



CUYAMA BASIN GROUNDWATER SUSTAINABILITY AGENCY SPECIAL BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING

Board of Directors

Cory Bantilan Chair, Santa Barbara County Water Agency
Derek Yurosek Vice Chair, Cuyama Basin Water District
Arne Anselm Secretary, County of Ventura
Byron Albano Treasurer, Cuyama Basin Water District
Rick Burnes Cuyama Basin Water District
Steve Jackson Cuyama Basin Water District

Jimmy Paulding County of San Luis Obispo
Zack Scrivner County of Kern
Das Williams Santa Barbara County Water Agency
Deborah Williams Cuyama Community Services District
Jane Wooster Cuyama Basin Water District

AGENDA

July 31, 2024

Agenda for a meeting of the Cuyama Basin Groundwater Sustainability Agency Board of Directors to be held on Wednesday, July 31, 2024, at 2:00 PM at the **Cuyama Valley Family Resource Center 4689 CA-166, New Cuyama, CA 93254**. Participate via computer at: <https://rb.gy/1nxwv> or by going to Microsoft Teams, downloading the free application, then entering Meeting ID: 224 192 969 900 Passcode: jVHbgy or enter or telephonically at (469) 480-3918 Phone Conference ID: 956 062 525#.

Teleconference Locations:

4689 CA-166 New Cuyama, CA 93254	1115 Truxtun Ave, 5 th Floor Bakersfield, CA 93301	900 Truxtun Ave, Ste 220 Bakersfield, CA 93308	800 S. Victoria Ave. Ventura, CA 93009
-------------------------------------	--	---	---

The order in which agenda items are discussed may be changed to accommodate scheduling or other needs of the Board or Committee, the public, or meeting participants. Members of the public are encouraged to arrive at the commencement of the meeting to ensure that they are present for discussion of all items in which they are interested.

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, if you need disability-related modifications or accommodations, including auxiliary aids or services, to participate in this meeting, please contact Taylor Blakslee at (661) 477-3385 by 4:00 p.m. on the Friday prior to this meeting. The Cuyama Basin Groundwater Sustainability Agency reserves the right to limit each speaker to three (3) minutes per subject or topic.

1. Call to Order (Bantilan) (1 min)
2. Roll Call (Blakslee) (1 min)
3. Pledge of Allegiance (Bantilan) (1 min)
4. Meeting Protocols (Blakslee) (2 min)
5. Standing Advisory Committee Meeting Report (Kelly) (3 min)

CONSENT AGENDA

Items listed on the Consent Agenda are considered routine and non-controversial by staff and will be approved by one motion if no member of the Board or public wishes to comment or ask questions. If comment or discussion is desired by anyone, the item will be removed from the Consent Agenda and will be considered in the listed sequence with an opportunity for any member of the public to address the Board concerning the item before action is taken.

6. Approve Meeting Minutes (Bantilan) (1 min)
 - a) May 1, 2024, Regular Board
 - b) May 23, 2024, Special Board

7. Approve Payment of Bills for April, May, and June 2024 (Blakslee) (1 min)
8. Approve Financial Reports for April, May, and June 2024 (Blakslee) (1 min)
9. Approve Monitoring Network Consultant Contract for FY 24-25 (Blakslee) (1 min)
10. Approve a Non-Cost, Time Extension for W&C Task Order No. 11 (Blakslee) (1 min)

ACTION ITEMS

All action items require a simple majority vote by default (50% of the vote). Items that require a super majority vote (75% of the weighted total) will be noted as such at the end of the item.

11. Groundwater Sustainability Plan Implementation
 - a) Update on Fault Investigation Study (Strandberg) (30 min)
 - b) Update on Cuyama Basin Water Resources Model (Beck/Van Lienden) (60 min)
 - c) Discuss and Take Appropriate Action on Data Management System Update Options (Van Lienden) (5 min)
12. Groundwater Sustainability Plan Amendment Components
 - a) Update on GSP Component Schedule (Blakslee/Van Lienden) (5 min)
 - b) Discuss and Take Appropriate Action on Project and Management Action Options [**Final Discussion**] (Beck/Van Lienden) (15 min)
 - c) Discuss and Take Appropriate Action on Glidepath Methodology [**Final Discussion**] (Beck/Van Lienden) (30 min)
 - d) Discuss and Take Appropriate Action on Basin-Wide Water Management Narrative (Beck/Van Lienden) (10 min)
 - e) Discuss and Take Appropriate Action on Updated CMA Boundary, Management Area Criteria, Use of an Operational Boundary and Use of Farm Units [**Final Discussion**] (Beck/Van Lienden) (60 min)
 - f) Discuss and Take Appropriate Action on Groundwater Allocation Program [**Final Discussion**] (Beck/Van Lienden) (30 min)
 - g) Discuss and Take Appropriate Action on Frequency of Changes to Groundwater Allocations (Beck) (10 min)
 - h) Discuss and Take Appropriate Action on GSP Draft Chapters: [**Final Discussion**] (Beck/Van Lienden) (30 min)
 - i. Chapter 2. Basin Setting
 - ii. Chapter 3. Undesirable Results
 - iii. Chapter 5. Sustainability Management Criteria
 - iv. Chapter 6. Data Management System (DMS)
 - i) Discuss and Take Appropriate Action on GSP Amendment Public Comment Process (Blakslee) (5 min)

REPORT ITEMS

13. Administrative Updates
 - a) Report of the Executive Director (Blakslee) (5 min)
 - b) Report of the General Counsel (Hughes) (5 min)
14. Technical Updates
 - a) Update on Groundwater Sustainability Plan Activities (Van Lienden) (5 min)
 - b) Update on Grant-Funded Projects (Van Lienden) (5 min)

c) Update on April 2024 Groundwater Conditions Report (Van Lienden) (5 min)

15. Report of Ad Hoc Committees (1 min)
16. Directors' Forum (1 min)
17. Public Comment for Items Not on the Agenda (5 min)
18. Correspondence (1 min)

CLOSED SESSION

19. Conference with Legal Counsel – Existing Litigation (15 min)
Pursuant to Government Code section 54956.9(d)(1)
 - (a) Bolthouse Land Company, LLC, et al v. All Persons Claiming a Right to Extract or Store Groundwater in the Cuyama Valley Groundwater Basin (BCV-21-101927)
20. Adjourn (8:00 p.m.)

CUYAMA BASIN GROUNDWATER SUSTAINABILITY AGENCY

2024 Board Ad hocs

1	GSP Amendment	Albano Paulding Williams, Das Wooster Yurosek
2	Basin-Wide Water Management Policy	Anselm Bantilan Williams, Deborah Yurosek
3	Central Management Area Policy	Anselm Bantilan Vickery Williams, Deborah Wooster
4	Grant-Funded Items	Albano Vickery Williams, Das Williams, Deborah
5	Unknown Extractors	Anselm Vickery

Tech Forum Participants

Participants	Entity	Representing
Neil Currie	Cleath-Harris	Grapevine Capital
Matt Klinchuch	Cuyama Basin Water District	Cuyama Basin Water District
Jeff Shaw John Fio Karthik Ramesh	EKI	Cuyama Basin Water District
Matt Young Matt Scrudato	Santa Barbara County Water Agency	Santa Barbara County
Bianca Cabera Steve Johnson Jeff Helsley	Stetson Engineers	Sunrise Olive

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 deminimus 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 over bearing 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 or not 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

Cuyama Basin Groundwater Sustainability Agency
Board of Directors Meeting

May 1, 2024

Draft Meeting Minutes

PRESENT:

Directors

Bantilan, Cory – Chair
Albano, Byron – Treasurer
Anselm, Arne – Secretary
Burnes, Rick
Jackson, Steve
Reely, Blaine
Yurosek, Derek
Williams, Das
Williams, Debby
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 2:01 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.

Incoming Director Steve Jackson introduced himself and thanked the Board for the

opportunity to serve. Mr. Jackson was recently appointed by the Cuyama Basin Water District in place of former Director Matt Vickery who resigned from the Board.

5. Election of Vice Chair

Chair Bantilan noted that a Vice Chair needs to be appointed since former Vice Chair Matt Vickery resigned from the Board.

MOTION

Director Reely made a motion to appoint Derek Yurosek as Vice Chair. The motion was seconded by Director Anselm, a roll call vote was made and passed with 100%.

AYES:	Albano, Anselm, Bantilan, Burnes, Jackson, Reely, Das Williams, Debby Williams, Wooster, Yurosek, Zenger
NOES:	None
ABSTAIN:	None
ABSENT:	None

6. Standing Advisory Committee Meeting Report

Standing Advisory Committee (SAC) Chair Brenton Kelly provided a report on the April 25, 2024, SAC meeting and is included below:

Submitted to the CBGSA Board of Directors on May 1st, 2024 By Brenton Kelly, SAC Chair The Standing Advisory Committee met at the Family Resource Center in a hybrid format, with five Committee Members present in-person and two on the conference line and one Committee Member absent. GSA Staff Taylor Blakeslee and legal counsel Alex Domínguez were present with assistance from Elijah Banda, and they were joined by Jim Beck and Brian Van Lienden on the call. Several public members were in the room and on the video conference line.

It was mentioned in public comment that the Cuyama Basin Groundwater Sustainability Agency has developed a "Cuyama Groundwater Basin Well Issue Reporting Form" that was emailed to stakeholders and is included on the CBGSA website at <https://cuyamabasin.org/resources>. This reporting, regarding dry and failing wells is vitally helpful for understanding current groundwater conditions in the basin. The Committee discussed how important it is for the GSA to pursue informing people about reporting any dry wells.

Due to an unfortunate mistake, SAC was unable to review and adopt the final edits of Chapter 3 & 5. The Committee spent more than 30 minutes in discussion of edits before a mistake was recognized that the wrong draft version was included in the Packet.

11d. Discuss and Take Appropriate Action on Data Management System Update Options

The SAC approved all the items currently planned for in the update of the DMS, like the automatic integration with publicly available GAMA, CASGEM and ILP data. A number of Committee Members were interested in the additional public facing Allocation vs. Actual Pumping Data tracker that would not violate property owners' data privacy.

Legal Council Alex Dominges said that there are certain protections for public utilities information but if you are over an allocation it would have to be shared. Taylor said last year's Allocations Use Report is posted on the website.

Committee Member DeBranch commented these opportunities are grant funded and implementing 'bells and whistles' with grant funds may be great but the groundwater sustainability agency (GSA) will ultimately be responsible for funding programs long term.

11e. Discuss and Take Appropriate Action on Website Update Options

The SAC approved the \$9000 website update. It was agreed that a transition from the development to the Implementation phase of the GSP calls for a new web display. The Resource page is overloaded and it could be made much easier to navigate.

12a. Update on GSP Component Schedule

The SAC accepts the revised schedule and recognizes the compressed timeline to meet our submission deadline in January 2025.

12b. Authorize 90-Day Notice to Cities and Counties for an Amendment to the GSP and Set a Public Hearing on November 6, 2024

The SAC approved the required 90-day Notice for the Public Hearing on November 6th.

12c. Discuss and Take Appropriate Action on Project and Management Action Options

The SAC approved the Projects and Management Actions that are currently Included in the GSP. As for the two new projects for consideration the following opinions were shared.

New Projects for Consideration:

- Flow Meter Recalibration Program

Committee member Caufield questioned the realistic effort of the +/- 5% accuracy goal both technically and financially. Dave Lewis asked if the cost of this policy would fall on the pumpers. Jim Beck said that first a policy plan would need to be worked out before possible funding could be pursued. The SAC recognized the need for Quality Control of flow meter data while avoiding additional financial burdens on top of the property owners' initial cost to install the mandated flow meters. There was general concern that this could be a significant cost to property owners. Taylor replied that no cost estimates are available at this time.

- Rangeland and Forest Management

The Committee recognized the challenges of this project and supported Staff recommendation to not pursue controlled burning in the foothills any further. However, the discussion continued with strong support for the idea of 'Vegetative Management' in the central valley for invasive weed control using prescribed grazing instead of burning. The SAC recommends that grazing management be investigated as a possible solution.

12d. Discuss and Take Appropriate Action on Basin-Wide Water Management

It was explained to us that for this familiar item, at this time, we should focus on the geographic questions that need answers now, while being aware of the policy considerations that will need to be answered next time. The question at the moment was: How many sub-regions to develop individual water budgets for within the basin wide Groundwater Model?

The SAC expresses a variety of opinions regarding the number of sub-regions to be considered. John Caulfield asked for clarification on how the grazing lands and unirrigated croplands will be treated differently than the irrigated acreage? This was a good example of the policy questions for next time. How to track and treat different Land Use?

Robbie Jaffe reflected on how these four areas look a lot like the way we started looking at the basin going back to the USGS in 2014. The problem has always been an issue of 'Data Gaps'. Robbie hoped that the GSA can benefit from the drilling log reports from the 11,000 foot deep exploratory oil well being proposed for drilling in the northwest end of the Basin right now. This data could provide greater understanding of the regional hydrogeology. Anticipating the policy questions ahead, Robbie felt strongly that it would be necessary to identify what type of irrigation is taking place since each farming type and crop uses different amounts of water per acre. She suggests a tiered approach to identify Irrigated lands by amount of the water use

Brian reminded us that currently, Land Use is only identifies as either Irrigated or Non-Irrigated and this is what the Board directed. Taylor said this map will be refined as the land use component is refined in the model.

Joe Haslett suggested that in the west end, each tributary acts unique to the others. The northwest is where they combine with the Cuyama Groundwater at the river. Joe suggested the need to consider bifurcating the west into two or more regions because all the drainages act differently. To manage the area as a whole is not realistic since there are so many different sources and types of water across the region with different dynamics in each canyon. As an example, he highlighted Schoolhouse Canyon vs Cottonwood Canyon.

Vice Chair Brad DeBranch suggested that this subdivision was putting the cart before the horse, because the Basin needs to be managed as one whole. As we are studying the science behind connectivity across these faults, we should consider the Basin as one whole and assume its interconnected. He thought that to study how these 4 regions may be unique and how they might be managed individually was premature. He asked "how can you have multiple management areas with different budgets if they are assumed to be connected".

Brian assured the SAC that the whole Basin Water Budget could be divided up in any number of discrete parts as needed for Basin wide management. The Question was How many? How complex? How simple?

Comments from the Public:

Jane Wooster pointed out that the yellow areas were all parcels outside the orange CMA that chose to be part of the Operational Area and managed as a Farming Unit within the CMA.

Lynn Carlisle suggested that if we go forward with 4 separate water budgets there would need to be strong justification for the setting of those boundaries. The precise location of the Fault lines for example are still in discussion. It was agreed that it would be best if these lines would not need to move during implementation of the GSP.

Adam Lovgren asked If I were in the purple area and my well was being impacted by larger nearby pumpers what can I do? How to determine who is responsible for the drawdown. Answer: All the areas adjacent to the CMA are in that situation and it is a policy consideration that needs to be addressed very soon.

The Committee Members were polled on their recommendation regarding the number of Management area:

- Robbie Jaffe felt that a more granular approach with the water budget analysis would provide valuable information, especially since the western and northwestern areas are so different. She is in favor of 5 Management Areas.
- Jean Gaillard felt that the whole central area should be managed as one MA. He was in favor of only having 3 total areas.
- John Caufield agreed with Jean on 3 MAs.
- Joe Haslett felt that the CMA was the only cause of the overdraft problem and only 1 MA was needed at this point while monitoring continues basin wide.
- Karen Adams agreed with Joe that the entire valley is not evenly interconnected, and is in support of having 1 MA focused on the only place where there is an obvious problem.
- Brad DeBranch was in favor of 1 MA for the entire interconnected Basin.
- Dave Lewis abstained on a number due to other bigger policy concerns
- Chair Kelly agrees with Robbie and supports 3 or more MAs that would more accurately reflect the unique hydrological characteristics of the Cuyama Basin

12e. Discuss and Take Appropriate Action on GSP Draft Chapters: [Final Discussion] Chapter 3. Undesirable Results & Chapter 5. Sustainability Management Criteria

I wish I could report on the robust discussion SAC to adopt these two Chapters, but I can't. I can report that your Stakeholder Advisory Committee read the many pages in the packet and could not advance staff recommendation for adoption. After serious discussions of disapproval, a text version mistake was realized. Although apologies were made by Staff for the unfortunate time wasted, we wish for all of you to recognize that the SAC Members are the voluntary and unpaid local Quality Control agents of this GSA, not grant funded copy editors. And we encourage you to read the packet carefully.

14a. Technical Updates on Fault Investigation Study

As the Fault Investigation studies continue to consume time and resources, this update did not bring much clarity to the questions that persist. Such as: What effect do the fault zones have on groundwater flow? What does it mean if there is “low resistivity data to the south juxtaposed with high resistivity to the north and another subvertical steeply dipping fault or fault splay to the north” (slide 97)? It now appears that we are less confident about where the east end of the SBC Fault is even located? Shouldn’t all this be determined before Management Area boundaries are set in the new GSP? Various members of the SAC and the Public expressed frustration with the inconclusive outcome of this ongoing Investigation, and that important decisions need to be made right now anyway.

14b. Technical Update on the Water Resources Model

Staff is on track to release a new calibrated Water Resources Model by the end of June and is expecting some changes in the new outputs. The current question is why the self-reported metered pumping data was 30% less than the Model projections in both 2022 & 2023. The discrepancy appears to be in the lower water use land crops, the non-irrigated rangeland and the smaller pumpers. Brian expects the reported yield changes will impact the model but they will not likely change the Sustainably Yield

16. Directors’ Forum

Committee Member Jaffe asked about the transparency of the new well permitting process with the hydrological study and Staff review. Robbie would like to see this info appear online. Taylor reminded the SAC that the policy is only for new wells, any replacement well does not require a study or Board approval.

*Respectfully submitted,
Brenton Kelly, SAC Chairperson*

**7. Approve Woodard & Curran Contract Change Order for Monitoring Well Installation
Recommended Motion**

Mr. Blakslee reported that the requested approval of a change order is due to unanticipated costs for the installation for the grant-funded dedicated monitoring well. He reported that the costs totaling \$177,698 is required for traffic control per Caltrans and is reimbursable by the existing grant.

Director Wooster asked if staff attempted to move the site locations onto private property, and W&C hydrogeologist Jim Strandberg reported that staff did try this avenue first, but were unable to get approval from nearby landowners and therefore ended up moving sites in the public right-of-way.

MOTION

Director Reely made a motion to approve the W&C change order. The motion was seconded by Director Debby Williams, a roll call vote was made and passed with 100%.

AYES: Albano, Anselm, Bantilan, Burnes, Jackson, Reely, Das Williams, Debby

	Williams, Wooster, Yurosek, Zenger
NOES:	None
ABSTAIN:	None
ABSENT:	None

CONSENT AGENDA

8-10. Consent Agenda

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

Director Jackson said the minutes incorrectly state a motion failed with 88% and should have read it passed.

Director Yurosek asked for a report on the grant reimbursement schedule in the financials and Mr. Blakslee reported that a few invoices have been submitted later than expected to the California Department of Water Resources (DWR) and staff is ensuring futures invoices are submitted in a timely manner. He also noted that DWR grant manager Chris Martinez recently left DWR, and they are trying to backfill those positions which has also contributed to reimbursement delays.

Director Yurosek noted that the Board packet included over 100 pages of receipts and said they Board does not need to see that level of detail going forward and Chair Bantilan agreed and said they can be summarized going forward.

Director Wooster said motion on the basin-wide water management issue should have included a statement that the Cuyama Basin Groundwater Sustainability Agency (CBGSA) would be managing irrigated ground and not grazing ground. Mr. Blakslee said that should have been included in the motion and staff will check this and make the appropriate correction.

MOTION

Director Yurosek made a motion to approve the consent agenda item nos. 8-10, with the corrections noted above. The motion was seconded by Director Anselm, a roll call vote was made and passed with 100%.

AYES:	Albano, Anselm, Bantilan, Burnes, Jackson, Reely, Das Williams, Debby Williams, Wooster, Yurosek, Zenger
NOES:	None
ABSTAIN:	None
ABSENT:	None

ACTION ITEMS

11. Groundwater Sustainability Plan Implementation

a. Discuss and Take Appropriate Action on the Fiscal Year 2024-2025 Budget and Cash Flow

Mr. Blakslee provided an overview of Fiscal Year 24-25 Budget and Cash flow which is included in the packet.

Director Yurosek asked if a rate comparison was reviewed by the ad hoc. Mr. Blakslee reported that a 5 percent rate increase for W&C was reviewed by the ad hoc, but Hallmark Group rates were not reviewed. He reported that Jim Beck's rate is not changing and his rate may have increased but he will check on that and include a rate comparison analysis for future budget ad hoc review.

MOTION

Director Anselm made a motion to approve the Fiscal Year 2024-2025 Budget and Cash Flow. The motion was seconded by Director Blaine Reeley, a roll call vote was made and passed with 100%.

AYES: Albano, Anselm, Bantilan, Burnes, Jackson, Reely, Das Williams, Debby Williams, Wooster, Yurosek, Zenger

NOES: None

ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: None

b. Discuss and Take Appropriate Action on Strategy for Setting Future Groundwater Extraction Fees

Mr. Blakslee reported that during the Budget ad hoc review of the cash flow staff discussed the strategy of setting future fees and review several fee setting strategies with the ad hoc. The ad hoc recommended the strategy for setting future fees be discussed with the entire Board to provide policy direction for setting future fees. He also noted that ins in past fee setting discussions, the CBGSA Board directed staff to target an ending fiscal year cash flow balance of approximately \$200,000.

Steve Jackson commented he prefers to keep fees as low, for as long as possible.

Director Yurosek commented he is concerned about financing on the front end and financing for others as some landowners will be reducing quicker than others

Stakeholder Ray Shady asked about the use of cash and if there are any projects previously discussed that could be reassessed with the available cash.

Das commented that he prefers option no. one and it is better to prevent steep increases in fees.

Director Jane Wooster asked if there should be a defined benefit to the fees that are assessed. Legal Counsel Alex Dominguez responded that the current fees are set under

the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA) for the purpose of administering the GSA and components of the Groundwater Sustainability Plan (GSP). He said there is a fine line between code section 10730, which we rely on, and 10730.2 and other mechanisms that are available to the GSA to collect fees. He said the fees we are collecting are for the administration of the GSA and project-specific costs will require an in-depth discussion regarding who is benefiting from the project.

Director Byron Albano said he prefers Option 1 and scale up steadily over time and noted he does not like option 2. He also noted that the adjudication may require the CBGSA to maintain a sufficient cash balance.

Director Jane Wooster commented that there should be a discussion of whether the ending cash balance target of \$200,000 may not be sufficient and Director Debby Williams concurred.

MOTION

Director Albano made a motion to approve option 1. The motion was seconded by Director Debby Williams, a roll call vote was made and passed with a 69% vote.

AYES: Albano, Anselm, Bantilan, Burnes, Reely, Vickery, Das Williams, Debby Williams
 NOES: Wooster, Jackson, Yurosek, Zenger
 ABSTAIN: None
 ABSENT: None

Chair Bantilan reported that staff will bring this back up for discussion prior to approval of next Fiscal Year's budget.

c. Discuss and Take Appropriate Action on Consultant Task Orders for Fiscal Year 2024-2025

Mr. Blakslee reported that the consultant contracts are based on the amounts approved in the budget and include rate sheets for each consultant. He also noted that due to a timing issue, Provost & Pritchard's contract for groundwater monitoring will be brought to the Board in July 2024.

MOTION

Director Anselm made a motion to approve Hallmark Group and Woodard & Curran task orders for Fiscal Year 2024-2025. The motion was seconded by Director Reely, a roll call vote was made and passed with 100%.

AYES: Albano, Anselm, Bantilan, Burnes, Jackson, Reely, Das Williams, Debby Williams, Wooster, Yurosek, Zenger
 NOES: None
 ABSTAIN: None
 ABSENT: None

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

Mr. Van Lienden provided an overview of potential updates to the data management system (DMS) which are included in the Board Packet.

SAC Chair Kelly provided the SAC report on this item.

Director Wooster asked if the DMS is the same program used as other GSAs and if there is a cost savings? She also asked if there will be ongoing costs for this program. Mr. Van Lienden responded that the DMS built for Cuyama has already benefited from efficiencies of the work done for other basins and does not anticipate additional, ongoing costs once the improvements have been made.

Director Zenger asked who is completing the integration and asked for a detailed statement of work with costs for this integration.

Director Derek Yurosek commented that the DMS should not give any more information than it has to. He also said he is cautious on access and agrees with requesting a statement of work.

Director Byron Albano commented that a timeframe function would be helpful in querying data and is ok with integrating data, and querying, but not the additional options presented.

Chair Bantilan requested staff bring back a detailed statement of work at the July 2024 meeting.

e. Website Update Options

Mr. Blakslee provided an overview of the plan to update the website. He reported that the website was designed during GSP development, and the proposed redesign will transition the website to a GSP implementation phase will optimize access to data with a focus on current, relevant issues in the basin.

SAC Chair Kelly provided the SAC report on this item.

MOTION

Director Wooster made a motion to approve the website restructuring. The motion was seconded by Director Debby Williams, a roll call vote was made and passed with 100%.

AYES: Albano, Anselm, Bantilan, Burnes, Jackson, Reely, Das Williams, Debby Williams, Wooster, Yurosek, Zenger

NOES: None

ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: None

12. Groundwater Sustainability Plan Amendment Components

a. Update on GSP Component Schedule

Mr. Blakslee provided an update on the GSP component schedule and noted that minor changes to the schedule and said the project is still on schedule, but the slack has been used up and any potential changes to the schedule may result in requiring additional special meetings.

Director Wooster noted that she is concerned with asking the Board to make decisions on basin-wide water management and boundaries issues when there is not time for peer review of the model. She said W&C will need time to perform quality control and quality assurance and is worried about the timeline proposed.

Director Anselm said this is not the only GSA that has used up all its slack in the schedule and we need to keep moving forward.

b. Authorize 90-Day Notice to Cities and Counties for an Amendment to the GSP and Set a Public Hearing on November 6, 2024

Legal Counsel Alex Dominguez provided an overview of the 90-day notice requirement to amend the GSP.

SAC Chair Kelly provided the SAC report on this item.

MOTION

Director Arnie Anselm made a motion to authorize 90-Day Notice. The motion was seconded by Director Debby Williams, a roll call vote was made and passed with 100%.

AYES:	Albano, Anselm, Bantilan, Burnes, Jackson, Reely, Das Williams, Debby Williams, Wooster, Yurosek, Zenger
NOES:	None
ABSTAIN:	None
ABSENT:	None

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

Mr. Beck provided an overview of current projects and management actions in the GSP.

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.

SAC Chair Kelly provided the SAC report on this item.

Director Anselm commented that he has managed a certified meter calibration program in the Fox Canyon Groundwater Management Agency (FCGMA) and while it can be burdensome, it is a good idea to add a consideration for low volume flows. He said he has had some users with spare meters sitting unused on the shelf and after three years they would be out of calibration even if they were not used. He also noted that if meters go out of calibration, they start measuring high so there is an incentive to keep them calibrated.

Director Jane Wooster commented that the State requires meter calibration every five years.

Chair Bantilan asked how accurate flow meters can get and Director Anselm said meters can measure within 5 percent accuracy.

Mr. Beck reminded the Board that staff is looking for direction to start the process on which programs to include in the GSP and the program does not need to be fully defined today.

Director Yurosek said the calibration is simpler, but the most important is the proper installation of a flow meter. He said the water district may have some opportunities that the CBGSA can utilize and encouraged W&C to coordinate with EKI on potential grant opportunities.

Director Albano commented that it is important to have a metering program and it will be very important to ensure the program is written correctly to achieve its objective without driving up costs.

Director Wooster said calibrating meters is important to a point, but expressed concern with creating a new regulatory requirement that may not have a benefit to all users.

Poll for Including Flow Meter Calibration:

All Directors responded yes.

Poll for Including a Rangeland/Forest Management Project:

All Directors responded no.

d. Discuss and Take Appropriate Action on Basin-Wide Water Management

Mr. Beck provided an overview of the Board direction from the March 27, 2024, meeting to “continue with cutbacks in the Central Management Area (CMA) while we create water budgets based on physical features and modeling data for the entire basin with the view to balance water in the entire basin and treat grazers different than irrigators.” He presented a draft map for Board input on how staff planned to report on water usage by different areas to assist in the discussion of basin-wide water management to occur at the July 2024 Board meeting.

Director Yurosek disagreed with the motion staff captured from the March 27, 2024 meeting and said the Board said “water budget” singular and not “water budgets.”

Chair Bantilan suggested the Board consider recording future meetings in Teams.

Director Wooster also expressed concern with the material presented to consider managing the entire basin, and not just the irrigated areas.

Legal Counsel Alex Dominguez responded that the staff interpreted the motion as best as they could and came up with the four potential areas to consider water management in the basin for the Board to consider action on developing a water budget or budgets.

Director Jackson asked staff if the basin is considered one basin, and Mr. Beck replied that

staff's understanding is that it is one basin because that is how it is defined by DWR. However, there may be discrete regions in the basin depending on the results of additional technical work being done in the basin including the fault investigation study.

Director Wooster commented that the basin is complex and described several unique geologic and hydrologic differences in the basin. She said the basin is not a bowl with a flat bottom and said it is conceivable that there are portions of the basin where water can work itself down to a deeper portion and not work its way back up and she believes this is true between Ventucopa and the CMA and the CMA and the west end. She said complicating things are numerous faults (not just the Russell or Santa Barbara Canyon faults) and springs. She said a lot of springs on the lower end have dried out because they are conceivable interconnected to the CMA and noted that Cuyama is a very complicated basin.

Director Albano said the basin may be interconnected in a variety of ways, but asked if the Ventucopa area was severely overdraft in the future would you manage just the Ventucopa area, or the entire basin? Mr. Beck responded that SGMA gives you the tools to manage discrete areas in the GSA to attain sustainability. He said if a portion of the basin becomes unsustainable in the future, he believes it would be appropriate to take discrete actions for portions of the basin and commented that SGMA gives you the tools to manage localized areas in a basin differently depending on the conditions occurring in those areas.

Stakeholder Steph Morris introduced herself and said she grew up in the Valley for 17 years and said she is a groundwater rights attorney that has done two groundwater adjudications and have been working for over 20 years. She said legislation never ends up how you want it to, and this is a very complicated piece of the law, but a good thing about SGMA is that it intends to leave control and management in the hands of the locals. She said the basin is not a giant bathtub. She said she represents clients in the Cuyama groundwater adjudication. She went on to read several documents from the CBSGA or comments that attorneys from Bolthouse made. She said in the adopted GSP, it states total basin-wide pumping may be required to be reduced by 50-67 percent with a major proportion of pumping reduction required in the CMA. She said there is already an acknowledgement of more than one management area. She noted that pumping reductions were only set in the CMA, and the GSP would need to determine the sustainable yield for this portion of the basin that is less than the sustainable yield for the entire basin. She also reported that this Board directed its staff to intervene in the adjudication and in the courts findings and said later phases of this adjudication may be used to determine whether management areas should be utilized or not and whether the Basin should be differentially or homogeneously managed. She said the Board received a letter today she surmised that subbasins and management areas are not different and the court excluded them, but they did not. She said as a public agency, it is critical to support the people who live and work in this Valley and to do the right thing for the Basin and to promote and protect the plan that you adopted.

Director Wooster asked Ms. Morris who she represented, and she said several landowners in Ventucopa including Mr. Wegis, Reyes and Albano.

The Groundwater Extraction Fee Public Hearing occurred at 4:30 p.m.

Stakeholder Ray Shady said he manages the North Fork Vineyard and Santa Barbara Highlands Vineyard. He said he was concerned with discussions on a uniform approach to preventing undesirable results and was pleased to see the discussion of management areas to come back up for discussion. He said it is important to consider the geology in the basin that creates perches of water and noted that the Ventucopa basin fills up very quickly in the rainy seasons and it is important to further study the connectivity of different areas in the basin. Chair Bantilan asked what Mr. Shady was advocating for and he responded that he would recommend the same delineations that were represented in the threshold regions.

SAC Chair Kelly provided the SAC report on this item.

Jim Wegis asked if the Board is trying to make management decisions of the entire basin without the results of all the recent technical data. Chair Bantilan said the Board has to wrestle with making a decision now or wait a number of years for now. Mr. Wegis asked what happens if the data proves the decision wrong and Chair Bantilan said the GSP can be amended to make changes based on new technical data. Director Wooster said the Board does not need to decide this issue now and should continue exploring the situation in the basin.

Stakeholder Mark Ellsworth asked if the Board is rejecting the results of phase one of the adjudication where the court rejected the concept of subbasins at the faults. Chair Bantilan responded that no, the Board is considering the issue of management areas. Mr. Ellsworth commented that areas upstream of the CMA does effect the sustainability of the CMA and is concerned that one group of pumpers will be disproportionately burdened with achieving sustainability for the entire basin.

Stakeholder Matt Vickery commented that he was surprised staff interpreted the March 2024 motion they way they did and said it feels like we are trying to speed up decisions that we are not ready for. He urged the board to wait until there is more information and the model before breaking management down by discrete areas and it should be treated as one basin until that technical work is complete.

Director Zenger said the information being presented today looks very similar to option 3 from the March 2024 meeting that did not have the majority of votes in the poll, and said she is very disappointed with what staff brought back and did not reflect the intent of Director Wooster's motion in March.

Director Derek Yurosek said he believes you need management areas for projects and management actions but is frustrated with the term "water budgets." He said the sustainable yield should be a basin-wide number that should be allocated basin-wide. He said he is not comfortable discussing management areas until the Board deals with the

native yield, safe yield or water budget for the basin. He said to get the GSP passed, the Board agreed to cutbacks in the CMA sooner to allow the rest of the basin to determine what that native yield is for the basin, and said the direction being presented by staff is significantly different.

Director Albano asked if that what we are talking about and starting to discuss how to establish the native yield for different portions of the basin to make logical management decisions on how to manage those portions of the basin. He said the Board needs to determine management for local, regional water conditions and noted that the technical forum members have been advising the Board that the faults are significant. He said if Grapevine or western growers make cuts they are irrelevant for folks in the eastern portion of the basin and said he expected the Board was going to get logical about managing water in the basin and uniform pumping reductions basin-wide will not fix the overdraft problem in the basin and water needs to be managed in different regions of the basin.

Director Anslem said the decision before the Board is not setting actions in these management areas but establishing different areas to develop management actions in the future.

Mr. Beck said to-date, there is only one sustainable yield estimate for the basin. He said the Board decided to allocate a portion of the sustainable yield to the CMA to administer groundwater allocations in the CMA. He said the Board has been clear about continuing with managing the CMA, but said staff is looking to get clarity on how the unallocated sustainable yield is managed, if at all. He said staff is not using the model to pull apart the sustainable yield by areas.

Director Wooster said there is no one on the Board that is saying only the CMA should be managed without looking at the other parts of the basin and said the issue is it should not have been sectioned off that it is presented in the packet. She said the Board is saying to keep moving forward but do so with science.

Mr. Dominguez confirmed this is not a final action today, but an attempt to get direction on how to potentially manage water in different portions of the basin.

Director Wooster said the Board did not ask staff to come up with an answer on this in July or in the following month. She said it should not be a staff-directed effort but based on science.

Mr. Beck said the model will be done at the end of June 2024 and understands the Board will review the updated CMA information. He said if you want to see any other information to direct staff and we will present that. Director Wooster replied they would like to see everything staff has, and Mr. Beck said we cannot provide the raw model data files and need to know what the Board wants.

Director Yurosek said he disagrees with Mr. Beck's statement that the Board has approved an allocation to the CMA based on the sustainable yield and said he would like to see

where the Board has provided that action. Mr. Beck said he disagrees, and staff can present how the allocation that was implemented by the Board that includes the sustainable yield portion for the CMA. Director Yurosek said the number was never agreed to by the Board, an while it was part of the math calculation for determining the ramp-down, was never agreed to.

Director Arne Anslem said he never met a hydrogeologist that has enough data and we have had technical folks that have looked at these lines. He also said the Board will not get an extension on submitting the five-year evaluation to DWR, and the Board needs to be mindful of the decisions we need to make.

Director Byron Albano said staff did take the Board's direction and looked at the physical features in the basin and the technical forum has been advising on this for some time and saying the faults are significant in the basin. He said divvying up the sustainable yield by every acre in the basin is completely inappropriate to do so.

Director Wooster said they did not instruct staff to get rid of the threshold regions but told staff we want to look at the physical features and look at data and figure out what to do. She said the data is not available yet and we need to move forward with the plan. She said she is not arguing that these two faults are not significant features, but we need to commit to analyzing the physical features and do not want staff second guessing what those are before we get the data which.

Chair Bantilan said he does not believe that is what staff did. He said they came back with a map and it is fine if we disagree with the map and can provide direction on how to look at different portions of the basin.

Director Wooster said staff has reported that the Santa Barbara Canyon fault (SBCF) has moved but are still trying to draw it on a map. Chair Bantilan noted the fault update is later in the agenda and asked W&C for a brief update.

Mr. Strandberg provided a brief update on the results of the Santa Barbara Canyon fault study and the potential movement of the fault over Hwy 33 where the USGS previously inferred the fault to be.

Director Burnes requested that staff develop options based on science and data and to do so in a clear and concise manner.

Chair Bantilan took a poll of the Board on this issue to determine how the Board would like to handle this issue in July 2024.

Board Poll

1. Director Burnes – Discussion today was good but need more data.
2. Director Jackson – Need more information on water moving across the faults and recommend no discussion in July 2024.
3. Director Katelyn – Support a basin-wide approach until the data says otherwise.
4. Director Wooster – Nothing additional to add.

5. Director Reely – Move down the road to delineate management areas based on physical features and the modeling data. Management area strategies should be considered acknowledging the differences in the basin (i.e. Ventucopa, main basin, etc.).
6. Director Debby Williams – Look at whole area and then decide what we need for management areas at a later time.
7. Director Yurosek – Said the Board needs to address the basin safe yield, native yield.
8. Director Elliott – Recommended the status quo for the GSP update and not discuss until the technical data is complete.
9. Director Albano – Agrees with Director Reely and Elliott.
10. Chair Bantilan – Agreed with pulling this off of next month’s agenda and figure out at a later date.

Mr. Beck said he wants to ensure staff has very specific direction from the Board and said he believes the following captures the wishes of the Board to come back with updated model data for two areas, (1) the CMA plus farming units modified by the model, (2) the sustainable yield for the rest of the basin, (3) staff to draft a simple addition to the pumping allocation project to say we will continue investigation of management areas.

Director Wooster said we need to include language in the GSP to reflect the March 2024 Board direction to look at other areas in the basin and look at the physical features and the modeling to see what we need to do with the water situation in those areas.

MOTION

Director Wooster made a motion to include language in the update [GSP] to reflect what we decided at the last meeting that we are going to look at the other areas of the basin and look at their physical features and the modeling to see what we need to do with the water situation in those areas. The motion was seconded by Director Debby Williams, a roll call vote was made and passed with 100%.

AYES:	Albano, Anselm, Bantilan, Burnes, Jackson, Reely, Das Williams, Debby Williams, Wooster, Yurosek, Zenger
NOES:	None
ABSTAIN:	None
ABSENT:	None

e. Discuss and Take Appropriate Action on GSP Draft Chapters

Mr. Van Lienden provided an overview of Chapters 3: Undesirable Results, and Chapter 5: Minimum Thresholds, Measurable Objectives, and Interim Milestones which are provided in the packet for consideration of approval.

Stakeholder Ray Shady commented he was concerned with the removal of any language related to threshold regions that were eliminated in setting sustainable management criteria using a common methodology.

Director Wooster said she did not feel prepared to vote on these chapters at this time.

Director Yurosek asked staff what the intent of staff is in removing the threshold regions and Mr. Van Lienden reported that the Chapters follow the Board direction from the January 2024 meeting and threshold regions are no longer applicable to the method in setting sustainable management criteria.

Director Albano said he is uncomfortable voting on these chapters at this time before the Board discusses if additional management areas are going to be created. He said he is concerned with efforts to remove references that describe the differences in the basin.

Chair Bantilan requested Chapters 3 and 5 be deferred to the July 2024 agenda.

REPORT ITEMS

13. Administrative Updates

a. Report of the Executive Director

Mr. Beck provided an update on Hallmark Group progress, next steps, and an overview of the CBGSA's expenses and budget-to-actuals, which are included in the Board packet.

b. Report of the General Counsel

Nothing to report.

14. Technical Updates

a. Fault Investigation Study

Mr. Strandberg provided an update on the fault investigation study which is included in the packet.

b. Water Resources Model Update

Mr. Van Lienden provided an update on the model timeline which is included in the Board packet.

c. Update on Groundwater Sustainability Plan Activities

Mr. Van Lienden provided an update on the accomplishments for January and February 2024 which are provided in the Board packet.

d. Update on Grant-Funded Projects

Mr. Van Lienden provided an update on grant-funded projects 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.

PUBLIC HEARING

19. PUBLIC HEARING: Groundwater Extraction Fee

Chair Bantian opened the public groundwater extraction fee hearing.

Mr. Beck reported that on May 3, 2023, the CBGSA held a public rate hearing and adopted a \$12 per acre-foot groundwater extraction fee to fund the cost of the CBGSA's groundwater management program, including the cost of implementing, its GSP, investigation of groundwater conditions, compliance assistance, enforcement, and program administration. He said the proposed Fiscal Year 2024-2025 fee reduction to \$5 per acre-foot is based on reported 2023 water use and the Fiscal Year 2024-2025 budget. He said prior to setting a groundwater extraction fee, this public hearing will provide an opportunity for the Board to receive and consider any public comment on the proposed fee.

Mr. Blakslee reported no written comments were received.

Stakeholder Jim Wegis requested the CBGSA to think about the assessments as if you were spending your own money.

Chair Bantilan closed public comment.

20. Consider for Approval Resolution No. 2024-051 Setting a Groundwater Extraction Fee for Fiscal Year 2024-2025 and Authorize Invoicing of Landowners

Mr. Blakslee reported that resolution No. 2024-051 reduces the Fiscal Year 2024-2025 groundwater extraction fee from \$12 per acre-foot to \$5 per acre-foot.

Director Derek Yurosek commented that since there is such a high cash balance he recommends setting the fee at \$0 per acre-foot. Mr. Beck recommended avoiding a negative cash balance due to the timing of DWR reimbursements.

MOTION

Director Burnes made a motion to approve the proposed reduced fee of \$5 per acre-foot. The motion was seconded by Director Albano, a roll call vote was made and passed with 100%.

AYES: Albano, Anselm, Bantilan, Burnes, Jackson, Reely, Das Williams, Debby Williams, Wooster, Yurosek, Zenger

NOES: None

ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: None

CLOSED SESSION

21. Closed Session

At 7:05 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.

22. Adjourn


Chair Bantilan adjourned the meeting at 8:34 PM.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE
CUYAMA BASIN GROUNDWATER SUSTAINABILITY AGENCY

Chair: _____

ATTEST:

Secretary: _____



Cuyama Basin Groundwater Sustainability Agency
Board of Directors Special Meeting

May 23, 2024

Draft Special Meeting Minutes

PRESENT:

Directors

Bantilan, Cory – Chair
Albano, Byron – Treasurer
Anselm, Arne – Secretary
Burnes, Rick
DeBranch, Brad
Klinchuch, Matt – Alternate for Vickery, Matt
Reely, Blaine – Alternate for Paulding, Jimmy
Elliot, Darcel – Alternate for Williams, Das
Williams, Debby
Wooster, Jane
Yurosek, Derek
Zenger, Katelyn – Alternate for Scrivner, Zack

Staff

Beck, Jim – Executive Director
Blakslee, Taylor – Assistant Executive Director
Dominguez, Alex – Legal Counsel
Hughes, Joe – Legal Counsel

ABSENT:

None

1. Call to Order

Cuyama Basin Groundwater Sustainability Agency (CBGSA) Chair Cory Bantilan called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.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.

REPORT ITEMS

- 5. Public comment for Items Not on the Agenda**
Nothing to report.

CLOSED SESSION

- 6. Conference with Legal Counsel – Anticipation Litigation**
Significant Exposure to Litigation Pursuant to Government Code section 54956.9(d)(2)
 - a. Number of Potential Cases: One

- 7. Conference with Legal Counsel – Existing Litigation**
Pursuant to Government Code section 54956.9(d)(1)
 - a. Bolthouse Land Company, LLC, et al v. All Persons Claiming a Right to Extract or Store Groundwater in the Cuyama Valley Groundwater Basin (BCV-21-101927)

At this point in the meeting, the Board returned to open session. No reportable action was taken.

- 8. Adjourn**
Chair Bantilan adjourned the meeting at 10:36 a.m.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE
CUYAMA BASIN GROUNDWATER SUSTAINABILITY AGENCY

Chair: _____

ATTEST:

Secretary: _____



TO: Board of Directors
 Agenda Item No. 7

FROM: Taylor Blakslee, Hallmark Group

DATE: July 31, 2024

SUBJECT: Approve Payment of Bills for April, May, and June 2024

Recommended Motion

Approve payment of the bills for April, May, and June 2024 in the amount of \$1,641,153.

Discussion

Consultant invoices for the months of April, May, and June 2024 are summarized below for consideration of Board approval.

Expense	April	May	June	Totals
BC2 Environmental - Monitoring wells	\$237,303	\$229,887	\$367,652	\$834,842
W&C – Technical support services	\$187,468	\$274,806	\$221,986	\$684,260
Hallmark – Executive Director services	\$22,670	\$17,820	\$12,378	\$52,868
P&P – Quarterly Groundwater levels	\$9,745	\$1,172	\$0	\$10,917
Klein – Legal services	\$13,846	\$17,678	\$13,592	\$45,116
USGS - Stream gauges	\$0	\$0	\$13,150	\$13,150
TOTALS	\$471,032	\$541,363	\$628,758	\$1,641,153



TO: Board of Directors
Agenda Item No. 8

FROM: Taylor Blakslee, Hallmark Group

DATE: July 31, 2024

SUBJECT: Approve Financial Reports for April, May, and June 2024

Recommended Motion

Approve financial reports for April, May, and June 2024.

Discussion

The Cuyama Basin Groundwater Sustainability Agency's financial reports for April, May and June 2024 are provided as Attachment 1, Attachment 2, and Attachment 3, respectively.

The reports include:

- Statement of Financial Position
- Receipts and Disbursements
- A/R Aging Summary
- A/P Aging Summary
- Statement of Operations with Budget Variance
- 2023/2024 Operating Budget



Cuyama Basin GSA

Financial Statements

April 2024

CUYAMA BASIN GSA
Statement of Financial Position
As of April 30, 2024

	Apr 30, 24	Apr 30, 23	\$ Change	% Change
ASSETS				
Current Assets				
Checking/Savings				
Chase - General Checking	1,392,243	893,994	498,249	56%
Total Checking/Savings	1,392,243	893,994	498,249	56%
Accounts Receivable				
Accounts Receivable	2,192,117	1,400,524	791,592	57%
Total Accounts Receivable	2,192,117	1,400,524	791,592	57%
Total Current Assets	3,584,360	2,294,519	1,289,841	56%
TOTAL ASSETS	3,584,360	2,294,519	1,289,841	56%
LIABILITIES & EQUITY				
Liabilities				
Current Liabilities				
Accounts Payable				
Accounts Payable	1,718,100	343,680	1,374,420	400%
Total Accounts Payable	1,718,100	343,680	1,374,420	400%
Other Current Liabilities				
New/Repl Well Deposits	2,000	0	2,000	100%
Total Other Current Liabilities	2,000	0	2,000	100%
Total Current Liabilities	1,720,100	343,680	1,376,420	401%
Total Liabilities	1,720,100	343,680	1,376,420	401%
Equity				
Unrestricted Net Assets	2,080,948	1,115,300	965,648	87%
Net Income	-216,688	835,539	-1,052,227	-126%
Total Equity	1,864,260	1,950,839	-86,579	-4%
TOTAL LIABILITIES & EQUITY	3,584,360	2,294,519	1,289,841	56%

CUYAMA BASIN GSA
Receipts and Disbursements
As of April 30, 2024

Type	Date	Num	Name	Debit	Credit
Chase - General Checking					
Payment	07/07/2023	4397	Groundwater Extraction Fees:Sunrise Olive Ranch, LLC	21,138.84	
Bill Pmt -Check	07/12/2023	1145	HGCPM, Inc.		31,707.72
Bill Pmt -Check	07/12/2023	1146	Klein DeNatale Goldner		18,234.50
Bill Pmt -Check	07/12/2023	1147	Provost & Pritchard Consulting Group		6,239.42
Bill Pmt -Check	07/12/2023	1148	Woodard & Curran Inc		161,164.95
Bill Pmt -Check	07/12/2023	1149	Provost & Pritchard Consulting Group		2,005.00
Payment	07/14/2023	21532	Groundwater Extraction Fees:Cuyama Orchards, Inc	12,682.80	
Payment	07/14/2023	1867	Groundwater Extraction Fees:Highland Vineyard SB, LLC	20,109.36	
Bill Pmt -Check	09/08/2023	1150	HGCPM, Inc.		42,426.72
Bill Pmt -Check	09/08/2023	1151	Klein DeNatale Goldner		8,782.05
Bill Pmt -Check	09/08/2023	1152	Provost & Pritchard Consulting Group		7,879.96
Bill Pmt -Check	09/08/2023	1153	U.S. Geological Survey		13,150.00
Bill Pmt -Check	09/08/2023	1154	Woodard & Curran Inc		218,671.47
Payment	10/17/2023	05-251132	Department of Water Resources	391,357.90	
Deposit	10/26/2023			0.71	
Bill Pmt -Check	11/01/2023	1155	HGCPM, Inc.		32,091.98
Bill Pmt -Check	11/01/2023	1156	Klein DeNatale Goldner		14,302.50
Bill Pmt -Check	11/01/2023	1157	Provost & Pritchard Consulting Group		11,238.91
Bill Pmt -Check	11/01/2023	1158	U.S. Geological Survey		13,150.00
Bill Pmt -Check	11/01/2023	1159	Woodard & Curran Inc		246,535.78
Deposit	12/11/2023			2,400.00	
Payment	12/13/2023	05-292282	Department of Water Resources	343,515.24	
Check	12/14/2023	1160	Groundwater Extraction Fees:Bolthouse Land Co, LLC		1,558.75
Bill Pmt -Check	01/10/2024	1161	BC2 Environmental		127,485.00
Bill Pmt -Check	01/10/2024	1162	Daniells Phillips Vaughan & Bock		7,500.00
Bill Pmt -Check	01/10/2024	1163	HGCPM, Inc.		38,547.20
Bill Pmt -Check	01/10/2024	1164	Klein DeNatale Goldner		14,852.15
Bill Pmt -Check	01/10/2024	1165	Provost & Pritchard Consulting Group		10,851.89
Bill Pmt -Check	01/10/2024	1166	Woodard & Curran Inc		123,934.89
Bill Pmt -Check	01/10/2024	1167	BC2 Environmental		199,646.25
Bill Pmt -Check	01/10/2024	1168	Woodard & Curran Inc		174,799.72
Bill Pmt -Check	03/06/2024	1169	BC2 Environmental		76,350.00
Bill Pmt -Check	03/06/2024	1170	CA Assoc of Mutual Water Companies		100.00
Bill Pmt -Check	03/06/2024	1171	Daniells Phillips Vaughan & Bock		1,950.00
Bill Pmt -Check	03/06/2024	1172	HGCPM, Inc.		48,855.11
Bill Pmt -Check	03/06/2024	1173	Klein DeNatale Goldner		61,594.40
Bill Pmt -Check	03/06/2024	1174	Provost & Pritchard Consulting Group		9,780.00
Bill Pmt -Check	03/06/2024	1175	Woodard & Curran Inc		281,027.33
Payment	04/03/2024	05-374754	Department of Water Resources	445,152.88	
Total Chase - General Checking				<u>1,236,357.73</u>	<u>2,006,413.65</u>
TOTAL				<u>1,236,357.73</u>	<u>2,006,413.65</u>

**CUYAMA BASIN GSA
A/R Aging Summary
As of April 30, 2024**

	<u>Current</u>	<u>1 - 30</u>	<u>31 - 60</u>	<u>61 - 90</u>	<u>> 90</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
Department of Water Resources	<u>0</u>	<u>1,333,840</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>858,277</u>	<u>2,192,117</u>
TOTAL	<u>0</u>	<u>1,333,840</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>858,277</u>	<u>2,192,117</u>

**CUYAMA BASIN GSA
A/P Aging Summary
As of April 30, 2024**

	Current	1 - 30	31 - 60	61 - 90	> 90	TOTAL
BC2 Environmental	237,303	0	313,720	203,075	0	754,098
HGCPM, Inc.	22,670	11,063	0	22,493	0	56,226
Insurica	0	0	17,317	0	0	17,317
Klein DeNatale Goldner	13,846	0	14,630	6,491	0	34,966
Provost & Pritchard Consulting Group	9,745	728	0	830	0	11,304
U.S. Geological Survey	0	13,150	0	0	13,150	26,300
Woodard & Curran Inc	187,468	402,892	0	227,528	0	817,888
TOTAL	471,034	427,832	345,667	460,417	13,150	1,718,100

CUYAMA BASIN GSA
Statement of Operations with Budget Variance
July 2023 through April 2024

	Jul '23 - Apr 24	Budget	\$ Over Budget	% of Budget
Ordinary Income/Expense				
Income				
Direct Public Funds				
Groundwater Extraction Fees	530,133	530,133	-0	100%
Grant Reimbursements	2,636,426	3,166,068	-529,642	83%
Total Direct Public Funds	3,166,558	3,696,201	-529,643	86%
Total Income	3,166,558	3,696,201	-529,643	86%
Cost of Goods Sold				
Program Expenses				
Technical Consulting				
Monitoring Network Enhancements	1,524,209	1,759,000	-234,791	87%
GSP Implementation - W&C	88,323	175,000	-86,678	50%
Stakeholder Engagement	135,990	110,000	25,990	124%
Technical Support for DWR	0	13,332	-13,332	0%
Outreach	0	25,555	-25,555	0%
Grant Proposals	0	35,000	-35,000	0%
Grant Administration	69,446	83,332	-13,886	83%
Improve Basin Water Use Info	39,743	85,000	-45,257	47%
Project & Mgmt Action Impl	395,601	385,000	10,601	103%
5 Year GSP Update - Technical	523,469	573,708	-50,239	91%
Fault Investigation	166,721	257,500	-90,779	65%
Well Permit Review - Technical	0	10,000	-10,000	0%
Total Technical Consulting	2,943,501	3,512,427	-568,926	84%
Other Technical Consulting				
Monitoring Network	89,132	68,000	21,132	131%
Stream Gauge Maintenance	0	42,489	-42,489	0%
Total Other Technical Consulting	89,132	110,489	-21,357	81%
Total Program Expenses	3,032,633	3,622,916	-590,283	84%
Total COGS	3,032,633	3,622,916	-590,283	84%
Gross Profit	133,925	73,285	60,640	183%
Expense				
General and Administrative				
GSA Executive Director				
GSA BOD Meetings	96,525	92,831	3,694	104%
Consult Mgmt and GSP Devel	39,475	61,125	-21,650	65%
Financial Information Coor	27,763	42,797	-15,035	65%
Funding Process (GWE Fee)	7,588	4,638	2,950	164%
CBGSA Outreach	10,350	8,933	1,417	116%
Adjudication Support	3,725	1,610	2,115	231%
Management Area Admin	1,188	9,810	-8,623	12%
5-Year GSP Update - Admin	0	15,181	-15,181	0%
Water Use Enforcement	50	21,166	-21,116	0%
Well Permit Review - Admin	0	1,666	-1,666	0%
Travel and Direct Costs	183	4,743	-4,560	4%
Total GSA Executive Director	186,845	264,500	-77,655	71%
Other Administrative				
Legal	129,090	166,666	-37,576	77%
Insurance - D&O and General	17,317	16,603	714	104%
Auditing/Accounting Fees	9,450	10,000	-550	95%
Printing and Copying	3,856	0	3,856	100%
Other Admin Expense	4,054	200	3,854	2,027%
Contingency	0	16,666	-16,666	0%
Total Other Administrative	163,768	210,135	-46,367	78%
Total General and Administrative	350,613	474,635	-124,022	74%
Total Expense	350,613	474,635	-124,022	74%
Net Ordinary Income	-216,688	-401,350	184,662	54%
Net Income	-216,688	-401,350	184,662	54%

CUYAMA BASIN GSA
FY 23/24 Budget Overview
 July 2023 - June 2024

	Jul '23 - Jun 24
Ordinary Income/Expense	
Income	
Direct Public Funds	
Groundwater Extraction Fees	530,133
Grant Reimbursements	4,221,424
Total Direct Public Funds	4,751,557
Total Income	4,751,557
Cost of Goods Sold	
Program Expenses	
Technical Consulting	
Monitoring Network Enhancements	2,443,000
GSP Implementation - W&C	210,000
Stakeholder Engagement	132,000
Technical Support for DWR	16,000
Outreach	30,667
Grant Proposals	42,000
Grant Administration	100,000
Basin Water Use Surveys	102,000
Project & Mgmt Action Impl	491,000
5 Year GSP Update - Technical	688,450
Fault Investigation	330,000
Well Permit Review - Technical	12,000
Total Technical Consulting	4,597,117
Other Technical Consulting	
Monitoring Network	68,000
Stream Gauge Maintenance	56,650
Total Other Technical Consulting	124,650
Total Program Expenses	4,721,767
Total COGS	4,721,767
Gross Profit	29,790
Expense	
General and Administrative	
GSA Executive Director	
GSA BOD Meetings	111,397
Consult Mgmt and GSP Devel	73,351
Financial Information Coord	51,357
Funding Process (GWE Fee)	5,562
CBGSA Outreach	10,721
Adjudication Support	1,932
Management Area Admin	11,772
5-Year GSP Update - Admin	18,217
Water Use Enforcement	25,400
Well Permit Review - Admin	2,000
Travel and Direct Costs	5,691
Total GSA Executive Director	317,400
Other Administrative	
Legal	200,000
Insurance - D&O and General	16,603
Auditing/Accounting Fees	10,000
Other Admin Expense	200
Contingency	20,000
Total Other Administrative	246,803
Total General and Administrative	564,203
Total Expense	564,203
Net Ordinary Income	-534,413
Net Income	-534,413



Cuyama Basin GSA

Financial Statements

May 2024

CUYAMA BASIN GSA
Statement of Financial Position
As of May 31, 2024

	May 31, 24	May 31, 23	\$ Change	% Change
ASSETS				
Current Assets				
Checking/Savings				
Chase - General Checking	145,905	1,399,747	-1,253,842	-90%
Total Checking/Savings	145,905	1,399,747	-1,253,842	-90%
Accounts Receivable				
Accounts Receivable	2,363,896	1,207,900	1,155,996	96%
Total Accounts Receivable	2,363,896	1,207,900	1,155,996	96%
Total Current Assets	2,509,802	2,607,647	-97,846	-4%
TOTAL ASSETS	2,509,802	2,607,647	-97,846	-4%
LIABILITIES & EQUITY				
Liabilities				
Current Liabilities				
Accounts Payable				
Accounts Payable	1,013,124	219,352	793,772	362%
Total Accounts Payable	1,013,124	219,352	793,772	362%
Other Current Liabilities				
New/Repl Well Deposits	1,900	-598	2,498	418%
Deferred Revenue - GWE Fees	171,780	530,133	-358,353	-68%
Total Other Current Liabilities	173,680	529,535	-355,856	-67%
Total Current Liabilities	1,186,803	748,887	437,917	59%
Total Liabilities	1,186,803	748,887	437,917	59%
Equity				
Unrestricted Net Assets	2,080,948	1,115,300	965,648	87%
Net Income	-757,950	743,460	-1,501,410	-202%
Total Equity	1,322,998	1,858,761	-535,762	-29%
TOTAL LIABILITIES & EQUITY	2,509,802	2,607,647	-97,846	-4%

CUYAMA BASIN GSA
Receipts and Disbursements
As of May 31, 2024

Type	Date	Num	Name	Debit	Credit
Chase - General Checking					
Payment	07/07/2023	4397	Groundwater Extraction Fees:Sunrise Olive Ranch, LLC	21,138.84	
Bill Pmt -Check	07/12/2023	1145	HGCPM, Inc.		31,707.72
Bill Pmt -Check	07/12/2023	1146	Klein DeNatale Goldner		18,234.50
Bill Pmt -Check	07/12/2023	1147	Provost & Pritchard Consulting Group		6,239.42
Bill Pmt -Check	07/12/2023	1148	Woodard & Curran Inc		161,164.95
Bill Pmt -Check	07/12/2023	1149	Provost & Pritchard Consulting Group		2,005.00
Payment	07/14/2023	21532	Groundwater Extraction Fees:Cuyama Orchards, Inc	12,682.80	
Payment	07/14/2023	1867	Groundwater Extraction Fees:Highland Vineyard SB, LLC	20,109.36	
Bill Pmt -Check	09/08/2023	1150	HGCPM, Inc.		42,426.72
Bill Pmt -Check	09/08/2023	1151	Klein DeNatale Goldner		8,782.05
Bill Pmt -Check	09/08/2023	1152	Provost & Pritchard Consulting Group		7,879.96
Bill Pmt -Check	09/08/2023	1153	U.S. Geological Survey		13,150.00
Bill Pmt -Check	09/08/2023	1154	Woodard & Curran Inc		218,671.47
Payment	10/17/2023	05-251132	Department of Water Resources	391,357.90	
Deposit	10/26/2023			0.71	
Bill Pmt -Check	11/01/2023	1155	HGCPM, Inc.		32,091.98
Bill Pmt -Check	11/01/2023	1156	Klein DeNatale Goldner		14,302.50
Bill Pmt -Check	11/01/2023	1157	Provost & Pritchard Consulting Group		11,238.91
Bill Pmt -Check	11/01/2023	1158	U.S. Geological Survey		13,150.00
Bill Pmt -Check	11/01/2023	1159	Woodard & Curran Inc		246,535.78
Deposit	12/11/2023			2,400.00	
Payment	12/13/2023	05-292282	Department of Water Resources	343,515.24	
Check	12/14/2023	1160	Groundwater Extraction Fees:Bolthouse Land Co, LLC		1,558.75
Bill Pmt -Check	01/10/2024	1161	BC2 Environmental		127,485.00
Bill Pmt -Check	01/10/2024	1162	Daniells Phillips Vaughan & Bock		7,500.00
Bill Pmt -Check	01/10/2024	1163	HGCPM, Inc.		38,547.20
Bill Pmt -Check	01/10/2024	1164	Klein DeNatale Goldner		14,852.15
Bill Pmt -Check	01/10/2024	1165	Provost & Pritchard Consulting Group		10,851.89
Bill Pmt -Check	01/10/2024	1166	Woodard & Curran Inc		123,934.89
Bill Pmt -Check	01/10/2024	1167	BC2 Environmental		199,646.25
Bill Pmt -Check	01/10/2024	1168	Woodard & Curran Inc		174,799.72
Bill Pmt -Check	03/06/2024	1169	BC2 Environmental		76,350.00
Bill Pmt -Check	03/06/2024	1170	CA Assoc of Mutual Water Companies		100.00
Bill Pmt -Check	03/06/2024	1171	Daniells Phillips Vaughan & Bock		1,950.00
Bill Pmt -Check	03/06/2024	1172	HGCPM, Inc.		48,855.11
Bill Pmt -Check	03/06/2024	1173	Klein DeNatale Goldner		61,594.40
Bill Pmt -Check	03/06/2024	1174	Provost & Pritchard Consulting Group		9,780.00
Bill Pmt -Check	03/06/2024	1175	Woodard & Curran Inc		281,027.33
Payment	04/03/2024	05-374754	Department of Water Resources	445,152.88	
Bill Pmt -Check	05/01/2024	1176	BC2 Environmental		516,795.00
Bill Pmt -Check	05/01/2024	1177	HGCPM, Inc.		33,555.45
Bill Pmt -Check	05/01/2024	1178	Insurica		17,317.00
Bill Pmt -Check	05/01/2024	1179	Klein DeNatale Goldner		21,120.00
Bill Pmt -Check	05/01/2024	1180	Provost & Pritchard Consulting Group		830.30
Bill Pmt -Check	05/01/2024	1181	Woodard & Curran Inc		630,420.14
Bill Pmt -Check	05/01/2024	1182	U.S. Geological Survey		26,300.00
Total Chase - General Checking				1,236,357.73	3,252,751.54
TOTAL				1,236,357.73	3,252,751.54

**CUYAMA BASIN GSA
A/R Aging Summary
As of May 31, 2024**

	Current	1 - 30	31 - 60	61 - 90	> 90	TOTAL
Department of Water Resources	0	0	0	1,333,840	858,277	2,192,117
Groundwater Extraction Fees						
Anderson Development	0	10	0	0	0	10
Adam Family	0	17	0	0	0	17
Duncan Family Farms	0	602	0	0	0	602
Boyajian, Tanner	0	40	0	0	0	40
CCSH Farms	0	497	0	0	0	497
Buck, Ann	0	522	0	0	0	522
Kooros Samadzadeh	0	69	0	0	0	69
Caliente Ranch	0	20	0	0	0	20
Bosma and Ricci	0	123	0	0	0	123
Apache Canyon Ranch, Inc	0	1,640	0	0	0	1,640
Perkins Ranch	0	566	0	0	0	566
Bolthouse Land Co, LLC	0	39,047	0	0	0	39,047
Brodiaea, Inc	0	3,992	0	0	0	3,992
Cheng, Ceferino	0	585	0	0	0	585
Cuyama Community Srvcs Dist	0	742	0	0	0	742
Cuyama Dairy Farm	0	1,154	0	0	0	1,154
Cuyama Orchards, Inc	0	4,376	0	0	0	4,376
E & B Natural Resources Mgmt Corp	0	122	0	0	0	122
Feinstein Investments	0	1,344	0	0	0	1,344
Grimmway Enterprises, Inc	0	61,259	0	0	0	61,259
H Lima Company	0	11	0	0	0	11
Harrington Farms	0	556	0	0	0	556
Triple H Farming/ R. Harrington	0	523	0	0	0	523
JHP Global, Inc	0	1,826	0	0	0	1,826
Karam Pistachio Farm	0	2,402	0	0	0	2,402
Kern Ridge Growers, LLC	0	13,367	0	0	0	13,367
Lear Real Estate Ent LLC	0	2,841	0	0	0	2,841
Lee, Jennifer	0	105	0	0	0	105
Lewis, David	0	170	0	0	0	170
Lucky Dog Ranch, LLC	0	1,715	0	0	0	1,715
Highland Vineyard SB, LLC	0	9,160	0	0	0	9,160
Sunridge Nurseries, Inc	0	5,160	0	0	0	5,160
Sunrise Olive Ranch, LLC	0	8,631	0	0	0	8,631
The Ranch	0	93	0	0	0	93
Tri-County Pistachios	0	5,590	0	0	0	5,590
Triangle E. Farms	0	2,904	0	0	0	2,904
Total Groundwater Extraction Fees	0	171,780	0	0	0	171,780
TOTAL	0	171,780	0	1,333,840	858,277	2,363,896

