



CUYAMA BASIN GROUNDWATER SUSTAINABILITY AGENCY

BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING

Board of Directors

Steve Jackson Chair, Cuyama Basin Water District

Arne Anselm Vice Chair, County of Ventura

Matthew Young Secretary, Santa Barbara County Water Agency

Cory Bantilan Treasurer, Santa Barbara County Water Agency

Derek Yurosek Cuyama Basin Water District

Deborah Williams Cuyama Community Services District

Brian Grant Cuyama Basin Water District

Kyle Richardson Cuyama Basin Water District

Jimmy Paulding County of San Luis Obispo

Katelyn Zenger County of Kern

Mark Ellsworth Cuyama Basin Water District

AGENDA

March 4, 2026

Agenda for a meeting of the Cuyama Basin Groundwater Sustainability Agency Board of Directors to be held on Wednesday, March 4, 2026, at 12:30 PM at the **Cuyama Valley Family Resource Center 4689 CA-166, New Cuyama, CA 93254**. Participate via computer at: <https://shorturl.at/CEXif> or by going to Microsoft Teams, downloading the free application, then entering Meeting ID: 285 525 814 804 96 Passcode: fc2R8yg6 or enter or telephonically at (469) 480-3918 Phone Conference ID: 955 559 561#.

Teleconference Locations:

4689 CA-166 New Cuyama, CA 93254	1115 Truxtun Ave, 5 th Floor Bakersfield, CA 93301	801 S. Miller St Santa Maria, CA 93454
130 E. Victoria St, Suite 200 Santa Barbara, CA 93101	1111 Fairway Dr Bakersfield, CA 93309	

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 (Jackson) (1 min)
2. Roll Call (Bianchi) (1 min)
3. Pledge of Allegiance (Jackson) (1 min)
4. Meeting Protocols (Bianchi) (2 min)
5. **Closed Session**
 - a) Conference with Legal Counsel – Public Employment (Gov. Code section 54957) (90 min)
Title: General Counsel
 - b) 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)

6. 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.

7. Approve January 14, 2026, Meeting Minutes (Jackson) (1 min)
8. Approve Payment of Bills for December 2025 and January 2026 (Blakslee) (1 min)
9. Approve Financial Reports for December 2025 and January 2026 (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.

10. Groundwater Sustainability Plan Implementation
- a) Discuss and Take Appropriate Action on DWR Review of GSP and Periodic Evaluation (Blakslee/Van Lienden) (30 min)
 - b) Discuss and Take Appropriate Action on Potential Areas of Overdraft Outside the Central Management Area (Blakslee/Bianchi) (30 min)
 - c) Discuss and Take Appropriate Action on FY 2026-2027 Strategic Plan and Budget Components (Blakslee) (15 min)
 - d) Discuss and Take Appropriate Action on Water Year 2024-2025 Annual Report (Van Lienden) (15 min)
 - e) Report on 2025 Central Management Area Allocations and Authorize Penalty Fees (Blakslee) (5 min)

REPORT ITEMS

11. Administrative Updates
- a) Report of the Executive Director (Blakslee) (5 min)
 - i. Report on 2025 Basin-wide Groundwater Use, 2025 CMA Allocation Compliance, and CMA Groundwater Allocation Exchanges
 - b) Report of the General Counsel (Hughes) (5 min)
12. 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 January 2026 Groundwater Level Conditions Reports (Van Lienden) (5 min)
13. Report of Ad Hoc Committees (1 min)
14. Directors' Forum (1 min)
15. Public Comment for Items Not on the Agenda (5 min)
16. Correspondence (1 min)
17. Adjourn (4:45 p.m.)

Cuyama Basin Groundwater Sustainability Agency
Board of Directors Meeting

January 14, 2026

Draft Meeting Minutes

PRESENT:

Directors

Jackson, Steve– Chair
Anselm, Arne – Vice Chair
Bantilan, Cory - Treasurer
Young, Matthew – Secretary
Ellsworth, Mark
Grant, Brian
Reely, Blaine – Alternate
Richardson, Kyle
Ricci, Malcom – Alternate
Yurosek, Derek
Zenger, Katelyn

Staff

Bianchi, Grace – Hallmark Group
Blakslee, Taylor –Executive Director, Hallmark Group
Ceyhan, Sercan – Woodard & Curran
Dominguez, Alex – Legal Counsel
Hughes, Joe – Legal Counsel
Strandberg, Jim – Woodard & Curran
Van Lienden, Brian – Woodard & Curran

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

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.

4. Meeting Protocols

Ms. Bianchi provided an overview of the meeting protocols.

5. Standing Advisory Committee Meeting Report

Meeting Date: January 8th, 2026

The Standing Advisory Committee met at the Family Resource Center in a hybrid format, with four Committee Members present in person and two on the conference line, with one member absent. GSA Staff Taylor Blakslee and Project Coordinator Grace Bianchi were present, and they were joined by Brian Van Lienden, Jim Strandberg, and Mr. Ceyhan on the call. Several stakeholders were in the room, with many more on the video conference.

In public comments, several Committee Members expressed their appreciation for Jane Wooster and Byron Albano for the time and commitment they have put toward groundwater sustainability in the Cuyama Valley as Directors on the GSA representing the CBWD. Their local perspective and community investment will be missed on the GSA moving forward.

Thank you for your service.

Several Committee Members expressed a desire for an introduction of the new CBWD Directors and their affiliation or experience in the Cuyama Valley specifically. We were told that this would happen, as it is on the GSA agenda.

Committee Member Robbie Jaffe asked the GSA to expedite the unanimous motion at the last GSA meeting regarding the Allocation Exchange that directs the Ad Hoc Committee to consider a small variance pool of water derived from the previous year's unused allocations to be made available to the smallest farmers who need a minimal amount of additional allocations to remain commercially viable. For certain small-scale farmers with minimal allocations who cannot afford to participate in the exchange, the lack of a variance pool for this allocation period will threaten their farm's existence.

Committee Member Lewis said the current allocation exchange process is inadequate for small pumpers like him who will fall victim to the lack of consideration for the small-scale family farm. He hopes the development of a variance pool will not die on the vine.

The Committee voted unanimously to keep the current slate of Officers, with Joe Haslett as Vice Chair and myself as Chair.

A significant amount of in-depth review and questioning went into the three-and-a-half-hour meeting. One motion was made with a split vote regarding what to do with the timeline of the next model calibration to include the additional Ventucopa Management Area information. Many recommendations were made, and I will endeavor to present them as those items are brought up in this meeting.

11a) Discuss and Take Appropriate Action on the Plan and Timeline to Evaluate Allocations in the Ventucopa Management Area

Appreciation and compliments were expressed to Staff for the accomplishment of identifying the Santa Barbara Canyon Fault. The location and complexity of the fault zone are now better known, and it appears that a naming process may be needed to identify several previously unknown faults found in this process. The series of faults depicts a distinct stair-stepping of groundwater elevations across the SBC Fault Zone that is assumed to be continuous across the width of the river valley.

Chair Kelly asked how this information will inform the model regarding the flow rates and volumes of groundwater flowing across the fault zone into the main basin. Mr. Strandberg responded that the faults are a barrier to flow and the fault zone is difficult to model because it does not present a constant gradient. Mr. Ceyhan suggested that the new data will improve gradient resolution, but the complexity of the stair-stepping is harder to simulate than an even gradient. The impacts to flow cannot be estimated without

recalibration of the model.

Committee Member DeBranch asked whether this model recalibration will require supplemental study or whether it will fit within the scope of the current work. Staff responded that recalibration would require additional costs and that the next agenda item includes estimated costs for model improvements.

Committee Member Caufield asked whether the current groundwater model already incorporates faults in the Ventucopa area. Mr. Ceyhan explained that the model includes faults based on prior USGS interpretations and that the representation is simplified. He clarified that the model currently treats the fault as one simple barrier to flow below a defined depth and assumes groundwater can flow over the fault at higher water levels, as well as around the fault zone in the east. Mr. Ceyhan stated that incorporating the improved fault characterization would reduce conductance values and increase resistance to flow across the fault zone. He explained that recalibration would be required and that the updated model should show much less flow over and around the fault than the current model suggests.

Stakeholder Byron Albano questioned whether additional funding and time should be allocated to fully determine fault extents, given the potential implications for Ventucopa groundwater management. Staff acknowledged the concern and stated that prioritization would be considered in the context of overall model improvement and budget constraints.

Stakeholder Jim Wegis asked when the next comprehensive model update is anticipated. Mr. Blakslee responded that staff is targeting 2028 to allow sufficient time for data collection, technical work, and preparation for the next periodic review in 2030. Stakeholder and Committee discussion focused on which items are time-sensitive and top priority and which could be deferred to the next comprehensive update. Mr. Blakslee stated that the timeline is driven by the GSA Board's priority to better understand and potentially implement allocations in the Ventucopa Management Area.

Stakeholder Jim Wegis suggested that because options #1–4 are required before #5, and #5 would need to be completed in a few years regardless, the GSA should spread out additional studies to collect more information. He stated that observed well data have not indicated decline and questioned the need for a Ventucopa allocation effort at this time. He recommended moving forward without taking action in Ventucopa until additional data are available and deferring costs until the next scheduled update.

Stakeholder Jane Wooster expressed concern about the wide cost ranges presented and requested refined cost estimates before major decisions are made.

Committee Chair Kelly expressed concern that the current model is insufficient basin-wide. He stated that Ventucopa is unique and complex and will benefit from incorporating data from improvement #1, but other studies should include input from major side channels throughout the basin, including Salisbury Canyon, Aliso Canyon, Schoolhouse Canyon, and others where similar data gaps exist. He emphasized that the GSA cannot make management decisions based on understanding one area in isolation and must understand the entire basin, given shared unknowns in stratigraphy and surface and subsurface flows. Committee Member DeBranch emphasized that overdraft is a basin-wide issue and cautioned against viewing Ventucopa in isolation. He noted that the prior 6 to 7 million dollars in grant funding provided significant data, but future work will be landowner funded and costly. He stated that while more data are always beneficial, he is not currently in favor of proceeding with additional work focused only on Ventucopa when needs exist across the

basin.

Stakeholder Byron Albano stated that improvements #1 and #2 addressing basin structure and fault behavior are foundational and should be prioritized, particularly #2 because it addresses headlands south of the fault. He stated that #1 will need to be completed eventually, while #5 can wait until the next scheduled model update. He added that no allocation for Ventucopa is needed because he believes Ventucopa is not overdrafted.

MOTION: Committee Member Jaffe made a motion to recommend Option 4, to defer model improvements until the next model update. The motion was seconded by Committee Member Haslett. A roll call vote was taken and the motion passed.

AYES: Haslett, Jaffe, Lewis, Kelly

NOES: DeBranch, Caufield

11b) Discuss and Take Appropriate Action on Options to Address New Pumping Outside the Management Area

There was general agreement that policy decisions should be driven by real groundwater data and ground truthing rather than solely by model predictions of less than two feet of drawdown over 50 years. Committee Members stated that land use changes, pumping records, and well improvement permit information should trigger localized staff analysis of impacts to sustainable yield. Concern was expressed that the monitoring network and sustainability criteria may not identify problems until it is too late. Several Members referenced the new Salisbury Canyon cannabis operation as an example.

Committee Member DeBranch emphasized that the basin is managed as a single interconnected system designated as overdrafted under SGMA. He stated that pumping increases outside the CMA could affect basin-wide sustainability and that cumulative pumping outside management areas could exceed what might otherwise be allocated under sustainable yield assumptions. He stated that pumping levels outside the CMA should remain static going forward.

Stakeholder Jane Wooster expressed concern about interpretation of the monitoring network, citing examples from the western area color-coded map. She stated that areas with no pumping and rising groundwater elevations are labeled as declining and emphasized the need for additional ground truthing and situational analysis.

13c) Update on October 2025 Groundwater Level and Quality Conditions Reports

Stakeholder Jim Wegis stated that he pays for water analysis out of pocket while the GSA collects similar data. He suggested that the GSA request irrigation well records required by the state for large pumpers, which include groundwater elevations, water quality, and pump capacity information.

Stakeholder Byron Albano agreed and stated that consulting costs could be reduced if duplication of data collection is minimized.

13d) Update on Adaptive Management Processes for Minimum Threshold Exceedances

Committee Member Robbie Jaffe stated that she remains confused about how Minimum Thresholds are established and is further concerned that the only solution to exceedances appears to be lowering the threshold.

Committee Member DeBranch stated that the concept of "Well Protection Depth" has technical merit and that correcting thresholds may be justifiable in some cases.

Chair Kelly expressed concern about continued downward groundwater trends. He cited Opti wells 91 and 99 as examples, noting that although they recover seasonally, they are declining nearly ten feet year over year. He stated that lowering Minimum Thresholds under Adaptive Management creates the appearance of compliance and risks failure under SGMA.

*Respectfully submitted,
Brenton Kelly
SAC Chairperson*

6. New Director Welcome

Chair Bantilan thanked the previous directors Wooster and Albano for their time serving on the board. He added that the new directors representing the water district, Kyle Richardson, Brian Grant, and Mark Ellsworth.

Director Richardson introduced himself as a representative of Diamond Farming on Apis Lane.

Director Grant introduced himself as representing Lerner and stated he previously served on the Board from 2015 through 2018.

Director Ellsworth introduced himself as representing Duncan Family Farms and noted their operations have been farming in the basin since 2010.

7. Election of Officers

Chair Bantilan noted that four positions, Chair, Vice Chair, Secretary, and Treasurer are up for election.

Director Yurosek commented that it would be beneficial to have board chair rotation and recommended Steve Jackson as chair.

Stakeholder Byron Albano commented that Chair Bantilan has been a fair and reasonable chair for the CBGSA.

Stakeholder Tristan Zannon asked if directors are being compensated for being on the board.

MOTION

Director Yurosek made a motion to nominate Director Jackson as Chair. The motion was seconded by Director Ellsworth. A roll call vote was made and the motion passed with 67%.

- AYES: Anselm, Ellsworth, Grant, Jackson, Reely, Richardson, Yurosek, Zenger
- NOES: Bantilan, Young
- ABSTAIN: Ricci
- ABSENT: None

MOTION

Director Young made a motion to nominate Director Anselm as Vice Chair. The motion

was seconded by Director Yurosek. A roll call vote was made and the motion passed with 89%.

- AYES: Anselm, Bantilan, Ellsworth, Grant, Jackson, Reely, Richardson, Young, Yurosek, Zenger
- NOES: None
- ABSTAIN: Ricci
- ABSENT: None

MOTION

Director Anselm made a motion to nominate Director Young as Secretary. The motion was seconded by Director Jackson. A roll call vote was made and the motion passed with 89%.

- AYES: Anselm, Bantilan, Ellsworth, Grant, Jackson, Reely, Richardson, Young, Yurosek, Zenger
- NOES: None
- ABSTAIN: Ricci
- ABSENT: None

Stakeholder Jane Wooster commented that Chair Bantilan has served as fair chairman and thanked him for his time as chair.

MOTION

Director Young made a motion to nominate Director Bantilan as Treasurer. The motion was seconded by Director Yurosek. A roll call vote was made and the motion passed with 67%.

- AYES: Anselm, Bantilan, Ellsworth, Grant, Jackson, Reely, Richardson, Young, Yurosek, Zenger
- NOES: None
- ABSTAIN: Ricci
- ABSENT: None

CONSENT AGENDA

8-10. Consent Agenda

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

Director Yurosek asked about the minutes and requested clarification on the motion regarding the allocation exchange policy. Mr. Blakslee noted that staff can review the recording to confirm the motion language.

MOTION

Director Anselm made a motion to approve the consent agenda item nos. 8-10. The motion was seconded by Director Young. A roll call vote was made and the motion

passed with 69%.

AYES: Anselm, Bantilan, Jackson, Reely, Young, Yurosek, Zenger
 NOES: None
 ABSTAIN: Ellsworth, Grant, Richardson, Ricci
 ABSENT: None

ACTION ITEMS

11. 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 introduced the item and stated that staff previously informed the Board that the current model may not be sufficient to support allocation decisions in the Ventucopa Management Area. He explained that staff committed to returning with a final recommendation after completing additional fault investigation.

Mr. Strandberg presented findings from additional Santa Barbara Canyon Fault (SBCF) investigation and noted it appears to extend farther than previously modeled. He added that the faults appear to act as zones of reduced permeability that slow groundwater movement but do not completely block flow. He noted that groundwater elevations appear to change in a step-like pattern across fault zones.

Mr. Ceyhan outlined five potential model improvements, including incorporating updated fault information, refining streamflow inputs, evaluating subsurface inflows, improving stream geometry representation, and recalibrating the model. He estimated costs ranging from approximately \$160,000 to \$280,000 depending on scope.

Director Ellsworth asked what prompted the additional fault investigation. Mr. Blakslee responded that there has been longstanding uncertainty regarding groundwater flow across the fault area, and the investigation was intended to clarify the fault's extent and influence on model results.

Director Young asked when the LiDAR data used for stream geometry was collected and whether timing could affect reliability. Mr. Van Lienden responded that LiDAR was flown in 2023 during dry conditions and acknowledged that stream channels are dynamic but the data remains useful.

Director Reely asked if, given the new subsurface information, Jim feels confident he can extend the mapped fault to the eastern edge of the basin so the model no longer lets water "flow around" an artificial fault endpoint. Mr. Strandberg responded that based on new findings, there is no reason to believe the fault abruptly ends, and extending it in the model would likely provide a more accurate representation.

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

Mr. Ceyhan clarified that while additional faults lengthen the low-conductance zone and would likely restrict cross-fault flow, the effective cross-sectional area may also be larger, so impacts on flow must be evaluated with the model.

Chair Jackson opened the floor for public comment.

Stakeholder Jim Wegis noted his historical water-level data from his Ventucopa-area well showing large inter-annual fluctuations but a long-term decline averaging about 5 inches per year, below the 2 ft/yr overdraft benchmark.

Stakeholder Jane Wooster expressed concern that once studies are done, their findings must be incorporated into the plan rather than used selectively, and criticizes that some well data supplied by landowners have not been fully integrated into the model.

Chair Jackson closed the floor for public comment.

Mr. Blakslee clarified that all fault-investigation work will be incorporated in the next major model update in 2028 even if no Ventucopa recalibration is funded sooner.

Chair Jackson asked whether potential model improvement #5, relating to model recalibration, is specific to the Ventucopa Management Area. He requested clarification on whether the scope is localized or basin-wide.

Mr. Ceyhan responded that some improvement tasks are specific to the Ventucopa Management Area, while others apply to the basin as a whole. He confirmed that development of a Cuyama River hydraulic model would benefit the entire basin, whereas isotope sampling and related analysis would focus more directly on conditions in the Ventucopa area.

Stakeholder Tristan Zannon asked when, after a model update, the board would decide whether Ventucopa needs allocations or is not in overdraft.

Stakeholder Byron Albano asked if model improvement #2 would inform the sustainable yield in the VMA or the whole basin. Mr. Ceyhan responded that the 2 ft/year is from the 50-year simulation and a better streamflow simulation will significantly affect sustainable yield estimates for Ventucopa but have a smaller effect on basin-wide yield because wet-year dynamics are more critical there than elsewhere.

Stakeholder Adam Lovgren asked whether doing this Ventucopa work now will reduce the amount of work and cost needed in 2028, or if it will essentially need to be redone then.

Mr. Ceyhan responded that work done now would generally not need to be repeated in 2028 unless new data reveals additional issues.

Director Ellsworth asked about impacts of waiting to complete the model improvements. Mr. Ceyhan responded that postponing the work is acceptable if the board is comfortable

delaying Ventucopa allocation decisions, though a few lower-cost tasks (e.g., isotopes or small watershed module checks) could still proceed earlier.

Mr. Blakslee presented four options: include recalibration in the upcoming budget, defer to the budget ad hoc process, decline recalibration at this time, or wait until the next scheduled model update in 2028.

Director Yurosek commented that the projected costs are significant and questioned whether immediate recalibration is necessary.

Director Grant stated he did not see urgency to update the model before reviewing the final report.

Alternate Ricci suggested that because the model seems inaccurate in this area, Option 2—having the budget ad hoc review and then the board revisit during budget deliberations—makes sense.

Mr. Blakslee clarified that Option 2 would include decision in the current budget cycle, while Option 3 would postpone it to the 2027–28 budget aligned with the 2028 model update. He added that staff will also be bringing other model-related projects (e.g., ET/irrigation efficiency studies) to the budget ad hoc this year.

MOTION

Director Ellsworth made a motion to move forward with option 2 to evaluate during the qualitative assessment. Director Grant seconded, a roll call vote was made and passed with 82%.

AYES: Anselm, Bantilan, Ellsworth, Grant, Ricci, Richardson, Jackson, Young,
Zenger
NOES: Reely, Yurosek
ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: None

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

Mr. Blakslee provided an overview of the options to address new pumping outside the management area and the board direction provided in September 2025. He reviewed the current management actions in the CMA and Ventucopa Management area.

