

# Cuyama Basin Groundwater Sustainability Agency Board of Directors Meeting

September 3, 2025

## Meeting Minutes

### **PRESENT:**

#### Directors

Bantilan, Cory – Chair  
Yurosek, Derek – Vice Chair  
Albano, Byron – Treasurer  
Anselm, Arne  
DeBranch, Brad – Alternate  
Jackson, Steve  
Reely, Blaine – Alternate  
Williams, Debby  
Wooster, Jane  
Young, Matthew – Secretary  
Zenger, Katelyn

#### Staff

Beck, Jim – Executive Director  
Bianchi, Grace – Project Coordinator  
Blakslee, Taylor – Assistant Executive Director  
Dominguez, Alex – Legal Counsel  
Van Lienden, Brian – Woodard & Curran

#### Absent

Higbee, Jason

#### **1. Call to Order**

Cuyama Basin Groundwater Sustainability Agency (CBGSA) Chair Cory Bantilan called the meeting to order at 2:00 p.m.

#### **2. Roll Call**

Ms. Bianchi 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.

## **CLOSED SESSION**

**Conference with Legal Counsel- Existing Litigation**

At 2:04 PM, the Board adjourned to closed session. At 2:53 PM, the Board returned from closed session at which time Legal Counsel reported to the public that there was no reportable action.

#### **4. Meeting Protocols**

Ms. Bianchi provided an overview of the meeting protocols.

#### **5. Standing Advisory Committee Meeting Report**

*Submitted to the CBGSA Board of Directors on September 3rd, 2025*

*By Brenton Kelly, SAC Chair*

*Last week on August 28th, the Standing Advisory Committee met at the Family Resource Center in a hybrid format, with all 7 members present, 5 in-person and 2 on the conference line from the remote locations that were posted on the agenda. GSA*

*Staff Taylor Blakslee was joined by Grace Bianchi and Alex Dominguez in the room, with Brian Van Lienden and Sercan Ceyhan from Woodard & Curran on the video call. It was well attended by more than a dozen members of the public present in the room and many more stakeholders were online. The meeting lasted a little over 4.5 hours.*

*The SAC spent almost 2 hours reviewing and discussing the Ventucopa and SBCF Data Analysis. This was a fascinating presentation and discussion but no actions were needed from the SAC. For 1.5 hours the SAC reviewed and discussed the Water Market Policy. The SAC made two unanimously approved Recommendations for this Board's consideration.*

*Stakeholder Tristan Zannon spoke about the Variance Request from Tri-County Pistachio Co. included in correspondence. He noted that he wasn't given sufficient time to review and address the complexity of the allocations in one month of last year. The GSA data is clearly wrong and he respectfully requests consideration for correction. Benjamin Markham, Zannon's Legal Counsel, added that there are documented errors on the GSA's estimation of historic use and they will bring this to the board on September 3, 2025. The SAC recognizes the Variance Process to be a logistical challenge for farmers and encourages every attempt to get it right and correct all known data errors.*

#### **9a) Discuss and Take Appropriate Action on the Plan and Timeline to Evaluate Allocations in the Ventucopa Management Area**

*The SAC was updated regarding the new timeline which continues to be delayed due to not knowing the location and characteristics of the Santa Barbara Canyon Fault. More data collection and analysis is required, thus more time is needed before we know if we know enough! We won't know until next year if there is sufficient confidence in our understanding of the SBC Fault to effectively consider allocations in the Ventucopa MA.*

*As for the rest of the data gaps in the other critical data sets, as clearly summarized on slide pg. 81, only a third (4 of the 12 data sets) are considered adequately available and the remaining data sets are either partially adequate or not available at all.*

*Committee Member Haslett asked when the CBGSA can expect to make a decision on*

*allocations. Mr. Blakslee responded that the staff report to the board in January will include a recommendation if the data is adequate to inform a decision to allocate. This would then inform the Annual Report and 2026-27 Budget and work plan for possible allocations in the fall of 2026, with time for the Variance Process for the calendar year 2027.*

*Committee Member Jaffe asked about the groundwater levels of wells on either side of the SBCF. Mr. Ceyhan confirmed that they believe the 700 ft drop in head across 1 mile (from 2600 to 1900) is indicative of being on opposite sides of a significant fault. Chair Kelly asked when the CIMIS was decommissioned and questioned the use of any historic ET Data from the old high school site which had not been maintained for decades. Even the precipitation data should not be considered accurate for Ventucopa. It is hoped that the new CIMIS stations can help correct the old. And then all the calculations can be recalibrated and changed, yet again.*