CUYAMA BASIN GSA
A/P Aging Summary
As of May 31, 2024

	Current	1 - 30	31 - 60	61 - 90	> 90	TOTAL
BC2 Environmental	229,887	0	237,303	0	0	467,190
HGCPM, Inc.	17,820	0	22,670	0	0	40,490
Klein DeNatale Goldner	17,678	0	13,846	0	0	31,524
Provost & Pritchard Consulting Group	1,172	0	9,745	728	0	11,646
Woodard & Curran Inc	274,806	0	187,468	0	0	462,274
TOTAL	541,362	0	471,034	728	0	1,013,124

CUYAMA BASIN GSA
Statement of Operations with Budget Variance
July 2023 through May 2024

	Jul '23 - May 24	Budget	\$ Over Budget	% of Budget
Ordinary Income/Expense				
Income				
Direct Public Funds				
Groundwater Extraction Fees	530,133	530,133	-0	100%
Grant Reimbursements	2,636,426	3,166,068	-529,642	83%
Total Direct Public Funds	3,166,558	3,696,201	-529,643	86%
Total Income	3,166,558	3,696,201	-529,643	86%
Cost of Goods Sold				
Program Expenses				
Technical Consulting				
Monitoring Network Enhancements	1,784,681	2,101,000	-316,319	85%
GSP Implementation - W&C	98,779	192,500	-93,721	51%
Stakeholder Engagement	146,571	121,000	25,571	121%
Technical Support for DWR	0	14,666	-14,666	0%
Outreach	1,025	28,111	-27,086	4%
Grant Proposals	0	38,500	-38,500	0%
Grant Administration	85,888	91,666	-5,779	94%
Improve Basin Water Use Info	39,743	93,500	-53,757	43%
Project & Mgmt Action Impl	478,441	438,000	40,441	109%
5 Year GSP Update - Technical	606,641	631,079	-24,438	96%
Fault Investigation	206,424	320,000	-113,576	65%
Well Permit Review - Technical	0	11,000	-11,000	0%
Total Technical Consulting	3,448,193	4,081,022	-632,829	84%
Other Technical Consulting				
Monitoring Network	90,305	68,000	22,305	133%
Stream Gauge Maintenance	0	42,489	-42,489	0%
Total Other Technical Consulting	90,305	110,489	-20,184	82%
Total Program Expenses	3,538,498	4,191,511	-653,013	84%
Total COGS	3,538,498	4,191,511	-653,013	84%
Gross Profit	-371,940	-495,310	123,370	75%
Expense				
General and Administrative				
GSA Executive Director				
GSA BOD Meetings	107,675	102,114	5,561	105%
Consult Mgmt and GSP Devel	41,538	67,238	-25,701	62%
Financial Information Coor	27,838	47,077	-19,240	59%
Funding Process (GWE Fee)	10,300	5,100	5,200	202%
CBGSA Outreach	11,188	9,827	1,361	114%
Adjudication Support	3,775	1,771	2,004	213%
Management Area Admin	1,188	10,791	-9,604	11%
5-Year GSP Update - Admin	0	16,699	-16,699	0%
Water Use Enforcement	50	23,283	-23,233	0%
Well Permit Review - Admin	0	1,833	-1,833	0%
Travel and Direct Costs	1,015	5,217	-4,202	19%
Total GSA Executive Director	204,565	290,950	-86,385	70%
Other Administrative				
Legal	146,768	183,333	-36,565	80%
Insurance - D&O and General	17,317	16,603	714	104%
Auditing/Accounting Fees	9,450	10,000	-550	95%
Printing and Copying	3,856	0	3,856	100%
Other Admin Expense	4,054	200	3,854	2,027%
Contingency	0	18,333	-18,333	0%
Total Other Administrative	181,445	228,469	-47,024	79%
Total General and Administrative	386,010	519,419	-133,409	74%
Total Expense	386,010	519,419	-133,409	74%
Net Ordinary Income	-757,950	-1,014,729	256,779	75%
Net Income	-757,950	-1,014,729	256,779	75%

CUYAMA BASIN GSA
FY 23/24 Budget Overview
 July 2023 - June 2024

	Jul '23 - Jun 24
Ordinary Income/Expense	
Income	
Direct Public Funds	
Groundwater Extraction Fees	530,133
Grant Reimbursements	4,221,424
Total Direct Public Funds	4,751,557
Total Income	4,751,557
Cost of Goods Sold	
Program Expenses	
Technical Consulting	
Monitoring Network Enhancements	2,443,000
GSP Implementation - W&C	210,000
Stakeholder Engagement	132,000
Technical Support for DWR	16,000
Outreach	30,667
Grant Proposals	42,000
Grant Administration	100,000
Basin Water Use Surveys	102,000
Project & Mgmt Action Impl	491,000
5 Year GSP Update - Technical	688,450
Fault Investigation	330,000
Well Permit Review - Technical	12,000
Total Technical Consulting	4,597,117
Other Technical Consulting	
Monitoring Network	68,000
Stream Gauge Maintenance	56,650
Total Other Technical Consulting	124,650
Total Program Expenses	4,721,767
Total COGS	4,721,767
Gross Profit	29,790
Expense	
General and Administrative	
GSA Executive Director	
GSA BOD Meetings	111,397
Consult Mgmt and GSP Devel	73,351
Financial Information Coord	51,357
Funding Process (GWE Fee)	5,562
CBGSA Outreach	10,721
Adjudication Support	1,932
Management Area Admin	11,772
5-Year GSP Update - Admin	18,217
Water Use Enforcement	25,400
Well Permit Review - Admin	2,000
Travel and Direct Costs	5,691
Total GSA Executive Director	317,400
Other Administrative	
Legal	200,000
Insurance - D&O and General	16,603
Auditing/Accounting Fees	10,000
Other Admin Expense	200
Contingency	20,000
Total Other Administrative	246,803
Total General and Administrative	564,203
Total Expense	564,203
Net Ordinary Income	-534,413
Net Income	-534,413



Cuyama Basin GSA

Financial Statements June 2024

CUYAMA BASIN GSA
Statement of Financial Position
As of June 30, 2024

	Jun 30, 24	Jun 30, 23	\$ Change	% Change
ASSETS				
Current Assets				
Checking/Savings				
Chase - General Checking	187,287	2,162,299	-1,975,012	-91%
Total Checking/Savings	187,287	2,162,299	-1,975,012	-91%
Accounts Receivable				
Accounts Receivable	3,522,515	738,216	2,784,299	377%
Total Accounts Receivable	3,522,515	738,216	2,784,299	377%
Total Current Assets	3,709,802	2,900,515	809,287	28%
TOTAL ASSETS	3,709,802	2,900,515	809,287	28%
LIABILITIES & EQUITY				
Liabilities				
Current Liabilities				
Accounts Payable				
Accounts Payable	1,641,881	341,806	1,300,075	380%
Total Accounts Payable	1,641,881	341,806	1,300,075	380%
Other Current Liabilities				
New/Repl Well Deposits	1,900	1,559	341	22%
Deferred Revenue - GWE Fees	171,780	476,202	-304,422	-64%
Total Other Current Liabilities	173,680	477,760	-304,081	-64%
Total Current Liabilities	1,815,560	819,567	995,994	122%
Total Liabilities	1,815,560	819,567	995,994	122%
Equity				
Unrestricted Net Assets	2,080,948	1,115,300	965,648	87%
Net Income	-186,707	965,648	-1,152,355	-119%
Total Equity	1,894,241	2,080,948	-186,707	-9%
TOTAL LIABILITIES & EQUITY	3,709,802	2,900,515	809,287	28%

CUYAMA BASIN GSA
Receipts and Disbursements
As of June 30, 2024

Type	Date	Num	Name	Debit	Credit
Chase - General Checking					
Payment	07/07/2023	4397	Groundwater Extraction Fees:Sunrise Olive Ranch, LLC	21,138.84	
Bill Pmt -Check	07/12/2023	1145	HGCPM, Inc.		31,707.72
Bill Pmt -Check	07/12/2023	1146	Klein DeNatale Goldner		18,234.50
Bill Pmt -Check	07/12/2023	1147	Provost & Pritchard Consulting Group		6,239.42
Bill Pmt -Check	07/12/2023	1148	Woodard & Curran Inc		161,164.95
Bill Pmt -Check	07/12/2023	1149	Provost & Pritchard Consulting Group		2,005.00
Payment	07/14/2023	21532	Groundwater Extraction Fees:Cuyama Orchards, Inc	12,682.80	
Payment	07/14/2023	1867	Groundwater Extraction Fees:Highland Vineyard SB, LLC	20,109.36	
Bill Pmt -Check	09/08/2023	1150	HGCPM, Inc.		42,426.72
Bill Pmt -Check	09/08/2023	1151	Klein DeNatale Goldner		8,782.05
Bill Pmt -Check	09/08/2023	1152	Provost & Pritchard Consulting Group		7,879.96
Bill Pmt -Check	09/08/2023	1153	U.S. Geological Survey		13,150.00
Bill Pmt -Check	09/08/2023	1154	Woodard & Curran Inc		218,671.47
Payment	10/17/2023	05-251132	Department of Water Resources	391,357.90	
Deposit	10/26/2023			0.71	
Bill Pmt -Check	11/01/2023	1155	HGCPM, Inc.		32,091.98
Bill Pmt -Check	11/01/2023	1156	Klein DeNatale Goldner		14,302.50
Bill Pmt -Check	11/01/2023	1157	Provost & Pritchard Consulting Group		11,238.91
Bill Pmt -Check	11/01/2023	1158	U.S. Geological Survey		13,150.00
Bill Pmt -Check	11/01/2023	1159	Woodard & Curran Inc		246,535.78
Deposit	12/11/2023			2,400.00	
Payment	12/13/2023	05-292282	Department of Water Resources	343,515.24	
Check	12/14/2023	1160	Groundwater Extraction Fees:Bolthouse Land Co, LLC		1,558.75
Bill Pmt -Check	01/10/2024	1161	BC2 Environmental		127,485.00
Bill Pmt -Check	01/10/2024	1162	Daniells Phillips Vaughan & Bock		7,500.00
Bill Pmt -Check	01/10/2024	1163	HGCPM, Inc.		38,547.20
Bill Pmt -Check	01/10/2024	1164	Klein DeNatale Goldner		14,852.15
Bill Pmt -Check	01/10/2024	1165	Provost & Pritchard Consulting Group		10,851.89
Bill Pmt -Check	01/10/2024	1166	Woodard & Curran Inc		123,934.89
Bill Pmt -Check	01/10/2024	1167	BC2 Environmental		199,646.25
Bill Pmt -Check	01/10/2024	1168	Woodard & Curran Inc		174,799.72
Bill Pmt -Check	03/06/2024	1169	BC2 Environmental		76,350.00
Bill Pmt -Check	03/06/2024	1170	CA Assoc of Mutual Water Companies		100.00
Bill Pmt -Check	03/06/2024	1171	Daniells Phillips Vaughan & Bock		1,950.00
Bill Pmt -Check	03/06/2024	1172	HGCPM, Inc.		48,855.11
Bill Pmt -Check	03/06/2024	1173	Klein DeNatale Goldner		61,594.40
Bill Pmt -Check	03/06/2024	1174	Provost & Pritchard Consulting Group		9,780.00
Bill Pmt -Check	03/06/2024	1175	Woodard & Curran Inc		281,027.33
Payment	04/03/2024	05-374754	Department of Water Resources	445,152.88	
Bill Pmt -Check	05/01/2024	1176	BC2 Environmental		516,795.00
Bill Pmt -Check	05/01/2024	1177	HGCPM, Inc.		33,555.45
Bill Pmt -Check	05/01/2024	1178	Insurica		17,317.00
Bill Pmt -Check	05/01/2024	1179	Klein DeNatale Goldner		21,120.00
Bill Pmt -Check	05/01/2024	1180	Provost & Pritchard Consulting Group		830.30
Bill Pmt -Check	05/01/2024	1181	Woodard & Curran Inc		630,420.14
Bill Pmt -Check	05/01/2024	1182	U.S. Geological Survey		26,300.00
Payment	06/17/2024	684	Groundwater Extraction Fees:The Ranch	92.50	
Payment	06/17/2024	517	Groundwater Extraction Fees:Lee, Jennifer	104.65	
Payment	06/17/2024	342	Groundwater Extraction Fees:Lucky Dog Ranch, LLC	1,715.00	
Payment	06/17/2024	848189675	Groundwater Extraction Fees:Cheng, Ceferino	585.00	
Payment	06/20/2024	12223414231...	Groundwater Extraction Fees:Sunrise Olive Ranch, LLC	8,630.55	
Payment	06/24/2024	62102	Groundwater Extraction Fees:Feinstein Investments	1,344.40	
Payment	06/24/2024	171479	Groundwater Extraction Fees:Kern Ridge Growers, LLC	13,366.85	
Payment	06/24/2024	19211	Groundwater Extraction Fees:Triangle E. Farms	2,903.74	
Payment	06/24/2024	2777	Groundwater Extraction Fees:Kooros Samadzadeh	68.65	
Payment	06/24/2024	2388	Groundwater Extraction Fees:Tri-County Pistachios	5,590.00	
Payment	06/24/2024	12567	Groundwater Extraction Fees:Cuyama Community Srvc's ...	741.71	
Payment	06/24/2024	111162	Groundwater Extraction Fees:Sunridge Nurseries, Inc	5,160.00	
Payment	06/24/2024	3436	Groundwater Extraction Fees:Harrington Farms	555.95	
Payment	06/24/2024	1360	Groundwater Extraction Fees:Triple H Farming/ R. Harring...	522.50	
Total Chase - General Checking				1,277,739.23	3,252,751.54
TOTAL				1,277,739.23	3,252,751.54

**CUYAMA BASIN GSA
A/R Aging Summary
As of June 30, 2024**

	Current	1 - 30	31 - 60	61 - 90	> 90	TOTAL
Department of Water Resources	1,200,000	0	0	0	2,192,117	3,392,117
Groundwater Extraction Fees						
Anderson Development	0	0	10	0	0	10
Adam Family	0	0	17	0	0	17
Duncan Family Farms	0	0	602	0	0	602
Boyajian, Tanner	0	0	40	0	0	40
CCSH Farms	0	0	497	0	0	497
Buck, Ann	0	0	522	0	0	522
Caliente Ranch	0	0	20	0	0	20
Bosma and Ricci	0	0	123	0	0	123
Apache Canyon Ranch, Inc	0	0	1,640	0	0	1,640
Perkins Ranch	0	0	566	0	0	566
Bolthouse Land Co, LLC	0	0	39,047	0	0	39,047
Brodiaea, Inc	0	0	3,992	0	0	3,992
Cuyama Dairy Farm	0	0	1,154	0	0	1,154
Cuyama Orchards, Inc	0	0	4,376	0	0	4,376
E & B Natural Resources Mgmt Corp	0	0	122	0	0	122
Grimmway Enterprises, Inc	0	0	61,259	0	0	61,259
H Lima Company	0	0	11	0	0	11
JHP Global, Inc	0	0	1,826	0	0	1,826
Karam Pistachio Farm	0	0	2,402	0	0	2,402
Lear Real Estate Ent LLC	0	0	2,841	0	0	2,841
Lewis, David	0	0	170	0	0	170
Highland Vineyard SB, LLC	0	0	9,160	0	0	9,160
Total Groundwater Extraction Fees	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>130,398</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>130,398</u>
TOTAL	<u><u>1,200,000</u></u>	<u><u>0</u></u>	<u><u>130,398</u></u>	<u><u>0</u></u>	<u><u>2,192,117</u></u>	<u><u>3,522,515</u></u>

CUYAMA BASIN GSA
A/P Aging Summary
As of June 30, 2024

	<u>Current</u>	<u>1 - 30</u>	<u>31 - 60</u>	<u>61 - 90</u>	<u>> 90</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
BC2 Environmental	367,652	229,887	0	237,303	0	834,842
HGCPM, Inc.	12,378	17,820	0	22,670	0	52,868
Klein DeNatale Goldner	13,592	17,678	0	13,846	0	45,116
Provost & Pritchard Consulting Group	0	1,172	0	9,745	728	11,646
U.S. Geological Survey	13,150	0	0	0	0	13,150
Woodard & Curran Inc	221,986	274,806	0	187,468	0	684,260
TOTAL	<u>628,757</u>	<u>541,362</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>471,034</u>	<u>728</u>	<u>1,641,881</u>

CUYAMA BASIN GSA
Statement of Operations with Budget Variance
 July 2023 through June 2024

	Jul '23 - Jun 24	Budget	\$ Over Budget	% of Budget
Ordinary Income/Expense				
Income				
Direct Public Funds				
Groundwater Extraction Fees	530,133	530,133	-0	100%
Grant Reimbursements	3,836,426	4,221,424	-384,998	91%
Total Direct Public Funds	4,366,558	4,751,557	-384,999	92%
Total Income	4,366,558	4,751,557	-384,999	92%
Cost of Goods Sold				
Program Expenses				
Technical Consulting				
Monitoring Network Enhancements	2,189,993	2,443,000	-253,007	90%
GSP Implementation - W&C	114,963	210,000	-95,037	55%
Stakeholder Engagement	154,053	132,000	22,053	117%
Technical Support for DWR	0	16,000	-16,000	0%
Outreach	1,340	30,667	-29,327	4%
Grant Proposals	0	42,000	-42,000	0%
Grant Administration	99,899	100,000	-101	100%
Improve Basin Water Use Info	39,743	102,000	-62,257	39%
Project & Mgmt Action Impl	541,218	491,000	50,218	110%
5 Year GSP Update - Technical	688,490	688,450	40	100%
Fault Investigation	208,133	330,000	-121,867	63%
Well Permit Review - Technical	0	12,000	-12,000	0%
Total Technical Consulting	4,037,831	4,597,117	-559,286	88%
Other Technical Consulting				
Monitoring Network	103,455	68,000	35,455	152%
Stream Gauge Maintenance	0	56,650	-56,650	0%
Total Other Technical Consulting	103,455	124,650	-21,195	83%
Total Program Expenses	4,141,286	4,721,767	-580,481	88%
Total COGS	4,141,286	4,721,767	-580,481	88%
Gross Profit	225,272	29,790	195,482	756%
Expense				
General and Administrative				
GSA Executive Director				
GSA BOD Meetings	109,694	111,397	-1,703	98%
Consult Mgmt and GSP Devel	44,594	73,351	-28,757	61%
Financial Information Coord	29,288	51,357	-22,070	57%
Funding Process (GWE Fee)	11,663	5,562	6,101	210%
CBGSA Outreach	12,606	10,721	1,885	118%
Adjudication Support	6,794	1,932	4,862	352%
Management Area Admin	1,188	11,772	-10,585	10%
5-Year GSP Update - Admin	0	18,217	-18,217	0%
Water Use Enforcement	50	25,400	-25,350	0%
Well Permit Review - Admin	0	2,000	-2,000	0%
Travel and Direct Costs	1,068	5,691	-4,623	19%
Total GSA Executive Director	216,943	317,400	-100,457	68%
Other Administrative				
Legal	160,360	200,000	-39,640	80%
Insurance - D&O and General	17,317	16,603	714	104%
Auditing/Accounting Fees	9,450	10,000	-550	95%
Printing and Copying	3,856	0	3,856	100%
Other Admin Expense	4,054	200	3,854	2,027%
Contingency	0	20,000	-20,000	0%
Total Other Administrative	195,037	246,803	-51,766	79%
Total General and Administrative	411,980	564,203	-152,223	73%
Total Expense	411,980	564,203	-152,223	73%
Net Ordinary Income	-186,707	-534,413	347,706	35%
Net Income	-186,707	-534,413	347,706	35%

CUYAMA BASIN GSA
FY 23/24 Budget Overview
 July 2023 - June 2024

	Jul '23 - Jun 24
Ordinary Income/Expense	
Income	
Direct Public Funds	
Groundwater Extraction Fees	530,133
Grant Reimbursements	4,221,424
Total Direct Public Funds	4,751,557
Total Income	4,751,557
Cost of Goods Sold	
Program Expenses	
Technical Consulting	
Monitoring Network Enhancements	2,443,000
GSP Implementation - W&C	210,000
Stakeholder Engagement	132,000
Technical Support for DWR	16,000
Outreach	30,667
Grant Proposals	42,000
Grant Administration	100,000
Basin Water Use Surveys	102,000
Project & Mgmt Action Impl	491,000
5 Year GSP Update - Technical	688,450
Fault Investigation	330,000
Well Permit Review - Technical	12,000
Total Technical Consulting	4,597,117
Other Technical Consulting	
Monitoring Network	68,000
Stream Gauge Maintenance	56,650
Total Other Technical Consulting	124,650
Total Program Expenses	4,721,767
Total COGS	4,721,767
Gross Profit	29,790
Expense	
General and Administrative	
GSA Executive Director	
GSA BOD Meetings	111,397
Consult Mgmt and GSP Devel	73,351
Financial Information Coord	51,357
Funding Process (GWE Fee)	5,562
CBGSA Outreach	10,721
Adjudication Support	1,932
Management Area Admin	11,772
5-Year GSP Update - Admin	18,217
Water Use Enforcement	25,400
Well Permit Review - Admin	2,000
Travel and Direct Costs	5,691
Total GSA Executive Director	317,400
Other Administrative	
Legal	200,000
Insurance - D&O and General	16,603
Auditing/Accounting Fees	10,000
Other Admin Expense	200
Contingency	20,000
Total Other Administrative	246,803
Total General and Administrative	564,203
Total Expense	564,203
Net Ordinary Income	-534,413
Net Income	-534,413



TO: Board of Directors
Agenda Item No. 9

FROM: Provost & Pritchard

DATE: July 31, 2024

SUBJECT: Discuss and Take Appropriate Action on a Monitoring Network Consultant Contract for FY 24-25

Recommended Motion

Approve groundwater level and water quality monitoring contract with Provost & Pritchard for Fiscal Year 2024-2025 for an amount not to exceed of \$68,000.

Discussion

Provost & Pritchard was selected by the Board to monitor quarterly groundwater levels and water quality. Provided as Attachment 1 is a draft contract with P&P to continue these services in Fiscal Year 2024-2025 for an amount not to exceed of \$68,000. This contract amount was budgeted in the adopted Fiscal Year 2024-2025 budget.



400 East Main Street, Suite 300
 Visalia, CA 93291-6367
 Tel: (559) 636-1166
 Fax: (559) 636-1177
www.ppeng.com

July 17, 2024

Taylor Blakslee
 Cuyama Basin Groundwater Sustainability Agency
 4900 California Ave, Tower B, 2nd Floor
 Bakersfield, CA 93309

Subject: CBGSA – Groundwater Monitoring (WY 2025)

Dear Mr. Blakslee:

Thank you for the opportunity to submit this proposal to provide consulting and monitoring services for the Cuyama Basin groundwater level monitoring network. This proposal discusses our understanding of the project, recommends a scope of services together with associated fees, deliverables, and approximate schedules, sets forth our assumptions and discusses other offered services that may be of interest as the project proceeds.

The dedicated and experienced team at Provost & Pritchard's Visalia and Bakersfield offices have extensive experience with the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (**SGMA**), groundwater monitoring network development, groundwater level measurements, and coordinating with multiple agencies to unify efforts and accomplish varied goals.

Project Understanding

The Cuyama Basin Groundwater Sustainability Agency (**CBGSA**) developed a Groundwater Sustainability Plan (**GSP**) as required by SGMA.

For the 2025 water year, the CBGSA would like to continue monitoring groundwater levels quarterly. The 2025 network anticipates an approximate total of 66 wells at 52 locations.

The network will be monitored quarterly during the months of October, January, April, and July. The monitoring schedules may be adjusted to access wells outside of rain events or surface water flows.

Scope of Services

Provost & Pritchard will continue to be in contact the CBGSA to prepare for the work and ensure all requirements will be met. Our scope of work for this proposal will be completed in two phases, described below.

Phase LVL: Groundwater Level Monitoring

1. Project Administration and Management
 - a. Provide consistent and available communications with CBGSA.
 - a. Track project deliverables, budget, and schedule.
2. Quarterly groundwater level measurements for up to 66 wells at approximately 52 locations and Quarterly Water Quality Measurements for up to 10 transducer equipped wells.
 - a. Groundwater levels in excel format reporting groundwater surface elevation, reference point elevation, and depth to groundwater with measurement reference on a quarterly basis.
 - b. Groundwater quality measurements in excel format reporting electroconductivity and water temperature on a quarterly basis for a preselected list of transducer-equipped wells
3. Technical Memo
 - a. Summary memorandum to the CBGSA documenting work performed at the conclusion of the 12-month reporting period.

Deliverables:

- Signed access and monitoring agreement from landowners that require them.
- Technical memorandum summarizing work performed.
- Excel workbook including date, time, location, groundwater level, water quality metrics for qualifying wells and pertinent notes for each measurement.
- Individual well dossier sheets for each well with measurements and pertinent notes for any newly added wells.

Phase QLT: Groundwater Quality Monitoring

1. Project Administration and Management
 - a. Provide consistent and available communications with CBGSA.
 - b. Track project deliverables, budget, and schedule.
2. Annual groundwater quality measurements for up to 30 wells at approximately 21 locations.
3. Obtain Landowner Agreements
 - a. Research missing contact information.
 - b. Request access from landowners/managers to sample wells.
 - c. Provide Access and Monitoring Agreements upon request and follow up.
4. Water quality measurements
 - a. Review any new wells for suitability.
 - b. Coordinate water quality testing with well owners.
 - c. Measure salinity as EC and TDS at each well. Measurement will be taken with a Horiba multimeter according to Standard Operating Procedures, including meter calibration, well purging, and applicable site condition notes.
 - d. Collect salinity as EC and TDS data at each well equipped with a transducer.

5. Data management and reporting

- a. Compile water quality data and complete data quality assurance and control measures.
- b. Develop technical memorandum documenting work performed.
- c. Complete Excel workbook with EC and TDS results.
- d. Complete dossier sheets for each well.

Deliverables:

- Signed access and monitoring agreement from landowners that require them.
- Technical memorandum summarizing work performed.
- Excel workbook including date, time, location, EC, TDS, and pertinent notes for each measurement.
- Individual well dossier sheets for each well with measurements and pertinent notes.
- All analyses documents provided by the lab.

Professional Fees

Provost & Pritchard Consulting Group will perform the services on a time and materials basis, in accordance with our Standard Fee Schedule in effect at the time services are rendered. For budgeting purposes, our preliminary estimate is that our fees will be **\$68,000**. Reimbursable expenses and professional fees are included in the estimate. These fees will be invoiced monthly as they are accrued, and our total fees, including reimbursable expenses, will not exceed our estimate without additional authorization.

Schedule

Provost & Pritchard is prepared to begin immediately upon authorization to proceed. Once we receive an executed copy of this Proposal along with the Consultant Services Agreement, and are authorized to proceed, we will work with the CBGSA to develop a mutually agreed upon schedule.

Assumptions

Phase LVL

- Survey by a CA State licensed surveyor is additional work and not included in the scope or fee estimate.
- Landowners are assumed to be amenable to monitoring and prompt in their communication. Landowners that require more than three (3) communication attempts to sign land access permissions and schedule a sample date are additional work and outside of the scope and fee estimate.
- Landowners are not required to be on premises for level measurements. Expecting field staff to communicate and meet discrete measurement appointments to allow landowner supervision is additional work, reduces the number of wells that can be measured within a day, and outside the scope of work and the fee estimate.
- Wells are in sufficient condition to be measured and modifications are not necessary.

- Additional wells for which landowner introductions and, site information forms, and/or access agreement can be added for additional scope and fee.

Phase QLT

- If any of the proposed wells are not suitable for sampling, then upon CBGSA's prior approval, other wells can be added for additional scope and fee. Wells without pumps will be sampled with passive sampling equipment, if possible.
- Landowners are assumed to be amenable to sampling and prompt in their communication. Landowners that require more than three (3) communication attempts to sign land access permissions and schedule a sample date are additional work and outside of the scope and fee estimate.
- Landowners are not required to be on premises for well sampling if the well will be running. Expecting field staff to communicate and meet discrete sampling appointments to allow landowner supervision is additional work, reduces the number of wells that can be sampled within a day, and outside the scope of work and the fee estimate.
- Surveying (establishing elevations) will not be required for wells which are not included in the Groundwater Level Monitoring Network.
- Data is to be reported to Woodard & Curran via Excel spreadsheet.
- Wells are in sufficient condition to be sampled and modifications are not necessary.
- Well Completion Reports will not be needed at this time.
- Without Well Completion Reports, the volume of three well casings cannot be calculated. Therefore, a standard purge time and/or volume will be utilized, which will be based on purge requirements for similar water quality networks.
- Provost & Pritchard will not turn pumps on or off. The landowner or authorized manager will need to be present if a well is not in operation.
- Landowners will provide guidance regarding discharge locations for purged water.

Additional Services

The following services are not included in this proposal. However, these and others can be provided at additional cost, either directly by Provost & Pritchard Consulting Group or through subconsultants, upon request.

- Data management system.
- Expansion of the CBGSA's monitoring network if the original wells are not sufficient.
- Licensed survey of ground surface elevation and well reference point elevation.

Terms and Conditions

If this proposal is acceptable, please sign the Consultant Services Agreement, and return a copy to our office. These documents will serve as our Notice to Proceed. This proposal is valid for 60 days from the date above.

Respectfully,

Provost & Pritchard Consulting Group



Jon Vander Schuur QSD/QSP CPESC
Project Manager

Soo Ho Park, RCE 89361
Director of Operations

Terms and Conditions Accepted

By: Cuyama Basin Groundwater Sustainability Agency

Signature

Printed Name

Title

Date



TO: Board of Directors
Agenda Item No. 10

FROM: Taylor Blakslee, Hallmark Group

DATE: July 31, 2024

SUBJECT: Approve a Non-Cost, Time Extension for W&C Task Order No. 11

Recommended Motion

Approve W&C Task Order No. 11, Amendment No. 2 for a Non-Cost, Time Extension.

Discussion

The following tasks authorized under Woodard & Curran task order No. 11 for Fiscal Year 2023-2024 have not been completed and staff recommends a no-cost, time extension through October 31, 2024 to complete these tasks:

- Task 3: Ongoing Monitoring Support and Enhancements
- Task 9: Perform Fault Investigation
- Task 10, Subtask 10.3: Website Redesign

AMENDMENT 2 TO TASK ORDER NUMBER 11

Issued Pursuant to the Consulting Services Agreement Between Woodard & Curran, Inc. and Cuyama Basin Groundwater Sustainability Agency, dated as of July 31, 2024.

This Amendment 2 to Task Order 11 is issued pursuant to, and in accordance with the Agreement, the terms and conditions of which are incorporated herein by this reference. Unless otherwise specified, all capitalized terms used in this Task Order shall have the same meaning as used in the Agreement. This Task Order Amendment will not be deemed valid and binding upon the Parties until both Consultant and Client have both signed below.

This no-cost amendment provides for additional time to complete Task Order 11 tasks.

Scope of Services:

There is no change to the scope of services.

Schedule:

The completion date for the following Task Order 11 tasks is extended to October 31, 2024:

- Task 3: Ongoing Monitoring Support and Enhancements
- Task 9: Perform Fault Investigation
- Task 10, Subtask 10.3: Website Redesign

Compensation:

For all Services duly rendered hereunder, Client shall pay Consultant in accordance with the Rate Table; and for Reimbursable Expenses. There is no change to the allowable compensation for Task Order No. 11 of \$2,616,815.

Designated Project Representative

Client: Jim Beck

Consultant: Brian Van Lienden

Effective date: July 31, 2024

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the undersigned have caused this Task Order to be duly executed by their authorized representatives set forth below.

Woodard & Curran, Inc.

Cuyama Basin Groundwater Sustainability Agency

Signed _____

Signed _____

Name _____

Name _____

Title _____

Title _____



TO: Board of Directors
Agenda Item No. 11a

FROM: Jim Strandberg, Woodard & Curran

DATE: July 31, 2024

SUBJECT: Update on Fault Investigation Study

Recommended Motion

None – information only.

Discussion

An update on the fault investigation study is provided as Attachment 1.

Cuyama Basin Groundwater Sustainability Agency

11a.Update on Fault Investigation Study

Jim Strandberg


July 31, 2024



Update on Streamlined Groundwater-Fault Interaction Investigation

- Santa Barbara Canyon and Russell Fault Zones
- Investigation Components Include:
 - Evaluate available water level and WQ data in investigation areas
 - Interpret AEM data and oil & gas geophysical logs
 - Conduct surface geophysical surveys
 - Construct a new monitoring well near SBC Fault (i.e., MW-H with funding covered by current grant agreement)
 - Sample groundwater and conduct geochemical analyses
 - Groundwater flow calculations and modelling

Update on Streamlined Groundwater-Fault Interaction Investigation



Shaded relief base created from 30-m digital elevation model from USGS National Elevation Dataset (NED); North America Vertical Datum 1983 (NAVD83). Hydrology sourced from 1:24,000-scale National Hydrography Dataset, 1974-2009. Place names sourced from USGS Geographic Names Information System 1974-2009. Albers Projection, NAD83

Groundwater hydrologic subregions and related geologic structures; B, simplified Cuyama major groundwater regions; and C, groups of landscape water-balance subregions for 1943–2010 in Cuyama Valley, California (USGS, 2015)

Cuyama groundwater basin subregions (table 1)

- Caliente/Northern-Main (CNMZ)
- Central Sierra Madre Foothills (CSMFH)
- Northeast Ventucopa Uplands (NEVU)
- Northwestern Sierra Madre Foothills (NSMFH)
- Northern Ventucopa Uplands (NVU)
- Southern Sierra Madre Foothills (SSMFH)
- Southern Ventucopa Uplands (SVU)
- Southern-Main (SMZ)
- Western-Main (WMZ)

See table 1 for subregion designation

- Normal fault
- ▲ Thrust fault
- ▲- Thrust fault, concealed
- +— Syncline
- - - Syncline, concealed

GRF, Graveyard fault;
SBCF, Santa Barbara Canyon fault;
TTRF, Turkey Trap Ridge fault

Groundwater-Fault Interaction Investigation – Geophysical Surveys

- **Field Surveys**
 - SBC Fault survey in mid-February
 - Russell Fault survey in late March
- **Survey Method**
 - 2D electrical resistivity (ER) and induced polarization
 - Two transects (lines) across each fault > 3,000 feet in length to investigate 600 to 800 feet in depth
 - Transects were linear over fairly level ground
 - Data processing using industry standard software


Groundwater-Fault Interaction Investigation – Geophysical Surveys - SBCF Fault



- Transects crossed the buried fault location inferred by the USGS.
- Line 1 was in the ROW of SR 33. Well MW-H provided a control point.
- Line 2 was in the Cuyama River channel among vegetation.


Groundwater-Fault Interaction Investigation – Geophysical Surveys - SBC Fault

Line 1



Line 2





- Relatively laterally continuous lithology across the profile.
- Fault mapped by the USGS is not present.
- Depth to water is about 600 feet bgs.



-  Electrical Resistivity Transect
-  Concealed fault mapped by the USGS



***Note: Not all below ground utilities or features may be represented on this map.

spectrum geophysics
 821 & LANIER ST. BLVD. #12
 HOLLYWOOD, CA 91603
 PHONE: (619) 806-4500
 www.spectrumgeophysics.com

Geophysical Survey Location Map
 Cuyama Valley Groundwater Basin
 SBCF
 San Luis Obispo County, California
 Woodard & Curran
 Sacramento, California




1

BM 43

1 inch = approx 300 ft | BAU | BAU | 7/19/24

Groundwater-Fault Interaction Investigation – Geophysical Surveys – Russell Fault



- Few options for linear transects to avoid bedrock outcrops, deeply incised and meandering Cuyama River channel, and oil field operations.
- Line 1 adjacent to dirt road crosses barbed wire fence and into dense vegetation.
- Line 2 in mostly flat area close to river between oil wells

Groundwater-Fault Interaction Investigation – Geophysical Surveys – Russell Fault


Line 1



Line 2




Groundwater-Fault Interaction Investigation – Geophysical Surveys – Russell Fault



- Abrupt lateral changes in resistivity indicate faults/fault plays (fault zone). Complex.
- A vertical anomaly interpreted to be the Russell Fault.
- Another, likely younger, apparent east-dipping thrust fault east of the Russell Fault is interpreted to be the Turkey Trap Ridge Fault.
- Faults are buried by about 100 feet or more.
- Groundwater appears to be approx. 50 feet bgs across the profile.
- Extent of saturated alluvium is greater in the eastern portion of the profile.

Line 2 Electrical Resistivity Profile Russell Fault



LEGEND
 - - - - - Interpreted base of alluvium/top of rock
 - - - - - Likely level of groundwater


	Electrical Resistivity Profile - Line 2 Russell Fault		6
	Cuyama Valley Groundwater Basin San Luis Obispo County, California		
16691 GOTHARD, SUITE L HUNTINGTON BEACH, CA 92646 (818) 896-4500 www.spectrum-geophysics.com	WOODARD & CURRAN Sacramento, California	PROJECT NO: 8443	DATE: 7/09/24
SCALE: 1 inch = 300 feet	SURVEY: BU	METHOD: LCD	TIME: 7/09/24

- Abrupt lateral changes in resistivity indicate faults/fault splays (fault zone). Complex.
- Significant electromagnetic noise required editing to remove erroneous measurements and artifacts.
- Russell Fault appears to be over-printed by a younger east-dipping thrust fault.
- Turkey Trap Ridge Fault interpreted to the east.
- Faults are buried by about 100 feet or more.
- Groundwater appears to be approx. 40 feet bgs across the profile.



Groundwater-Fault Interaction Investigation – Water Quality

- **SBC Fault/Fault Zone**
 - TSS #3 wells 903-905 were sampled in 2021; sampled 904 in 2024.
 - Kern Ridge Growers well CHR2 was sampled in 2024.
 - Stiff diagrams to display the data.
- **Russell Fault/TTRF System**
 - TSS #1 wells 900-902 were sampled in 2021; sampled 901 & 902 in 2024.
 - North Fork Ranch well NF-20 was sampled in 2020.
 - Stiff diagrams to display the data.




**Wells Near
Santa Barbara Canyon Fault
with Groundwater Quality Data**
Cuyama Basin
Map Created: March 2023





Legend

- Highways
- Local Roads
- SBC Fault
- Cuyama River
- Wells with Water Quality Data and Total Depth



Groundwater-Fault Interaction Investigation – Water Quality – SBC Fault






**Wells Near
Russell Fault
with Groundwater Quality Data**

Map Created: July 2024





Legend

- Highways
- Local Roads
- Cuyama River
- Russell Fault
- ▭ Cuyama Basin
- Wells with Water Quality Data and Total Depth



Groundwater-Fault Interaction Investigation – Water Quality – Russell Fault



Groundwater-Fault Interaction Investigation – Groundwater Flow – SBC and Russell Faults

Simulated flow based on previous and current versions of the model:

Santa Barbara Canyon Fault

- v0.20: 2,400 AFY
- V0.30: 3,300 AFY
 - Includes ~500 AFY from Santa Barbara Canyon

Russell Fault

- v0.20: 200 AFY
- V0.30: 190 AFY

Groundwater-Fault Interaction Investigation - Conclusions

Geophysical Survey

- SBC and Russell Fault systems are more complex than previously reported.
- The older buried faults are over-printed by younger thrust faults.

Santa Barbara Canyon Fault System

- Identified beneath the Cuyama River but not to the northeast as mapped.
- Fault system creates an abrupt transition in the depth to water from about 50 to 100 feet bgs to the south and greater than 600 feet bgs to the north.
- Groundwater quality is similar south and north of the fault system at depths of 265 to 1,100 feet bgs.
- Flow across the fault appears to be approx. 3,300 AFY

Russell Fault System

- Fault system does not affect depth to water on either side.
- Groundwater quality immediately east of the fault system is significantly more saline than to the west.
- Flow across the fault appears to be minimal.

Workshop Feedback

Model Update and Groundwater Sustainability

- Monitoring data availability and changes in GW levels since 2020
 - Interest in seeing specific well information and regional trends
- Benchmarks for progress towards sustainable yield and triggers for adaptive management
 - Concern that we will not know if we are on track and what to do if we are off track
- Future groundwater levels when the basin achieves sustainability
 - Concern that the GW levels will continue to drop until the basin is in balance (2038), leaving users with less (or more expensive) access to groundwater



TO: Board of Directors
Agenda Item No. 11b

FROM: Brian Van Lienden / Jim Beck

DATE: July 31, 2024

SUBJECT: Update on Water Resources Model

Recommended Motion

None – information only.

Discussion

An presentation on the Water Resources Model is provided as Attachment 1.

Cuyama Basin Groundwater Sustainability Agency

11b. Update on Cuyama Basin Water Resources Model

Jim Beck / Brian Van Lienden

July 31, 2024



Agenda

- Briefing on the CBWRM model upgrade
- Review model results
- Update on Sustainable Yield Analysis
- Update on Management Area Extent


Key Outcomes

- The updated model incorporates significant new data that was previously unavailable
- Projected basin-wide pumping (42,400 AFY) and groundwater storage deficit (17,600 AFY) are both lower than previous estimates
- Basin-wide sustainable yield is estimated to be between 15,900 AFY and 17,500 AFY
- Pumping cap in current Central Management Area plus Farming Units is between 10,900 AFY and 12,100 AFY
- Approach to uncertainty analysis for the updated model is similar to that of the GSP.



Components of the Cuyama Basin Water Resources Model

- Groundwater aquifers
- Agricultural and domestic pumping
- Percolation
- Surface water interaction



Model Development and Application History

- **CBWRM was originally developed for the 2020 GSP (v0.10)**
 - This version was used to develop water budget and sustainability estimates contained in the 2020 GSP
 - Applied for water year 2020 and 2021 Annual Reports
- **July 2022 Update (v0.20)**
 - Incorporated updated data available at that time
 - Applied for water year 2022 and 2023 Annual Reports
 - Used to develop CMA allocation tables for 2023 and 2024
- **July 2024 Update (v0.30)**
 - Incorporates additional data updates that are now available

Newly available information

- **Geology:**
 - AEM
 - Fault investigation
 - Well log data from the newly installed monitoring wells
- **Land use:**
 - Updated land use data from LandIQ and local landowners
- **Pumping:**
 - Reported pumping for 2022 and 2023
 - Detailed information about the well location and service areas as a result of the well survey and pumping reports
- **Recalibration:**
 - Groundwater level and streamflow measurements from CBGSA monitoring program

CBWRM Model Update

- Revised model layering by incorporating AEM, fault investigation, and other geologic data.
- Revised the land surface component to align simulated pumping with the reported pumping values for 2022 and 2023 and incorporate non-irrigated land use types.
- Estimates of Non-irrigated parcels based on recent idle acreage
- Refined pumping wells and service areas.
- Recalibrated the model using data through WY 2023.
- Updated historical and future conditions budgets, and estimate sustainable yield.



Other available data not incorporated in the model



- Streambed LiDAR survey
 - Model requires consistent invert elevation and rating tables
 - Holding this update until improved rating tables are available
- Non-irrigated fields from LandIQ
 - Dataset was not available on time to integrate into the land use
 - Instead manually checked satellite images for the last two years and marked them as non-irrigated
 - Can be incorporated in the next annual report

Geology Update




Airborne Electromagnetic (AEM) Surveys

- DWR conducted AEM surveys in California's high- and medium-priority groundwater basins as part of the Basin Characterization program.
- During an AEM survey, a helicopter tows electronic equipment that sends signals into the ground which bounce back. The data collected is used to develop continuous images that are interpreted for underground geology.





Used DWR's AEM Survey





DRAFT

Layer 2 of the Model is Updated





DRAFT

Model layer definition have improved based on the AEM Data



DRAFT

Model layer definition have improved based on the AEM Data



DRAFT

Incorporation of Fault Investigation Data into the Model

- Appropriate resistivity lines were incorporated along with data from AEM surveys were incorporated into the model layers
- Based on the analysis, an improved representation of flow barrier conditions across the fault is incorporated in the model
- Incorporating the fault investigation and AEM data in the model at the SBCF area, the model simulation capabilities near the SBCF has improved

Land Use Update



Land Surface Update

- Revised historical land use data:
 - Combined historical land use data into a single, consistent shapefile
 - Reviewed and revised the matching of crop categories to model crop types when needed
 - Introduced non-irrigated land use type
- Revised IDC calibration:
 - Adjusted ET rates to align simulated pumping with the reported volumes for 2022-23
 - Reviewed root zone and land & water use budgets
 - Adjusted soil parameters as necessary



Historical Land Use Data



- v0.20 land use was developed:
 - By Davids Engineering for the years 1994-2017
 - By Woodard & Curran for the years 2018-recent
 - Data from each year is independently stored and processed, which may lead to inconsistency between years
- v0.30 land use is developed:
 - For the years 1994-recent
 - All the data is combined into a single master shapefile
 - All years are batch-processed with a consistent methodology using only LandIQ and local landowner provided data
- ***Updated land use data has a better representation of the historical conditions and agricultural development in the valley.***



Historical Land Use Data in the Model

v0.20 (as of 2023 annual report)


v0.30 (updated version)



DRAFT

2023 Land Use in the Model

- Source:
 - Land IQ 2023 Survey
 - 2022/23 Local crop reports



DRAFT

Pumping Update



ET for these 106 crops have not been changed:

Historical Potential ET rates



- Previous discussions with the locals concluded that the model does not correctly represent irrigation practices for certain crop types.
- Reported pumping volumes showed difference from simulated ones for 2022 and 2023.
- Potential ET rates are modified to take into account those practices, and to better match the reported pumping for 2022 and 2023.

Crop	v0.20 ET (ft/yr)	v0.30 ET (ft/yr)	Change
Carrot	3.20	3.84	↗
Idle	0.82	0.08	↘
M Truck	2.84	3.84	↗
M Field	3.89	0.58	↘
M Grain	2.03	0.51	↘
Onion	2.53	2.78	↗
Pistachio	2.73	3.55	↗
Potato	2.74	3.02	↗
Safflower	1.28	0.26	↘

Crop	v0.20 & v0.30 ET (ft/yr)
Alfalfa	4.48
Apple	4.00
Bean	1.74
Berry	1.89
Citrus	2.32
Cole	1.61
Corn	4.13
Grape	1.89
Green	1.02
Lettuce	1.54
Melons	2.35
M Decid.	2.54
M Grass	3.12
M Subt.	1.94
Olive	1.33
Wheat	2.05
YTrees	1.34


*Native, Mixed Pasture and Non-irrigated land use type ETs are limited by available precipitation. Actual ET is around 10 inches/year.

Model Estimated vs. Reported Pumping



Pumping Wells Included in Model

- Total 186 pumping wells
 - 122 Original Model
 - 64 New wells Added
- Most of Central basin wells, and some others, were already in the model.
- Coordinates are updated for the existing wells.
- More wells are added in the Western and Eastern parts of the basin.




DRAFT

Third Party GIS Disclaimer: This map is for reference and graphical purposes only and should not be relied upon by third parties for any legal decisions. Any reliance upon the map or data contained herein shall be at the users' sole risk. Data sources: CA DWR, Esri, USGS


De Minimis Domestic Wells

- Wells producing less than 2 AFY (~1,785 GPD)
- Total 49 Wells
- Additional information provided by some of the well owners



Service Areas

- 40 service areas are defined for reporting operating companies' fields.
- These service areas are linked to the wells serving those areas.
- Information is mostly coming from pumping reports and farm unit applications.



DRAFT

Third Party GIS Disclaimer: This map is for reference and graphical purposes only and should not be relied upon by third parties for any legal decisions. Any reliance upon the map or data contained herein shall be at the users' sole risk. Data sources: CA DWR, Esri, USGS

Land Use and Pumping Refinements

- Refinements to the land use data have contributed to improvement of model representation of the agricultural and crop acreage over time
- Identification of pumping wells and reporting of pumping rates along with the service area delineation has helped improve model representation of location and amount of pumping
- Pumping and crop reporting should continue on an annual basis to help improve the sustainability analysis and accounting process
- These improvements have contributed to more accurate calibration of the model, which is presented in the following slides



Model Recalibration




Model Recalibration

- As a result of the changes in model stratigraphy and land surface water budget components (crop demand, pumping, and deep percolation estimates), model required a recalibration.
- Aquifer parameter distribution was revised to better match the understanding from the AEM hydrogeologic information.
- Uncertainties in representation and interpretation of observed GWL data was minimized by vertical averaging of the observed data.

All wells with a historical groundwater measurement


- Wells were compiled during GSP development (507)
- Sources:
 - DWR
 - USGS
 - Counties
 - CCSD
 - Landowners



Board Approved Groundwater Levels Monitoring Network


115
Updated

- These wells have been monitoring by the CBGSA since 2020



Model Calibration Wells

- Model calibration wells (76) were selected based on the following criteria:
 - Availability and the length of data during calibration period
 - Spatial coverage within Basin





Model Calibration Statistics

Observed GWLs vs. Simulated GWLs

“perfect results would be on the red line”

117
Updated



v0.30 shows improved residual statistics compared to v0.20.

DRAFT

Summary of Re-calibration Effort

- Model calibration has improved in many areas of the basin
- Improvements in model representation of the historical conditions helps:
 - Improve projection of future conditions
 - Better estimation of sustainable yield
 - More representative delineation of Management Area boundaries and GW allocation


Updated Results

Budgets, GWL Change, Sustainable Yield

Updated Basin-Wide Conditions

Historical Groundwater Budget

Component	GSP – v0.10 (1998-2017) AF/Yr	v0.20 (1998-2021) AF/Yr	v0.30 (1998-2023) AF/Yr
Inflow			
Deep Percolation	28,000	27,000	19,000
<i>DP (Precip)</i>	18,400	17,800	12,500
<i>DP (AW)</i>	9,600	9,200	6,500
Stream Seepage	3,000	4,700	4,100
Boundary and Other Inflows	5,000	2,800	2,800
Total Inflow	36,000	34,500	25,900
Outflow			
Groundwater Pumping	59,000	59,300	46,200
Total Outflow	59,000	59,300	46,200
GW Storage Deficit	23,000	24,800	20,300




DRAFT

Updated Basin-Wide Conditions Projected Groundwater Budget

Based on the 50-year hydrology (WY 1968-2017)

Component	GSP – v0.10 Projected AF/Yr	v0.20 Projected AF/Yr	v0.30 Projected AF/Yr
Inflow			
Deep Percolation	25,000	24,800	16,700
DP (Precip)	16,600	16,500	10,700
DP (AW)	8,400	8,300	6,000
Stream Seepage	5,000	5,600	5,400
Boundary and Other Inflows	5,000	2,900	2,800
Total Inflow	35,000	33,300	24,900
Outflow			
Groundwater Pumping	60,000	56,500	42,400
Total Outflow	60,000	56,500	42,400
GW Storage Deficit	25,000	22,300	17,500




DRAFT

Updated Basin-Wide Conditions Projected with Climate Change Groundwater Budget

Based on the 50-year hydrology (WY 1968-2017)
adjusted for climate change

Component	GSP – v0.10 Projected w/CC AF/Yr	v0.20 Projected w/CC AF/Yr	v0.30 Projected w/CC AF/Yr
Inflow			
Deep Percolation	26,000	25,000	16,800
DP (Precip)	17,300	16,600	10,800
DP (AW)	8,700	8,400	6,000
Stream Seepage	6,000	6,200	6,000
Boundary and Other Inflows	5,000	3,300	3,200
Total Inflow	37,000	34,500	26,000
Outflow			
Groundwater Pumping	64,000	61,200	46,000
Total Outflow	64,000	61,200	46,000
GW Storage Deficit	27,000	25,800	20,000




DRAFT


Effects of Climate Change on Basin-Wide Water Budget

123
Updated

Baseline GW Budget



Baseline GW Budget under Climate Change



DRAFT

Updated Basin-Wide Conditions

Summary of the Updated Groundwater Budgets

Component	Historical AF/Yr	Projected AF/Yr	Projected w/CC AF/Yr
	WY 1998-2023	WY 1968-2017	WY 1968-2017
Inflow			
Deep Percolation	18,100	16,100	16,100
Stream Seepage	4,000	5,500	6,000
Boundary and Other Inflows	2,800	2,800	3,200
<i>Total Inflow</i>	<i>24,900</i>	<i>24,400</i>	<i>25,300</i>
Outflow			
Groundwater Pumping	41,700	38,500	41,800
<i>Total Outflow</i>	<i>41,700</i>	<i>38,500</i>	<i>41,800</i>
GW Storage Deficit	16,800	14,100	16,500

Updated Basin-Wide Conditions

Summary of the Updated Groundwater Budgets

Component	Historical AF/Yr	Projected AF/Yr	Projected w/CC AF/Yr
	WY 1998-2023	WY 1968-2017	WY 1968-2017
Inflow			
Deep Percolation	19,000	16,700	16,800
Stream Seepage	4,100	5,400	6,000
Boundary and Other Inflows	2,800	2,800	3,200
<i>Total Inflow</i>	<i>25,900</i>	<i>24,900</i>	<i>26,000</i>
Outflow			
Groundwater Pumping	46,200	42,400	46,000
<i>Total Outflow</i>	<i>46,200</i>	<i>42,400</i>	<i>46,000</i>
GW Storage Deficit	20,300	17,500	20,000

Summary Slide

- Updated estimates of groundwater budget are more credible and based on the latest reports on cropping acreage and reported water use for 2022-23
- Updated Pumping estimates are:
 - Historical: 46,200 AFY
 - Projected: 42,400 AFY
 - Projected w CC: 46,000 AFY
- Updated overdraft estimates are:
 - Historical: 20,300 AFY
 - Projected: 17,500 AFY
 - Projected w CC: 20,000 AFY

Next Steps in Model Use

- Sustainable Yield Estimation
- Delineation of Management Area Extent


Sustainable Yield

- Sustainable Yield** – Sustainable yield is the average annual groundwater pumping that can be sustained without any long-term negative net change in groundwater storage. *(GSP p. 2-122)*

Sustainability Indicators	 Lowering GW Levels	 Reduction of Storage	 Seawater Intrusion	 Degraded Quality	 Land Subsidence	 Surface Water Depletion
Metric(s) Defined in GSP Regulations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Groundwater Elevation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Extraction Volume 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Chloride concentration isocontour 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Migration of Plumes Number of supply wells Volume Location of isocontour 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rate and Extent of Land Subsidence 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Volume or rate of surface water depletion

Sustainable Yield Estimation Approach

- Permanently fallow annual crop acreage in Central Region to have approximately zero long-term storage change in the Central Region.
- Maintain Western and Eastern regions pumping, because these regions are not expected to be in overdraft under projected conditions.



Sustainable Yield Estimate (7/22/24 version)

Basin-Wide GW Budget

Component	Projected Baseline AF/Yr	Sustainable Conditions AF/Yr
Inflow		
Deep Percolation	16,100	9,600
Stream Seepage	5,500	5,400
Boundary and Other Inflows	2,800	2,800
Total Inflow	24,400	17,800
Outflow		
Groundwater Pumping	38,500 <i>(GSP: 60,000, v0.20: 56,500)</i>	17,800 <i>(GSP: 20,000, v0.20: 23,900)</i>
Total Outflow	38,500	17,800

Sustainable Yield for the entire basin: 17,800 AFY

Central Region: 13,200 AFY

Western Area: 1,200 AFY

Eastern Area: 3,400 AFY

Pumping cap within current CMA+Farming Unit area: 10,500 AF/Yr

Updated Sustainable Yield Estimate

Basin-Wide GW Budget

Component	Projected Baseline AF/Yr	Sustainable Conditions AF/Yr
Inflow		
Deep Percolation	16,700	8,600
Stream Seepage	5,400	5,300
Boundary and Other Inflows	2,800	2,800
Total Inflow	24,900	16,700
Outflow		
Groundwater Pumping	42,400	16,700
Total Outflow	42,400	16,700
GW Storage Deficit	17,500	0

Range of sustainable yield:

Lower Bound: 15,900 AF/Yr
Average: 16,700 AF/Yr
 Upper Bound: 17,500 AF/Yr


Range of reduction in annual pumping:

Lower Bound: 24,900 AF/Yr
Average: 25,700 AF/Yr
 Upper Bound: 26,500 AF/Yr
(GSP: 40,000 AF/Yr, v0.20: 32,600 AF/Yr)

Pumping cap for the CMA + Farming Unit*:
 11,500 AF/Yr (range of 10,900 – 12,100 AF/Yr)


*as delineated in 2022

Sustainable Yield Update – Basin wide GW Balance



DRAFT

Example of GW Levels Under Sustainable Conditions




*This chart reflects the MT as was established in the 2020 GSP





DRAFT

Current Management Area Average Annual Groundwater Level Change during Projected BL(2022 Version)




Updated Management Area Average Annual Groundwater Level Change during Projected BL




DRAFT

Management Area (7/22/24 version) 2022 Version vs. Updated 2 ft/yr Contour



- Total acreage within 2ft/yr contour:
 - 2022: 22,500 acres
 - 2024: 21,800 acres
- Causes of shift:
 - Updated geology and aquifer parameters
 - Reduced pumping
 - Improved calibration


Updated Management Area 2022 Version vs. Updated 2 ft/yr Contour



- Total CMA acreage within 2ft/yr contour:
 - 2022: 22,500 acres
 - 2024: 25,900 acres
- Causes of shift:
 - Updated geology and aquifer parameters
 - Reduced pumping
 - Improved calibration

DRA

Updated Management Area 2022, 7/22/24, and 7/31/24 versions



DRA

Key Outcomes

- The updated model incorporates significant new data that was previously unavailable
- Projected basin-wide pumping (42,400 AFY) and groundwater storage deficit (17,600 AFY) are both lower than previous estimates
- Basin-wide sustainable yield is estimated to be between 15,900 AFY and 17,500 AFY
- Pumping cap in current Central Management Area plus Farming Units is between 10,900 AFY and 12,100 AFY
- Approach to uncertainty analysis for the updated model is similar to that of the GSP.




Supplemental Slides



Non-Irrigated Fields (W&C Estimate)


Parcels that were idle for five consecutive years and show as native vegetation in recent satellite images are classified as “Non-Irrigated”. This information is included in the latest CBWRM Update.



White = Irrigated
Gold = Non-irrigated

DRAFT

Historical Precipitation for the period from 1968-2017



Cuyama Basin – Adjusted PRISM Precipitation 1960-2015

Cuyama Watershed

-  Contributes to Cuyama GW Basin
-  Does Not Contribute to Cuyama GW Basin

Average Annual Precipitation (in)


-  5.1 - 7.5
-  7.6 - 10.0
-  10.1 - 12.5
-  12.6 - 15.0
-  15.1 - 17.5
-  17.6 - 20.0
-  20.1 - 22.5
-  22.6 - 25.0
-  25.1 - 27.5
-  27.6 - 30.0

Santa Maria

New Guyama

Guyama

Ventucopa



California Irrigation Management Information System (CIMIS)

CIMIS Monthly Report

Rendered in ENGLISH Units.


January 2022 - December 2022

Printed on Wednesday, July 17, 2024

Cuyama - Central Coast Valleys - Station 88


Month Year	Total ETo (in)	Total Precip (in)	Avg Sol Rad (Ly/day)	Avg Vap Pres (mBars)	Avg Max Air Temp (°F)	Avg Min Air Temp (°F)	Avg Air Temp (°F)	Avg Max Rel Hum (%)	Avg Min Rel Hum (%)	Avg Rel Hum (%)	Avg Dew Point (°F)	Avg Wind Speed (mph)	Avg Soil Temp (°F)
Jan 2022	2.35	0.12	258	6.3	62.8	33.0	45.8	85	33	60	31.7	4.7	47.9 L
Feb 2022	3.25	0.05	376	4.5 K	66.0 K	29.6 K	46.0 K	75	21	44 K	24.3 K	5.3	51.4 L
Mar 2022	4.90	0.72	471	6.4 K	70.5 K	37.4	53.0 K	78	24	47 K	32.1 K	5.6	60.2 L
Apr 2022	6.36	0.19	604 K	6.5 K	73.5 K	40.9 K	57.2 K	72	21	41 K	32.6 K	5.8 K	67.5 L
May 2022	8.37	0.00	712 K	6.6 K	81.5 K	45.9 K	64.0 K	60	15	32 K	33.2 K	6.0	75.8
Jun 2022	9.24	0.00	728 K	7.6 K	91.6	54.6 K	74.1 K	56	14	27 K	36.6 K	6.0 K	84.7
Jul 2022	9.52	0.01	693	8.7 K	97.8	59.9 K	78.9 K	49	14	26 K	40.1 K	5.2	90.3 L
Aug 2022	8.26 K	0.00 K	628 K	9.5 K	99.1	62.1 K	80.1 K	51 L	14 L	27	42.7	5.2 K	91.9 K
Sep 2022	1.43 K	0.20 K	488 K	10.8 K	92.3 K	58.1 K	74.4 K	50 L	12 L	37 L	45.0 L	5.4 K	85.3 L
Oct 2022	4.11 K	0.00 K	401 K	7.7 K	82.9	46.7 K	63.5 K	62 L	18 L	39	36.9	5.2 K	75.3 K
Nov 2022	2.64	0.83	281	5.5	63.9	32.3	46.3	77	28	52	28.2	5.0 K	53.0 L
Dec 2022	1.58 K	2.33 K	200 K	7.8 K	59.4	35.8 K	45.9 K	93 K	48 K	73 K	37.3 K	4.7 K	48.6 L
Tots/Avgs	62.01	4.4	487	7.3	78.4	44.7	60.8	67	22	42	35.1	5.3	69.3

Flag Legend		
M - All Daily Values Missing	K - One or More Daily Values Flagged	
J - One or More Daily Values Missing	L - Missing and Flagged Daily Values	
Conversion Factors		
W/sq.m = Ly/day/2.065	inches * 25.4 = mm	(F-32) * 5/9 = c
	mBars * 0.1 = kPa	--



Example for Carrot Fields

Potential ET rate is 3.84 ft/yr = 46.1 in/yr




Acronym	Meaning
P	Precipitation
AW	Applied water
RO	Runoff of precipitation
ET - aw	Evapotranspiration of applied water
ET - p	Evapotranspiration of precipitation
I	Infiltration
DP - aw	Deep percolation of applied water
DP - p	Deep percolation of precipitation

All Values = in/yr

Consumptive Use Factors (I.E.) Modeled


Historical Conditions

Consumptive Use Factor
(ETAW / Applied Water)



Projected Conditions

Consumptive Use Factor
(ETAW / Applied Water)



Model Calibration Statistics



Observed GWLs vs. Simulated GWLs

“better results would be closer to the center and distributed symmetrically”

147
Updated

Model Version 0.20

Model Version 0.30



v0.30 shows improved residual statistics compared to v0.20.

DRAFT

Updated


Historical Land Surface & Root Zone Budget

Native Veg.
210,600 ac.

Ag.
30,700 ac.

Domestic
800 ac.

All Values = in/yr




Acronym	Meaning
P	Precipitation
AW	Applied water
RO	Runoff of precipitation
ET	Evapotranspiration
ET - aw	Evapotranspiration of applied water
ET - p	Evapotranspiration of precipitation
I	Infiltration
DP	Deep percolation
DP - aw	Deep percolation of applied water
DP - p	Deep percolation of precipitation

DRAFT

Historical Groundwater and Foothill Watersheds Budget

149
Updated



Acronym	Meaning
DP	Deep percolation
Pump = AW	Pumped water = Applied Water
S	Stream seepage
SF	Surface flow
BF	Base flow
P	Precipitation
ET	Evapotranspiration

DRAFT


Projected Land Surface & Root Zone Budget

Native Veg.
207,200 ac.

Ag.
34,000 ac.

Domestic
800 ac.

All Values = in/yr




Acronym	Meaning
P	Precipitation
AW	Applied water
RO	Runoff of precipitation
ET	Evapotranspiration
ET - aw	Evapotranspiration of applied water
ET - p	Evapotranspiration of precipitation
I	Infiltration
DP	Deep percolation
DP - aw	Deep percolation of applied water
DP - p	Deep percolation of precipitation

DRAFT

Projected Groundwater and Foothill Watersheds Budget

151
Updated



Acronym	Meaning
DP	Deep percolation
Pump = AW	Pumped water = Applied Water
S	Stream seepage
SF	Surface flow
BF	Base flow
P	Precipitation
ET	Evapotranspiration

DRAFT

Validation of Sustainable Yield Calculation

		Sustainable Yield Scenario	Notes
Area	1 Ag Area (Ac)	16,500	17,500 acres of ag. land converted to Native land
	2 Native Area (Ac)	224,700	Total Native land acreage increased by 17,500 acres
	3 Urban Area (Ac)	800	No change
Deep Percolation	4 AW on Ag Area (AFY)	2,750	Ag Area x 2.0 in/yr
	5 Precip on Ag Area (AFY)	4,000	Ag Area x 2.9 in/yr
	6 Precip on Native Area (AFY)	2,430	Native Area x 0.13 in/yr
	7 Precip on Urban Area (AFY)	40	Urban Area x 0.6 in/yr
Flow	8 Net Boundary Flow (AFY)	2,800	From Model Runs
	9 Net Stream Seepage to GW (AFY)	5,400	From Model Runs
Natural Yield		14,670	Row 5+6+7+8+9
Natural Yield + Deep Perc. of Applied Water		17,400	Row 4+5+6+7+8+9
Sustainable Yield per GSP Method		15,900-17,500	

DRAFT



TO: Board of Directors
Agenda Item No. 11c

FROM: Brian Van Lienden, Woodard & Curran

DATE: July 31, 2024

SUBJECT: Discuss and Take Appropriate Action on Data Management System Update Options

Recommended Motion

Board of Directors feedback requested.