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

Chair Jackson opened the floor for public comment.

Stakeholder Joe Haslett urged the Board to carefully evaluate the impacts of additional regulation. He emphasized the importance of fairness across different areas of the basin.

Director Bantilan commented that the Board must balance flexibility with the responsibility to prevent worsening overdraft conditions. He stated that proactive discussion is necessary before impacts become more severe.

Director Ellsworth asked whether all wells in the basin are currently monitored. Mr. Blakslee responded that wells in the representative monitoring network are measured quarterly, but not every individual production well is directly monitored.

Stakeholder Ann Myhre commented that groundwater level changes do not appear uniform across the basin and expressed concern about broad management actions. She encouraged the Board to consider localized conditions before imposing restrictions.

Chair Jackson closed the floor for public comment.

Director Zenger asked for clarification on the Agency's authority under SGMA to regulate pumping outside designated management areas. Legal Counsel Dominguez referenced the applicable Water Code provisions and stated that the Agency has authority to manage groundwater extraction to achieve sustainability, subject to adopted policies and procedures.

REPORT ITEMS

12. Administrative Updates

a. Report of the Executive Director

i. Report on Fiscal Year 2026-2027 Budget Schedule

Mr. Blakslee provided an overview of the fiscal year 2026-2027 budget schedule.

ii. Report on Water Year 2025 Annual Report Schedule

Mr. Blakslee provided a brief overview of the water year 2025 annual report schedule.

b. Report of the General Counsel

Mr. Dominguez provided an update on his employment at Klein DeNatale Goldner.

13. Technical Updates

a. Update on Groundwater Sustainability Plan Activities

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

b. Update on Grant-Funded Projects

Mr. Van Lienden briefly reported that CIMIS stations are expected to be installed by February.

14. Report of Ad Hoc Committees

Nothing to report.

15. Directors' Forum

Nothing to report.

16. Public comment for Items Not on the Agenda

Karen Lewis provided public comment regarding the allocations framework and the financial impacts to small farms. She described her family’s farming history and stated that, after planting pistachios and lavender, their water needs have increased as trees mature. She stated the GSA has denied a permanent variance and that purchasing water from the pool, combined with extraction fees and adjudication costs, creates significant financial hardship, and she requested the Board consider a permanent option to address impacts to small farms under the current methodology

17. Correspondence

No correspondence was received.

CLOSED SESSION

18. Conference with Legal Counsel – Public Employment (Gov. Code section 54957)

Title: General Counsel

19. 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)

20. Adjourn

Chair Jackson adjourned the meeting at 6:22 PM.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE
 CUYAMA BASIN GROUNDWATER SUSTAINABILITY AGENCY

Chair: _____

ATTEST:

Secretary: _____



O: Board of Directors
Agenda Item No. 8

FROM: Taylor Blakslee, Hallmark Group

DATE: March 4, 2026

SUBJECT: Approve Payment of Bills for December 2025 and January 2026

Recommended Motion

Approve payment of the bills for December 2025 and January 2026 in the amount of \$254,982.

Discussion

Consultant invoices for the months of December 2025 and January 2026 are summarized below for consideration of Board approval.

Expense	December	January	Totals
Woodard & Curran – Technical Services	\$39,834	\$88,096	\$127,930
Hallmark – Executive Director Services	\$12,817	\$27,642	\$ 40,459
Cuyama Orchards – CIMIS Station	\$35,425	\$0	\$ 35,425
Klein DeNatale Goldner – Legal Services	\$6,217	\$17,081	\$ 23,298
Provost & Pritchard – Quarterly groundwater levels	\$4,876	\$9,844	\$ 14,720
US Geological Survey – Stream Gauges	\$13,150	\$0	\$ 13,150
TOTALS	\$112,319	\$142,663	\$254,982



TO: Board of Directors
Agenda Item No. 9

FROM: Taylor Blakslee, Hallmark Group

DATE: March 4, 2026

SUBJECT: Approve Financial Reports for December 2025 and January 2026

Recommended Motion

Approve financial reports for December 2025 and January 2026.

Discussion

The Cuyama Basin Groundwater Sustainability Agency's financial report for December 2025 is provided as **Attachment 1** and the financial report for January 2026 is provided as **Attachment 2**.

The reports include:

- Statement of Financial Position
- Receipts and Disbursements
- A/R Aging Summary
- A/P Aging Summary
- Statement of Operations with Budget Variance
- Fiscal Year 2025/2026 Operating Budget



Cuyama Basin GSA

Financial Statements December 2025

CUYAMA BASIN GSA
Statement of Financial Position
As of December 31, 2025

	Dec 31, 25	Dec 31, 24	\$ Change	% Change
ASSETS				
Current Assets				
Checking/Savings				
Chase - General Checking	1,215,289	2,625,978	-1,410,689	-54%
Total Checking/Savings	1,215,289	2,625,978	-1,410,689	-54%
Accounts Receivable				
Accounts Receivable	568	623,688	-623,121	-100%
Total Accounts Receivable	568	623,688	-623,121	-100%
Other Current Assets				
Grant Retention Receivable	758,352	172,527	585,825	340%
Total Other Current Assets	758,352	172,527	585,825	340%
Total Current Assets	1,974,209	3,422,194	-1,447,985	-42%
TOTAL ASSETS	1,974,209	3,422,194	-1,447,985	-42%
LIABILITIES & EQUITY				
Liabilities				
Current Liabilities				
Accounts Payable				
Accounts Payable	429,940	1,174,024	-744,084	-63%
Total Accounts Payable	429,940	1,174,024	-744,084	-63%
Other Current Liabilities				
New/Repl Well Deposits	0	3,100	-3,100	-100%
Total Other Current Liabilities	0	3,100	-3,100	-100%
Total Current Liabilities	429,940	1,177,124	-747,184	-64%
Total Liabilities	429,940	1,177,124	-747,184	-64%
Equity				
Unrestricted Net Assets	2,022,095	2,346,115	-324,020	-14%
Net Income	-477,827	-101,046	-376,781	-373%
Total Equity	1,544,268	2,245,069	-700,801	-31%
TOTAL LIABILITIES & EQUITY	1,974,209	3,422,194	-1,447,985	-42%

CUYAMA BASIN GSA
Receipts and Disbursements
As of December 31, 2025

Type	Date	Num	Name	Debit	Credit
Chase - General Checking					
Bill Pmt -Check	07/09/2025	1223	HGCPM, Inc.		41,881.43
Bill Pmt -Check	07/09/2025	1224	Klein DeNatale Goldner		34,078.41
Bill Pmt -Check	07/09/2025	1225	Provost & Pritchard Consulting Group		11,231.19
Bill Pmt -Check	07/09/2025	1226	Woodard & Curran Inc		86,576.03
Payment	07/18/2025	25335	Groundwater Extraction Fees:Yeguada Trujillo	165.25	
Payment	07/18/2025	542062	Groundwater Extraction Fees:Grimmway Enterprises, Inc	66,896.75	
Payment	07/18/2025	10608	Groundwater Extraction Fees:JHP Global, Inc	1,771.50	
Payment	07/18/2025	2616	Groundwater Extraction Fees:Tri-County Pistachios	5,450.00	
Payment	07/18/2025	53647	Groundwater Extraction Fees:Cuyama Dairy Farm	1,711.65	
Deposit	07/18/2025			13.20	
Bill Pmt -Check	09/05/2025	1227	HGCPM, Inc.		33,724.66
Bill Pmt -Check	09/05/2025	1228	Klein DeNatale Goldner		18,160.50
Bill Pmt -Check	09/05/2025	1229	Provost & Pritchard Consulting Group		12,886.35
Bill Pmt -Check	09/05/2025	1230	U.S. Geological Survey		13,150.00
Bill Pmt -Check	09/05/2025	1231	Woodard & Curran Inc		73,258.46
Bill Pmt -Check	09/22/2025	1232	Campbell Scientific Inc.		20,267.35
Payment	09/24/2025	84963	Groundwater Extraction Fees:Duncan Family Farms	263.40	
Payment	10/22/2025	44177	Groundwater Extraction Fees:El Rancho Espanol	15.84	
Deposit	11/05/2025			602.07	
Payment	11/14/2025	864	Groundwater Extraction Fees:Lewis, David	246.64	
Bill Pmt -Check	11/18/2025	1233	Daniells Phillips Vaughan & Bock		9,500.00
Bill Pmt -Check	11/18/2025	1234	HGCPM, Inc.		54,312.10
Bill Pmt -Check	11/18/2025	1235	Klein DeNatale Goldner		35,504.59
Bill Pmt -Check	11/18/2025	1236	Provost & Pritchard Consulting Group		8,794.77
Bill Pmt -Check	11/18/2025	1237	Woodard & Curran Inc		87,910.91
Deposit	11/25/2025			3.97	
Payment	12/10/2025	26727	Groundwater Extraction Fees:Yeguada Trujillo	4,791.38	
Bill Pmt -Check	12/16/2025	1238	U.S. Geological Survey		13,150.00
Total Chase - General Checking				81,931.65	554,386.75
TOTAL				81,931.65	554,386.75

* Miscellaneous deposits consist of interest income from Santa Barbara and Ventura Counties.

CUYAMA BASIN GSA
A/R Aging Summary
As of December 31, 2025

	<u>Current</u>	<u>1 - 30</u>	<u>31 - 60</u>	<u>61 - 90</u>	<u>> 90</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
Groundwater Extraction Fees Double H Farming, LLC	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>568</u>	<u>568</u>
Total Groundwater Extraction Fees	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>568</u>	<u>568</u>
TOTAL	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>568</u>	<u>568</u>

CUYAMA BASIN GSA
A/P Aging Summary
As of December 31, 2025

	Current	1 - 30	31 - 60	61 - 90	> 90	TOTAL
Cuyama Orchards, Inc	35,425	0	0	0	0	35,425
Daniells Phillips Vaughan & Bock	0	0	1,000	0	0	1,000
HGCPM, Inc.	12,817	0	17,869	37,428	0	68,114
Klein DeNatale Goldner	6,217	0	20,990	7,609	0	34,816
Provost & Pritchard Consulting Group	4,876	0	702	17,835	0	23,413
Sunridge Nurseries, Inc	0	0	54,055	0	0	54,055
U.S. Geological Survey	13,150	0	0	0	0	13,150
Woodard & Curran Inc	39,834	0	94,029	66,104	0	199,967
TOTAL	112,319	0	188,645	128,977	0	429,940

CUYAMA BASIN GSA
Statement of Operations with Budget Variance
 July through December 2025

	Jul - Dec 25	Budget	\$ Over Budget	% of Budget
Ordinary Income/Expense				
Income				
Direct Public Funds				
Groundwater Extraction Fees	184,110	180,000	4,110	102%
Grant Reimbursements	70,688	72,336	-1,648	98%
GWE Late Fees	1,243	0	1,243	100%
Total Direct Public Funds	256,041	252,336	3,704	101%
Other Income				
Interest Income	619	0	619	100%
Total Other Income	619	0	619	100%
Total Income	256,660	252,336	4,324	102%
Cost of Goods Sold				
Program Expenses				
Technical Consulting				
Adjudication Support	0	19,300	-19,300	0%
GSP Implementation - W&C	76,593	104,498	-27,905	73%
Stakeholder Engagement	50,408	48,600	1,808	104%
Technical Support for DWR	0	5,002	-5,002	0%
Outreach	0	10,552	-10,552	0%
Grant Administration	26,738	30,000	-3,263	89%
Improve Basin Water Use Info	7,256	9,502	-2,246	76%
Fault Investigation	120,963	0	120,963	100%
Other Technical Tasks	45,696	132,000	-86,304	35%
Total Technical Consulting	327,655	359,454	-31,799	91%
Other Technical Consulting				
Monitoring Network	44,499	37,500	6,999	119%
Stream Gauge Maintenance (USGS)	26,300	26,600	-300	99%
CIMIS Station	114,117	60,000	54,117	190%
Total Other Technical Consulting	184,916	124,100	60,816	149%
Total Program Expenses	512,570	483,554	29,016	106%
Total COGS	512,570	483,554	29,016	106%
Gross Profit	-255,910	-231,218	-24,692	111%
Expense				
General and Administrative				
Executive Director				
Board Meetings	56,099	68,300	-12,202	82%
Consult Mgmt and GSP Devel	48,373	25,010	23,363	193%
Financial Information Coor	16,788	23,400	-6,613	72%
Support for DWR/Public Comments	0	7,050	-7,050	0%
Funding - GWE Fees	2,370	0	2,370	100%
CMA Policy and Allocations	231	19,800	-19,569	1%
Outreach	4,439	10,252	-5,813	43%
Adjudication Support	3,484	12,052	-8,568	29%
Water Use Enforcement	0	998	-998	0%
Travel and Direct Costs	2,577	0	2,577	100%
Total Executive Director	134,360	166,862	-32,502	81%

CUYAMA BASIN GSA
Statement of Operations with Budget Variance
 July through December 2025

	<u>Jul - Dec 25</u>	<u>Budget</u>	<u>\$ Over Budget</u>	<u>% of Budget</u>
Other Administrative				
Legal	73,840	125,002	-51,163	59%
Audit Fees	10,500	10,000	500	105%
Printing and Copying	393	2,600	-2,207	15%
Other Admin Expense	2,824	4,000	-1,176	71%
Contingency	0	9,998	-9,998	0%
Total Other Administrative	<u>87,556</u>	<u>151,600</u>	<u>-64,044</u>	<u>58%</u>
Total General and Administrative	<u>221,916</u>	<u>318,462</u>	<u>-96,546</u>	<u>70%</u>
Total Expense	<u>221,916</u>	<u>318,462</u>	<u>-96,546</u>	<u>70%</u>
Net Ordinary Income	<u>-477,827</u>	<u>-549,680</u>	<u>71,853</u>	<u>87%</u>
Net Income	<u>-477,827</u>	<u>-549,680</u>	<u>71,853</u>	<u>87%</u>

CUYAMA BASIN GSA
FY 25/26 Budget
 July 2025 - June 2026

	Jul '25 - Jun 26
Ordinary Income/Expense	
Income	
Direct Public Funds	
Groundwater Extraction Fees	180,000
Grant Reimbursements	72,336
Total Direct Public Funds	252,336
Total Income	252,336
Cost of Goods Sold	
Program Expenses	
Technical Consulting	
Adjudication Support	38,500
GSP Implementation - W&C	209,000
Stakeholder Engagement	97,200
Technical Support for DWR	10,000
Outreach	21,100
Grant Proposals	45,100
Grant Administration	30,000
Improve Basin Water Use Info	19,000
Other Technical Tasks	262,100
Total Technical Consulting	732,000
Other Technical Consulting	
Monitoring Network	75,000
Stream Gauge Maintenance (USGS)	53,200
CIMIS Station	74,000
Total Other Technical Consulting	202,200
Total Program Expenses	934,200
Total COGS	934,200
Gross Profit	-681,864
Expense	
General and Administrative	
Executive Director	
Board Meetings	136,700
Consult Mgmt and GSP Devel	50,000
Financial Information Coor	46,800
Support for DWR/Public Comments	14,100
Funding - GWE Fees	12,000
CMA Policy and Allocations	24,500
Outreach	20,500
Adjudication Support	24,100
Water Use Enforcement	2,000
Total Executive Director	330,700
Other Administrative	
Legal	250,000
Insurance Policies	21,400
Audit Fees	10,000
Printing and Copying	5,000
Other Admin Expense	4,200
Contingency	20,000
Total Other Administrative	310,600
Total General and Administrative	641,300
Total Expense	641,300
Net Ordinary Income	-1,323,164
Net Income	-1,323,164



Cuyama Basin GSA

Financial Statements January 2026

CUYAMA BASIN GSA
Statement of Financial Position
As of January 31, 2026

	Jan 31, 26	Jan 31, 25	\$ Change	% Change
ASSETS				
Current Assets				
Checking/Savings				
Chase - General Checking	899,475	1,573,388	-673,913	-43%
Total Checking/Savings	899,475	1,573,388	-673,913	-43%
Accounts Receivable				
Accounts Receivable	0	623,688	-623,688	-100%
Total Accounts Receivable	0	623,688	-623,688	-100%
Other Current Assets				
Grant Retention Receivable	758,352	172,527	585,825	340%
Total Other Current Assets	758,352	172,527	585,825	340%
Total Current Assets	1,657,827	2,369,603	-711,776	-30%
TOTAL ASSETS	1,657,827	2,369,603	-711,776	-30%
LIABILITIES & EQUITY				
Liabilities				
Current Liabilities				
Accounts Payable				
Accounts Payable	255,082	281,741	-26,659	-10%
Total Accounts Payable	255,082	281,741	-26,659	-10%
Other Current Liabilities				
New/Repl Well Deposits	0	3,100	-3,100	-100%
Total Other Current Liabilities	0	3,100	-3,100	-100%
Total Current Liabilities	255,082	284,841	-29,759	-11%
Total Liabilities	255,082	284,841	-29,759	-11%
Equity				
Unrestricted Net Assets	2,022,095	2,346,115	-324,020	-14%
Net Income	-619,350	-261,353	-357,997	-137%
Total Equity	1,402,744	2,084,762	-682,018	-33%
TOTAL LIABILITIES & EQUITY	1,657,827	2,369,603	-711,776	-30%

CUYAMA BASIN GSA
Receipts and Disbursements
 As of January 31, 2026

Type	Date	Num	Name	Debit	Credit
Chase - General Checking					
Bill Pmt -Check	07/09/2025	1223	HGCPM, Inc.		41,881.43
Bill Pmt -Check	07/09/2025	1224	Klein DeNatale Goldner		34,078.41
Bill Pmt -Check	07/09/2025	1225	Provost & Pritchard Consulting Group		11,231.19
Bill Pmt -Check	07/09/2025	1226	Woodard & Curran Inc		86,576.03
Payment	07/18/2025	25335	Groundwater Extraction Fees:Yeguada Trujillo	165.25	
Payment	07/18/2025	542062	Groundwater Extraction Fees:Grimmway Enterprises, Inc	66,896.75	
Payment	07/18/2025	10608	Groundwater Extraction Fees:JHP Global, Inc	1,771.50	
Payment	07/18/2025	2616	Groundwater Extraction Fees:Tri-County Pistachios	5,450.00	
Payment	07/18/2025	53647	Groundwater Extraction Fees:Cuyama Dairy Farm	1,711.65	
Deposit	07/18/2025		*	13.20	
Bill Pmt -Check	09/05/2025	1227	HGCPM, Inc.		33,724.66
Bill Pmt -Check	09/05/2025	1228	Klein DeNatale Goldner		18,160.50
Bill Pmt -Check	09/05/2025	1229	Provost & Pritchard Consulting Group		12,886.35
Bill Pmt -Check	09/05/2025	1230	U.S. Geological Survey		13,150.00
Bill Pmt -Check	09/05/2025	1231	Woodard & Curran Inc		73,258.46
Bill Pmt -Check	09/22/2025	1232	Campbell Scientific Inc.		20,267.35
Payment	09/24/2025	84963	Groundwater Extraction Fees:Duncan Family Farms	263.40	
Payment	10/22/2025	44177	Groundwater Extraction Fees:El Rancho Espanol	15.84	
Deposit	11/05/2025		*	602.07	
Payment	11/14/2025	864	Groundwater Extraction Fees:Lewis, David	246.64	
Bill Pmt -Check	11/18/2025	1233	Daniells Phillips Vaughan & Bock		9,500.00
Bill Pmt -Check	11/18/2025	1234	HGCPM, Inc.		54,312.10
Bill Pmt -Check	11/18/2025	1235	Klein DeNatale Goldner		35,504.59
Bill Pmt -Check	11/18/2025	1236	Provost & Pritchard Consulting Group		8,794.77
Bill Pmt -Check	11/18/2025	1237	Woodard & Curran Inc		87,910.91
Deposit	11/25/2025		*	3.97	
Payment	12/10/2025	26727	Groundwater Extraction Fees:Yeguada Trujillo	4,791.38	
Bill Pmt -Check	12/16/2025	1238	U.S. Geological Survey		13,150.00
Payment	01/16/2026	2381	Cambell Scientific Inc	1,239.83	
Bill Pmt -Check	01/16/2026	1239	Daniells Phillips Vaughan & Bock		1,000.00
Bill Pmt -Check	01/16/2026	1240	HGCPM, Inc.		55,297.75
Bill Pmt -Check	01/16/2026	1241	Klein DeNatale Goldner		28,598.91
Bill Pmt -Check	01/16/2026	1242	Provost & Pritchard Consulting Group		18,537.00
Bill Pmt -Check	01/16/2026	1243	Sunridge Nurseries, Inc		54,054.53
Bill Pmt -Check	01/16/2026	1244	Woodard & Curran Inc		160,133.63
Payment	01/28/2026	1053	Groundwater Extraction Fees:Double H Farming, LLC	567.50	
Total Chase - General Checking				<u>83,738.98</u>	<u>872,008.57</u>
TOTAL				<u>83,738.98</u>	<u>872,008.57</u>

* Miscellaneous deposits consist of interest income from Santa Barbara and Ventura Counties.