*The Land Use data sets were brought into question. The accuracy of Land IQ is recognized and the GSA has asked that local property owners verify and update the land use maps. It was noted that recent changes to Highland Vineyard of pulling out acres of vines are not reflected in the current Land use maps.*

*Mr. Ceyhan explained that Ratings Tables are used to convert the flow volume into the flow height in the channel to help define how much water is seeping into the groundwater basin from the stream surface flow. The Cuyama River is wide and braided and the data gap in Rating Tables prevents the use of the high tech LiDAR River Survey data to inform the Model to calculate the amount of groundwater coming in or surface water flowing out. This data gap is understood to introduce a significant degree of uncertainty to an important calculation in the mass balance equation of the Cuyama Groundwater Basin.*

*Mr. Ceyhan continued to explain that the lack of understanding of the bottom layer of the Ventucopa basin makes it difficult for the Model to estimate subsurface flows. Local stakeholder Jim Wegis commented that there is a well near his property that is 700 feet deep and dry because it is only perforated at the bottom. Once you drill below the clay at >250' there is no water. He will share the e-log for the well with staff, but it has been capped. Chair Kelly noted that this lowest layer, called the Morales, which appears to be dry or absent in the Ventucopa area is the major groundwater producing aquifer in the CMA. This is demonstrated by the steep gradient across the SBC Fault suggesting a significant separation in groundwater connectivity.*

*Chair Kelly was pleased to hear Mr Ceyhan's suggestion that an inexpensive Geochemical/Tracer/Isotope Analysis study would fill important data gaps and greatly enhance the Model calculations for the subsurface flows through the Basin. Chair Kelly has supported this particular technical analysis for a decade. The collective take-away from this thorough and accessible presentation was that the analysis of available data does not support confidence in the hydrogeologic understanding of the Ventucopa Management Area and in fact it leans decidedly toward low confidence.*

***Santa Barbara Canyon Fault Study:***

*Committee Member DeBranch asked about the possibility of the fault ending between the two transect lines of the 2024 study. Mr. Van Lienden thought it might be possible but suggested that Jim Steinberg may have a more thorough answer. Stakeholder Tristan Zannon commented that visual observation of the escarpment on the west side of the River may indicate a potential fault south of the mouth to Santa Barbara Canyon. This along with well data from the new monitoring wells (Opti 915-916) could suggest the fault is farther to the south on the 33 than the first transect.*

***9b) Discuss and Take Appropriate Action on the CMA Allocation******Exchanges Policy (i.e. Water Market)***

*After a thorough discussion of this item the SAC unanimously approved a motion to delay approval of this policy until further development.*

*Legal counsel Alex Dominguez presented the Policy developed by counsel with input from the GSA ad hoc and to be presented to the GSA Board on September 3rd. The following discussion took place:*

*Chair Kelly asked if someone who had to over-pump, but then paid the penalty fees, would be eligible to participate in an allocation exchange? Legal Counsel Alex Dominguez responded that a landowner that has paid fees would be considered in good standing with the GSA and would be able to exchange.*

*Chair Kelly then asked if a lessee could exchange the allocations of parcels that they leased? Legal Counsel Alex Dominguez responded that only a property owner could participate in an exchange of their own allocations. This would suggest that any allocations assigned to Farming Units would not be available on the Exchange.*

*Committee Member Jaffe asked how the transfers would be tracked and reported? Mr. Blakslee noted that Hallmark Group will track allocations through the metered pumping reports and report them in an additional column on the annual Allocations Use Report that comes out in April-May Packet. She expressed concern about the lack of detail in the policy and noted the Fox Canyon water markets had to close their water market program because large pumpers' aggregated parcels operated outside the water market and depleted Fox Canyon's sensitive area even further.*

*It was noted that in the 2024 Allocations Use Report only 57% of the groundwater allocations were actually utilized and most of the unused allocations were in the Farming Units. It would be helpful to understand if this overestimation could be used to establish available allocations for in the Exchange.*

*Committee Member Haslett asked about the timeframe in which exceedances are identified and addressed. Mr. Blakslee responded that in the next agenda item Staff is recommending a process and timeframe in the Adaptive Management Standard Operating Procedures (SOP). Haslett was also concerned that the ad hoc and Board conversations are not representative of small farmers' concerns. He recommended a public process for interested parties to register for the water markets so buyers could find sellers or otherwise allocate a small percentage of the*