Discussion

A presentation on Data Management System (DMS) option enhancements is provided as Attachment 1, and a scope of work and budget breakdown is provided as Attachment 2.

Cuyama Basin Groundwater Sustainability Agency

11c. Data Management System Update Options

Brian Van Lienden

July 31, 2024



Potential DMS Updates

- Available grant budget: ~\$40,000
- Staff recommended updates:
 - Implement automated connections to external databases (GAMA, CASGEM)
 - Update DMS input tools
 - Implement SMC displays for TDS
- A scope of work and budget breakdown for the staff recommended updates are provided in the attached document



Woodard & Curran recommends the following data management system (DMS) updates. For each task, Woodard & Curran will implement the upgrades in the development environment and perform user testing. Upon completion, Woodard & Curran will migrate the completed enhancements to the production environment in coordination with the GSA. Woodard & Curran will also update the User Guide as needed to accommodate the enhancements.

Implement Automated Connections to External Databases - \$21,290 (80 hours)

Woodard & Curran will integrate with readily available and relevant public datasets via published APIs. Dataset linkages will include GAMA and DWR's Period Groundwater Level Measurements (at a minimum) using published APIs on the California Natural Resources Agency Open Data Portal.

Woodard & Curran will copy measurement data and other relevant data (e.g., reference point elevation, ground surface elevation) that does not exist within the DMS for wells that are included in the DMS. The linkage will be automated to run on a monthly basis. Data pulled from API sources shall be displayed and available through the well's graphs, tables, and well information module.

Deliverables:

- *DMS connection to California Natural Resources Agency Open Data Portal GAMA and DWR Groundwater Level APIs*
- *Updated data visualization to well chart, table, and information module.*

Update DMS Input Tools - \$15,960 (60 hours)

Woodard & Curran will update input tools and quality check functionality in the DMS to streamline data entry and quality control, and more closely align with recent work done with DWR to standardize groundwater data reporting formats. The updated import tool includes functionality to allow users to enter field measurements, automate calculations for groundwater elevation and depth to water from ground surface based on available reference point data, and automate calculations based on different measurement methods. Quality control functions will be updated based on the new import functionality. Import templates will be updated as needed to implement the upgrade.

Deliverables:

- *Updated import tool and data quality check functionality*
- *Updated import templates*

Implement Sustainable Management Criteria Displays for TDS - \$2,680 (10 hours)

Woodard & Curran will integrate sustainable management criteria (SMC) displays for groundwater quality constituent total dissolved solids (TDS). Updated chart display allows for user to easily distinguish SMC values related to the selected well.

Deliverables:

- *Updated groundwater quality well chart displays*



TO: Board of Directors
Agenda Item No. 12a

FROM: Jim Beck / Brian Van Lienden

DATE: July 31, 2024

SUBJECT: Update on GSP Components Schedule

Recommended Motion

None – information only.

Discussion

On July 12, 2023, the Cuyama Basin Groundwater Sustainability Agency Board of Directors reviewed and approved a schedule for updating the Groundwater Sustainability Plan (GSP) ahead of the January 2025 deadline and that schedule is provided as Attachment 1 for reference.

GSP Update and Board Policy Discussions Schedule

Updated/New Schedule

	2023			2024							2025
	1 July	2 Sep	3 Nov	4 Jan	5 Mar	6 May	7 Jul	8 Sep	9 Nov	10 Jan	
Board Direction:	<p>Finalize: Feedback on engagement strategy</p>	<p>Basin-wide pumping restrictions/Central Management Area (CMA) boundary</p> <p>Finalize: Groundwater (GW) levels & storage monitoring networks</p> <p>GW levels & storage sustainable management criteria (SMC) and undesirable results (UR) criteria options</p> <p>Allocation methodology</p>	<p>Finalize: Subsidence, interconnected surface water (ISW), and water quality (WQ) monitoring networks</p> <p>GW subsidence ISW, and WQ SMC and UR options</p> <p>Glidepath methodology</p>	<p>Finalize: GW levels, storage, subsidence, ISW, WQ SMC and UR</p>	<p>Project and Management Action (PMA) options</p> <p>Sustainable yield (SY) methodology</p>	<p>Continued: PMA options</p> <p>Basin-wide pumping restrictions</p> <p>Allocation program</p> <p>----- Issue 90-Day Notice</p>	<p>Finalize: Basin-wide Pumping Restrictions/MA Boundary (updated model)</p> <p>Allocation methodology</p> <p>Glidepath methodology</p> <p>PMA options</p> <p>SY approach</p>	<p>Review Public draft</p>	<p>**Public Hearing to adopt amended GSP</p>	<p>Submit revised GSP and periodic evaluation to DWR</p>	
GSP Chapter Review:				<p>Ch 1. Agency Info/Plan Area</p> <p>Ch 4. Monitoring Network</p>		<p>Ch 3. URs</p> <p>Ch 5. SMCs</p>	<p>Ch 2. Basin Setting</p> <p>Ch 6. DMS</p>	<p>Ch 7. PMAs</p> <p>Ch 8. Plan Implementation Executive Summary</p>			
Public Workshop		✓					✓	✓			



TO: Board of Directors
Agenda Item No. 12b

FROM: Jim Beck / Brian Van Lienden

DATE: July 31, 2024

SUBJECT: Discuss and Take Appropriate Action on Project and Management Action Options

Recommended Motion

Board of Directors feedback requested.

Discussion

On March 6, 2024, Cuyama Basin Groundwater Sustainability Agency (CBGSA) staff presented draft projects and management action options to the Standing Advisory Committee (SAC) and Board, and options for final direction are provided as Attachment 1.

Cuyama Basin Groundwater Sustainability Agency

12b. Discuss and Take Appropriate Action on Project and Management Action Options

Jim Beck / Brian Van Lienden

July 31, 2024



Projects and Management Action Options

- **Projects and Management Actions Included in the GSP**
 - Flood and Stormwater Capture
 - Water Supply Transfers/Exchanges
 - Precipitation Enhancement
 - Improve Reliability of Water Supplies for Local Communities
 - Basin-Wide Economic Analysis - **completed**
 - Pumping Allocations in Central Management Area (covered separately)
 - Adaptive Management
- **New Projects for Consideration**
 - Flow Meter Recalibration Program
 - Rangeland and Forest Management
- **Board Direction Required: the Board needs to decide which projects to include in the 2025 GSP Update at the July 2024 Board meeting**
 - Staff recommends inclusion of all projects listed above with the exception of rangeland and forest management

Flood and Stormwater Capture

- **Flood and stormwater capture** was described in **GSP Section 7.4.1: Flood and stormwater capture would include infiltration of stormwater and flood waters to the groundwater basin using spreading facilities (recharge ponds or recharge basins) or injection wells.**
- Technical Analysis performed for the GSP:
 - Assumed that there would be sufficient flows for recharge in 3/10 years, with an average of 14,700 AF/year available
 - Estimated benefits: ~4,000 AF/year on average
- Updated technical analysis that accounts for Lake Twitchell operations indicate that recharge may be possible in approximately 1/10 years
 - Revised estimated benefits: ~1,000-1,500 AF/year on average
- **Board Decision: Should this project be included in the 2025 GSP?**
 - Staff recommends that this project should be included

Water Supply Transfers/Exchanges

- **Water supply transfers/exchanges** were described in **GSP Section 7.4.3:** *This project would evaluate the feasibility of purchasing transferred water and exchanging it with downstream users (downstream of Lake Twitchell) to allow for additional stormwater and floodwater capture in the Basin to protect water rights of downstream users. Because this action is intended only as a complement to a potential stormwater or floodwater capture project, all potential purchase transfer water would originate outside of the Cuyama River watershed, and **this action would not include the transfer or sale of existing Cuyama Basin groundwater out of the watershed.***
- This project would only be explored if flood and stormwater capture was feasible but greater volumes of recharge were desired
- **Board Decision: Should this project be included in the 2025 GSP?**
 - Staff recommends that this project should be included

Precipitation Enhancement

- **Precipitation enhancement** was described in **GSP Section 7.4.2**: *A precipitation enhancement project would involve implementation of a cloud seeding program to increase precipitation in the Basin. This project would target cloud seeding in the upper Basin, southeast of Ventucopa, and would include introduction of silver iodide into clouds to increase nucleation (the process by which water in clouds freeze to then precipitate out).*
- Technical analysis performed for the GSP:
 - Assumed cloud seeding would increase precipitation by 10% from November through March each year
 - Estimated benefits: ~1,500 AF/year on average
- An updated cloud seeding study by Desert Research Institute is currently underway, with results available in August 2024. These results will help refine what a potential project may look like.
- **Board Decision: Should this project be included in the 2025 GSP?**
 - Staff recommends that this project should be included

Improve Reliability of Water Supplies for Local Communities

- **The Improve Reliability of Water Supplies for Local Communities project** was described in **GSP Section 7.4.4**: *This management action would include consideration of opportunities to improve water supply reliability for Ventucopa and within the CCSD service area. Potential projects that would be considered under this management action include a replacement well for CCSD Well 2, which is currently abandoned, and improvements to Ventucopa Water Supply Company's (VWSC's) existing well*
- The GSP also supported a potential project for the town of Cuyama (GSP pg 7-19)
- Since submittal of the GSP, CCSD has received grant funding to install a new well
- **Board Decision: Should this project be included in the 2025 GSP?**
 - Staff recommends that this project should be included

Adaptive Management in the Cuyama GSP

- What does the GSP say?
 - Section 7.6 of the Adopted GSP: “Adaptive management triggers are threshold that, if reached, initiate the process for considering implementation of adaptive management actions or projects.”
 - Adaptive Management Triggers
 - **Pumping reductions are more than 5 percent off the glide path identified in the pumping allocation plan:** CBGSA would evaluate why pumping allocation are not being met and implement additional outreach or enforcement, as appropriate.
 - **If the Basin is whin the Margin of Operational Flexibility, but trending toward Undesirable Results, *and* within 10 percent of the Minimum Threshold:** CBGSA will investigate the cause and determine appropriate actions
- **Board Decision: Should this project be included in the 2025 GSP as shown above?**
 - Staff recommends that this project should be included as shown above

Flow Meter Recalibration Program

- The flow meter recalibration program would require all flow meters to be tested for accuracy on a periodic basis to demonstrate accuracy
 - Testing would be performed by a qualified flow meter testing company or other person approved by the GSA
 - Approved testing methods would also be approved by the GSA
- A similar program has been implemented by Fox Canyon GSA, where testing for accuracy is required once every three years to demonstrate accuracy within +/- 5%
- **Board Decision: Should this project be included in the 2025 GSP?**
 - **Staff recommends that this project should be included**

Rangeland and Forest Management

- Description: Removal of native vegetation in forest or rangeland areas through controlled burning could reduce water consumption through decreased evapotranspiration
- Potential Benefit: Reduction in ET consumption from native vegetation
- Potential Implementation Issues: potential adverse effects on wildlife habitat; air quality concerns from smoke and dust; potential increase in flood flows due to reduced water interception
- Estimated Cost: \$500-600/acre-foot
- Project was considered for 2020 GSP but was not included
- **Board Decision: Should this project be included in the 2025 GSP?**
 - Staff recommends that this project should NOT be included due to uncertain benefits and potential wildlife and air quality impacts

Workshop Feedback

Projects and Management Actions

- Groundwater Recharge Projects
 - Will recharge projects be in specific areas?
 - USGS reports that deep wells extract water that is thousands of year old. How can recharge projects reasonably replace this water?
 - Incentivizing certain irrigation practices could increase recharge
- Flow Meter Calibration
 - What are the costs and cost per acre-foot for this project?
- Rangeland Management
 - The GSA should consider other types of rangeland management than prescribed burning
- Water Quality
 - Are there any management actions for protecting groundwater quality, specifically arsenic and nitrates?
- General Comments
 - Most, if not all, of these projects appear infeasible. Pumping reductions are the only reasonable approach



TO: Board of Directors
Agenda Item No. 12c

FROM: Jim Beck / Brian Van Lienden

DATE: July 31, 2024

SUBJECT: Discuss and Take Appropriate Action on Glidepath Methodology [Final Discussion]

Recommended Motion

Board of Directors feedback requested.

Discussion

Staff provided an initial presentation on glidepath options in September 2023. A presentation on the glidepath methodology for final direction is provided as Attachment 1.

Cuyama Basin Groundwater Sustainability Agency

12c. Discuss and Take Appropriate Action on Glidepath
Methodology

Jim Beck / Brian Van Lienden


July 31, 2024



GSP Approach


Board Policy in 2025 GSP Update will apply for 5 years until next update

- The glide path was developed as part of the Central Basin pumping allocations action in the GSP
- **GSP Section 7.5.2 (p. 7-23):** “The required decreases in pumping volumes to achieve balanced groundwater use in the Basin may result in substantial reductions in water availability over current use. The CBGSA plans to complete the pumping allocation plan in 2022, with pumping reductions beginning in 2023 at 5 percent of the total required reduction to achieve sustainability, and an additional 5 percent reduction in 2024. From 2025 to 2038, pumping would be reduced by 6.5 percent annually, so as to achieve sustainability in the Basin in 2038.”




CBGSA GSP - Pumping Allocations Action

- Based on updated modeling estimates, the **Glide Path** results in Central Management Area pumping allocations equal to about 30% of baseline pumping levels in 2040 (a reduction of ~70%)



Potential Options presented in Nov 2023

- Central Management Area options:
 1. Continue to use the same glide path for pumping allocations
 2. Adjust glide path to have greater reductions earlier in the period and lesser reductions later in the period (less overall reduction in groundwater storage and levels)
 3. Adjust glide path to have lesser reductions earlier in the period and greater reductions later in the period (less early impacts to agricultural users)



Potential Options

- Other Central Management Area options presented in Nov 2023:
 1. Adjust the glide path to account for potential implementation of water supply projects
 2. Adjust the glide path schedule in conjunction with minimum thresholds so that that groundwater levels stay above minimum thresholds in 2040
- **Board Direction Needed: Which glide path option should be incorporated into the GSP?**



TO: Board of Directors
Agenda Item No. 12d

FROM: Jim Beck / Brian Van Lienden

DATE: July 31, 2024

SUBJECT: Discuss and Take Appropriate Action on Basin-Wide Water Management Narrative

Recommended Motion

Board of Directors feedback requested.

Discussion

A presentation on the basin-wide water management narrative is provided as Attachment 1.

Cuyama Basin Groundwater Sustainability Agency

12d. Discuss and Take Appropriate Action on Basin-Wide Management Narrative

Jim Beck / Brian Van Lienden

July 31, 2024



What does the 2020 GSP say?

- **GSP Section 7.5.2:** “This project would involve development of pumping allocations in the Central Basin Management Area. Consistent with the magnitude of projected overdraft estimated by the numerical model, pumping allocations would not apply to the Ventucopa Management Area or to users outside of a Management Area. CCSD would be provided allocations based on historical water use, and would not be required to reduce pumping over time, but would be limited in how much pumping could increase in the future.”

What does the 2020 GSP say?

179

- **GSP Section 7.5.2:** “This project would involve development of pumping allocations in the Central Basin Management Area. Consistent with the magnitude of projected overdraft estimated by the numerical model, pumping allocations would not apply to the Ventucopa Management Area or to users outside of a Management Area. CCSD would be provided allocations based on historical water use, and would not be required to reduce pumping over time, but would be limited in how much pumping could increase in the future.”



TO: Board of Directors
Agenda Item No. 12e

FROM: Jim Beck / Brian Van Lienden

DATE: July 31, 2024

SUBJECT: Discuss and Take Appropriate Action on Updated CMA Boundary, Management Area Criteria, Use of an Operational Boundary and Use of Farm Units [Final Discussion]

Recommended Motion

Board of Directors feedback requested.

Discussion

Staff provided an initial presentation on the CMA Boundary and management area criteria in September 2023. A presentation on the management area criteria, central management area and use of farm units for final direction is provided as Attachment 1.

Cuyama Basin Groundwater Sustainability Agency

12e. Discuss and Take Appropriate Action on Management Area Criteria, Updated CMA Boundary and Use of Farm Units (Final Discussion)

Jim Beck / Brian Van Lienden



July 31, 2024



Management Area Criteria, CMA Boundary and Farming Units

- As specified in the 2020 GSP, the current CMA includes all areas that have a 2-foot per year or greater projected overdraft as projected by the Cuyama groundwater model.
 - For implementation of pumping allocations, the Board approved creation of an “operational” CMA boundary
 - The Board established “farming units” to accommodate operators with irrigated lands both inside and outside the CMA boundary
- With the updated model, the 2-foot per year boundary has shifted
- **Questions for Board Consideration:**
 - Should the CMA continue to be defined by the 2-foot per year line as projected by the model?
 - Should the CMA be adjusted to conform with the boundary developed by the updated version of the model?
 - Should the Board continue with the farming unit policy?

Updated Management Area 2022 Version vs. Updated 2 ft/yr Contour




- Total acreage within 2ft/yr contour:
 - 2022: 22,500 acres
 - 2024: 21,800 acres

DRAFT

Updated Management Area

Average Annual Modeled GWL Change





TO: Board of Directors
Agenda Item No. 12f

FROM: Jim Beck / Brian Van Lienden

DATE: July 31, 2024

SUBJECT: Discussion and Take Appropriate Action on Groundwater Allocations [Final Discussion]

Recommended Motion

Board of Directors feedback requested.

Discussion

Staff provided an initial presentation on the groundwater allocations in September 2023 and January 2024. A presentation for the groundwater allocations for final direction is provided as Attachment 1.

Cuyama Basin Groundwater Sustainability Agency

12f. Discuss and Take Appropriate Action on Groundwater Allocation Program (Final Discussion)

Jim Beck / Brian Van Lienden

July 31, 2024



The CBGSA Board Approved the Existing Groundwater Allocation Program for 2023 and 2024

- Allocation Implementation: Calendar years 2023 and 2024
- Applies to: Central Management Area (CMA) + Farming Units
- Baseline Allocation Amount: 2021 modeled water use plus Farming Units in the CMA excluding CCSD metered use and residential pumping (estimated by model)
- Sustainable Yield: Calculated by the model for the CMA (including Farm Units)
- Allocation Methodology: estimated historic water use averaged from the 1998-2017 Water Year period for each parcel in the CMA

How Should the Groundwater Allocation Program Continue beyond 2024?

Board Feedback Needed:

1. Options for allocation Implementation period
 - 5 years (i.e. 2025-2029) and then reassess for next 5-year period
 - Other
2. Applies to
 - CMA + farming units
3. Baseline allocation amount
 - Jan 10th Board direction to use 2021 updated by the model. Continue with this?

How Should the Groundwater Allocation Program Continue beyond 2024?

Board Feedback Needed:

4. Sustainable yield

- Should we use the number estimated by the updated model?

5. Allocation methodology

- Should we continue to use estimated historic water uses average from the 1998-2017 water years?
- If so, should we revert to the numbers estimated by the updated model?

6. Carryover

- Should we incorporate a carryover policy? (general Board support from March 6th Board meeting)

Workshop Feedback

Groundwater Allocations

- Pumping Reduction Program
 - The “one-size-fits-all” structure of the program is not appropriate for such a wide range of pumping and uses
 - Using historical water use for determining allocation share unfairly disadvantages more recent pumpers and pumpers that have historically conserved water
- Groundwater Levels
 - The pumping reduction program does not consider actual groundwater levels, the potential for going below minimum thresholds, and impacts of climate change
 - An analysis of how the gradual reduction in pumping to 2038 will affect groundwater levels is needed
 - Are long-term changes in GW levels outside the CMA due to pumping in those areas or a cone of depression from pumping in the CMA?
- Central Management Area
 - Some support for updating the CMA + Farming Units based on the new model information
- Outside the Central Management Area
 - Some support for extending pumping reductions beyond the CMA, but only if the pumping reductions consider more factors than historical use (e.g., regional sustainability, duration of pumping, conservation practices)
 - How much pumping outside the CMA causes overdraft?
- Water Quality
 - The pumping reduction program should consider protection of water quality from arsenic and nitrates



TO: Board of Directors
Agenda Item No. 12g

FROM: Jim Beck

DATE: July 31, 2024

SUBJECT: Discussion and Take Appropriate Action on Frequency of Changes to Groundwater Allocations [Final Discussion]

Recommended Motion

Board of Directors feedback requested.

Discussion

A presentation outlining options for determining if and when water management outside the Central Management Area is considered and provided as Attachment 1.

Cuyama Basin Groundwater Sustainability Agency

12g. Discuss and Take Appropriate Action on Frequency of
Changes to Pumping Reduction Program

Jim Beck

July 31, 2024



Potential Options

- Staff recommends the Board adopt a policy to determine if and when pumping groundwater allocations would be applied to areas outside of the CMA plus farming units
- Potential options include:
 - Identifying a quantitative metric (e.g. based on groundwater level changes or modeled water budgets) that would trigger consideration of allocations
 - Perform a qualitative assessment of whether groundwater allocations should be considered outside the CMA on one of the following intervals:
 - During each Annual Report
 - During each GSP Periodic Evaluation (i.e. every 5 years)
 - Other
- **Which option does the Board want staff to include in the GSP?**



TO: Board of Directors
Agenda Item No. 12h

FROM: Jim Beck / Brian Van Lienden

DATE: July 31, 2024

SUBJECT: Discuss and Take Appropriate Action on GSP Draft Chapters

Recommended Motion

Approve groundwater sustainability plan chapters 2, 3, 5 and 6.

Discussion

An update on draft Groundwater Sustainability Plan (GSP) chapters 2, 3, 5, and 6 is provided as Attachment 1, and draft final redline GSP chapters are provided as Attachment 2 for consideration of approval.

- i. Chapter 2. Basin Setting
- ii. Chapter 3. Undesirable Results
- iii. Chapter 5. Minimum Thresholds, Measurable Objectives, and Interim Milestones
- iv. Chapter 6. Data Management System (DMS)

Cuyama Basin Groundwater Sustainability Agency

12h. Discuss and Take Appropriate Action on GSP Chapters

Jim Beck / Brian Van Lienden

July 31, 2024



Discuss and Take Appropriate Action on GSP Draft Chapters

- Updated versions of the following chapters have been provided for approval:
 - Chapter 2: Basin Setting
 - Chapter 3: Undesirable Results
 - Chapter 5: Minimum Thresholds, Measurable Objectives, and Interim Milestones
 - Chapter 6: Data Management System
- Updates account for:
 - New information not available when 2020 GSP was developed
 - Updated policies approved by the CBGSA Board at Jan 2024 Board meetings
- Staff is requesting Board approval of these chapters at this Board meeting
- Comments can be provided by email or by mail to Taylor Blakslee
 - These will be considered when preparing the full Public Draft version of the GSP in September 2024



2. Basin Settings: Overview

This Cuyama Valley Groundwater Basin (Basin) Settings chapter contains three main sections as follows:

- **Hydrogeologic Conceptual Model (HCM)** – The HCM section (Section 2.1) provides the geologic information needed to understand the framework that water moves through in the Basin. It focuses on geologic formations, aquifers, structural features, and topography.
- **Groundwater Conditions** – The Groundwater Conditions section (Section 2.2) describes and presents groundwater trends, levels, hydrographs and level contour maps, estimates changes in groundwater storage, identifies groundwater quality issues, addresses subsidence, and addresses surface water interconnection.
- **Water Budget** – The Water Budget section (Section 2.3) describes the data used to develop the water budget. Additionally, this section discusses how the budget was calculated, provides water budget estimates for historical conditions, and current conditions and projected conditions.

2.1 Basin Settings: HCM

This section of Chapter 2 describes the HCM for the Basin. Additionally, this HCM section satisfies Section 354.8 of the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA) regulations. As defined in the regulations promulgated by the Department of Water Resources (DWR), the HCM:

1. “Provides an understanding of the general physical characteristics related to regional hydrology, land use, ~~geology~~ geologic structure, water quality, principal aquifers, and principal aquitards of the basin setting;
2. Provides the context to develop water budgets, mathematical (analytical or numerical) models, and monitoring networks, and
3. Provides a tool for stakeholder outreach and communication.”

This HCM was developed to understand and then convey information about the physical conditions by which water moves through the Basin. This information is also used to support development of water budgets (Section 2.3).

2.1.1 Useful Terms

This chapter includes descriptions of geologic formations and structures, aquifers, and properties of geology related to groundwater, among other related components.



A glossary of technical terms is below. The terms listed here are intended as a guide for readers, and are not a definitive definition of any term.

- **Formation** – A formation, or geologic formation, is a unit of rock of similar properties, such as grain size, mineral composition, or depositional environment. Geologic formations are distinct from surrounding rock types and are large enough to be mapped regionally. If the formation contains a dominant rock type, such as sandstone, it may be included in the name of the formation.
- **Basement rocks** – Basement rocks are the oldest and deepest rocks in the subsurface. Basement rocks are typically crystalline and metamorphic or igneous in origin, and groundwater generally only moves through fractures in the rock instead of pore spaces like in sedimentary rocks. No sedimentary layers are found below the basement rocks.
- **Water bearing formation** – A water bearing formation is a rock formation that is saturated and contains water within the pores or fractures of the unit. One or more water bearing formations compose an aquifer.
- **Aquifer** – An aquifer is an underground reservoir of water stored within the pores and fractures of rocks and sediments.
- **Unconfined aquifer** – An unconfined aquifer is an aquifer that does not have an impermeable layer above it (such as a clay layer). With an unconfined aquifer, the upper water surface is defined as the water table and is at atmospheric pressure. Water seeps from the ground surface directly into the aquifer, as there are not impermeable layers to prevent the water from entering the aquifer.
- **Cross section** – A cross section is a diagram that identifies subsurface layers located beneath a surficial trend. Stratigraphic cross sections depict geologic formations in the subsurface in relation to elevation. Cross sections are useful tools to interpret geology in the subsurface and visualize the relative thickness and distribution of geologic formations. Cross sections are often presented with an accompanying map that acts as a reference to spatially locate the trend of the cross section at the surface. To read cross sections, use the location and trend of the surficial lines on the location map as a key. For instance, where A-A' is marked on the map represents where the cross section named A-A' is located spatially
- **Hydraulic conductivity** – Hydraulic conductivity is defined as the “measure of a rock or sediment’s ability to transmit water,” typically measured in feet or meters per unit of time (day, hour, minute) (DWR, 2003). Rocks and sediments with high values of conductivity, such as gravels or coarse sands, are able to sustain groundwater flow better than rocks and sediments with low values of conductivity. Rocks and sediments with near zero values of hydraulic conductivity, such as very fine-grained sandstones, shale, or granites, do not transmit groundwater and are barriers to flow. Values of conductivity are used in the groundwater model to determine how quickly formations transmit groundwater and where barriers to groundwater flow (i.e., formations with very low values of conductivity) exist.
- **Hydrogeology** – The study of groundwater and aquifers.



- **Primary aquifer** – According to SGMA regulations, primary aquifers must be identified. In the Groundwater Sustainability Plan (GSP), aquifers requiring specific monitoring and management must also be identified. Primary aquifers are regionally extensive and are sources of groundwater used for beneficial uses.
- **Aquitard** – An aquitard is a layer of strata that has a low conductivity that groundwater flows very slowly through. Aquitards can be regional, ~~such as the Coreoran Clay~~ in the ~~Cuyama~~ San Joaquin Valley, where it prevents flow from upper strata to lower strata across the western side of the valley, or it can be localized, which is common in most alluvial settings. Localized aquitards restrict vertical flows in a small region of an aquifer, and water will generally move laterally around localized aquitards as it flows by gravity toward the bottom of the aquifer.
- **Piper diagrams** – A Piper diagram is used to characterize the chemical quality of a water sample, and involves plotting the relative proportions of major ions. Piper diagrams show the relative abundance of major cations (e.g., sodium, potassium, calcium, magnesium) and anions (e.g., bicarbonate, carbonate, sulfate, chloride, fluoride) commonly found in water on a charge equivalent basis, as a percentage of the total ion content of the water. Piper diagrams are useful for understanding what kind of salts make up the total dissolved solids (TDS) in a location.

2.1.2 Regional Geologic and Structural Setting

The Basin is located at the southeastern end of the California Coast Ranges and north of the Western Transverse Ranges (~~Figure 2-1~~), Figure 2-1) and is in an area of high tectonic activity. The Basin is bounded on the north and south by faults, and is located near major fault zones such as the San Andreas and Santa Maria River fault zones. Because the Basin is located in a mountainous region with high tectonic activity, it has a number of structural features generated by this activity. The Basin has been deformed by this tectonic activity, and is generally a synclinal basin, with multiple synclines that are oriented to the northwest and a number of faults ~~that cross~~ within the Basin.

Tectonic activity from the northwest movement of the San Andreas Fault system has led to the development of a fold and thrust belt, which has driven the deformation of the Cuyama Valley for the past four million years (United States Geological Survey [USGS], 2013c). The Cuyama Valley was formed by a downfaulted block of the earth's crust called a graben. This block is bordered on the north by the Morales and Whiterock faults and on the south by the South Cuyama and Ozena faults. Along these borders the faults have thrust older rocks of pre-Pliocene age over the rocks of Pliocene age and younger. In the eastern part of the valley the north-bordering faults approach the San Andreas Fault zone and the south-bordering faults approach the Big Pine Fault zone. (Singer and Swarzenski, 1970)







Figure 2-1: Regional Geologic Setting

Cuyama Basin Groundwater Sustainability Agency
 Cuyama Valley Groundwater Basin Groundwater Sustainability Plan
 December 2019



Legend

- Cuyama Basin
- Faults and Folds

Fault Data Sources:
 Fault Activity Map of California (2010) from the California Department of Conservation. Retrieved 6/13/2018. <<http://maps.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/fam/>>
 California Geologic Map Data from United States Geologic Survey. Retrieved 2/8/2018. <<https://mrdata.usgs.gov/geology/state/state.php?state=CA>>

Figure Exported: 10/19/2018 By: cegjlsblon Using: C:\Users\cegalblon\OneDrive - Woodard & Curran\PC\Folders\Desktop\11078-003 - Cuyama01 - Local\Cuyama GIS_20180603\MXD\Text\TCM\Fig_2_1-1_RegionalGeologicSetting.mxd



2.1.3 Geologic History

The Basin has a long history of deformation and deposition, most of this influenced by tectonic activity and cycles of marine transgression and regression. Formations in the Basin reflect variable depositional environments, from the middle bathyal shales and siltstones to the nonmarine sandstone, conglomerate, and mudstones. Marine rocks are dominant in the western part of the Basin and interfinger to the east with nonmarine rocks (Ellis, 1994).

A major late Eocene/early Oligocene (38 to 28 million years (Ma)) unconformity affected all regions south of the San Andreas Fault, shown in the geologic record by nonmarine Oligocene (23 Ma) rocks overlying a thick section (i.e., several kilometers) of upper Eocene (56 Ma) marine rocks (Kellogg et al., 2008; Ellis, 1994). This unconformity is a result of the Ynezian orogeny (around 30 Ma) during which pre-Oligocene marine rocks were folded and uplifted above younger, Oligocene-age sediments (Kellogg et al., 2008).

Following a period of orogeny, deformation changed to extension from the late Oligocene and early Miocene (around 23 Ma) and the Basin became a major extensional basin (Ellis, 1994). This period also correlated with two transgressive-regressive cycles, where the sea advanced and retreated over geologic time over the sediments now in the Basin due to tectonic subsidence (Bazeley, 1988). Sediments deposited during this period reflect the cyclical nature of sea-level rise and are generally categorized by marine strata in the west and nonmarine strata to the east. Formations deposited during ocean transgression are thick marine sediments, including the Vaqueros Formation, Monterey Formation, Branch Canyon Sandstone, and Santa Margarita Sandstone (Kellogg et al., 2008; Lagoe, 1981). Many of the marine units interfinger with terrestrial units and eventually pinch out to zero thickness in the east. During the late Miocene (8 Ma), the sea regressed from the western part of the region, evident in the geologic record where the nonmarine Caliente Formation interfingers with the similarly aged marine Santa Margarita Sandstone and unconformably overlies the Branch Canyon Sandstone (Kellogg et al., 2008). By the middle Miocene (15 Ma), the eastern Cuyama Valley area was characterized by a shelf and nonmarine deposition. Deformation by the middle Miocene changed from extension to right-lateral strike slip motion, resulting in the development of the Russell ~~F~~fault.

Deformation from Oligocene extension and Miocene strike-slip faulting regimes was buried by the folding, uplift, and thrust faulting during the Pliocene through Pleistocene compression (beginning around 4 Ma) (Ellis, 1994). Compression led to the uplift of the Coast and Transverse mountain ranges surrounding the current topographic valley and the converging thrust faults that surround the present day topographic basin, including the Whiterock, Morales, and South Cuyama ~~F~~faults (USGS, 2013b). The transition to a predominantly compressional system led to the development of a thrust system across the older extensional basin and began thrusting older sediments above younger sediments through the Cuyama Valley (Davis et al., 1988). Older, inactive faults and rocks were buried by the deposition of the younger Morales Formation, Older Alluvium, and Younger Alluvium. Thrust and compression continued into the Quaternary (3 to 2.5 Ma) and uplifted the Caliente Range and thrusted Miocene-aged rocks of the Caliente Range southward over Quaternary alluvium on the Morales ~~F~~fault (USGS, 2013b; Ellis, 1994).



The Morales Formation and Older Alluvium are folded into synclines along the north and south margins of the valley near the bounding thrust faults (USGS, 2013b). The end of the Pliocene (around 2 Ma) marks the complete withdrawal of the sea from the area and the final sea regression marks the change in deposition of marine sediments to the continental clay, silt, sand, and gravel of the Morales Formation and alluvium (Singer and Swarzenski, 1970; Ellis, 1994). Fluvial deposits of claystone, sandstone, and conglomerate became the primary forms of sedimentation.

2.1.4 Geologic Formations/Stratigraphy

The Basin is composed of a sequence of unconsolidated to partly consolidated nonmarine deposits of Pliocene to Pleistocene age unconformably overly consolidated marine and nonmarine sedimentary rocks of late Cretaceous to middle Cenozoic age on top of Mesozoic crystalline granitic and gneissic bedrock (Davis et al., 1988). The unconsolidated to partly consolidated nonmarine deposits are the primary water-bearing units in the Basin and are described in further detail in Section 2.1.7. Individual geologic units found in the Basin are described in detail below, in order of youngest to oldest in deposition. Geologic units mapped at the surface are shown in [Figure 2-2](#). A generalized stratigraphic column of the Cuyama Valley is shown in [Figure 2-3](#).

Figure Exported: 8/21/2018 8: By: cersigleton Using: C:\Users\cersigleton\OneDrive - Woodard & Curran\ PC\Folders\Desktop\01078-003 - Cuyama.GIS Imported: 20180603\MXD\01\Text\TCM\Fig_2-2_Geology.mxd

Dibblee Geology Map Key 204

Color	Code	Type
	Qg	Surficial sediments
	Qa	Surficial sediments
	Qoa	Older surficial sediments
	Qog	Older surficial sediments
	QTp	Paso Robles formation
	Tmo	Morales Formation
	Tmou	Morales formation
	Tql	Quatal formation
	Tc	Caliente Formation
	Tsm	Santa Margarita Formation
	Tm	Monterey Formation
	Tvl	Vaqueros formation
	Tvq	Vaqueros formation
	Tss	Marine Sedimentary Rocks, Unnamed





Figure 2-2: Geologic Map



Cuyama Basin Groundwater Sustainability Agency
 Cuyama Valley Groundwater Basin Groundwater Sustainability Plan
 December 2019



Legend

- Cuyama Basin
- Cuyama River
- Streams
- Highways

Data Source: Thomas W. Dibblee, Jr., Dibblee Foundation
 Released in June 2012, Purchased from AAPG as
 GeoTIF 28 March 2018.







Figure 2-3: Generalized Stratigraphic Column of the Cuyama Valley




Stratigraphic Units of the Cuyama Basin Aquifer

Stratigraphic units in this section are presented in order from youngest to oldest. The USGS prepared a generalized stratigraphic diagram of the Basin and surrounding area in 2013 (2013a, Figure 2-4). The diagram shows the relationship of the Young Alluvium, Older Alluvium, Morales Formation, and basement rocks in and near the Basin. The diagram shows that the Morales formation is thicker to the east, and that the Caliente Formation is interfingered with a number of other basement rock formations (Santa Margarita, Monterey, Vaqueros) beneath the Basin (USGS, 2013a). This diagram shows the general relationship of formations in the Cuyama area and is not a precise representation of unit thickness.



DIAGRAMMATIC, NOT TO SCALE

Adapted from Dibblee (1995)



DIAGRAMMATIC, NOT TO SCALE

Adapted from Dibblee (1995)

Source: USGS, 2013a.



Figure 2-4: Generalized Stratigraphic Diagram

Recent and Younger Alluvium

The youngest deposit ~~of~~in the Basin is the Recent and Young aAlluvium. Recent alluvium is made up of active fluvial channel deposits associated with the Cuyama River and other active channels. Deposits include river-bed gravels and grain sizes rangeing from silt to boulder size and are found along active fluvial channels in the Basin. The Younger Alluvium is inactive fluvial deposits consisting of unconsolidated to partly consolidated sand, gravel, and boulders, with some clay deposited as part of stream channels, floodplains, alluvial fans, or stream terraces (USGS, 2013c). Younger Alluvium is exposed throughout the central portion of the Central Valley and along the active channels and flood plains of the Cuyama River and other streams. The deposits thicken to the east, typically ranging from 5 to 50 feet in the west and ~~thickening from 630 to~~ possibly as much as 1,100 feet in the east (Singer and Swarzenski, 1970). Recent and Younger aAlluvium are primarily Holocene in age, but the Younger aAlluvium can date back to the Pleistocene (USGS, 2013c). ~~The Younger and Recent alluvium are the principal water-bearing formations in the Basin.~~

Older studies do not distinguish Younger Alluvium from Older Alluvium (Upson and Worts, 1951; Singer and Swarzenski, 1970), but more recent studies (Kellogg et al., 2008) mapped the two alluvium units as distinguishable mappable units at the surface, and in 2013, the USGS identified differences in the two units using electric log signatures: (2013a). A greater degree of consolidation, dissection, and local deformation distinguishes the Older Alluvium deposits from the Younger aAlluvium.

Older Alluvium

Older Alluvium is primarily Pleistocene in age and is composed of unconsolidated to partly consolidated sand, gravel, and boulders with some clay (USGS, 2013a). The percentage of clay increases in the western part of the Cuyama Valley. Older Alluvium deposits are typically more consolidated and deformed than Younger aAlluvium deposits and contain a higher clay content. The Older aAlluvium is dissected alluvial fans, colluvial deposits and sediments on multiple terraces and alluvial surfaces and is found exposed on uplifted alluvial surfaces along the south side of the Cuyama Valley and on the caps of the Turkey Trap and Graveyard ridges (USGS, 2013a). Older Alluvium is typically 400 to 600 feet thick, but increases in thickness up to 1,000 feet near the axis of the Cuyama Valley and decreases in thickness west of the Russell ~~f~~Fault (USGS, 2013a; Cleath-Harris, 2018). The Older Alluvium overlies the Morales Formation unconformably, west of the Cuyama Badlands (Ellis, 1994).

Paso Robles Formation

The Paso Robles Formation is part of the Quaternary alluvium series and is commonly grouped with the Older Alluvium. The Paso Robles Formation is a gray, crudely bedded alluvial gravel derived from Miocene rocks and basement rocks of western San Emigdio Mountains east of San Andreas Fault (Davis



et al., 1988). The Formation is composed of pebbles, gravel, sand, and some cobbles. The Paso Robles Formation is sandwiched between two unconformities; it rests unconformably below the Older Alluvium and with angular discordance above the Morales Formation (Davis et al., 1988; Ellis, 1994). The Paso Robles Formation is present only in a small northeastern portion of the Basin.

Morales Formation

The Pliocene to Pleistocene-aged Morales Formation (Morales) is divided into two members, the upper and lower. The Morales Formation is the oldest formation to respond to the modern topography of the Basin, indicating its deposition simultaneous to acceleration of tectonic-driven subsidence (Yeats et al., 1989). The contact between the upper and lower members of the Morales is used to define the base of water-bearing units of the Basin (USGS, 2013a). The Younger and Older Alluvium, and Upper Morales Formation are the principal water-bearing formations in the Basin.

The Morales is massively bedded and ranges from 1,000 to 5,000 feet in thickness east of the Russell Fault and up to 1,200 feet thick west of the Russell Fault (USGS, 2013a; Cleath-Harris, 2018). ThicknessThe thickness of the Morales Formation is disputed amongst published references. In 1970, Singer and Swarzenski reported the Morales Formation to be up to 10,000 feet in thickness along the northern margin of the Valley (~~Singer and Swarzenski, 1970~~). The Morales Formation is found throughout the Valley and is widely exposed to the east of the Cuyama River near Ventucopa and the Cuyama Badlands. Its lateral extent is generally limited by faults. The Morales Formation is overlain unconformably by the older and Younger Alluvium (Hill, 1958).

Upper Morales

The upper member of the Morales is composed of partly consolidated, poorly sorted deposits of gravelly arkosic sand, pebbles, cobbles, siltstone, and clay of Pleistocene age (Davis et al., 1988). The upper Morales is a water-bearing unit and the base of this member marks the base of aquifer materials in the Basin. The upper Morales is thickest to the east near the Cuyama Badlands, approximately 2,200 feet, and shallows to the west, less than 800 feet west of the Russell Fault (Hill, 1958; Cleath-Harris, 2018). In the central portion of the Basin, south of the Cuyama River, the upper Morales is around 1,500 feet thick (Ellis, 1994). In some areas, such as near Ballinger Canyon, the Morales shows some degree of angular unconformity (Ellis, 1994).

Stratigraphic Units Below the Basin Aquifer

Lower Morales

The lower member of the Morales consists of clay, shale, and limestone with lacustrine clay beds with distinct coarse-grained intervals, boulder trains, and gravelly channel deposits (USGS, 2013a). The lower member of the Morales is finer grained than the upper Morales and is less permeable. The lower Morales is not considered a water bearing unit. South of the Cuyama River, the lower part of the Morales consists



of about 1,300 feet of gray, gypsiferous, lacustrine claystones (Hill, 1958). The lower Morales lies conformably on the Quatal Formation and, in western areas of the Basin, unconformably on other marine units (Ellis, 1994).

Quatal Formation

The Quatal Formation is a sequence of fluvial and lacustrine claystone, siltstone, and sandstone which unconformably underlies the Morales Formation. Near the Cuyama Badlands, the formation is up to 820 feet of gypsiferous claystone while in other areas the unit is nonmarine sandstones interbedded with the claystone (USGS, 2013a). The Quatal Formation thins to the west and pinches out to zero in thickness near the town of Cuyama. In the eastern and central parts of the Basin, the Quatal Formation is a distinct stratigraphic marker that defines the bottom of the Morales Formation (USGS, 2013a). The Quatal Formation is not a water bearing unit and is not considered a part of the Basin groundwater system.

Caliente Formation

The Caliente Formation is composed of nonmarine sandstones, claystones, and conglomerates of Miocene age (Davis et al., 1988). Layers of volcanic ash and basalt sills and dikes are commonly found in the formation and tertiary basalt is found interbedded with the formation in the Caliente Range (Davis, 1988; Dudek, 2016). The formation is exposed ~~on~~in the eastern half the Valley, along the Basin edge in the Caliente Ranges and in a footwall block of the Pine Mountain ~~f~~fault (Kellogg et al., 2008). The fluvial Caliente Formation was deposited in the east at the same time the marine Branch Canyon Sandstone and Santa Margarita Formation were being deposited to the west (Ellis, 1994). The Caliente Formation conformably overlies and interfingers with the marine sedimentary rocks of the Santa Margarita Formation and pinches out to zero thickness to the west (Kellogg et al., 2008; Davis et al., 1988).

Santa Margarita Formation

The Santa Margarita Formation is composed of shallow-marine, consolidated sandstones from the middle to late Miocene (USGS, 2013b). The formation contains a gypsum member and a sandstone-mudstone member. The gypsum member consists of a greenish-gray, medium to thin bedded gypsum, up to 82 feet thick (Kellogg et al., 2008). The sandstone and mudstone member consists of interbedded layers of arkosic sandstone, mudstone, and siltstone, up to 400 feet thick (Kellogg et al., 2008). The sandstone sequence is rich in shallow marine molluscan fossils. The formation unconformably underlies the Morales Formation in the northwest of the Valley and grades into the Caliente Formation to the east (Hill, 1958). Locally, the formation contains layers of volcanic ash, basalt sills, dikes and flow units (Davis et al., 1988). The Santa Margarita Formation is the youngest marine unit in the Basin and marks the final phase of marine sedimentation and sea transgression (Lagoe, 1981).



Monterey Formation

The Monterey Formation consists of intervals of dolomitic marine shale, mudstone, and siltstone. The formation is subdivided into two members: the upper Whiterock Bluff Shale member and the lower Saltos Shale member (Davis et al., 1988). The Whiterock Bluff Shale is calcareous in the lower two-thirds and becomes gradually siliceous in the upper one-third and is found up to 1,200 feet in thickness (Bazeley, 1988; Hill, 1958). The Saltos Shale member is a calcareous shale with turbiditic sandstones and was deposited at the same time as the fluvial Caliente Formation, but in the western, bathyal portion of the Basin (Davis et al., 1988; USGS, 2013b). The Saltos Shale member is found up to 2,250 feet thick (Hill, 1958). The formation is middle Miocene in age and is cut with layers of volcanic ash and Miocene-age basalt sills (Davis et al., 1988). In the Caliente Mountain Range, Tertiary basalt is found interbedded with the Monterey Formation (Davis et al., 1988). To the east, the Monterey Formation grades into the Branch Canyon Sandstone. The formation is conformably overlain by the Santa Margarita Formation.

Branch Canyon Sandstone

The Branch Canyon Sandstone is Middle Miocene in age and is a shallow marine sandstone (Davis et al., 1988). Like the Monterey and Santa Margarita formations, the Branch Canyon Sandstone contains layers of volcanic ash and is cut by basalt sills and dikes (Davis et al., 1988). The sandstone grades into the Caliente Formation to the east and is up to 2,500 feet thick (Kellogg et al., 2008). The easternmost extent of the Branch Canyon Sandstone represents an early Miocene wave-dominated shoreline and is defined by the gradational change into the nonmarine Caliente Formation to the east (Davis et al., 1988; Bazeley, 1988).

Vaqueros Formation

Most of the oil produced in the Basin comes from the Vaqueros Formation. The formation is late Oligocene to early Miocene in age and is a marine clastic unit that is subdivided into three members: the upper, shallow-marine Painted Rock Sandstone member, the middle, bathyal Soda Lake Shale member, and the lower, shallow-marine Quail Canyon Sandstone member (Davis et al., 1988). The Vaqueros Formation represents a shallow-marine, high-energy, shoreface environment where the lower half represents a transgressive environment and the upper half represents a regressive environment (Bazeley, 1988). To the east, the Vaqueros Formation grades into the lower part of the nonmarine Caliente Formation. In the Cuyama Badlands, the Vaqueros Formation rests on the Simmler Formation and crystalline basement rocks, while in the central portion of the Basin, the Vaqueros Formation rests on Paleogene sedimentary rocks (Ellis, 1994). The Branch Canyon Sandstone and Monterey Formation are conformably above the Vaqueros Formation (Davis et al., 1988).

Simmler Formation

The Simmler Formation is a terrestrial sandstone, siltstone, and conglomerate of the Oligocene epoch (Davis et al., 1988). The Simmler Formation contains a shale member containing with intervals of



claystones and siltstones interbedded with coarse sandstones and a sandstone member containing sandstones interbedded with siltstones and claystones (Kellogg et al., 2008). The formation is as thick as 2,800 feet and overlies the Eocene-Oligocene unconformity (Kellogg et al., 2008). To the east, the Simmler Formation interfingers with a thin section of the marine Vaqueros Formation, marking the beginning of marine regression in the early to middle Miocene (Kellogg et al., 2008). Sediments of the Simmler Formation were sourced from the erosion of the Santa Barbara Canyon area and were deposited on a wide, delta plain (Bazeley, 1988). Though rare, the Simmler Formation can contain interbedded mafic volcanics (Yeats et al., 1989).

Marine Sedimentary Rocks


Late Cretaceous to Eocene marine rocks are unnamed but are part of the crystalline basement of the Cuyama Valley (Davis et al., 1988). The strata are unconformably overlain by a thick section of middle and upper Cenozoic rocks and are primarily exposed in the La Panza and Sierra Madres ranges and the hanging walls of the South Cuyama, La Panza, and Ozena faults (Davis et al., 1988).

Formations Older Than Marine Sedimentary Rocks

The crystalline rocks of the Cuyama Valley are composed of Mesozoic-age granitic rocks and Precambrian-age gneissic rocks (Davis et al., 1988). Cretaceous granitic rocks are exposed in the La Panza Range and near the San Andreas Fault, 12 to 18 miles southeast of the Cuyama Valley (USGS, 2013b). Precambrian granitic gneissic rocks outcrop east of the Cuyama Badlands and the La Panza Range (USGS, 2013b). Total thickness is unknown.


[Figure 2-5](#) shows the locations of cross sections across the central portion of the Basin prepared by the USGS in 2013. [Figure 2-5](#) shows a west-east cross section that runs near the towns of New Cuyama and Cuyama labeled A-A', and a south-north cross section labeled B-B'.

[Figure 2-6](#) shows the A-A' cross section and [Figure 2-7](#) shows the B-B' cross section. Cross-section A-A' shows the layering of Recent and Old alluvial aquifers and the Morales Formation aquifer. It also shows where the Russell Fault and Turkey Trap Ridge Fault cross the cross section, and shows groundwater elevation. [Figure 2-7](#) shows cross section B-B', which shows layering of the aquifers and the locations where the Rehoboth and Graveyard Ridge fault cross the cross section.




Shaded relief base created from 30-m digital elevation model from USGS National Elevation Dataset (NED); North American Vertical Datum 1983 (NAVD83)
 Hydrology sourced from 1:24,000-scale National Hydrography Dataset, 1974–2009
 Place names sourced from USGS Geographic Names Information System, 1974–2009
 San Andreas fault from Bryant (2005), Albers Projection, NAD83

<p>Generalized stratigraphic units</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Qc, active channel Qya, young alluvium Qoa, older alluvium QTm, Morales Formation BR1, Quatal Formation BR1, Caliente Formation BR2, bedrock unit 2 	<p>EXPLANATION</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Normal fault ▲ Thrust fault Thrust fault, concealed ↔ Strike-slip fault ↖ Syncline, showing plunge direction Syncline, concealed Study-area boundary Oil field A Line of section <p>GRF, Graveyard Ridge fault; SBCF, Santa Barbara Canyon fault; TTRF, Turkey Trap Ridge fault</p>
---	--



Source: USGS, 2015

Figure 2-6: USGS Cross Section A-A'




EXPLANATION

Generalized stratigraphic units

- Recent alluvial aquifer
- Older alluvial aquifer
- Morales Formation aquifer
- Bedrock

Faults

- Water level – 1966
- Water level – 2008



Source: USGS, 2015

Figure 2-7: USGS Cross Section B-B'



2.1.5 Faults and Structural Features

The Basin is bounded by faults and contains a number of tectonic features including synclines, faults, and outcrops of basement rocks in the Basin. Major faults and synclines are shown in Figure 2-8. ~~Outcrops~~ shows outcrops of basement rocks are shown on the geologic maps ~~(Figure 2-2 (and Figure 2-5 Figure 2-5))~~.

Synclines

There are a number of synclines in the Basin; they are generally oriented to the northwest/southeast consistent with how the majority of the Basin is oriented.

Cuyama Syncline

The Cuyama Syncline is located in the southeastern portion of the Basin. It stretches from the Ballinger Canyon south into the Cuyama Badlands, ending along the Cuyama River. The Cuyama Syncline plunges from the Ventucopa area northwestward to beneath the valley from the Ventucopa area to the southeast. The syncline is known from subsurface data from oil exploration wells beneath the valley and exposures near the town of Ventucopa and in the Cuyama Badlands. (USGS, 2013a). The axis of the syncline strikes roughly parallel to the San Andreas Fault (N50°W) and plunges to the northwest (13°NW) (Singer and Swarzenski, 1970; Ellis, 1994). The Cuyama syncline was a depocenter (a site of sediment accumulation) during the deposition of the Morales Formation (Ellis, 1994). The syncline has folded water and non-water bearing formations and is favorable to the transmission of water from the southeast end of the valley but otherwise has no pronounced effect on the occurrence of groundwater (Upson and Worts, 1951).

Syncline Near the Santa Barbara Canyon Fault

Near the Santa Barbara Canyon Fault, A syncline is indicated by the USGS ~~(2013a)~~. The syncline runs generally east-west and is roughly 5 miles long. It ends near the southern edge of the South Cuyama ~~fault (USGS, 2013a)~~ Fault.

Syncline in the ~~NS~~ Southwestern Portion of the Basin

There is a syncline in the western portion of the Basin that roughly follows a west-northwest direction near the southern border of the Basin, located southwest of the Russel ~~f~~ F fault, near an outcrop of the Santa Margarita formation (Cleath-Harris, 2018). The full extent of this syncline, and its length are not documented at this time, but likely extends 5 to 10 miles, which is the length of documented ~~f~~ F faults in the area, as mapped by Dibblee ~~(Dibblee, (2005))~~.



Major Faults

There are a number of faults within the Basin, many of which take the form of ‘fault zones’ where there are multiple individual faults close together oriented in the same direction. This section describes each major fault individually, with consideration that there are often additional small faults near each major fault. Major faults are shown in Figure 2-8.

Russell Fault

The Russell fault is a subsurface, right lateral, strike-slip fault that is ~~7~~^{seven} miles long and runs roughly parallel to the Russell Ranch oil field through the western portion of the Basin.

The Russell fault offsets the top of bedrock by as much as 1,500 feet (Nevins, 1982), ~~and has had approximately 18 miles of right lateral offset documented on the~~. The NW-striking Russell fault in the northwestern part of the Cuyama Valley ~~has had approximately 18 miles of right-lateral offset that~~ occurred between 23 and 4 Ma (USGS, 2013a; Ellis, 1994). The fault is referred to as strike-slip by several authors, and normal fault by others, and is sometimes referred to as both strike-slip and normal ~~within fault in~~ the same document (USGS, 2013a). Water bearing units on the western (upthrown) side of the Russell fault become thinner to the west ~~of the Russell Fault~~ and become thicker to the east ~~of the Russell Fault~~ due to this uplift. Alluvium is generally limited to stream channels and the Cuyama River bed on the western side of the fault.

The Russell fault has been analyzed by a number of authors who have come to ~~different~~ conclusions regarding the fault’s potential to be a barrier to groundwater flow. In 1989, Yeats stated that “the base of the Morales Formation is not cut by the fault” (~~Yeats et al., 1989~~). Using tectonic activity and decreasing offset of younger beds, Yeats concluded that the Vaqueros Formation is primarily impacted as it was deposited during the fault’s most active period and that by the time the Morales Formation was deposited 19 million years later, activity on the fault had ceased (Yeats et al., 1989). ~~The USGS in 2008 initially concluded that the fault was not a barrier to flow (USGS, 2013c). The USGS in 2013~~ In 2013, the USGS studied the fault using interferometric synthetic-aperture radar (InSAR) data and concluded that “the Russell fault did not appear to be acting as a barrier to groundwater flow” (USGS, 2013c). In 2015, the USGS identified the Russell fault as a barrier to flow and used it as a no flow boundary in the Cuyama Valley Hydrologic Model (CUVHM) (USGS, 2015). Based on the conclusions of the USGS, Dudek stated that the fault has indicators that it obstructs groundwater flow due to truncation of older geologic formations and standing moisture near the fault and prepared a basin boundary modification request based on the conclusion that the fault is a barrier to flow (Dudek, 2016). In addition, Cleath-Harris ~~determined~~ ~~Geologists concluded~~ that the fault is a barrier to flow and prepared a technical memorandum to document their study of the fault’s behavior (Cleath-Harris, 2018). In 2016, DWR denied a request for a ~~Basin boundary modification~~ ~~motivated by~~ ~~based on~~ claims that the Russell fault is a barrier to groundwater flow and divides groundwater in the central portion of the Basin from groundwater in the west. ~~DWR rejected the Basin boundary modification request~~, citing a lack of hydrogeologic data that supported evidence of barrier. EKI Environment & Water, Inc. (EKI) reviewed the USGS’s work in 2017



and concluded the fault potential to be a barrier is not understood and recommended additional study to refine the fault’s properties (EKI, 2017).






Figure Exported: 8/21/2018 8: By: cengipten Using: C:\Users\cengipten\OneDrive - Woodard & Curran\PCF\Folders\Desktop\011078-003 - Cuyama.GIS Imported: 20180805\1\X\Bas\Text\TCM\Fig 2 1-8 Major Faults.mxd




Figure 2-8: Major Faults

Cuyama Basin Groundwater Sustainability Agency
 Cuyama Valley Groundwater Basin Groundwater Sustainability Plan
 December 2019



Legend

- Fault Types**
- Normal
 - Syncline
 - Thrust
 - - - Thrust Fault, Concealed
- Cuyama Basin



Rehoboth Fault

The Rehoboth **f**Fault is a normal, subsurface fault that bisects the central portion of the Basin. The fault is approximately **8**eight miles long and trends to the **e**east-southeast. The USGS concluded that evidence of the fault is inferred based on water level-changes in the west-central part of the valley and offset of the Morales Formation (USGS, 2013b; USGS, 2013a). The top of the Morales Formation is offset 160 feet on the northeast side of the fault and the offset increases with depth (USGS, 2013a). Surface exposures of the Older Alluvium do not appear to be offset along the trace of the fault, indicating the motion of the Rehoboth **f**Fault ceased prior to the deposition of the **e**Older and Younger Alluvium (USGS, 2013a).

Despite stating that the Rehoboth **f**Fault does not “have a discernible effect on the elevation” of the Older **A**Alluvium and Younger Alluvium and that the fault was “not a significant barrier to groundwater flow” as symmetrical subsidence and uplift was observed on both sides of the fault, the USGS included the Rehoboth **f**Fault as a leaky, horizontal barrier to groundwater flow in the CUVHM (USGS, 2013a; USGS, 2013b; USGS, 2015). In the CUVHM, the Rehoboth **f**Fault impedes underflow in the Older Alluvium and Morales Formation along the Sierra Madre Foothills region (USGS, 2015). The USGS also listed the Rehoboth **f**Fault as affecting the **y**Younger and Older Alluviums and the Morales Formation in a summary table of “Geologic Units affected by Cuyama Valley faults” (USGS, 2013a).

Whiterock Fault

The Whiterock **f**Fault is a surface and subsurface thrust fault that runs along the northern finger **i**in the **w**western part of the Cuyama Basin. The fault can be traced further south under the Basin near the Cuyama River and **t**the Russell Fault and State Route (SR) 166, though it is **s**subsurfaceburied (Calhoun, 1985). The fault dips northeast and is late Oligocene to early Miocene in age (Davis et al., 1988). The Whiterock **f**Fault is exposed at the surface where it thrusts the Monterey Formation over the Morales Formation (Davis et al., 1988). Activity along the fault began after movement ceased on the Russell **f**Fault and tectonically overrides the Russell **f**Fault (Nevins, 1982; Calhoun, 1985). The fault cuts the Morales Formation south of the Cuyama River but does not affect the **y**Younger or Older Alluviums (DeLong et al., 2011; Nevins, 1982).

Turkey Trap Ridge Fault and Graveyard Ridge Fault

The Turkey Trap Ridge **f**Fault and the Graveyard Ridge **f**Fault are normal, subsurface faults that trend slightly north of west in the **w**west-center part of the Cuyama Valley (USGS, 2013a). The primary difference between the two faults is that the Turkey Trap Ridge **f**Fault is 11 miles long and located southwest of the Graveyard Ridge **f**Fault; the Graveyard Ridge **f**Fault is **4**four miles long. Both faults are located north of SR 166 and are oriented in a “left-stepping, echelon pattern” (USGS, 2013a). Seismic reflection profiles collected along the ridges indicate they are bounded by north-dipping, south-directed, reverse faults along the south sides (USGS, 2013a). Both faults are considered to be barriers to groundwater **f**flow. Evidence of the faults and their no-flow zones include springs and seeps along the base



of the faults in the 1940-50s and water-level changes across the faults of 80 to 100 feet in the area near these ridges (Upson and Worts, 1951; Singer and Swarzenski, 1970).



In 1970, Singer and Swarzenski (1970) reported that water removed by pumping from this region was slow to replenish because the faults restrict movement of water from neighboring areas. The impediment to flow could be related to the hydraulic properties of the faults themselves or fault juxtaposition of older, slightly less permeable Older Alluvium to the north against Younger Alluvium to the south of the faults (USGS, 2013a).

South Cuyama Fault

The South Cuyama ~~f~~Fault is a surficial, thrust fault that defines a 39-mile stretch of the Basin's southwestern boundary. The fault thrusts the Eocene-Cretaceous aged marine sediments against the Older Alluvium and Morales Formation and impedes groundwater flow across the fault zone.

Ozena Fault

The Ozena ~~f~~Fault is a 17-mile long surficial, thrust fault located ~~3~~three miles south of the Cuyama Basin and locally cuts through the southeastern canyons of the Basin. Less than ~~1~~one mile of the Ozena ~~f~~Fault is within the ~~Cuyama~~ Basin boundary. The fault trends west to northwest and runs parallel to the Basin boundary.

Santa Barbara Canyon Fault

The Santa Barbara Canyon ~~f~~Fault is a normal, subsurface fault ~~that runs 5 miles perpendicular to with a northeast strike near the opening of~~ the Santa Barbara Canyon. The fault ~~is east-west striking and~~ offsets ~~b~~Basin deposits with impermeable Eocene-Cretaceous marine rocks (typically the Simmler and Vaqueros Formations) (Bazeley, 1988). Evidence of the fault comes from reported seasonal springs, a steep hydraulic gradient in the southeastern part of the Cuyama Valley near the fault, and the truncation of distinct gravel beds (Singer and Swarzenski, 1970). ~~Water levels~~Groundwater elevations in the Ventucopa area have been reported ~~98~~110 feet higher than water levels to the north (Singer and Swarzenski, 1970). ~~The fault is considered a barrier to groundwater flow as it prevents groundwater flow from moving across~~In 2013, the ~~boundary bounded by the marine rocks~~ (USGS, 2015). The USGS in 2013 also concluded that the Santa Barbara Canyon ~~f~~Fault was a barrier to groundwater flow: “Relatively small amount of vertical offset in the Santa Barbara Canyon ~~f~~Fault indicates changes in water levels across the fault documented in previous studies are perhaps the result of distinct fault-zone properties rather than juxtaposition of units of differing water-transmitting ability” (USGS, 2013a). ~~In 2015, the USGS also considered the fault to be a barrier as it prevents groundwater flow from moving across the boundary bounded by the marine rocks~~ (2015).

La Panza Fault

The La Panza ~~f~~Fault is a surficial thrust fault that trends west to northwest along 22 miles of the western margin of the Basin (USGS, 2013b). The present day thrust fault is a reactivated Oligocene extensional fault that was once part of the same system with the Ozena ~~f~~Fault (USGS, 2013b; Yeats et al., 1989). The



fault defines the west-central margin of the Basin as it juxtaposes older non-water bearing Eocene to Cretaceous marine rocks and the Simmler Formation against the younger, water bearing alluvium and Morales Formation, impeding groundwater flow across the fault.

Morales Fault

The Morales fault is a 30-mile-long thrust fault that forms the boundary along the north-central portion of the Basin. The Morales thrust fault has a dip of approximately 30 degrees (Davis et al., 1988).

Unnamed Fault Near Outcrop of Santa Margarita Formation

A fault located southwest of the Russell fault runs southeast to northwest and is located next to an outcrop of the Santa Margarita Formation inside the Basin (Dibblee, 2005). The fault runs parallel to the long side of the outcrop and bounds the syncline that is to the south of the outcrop. The fault's extent is not well documented, and its surficial exposure is roughly five miles long.

Outcrops of Bedrock Inside the Basin

There are a number of outcrops of non-aquifer material within the Basin. The outcrops occur primarily in the eastern upland portion of the Basin and the western portion, near and to the west of the Russell Fault. Outcrops of basement rock in the western portion of the Basin occur in a different manner than those in the eastern portion, outcrops in the eastern portion are likely depositional contacts with the Morales Formation that were missed during basin delineation by DWR.¹ Outcrops in the western portion are likely tied to tectonic activity and faulting.

Outcrops of basement rock in the eastern upland portion of the Basin are shown in Figure 2-2. The Quatal Formation and the Caliente Formation are present within the Basin boundary near the edges of the Basin. The Quatal Formation is exposed at the surface near the Cuyama River, and at the higher elevation portions of the Basin, and in a band near the Quatal Canyon. The Caliente Formation is exposed at the surface within the Basin in the northeast portion of the Basin, near and along the Quatal Canyon. Another outcrop of Caliente Formation is present near the Cuyama River, but that outcrop has been excluded from the Basin during the Basin's delineation by DWR and is visible in Figure 2-2.

Figure 2-2_ Outcrops of basement rock in the western portion of the Basin are exposed at the surface in limited areas and are tied to tectonic activity in the area.

¹ DWR delineates basins based on the type of restrictions to groundwater flow. The boundaries of the Cuyama Basin were delineated by DWR because they were the boundary between permeable sedimentary materials (within the Basin) and impermeable bedrock (outside the Basin). DWR defines this boundary as "Impermeable bedrock with lower water yielding capacity. These include consolidated rocks of continental and marine origin and crystalline/or metamorphic rock."