**CUYAMA BASIN GSA
A/P Aging Summary**

As of January 31, 2026

	Current	1 - 30	31 - 60	61 - 90	> 90	TOTAL
CA Assoc of Mutual Water Companies	0	100	0	0	0	100
Cuyama Orchards, Inc	0	0	35,425	0	0	35,425
HGCPM, Inc.	27,642	0	12,817	0	0	40,459
Klein DeNatale Goldner	17,081	0	6,217	0	0	23,298
Provost & Pritchard Consulting Group	9,844	0	4,876	0	0	14,720
U.S. Geological Survey	0	0	13,150	0	0	13,150
Woodard & Curran Inc	88,096	0	39,834	0	0	127,930
TOTAL	142,664	100	112,319	0	0	255,082

CUYAMA BASIN GSA
Statement of Operations with Budget Variance
 July 2025 through January 2026

	Jul '25 - Jan 26	Budget	\$ Over Budget	% of Budget
Ordinary Income/Expense				
Income				
Direct Public Funds				
Groundwater Extraction Fees	184,110	180,000	4,110	102%
Grant Reimbursements	70,688	72,336	-1,648	98%
GWE Late Fees	1,243	0	1,243	100%
Total Direct Public Funds	256,041	252,336	3,704	101%
Other Income				
Interest Income	619	0	619	100%
Total Other Income	619	0	619	100%
Total Income	256,660	252,336	4,324	102%
Cost of Goods Sold				
Program Expenses				
Technical Consulting				
Adjudication Support	0	22,500	-22,500	0%
GSP Implementation - W&C	122,554	121,915	639	101%
Stakeholder Engagement	66,616	56,700	9,916	117%
Technical Support for DWR	0	5,835	-5,835	0%
Outreach	0	12,310	-12,310	0%
Grant Administration	27,253	30,000	-2,748	91%
Improve Basin Water Use Info	16,336	11,085	5,251	147%
Fault Investigation	131,676	0	131,676	100%
Other Technical Tasks	51,316	154,000	-102,684	33%
Total Technical Consulting	415,751	414,345	1,406	100%
Other Technical Consulting				
Monitoring Network	54,342	43,750	10,592	124%
Stream Gauge Maintenance (USGS)	26,300	26,600	-300	99%
CIMIS Station	112,877	62,400	50,477	181%
Total Other Technical Consulting	193,519	132,750	60,769	146%
Total Program Expenses	609,270	547,095	62,175	111%
Total COGS	609,270	547,095	62,175	111%
Gross Profit	-352,610	-294,759	-57,852	120%
Expense				
General and Administrative				
Executive Director				
Board Meetings	69,602	79,700	-10,098	87%
Consult Mgmt and GSP Devel	53,892	29,175	24,717	185%
Financial Information Coor	18,738	27,300	-8,563	69%
Support for DWR/Public Comments	0	8,225	-8,225	0%
Funding - GWE Fees	3,573	0	3,573	100%
CMA Policy and Allocations	416	23,000	-22,584	2%
Outreach	5,548	11,960	-6,413	46%
Adjudication Support	3,762	14,060	-10,299	27%
Water Use Enforcement	0	1,165	-1,165	0%
Travel and Direct Costs	3,101	0	3,101	100%
Total Executive Director	158,630	194,585	-35,955	82%

CUYAMA BASIN GSA
Statement of Operations with Budget Variance
 July 2025 through January 2026

	<u>Jul '25 - Jan 26</u>	<u>Budget</u>	<u>\$ Over Budget</u>	<u>% of Budget</u>
Other Administrative				
Legal	90,714	145,835	-55,122	62%
Audit Fees	10,500	10,000	500	105%
Printing and Copying	3,765	3,000	765	125%
Other Admin Expense	3,132	4,200	-1,068	75%
Contingency	0	11,665	-11,665	0%
Total Other Administrative	<u>108,110</u>	<u>174,700</u>	<u>-66,590</u>	<u>62%</u>
Total General and Administrative	<u>266,740</u>	<u>369,285</u>	<u>-102,545</u>	<u>72%</u>
Total Expense	<u>266,740</u>	<u>369,285</u>	<u>-102,545</u>	<u>72%</u>
Net Ordinary Income	<u>-619,350</u>	<u>-664,044</u>	<u>44,693</u>	<u>93%</u>
Net Income	<u>-619,350</u>	<u>-664,044</u>	<u>44,693</u>	<u>93%</u>

CUYAMA BASIN GSA
FY 25/26 Budget
 July 2025 - June 2026

	Jul '25 - Jun 26
Ordinary Income/Expense	
Income	
Direct Public Funds	
Groundwater Extraction Fees	180,000
Grant Reimbursements	72,336
Total Direct Public Funds	252,336
Total Income	252,336
Cost of Goods Sold	
Program Expenses	
Technical Consulting	
Adjudication Support	38,500
GSP Implementation - W&C	209,000
Stakeholder Engagement	97,200
Technical Support for DWR	10,000
Outreach	21,100
Grant Proposals	45,100
Grant Administration	30,000
Improve Basin Water Use Info	19,000
Other Technical Tasks	262,100
Total Technical Consulting	732,000
Other Technical Consulting	
Monitoring Network	75,000
Stream Gauge Maintenance (USGS)	53,200
CIMIS Station	74,000
Total Other Technical Consulting	202,200
Total Program Expenses	934,200
Total COGS	934,200
Gross Profit	-681,864
Expense	
General and Administrative	
Executive Director	
Board Meetings	136,700
Consult Mgmt and GSP Devel	50,000
Financial Information Coor	46,800
Support for DWR/Public Comments	14,100
Funding - GWE Fees	12,000
CMA Policy and Allocations	24,500
Outreach	20,500
Adjudication Support	24,100
Water Use Enforcement	2,000
Total Executive Director	330,700
Other Administrative	
Legal	250,000
Insurance Policies	21,400
Audit Fees	10,000
Printing and Copying	5,000
Other Admin Expense	4,200
Contingency	20,000
Total Other Administrative	310,600
Total General and Administrative	641,300
Total Expense	641,300
Net Ordinary Income	-1,323,164
Net Income	-1,323,164



TO: Board of Directors
Agenda Item No. 10a

FROM: Taylor Blakslee

DATE: March 4, 2026

SUBJECT: Discuss and Take Appropriate Action on DWR Review of GSP and Periodic Evaluation

Recommended Motion

None – information only.

Discussion

On January 9, 2026, the Department of Water Resources issued a letter requesting additional information as part of its 2025 Periodic Review of the Cuyama Valley Basin, which is provided as **Attachment 1**.

On February 6, 2026, a board ad hoc (Directors Anselm, Bantilan, Jackson, Yurosek, Williams) met with staff and DWR to review a summary presentation of the letter and additional information requests, which is provided as **Attachment 2**.

Staff will work with the ad hoc to develop formal responses for review by the Board on May 6, 2026, prior to submitting to DWR by their requested deadline of July 31, 2026.



CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF WATER RESOURCES

SUSTAINABLE GROUNDWATER MANAGEMENT OFFICE

715 P Street, 8th Floor | Sacramento, CA 95814 | P.O. Box 942836 | Sacramento, CA 94236-0001

January 9, 2026

Taylor Blakslee
Cuyama Basin GSA
4900 California Ave, Tower B, 2nd Floor
Bakersfield, CA 93309
tblakslee@hgcpm.com

RE: Cuyama Valley Basin (No. 3-013) - 2025 Periodic Review – Additional Information Request

Dear Taylor,

The Department of Water Resources (Department) is conducting its periodic review of the 2025 Periodic Evaluation and 2025 Amended Groundwater Sustainability Plan (GSP or Plan) for the Cuyama Valley Basin. The Department is requesting a meeting to explain the need for additional information the Department believes is necessary to inform that review.

During this meeting, Department staff will further specify details regarding each of the topics listed below and discuss the types of documentation and information needed to inform our review. Department staff will work with you to: (1) establish a reasonable schedule for providing the necessary additional information, (2) explain the process for submitting this additional information, and (3) determine whether a follow-up meeting is necessary. The GSA is not expected to respond to the information request during this meeting, nor does it need to prepare a presentation. However, it will be crucial for the GSA to provide the additional information requested within the agreed timeline for the Department to fully inform the periodic review.

Department staff will discuss with you the need for additional information regarding the following topics:

1. Groundwater Levels (GWL) Sustainable Management Criteria (SMC)

- **SMC update justification:** Provide justification for the change in minimum thresholds, measurable objectives, and interim milestones for groundwater levels.
- **Minimum thresholds:** Provide a discussion of how the updated minimum thresholds may impact beneficial uses and users.
- **Relationship with other sustainability indicators:** Provide information regarding the relationship or effects the groundwater level minimum thresholds have with other sustainability indicators.

- **Measurable objectives and interim milestones:** Provide details regarding the process of establishing measurable objectives and interim milestones.
2. Groundwater Quality: Total Dissolved Solids (TDS)
 - **Significant and unreasonable effects:** Explain how undesirable result definition of two years will not cause significant and unreasonable impacts to beneficial uses and users.
 - **SMC update justification:** Provide justification on why it was necessary to update the water quality minimum thresholds.
 - **Minimum thresholds:** Provide a discussion of how the updated minimum thresholds may impact beneficial uses and users.
 3. Groundwater Quality: Nitrate and Arsenic
 - **SMC development:** Provide justification for not establishing SMCs.
 4. Land Subsidence
 - **Minimum thresholds:** Clarify and justify the current minimum threshold that appears to have an incremental 2 inches per year increase.
 - Identification of critical infrastructure.
 5. Monitoring
 - **Coverage and measurements missed:** There are water quality (arsenic and nitrates) monitoring coverage concerns and how the missed measurements for groundwater levels were considered for identifying undesirable results.
 6. Plan Implementation
 - **Management Action 2 – pumping allocations:** Clarify the timelines and the specific actions the GSA plans to take if it does not meet its allocation targets.
 7. Data Reporting
 - **Extraction reporting:** Clarify and justify the use of modelled data over metered extraction data and reporting periods, i.e., water year, calendar year.

In addition, the Department is still reviewing GSA's approach to interconnected surface water, which may require interconnected surface water to be a topic of discussion in the meeting as well.

To schedule the meeting, please contact me at monica.salais@water.ca.gov by January 23, 2026.

Thank You,

Monica Salais

Monica Salais, PE
Supervising Water Resources Engineer
Groundwater Sustainable Review Section Lead
Sustainable Groundwater Management Office

Cuyama Valley Basin 2025 Periodic Review Additional Information

Basin No. 3-013
February 5, 2026



CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF WATER RESOURCES
SUSTAINABLE GROUNDWATER
MANAGEMENT OFFICE

Agenda

1. Groundwater Levels Sustainable Management Criteria
2. Groundwater Quality: Total Dissolved Solids
3. Groundwater Quality: Nitrates and Arsenic
4. Land Subsidence
5. Monitoring
6. Plan Implementation
7. Data Reporting

1. Groundwater Levels Sustainable Management Criteria (SMC)

1. Groundwater Levels SMC

Undesirable Results

- ▶ “This result is considered to occur during GSP implementation when 30 percent of representative monitoring wells ... fall below their minimum groundwater elevation thresholds for two consecutive years.” 2025 GSP, p. 286
- ▶ “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” 2025 GSP, p. 286
- ▶ Department staff cannot tell how an undesirable result is determined.
 - Is it 30% of the measured RMS that exceed minimum thresholds for four consecutive seasonal measurements?
 - Is it when there are 30% of the measured RMS that have 24 months or more of minimum threshold exceedances?
 - Note: This interpretation could mean that there can be 30% or more minimum threshold exceedances but only those with 24 months of exceedances are used in the undesirable result determination.

1. Groundwater Levels SMC

Undesirable Results

- ▶ “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” and “using 24 consecutive months allows the GSA time to address issues, perform investigations, and implement projects and management actions as needed.” 2025 GSP, p. 286
 - As discussed in some of the Annual Reports, because several wells in the Basin are trending towards undesirable results, the CBGSA Board undertook efforts to review wells with threshold exceedances, investigated potential causes of the exceedances, and identified if any domestic or production wells were affected by declining groundwater levels. During the wet WY 2023, several wells with groundwater levels that previously exceeded minimum thresholds recovered to or above these threshold levels. Periodic Evaluation, Section 4.2.5, p. 63
- ▶ Overall, periodic evaluation, 2025 GSP, and annual reports did not provide the level of detail necessary for staff to understand the progress and implementation of the adaptive management actions underlined above (i.e., details as to the impacts, investigations, results of investigations, or specific actions that were taken to mitigate the impacts).

1. Groundwater Levels SMC

Undesirable Results – Impacts to Beneficial Uses and Users

- ▶ The use of the five methods for determining minimum thresholds verses the quantitative undesirable definition (30%) does not appear to be protective of all beneficial uses and users.
 - Example: Beneficial users (that are covered under well protection or GDEs) will have to rely on additional unrelated representative wells (to exceed minimum thresholds) for an undesirable result to be identified.

MT Calculation Method	Number of Wells	Percentage out of Total Wells (47)
Well Protection	12	25%
GDE Protection	5	11%
Glidepath	13	28%
Recent Deepest Measurement	15	32%
Saturated Thickness	2	4%

Undesirable Result Definition Reminder

Qualitative : 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.

Quantitative : 30% of RMS (i.e., 15 of 47 wells) fall below their minimum thresholds for two consecutive years (or for 24 consecutive months)

1. Groundwater Levels SMC

Undesirable Results

Additional Information Request 1:

- a) Provide a detailed explanation for how the groundwater level (and water quality) quantitative definition is to be used to monitor conditions and determine when an undesirable result has occurred. Explain any differences between two years and 24 months. Clarify and provide assurances that future adaptive management actions include sufficient details of the triggering event(s), investigations and their results, and specific actions that were taken.
- b) Explain how the current quantitative definition for an undesirable result is protective of beneficial uses and users. 23 CCR § 354.26(b)(3)

1. Groundwater Levels

Sustainable Management Criteria

- ▶ Undesirable results were occurring between 2022 and 2024 under 2022 GSP sustainable management criteria, and none under the 2025 GSP sustainable management criteria.
- ▶ 2025 GSP minimum threshold changes resulted an average lowering of 36 ft to a max lowering of 235 ft

Year	2022 GSP				2025 GSP			
	Seasonal High		Seasonal Low		Seasonal High		Seasonal Low	
	# Exceed MT	% Exceed (of 60 RMS)	# Exceed MT	% Exceed (of 60 RMS)	# Exceed MT	% Exceed (of 47 RMS)	# Exceed MT	% Exceed (of 47 RMS)
2020	2	3%	21	35%	2	4%	5	11%
2021	21	35%	24	40%	3	6%	3	6%
2022	18	30%	19	32%	3	6%	5	11%
2023	12	20%	15	25%	2	4%	2	4%
2024	12	20%	22	37%	2	4%	5	11%

Source: Data submitted to Monitoring Network Module

1. Groundwater Levels

Sustainable Management Criteria – Justification

- ▶ Regulations require as part of the Periodic Evaluation:
 - ▶ 23 CCR § 356.4(f): A description of significant new information that has been made available since Plan adoption or amendment, or the last five-year assessment. The description shall also include **whether new information warrants changes to any aspect of the Plan**, including the evaluation of the basin setting, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, or the criteria defining undesirable results.
- ▶ “Undesirable results conditions have not been reached within the Basin, however, there have been minimum threshold exceedances. As described in this Periodic Evaluation, the CBGSA intends to revise the minimum thresholds and update them based on new data and the updated model, which is anticipated to provide minimum thresholds and measurable objectives that better reflect conditions and hydrogeologic conditions within the Basin.” Periodic Evaluation, Section 3.1.3, p. 35
- ▶ In 2025 GSP, a new threshold calculation for groundwater levels sustainable management criteria was used, which incorporated new data, potential impacts to beneficial uses and users of groundwater, and variations in local conditions in a consistent manner across the basin

1. Groundwater Levels

Sustainable Management Criteria

- ▶ The 2025 GSP and periodic evaluation does not specifically identify the data that was used to justify the changes from management areas to the five-method approach and the subsequent changes in sustainable management criteria.
- ▶ Additionally, the 2025 GSP and periodic evaluation did not describe the processes used to assess potential impacts to beneficial uses and users or how consistency was applied to the variations in local conditions across the Basin.
- ▶ Overall, the 2025 GSP and periodic evaluation did not explain how the new information warranted changes to the sustainable management criteria for groundwater levels. ^{23 CCR § 356.4(f)}

Additional Information Request 1:

- c) Clarify what new information was used and provide a detailed explanation on how this new information warranted changes to the sustainable management criteria for groundwater levels.

1. Groundwater Levels

Minimum Thresholds: Well Protection Method

- ▶ 2025 GSP provided a stepwise flowchart, but with no explanation on how it was used in practice at the 12 RMS for well protection.
 - Does not provide explanation for how wells were selected at individual RMS, i.e., how far from the RMS well; how more than one well type were handled in the process; and if any wells (domestic, production) were excluded.
- ▶ 2025 GSP did not provide definitions or data used for “Regional Median Well Protection Depth” and “Trendline calculation of known well depths vs. middle screen interval” for production wells.

Additional Information Request 1:

- d) Provide a detailed explanation of how the well protection minimum threshold method was applied for each RMS. What was the criteria for identifying the well(s) being considered at individual well protection RMS? If there were multiple wells (types) that needed to be protected by a single RMS, how were they processed and what is their relationship to the MT?

1. Groundwater Levels

Minimum Thresholds: Well & GDE Protection Method


- ▶ The 2025 GSP indicates that the Well and GDE Protection methods were combined to create a protection interpolated surface
- ▶ Information was not provided in the 2025 GSP on how the data was combined, how the surface was created, or how the surface was used to establish sustainable management criteria at each applicable RMS.
- ▶ Five GDE representative wells were assigned a protection depth of 30 ft bgs; however, the minimum thresholds ranged from 47 to 63 ft bgs.

Additional Information Request 1:

- e) Provide a detailed explanation of how the Well and GDE Protection interpolated surface was created and of how the interpolated surface was used to determine the sustainable management criteria (i.e., minimum thresholds). Provide a discussion on any expected impact on beneficial users (i.e., dry wells) because of the updated minimum thresholds.
- f) Explain how the GDE protection wells minimum thresholds were established deeper than the protection depth of 30 feet bgs and explain how these deeper levels are protective of GDEs.

1. Groundwater Levels

Minimum Thresholds at a Basin-wide Level



Example 1: 120-ft difference

Well	Method	MT (ft bgs)
117	Recent Deepest Measurement	163
118	Well Protection	40
571	Glidepath	142

Example 2: 50-ft difference

Well	Method	MT (ft bgs)
72	Recent Deepest Measurement	373
74	Glidepath	322

Additional Information Request 1:

g) Explain how the individual methods were selected for each RMS and how the different methods may interact with each other across the basin.²³ CCR § 354.28(b)(1) and (4)

1. Groundwater Levels

Sustainable Management Criteria

- ▶ 2025 GSP does not provide explanation for how the other sustainability indicators may have or have not been impacted by this change in sustainability management criteria.

Additional Information Request 1:

- h) Provide a detailed explanation of how the changes to the groundwater level sustainable management criteria will not have an impact on other sustainability indicators (i.e., subsidence, depletion of groundwater storage, water quality, and depletion of interconnected surface water). ^{23 CCR § 354.28(b)(2)}

1. Groundwater Levels

Sustainable Management Criteria

- ▶ 2025 GSP does not provide explanation for how the interim milestones and measurable objectives were established.
 - An explanation was provided in the 2022 GSP, however the content was removed and not replaced with updated explanation for the 2025 GSP updates.

Additional Information Request 1:

- i) Provide the metric and associated data used to determine groundwater level interim milestones and measurable objectives. 23 CCR § 354.30(b), 23 CCR § 354.30(e)

2. Groundwater Quality: Total Dissolved Solids (TDS)

2. Groundwater Quality – Total Dissolved Solids (TDS) Significant and Unreasonable Effects

17

- ▶ The 2025 GSP does not explain how the quantitative undesirable result definition of two years will not cause significant and unreasonable impacts to beneficial uses and users.

Reminder

Quantitative Definition: 30% of RMS (i.e., 9 of 29 wells) fall below their minimum thresholds for two consecutive years (or for 24 consecutive months) (p. 292)

Additional Information Request 2:

- a) Explain how undesirable result definition of two years will not cause significant and unreasonable impacts to beneficial uses and users.

