responded that if the CMA boundary is changed, the GSP would have to be amended, but the section added could be short to expediate the process.

Director Albano asked if the allocation amounts are the same each year or is it adjusted

based on water data. Mr. Van Lienden responded that the calculations included the data available for 2023-2024 allocation and the percent reduction followed the glidepath.

Director Yurosek commented that updating the GSP does not have to be a lengthy process. Mr. Beck commented that the change in farming unit process/administration does not need to be in the supplemental plan.

Poll:

- Director Wooster commented in favor of the new CMA and keeping the operational language but said Ventucopa should be out of the boundary.
- Director Zenger commented in favor of following the scientific data and that management areas should be treated equally and noted she is in favor of using the updated CMA boundary with Ventucopa area.
- Director Jackson commented in favor of using the updated CMA boundary with Ventucopa management area.
- Chair Bantilan said he was in favor of developing a different management area for Ventucopa.
- Director Elliott is in favor of keeping the CMA boundary for now and keeping the Ventucopa management area as included in the 2020 GSP, with the possibility to change later.
- Director Albano is not in favor of including Ventucopa management area.
- Director Barnett is in favor of leaving Ventucopa out of the boundary.
- Director Reely is in favor of the new Ventucopa management area and allocations.
- Director Burnes commented it is too early to decide whether Ventucopa should be included in the boundary.
- Director Yurosek is in favor of including Ventucopa and having a separate management plan to address DWR's comments to investigate the Ventucopa area.
- Director Anslem is in favor of leaving Ventucopa out and following the language in the GSP since the 2-ft contour is forecasted, not measured.

Mr. Beck said because there are less wells in the Ventucopa area therefore, there is more uncertainty about the groundwater levels in that region.

Mr. Blakeslee provided the definition of a farming unit which is "a grouping of two or more parcels of land that is under the ownership or control by lease or otherwise, of a single water user, which includes CMA land and may include non-CMA land provided that lands are served by a common irrigation system."

MOTION

Director Yurosek made a motion to adopt the CMA for a five-year period updated by the model using an operational boundary based on the existing definition and continue the use of farming units based on the existing farming unit policy, however, included farming units that exit before the period ends are still subject to pumping restrictions for that period and develop a management plan for the Ventucopa management area identified in the GSP and on the map. The motion was seconded by Director Reely and did not pass with a 46% vote.

AYES: Jackson, Reely, Yurosek, Zenger
 NOES: Albano, Anselm, Bantilan, Barnett, Burnes, Elliott, Wooster
 ABSTAIN: None
 ABSENT: None

Mr. Taghavi commented that there will be significant data to update the CMA in the next year. Director Wooster asked if the LiDAR would provide more data for the model. Mr. Taghavi responded that the pumping data is the most critical component in refining the model.

Director Burnes asked if the model was complete or if there will be additional revisions. Mr. Taghavi responded that the model is complete and there is no additional quality controls to be performed.

MOTION

Director Albano made a motion to adopt the CMA for a five-year period updated by the model using an operational boundary based on the existing definition, continue the use of farming units based on the existing farm unit policy; however, included farm units that exit before the period ends are still subject to pumping restrictions for that period and update the Ventucopa management area using the model and evaluate the management area at the next model calibration or GSP update, whichever is sooner. The motion was seconded by Director Elliott and did not pass with a 47% vote.

AYES: Albano, Anselm Barnett, Elliott, Wooster
 NOES: Bantilan, Burnes, Jackson, Reely, Yurosek, Zenger
 ABSTAIN: None
 ABSENT: None

MOTION

Director Reely made a motion to adopt the CMA for a five-year period updated by the current model, using an operational boundary based on the existing definition, and continue the use of farming units based on the existing Farm Unit Policy, however, included farm units that exit before the period ends are still subject to pumping restrictions for that period, and develop a management plan for the Ventucopa management area identified in the GSP and on the map, which may or may not provide for pumping restrictions. The motion was seconded by Director Burnes and passed unanimously.

AYES: Albano, Anselm, Bantilan, Barnett, Burnes, Elliott, Jackson, Reely, Wooster, Yurosek, Zenger
 NOES: None
 ABSTAIN: None
 ABSENT: None

f. Discuss and Take Appropriate Action on Groundwater Allocations

Mr. Beck provided a brief overview of the existing groundwater allocation program for 2023 and 2024. He provided options on the implementation period, who the program applies to, baseline (i.e. starting point) amount, sustainable yield, allocation methodology, and carryover, for the Board's consideration.

Director Wooster asked about the difference between the management area and the CMA. Mr. Van Lienden responded that the updated sustainable yield calculation for CMA plus farming units is 11,500 acre-feet.

SAC Vice Chair DeBranch provided the SAC report, which is included in the Board packet.

Chair Bantilan opened the floor for public comment.

Stakeholder Wegis asked for an aerial photograph of the CMA boundary and if his land is included in the CMA.

Chair Bantilan closed the floor public comment and opened the floor for Board comments.