Figure 2-9 shows the outcrops of bedrock near the Russell Fault with an overlay of areas identified by DeLong as “Tr,” or out of basin bedrock, overlain on the geologic mapping performed by Dibblee. In general, the outcrops identified by DeLong and Dibblee largely overlap and indicate that in separate field study efforts, the outcrops were identified independently by different geologists. As shown in



~~Figure 2-9~~, Figure 2-9 outcrops of non-aquifer materials are present near the Russell Fault, next to the Cuyama River, as well as to the south of the Cuyama River, both in small outcrops that are partially linear in nature, and larger outcrops that are located next to faults, such as where the Santa Margarita, ~~and~~ Monterey ~~Formations~~ and Marine Sedimentary ~~Formations~~ ~~Rocks~~ are present. The presence of these non-aquifer materials in this area likely restricts groundwater movement by limiting the extent of permeable materials in this portion of the Basin.

Data Sources:
 De Long: Climate change triggered sedimentation and progressive tectonic uplift in a coupled piedmont-axial system: Cuyama Valley, California, USA. Stephen B. DeLong, Jon D. Pelletier, and Lee J. Arnold Earth Surface Processes and Landforms Earth Surf. Process. Landforms 33, 1033-1046 (2008) Published online 13 September 2007 in Wiley InterScience (www.interscience.wiley.com) DOI: 10.1002/esp.1600
 Dibblee: Thomas W. Dibblee, Jr., Dibblee Foundation, Released in June 2012, Purchased from AAPG as GeoTIF 28 March 2018.




Figure 2-9: Geology with De Long "Tr" Overlay

Cuyama Basin Groundwater Sustainability Agency

Cuyama Valley Groundwater Basin Groundwater Sustainability Plan

December 2019



Legend

- Cuyama Basin
- De Long Geology "Tr" - Out of Basin Bedrock
- Highways
- Cuyama River

Dibblee Geology Map Key

Color	Code	Type
	Qg	Surficial Sediments
	Qa	Surficial Sediments
	Qoa	Older surficial sediments
	Qog	Older surficial sediments
	QTp	Paso Robles Formation
	Tmo	Morales Formation
	Tmou	Morales Formation
	Tql	Quatal Formation
	Tc	Caliente Formation
	Tsm	Santa Margarita Formation
	Tm	Monterey Formation
	Tvl	Vaqueros Formation
	Tvq	Vaqueros Formation
	Tss	Marine Sedimentary Rocks,



Additional Analysis Since GSP was submitted

Airborne Electromagnetic Surveys

In order to better characterize the subsurface hydrogeology in the Basin, DWR coordinated a regional Airborne Electromagnetic Survey (AEM). This survey was performed in August 2021 and involved scanning the Basin with helicopter-mounted geophysical equipment to measure electrical resistivity at depths of up to 1,500 feet bgs. Twenty-three survey lines were performed with one line run generally parallel to the Cuyama River and the remaining lines running perpendicular to the river valley in order to generate a 3-D cross sectional model of the basin. Figure 2-10210 shows the distribution of AEM survey flights over the Basin.

The resulting raw survey data was processed by Ramboll on behalf of DWR and provided to the public. The released data was provided in cross sectional resistivity as well as interpreted ratios of sand vs fines. Woodard & Curran staff analyzed the public AEM data in both formats to generate a more refined conceptual model of the Basin. The AEM data were used to improve the design of the layering in the CBWRM Model, as well as model parameterization and calibration. Lithology data gathered from well logs were correlated with the AEM data as well as general knowledge of the geology of the Basin from previous USGS work was also used. Faults were also identified in the AEM survey and were taken into consideration in refining model layering and hydraulic conductivity. Figure 2-11214 shows several flight lines in the southeastern portion of the Basin as red lines on an aerial photograph. The figure also shows the 3D representation of resistivity along those lines to the depth of investigation. The resistivity scale indicates low readings in blue and high readings in red.

CBGSA Investigation of Russell and Santa Barbara Canyon Faults

The CBGSA authorized Woodard & Curran to conduct a streamlined investigation of the Santa Barbara Canyon Fault in the southeastern portion of the Basin and the Russell Fault in the western portion of the Basin. These faults have been analyzed by a number of authors who have come to different conclusions regarding the potential of the faults to be a barrier to groundwater flow, particularly the Russell Fault. The investigation consisted of several components with surface geophysical surveys being the primary component. Spectrum Geophysics of Huntington Beach, California was retained to conduct the surveys and analyze the data.

The surface geophysical surveys were designed to evaluate the depth of the buried faults since both are reportedly inactive and buried by alluvium after movement ceased, the orientation and historic movement (i.e., normal, strike-slip, or thrust), the juxtaposition of formations with different water transmitting capacities resulting from past movement, and evidence of the presence of groundwater on both sides of the faults and flow across them.

The study consisted of two transects (or lines) across the mapped locations of the faults with lengths of 3,000 to 3,600 feet to achieve investigation depths of 600 to 800 feet bgs. The linear transects were laid out roughly perpendicular to the faults, subject to land access (private and government) and terrain.



Electrodes were attached to steel stakes that were spaced 10 meters (roughly 30 feet) apart and driven about 18 inches into the ground. The surveys were conducted using direct current (DC) electrical resistivity (ER) and induced polarization.

The transects for the Santa Barbara Canyon Fault are shown in Figure 2-12. Line 1 was oriented southeast to northwest and located on the east side of Highway 33 in the right-of-way. The work was conducted under an encroachment permit from Caltrans. Line 2 was oriented south to north and located in the floodplain and bed of the Cuyama River. The work was conducted pursuant to a Categorical Exemption from the U.S. Bureau of Land Management. Profiles of ER for Line 1 and Line 2 are shown in Figure 2-13. Similarly, profiles of induced polarization for both lines are shown in Figure 2-14.

The ER data on Line 1 shows relatively laterally continuous lithology across the profile. The inferred location of the fault by the USGS was not present. Depth to groundwater was about 600 feet bgs based on information from monitoring well MW-H (Opti 915 and 916) that was recently constructed within Line 1. In contrast, the ER data on Line 2 shows abrupt lateral changes that are interpreted to be faults. The Santa Barbara Canyon Fault was identified as a vertical/subvertical north-dipping fault near the mid-point of the transect at a depth of about 212 feet bgs. A younger, unnamed south-dipping thrust fault was detected a short distance to the south. This younger fault appears to be thrusting Lower Morales over the Upper Morales. Depth to groundwater south of this fault is 50 to 100 feet bgs and markedly lower to the north. Water bearing zones were not observed north of the buried Santa Barbara Canyon Fault to the investigation depth of about 600 feet bgs.

The locations of these faults are shown in Figure 2-12. It appears the Santa Barbara Canyon Fault extends further to the northeast rather than bend distinctly to the east as reported. Interpretation of this data set indicates that the fault zone/system offsets both the Lower and Upper Morales as well as deep alluvium, contrary to published literature.

The transects for the Russell Fault are shown in Figure 2-15. Locations were restricted to avoid bedrock outcrops, the deeply incised and meandering Cuyama River channel, and oil field operations immediately east of the fault. Line 1 and Line 2 were oriented southeast to northwest oblique to the mapped location of the fault. The transects extended from the Russell Ranch east of the fault to the North Fork Ranch to the west. Natural vegetation was more extensive on the North Fork Ranch. Cultural interferences included a barbed wire fence between the private properties, oil wells, and pipelines. The ER profiles for Line 1 and Line 2 are shown in Figure 2-16. The induced polarization profile for Line 1 is shown on Figure 2-17.

The ER data on Line 1 shows abrupt lateral changes in resistivity that are interpreted to be faults. The vertical anomaly at the mid-point of the transect is interpreted to be the vertical Russell Fault that extends upward to a depth of 50 feet bgs. A likely younger, apparent east-dipping thrust fault east of the Russell Fault is interpreted to be the Turkey Trap Ridge Fault. This interpretation is consistent with mapping of the Russell, Turkey Trap Ridge, and Whiterock faults in this area by the USGS (2015). The Lower Morales has been mapped east of the Russell Fault. A similarly very low resistivity unit is interpreted to be the Lower Morales west of the fault overlying the older Monterrey Formation. The younger Turkey



Trap Ridge Fault appears to be thrusting the older Monterrey Formation over the Lower Morales west of the fault. Groundwater appears to be about 50 feet bgs across the profile. The extent of saturated alluvium is greater east of the fault zone/system.

Abrupt lateral changes in resistivity are also observed on Line 2. The vertical Russell Fault and apparent east-dipping thrust fault east of the Russell Fault interpreted to be the Turkey Trap Ridge Fault are shown. Another thrust fault appears to be thrusting the Lower Morales over the more deeply buried Russell Fault and Monterrey Formation west of the fault. Groundwater appears to be about 40 feet bgs across Line 2 which is closer to the Cuyama River.

The locations of these faults are shown in Figure 2-15. Interpretation of this data set indicates that the Russell Fault offsets the Morales and deep alluvium, contrary to published literature. The Turkey Trap Ridge Fault offsets both the Upper and Lower Morales and deep alluvium. Similar to the investigation of the Santa Barbara Canyon Fault, this geophysical survey identified a more complex fault system than previously reported in published literature.

Figure Exported: 7/10/2024, By: Acanallie, Using: \woodardcurran\mellebarnd\Projects\CA\Cuyama Basin\GSA0011078\01_GSP\wpz\GIS\2025_GSP_Update\02_Basin_Settling_Overview\geophysical\AEM_lines\AEM_lines.aprx




Figure 2-10: Distribution of AEM Flight Lines

Cuyama Valley Groundwater Basin

Legend

- Highway
- AEM Flight Lines
- Town
- Cuyama River
- Cuyama Basin



0 1.75 3.5 7 Miles

Map Created: July 2024

Third Party GIS Disclaimer: This map is for reference and graphical purposes only and should not be relied upon by third parties for any legal decisions. Any reliance upon the map or data contained herein shall be at the users' sole risk. Data sources: CA DWR, Esri, USGS




Figure 2-11: DWR AEM Survey Transect




Figure 2-12: Location of Transects for Santa Barbara Canyon Fault





Figure 2-13: Resistivity Profiles for Santa Barbara Canyon Fault





Figure 2-14: Induced Polarization Profile for Santa Barbara Canyon Fault




Figure 2-15: Location of Transects for Russell Fault





Figure 2-16: Resistivity Profiles for Russell Fault




Figure 2-17: Induced Polarization Profile for Russel Fault



2.1.6 Basin Boundaries

The Basin has multiple types of basin boundaries. The majority of the boundaries are in contact with impermeable bedrock and faults, and a small portion is bounded by a groundwater divide between this Basin and the Carrizo Plain groundwater basin.

Lateral Boundaries

The Cuyama Basin is geologically and topographically bounded; to the north by the Morales and Whiterock faults and the Caliente Range, to the west by the South Cuyama and Ozena faults and the Sierra Madre Range, to the east within the Los Padres National Forest and Caliente Range, and to the south by the surface outcrops of Pliocene and younger lithologies, which are surrounded by Miocene and older consolidated rocks (Dudek, 2016). The boundaries of the Cuyama Basin were delineated by DWR in Bulletin 118 because they were the boundary between permeable sedimentary materials and impermeable bedrock. DWR defines this type of boundary as, “Impermeable bedrock with lower water yielding capacity. These include consolidated rocks of continental and marine origin and crystalline/or metamorphic rock” (DWR, 2003). The thrust faults bounding the Cuyama Basin juxtapose younger, water-bearing lithologies against older, impermeable rocks. The consolidated continental and marine rocks and shales of the bordering mountain ranges mark a transition from the permeable aquifer sediments to impermeable bedrock.

Boundaries with Neighboring Subbasins

The Cuyama Basin shares a boundary to the east with the Carrizo Plain Groundwater Basin (Carrizo Plain Basin) and the Mil Potrero Area Groundwater Basin, ~~as shown in Figure 1-3.~~ The Cuyama and Carrizo Plain basins share a 4-mile boundary along the Caliente Ranges, which is a groundwater divide basin boundary. DWR defines this type of boundary as, “A groundwater divide is generally considered a barrier to groundwater movement from one basin to another for practical purposes. Groundwater divides have noticeably divergent groundwater flow directions on either side of the divide with the water table sloping away from the divide” (DWR, 2003).

The Cuyama and Mil Potrero basins ~~are share a~~ less than ~~1 a~~ one mile boundary along the San Emigdio Canyon. The division between the Cuyama and Mil Potrero basins is also a groundwater divide basin boundary.



Bottom of the Cuyama Basin

The bottom of the Basin is generally defined by the base of the upper member of the Morales Formation (USGS, 2015). The lower member of the Morales Formation is composed of clay, shale, and limestone and is less permeable than the upper member of the Morales Formation (USGS, 2013a). The USGS describes the Morales Formation (both the upper and lower member combined) as up to 5,000 feet thick (USGS, 2013a). The top of the Morales Formation is generally encountered 750 feet below ground surface (bgs) but ranges up to 1,750 feet bgs in the Sierra Madre Foothills (USGS, 2013a). When referring to the Morales Formation in the context of the Cuyama aquifer, ~~this is a reference to~~ only the upper member of the Morales Formation is considered.

2.1.7 Principal Aquifers and Aquitards

There is one principal aquifer in the Basin ~~composed of the Younger Alluvium, Older Alluvium, and the Morales Formation~~. DWR's *Groundwater Glossary* defines an aquifer as "a body of rock or sediment that is sufficiently porous and permeable to store, transmit, and yield significant or economic quantities of groundwater to wells and springs" and an aquitard as "a confining bed and/or formation composed of rock or sediment that retards but does not prevent the flow of water to or from an adjacent aquifer." Most of the water pumped in the valley is contained in the ~~y~~Younger and Older Alluviums. These two units are indistinguishable in the subsurface and are considered, hydrologically, one unit. There are no major stratigraphic aquitards or barriers to groundwater movement, amongst the alluvium and the Morales Formation. The aquifer is considered to be continuous and unconfined with the exception of locally perched aquifers resulting from clays in the formations.

Aquifers

The aquifers making up the principal aquifer in the Cuyama Basin are Younger Alluvium, Older Alluvium, and the Upper Member of the Morales Formation. These units consist of unconsolidated to partly consolidated sand, gravel, silt, clay, and cobbles within alluvial fan and fluvial deposits and in total range from 3,000 to 4,000 feet in thickness (Upson and Worts, 1951). Rocks older than the upper Morales Formation are generally considered either non-water bearing or contain water, ~~but the water that~~ is released too slowly or of quality that is too poor for domestic and irrigation uses (USGS, 2013a). ~~Historically, most of the water pumped in the Cuyama Valley has been extracted from the Younger and Older alluvium.~~



Recent and Younger Alluvium

Historically, most of the water pumped in the Cuyama Basin was sourced from the saturated portions of the Younger and Older alluvium (Singer and Swarzenski, 1970). Groundwater is found in the permeable Holocene alluvial fill and in the underlying, less permeable, Pliocene-Pleistocene continental alluvial deposits. Younger Alluvium deposits thicken to the east, typically ranging from 5 to 50 feet in the west and thicken from 630 to 1,100 feet in the east (Singer and Swarzenski, 1970).

The Younger Alluvium varies compositionally across the Basin (Upson and Worts, 1951). The Recent and Younger aAlluvium is the primary source of groundwater on the western side of the Basin. In the west, Younger Alluvium consists of interbedded layers of sand and gravel and thick beds up clay (ranging from 1 to 36 feet thick) (Upson and Worts, 1951). Clay beds, found 100 to 150 feet bgs, define the base of the Younger Alluvium (Upson and Worts, 1951). Wells in the western part of the Basin that are screened in the Younger Alluvium are shallow but have moderately large yields, as the sands and gravels have high permeabilities (Singer and Swarzenski, 1970).

In the south-central part of the Basin, the alluvium contains more gravel and is less fine-grained compared to western alluvium. The alluvium is predominantly sand and silt with some beds of gravel and clay, though no continuous layers of any material exist (Upson and Worts, 1951).

Older Alluvium

Older Alluvium consists of unconsolidated to partly consolidated sand, gravel, boulders, and some clay. Similar to the Younger Alluvium, clay content increases to the west (Upson and Worts, 1951). Like the Younger Alluvium, historically most of the water pumped in the Cuyama Basin was sourced from the saturated portions of the yYounger and Older Alluvium (Singer and Swarzenski, 1970). More wells are perforated in the Older Alluvium in the western portion of the Basin than to the east (USGS, 2013c). In most regions of the Basin, the top of the saturated zone (the water table) is either deep in the alluvium or below its base (Upson and Worts, 1951).

Upper Morales Formation

The Pliocene to Pleistocene-aged Morales Formation is divided into two members, the upper and lower. The upper member of the Morales Formation is composed of partly consolidated, poorly sorted deposits of gravelly arkosic sand, pebbles, cobbles, siltstone, and clay and is considered water bearing (USGS, 2013a). Water bearing properties of the Morales Formation are not well defined, but available data indicate that the hydraulic conductivity of the formation varies greatly laterally and with depth (USGS, 2013c). ~~Permeabilities of the upper Morales Formation vary greatly laterally and with depth; the~~ The highest values occur in the syncline beneath the central part of the valley and decrease to the west (Singer and Swarzenski, 1970). In the east and southeastern parts of the valley where the Morales Formation crops out, the formation is coarse grained and moderately permeable, but land is topographically unsuited to agricultural development and few wells have been installed.



Aquifer Properties

The highest yielding wells are screened in the alluvium and located in the north-central portion of the Basin. Pumping in the alluvium also occurs in the eastern part of the Cuyama Valley, along the Cuyama River and its tributary canyon as far as a few miles upstream from Ozena (Singer and Swarzenski, 1970).

Hydraulic Conductivity

DWR defines hydraulic conductivity as the “measure of a rock or sediment’s ability to transmit water” (DWR, 2003). ~~The hydraulic~~ Hydraulic conductivity is variable within the principal aquifer, varying laterally, vertically, and amongst the three aquifer formations. In general, hydraulic conductivity is highest near the center of the Basin and decreases to the west and east with the highest values associated with the Younger Alluvium and the Upper Morales Formation with the lowest. ~~Conductivity~~ Hydraulic conductivity data are widely available for the central portion of the Basin (near the towns of New Cuyama and Cuyama) and near the western vineyards; ~~but~~ data are sparse elsewhere.

Available data from field tests (including pump and slug tests) were reviewed from the following sources:

- ~~3~~ Three multi-completion USGS wells (USGS, 2013c)
- 51 PG&E wells (USGS, 2013c)
- 66 private landowner wells in the central portion of the Basin
- ~~2~~ Two private landowner wells in the western portion of the Basin

Figure 2-18 shows the locations of these wells. Dates of field tests range from 1942 (PG&E tests) to ~~2018 (Grapevine Capital tests), and~~ 2022 (Woodard & Curran test). Test wells are screened in all three of the main aquifer formations, including the Younger Alluvium, Older Alluvium, and Upper Morales Formation. Additional sources of hydraulic conductivity include the ~~USGS’s 2015~~ Hydrologic Models and Analysis of Water Availability in Cuyama Valley, California, (USGS, 2015), which describes conductivity values used in the CUVHM, along with Singer and Swarzenski (1970), and a ~~2011~~ USGS study, (2011). The CUVHM characterizes the ~~Recent~~ and Younger Alluvium as having the highest hydraulic conductivity of ~~all the three~~ aquifer units/formations (USGS, 2015). ~~Conductivity~~ Hydraulic conductivity values calculated from field tests ~~for the wells~~ are used to characterize ~~each~~ these aquifer formation, as described below and summarized in ~~Table 2-1~~ Table 2-1.



Recent and Younger Alluvium —As shown in

Table 2-1, shows wells screened exclusively in the Younger Alluvium in the central portion of the Basin have hydraulic conductivities ranging from 1 to ~~31.9 feet~~32 feet per day and with a median conductivity value of ~~9.5~~about 10 feet per day. Wells screened in both the ~~y~~Younger and Older Alluvium in the central portion of the Basin had a higher comparable median conductivity of 10.1 feet per day value. Field tests are lower than those reported by the USGS ~~in (2015, which reported hydraulic conductivity for)~~. For the ~~R~~Recent and Younger Alluvium ~~range from 5.2, the range is about 5~~ to 85 feet per day (USGS, 2015). Within the Recent and Younger Alluvium, the highest horizontal conductivity is estimates are at wells constructed near the Cuyama River. Vertical Calculations of vertical hydraulic conductivity ranges from 0.2 feet per day in tributaries crossing the ~~a~~Alluvium in areas west of the Russell ~~f~~Fault up to 49 feet per day in near the Cuyama River in the Ventucopa Uplands (USGS, 2015).

In March 2022, Woodard & Curran conducted a 72-hour constant rate test on a private agricultural well located several miles south of Ventucopa. Estimated values of hydraulic conductivity at the pumping well and several observation wells ranged from 145 to 407 feet per day with a geometric mean of 278 feet per day. These values are within the range of hydraulic conductivities for coarse sand and gravel.

Older Alluvium –

In the central portion of the Basin, hydraulic conductivity in the Older Alluvium ranges ~~from 0 up to~~ about 81.2 feet per day, with a median hydraulic conductivity of 16 feet per day. Field tests are also higher than those reported by the USGS ~~in (2015, which reported conductivity for the Older Alluvium ranges and 2011) that range~~ from 0.3 to 28 feet per day ~~in the central Basin (USGS, 2015; USGS, 2011).~~. West of the Russell ~~fault, Fault, near the vineyards, hydraulic~~ conductivity reportedly ranges from about 0.778 to 1.798 feet per day with a median value of 1.24 feet per day in areas west of the Russell Fault, near the vineyards. Conductivity generally decreases with depth. 2 feet per day. Field data show that ~~while~~ the range in hydraulic conductivity for wells screened in both the Older Alluvium and Morales Formation is lower than wells screened exclusively in the Older Alluvium ~~(ranging from 0. Estimates range up to 61.2 feet per day), the~~ with a median value is higher at of 21.4 feet per day. ~~The USGS calculated the median hydraulic conductivity for the Older Alluvium (15 feet per day) to be about five times the estimated value for the Morales Formation (i.e., 3.1 feet per day) (USGS, 2013e).~~

Morales Formation –

The Upper Morales Formation has the lowest hydraulic conductivity of ~~aH~~the aquifer units. In the central portion of the Basin, the hydraulic conductivity ~~for at~~ wells exclusively only screened in the Morales Formation ranges from 1.6 to ~~9.9~~10 feet per day, with a median value of ~~3.4~~5.2 feet per day. Two wells were interpreted to be screened exclusively only in the Morales Formation west of the Russell ~~fault, Fault.~~ The hydraulic conductivity for these wells ranges from 1.6 ~~—1.98 to 2~~ feet per day. The hydraulic conductivity of the Upper Morales Formation decreases with depth ~~and the lower member of the formation (the clay and limestone unit) has a lower conductivity than the upper member (sandstone).~~



highest values of hydraulic conductivity in the Morales Formation occur in the central portion of the valley Basin and decrease to the west (Singer and Swarzenski, 1970).


Table 2-1: Summary of Hydraulic Conductivities in Aquifer Formations

Well Owner	Number of Wells	Formation(s) Well is Screened In	Conductivity Range (feet/day)	Median Conductivity (feet/day)
USGS	6 ^a	Older Alluvium	1.5 – 18.1	15
	6 ^a	Upper Morales Formation	1.6 – 9.9	3.15
PG&E ^b	22	Younger Alluvium	1 - 30	9
	19	Younger and Older Alluvium	0.1 - 37	4.5
	8	Older Alluvium	0.1 – 17	4
	2	Older Alluvium and Upper Morales Formation	0.1 – 4	2
Private Landowners, Central Portion of the Basin ^c	2	Younger Alluvium	28.9 – 31.9	30.4
	19	Younger Alluvium and Older Alluvium	3.9 – 68.6	17.1
	6	Younger Alluvium and Upper Morales Formation	1 – 21.3	12
	16	Older Alluvium	3.2 – 81.2	17.15
	23	Older Alluvium and Upper Morales Formation	3.6 – 61.2	23
Private Landowners, Western Portion of the Basin ^c	4	Older Alluvium	0.77 – 1.79	1.47
	6	Older Alluvium and Upper Morales Formation	0.64 – 1.59	1.22
	2	Upper Morales Formation	1.6 – 1.98	1.79
<u>Private Landowners, Southeast Portion of the Basin^c</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>Younger Alluvium and Older Alluvium</u>	<u>145 - 407</u>	<u>278</u>

Notes:
^aThree wells with four completions each; each well completion is reported as a single well.

^bConductivity estimated using transmissivity field tests.

^cConductivity estimated using specific capacity field tests.



Specific Yield

DWR defines specific yield as the “amount of water that would drain freely from rocks or sediments due to gravity and describes the portion of groundwater that could actually be available for extraction” (DWR, 2003). Specific yield is a measurement ~~specific that applies only~~ to unconfined aquifers, ~~such as which is~~ the primary aquifer in the Cuyama Basin.² The ~~dewatered alluvium~~ Alluvium has an average specific yield of 0.15 (Singer and Swarzenski, 1970). The USGS estimated the specific yields of the three aquifer formations during CUVHM calibration, ~~calculating that the recent alluvium~~. The Recent and Younger Alluvium had the lowest specific yield ranging from 0.02 to 0.14, the Older Alluvium has a specific yield ranging from slightly higher range of 0.05 to 0.19, and the Morales Formation has d the highest specific yield ranging from 0.06 to 0.25 (USGS, 2015).

Specific Capacity

Specific capacity is defined as “the yield of the well, in gallons per minute, divided by the pumping drawdown, in feet” (Singer and Swarzenski, 1970). Specific capacity ~~in of~~ the aquifer varies laterally and vertically but is typically highest in the Younger Alluvium and lowest in the Morales Formation. Wells ~~perforated screened~~ in the Younger Alluvium have a median specific capacity of 60 gallons per minute (gpm) per foot (USGS, 2013c). Wells ~~perforated screened~~ in both the Younger and Older alluvium have a lower median specific capacity of 40 gpm per foot ~~(USGS, 2013c)~~. Wells ~~perforated screened~~ in the Older Alluvium have a median specific capacity of 20 gpm per foot (USGS, 2013c). The silt and clay content of the Older Alluvium increases to the west and corresponds to a decrease in specific capacity ~~in the alluvium~~; specific capacities are less ~~on~~ in the western half portion of the valley Basin compared to the eastern half portion. However, a greater percentage of wells in the western portion are ~~perforated screened~~ in the Older Alluvium (USGS, 2013c). The specific capacity of the Morales Formation also varies laterally but is generally less than the specific capacity of the Younger and Older Alluvium. In the western part of the valley Basin, the Morales Formation has a specific capacity ranging from 5 to 25 gpm per foot. In the north to north-central portion of the Basin the specific capacity increases to 25 to 50 gpm per foot (Singer and Swarzenski, 1970).

² For confined aquifers, the measurement of “storativity” is used instead of specific yield.



Transmissivity

DWR defines transmissivity as the “aquifer’s ability to transmit groundwater through its entire saturated thickness” (DWR, 2003). Using aquifer tests ~~from 63~~ at the 64 wells (shown in Figure 2-18), estimates of transmissivity ranged from 560 to 163,400 gallons per day per foot (gpd/foot) and decreased with depth (USGS, 2013c). Among the aquifer units, wells screened in the Younger Alluvium had the highest transmissivity, with a median value of 15,700 gpd/foot (USGS, 2013c). The aquifer test conducted by Woodard & Curran in 2022 provided an estimated range of 100,000 to 270,000 gpd/foot.

Wells screened in Older Alluvium had a transmissivity three times ~~less~~ lower than the Younger Alluvium wells, ~~at~~ with a median value of 5,000 gpd/foot (USGS, 2013c). Wells screened in both the ~~y~~ Younger and ~~alluvium~~ Older Alluvium had a median transmissivity of 11,300 gpd/foot (USGS, 2013c). ~~Data from the 61 wells were not available for the Morales Formation, but a~~ Estimates of transmissivity ~~estimate~~ from two wells screened in both the Older Alluvium and Morales Formation averaged 4,900 gpd/foot (USGS, 2013c). No values are available for only the Morales Formation. Using groundwater level contours, Singer and Swarzenski (1970) determined the range of transmissivity values in the Morales Formation ~~to~~ change much ~~are~~ more variable than ~~the~~ transmissivity values ~~of~~ for the ~~y~~ Younger and Older Alluvium; ~~i~~ n general, values of transmissivity are highest in the central portion of the ~~valley~~ Basin and decline to the west as the thicknesses of the ~~y~~ Younger and Older Alluvium ~~become more shallow~~ decreases.



2.1.8 Natural Water Quality Characterization

Water quality in the Basin has historically had a high level of TDS and sulfates. High concentrations of other constituents, such as nitrate, arsenic, sodium, boron, and hexavalent chromium are localized (USGS, 2013c). Locations where water quality measurements were taken by the USGS are shown in ~~Figure 2-11~~. Figure 2-19

Singer and Swarzenski studied groundwater in the Basin in 1970. Groundwater ranged from hard to very hard and is predominantly of the calcium-magnesium-sulfate type (Singer and Swarzenski, 1970). Averages of concentrations include 30 milligrams per liter (mg/L) chloride, 0.20 mg/L of boron, and 1,500 to 1,800 mg/L TDS (Singer and Swarzenski, 1970). Along the periphery of the Basin, groundwater quality is variable. Along the southern boundary and near the eastern badlands, the groundwater quality reflects the recharge from springs and runoff from the Sierra Madre Mountains; TDS concentrations range from 400 to 700 mg/L and most of the water is sodium calcium bicarbonate (Singer and Swarzenski, 1970). Along the eastern edge of the valley, near the Caliente Range, water quality declines as concentrations of sodium, chloride, TDS, and boron increase. Concentrations of boron range up to 15 mg/L, concentrations of chloride increase up to 1,000 mg/L, and TDS concentrations range from 3,000 to 6,000 mg/L (Singer and Swarzenski, 1970).

Singer and Swarzenski in 1970 also concluded that the Basin's water quality potentially results from the mixing of water from the marine rocks: "This water quality presumably results from the mixing of water from the marine rocks of Miocene age with the more typical water from the alluvium and is characterized by increased sodium, chloride, and boron. Although chloride and boron concentrations commonly are less than 30 and 0.20 mg/L, respectively, in the central part of the valley, the water from many wells ~~is~~ close to the Caliente Range contains several hundred to nearly 1,000 mg/L of chloride and as much as 15 mg/L of boron." (Singer and Swarzenski, 1970). Singer and Swarzenski did not provide a map showing their sampling locations.

In 2011, the USGS published the *Kirschenmann Road Monitoring Well Site Open File Report* (USGS, 2011), which included analysis of major-ion composition for samples collected from the multiple-well monitoring site CVKR, and samples from selected water supply and irrigation wells in the Cuyama Valley. Figure 2-20 shows a Piper diagram of the major-ion analysis. Figure 2-20 shows that groundwater in the central portion of the Basin shares similar major-ions, and is largely chloride, fluoride, sulfate and calcium magnesium type water. Figure 2-21 shows the locations USGS sampled to perform this analysis.

In 2017 EKI compiled water quality data contained in the appendices of the USGS report *Geology, Water-Quality, Hydrology, and Geomechanics of the Cuyama Valley Groundwater Basin, California, 2008-12* (USGS 2013c). and prepared a Piper diagram with the data (Figure 2-22). The locations of the data used in this Piper diagram are shown in Figure 2-23. The Piper diagram shows the majority of samples indicate that water in the Basin can be characterized as calcium-magnesium sulfate waters, which agrees with conclusions made by USGS in 2013.





Figure 8. The location of multiple-well monitoring sites, domestic and supply wells, springs, and surface water sites with available water-quality data, Cuyama Valley, Santa Barbara County, California.



Shaded relief base created from 30-m digital elevation model from USGS National Elevation Dataset (NED), North America Vertical Datum 1988 (NAVD88)
 Hydrology sourced from 1:24,000-scale National Hydrography Dataset, 1974–2009
 Place names sourced from USGS Geographic Names Information System, 1974–2009
 Albers Projection, NAD83

EXPLANATION	
Cuyama groundwater basin zones	Site type
Caliente Northern-Main	○ Spring
Central Sierra Madre Foothills	△ Surface-water site
Northeast Ventucopa Uplands	● U.S. Geological Survey monitoring site
Northwestern Sierra Madre Foothills	● Water-quality site
Northern Ventucopa Uplands	
Southern Sierra Madre Foothills	
Southern Ventucopa Uplands	
Southern-Main	
Western Basin	
	— Cuyama Basin

Figure 8. The location of multiple-well monitoring sites, domestic and supply wells, springs, and surface water sites with available water-quality data, Cuyama Valley, Santa Barbara County, California.

Source: USGS, 2013c.

Figure 2-19: Location of USGS 2013 Groundwater Quality Sampling Sites




Figure 4. Piper diagram depicting major-ion composition for groundwater collected from multiple-well monitoring site CVKR, and selected water-supply and irrigation wells, Cuyama Valley, California.




Figure 4. Piper diagram depicting major-ion composition for groundwater collected from multiple-well monitoring site CVKR, and selected water-supply and irrigation wells, Cuyama Valley, California.

Figure 2-20: Piper Diagram for Well CVKR1-4




Figure 2-21: Location Map for Samples Used in Figure 2-20




Figure 2-22: Piper Diagram of USGS 2013 Water Quality Sampling




Figure 2-23: Location Map of USGS 2013 Sampling



Aquifer Use

The Cuyama Valley is dependent on groundwater as its sole source of supply. Groundwater is used for irrigation, domestic and municipal use (USGS, 2013c). The majority of agricultural activity occurs between the New Cuyama and Ventucopa areas, and west of the Russell ~~fault near the north fork~~ Fault.

2.1.9 Topography, Surface Water and Recharge

This section describes the topography, surface water, soils, and groundwater recharge potential in the Basin. There are no imported water supplies to the Cuyama Basin and are not discussed in this section.

Topography

The Basin is lowest in the northwest, and highest in the southeast. The lowest elevation in the Basin is located at the west edge where the Cuyama River exits at approximately 1,300 feet, while the highest point is approximately 7,250 feet on the eastern boundary. Figure 2-24 shows the topographic characteristics of the Basin. The south facing northern slopes of the valley are generally steeper than the north facing south slopes. The eastern portion of the Basin along the valley walls becomes steep, characterized by mountainous runoff-cut topography.

Surface Water Bodies

The Cuyama River is the primary surface water feature in the valley and flows from an elevation of 3,800 feet on the eastern side to ~~the west of the Basin to~~ 1,300 feet at the western outlet of the Basin. The Cuyama River travels approximately 55 miles through the Basin and has a slope ratio of approximately 1:125. The river is perennial, with most dry seasons seeing little to no flows. Large flows usually occur in flashes due to the small watershed and storms that provide precipitation onto the surrounding Coastal Range Mountains. Peak flows through the Cuyama River, dated between 1929 and 2017~~23~~, range from approximately 6,000 cubic feet per second to the highest recorded flow of 15,500 cubic feet per second on February 18, 2017 (National Watershed Information System [NWIS], 2018). There are approximately four main perennial streams that feed the Cuyama River: Aliso Canyon Creek, Santa Barbara Creek, Quatal Canyon Creek, and Cuyama Creek. However, during precipitation events many more smaller streams flow from the valley walls and surrounding mountains. Figure 2-25 shows the locations of surface water bodies in the Basin.

Downstream on the Cuyama River lies Twitchell Reservoir, however this is an artificial body of water outside of the Basin.

Figure Exported: 2/14/2024, By: Dhlunt, Using: \\woodardcurran.net\shared\Projects\CA\Cuyama Basin_GSA0011078.01_GSP\wp\z_GIS2_Maps\2025_GSP_Update\02_Basin_Setting_Overview\geophysical\topology\topology.aprx





Figure 2-24: Topography

Cuyama Valley Groundwater Basin

Legend

 Cuyama Basin



Map Created: February 2024

Third Party GIS Disclaimer: This map is for reference and graphical purposes only and should not be relied upon by third parties for any legal decisions. Any reliance upon the map or data contained herein shall be at the users' sole risk. Data sources: CA DWR, Esri, USGS

Figure Exported: 4/30/2024, By: Dhirant, Using: WoodardCurran.net\shared\Projects\CA\Cuyama Basin_GSA0011078.01_GSP\wp\GIS2_Maps\3_2025_GSP_Update\02_Basin_Setting_Overview\arcphysically\hydrology\hydrology.aprx




Figure 2-25: Surface Water

Cuyama Valley
Groundwater Basin

Legend

- Cuyama River
- Notable Creeks
- NHD Flowlines
- Town
- Cuyama Watershed (HUC8)
- Cuyama Basin





0 1.75 3.5 7 Miles

Map Created: April 2024

Third Party GIS Disclaimer: This map is for reference and graphical purposes only and should not be relied upon by third parties for any legal decisions. Any reliance upon the map or data contained herein shall be at the users' sole risk. Data sources: CA DWR, Esri, USGS



Areas of Recharge, Potential Recharge, and Groundwater Discharge Areas

Areas of recharge and potential recharge lie primarily within the central and low-lying areas of the Cuyama Valley. Agricultural and open space lands are considered areas of potential recharge.

Figure 2-26

~~Figure 2-26~~ shows areas with their potential for groundwater recharge, as identified by the Soil Agricultural Groundwater Banking Index (SAGBI). SAGBI provides an index for the groundwater recharge for agricultural lands by considering deep percolation, root zone residence time, topography, chemical limitations, and soil surface condition. SAGBI data categorizes 22,675 acres out of 37,568 acres (60 percent) of agricultural and grazing land within the Basin as moderately good, good, or excellent for groundwater recharge (University of California, Davis, 2018). SAGBI data shown in

Figure 2-26

~~Figure 2-26~~ is derived from “modified” SAGBI data. “Modified” SAGBI data show higher potential for recharge than unmodified SAGBI data because the modified data assume that the soils have been or will be ripped to a depth of 6 feet, which can break up fine grained materials at the surface to improve percolation. Groundwater discharge areas are identified as springs located within the Basin. ~~Figure 2-26 shows the location of historical springs identified by the USGS (NWIS, 2018). The springs shown represent a dataset collected by the USGS and are not a comprehensive map of springs in the Basin.~~

~~Groundwater discharge areas are identified as springs located within the Basin.~~

~~Figure 2-18 shows the location of historical springs identified by the USGS (NWIS, 2018). The springs shown in represent a dataset collected by the USGS and are not a comprehensive map of springs in the Basin.~~

Soils

Soils in the Basin were categorized by the National Resource Conservation Service (NRCS). The Basin is comprised mostly of fine- to coarse-loamy soils (NRCS STATSGO2, 2018). As shown in Figure 2-27, the valley bottom and primary soil surrounding the Cuyama River and its tributaries is primarily fine-loamy soils, while the northern boundary of the Basin has coarse-loamy soils.

Figure 2-28 shows soils by hydrologic soil group. Hydrologic soil groups were calculated by the NRCS on a by-county basis. As shown in Figure 2-28, interpretations of soil groups varied by county in each study. In general, hydrologic soil groups are sorted by permeability, with class A being the most permeable and class D being the least permeable. Figure 2-28 shows that in general most of the soils in the Basin have lower permeabilities and are listed as class C or D, with higher permeabilities being located near streams and rivers.



Figure Exported: 2/27/2024, By: Dhruti, Using: \woodardcurran\metashared\Projects\CA\Cuyama Basin_GSA\0011078_01_GSP\wpwpz_gis\2_Maps\2025_GSP_Update\02_Basin_Setting_Overview\geophysical\hydrology\hydrology\hydrology\wpwpz




Figure 2-26: Recharge Areas, Springs, and Seeps

Cuyama Valley Groundwater Basin

Legend

- | | | |
|----------------------|--|---|
| Modified SAGBI Score | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Excellent (100 - 85) Good (85 - 69) Moderately Good (69 - 49) Moderately Poor (49 - 29) Poor (29 - 15) Very Poor (15 - 0) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> NHD Springs and Seeps Creek Cuyama River Cuyama Basin |
|----------------------|--|---|



0 1.75 3.5 7 Miles

Map Created: February 2024

Third Party GIS Disclaimer: This map is for reference and graphical purposes only and should not be relied upon by third parties for any legal decisions. Any reliance upon the map or data contained herein shall be at the users' sole risk. **Data sources: CA DWR, CA Soil Resource, Esri, UC Davis, USGS**

STATSGO2 Soils

- Nacimiento-Los Osos-Balcom-Ayar (s897) - Fine-loamy
- Shedd-Gaviota (s922) - Fine-silty, loamy
- Xerothents-Pleasanton-Elder-Botella (s924) - Fine-Loamy
- Stutzville-Panoche-Metz (s925) - Fine-loamy
- Wasioja-Panoza (s928) - Fine/coarse-loamy
- Semper-Rock outcrop-Panzoa (s931) - Coarse-loamy
- Kilmer-Beam-Badland (s932) - Fine-loamy
- Millsholm-Millerton-Lodo (s933) - Loamy
- Modjeska family-Coarsegold-Aramburu variant (s934) - Loamy
- Marpa-Hilt-Arrastre (s935) - Fine/coarse/skeletal-loamy
- Los Gatos-Gamboa (s936) - Fine/skeletal-loamy
- Xerofluvents-Oak Glen-Dotta (s937) - Coarse/fine-loamy
- Panzoa-Kilmer-Hillbrick-Beam (s977) - Loamy
- Yeguas variant-Rock outcrop-Gaviota-Franciscan-Bellyache variant (s978) - Fine-loamy





Figure 2-27: Soils

Cuyama Basin Groundwater Sustainability Agency

Cuyama Valley Groundwater Basin Groundwater Sustainability Plan

December 2019



Legend

Cuyama Basin

Figure Exported: 8/21/2018 8:00 AM By: cengj1018 Using: C:\Users\cengj1018\OneDrive - Woodard & Curran\PCF\Folders\Desktop\011078-003 - Cuyama.GIS\Imported\20180803MXD\as\Text\TCM\Fig 2_1-19_Soils.mxd



2.1.10 Hydrogeologic Conceptual Model Data Gaps

The following are the HCM data gaps that were identified during the development of this GSP. ~~There is no consensus about whether faults are barriers to flow amended GSP. The surface geophysical survey of the subsurface Santa Barbara Canyon Fault confirmed its presence in the Basin, and if so, at what depth are they a barrier to flow. There is Cuyama River channel near its inferred location. The survey also confusion about whether smaller faults and confirmed the fault splays are barriers does not extend to the east as reported. It is uncertain whether the fault extends to the northeast from the location identified by the geophysical survey and, if so, where it crosses SR 33 to flow. Aquifer the north of Line 1. However, the possible northeast extension of the fault would not resolve the significant change in groundwater elevations that occurs further to the south of Line 1, namely between TSS #3 and MW-H (i.e., Opti wells 903-905 and 915 and 916). These data gaps may be resolved with an additional surface geophysical survey with transects extending to the north and to the south of Line 1 on or near SR 33. A continuing data gap is aquifer properties in areas where aquifer testing has not been conducted. These aquifer properties are not well defined, and are estimated. The connection between groundwater levels upstream of Ventucopa and in the Ventucopa region are not well understood; additionally, it is not well understood if. Lastly, the extent of brackish groundwater flows are channelized discovered in the Ventucopa and upland regions. Lastly, connectivity between the alluvium west TSS #1 wells east of the Russel Fault and areas in upland areas is unknown and potential impacts to nearby groundwater is not agreed upon understood.~~ Other data gaps may be discovered during implementation of the GSP.



2.2 Basin Settings: Overview

This Cuyama Valley Groundwater Basin (Basin) Settings chapter contains three main sections as follows:

- **Hydrogeologic Conceptual Model (HCM)** – The HCM section (Section 2.1) provides the geologic information needed to understand the framework that water moves through in the Basin. It focuses on geologic formations, aquifers, structural features, and topography.
- **Groundwater Conditions** – The Groundwater Conditions section (Section 2.2) describes and presents groundwater trends, levels, hydrographs and level contour maps, estimates changes in groundwater storage, identifies groundwater quality issues, addresses subsidence, and addresses surface water interconnection.
- **Water Budget** – The Water Budget section (Section 2.3) describes the data used to develop the water budget. Additionally, this section discusses how the budget was calculated, provides water budget estimates for historical conditions, and current conditions and projected conditions.

2.1.12.2.1 Basin Settings: Groundwater Conditions

This section of Chapter 2 satisfies Section 354.8 of the SGMA regulations, and describes the historical and current groundwater conditions in the Basin. Water budget components follow in Section 2.3.

As defined by the SGMA regulations, this section does the following:

- Defines current and historical groundwater conditions in the Basin
- Describes the distribution, availability, and quality of groundwater
- Identifies interactions between groundwater, surface water, groundwater-dependent ecosystems, and subsidence
- Establishes a baseline of groundwater quality and quantity conditions that will be used to monitor changes in the groundwater conditions relative to measurable objectives and minimum thresholds
- Provides information to be used for defining measurable objectives to maintain or improve specified groundwater conditions
- Supports development of a monitoring network to demonstrate that the Cuyama Basin Groundwater Sustainability Agency (CBGSA) is achieving Basin sustainability goals

The majority of published information about groundwater in the Basin is focused on the central part of the Basin, roughly from an area a few miles west of New Cuyama to roughly Ventucopa. The eastern uplands and western portion of the Basin have been studied less, and consequentially, fewer publications have been written about those areas, and less historical information is available in those areas.



The groundwater conditions described in this section are intended to convey the present and historical availability, quality, and distribution of groundwater and are used elsewhere in the GSP to define measurable objectives, identify sustainability indicators, and establish undesirable results.

Groundwater conditions in the Basin vary by location. To assist in discussion of the location of specific groundwater conditions, ~~Figure 2-21~~ Figure 2-29 shows selected landmarks in the Basin to ~~assist~~support ~~the~~ discussion of the location of specific groundwater conditions. ~~Figure 2-21~~ Figure 2-29 shows major faults in the Basin in red, highways in yellow, towns as orange dots, and canyons and Bitter Creek in purple lines that show their location. The map calls out the Russell Ranch and South Cuyama oil fields in red.

Figure Exported: 4/30/2024, By: Dhlunt, Using: WoodardCurran.net\shared\Projects\CA\Cuyama Basin_GSA00011078.01_GSP\wp\z_GIS2_Maps\3_2025_GSP_Update\02_Basin_Sealing_Overview\basin_landmarks.aprx




Figure 2-29: Landmarks

Cuyama Valley Groundwater Basin

Legend

- Oil Field
- Highway
- Creek
- Landmark
- Local Road
- Cuyama River
- Town
- Cuyama Basin



0 1.5 3 6 Miles

Map Created: April 2024

Third Party GIS Disclaimer: This map is for reference and graphical purposes only and should not be relied upon by third parties for any legal decisions. Any reliance upon the map or data contained herein shall be at the users' sole risk. Data sources: CA DOC, CA DWR, Esri, USGS



2.1.122.2.2 Useful Terms

This section of Chapter 2 includes descriptions of the amounts, quality, and movement of groundwater, among other related components. A list of technical terms and their definitions are below. These definitions are given to guide readers through the section and are not a definitive definition of any term.

- **Depth to groundwater** – This is the distance from the ground surface to groundwater, typically reported at a well.
- **Horizontal gradient** – The horizontal gradient is the slope of groundwater from one location to another when one location is higher, or lower than the other. The horizontal gradient is shown on maps with an arrow showing the direction of groundwater flow in a horizontal direction.
- **Vertical gradient** – A vertical gradient describes the movement of groundwater perpendicular to the ground surface. Vertical gradient is measured by comparing the elevations of groundwater in wells that are of different depths. A downward gradient is one where groundwater is moving down into the ground, and an upward gradient is one where groundwater is upwelling towards the surface.
- **Contour map** – A contour map shows changes in groundwater elevations by interpolating groundwater elevations between monitoring sites. The elevations are shown on the map with the use of a contour line, which indicates that at all locations that line is drawn, it represents groundwater being at the elevation indicated. There are two versions of contour maps shown in this section as follows:
 - Elevation of groundwater above mean sea level, which is useful because it can help identify the horizontal gradients of groundwater, and
 - Depth to water (i.e. the distance from the ground surface to groundwater), which is useful because it can help identify areas of shallow or deep groundwater.
- **Hydrograph** – A hydrograph is a graph that shows the changes in groundwater elevation over time for each monitoring well. Hydrographs show how groundwater elevations change over the years and indicate whether groundwater is rising or descending over time.
- **Maximum contaminant level (MCL)** – An MCL is a standard set by the State of California regarding drinking water quality. An MCL is the legal threshold on the amount of a substance that may appear in public water systems. MCLs are different for different constituents in drinking water.
- **Elastic land subsidence** – Elastic land subsidence is the reversible and temporary fluctuation in the earth’s surface in response to seasonal periods of groundwater extraction and recharge.
- **Inelastic land subsidence** – Inelastic land subsidence is the irreversible and permanent decline in the earth’s surface resulting from the collapse or compaction of the pore structure within the fine-grained portions of an aquifer system.



2.1.132.2.3 Historical Groundwater Elevation Data Processing

Groundwater Prior to GSP adoption in January 2020 groundwater well information and groundwater level monitoring data were compiled from four public sources, with additional data compiled from private landowners. These sources include the following:

- DWR
- USGS
- ~~DWR~~
- Santa Barbara County Water Agency (SBCWA)
- San Luis Obispo County
- Private landowners

Data provided by these sources included well information such as location, well construction, well owner, ground surface elevation and other related components, as well as groundwater elevation data including information such as date measured, depth to water, groundwater surface elevation, questionable measurement code, and comments. At the time that this analysis was performed, groundwater elevation data was available for the time period from 1949 to June 2018.³ There are many wells with monitoring data from some time in the past, but no recent data, while a small number of wells have monitoring data recorded for periods of greater than 50 years. Figure 2-30 through Figure 2-33 show well locations with available monitoring data, and the entity that maintains monitoring records at each well. These figures also show in a larger, darker symbol if the monitoring well has been measured in 2017 or 2018.

Figure 2-30 shows the locations of well data received from the DWR database. As an assessment of which wells have been monitored recently, the wells with monitoring data collected between January 2017 and June 2018 were identified. Roughly half of the wells from DWR's database contain monitoring data in 2017-18, with roughly half the wells having no monitoring data during this period. Wells in DWR's database are concentrated in the central portion of the Basin, east of Bitter Creek and north of the Santa Barbara Canyon Fault (SBCF). Many wells in DWR's database have been typically measured bi-annually, with one measurement in the spring, and one measurement in the fall.

Figure 2-31 shows the locations of well data received from the USGS database. Many of these wells are duplicative of wells contained in the DWR database. The majority of wells from the USGS database were not monitored in 2017-18. Wells that were monitored in 2017-18 are concentrated in the western portion of the Basin, west of New Cuyama, with a small number of monitoring wells in the central portion of the

³ The analysis shown in this section was performed in the summer of 2018 and does not reflect data that may have been collected after June 2018. In addition, the analysis reflects the available data as provided by each entity - an assessment has not been performed on the standards and protocols followed by each entity that compiles and maintains the available datasets.



Basin and near Ventucopa. Many wells in the USGS database have~~s~~ been typically measured bi-annually, with one measurement in the spring, and one measurement in the fall-

Figure 2-24.



Figure 2-32 ~~Figure 2-32~~ shows the locations of well data received from Santa Barbara and San Luis Obispo counties. Wells from both counties were monitored in 2017-18. Wells monitored by Santa Barbara County are concentrated in the western portion of the Basin west of Bitter Creek. The two wells monitored by San Luis Obispo County are in the central portion of the Basin; these wells also appear in the USGS database. Data are collected in many of these wells on a bi-annual basis, with one measurement in the spring, and one measurement in the fall, with some measurements at some wells occurring on a quarterly basis.

Figure Exported: 11/13/2018 8:54:30 AM By: cegelelon Using: C:\Users\cegelelon\OneDrive - Woodard & Curran\PCFolders\Desktop\Current Projects\011078-003 - Cuyama01 Local Cuyama GIS 2018\0803\WXDs\Text\Groundwater Conditions\Fig2_22_OPT1_Wells by_Agency





Figure 2-30: Cuyama GW Basin Wells with Monitoring Data Provided by DWR

Cuyama Basin Groundwater Sustainability Agency

Cuyama Valley Groundwater Basin Groundwater Sustainability Plan

December 2019

	Legend	 Cuyama Basin	 DWR Database Wells Last Measured in 2017-2018
		 Towns	 DWR Database Wells Last Measured 2016 and Earlier
		 Highways	
		 Cuyama River	
		 Streams	



Figure Exported: 11/13/2018 11:13:2018 By: cegelelon Using: C:\Users\cegelelon\OneDrive - Woodard & Curran\PCFolders\Desktop\Current Projects\011078-003 - Cuyama01 Local Cuyama GIS 2018\0803\WXDs\Text\Groundwater Conditions\Fig2_24_OPT1_Wells by_Agency





Figure 2-32: Cuyama GW Basin Wells with Monitoring Data Provided by Local Agencies

Cuyama Basin Groundwater Sustainability Agency

Cuyama Valley Groundwater Basin Groundwater Sustainability Plan

December 2019

 <p>WOODARD & CURRAN</p>	<p>Legend</p>	 Cuyama Basin	 County Database Wells Last Measured in 2017-2018
		 Towns	 County Database Wells Last Measured 2016 or Earlier
		 Highways	
		 Cuyama River	
		 Streams	



Figure 2-33 shows the locations of well data received from private landowners. The majority of wells provided by private landowners are located in the central portion of the Basin, between the Cuyama River and Highway 33, generally running along SR 166. Additional wells provided by private landowners are located along the Cuyama River and SR 166, nearwest of the Russell Ranch Oilfields Fault. Associated data provided with private landowners varies by source. Some data and measurements were taken annually, while other well owners ~~were taken~~ recorded data biannually or quarterly.

Figure 2-34 shows the locations of collected data from all entities by their last measured date- prior to the GSP 2020 submittal. Wells with monitoring data in 2017-2018 are shown in bright green triangles. There are recent measurements in many different parts of the Basin as follows:

- Near the Cuyama River in the eastern uplands and near Ventucopa
- In the central portion of the Basin, especially north of SR 166 but with some wells located in the southern portion of the central basin
- In the western portion of the Basin east of Aliso Canyon. An additional concentration of recent monitoring points is present along the Cuyama River near east of the Russell Ranch Oilfields Fault.

Figure 2-35 shows a comparison of data provided by private landowners and data compiled from the DWR, USGS, and the USGS county databases in the central portion of the Basin. This figure was developed to provide information on the consistency between data from these differing sources. The figure shows the location of compared wells, and the measurements on those wells by source. The measurements of groundwater elevation among the ~~measured~~ wells shown indicate that the monitoring by the private landowners and agencies approximately match in tracking historical trends from the public databases.

Figure 2-36 shows a comparison of data collected from other private landowners, and data collected from SBCWA. This figure was developed to provide information on the consistency between data from these differing sources. The figure shows the location of compared wells, and the measurements ~~on~~ from those wells by source. A long-term comparison is not possible due to the shorter measurement period of the Santa Barbara County wells, but the measurements of groundwater elevation among the measured wells indicate that the monitoring by private landowners in the western portion of the Basin and the county are similar in elevation, with the county's data showing slightly higher elevations.

2.2.4 Processing of Groundwater Elevation Data Since GSP Submittal

Since 2020, the CBGSA has performed monitoring of groundwater levels on a quarterly basis through the development of its own monitoring network. This network is described in detail in Chapter 4 of this GSP. Data collection was begun in August 2020. Additional efforts have improved understanding of the wells in the monitoring network, including a well survey that was completed in 2021 which surveyed the latitude, longitude, and elevation of each well. In addition, in October 2022, a well information survey was sent to all landowners in the Basin. This survey provided information on well ownership, location,



and completion information, well type (irrigation, residential, etc.), and well status (pumping vs not pumping).

Data processing of these data has been refined as additional data on wells from landowners has been received. This information has been included in the public Opti data management system (DMS) for review by Cuyama Basin Stakeholders. In addition to collecting data on wells already identified during GSP development, the CBGSA has constructed three new piezometers near mapped GDE locations and new multi-completion nested monitoring wells at six locations using grant funding from DWR. In addition, DWR constructed three new multi-completion nested wells under its Technical Support Services program. These new wells are located in areas that were identified by the CBGSA as spatial data gaps in the 2020 GSP. They are described in more detail in sections 2.2.4 and 2.2.10.

Figure Exported: 11/19/2018 11:19:2018 By: ceq@lelelon Using: C:\Users\ceq@lelelon\OneDrive - Woodard & Curran\PCFolders\Desktop\Current Projects\011078-003 - Cuyama\01 Local Cuyama GIS 2018\0803\WXDs\Text\Groundwater Conditions\Fig2 2-5 OPTI Wells by_Agency




Figure 2-33: Cuyama GW Basin Wells with Monitoring Data Provided by Private Landowners

Cuyama Basin Groundwater Sustainability Agency
 Cuyama Valley Groundwater Basin Groundwater Sustainability Plan
 December 2019



Legend

- Cuyama Basin
- Towns
- Highways
- Cuyama River
- Streams
- Private Landowners Reported Wells Last Measured in 2017-2018
- Private Landowners Reported Wells Last Measured 2016 and Earlier

Figure_Exported_6/2/2019_10:58:00 AM - Woodard & Curran - PCF\Projects\Current\Projects\011076-003 - Cuyama01 - Local Cuyama GIS - 20180803\MXD\Text\Groundwater\Conditionals\Fig2-28 - OPTI - Wells by Last Measured Date.mxd




Figure 2-34: Cuyama GW Basin Wells by Last Measurement Date

Cuyama Basin Groundwater Sustainability Agency
 Cuyama Valley Groundwater Basin Groundwater Sustainability Plan
 September 2019

 WOODARD & CURRAN	Legend	 Cuyama Basin	 Cuyama River	Most Recent Year with Measurements		
		 Highways	 Streams	 2017 - 2018	 1980 - 1989	 Pre-1950
		 Towns	 Fault	 2010 - 2016	 1970 - 1979	 No Measurement Data
				 2000 - 2009	 1960 - 1969	
				 1990 - 1999	 1950 - 1959	




Figure Exported: 9/11/2018 8:54:33 AM by: ceapleton Using: C:\Users\ceapleton\OneDrive - Woodard & Curran\PC Folders\Desktop\011078-003 - Cuyama\01 - Local\Cuyama_GIS_20180803\MXD\Text\Groundwater_Comparison.mxd

Figure 2-35: Central Cuyama GW Basin Wells and Hydrographs by Data Source

Cuyama Basin Groundwater Sustainability Agency

Cuyama Valley Groundwater Basin Groundwater Sustainability Plan

December 2019



Legend

- Cuyama Basin
- USGS, DWR, County, Etc., Wells
- Towns
- Private Landowners
- Highways
- Cuyama River
- Streams



Figure_Exported_9/11/2018 8:54:33 AM By: ceapleton Using: C:\Users\ceapleton\OneDrive - Woodard & Curran - PC\Folders\Desktop\011078-003 - Cuyama01 - Local\Cuyama_GIS_20180903\MXDs\Text\Groundwater_Conditions\Fig2_28 - WesternBasinHydroComparison.mxd





Figure 2-36: Western Cuyama GW Basin Wells and Hydrographs by Data Source

Cuyama Basin Groundwater Sustainability Agency
 Cuyama Valley Groundwater Basin Groundwater Sustainability Plan
 December 2019



- Legend**
- Cuyama Basin
 - Highways
 - Cuyama River
 - Streams
 - USGS, DWR, County, Etc. Wells
 - Private Landowner Wells





2.1.142.2.5 Groundwater Trends

This section describes groundwater trends in the Basin generally from the oldest available studies and data to the most recent. Groundwater conditions vary widely across the Basin. In the following sections, historical context is provided by summarizing information from relevant studies about conditions from 1947 to 1966, followed by discussion of how groundwater conditions have changed based on available historical groundwater level monitoring data.


Historical Context – 1947 to 1966 Groundwater Trends

This section discusses public reports about conditions from 1947 to 1966. Information about groundwater conditions in the Basin during this period are limited to reports that discuss the central portion of the Basin and scattered groundwater elevation measurements in monitoring wells.

A USGS report titled *Water Levels in Observation Wells in Santa Barbara County, California* (USGS, 1956) discussed groundwater elevation monitoring in the Basin. The report states that ~~–,~~ prior to 1946, there was no electric power in the Cuyama Valley, which restricted intensive irrigation, and that groundwater levels in the central portion of the Basin remained fairly static until 1946. The report states that: “Declines in groundwater began after 1946,” and that groundwater declined “as much as 8.8 feet from the spring of 1955 to 1956; the average decline was 5.2 feet. The decline of water levels at the lower and upper ends of the valley during this period was not so great as in the middle portion and averaged 1.7 and 2.2 feet respectively. Since 1946, water levels in observation wells have declined d on the average of about 27 feet” (USGS, 1956).

A USGS report titled *Hydrologic Models and Analysis of Water Availability in the Cuyama Valley, California* (USGS, 2015) presents two maps generated by using CUVHM simulated data. ~~Figure 2-29~~ Figure 2-37 shows the estimated drawdown in the central portion of the Basin from 1947 to 1966. ~~Figure 2-29~~ Figure 2-37 shows that estimated drawdown ranged from zero at the edges of the central basin to over 160 feet in the southeastern portion of the central Basin.

~~Figure 2-30~~ Figure 2-38 shows the estimated contours of groundwater elevation for ~~Septembersummer~~ 1966. These contours show a low area in the central portion of the central Basin, and a steep groundwater gradient in the southeast portion near Ventucopa and in the highlands. A gentle groundwater gradient occurs in the southwestern portion of the central Basin, generally matching topography. Few wells are located in this area and groundwater elevation contours were estimated over large distances by the USGS.




Shaded relief base created from 30 m digital elevation model from USGS National Elevation Dataset (NED); North America Vertical Datum 1983 (NAVD83). Hydrology sourced from 1:24,000-scale National Hydrography Dataset, 1974-2008. Place names sourced from USGS Geographic Names Information System, 1974-2009. Albers Projection, NAD83.

Modified from Singer and Swarzenski, 1970

EXPLANATION

<p>Cuyama groundwater basin subregion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Caliente Northern-Main Central Sierra Madre Foothills Northeast Ventucopa Uplands Northwestern Sierra Madre Foothills Northern Ventucopa Uplands Southern Sierra Madre Foothills Southern Ventucopa Uplands Southern-Main Western Basin 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Normal fault Thrust fault Thrust fault, concealed <p>GRF, Graveyard fault; SBCF, Santa Barbara Canyon fault; TTRF, Turkey Trap Ridge fault</p>	<p> Estimated drawdown contour (1966-1947). Interval is 40 feet</p>
---	--	---



Shaded relief base created from 30 m digital elevation model from USGS National Elevation Dataset (NED); North America Vertical Datum 1983 (NAVD83). Hydrology sourced from 1:24,000-scale National Hydrography Dataset, 1974-2008. Place names sourced from USGS Geographic Names Information System, 1974-2009. Albers Projection, NAD83.


Modified from Singh and Swarzenski, 1970

EXPLANATION

<p>Cuyama groundwater basin subregion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Caliente Northern-Main Central Sierra Madre Foothills Northeast Ventucopa Uplands Northwestern Sierra Madre Foothills Northern Ventucopa Uplands Southern Sierra Madre Foothills Southern Ventucopa Uplands Southern-Main Western Basin 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Normal fault Thrust fault Thrust fault, concealed <p>GRF, Graveyard fault; SBCF, Santa Barbara Canyon fault; TTRF, Turkey Trap Ridge fault</p>	<p> Estimated drawdown contour (1966-1947). Interval is 40 feet</p>
---	--	--

Source: USGS, 2015

Figure 2-37: Water Level Drawdown Contours, 1947 to 1966 to 1947



Shaded relief base created from 30-m digital elevation model from USGS National Elevation Dataset (NED); North America Vertical Datum 1983 (NAVD83). Hydrology sourced from 1:24,000-scale National Hydrography Dataset, 1974-2009. Place names sourced from USGS Geographic Names Information System, 1974-2009. Albers Projection, NAD83.

Modified from Singer and Swarzenski, 1970

EXPLANATION		
Cuyama groundwater basin subregion	— Normal fault	— Active model-grid boundary
Caliente Northern-Main	▲ Thrust fault	Water-level altitude, summer 1966 ; interval is 50 feet
Central Sierra Madre Foothills	▲--- Thrust fault, concealed	● Control point
Northeast Ventucopa Uplands	GRF, Graveyard fault;	
Northwestern Sierra Madre Foothills	SBCF, Santa Barbara Canyon fault;	
Northern Ventucopa Uplands	TTRF, Turkey Trap Ridge fault	
Southern Sierra Madre Foothills		
Southern Ventucopa Uplands		
Southern-Main		
Western Basin		

Source: USGS, 2015

Figure 2-38: 1966 Water Level Contours



Groundwater Trends According to Available Monitoring Data

To understand how groundwater conditions have changed in the Basin in recent decades, analysts developed and analyzed groundwater ~~hydrographs, vertical gradients and contours, which are discussed below~~ elevation hydrographs and contour maps, and horizontal and vertical hydraulic gradients, which are discussed below. Since the GSP was approved, the CBGSA has implemented its own monitoring program to monitor groundwater trends. The CBGSA publishes quarterly groundwater conditions reports that provide groundwater trends from the Basin's groundwater monitoring network (described in detail in Chapter 4). All data are published to the CBGSA's online public Opti DMS.

Groundwater Hydrographs

Groundwater hydrographs were developed to provide indicators of groundwater trends throughout the Basin. Measurements from each well ~~with historical monitoring data~~ were compiled into one hydrograph for ~~each well~~ data collected from 2015 through early 2024. These hydrographs are presented in Appendix A.

In many cases, changes in historical groundwater conditions at particular wells have been influenced by climactic patterns in the Basin (Section 2.3). Historical precipitation is highly variable, with several relatively wet years and some multi-year droughts.

~~Groundwater conditions generally vary in~~ Figure 2-39239 shows the current monitoring network that has been updated with this GSP submittal. Subsequent maps show different parts of the Basin. ~~Figure 2-31 starting in the west and moving to the eastern portion of the Basin to show specific groundwater conditions in selected areas.~~

Figure 2-40 shows hydrographs ~~in select wells in different portions~~ for each region of the Basin. These wells were selected because they broadly represent Basin conditions in their areas. More information about conditions is below.