2. Groundwater Quality – Total Dissolved Solids (TDS) Sustainable Management Criteria

- ▶ The 2025 GSP and periodic evaluation explains that modifications were done to:
 - Expand the available data used to calculate each threshold (data from between 2020 to current update)
 - Ensure wells that had very low historic TDS levels were not unduly limited in the event of TDS concentration increases.
- ▶ Including recent data resulted in the minimum thresholds at:
 - 21 sites showing an increase, ranging from 3 to 200 mg/L.
 - Five sites being raised to 1,000 mg/L (Secondary Maximum Contaminant Level for TDS)
 - Three sites being lowered or experiencing no change due to no new measurements since the 2020 GSP.
- ▶ The Plan and Periodic Evaluation do not provide a discussion of how the updated minimum thresholds may impact beneficial uses and users.
- ▶ Overall, the 2025 GSP and periodic evaluation did not explain how the new information warranted changes to the sustainable management criteria for groundwater quality. ²³ CCR § 356.4(f)

2. Groundwater Quality – Total Dissolved Solids (TDS) Sustainable Management Criteria

19

Additional Information Request 2:

b) Provide a detailed explanation on how the new information warrants changes to the sustainable management criteria for TDS groundwater quality. Provide a discussion of how the updated minimum thresholds may impact beneficial uses and users.

- ▶ 2025 GSP does not provide explanation for how TDS interim milestones and measurable objectives were established.
 - 2025 GSP Table 5-2 no longer provides sufficient data to explain the updated sustainable management criteria.

Additional Information Request 2:

c) Provide the data and criteria relied upon to establish the updated minimum thresholds, interim milestone, and measurable objectives (ref: 2022 GSP Table 5-2).

3. Groundwater Quality

Nitrates and Arsenic

3. Groundwater Quality – Nitrate and Arsenic

- ▶ 2020 GSP identified Arsenic and Nitrate as a constituent of concern.
- ▶ June 3, 2021 – Department issued a letter of potential corrective actions (#3 related to water quality).
- ▶ January 21, 2022 – Department issued incomplete determination with deficiency #3 related to water quality.
- ▶ May 25, 2023 – Department issued approval with recommended corrective actions related to Nitrate and Arsenic (pages 14-17 of the Staff Report)
 - RCA #3 had SMCs for arsenic as conditional if a suitable urban supply well for New Cuyama was not installed by 2025. The well has not been completed and no additional details concerning the installation has been provided. Therefore, per the RCA, arsenic SMCs are required.
 - RCA #4 required the establishment of SMCs for nitrates
 - RCA #5 required the GSA to establish monitoring for nitrates and arsenic

3. Groundwater Quality – Nitrate and Arsenic

- ▶ To date, SMC has not been established for Nitrate and Arsenic and activities identified by the GSA to take steps in this direction have not been carried out.
 - Improved Reliability of Water Supplies for Local Communities Project – Project has not been completed as indicated in the 2022 GSP, which Department relied on for past approval.
 - Outcome of baseline analysis for Arsenic and Nitrate has not been confirmed (See Section 4.3.2.3 of Department 2023 Staff Report). Baseline for arsenic and nitrates was to be completed in 2022. However, the project extended into 2023. Repeated every five years.
 - Leverage existing programs for monitoring arsenic and nitrate to supplement when the GSA is not monitoring (sampling every five years). However, the annual reports show the arsenic and nitrate measurements over a range of time, and it is not clear what year each data point comes from.

- ▶ Response between 2022 GSP to 2025 GSP and Periodic Evaluation has not changed.
 - “The GSP discussion noted that the CBGSA **does not have the ability or authority to perform actions to address nitrate or arsenic** levels in the Basin.” – Cuyama Valley Periodic Evaluation, pp. 42-43.

3. Groundwater Quality – Nitrates and Arsenic

- ▶ Additional meetings may be necessary for us to discuss this matter prior to the GSA providing the following additional information.


Additional Information Request 3:

- a) Provide an explanation for the lack of advancement on the development of sustainable management criteria for nitrate and arsenic.
- b) What is the status of the Improvement Water Supply Reliability for Local Communities project, the baselines establishment for arsenic and nitrates, and the establishment of a monitoring network as mentioned in the 2022 GSP which the Department highlighted in the 2023 Staff Report?
- c) Establish sustainable management criteria and a monitoring network for Nitrates and Arsenic.²³
CCR § 354.26(d)

4. Land Subsidence

4. Land Subsidence

- ▶ In light of lowering MTs for groundwater levels, impacts to land subsidence should be re-evaluated.
 - Subsidence BMP provides guidance.
 - The 2025 GSP still indicates the same minimum threshold of 2-inch per year, which allows 6.6 feet of total subsidence by 2040.
 - Department staff are unclear what amount of Total Cumulative Subsidence is considered significant and unreasonable.



Source: Cuyama Valley Basin Periodic Evaluation

- ▶ (Implementation component) The 2025 GSP, annual reports, or periodic evaluation do not explain how the reported rate of subsidence is calculated annually.

4. Land Subsidence

Additional Information Request 4:

In light of changes to groundwater levels sustainable management criteria, explain impacts to subsidence, including:

- How the basin will be able to achieve the measurable objective of zero subsidence,
- The amount total cumulative subsidence which will avoid significant and unreasonable impacts,
- How a minimum threshold of 2 inches per year continues to be reasonable.

The Subsidence Best Management Practices provides guidance on this matter. Also provide an explanation of how the subsidence rate is calculated for implementation tracking clarity.

5. Monitoring

5. Monitoring – Measurements

- ▶ Over the years, the monitoring network has been refined to reflect measurable sites and collection improved (i.e., groundwater levels).
- ▶ Department staff cannot tell how missed measurements are factored into the undesirable results definition. Two different approaches appear to be presented in annual reports:
 - For groundwater levels, missed measurements appear not to be considered.
 - For groundwater quality, missed measurements appear to be considered.
- Example: 72% of the 29 WQ RMS measured annually since 2021-2024 is a lot of missed measurements.

Additional Information Request 5:

- a) Clarify how missed measurements are factored when determining an undesirable result.

5. Monitoring – Total Dissolved Solids (TDS)

- ▶ Throughout the 2025 GSP, annual report, and periodic evaluation documents, TDS monitoring network has been inconsistently reported. Department staff are unclear which wells are part of the network.
 - 2025 GSP Table 4-6 lists 28 total RMS
 - 2025 GSP Table 5-2 and Periodic Evaluation lists 29 total RMS
 - 2024 Annual Report list 29 total RMS, but several wells are different from the 29 identified in the 2025 GSP Table 5-2 and Periodic Evaluation
- ▶ Only the 2025 GSP Table 5-2 and Periodic Evaluation 29 RMS are consistently with each other.

Additional Information Request 5:

- b) Reconcile the list of wells and provide the list of TDS water quality RMS wells; and consistently report on these wells in future periodic evaluations and annual reports.

5. Monitoring – Data Gaps

- ▶ The periodic evaluation mentions efforts to fill spatial data gaps identified in 2020 using funding from DWR’s TSS and SGMA grant programs.
 - There are 22 new wells (Opti Wells 900 to 921) per DWR’s SGMA Portal MNM that may include:
 - Three wells near groundwater dependent ecosystems (GDEs), six multi-completion wells at various locations within the Basin and two existing wells provided to the GSA by landowners for monitoring, which have been added to the groundwater levels monitoring network.
- ▶ Most of these monitoring additions are not clearly identified in the 2025 GSP or periodic evaluation.
 - Only Opti Wells 900 to 907 appear on a map^{2025 Periodic Evaluation Figure 6-1, p. 85}
- ▶ The periodic evaluation states that the new wells have “filled all of the spatial data gaps identified in the 2020 GSP”. However, the new wells are not considered representative monitoring sites and do not have sustainable management criteria established for them.

Additional Information Request 5:

- c) Provide a schedule for migrating new wells, installed as part of the GSP implementation, to become representative monitoring sites with sustainable management criteria.

6. Plan Implementation

6. Plan Implementation

Management Action 2: Pumping Allocations

- ▶ Department staff understand that this management action is the main PMA for the basin.
- ▶ 2025 GSP presents allocations through 2029, which covers the Central Management Area (CMA) only.
 - The 2029 pumping target for CMA is 27,800 AF; goal is to reach CMA sustainable yield of 12,042 AF by 2038.
 - It's unclear to Department staff how allocations from 2030 to 2038 will be carried out.
- ▶ The baselines used to calculate the annual allocations changed between WYs 2023/2024, WY 2025, and WYs 2026 to 2029.
 - It is unclear to Department staff what the baseline was for WYs 2023 and 2024. However, it is reported that there was a targeted reductions of 5% each year (2,000 AF); no annual targets for pumping was provided; actual pumping was reported for WY 2023 (23,455 AF) only.
 - WY 2024 annual report explains that the baseline adjustment for WYs 2026 to 2029 was necessary to account for new management area boundary (additional parcels included as part of farming units) and the updated model. Additionally, the baseline adjustment included a change in the historical pumping period from 2021 used for WY 2025 to years 1998 to 2017 for WYs 2026 to 2029.

6. Plan Implementation

Management Action 2: Pumping Allocations

Overall, periodic evaluation, 2025 GSP, and annual reports did not provide the level of detail necessary for staff to understand the progress and implementation of Management Action 2: Pumping Allocations.

Additional Information Request 6:

Provide what the target and actual allocations through WY 2024 were for Management Action 2: Pumping Allocations and confirm the single baseline for the allocations. In addition, provide details on what the annual targets for reduced pumping will be through 2040. Also, ensure that future annual reports include target and actual allocation reduction results and an explanation for any future adjustments to the baseline.

7. Data Reporting

7. Data Reporting – Extraction Reporting

- ▶ Across annual reports, SGMA Portal annual report tabular data, and the periodic evaluation, groundwater extractions have been reported inconsistently.
- ▶ This information is necessary for our review, to verify Plan implementation is likely to achieve the sustainability goal for the basin.
 - Example: WY 2023 and 2024 groundwater extractions

WY 2024 Annual Report		SGMA Portal	Periodic Evaluation
2023: 49,900 AF 2024: 33,700 AF (Section 3.1)	2023: 34,100 AF 2024: 33,800 AF (Table 4-1)	2023: 49,900 AF 2024: 33,800 AF	2023: 49,900 AF 2024: not reported

- 49,900 AF to 34,100 AF – 46% overestimation but the estimation (model) is reported to be 90-100% accurate
- ▶ The 2025 GSP provided graphs that shows the averages generalized by water year type (ex: Table 2-7, Figure 2-99) rather than measured annual water use data.

7. Data Reporting – Extraction Reporting

Additional Information Request 7:

Provide the measured extraction data for water years 2020 through 2024. If modeled data is the best available for the basin, please provide an explanation of how the modeled data is more accurate than measured extraction data.

In the future, the GSA should be providing the consistent accurate data with the best available science via annual reports, periodic evaluations, and any future GSP updates in a manner consistent with GSP Regulations.

Next Steps

- ▶ Method to address Additional Information
 - ▶ Letter, Technical Memorandum, updated periodic evaluation, or Amendment; method used must include evidence that GSA is aware and has approved the submittal to DWR
 - ▶ Deliverable to be emailed to roy.hull@water.ca.gov and CC monica.salais@water.ca.gov
- ▶ Schedule
 - ▶ Check-In Meeting by first week of March
 - ▶ Response by July 31
- ▶ Contact with Questions
 - ▶ roy.hull@water.ca.gov, CC monica.salais@water.ca.gov



TO: Board of Directors
Agenda Item No. 10b

FROM: Taylor Blakslee, Hallmark Group

DATE: March 4, 2026

SUBJECT: Discuss and Take Appropriate Action on Potential Areas of Overdraft Outside the Central Management Area

Recommended Motion

None, information only.

Discussion

An update on the initial assessment of potential overdraft areas outside the Central Management Area is provided in **Attachment 1**.

Cuyama Basin Groundwater Sustainability Agency

7b. Discuss and Take Appropriate Action on Potential Areas of Overdraft Outside the Central Management Area

Taylor Blakslee

February 26, 2026



Potential Areas of Overdraft Outside the Central Management Area | Background

- On July 9, 2025, the CBGSA Board directed staff to prepare a list of options to address new pumping outside the existing management areas.
- On September 3, 2025, staff presented management approaches and the Board directed staff to continue with basin-wide management while preventing new or expanded pumping outside existing management areas.
- On November 5, 2025, staff provided an overview of the current water use management in the basin according to the GSP and Board policy.
 - Staff provided a reminder of the Board policy that calls for an annual assessment of water use outside the CMA to determine whether further management and potential localized allocations are needed.
- On January 14, 2026, staff presented the approach to for annually evaluating potential increase water use outside the CMA.


Potential Areas of Overdraft Outside the Central Management Area | Background

- The Board directed staff to proceed with the initial assessment to evaluate potential areas of overdraft outside the CMA and determine whether a more detailed analysis or potential management actions are warranted.
- The initial assessment evaluates three criteria:
 1. Groundwater Pumping
 2. Groundwater Levels
 3. Land Use and Well Permitting
- An overview of the initial assessment is provided on the following slides.

Potential Areas of Overdraft Outside the Central Management Area | Initial Assessment

1. Groundwater Pumping:


- Based on 2025 reported groundwater pumping, areas with significant increases in use compared to 2024 are shown in orange on the map.







Potential Areas of Overdraft Outside the Central Management Area | Initial Assessment

2. Groundwater Levels:

- Analysis:** Review change in groundwater levels from previous water year (developed for Annual Report as shown below).
- Determine if a more detailed analysis is required.** Compare each well's annual change to regional average GWL change (defined by three regions separated by the Russel Fault and Santa Barbara Canyon Fault). If a well's GWL change exceeds regional average GWL change, then a more detailed analysis will be performed.





Potential Areas of Overdraft Outside the Central Management Area | Initial Assessment

3. Land Use / Well Permitting

- *Staff is currently working with County permitting agencies to procure well permit information that will be reviewed with the ad hoc, SAC and Board at subsequent meetings.*
- **Analysis:** Map changes in land use (annual landowner reports and current State/Land IQ data set) and new wells including well size/capacity (from County permitting).
- **Determine if a more detailed analysis is required.** If changes in land use result in potential material groundwater extractions, then, a more detailed analysis will be performed.

Potential Areas of Overdraft Outside the Central Management Area | Next Steps

Detailed Assessment (if required)

- If it is determined that increased water use is occurring or likely to occur in the near-term for land outside the CMA, staff will consider the potential options with an ad hoc and full Board.

Implement Management Actions (if required)

- Appropriate management actions will be presented by staff to an ad hoc of the Board and the full Board prior to implementation. Management actions may include, but are not limited to:
 - Establishing a “watch area”.
 - Increased monitoring.
 - Implementing localized allocations.
 - Temporarily restricting pumping from specific wells.



TO: Board of Directors
Agenda Item No. 10c

FROM: Taylor Blakslee, Hallmark Group

DATE: March 4, 2026

SUBJECT: Discuss and Take Appropriate Action on Fiscal Year 2026-2027 Budget Components

Recommended Motion

Board of Directors feedback requested on the draft budget component list.

Discussion

Staff prepared a Fiscal Year 2026-2027 budget component list to guide the development of the Cuyama Basin Groundwater Sustainability Agency's budget, which identifies required SGMA compliance activities, optional items for consideration, and It also reflects prior Board direction to revisit previously ranked projects. The draft budget component list, Attachment 1, includes the draft components and the budget ad hoc committee recommendation (Brian Grant, Mark Ellsworth, and Matt Young) for consideration.

Budget Item for Consideration	Description	Required Score	Staff Recommendation	Ad Hoc Feedback	
Required					
1	Board/SAC Meetings	✓			
2	Annual Report Development	✓			
3	Response to DWR's Review of amended GSP/periodic eval	✓			
4	Monitoring	✓		Collecting data loggers and uploading single monthly point to be consistent with other wells. Not evaluating to achieve static measurement.	
5	Adaptive Management	✓			
6	Groundwater Extraction Fee Administration	✓			
7	Adjudication	✓			
New Information					
8	DWR Subsidence Best Management Practice (BMP) Guidance Document		Include in budget.	Agree with staff recommendation.	
9	DWR Interconnected Surface Water BMP			Don't consider until DWR guidance is provided.	
10	New Legislation (new bills, etc.)	AB 339: Union noticing requirements for contracts.	✓		
Previous Board Direction					
11	Evaluate carryover policy during budget process			In July 2025, the Board considered implementing a carryover policy however, decided to postpone implementation and consider at the next budgeting process.	
12	Consider improvements to allocation exchange policy and evaluate variance pool concept			In November 2025, the board approved a allocation exchange policy for landowners within the CMA including Farming Units. However, the policy was approved as a one-year pilot program with direction for the staff to work with the ad hoc to consider a variance pool	
13	Consider Ventucopa model update during budget process			In January 2026, W&C provided a list of recommendations for updating the model for the Ventucopa area. The board directed the ad hoc to consider the recommendations	
Projects with score <5 to be evaluated during budget process in March 2026					
14	Ventucopa Management Area	Perform model updates in the Ventucopa region as recommended at the January 12, 2026 Board meeting.	7	Include in budget (1/2 of overall cost in FY 26-27)	Reconsider with budget ad hoc/Board after cost estimate.
15	Evapotranspiration Study	Improve crop ET values used in model to estimate pumping.	6	Include in budget (1/2 of overall cost in FY 26-27)	Reconsider with budget ad hoc/Board after cost estimate.
16	Irrigation Efficiency/Methods Study	Investigate irrigation methods and efficiencies in Cuyama and include in the model.	5	Include in budget (1/2 of overall cost in FY 26-27)	Reconsider with budget ad hoc/Board after cost estimate.
17	Infiltration Rate Study	Improve infiltration rates used in the model.	4	Include in budget (1/2 of overall cost in FY 26-27)	Reconsider with budget ad hoc/Board after cost estimate.
18	Reconsider Allocation Policy	Consider allocation methodologies (e.g. historic use, etc.)	4	Do not include in budget.	Agree with staff recommendation.
19	ISW Depletion Study	Perform Analysis to Estimate ISW Depletion Caused by Groundwater Use (per DWR guidance)	✓	4	Guidance not released yet. Consider when guidance document is release
20	Basin-Wide Moratorium on New Wells	Consider developing a moratorium on new wells.	4	4	Considered during Nov 1, 2025 Board, but directed staff to perform annual evaluation of increased water use. Don't include in FY 26-27 budget.
21	Flow Meter Calibration Program	Develop a flow meter calibration program including funding mechanism.	4	4	Include in budget. Agree with staff recommendation.
22	Historical Land Use Update	Land IQ to develop land use estimates for missing years in the model (1997-99, 2001-02, 2004-05, 2007-08, 2010-11, 2013, 2015, 2017) and provide improved data for other years based on improved understanding of land use in Cuyama.	4	4	Include in budget. Reconsider with budget ad hoc/Board after cost estimate.
23	Deep Percolation Study	Review deep percolation assumptions and consider potential	3	3	Captured within Infiltration Rate Improvements.
24	3D Basin Map	Develop 3D geologic map of the basin	3	3	Do not include at this time. Agree with staff recommendation.
25	Land Repurposing Grants / Incentives	TBD	3	3	No recommendation. Consider under existing grant proposal line item.
26	New Monitoring Wells	Install new, dedicated monitoring wells to replace active pumping wells	3	3	Only include if grant funding received. Agree with staff recommendation.
27	Water Age Testing	Perform water age testing using isotopic analysis	2	2	Do not include at this time. Agree with staff recommendation.
28	Irrigation Efficiency Grants / Incentives	TBD	2	2	No recommendation. Don't consider at this time.
29	Santa Barbara Canyon Fault	Further investigations to determine fault location (e.g. north line) and permeability to improve understanding of geology and impact on groundwater flow	2	2	Already performed.
30	Analyze Geochem of Water	Perform Geochem analysis of groundwater wells to determine common sources of groundwater in the basin	2	2	Performed for areas near fault sites.
31	Ozena	Additional investigation (not studied yet) to improve understanding of geology and impact on groundwater flow	2	2	Do not include at this time. Agree with staff recommendation.
32	ISW Sustainable Management Criteria and Monitoring Network	Develop updated monitoring network and SMCs per DWR guidance to appropriately manage ISWs per DWR guidance	✓	2	Guidance not released yet
33	Workshops	Periodic public workshops to educate and received feedback from the public to continue education/outreach/feedback to stakeholders	2	2	Include in budget, but pursue DWR facilitation services. Don't consider at this time.
34	Irrigation Water Run Off Study		2	2	Irrigation Efficiency/Methods study would include this item.
35	Russell Fault	Investigate salinity changes on both sides of fault given water flowing over top to improve understanding of geology and impact on groundwater flow	1	1	Already performed.
36	Improve Reliability of Water Supplies for Local Communities (Ventucopa Water Supply Company Well)	Consider opportunities to improve water supply reliability for VWSC to improve water supply reliability	1	1	No recommendation. Don't consider at this time. CSD's new well already addresses the primary community supply need
37	Flood and Stormwater Capture - Project Feasibility Study	Perform detailed analysis of project pending results from water rights analysis to determine feasibility of stormwater capture project	1	1	Already performed.
38	Prescriptive Burns	Consider a prescriptive burn policy to improve water recharge in the basin	1	1	Do not include at this time.
39	Vegetation Management	Consider a vegetation management policy to improve water recharge in the basin	1	1	No recommendation. Don't consider at this time.