*total allocations as a pool for the exchange.*

*Committee Member Gaillard asked if there could be a registration process in which the exchanges are connected so that small farmers might have a priority in the market because this policy was conceived to provide viability to small farmers like the Lewis's.*

*Gaillard also suggested that transducers could be used to monitor changes in the groundwater elevations of participating wells.*

*Chair Kelly agreed with Gaillard because the Monitoring Network is not robust everywhere in the CMA and that moving forward the Network is particularly sparse in many areas outside of the CMA.*

*Committee Member Lewis expressed concern for the absence of small farmers on the ad hoc or board. He was disappointed that there was no mechanism for buyers to find sellers. And he repeated his objection to the policy of only using historical use to set allocations because it rewards the biggest pumpers who have been pumping too much for too long.*

*Committee Member DeBranch commented that a simpler policy would be best and this was a good first pass. He suggested that the price would likely be driven by the penalty fee that the GSA has set forth, and that it would serve as the back stop. He also said that no one had approached him for water.*

*Committee Member Jaffe recommended that the policy consider additional stakeholder input including more input from small farmers like Dave Lewis. She suggested if done right this could be an opportunity to build trust, transparency and equity in the Basin, but that the policy isn't ready for adoption yet.*

*Stakeholder Tristan Zannon said that although he appreciated the expediency of the policy development and would prefer a simple policy that would be subject to revisions over time, he added that he hasn't found any sellers. He suggested that without a pool to get started it was like blind moles trying to find each other in the dark. This system may not be helpful to anyone!*

*Stakeholder Jim Wegis commented that the pool idea only works for landowners that have extra water that they can make available and should not be taken out of everyone's allocations. He thought an auction could be good but it would not address equity concerns. He believes that the GSA should not be involved in choosing between winners and losers in the fall-out of SGMA. This is a very difficult situation for everyone.*

**Motion:**

*Committee Member Jaffe made a motion to recommend that the board NOT adopt this Exchange Policy until there is further refinement and the engagement of stakeholders impacted. The motion was seconded by Committee Member Haslett. And passed unanimously.*

**9d) Discuss and Take Appropriate Action on Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) for the Adaptive Management Process**

*Although the discussion of this item did not take very long the Committee did adopt a unanimous recommendation.*

*Committee Chair Kelly asked who would be responsible for implementing the potential Adaptive Management Strategy to Install replacement wells or deepen existing wells? Would it be the GSA's responsibility? Mr. Blakslee suggested that the GSA could work with local landowners and the responsible neighbor might volunteer support. He stated that this is just one potential option, and that a more likely management strategy could be to implement a localized pumping management plan.*

*Committee Member Jaffe and Haslett both mentioned the concern brought up from the last item regarding the time frame within which action must be taken. The SOP does not specify a timeline by which exceedances would be investigated or by which management actions would be implemented. Mr. Blakslee stated that he could include a timeline for the steps in the procedure to be taken within months (not years). This would need to be reviewed by the Board.*

**Motion:**

*Committee Member Caufield made a motion to recommend the GSA Board adopt the SOP for Adaptive Management with the inclusion of a monthly timeline. The motion was seconded by Committee Member Haslett. A roll call vote was made, and the motion passed unanimously.*

**9e) Discuss and Take Appropriate Action on Options to Address New Pumping Outside the CMA**

*Committee Member Jaffe called out the elephant in the room and asked how these decisions will be impacted by the Adjudication and why go through this allocation process if the courts will decide in the end. She does consider it important to manage any new irrigated operations on former rangeland, like the new Salisbury Canyon cannabis operation.*

*Legal Counsel Dominguez responded that the GSA has to find a way to fulfill court orders and fulfill SGMA requirements. The time line for this match up can not be known as it is unclear when the courts will determine allocations, so in the meantime the GSA is exploring setting basin wide allocations on its own. He opined that the Adjudication can do things that the GSA can not do.*

*Committee Member Haslett stated that groundwater availability is not uniform across the basin, so the Basin can not be balanced by cutting back evenly across the basin. He supports option 1, continuing implementing the current Plan and not to descend the slippery slope toward basin wide cutbacks.*

*Committee Member DeBranch commented that the data he has seen suggests that cut-backs to the CMA alone will not achieve Sustainability. He asked at what point do we address the estimated 3000 to 5000 AFY of overdraft outside the CMA? He suggested this was a good first attempt.*

*Chair Kelly asked how the remaining model-estimated overdraft will be identified in the basin?*

*How do any of these options attempt to identify that specifically? Any new significant pumping on formally unirrigated land is a big problem and should be managed immediately, but historic use on unirrigated rangeland and small farming operations have not contributed to the historic basin overdraft.*

*Respectfully submitted,  
Brenton Kelly SAC Chair*

## CONSENT AGENDA

### 6-8. Consent Agenda

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

There were no public comments on this item.