- ~~In the area southeast of southwest region near Round Springs Canyon, near the Ozena Fire Station (Well 89), groundwater levels have shown a decline from 2019-2022 and then have been fluctuating from 2022-2024. This well is not pumped and the measurements represent static water levels. In the eastern region in the City of Ventucopa (Well 62), groundwater levels have stayed relatively stable with a small decline during over the 2012 to 2015 drought, historical record and showed quick recovery.~~
- ~~In the vicinity of Ventucopa (at Well 62), groundwater levels have followed climactic patterns and have generally been declining since 1995.~~
- ~~Just south of the SBCF (at Well 101), a recent increase in groundwater levels have been fairly stable and are closer to the surface than levels in Ventucopa.~~



- North of the SBCF starting at the end of 2023. This well is not pumped and east of Bitter Creek measurements represent static water levels.
- In the central portion of the Basin (at Wells 55 and 615 Well 91), groundwater levels have been declining consistently since 1950 from 2015 to 2024. There was an increase in the decline in 2021 but water levels rebounded. This well is not pumped and measurements represent static water levels.
- In the area west of Bitter Creek (at Wells 119 and 830) Also, in the central region (Well 77), groundwater levels are near ground surface near the Cuyama River, and are below ground in the area to the south, uphill from the river. Levels have shown steady declines since 2015 with seasonal fluctuations during most years.
- In the western portion of the Basin (Well 118), groundwater levels have been generally stable since 1966 2016 with groundwater levels within about 60 feet of ground surface. This well is not pumped and measurements represent static water levels.

Figure 2-32 shows selected hydrographs for wells in the area near Ventucopa. Near Ventucopa, hydrographs for Wells 85 and 62 show the same patterns and conditions from 1995 to the present and show that groundwater levels in this area respond to climatic patterns, but also have been in decline since 1995 and are currently at historic low elevations. The hydrograph for Well 85 shows that prior to 1985 groundwater levels responded to drought conditions but recovered during wetter years. Well 40 is located just south of the SBCF and its hydrograph indicates that groundwater levels in this location have remained stable from 1951 to 2013, when monitoring ceased. Wells 91 and 620 are north of the SBCF and their hydrographs show more recent conditions, where depth to water has declined consistently and is below 580 feet below ground surface (bgs).

Figures 2-33 and 2-34 show hydrographs of discontinued and currently monitored wells in the central portion of the Basin, north of the SBCF and east of Bitter Creek. The hydrographs of discontinued wells in this area are shown in Figure 2-33. These hydrographs show consistent declines of groundwater levels and little to no response to either droughts or wetter periods. The hydrograph for Well 35 shows a consistent decline from 1955 to 2008, from 30 feet bgs to approximately 150 feet bgs. Well 472 shows a decline from approximately 5 feet bgs in 1949 to approximately 85 feet bgs in 1978.

Figure 2-34 shows hydrographs of currently monitored wells in the central portion of the Basin. In general, these hydrographs show that groundwater levels are decreasing, with the lowest levels in the southeast portion of the area just northwest of the SBCF, as shown in the Well 610 hydrograph, where groundwater levels were below 600 feet bgs. Levels remain lowered along the Cuyama River, as shown in the hydrographs for Wells 604 and 618, which are currently approximately 500 feet bgs. Groundwater levels are higher to the west (Well 72) and towards the southern end of the area (Well 96). However, almost all monitoring wells in this area show consistent declines in elevation.

Figure 2-35 shows hydrographs of monitoring wells in the western portion of the Basin, west of Bitter Creek. Hydrographs in this area show that generally, groundwater levels are near the surface near the



Cuyama River, and further from the surface to the south, which is uphill from the river. The hydrograph for Well 119 shows a few measurements from 1953 to 1969, and three more recent measurements. All measurements for Well 119 show a depth to water of 60 feet bgs. The hydrograph for Well 846 shows that in 2015 depth to water was slightly above 40 feet and is slightly below 40 feet in 2018. The hydrograph for Well 840 shows a groundwater level near ground surface in 2015, and a decline to 40 feet bgs in 2018. Hydrographs for wells uphill from the river (Wells 573 and 121) show that groundwater is roughly 70 feet bgs in this area. Hydrographs for Wells 571 and 108, at the edge of the Basin have recent measurements, and show groundwater levels that range from 120 to 140 feet bgs.



Figure 2-41 shows hydrographs for six wells in the western part of the Basin. Wells 836 and 830 show a similar trend of stable water levels. A slight decline in water levels occurs in late followed by a rebound through 2023 due to the wet hydrologic conditions. The hydrograph for Well 833 shows a sharp water level decline in late 2020 with variable recovery through 2023 with water levels fluctuating 20 feet over this period. Wells 841 and 845 show seasonal fluctuations that reflect seasonal pumping for irrigated agriculture. The wells are located adjacent to the Cuyama River and have water levels within 100 feet of ground surface.

Figure 2-42 shows hydrographs for six other wells in the western portion of the Basin that not adjacent to the Cuyama River. However, only Wells 117 and 106 are dedicated monitoring wells with no pumping. Well 117 has been stable other than a sharp increase in 2017. Wells 573, 118, and 106 have had stable water levels throughout the period of record at approximately 70 feet bgs, 55 feet bgs, and 140 feet bgs, respectively. At Well 107, groundwater levels have fluctuated from 70 to 110 feet bgs from 2017 through 2023.

Figure 2-43 shows hydrographs for four wells in the western central part of the Basin. Wells 114 and 112, both active pumping wells, show steady water levels at depths of 50 feet and 90 feet bgs, respectively. Well 568, also an active pumping well, shows steady water levels except in late 2022 but the water level recovered in mid-2023. Well 474 is a monitoring well that had steady water levels from 2015 to 2019 with depth to water of 190 feet bgs. Since that time, water levels have risen about 30 feet..

Figure 2-44 shows hydrographs for three wells in the north central portion of the Basin. Well 72, 74 and 604 are all active pumping wells. Well 72 has seen fluctuations in groundwater levels with current measurements just below 150 feet bgs. Water levels in Well 74 have been slowly declining with current water level at 250 feet bgs. Water levels in Well 604 have risen since 2018 to about 450 feet bgs.

Figure 2-45 shows selected hydrographs also in the central portion of the Basin. Well 103 is a dedicated monitoring well, and Wells 608 and 609 are active pumping wells. Well 103 has the shallowest depth to water, with water levels still fluctuating from 2015-2024, with current depths just above 250 ft bgs. Wells 608 and 609, both close to the Cuyama River, had similar water level increases in 2017 and subsequent fluctuations since late 2020. Current depth to water measurements are slightly above 450 feet bgs.

Figure 2-46 shows selected hydrographs in the central portion of the Basin further east of those noted above. Well 96 is a monitoring well while Wells 612 and 615 are active pumping wells. Well 96 has seen steady water level measurements from 2015-2024. Well 612, close to the Cuyama River, had increasing water levels from 2018 to mid-2020 and decreasing levels to 2024 to below 450 ft bgs. Well 615 has seen steady declines in water level measurements since 2017 with current depth to water below 500 feet bgs.

Figure 2-47 shows selected hydrographs also in the central portion of the Basin further to the east. Wells 95, 610, 629, and 633 are active pumping wells, while Wells 91 and 316 are monitoring wells. All wells have decreasing water level measurements from 2015 to 2024 except Well 629 that had an increase



in 2023. Depth to water in Well 629 is about 530 feet bgs whereas it ranges from below 550 to 650 ft bgs in the other wells.

Figure 2-48 is the final hydrograph map in this series, showing selected hydrographs for the southeastern portion of the Basin. Wells 85, 100, and 101 are active pumping wells, while Wells 62 and 89 are monitoring wells. These five wells span a large area of the Basin and have varying water level changes from 2015 to 2024. Water levels have increased in Wells 62, 85, and 100 in 2023, corresponding to the wet hydrologic conditions in the Basin. Water levels in Well 101 from 2015 to 2022 but have been steady since that time. Water levels in Well 89 have fluctuated but show an overall increase. This well has the shallowest depth to water of this group of wells at around 30 feet bgs.

Figure Exported: 7/8/2024, By: DHunt, Using: \woodardcurran.net\share\Projects\CA\Cuyama Basin_GSA\0011078\01_GSP\wip\Z_GIS2_Maps\3_2025_GSP_Update\02_Basin_Setting_Overview\wdrms_hydrographs.aprx




Figure 2-39: Monitoring Well Locations

Cuyama Valley Groundwater Basin

Legend	● Well with Hydrograph	— Highway	— Cuyama River
	● Well without Hydrograph	— Local Road	 Cuyama Basin
	● Well not Monitored	— Creek	

N

0 1.25 2.5 5 Miles

Map Created: July 2024

Third Party GIS Disclaimer: This map is for reference and graphical purposes only and should not be relied upon by third parties for any legal decisions. Any reliance upon the map or data contained herein shall be at the users' sole risk. **Data sources: CA DWR, Esri, USGS**

Figure Exported: 7/8/2024, By: DHunt, Using: \woodardcurran\external\Projects\CA\Cuyama Basin GSA\00110726\01-GSP\pip\2_GIS2_Maps\3_2025_GSP_Update\02_Basin_Setting_Overview\wms_hydrographs\wms_hydrographs.aprx




Figure 2-40: Monitoring Well Network Hydrographs

Cuyama Valley Groundwater Basin

Legend

- Well with Hydrograph
- Well without Hydrograph
- Well not Monitored
- Highway
- Local Road
- Creek
- Cuyama River
- Cuyama Basin

Woodard & Curran

CUYAMA BASIN
GROUNDWATER SUSTAINABILITY AGENCY

0 1.25 2.5 5 Miles

Map Created: July 2024

Third Party GIS Disclaimer: This map is for reference and graphical purposes only and should not be relied upon by third parties for any legal decisions. Any reliance upon the map or data contained herein shall be at the users' sole risk. Data sources: CA DWR, Esri, USGS



Figure Exported: 7/8/2024, By: DHunt, Using: \\woodcurran.net\share\Projects\CA\Cuyama Basin GSA\0011078\01.GSP\pip2.GIS2_Maps\3_2023_GSP_Update\02_Basin_Setting_Overview\mms_hydrographs.aprx










Figure 2-41: Monitoring Well Network Hydrographs
Cuyama Valley Groundwater Basin

Legend

- Well with Hydrograph
- Well without Hydrograph
- Well not Monitored
- Highway
- Local Road
- Creek
- Cuyama River
- Cuyama Basin



0 0.75 1.5 3 Miles
Map Created: July 2024

Third Party GIS Disclaimer: This map is for reference and graphical purposes only and should not be relied upon by third parties for any legal decisions. Any reliance upon the map or data contained herein shall be at the users' sole risk. Data sources: CA DWR, Esri, USGS

Figure Exported: 7/8/2024, By: DHunt, Using: \woodwardcurran\shared\Projects\CA\Cuyama Basin_GSA\001\0726-01-GSP\wip\2_GIS2_Maps\3_2023_GSP_Updated\02_Basin_Setting_Overview\wms_hydrographs\wms_hydrographs.aprx










Figure 2-42: Monitoring Well Network Hydrographs

Cuyama Valley Groundwater Basin

Legend

- Well with Hydrograph
- Well without Hydrograph
- Well not Monitored
- Highway
- Local Road
- Creek
- Cuyama Basin

North arrow pointing up.

0 0.75 1.5 3 Miles

Map Created: July 2024

Third Party GIS Disclaimer: This map is for reference and graphical purposes only and should not be relied upon by third parties for any legal decisions. Any reliance upon the map or data contained herein shall be at the users' sole risk. Data sources: CA DWR, Esri, USGS

Figure Exported: 7/8/2024, By: DHunt, Using: \woodwardcurran\external\Projects\CA\Cuyama Basin GSA\00110728\01-GSP\wip\2_GIS2_Maps\3_2023_GSP_Update\02_Basin_Setting_Oveerview\wms_hydrographs\wms_hydrographs.aprx








Figure 2-43: Monitoring Well Network Hydrographs

Cuyama Valley Groundwater Basin

Legend

- Well with Hydrograph
- Well without Hydrograph
- Well not Monitored
- Highway
- Local Road
- Creek
- Cuyama River
- Cuyama Basin



0 0.5 1 2 Miles

Map Created: July 2024

Third Party GIS Disclaimer: This map is for reference and graphical purposes only and should not be relied upon by third parties for any legal decisions. Any reliance upon the map or data contained herein shall be at the users' sole risk. Data sources: CA DWR, Esri, USGS

Figure Exported: 7/8/2024, By: DHunt, Using: \woodardcurran\external\Projects\CA\Cuyama Basin\GSA\0011078\01\GSP\wip\2_GIS2_Maps\3_2025_GSP\Update\02_Basin_Setting_Overview\wms_hydrographs\dms_hydrographs.aprx







Figure 2-44: Monitoring Well Network Hydrographs

Cuyama Valley Groundwater Basin

Legend

- Well with Hydrograph
- Well without Hydrograph
- Well not Monitored
- Highway
- Local Road
- Creek
- Cuyama River
- Cuyama Basin



0 0.5 1 2 Miles

Map Created: July 2024

Third Party GIS Disclaimer: This map is for reference and graphical purposes only and should not be relied upon by third parties for any legal decisions. Any reliance upon the map or data contained herein shall be at the users' sole risk. Data sources: CA DWR, Esri, USGS

Figure Exported: 7/19/2024, By: ceapleton Using: \\woodandcurran.net\shared\Projects\CA Cuyama Basin GSA\011078.01 GSP\wp\Z_GIS\2_Maps\3_2025 GSP Update\02_Basin_Setting_Overview\dms_hydrographs\dms_hydrographs.aprx







Figure 2-45: Monitoring Well Network Hydrographs

Cuyama Valley Groundwater Basin

Legend

- Well with Hydrograph
- Well without Hydrograph
- Well not Monitored
- Highway
- Local Road
- Creek
- Cuyama River
- Cuyama Basin

Woodard & Curran
GROUNDWATER SUSTAINABILITY AGENCY

0 0.5 1 2 Miles

Map Created: July 2024

Third Party GIS Disclaimer: This map is for reference and graphical purposes only and should not be relied upon by third parties for any legal decisions. Any reliance upon the map or data contained herein shall be at the users' sole risk. Data sources: CA DWR, Esri, USGS

Figure Exported: 7/8/2024, By: DHunt, Using: \\woodardcurran.net\shared\Projects\CA\Cuyama Basin\GSA\0011078\01-GSP\wip\2_GIS2_Maps\3_2023_GSP\wip\2_GIS2_Update\02_Basin_Setting_Overview\wms_hydrographs\wms_hydrographs.aprx







Figure 2-46: Monitoring Well Network Hydrographs

Cuyama Valley Groundwater Basin

Legend

- Well with Hydrograph
- Well without Hydrograph
- Well not Monitored
- Highway
- Local Road
- Creek
- Cuyama River
- Cuyama Basin



0 0.5 1 2 Miles

Map Created: July 2024

Third Party GIS Disclaimer: This map is for reference and graphical purposes only and should not be relied upon by third parties for any legal decisions. Any reliance upon the map or data contained herein shall be at the users' sole risk. **Data sources: CA DWR, Esri, USGS**

Figure Exported: 7/8/2024, By: DHunt, Using: \woodardcurran\external\Projects\CA\Cuyama Basin\GSA\0011078\01-GSP\wpip\2_GIS2_Maps\3_2025_GSP\Update\02_Basin_Setting_Overview\mms_hydrographs\mms_hydrographs.aprx








Figure 2-47: Monitoring Well Network Hydrographs

Cuyama Valley Groundwater Basin

Legend

- Well with Hydrograph
- Well without Hydrograph
- Well not Monitored
- Highway
- Local Road
- Creek
- Cuyama River
- Cuyama Basin



0 0.5 1 2 Miles

Map Created: July 2024

Third Party GIS Disclaimer: This map is for reference and graphical purposes only and should not be relied upon by third parties for any legal decisions. Any reliance upon the map or data contained herein shall be at the users' sole risk. Data sources: CA DWR, Esri, USGS



Figure Exported: 7/8/2024, By: DHunt, User: \\woodwardcurran.net\shared\Projects\CA\Cuyama Basin_GSA\0011078\01_GSP\pip\2_GIS2_Map\3_2025_GSP_Update\02_Basin_Setting_Overview\dms_hydrographs\dms_hydrographs.aprx






Figure 2-48: Monitoring Well Network Hydrographs

Cuyama Valley Groundwater Basin

Legend

- Well with Hydrograph
- Well without Hydrograph
- Well not Monitored
- Highway
- Local Road
- Creek
- Cuyama River
- Cuyama Basin



0 0.5 1 2 Miles

Map Created: July 2024

Third Party GIS Disclaimer: This map is for reference and graphical purposes only and should not be relied upon by third parties for any legal decisions. Any reliance upon the map or data contained herein shall be at the users' sole risk. **Data sources: CA DWR, Esri, USGS**



Vertical Gradients

A vertical hydraulic gradient ~~describes~~represents the movement of groundwater perpendicular to the ground surface, and may be up or down. A vertical gradient is ~~typically measured~~calculated by comparing the elevations of groundwater in ~~a well~~wells with ~~multiple completions that are~~ of different screen depths. If groundwater elevations in the shallower ~~completions~~well are higher than in the deeper ~~completions~~well, the gradient is ~~identified as a~~ downward ~~gradient~~. ~~A, corresponding to~~ downward ~~gradient is one where~~ groundwater ~~is moving down into the ground~~flow. If groundwater elevations in the shallower ~~completions~~well are lower than in the deeper ~~completions~~well, the gradient is ~~identified as an~~ upward ~~gradient~~. ~~An, corresponding to~~ upward ~~gradient is one where~~ groundwater ~~is upwelling towards the surface~~flow. If groundwater elevations are similar ~~throughout the completions, there is no~~, the vertical gradient ~~to identify is~~ insignificant. An understanding of the Basin's vertical gradients is required by Section 354.16(a) of the SGMA regulations, and this understanding further describes how groundwater moves in the Basin.

There are ~~three~~12 multiple completion nested wells in the Basin. ~~A multiple~~ At these locations, individual wells are constructed in the same borehole with different screen intervals. The depth between the screen intervals is sealed to prevent groundwater flow from one screen to another in the borehole. The USGS constructed nested monitoring wells at three locations in Cuyama Valley known as CVKR, CVBR, and CVFR. These nests are named after their location on Kirschenmann Road, Bell Road, and Foothill Road, respectively. Each location consists of four individual nested wells.

Three additional multi-completion nested well includes perforations at multiple intervals, and therefore provides information locations were constructed by DWR under its Technical Support Services (TSS) program. Each location consists of three individual nested wells with Opti numbers 900-902 at multiple depths in the well. Figure TSS #1, 903-905 at TSS #3, and 906-908 at TSS #2-23. The CBGSA received additional grant funding through the SGMA implementation grant and has installed five multi-completion wells; however, since these wells are newly constructed and do not yet have a record of groundwater level measurements, discussions of vertical gradients for these wells are not included.. Figure 2-49249 is an overview map that shows the locations of the multiple completion wells in the Basin, and are located in the central portion of the Basin, north of 11 multi-competition wells and Opti well 914 and MW-D. Opti well 914 was drilled in a location that was identified as a potential multi completion well, but due to the SBCF and east of Bitter Creek geology encountered during drilling, it ended up with only one well completion. MW-D has not been constructed yet but will be completed prior to the GSP submittal.



~~Figure 2-36~~ Figure 2-50 shows the combined hydrograph for the multiple completion well CVFR, which was ~~installed by USGS.~~⁴ ~~constructed by the USGS.~~⁵ ~~The first measurements were recorded on October 27, 2009.~~ CVFR is comprised of four ~~completions, each at wells with~~ different ~~screen~~ depths as follows:

- ~~Opti well 91 (CVFR-1)~~ is the deepest completion with a screened interval from 960 to 980 feet bgs.
- ~~Opti well 316 (CVFR-2)~~ is the second deepest completion with a screened interval from 810 to 830 feet bgs.
- ~~Opti well 17 (CVFR-3)~~ is the third deepest completion with a screened interval from 680 to 700 feet bgs.
- ~~Opti well 318 (CVFR-4)~~ is the shallowest completion with a screened interval from 590 to 610 feet bgs. ~~Measurements for the shallowest completion stopped in 2014 when the depth to water dropped below 610 ft bgs (i.e., the well is dry).~~

The hydrograph of the four completions shows that they are close to the same elevation at each completion, ~~and therefore it is unlikely that there is any vertical gradient with a change of only three feet on the last recorded measurement date of April 26, 2024.~~ Therefore, the vertical gradient is insignificant at this location.

~~Figure 2-37~~ ~~Figure 2-51~~⁵¹ shows the combined hydrograph for the multiple completion well CVBR, which was ~~installed by USGS.~~ The first measurements occurred on September 29, 2009. CVBR is comprised of four ~~completions, each at wells with~~ different ~~screen~~ depths as follows:

- ~~Opti well 99 (CVBR-1)~~ is the deepest completion with a screened interval from 830 to 850 feet bgs.
- ~~Opti well 322 (CVBR-2)~~ is the second deepest completion with a screened interval from 730 to 750 feet bgs.
- ~~Opti well 324 (CVBR-3)~~ is the third deepest completion with a screened interval from 540 to 560 feet bgs.
- ~~Opti well 325 (CVBR-4)~~ is the shallowest completion with a screened interval from 360 to 380 feet bgs.

~~The hydrograph of the four completions shows that at the deeper completions, groundwater elevations are slightly lower than the shallower completions in the winter and spring, and deeper completions are generally lower than the shallower completion in the summer and fall. This indicates that during the irrigation season, the deeper portions of the aquifer are likely to be where pumping occurs. This pumping removes water from the deeper portion of the aquifer, creating a vertical gradient during the summer and~~

⁴ ~~All three multiple completion wells were installed by the USGS as part of the Cuyama Valley Water Availability Study in cooperation with SBCWA~~

⁵ ~~All three multiple completion wells were constructed by the USGS as part of the Cuyama Valley Water Availability Study in cooperation with SBCWA~~



fall. By the spring, enough water has moved down or horizontally to replace removed water, and the vertical gradient is significantly smaller at this location in the spring measurements.

Figure 2-38 Historical measurements in the four wells illustrate that water levels are typically lowest in the deepest well and highest in the shallowest well, indicating a downward vertical gradient. However, beginning in 2023, water levels in the deepest and shallowest wells are about the same, with a difference of only about two feet. These recent measurements indicate an insignificant vertical gradient.

Figure 2-52 shows the combined hydrograph for the multiple completion well CVKR, which was installed by the USGS. The first measurements were recorded on March 3, 2009. CVKR is comprised of four completions, each at wells with different screen depths as follows:

- Opti well 77 (CVKR-1) is the deepest completion with a screened interval from 960 to 980 feet bgs.
- Opti well 420 (CVKR-2) is the second deepest completion with a screened interval from 760 to 780 feet bgs.
- Opti 421 (CVKR-3) is the third deepest completion with a screened interval from 600 to 620 feet bgs.
- Opti 422 (CVKR-4) is the shallowest completion with a screened interval from 440 to 460 feet bgs.

The hydrograph of the four completions shows that at the deeper completions are slightly lower than the shallower completions in the spring at each completion, and deeper completions are generally lower in the summer and fall. This indicates that during the irrigation season, the deeper portions of the aquifer are likely to be where pumping occurs. This pumping removes water from the deeper portion of the aquifer, creating a vertical gradient during the summer and fall. By the winter and spring, enough water has moved down to replace removed water, and the vertical gradient is very small at this location in the spring measurements.




Figure 2-36: Hydrographs of CVFR1-4






Figure 2-53253 Similar to the hydrograph for CVBR, the hydrograph of these four wells illustrates that water levels are typically lowest in the deepest well and highest in the shallowest well, indicating a downward vertical gradient. The hydrograph also shows an apparently erroneous measurement in the shallowest well, in mid-2023. Figure 2-53253 shows the combined hydrograph for the multi completion wells at TSS #1, Opti numbers 900-902. These three wells have different screen depths as follows:

- Opti well 902 is the deepest completion with a screen interval from 325 to 365 feet bgs.
- Opti well 901 is the second deepest completion with a screened internal from 165 to 205 feet bgs.
- Opti well 900 is the shallowest completed with a screened interval from 50 to 60 feet bgs.

The combined hydrograph shows that the deepest well typically has the highest water level, indicating a small upward vertical gradient. However, the latest measurement, taken on April 24, 2024, shows only a two-foot variation between these wells.

Figure 2-54254 shows the combined hydrograph for the multi completion wells at TSS #3, Opti numbers 903-905. These three wells have different screen depths as follows:

- Opti well 905 is the deepest completion with a screen interval from 540 to 570 feet bgs.
- Opti well 904 has the second deepest completion with a screen interval from 360 to 400 feet bgs.
- Opti well 903 has the shallowest completion with a screen interval from 265-305 feet bgs.

Similar to the wells at TSS #1, the hydrograph shows the deepest well typically has the highest water level, indicating a small upward vertical gradient. This small has remained consistent throughout the sampling period from July 2022 to the last current measurement in April 2024. Figure 2-55255 shows the combined hydrograph for the multi completion wells at TSS #2, Opti numbers 906-908. These three wells have different screen depths as follows:


- Opti well 908 is the deepest completion with a screen interval from 650-660 feet bgs.
- Opti well 907 is the second deepest completion with a screen interval 515-525 feet bgs.
- Opti well 906 is the shallowest completion with a screen interval from 130-150 feet bgs.

The combined hydrographs for these wells show an upward vertical gradient with the highest water levels in the deepest well followed by the intermediate-depth well, and the shallowest well, respectively. The differences in groundwater elevation indicate the upward vertical gradient between the intermediate and deep well is higher than the vertical gradient between the shallow and intermediate well. These water level differences are generally consistent throughout the sampling period.



Table 2-2-2-2 shows the screen depths for new multi completion wells recently constructed by the CBGSA under the SGMA grant.

Table 2-37: Hydrographs of CVBR1-42: CBGSA Nested Wells





Nested Well	Deep Completion (feet bgs)	Shallow Completion (feet bgs)	Water Level Measurements (feet bgs)
Opti well 912-913 (MW-F)			
Opti 913	350-370 ft.	-	6/5/2024 (39.29 ft.)
Opti 912	-	180-200 ft.	6/5/2024 (8.05 ft.)
Opti 915-916 (MW-H)			
Opti 916	880- 900 ft.	-	5/13/2024 (507.82 ft.)
Opti 915	-	660-680 ft.	5/13/2024 (574.67 ft.)
Opti 917-918 (MW-E)			
Opti 918	720-740 ft.	-	No current Water Level data
Opti 917	-	610- 630 ft	No current Water Level data
Opti Well 919-920 (MW-G)			
Opti 920	420-440 ft.	-	No current Water Level data
Opti 919	-	280-300 ft.	No current Water Level data
Opti 914 (MW-C)			
Opti 914	500-520 ft. (Only one completion due to the geology encountered during drilling)		No current Water Level data
MW-D	This well has not been constructed but will be completed prior to the GSP 2025 Submittal.		




Figure 2-49: Multi Completion And Nested Wells
Cuyama Valley Groundwater Basin

Legend	CBGSA	Highway	Creek
	TSS	Local Road	Cuyama River
	USGS	Town	Cuyama Basin

WOODWARD & CURRAN
GROUNDWATER SUSTAINABILITY AGENCY

0 1.25 2.5 5 Miles

Map Created: July 2024

Figure Exported: 7/15/2024, By: Dhlunt, Using: WoodwardCurran.net\shared\Projects\CA Cuyama Basin_GSA0011078.01_GSP\wp\Z_GIS2_Maps\3_2025_GSP_Update\02_Basin_Sealing_Overview\multi_completion_wells\multi_completion_wells.aprx

Third Party GIS Disclaimer: This map is for reference and graphical purposes only and should not be relied upon by third parties for any legal decisions. Any reliance upon the map or data contained herein shall be at the users' sole risk. Data sources: CA DWR, Esri, USGS




Figure 2-50: Hydrographs of Opti well 91, 316, 317, 318 (USGS Well CVFR1-4)




Figure 2-51: Hydrographs of Opti well 99, 322, 325, and 325 (USGS Well CVBR1-4)




Figure 2-52: Hydrographs of Opti well 77, 420, 421, and 422 (USGS well CVKR1-4)




Figure 2-53: TSS Hydrographs Opti well 900, 901 and 902




Figure 2-54: TSS Hydrograph 2 Opti wells 903, 904, and 905.




Figure 2-55: TSS hydrograph 3 for Opti wells 906, 907, and 908.



Groundwater Contours

Analysts prepared groundwater contour maps to improve understanding of recent groundwater trends in the Basin. Analysts used the data collected and described in ~~Section 0~~[Sections 2.2.3 and 2.2.4](#) to develop these maps. A contour map shows changes in groundwater elevations by interpolating groundwater elevations between monitoring sites. The elevations are shown on the map with the use of a contour line, which indicates that at all locations that line is drawn, the line represents groundwater at the elevation indicated. There are two versions of contour maps used in this section: one that shows the elevation of groundwater above mean sea level, which is useful because it can be used to identify the horizontal gradients ~~of~~[and](#) groundwater [flow directions](#), and one that shows contours of depth to water, the distance from the ground surface to groundwater, which is useful because it can identify areas of shallow or deep groundwater.

Methodology

To complete the groundwater elevation maps in the 2020 GSP an inverse distance weighting (IDW) interpolation was conducted and then manually adjusted to meet expected conditions. The new methodology interpolates groundwater elevation using a specialized algorithm to create a ‘hydrologically connected’ potentiometric surface (ArcGIS Topo to Raster tool). This best represents the groundwater elevations as it helps to reduce depressions and variance in areas with limited data. The resulting interpolation and contours were then cropped within the bounding area of available data using a concave hull. Some minor manual adjustments were applied to the Basin boundary to reduce or remove areas with sparse data. Contours greater than one mile away from any well were labeled as ‘approximate.’ Conceptual flowlines were added based on the interpolated groundwater elevation contours to represent generalized groundwater flow directions.

To visualize the depth to groundwater in the Basin and areas with localized drawdown, an IDW was used for interpolation of depth to water measurements. Resulting rasters and contours were then cropped using the same procedure described above.

The new methodology is an improvement over the original methodology because it does not rely on manual contouring. Data can be processed following a set protocol, producing consistent results.

Analysts prepared groundwater contour maps for both groundwater elevation and depth to water for the following periods:

- [Spring 2024](#)
- [Fall 2022](#)
- [Fall 2020](#)
- Spring 2018
- Fall 2017



- Spring 2017
- Spring 2015

• ~~Fall 2014~~

These years were selected for ~~contours display~~ because they are representative of current conditions, and ~~because these years identify conditions near January 1, 2015, when SGMA came into effect. seasonal patterns.~~ The contour maps are described below.

Each contour map follows the same general format. ~~Each contour map is contoured at using a 50100-foot contour interval, with contour elevations indicated in white numeric labels, and measurements at individual monitoring points indicated in black numeric labels. Areas where the contours are dashed and not colored inbetween are inferred contours that extend elevations beyond because the available data availability are spaced far apart~~ and are included for reference only. The groundwater contours were also based on certain assumptions in order to accumulate enough data points to generate useful contour maps. Assumptions are as follows:

- Measurements from wells of different depths are representative of conditions at that location and there are no vertical gradients. Due to the limited spatial amount of monitoring points, data from wells of a wide variety of depths were used to generate the contours.
- Measurements from dates that may ~~be as far apart temporally as span up to~~ three months are representative of conditions during the spring or fall season, and conditions have not changed substantially from the time of the earliest measurement used to the latest. ~~Due to the limited temporal amount of measurements in the Basin, data from a wide variety of measurement dates were used to generate the contours.~~



within that season.

These assumptions generate allow for the generation of contours that are useful at the planning level for understanding groundwater levels across the Basin, and to identify general horizontal gradients and regional groundwater level trends. The contour maps are not indicative of exact values across the Basin because the interpolated groundwater contour maps contours reflect approximate conditions between measurement points, ~~and~~. The contours do not account for topography or bedrock outcrops within the Basin. Therefore, a well on a ridge may be farther from groundwater than one in a canyon, and the contour map will not reflect that level of detail. Figure 2-56 shows groundwater elevation contours for spring of 2024. In the southeastern portion of the Basin near the Ozena fire station, the groundwater gradient appears to indicate flow that follows the Cuyama River. The contour map shows a steep gradient across the SBCF and groundwater flow to an area of lower groundwater elevation northeast of the town of Cuyama. From the town of New Cuyama to the west, the groundwater elevation contours reflect a gradient and flow to the north-northeast, from areas with higher land surface elevations towards areas with lower elevations and towards the Cuyama River.

Expansion and improvement of the monitoring network to generate a more accurate understanding of groundwater trends in the Basin is discussed in Chapter 4.

~~Figure 2-39~~ Figure 2-57 shows depth to groundwater contours for spring of 2024. South of the SBCF, depth to groundwater is about 100-200 feet bgs. North of the SBCF, depth to groundwater declines rapidly to over 600 feet bgs. Depth to groundwater reduces (i.e., is closer to ground surface) to the west towards New Cuyama, where groundwater is around 200-300 feet bgs. West of Bitter Creek, groundwater is shallower than 200 feet bgs in many locations and shallower than 100 feet bgs at some well locations.

~~Figure 2-58~~ Figure 2-58 shows groundwater elevation contours for fall of 2022. The contour map shows a steep gradient across the SBCF and groundwater flow to an area of lower groundwater elevation northeast of the town of Cuyama. From the town of New Cuyama to the west, the groundwater gradient reflects generalized flow to the north-northeast, from topographically higher areas towards areas with lower topography and the Cuyama River.

~~Figure 2-59~~ Figure 2-59 shows depth to groundwater contours for fall of 2022. Just south of the SBCF, depth to groundwater is about 200-300 feet bgs. North of the SBCF, depth to groundwater declines rapidly to over 600 feet bgs. Depth to groundwater reduces (i.e., is closer to ground surface) to the west towards New Cuyama, where groundwater is around 300 feet bgs. West of Bitter Creek, groundwater is shallower than 200 feet bgs in many locations and shallower than 100 feet bgs in some well locations.

Figure 2-60 shows groundwater elevation contours for fall of 2020. Much like the maps for 2024 and 2022, the contour map shows a steep gradient across the SBCF and groundwater flow to an area of lower groundwater elevation northeast of the town of Cuyama. From the town of New Cuyama to the west, the groundwater elevation contours reflect a gradient and flow to the north-northeast, from areas with higher land surface elevations towards areas with lower elevations and towards the Cuyama River.



Figure 2-61261 shows depth to groundwater contours for fall of 2020. Just south of the SBCF, depth to groundwater is about 200 feet bgs. North of the SBCF, depth to groundwater declines rapidly to over 600 feet bgs. Depth to groundwater reduces (i.e., is closer to ground surface) to the west towards New Cuyama, where groundwater is around 300 feet bgs. West of Bitter Creek, groundwater is shallower than 100 feet bgs in most well locations.

Figure 2-62262 shows groundwater elevation contours for spring of 2018, along with arrows showing the direction of groundwater flow. In the southeastern portion of the Basin near Ventucopa, groundwater ~~has a horizontal gradient~~ flows to the northwest. The gradient increases in the vicinity of the SBCF and groundwater flows to an area of lowered groundwater elevation southeast of the town of Cuyama. Lowered groundwater elevations in this area are also associated with a flow gradient to the southeast from the town of Cuyama. From the town of New Cuyama to the west, ~~the groundwater has~~ elevation contours reflect a horizontal gradient that generally flows and flow to the northeast, from areas with higher elevation topography and land surface elevations towards areas with lower elevation topography where elevations and towards the Cuyama River is located.

~~Figure 2-40~~Figure 2-63263 shows depth to groundwater contours for spring of 2018. Just south the SBCF, depth to groundwater is ~~near~~ about 100 feet bgs. North of the SBCF, depth to groundwater declines rapidly ~~and is~~ over 600 feet bgs. Depth to groundwater reduces (i.e., is closer to ground surface) to the west towards New Cuyama, where groundwater is around 150 feet bgs. West of Bitter Creek, groundwater is shallower than 100 feet bgs in most locations, and is shallower than 50 feet bgs in the far west and along the Cuyama River.



Figure 2-39: Cuyama Basin Wells by Groundwater Surface Elevation in Spring 2018



Figure 2-40: Cuyama Basin Wells by Depth to Water in Spring 2018



The remaining contour maps for spring 2017, fall 2017, spring 2015, and fall 2014 are shown below. These dates were selected to show the changes over the most recent period of three years for which data were available in the spring (from 2015 to 2018) and from the fall (from 2014 to 2017).

Figure 2-41 shows groundwater elevation contours for fall of 2017. Because more data were available in this time frame, the contour map shows increased detail in some areas. In the southeastern portion of the Basin near the Ozena fire station, groundwater gradients appear to indicate flows that follow the Cuyama River. The contour map shows a steep gradient across the SBCF and flows groundwater flow to an area of lowered groundwater elevation northeast of the town of Cuyama. From the town of New Cuyama to the west, the groundwater has elevation contours reflect a horizontal gradient that generally flows and flow to the northeast, from areas with higher elevation topography and surface elevations towards areas with lower elevation topography where elevations and towards the Cuyama River is located.



Figure 2-41: Fall 2017 Groundwater Elevation Contours



~~Figure 2-42~~Figure 2-65~~265~~ shows depth to water contours for fall of 2017. ~~Because more data were available in this time frame, the contour map has increased detail in some areas. In the southeastern portion of the Basin near the Ozena fire station, depth to water is under 50 feet bgs.~~ There is a steep gradient near the SBCF, and depth to groundwater is below 600 feet bgs immediately northwest of the SBCF. The central portion of the Basin generally has a depth to water between 400 and 500 feet bgs, with depth to groundwater decreasing to the west of New Cuyama. West of Bitter Creek, groundwater is generally shallower than 100 feet below bgs, and is shallower than 50 feet bgs along the Cuyama River in most cases.

Figure 2-66~~266~~



Figure 2-42: Fall 2017 Depth to Water Contours



Figure 2-43 shows groundwater elevation contours for spring of 2017. ~~Because more data were available in this time frame, the contour map has increased detail in some areas. In the southeastern portion of the Basin near the Ozena fire station, groundwater gradients appear to indicate flows that follow the Cuyama River.~~ The contour map shows a steep gradient across the SBCF and ~~flows groundwater flow~~ to an area of lowered groundwater elevation northeast of the town of Cuyama. From the town of New Cuyama to the west, ~~the groundwater~~ ~~has~~ ~~elevation contours reflect~~ a ~~horizontal~~ gradient ~~that generally flows and flow~~ to the northeast, from areas with higher ~~elevation topography~~ ~~land surface elevations~~ towards areas with lower ~~elevation topography where~~ ~~elevations and towards~~ the Cuyama River ~~is located~~.



Figure 2-43: Spring 2017 Groundwater Elevation Contours



~~Figure 2-44~~~~Figure 2-67~~~~267~~ shows depth to water contours for spring of 2017. ~~In the southeastern portion of the Basin near the Ozena fire station, depth to water is under 50 feet bgs.~~ Depth to groundwater near Ventucopa is between 150 and 200 feet bgs. There is a steep gradient near the SBCF, and depth to groundwater is below 600 feet bgs immediately northwest of the SBCF. The central portion of the Basin generally has a depth to water between 350 and 500 feet bgs, with depth to groundwater decreasing to the west of New Cuyama. West of Bitter Creek, groundwater is generally shallower than 100 feet below bgs, and is shallower than 50 feet bgs along the Cuyama River in most cases.



Figure 2-44: Spring 2017 Depth to Water Contours



Figure 2-45 ~~Figure 2-68~~268 shows groundwater elevation contours for spring of 2015. ~~In the southeastern portion of the Basin near the Ozena fire station, Data for this year is more limited but the groundwater gradients appear to indicate flows~~ gradient indicates flow that follows the Cuyama River. ~~The contour map shows a steep gradient across the SBCF and flows to an area of lowered groundwater elevation northeast of the town of Cuyama. From the town of New Cuyama to the west, the limited number of data points restrict strong interpretation of the gradient, which is to the northwest, from areas with higher land surface elevations towards areas with lower elevations towards the central portion of the Basin.~~




Figure 2-45: Spring 2015 Groundwater Elevation Contours



Figure 2-46 Figure 2-69269 shows depth to water contours for spring of 2015. ~~In the southeastern portion of the Basin~~Data indicates a steep gradient near the ~~Ozena fire station,~~SBCF, and depth to ~~water is under~~ 50 feet bgs. ~~Depth to groundwater near Ventucopa is between 150 and 200 feet bgs. There is a steep gradient near the SBCF, and~~ groundwater is below 600 feet bgs immediately northwest of the SBCF. The central portion of the Basin generally has a depth to water between 3~~500~~ and 4~~50~~600+ feet bgs, with groundwater levels rising to the west of New Cuyama. These depths are in general less severe than those shown for the spring of 2017, reflecting deepening depth to groundwater conditions in the central portion of the Basin. Interpretation from New Cuyama to monitoring points in the northwest is hampered by a limited set of data points.

Figure Exported: 7/18/2024, By: ceapleken, Using: \\woodardcurran.net\shared\Projects\CA Cuyama Basin_GSAU0011078_01_GSP\wp\Z_GIS\2_Maps\3_2025_GSP_Update\02_Basin_Setting_Overview\GSP2025_dfw_gvsa2025_dfw_gvsa.aprx



Groundwater Elevation (feet MSL)

3,601 - 3,700
3,501 - 3,600
3,401 - 3,500
3,301 - 3,400
3,201 - 3,300
3,101 - 3,200
3,001 - 3,100
2,901 - 3,000
2,801 - 2,900
2,701 - 2,800
2,601 - 2,700
2,501 - 2,600
2,401 - 2,500
2,301 - 2,400
2,201 - 2,300
2,101 - 2,200
2,001 - 2,100
1,901 - 2,000
1,801 - 1,900
1,701 - 1,800
1,601 - 1,700
1,501 - 1,600
1,400 - 1,500

Figure 2-56: Spring 2024 Groundwater Elevation
Cuyama Valley Groundwater Basin

Legend

- Groundwater Elevation Contour
- - - Approximate Contour
- > Conceptual Flowline
- Highway
- Cuyama Basin
- Well Depth (feet)
- 401 - 600
- Unknown
- 0 - 200
- 201 - 400
- 601 - 800
- 801 - 1000
- 1001 - 1200



0 1.25 2.5 5 Miles

Map Created: July 2024


Third Party GIS Disclaimer: This map is for reference and graphical purposes only and should not be relied upon by third parties for any legal decisions. Any reliance upon the map or data contained herein shall be at the users' sole risk. Data sources: CA DWR, Esri, USGS



~~Figure 2-47 shows groundwater elevation contours for fall of 2014. In the southeastern portion of the Basin near the Ozena fire station, groundwater gradients appear to indicate flows that follow the Cuyama River. The contour map shows a steep gradient across the SBCF and flows to an area of lowered groundwater elevation northeast of the town of Cuyama.~~ Basin Wells by Groundwater Surface Elevation in Spring 2024



Figure Exported: 7/18/2024, By: ceapleton Using: \\woodandcurran.net\shared\Projects\CA Cuyama Basin_GSA\0011078_01_GSP\wp\Z_GIS\2_Maps\3_2025_GSP_Update\02_Basin_Setting_Overview\GSP2025_dtw_gwa.aprx



Spring 2024 DTW (feet bgs)

- 0 - 100
- 101 - 200
- 201 - 300
- 301 - 400
- 401 - 500
- 501 - 600
- 601 - 700

Figure 2-57: Spring 2024 Depth to Water

Cuyama Valley Groundwater Basin

Legend

— Depth to Water Contour	— Highway	Well Depth	○ 601 - 800
- - - Approximate Contour	— Local Road	○ Unknown	○ 801 - 1000
• Town	□ Cuyama Basin	● 0 - 200	● 1001 - 1200
		● 201 - 400	
		● 401 - 600	

Woodard & Curran

CUYAMA BASIN
GROUNDWATER SUSTAINABILITY AGENCY

0 1.25 2.5 5 Miles

Map Created: July 2024


Third Party GIS Disclaimer: This map is for reference and graphical purposes only and should not be relied upon by third parties for any legal decisions. Any reliance upon the map or data contained herein shall be at the users' sole risk. Data sources: CA DWR, Esri, USGS



~~Figure 2-48 shows depth to water contours for fall of 2014. In the southeastern portion of the Cuyama Basin near the Ozena fire station, depth to water is under 50 feet bgs. There is a steep gradient near the SBCF, and groundwater is below 600 feet bgs immediately northwest of the SBCF. The central portion of the Basin generally has a depth to water between 350 and 500 feet bgs, with groundwater levels rising to the west of New Cuyama. These depths are in general less severe than those shown for the fall of 2017, reflecting depth to groundwater conditions in the central portion of the Basin. Interpretation from New Cuyama to monitoring points in the northwest is hampered by a limited set of data points.~~ Wells by Depth to Water in Spring 2024



Figure Exported: 7/18/2024, By: ceapleken, Using: \\woodandcurran.net\shared\Projects\CA Cuyama Basin_GSAU0011078_01_GSP\wp\Z_GIS\2_Map\3_2025_GSP_Update\02_Basin_Setting_Overview\GSP2025_dfw_gvsa2025_dfw_gvsa.aprx



Groundwater Elevation (feet MSL)

3,601 - 3,700
3,501 - 3,600
3,401 - 3,500
3,301 - 3,400
3,201 - 3,300
3,101 - 3,200
3,001 - 3,100
2,901 - 3,000
2,801 - 2,900
2,701 - 2,800
2,601 - 2,700
2,501 - 2,600
2,401 - 2,500
2,301 - 2,400
2,201 - 2,300
2,101 - 2,200
2,001 - 2,100
1,901 - 2,000
1,801 - 1,900
1,701 - 1,800
1,601 - 1,700
1,501 - 1,600
1,400 - 1,500

Figure 2-58: Fall 2022 Groundwater Elevation

Cuyama Valley Groundwater Basin

Legend

— Groundwater Elevation Contour	— Highway	Well Depth (feet)	● 401 - 600
- - - Approximate Contour	□ Cuyama Basin	○ Unknown	● 601 - 800
- -> Conceptual Flowline		● 0 - 200	● 801 - 1000
		● 201 - 400	● 1001 - 1200




0 1.25 2.5 5 Miles

Map Created: July 2024

Third Party GIS Disclaimer: This map is for reference and graphical purposes only and should not be relied upon by third parties for any legal decisions. Any reliance upon the map or data contained herein shall be at the users' sole risk. Data sources: CA DWR, Esri, USGS

Figure Exported: 7/18/2024, By: ceapleton Using: \\woodandcurran.net\shared\Projects\CA\Cuyama Basin_GSA\0011078_01_GSP\wp\Z_GIS\2_Map\3_2025_GSP_Update\02_Basin_Setting_Overview\GSP2025_dtw_gwa.aprx



Fall 2022 DTW (feet bgs)

- 0 - 100
- 101 - 200
- 201 - 300
- 301 - 400
- 401 - 500
- 501 - 600
- 601 - 700

Figure 2-59: Fall 2022 Depth to Water
Cuyama Valley Groundwater Basin

Legend

— Depth to Water Contour	— Highway	Well Depth	○ 601 - 800
- - - Approximate Contour	— Local Road	○ Unknown	● 801 - 1000
• Town	□ Cuyama Basin	● 0 - 200	● 1001 - 1200
		● 201 - 400	
		● 401 - 600	

Woodard & Curran


CUYAMA BASIN
GROUNDWATER SUSTAINABILITY AGENCY

0 1.25 2.5 5 Miles

Map Created: July 2024

Third Party GIS Disclaimer: This map is for reference and graphical purposes only and should not be relied upon by third parties for any legal decisions. Any reliance upon the map or data contained herein shall be at the users' sole risk. Data sources: CA DWR, Esri, USGS

Figure Exported: 7/18/2024, By: ceapleken, Using: \\woodandcurran.net\shared\Projects\CA Cuyama Basin_GSAU0011078_01_GSP\wp\Z_GIS2_Map\3_2025_GSP_Update\02_Basin_Setting_Overview\GSP2025_dfw_gvsa2025_dfw_gvsa.aprx



Groundwater Elevation (feet MSL)

3,601 - 3,700
3,501 - 3,600
3,401 - 3,500
3,301 - 3,400
3,201 - 3,300
3,101 - 3,200
3,001 - 3,100
2,901 - 3,000
2,801 - 2,900
2,701 - 2,800
2,601 - 2,700
2,501 - 2,600
2,401 - 2,500
2,301 - 2,400
2,201 - 2,300
2,101 - 2,200
2,001 - 2,100
1,901 - 2,000
1,801 - 1,900
1,701 - 1,800
1,601 - 1,700
1,501 - 1,600
1,400 - 1,500

Figure 2-60 Fall 2020 Groundwater Elevation

Cuyama Valley Groundwater Basin

Legend

- Groundwater Elevation Contour
- - - Approximate Contour
- > Conceptual Flowline
- Highway
- Cuyama Basin
- Well Depth (feet)
- 401 - 600
- Unknown
- 0 - 200
- 201 - 400
- 601 - 800
- 801 - 1000
- 1001 - 1200




0 1.25 2.5 5 Miles

Map Created: July 2024

Third Party GIS Disclaimer: This map is for reference and graphical purposes only and should not be relied upon by third parties for any legal decisions. Any reliance upon the map or data contained herein shall be at the users' sole risk. Data sources: CA DWR, Esri, USGS

Figure Exported: 7/18/2024, By: ceapleton Using: \\woodandcurran.net\shared\Projects\CA\Cuyama Basin_GSA\00110728_01_GSP\wp\Z_GIS\2_Maps\3_2025_GSP_Update\02_Basin_Setting_Overview\GSP2025_dtw_gvsa.aprx




Fall 2020 DTW (feet bgs)

- 0 - 100
- 101 - 200
- 201 - 300
- 301 - 400
- 401 - 500
- 501 - 600
- 601 - 700

<p>Figure 2-61: Fall 2020 Depth to Water</p> <p>Cuyama Valley Groundwater Basin</p>	<p>Legend</p>	<p>— Depth to Water Contour</p> <p>- - - Approximate Contour</p>	<p>— Highway</p> <p>— Local Road</p> <p>• Town</p> <p>□ Cuyama Basin</p>	<p>Well Depth</p> <p>○ Unknown</p> <p>● 0 - 200</p> <p>● 201 - 400</p> <p>● 401 - 600</p>	<p>○ 601 - 800</p> <p>● 801 - 1000</p> <p>● 1001 - 1200</p>	<p>N</p> <p>0 1.25 2.5 5 Miles</p> <p>Map Created: July 2024</p>
		<p>Woodard & Curran</p> <p>CUYAMA BASIN GROUNDWATER SUSTAINABILITY AGENCY</p>				

Third Party GIS Disclaimer: This map is for reference and graphical purposes only and should not be relied upon by third parties for any legal decisions. Any reliance upon the map or data contained herein shall be at the users' sole risk. Data sources: CA DWR, Esri, USGS

Figure Exported: 7/18/2024, By: ceapleken, Using: \\woodandcurran.net\shared\Projects\CA Cuyama Basin_GSA\011078_01_GSP\wp\Z_GIS\2_Maps\3_2025_GSP_Update\02_Basin_Setting_Overview\GSP2025_dfw_gvsa2025_dfw_gvsa.aprx



Groundwater Elevation (feet MSL)

3,601 - 3,700
3,501 - 3,600
3,401 - 3,500
3,301 - 3,400
3,201 - 3,300
3,101 - 3,200
3,001 - 3,100
2,901 - 3,000
2,801 - 2,900
2,701 - 2,800
2,601 - 2,700
2,501 - 2,600
2,401 - 2,500
2,301 - 2,400
2,201 - 2,300
2,101 - 2,200
2,001 - 2,100
1,901 - 2,000
1,801 - 1,900
1,701 - 1,800
1,601 - 1,700
1,501 - 1,600
1,400 - 1,500

Figure 2-62: Spring 2018 Groundwater Elevation

Cuyama Valley Groundwater Basin

Legend

— Groundwater Elevation Contour	— Highway	Well Depth (feet)	● 401 - 600
- - - Approximate Contour	□ Cuyama Basin	○ Unknown	● 601 - 800
- -> Conceptual Flowline		● 0 - 200	● 801 - 1000
		● 201 - 400	● 1001 - 1200




0 1.25 2.5 5 Miles

Map Created: July 2024

Third Party GIS Disclaimer: This map is for reference and graphical purposes only and should not be relied upon by third parties for any legal decisions. Any reliance upon the map or data contained herein shall be at the users' sole risk. Data sources: CA DWR, Esri, USGS

Figure Exported: 7/18/2024, By: cecep10en, Using: \\woodandcurran.net\shared\Projects\CA\Cuyama Basin_GSA\0011078_01_GSP\wp\Z_GIS\2_Maps\3_2025_GSP_Update\02_Basin_Setting_Overview\GSP2025_dtw_gwa.aprx



Spring 2018 DTW (feet bgs)

- 0 - 100
- 101 - 200
- 201 - 300
- 301 - 400
- 401 - 500
- 501 - 600
- 601 - 700

Figure 2-63: Spring 2018 Depth to Water
Cuyama Valley Groundwater Basin


Legend	Depth to Water Contour	Highway	Well Depth	601 - 800
	Approximate Contour	Local Road	Unknown	801 - 1000
	Town	Cuyama Basin	0 - 200	1001 - 1200
			201 - 400	
			401 - 600	

0 1.25 2.5 5 Miles

Map Created: July 2024

Third Party GIS Disclaimer: This map is for reference and graphical purposes only and should not be relied upon by third parties for any legal decisions. Any reliance upon the map or data contained herein shall be at the users' sole risk. **Data sources: CA DWR, Esri, USGS**

Figure Exported: 7/18/2024, By: ceapleken, Using: \\woodandcurran.net\shared\Projects\CA Cuyama Basin_GSA\00110708_01_GSP\wp\Z_GIS\2_Maps\3_2025_GSP_Update\02_Basin_Setting_Overview\GSP2025_dfw_gvsa2025_dfw_gvsa.aprx



Groundwater Elevation (feet MSL)

3,601 - 3,700
3,501 - 3,600
3,401 - 3,500
3,301 - 3,400
3,201 - 3,300
3,101 - 3,200
3,001 - 3,100
2,901 - 3,000
2,801 - 2,900
2,701 - 2,800
2,601 - 2,700
2,501 - 2,600
2,401 - 2,500
2,301 - 2,400
2,201 - 2,300
2,101 - 2,200
2,001 - 2,100
1,901 - 2,000
1,801 - 1,900
1,701 - 1,800
1,601 - 1,700
1,501 - 1,600
1,400 - 1,500

Figure 2-64: Fall 2017 Groundwater Elevation

Cuyama Valley Groundwater Basin

Legend

— Groundwater Elevation Contour	— Highway	Well Depth (feet)	● 401 - 600
- - - Approximate Contour	□ Cuyama Basin	○ Unknown	● 601 - 800
- -> Conceptual Flowline		● 0 - 200	● 801 - 1000
		● 201 - 400	● 1001 - 1200




0 1.25 2.5 5 Miles

Map Created: July 2024

Third Party GIS Disclaimer: This map is for reference and graphical purposes only and should not be relied upon by third parties for any legal decisions. Any reliance upon the map or data contained herein shall be at the users' sole risk. Data sources: CA DWR, Esri, USGS

Figure Exported: 7/18/2024, By: ceapleton Using: \\woodandcurran.net\shared\Projects\CA Cuyama Basin_GSA\0011078_01_GSP\wp\Z_GIS\2_Maps\3_2025_GSP_Update\02_Basin_Settling_Overview\GSP2025_dtw_gvsa2025_dtw_gvsa.aprx



Fall 2017 DTW (feet bgs)

- 0 - 100
- 101 - 200
- 201 - 300
- 301 - 400
- 401 - 500
- 501 - 600
- 601 - 700

Figure 2-65: Fall 2017 Depth to Water

Cuyama Valley Groundwater Basin

Legend

— Depth to Water Contour	— Highway	Well Depth	○ 601 - 800
- - - Approximate Contour	— Local Road	○ Unknown	○ 801 - 1000
• Town	□ Cuyama Basin	● 0 - 200	● 1001 - 1200
		● 201 - 400	
		● 401 - 600	

Woodard & Curran


CUYAMA BASIN
GROUNDWATER SUSTAINABILITY AGENCY

0 1.25 2.5 5 Miles

Map Created: July 2024

Third Party GIS Disclaimer: This map is for reference and graphical purposes only and should not be relied upon by third parties for any legal decisions. Any reliance upon the map or data contained herein shall be at the users' sole risk. Data sources: CA DWR, Esri, USGS

Figure Exported: 7/18/2024, By: ceapleken, Using: \\woodandcurran.net\shared\Projects\CA Cuyama Basin_GSA\00110708_01_GSP\wp\Z_GIS\2_Maps\3_2025_GSP_Update\02_Basin_Setting_Overview\GSP2025_dfw_gvsa2025_dfw_gvsa.aprx



Groundwater Elevation (feet MSL)

3,601 - 3,700
3,501 - 3,600
3,401 - 3,500
3,301 - 3,400
3,201 - 3,300
3,101 - 3,200
3,001 - 3,100
2,901 - 3,000
2,801 - 2,900
2,701 - 2,800
2,601 - 2,700
2,501 - 2,600
2,401 - 2,500
2,301 - 2,400
2,201 - 2,300
2,101 - 2,200
2,001 - 2,100
1,901 - 2,000
1,801 - 1,900
1,701 - 1,800
1,601 - 1,700
1,501 - 1,600
1,400 - 1,500

Figure 2-66: Spring 2017 Groundwater Elevation

Cuyama Valley Groundwater Basin

Legend

- Groundwater Elevation Contour
- - - Approximate Contour
- -> Conceptual Flowline
- Highway
- Cuyama Basin
- Unknown
- 401 - 600
- 601 - 800
- 801 - 1000
- 1001 - 1200
- 0 - 200
- 201 - 400




0 1.25 2.5 5 Miles

Map Created: July 2024

Third Party GIS Disclaimer: This map is for reference and graphical purposes only and should not be relied upon by third parties for any legal decisions. Any reliance upon the map or data contained herein shall be at the users' sole risk. Data sources: CA DWR, Esri, USGS

Figure Exported: 7/18/2024, By: cecep10en, Using: \\woodandcurran.net\shared\Projects\CA\Cuyama Basin_GSA\0011078_01_GSP\wp\Z_GIS\2_Maps\3_2025_GSP_Update\02_Basin_Setting_Overview\GSP2025_dtw_gwa.aprx



Spring 2017 DTW (feet bgs)

- 0 - 100
- 101 - 200
- 201 - 300
- 301 - 400
- 401 - 500
- 501 - 600
- 601 - 700

Figure 2-67: Spring 2017 Depth to Water

Cuyama Valley Groundwater Basin

Legend

— Depth to Water Contour	— Highway	Well Depth	○ 601 - 800
- - - Approximate Contour	— Local Road	○ Unknown	● 801 - 1000
● Town	□ Cuyama Basin	● 0 - 200	● 1001 - 1200
		● 201 - 400	
		● 401 - 600	

North Arrow

Woodard & Curran


CUYAMA BASIN
GROUNDWATER SUSTAINABILITY AGENCY

0 1.25 2.5 5 Miles

Map Created: July 2024

Third Party GIS Disclaimer: This map is for reference and graphical purposes only and should not be relied upon by third parties for any legal decisions. Any reliance upon the map or data contained herein shall be at the users' sole risk. Data sources: CA DWR, Esri, USGS

Figure Exported: 7/18/2024, By: ceapleken, Using: \\woodandcurran.net\shared\Projects\CA\Cuyama Basin_GSAU0011078_01_GSP\wp\Z_GIS\2_Map\3_2025_GSP_Update\02_Basin_Setting_Overview\GSP2025_dtw_gvsa.aprx



Groundwater Elevation (feet MSL)	
3,601 - 3,700	
3,501 - 3,600	
3,401 - 3,500	
3,301 - 3,400	
3,201 - 3,300	
3,101 - 3,200	
3,001 - 3,100	
2,901 - 3,000	
2,801 - 2,900	
2,701 - 2,800	
2,601 - 2,700	
2,501 - 2,600	
2,401 - 2,500	
2,301 - 2,400	
2,201 - 2,300	
2,101 - 2,200	
2,001 - 2,100	
1,901 - 2,000	
1,801 - 1,900	
1,701 - 1,800	
1,601 - 1,700	
1,501 - 1,600	
1,400 - 1,500	

Figure 2-68: Spring 2015 Groundwater Elevation

Cuyama Valley Groundwater Basin

Legend

— Groundwater Elevation Contour	— Highway	Well Depth (feet)	● 401 - 600
- - - Approximate Contour	□ Cuyama Basin	○ Unknown	● 601 - 800
- - > Conceptual Flowline		● 0 - 200	● 801 - 1000
		● 201 - 400	● 1001 - 1200




0 1.25 2.5 5 Miles

Map Created: July 2024

Third Party GIS Disclaimer: This map is for reference and graphical purposes only and should not be relied upon by third parties for any legal decisions. Any reliance upon the map or data contained herein shall be at the users' sole risk. Data sources: CA DWR, Esri, USGS

Figure Exported: 7/18/2024, By: cecep1elon, Using: \\woodandcurran.net\shared\Projects\CA Cuyama Basin_GSA\00110728_01_GSP\wp\Z_GIS\2_Maps\3_2025_GSP_Update\02_Basin_Setting_Overview\GSP2025_dtw_gvsa2025_dtw_gvsa.aprx



Spring 2015 DTW (feet bgs)

- 0 - 100
- 101 - 200
- 201 - 300
- 301 - 400
- 401 - 500
- 501 - 600
- 601 - 700

Figure 2-69: Spring 2015 Depth to Water

Cuyama Valley Groundwater Basin

Legend	Depth to Water Contour	Highway	Well Depth	601 - 800
	Approximate Contour	Local Road	Unknown	801 - 1000
	Town	Cuyama Basin	0 - 200	1001 - 1200
			201 - 400	
			401 - 600	

0 1.25 2.5 5 Miles

Map Created: July 2024

Third Party GIS Disclaimer: This map is for reference and graphical purposes only and should not be relied upon by third parties for any legal decisions. Any reliance upon the map or data contained herein shall be at the users' sole risk. **Data sources: CA DWR, Esri, USGS**



2.1.152.2.6 Change in Groundwater Storage

Historical change in Basin groundwater storage has shown a consistent decline. ~~Figure 2-49~~ ~~Figure 2-70~~ ~~270~~ shows change in storage by year, water year type,⁶ and cumulative water volume for the last ~~2026~~ ~~26~~ years. Change in storage was calculated using the Cuyama Basin Water Resources Model (CBWRM). Average annual ~~usedepletion of groundwater storage~~ ~~over the 2026-year period~~ ~~was -23,076~~ ~~16,900~~ acre-feet. The color of bar for each year of change in storage correlates a water year type defined by Basin precipitation. Change in storage is negative in ~~18~~ ~~22~~ of the ~~2025~~ ~~25~~ years, and was ~~negative~~ ~~positive~~ during ~~two~~ ~~of~~ ~~three~~ ~~of~~ ~~the~~ ~~four~~ wet years, as designated by the water year type.




Figure 2-70: Cuyama Groundwater Storage by Year, Water Year Type, and cumulative Water volume

⁶ Water year types are customized for the Basin watershed based on annual precipitation as follows:

- Wet year = more than 19.6 inches
- Above normal year = 13.1 to 19.6 inches
- Below normal year = 9.85 to 13.1 inches
- Dry year = 6.6 to 9.85 inches
- Critical year = less than 6.6 inches.




Figure 2-49: Cuyama Groundwater Storage by Year, Water Year Type, and Cumulative Water Volume

2.1.162.2.7 Seawater Intrusion

Seawater intrusion is not an applicable sustainability indicator, because seawater intrusion is not present in the Basin and is not likely to occur due to the distance between the Basin and the Pacific Ocean, its bays, deltas, or inlets.

2.1.172.2.8 Land Subsidence

In 2015, USGS measured land subsidence as part of its technical analysis of the Cuyama Valley. USGS used two continuous global positioning systems (GPS) sites and five reference point InSAR sites, shown in

Figure 2-71

Figure 2-71 (USGS, 2015). There are 308 monthly observations from 2000 to 2012, and total subsidence from 2000 to 2012 ranged from 0.0 to 0.4 feet. USGS simulated subsidence using the CUVHM, and estimated that inelastic subsidence began in the late 1970s (USGS, 2015).



Subsidence data were collected from the University NAVSTAR Consortium (UNAVCO) database. UNAVCO maintains data on five GPS monitoring stations in the area in and around the Basin. ~~Figure 2-43~~~~Figure 2-72~~~~Figure 2-72~~ shows the monitoring stations and their measurements since 1999. Three stations (P521, OZST, and BCWR) are located just outside the Basin. The three stations' measurements show ground surface level as either staying constant or slightly increasing. The increase is potentially due to tectonic activity in the region. Two stations (VCST and CUHS) are located within the Basin. Station VCST is located near Ventucopa and indicates that subsidence is not occurring in that area. Station CUHS indicates that ~~300~~~~339~~ millimeters (approximately ~~12 inches~~)1.1 feet. of subsidence have occurred in the vicinity of New Cuyama over the ~~19~~~~25~~ years that were monitored: (1999 - 2023). The subsidence at this station increases in magnitude following 2010, and generally follows a seasonal pattern. The seasonal pattern is possibly related to water level drawdowns during the summer, and elastic rebound occurring during winter periods.

In the fall of 2024, an investigation was completed of the Cuyama Valley High School (CUHS) station. This station is currently operated and maintained by USGS. An onsite inspection was performed and USGS staff were contacted to investigate the construction, sort term and seasonal fluctuations in all position's displacement components. USGS regularly reviews the data collected and did not identify any data quality issues and the site inspection did not identify any potential issue. It was concluded that the longer-term subsidence is occurring consistent with groundwater pumping and drought. Seasonal fluctuations are likely due to rainfall and possible the absence of bedrock anchoring allowing the station to move up and down on a titled axis.

A white paper that provides information about subsidence and subsidence monitoring techniques is in Appendix B.