Budget Item for Consideration	Description	Required Score	Staff Recommendation	Ad Hoc Feedback
40	Precipitation Enhancement - Project Feasibility Study	1	Board considered study in March 2025 and decided not to move forward with additional analysis.	
41	Groundwater Dependent Ecosystem Enhancement	1	Do not include at this time.	
42	Irrigation Method Comparison	1		
43	Water Supply Transfers/Exchanges - Companion Project to Flood and Stormwater Capture	0		
44	Newsletters	0	Only include if funded by grant	Agree with staff recommendation.
Optional				
45	Update process for local landowner use surveys		Reconsider with budget ad hoc/Board after cost estimate.	Agree with staff recommendation.
46	Land Use Surveys (Land IQ)		Include in budget.	Reconsider with budget ad hoc/Board after cost estimate.
47	Telemetry in Wells		Reconsider with budget ad hoc/Board after cost estimate.	Agree with staff recommendation.
48	Water Quality Data Collection		Reconsider with budget ad hoc/Board after cost estimate.	Agree with staff recommendation.
49	Evaluation of Promoting Dedicated Monitoring Wells as Representative Monitoring Well (RMW) Sites		Include in budget.	Agree with staff recommendation.



TO: Board of Directors
Agenda Item No. 10d

FROM: Taylor Blakslee / Brian Van Lienden

DATE: March 4, 2026

SUBJECT: Discuss and Take Appropriate Action on Water Year 2024-2025 Annual Report

Recommended Motion

Approve the Water Year 2024-2025 Annual Report.

Discussion

In compliance with the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act, annual reports on basin sustainability metrics and progress on Groundwater Sustainability Plan implementation must be submitted to the California Department of Water Resources (DWR) by April 1st of each year.

A summary of the draft annual report for Water Year 2024-2025 (October 1, 2024 through September 30, 2025) is provided as **Attachment 1**, and the full report is provided as **Attachment 2** for consideration of approval.

Cuyama Basin Groundwater Sustainability Agency

Discuss and Take Appropriate Action on Water Year 2024-2025 Annual Report



Annual Report Timeline

- DWR SGMA regulations require that an Annual Report be submitted each year by April 1st each year
- Staff is requesting approval of the [Annual Report](#)


Data and Model Updates

- Groundwater elevations:
 - Available data collected for all wells in monitoring network through 2025
- Groundwater model update
 - Historical model period is extended through 2025
 - Annual Report model reflects the model updates that were completed in 2025
 - Updated land use, precipitation and evapotranspiration data collected for 2025
 - Updated land use data has been provided for 2025 period by local landowners
 - Data from LandIQ was used to supplement local landowner data

Estimated Groundwater Extraction


- Landowner reported groundwater extractions:
 - 2023: 34,387 AF
 - 2024: 36,118 AF
 - 2025: TBD

- Model estimated groundwater extractions:
 - WY 2023: 34,100 AF
 - WY 2024: 33,800 AF
 - WY 2025: 38,100 AF





Change in Groundwater Storage

- Estimated change in storage:
 - 2023: +9,900 AF
 - 2024: -2,100 AF
 - 2025: -23,900 AF



Updated Groundwater Conditions Figures

Updated Contour Maps were created for 2025 (Spring and Fall)



Salinity (TDS) Conditions Figures **DRAFT**




Figure 5-2: Groundwater Quality Measurements - TDS
 October 2025 Data
 Cuyama Valley Groundwater Basin

▲ < 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		

**Nested well at this location.

Woodard & Curran
 CUYAMA BASIN
 0 1.25 2.5 5 Miles
 Map Created: January 2026

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 5-3: Groundwater Quality Status - TDS
 Years 2022 to 2025
 Cuyama Valley Groundwater Basin

● Below Measurable Objective	□ Cuyama Basin	• Town
● More than 10% Below Minimum Threshold	— Highway	— Creek
○ No available data this period	— Local Road	— Cuyama River

*Most recent values from monitoring wells with multiple observations are shown.

Woodard & Curran
 CUYAMA BASIN
 0 1.25 2.5 5 Miles
 Map Created: January 2026

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





**Cuyama Basin
Groundwater Sustainability Plan—
Draft Annual Report for 2024-2025 Water Year**

Prepared by:



March 2026

This page intentionally blank

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	1
ES-1 Introduction	1
ES-2 Groundwater Levels	2
ES-3 Water Use	3
ES-4 Change in Groundwater Storage	4
ES-5 Groundwater Quality	5
ES-6 Land Subsidence	5
ES-7 Plan Implementation	5
Section 1. Introduction	1-1
1.1 Introduction and Agency Information	1-1
1.1.1 Management Structure	1-1
1.1.2 Legal Authority.....	1-2
1.1.3 Groundwater Sustainability Plan	1-2
1.2 Plan Area	1-3
Section 2. Groundwater Levels	2-7
2.1 Groundwater Levels Representative Monitoring Network	2-7
2.2 Groundwater Contour Maps	2-9
2.3 Hydrographs	2-15
Section 3. Water Use	3-1
3.1 Groundwater Extraction.....	3-1
3.1.1 Landowner Reported Groundwater Extractions	3-1
3.1.2 Model Estimated Groundwater Extractions	3-1
3.2 Surface Water Use.....	3-4
3.3 Total Water Use	3-4
Section 4. Change in Groundwater Storage	4-1
Section 5. Groundwater Quality	5-1
Section 6. Land Subsidence	6-8
Section 7. Plan Implementation	7-1
7.1 Progress Toward Achieving Interim Milestones	7-1
7.2 Funding to Support GSP Implementation	7-6
7.3 Stakeholder Outreach Activities in Support of GSP Implementation	7-7
7.4 Progress on Implementation of GSP Projects	7-7

7.4.1	Project 1: Flood and Stormwater Capture	7-8
7.4.2	Project 2: Precipitation Enhancement	7-9
7.4.3	Project 3: Water Supply Transfers or Exchanges.....	7-9
7.4.4	Project 4: Improve Reliability of Water Supplies for Local Communities	7-9
7.5	Management Actions.....	7-9
7.5.1	Management Action 1: Basin-Wide Economic Analysis	7-9
7.5.2	Management Action 2: Pumping Allocations in Central Basin Management Area	7-9
7.5.3	Consideration of Pumping Allocations Outside of Central Management Area.....	7-10
7.6	Adaptive Management	7-11
7.7	Progress Toward Implementation of Monitoring Networks.....	7-11
7.7.1	Groundwater Levels Monitoring Network	7-11
7.7.2	Surface Water Monitoring Network	7-11
Section 8.	References	8-1

Tables

Table 2-1:	Groundwater Trends by Threshold Regions.....	2-15
Table 3-1:	Basin-Wide Extractions Reported by Landowners.....	3-1
Table 3-2:	Groundwater Extraction By Water Use Sector (WY 2025)	3-3
Table 3-3:	Groundwater Extraction Measurement Volume Methods and Accuracy Table	3-4
Table 4-1:	Groundwater Budget Estimates for Water Years 2023, 2024, and 2025	4-1
Table 5-1:	Groundwater Quality Network Wells and TDS Measurements	5-2
Table 6-1:	Summary Subsidence Trends	6-9
Table 7-1:	Measured Depths to Groundwater Compared to 2025 Minimum Thresholds	7-4
Table 7-2:	Summary of Projects and Management Actions included in the GSP	7-8

Figures

Figure 1-1:	Cuyama Valley Groundwater Sustainability Plan Area	1-4
Figure 1-2:	Cuyama Valley Groundwater Sustainability Agency Boundary.....	1-5
Figure 2-1:	Groundwater Levels Monitoring Network	2-8
Figure 2-2:	Cuyama Basin Spring 2025 Groundwater Elevation Contours	2-11
Figure 2-3:	Cuyama Basin Spring 2025 Depth to Groundwater.....	2-12
Figure 2-4:	Cuyama Basin Fall 2025 Groundwater Elevation Contours.....	2-13

Figure 2-5: Cuyama Basin Fall 2025 Depth to Groundwater	2-14
Figure 2-6: Cuyama Basin Threshold Regions.....	2-16
Figure 2-7: Example Well Hydrographs – Northwestern Region.....	2-17
Figure 2-8: Example Well Hydrographs – Western Region	2-18
Figure 2-9: Example Well Hydrographs – Central Region	2-19
Figure 2-10: Example Well Hydrographs – Central Region	2-20
Figure 2-11: Example Well Hydrographs – Eastern Region	2-21
Figure 2-12: Example Well Hydrographs – Southeastern Region.....	2-22
Figure 3-1: Annual Groundwater Extraction in the Cuyama Basin in Water Years 1998-2025	3-3
Figure 3-2: Locations of Groundwater Use in the Cuyama Basin	3-5
Figure 3-3: Active Pumping Wells	3-6
Figure 4-1: Estimated Groundwater Level Storage Change Between Fall 2024 and Fall 2025	4-2
Figure 4-2: Change in Groundwater Storage by Year, Water Year Type, and Cumulative Water Volume	4-3
Figure 5-1: Revised Groundwater Quality Representative Monitoring Network	5-3
Figure 5-2: Cuyama Basin 2025 Groundwater Quality Measurements – TDS.....	5-4
Figure 5-3: Cuyama Basin 2024 Groundwater Quality Measurements TDS Measurements Compared to SMC.	5-5
Figure 5-4: Cuyama Basin 2022-2025 Groundwater Quality Measurements – Nitrate.....	5-6
Figure 5-5: Cuyama Basin 2022-2025 Groundwater Quality Measurements – Arsenic	5-7
Figure 6-1: Subsidence Monitoring Data	6-9
Figure 6-2: Cuyama Subsidence Raster from SGMA Data Viewer – TRE Altamira InSAR Data – WY2025.....	6-10
Figure 7-1: Well Protection Depth Stepwise Diagram for Production and Domestic Wells.....	7-2

Appendices

Appendix A: Updated Hydrographs for Representative Wells

Abbreviations and Acronyms

AF	acre-feet
CBGSA	Cuyama Basin Groundwater Sustainability Agency
CBWD	Cuyama Basin Water District
CBWRM	Cuyama Basin Water Resources Model
CCSD	Cuyama Community Services District
DMS	Data Management System
DWR	California Department of Water Resources
GSA	Groundwater Sustainability Agency
GSP	Groundwater Sustainability Plan
MoOF	
SAC	Standing Advisory Committee
SBCWA	Santa Barbara County Water Agency
SGMA	Sustainability Groundwater Management Act
SR	State Route
TSS	Technical Support Services
USGS	United States Geological Survey

Executive Summary

§356.2 (a)	General information, including an executive summary and a location map depicting the basin covered by the report.
------------	---

ES-1 Introduction

In 2014, the California legislature enacted the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA) in response to continued overdraft of California’s groundwater resources. The Cuyama Groundwater Basin (Basin) is one of 21 basins and subbasins identified by the California Department of Water Resources (DWR) as being in a state of critical overdraft. SGMA requires that a Groundwater Sustainability Plan (GSP) be prepared to address the measures necessary to attain sustainable conditions in the Cuyama Groundwater Basin. Within the framework of SGMA, sustainability is generally defined as the conditions that result in long-term reliability of groundwater supply and the absence of undesirable results.

In response to SGMA, the Cuyama Basin Groundwater Sustainability Agency (CBGSA) was formed in 2017. The CBGSA is a joint-powers agency that is comprised of Kern, Santa Barbara, San Luis Obispo and Ventura Counties, plus the Cuyama Community Services District and the Cuyama Basin Water District. The CBGSA is governed by an 11-member Board of Directors, with one representative from Kern, San Luis Obispo and Ventura counties, two representatives from Santa Barbara County, one member from the Cuyama Community Services District, and five members from the Cuyama Basin Water District.

The Draft Cuyama Basin GSP was adopted on December 4, 2019 by the CBGSA and submitted to DWR on January 28, 2020. SGMA requires that the CBGSA develop a GSP that achieves groundwater sustainability in the Basin by the year 2040.

On January 21, 2021, DWR determined that the GSP was “incomplete” and recommended CBGSA to amend the GSP to address four corrective actions. To address these corrective actions, CBGSA developed supplemental sections to the GSP and resubmitted to DWR on July 18, 2022. On March 2, 2023, DWR announced that the Revised GSP had been Approved.

In compliance with SGMA Regulations the 2025 GSP Update was developed and approved by the CBGSA in November of 2024. The 2025 GSP update incorporated recent monitoring data, an updated groundwater model, new information and studies, and updated monitoring networks and sustainable management criteria (SMC). The updated GSP was submitted to DWR on January 29, 2025. The jurisdictional area of the CBGSA is defined by DWR’s Bulletin 118, 2013, the 2016 Interim Update, and the latest 2020 update. The Cuyama Groundwater Basin generally underlies the Cuyama Valley, as shown in **Figure ES-1**.


Figure ES-1: GSP Plan Area



ES-2 Groundwater Levels

The Annual Report for the 2025 water year includes groundwater contours for Spring and Fall of 2025, and updated hydrographs for the groundwater level monitoring network identified in the Cuyama Basin GSP. The Cuyama Basin consists of a single principal aquifer, and water levels in Basin monitoring wells are considered representative of conditions in that aquifer. Groundwater levels in some portions of the Basin have been declining for many years while other areas of the Basin have experienced no significant change in groundwater levels. Groundwater levels vary across the Basin, with the highest depth to water occurring in the central portion of the Basin (**Figure ES-2**). The western and eastern portions of the Basin have generally shallower depth to water. Generally, depth to water and groundwater elevation in 2025 have changed a small amount in the central basin compared to 2024 levels with little change in other parts of the basin.


Figure ES-2: Cuyama Basin Depth to Water Contour Map (Fall 2025)



ES-3 Water Use

The Cuyama Groundwater Basin is supplied entirely by groundwater, with minimum surface water use. Groundwater pumping in the Basin is estimated to have been about 38,200 AF in WY 2025. This reflects an increase of about 4,500 AF as compared to WY 2024. (See **Figure ES-3**).


Figure ES-3: Annual Groundwater Extraction in the Cuyama Basin in Water Years 1998-2025



ES-4 Change in Groundwater Storage

It is estimated that there was a decrease in Basin groundwater storage of 23,900 AF in 2025. There continues to be a long-term trend of groundwater storage reduction in the Basin since 1999. **Figure ES-4** shows the historical change in groundwater storage by year, water year type,¹ and cumulative water volume in each year for the period from 1998 through 2025.

Figure ES-4: Change in Groundwater Storage by Year, Water Year Type, and Cumulative Water Volume



¹ 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.

ES-5 Groundwater Quality

Only 86% (25 of 29) of monitoring wells were sampled for total dissolved solids (TDS) in 2025. Eight wells exceeded (were better) than their measurable objective, 17 wells were between the measurable objective and minimum threshold, and no wells exceeded (were worse) than the minimum threshold. 14% of wells were not sampled due to access limitations.

ES-6 Land Subsidence

Observed subsidence rates in the Basin are well below the minimum threshold, and thus undesirable results for subsidence are not occurring in the Basin.

ES-7 Plan Implementation

The following plan implementation activities were accomplished in 2025:

- Implementation of a groundwater extraction fee and supplemental fee, which is expected to generate revenue to cover the administrative costs of the CBGSA for the period from July 1, 2025 through June 30, 2026.
- A total of 14 public meetings were conducted at which GSP development and implementation was discussed.
- The Cuyama Basin Groundwater Sustainability Agency (CBGSA) Board continued implementation of the groundwater levels monitoring network, includes quarterly monitoring at each monitoring well.
- The CBGSA continued to utilize the COD SGMA Implementation Grant for \$7.6 million in funding for implementation activities.
- The CBGSA and Cuyama Basin Water District (CBWD) continued implementation of management actions in the Central management area.

This page intentionally blank

Section 1. Introduction

§356.2 (a)	General information, including an executive summary and a location map depicting the basin covered by the report.
------------	---

1.1 Introduction and Agency Information

This section describes the Cuyama Basin Groundwater Sustainability Agency (CBGSA), its authority in relation to the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA), and the purpose of this Annual Report.

This Annual Report meets regulatory requirements established by the California Department of Water Resources (DWR) as provided in Article 7 of the California Code of Regulations, Title 23, Division 2, Chapter 1.5, Subchapter 2.

The CBGSA was created by a Joint Exercise of Powers Agreement among the following agencies:

- Counties of Kern, San Luis Obispo, and Ventura
- Santa Barbara County Water Agency (SBCWA), representing the County of Santa Barbara
- Cuyama Basin Water District (CBWD)
- Cuyama Community Services District (CCSD)

The CBGSA Board of Directors includes the following individuals:

- Steve Jackson – Chairperson, Cuyama Basin Water District
- Arne Anselm – Vice Chair, County of Ventura
- Cory Bantilan – Santa Barbara County Water Agency
- Mark Ellsworth– Cuyama Basin Water District
- Brian Grant – Cuyama Basin Water District
- Jimmy Paulding – County of San Luis Obispo
- Kyle Richardson – Cuyama Basin Water District
- Deborah Williams –Cuyama Community Services District
- Matthew Young – Santa Barbara County Water Agency
- Derek Yurosek – Cuyama Basin Water District
- Katelyn Zenger – County of Kern

The CBGSA’s established boundary corresponds to DWR’s California’s Groundwater Bulletin 118 – Update 2003 (Bulletin 118) groundwater basin boundary for the Cuyama Valley Groundwater Basin (Basin) (DWR, 2003). No additional areas were incorporated.

1.1.1 Management Structure

The CBGSA is governed by an 11-member Board of Directors that meets bi-monthly (i.e. six-times a year). A General Manager manages day-to-day operations of the CBWD, while Board Members vote on actions of the CBGSA; the Board is the CBGSA’s decision-making body. The Board also formed a Standing

Advisory Committee comprised of nine stakeholders to provide recommendations to the Board on key technical issues which also meets regularly.

1.1.2 Legal Authority

Per Section 10723.8(a) of the California Water Code, the Santa Barbara County Water Agency (SBCWA) gave notice to DWR on behalf of the CBGSA of its decision to form a GSA, which is Basin 3-013, per DWR's Bulletin 118.

1.1.3 Groundwater Sustainability Plan

The CBGSA Board of Directors approved the first iteration of the Cuyama Groundwater Sustainability Plan (GSP) on December 4, 2019. The GSP was submitted to DWR for approval on January 28, 2020.

On January 21, 2021, DWR determined that the GSP was “incomplete” and recommended CBGSA amend the GSP to address the following four corrective actions:

- Provide justification for, and effects associated with, the sustainable management criteria;
- Use of groundwater levels as a proxy for depletion of interconnected surface water;
- Further address degraded water quality; and
- Provide explanation for how overdraft will be mitigated in the basin.

To address these corrective actions, the CBGSA developed the following supplement sections to the GSP and resubmitted to DWR on July 18, 2022:

- Supplemental Section 2.2.7: Basin Settings, Groundwater Conditions, Groundwater Quality performed additional data collection efforts for nitrate and arsenic measurements.
- Supplemental Section 3.3: Undesirable Results, Evaluation of the Presence of Undesirable Results provided additional information regarding the rationale for the criteria used in the GSP to define the point at which Basin conditions cause significant and unreasonable effects to occur.
- Supplemental Section 4.10: Monitoring Networks, Depletions of Interconnected Surface Water Monitoring Network identifies a subset of groundwater level representative monitoring wells for use in ISW monitoring and provides a rationale for their selection and adequate data collection and monitoring for ISWs.
- Supplemental Section 5.2: Minimum Thresholds, Measurable Objectives, and Interim Milestones, Chronic Lowering of Groundwater Levels performed two technical analyses to provide additional information related to the effects of the GSP's groundwater levels minimum thresholds and undesirable results on well infrastructure and on environmental uses of groundwater.
- Supplemental Section 5.5: Minimum Thresholds, Measurable Objectives, and Interim Milestones, Degraded Water Quality provides information on why groundwater management is unlikely to affect nitrate and arsenic concentrations.
- Supplemental Section 7.2: Projects and Management Actions, Management Areas provide additional information regarding the Ventucopa management area and the northwestern region of the Basin.
- Supplemental Section 7.6: Projects and Management Actions, Adaptive Management explains the circumstances of when adaptive management strategies may be also triggered for other reasons.

On March 2, 2023, DWR announced that the Revised GSP had been Approved.

The CBGSA prepared an updated GSP, which was approved in November 2024 and submitted to DWR in January 2025. The updated GSP incorporates newly collected data and updated groundwater model, updated sustainable management criteria, and updates to projects and management actions. The resubmitted 2022 GSP and Updated 2025 GSP are available for viewing online at <http://cuyamabasin.org/>.