#### MOTION

Director Williams made a motion to approve the consent agenda item nos. 6-8. The motion was seconded by Director Jackson. A roll call vote was made and the motion passed with 89%.

AYES:	Albano, Anselm, Bantilan, DeBranch, Jackson, Wooster, Young, Yurosek, Zenger, Reely, Williams
NOES:	None
ABSTAIN:	None
ABSENT:	None

## ACTION ITEMS

### 9. Groundwater Sustainability Plan Implementation

#### a. Discuss and Take Appropriate Action on the Plan and Timeline to Evaluate Allocations in the Ventucopa Management Area

Mr. Blakslee provided an overview of the objective for evaluating allocations in the Ventucopa Management Area.

Sercan Ceyhan from Woodard & Curran provided a presentation on the datasets in the Ventucopa Management Area for use to calculate sustainable yield and allocations.

Director Young asked if the rating tables will be redone with improved elevation data. Mr. Ceyhan responded that staff proposes the action of redoing the rating tables.

Mr. Ceyhan reviewed the recent efforts by the GSA to collect more data and potential improvements to the existing datasets for Cuyama Basin Water Resource Model (CBWRM) enhancement.

Director Steve Jackson asked whether the model update would help determine how to split the sustainable yield among the management areas. Staff confirmed that the model will inform that evaluation.

Director Wooster asked about the graph on pumping after ET adjustment graphs, specifically the difference between the reported pumping vs simulated pumping. Mr. Ceyhan responded that the model overestimated by approximately 5% in 2022 and underestimated by 0.5% in 2023.

Chair Bantilan asked about the outlier on the graph. Mr. Ceyhan responded that the reported pumping didn't match the land use and that they can investigate the outlier.

Mr. Van Lienden and Mr. Strandberg provided an update on the Santa Barbara Canyon Fault (SBCF) investigation.

SAC Chair Brenton Kelly provided the SAC report on this item.

Mr. Strandberg responded that there is likely to be a fault south of line 1. He noted that a western fault would not address the water level difference between wells.

Director Albano noted that there not any productive wells south of line 1 near Jim Wegis's property. He asked if its worth checking closer to that area. Mr. Strandberg responded that it wouldn't be feasible due to differences in topography across the transect.

Mr. Blakslee asked about use of dogger wells. Mr. Strandberg responded that the dogger wells are deeper and wouldn't be useful to locating the SBCF.

*Chair Bantilan opened the floor for public comment.*

Tristan Zannon suggested that the fault may be present to the south of the current proposed transect and pointed out an escarpment area just south of Badlands Ranch off of Highway 33.

Chair Bantilan asked if Jim and Mr. Strandberg are open to exploring this, to which Mr. Strandberg answered in the affirmative and confirmed that it is possible to run a longer transect study (~3600 ft).

Mr. Lovgren asked if the fault is bigger than previously thought, does the model show the potential range in reduction of groundwater flows from Ventucopa to the CMA?

Mr. Blakslee answered that this is one of the key questions that the study is will answer. Sercan responded that he believes the model estimates 800-1,000 af year.

*Chair Bantilan closed the floor for public comment.*

Director Albano expressed he feels the volume of water that the model predicts is flowing across the SB Canyon Fault into CMA is what should be managed.

Chair Bantillan asked to clarify if Director Albano means the historic flow across the fault. Director Albano responded he sees the historical flow should be the critical concern for management.

Director Albano asked if the flow across the fault (800-1000 af) is the ultimate goal for management.

Mr. Ceyhan responded that the real goal is to come up with a sustainable yield calculation that managers can be confident in, but the historical outflow is one of the components of that calculation.

Mr. Van Lienden added that the goal is to calculate how much pumping allows us to be balanced in the long term, accounting for all inputs and outputs.

Director Young asked if the board needs to make the model calibration decision by November meeting and Mr. Blakslee reminded him that the meeting will be in January after the study is conducted.