Figure 29. Historical subsidence as A, map of seasonal InSAR with graphs of simulated and measured time series for selected locations of relative land-surface deformation from Plate-Boundary Observation (PBO) sites and Point InSAR targets, and B, simulated total subsidence 1950–2010 for the calibrated hydrologic flow model, Cuyama Valley, California.

Source: USGS, 2015

Figure 2-71: Locations of Continuous GPS and Reference InSAR Sites in the Cuyama Valley




Figure 2-72: Subsidence Monitoring Network

Cuyama Valley Groundwater Basin

Legend

- Plate Boundary Observatory GPS Station
- Highway
- Local Road
- Town
- Cuyama River
- Creek
- Cuyama Basin



0 1 2 4 Miles

Map Created: December 2023

Figure Exported: 12/27/2023 By: DHunt Using: \woodardcurran.net\shared\Projects\CA Cuyama Basin_GSA\0011078_01_GSP\Map\Z_GIS2_Map\2023_GSP Update\04_Monitoring_Networks\22_subsidence\subsidence_network.aprx



2.1.182.2.9 Groundwater Quality

This section presents Basin groundwater quality information, including a discussion of available water quality data and references, results of water quality data analysis performed for the GSP, and a literature review of previous studies about water quality in the Basin.

Reference and Data Collection

Data collection was completed as part of the 2020 GSP compilation. References and data related to groundwater quality were collected from the following sources:

- USGS National Water Quality Monitoring Council. Downloaded data from June 1, 2018 from <https://www.waterqualitydata.us/portal/>
- DWR GeoTracker California Groundwater Ambient Monitoring and Assessment (GAMA) Program. Downloaded data on June 5, 2018 for each county, from <http://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/gama/datadownload>
- DWR California Natural Resources Agency data. Downloaded on June 14, 2018 from <https://data.cnra.ca.gov/dataset/periodic-groundwater-level-measurements>
- County of Ventura
- Private landowners

In addition to accessing the public portals for each program, CBGSA staff coordinated with RWQCB staff to ensure that all publicly available data was collected. It was confirmed by RWQCB staff that all available data for the ILP program was included in the online GAMA data portal download. Some of these public portals have overlapping data that, where possible, were removed, to develop a comprehensive data set for the Basin. Data were then compiled into a database for analysis.

Analysts also compiled references containing groundwater quality information. The information included in these references were used to enhance understanding of groundwater quality conditions beyond available data. References used in this section include the following:

- Singer and Swarzensky. 1970. *Pumpage and Ground-Water Storage Depletion in Cuyama Valley, 1947-1966*. This report focuses on groundwater depletion, but also includes information about groundwater quality.
- USGS. 2008 *Groundwater-Quality Data in the South Coast Interior Basins Study Unit, 2008: Results from the California Groundwater Ambient Monitoring and Assessment (GAMA) Program*. This study summarizes water quality testing on 12 wells in the Cuyama Valley; wells were tested for a variety of constituents.
- SBCWA. 2011. *Santa Barbara County 2011 Groundwater Report*. This report provides groundwater conditions from throughout the county, and provides water quality information for the Cuyama Valley.



- USGS. 2013c. *Geology, Water-Quality, Hydrology, and Geomechanics of the Cuyama Valley Groundwater Basin, California, 2008-12*. This report investigates a wide variety of groundwater components in the Cuyama Valley, including water quality.

Historical Data Analysis

Collected data were analyzed for TDS, nitrate, and arsenic. These three constituents were included in analysis because they were cited in previous studies of the Basin, and they were discussed during public meetings as being of concern to stakeholders in the Basin. The Figures below show historical measurements of TDS nitrate and arsenic collected prior to GSP development as well as also recent sampling results from the CBGSA's monitoring network and collected from public portals described earlier in this chapter.

~~Figure 2-52~~ ~~Figure 2-73~~ ~~Figure 2-73~~ shows TDS of groundwater measured in wells in 1966. In 1966, TDS was above the MCL of 1,500 micrograms per liter (mg/L) in over 50 percent of measurements. TDS was over 2,000 mg/L near the Cuyama River in the southeast portion of the Basin near the Ozena Fire Station, Santa Barbara Canyon, and upper Quatal Canyon, indicating that high TDS water was entering the Basin from the watershed above these measurement points. TDS measurements were over the MCL throughout the central portion of the Basin, where irrigated agriculture was operating, near the towns of Cuyama and New Cuyama, and along the Cuyama River to the northwest of New Cuyama. TDS was less than 500 mg/L in a number of measurements between Bitter Creek and Cottonwood Canyon, indicating that lower TDS water was entering the Basin from the watersheds in this area.

~~Figure 2-53~~ ~~Figure 2-74~~ ~~Figure 2-74~~ shows TDS of groundwater measured in wells between 2011 and 2018. Multiple years of collected data were used to generate enough mapped data density for comparison to 1966 data. From 2011 to 2018 period, TDS was above the MCL in over 50 percent of measurements. TDS was over 1,500 mg/L near the Cuyama River in the southeast portion of the Basin near the Ozena Fire Station, and in Santa Barbara Canyon, indicating that high TDS water was entering the Basin from the watershed above these measurement points. TDS measurements were over the MCL throughout the central portion of the Basin where irrigated agriculture was operating. A number of 500 to 1,000 mg/L TDS concentrations were measured near New Cuyama and in upper Quatal Canyon, and along the Cuyama River between Cottonwood Canyon and Schoolhouse Canyon.

~~Figure 2-54~~



~~Figure 2-75~~ Figure 2-75 shows measurements of TDS for selected monitoring points over time. Monitoring points were selected by the number of measurements, with higher counts of measurements selected to be plotted. The charts indicate that TDS in the vicinity of New Cuyama has been over 800 mg/L TDS throughout the period of record, and that TDS has either slightly increased or stayed stable over the period of record. The chart for Well 85 at the intersection of Quatal Canyon and the Cuyama River is generally below 800 mg/L TDS with rapid spikes of TDS increases above that level. The timing of rapid increases in measured TDS correspond with Cuyama River flow events, indicating a connection between rainfall and stream flow and an increase in TDS. This is the only location where this trend was detected.

~~Figure 2-55~~ Figure 2-76 shows measurements of nitrate in 1966. This figure also shows that data collected in 1966 shows the Basin was below the MCL of 10 mg/L throughout, with some measurements above the MCL in the central portion of the Basin where irrigated agriculture was operating.

~~Figure 2-56 shows measurements of nitrate in groundwater measured in wells between 2011 and 2018. Multiple years of collected data were used to generate enough mapped data density for comparison to 1966 data. This figure also shows that data collected over this period show the Basin was generally below the MCL, with two measurements that were over 20 mg/L.~~

~~Figure 2-57 shows arsenic measurements from 2008 to 2018. Data were not available prior to this time in significant amounts.~~

~~Figure 2-57 also shows that arsenic measurements were below the MCL of 10 micrograms per liter ($\mu\text{g/L}$) in the majority of the Basin where data was available. However, high arsenic values exceeding 20 $\mu\text{g/L}$ were recorded at three well locations in the area south of New Cuyama; all of these high concentration samples were taken at depths of 700 feet or greater, and readings in the same area taken at shallower depths were below the MCL.~~

~~Figure 2-58~~ Figure 2-77 shows the locations of wells with monitoring measurements for nitrates during the 2010-2020 period and the average concentrations measured in each well. For nitrate, 41 of the 102 wells recorded MCL exceedances from 2010-2020. A review of the data for wells with measurements both before and after 2015 showed little change in concentrations, with no wells showing water quality degradation for nitrate or arsenic.



Figure 2-78 shows the locations of wells with monitoring measurements for arsenic during the 2010-2020 period and the average concentrations measured in each well. For arsenic, five of the 23 wells with measurement recorded a measurement exceeding the MCL of 10 $\mu\text{g/L}$. A review of the data for wells with measurements both before and after 2015 showed little change in concentrations, with no wells showing water quality degradation for arsenic.

Figure 2-79 shows the results of a query using the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB)'s GeoTracker website. GeoTracker documents RWQCB contaminant concerns and mitigation projects. As shown in the figure, most GeoTracker sites show that gasoline, oil and/or diesel fuel have been cited as the contaminant of concern.



Analysis of Recent Data

Since the GSP adoption, the CBGSA has started collecting its own water quality results through the development of a water quality monitoring network. The CBGSA conducts its own sampling for TDS annually and samples for nitrate and arsenic once every five years. In the interim years, the CBGSA leverages existing monitoring programs for nitrate and arsenic through the California State Water Resource Control Board Groundwater Ambient Monitoring and Assessment (GAMA) Database, which includes data from the Central Coast Regional Water Board's Irrigated Lands Program for nitrates as part of its database.

Figure 2-80~~280~~ shows TDS measurements as part of the water quality monitoring network sampled by the CBGSA in 2023. TDS ranges from less than 500 in the eastern part of the Basin to over 1700 in the central part of the Basin, where most of the agricultural production is located.

Figure 2-81~~281~~ shows nitrate concentrations from 2022 and 2023 from the CBGSA monitoring and results from the GAMA database. Nitrate concentrations over the MCL are located in the central part of the basin where most of the agricultural production is located.

Figure 2-82~~282~~ shows arsenic concentrations from 2022 and 2023 from CBGSA monitoring and results from the GAMA database. All wells with arsenic concentrations exceeding MCLs are located in the Central Threshold Region. The locations of high arsenic concentrations are focused south of New Cuyama near the existing Cuyama Community Services District (CCSD) well. This is a known issue for the CCSD that has been mitigated by the construction of a replacement well for the district, which is included as a project in the GSP (see Chapter 7).




Figure Exported: 8/16/2018 8:46:20 AM. C:\Users\scopple\OneDrive - Woodard & Curran\PCF\Projects\DesKopp\11078-003 - Cuyama\GIS\Imported 20180803\MXD\Working\Water Quality\WaterQuality_TDS1966.mxd




Figure 2-73: 1966 Average Well Measurements of Total Dissolved Solids, mg/L

Cuyama Basin Groundwater Sustainability Agency
 Cuyama Valley Groundwater Basin Groundwater Sustainability Plan
 December 2019



Legend

TDS, mg/L	
○ No Measurements	● 1,500 - 1,750 mg/L
● < 500 mg/L	● 1,750 - 2,000 mg/L
● 500 - 1,000 mg/L	● >2,000 mg/L
● 1,000 - 1,500 mg/L	




Figure Exported: 11/19/2018 11:19:20 AM Using: C:\Users\celestine\OneDrive - Woodard & Curran\PC\Folders\Desktop\Current Projects\011075-003 - Cuyama\01 Local Cuyama GIS 2018\0803\MapDocs\Working\Water Quality\WaterQuality_TDS_2011-2018.mxd




Figure 2-74: 2011-2018 Average Well Measurements of Total Dissolved Solids, mg/L
 Cuyama Basin Groundwater Sustainability Agency
 Cuyama Valley Groundwater Basin Groundwater Sustainability Plan
 December 2019



Legend

TDS, mg/L	
Average_Re	
● < 500 mg/L	● 1,750 - 2,000 mg/L
● 500 - 1,000 mg/L	● > 2,000 mg/L
● 1,000 - 1,500 mg/L	






Figure 2-75: Cuyama Groundwater Basin Historic TDS Levels in Selected Wells

Cuyama Basin Groundwater Sustainability Agency

Cuyama Valley Groundwater Basin Groundwater Sustainability Plan

December 2019



Legend

- Cuyama Basin
- Cuyama River
- Wells with Graphed Data
- Towns
- Streams
- Location of TDS WQ Measurements
- Highways




Figure Exported: 8/20/2018 8:20:20 AM by: ceag@ltd.com C:\Users\ceag@ltd.com\OneDrive - Woodward & Curran\PCF\Folders\DesKtop\011078-003 - Cuyama\GIS\Imported\20180803\MXD\Working\WaterQuality\TDS - Locations - Historid-levels.mxd




Figure Excerpted: 8/16/2018, By: ceaplinton Using: C:\Users\scopple\OneDrive - Woodard & Curran\PCF\Projects\DesKopp\11078-003 - Cuyama\GIS\Imported\20180803\Mapa\Working\Water Quality\WaterQuality_Nitrate1966.mxd





Figure 2-76: 1966 Average Well Measurements of Nitrate (NO3) as Nitrogen
 Cuyama Basin Groundwater Sustainability Agency
 Cuyama Valley Groundwater Basin Groundwater Sustainability Plan
 December 2019



Legend

Nitrate (NO3) as N, mg/L	
○ No Measurements	● 10 - 15 mg/L
● < 5 mg/L	● 15 - 20 mg/L
● 5 - 8 mg/L	● > 20 mg/L
● 8 - 10 mg/L	



Figure_Exported_10/7/2021_10:77:2021_Bv_cooplation Using: \\woodardcurran.net\share\Projects\IRM\C\BAC\0011078_00 - Cuyama Basin_GSP\B - Project\Work\GIS - GIS\GIS - TrmME_20210826\Map\Working\Water_Quality\WaterQuality - 2010-2020_Updated20211007.mxd



Figure 2-77: 2010-2020 Average Well Measurements of Nitrate (NO3) as Nitrogen

Cuyama Basin Groundwater Sustainability Agency

Cuyama Valley Groundwater Basin Groundwater Sustainability Plan


October 2021



Legend

Nitrate (NO3) as N, mg/L	
● < 5 mg/L	● 10 - 15 mg/L
● 5 - 8 mg/L	● 15 - 20 mg/L
● 8 - 10 mg/L	● > 20 mg/L





Figure_Exported_10/7/2021_10:17:20 AM Using: \\woodardcurran.net\share\Projects\IRM\C\BAC\0011078_00 - Cuyama Basin_GSP\B - Project\Work\GIS - GIS\GIS - TrmME_20210826\Map\Working\Water_Quality\WaterQuality_A5_2010-2020_Updated20211007.mxd



Figure 2-78: 2010-2020 Average Well Measurements of Arsenic, $\mu\text{g/L}$

Cuyama Basin Groundwater Sustainability Agency
 Cuyama Valley Groundwater Basin Groundwater Sustainability Plan
 October 2021



Legend

- Arsenic (As), $\mu\text{g/L}$**
- < 5 $\mu\text{g/L}$
 - 10 - 20 $\mu\text{g/L}$
 - 5 - 10 $\mu\text{g/L}$
 - > 20 $\mu\text{g/L}$




Figure 2-79: Sites with Water Quality Concerns

Cuyama Valley Groundwater Basin

Legend

Contaminant of Concern	Site Status	Highway	Creek
Alcohol	Closed	Highway	Cuyama River
Gas	Open	Local Road	Cuyama Basin
Lead	Town		
Oil			



0 1.75 3.5 7 Miles

Map Created: April 2024

Third Party GIS Disclaimer: This map is for reference and graphical purposes only and should not be relied upon by third parties for any legal decisions. Any reliance upon the map or data contained herein shall be at the users' sole risk. Data sources: CA DWR, CA GeoTracker, Esri, USGS

Figure Exported: 4/30/2024, By: Dhlunt, Using: WoodardCurran.net\shared\Projects\CA Cuyama Basin_GSA0011078.01_GSP\wp\GIS2_Maps\3_2025_GSP_Update\02_Basin_Setting_Overview\groundwater_quality\geotracker_contamination_sites\fig2-79\fig2-79.aprx

Figure Exported: 3/13/2024, By: DhiJont, Using: WoodardCurran.net\shared\Projects\CA\Cuyama Basin_GSA0011078.01_GSEP\wp07_GIS\2_Maps\2_Annual Reports\WY2023_AR\groundwater_quality\groundwater_quality.aprx




Figure 2-80: Groundwater Quality Measurements - TDS
2023 Data
Cuyama Valley Groundwater Basin

Legend	< 500 mg/L	1,251 - 1,500 mg/L	Highway	Creek
	501 - 750 mg/L	1,501 - 1,750 mg/L	Local Road	Cuyama River
	751 - 1,000 mg/L	1,751 - 2,000 mg/L	Town	Cuyama Basin
	1,001 - 1,250 mg/L	2,001 - 2,250 mg/L		

WOODWARD & CURRAN
GROUNDWATER SUSTAINABILITY AGENCY

CUYAMA BASIN
GROUNDWATER SUSTAINABILITY AGENCY

Map Created: March 2024

Third Party GIS Disclaimer: This map is for reference and graphical purposes only and should not be relied upon by third parties for any legal decisions. Any reliance upon the map or data contained herein shall be at the users' sole risk. Data sources: CA DWR, Esri, USGS

Figure Exported: 4/30/2024, By: D:\h\int... \kingsp\woodardcurran.net\shared\Projects\CA\Cuyama Basin_GSA0011078_01_GSEP\wp07_GIS\2_Maps\2_Annual Reports\WY2023_AR\groundwater_quality\groundwater_quality.aprx




Figure 2-81: Groundwater Quality Measurements - Nitrate
 Years 2022 and 2023
Cuyama Valley Groundwater Basin

Legend	< 5 mg/L	10 - 15 mg/L	Highway	Creek
	5 - 8 mg/L	15 - 20 mg/L	Local Road	Cuyama River
	8 - 10 mg/L	> 20 mg/L	Town	Cuyama Basin

*Values from monitoring wells with multiple observations were averaged with respect to year sampled. **Nestled well at this location.
 Third Party GIS Disclaimer: This map is for reference and graphical purposes only and should not be relied upon by third parties for any legal decisions. Any reliance upon the map or data contained herein shall be at the users' sole risk. **Data sources: CA DWR, Esri, USGS**

WOODWARD & CURRAN
 GROUNDWATER SUSTAINABILITY AGENCY

Map Created: April 2024

Figure Exported: 4/30/2024, By: DHI\jnt... \kings\woodardcurran.net\shared\Projects\CA\Cuyama Basin_GSA0011078.01_GSEP\wpz_GIS\2_Maps\2_Annual Reports\WY2023_AR\groundwater_quality\groundwater_quality.aprx




Figure 2-82: Groundwater Quality Measurements - Arsenic
 Years 2022 and 2023
Cuyama Valley Groundwater Basin

Legend	< 5 µg/L	10 - 15 µg/L	Highway	Creek
	5 - 8 µg/L	15 - 20 µg/L	Local Road	Cuyama River
	8 - 10 µg/L	> 20 µg/L	Town	Cuyama Basin

*Values from monitoring wells with multiple observations were averaged with respect to year sampled. **Nestled well at this location.

0 1.25 2.5 5 Miles

Map Created: April 2024

Third Party GIS Disclaimer: This map is for reference and graphical purposes only and should not be relied upon by third parties for any legal decisions. Any reliance upon the map or data contained herein shall be at the users' sole risk. **Data sources: CA DWR, Esri, USGS**



Literature Review


The information contained in this literature review was compiled during the development of the GSP. In 1970, Singer and Swarzenski reported that TDS in the central basin portion of the Basin was in the range of 1,500 to 1,800 mg/L TDS, and that the cations that contributed to the TDS and the amount of TDS varied by location in the Basin. They also reported that TDS was lower (i.e., from 400 to 700 mg/L) in areas downstream from the Sierra Madre Mountains where TDS was made up of sodium or calcium bicarbonate, and higher (i.e., from 3,000 to 6,000 mg/L) in wells close to the Caliente Range and in the northeastern part of the valley. Singer and Swarzenski stated that the high TDS was generated by mixing of water from marine rocks with more recent water from alluvium. They determined that groundwater movement favors movement of brackish water from the north of the Cuyama River toward areas of groundwater depletion, and that return of some water applied during irrigation and needed for leaching the soil carries dissolved salts with it to the water table (Singer and Swarzensky, 1970).

In 2008, USGS reported GAMA Program results. The GAMA Program sampled 12 Basin wells for a wide variety of constituents. Figure 2-59~~Figure 2-83~~²⁸³ shows the location of GAMA Program wells. The GAMA Program identified that specific conductance, which provides an indication of salinity, ranged from 637 to 2,380 microsiemens per centimeter ($\mu\text{S}/\text{cm}$) across the study's 12 wells. The GAMA Program study reported that the following constituents were not detected at levels above the MCL for each constituent in any samples for the following constituents:

- Pesticides or pesticide degradates
- Gasoline and refrigerants
- Aluminum, antimony, barium, beryllium, boron, cadmium, copper, iron, and lead
- Ammonia and phosphate
- Lithium, molybdenum, nickel, selenium, strontium, thallium, tungsten, uranium, vanadium, and zinc
- Bromide, calcium, chloride, fluoride, iodide, magnesium, potassium, silica, and sodium

The GAMA Program reported that there were detections at levels above the MCL for the following constituents:


- Manganese exceeded its MCL in two wells
- Arsenic exceeded the MCL in one well
- Nitrate exceeded the MCL in two wells
- Sulfate exceeded its MCL in eight wells
- TDS exceeded its MCL in seven wells
- VOCs detected in one well



Base from U.S. Geological Survey National Elevation Dataset, 2006, Albers Equal-Area Conic Projection



Location of groundwater basins in this study



EXPLANATION

- Cuyama Valley groundwater basin (from California Department of Water Resources, CDWR)
- Castaic Lake Valley, Cuddy Canyon Valley, Cuddy Ranch Area, Cuddy Valley, and Mil Potrero groundwater basins included in this study (from California Department of Water Resources, CDWR)
- Randomized sampling grid cell
- Fault
- CUY-09 Grid well
- CUYU-02 Understanding well
- Water bodies
- Stream or river

Figure 5. The South Coast Interior Basins Groundwater Ambient Monitoring and Assessment (GAMA) study unit showing the distribution of the Cuyama study-area grid cells, the location of sampled grid wells and understanding wells, the Cuyama Valley, Castaic Lake Valley, Cuddy Canyon Valley, Cuddy Ranch Area, Cuddy Valley, and Mil Potrero groundwater-basin boundaries (as defined by the California Department of Water Resources, CDWR), major cities, major roads, topographic features, and hydrologic features. Alphanumeric identification numbers for grid wells

Source: USGS, 2008

Figure 2-59: Locations of GAMA Sample Locations



In 2011, SBCWA reported that TDS in the Basin typically ranged from 1,500 to 1,800 mg/L in the main part of the Basin, while the eastern portion of the Cuyama Badlands near Ballinger, Quatal, and Apache Canyons had better water quality with TDS typically ranging from 400 to 700 mg/L. SBCWA noted spikes in TDS in the Badlands well following the wet rainfall years of 1969 and 1994 and stated that the spikes are attributable to overland flow from rainfall which is flushing the upper part of the Basin after dry periods.

SBCWA reported that boron is generally higher in the upper part of the Basin and is of higher concentration in the uplands than in the deeper wells in the central part of the Basin. Toward the northeast end of the Basin at extreme depth there exists poor quality water, perhaps connate (trapped in rocks during deposition) from rocks of marine origin.

SBCWA also reported: “There was little change in TDS, calcium, magnesium, nitrates and sulfates during the 2009- 2011 period. In some cases, concentrations of these nutrients actually fell during the period, most likely due to a lack of rainfall, recharge and flushing of the watershed. As the Cuyama watershed is mostly dry, water quality data must be examined with caution as sometimes overland flow from rainfall events “flushes” the watershed and inorganic mineral concentrations actually peak during storm flows. Typically, in other areas of Santa Barbara County mineral concentrations are diluted during widespread storm runoff out of natural watersheds.”

In 2013, USGS reported that they collected groundwater quality samples at 12 monitoring wells, 27 domestic wells, and two springs for 53 constituents including: field parameters (water temperature, specific conductance, pH, DO, alkalinity), major and minor ions, nitrate, trace elements, stable isotopes of hydrogen and oxygen, tritium and carbon-14 activities, arsenic, iron, and chromium. Figure 2-60 Figure 2-84 shows the USGS sampling locations, which were presented in a figure from their report. The USGS reported sampling result as follows:

- Groundwater in the alluvial aquifer system has high concentrations of TDS and sulfate
- 97 percent of samples had concentrations greater than 500 mg/L for TDS
- 95 percent of samples had concentrations greater than 250 mg./L for sulfate
- 13 percent of samples had concentrations greater than 10 mg/L for nitrate
- 12 percent of samples had concentrations greater than 10 ug/L for arsenic
- One sample had concentrations greater than the MCL for fluoride
- Five samples had concentrations greater than 50 mg/L for manganese
- One sample had concentration of iron greater than 300 mg/L for iron
- One sample had concentration of aluminum greater than 50 mg/L

USGS reported that nitrate was detected in five locations above the MCL of 10 mg/L. Four wells where nitrate levels were greater than the MCL were in the vicinity of the center of agricultural land-use area. Irrigation return flows are a possible source of high nitrate concentrations. There was a decrease in



concentrations with depth in the agricultural land use area which indicated the source of higher nitrate concentrations likely to be near the surface. The lowest nitrate levels were outside the agricultural use area, and low concentrations of nitrate (less than 0.02 mg/L) in surface water samples indicated surface water recharge was not a source of high nitrate

The USGS reported that arsenic was found in greater concentration than the MCL of 10 ug/L in four of the 33 wells sampled, and samples of total chromium ranged from no detections to 2.2 ug/L, which is less than the MCL of 50 ug/L. Hexavalent chromium ranged from 0.1 to 1.7 ug/L which is less than the MCL of 50 ug/L.




Figure 5. The South Coast Interior Basins Groundwater Ambient Monitoring and Assessment (GAMA) study unit showing the distribution of the Cuyama study-area grid cells, the location of sampled grid wells and understanding wells, the Cuyama Valley, Castaic Lake Valley, Cuddy Canyon Valley, Cuddy Ranch Area, Cuddy Valley, and Mil Potrero groundwater-basin boundaries (as defined by the California Department of Water Resources, CDWR), major cities, major roads, topographic features, and hydrologic features. Alphanumeric identification numbers for grid wells

Source: USGS, 2008





Figure 2-83: Locations of GAMA Sample Locations



USGS 2013c

Figure 2-84: USGS 2013c Water Quality Monitoring Sites



2.1.192.2.10 Interconnected Surface Water Systems

The CBWRM, described in Appendix C, was used to analyze interactions between surface water flows in the Basin. Surface water flows in the model were assigned reaches, five on the Cuyama River, and four for creeks that run off into the river. These reaches are shown in Figure 2-51, with each reach assigned a number. Results of the analysis are shown in Table 2-2 in AF for each reach. Seven years had higher total depletions than 2017, which had a depletion estimate of 5,016 AF. Reach characteristics are listed below:

- ~~**Reach 1 — Alamo Creek:** This reach was gaining in each year analyzed, with an average gain of 380 AF per year. The highest gain of 692 AF was in 1998, and the lowest gain was 192 AF in 2016.~~
- ~~**Reach 2 — Cuyama River, from edge of basin to Alamo Creek:** This reach was losing in each year analyzed, with an average loss of 26 AF. The smallest loss was 1 AF in 2007, and the largest loss was 109 AF in 2005.~~
- ~~**Reach 3 — Cuyama River from Alamo Creek, to Quatal Canyon Creek:** This reach was mostly gaining in each year, and lost in one year. The average of gains and losses was a gain of 931 AF. The highest gain of 2,781 was in 1998, and the loss of 300 AF occurred in 2017.~~
- ~~**Reach 4 — Quatal Canyon Creek:** This reach was losing in each year analyzed, with an average loss of 83 AF. The smallest loss was 1 AF in 2007, and the largest loss was 347 AF in 1998.~~
- ~~**Reach 5 — Cuyama River from Quatal Canyon Creek to Santa Barbara Canyon Creek:** This reach was losing in each year analyzed, with an average loss of 926 AF. The smallest loss was 180 AF in 2013, and the largest loss was 2,394 AF in 2005.~~
- ~~**Reach 6 — Santa Barbara Canyon Creek:** This reach was gaining in each year analyzed, with an average gain of 95 AF per year. The highest gain of 222 AF was in 1999, and the lowest gain was 222 AF in 2016.~~
- ~~**Reach 7 — Cuyama River from Santa Barbara Canyon Creek to Schoolhouse Canyon Creek:** This reach was losing in each year analyzed, with an average loss of 5,218 AF. The smallest loss was 797 AF in 2013, and the largest loss was 16,472 AF in 1998.~~
- ~~**Reach 8 — Schoolhouse Canyon Creek:** This reach was gaining in each year analyzed, with an average gain of 175 AF/year. The highest gain of 249 AF was in 1998, and the lowest gain was 134 AF in 2017.~~
- ~~**Reach 9 — Cuyama River west of Schoolhouse Canyon Creek:** This reach was gaining in each year analyzed, with an average gain of 1,333 AF/year. The highest gain of 2,743 AF was in 1998, and the lowest gain was 750 AF in 2015.~~



Figure 2-61: Assigned Surface Water Flow Reaches



This page intentionally left blank.


Table 2-2: Stream Depletion by Reach

Year	Reach-1 (AF)	Reach-2 (AF)	Reach-3 (AF)	Reach-4 (AF)	Reach-5 (AF)	Reach-6 (AF)	Reach-7 (AF)	Reach-8 (AF)	Reach-9 (AF)	Total (AF)
1998	692.9	-100.7	2780.8	-346.8	-2182.5	164	-16471.5	249.3	2742.9	-12471.6
1999	547.1	-4.3	2636.1	-15.1	-561.3	222.1	-3060.8	234.1	2383.5	2381.4
2000	492.6	-19.3	1915.6	-60.8	-973.6	150	-4602.7	218.3	2152.4	-727.5
2001	460.6	-55.1	1300.5	-194.6	-1369.1	134	-7776	197.8	1906.3	-5395.6
2002	376.6	-1.2	1519.8	-2	-268.8	99.3	-1215.9	198.7	1783.1	2489.6
2003	340	-25.8	463.2	-78	-1247.9	75.8	-6156.6	189.6	1320.9	-5118.8
2004	293	-13.5	706.4	-37.2	-711.3	61.6	-3370.3	183.1	1447.5	-1440.7
2005	525.5	-109	668.7	-254.7	-2394	152.8	-14950.5	178	1115.9	-15067.3
2006	583.8	-23	1112.7	-106.3	-1302.3	155.6	-7026.4	172.2	1089.5	-5344.2
2007	455.6	-0.7	1542.1	-0.8	-269.9	114.1	-1327.9	172.3	1328.8	2013.6
2008	426.3	-26.6	797.8	-92.4	-1204.7	103.2	-5902.4	160.6	1105.7	-4632.5
2009	361.8	-8.3	956.6	-33.7	-540.2	77.5	-3191.7	164.2	997.3	-1216.5
2010	347.2	-29.4	294.2	-74.9	-1091.6	72.6	-5843.1	158.2	836	-5330.8
2011	332.3	-48.6	397.4	-191.5	-1518.5	79.5	-7937.3	143.2	899.7	-7843.8
2012	274.1	-7.7	650.6	-28.2	-457.8	60.6	-2720.4	153.9	1091.8	-983.1
2013	244.9	-0.9	768.7	-4.7	-180.2	46.9	-797.2	150.9	1169	1397.4
2014	226.4	-11	183.1	-31.2	-548	37	-2429.6	147.9	971.8	-1453.6
2015	211.9	-7.7	211.7	-16.5	-350.6	30.2	-1968.7	143.9	749.5	-996.3
2016	191.5	-8.6	16.8	-23	-447.1	27.1	-2713	141.1	766.7	-2048.5
2017	208.2	-19.9	-300.4	-67.8	-906	34.5	-4900.3	133.7	801.8	-5016.2
Annual Average	379.6	-26.1	931.1	-83.0	-926.3	94.9	-5218.1	174.6	1333.0	-3340.3



This page intentionally left blank.



The ISW section will be developed once guidance documents are available from DWR.

2.1.202.2.11 Groundwater Dependent Ecosystems

A groundwater dependent ecosystem (GDE) is defined by SGMA emergency regulations in Section- 351(m) as referring “to ecological communities or species that depend on groundwater emerging from aquifers or on groundwater occurring near the ground surface.” Section 354.16(g) of the same regulations requires identification of GDEs in the Basin using data available from DWR, or the best available information. GDEs are not mentioned elsewhere in the emergency regulations. Because the Natural Communities Commonly Associated with Groundwater (NCCAG) dataset includes a number of estimates, DWR recommends the verification of NCCAG-identified locations by a licensed biologist.

DWR provided the NCCAG dataset through the SGMA data portal at <https://gis.water.ca.gov/app/NCDataSetViewer/>. The NCCAG dataset was compiled using a set of six pre-existing dataset sources, and is explained in detail at: <https://gis.water.ca.gov/app/NCDataSetViewer/sitedocs/#>. ~~Figure 2-62~~ Figure 2-85 shows the locations of areas identified as NCCAG in the dataset.

A Woodard & Curran licensed wetlands biologist verified the NCCAG dataset using remote sensing techniques supported by in-person field verification. This work is documented in a Technical Memorandum (Appendix D). The analysis was performed by groupings, and the results of analysis at the groupings level is shown in Figure 2-86. Analysis concluded that there were 123 probable GDEs and 275 probable non-GDEs in the Basin, ~~as shown in Figure 2-64.~~

The installation of piezometers

Since the GSP was adopted, the CBGSA has installed 3 new wells in the vicinity of GDEs to measure groundwater depths near GDE locations would be levels and their impact on beneficial users. These are shallow wells, which are often called piezometers. These wells include:

- Opti well 910 is completed to help monitor the health of GDEs, especially in the western portion a depth of 50 feet bgs with a screen interval from 25-45 feet bgs.
- Opti well 911 is completed to a depth of the Basin. During GSP implementation, the CBGSA will solicit the assistance 45 feet bgs with a screen interval from 10-40 feet bgs.
- Opti well 909 is completed to a depth of private landowners in the western portion 90 feet bgs with a screen interval from 50-80 feet bgs.

Figure 2-87 shows the well locations of these new GDE wells. Additionally, this figure shows seven representative monitoring wells identified as wells that monitor groundwater levels near GDEs and have minimum thresholds based on a GDE protection depth as described in Section 5.2.2. These wells were identified because they fall within 2000 feet of potential GDEs, with some exceptions for topography. These representative monitoring wells are Opti wells 2, 114, 568, 830, 832, 833, and 836.



The CBGSA now uses these 10 wells (three new wells and seven existing groundwater level representative monitoring wells) to monitor groundwater levels that help identify potential impacts to groundwater dependent ecosystems. Through these monitoring wells and the results of the fieldwork and analysis conducted by the Basin to help support installation of piezometers, licensed wetlands biologist, the CBGSA no longer relies on the NCAA remote sensing database for estimating or monitoring probable GDE locations.



Figure Exported: 3/18/2024, By: D:\h\unt... Using: \woodardcurran\refshared\Projects\CA\Cuyama Basin\GSA0011078.01_GSP\wp\z_GIS\2_2025_GSP_Update\02_Basin_Setting_Overview\surface_water\gde\gde.aprx




Figure 2-85: Potential GDEs Identified
 2018 i02 NCCAG
 Cuyama Valley Groundwater Basin

Legend	GDE Vegetation	Local Road	Cuyama River
	GDE Wetland	Town	Cuyama Basin
	Highway	Creek	

0 1.25 2.5 5 Miles

Map Created: March 2024

Third Party GIS Disclaimer: This map is for reference and graphical purposes only and should not be relied upon by third parties for any legal decisions. Any reliance upon the map or data contained herein shall be at the users' sole risk. Data sources: CA DWR, Esri, TNC, USGS

Figure Exported: 3/18/2024, By: Dhiraj, Using: \\woodardcurran.net\shared\Projects\CA\Cuyama Basin_GSA0011078.01_GSP\wp\z_GIS2_Maps\3_2025_GSP_Update\02_Basin_Setting_Overview\surface_water\gde\gde.aprx




Figure 2-86: GDE Ground Truthing Analysis Results

Cuyama Valley Groundwater Basin

Legend

- Probable GDEs
- Probable Non-GDEs
- GDE Vegetation
- GDE Wetland
- Highway
- Local Road
- Town
- Creek
- Cuyama River
- Cuyama Basin



0 1.25 2.5 5 Miles

Map Created: March 2024

Third Party GIS Disclaimer: This map is for reference and graphical purposes only and should not be relied upon by third parties for any legal decisions. Any reliance upon the map or data contained herein shall be at the users' sole risk. **Data sources: CA DWR, Esri, TNC, USGS**

Figure Exported: 6/27/2024, By: D:\hant Using: \woodcurran\refshered\Projects\CA\Cuyama Basin\GSA0011078.01_GSP\wpiz_GIS\2_Maps\3_2025_GSP_Update\02_Basin_Sealing_Overview\surface_water\gsd\gsd.aprx




Figure 2-87: Probable GDEs Based on Analysis

Cuyama Valley Groundwater Basin

Legend

- Monitoring Well
- GDE Vegetation*
- GDE Wetland*
- Highway
- Local Road
- Town
- Creek
- Cuyama River
- Cuyama Basin

*GDE Vegetation and Wetland boundaries have been buffered 300 feet to improve visibility.





0 1.25 2.5 5 Miles

Map Created: June 2024

Third Party GIS Disclaimer: This map is for reference and graphical purposes only and should not be relied upon by third parties for any legal decisions. Any reliance upon the map or data contained herein shall be at the users' sole risk. Data sources: CA DWR, Esri, TNC, USGS



2.1.212.12 Data Gaps

Groundwater conditions data gaps were identified during the development of this GSP, and when additional questions were asked by stakeholders during GSP development. Data gaps are summarized below. Since that time, many of these data gaps have been addressed. This section summarizes the data gaps that were described in the GSP and subsequent CBGSA actions to address them.

- Due to sporadic monitoring by a variety of monitoring entities, a long period of record of monitoring for groundwater levels does not exist in many areas in the Basin.
 - The CBGSA has implemented a quarterly monitoring program for the measurement of groundwater levels throughout the Basin. This program allows the CBGSA to have consistent and regular monitoring going forward. This data gap has been addressed to the extent possible. The monitoring program is described in Chapter 4. Additionally, the CBGSA has reclassified the lack of historical data as a data limitation, but not a data gap. As outlined in the SGMA regulations, a “data gap” must be addressed by a GSA. However, historical data is out of the CBGSA’s ability to rectify, and therefore, it is inappropriate to label a lack of historical data as such
- The depths where arsenic occurs are not known, making setting sustainability thresholds for arsenic not feasible.
 - There is limited information on depth and location of elevated arsenic in the Basin. The one public water supply well owned and operated by CCSD, which has levels of arsenic above the EPA standards, is currently in the process of being replaced with a new in a location where arsenic concentrations are much lower. The CCSD is also looking at implementing treatment options for the current municipal water supply well. Through these changes, arsenic is not impacting beneficial uses or users within the Basin and therefore the CBGSA is not setting sustainability thresholds for arsenic.
- The Cuyama River is not gaged inside the Cuyama Basin, so flows of the river in the Basin have been estimated based on available precipitation data and flow measurements at downstream gages.
 - The CBGSA has installed a new stream gage on the Cuyama River and worked to re-activate an additional gage located within the Basin. Data is currently being collected by the USGS and monitored by the CBGSA.
- Subsidence in the central portion of the Basin where groundwater levels are lowest is not monitored nor understood.



- The state provides InSAR data that can now be used to monitor subsidence within the Basin. Additionally, there are several CGPS stations in and around the Basin, with one in the central portion near the Cuyama High School which was verified in 2024 as active and accurate. After additional analysis during GSP implementation, results indicated that there were no impacts to critical infrastructure in the Basin due to subsidence, nor impact to any other beneficial uses or users of groundwater in the Basin. While additional monitoring in the central portion of the Basin is expected to occur in the future, the CBGSA does not see an immediate need for the installation of additional subsidence monitoring stations.
- Vertical gradients in the majority of the Basin are not understood due to the lack of wells with completions of different depths ~~near~~ located near each other-.
 - Salinity in groundwater in the BasinAs described in Section 2.2.3, DWR installed multi-completion (or nested) wells at three locations and the CBGSA has installed multi-completion wells at six additional locations throughout the Basin. These nested wells are completed at different depths to evaluate vertical gradients. Some of the USGS wells have been equipped with pressure transducers to automatically record groundwater levels on a programmed time interval. Readings are downloaded quarterly. The CBGSA also plans to equip the new multi-completion wells that have been drilled with grant funding from DWR with transducers. Other wells are monitored manually at a quarterly frequency. These wells allow the CBGSA to document and monitor changes in vertical gradients at multiple locations.
- Groundwater salinity in the Basin has a number of natural sources, but these sources are not discretely identified.
 - The CCSD has installed a new well that monitors TDS quarterly and the CBGSA has measured TDS in a number of wells as part of its fault investigation, as described in Section 2.1.5. Natural sources of TDS are still not discretely identified throughout the Basin, but additional work has been done to monitor salinity in groundwater. While additional data may be helpful, the CBGSA has determined through its data analysis during GSP implementation that regulating TDS and setting thresholds for TDS falls outside of the GSA's authority.
- GDEs could be evaluated in greater detail.
 - Section 2.2.9 describes the groundwater dependent ecosystem studies that were completed historically utilizing the NCCAG database. Since that time, the CBGSA has installed three new wells (piezometers) and monitored an additional seven groundwater level representative wells at locations identified as at or near groundwater dependent ecosystems. These 10 wells



help the CBGSA understand groundwater levels near the identified potential GDEs throughout the Basin and their potential impact on GDEs.

- Faults are not well understood with regard to the degree they represent a barrier to flow and at what depth below the surface.
 - The CBGSA completed an investigation of the Russell and Santa Barbara Canyon Faults/fault zones as described in Sections 2.1.5. These are the two major faults identified by USGS as impacting groundwater flow. The Santa Barbara Canyon Fault zone includes an unnamed thrust fault and together they juxtapose formations with different water-bearing capacity that results in a significant difference in groundwater elevation across the fault zone. The fault zone is thought to restrict groundwater flow but is not literally a barrier to groundwater flow. Groundwater quality to the south and north of the fault zone is very similar. The Russell Fault zone does not appear to restrict groundwater flow. Depth to groundwater is consistent to the east and west of the fault zone. While the impact on groundwater flow is not fully understood for the Santa Barbara Canyon fault zone in particular, a significant investigation was completed to better understand impacts of both faults. The CBGSA may consider an additional investigation in the future. .
- The size of the Basin regarding groundwater in storage is not well understood.
 - The CBGSA has undertaken a complete update of the water resources model, which uses groundwater levels to predict storage. Significant progress has been made in identifying the storage capacity of each layer and calibrating it to current groundwater level trends. This analysis has been addressed to the extent possible, given the data available in the Basin.
- Information about many of the wells in the Basin is incomplete, and additional information is needed regarding well depths, perforation intervals and current status.

~~As the CBGSA develops its monitoring networks and implements the GSP, these data gaps will be revisited and re-evaluated for importance during the five-year update of the GSP.~~

- Several data collection efforts by the CBGSA have yielded additional information about wells within the Basin. The CBGSA conducted a well survey in 2021 on its groundwater level representative network yielding more accurate and updated construction and survey data such as ground surface elevations and reference point elevations. Additionally, the CBGSA has sent out surveys and worked with Basin stakeholders and landowners to get as much construction information as possible and categorize all wells in the Basin as either inactive or active to use in all future analyses. This information has been updated in the CBGSA's online Opti DMS.



2.22.3 Basin Settings: Water Budget

This section describes the historical, current and projected water budgets for the Basin. As defined by SGMA regulations, this section quantifies the following:

- Total surface water entering and leaving a basin by water source type
- Inflow to the groundwater system by water source type
- Outflows from the groundwater system by water use sector
- The change in the annual volume of groundwater in storage between seasonal high conditions
- If overdraft conditions occur, a quantification of overdraft over a period of years during which water year and water supply conditions approximate average conditions
- The water year type associated with the annual supply, demand, and change in groundwater stored
- An estimate of sustainable yield for the Basin

2.2.12.3.1 Useful Terms

This section of Chapter 2 describe components of water budgets in the Basin. The terms listed here are intended as a guide for readers, and are not a definitive definition of any term.

- **Precipitation** – Precipitation is the volume of rainfall that travels from the soil zone to the unsaturated (vadose) zone of the groundwater aquifer.
- **Applied Water** – Applied water is the volume of water that is applied by an irrigation system to assist crop and pasture growth.
- **Evapotranspiration** – Evapotranspiration is the volume of water entering the atmospheric system through the combined process of evaporation from soil and plant surfaces and transpiration from plants.
- **Domestic Water Use** – Domestic water use is the volume of water used for indoor household purposes, including potable and non-potable water provided to households by a public water supplier (domestic deliveries) and self-supplied water.
- **Deep Percolation** – Deep percolation is the volume of applied water and precipitation that travels from the soil zone to the unsaturated (vadose) zone of the groundwater aquifer.
- **Runoff** – Runoff is the volume of water flowing into the surface water system in a water budget zone from precipitation over the land surface.
- **Stream Seepage** – Stream seepage is the volume of water entering the groundwater system from rivers and streams.




- **Subsurface Inflow** – Subsurface inflow is the volume of water entering as groundwater into the groundwater system through its subsurface boundaries.
- **Change in Storage** – Change in storage is the net change in the volume of groundwater stored in the underlying aquifer.
- **Overdraft** – Overdraft is the long-term negative net change in volume of groundwater stored in the underlying aquifer.
- **Sustainable Yield** – Sustainable yield is the average annual groundwater pumping that can be sustained without any long-term negative net change in groundwater storage.

2.2.22.3.2 Water Budget Information

This water budget was developed to provide a quantitative accounting of water entering and leaving the Basin. Water entering the Basin includes water entering at the surface and entering through the subsurface. Similarly, water leaving the Basin leaves at the surface and through the subsurface. Water enters and leaves naturally, such as through precipitation and streamflow, and through human activities, such as pumping and recharge from irrigation. Figure 2-88 presents a vertical slice through the land surface and aquifer to summarize the water balance components used during analysis.

The values presented in the water budget provide information about historical, current, and projected conditions as they relate to hydrology, water demand, water supply, land use, population, climate change, sea-level rise (which is not applicable in the Basin), groundwater and surface water interaction, and subsurface groundwater flow. This information can help manage groundwater on the Basin by identifying the scale of different uses, highlighting potential risks, and identifying potential opportunities to improve water supply conditions, among other elements.



(Source: DWR)

Figure 2-88: Generalized Water Budget Diagram

Water budgets can be developed on different spatial scales. In agricultural use, water budgets may be limited to the root zone in soil, improving irrigation techniques by estimating the inflows and outflows of water from the upper portion of the soil accessible to plants through their roots. In a strictly groundwater study, water budgets may be limited to water flow in the subsurface, helping analysts understand how water flows beneath the surface. Global climate models simulate water budgets that incorporate atmospheric water, allowing for simulation of climate change conditions. In this document, consistent



with the SGMA regulations, water budgets investigate the combined surface water and groundwater system in the Basin.

Water budgets can also be developed at different temporal scales. Daily water budgets may be used to demonstrate how evaporation and transpiration increase during the day and decrease at night. Monthly water budgets may be used to demonstrate how groundwater pumping increases in the dry, hot summer months and decreases in the cool, wet winter months. In this section, and consistent with SGMA regulations, this water budget focuses on the full water year (i.e., the 12 months spanning from October of the previous year to September of the current year), with some consideration to monthly variability.

The SGMA regulations require that annual water budgets are based on three different conditions: historical, current, and projected. Water budgets are developed to capture typical conditions during these time periods. Typical conditions are developed through averaging over hydrologic conditions that incorporate droughts, wet periods, and normal periods. By incorporating these varied conditions in the budgets, an analysis of the water system under certain hydrologic conditions such as drought can be performed along with an analysis of long-term average conditions. Information is provided below about the hydrology dataset used to identify time periods for budget analysis, the use of the CBWRM and associated data in water budget development, and about budget estimates.


2.2.32.3 Identification of Hydrologic Periods

Hydrologic periods were selected to meet the needs of developing historical, current, and projected water budgets. The SGMA regulations require that the projected water budget reflect 50 years of historical hydrology to reflect long-term average hydrologic conditions. Historical precipitation data for the Basin was used to identify hydrologic periods that would provide a representation of wet and dry periods and long-term average conditions needed for budget analyses. Analysis of a long-term historical period time provides information that is expected to be representative of long-term future conditions.

Figure 2-89 shows annual precipitation in the Basin for water years 1968 to 2017~~23~~. The chart includes bars displaying annual precipitation for each water year and a horizontal line representing the mean precipitation of 13.40 inches. Rainfall data for the Basin are derived from the Parameter-Elevation Regressions on Independent Slopes Model (PRISM) dataset of DWR's California Simulation of Evapotranspiration of Applied Water (CALSIMETAW) model. Analysts identified periods with a balance of wet and dry periods using the cumulative departure from mean precipitation method. Under this method, the long-term average precipitation is subtracted from annual precipitation in each water year to develop the departure from mean precipitation for each water year. Wet years have a positive departure and dry years have a negative departure; a year with exactly average precipitation would have zero departure. Starting at the first year analyzed, departures are added cumulatively for each year. So, if the departure for Year 1 is 5 inches and the departure for Year 2 is -2 inches, the cumulative departure would be 5 inches for Year 1 and 3 inches (i.e., 5 plus -2) for Year 2.



The cumulative departure of the spatially averaged rainfall in the Basin is shown on Figure 2-89. The cumulative departure from mean precipitation is based on ~~these data sets~~ the PRISM dataset, and is displayed as a line that starts at zero and highlights wet periods with upward slopes and dry periods with downward slopes. More severe events are shown by steeper slopes and greater changes. The period from 2013 to 2014 illustrates a short period with dramatically dry conditions (i.e., a 16-inch decline in cumulative departure over ~~two years~~ four years). The decline in cumulative departure continued in the later years including 2022. The wet period in 2023 brings the cumulative departure back to the zero line.






Figure 2-89: 50-Year Historical Precipitation and Cumulative Departure from Mean Precipitation

2.2.42.3.4 CBWRM Model Use and Associated Data for Water Budget Development

Water budgets were developed using the CBWRM model, which is a fully integrated surface and groundwater flow model covering the Basin. The CBWRM was developed in consultation with members of the Technical Forum, which includes technical staff and consultants representing a range of public and private entities in the Basin. Participants on the Technical Forum are shown in Chapter 1 Section 1.3. The Technical Forum held 14 monthly conference calls over the course of model development- [for the 2020 GSP. Additional Technical Forum calls have occurred as the model has been updated for the 2025 GSP Update.](#) These calls provided opportunities for Technical Forum members to review and comment on all major aspects of model development.

The CBWRM integrates the groundwater aquifer with the surface hydrologic system and land surface processes and operations. The CBWRM was calibrated for the hydrologic period of October 1995 to September 2015~~23~~ by comparing simulated evapotranspiration, groundwater levels, and streamflow records with historical observed records. Development of the model involved study and analysis of



hydrogeologic conditions, agricultural and urban water demands, agricultural and urban water supplies, and an evaluation of regional water quality conditions.

The ~~model~~updated model used for the 2025 GSP Update was developed based on the best available data and information as of ~~June 2018~~September 2023. This version of the model includes substantial data changes compared to the version that was released in 2020, reflecting additional data and information that was not available at that time. The data changes include the following:

- Updated geologic representation developed using:
 - The results of a fault investigation conducted by the CBGSA for the Santa Barbara Canyon and Russell faults
 - Airborne Electromagnetic (AEM) survey data collected by the California Department of Water Resources
 - Well log data from new monitoring wells installed in the Basin
- Updated pumping well locations using data provided by landowner surveys
- Updated land use using data and designations of non-irrigated land areas based on information provided by landowners
- Updated evapotranspiration estimates calibrated to better match metered reporting data provided by landowners for 2022 and 2023
- Calibration period extended to incorporate groundwater level measurements taken by the GSA's monitoring program up through WY 2023

It is expected that the model will continue to be refined in the future as improved and updated monitoring information becomes available for the Basin. These refinements may result in changes in the estimated water budgets described in this section.

Additional information on the development and calibration of the CBWRM is included in Appendix C.

CBWRM simulations were developed to allow for the estimation of water budgets. Model simulations were used to develop the water budgets for historical, current, and projected conditions, which are discussed in detail below:

- The **historical water budget** was based on a simulation of historical conditions in the Basin.
- The **current water budget** was based on a simulation of current (~~2017~~23) land and water use over historical hydrologic conditions, assuming no other changes in population, water demands, land use, or other conditions.



- The **projected water budget** was based on a simulation of future land and water use over the historical hydrologic conditions. Since future land and water use in the Cuyama Basin is assumed to be the same as current conditions, the projected water budget is the same as the current water budget.

Water Budget Definitions and Assumptions

Definitions and assumptions for the historical, current, and projected water budgets are provided below.

~~Table 2-2~~ Table 2-3 summarizes these assumptions.

Historical Water Budget

The historical water budget is intended to evaluate availability and reliability of past surface water supply deliveries, aquifer response to water supply, and demand trends relative to water year type. The hydrologic period of 1998 through 20~~17~~23 was selected for the historical water budget to provide a period of representative hydrology while capturing recent Basin operations. The period 1998 through 20~~17~~23 has an average annual precipitation of 12.~~26~~26 inches, ~~nearly the same as~~0.4 inches less than the long-term average of 13.~~40~~40 inches and includes the ~~recent~~ 2012 to 2017 drought, the wet years of 1998, 2005, and 20~~05~~23, and periods of normal precipitation.

Current and Projected Water Budget

While a budget indicative of current conditions could be developed using the historical calibration model, like the historical water budget, such an analysis would be difficult to interpret due to the extreme weather conditions of the past several years and its effect on local agricultural operations. Instead, to analyze the effects of current land and water use on groundwater conditions, and to accurately estimate current inflows and outflows for the Basin, a current and projected conditions baseline scenario was developed using the IWFEM. This baseline uses current land and water use conditions approximating year 20~~17~~23 conditions with a historical precipitation sequence and a year-to-year variance in cropping patterns that matches the historical variability. Because there is no basis to assume any changes in Basin population or land use in the future as compared to current conditions (in the absence of projects or actions), a single baseline has been developed that reflects both current and projected conditions.

The current and projected conditions baseline includes the following conditions:

- Hydrologic period:
 - Water years 1968 to 2017 (i.e., a 50-year hydrology)
- Precipitation is based on:
 - PRISM dataset for the period from 1968 to 2017
- Land use is based on:



- ~~— Land use estimates developed by DWR and the CBGSA using remote sensing data~~
- Land use information for historical years was developed from private landowner provided by private landowners data, and the remote sensing data provided by DWR and the CBGSA.
- ~~— Permanent crop acreage from 2023 was maintained, while the annual crop pattern was varied from year-to-year similar to the historical data.~~

- Domestic water use is based on:
 - Current population estimates
 - Cuyama Community Services District delivery records
- Agricultural water demand is based on:
 - The IWFDM Demand Calculator in conjunction with historical remote sensing technology, Mapping Evapotranspiration at High Resolution and Internalized Calibration (METRIC)

Table 2-3: Summary of Groundwater Budget Assumptions

Water Budget Criteria	Historical	Current and Projected
Scenario	Historical simulation	Current and projected conditions baseline
Hydrologic Years	Water years 1998 to 2017	Water years 1968 to 2017
Development	Historical	Current
Agricultural Demand	Historical land use	Current conditions
Domestic Use	Historical records	Current conditions

Projected Water Budget with Climate Change

A second projected level water budget has been developed that incorporates the projected effects of climate change. The projected conditions with climate change baseline are the same as the current and projected conditions baseline, except that adjustments have been made to estimated precipitation and agricultural and native vegetation evapotranspiration during the 50-year hydrologic period. The estimated precipitation and evapotranspiration from 1968 to 2017 were adjusted using perturbation factors developed from the Central Tendency climate scenario data provided by DWR. On average, the perturbation factors for this scenario result in an increase in precipitation of about 1.4 percent and in an increase in crop evapotranspiration of about 5.4 percent. Additional information about how precipitation and evapotranspiration were adjusted for climate change can be found in the IWFDM documentation in Appendix C.



Water Budget Estimates

Land surface and groundwater budgets are reported for the historical period, for current and projected conditions, and for projected conditions with climate change.

The following components are included in the land surface water budget:

- Inflows:
 - Precipitation
 - Applied Water
- Outflows:
 - Evapotranspiration
 - Agriculture
 - Native vegetation
 - Domestic water use
 - Deep percolation
 - From precipitation
 - From applied water
 - Runoff
 - Stream seepage to groundwater
 - Flow out of Basin

The following components are included in the groundwater budget:

- Inflows:
 - Deep percolation
 - Stream seepage
 - Subsurface inflow
- Outflows:
 - Groundwater pumping
- Change in storage (where negative values reflect overdraft conditions)

The estimated average annual water budgets are provided in Tables 2-4 and 2-5 for the historical period and for current and projected conditions. The following sections provide additional information regarding each water budget.



Table 2-4: Average Annual Land Surface Water Budget

Component	Historical Water Volume ^a (AFY)	Current and Projected Water Volume ^b (AFY)	Projected Water Volume With Climate Change ^b (AFY)
Inflows			
Precipitation	226,000 <u>223,600</u>	230,000 <u>231,100</u>	233,000 <u>236,400</u>
Applied water	58,000 <u>41,600</u>	59,000 <u>38,500</u>	63,000 <u>41,800</u>
Total Inflow	285,000 <u>265,200</u>	289,000 <u>269,600</u>	296,000 <u>278,200</u>
Outflows			
Evapotranspiration			
___ Agriculture	58,000 <u>45,700</u>	63,000 <u>47,900</u>	66,000 <u>51,100</u>
___ Native vegetation	167,000 <u>169,700</u>	174,000 <u>178,200</u>	174,000 <u>180,200</u>
Domestic water use	3 <u>400</u>	400	400
Deep Percolation			
Precipitation	18,000 <u>4,500</u>	15,000 <u>5,300</u>	155,000
Applied water	40,000 <u>13,600</u>	41,000 <u>10,800</u>	11,100 <u>0</u>
Runoff	32,000 <u>31,500</u>	26,900 <u>0</u>	29,000 <u>30,200</u>
Total Outflow	285,000 <u>265,400</u>	289,000 <u>269,500</u>	296 <u>278,000</u>
Notes: AFY = acre-feet per year ^a From water years 1998 to 2017 <u>23</u> ^b Based on 50-year hydrology			



Table 2-5: Average Annual Groundwater Budget

Component	Historical Water Volume ^a (AFY)	Current and Projected Water Volume ^b (AFY)	Projected Water Volume with Climate Change ^b (AFY)
Inflows			
Deep percolation	28,000 <u>18,100</u>	25,000 <u>16,100</u>	26,000 <u>16,100</u>
Stream seepage	3,900 <u>0</u>	5,400 <u>0</u>	6,000 <u>5,900</u>
Subsurface inflow	5,000 <u>2,800</u>	5,000 <u>2,800</u>	5,000 <u>3,200</u>
Total Inflow	36,000 <u>24,800</u>	35,000 <u>24,300</u>	37,000 <u>25,200</u>
Outflows			
Groundwater pumping	59,000 <u>41,700</u>	60,000 <u>38,500</u>	64,000 <u>41,800</u>
Total Outflow	59,000 <u>41,700</u>	60,000 <u>38,500</u>	64,000 <u>41,800</u>
Change in Storage	(23,000) <u>16,900</u>	(25,000) <u>13,800</u>	(27,000) <u>15,900</u>
Notes: AFY = acre-feet per year ^a From water years 1998 to 20 <u>17</u> 23 ^b Based on 50-year hydrology			

2.2.52.3.5 Historical Water Budget

The historical water budget is a quantitative evaluation of the historical surface and groundwater supply covering the ~~2026~~-year period from 1998 to 2017~~23~~. This period was selected as the representative hydrologic period to calibrate and reduce the uncertainty of the IWFM. Proper analysis and calibration of water budgets within IWFM ensures the hydrologic characteristics of the groundwater basin are accurately represented. The goal of the water budget analysis is to characterize the supply and demand, while summarizing the hydrologic flow within the Basin, including the movement of all primary sources of water such as rainfall, irrigation, streamflow, and subsurface flows.

Figure 2-67 Figure 2-90 summarizes the average annual historical land surface inflows and outflows in the Basin. Figure 2-91 shows the annual time series of historical land surface inflows and outflows.







Figure 2-90: Historical Average Annual Land Surface Water Budget






Figure 2-91: Historical Land Surface Water Budget Annual Time Series

The Basin experiences about 2865,000 AF of land surface inflows each year, of which 2263,000 AF is from precipitation and the remainder is from applied water. About 225216,000 acre-feet per year (AFY) is consumed as evapotranspiration or domestic use, with the remainder either recharging the groundwater aquifer as deep percolation or stream seepage or leaving the Basin as river flow.

The annual time series shows large year-to-year variability in the availability of water, with land surface inflows ranging from a low of about 1320,000 AF to a high of 645622,000 AF. These year-to-year changes in inflows result in corresponding differences in outflows, with total annual agricultural, native vegetation and domestic evapotranspiration ranging from 1084,000 to 444342,000 AF.

~~Figure 2-69~~ Figure 2-92 summarizes the average annual historical groundwater inflows and outflows in the Basin. ~~Figure 2-70~~ Figure 2-93 shows the annual time series of historical groundwater inflows and outflows. The Basin average annual historical groundwater budget has greater outflows than inflows, leading to a projected average annual decrease in groundwater storage (i.e., overdraft) of 23,000 ~~AF-17,000~~ AF. Note that with metered pumping data now available to calibrate the CBWRM the estimated pumping and reduction in storage are both now lower than what was estimated by the CBWRM in the 2020 GSP. Accounting for potential uncertainties in numerical model parameters (as described in Appendix C), the projected average annual overdraft could range from 2115,000 to 2619,000 AF. The



groundwater storage decreases consistently over time, despite year-to-year variability in groundwater inflows.







Figure 2-92: Historical Average Annual Groundwater Budget






Figure 2-93: Historical Groundwater Budget Annual Time Series

2.2.62.3.6 Current and Projected Water Budget

The current and projected water budget quantifies inflows to and outflows from the Basin using 50 years of hydrology in conjunction with 2017-20 population, water use, and land use information.

Figure 2-71 Figure 2-94 summarizes the average annual current and projected land surface inflows and outflows in the Basin. Figure 2-72 Figure 2-95 shows the annual time series of current and projected land surface inflows and outflows.





Figure 2-94: Current and Projected Average Annual Land Surface Water Budget







Figure 2-95: Current and Projected Land Surface Water Budget Annual Time Series



Under current and projected conditions, the Basin experiences about 2690,000 AF of land surface inflows each year, of which 2301,000 AF is from precipitation and the remainder is from applied water. ~~About 238,000 AFY is consumed as evapotranspiration or domestic use, with the remainder either recharging the groundwater aquifer as deep percolation or stream seepage or leaving the Basin as river flow.~~

~~The annual time series shows the year to year variability in the availability of water, with land surface inflows ranging from a low of about 147,000 AF to a high of 628,000 AF. These year to year changes in inflows result in corresponding differences in outflows, with total annual agricultural, native vegetation and domestic evapotranspiration ranging from 127,000 to 429,000 AF.~~

~~Figure 2-73 summarizes the average annual current and projected groundwater inflows and outflows in the Basin. Figure 2-74 shows the annual time series of current and projected groundwater inflows and outflows. The Basin average annual current and projected groundwater budget has greater outflows than inflows, leading to an average annual decrease in groundwater storage (i.e. overdraft) of 25,000 AF. Accounting for potential uncertainties in numerical model parameters (as described in Appendix C), the projected average annual overdraft could range from 23,000 to 27,000 AF. As with the historical conditions, the groundwater storage decreases consistently over time, despite year to year variability in groundwater inflows.~~



Figure 2-73: Current and Projected Average Annual Groundwater Budget




Figure 2-74: Current and Projected Groundwater Budget Annual Time Series

The current and projected water demand, water supply, and change in groundwater storage vary by water year type⁷, as shown in Table 2-6. In wet years, precipitation meets a relative high proportion of the water demand, which reduces the need for groundwater. By contrast, in drier years more groundwater pumping is required to meet the agricultural demand not met by precipitation. This leads to an increase in groundwater storage in wet years and a decrease in the other year types.

⁷Water year types are customized for the Basin watershed based on annual precipitation as follows:

- Wet year = more than 19.6 inches
- Above normal year = 13.1 to 19.6 inches
- Below normal year = 9.85 to 13.1 inches
- Dry year = 6.6 to 9.85 inches
- Critical year = less than 6.6 inches





Table 2-6: Current and Projected Average Annual Supply, Demand, and Change in Groundwater Storage by Water Year Type

Component	Water Year Type				
	Wet	Above Normal	Below Normal	Dry	Critical
Water Demand					
-Agricultural Evapotranspiration (AFY)	64,000	63,000	64,000	63,000	60,000
-Domestic Use (AFY)	500	400	400	300	200
Total Demand	64,000	63,000	64,000	63,000	60,000
Water Supply					
-Groundwater Pumping (AFY)	54,000	59,000	62,000	61,000	66,000
Total Supply	54,000	59,000	62,000	61,000	66,000
Change in Storage	18,000	(21,000)	(34,000)	(37,000)	(46,000)

2.2.72.1.1 Projected Water Budget with Climate Change

The projected water budget with climate change quantifies inflows to and outflows from the Basin using 50 years of hydrology in conjunction with 2017 population, water use, and land use information, with historical precipitation and evapotranspiration values modified for climate change.

Figure 2-75 summarizes the average annual current and projected land surface inflows and outflows in the Basin. Figure 2-76 shows the annual time series of current and projected land surface inflows and outflows.




Figure 2-75: Projected Average Annual Land Surface Water Budget with Climate Change




Figure 2-76: Projected Land Surface Water Budget with Climate Change Annual Time Series

Under projected conditions with climate change, the Basin experiences about 296,000 AF of land surface inflows each year, of which 233,000 AF is from precipitation and the remainder is from applied water. About 244 Table 2-4. About 227,000 AFY is consumed as evapotranspiration or domestic use, with the remainder either recharging the groundwater aquifer as deep percolation or stream seepage or leaving the Basin as river flow.

The annual time series shows the year-to-year variability in the availability of water, with land surface inflows ranging from a low of about 138,122,000 AF to a high of 663,621,000 AF. These year-to-year changes in inflows result in corresponding differences in outflows, with total annual agricultural, native vegetation and domestic evapotranspiration ranging from 123,108,000 AF to 438,447,000 AF.