1.2 Plan Area

Figure 1-1 shows the Basin and its key geographic features. The Basin encompasses an area of about 378 square miles² and includes the communities of New Cuyama and Cuyama, which are located along State Route (SR) 166, and Ventucopa, which is located along SR 33. The Basin encompasses an approximately 55-mile stretch of the Cuyama River, which runs through the Basin for much of its extent before leaving the Basin to the northwest and flowing toward the Pacific Ocean. The Basin also encompasses stretches of Wells Creek in its north-central area, Santa Barbara Creek in the south-central area, the Quatal Canyon drainage and Cuyama Creek in the southern area of the Basin. Most of the agriculture in the Basin occurs in the central portion east of New Cuyama, and along the Cuyama River near SR 33 through Ventucopa.

Figure 1-2 shows the CBGSA boundary. The CBGSA boundary covers all of the Cuyama Valley Groundwater Basin.

² The 2003 version of Bulletin 118 section on the Cuyama Valley Groundwater Basin incorrectly stated that the Basin area is 230 square miles. The estimate of 378 square miles shown here and in the GSP is consistent with the mapping shown on DWR's GSA Map Viewer.

Figure Exported: 2/20/2024, By: Dhlunt, Using: \\woodardcurran.net\shared\Projects\CA\Cuyama Basin_GSA0011078.01_GSP\wp\p\z_GIS2_Maps\Annual Reports\WY 2023 AR\Introduction\ar_2024_Introduction.aprx




Figure 1-1: Groundwater Sustainability Plan Area

Cuyama Valley Groundwater Basin

Legend	Cuyama Basin	Creek	Local Road
	Cuyama River	Highway	Town

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: 2/12/2024, By: Dhlunt, Using: \woodardcurran\net\shared\Projects\CA\Cuyama Basin_GSA\0011078.01_GSP\wp\z_GIS2_Maps\Annual Reports\WY 2023 AR\Introduction.arx, 2024_Introduction.aprx



Figure 1-2: Groundwater Sustainability Agency Boundary

Cuyama Valley Groundwater Basin

Legend	Cuyama Basin	Highway	Cuyama Basin GSA
	Cuyama River	Local Road	
	Creek	Town	

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, Esri, OpenStreetMap, USGS**

This page intentionally blank

Section 2. Groundwater Levels

§356.2 (b)(1)	Groundwater elevation data from monitoring wells identified in the monitoring network shall be analyzed and displayed as follows:
§356.2 (b)(1)(A)	Groundwater elevation contour maps for each principal aquifer in the basin illustrating, at a minimum, the seasonal high and seasonal low groundwater conditions.
§356.2 (b)(1)(B)	Hydrographs of groundwater elevations and water year type using historical data to the greatest extent available, including from January 1, 2015, to current reporting year.

2.1 Groundwater Levels Representative Monitoring Network

As required by DWR’s SGMA regulations, a monitoring network and representative monitoring network were identified in the Cuyama Basin GSP utilizing existing wells. The current groundwater levels representative monitoring network that was approved by the CBGSA Board is shown on **Figure 2-1**. The Cuyama Basin consists of a single principal aquifer, and water levels in monitoring network wells are considered representative of conditions in that aquifer. The objective of the representative monitoring network is to detect undesirable results in the Basin related to groundwater levels using the sustainability thresholds described in the GSP. Other related objectives of the monitoring network are defined via the SGMA regulations as follows:

- Demonstrate progress toward achieving measurable objectives described in the GSP.
- Monitor impacts to the beneficial uses or users of groundwater.
- Monitor changes in groundwater conditions relative to measurable objectives and minimum thresholds.
- Quantify annual changes in water budget components.
- Monitoring that has occurred on the groundwater level monitoring network since the development of the Cuyama Basin GSP is included in this Annual Report. Collected groundwater level data has been analyzed to prepare contour maps and updated hydrographs, which are presented in the following sections.

In advance of the 2025 GSP Update, the CBGSA Board voted to modify the representative monitoring network to remove two wells for which the CBGSA has not been able to get a landowner agreement. In addition, CBGSA Board approved updated minimum thresholds and measurable objectives that take into consideration beneficial uses and users of groundwater and data collected over the last several years of Basin implementation. These changes have been reflected in the Updated 2025 GSP and in this Annual Report.




Figure Exported: 1/26/2026, By: Kerry Flynn, Using: \woodardcurran\ref\shared\Projects\CA\Cuyama Basin\GSA0011076\01_GSP\wp\p\Z_GIS\Z_Maps\2_Annual Reports\WY_2025\AR\dw_gwlev_dwr.aprx

Figure 2-1: Updated Groundwater Level Monitoring Network

Cuyama Valley Groundwater Basin

Legend

- | | | |
|---------------------------------|--------------|----------------|
| ● Network Well | — Highway | — Cuyama River |
| ▲ Representative Monitoring | — Local Road | — Creek |
| ▲ Non-representative Monitoring | • Town | □ Cuyama Basin |



0 1.25 2.5 5 Miles

Map Created: January 2026

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, Cuyama Opti DB, Esri, USGS**

2.2 Groundwater Contour Maps

The Updated 2025 GSP submitted in January 2025, included contour maps up through the spring of 2024. The previous Annual Reports included contour maps for spring and fall of 2019 through 2024. For this Annual Report, analysis was conducted to incorporate data through October 2025 that was collected by the CBGSA and local landowners. Data was then added to the Data Management System (DMS) and processed to analyze the current groundwater conditions by creating seasonal groundwater contour/raster maps for the spring and fall of 2025 and hydrographs of Basin monitoring wells.

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 groundwater, 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.

Analysts prepared groundwater contour maps under the supervision of a Certified Hydrogeologist in the State of California for both groundwater elevation and depth to water for both spring and fall of 2025.

Each contour map is contoured at a 50-foot contour interval, with contour elevations indicated in white numeric label. The groundwater contours were also based on 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 significant known 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 collected by the CBGSA monitoring program in April 2025 were used to develop the spring contours and in October 2025 to develop the fall contours. It is assumed that these measurements 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.

These assumptions generate 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 groundwater contour maps approximate conditions between measurement points, and do not account for topography. 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 2-2 shows groundwater elevation contours for Spring of 2025. Based on data that was collected by local landowners and the CBGSA. The contours developed using the available data show two general trends in the Basin. First, in most of the Basin, groundwater generally reflects the topography of the Basin. For example, groundwater elevations decrease moving from the highest portions of the Valley in the Southeastern portion of the Basin towards the central portion, and groundwater also travels down slope in a northern direction off of the southern foothills towards the Cuyama River. The second trend and potential exception to the first, is the central portion of the Basin where there is a depression and deviation from the topography (more clearly seen in the following figure). Groundwater levels near the town of Cuyama and slightly towards the east are much deeper and do not match the surface topography. There is also a greater decline in groundwater elevations between the Ventucopa area and the central portion of the Basin.

Figure 2-3 shows the depth to groundwater contours for Spring 2025 and more clearly shows a depression in the central portion of the Basin greater than 600 ft below ground surface. Groundwater levels then increase toward the west reaching depths of less than 100 ft in the western portion of the Basin. These levels align with trends seen in previous contour maps provided in previous Annual Reports.

Figure 2-4 shows the groundwater elevation contours for Fall of 2025. Groundwater elevations show a depression in the central portion of the Basin and a steep gradient between the central portion of the Basin and the Ventucopa area, which is consistent with contour maps for 2015 through 2024 conditions and previous Annual Reports. Contours indicate a groundwater flow down the Basin from south to north before turning east to west generally following the Cuyama River in the central portion of the Basin, with a decrease in gradient through the central portion of the Basin.

Figure 2-5 shows the depth to groundwater contours for the Fall of 2025. Depth to water contours indicate a depression in the central portion of the Basin, and a steep gradient between the central portion of the Basin and the Ventucopa area, which is consistent with contour maps for 2015 through 2024 conditions and previous Annual Reports.

Figure Exported: 2/4/2026 By: Keno Flynn Using: \\woodardcurran.net\shared\Projects\CA\Cuyama Basin_GSA\0011078_01_GSP\Map\Z_GIS\2_Maps\2_Annual_Reports\WY_2025_AR\groundwater_contouring_AR2025_dwg_pvw.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 2-2: Spring 2025 Groundwater Elevation
Cuyama Valley Groundwater Basin


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

Map navigation and metadata:

- North arrow pointing up.
- Scale bar: 0, 1.25, 2.5, 5 Miles.
- Map Created: February 2026
- Logos for Woodard & Curran and Cuyama Basin Groundwater Sustainability Agency.

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: 2/4/2026, By: Keno Flynn, Using: \\woodardcurran.net\shared\Projects\CA\Cuyama Basin_GSA\0011078_01_GSP\Map2_Annual_Reports\WY_2025_AR\groundwater_contouring\AR2025_dhw_gvse.aprx



Depth to Water (feet bgs)

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

**Figure 2-3: Spring 2025
Depth to Water**

**Cuyama Valley
Groundwater Basin**

Legend

- Depth to Water Contour
- Highway
- Well Depth (feet)
- 601 - 800
- - - Approximate Contour
- Creek
- Unknown
- 801 - 1000
- Cuyama River
- 0 - 200
- 201 - 400
- 1001 - 1200
- Cuyama Basin
- 401 - 600



0 1.25 2.5 5 Miles

Map Created: February 2026

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: 2/4/2026, By: Keno Flynn, Using: \\woodardcurran.net\shared\Projects\CA\Cuyama Basin_GSA\0011078_01_GSP\Map2_Z_GIS2_Maps2_Annual_Reports\WY_2025_AR\groundwater_contouring_AR2025_dwg_rvise.aprx





Figure 2-4: Fall 2025 Groundwater Elevation

Cuyama Valley Groundwater Basin

Legend

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




0 1.25 2.5 5 Miles

Map Created: February 2026

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: 2/4/2026, By: Keno Flynn, Using: \\woodardcurran.net\shared\Projects\CA\Cuyama Basin_GSA\011078_01_GSP\Map2_GIS2_Maps\2_Annual_Reports\WY_2025_AR\groundwater_contouring_AR2025_dhw_pvw.aprx



Depth to Water (feet bgs)

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

**Figure 2-5: Fall 2025
Depth to Water**

Cuyama Valley
Groundwater Basin

Legend

- Depth to Water Contour
- Highway
- Well Depth (feet)
- 601 - 800
- - - Approximate Contour
- Creek
- Unknown
- 801 - 1000
- Cuyama River
- 0 - 200
- 1001 - 1200
- Cuyama Basin
- 201 - 400
- 401 - 600



0 1.25 2.5 5 Miles

Map Created: February 2026

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

2.3 Hydrographs

Groundwater hydrographs were developed for each representative monitoring network well 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. A selection of wells from each threshold region are provided below, while hydrographs for every groundwater level representative network well are presented in Appendix A.

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

Groundwater conditions generally vary in different parts of the Basin. To provide a comparative analysis general groundwater trends are provided in **Table 2-1** and are accompanied by hydrographs for an example well in each threshold region. A map of threshold regions is provided in **Figure 2-6**, which also shows the locations of example wells used in each threshold region.

Table 2-1: Groundwater Trends by Threshold Regions

Threshold Region	Groundwater Trend	Example Well(s)
Northwestern Region	Seasonal trends with an overall similar levels seen in the previous water year. Although there are recent changes in land use that have begun to pump groundwater, levels have remained relatively similar over the past water year. Levels are approximately 100 ft above the Measurable Objective.	841 (Figure 2-7)
Western Region	Levels in this region showed a significant recovery due to previous wet water years to within 40 feet of ground surface. Current levels are approximately 20 ft above the Measurable Objective.	571 (Figure 2-8)
Central Region	Levels have historically had a steady downward trend with some seasonal fluctuations. This pattern remains for some wells but with slight bumps correlated with the wet year (Well 91) with trends continuing downward and, in some cases, levels surpassing minimum thresholds. There is some indication of recovery in some wells such as Well 74 where groundwater levels improved and then begin to level off.	74 and 91 (Figure 2-9 & Figure 2-10)
Eastern Region	This region has seen an overall decline over several decades. However, with the wet conditions, groundwater trends appear to be improving consistently and are far above the MO.	62 (Figure 2-11)
Southeastern Region	Levels in this relatively small region decreased slightly during the last drought but have recovered over the past few years and are well above the Measurable Objective.	89 (Figure 2-12)

Figure Exported: 1/27/2026, By: Kerry Flynn, Using: \woodardcurran\external\Projects\CA\Cuyama Basin\GSA0011076.01_GSP\wp\Z_GIS2_Maps2_Annual Reports\WY_2026\AR17_19_groundwater_level_network.aprx




Figure 2-6: Representative Groundwater Monitoring Network and Threshold Regions

Cuyama Valley Groundwater Basin

Legend	Representative Well	Eastern Region	Highway	Creek
	Threshold Regions	Northwestern Region	Local Road	Cuyama River
	Badlands Region	Southeastern Region	Town	Cuyama Basin
	Central Region	Western Region		

WOODARD & CURRAN
GROUNDWATER SUSTAINABILITY AGENCY

Map Created: January 2026

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. Monitoring well data available in the Opti data catalog: <https://opti.woodardcurran.com/cuyama/login.php>

Figure 2-7: Example Well Hydrographs – Northwestern Region




Figure 2-8: Example Well Hydrographs – Western Region




Figure 2-9: Example Well Hydrographs – Central Region




Figure 2-10: Example Well Hydrographs – Central Region




Figure 2-11: Example Well Hydrographs – Eastern Region





Figure 2-12: Example Well Hydrographs – Southeastern Region



Section 3. Water Use

§356.2 (b) (2)	Groundwater extraction for the preceding water year. Data shall be collected using the best available measurement methods and shall be presented in a table that summarizes groundwater extractions by water use sector, and identifies the method of measurement (direct or estimate) and accuracy of measurements, and a map that illustrates the general location and volume of groundwater extractions.
§356.2 (b) (3)	Surface water supply used or available for use, for groundwater recharge or in-lieu use shall be reported based on quantitative data that describes the annual volume and sources for the preceding water year.
§356.2 (b) (4)	Total water use shall be collected using the best available measurement methods and shall be reported in a table that summarizes total water use by water use sector, water source type, and identifies the method of measurement (direct or estimate) and accuracy of measurements. Existing water use data from the most recent Urban Water Management Plans or Agricultural Water Management Plans within the basin may be used, as long as the data are reported by water year.

3.1 Groundwater Extraction

The Annual Report provides both landowner reported groundwater extraction (on a calendar year basis) and modeled groundwater extraction estimates (on a water year basis). Landowner reported groundwater extraction volumes are used to set extraction fees, verify landowners are pumping less than or equal to their allocations, and to validate the groundwater model. Modeled extraction estimates are used to develop the basin water budgets.

3.1.1 Landowner Reported Groundwater Extractions

Landowners within the CMA have been required to report groundwater pumping on a calendar year basis since 2023. The total groundwater extraction volumes reported for each year are shown in Table 3-1 below. [Note: 2025 results will be compiled and included in table and discussion in final Annual Report.] Note that while these quantities are used to calibrate the model, they won’t match exactly with the model reported values below because of the differences between calendar and water year reporting and because the model estimation of pumping is based on land use and evapotranspiration assumptions and may not exactly match real-world results in any given year.

Table 3-1: Basin-Wide Extractions Reported by Landowners

Calendar Year	Landowner Reported Extractions (Acre-feet)
2023	34,387
2024	36,118
2025	TBD

3.1.2 Model Estimated Groundwater Extractions

Water budgets in the Cuyama Basin GSP were developed using the Cuyama Basin Water Resources Model (CBWRM) model, which is a fully integrated surface and groundwater flow model covering the Basin. The CBWRM was used to develop a historical water budget that evaluated the availability and reliability of past

surface water supply deliveries, aquifer response to water supply, and demand trends relative to water year type. For the 2020 GSP, the CBWRM was used to develop water budget estimates for the hydrologic period of 1998 through 2017. An update of the model, including re-calibration based on recently available data, was completed for the 2025 GSP Update and is based on the best available data and information as of September 2023. An assessment of model uncertainty included in the GSP estimated an error range in overall model results of about +/- 10%. It is expected that the model will be refined in the future as improved and updated monitoring information becomes available for the Basin. For the current Annual Report, the CBWRM model was extended to include the 2025 water year, utilizing updated land use, reference evapotranspiration, and precipitation³ data from those years.

Figure 3-1 shows the annual time series of groundwater pumping for the water years 1998 through 2025.⁴ The CBWRM estimates a total groundwater extraction amount of 38,200 AF in the Cuyama Basin in the 2025 water year. This reflects a increase of about 4,500 AF as compared to 2024. Almost all groundwater extraction in the Basin is for agriculture use. There is approximately 200 AF of domestic use in each year, with the remainder in each year being for agricultural use.

The total pumping volume in the basin in water year 2025 was significantly higher than the sustainable yield of 16,800 AF estimated in the GSP. The GSP included a pumping allocations management action to reduce pumping levels to sustainable levels by 2040. See section 7.5.2 for an update on progress made to implement this management action.

³ Precipitation data provided by PRISM was updated and there are minor changes to some historical (pre-2020) data reflected in the water budget results when compared to previous reports.

⁴ Groundwater extraction estimates for years 1998 through 2024 may differ from estimates reported in previous Cuyama Basin Annual Reports due to the model update and re-calibration that was performed for the 2025 GSP Update.

Figure 3-1: Annual Groundwater Extraction in the Cuyama Basin in Water Years 1998-2025




Table 3-2 shows groundwater extractions by water use sector. The primary use of groundwater extractions in the basin is agricultural, accounting for 99% of the groundwater utilized. Urban water use is primarily in Cuyama and New Cuyama for drinking water supply. Groundwater use for other sectors in the Cuyama Basin is minimal.

As shown in **Table 3-3**, the groundwater extraction estimates were developed using the CBWRM model developed by the CBGSA. The model uses crop acreage from local landowners and LandIQ to estimate crop demands.

Table 3-2: Groundwater Extraction By Water Use Sector (WY 2025)

Groundwater Extraction Sector	Total Water Use (Acre-feet)
Agricultural	38,000
Urban	200
Industrial	0
Managed Wetlands	0
Managed Recharge	0
Native Vegetation	0
Other	0
Total	38,200

Table 3-3: Groundwater Extraction Measurement Volume Methods and Accuracy Table

Groundwater Extraction Volume	Measurement Type	Method Description	Accuracy	Accuracy Description
38,200	CBRWM	Indirect estimate of groundwater extraction based upon a calculated demand. Crop demand is estimated using locally reported crops per field with the spatial support of LandIQ.	+/-10%	CBWRM utilizes available land use, precipitation, evapotranspiration, soil survey, geological survey, population and per-capita water use data in the subbasin. Since the primary water use sector is agriculture, LandIQ was correlated with local survey data to better estimate crop demand.

Figure 3-2 shows the locations where groundwater is applied in the Basin. The locations of groundwater use have not changed significantly since completion of the GSP.

Figure 3-3: Shows the active pumping wells within the Cuyama Basin Boundary.

3.2 Surface Water Use

Figure 3-2 shows some specific land areas in which landowners reported that surface water was supplied. In addition, there are some areas that are supplied by small seeps and washes but are not shown on the figure. However, overall surface water use in the Cuyama Basin was unmeasured and minimal in quantity during the reporting period.

3.3 Total Water Use

Since there is minimal surface water use in the Cuyama Basin, the total water use equals the groundwater extraction in each year, as shown in Section 3.1.

Figure Exported: 2/17/2026, By: Dhlunt, Using: WoodardCurran net\shared\Projects\CA Cuyama Basin_GSA00011078_01_GSP\wp\z_GIS\2_Maps\2_Annual Reports\WY 2025 AR\and\use_and\use_water\Source\historical_land_use.aprx




Figure 3-2: Land Use by Water Source

Cuyama Valley Groundwater Basin

Legend

- Irrigated by Surface Water*
- Irrigated by Surface and Groundwater*
- Irrigated by Groundwater
- Highway
- Local Road
- Town
- Cuyama River
- Creek
- Cuyama Basin

*Some areas are supplied by small seeps and washes and are not designated as surface water on the map.



0 1.25 2.5 5 Miles

Map Created: February 2026

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. Water source from 2024 LandIQ and locally reported 2025 land use data.