Director Yurosek asked if changes in head pressure would cause changes in the flows coming into the CMA across the fault. Brian responded that there is likely variability in the amount of flow.

Director Jackson posed the question on how much unrestricted pumping outside of the CMA is impacting the ability of the CMA to become sustainable.

Director Albano iterated that the lingering question is how much inflow of groundwater into the CMA needs to be sustained.

There was consensus for staff to explore potential extension south of fault line one.

**b. Discuss and Take Appropriate Action on the CMA Allocation Exchanges Policy**

Mr. Blakslee provided an overview of the Central Management Area (CMA) Allocation Exchanges Policy and background on previous board direction. Legal Counsel Alex Dominguez reviewed each article of the draft policy.

Director Young asked how farming units are accounted for in this process. Legal Counsel Alex Dominguez responded that allocations are given to landowners and the entirety of the farming unit would need to approve transfers.

Director Reely asked if price of allocations will be public. Legal Counsel Dominguez responded that the GSA doesn't request landowners to provide that information

Director Albano asked if farming units are included in the CMA. Legal Counsel Dominguez responded that it was implied that farming units are included in the policy.

Director Wooster commented that the ad hoc discussed that farming units should be included in the CMA and that the map in Exhibit B be updated to include the farming units. She asked why the policy doesn't apply to the entire basin.

Director Young commented that all areas with allocations should have ability to participate in

the allocation exchanges.

Director Albano expressed concern that landowners may pump to receive allocations in the CMA to sell off allocations.

Chair Bantilan noted that farming units cannot be created until the next round of allocations in 2030.

Director Yurosek commented that allocation transfers should be traced back to the wellhead. He suggested only requiring the landowners whose allocation is being transferred from rather than requiring all farming units to sign the transfer.

SAC Chair Brenton Kelly provided the SAC feedback on this item.

*Chair Bantilan opened the floor for public comment.*

Stakeholder Ann Myhre commented if her landlord couldn't farm their land, then they would.

Stakeholder Tristan Zannon commented there is not going to be an allocation exchange marked if Bolthouse and Grimmway decide not to sell any water.

Stakeholder Robbie Jaffe urged the CBGSA to engage stakeholders who will be impacted in the process of developing this policy.

Stakeholder Joe Haslett commented that Dave Lewis and Tristan Zannon were two landowners impacted by the shift of the CMA following the model update. He added that the

Stakeholder Adam Lovgren commented that Sunridge would participate in allocation exchanges in the future if they are given allocations, but is worried about the formation of a market and process of exchanging allocations.

Stakeholder Tristan Zannon from Tri-County Pistachio commented that he is looking to buy water. He is in support of a carryover policy

*Chair Bantilan closed the floor for public comment.*

Director Young asked if the policy prohibits the carryover of purchased allocations or allocations as provided by the GSA. Legal Counsel Dominguez responded that there is no carryover of any water.

Stakeholder David Lewis expressed concern that there are no small pumpers represented on the board or on the ad hoc.

Director Wooster suggested small pumpers come to the board meetings and provide solutions.

The Board directed staff to meet with the ad hoc to revise the policy and to address a.) who signs off on the farming units, b.) develop communication strategies for allocation exchange participants, and c.) update the Exhibit B map to include farming units.

**c. Discuss and Take Appropriate Action on a Monitoring Network Consultant Contract for FY 25-26**

Mr. Blakslee provided an overview of the monitoring network contract with Provost & Pritchard (P&P) for fiscal year (FY) 25-26. He reported that the FY budget was for \$75k and staff recommend approving the contract as they have been historically below budget.

There were no comments on this item.

**MOTION**

Director Young made a motion to approve the monitoring network contract with P&P for monitoring network for fiscal year 2025-2026 for an amount not to exceed \$80,000. Director Anselm seconded, a roll call vote was made and passed with 100%.

- AYES: Albano, Anselm, Bantilan, DeBranch, Jackson, Reely, Young, Yurosek, Williams, Wooster, Zenger
- NOES: None
- ABSTAIN: None
- ABSENT: None

**d. Discuss and Take Appropriate Action on Standard Operating Procedures for Adaptive Management Process**

Mr. Blakslee provided an overview of the draft standard operating procedures (SOP) for adaptive management process.

Director Reely asked about the costs for the evaluating wells below MTs and if this work was accounted for in the budget. Mr. Blakslee responded that there is a line item in the budget for adaptive management.