Figure 2-77 Figure 2-96 summarizes the average annual current and projected groundwater inflows and outflows in the Basin. Figure 2-97 shows the annual time series of current and projected groundwater inflows and outflows. The Basin average annual current and projected groundwater budget has greater outflows than inflows, leading to an average annual decrease in groundwater storage (i.e. overdraft) of 14,000 AF. Similar to the historical water budget, the estimated pumping and reduction in storage are both now lower than what was estimated by the CBWRM in the 2020 GSP. Accounting for potential uncertainties in numerical model parameters (as described in Appendix C), the projected average annual overdraft could range from 12,000 to 16,000 AF. As with the historical conditions, the



groundwater storage decreases consistently over time, despite year-to-year variability in groundwater inflows.




Figure 2-96: Current and Projected Average Annual Groundwater Budget




Figure 2-97: Current and Projected Groundwater Budget Annual Time Series

The current and projected water demand, water supply, and change in groundwater storage vary by water year type⁸, as shown in Table 2-626. In wet years, precipitation meets a relatively high proportion of the water demand, which reduces the need for groundwater. By contrast, in drier years more groundwater pumping is required to meet the agricultural demand not met by precipitation. This leads to an increase in groundwater storage in wet years and a decrease in all other year types.

⁸ Water year types are customized for the Basin watershed based on annual precipitation as follows:

- Wet year = more than 19.6 inches
- Above normal year = 13.1 to 19.6 inches
- Below normal year = 9.85 to 13.1 inches
- Dry year = 6.6 to 9.85 inches
- Critical year = less than 6.6 inches



Table 2-6: Current and Projected Average Annual Supply, Demand, and Change in Groundwater Storage by Water Year Type

Component	Water Year Type				
	Wet	Above Normal	Below Normal	Dry	Critical
Water Demand					
<u>Agricultural Evapotranspiration (AFY)</u>	<u>53,500</u>	<u>48,000</u>	<u>48,200</u>	<u>46,300</u>	<u>42,800</u>
<u>Domestic Use (AFY)</u>	<u>200</u>	<u>200</u>	<u>200</u>	<u>200</u>	<u>200</u>
<u>Total Demand</u>	<u>53,700</u>	<u>48,200</u>	<u>48,400</u>	<u>46,500</u>	<u>43,000</u>
Water Supply					
<u>Groundwater Pumping (AFY)</u>	<u>37,200</u>	<u>37,100</u>	<u>38,600</u>	<u>39,400</u>	<u>41,200</u>
<u>Total Supply</u>	<u>37,200</u>	<u>37,100</u>	<u>38,600</u>	<u>39,400</u>	<u>41,200</u>
<u>Change in Storage</u>	<u>14,200</u>	<u>(9,600)</u>	<u>(20,900)</u>	<u>(24,000)</u>	<u>(28,700)</u>

2.3.7 Projected Water Budget with Climate Change

The projected water budget with climate change quantifies inflows to and outflows from the Basin using 50-years of hydrology in conjunction with 2017 population, water use, and land use information, with historical precipitation and evapotranspiration values modified for climate change.

Figure 2-98298 summarizes the average annual current and projected land surface inflows and outflows in the Basin. Figure 2-99299 shows the annual time series of current and projected land surface inflows and outflows.




Figure 2-98: Projected Average Annual Land Surface Water Budget with Climate Change






Figure 2-99: Projected Land Surface Water Budget with Climate Change Annual Time Series

Under projected conditions with climate change, the Basin experiences about 278,000 AF of land surface inflows each year, of which 236,000 AF is from precipitation and the remainder is from applied water as shown in Table 2-4. About 232,000 AFY is consumed as evapotranspiration or domestic use, with the remainder either recharging the groundwater aquifer as deep percolation or stream seepage or leaving the Basin as river flow.

The annual time series shows the year-to-year variability in the availability of water, with land surface inflows ranging from a low of about 120,000 AF to a high of 621,000 AF. These year-to-year changes in inflows result in corresponding differences in outflows, with total annual agricultural, native vegetation and domestic evapotranspiration ranging from 104,000 AF to 448,000 AF.

Figure 2-100 summarizes the average annual projected groundwater inflows and outflows with climate change in the Basin. ~~Figure 2-78~~ Figure 2-101 shows the annual time series of projected groundwater inflows and outflows with climate change. The Basin average annual current and projected groundwater budget has greater outflows than inflows, leading to an average annual decrease in groundwater storage (i.e., overdraft) of ~~27,000 AF~~ 16,000 AF. Similar to the historical water budget, the estimated pumping and reduction in storage are both now lower than what was estimated by the CBWRM in the 2020 GSP. As with the historical conditions, the groundwater storage decreases consistently over time, despite year-to-year variability in groundwater inflows.





Figure 2-100: ~~Current and~~ Projected Average Annual Groundwater Budget with Climate Change






Figure 2-101: ~~Current and~~ Projected Groundwater Budget with Climate Change Annual Time Series

2.2.82.3.8 Sustainable Yield Estimates

Four simulations ~~were~~will be performed with the updated version of the model to estimate the sustainable yield in the Basin as follows:

- Current and projected conditions sustainability with pumping reductions only
- Current and projected conditions sustainability with pumping reductions and water supply projects
- Projected sustainability with climate change with pumping reductions only
- Projected sustainability with climate change with pumping reductions and water supply projects

As of this draft of the document, sustainable yield estimates with climate change and with water supply projects were still under development. These simulations were performed using the current and projected conditions and projected conditions with climate change baselines described above, with projects and pumping reductions implemented so as to achieve an exact balance between supplies and demands in the Basin-wide groundwater budget on average over the 50-year simulation period.



Each simulation incorporating water supply projects was performed using example projects intended to estimate the potential water supply benefits from those projects. It is anticipated that these projects will be further evaluated and refined in the future prior to potential implementation. The analyses included the following water supply projects:

- **Flood and stormwater capture**—it was assumed that facilities would be developed to capture stormwater flows and recharge them into the groundwater aquifer in the central basin area. It was assumed that approximately 2,500 AF per year could be captured and recharged.
- **Precipitation enhancement**—it was assumed that cloud seeding would be performed to increase precipitation in the upper watershed areas. Based on previous studies of potential cloud seeding programs, it was assumed that precipitation would increase by 10% on average.

Chapter 7 of this GSP describes these potential water supply projects in greater detail. Chapter 7 also describes potential mechanisms to reduce groundwater pumping.

As noted above, these simulations were performed using the best available data and information as of June 2018²⁴. It is expected that the model will continue to be refined in the future as improved and updated monitoring information becomes available in the Basin. These refinements will result in changes in the sustainable yield estimates described in this section.

~~Table 2-7~~ Table 2-7 shows the groundwater budget for each sustainability scenario. Because there is no long-term average change in groundwater storage in these scenarios, the groundwater pumping represents the overall estimated sustainable yield in each scenario. The Basin sustainable yield is estimated to be about ~~20,000 to 21,000~~ 17,800 AFY without water supply projects (i.e., a ~~67~~ 54 percent reduction in groundwater pumping compared to baseline) and about 27,000 AFY with water supply projects (i.e., a ~~55 to 63~~ percent reduction in groundwater pumping compared to baseline).



Table 2-7: Average Annual Groundwater Budget for Sustainability Scenarios

Component	Current and Projected Conditions with Pumping Reductions Only (AFY)	Projected Conditions with Climate Change with Pumping Reductions Only (AFY)	Current and Projected Conditions with Pumping Reductions and Water Supply Projects (AFY)	Projected Conditions with Climate Change with Pumping Reductions and Water Supply Projects (AFY)
Inflows				
Deep percolation	12,000 9,600	11,000Under Development	18,000Under Development	18,000Under Development
Stream seepage	4,000 5,400	5,000Under Development	4,000Under Development	4,000Under Development
Subsurface inflowBoundary and Other	4,000 2,800	5,000Under Development	5,000Under Development	5,000Under Development
Total Inflow	20,000 17,800	21,000 Under Development	27,000 Under Development	27,000 Under Development
Outflows				
Groundwater pumping	20,000 17,800	21,000Under Development	27,000Under Development	27,000Under Development
Total Outflow	20,000 17,800	21,000Under Development	27,000Under Development	27,000Under Development
Change in Storage	(0)	(0)Under Development	(0)Under Development	(0)Under Development
Reduction in groundwater pumping relative to Baseline	(40,000) 20,700	(43,000)Under Development	(33,000)Under Development	(37,000)Under Development
Percent reduction	-67 54%	-67%Under Development	-55%Under Development	-63%Under Development
Notes: All sustainability scenarios are simulated using the 1968 to 2017 hydrologic period.				



2.32.4 References

2.3.12.4.1 HCM References

- Bazeley, W.J.M. 1988. "Tertiary Tectonics and Sedimentation in the Cuyama Basin, San Luis Obispo, Santa Barbara, and Ventura Counties, California." *Society of Economic Paleontologists and Mineralogists, Pacific Section*. Volume 59. Accessed August 14, 2018.
- Calhoun, J.A. 1985. *Structural Geology of the Morales Canyon and Taylor Canyon Region of the Cuyama Basin, Southern Coast Ranges, California*.
https://ir.library.oregonstate.edu/concern/graduate_thesis_or_dissertations/st74cw55k. Accessed August 14, 2018.
- California Department of Water Resources (DWR). 2003. *California's Groundwater Bulletin 118 – Update 2003*. Sacramento, California.
- California Department of Water Resources (DWR). 2016. *Best Management Practices for Sustainable Management of Groundwater – Hydrogeologic Conceptual Model*.
https://www.water.ca.gov/LegacyFiles/groundwater/sgm/pdfs/BMP_HCM_Final_2016-12-23.pdf. Accessed April 18, 2018.
- Cleath-Harris. 2018. *Cuyama Valley Groundwater Basin (3-13) Boundary Modification Request*. San Luis Obispo, California. <http://cuyamabasin.org/assets/pdf/Russell-Fault-BBMR-Report-Final.pdf>
- Davis, T.L., Lagoe, M.B., Bazeley, W.J.M., Gordon, Stuart, McIntosh, Kirk, and Namson, J.S. 1988. *Structure of the Cuyama Valley, Caliente Range, and Carrizo Plain and its significance to the structural style of the southern Coast Ranges and western Transverse Ranges*.
<http://www.thomasldavisgeologist.com/downloads/StructureCuyamaBasinDavis88.pdf>. Accessed June 4, 2018.
- DeLong, S.B., Pelletier, J.D., and Arnold, L.J. 2011. "Late Holocene Alluvial History of the Cuyama River, California, USA." *Geological Society of American Bulletin*. Volume 123, No. 11-12. Accessed August 14, 2018.
- Dibblee, T.W. 2005. *Geologic map of the Peak Mountain quadrangle, San Luis Obispo and Santa Barbara Counties, California*: Dibblee Geological Foundation Map DF-181, scale 1:24,000.
- Dudek. 2016. *Hydrogeologic Conceptual Model to Fulfill Requirements in Section I of the Basin Boundary Modification Application for the Cuyama Valley Groundwater Basin*.
<http://sgma.water.ca.gov/basinmod/docs/download/784>. Accessed September 14, 2018



- EKI Environment & Water, Inc. (EKI). 2017. *Preliminary Findings from Review of the USGS Study of the Cuyama Valley Groundwater Basin*. Burlingame, California.
http://cuyamabasin.org/assets/pdf/EKI-Review_of_USGS_Study_2017-10-27_final.pdf
- Ellis, B.J. 1994. *Changing Tectonic Regimes in the Southern Salinian Block: Extension, Strike-Slip Faulting, Compression and Rotation in the Cuyama Valley, California*.
https://ir.library.oregonstate.edu/concern/graduate_thesis_or_dissertations/3t945t508. Accessed August 14, 2018.
- Hill, M.L., Carlson, S.A., Dibblee, T.W. 1958. "Stratigraphy of Cuyama Valley-Caliente Range Area, California." *Bulletin of the American Association of Petroleum Geologists*. Volume 42, No. 12. Accessed August 14, 2018.
- Kellogg, K.S., Minor, S.A., and Cossette, P.M. 2008. *Geologic map of the eastern three-quarters of the Cuyama 30' x 60' quadrangle, California*. https://pubs.usgs.gov/sim/3002/downloads/pdf/SIM-3002_pamphlet_508.pdf. Accessed June 4, 2018.
- Lagoe, M.B. 1981. *Subsurface Facies Analysis of the Saltos Shale Member, Monterey Formation (Miocene) and Associated Rocks, Cuyama Valley, California*.
http://archives.datapages.com/data/pac_sepm/030/030001/pdfs/199.htm. Accessed June 4, 2018.
- Nevins, B.B. 1982. *Structural evolution of the Russell Ranch oil field and vicinity, southern Coast Ranges, California*. https://ir.library.oregonstate.edu/concern/parent/mg74qr02k/file_sets/dz010v336. Accessed June 4, 2018.
- Singer, J.A., and Swarzenski, W.V. 1970. *Pumpage and ground-water storage depletion in Cuyama Valley California*. <https://pubs.usgs.gov/of/1970/0304/report.pdf>. Accessed June 4, 2018.
- Soil Survey Staff, Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS). (n.d.) *United States Department of Agriculture. U.S. General Soil Map (STATSGO2)*. <https://sdmdataaccess.sc.egov.usda.gov>. Accessed April 24, 2018.
- [Spectrum Geophysics. Report of Geophysical Investigation for Cuyama Valey Groundwater Basin. 2024](#)
- United States Geological Survey (USGS) National Water Information System (NWIS): Web Interface. 2018. *Surface Water Gage 11136800 Cuyama R BL Buckhorn Cyn NR Santa Maria CA*. Data range: 10/1/1988 - 4/20/2018. https://waterdata.usgs.gov/nwis/uv?site_no=11136800. Accessed April 20, 2018.



- United States Geological Survey (USGS). 2013a. *Construction of 3-D Geologic Framework and Textural Models for Cuyama Valley Groundwater Basin, California*.
<https://pubs.usgs.gov/sir/2013/5127/pdf/sir2013-5127.pdf>. Accessed January 19, 2018.
- United States Geological Survey (USGS). 2013b. *Digital Tabulation of Stratigraphic Data from Oil and Gas Wells in Cuyama Valley and Surrounding Areas, Central California*.
<https://pubs.usgs.gov/sir/2013/5108/pdf/sir2013-5108.pdf>. Accessed June 4, 2018.
- United States Geological Survey (USGS). 2013c. *Geology, Water-Quality, Hydrology, and Geomechanics of the Cuyama Valley Groundwater Basin, California, 2008-12*.
<https://pubs.usgs.gov/sir/2013/5108/pdf/sir2013-5108.pdf>. Accessed April 12, 2018.
- United States Geological Survey (USGS). 2015. *Hydrologic Models and Analysis of Water Availability in Cuyama Valley, California*. <https://pubs.usgs.gov/sir/2014/5150/pdf/sir2014-5150.pdf>. Accessed June 4, 2018.
- University of California, Davis (UCD) Department of Agriculture and Natural Resources. *Soil Resource Lab. Soil Agricultural Groundwater Banking Index (SAGBI)*.
<https://casoilresource.lawr.ucdavis.edu/sagbi/>. Accessed April 20, 2018.
- Upson and Worts. 1951. *Groundwater in the Cuyama Valley California*.
<https://pubs.usgs.gov/wsp/1110b/report.pdf>. Accessed April 18, 2018.
- Yeats, R.S., Calhoun, J.A., Nevins, B.B, Schwing, H.F., and Spitz, H.M. 1989. “The Russell Fault: An Early Strike-Slip Fault of the California Coast Ranges.” *Bulletin of the American Association of Petroleum Geologists*. Volume 73, No. 9. Accessed August 14, 2018.

2.3-22.4.2 Groundwater Conditions References

- California Department of Water Resources (DWR). 2003. *California’s Groundwater Bulletin 118 – Update 2003*. Sacramento, California.
- California Department of Water Resources (DWR). 2018. *Summary of the “Natural Communities Commonly Associated with Groundwater” Dataset and Online Web Viewer*.
<https://water.ca.gov/-/media/DWR-Website/Web-Pages/Programs/Groundwater-Management/Data-and-Tools/Files/Statewide-Reports/Natural-Communities-Dataset-Summary-Document.pdf>
- Cleath-Harris. 2016. *Groundwater Investigations and Development, North Fork Ranch, Cuyama, California*. Santa Barbara, California.



- Dudek. 2016. *Hydrogeologic Conceptual Model to Fulfill Requirements in Section I of the Basin Boundary Modification Application for the Cuyama Valley Groundwater Basin*. <http://sgma.water.ca.gov/basinmod/docs/download/784>. Accessed September 14, 2018
- EKI Environment & Water, Inc. (EKI). 2017. *Preliminary Findings from Review of the USGS Study of the Cuyama Valley Groundwater Basin*. Burlingame, California.
- Santa Barbara County Water Agency (SBCWA). 1977. *Adequacy of the Groundwater Basins of Santa Barbara County*. http://www.countyofsb.org/uploadedFiles/pwd/Content/Water/WaterAgency/Adequacy%20of%20the%20GW%20Basins%20of%20SBC%201977_sm.pdf
- Singer, J.A., and Swarzenski, W.V. 1970. *Pumpage and ground-water storage depletion in Cuyama Valley California*. <https://pubs.usgs.gov/of/1970/0304/report.pdf>. Accessed June 4, 2018.
- United States Geological Survey (USGS). 2009. *Groundwater-Quality Data in the South Coast Interior Basins Study Unit, 2008: Results from the California GAMA Program*. https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/gama/docs/dsr_southcoastinterior.pdf
- United States Geological Survey (USGS). 2013a. *Construction of 3-D Geologic Framework and Textural Models for Cuyama Valley Groundwater Basin, California*. <https://pubs.usgs.gov/sir/2013/5127/pdf/sir2013-5127.pdf>. Accessed January 19, 2018.
- United States Geological Survey (USGS). 2013b. *Geology, Water-Quality, Hydrology, and Geomechanics of the Cuyama Valley Groundwater Basin, California, 2008-12*. <https://pubs.usgs.gov/sir/2013/5108/pdf/sir2013-5108.pdf>. Accessed April 12, 2018.
- United States Geological Survey (USGS). 2015. *Hydrologic Models and Analysis of Water Availability in Cuyama Valley, California*. <https://pubs.usgs.gov/sir/2014/5150/pdf/sir2014-5150.pdf>. Accessed June 4, 2018.
- Upton and Worts. 1951. *Groundwater in the Cuyama Valley California*. <https://pubs.usgs.gov/wsp/1110b/report.pdf>. Accessed April 18, 2018.



3. Undesirable Results

This chapter presents the Undesirable Results statements for the Cuyama Valley Groundwater Basin (Basin). These statements are based on quantitative thresholds on monitoring points described in Chapter 5, which are used here to indicate where Undesirable Results might occur in the monitoring network.

The first section of this chapter is the ~~draft~~ Undesirable Results section. The second section contains guidance from relevant portions of the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA) regulations about Undesirable Results, and lists guidance about addressing Undesirable Results from the *Sustainable Management Criteria Best Management Practices* (BMPs) (DWR, 2017).

On June 6, 2018, a public workshop was held where sustainability and undesirable outcomes were discussed with the public. Input from stakeholders at the meeting was tabulated, and stakeholder input was tied to the most relevant GSP component. The sorted results were used to guide creation of the Undesirable Results statements, and are included in Appendix A.

[For this 2025 updated GSP, a CBGSA Board meeting was held on January 10th, 2024 where the Board approved retaining the original Undesirable Results definitions included in the original 2020 GSP. This decision was made with review and input from both the Technical Forum and the Standing Advisory Committee.](#)

3.1 Sustainability Goal

Sustainability Goal: To maintain a sustainable groundwater resource for beneficial users of the Basin now and into the future consistent with the California Constitution.

3.2 Undesirable Results Statements

Undesirable Results are defined in SGMA as one or more of the following effects caused by groundwater conditions occurring throughout the Basin:

- Chronic lowering of groundwater levels indicating a significant and unreasonable depletion of supply if continued over the planning and implementation horizon. Overdraft during a period of drought is not sufficient to establish a chronic lowering of groundwater levels if extractions and groundwater recharge are managed as necessary to ensure that reductions in groundwater levels or storage during a period of drought are offset by increases in groundwater levels or storage during other periods.
- Significant and unreasonable reduction of groundwater storage.
- Significant and unreasonable seawater intrusion.
- Significant and unreasonable degraded water quality, including the migration of contaminant plumes that impair water supplies.
- Significant and unreasonable land subsidence that substantially interferes with surface land uses.

Style Definition: Bullet_LD: Indent: Left: 0", Hanging: 0.25", Tab stops: Not at 0.25"

Formatted: Normal, Space After: 12 pt

Formatted: Normal, Space After: 12 pt, Don't adjust space between Latin and Asian text, Don't adjust space between Asian text and numbers

Formatted: Highlight



- Depletions of interconnected surface water that have significant and unreasonable adverse impacts on beneficial uses of the surface water.

Undesirable Results related to seawater intrusion are not present in the Basin, and are not likely to occur in the Basin.

The term “significant and unreasonable” is not defined by SGMA regulations. Instead, the conditions leading to this classification are determined by the GSA, beneficial users, and other interested parties in each basin. In the Basin, the identification of URs were developed through an extensive stakeholder-driven process that included:

- Careful consideration of input from local stakeholders and landowners;
- A conceptualization of the hydrogeological conceptual model;
- An assessment of current and historical conditions and best available data; and
- Local knowledge and professional opinion.

The CBGSA recognizes the lack of reliable historical data and acknowledges the limitations and uncertainties it causes (see Data Gaps and Plan to Fill Data Gap subsections of Section 4 – Monitoring Networks and Section 8 – Implementation Plan for addressing those limitations). However, the re-assessment of thresholds and UR statements has been a component of the redevelopment of this updated GSP and have taken recent data, information, stakeholder input, and modeling updates/calibration into consideration.

Information is provided below for each effect as it applies to the Basin. For the sustainability indicators relevant to the Basin, the discussion does the following:

- Describes the Undesirable Result
- Identifies Undesirable Results
- Identifies potential causes of Undesirable Results
- Identifies potential effects of Undesirable Results on beneficial uses

For any indicator not present, a justification for not establishing Undesirable Results is provided. This information was developed based on the California Water Code, SGMA regulations, BMPs, and stakeholder input.

3.2.1 Chronic Lowering of Groundwater Levels

Description of Undesirable Results

The Undesirable Result for the chronic lowering of groundwater levels is a result that causes significant and unreasonable reduction in the long-term viability of domestic, agricultural, municipal, or environmental uses over the planning and implementation horizon of this GSP.



Identification of Undesirable Results

This result is considered to occur during GSP implementation when 30 percent of representative monitoring wells (i.e., 1518 of 4760 wells) fall below their minimum groundwater elevation thresholds for two consecutive years.

The 30 percent of wells exceeding their MT for 24 consecutive months criteria included in the GSP allows the CBGSA the flexibility to identify the cause of MT exceedances and to develop a plan for response (per the Adaptive Management approach described in Section 7.6). Potential causes of MT exceedances could include:

- Prolonged drought;
- Pumping nearby the representative well; and
- Unreliable and non-representative data used to calculate the MT.

Minimum threshold exceedances in multiple wells is considered more indicative of a basin-scale decline in groundwater levels and potential adverse impacts on groundwater infrastructure, as opposed to more localized groundwater level declines, which could be associated with nearby pumping. Furthermore, groundwater levels in areas of the Basin change in response to climatic conditions and therefore sustained exceedances of minimum thresholds are considered to be more significant than short-term exceedances. Setting the Identification of Undesirable Results criteria at 30 percent or more of wells exceeding their MT is intended to reflect undesirable results at the basin-scale and using 24 consecutive months allows the GSA time to address issues, perform investigations, and implement projects and management actions as needed.

Potential Causes of Undesirable Results

Potential causes of Undesirable Results for the chronic lowering of groundwater levels are groundwater pumping that exceeds the average sustainable yield in the Basin, and changes in precipitation in the Cuyama Watershed in the future.

Potential Effects of Undesirable Results

If groundwater levels were to reach Undesirable Results levels, the Undesirable Results could cause potential de-watering of existing groundwater infrastructure, starting with the shallowest wells, could potentially adversely affect groundwater dependent ecosystems, and could potentially cause changes in irrigation practices, crops grown, and adverse effects to property values. Additionally, reaching Undesirable Results for groundwater levels could adversely affect domestic and municipal uses, including uses in disadvantaged communities, which rely on groundwater in the Basin.



3.2.2 Reduction of Groundwater Storage

Description of Undesirable Results

The Undesirable Result for the reduction in groundwater storage is a result that causes significant and unreasonable reduction in the viability of domestic, agricultural, municipal, or environmental uses over the planning and implementation horizon of this GSP.

Justification of Groundwater Elevations as a Proxy

Use of groundwater elevation as a proxy metric for Undesirable Results is appropriate for groundwater storage. The change in storage is directly correlated to changes in groundwater elevation. By setting minimum thresholds for levels, storage is also effectively managed.

Identification of Undesirable Results

This result is considered to occur during GSP implementation when 30 percent of representative monitoring wells (i.e., 1518 of 4760 wells) fall below their minimum groundwater elevation thresholds for two consecutive years.

The 30 percent of wells exceeding their MT for 24 consecutive months criteria included in the GSP allows the CBGSA the flexibility to identify the cause of MT exceedances and to develop a plan for response (per the Adaptive Management approach described in Section 7.6). Potential causes of MT exceedances could include:

- Prolonged drought;
- Pumping nearby the representative well; and
- Unreliable and non-representative data used to calculate the MT.

Minimum threshold exceedances in multiple wells is considered more indicative of a basin-scale decline in groundwater levels and potential adverse impacts on groundwater infrastructure, as opposed to more localized groundwater level declines, which could be associated with nearby pumping. Furthermore, groundwater levels in areas of the Basin change in response to climatic conditions and therefore sustained exceedances of minimum thresholds are considered to be more significant than short-term exceedances. Setting the Identification of Undesirable Results criteria at 30 percent or more of wells exceeding their MT is intended to reflect undesirable results at the basin-scale and using 24 consecutive months allows the GSA time to address issues, perform investigations, and implement projects and management actions as needed.



Potential Causes of Undesirable Results

Potential causes of Undesirable Results for the reduction in groundwater storage are groundwater pumping that exceeds the average sustainable yield in the Basin, and decreases in precipitation in the Cuyama Watershed in the future.

Potential Effects of Undesirable Results

If reduction of groundwater in storage were to reach Undesirable Results levels, the Undesirable Results could cause potential de-watering of existing groundwater infrastructure and springs, starting with the shallowest wells, could potentially adversely affect groundwater dependent ecosystems, and potentially cause changes in irrigation practices, crops grown, and adverse effects to property values. Additionally, reaching Undesirable Results for reduction of groundwater in storage could adversely affect domestic and municipal uses, which rely on groundwater in the subbasin.

3.2.3 Seawater Intrusion

Seawater intrusion is not an applicable sustainability indicator in the Basin, because seawater intrusion is not present and is not likely to occur due to the distance between the Basin and the Pacific Ocean, bays, deltas, or inlets.

3.2.4 Degraded Water Quality

Description of Undesirable Results

The Undesirable Result for degraded water quality is a result stemming from a causal nexus between SGMA-related groundwater quantity management activities and groundwater quality that causes significant and unreasonable reduction in the long-term viability of domestic, agricultural, municipal, or environmental uses over the planning and implementation horizon of this GSP.

Identification of Undesirable Results

This result is considered to occur during GSP implementation when 30 percent of the representative monitoring points (i.e., 929 of 2964 sites) exceed the minimum threshold for a constituent for two consecutive years.

The 30 percent of wells exceeding their MT for 24 consecutive months criteria included in the GSP allows the CBGSA the flexibility to identify the cause of MT exceedances and to develop a plan for response (per the Adaptive Management approach described in Section 7.6). Potential causes of MT exceedances could include:

- Prolonged drought;
- Pumping nearby the representative well; and



- Unreliable and non-representative data used to calculate the MT.

Formatted: Bullet_LD

Minimum threshold exceedances in multiple wells is considered more indicative of a basin-scale decline in groundwater quality and potential adverse impacts on beneficial uses and users of groundwater, as opposed to more localized groundwater quality declines. Setting the Identification of Undesirable Results criteria at 30 percent or more of wells exceeding their MT is intended to reflect undesirable results at the basin-scale and using 24 consecutive months allows the GSA time to address issues, perform investigations, and implement projects and management actions as needed.

Potential Causes of Undesirable Results

Potential causes of Undesirable Results for the degraded water quality are conditions where groundwater pumping degrades the groundwater quality.

Potential Effects of Undesirable Results

If groundwater quality were degraded to reach Undesirable Results levels, the Undesirable Results could potentially cause a shortage in supply to groundwater users, with domestic wells being most vulnerable as treatment costs or access to alternate supplies can be high for small users. Water quality degradation could cause potential changes in irrigation practices, crops grown, and adverse effects to property values. Additionally, reaching Undesirable Results for groundwater quality could adversely affect municipal uses, including disadvantaged communities, which could have to install treatment systems.

3.2.5 Land Subsidence

Description of Undesirable Results

The Undesirable Result for land subsidence is a result that causes significant and unreasonable reduction in the viability of the use of infrastructure over the planning and implementation horizon of this GSP.

Identification of Undesirable Results

This result is detected to occur during GSP implementation when 30 percent of representative subsidence monitoring sites (i.e., 1 of 2 sites) exceed the minimum threshold for subsidence over two years.

The 30 percent of sites exceeding their MT for 24 consecutive months criteria included in the GSP allows the CBGSA the flexibility to identify the cause of MT exceedances and to develop a plan for response (per the Adaptive Management approach described in Section 7.6). Potential causes of MT exceedances could include:

- Prolonged drought;
- Pumping nearby the representative sites; and
- Unreliable and non-representative data used to calculate the MT.

Formatted: Highlight



Potential Causes of Undesirable Results

Potential causes of future Undesirable Results for land subsidence are likely tied to groundwater pumping resulting in dewatering of compressible clays in the subsurface.

Potential Effects of Undesirable Results

If land subsidence conditions were to reach Undesirable Results, the Undesirable Results could potentially cause damage to infrastructure, including water conveyance facilities and flood control facilities roads, utilities, buildings, and pipelines.

3.2.6 Depletions of Interconnected Surface Water

Description of Undesirable Results

The Undesirable Result for depletions of interconnected surface water is a result that causes significant and unreasonable reductions in the viability of agriculture or riparian habitat within the Basin over the planning and implementation horizon of this GSP.

~~Identification of Undesirable Results~~ This will be developed once guidance documents are provided by DWR.

This result is considered to occur during GSP implementation when 30 percent of representative monitoring wells (i.e., 18 of 60 wells) fall below their minimum groundwater elevation thresholds for two consecutive years.

Justification of Groundwater Elevations as a Proxy

Use of groundwater elevation as a proxy metric for Undesirable Results is necessary given the difficulty and cost of direct monitoring of depletions of interconnected surface water. The depletion of interconnected surface water is driven by a gradient between water surface elevation in the surface water body and groundwater elevations in the connected, shallow groundwater system. By setting minimum thresholds on shallow groundwater wells near surface water, the CBGSA can to monitor and manage this gradient, and in turn, manage potential changes in depletions of interconnected surface.

Potential Causes of Undesirable Results

Potential causes of future Undesirable Results for depletions of interconnected surface water are likely tied to groundwater production, which could result in lowering of groundwater elevations in shallow aquifers near surface water courses. This could change the hydraulic gradient between the water surface elevation in the surface water course and the groundwater elevation, resulting in an increase in depletion of surface water to groundwater.

Formatted: Highlight



Potential Effects of Undesirable Results

If depletions of interconnected surface water were to reach Undesirable Results, groundwater dependent ecosystems could be affected.

3.3 Evaluation of the Presence of Undesirable Results

DWR developed the *Sustainable Management Criteria* BMP (DWR, 2017) to help GSAs develop their sustainability criteria, and to identify the presence of Undesirable Results. The *Sustainable Management Criteria* BMP states: “Undesirable results will be defined by minimum threshold exceedances.” The *Sustainable Management Criteria* BMP helps GSAs identify the presence of an Undesirable Result by identifying a quantitative number and location of monitoring points that may be below the minimum threshold prior to a GSA identifying conditions as an Undesirable Result.

Formatted: Font: 11 pt

Formatted: Font: 11 pt

This section evaluates current conditions and compares them with the minimum thresholds established in Chapter 5. Using the method identified above for each sustainability indicator, a GSA can identify the presence of Undesirable Results. For the Basin, Undesirable Results are identified at the Basin scale; this scale may be modified by the CBGSA Board if appropriate or necessary in the future.

3.3.1 Chronic Lowering of Groundwater Levels

The Undesirable Result for the chronic lowering of groundwater levels is considered to occur during GSP implementation when 30 percent of representative monitoring wells (i.e., ~~148~~ of ~~4760~~ wells) fall below their minimum groundwater elevation thresholds for two consecutive years (Section 3.2.1).

Formatted: Font: 11 pt

Chapter 5 discusses how minimum thresholds were selected. Appendix A of Chapter 5 presents the hydrographs of groundwater levels through ~~2024~~~~2018~~ and the established depth of the minimum threshold for each monitoring site. Of the ~~4760~~ monitoring sites, ~~threenine~~ were below the minimum threshold in the latest measurement in ~~2024~~~~2018~~, which is ~~six~~~~15~~ percent of representative monitoring wells (i.e., ~~39~~ of ~~4760~~), indicating that the Basin does not currently exceed the requirements for an undesirable condition for the chronic lowering of groundwater levels.

3.3.2 Reduction of Groundwater Storage

The Undesirable Result for the reduction of groundwater storage is monitored by proxy using groundwater levels and groundwater level minimum thresholds (Section 3.2.2). Because measurements show that levels are not in an undesirable condition, reduction of groundwater storage is not identified to be in an undesirable condition.

Formatted: Highlight



3.3.3 Seawater Intrusion

Seawater intrusion is not an applicable sustainability indicator, because seawater intrusion is not present and is not likely to occur due to the distance between the Basin and the Pacific Ocean, bays, deltas, or inlets (Section 3.2.4). Therefore, there is no possibility of an undesirable result due to seawater intrusion.

3.3.4 Degraded Water Quality

The Undesirable Result for degraded water quality is considered to occur during GSP implementation when 30 percent of representative monitoring wells (i.e., ~~920~~ of ~~2964~~ wells) for water quality exceed minimum threshold levels for two consecutive years (Section 3.2.4).

Discussion of how minimum thresholds were selected is presented in Chapter 5. Table 5-2 in Chapter 5 shows the minimum thresholds and the most recent measurement for each monitoring site. Of the ~~2964~~ monitoring sites, none were worse than the minimum threshold in the latest measurement in ~~2023~~~~2018~~, which is 0 percent of representative monitoring wells (i.e., 0 of ~~2960~~), indicating that the Basin does not currently meet the requirements for an undesirable condition for degraded water quality.

3.3.5 Land Subsidence

The Undesirable Result for land subsidence is considered to occur during GSP implementation when 30 percent of representative subsidence monitoring sites (i.e., 1 of 2 sites) exceed the minimum threshold for subsidence over two consecutive years (Section 3.2.5).

Chapter 5 discussed how minimum thresholds were selected. The minimum threshold for subsidence has been set at 2 inches per year.

The rate of subsidence at the Cuyama Valley High School (CVHS) station is measured daily. Subsidence at the CVHS station cycles annually, with elastic rebound occurring in the winter, indicated by an annual high. ~~Recent data available through 2022 (2023 data) Highs during the period of rebound occur between January 1 and March 10 each year. Measurements taken from January 1, 2017 to March 10, 2017 were compared with measurements from January 1, 2018 to March 10, 2018. Each daily measurement was not yet available) compared and the difference between each day was downloaded from UNAVCO¹ and the averaged. The average decline from a day in 2017 during that period and the same day in 2018 during that period was 33 millimeters (1.3 inches).~~

~~The rate of subsidence trend for CUHS was recalculated. Subsidence rates during 2021 and 2022 actually reflected a positive change in ground surface elevation, and current on the Ventueopa station was 0 inches over the same period. Because neither station showed a rate of subsidence rates in the central portion of the Basin are 34.02 mm per year or 1.34 over 2 inches per year (for WY 2022). This rate is below the~~

¹ <https://www.unavco.org/data/web-services/documentation/documentation.html#!/GNSS47GPS/getPositionByStationId>

Formatted: Font: 11 pt

Formatted: Highlight



minimum threshold, and thus, the Basin does not currently meet the requirements for an undesirable result condition for land subsidence are not occurring in the Basin.

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Highlight



3.3.6 Depletions of Interconnected Surface Water

This will be developed once guidance documents are provided by DWR.

~~The Undesirable Result for the depletion of interconnected surface water is monitored by proxy using groundwater levels and groundwater level minimum thresholds (Section 3.2.6). Because measurements show that levels do not currently meet the requirements for an undesirable condition, depletion of interconnected surface water is not identified to be in an undesirable condition.~~

3.4 References

California Department of Water Resources (DWR). 2018. *Sustainable Management Criteria Best Management Practice*. Sustainable Groundwater Management Program. November.
<https://water.ca.gov/-/media/DWR-Website/Web-Pages/Programs/Groundwater-Management/Sustainable-Groundwater-Management/Best-Management-Practices-and-Guidance-Documents/Files/BMP-6-Sustainable-Management-Criteria-DRAFT.pdf>. Accessed March 30, 2018.



Chapter 5 Minimum Thresholds, Measurable Objectives, and Interim Milestones

This chapter of the Cuyama Groundwater Basin (Basin) *Groundwater Sustainability Plan* (GSP) defines the sustainability criteria used to avoid undesirable results during GSP implementation. The Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA) requires the application of minimum thresholds (MTs), measurable objectives (MOs), and interim milestones (IMs) to all representative monitoring sites identified in the GSP. These values, or thresholds, will help the Cuyama Basin Groundwater Sustainability Agency (CBGSA) and other groundwater users in the Basin identify sustainable values for the established SGMA sustainability indicators, and will help identify progress indicators over the 20-year GSP implementation period.

5.1 Useful Terms

There are several terms used in this chapter that describe Basin conditions and the values calculated for the representative sites. These terms are intended as a guide for readers, and are not a definitive definition of any term.

- **Interim Milestones** – IMs are a target value representing measurable conditions, set in increments of five years. They are set by the CBGSA as part of the GSP; IMs will help the Basin reach sustainability by 2040.
- **Measurable Objectives** – MOs are specific, quantifiable goals for maintaining or improving specified groundwater conditions that are included in the adopted GSP to achieve the Basin’s sustainability goal.
- **Minimum Thresholds** – MTs are a numeric value for each sustainability indicator, which are used to define when undesirable results occur if minimum thresholds are exceeded in a percentage of sites in the monitoring network.
- **Sustainability Goals** – Sustainability goals are the culmination of conditions in the absence of undesirable results within 20 years of the applicable statutory deadline.
- **Undesirable Results** – Undesirable results are the significant and unreasonable occurrence of conditions that adversely affect groundwater use in the Basin, as defined in Chapter 3.

Formatted: Font: Not Bold



- **Sustainability Indicators** – These indicators refer to any of the effects caused by groundwater conditions occurring throughout the Basin that, when significant and unreasonable, cause undesirable results, as described in Water Code Section 10721(x). These include the following:
 - Lowering groundwater levels
 - Reduction of groundwater storage
 - Seawater intrusion
 - Degraded water quality
 - Land subsidence
 - Depletion of interconnected surface water

Both MOs and MTs are applied to all sustainability indicator representative sites. Sites in the Basin’s monitoring networks that are not classified as representative sites are not required to have MOs or MTs. All of the Basin’s representative sites will also have IMs calculated for 2025, 2030, and 2035 to help guide the CBGSA toward its 2040 sustainability goals. All wells meeting the representative well criteria outlined in this GSP are included in the Basin’s monitoring network, although participation in the SGMA monitoring program is dependent upon agreements between the CBGSA and the well owners.

The following subsections describe the process of establishing MOs, MTs, and IMs for each of the sustainability indicators described above. They also discuss the results of this process.

5.2 Chronic Lowering of Groundwater Levels

The undesirable result for the chronic lowering of groundwater levels is a result that causes significant and unreasonable reduction in the long-term viability of domestic, agricultural, municipal, or environmental uses over the planning and implementation horizon of this GSP.

Groundwater conditions, as discussed in Chapter 2, Section 2.2, vary across the Basin. Groundwater conditions are influenced by geographic attributes, geologic attributes, and overlying land uses in the Basin. Because of the variety of conditions, six threshold regions were established in the Basin so appropriate sustainability criteria could be set more precisely for each region.

5.2.1 Threshold Regions

The ~~previous GSP utilized six~~ threshold regions ~~that~~ were defined to allow areas with similar conditions to be grouped together for calculation of MOs, MTs, and IMs. ~~However, for this GSP Update the CBGSA has utilized new threshold calculations that incorporate historical data, potential impacts to beneficial uses and users of groundwater, and variations in local conditions in a consistent manner across the Basin. Therefore, these~~ threshold regions are ~~no longer being used~~ shown in Figure 5-1. ~~The following subsections discuss threshold region characteristics and boundaries.~~



Southeastern Threshold Region

The Southeastern Threshold Region lies on the southeastern edge of the Basin, and is characterized as having moderate agricultural land use with steep geographic features surrounding the valley. Groundwater is generally high in this area, with recent historical data showing levels around 50 feet or less below ground surface, which indicates that this region is likely currently in a full condition. Groundwater levels in this region are subject to declines during drought periods, but have typically recovered back to previous levels during historically wet periods. The northern boundary of this region is the narrows at the Cuyama River approximately at the boundary with U.S. Forest Service lands, and the eastern boundary is the extent of alluvium. The southern and western extent of this region is defined by the groundwater basin boundary.



Figure 5-4: Threshold Regions

Formatted: Body Text



Eastern Threshold Region

The Eastern Threshold Region lies southeast of the central part of the Basin and encompasses Ventucopa and much of the surrounding agricultural property. This part of the Basin has agricultural pumping. Hydrographs in this region indicate that groundwater levels have historically ranged widely and repeatedly over the last 50 years, and in general, are declining over the past 20 years. However, these levels are generally higher than those in the Central Threshold Region. The northern boundary of this region is the Santa Barbara Canyon Fault, and the southern boundary is where the Cuyama Valley significantly narrows due to geographic changes. The eastern boundary is the extent of the boundary, and the western boundary is defined by the groundwater basin boundary.

Central Threshold Region

The Central Threshold Region incorporates the majority of agricultural land use in the Basin, as well as the towns of Cuyama and New Cuyama. The greatest depths to groundwater are also found in the Central Threshold Region, and groundwater levels have generally been declining in this region since the 1950s. The southeastern boundary is defined by the Santa Barbara Canyon fault, and the western boundary by the Russell Fault. The northern and southern boundary of this region is defined by the Basin boundary.

Western Threshold Region

The Western Threshold Region is characterized by shallow depth to water, and recent historical data and hydrographs in this region indicate that it is likely this portion of the Basin is currently in a full condition. Land uses in this area generally include livestock and small agricultural operations. It lies primarily on the north-facing slope of the lower Cuyama Valley. The eastern boundary is defined by the Russell Fault, and the northern boundary was drawn to differentiate distinct land uses. The southwestern boundary is defined by the groundwater basin boundary.

Northwestern Threshold Region

The Northwestern Threshold Region is the bottom of the Cuyama Basin and has undergone changes in land use from small production agricultural and grazing to irrigated crops over the last four years. Recent historical data and hydrographs in this portion of the Basin indicate that this portion is likely currently in a full condition. The southern border was drawn to differentiate between the land uses of the Western and Northwestern Threshold regions, resulting in different kinds of agricultural practices. The rest of the region is defined by the Basin boundary.



Badlands Threshold Region

The Badlands Threshold Region includes the areas east of the Central, East, and Southeast Threshold regions on the west facing slope of the Cuyama Valley. There are no active wells and there is little groundwater use in this area. There is no monitoring in this region, and no sustainability criteria were developed for this region.

5.2.2 Minimum Thresholds, Measurable Objectives, and Interim Milestones

This section describes how MTs, MOs, and IMs were established for each representative well by threshold region, and explains the rationale behind the each selected methodologies methodology.


The minimum threshold calculation uses a stepwise function that takes a conservative approach to protect wells (production and domestic) across the Basin while providing flexibility when possible, to accommodate the CBGSA planned pumping allocations and reductions strategy. The stepwise function has four potential calculation outcomes:

1. **Combined Well protection and GDE protection depth:** The well protection depth and GDE protection depth were merged together in a GIS analysis process that interpolated the data into a 3-dimensional coverage across the Basin, in the same process elevation points make a topographic map of the surface elevation. For each RMW's location, the interpolated protection depth was then extracted to get the final Well Protection / GDE protection depth value.
 - a. **Well Protection Depth:** The well protection depth is used to ensure that active production and domestic wells within the Basin are protected from harm to their beneficial uses. The well protection depth is a numerical value representing the approximate depth at which, if exceeded, beneficial uses could be impacted in a well. This value is unique and calculated for each active production and domestic well within the Basin where there is available data. Where data is not available, generalized or regional proxy data is utilized. Some wells are screened from this analysis either because they are too far removed from the representative well network (and therefore conditions at the nearest RWM are not indicative of conditions at the active well because of distance and/or other conditions such as geology or topology) or wells were already dry in 2015. The well protection depth is calculated for each pumping well as a four-part stepwise function, with a slight difference in the fourth step between domestic and production wells (Figure 5-1).
 - b. **GDE Protection Depth:** GDEs are incorporated two ways into the well protection depth GIS analysis. First, RMW wells within 2,000 feet of potential GDEs (with two exceptions due to local topography) were automatically assigned a well protection depth of 30 ft bgs. These RMWs are Opti wells 2, 114, 568, 830, 832, 833, and 836. Second, all potential GDE locations in the Basin were assigned a protection depth of 30 ft bgs via a dense spatial point-cloud within each GDE polygon in GIS. The point-clouds allow GIS to

Formatted: Font: Bold



utilize the same data type (points instead of polygons) in the processing required for the protection depth calculation.



Southeastern Threshold Region

Monitoring in this threshold region indicates groundwater levels are static except during drought conditions from 2013 to 2018. Static groundwater levels indicate this area of the Basin is generally at capacity; therefore, the MT is protective of domestic, private, public, and environmental uses.

The MO for the Southeastern Threshold Region’s wells was calculated by finding the measurement taken closest to (but not before) January 1, 2015 and not after April 30, 2015. If no measurement was taken during this four-month period, then a linear trendline was applied to the data and the value for January 1, 2015 was extrapolated.



To provide an operational flexibility range, the MT was calculated by subtracting five years of groundwater storage from the MO. Five years of storage was calculated by finding the decline in groundwater levels from 2013 to 2018, which was considered a period of drought. If measurements were insufficient for this time period, a linear trendline was used to extrapolate the value decline value.

IMs were set to equal the MT in 2025, with a projected improvement to one-third the distance between the MT and MO in 2030 and half the distance between the MT and MO in 2035. As a result, IMs will a way to measure progress toward sustainability over the GSP's planning horizon.

Groundwater levels will be measured using the protocols documented in Chapter 4's Appendix A.

Eastern Threshold Region

Monitoring in this threshold region indicates a downward trend in groundwater levels. However, much of this downward trend is due to hydrologic variability and may be recovered in the future. Therefore, MTs have been set to allow for greater flexibility as compared to other regions. The MT for wells in this region intends to protect domestic, private, public and environmental uses of the groundwater by allowing for managed extraction in areas that have beneficial uses and protecting those with at risk infrastructure.

Stakeholders reported concern about the dewatering of domestic wells in this region, and groundwater levels have been declining in monitoring wells. Both the MT and MO consider the sustainability of water levels in regard to both domestic and agricultural users.

The MT was calculated by taking the total historical range of recorded groundwater levels and used 35 percent of the range. This 35 percent was then added below the value closest to January 1, 2015 (as described above).

MOs were calculated by subtracting five years of groundwater storage from the MT. Five years of storage was found by calculating the decline in groundwater levels from 2013 to 2018 (a drought period). If measurements were insufficient for this time period, a linear trendline was used to extrapolate the value.

IMs were set to equal the MT in 2025, with a projected improvement to one-third the distance between the MT and MO in 2030 and half the distance between the MT and MO in 2035. As a result, IMs will a way to measure progress toward sustainability over the GSP's planning horizon.

Groundwater levels will be measured using the protocols documented in Chapter 4's Appendix A.

Central Threshold Region

Monitoring in this threshold region indicates a decline in groundwater levels, indicating an extraction rate that exceeds recharge rates. The MT for this region is set to allow current beneficial uses of groundwater while reducing extraction rates over the planning horizon to meet sustainable yield. The MO is intended to allow sufficient operational flexibility for future drought conditions.



The MT for representative wells in the Central-Threshold Region was calculated by finding the maximum and minimum groundwater levels for each representative well, and calculating 20 percent of the historical range. This 20 percent was then added to the depth to water measurement closest to, but not before, January 1, 2015, and no later than April 30, 2015. If no measurement was taken during this four-month period, then a linear trendline was applied to the wells data, and the value for January 1, 2015 was extrapolated.

The MO was calculated by subtracting five years of groundwater storage from the MT. Five years of storage was found by calculating the decline in groundwater levels from 2013 to 2018 (a drought period). If measurements were insufficient for this time period, a linear trendline was used to extrapolate the value.

For Opti- Wells 74, 103, 114, 568, 609, and 615, a modified MO calculation was used where the MO used the linear trendline of the full range of measurements to extrapolate a January 1, 2015 value. This modification was made because measurements from 2013 to 2018 in these wells did not provide sufficient data to provide an adequate trendline for calculating the MO.

IMs were set to equal the in 2025, with a projected improvement to one-third the distance between the MT and MO in 2030 and half the distance between the MT and MO in 2035. As a result, IMs will a way to measure progress toward sustainability over the GSP's planning horizon.

Groundwater levels will be measured using the protocols documented in Chapter 4's Appendix A.

Western Threshold Region

Monitoring in this threshold region indicates groundwater levels are stable, and levels varied significantly depending on where representative wells were in the region. The most common use of groundwater in this region is for domestic use. Due to these hydrologic conditions, the MT was set to protect the water levels from declining significantly, while allowing beneficial land surface uses of the groundwater and protection of current well infrastructure. The MT was calculated by taking the difference between the total well depth and the value closest to mid-February, 2018, and calculating 15 percent of that depth. Values from 2018 are used because data collected during this time represent a full basin condition. That value was then subtracted from the mid-February, 2018 measurement to calculate the MT. This allows users in this region to use their groundwater supply without increasing the risk of running a well beyond acceptable limits, and this methodology is responsive to the variety of conditions and well depths in this region.

The MO was then calculated by finding the measurement closest to mid-February, 2018, which monitoring indicates is likely a full condition.

Opti- Well 474 uses a modified MO calculation where the historical high elevation measurement was used as the MO. This was done to allow for a sufficient operational flexibility based on historical data for the well.



IMs were set to equal the in 2025, with a projected improvement to one-third the distance between the MT and MO in 2030 and half the distance between the MT and MO in 2035. As a result, IMs will a way to measure progress toward sustainability over the GSP's planning horizon.

Groundwater levels will be measured using the protocols documented in Chapter 4's Appendix A.

Northwestern Threshold Region

Monitoring in this threshold region indicates levels are stable, with some declines in the area where new agriculture is established. Due to these hydrologic conditions, the MT was set to protect the water levels from declining significantly, while allowing beneficial land surface uses (including domestic and agricultural uses) and using the storage capacity of this region. The MT for the this region was found by determining the region's total average saturated thickness for the primary storage area, and calculating 15 percent of that depth. This value was then set as the MT.

The MO for this region was calculated using 5 years of storage. Because historical data reflecting new operations in this region are limited, 50 feet was used as 5 years of storage based on local landowner input.

There are several representative wells in this region that were reclassified as far-west northwestern wells, and include Opti Wells 830, 831, 832, 833, 834, 835, and 836. These wells have total depths that are shallower, and they use the same strategies as the Western Threshold Region for their MOs and MTs to be more protective of these wells and ensure levels do not drop below the total well depth.

IMs were set to equal the MT in 2025, with a projected improvement to one-third the distance between the MT and MO in 2030 and half the distance between the MT and MO in 2035. As a result, IMs will a way to measure progress toward sustainability over the GSP's planning horizon.

Groundwater levels will be measured using the protocols documented in Chapter 4's Appendix A.

Badlands Threshold Region

This threshold region has no groundwater use or active wells. As a result, no MO, MT, or IM was calculated.

Figure 5-1: Well Protection Depth Stepwise Diagram for Production and Domestic Wells

2. **Recent deepest measurement plus 10 ft or 5% buffer (whichever is greater):** Historical data for the last ten years (2013-2023 based on the timing of the development of this methodology) was analyzed to find the deepest depth to water during that period. A buffer of the greater of either 10 ft or 5% of the depth to water value was then added to the max depth. This methodology



helps utilize, where appropriate, historical and recently collected data that captures both wet and dry periods. This criteria allows for the flexibility for regions of the Basin that experience significant drawdown and recovery during dry and wet hydrologic cycles to manage those variations in groundwater elevation.

3. Projected depth of water in 2040 based on modeled glidepath: The Cuyama Basing Groundwater Model (updated in 2024) was used to project the depth of water in 2040 based on the CBGSA's planned allocation and glidepath pumping reductions. In regions of the Basin where there is significant pumping, this allows for groundwater levels to decline to where the model predicts they will be in 2040 given the anticipated schedule for pumping reductions.

4. Saturated thickness in areas of greater geologic understanding: The calculation for this strategy uses the localized region's total average saturated thickness for the primary storage area and calculating 15 percent of that depth. Because there is an area in the northwestern portion of the Basin with greater geological research and understanding, the saturated thickness provides a measurable and defined direct relationship between available water in the aquifer, storage capacity, and undesirable conditions. As discussed in the following section, additional analysis has also been conducted to ensure that the calculated MTs in this area do not impact beneficial uses or uses at any nearby active wells or potential GDEs.

Using these four options above, the stepwise function to determine the appropriate MT for each RMW is as follows:

1. For RMWs that used the saturated thickness approach in the approved 2020 GSP, utilize that same approach.
2. For RMWs that did not utilize the saturated thickness approach in the approved 2020 GSP,
 - a. First find the deeper of these two values:
 - i. Deepest depth to water (DTW) from 2013-2023 + buffer
 - ii. Cuyama Basin groundwater model projected DTW in 2040
 - b. Then find the shallower value between Step 2a, the WPD and the GDE protection depth

Figure 5-2 shows the groundwater level SMC minimum threshold methodology that resulted from the stepwise function above for all representative wells.


Formatted: Font: Bold

The CBGSA determined that the same margin of operational flexibility (MoOF) utilized in the 2020 GSP should be used again, unless that margin was less than 10 feet in which the MoOF would be equal to 10 feet.

In summary, this approach achieves the CBGSA's goal of allowing for operational and hydrologic flexibility in all parts of the Basin while also ensuring that groundwater pumping wells and GDEs are protected from negative impacts.



Figure 5-2: Groundwater Level SMC Minimum Threshold Methodology





Analysis of Northwestern Region Minimum Thresholds

DWR's consultation letter expressed concern about whether the thresholds established using the saturated thickness methodology (applied to RMW Opti wells 841 and 845) are protective of nearby beneficial users of water. Specifically, DWR questioned what impact(s) may occur to nearby domestic wells and GDEs if groundwater levels were to reach MTs in representative wells. To address this, the Cuyama Basin Water Resources Model (CBWRM) was used to simulate groundwater level conditions by artificially dropping groundwater levels near Opti Wells 841 and 845 to the set MTs. This was done by assigning specified head boundary conditions at the MT levels for the model nodes near these well locations. The simulation was run for 10 years over the historical period between water years (WY) 2011 to 2020 during which the specified head boundary conditions at the MT levels were continuously active.

Figure 5-3 shows the modeled change in groundwater elevations resulting from setting groundwater levels at the MTs at wells 841 and 845. Areas shaded in red or tan color on the figure had reduced groundwater elevations as compared to the baseline condition. Areas shaded in lime green were unaffected by the change in groundwater elevations at well 841 and 845 locations. As shown in the figure, there are no active domestic wells within the area affected by the lowered groundwater elevations at wells 841 and 845. The only GDE which may be affected is the GDE located at the confluence of Cottonwood Creek and the Cuyama River, which has an expected impact of less than 5 feet. However, even with this difference, the estimated depth to water at this GDE location would be shallower than 30 feet and therefore should not have a detrimental impact on these potential GDEs. Potential impacts on this GDE location will be monitored at nearby Opti well 832.

Formatted: Font: Bold

As noted above, the other potential beneficial use that may be affected comes from Cuyama River inflows into Lake Twitchell. The model simulation also showed an increase in stream depletion in the affected portion of the aquifer of about 1,200 acre-feet per year. This represents about 12 percent (out of 10,200 AFY) of the modeled streamflow in the Cuyama River at this location during the WY 2011-2020 model simulation period. However, the actual change in inflows into Lake Twitchell would be less than 1,200 AFY because of stream depletions that would occur between Cottonwood Creek and Lake Twitchell. For comparison, during the same period the USGS gage on the Cuyama River just upstream of Lake Twitchell (11136800) recorded an average annual flow of 7,900 AFY, only a portion of which comes from the Cuyama Basin. Given the lack of data regarding the hydrology and stream seepage between Cottonwood Creek and Lake Twitchell, it is uncertain how much of an impact this would have on the flows that ultimately are stored in Lake Twitchell.




5.2.3 Selected MT, MO, and IM Graphs, Figures, and Tables

Figure 5-4 shows an example hydrograph with indicators for the MT and MO, and IM over the hydrograph. The left axis shows elevation above mean sea level, the right axis shows depth to water below ground surface. The brown line shows the ground surface elevation, and time in years is shown on the bottom axis. Each measurement taken at the monitoring well is shown as a blue dot, with blue lines connecting between the blue dots indicating the interpolated groundwater level between measurements. The MT and IM are shown as a red line, and the MO is shown as a green line. Appendix A includes hydrographs with MT, MO and IM for each representative monitoring well.

Formatted: Font: Bold

Table 5-1 shows the representative monitoring network and the numerical values for the MT, MO, and IM for each representative well.

Formatted: Font: Bold






Figure 5-4: Example Hydrograph



Table 5-1: Representative Monitoring Network and Sustainability Criteria

OPTI Well	Region	Final MT	Final MO	2025 IM	2030 IM	2035 IM	Well Depth (feet)	Screen Top (feet)	Screen Bottom (feet)	GSE (feet)	
72	Central		<u>373469</u>	<u>328424</u>	<u>362469</u>	<u>350454</u>	<u>339447</u>	790	340	350	2,171
74	Central		<u>322256</u>	<u>309243</u>	<u>319256</u>	<u>316252</u>	<u>312250</u>	--	--	--	2,193
77	Central		<u>514450</u>	<u>464400</u>	<u>501450</u>	<u>489433</u>	<u>476425</u>	980	960	980	2,286
91	Central		<u>730625</u>	<u>681576</u>	<u>718625</u>	<u>705609</u>	<u>693604</u>	980	960	980	2,474
95	Central		<u>597573</u>	<u>562538</u>	<u>588573</u>	<u>580564</u>	<u>571556</u>	805	--	--	2,449
96	Central		<u>369333</u>	<u>361325</u>	<u>367333</u>	<u>365330</u>	<u>363329</u>	500	--	--	2,606
98	Central		450	430	450	446	445	750	--	--	2,688
99	Central		<u>379344</u>	<u>368300</u>	<u>377344</u>	<u>374307</u>	<u>371306</u>	750	730	750	2,513
102	Central		<u>470235</u>	<u>432497</u>	<u>461235</u>	<u>451222</u>	<u>442246</u>	--	--	--	2,046
103	Central		<u>379290</u>	<u>324235</u>	<u>365290</u>	<u>351272</u>	<u>338263</u>	1,030	--	--	2,289
112	Central		<u>10287</u>	<u>10085</u>	<u>10187</u>	<u>10186</u>	<u>10086</u>	441	--	--	2,139
114	Central		<u>5847</u>	<u>5645</u>	<u>5847</u>	<u>5746</u>	<u>5746</u>	58	--	--	1,925
316	Central		<u>731623</u>	<u>682574</u>	<u>719623</u>	<u>706607</u>	<u>694599</u>	830	--	--	2,474
317	Central		<u>700623</u>	<u>650573</u>	<u>688623</u>	<u>675606</u>	<u>663598</u>	700	--	--	2,474
322	Central		<u>387307</u>	<u>378298</u>	<u>385307</u>	<u>383304</u>	<u>381303</u>	850	--	--	2,513
324	Central		<u>365344</u>	<u>353299</u>	<u>362344</u>	<u>359307</u>	<u>356305</u>	560	--	--	2,513
325	Central		<u>331300</u>	<u>323292</u>	<u>329300</u>	<u>327297</u>	<u>325296</u>	380	--	--	2,513
420	Central		<u>514450</u>	<u>464400</u>	<u>501450</u>	<u>489433</u>	<u>476425</u>	780	--	--	2,286

Formatted Table

Formatted Table



Table 5-1: Representative Monitoring Network and Sustainability Criteria

OPTI Well	Region	Final MT	Final MO	2025 IM	2030 IM	2035 IM	Well Depth (feet)	Screen Top (feet)	Screen Bottom (feet)	GSE (feet)	
421	Central		<u>514446</u>	<u>466398</u>	<u>502446</u>	<u>490430</u>	<u>478422</u>	620	--	--	2,286
422	Central		444	397	444	428	421	460	--	--	2,286
474	Central		<u>197488</u>	<u>178460</u>	<u>192488</u>	<u>188482</u>	<u>183470</u>	213	--	--	2,369
568	Central		<u>4737</u>	<u>4636</u>	<u>4737</u>	<u>4737</u>	<u>4637</u>	188	--	--	1,905
604	Central		<u>544526</u>	<u>505487</u>	<u>534526</u>	<u>524543</u>	<u>515507</u>	924	454	924	2,125
608	Central		<u>504436</u>	<u>475407</u>	<u>497436</u>	<u>490426</u>	<u>483422</u>	745	440	745	2,224
609	Central		<u>499458</u>	<u>462424</u>	<u>490458</u>	<u>480446</u>	<u>471440</u>	970	476	970	2,167
610	Central		<u>557624</u>	<u>527504</u>	<u>549624</u>	<u>542644</u>	<u>534606</u>	780	428	780	2,442
612	Central		<u>513463</u>	<u>490440</u>	<u>507463</u>	<u>502455</u>	<u>496452</u>	1,070	657	1070	2,266
613	Central		<u>578503</u>	<u>550475</u>	<u>571503</u>	<u>564404</u>	<u>557480</u>	830	330	830	2,330
615	Central		<u>588500</u>	<u>556468</u>	<u>580500</u>	<u>572480</u>	<u>564484</u>	865	480	865	2,327
620	Central		606	566	606	593	586	4,035	550	4035	2,432
629	Central		<u>613550</u>	<u>581527</u>	<u>605550</u>	<u>597548</u>	<u>589543</u>	1,000	500	1000	2,379
633	Central		<u>605547</u>	<u>551493</u>	<u>591547</u>	<u>578520</u>	<u>564520</u>	1,000	500	1000	2,364
62	Eastern		<u>212482</u>	<u>187457</u>	<u>206482</u>	<u>199460</u>	<u>193470</u>	212	--	--	2,921
85	Eastern		<u>200233</u>	<u>176200</u>	<u>194233</u>	<u>188204</u>	<u>182224</u>	233	--	--	3,047
100	Eastern		<u>186484</u>	<u>157452</u>	<u>179484</u>	<u>172462</u>	<u>164467</u>	284	--	--	3,004
101	Eastern		<u>138444</u>	<u>11588</u>	<u>133444</u>	<u>127404</u>	<u>121400</u>	200	--	--	2,741

Formatted Table

Formatted Table



Table 5-1: Representative Monitoring Network and Sustainability Criteria

OPTI Well	Region	Final MT	Final MO	2025 IM	2030 IM	2035 IM	Well Depth (feet)	Screen Top (feet)	Screen Bottom (feet)	GSE (feet)	
840	Northwestern		203	453	203	486	478	900	200	880	4,713
841	Northwestern		203	153	191203	178486	166478	600	170	580	1,761
843	Northwestern		203	453	203	486	478	620	60	600	4,764
845	Northwestern		203	153	191203	178486	166478	380	100	360	1,712
849	Northwestern		203	453	203	486	478	570	450	550	4,713
2	Southeastern		5272	3555	4872	4466	3964	73	--	--	3,720
89	Southeastern		6264	4244	5764	5257	4754	125	--	--	3,461
106	Western		164454	152441.4	161454	158450	155448	227.5	--	--	2,327
107	Western		12294	10372.23	11794	11385	10882	200	--	--	2,482
408	Western		465	435.62	465	455	450	328.75	--	--	2,629
117	Western		163460	154450.82	161460	158457	156455	212	--	--	2,098
118	Western		40424	1057.22	24424	7402	-1094	500	--	--	2,270
423	Western		34	42.50	34	25	22	438	--	--	2,465
424	Western		73	57.12	73	68	65	460.55	--	--	2,287
427	Western		42	34.74	42	39	37	400.25	--	--	2,364
571	Western		142444	118420.5	136444	130436	124432	280	--	--	2,307
573	Western		93448	4267.5	80448	68404	5593	404	--	--	2,084
830	Far-West Northwestern		6350	6056	6250	6258	6158	77.2	--	--	1,571

Formatted Table

Formatted Table

Formatted Table

Formatted Table

Formatted Table

Formatted Table



Table 5-1: Representative Monitoring Network and Sustainability Criteria

OPTI Well	Region	Final MT	Final MO	2025 IM	2030 IM	2035 IM	Well Depth (feet)	Screen Top (feet)	Screen Bottom (feet)	GSE (feet)
831	Far-West Northwestern	77	52	77	69	65	213.75	-	-	1,557
832	Far-West Northwestern	<u>5045</u>	<u>3530</u>	<u>4645</u>	<u>4340</u>	<u>3938</u>	131.8	--	--	1,630
833	Far-West Northwestern	<u>4896</u>	<u>1024</u>	<u>3096</u>	<u>1272</u>	<u>-660</u>	503.55	--	--	1,457
834	Far-West Northwestern	84	42	84	70	63	320	-	-	1,508
835	Far-West Northwestern	55	36	55	49	46	162.2	-	-	1,555
836	Far-West Northwestern	<u>4979</u>	<u>1036</u>	<u>3879</u>	<u>2865</u>	<u>1758</u>	325	--	--	1,486

Formatted Table

Formatted Table



Page intentionally left blank.