Figure Exported: 12/26/2023 By: DHunt Using: \woodardcurran\external\Projects\CA\Cuyama Basin_GSA\011078.01_GSP\wip\Z_GIS2_Map\2023_GSP_Update\01_Agency_Info_Plan Area_Combiactive_opti_wells_active_opti_wells.aprx




Figure 3-3: Active Wells in Network
Cuyama Valley Groundwater Basin

Legend	Well Type	— Highway	— Cuyama River
	● Domestic	— Local Road	— Creek
	● Production	● Town	□ Cuyama Basin
	● Public		

N

Woodard & Curran

CUYAMA BASIN
GROUNDWATER SUSTAINABILITY AGENCY

0 1.25 2.5 5 Miles

Map Created: December 2023

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

Section 4. Change in Groundwater Storage

§356.2 (b) (5)	Change in groundwater in storage shall include the following:
§356.2 (b) (5) (A)	Change in groundwater in storage maps for each principal aquifer in the basin.
§356.2 (b) (5) (B)	A graph depicting water year type, groundwater use, the annual change in groundwater in storage, and the cumulative change in groundwater in storage for the basin based on historical data to the greatest extent available, including from January 1, 2015, to the current reporting year.


Figure 4-1 shows contours of the estimated change in groundwater levels in the Cuyama Basin between fall 2024 and fall 2025. The changes shown are based on historical measurements of groundwater elevations in Cuyama Basin representative wells that have recorded measurements in the fall period of each year. These contours are useful at the planning level for understanding groundwater levels across the Basin, and to identify general horizontal gradients and regional groundwater level trends. Additionally, the changes in groundwater levels as represented in **Figure 4-1** are influenced by the period range of sampling, local hydrologic and geologic conditions, localized groundwater extraction, and precipitation events. The contour map is not indicative of exact values across the Basin because groundwater contour maps approximate conditions between measurement points, and do not account for topography. The methodology behind the production of **Figure 4-1** has been updated as compared to previous versions. First, all measurements from multi-completion (or multi-depth) wells are no longer included in the figure, only the shallowest completion data is provided. This removes conflicting data from wells experiencing vertical gradients and provides more accurate storage data. In addition, the contours and symbology were updated so that storage changes between -5 and 5 feet are shown together as representing a range of nominal positive or negative change during the year.

The CBWRM model was used to develop a quantitative estimate of the annual change in groundwater storage. The CBWRM model was used to estimate the full groundwater budget for each year in the Cuyama Basin, which consists of a single principal aquifer. The estimated values for each water budget component in each of the past three years are shown in **Table 4-1**. The CBWRM estimates an increase in groundwater storage of 9,900 AF in 2023, a reduction of 2,100 AF in 2024, and a reduction of 23,900 in 2025.

Table 4-1: Groundwater Budget Estimates for Water Years 2023, 2024, and 2025

Component	Water Year 2023 (AFY)	Water Year 2024 (AFY)	Water Year 2025 (AFY)
Inflows			
Deep percolation	26,900	21,300	10,500
Stream seepage	11,800	8,100	2,200
Subsurface inflow	5,300	2,300	1,600
Total Inflow	44,000	31,700	14,300
Outflow			
Groundwater pumping	34,100	33,800	38,200
Total Outflow	34,100	33,800	38,200
Change in Storage	+9,900	-2,100	-23,900

Figure Exported: 2/18/2026, By: Dhlunt, Using: Woodwardcurran.net\shared\Projects\CA\Cuyama Basin_GSA0011078.01_GSP\Wpiz_GIS2_Maps2_Annual Reports\WY 2025 AR\groundwater_contouring\AR2025_dwg_gwv.aprx



Change in Groundwater Level (feet)

- < -10
- 10 to -5
- 5 to 5
- 5 to 10
- 10 to 20
- > 20

Figure 4-1: Groundwater Level Change - Fall 2024 to Fall 2025

Cuyama Valley Groundwater Basin

Legend

- Measurement Well
- Cuyama Basin
- Highway

GWL difference was calculated from wells with measurements collected in both October 2024 and 2025. Opti ID numbers are located underneath the difference in groundwater level (feet) label - refer to individual well hydrographs for a more informative view of GWL change.

N





0 1.25 2.5 5 Miles

Map Created: February 2026

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 4-2 shows the historical change in groundwater storage by year, water year type,⁵ and cumulative water volume in each year for the period from 1998 through 2025.⁶ The change in groundwater storage in each year was estimated by the CBWRM model. The color of bar for each year of change in storage correlates with a water year type defined by Basin precipitation.

Figure 4-2: Change in Groundwater Storage by Year, Water Year Type, and Cumulative Water Volume



⁵ 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.

⁶ Groundwater storage change estimates for years 1998 through 2024 may differ from estimates reported in previous Cuyama Basin Annual Reports due to model updates using the most recent land use data.

Section 5. Groundwater Quality

As discussed in Section 4.8 of the Cuyama GSP, the CBGSA's groundwater quality network is designed to monitor salinity levels (as total dissolved solids (TDS)). In 2023 a comprehensive review of the groundwater quality network was conducted after three years of annual sampling for TDS had been performed. Wells were evaluated with respect to the following issues: lack of landowner agreements for monitoring, access issues at well sites, access issues due to weather. Based on this analysis, the CBGSA board approved a revised water quality network in November 2023, which includes 29 representative wells and 12 non-representative wells, is shown in **Figure 5-1**. This revised network will take effect when the 2025 GSP Update is complete and will provide adequate coverage in the Basin while ensuring continued and consistent monitoring during the GSP implementation period.

In 2025, the CBGSA collected TDS measurements at 25 of the 29 representative wells (86%) in the groundwater quality monitoring network. The results are listed in **Table 5-1** and shown on **Figure 5-2**. Of the 25 representative wells measured in water year 2025, eight wells were lower (i.e. better) than their measurable objective, 17 wells were between the measurable objective and minimum threshold, and no wells exceeded the minimum threshold. 14% of wells were not sampled due to limitations in gaining access to well sites. Water quality results (as compared to minimum thresholds) can be found in **Table 5-1** and **Figure 5-3**. While TDS levels are relatively high in many parts of the Basin, they are consistent with historical measurements and therefore do not exceed the minimum thresholds established in the GSP. The CBGSA will continue to sample for TDS on an annual basis and will assess the appropriateness of sustainability criteria for TDS in the future.

The CBGSA conducts its own sampling for nitrate and arsenic once every five years. In the interim years the CBGSA leverages existing monitoring programs for nitrate and arsenic through California State Water Resource Control Board Groundwater Ambient Monitoring and Assessment (GAMA) Database, which includes in particular data from the Central Coast Regional Water Board's Irrigated Lands Program for nitrates as part of its database. Nitrate and arsenic data are shown on **Figure 5-4** for nitrate and on **Figure 5-5** for arsenic. These maps include data downloaded from GAMA and the sampling results from the CBGSA's sampling for these constituents conducted in 2022 and reported in the WY 2022 Annual Report. Because few measurements were available for WY 2023 through WY 2025, these maps include data for water years 2022 through 2025 in order to provide a more complete picture of the presence of each constituent in the Cuyama Basin.

These recent measurements for nitrate and arsenic can be compared to those that were reported in the 2025 GSP for the 2010-2020 period for nitrate (GSP Figure 2-80) and for arsenic (GSP Figure 2-81) to assess what changes may have occurred. As reported in the GSP, from 2010-2020, there were multiple wells with nitrate concentrations over the MCL, mostly located in the central part of the Basin. The more recent data from 2022-2025 shows fewer wells with high nitrate concentrations; these wells are also located in the central part of the Basin. For arsenic, both the data from 2010-2020 and that from 2022-2025 show high concentrations in wells located just south and east of New Cuyama. Therefore, the available data indicates that the wells with high concentrations of both nitrate and arsenic are at similar locations to historical measurements.

The CBGSA will continue to rely on these third-party sources as described in Chapter 2 of the 2025 GSP.

Table 5-1: Groundwater Quality Network Wells and TDS Measurements

Opti ID	TDS						
	Date	Measurement (mg/L)	MO (mg/L)	MT (mg/L)	MT Status	2025 Interim Milestone (mg/L)	Interim Milestone Status
61	-	-	585	1000	-	896	-
72	10/3/2025	895	900	1106	Below MO	1055	Below IM
74	10/3/2025	1340	1310	1872	Below MT	1732	Below IM
77	10/20/2025	1164	1120	1682	Below MT	1542	Below IM
79	10/2/2025	1620	1500	2318	Below MT	2114	Below IM
83	10/2/2025	1040	1120	1816	Below MO	1642	Below IM
88	12/3/2025	349	320	1000	Below MT	830	Below IM
90	10/2/2025	1170	1400	1596	Below MO	1547	Below IM
91	10/20/2025	1057	1020	1558	Below MT	1424	Below IM
95	10/2/2025	1340	1340	1950	Below MT	1798	Below IM
96	10/2/2025	1240	1100	1676	Below MT	1532	Below IM
99	10/3/2025	1100	1140	1658	Below MO	1529	Below IM
101	10/2/2025	1310	1210	1735	Below MT	1604	Below IM
102	10/2/2025	1660	1500	2551	Below MT	2288	Below IM
157	-	-	1360	2468	-	2191	-
204	12/3/2025	369	380	1000	Below MO	845	Below IM
242	10/2/2025	598	780	1656	Below MO	1437	Below IM
316	10/20/2025	1106	1060	1524	Below MT	1408	Below IM
317	10/20/2025	1120	692	1444	Below MT	1256	Below IM
322	10/3/2025	1220	1140	1504	Below MT	1413	Below IM
324	10/3/2025	749	740	1000	Below MT	935	Below IM
325	10/3/2025	1090	1070	1687	Below MT	1533	Below IM
420	10/20/2025	1119	1080	1560	Below MT	1440	Below IM
421	10/20/2025	1394	1280	1761	Below MT	1640	Below IM
424	10/3/2025	1230	1260	1658	Below MO	1559	Below IM
467	10/2/2025	926	1070	1846	Below MO	1652	Below IM
568	10/2/2025	931	860	1118	Below MT	1054	Below IM
841	-	-	561	1000	-	890	-
845	-	-	1250	1250	-	1250	-

Figure Exported: 2/17/2026, By: Dhlunt, Using: \\woodardcurran.net\shared\Projects\CA\Cuyama Basin_GSA00011078.01_GSP\wp\p\GIS2_Maps\2_Annual Reports\WY 2025 AR\groundwater_quality\groundwater_quality.aprx




Figure 5-1: Groundwater Quality Monitoring Network

Cuyama Valley Groundwater Basin

Legend

- ▲ Non-representative Monitoring
- Representative Monitoring
- Creek
- Cuyama River
- Local Road
- Highway
- Town
- Cuyama Basin



0 1.25 2.5 5 Miles

Map Created: February 2026

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: 1/27/2026, By: Kerry Flynn, Using: \\woodardcurran.net\shared\Projects\CA\Cuyama Basin\GSA0011076.01_GSP\wp\Z_GIS\2_Maps\2_Annual Reports\WY_2025\AR\groundwater_quality\groundwater_quality.aprx




Figure 5-2: Groundwater Quality Measurements - TDS
 October 2025 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		

**Nestled well at this location.

N




0 1.25 2.5 5 Miles

Map Created: January 2026

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: 1/27/2026, By: Kerry Flynn, Using: \\woodardcurran.net\shared\Projects\CA\Cuyama Basin\GSA0011076.01_GSP\wp\Z_GIS2_Maps\2_Annual Reports\WY_2025 AR\groundwater_quality\groundwater_quality.aprx




Figure 5-3: Groundwater Quality Status - TDS
 Years 2022 to 2025
Cuyama Valley Groundwater Basin

Legend	● Below Measurable Objective	Cuyama Basin	● Town
	● More than 10% Below Minimum Threshold	Highway	Creek
	○ No available data this period	Local Road	Cuyama River

*Most recent values from monitoring wells with multiple observations are shown.

0 1.25 2.5 5 Miles

Map Created: January 2026

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: 1/13/2026, By: Kerry Flynn, Using: \woodardcurran\ref\shared\Projects\CA\Cuyama Basin\GSA0011076.01_GSP\wp\Z_GIS\Z_Maps\2_Annual Reports\WY_2024 AR\groundwater_quality\groundwater_quality.aprx




Figure 5-4: Groundwater Quality Measurements - Nitrate as NO3-N
 Years 2022 to 2025
Cuyama Valley Groundwater Basin


Legend	0 - 5 mg/L	8 - 10 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
	*Most recent values from monitoring wells with multiple observations are shown.			

0 1.25 2.5 5 Miles

Map Created: January 2026

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: 1/13/2026, By: Kerry Flynn, Using: \woodardcurran\ref\shared\Projects\CA\Cuyama Basin\GSA0011076.01_GSP\wp\Z_GIS2_Maps2_Annual Reports\WY_2024\AR\groundwater_quality\groundwater_quality.aprx



Well Depth (feet bgs)	Arsenic (µg/L)
60	6.3
215	4.2
375	6

Well Depth (feet bgs)	Arsenic (µg/L)
535	54
670	45

Well Depth (feet bgs)	Arsenic (µg/L)
380	2.6
560	9.5
750	33
850	49

Well Depth (feet bgs)	Arsenic (µg/L)
315	ND
410	ND
580	ND

Figure 5-5: Groundwater Quality Measurements - Arsenic
 Years 2022 to 2025
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

*Most recent values from monitoring wells with multiple observations are shown. **Nested well at this location.

N

0 1.25 2.5 5 Miles

Woodard & Curran

CUYAMA BASIN
GROUNDWATER SUSTAINABILITY AGENCY

Map Created: January 2026

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**

Section 6. Land Subsidence

Section 4.9 of the Cuyama Basin GSP describes the monitoring network for land subsidence in the Basin, which is composed of five continuous geographic positioning system (CGPS) stations in and around the Basin to monitor lateral and vertical ground movements. Two of the five stations, the Cuyama Valley High School (CUHS) and the Ventucopa (VCST) stations, are within the Basin boundary. The other three stations are outside of the Basin and provide data comparative data for vertical movements that are more likely related to tectonic displacement rather than land subsidence.

The undesirable result for subsidence, as described in Section 3.2.5, is detected when 30 percent of representative subsidence monitoring sites (i.e. 1 of 2 sites) exceed the minimum threshold for subsidence over two years. The minimum threshold for subsidence, as defined in GSP Section 5.6.3, is 2 inches per year.

At the time the GSP was submitted in 2020, subsidence rates for the CUHS station were -0.56 inches per year. As shown in **Figure 6-1** data through 2025 was downloaded from the USGS Earthquakes Hazards Program, Central California Network⁷. Data was formerly downloaded from UNAVCO⁸ and the subsidence trend for CUHS was recalculated. Subsidence rates for the last few years have shown positive or near no change in ground surface elevation. USGS applied a manual adjustment in 2024 (clear shown by the jump up in vertical displacement) for station CUHS⁹. Other stations have also had historical data sets updated or edited while using the new online interface⁷. To use a conservative analysis, “Trended” data for each station is downloaded and analyzed and shown in **Figure 6-1**.

Subsidence rates are calculated by taking the rate of subsidence for the current and previous water years (two-year time span) and calculating the slope of the rate over that period. Because USGS applied a manual adjustment in 2024, this slope for CUHS was calculated to be a positive 4.02 inches over the last two water years. However, because of the manual adjustment, this could be seen as a misrepresentation of the rates of subsidence and an artifact of USGS’s data correction. Therefore, the CBGSA has for this Annual Report “removed” that adjustment in 2024 and normalized the data. This was done by:

1. Identifying the date of the manual adjustment = April 5, 2024.
2. Finding the difference between 4/4/2024 and 4/5/2024 and using this as the vertical displacement manual adjustment value. This difference = -0.29724 inches.
3. Taking all data from 4/5/2024 through the end of WY 2025 (9/30/2025) and manual adjusting that data by the -0.29724 so that the points simulate a non-corrected trend over the rate evaluation period
4. Recalculating the slope with the “non-adjusted” data over that time. Found to be 0.15 inches per year.

Applying this adjustment results in a more realistic estimate of the rate of subsidence for the period of interest presented in this report.

⁷ https://earthquake.usgs.gov/monitoring/gps/CentralCalifornia_ITRF2014/.

⁸ <https://www.unavco.org/data/web-services/documentation/documentation.html#!/GNSS47GPS/getPositionByStationId>

⁹ https://earthquake.usgs.gov/monitoring/gps/CentralCalifornia_ITRF2014/cuhs


Table 6-1 shows the summary trends and statistics for the subsidence monitoring stations within the Basin. Several different comparisons are shown for transparency, however, the rate over the last two WYs is used to assess whether URs are occurring.

All current rates are below the minimum threshold, and thus undesirable results for subsidence are not occurring in the Basin.

Table 6-1: Summary Subsidence Trends


Station	Rate of Subsidence – All Records	Rate of Subsidence – WY 2024 & 2025	MT (in/yr)	MT Exceedance?
CUHS (with USGS Adjustment)	-0.62	+2.01	-2	No
CUHS (without USGS Adjustment)	N/A	+0.07	-2	No
VCST	+0.17	+0.31	-2	No

Figure 6-1: Subsidence Monitoring Data



Additional subsidence data is available through TRE Altamira InSAR Dataset from DWR, which was used to verify that no detrimental or drastic changes had occurred. Raster results for the change over the water year are presented in **Figure 6-2** and show no discernable change (between -0.1 and +0.1 feet) in any part of the Basin over that period.

Figure 6-2: Cuyama Subsidence Raster from SGMA Data Viewer – TRE Altamira InSAR Data – WY2025



Section 7. Plan Implementation

§356.2 (c)	A description of progress toward implementing the Plan, including achieving interim milestones, and implementation of projects or management actions since the previous annual report.
------------	--

This section describes management activities taken by the CBGSA to implement the Cuyama Basin GSP from adoption of the GSP through preparation of this Annual Report.

7.1 Progress Toward Achieving Interim Milestones

Since the original GSP was adopted by the CBGSA Board recently and CBGSA data collection efforts began in the second half of 2020, progress toward achieving interim milestones is in its early stages.

To track changes in groundwater conditions and the Basins progress towards sustainability, the GSA compiles a quarterly groundwater condition reports based on the data collected to monitoring groundwater levels. Current data collection occurs quarterly with corresponding reports. Data collection prior to 2022 was conducted monthly, but the CBGSA determined quarterly data collection was sufficient after a full year of monthly monitoring had been performed.

The Updated 2025 GSP included a reevaluation of thresholds for the groundwater level sustainability indicator, as described in Section 5 (Minimum Thresholds, Measurable Objectives, and Interim Milestones). As described in the 2025 GSP Update, the minimum threshold calculation now 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 RMW 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 7-1).
 - b. **GDE Protection Depth:** 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 utilize the same data type (points instead of polygons) in the processing required for the protection depth calculation.




Figure 7-1: 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 for the 2025 GSP) 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
3. Then find the shallower value between Step 2a, the WPD and the GDE protection depth

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). As of October 2025, 2% of representative wells (1 of 46) was below the minimum threshold ([Cuyama Groundwater Conditions Report](#), pg. 1). Undesirable results conditions have therefore not been met.

Cuyama Basin Groundwater Sustainability Plan—
Draft 2024-2025 WY Annual Report

Table 7-1: Measured Depths to Groundwater Compared to 2025 Minimum Thresholds

Well	Region	Depth to Water (feet)	Measurement Month	Minimum Threshold	Status
72	Central	142	October 2025	373	Above Measurable Objective
74	Central	240	October 2025	322	Above Measurable Objective
77	Central	501	October 2025	514	More than 10% above Minimum Threshold
91	Central	683	October 2025	730	More than 10% above Minimum Threshold
95	Central	588	October 2025	597	More than 10% above Minimum Threshold
96	Central	341	October 2025	369	Above Measurable Objective
99	Central	309	October 2025	379	Above Measurable Objective
102	Central	375	October 2025	470	Above Measurable Objective
103	Central	229	October 2025	379	Above Measurable Objective
112	Central	83	October 2025	102	Above Measurable Objective
114	Central	47	October 2025	58	Above Measurable Objective
316	Central	685	October 2025	731	More than 10% above Minimum Threshold
317	Central	683	October 2025	700	More than 10% above Minimum Threshold
322	Central	310	October 2025	387	Above Measurable Objective
324	Central	306	October 2025	365	Above Measurable Objective
325	Central	300	October 2025	331	Above Measurable Objective
420	Central	502	October 2025	514	More than 10% above Minimum Threshold
421	Central	503	October 2025	514	More than 10% above Minimum Threshold
474	Central	130	October 2025	197	Above Measurable Objective
568	Central	37	October 2025	47	Above Measurable Objective
604	Central	463	October 2025	544	Above Measurable Objective
935	Central	438	October 2025	504	Above Measurable Objective
609	Central	419	October 2025	499	Above Measurable Objective
610	Central	646	October 2025	557	Below Minimum Threshold (63 months)

Cuyama Basin Groundwater Sustainability Plan—
Draft 2024-2025 WY Annual Report

612	Central	441	October 2025	513	Above Measurable Objective
613	Central	507	October 2025	578	Above Measurable Objective
615	Central	523	October 2025	588	Above Measurable Objective
629	Central	556	October 2025	613	Above Measurable Objective
633	Central	556	October 2025	605	More than 10% above Minimum Threshold
62	Eastern	89	October 2025	212	Above Measurable Objective
85	Eastern	141	October 2025	200	Above Measurable Objective
100	Eastern	89	October 2025	186	Above Measurable Objective
101	Eastern	68	October 2025	138	Above Measurable Objective
841	Northwestern	69	October 2025	203	Above Measurable Objective
845	Northwestern	79	October 2025	203	Above Measurable Objective
2	Southeastern	31	October 2025	52	Above Measurable Objective
89	Southeastern	29	October 2025	62	Above Measurable Objective
106	Western	141	October 2025	164	Above Measurable Objective
107	Western	78	October 2025	122	Above Measurable Objective
117	Western	154	October 2025	163	More than 10% above Minimum Threshold
118	Western	51	October 2025	72	More than 10% above Minimum Threshold
571	Western	96	October 2025	142	Above Measurable Objective
573	Western	66	October 2025	93	More than 10% above Minimum Threshold
830	Far-West Northwestern	-	October 2025	63	No available data this period (Above MO in July 2024)
832	Far-West Northwestern	33	October 2025	50	Above Measurable Objective
833	Far-West Northwestern	26	October 2025	48	More than 10% above Minimum Threshold
836	Far-West Northwestern	31	October 2025	49	More than 10% above Minimum Threshold

Note: Wells only count towards the identification of undesirable results if the level measurement is below the minimum threshold for 24 consecutive months.