Director Wooster commented that if the new CMA boundary is adopted, the Ventucopa area needs to be managed according to the Ventucopa area and not according to the CMA because the Board has already established a boundary for the CMA.

Options for Allocation Implementation Period

Director Albano commented in favor of the five-year period or if there's a model update, whichever comes first. The Board generally agreed with this approach.

Baseline allocation amount

Mr. Van Lienden commented that if boundary lines change, then the farming units will need to be readdressed.

Chair Bantilan asked if staff could provide additional baseline options including several historical use options for the CMA plus farming units based on historical use. Director Albano asked if allocation amounts for each area will be provided. Mr. Beck responded that staff would provide several options and will have the 2021 baseline updated with the model.

Sustainable Yield Options

Mr. Beck recommended using the updated average sustainable yield, and the Board agreed with this approach.

Allocation Methodology Options

Mr. Beck asked the Directors if they would like to stay with the current model pumping estimates or update them with the recent model to recalculate landowner allocation percentages.

Director Wooster commented it will be more accurate to use updated metered use numbers, but it will be easier to use historic model estimate numbers.

Chair Bantilan commented there is more recent data that can be used, and he added he would like to see 2018-2023 data for allocations.

Director Yurosek commented that the using historical data for allocations provided a reference for usage before SGMA implementation and using new estimates from the updated model may penalize users because usage will continue to change.

Director Albano recommended sticking to the data provided.

Carryover Options

Director Burnes asked for clarification on the carryover policy. Mr. Beck asked if the Board would like the carryover policy to be developed or to be explored.

Director Albano commented that he does not believe the carryover policy should be prioritized in the GSP and staff should include soft language on the policy in the GSP.

Director Jackson asked for staff to explore carryover options early 2025.

The Board directed staff to develop language in the amended 2025 GSP that says staff “shall” develop a policy for carryover.

Applies to CMA + farming units

The Board agreed that the groundwater allocation program should apply to the CMA including Farming Units.

g. Discuss and Take Appropriate Action on Frequency of Changes to Groundwater Allocations

This item was deferred to the September Board meeting.

h. Discuss and Take Appropriate Action on GSP Chapters

Mr. Van Lienden presented updated versions of Chapter 2: Basin Setting; Chapter 3: Undesirable Results; Chapter 5: Minimum Thresholds, Measurable Objectives, and Interim Milestones; and Chapter 6: Data Management System which were provided in the packet for consideration of approval.

SAC Vice Chair DeBranch provided the SAC report, which is included in the Board packet.

Director Barnett it there will be additional chapters up for approval. Mr. Van Lienden responded that Chapters 1 and 4 have been approved by the Board and a public draft of all the chapters will be included for approval at the next meeting in September 2024.

MOTION

Director Albano made a motion to approve the updated versions of the GSP chapters. The motion was seconded by Director Burnes and the motion passed with a 89% vote.

AYES: Albano, Anslem, Bantilan, Burnes, Elliott, Jackson, Reely, Wooster,

Yurosek, Zenger
 NOES: None
 ABSTAIN: Barnett
 ABSENT: None

i. Discuss and Take Appropriate Action on Public Comment Process

Mr. Blakslee provided an overview of the proposed public comment process for the draft GSP chapters.

MOTION

Director Jackson made a motion to approve the public comment process. The motion was seconded by Director Burnes and the motion passed with a 93% vote

AYES: Albano, Anslem, Bantilan, Barnett, Burnes, Elliott, Jackson, Reely, Yurosek, Zenger
 NOES: None
 ABSTAIN: None
 ABSENT: Wooster

REPORT ITEMS

13. Administrative Updates

a. Report of the Executive Director

Nothing to report.

b. Report of the General Counsel

Nothing to report.

14. Technical Updates

a. Update on Groundwater Sustainability Plan Activities

Mr. Van Lienden briefly mentioned accomplishments for April, May, and June 2024, which is provided in the Board packet.

b. Update on Grant-Funded Projects

Mr. Van Lienden briefly provided an update on grant-funded projects, which is provided in the Board packet.

c. Update on Quarterly Groundwater Conditions Report

Mr. Van Lienden briefly reviewed the April Groundwater Conditions Report, which is provided in the Board packet.

15. Report of Ad Hoc Committees

Nothing to report.

16. Directors' Forum

Nothing to report.

17. Public comment for Items Not on the Agenda

Nothing to report.

18. Correspondence

Nothing to report.

CLOSED SESSION

19. Closed Session

At 8:06 PM, the Board adjourned to closed session. At 8:30 PM, the Board returned from closed session at which time Legal Counsel reported to the public that there was no reportable action.

20. Adjourn

Chair Bantilan adjourned the meeting at 8:31 PM.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE
CUYAMA BASIN GROUNDWATER SUSTAINABILITY AGENCY

Chair: *Cory Bantilan*
[Cory Bantilan \(Oct 29, 2024 17:03 PDT\)](#)

ATTEST:

Secretary: _____