5.3 Reduction of Groundwater Storage

The undesirable result for the reduction in groundwater storage is a result that causes significant and unreasonable reduction in the viability of domestic, agricultural, municipal, or environmental uses over the planning and implementation horizon of this GSP.

Direct measurement of the reduction of groundwater storage in the Basin is not needed because monitoring in several areas of the Basin (i.e., the western, southeastern, and portions of the north facing slope of the Cuyama Valley near the center of the Basin) indicate that those regions are likely near, or at full conditions. Additionally, the Basin's primary aquifer is not confined and storage closely matches groundwater levels.

SGMA regulations define the MT for reduction of groundwater storage as "...the total volume of groundwater that can be withdrawn from the basin without causing conditions that may lead to undesirable results."

Undesirable results for groundwater storage volumes in this GSP will use groundwater levels as a proxy, as the groundwater level sustainability criteria are protective of groundwater in storage.

5.3.1 Threshold Regions

~~Groundwater storage is measured by proxy using groundwater level thresholds, and thus uses the same methodology and threshold regions as groundwater levels.~~

5.3.25.3.1 Proxy Monitoring

Reduction of groundwater storage in the Basin uses groundwater levels as a proxy for determining sustainability, as permitted by Title 23 of the California Code of Regulations in Section 354.26 (d), Chapter 1.5.2.5. Additionally, there are currently no state, federal, or local standards that regulate groundwater storage. As described above, any benefits to groundwater storage are expected to coincide with groundwater level management.

5.4 Seawater Intrusion

Due to the geographic location of the Basin, seawater intrusion is not a concern, and thus is not required to establish criteria for undesirable results for seawater intrusion, as supported by Title 23 of the California Code of Regulations in Section 354.26 (d), Chapter 1.5.2.5.

5.5 Degraded Water Quality

The undesirable result for degraded water quality is a result stemming from a causal nexus between SGMA-related groundwater quantity management activities and groundwater quality that causes significant and unreasonable reduction in the long-term viability of domestic, agricultural, municipal, or environmental uses over the planning and implementation horizon of this GSP.



The SGMA regulations specify that, “minimum thresholds for degraded water quality shall be the degradation of water quality, including the migration of contaminant plumes that impair water supplies or other indicator of water quality as determined by the Agency that may lead to undesirable results.”

Salinity (measured as total dissolved solids [TDS]), arsenic, and nitrates ~~were have all been identified during the development of the 2020 GSP as potential constituents potentially being of concern for water quality in the Basin.~~ However, ~~recent data analysis has led the CBGSA to conclude that thresholds for TDS are warranted and thresholds for as noted in the Groundwater Conditions section, there have only been two nitrate measurements and three arsenic measurements in recent years that exceeded MCLs. In the case of arsenic, all of the high concentration measurements have been taken at groundwater depths of greater than 700 feet, outside of the range of pumping. Furthermore, unlike with salinity, there is no evidence to suggest a causal nexus between potential GSP actions and arsenic or salinity. Therefore, the groundwater quality network has been established to monitor for salinity (measured as TDS) but does not aligned with the CBGSAs role within the Subbasin. include arsenic or nitrates at this time.~~

TDS is being monitored by the GSA for several reasons. Local stakeholders identified TDS as one of the constituents of concerns in the GSP development processes, and TDS has had several exceedance measurements near domestic and public supply wells. Although high TDS concentrations are naturally occurring within the Basin, it is believed that management of groundwater levels may help improve TDS concentration levels towards levels reflective of the natural condition.

5.5.1 – Threshold Regions

~~Groundwater quality monitoring does not use threshold regions, because the same approach is used for all wells in the Basin. Figure 5-3 shows groundwater quality representative well locations in the Basin.~~



~~Figure 5-3-~~ The CBGSA will continue to monitor TDS and utilize the undesirable results statement and UR triggers identified in Section 3.2.4 to determine the appropriate actions and timing of applicable actions to address water quality concerns. As discussed in Section 7.6 Adaptive Management, the CBGSA has also set adaptive management triggers. Adaptive management triggers are thresholds that, if reached, initiate the process for considering implementation of adaptive management actions or projects. During GSP implementation, regular monitoring reports will be prepared for the CBGSA that summarize and provide updates on groundwater conditions, including groundwater quality.

Commented [CE2]: Confirm this is still the correct section during GSP compilation.

Nitrates and Arsenic

Nitrates are the result of fertilizer application on agricultural land. The CBGSA does not have the regulatory authority granted through SGMA to regulate the application of fertilizer. This regulatory authority is held by the SWRCB through the Irrigated Lands Regulatory Program (ILRP). The CBGSA can encourage agricultural users in the Basin to use best management practices when using fertilizers but cannot limit their use. Because the CBGSA has no mechanism to directly control nitrate concentrations, the GSA believes that setting thresholds for nitrates is not appropriate. However, it should be noted that GSP implementation will likely have an indirect effect on nitrates in the central portion of the Basin due to the reduction in pumping allocations that were included in the GSP. This will likely reduce the application of fertilizers in the central part of the Basin as agricultural production in the Basin is reduced over time.

Similarly, because arsenic is naturally occurring, the CBGSA does not believe the establishment of thresholds for arsenic is appropriate. As shown in Figure 2-79, wells with high arsenic concentrations are located in a relatively small area of the Basin south of New Cuyama. A review of production well data provided by the counties (discussed in Section 2) indicates that there are no active private domestic wells located in this part of the Basin. The only operational public well that that is located in this part of the Basin serves the Cuyama Community Services District (CCSD). As described in Chapter 7, the CCSD is currently pursuing the drilling of a new production well, which was included as a project in the GSP. Once this well is completed, it is not believed that any domestic water users will be using a well that accesses groundwater with known high arsenic concentrations.

Commented [CE3]: Link this and confirm this is the correct reference number when document is combined.

Monitoring Approach for Nitrates and Arsenic

The CBGSA will continue to coordinate and work with the Regional Water Quality Control Board and other responsible regulatory programs on a regular basis for the successful and sustainable management of water resources that protect against undesirable conditions related to nitrates and arsenic. As discussed in Chapter 4, the CBGSA will take nitrate and arsenic measurements once every five years as part of its monitoring program and will use existing monitoring programs for nitrates and arsenic, in particular ILP for nitrates and USGS for arsenic.

In the event groundwater conditions related to nitrate and arsenic begin to impact the beneficial uses and users of groundwater in the Basin, the CBGSA will notify the appropriate regulatory program and/or agency and initiate more frequent coordination to address those conditions and support their regulatory actions to address those conditions. If undesirable groundwater



conditions for nitrate and arsenic are found to be the result of Basin management by the CBGSA, a process may be developed to help mitigate or assist those uses and users by utilizing adaptive management strategies, including pumping management or well rehabilitation or replacement. At this time, however, the CBGSA will rely on the current processes and programs set forth to manage nitrate and arsenic in a sustainable manner.Groundwater Quality Representative Wells



5-5.25.5.1 Proxy Monitoring

Proxy monitoring is not used for groundwater quality monitoring in the Basin.

5-5.35.5.2 Minimum Thresholds, Measurable Objectives, and Interim Milestones

The CBGSA has decided to address TDS within the Basin by setting MTs, MOs, and IMs as shown in **Table 5-2**. TDS does not have a primary maximum contaminant level (MCL), but does have both a California Division of Drinking Water and U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. Secondary standard of 500 milligrams per liter (mg/L), and a short-term standard of 1,500 mg/L. Current levels in the Basin range from 84 to 4,400 mg/L. This is due to saline conditions in the portions of the watershed where rainfall percolates through marine sediments that contain large amounts of salt.

Formatted: Font: Bold

Due to this natural condition, additional data **has been and will continue to** be collected during GSP implementation to increase the CBGSA's understanding of TDS sources in the Basin. It should be noted however, that TDS levels in groundwater may not detrimentally impact the agricultural economy of the Basin. Much of the crops grown in the Basin, including carrots, are not significantly affected by the kinds of salts in the Basin.

Due to these factors, the MT for representative well sites was set to be the 20 percent of the total range of each representative monitoring site above the 90th percentile of measurements for each site. For example, Opti Well 72 has a minimum recorded TDS value of 955 mg/L and a maximum of 1,020 mg/L. This is a range of 65 mg/L, and 20 percent of that range is 13 mg/L. The 90th percentile for Opti Well 72 is 1,010 mg/L. The MT is then calculated by taking the 90th percentile of 1,010 mg/L and adding 13mg/L to reach a final MT of 1,023 mg/L.

To provide for an acceptable margin of operational flexibility, the MO for TDS levels in the Basin have been set to the temporary MCL of 1,500 mg/L for each representative well where the latest measurements as of 2018 are greater than 1,500 mg/L. For wells with recent measurements of less than 1,500 mg/L, the MO was set to the most recent measurement as of 2018.

GSP regulations require GSAs to avoid undesirable results by 2040, which means they must meet or exceed the MTs. The CBGSA also recognizes that reaching an MO is a priority, but meeting or exceeding the MT is required by SGMA. For this reason, the IMs for 2025 has been set as the same value as the MT, with a projected improvement to one-third of the distance between the MT and MO in 2030 and one-half of the distance between the MT and MO in 2035.



Table 5-2: MOs, MTs, and Interim Milestones for Groundwater Quality Representative Sites - TDS

Opti Well	Well Depth (feet below GSE)	Screen Interval (feet below GSE)	Well Elevation (feet above MSL)	Most Recent Measurement (feet)	Minimum Value (mg/L)	Maximum Measurement Value (mg/L)	20% of Range (mg/L)	90 th Percentile (mg/L)	MO (mg/L)	MT (mg/L)	2025 I M (mg/L)	2030 I M (mg/L)	2035 IM (mg/L)
61	357	Unkn own	<u>36813</u> <u>,684</u>	585	<u>10004</u> <u>68</u>	<u>896602</u>	<u>793</u> <u>26.8</u>	<u>68958</u> <u>8.4</u>	585	645.2	645	605	600
72	790	340 – 350	<u>21712</u> <u>,174</u>	<u>900996</u>	<u>11069</u> <u>55</u>	<u>105540</u> <u>20</u>	<u>100</u> <u>343</u>	<u>95240</u> <u>40</u>	996	4,023	4023	4014	4010
73	880	Unkn own	<u>2,252</u>	805	777	844	43.4	842.5	805	855.9	856	839	830
74	--	Unkn own	<u>21932</u> <u>,193</u>	<u>13104,5</u> <u>50</u>	<u>18724</u> <u>,530</u>	<u>17324,8</u> <u>20</u>	<u>159</u> <u>158</u>	<u>14514</u> <u>775</u>	4,500	4,833	4833	4722	4667
76	720	Unkn own	<u>2,277</u>	4,700	4,280	2,400	482	2,124.9	4,500	2,306.9	2307	2038	4903
77	980	960 – 980	<u>22862</u> <u>,286</u>	<u>1,12052</u> <u>0</u>	<u>16824</u> <u>,520</u>	<u>15424,5</u> <u>80</u>	<u>140</u> <u>142</u>	<u>12614</u> <u>580</u>	4,500	4,592	4592	4564	4546
79	600	Unkn own	<u>23742</u> <u>,374</u>	2,140	4,840	2,280	94	2226	1,500	23182,320	21142,320	19092,047	17054940
84	455	Unkn own	<u>2,698</u>	2,620	2,620	2,760	28	2760	4,500	2,788	2788	2350	2144

Formatted Table

Formatted Table

Formatted Table



Table 5-2: MOs, MTs, and Interim Milestones for Groundwater Quality Representative Sites - TDS

Opti Well	Well Depth (feet below GSE)	Screen Interval (feet below GSE)	Well Elevation (feet above MSL)	Most Recent Measurement (feet)	Minimum Value (mg/L)	Maximum Measurement Value (mg/L)	20% of Range (mg/L)	90 th Percentile (mg/L)	MO (mg/L)	MT (mg/L)	2025 I M (mg/L)	2030 I M (mg/L)	2035 IM (mg/L)		
83	198	Unknown	28582.858	1,120660	18164.660	16421.720	1468.12	12944.714	1,500	1,726	1726	1654	1613		
85	233	Unknown	3,047	618	491	1,500	201.8	1,189.4	618	1,391.2	1394	1133	1005		
86	230	Unknown	3,144	969	912	969	11.4	963.3	969	974.7	975	973	972		
87	232	Unknown	3,546	1,090	891	1,160	53.8	1,114	1,090	1,164.8	1165	1140	1127		
88	400	Unknown	35493.549	320302	1000302	830302	6600	490302	302	302	302	302	302		
90	800	Unknown	25522.552	1,400530	15964.440	1,580	28	1,565	1,500	1,593	1593	1562	1547	1498	1449
91	980	960 – 980	24742.474	1,020410	15581.410	14241.480	1289.14	11551.473	1,410	1,487	1487	1461	1449		
94	550	Unknown	2,456	1,050	1,050	1,230	36	1,209	1,050	1,245	1245	1180	1148		
95	805	Unknown	24492.449	13401.740	19501.710	17981.840	1645.26	14931.840	1,500	1,866	1866	1744	1683		

Formatted Table

Formatted Table

Formatted Table



Table 5-2: MOs, MTs, and Interim Milestones for Groundwater Quality Representative Sites - TDS

Opti Well	Well Depth (feet below GSE)	Screen Interval (feet below GSE)	Well Elevation (feet above MSL)	Most Recent Measurement (feet)	Minimum Value (mg/L)	Maximum Measurement Value (mg/L)	20% of Range (mg/L)	90 th Percentile (mg/L)	MO (mg/L)	MT (mg/L)	2025 I M (mg/L)	2030 I M (mg/L)	2035 IM (mg/L)	
96	500	Unknown	26062 2606	11004.5 1100.5	16764 1676.4	15324.6 1532.46	138 13.8	12444 1244.4	1,500	1,632	1632	1588	1566	
98	750	Unknown	2,688	2,220	2,220	2,370	30	2,370	1,500	2,400	2400	2100	1950	
99	750	730 – 750	25132 2513	1,14049 1,140.49	16584 1658.4	15294.5 1529.45	139 13.9	12704 1270.4	1,400	1,562	1562	1538	1526	
101	200	Unknown	27412 2741	12104.5 1210.45	17354 1735.4	16044.6 1604.46	147 14.7	13414 1341.4	1,500	1,693	1693	1629	1597	
102	--	Unknown	20462 2046	1,970	1,920	2,200	74	2,277	1,500	25512 2551.2	22882 2288.2	20262 2026.2	17631926 1763.1926	
130	--	Unknown	3,536	1,800	1,800	1,850	40	1,845	1,500	1,855	1855	1737	1678	
131	--	Unknown	2,990	1,850	1,850	1,970	24	1,958	1,500	1,982	1982	1824	1744	
157	71	Unknown	37553 3755	1,930	1,910	2,320	82	2,278	1,500	12,360 1236	24682 2468.2	21912 2191.2	191449 19144.9	1637
196	741	Unknown	3,117	851	682	868	37.2	866.5	851	903.7	904	886	877	

Formatted Table

Formatted Table



Table 5-2: MOs, MTs, and Interim Milestones for Groundwater Quality Representative Sites - TDS

Opti Well	Well Depth (feet below GSE)	Screen Interval (feet below GSE)	Well Elevation (feet above MSL)	Most Recent Measurement (feet)	Minimum Value (mg/L)	Maximum Measurement Value (mg/L)	20% of Range (mg/L)	90 th Percentile (mg/L)	MO (mg/L)	MT (mg/L)	2025 I M (mg/L)	2030 I M (mg/L)	2035 IM (mg/L)
204	--	Unknown	36933 36933,693	380253 380253	1000253 1000253	845266 845266	690 690/2.6	535266 535266	253	268.6	269	263	261
226	--	Unknown	2,945	1,760	1,760	1,830	44	1,830	1,500	1,844	1844	1720	1672
242 227	155	Unknown	29333 29333,902	1,780	16564 16564,780	14372,2 14372,200	121 121/884	9992,4 9992,446	1,500	2,230	2230	1987	1865
242	155	Unknown	2,933	1,470	1,470	1,510	8	1,510	1,470	1,518	1518	1502	1494
269	--	Unknown	2,756	1,570	1,570	1,690	24	1,678	1,500	1,702	1702	1635	1604
309	1,100	Unknown	2,513	1,410	1,410	1,500	48	1,494	1,410	1,509	1509	1476	1460
316	830	Unknown	24742 24742,474	1,06038 1,060380	15244 15244,380	14081,4 14081,460	129 129/246	11764 11764,452	1,380	1,468	1468	1439	1424
317	700	Unknown	24742 24742,474	6921,26 6921,260	14441 14441,260	12561,3 12561,330	106 106/844	8801,3 8801,323	1,260	1,337	1337	1311	1299
322 318	85064 0	Unknown	25132 25132,474	1,080	1,080	1,140	1504 1504/42	14134 14134,140	13224 13224,080	12314 12314,152	1152	1128	1116

Formatted Table

Formatted Table

Formatted Table



Table 5-2: MOs, MTs, and Interim Milestones for Groundwater Quality Representative Sites - TDS

Opti Well	Well Depth (feet below GSE)	Screen Interval (feet below GSE)	Well Elevation (feet above MSL)	Most Recent Measurement (feet)	Minimum Value (mg/L)	Maximum Measurement Value (mg/L)	20% of Range (mg/L)	90 th Percentile (mg/L)	MO (mg/L)	MT (mg/L)	2025 I M (mg/L)	2030 I M (mg/L)	2035 IM (mg/L)
322	850	Unknown	2,513	1,350	1,350	1,380	6	1,380	1,350	1,386	1386	1374	1368
324	560	Unknown	25132,513	740746	1000746	935772	8705.2	805772	746	777.2	777	767	762
325	380	Unknown	25132,513	1,070470	16874,470	15331,560	137848	12244,554	1,470	1,569	1569	1536	1520
400	2,120	Unknown	2,298	948	680	948	53.6	922	918	975.6	976	956	947
420	780	Unknown	22862,286	1,080430	15604,430	14404,480	132040	12004,480	1,430	1,490	1490	1470	1460
421	620	Unknown	22862,286	1,280520	17614,520	16404,600	152046	14004,600	1,500	1,616	1616	1577	1558
422	460	Unknown	2,286	1,810	1,810	1,930	24	1,918	1,500	1,942	1942	1795	1724
424	10004,000	Unknown	22912,294	1,260540	16584,540	1,580	8	1,580	1,500	1,588	1588	1559	14594544, 1360
467	11404,140	Unknown	22242,224	10704,630	18464,530	16524,730	145840	12644,724	1,500	1,764	1764	1676	1632

Formatted Table

Formatted Table

Formatted Table



Table 5-2: MOs, MTs, and Interim Milestones for Groundwater Quality Representative Sites - TDS

Opti Well	Well Depth (feet below GSE)	Screen Interval (feet below GSE)	Well Elevation (feet above MSL)	Most Recent Measurement (feet)	Minimum Value (mg/L)	Maximum Measurement Value (mg/L)	20% of Range (mg/L)	90 th Percentile (mg/L)	MO (mg/L)	MT (mg/L)	2025 I M (mg/L)	2030 I M (mg/L)	2035 IM (mg/L)
568	188	Unknown	1,905.4	860.874	111.8874	1,054.1480	98.9648	925.429.6	874	1,194.4	1194	1085	1034
702	-	Unknown	3,539	110	48	1,900	370.4	1,704	110	2,074.4	2074	1420	1092
703	-	Unknown	1,613	400	16	4,500	896.8	3,200	400	4,096.8	4097	2865	2248
710	-	Unknown	2,942	1,040	1,040	1,040	0	1,040	1,040	1,040	1040	1040	1040
711	-	Unknown	1,905	928	928	928	0	928	928	928	928	928	928
712	-	Unknown	2,171	977	972	977	1	9,76.5	977	977.5	978	977	977
713	-	Unknown	2,456	1,200	1,200	1,200	0	1,200	1,200	1,200	1200	1200	1200
721	-	Unknown	2,374	2,170	2,170	2,170	0	2,170	1,500	2,170	2170	1947	1835
758	-	Unknown	3,537	900	760	923	32.6	9,21.7	900	954.3	954	936	927



Table 5-2: MOs, MTs, and Interim Milestones for Groundwater Quality Representative Sites - TDS

Opti Well	Well Depth (feet below GSE)	Screen Interval (feet below GSE)	Well Elevation (feet above MSL)	Most Recent Measurement (feet)	Minimum Value (mg/L)	Maximum Measurement Value (mg/L)	20% of Range (mg/L)	90 th Percentile (mg/L)	MO (mg/L)	MT (mg/L)	2025 I M (mg/L)	2030 I M (mg/L)	2035 IM (mg/L)
840	900	200—880	1,713	559	559	559	0	559	559	559	559	559	559
841	600	170—580	17614,764	561	1000564	890564	7810	671564	564	564	564	564	564
842	450	60—430	1,759	547	547	547	0	547	547	547	547	547	547
843	620	60—600	1,764	569	569	569	0	569	569	569	569	569	569
844	730	100—720	1,713	484	484	484	0	484	484	484	484	484	484
845	380	100—360	17124,742	1,250	12504,250	1,250	0	1,250	1,250	1,250	1250	1250	1250
846	610	130—590	1,715	918	918	918	0	918	918	918	918	918	918
847	600	180—580	1,733	480	480	480	0	480	480	480	480	480	480
848	390	110—370	1,694	674	674	674	0	674	674	674	674	674	674

Formatted Table

Formatted Table



Table 5-2: MOs, MTs, and Interim Milestones for Groundwater Quality Representative Sites - TDS

Opti Well	Well Depth (feet below GSE)	Screen Interval (feet below GSE)	Well Elevation (feet above MSL)	Most Recent Measurement (feet)	Minimum Value (mg/L)	Maximum Measurement Value (mg/L)	20% of Range (mg/L)	90 th Percentile (mg/L)	MO (mg/L)	MT (mg/L)	2025 I M (mg/L)	2030 I M (mg/L)	2035 IM (mg/L)
849	570	150—550	1,713	1,780	1,780	1,780	0	1,780	1,500	1,780	1780	1687	1640
850	790	180—780	1,759	472	472	472	0	472	472	472	472	472	472



This page intentionally left blank.

Formatted: Space After: 0 pt



5.6 Subsidence

The undesirable result for land subsidence is a result that causes significant and unreasonable reduction in the viability of the use of infrastructure over the planning and implementation horizon of this GSP.

5.6.1 Threshold Regions

~~Subsidence monitoring does not use threshold regions, because the same approach is used for all wells in the Basin.~~

~~Figure 5-4 shows representative locations of subsidence in the Basin.~~

5.6.25.6.1 Representative Monitoring

As discussed in ~~Chapter 4~~, Section 4.9, all monitoring network subsidence monitoring stations in the Basin, and three additional sites outside of the Basin are designated as representative monitoring sites. ~~(Figure 5-4)~~. Detrimental impacts of subsidence include groundwater storage reductions and potential damage to infrastructure, such as large pipelines, roads, bridges, and canals. However, the Basin does not currently have infrastructure of this type, and storage losses are small enough they are unlikely to have a meaningful effect on the Basin water budget.

Subsidence in the central portion of the Basin is approximately 0.95 inches per year, as shown in ~~Section Chapter 2, Section 2.2~~. Currently, there are no state, federal, or local standards that regulate subsidence rates.

5.6.35.6.2 Minimum Thresholds, Measurable Objectives, and Interim Milestones

Although several factors may affect subsidence rates, including natural geologic processes, oil pumping, and groundwater pumping, the primary influence within the Basin is due to groundwater pumping. Because current subsidence rates (approximately 0.98 inches per year) are not significant and unreasonable, the MT rate for subsidence was set at 2 inches per year to allow for flexibility as the Basin works toward sustainability in 2040. This rate is applied primarily to the two stations in the Basin (CUHS and VCST), as the other stations in the monitoring network represent ambient changes in vertical displacement, primarily due to geological influences. This level of subsidence is considered unlikely to cause a significant and unreasonable reduction in the viability of the use of infrastructure over the planning and implementation horizon of this GSP.

Subsidence is expected to be influenced through the management of groundwater pumping through the groundwater level MOs, MTs, and IMs. Thus, the MO for subsidence is set for zero lowering of ground surface elevations.



IMs are not needed for the subsidence sustainability indicator because the current rate of subsidence is above the MT.

Subsidence rates will be measured in the frequency of measurement and monitoring protocols documented in Section 4's Appendix A.



Figure 5-4: Subsidence Representative Locations



5.7 Depletions of Interconnected Surface Water

~~This section will be developed once guidance documents are available from DWR. The undesirable result for depletions of interconnected surface water is a result that causes significant and unreasonable reductions in the viability of agriculture or riparian habitat in the Basin over the planning and implementation horizon of this GSP.~~

~~SGMA regulations define the MT for interconnected surface water as “...the rate or volume of surface water depletions caused by groundwater use that has adverse impacts on the beneficial uses of the surface water and may lead to undesirable results.” Under normal surface water conditions in the Basin as of January 1, 2015, surface flows infiltrate into the groundwater system and are used by phreatophytes, except in the most extreme flash flood events, when surface water flows out of the Basin. Historically, these flash flood events flow for less than one week of the year. Conditions have not changed since January 1, 2015, and surface flows continue to infiltrate into the groundwater system for use by local phreatophytes.~~

~~Because current Basin conditions have not varied from January 1, 2015 conditions, the groundwater level thresholds established in Section 5.2 will act to maintain depletions of interconnected surface water at similar levels to those that existed in January 1, 2015. Therefore, groundwater level thresholds are used by proxy to protect the Basin from undesirable results related to depletion of interconnected surface water.~~

5.8 References

California Water Boards Irrigated Land Regulatory Program (ILRP) website.

https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/water_issues/irrigated_lands/. Accessed January 11, 2019.



Chapter 6 Data Management System

This chapter includes an overview of the Cuyama Basin Data Management System (DMS), describes how the DMS works, and details the data used in the DMS. This chapter satisfies Section 352.6 of the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA) regulations.

6.1 DMS Overview

The Cuyama Basin DMS uses the Opti platform, which is a flexible and open software platform that uses familiar Google maps and charting tools for analysis and visualization. The DMS serves as a data-sharing portal that enables use of the same data and tools for visualization and analysis. These tools support sustainable groundwater management and create transparent reporting on collected data and analysis results. **Figure 6-1** is a screenshot of the Opti platform.





Figure 6-1: Screenshot of Opti Platform

The Cuyama Basin DMS is a web-based publicly accessible portal that may be viewed using common web browsers such as Google Chrome, Firefox, and Microsoft Edge. The DMS utilizes Google maps and other charting tools for analysis and visualization. The site may be accessed at

<http://opti.woodardcurran.com/cuyama>.



6.2 DMS Functionality

The DMS is a modular system that includes numerous tools to support GSP development and ongoing implementation, including the following:

- User and data access permissions
- Data entry and validation
- Visualization and analysis
- Query and reporting

As the needs of the Cuyama Basin Groundwater Sustainability Agency (CBGSA) change over time, the DMS can be configured for additional tools and functionality. The following sections describe the DMS's currently configured tools. For more detailed instructions about how to use the DMS, refer to the Cuyama Basin Data Management System Opti Data Public User Guide (Appendix A).

6.2.1 User and Data Access Permissions

DMS user access permissions are controlled through ~~several~~ user types. These user types have different roles in the DMS as summarized in **Table 6-1** below. These user types are broken into three high-level categories as follows:

- **System Administrator** – System administrators manage information at a system-wide level, with access to all user accounts and entity information. System administrators can set and modify user access permissions when an entity is unable to do so.
- **Managing Entity (Administrator, Power User, User)** – Managing entity users are responsible for managing their entity's site/monitoring data, and can independently control access to these data. Entity users can view and edit their entity's data and view (but not edit) shared or published data supplied by other entities. An entity's site information (i.e., wells, gages, etc.) and associated data may only be edited by system administrators and power users associated with the entity. The CBGSA is currently configured as the managing entity for all datasets in the DMS.
- **Public** – Public users may view data that are published, but may not edit any information. Public users may access the DMS using the guest login feature on the DMS login screen (**Figure 6-2**).



Table 6-1: Data Management System User Types/Access

Modules/ Submodules	System Administrators	Managing Entity			Public
		Admin	Power User	User	
Data: Map	Access to all functionality	Access to all functionality	Access to all functionality	Access to all functionality	Access to partial functionality
Data: List	Access to all functionality	Access to all functionality	Access to all functionality	Access to all functionality	Access to partial functionality
Data: Add/Edit	Access to all functionality	Access to all functionality	Access to all functionality	--	--
Data: Import	Access to all functionality	Access to all functionality	Access to all functionality	--	--
Query	Access to all functionality	Access to all functionality	Access to all functionality	Access to all functionality	Access to partial functionality
Admin	Access to all functionality	--	--	--	--
Profile	Access to all functionality	Access to all functionality	Access to partial functionality	Access to partial functionality	Access to partial functionality





Figure 6-2: Screenshot of Opti Login Screen

Monitoring sites and their associated datasets are added to the DMS by managing entity administrators, ~~power users~~. In addition to user permissions, access to the monitoring datasets is controlled through assigning one of three options to the data type as follows:

- **Private data** – Private data are monitoring datasets only available for viewing, depending on user type, by the entity’s associated users in the DMS.
- **Shared data** – Shared data are monitoring datasets available for viewing by all users in the DMS, except for public users.
- **Public data** – Public data are monitoring datasets that are available publicly that can be viewed by all user types in the DMS; public datasets may also be published to other websites or DMSs as needed.



~~Managing entity administrators can set and maintain data access options for each data type associated with their entity.~~

6.2.2 Data Entry and Validation

~~Data~~To encourage agency and user participation in the DMS, data entry and import tools are designed to be easy to use, are accessible over the web, and help maintain data consistency and standardization. The DMS allows entity administrators ~~and power users~~ to enter data either manually via easy-to-use interfaces, or through an import tool using Microsoft Excel templates, so that data may be entered into the DMS as soon as possible after collection. The data records are validated by ~~a managing entity's administrators or power users~~ using a number of quality control checks prior to inclusion in the DMS.

Data Collection Sites

Users can input site information about groundwater wells, stream gages, and precipitation meters manually either through the data entry tool or when prompted in the import tool. Using the data entry tool, new sites may be added by clicking on “New Site.” Existing sites may be updated using the “Edit Site” tool. During data import, the sites associated with imported data are checked by the DMS against an existing site list. If the site is not in the existing site list, the user is prompted to enter the information via the new site tool before the data import can proceed.



Table 6-2 Table 6-2 lists the information that is collected for sites. Required information is indicated with an asterisk; all other information is considered optional.

Table 6-2: Data Collection Site Information		
Basic Information	Well Information	Construction Information
Monitoring Network Site Type* Opti Site Name* Local Site Name* State Well ID DWR Site Code Additional Name USGS Code Managing Entity* Monitoring Entity* Monitoring Frequency Latitude/Longitude* Description Coordinates Method County Principal Aquifer County Managing Entity* Monitoring Entity* Type of Monitoring Type of Measurement Monitoring Frequency Principal Aquifer GW Basin Code GW Basin Name Well Location Description	Well Status Well Use Type State Well Completion Type ID MSC (Master State Well Code) USGS Code CASGEM ID Ground Surface Elevation (feet) Reference Point Elevation (feet) Reference Point Location Reference Point Description Well Use Well Status Well Type Aquifers Monitored Groundwater Surface Elevation Basin Name/Code Groundwater Elevation Begin/End Date Groundwater Elevation Measurement Count Water Level Measurement Method Additional Groundwater Quality Begin/End Date Groundwater Quality Measurement Count Comments	Well Completion Report Number Date Constructed Total Well Depth Total Perforation – Interval 1 Borehole Depth Casing Perforations Top/Bottom Perforation – Interval 1 Elevation Casing Material Casing Diameter Date Survey Casing Modifications Well Capacity Well Completion Report Number Comments Construction Documents (att.)
Contacts	Photos	Thresholds
Owner Name Owner Phone Owner Email Owner Address Monitoring Contact Name Monitoring Contact Phone Monitoring Contact Email Monitoring Contact Address	Upload Photos (att.)	MT Elevation MT Depth MO elevation MO Depth TDS MT TDS MO
Notes: ID = identification number MSC = Master State Well Code USGS = United States Geological Survey CASGEM = California Statewide Groundwater Elevation Monitoring Program Att. = attachment (for upload)		



Table 6-2: Data Collection Site Information

Basic Information	Well Information	Construction Information
<p><u>MT = Minimum Thresholds</u> <u>MO = Measurable Objectives</u> <u>TDS = Total Dissolved Solids</u> <u>* Required information</u></p>		



Monitoring Data Entry

Monitoring data, including groundwater elevation, groundwater quality, streamflow, and precipitation may be input either manually through the data entry tool or by using templates in the import tool. **Figure 6-3** ~~Figure 6-3~~ is a screenshot of the data entry interface.




Figure 6-3: Screenshot of Data Entry Tool Interface



The data entry tool allows users to select a site and add data for the site using a web-based form. The following information is collected:

- Data type (e.g. groundwater elevation, groundwater quality, streamflow, or precipitation)
- Parameter for selected data type, units populate based on selection
- Date of measurement
- Measurement value
- Unit of measurement
- Issue/quality flag (i.e., quality assurance description for the measurement such as “Pumping,” “Can’t get tape in casing,” etc. as documented by the data collector)
- Data collector
- Supplemental information based on data type (i.e., reference point elevation, ground surface elevation, etc.)

Data import templates include the same data entry fields and are available for download from the DMS. The Microsoft Excel-based templates contain drop-down options and field validation similar to the data entry interface.

Data Validation

Quality control helps ensure the integrity of the data added to the DMS. The entities that maintain the monitoring data loaded into the DMS may have performed previous validation of that data; no effort was made to check or correct that previous validation, and it was assumed that all data records provided were valid. While it is nearly impossible to determine complete accuracy of the data added to the DMS since the DMS cannot detect incorrect measurements due to human error or mechanical failure, it is possible to verify that the data input into the DMS meets some data quality standards. This helps promote user confidence in the data both stored and published for visualization and analysis.

Upon saving the data via the data entry interface or by importing the data using the Microsoft Excel templates, the following data validation checks are performed by the DMS:

- **Duplicate measurements** – The DMS checks for duplicate entries based on the unique combination of site, data type, date, and measurement value.
- **Inaccurate measurements** – The DMS compares data measurements against historical data for the site and flags entries that are outside the historical minimum and maximum values.
- **Incorrect data entry** – Data field entries are checked for correct data type (e.g., number fields do not include text, date fields contain dates, etc.).

Users are alerted to any validation issues and may either update the data entries or accept the values and continue with the entry/import. Users may access partially completed import validation through the import logs that are saved for each data import. The partially imported datasets are identified in the import



log with an incomplete icon under the status field. This allows a second person to also access the imported data and review prior to inclusion in the DMS.

6.2.3 Visualization and Analysis

Transparent visualization and analysis tools enable use of the same data and methodologies, allowing stakeholders and neighboring GSAs to use the same data and methods for tracking and analysis. In the DMS, data visualization and analysis are performed in both map and list views, as described below.

Map View

The map view displays all sites (i.e., groundwater wells, stream gages, precipitation meters, etc.) in a map-based interface (**Figure 6-4**, ~~Figure 6-4~~). The sites are color-coded based on associated data type and may be filtered by different criteria, such as number of records or monitoring entity. Users may click on a site to view the site detail information and associated data. The monitoring data records are displayed in both chart and table formats. In these views, the user may view different parameters for the data type. The chart and table may be updated to display selected date ranges, and the data may be exported to Microsoft Excel.




Figure 6-4: DMS Map View

List View

The list view displays all sites (i.e., groundwater wells, stream gages, precipitation meters, etc.) in a tabular interface. The sites are listed according to names and associated entities. The list can be sorted and filtered by different criteria such as number of records or monitoring entity. Similar to the map view, users may click on a site to view the [site's detailed site detail](#) information and associated data. The monitoring data records are displayed in both chart and table formats. In these views, the user may view different parameters for the data type. The chart and table may be updated to display selected date ranges, and the data may be exported to Microsoft Excel.



Analysis Tools

The toolbox is available in the map view and offers administrative ~~and entity users~~ access to the well tiering tool to support monitoring plan development. The DMS' flexible platform allows for the development and addition of future analysis tools, including contouring, total water budget visualization, and management area tracking.

Dashboards

A feature added after the adoption of the GSP is Dashboards within the DMS to assist in the review and assessment of Basin conditions for both groundwater levels and groundwater quality. The dashboards provide a graphical representation of the monitoring sites compared to their thresholds over a user designated period. A color-coded summary table of conditions is also provided relative to each representative sites' minimum threshold. The dashboards may be used by the CBGSA to develop quarter groundwater conditions reports available to the public from the CBGSA website.

6.2.4 Query and Reporting

The DMS has the ability to format and export data and analysis at different levels of aggregation, and in different formats, to support local decision making and for submission to various statewide and local programs (i.e., SGMA, CASGEM Program, Groundwater Ambient Monitoring and Assessment (GAMA) Program, etc.).



Ad Hoc Query

Data in the DMS can be queried and reported using the query tool. The query tool includes the ability to build ad hoc queries using simple options. The data can be queried by the following criteria:

- Monitoring or managing entity
- Site name
- Data type

Once the type of option is selected, the specific criteria may be selected (e.g., groundwater elevation greater than 100 feet). Additionally, users may include time periods as part of the query. The query options can build upon each other to create reports that meet specific needs. Queries may be saved and will display in the saved query drop-down menu for future use.

Query results are displayed in a map format and a list format. In both the map and list views, the user may click on a well to view the associated data. Resulting query data may be exported to Microsoft Excel.

Standard Reports

The DMS can be configured to support wide-ranging reporting needs through the reports tool. Standard report formats may be generated based on a predetermined format and may be created at the click of a button. These report formats may be configured to match state agency requirements for submittals, including annual reporting of monitoring data that must be submitted electronically on forms provided by the California Department of Water Resources (DWR).

6.3 Data Included in the DMS

Because many monitoring programs operate in the Basin at both the local and state/federal levels, a cross-sectional analysis was conducted during GSP development in the Cuyama Basin to document and assess the availability of water-related data in the Basin. Statewide and federal databases that provide data relevant to Basin were also assessed.



The DMS can be configured to include a wide variety of data types and associated parameters. Based on the analysis of existing datasets from the Basin and GSP needs, **Table 6-3** lists the data that are identified and currently configured in the DMS. The DMS includes 942 monitoring sites~~730 wells~~, of which 511488 have historical groundwater elevation data and 376294 have historical groundwater quality measurements.

Table 6-3: Data Types and Their Associated Parameters Configured in the DMS

Data Type	Parameter	Units	Currently Has Data in DMS
Groundwater Elevation	Depth to Groundwater	feet	Yes
	Groundwater Elevation	feet	Yes
Groundwater Quality	Total Dissolved Solids (TDS)	milligrams per liter (mg/L)	Yes
	Nitrate (NO ₃)	mg/L	Yes
	Arsenic	micrograms per liter (µg/L)	Yes
	Benzene	µg/L	No
	Chloride	mg/L	No
	Hexavalent Chromium (Cr(VI))	µg/L	No
	1,2-Dibromo-3-Chloropropane (DBCP)	µg/L	No
	Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE)	µg/L	No
	Perchlorate	µg/L	No
	Tetrachloroethylene (PCE)	µg/L	No
	Specific Electrical Conductivity (SC)	micromhos per centimeter (µmhos/cm)	No
	1,1,1-Trichloroethane (111-TCA)	µg/L	No
	Trichloroethylene (TCE)	µg/L	No
	1,2,3-Trichloropropane (123-TCP)	µg/L	No
	Chloride (CL)	parts per million (ppm)	No
	Electrical Conductivity (EC)	millimhos (mmhos)	No
Total Dissolved Solids (TDS)	ppm	No	
Streamflow	Streamflow	cubic feet per second (cfs)	Yes
Precipitation	Precipitation	inches	Yes
	Reference Evapotranspiration (ET _o)	--	Yes
	Average Air Temperature	--	No
Subsidence	Subsidence	vertical (in millimeters)	Yes



Additional data types and parameters can be added and modified as the DMS grows over time.

The datasets were collected from a variety of sources, as shown in **Table 6-4**. Each dataset was reviewed for overall quality and consistency prior to consolidation and inclusion in the database. In many cases, there were discrepancies between the ground surface elevation (GSE) of a well from different sources. In these cases of discrepancy, the GSE of the well was updated using the USGS digital elevation model (DEM). The CBGSA did perform a well survey after the adoption of the 2020 GSP, so in some cases, GSEs and RPEs were updated based on the results of that survey.

The groundwater wells shown in the DMS are those that included datasets provided by the monitoring data sources for groundwater elevation and quality. These do not include all wells currently used for production, and may include wells historically used for monitoring that do not currently exist. Care was taken to minimize duplicate well information in the DMS. As datasets were consolidated, sites were evaluated based on different criteria (e.g., naming conventions, location, etc.) to determine if the well was included in a different dataset. Data records for the wells were then associated with the same well, where necessary.

After the datasets were consolidated and reviewed for consistency, they were loaded into the DMS. Using the DMS data viewing capabilities, the datasets were then reviewed for completeness and consistency to ensure imports were successful.

Since the adoption of the 2020 GSP, the CBGSA has continued to collect data, refine its existing dataset, and incorporated new data from other sources as it has become available. Table 6-4 includes the dates of assembled data from the original compilation of the DMS, but has been updated with additional data sources that the CBGSA has utilized.



Table 6-4: Sources of Data Included in the Data Management System

Data Source	Datasets Collected	Date Collected	Activities Performed
US Geological Survey (USGS)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Groundwater • Elevation • Streamflow • Precipitation 	5/4/2018	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Removed duplicate records • Recalculated GSE based on DEM on select wells
DWR CASGEM/Water Data Library (WDL)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Groundwater • Elevation 	4/18/2018	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Removed duplicate records • Recalculated GSE based on DEM on select wells
San Luis Obispo County	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Groundwater • Elevation • Groundwater Quality 	4/2/2018	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Removed duplicate records • Recalculated GSE based on DEM on select wells
Santa Barbara County Water Agency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Groundwater • Elevation • Precipitation 	3/27/2018	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Removed duplicate records • Recalculated GSE based on DEM on select wells
Ventura County	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Groundwater • Elevation • Groundwater Quality • Precipitation 	3/8/2018	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Removed duplicate records • Recalculated GSE based on DEM on select wells
DWR Natural Resources Agency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Groundwater Quality 	6/14/2018	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Removed duplicate records
GeoTracker	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Groundwater Quality 	6/5/2018	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Removed duplicate records
California Environmental Data Exchange Network (CEDEN)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Groundwater Quality 	8/29/2018	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Removed duplicate records
National Water Quality Monitoring Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Groundwater Quality 	6/1/2018	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Removed duplicate records
UNAVCO	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ground Surface Elevation 	3/12/2018	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None
Local Data	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Groundwater • Elevation • Groundwater Quality • Other 	Various	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Removed duplicate records • Recalculated GSE based on DEM on select wells
<u>CBGSA Monitoring Network Survey</u>		<u>1/29/2021</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Survey wells in the GWL Representative network to get updated construction information such as ground surface elevation and reference point elevations.</u>
<u>Domestic Well Survey</u>		<u>2/23/2023</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Update current records</u>



Table 6-4: Sources of Data Included in the Data Management System

Data Source	Datasets Collected	Date Collected	Activities Performed
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assist in the development of an "active well" dataset
<u>Active Well Survey</u>		<u>10/1/2022</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assist in the development of an "active well" dataset, including production wells
<u>Continued CBGSA Monitoring</u>		<u>Ongoing</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continued monitoring



TO: Board of Directors
Agenda Item No. 12i

FROM: Taylor Blakslee / Charles Gardiner

DATE: July 31, 2024

SUBJECT: Discuss and Take Appropriate Action on GSP Amendment Comment Process

Recommended Motion

Approve GSP Update Public Review Process.

Discussion

A brief overview of the public comment process for the Groundwater Sustainability Plan (GSP) amendment is provided in Attachment 1.

Cuyama Basin Groundwater Sustainability Agency

12i. Discuss and Take Appropriate Action on GSP
Amendment Comment Process

Taylor Blakslee / Charles Gardiner


July 31, 2024



Proposed Public Comment Process

1. Staff to compile stakeholder comments in a matrix and develop draft responses to comments
2. Staff to include matrix in meetings packets for SAC/Board review and direction to staff (September and November)
3. Due to the schedule, comments received after October 7th may not include a staff response, but will be provided for SAC/Board review

GSP Update Timeline



Public Review Next Steps

- **August 29:** SAC meeting
- **September 4:** Board Discussion – Draft GSP Update
- **September 6:** Begin 30-day public review of Draft GSP Update
- **Late September:** Community meeting on Draft GSP Update (date TBD)
- **October 7:** Deadline for staff response to written comments on Draft GSP Update
- **October 31:** SAC meeting
- **November 6:** Public Hearing to receive comments on Final GSP Update
- **November 6:** Board adopts Final GSP
- **January 9, 2025:** SAC Meeting
- **January 15, 2025:** Alternate date for Board adoption of Final GSP Update
- **January 24, 2025:** CBGSA submits Final GSP to DWR

Public Comments on Draft GSP Update

- Public Comments on Final Draft GSP can be provided the following ways:
 - In writing to CBGSA, 4900 California Ave, Tower B, 2nd Floor, Bakersfield, CA 93309
 - Via email to tblakslee@hgcpm.com
 - In-person (orally or written) at SAC, Board, or community meeting

Outreach for Public Comment Period and Public Hearing on Final Draft GSP

- Post card mailing (all parcel owners)
 - Announce public comment opportunity and public hearing date
- Email to CBGSA contact list and post to website
- Flyer for distribution throughout the Cuyama Basin



TO: Board of Directors
Agenda Item No. 13a

FROM: Taylor Blakslee, Hallmark Group

DATE: July 31, 2024

SUBJECT: Report of the Executive Director

Recommended Motion

None – information only.

Discussion

Progress and next steps for the Hallmark Group for May, April, and June 2024, and an overview of consultant budget-to-actuals are provided as Attachment 1.

Cuyama Basin Groundwater Sustainability Agency


13a. Report of the Executive Director
Taylor Blakslee

July 31, 2024




Legal Counsel – Budget-to-Actuals

FY 23/24




Hallmark Group – Budget-to-Actuals

FY 23/24




Provost & Pritchard – Budget-to-Actuals

FY 23/24




Woodard & Curran – Budget-to-Actuals


FY 23/24



CBGSA FY 23/24 – Budget-to-Actuals



CBGSA FY 22/23 – Budget-to-Actuals





TO: Board of Directors
Agenda Item No. 14a

FROM: Brian Van Lienden, Woodard & Curran

DATE: July 31, 2024

SUBJECT: Update on Groundwater Sustainability Plan Activities

Recommended Motion

None – information only.

Discussion

Cuyama Basin Groundwater Sustainability Agency (CBGSA) Groundwater Sustainability Plan (GSP) activities and consultant Woodard & Curran's (W&C) accomplishments are provided as Attachment 1.

Cuyama Basin Groundwater Sustainability Agency

14a. Update on Groundwater Sustainability Plan Activities

Brian Van Lienden

July 31, 2024



May-Jun Accomplishments

- ✓ Performed installation of two multi-completion monitoring wells
- ✓ Performed geophysical surveys at Russell and Santa Barbara Canyon Faults
- ✓ Completed update and re-calibration of the Cuyama Basin groundwater model
- ✓ Developed options for projects and management actions for Board consideration
- ✓ Developed updated draft GSP Chapters 2 and 6 for Board consideration
- ✓ Prepared grant invoice for submittal to DWR



TO: Board of Directors
Agenda Item No. 14b

FROM: Brian Van Lienden, Woodard & Curran

DATE: July 31, 2024

SUBJECT: Update on Grant-Funded Projects

Recommended Motion

None – information only.

Discussion

An update on Cuyama Basin Groundwater Sustainability Agency (CBGSA) grant-funded projects is provided as Attachment 1.

Cuyama Basin Groundwater Sustainability Agency

14b. Update on Grant Funded Projects
Brian Van Lienden

July 31, 2024



Status of Monitoring Well and Piezometer Installation


- Piezometer (GDE) Wells:
 - Wells have been constructed at all 3 locations (GDE-1, GDE-4 and GDE-5)
- Multi-Completion Nested Monitoring Wells:
 - MW-F constructed in November 2023. Well screen intervals are 180-200 feet and 350-370 feet.
 - MW-C constructed in February 2024. Well screen interval is 500-520 feet.
 - MW-H constructed in March 2024. Well screen intervals are 660-680 feet and 880-900 feet.
 - MW-E drilling completed in April 2024. Well screen intervals are 610-630 feet and 720-740 feet.
 - MW-G drilling completed in July 2024. Well screen intervals are 280-300 feet and 420-440 feet.
 - MW-D drilling and construction will be complete in August 2024.

Plan and Prioritization for Multi-Completion Monitoring Wells

- Installation of multi-completion wells will be completed at 6 locations with 1 or 2 nested wells at each location

Location	Approximate Depth to Water (Fall 2023)	# of Completions
MW-A	400-500	Removed due to insufficient grant budget
MW-C	480	1
MW-D	600-650	2
MW-E	500-600	2
MW-F	20	2
MW-G	400-500	2
MW-H	610	2

Prioritization of Multi-Completion Monitoring Well Locations



- Drilling is complete
- Drilling to be complete by August 2024
- Grant budget not available to install

Pumping Status		WY 2022 Pumping < 10 AFY	
●	Representative Monitoring - Active	●	Representative Monitoring
●	Representative Monitoring - Inactive	▲	Non-representative Monitoring
▲	Non-representative Monitoring - Active	●	Not in Monitoring Network
▲	Non-representative Monitoring - Inactive	■	New Wells to be Installed 2023
◆	Proposed - Active		
◆	Proposed - Inactive		



TO: Board of Directors
Agenda Item No. 14c

FROM: Brian Van Lienden, Woodard & Curran

DATE: July 31, 2024

SUBJECT: Update on April 2024 Groundwater Levels Conditions Report

Recommended Motion

None – information only.

Discussion

The quarterly Groundwater Levels Conditions Report for April 2024 is summarized as Attachment 1. The detailed report is provided as Attachment 2.

Cuyama Basin Groundwater Sustainability Agency

14c. Update on Quarterly Groundwater Conditions Report

Brian Van Lienden

July 31, 2024


*April 2024
Report*

Groundwater Levels Monitoring Network – Summary of Current Conditions


- Monitoring data from October 2023, January 2024 and April 2024 for representative wells is included in the Groundwater Conditions report
- 47 of 49 representative monitoring wells have levels data in at least one out of the previous 12 months
- 13 wells were below the minimum threshold based on latest measurement since October 2023

Summary of Groundwater Well Levels as Compared To Sustainability Criteria

- 13 wells are currently below minimum threshold (MT)
 - 11 wells (22%) have been below the MT for at least 24 months
 - 1 well dropped below the MT this month
 - 2 wells rose above the MT this month





Current Status of Representative Monitoring Wells





Map created using ArcGIS Pro. Data sources: USGS National Water Research Institute, California Department of Water Resources, and local monitoring agencies.

Updated Hydrographs for Selected Monitoring Wells




Updated Hydrographs for Selected Monitoring Wells

74 Hydrograph




91 Hydrograph





Updated Hydrographs for Selected Monitoring Wells



571 Hydrograph



841 Hydrograph





**GROUNDWATER
CONDITIONS
REPORT –
CUYAMA VALLEY
GROUNDWATER
BASIN**

April 2024

801 T Street
Sacramento, CA
916.999.8700

woodardcurran.com

**Cuyama Basin
Groundwater
Sustainability Agency**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION	PAGE NO.
1. INTRODUCTION	1
2. SUMMARY STATISTICS	1
3. CURRENT CONDITIONS	2
4. HYDROGRAPHS	11
5. MONITORING NETWORK UPDATES	17

TABLES

Table 1: Recent Groundwater Levels for Representative Monitoring Network.....	3
Table 2: Well Status Related to Thresholds	6


FIGURES

Figure 1: Groundwater Level Representative Wells and Status in April 2024	10
Figure 2: Southeast Region – Well 89	11
Figure 3: Eastern Region – Well 62	12
Figure 4: Central Region – Well 91	13
Figure 5: Central Region – Well 74	14
Figure 6: Western Region – Well 571	15
Figure 7: Northwestern Region – Well 841	16
Figure 8: Threshold Regions in the Cuyama Groundwater Basin	17

1. INTRODUCTION

This report is intended to provide an update on the current groundwater level conditions in the Cuyama Valley Groundwater Basin. This work is completed by the Cuyama Basin Groundwater Sustainability Agency (CBGSA), in compliance with the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA).

2. SUMMARY STATISTICS



There are currently 13 wells with groundwater levels exceeding minimum thresholds. As outlined in the GSP, undesirable results for the chronic lowering of groundwater levels occurs, "when 30 percent of representative monitoring wells... fall below their minimum groundwater elevation threshold for two consecutive years." (Cuyama GSP, pg. 3-2). Currently, 22% of representative monitoring wells (i.e. 11 wells) have exceeded the minimum threshold for 24 or more consecutive months.

3. CURRENT CONDITIONS

Table 1 includes the most recent groundwater level measurements taken in the Cuyama Basin from representative wells included in the Cuyama GSP Groundwater Level Monitoring Network, as well as the previous two measurements and the measurement from the same time period in the previous year. Table 2 includes all of the wells and their current status in relation to the thresholds applied to each well. This information is also shown on Figure 1.

All measurements are also incorporated into the Cuyama DMS, which may be accessed at <https://opti.woodardcurran.com/cuyama/login.php>.

Table 1: Recent Groundwater Levels for Representative Monitoring Network

Well	Region	Oct-23	Jan-24	Apr-24	Last Year		Annual Elevation Change (ft)
		GWL (ft. msl)	GWL (ft. msl)	GWL (ft. msl)	GWL (ft. msl)	Month/Year	
72	Central	2017	2027	2034	2019	Apr-23	15.4
74	Central	1940	1940	1941	-	-	-
77	Central	1793	1804	1795	1798	Apr-23	-2.5
91	Central	1800	1811	1813	1810	Apr-23	3.8
95	Central	1841	1850	2389	-	-	-
96	Central	2270	2273	2269	2275	Apr-23	-6.5
98	Central	-	-	-	-	-	-
99	Central	2223	2216	2218	2223	Apr-23	-5.7
102	Central	1758	-	-	-	-	-
103	Central	2044	2046	2050	2045	Apr-23	5.6
112	Central	2053	2041	2042	2053	Apr-23	-11.7
114	Central	-	1879	1880	-	-	-
316	Central	1799	1810	1812	1808	Apr-23	3.7
317	Central	1801	1811	1814	-	-	-
322	Central	2222	2216	2217	2222	Apr-23	-5
324	Central	2221	2215	2216	2220	Apr-23	-3.8
325	Central	2222	2215	2216	2222	Apr-23	-6.3
420	Central	1792	1803	1794	1795	Apr-23	-1.1
421	Central	1793	1802	1800	1802	Apr-23	-1.8

Well	Region	Oct-23	Jan-24	Apr-24	Last Year		Annual Elevation Change (ft)
		GWL (ft. msl)	GWL (ft. msl)	GWL (ft. msl)	GWL (ft. msl)	Month/Year	
474	Central	-	2228	2232	2202	Apr-23	29.4
568	Central	1867	1874	1874	1870	Apr-23	4.2
604	Central	1684	1655	1655	1656	Apr-23	-0.7
608*	Central	1790	-	1778*	-	-	-
609	Central	1725	1721	1723	1705	Apr-23	17.7
610	Central	1805	1808	1808	1813	Apr-23	-5.6
612	Central	1788	1797	1796	1801	Apr-23	-4.5
613	Central	1801	1799	1797	1788	Apr-23	8.3
615	Central	1809	1808	1806	1810	Apr-23	-3.8
629	Central	1848	1817	1821	1803	Apr-23	18.1
633	Central	1798	1796	1800	1851	Apr-23	-51.4
62	Eastern	2789	2793	2806	2774	Apr-23	32.1
85	Eastern	2870	2883	2891	2844	Apr-23	46.3
100	Eastern	2909	2911	2939	2901	Apr-23	38
101	Eastern	2635	2653	2658	-	-	-
841	Northwestern	1692	1706	1709	1685	Apr-23	24.4
845	Northwestern	1637	1641	1643	1647	Apr-23	-4.6
2	Southeastern	3698	3697	3706	3704	Apr-23	2.1
89	Southeastern	3432	3390	3413	3428	Apr-23	-15.9
106	Western	2185	2175	2175	2184	Apr-23	-8.9

Well	Region	Oct-23	Jan-24	Apr-24	Last Year		Annual Elevation Change (ft)
		GWL (ft. msl)	GWL (ft. msl)	GWL (ft. msl)	GWL (ft. msl)	Month/Year	
107	Western	-	2422	2419	2390	Apr-23	28.6
117	Western	1946	1947	1947	1950	Apr-23	-3.7
118	Western	2217	2211	2213	2214	Apr-23	-1.8
124	Western	-	-	-	-	-	-
571	Western	2235	2240	2236	2269	Apr-23	-32.6
573	Western	2015	2010	2010	2015	Apr-23	-4.6
830	Far-West Northwestern	1522	1512	1511	1516	Apr-23	-5.3
832	Far-West Northwestern	1595	1604	1604	1596	Apr-23	8.4
833	Far-West Northwestern	1434	1433	1433	1426	Apr-23	7.4
836	Far-West Northwestern	1456	1479	1479	1450	Apr-23	29
<p>*Well 608 is now confirmed to be “destroyed” and is no longer available for monitoring. The landowner and monitoring staff have identified a well within 100 ft that is suitable to continue monitoring in this location, and the groundwater level monitoring network will be modified to remove well 608 and add in this new well. The new well is in the process of being incorporated into Opti and being assigned an ID number.</p>							

Table 2: Well Status Related to Thresholds

Well	Region	Current Month		Minimum Threshold	Within 10% Minimum Threshold	Measurable Objective	Well Depth	Status	GSA Action Required?
		GWL (DTW)	Date						
72	Central	131.30	04-24-2024	169	165	124	790	More than 10% Above Minimum Threshold	No
74	Central	246.06	04-25-2024	256	255	243		More than 10% Above Minimum Threshold	No
77	Central	489.27	04-25-2024	450	445	400	980	Below Minimum Threshold (44 months of exceedance)	No
91	Central	667.34	04-26-2024	625	620	576	980	Below Minimum Threshold (44 months of exceedance)	No
95	Central	67.15	04-25-2024	573	570	538	805	Above Measurable Objective	No
96	Central	337.42	04-25-2024	333	332	325	500	Below Minimum Threshold (1 month of exceedance)	No
98	Central	-	-	450	449	439	750	No available data this period	No
99	Central	287.81	04-24-2024	311	310	300	750	Above Measurable Objective	No
102	Central	-	-	235	231	197		No data available this period (Below MT in Oct 2023, 42 months)	No
103	Central	233.41	04-25-2024	290	285	235	1030	Above Measurable Objective	No
112	Central	84.40	04-24-2024	87	87	85	441	Above Measurable Objective	No
114	Central	45.18	04-24-2024	47	47	45	58	More than 10% Above Minimum Threshold	No
316	Central	668.59	04-26-2024	623	618	574	830	Below Minimum Threshold (44 months of exceedance)	No


Well	Region	Current Month		Minimum Threshold	Within 10% Minimum Threshold	Measurable Objective	Well Depth	Status	GSA Action Required?
		GWL (DTW)	Date						
317	Central	666.85	04-26-2024	623	618	573	700	Below Minimum Threshold (44 months of exceedance)	No
322	Central	288.31	04-24-2024	307	306	298	850	Above Measurable Objective	No
324	Central	289.52	04-24-2024	311	310	299	560	Above Measurable Objective	No
325	Central	289.59	04-24-2024	300	299	292	380	Above Measurable Objective	No
420	Central	490.46	04-25-2024	450	445	400	780	Below Minimum Threshold (44 months of exceedance)	No
421	Central	484.66	04-25-2024	446	441	398	620	Below Minimum Threshold (44 months of exceedance)	No
474	Central	130.78	04-24-2024	188	186	169	213	Above Measurable Objective	No
568	Central	33.95	04-24-2024	37	37	36	188	Above Measurable Objective	No
604	Central	460.61	04-26-2024	526	522	487	924	Above Measurable Objective	No
608*	Central	431.24	04-25-2024	436	433	407	745	More than 10% Above Minimum Threshold	No
609	Central	435.09	04-26-2024	458	454	421	970	More than 10% Above Minimum Threshold	No
610	Central	629.28	04-25-2024	621	618	591	780	Below Minimum Threshold (37 months of exceedance)	No
612	Central	472.64	04-25-2024	463	461	440	1070	Below Minimum Threshold (28 months of exceedance)	No
613	Central	527.84	04-25-2024	503	500	475	830	Below Minimum Threshold (42 months of exceedance)	No

Well	Region	Current Month		Minimum Threshold	Within 10% Minimum Threshold	Measurable Objective	Well Depth	Status	GSA Action Required?
		GWL (DTW)	Date						
615	Central	514.74	04-25-2024	500	497	468	865	Below Minimum Threshold (41 months of exceedance)	No
629	Central	557.23	04-25-2024	559	556	527	1000	Within Adaptive Management Zone	No
633	Central	563.67	04-25-2024	547	542	493	1000	Below Minimum Threshold (7 months of exceedance)	No
62	Eastern	110.63	04-25-2024	182.45	178	142	212	Above Measurable Objective	No
85	Eastern	156.76	04-25-2024	233.12	225	147	233	More than 10% Above Minimum Threshold	No
100	Eastern	66.88	04-25-2024	181.02	175	125	284	Above Measurable Objective	No
101	Eastern	87.29	04-25-2024	110.55	108	81	200	More than 10% Above Minimum Threshold	No
830	Far-West Northwestern	49.14	04-24-2024	59	59	56	77.2	Above Measurable Objective	No
832	Far-West Northwestern	32.86	04-24-2024	45	44	30	131.8	More than 10% Above Minimum Threshold	No
833	Far-West Northwestern	20.11	04-24-2024	96	89	24	503.55	Above Measurable Objective	No
836	Far-West Northwestern	27.20	04-24-2024	79	75	36	325	Above Measurable Objective	No
841	Northwestern	50.05	04-20-2024	203	198	153	600	Above Measurable Objective	No
845	Northwestern	69.11	04-20-2024	203	198	153	380	Above Measurable Objective	No
2	Southeastern	14.10	04-24-2024	72	70	55	73	Above Measurable Objective	No

Well	Region	Current Month		Minimum Threshold	Within 10% Minimum Threshold	Measurable Objective	Well Depth	Status	GSA Action Required?
		GWL (DTW)	Date						
89	Southeastern	21.11	04-24-2024	64	62	44	125	Above Measurable Objective	No
106	Western	141.36	04-24-2024	154	153	141.4	227.5	Above Measurable Objective	No
107	Western	72.44	04-24-2024	91	89	72.23	200	More than 10% Above Minimum Threshold	No
117	Western	151.4	04-25-2024	160	159	150.82	212	More than 10% Above Minimum Threshold	No
118	Western	49.62	04-25-2024	124	117	57.22	500	Above Measurable Objective	No
124	Western	-	-	73	71	57.12	160.55	No available data this period	No
571	Western	78.29	04-25-2024	144	142	120.5	280	Above Measurable Objective	No
573	Western	67.66	04-24-2024	118	113	67.5	404	More than 10% Above Minimum Threshold	No
<p>*Well 608 is now confirmed to be “destroyed” and is no longer available for monitoring. The landowner and monitoring staff have identified a well within 100 ft that is suitable to continue monitoring in this location, which is where the measurement shown was taken. The groundwater level representative network will be modified to remove well 608 and add in this new well. The new well is in the process of being incorporated into Opti and being assigned an ID number.</p>									

Note: Wells only count towards the identification of undesirable results if the level measurement is below the minimum threshold for 24 consecutive months.

Figure 1: Groundwater Level Representative Wells and Status in April 2024



Third Party GIS Disclaimer: This map is for reference and graphical purposes only and should not be relied upon by third parties for any legal decisions.

4. HYDROGRAPHS

The following hydrographs provide an overview of conditions in each of the six areas threshold regions identified in the GSP.

Figure 2: Southeast Region – Well 89




Figure 3: Eastern Region – Well 62




Figure 4: Central Region – Well 91




Figure 5: Central Region – Well 74




Figure 6: Western Region – Well 571





Figure 7: Northwestern Region – Well 841






Figure 8: Threshold Regions in the Cuyama Groundwater Basin

5. MONITORING NETWORK UPDATES

As shown in Table 2, there are three wells with no measurement during the current monitoring period. These “no measurement codes” can have different causes as described below.

- Access agreements have not been established with the landowner:
 - Wells 98, 124
- Data not yet available due to transducer malfunction:
 - 102

Additionally, Well 608 is now confirmed to be “destroyed” and is no longer available for monitoring. The landowner and monitoring staff have identified a well within 100 ft that is suitable to continue monitoring in this location; the data from that new well is reported for well 608 in this version of the report. The groundwater level monitoring network will be modified to remove well 608 and add in this new well. The new well is in the process of being incorporated into Opti. The new well will use historical data from Well 608 as a proxy for future analysis conducted for GSP implementation.



We had quite a discussion on the term “Idle Land” that I thought in the end was nonetheless dismissed. However, by definition “idle” means unproductive and unused. To the general public, idle will equate with empty land. In Ali’s presentation, “Idle Land” will include:

- All public land, both state and federal
- De minimus water users
- Small farmers and ranchers
- Dry farmers
- Rangelands and grazing lands
- Fallow farm fields

In total, this category encompasses tens of thousands of acres and landowners/well data reporters who become virtually invisible. The Idle Land category needs to be footnoted as including all of these. If this is to be a catch-all category, Ali needs to show in his report how they are not impacting the model, not just dismissing them as insignificant impacts.

Thanks for taking my comments. I appreciate all of the effort everyone puts into the GSP.

Pam Doiron