SAC Chair Brenton Kelly provided the SAC report on this item.

*There were no public comments on this item.*

Chair Bantilan asked about the rationale for five percent off the glidepath in the adaptive management triggers. He suggested revising glidepath language.

**MOTION**

Director Young made a motion to approve the adaptive management SOP with revisions to include a timeline. Director Anselm seconded, a roll call vote was made and passed with 100%.

- AYES: Albano, Anselm, Bantilan, DeBranch, Jackson, Reely, Williams, Wooster, Young, Yurosek, Zenger

NOES: None  
ABSTAIN: None  
ABSENT: None

**e. Discuss and Take Appropriate Action on Options to Address New Pumping Outside the Management Area**

Legal Counsel Dominguez provided an overview of what the GSP allows, SGMA allows and what other GSAs are doing to address new pumping outside the management area. He reviewed some suggestions available to the CBGSA.

SAC Chair Brenton Kelly provided SAC feedback on this item.

*Chair Bantilan opened the floor for public comment.*

Stakeholder Kathleen March commented that the GSA should address North Fork Vineyard pumping.

*Chair Bantilan closed the floor for public comment.*

Director Jackson commented that the GSA should address pumping on all areas outside the CMA and if the GSA does nothing then we will be held accountable.

Director Wooster suggested focusing on all problem areas and what may be a problem.

Director Young expressed support for options that manage new use in the basin outside existing MA.

Chair Bantilan commented that the MA shouldn't be more restrictive than the CMA.

Director Wooster commented on option 4 that any water use in the valley may impact the GSAs ability to achieve sustainability.

Director Williams commented on land that has been sold for exploratory drilling and that there should be control for new pumping for that.

Director Albano asked if historical use is by parcel, landowner, etc. and suggested looking at developing options at a regional level.

Chair Bantilan commented that all parcels should have a minimum allocation.

Director Yurosek commented that he doesn't agree that all parcels should be given an allocation and it is not fair to the landowners who have put a lot of money into historic operations.

Director Albano commented that there are a lot of small farmers who will not have an opportunity to farm in the valley.

Director Jackson expressed support for option to manage the basin outside existing management areas.

Director Reely expressed support for merging option to expand groundwater allocations basin-wide and manage the basin outside the existing management areas.

Chair Bantilan directed staff to work with ad hoc to address new wells outside of the existing MA.

## REPORT ITEMS

### 10. Administrative Updates

#### a. Report of the Executive Director

Mr. Blakslee noted that financial report is included in the packet.

#### b. Report of the General Counsel

Nothing to report.

### 11. Technical Updates

#### a. Update on Groundwater Sustainability Plan Activities

Mr. Blakslee noted that these updates are included in the board packet.

#### b. Update on Grant-Funded Projects

Mr. Blakslee noted that these updates are included in the board packet.

#### c. Quarterly Groundwater Conditions Report

Mr. Blakslee noted that these updates are included in the board packet.

### 12. Report of Ad Hoc Committees

Nothing to report.

### 13. Directors' Forum

Nothing to report.

### 14. Public comment for Items Not on the Agenda

There were no public comments.

### 15. Correspondence

Ms. Amy Steinfeld commented on the variance request submitted for Tri-County Pistachios. She added that Tri-County was not given the same time as other letters to address the variance. She noted that allocations are inconsistent and violate

Tristan Zannon from Tri-County Pistachio noted that the historical use is incorrect and this can be seen on google earth.

Director Albano asked about impacts to the variance process. He requested staff review land use data.

Legal Counsel Dominguez responded that by allowing the variance process, it could open the door for other landowners to request variance.

Director Zenger asked if the accounting error was a human error.

Director Anselm suggested that staff review the data and determine the source of error.

Director Young suggested legal analysis on potential legal exposure to the GSA, or on both parties.

Director Jackson suggested staff look the water use data for any potential clerical issues and review land use.

Chair Bantilan noted that this will be agendized in the future.

**16. Adjourn**

Chair Bantilan adjourned the meeting at 7:13 PM.

-----  
BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE  
CUYAMA BASIN GROUNDWATER SUSTAINABILITY AGENCY

Chair: *Cory Bantilan*  
Cory Bantilan (Nov 5, 2025 15:39:49 PST)

ATTEST:

Secretary: *Matt Young*  
Matt Young (Nov 13, 2025 08:19:06 PST)