7.2 Funding to Support GSP Implementation

On May 22, 2025, the CBGSA Board held a rate hearing and set a groundwater extraction fee of \$5 per acre-foot for FY 2025-26.

Additionally, the CBGSA has been awarded a \$7.6 million in grant fund under the Critically Overdrafted Basin (COD) SGMA Implementation Round 1 grant opportunity, with funding awarded for the following activities:

- Ongoing Monitoring and Enhancements
 - Installation of Piezometers
 - installation of dedicated monitoring wells
 - DMS maintenance and enhancements
 - Groundwater level and quality monitoring
 - USGS stream gage maintenance
- Project and Management Action Implementation
 - CBWRM model update and re-calibration
 - Develop and implement framework for pumping allocations
 - Analysis of management actions implementation options
 - Adaptive management support
 - Precipitation enhancement technical analysis
 - Flood and stormwater capture technical analysis
- GSP Implementation and Outreach Activities
 - GSP implementation program management
 - Stakeholder engagement and community outreach
 - Prepare annual reports
 - Modify GSP in response to DWR determination
 - 5-year GSP update
- Improving Understanding of Basin Water Use
 - Perform updated land use survey
 - Perform river channel survey
 - Enhance existing CIMIS station and implement new stations

While the original grant agreement specified a completion date of April 30, 2025, this has been extended to March 31, 2026.

7.3 Stakeholder Outreach Activities in Support of GSP Implementation

The following is a list of public meetings where GSP development and implementation was discussed during the 2024-2025 water year.

- [CBGSA Board meetings¹⁰](#): November 6, January 15, January 27, March 5, May 7, May 22, July 9, and September 3
- [Standing Advisory Committee \(SAC\) meetings¹¹](#): October 31, January 9, February 27, May 1, June 26, and August 28

7.4 Progress on Implementation of GSP Projects

Table 7-2 shows the projects and management actions that were included in the GSP. The following subsections describe the progress of implementation of each GSP project.

¹⁰ <https://cuyamabasin.org/board-of-directors>

¹¹ <https://cuyamabasin.org/standing-advisory-committee>

Table 7-2: Summary of Projects and Management Actions included in the GSP

Activity	Current Status	Anticipated Timing	Estimated Cost ^a
Project 1: Flood and Stormwater Capture	A water rights analysis of potential water supplies was completed during WY 2024-2025.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Feasibility study: 0 to 5 years Design/Construction: 5 to 15 years 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Study: \$1,000,000 Flood and Stormwater Capture Project: \$600-\$800 per AF (\$2,600,000 – 3,400,000 per year)
Project 2: Precipitation Enhancement	A cloud seeding effects study was completed by the Desert Research Institute during WY 2024-2025.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Refined project study: 0 to 5 years Implementation of Precipitation Enhancement: 5 to 15 years 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Study: \$200,000 Precipitation Enhancement Project: \$25 per AF (\$150,000 per year)
Project 3: Water Supply Transfers/Exchanges	Not yet begun	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Feasibility study/planning: 0 to 5 years Implementation in 5 to 15 years 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Study: \$200,000 Transfers/Exchanges: \$600-\$2,800 per AF (total cost TBD)
Project 4: Improve Reliability of Water Supplies for Local Communities	A new well was installed by the CCSD during WY 2024-25; not yet begun for other communities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Feasibility studies: 0 to 2 years Design/Construction: 1 to 5 years 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Study: \$100,000 Design/Construction: \$1,800,000
Management Action 1: Basin-Wide Economic Analysis	Completed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> December 2020 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> \$60,000
Management Action 2: Pumping Allocations in Central Basin Management Area	Additional allocations developed for Central Management Area for 2025 through 2029	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allocations implemented: 2023 through 2040 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Plan: \$300,000 Implementation: \$150,000 per year
Adaptive Management	Board ad-hoc committee was formed and considered potential actions; standard operating procedures were developed	Only implemented if triggered; timing would vary	TBD

^a Estimated cost based on planning documents and professional judgment
AF = acre-feet

7.4.1 Project 1: Flood and Stormwater Capture

The CBGSA application for COD SGMA Implementation Grant funding from DWR includes a task to understand the feasibility of future flood and stormwater capture. Specifically, funding was sought to perform a water rights analysis on flood and stormwater capture flows in the Basin to understand the feasibility of further developing a stormwater capture project in the Basin given water availability and existing water rights. A technical and legal water rights analysis was completed during WY 2025, which

concluded that while there may be potential water supply benefits from stormwater capture, there are also potential challenges related to the water rights of existing downstream users that could affect the feasibility of a potential project.

7.4.2 Project 2: Precipitation Enhancement

The CBGSA application for COD SGMA Implementation Grant funding from DWR, which includes a task to understand the feasibility of precipitation enhancements efforts. Specifically, funding was sought to perform a study of the precipitation enhancement action identified in the GSP to determine if this action should be pursued and implemented in the Basin. The CBGSA contracted with the Desert Research Institute (DRI) to assess cloud seeding effects on Santa Barbara County and the Cuyama Valley; DRI completed their study and provided a final report to the CBGSA in January 2025. While the study indicated that there may be some potential water supply benefits from the implementation of cloud seeding, cost and implementation concerns may preclude development of a cloud seeding project in the Basin.

7.4.3 Project 3: Water Supply Transfers or Exchanges

No progress was made toward implementation of this project since completion of the GSP in January 2020. This project will be explored if Project 1 mentioned above: flood and stormwater capture was feasible but greater volumes of water are desired.

7.4.4 Project 4: Improve Reliability of Water Supplies for Local Communities

This management action includes consideration of opportunities to improve water supply reliability for Ventucopa within CCSD service area. Potential projects include a replacement well for CCSD and improvement of Ventucopa Water Supply Company (VWSC's) existing well. Since the 2020 GSP adoption DWR's IRWM program awarded CCSD a grant to install a new production well. A new well was installed by the CCSD to install the new well during WY 2025.

7.5 Management Actions

Table 7-2 shows the projects and management actions that were included in the GSP. The following subsections describe the progress of implementation of each GSP management action.

7.5.1 Management Action 1: Basin-Wide Economic Analysis

A Basin-wide direct economic analysis of proposed GSP actions was completed. The results of this analysis were presented to the GSP Board on December 4, 2019, and the final report was completed in December 2019. The final Basin-wide economic analysis report was provided in the 2020 Annual Report. This management action is 100% complete.

7.5.2 Management Action 2: Pumping Allocations in Central Basin Management Area

CBGSA staff has worked and continues to work with the Board and stakeholders to implement pumping allocations in the Central Management Area which began in the 2023 calendar year. As directed by the Board, in July 2022, CBGSA staff developed pumping allocations for 2023 and 2024 for each parcel located within the Central Management Area. These allocations reflected a 5% reduction in 2023 and a 10% reduction in 2024 relative to baseline levels.

Allocations for 2025 through 2029 were developed using the updated version of the CBWRM model developed as part of the 2025 GSP Update and were approved by the Board in January 2025. These new allocations take into consideration a new management area boundary developed using the same

methodology as the previous management area, but utilizing the updated model and recent monitoring data. These allocations are available for review on the CBGSA website.

Table 7-3 compares the total Central Management Area allocation quantities in 2023 through 2025 with actual pumping, which was recorded by pumping meters by water users in the Central Management Area in each year. All users were at or below their pumping allocation amount in both 2023 and 2024. [Note: 2025 results will be compiled and included in table and discussion in final Annual Report.]

Table 7-3: Total Central Management Area Allocations and Extractions

Calendar Year	Allocations (Acre-feet)	Extractions (Acre-feet)
2023	47,246	26,850
2024	45,350	28,107
2025	44,295	TBD

The CBGSA intends to develop additional allocations for the period beyond 2029 that would achieve the overall target reduction volume specified in the GSP to reach sustainable conditions. The specific approaches for determining the allocation amounts will be developed and implemented during WY 2029 to take advantage of future data improvements and an anticipated update of the CBWRM model.

7.5.3 Consideration of Pumping Allocations Outside of Central Management Area

The 2025 GSP Update included a Ventucopa Management Area but did not include a management action to implement pumping allocations outside the Central Management Area. Instead the GSP specified that the CBGSA would develop a management plan for the Ventucopa Management Area in the future. During the summer and fall of 2025, the CBGSA performed an analysis of the available data and current CBWRM model capability to simulate the water budgets in the Ventucopa portion of the Basin. The analysis concluded that while the CBWRM model can simulate general trends, seasonal fluctuations, and small recoveries in groundwater levels, the model needs further adjustments to the overall estimates of water budgets and in the simulation of groundwater level recoveries during wet periods. Recommended model improvements were identified; the CBGSA Board will consider whether to fund these improvements during future fiscal years.

In addition, the CBGSA developed an approach to manage potential increased water use outside of the Central Management Area. This approach includes making an initial assessment on an annual basis that considers changes in groundwater pumping, groundwater levels, land use and well permits to determine if a more detailed assessment is required. If it is determined that increased water use is occurring or likely to occur in the near-term for land outside the Central Management Area, the CBGSA will consider performing a more detailed analysis which may include additional ground truthing and analysis of potential impacts to beneficial uses and users. If impacts are identified, appropriate management actions may then be considered, including establishing a “watch area”, additional monitoring, implementing localized allocations, or temporary pumping restrictions on individual wells.

7.6 Adaptive Management

As discussed in the previous annual report, some wells in the Basin were trending towards undesirable results. The CBGSA Board undertook efforts to review wells that exceeded minimum thresholds, investigate potential causes of the exceedances, and identify if any domestic or production wells are affected by declining groundwater levels. This effort was incorporated into the updates included in the 2025 GSP, and are reflected in the revised SMCs, which utilize GSA collected data to protect beneficial uses and users of groundwater within the Basin. As discussed above, only one well had exceeded its minimum threshold during the October 2025 monitoring.

In addition, the CBGSA has established new standard operating procedures for the adaptive management process that outlines steps that the CBGSA would take to investigate the cause of changing conditions and develop adaptive management strategies for Board consideration. The procedures include forming an ad-hoc committee, performing an investigation, developing draft adaptive management response strategies, and implementing potential response strategies to correct the change in Basin conditions.

7.7 Progress Toward Implementation of Monitoring Networks

This section provides updates about implementation of the monitoring networks identified during GSP development.

7.7.1 Groundwater Levels Monitoring Network

In October 2021 the CBGSA transitioned to quarterly groundwater monitoring from its groundwater levels network. The CBGSA goes out in the field and collects Depth to Water measurements quarterly and attempts to take measurements from each of the representative and non-representative wells in the monitoring network. The results of this groundwater level monitoring are shown in Table 7-1. In September 2023, the CBGSA board voted to revise the monitoring network; the revised monitoring network has been included in the 2025 GSP Update and is reflected in this Annual Report.

Additionally, CBGSA Staff worked with the SGMA Portal team at DWR to ensure that GWL RMN changes are accurately reflected.

7.7.2 Surface Water Monitoring Network

Under a Category 1 grant from DWR, two new surface flow gages were installed on the Cuyama River during 2021. These gages are managed by the United States Geologic Survey (USGS), and data collected at the gage locations are available on the USGS website at the following links:

https://waterdata.usgs.gov/nwis/uv?site_no=11136500

https://waterdata.usgs.gov/ca/nwis/uv?site_no=11136710


Section 8. References


California Department of Water Resources (DWR). 2003. *California's Groundwater Bulletin 118—Update 2003*. <https://water.ca.gov/LegacyFiles/groundwater/bulletin118/basindescriptions/3-13.pdf>


This page intentionally blank


Appendix A


Updated Hydrographs for Representative Wells









































































































































This page intentionally blank



TO: Board of Directors
 Agenda Item No. 10e

FROM: Taylor Blakslee, Hallmark Group

DATE: March 4, 2026

SUBJECT: Report on 2025 Central Management Area Allocations and Authorize Penalty Fees

Recommended Motion

Authorize the invoicing and collection of 2025 central management area penalty fees.

Discussion

On February 7, 2025, the Board issued final groundwater allocations for 2025 to 2029 in the Central Management Area (CMA) and provided notice of the enforcement process for over-pumping which is provided as **Attachment 1**.

The 2025 Central Management Area Allocation Compliance Report, provided as **Attachment 2**, compares each landowner’s 2025 allocation to reported pumping, and collectively, groundwater extractions represented only 56% of available pumping. However, two reporting entities exceeded their allocation and are subject to the below penalty fees, and per the Board policy “any and all over-pumped water will be debited against that landowner’s allocation for the following year.”

	Water User	2025 Allocation (AF)	2025 Use (AF)	Over-Pumped (AF)	Penalty Fee Per AF	Penalty Fee
1	Sunrise Olive Ranch, LLC	1,953.22	2,060.03	106.81	\$250	\$26,702.50
2	Tri-County Pistachio	467.12	472.62	5.5	\$250	\$1,375.00

Staff is seeking Board direction on the invoicing and collection of penalty fees for landowners that have exceeded their allocation.



NOTICE OF FINAL CENTRAL MANAGEMENT AREA ALLOCATIONS FOR 2025-2029 (5 YEARS)

February 7, 2025

The purpose of this Notice of Final Central Management Area Allocations for 2025 – 2029 (**Notice**) is to provide all landowners within the Central Management Area (**CMA**) with their final groundwater allocations for the next five years (i.e., 2025 – 2029), as approved by the Cuyama Basin Groundwater Sustainability Agency's (**CBGSA**) Board of Directors (**Board**).

Directors:

Cory Bantilan
Chair

Derek Yurosek
Vice Chair

Byron Albano

Arne Anselm

Rick Burnes

Steve Jackson

Jimmy Paulding

Deborah Williams

Jane Wooster

Matt Young

Katelyn Zenger

Staff:

James M. Beck
Executive Director

Joe Hughes

Alex Dominguez
Legal Counsel

On November 12, 2024, CBGSA distributed initial groundwater allocations to all landowners within the CMA and provided notice of a variance process to allow these landowners to correct any potential incorrect technical information used by CBGSA in developing these initial groundwater allocations. On January 15, 2025, the CBGSA Board reviewed those submitted variance requests and directed CBGSA staff to (a) update the initial groundwater allocations, incorporating specific changes as a result of the submitted and reviewed variance requests, and (b) distribute those updated and final groundwater allocations to all landowners within the CMA.

**The final groundwater allocations by parcel for 2025 – 2029 are enclosed as Attachment 1.
Operator allocations are summarized in Attachment 2.**

TRACKING/REPORTING PROCESS

To ensure that landowners are adhering to these adopted groundwater allocations, the CBGSA Board adopted the following tracking and reporting policy on January 18, 2023:

1. Each landowner/operator must submit monthly meter readings for the preceding year by January 31st, according to the CBGSA meter reporting instructions provided at www.cuyamabasin.org.
2. Each landowner/operator must list the APNs, the well served, and how many acre-feet of water was used on each APN, as listed in the water use reporting forms.
3. CBGSA staff will develop a water accounting to report at the March CBGSA Board meeting to confirm annual pumping reduction goals are met for the net water use for landowners/operators.

NON-COMPLIANCE/OVER PUMPING ENFORCEMENT

If a landowner does not adhere to their adopted groundwater allocation, any and all over-pumped water will be debited against that landowner's allocation for the following year and CBGSA will impose a financial penalty as follows:

- Tier 1: 0-5 percent pumping over allocation = \$250/acre-foot
- Tier 2: >5 percent pumping over allocation = \$500/acre-foot

These penalty fees for over-pumping will be invoiced in March and due by May 1st of each year. CBGSA will use any penalty fees collected for projects in the CMA. If a landowner over-pumps by 20% or more of their groundwater allocation in any given year, CBGSA may consider legal action.

Please contact me at (661) 477-3385, or tblakslee@hgcpm.com if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Taylor Blakslee".

Taylor Blakslee
Assistant Executive Director
Cuyama Basin Groundwater Sustainability Agency



TO: Board of Directors
Agenda Item No. 11a

FROM: Taylor Blakslee, Hallmark Group

DATE: March 4, 2026

SUBJECT: Report of the Executive Director

Recommended Motion

None – information only.

Discussion

An overview of consultant budget-to-actuals are provided as **Attachment 1**.


Cuyama Basin Groundwater Sustainability Agency

Financial Report

March 4, 2026


Legal Counsel – Budget-to-Actuals

FY 25/26




Hallmark Group – Budget-to-Actuals

FY 25/26



Provost & Pritchard – Budget-to-Actuals


FY 25/26




Woodard & Curran – Budget-to-Actuals

FY 25/26


Budget and Actuals Include BC2 Environmental



CBGSA FY 25/26 – Budget-to-Actuals



CBGSA FY 24/25 – Budget-to-Actuals





TO: Board of Directors
Agenda Item No. 11ai

FROM: Taylor Blakslee

DATE: March 4, 2026

SUBJECT: Report on 2025 Basin-wide Groundwater Use, 2025 CMA Allocation Compliance, and CMA Groundwater Allocation Exchanges

Recommendation

None; information only.

Discussion

On March 5, 2025, the Cuyama Basin Groundwater Sustainability Agency (CBGSA) Board of Directors directed staff to present an annual report on reported groundwater pumping and use. The 2025 Basin-Wide Groundwater Use Report is provided as **Attachment 1**.

The CBGSA began collecting water use information in 2019 and Attachment 1 summarizes reported groundwater use by landowners from 2019 through 2025. A key distinction in the datasets is that meters were required and largely installed by 2022. As a result, reported pumping from 2022 through 2025 primarily reflects metered groundwater use (gross extractions). For 2019 through 2021, reported water use was largely based on crop factors or other reporting methods used to determine net water use.

Staff is finalizing the 2025 Central Management Area Allocation Report and has included a preliminary version as **Attachment 2**. A final report will be provided in April as staff continues to receive additional pumping information.

In November 2025, the Board adopted Rules and Regulations for the Transfer of Groundwater Allocations (**Attachment 3**) as a one-year pilot program beginning January 1, 2026. Consistent with the adopted policy, staff will provide a report of any allocation exchanges that have occurred. Since January 1, 2026, there have been no requests to transfer groundwater allocations.

Cuyama Basin 2025 Water Use

DM= 2AFY / per well

No.	Reporting Entity	2019 AF	2020 AF	2021 AF	2022 AF	2023 AF	2024 AF	2025 AF
1	Anderson Development					2.07	40.83	
2	Ann Buck					104.40	111.50	116.20
3	Apache Canyon Ranch	323.93	318.65	322.40	357.45	327.96	339.55	346.84
4	Bolthouse Farms, Inc.	6,004.60	8,267.22	6,432.20	11,317.03	7,809.44	9,340.12	9,453.64
5	Bosma and Ricci	DM	-	-	13.62	24.51	24.51	26.51
6	Brodiaea, Inc. (Grapevine/North Fork)	702.79	757.54	790.54	835.97	798.35	953.96	921.78
7	CCSH Farms					99.40	107.00	124.40
8	Ceferino Cheng	-	104.65	110.63	159.24	117.00	131.60	141.20
9	Cuyama Community Services District (CCSD)	94.97	98.71	113.20	119.77	148.34	158.79	175.54
10	Hoekstra Family Trust	495.45	551.41	924.86	632.04	230.73	342.33	300.59
11	Cuyama Orchards	878.47	878.47	966.32	1,056.90	875.22	1,120.60	
12	David Lewis	10.22	10.22	42.74	30.19	34.01	43.27	35.75
13	Double H Farming, LLC (formerly Triple H)	358.80	358.80	358.80	382.16	104.50	113.50	118.70
14	Duncan Family Farms, LLC/Aguila G Boys	2,048.00	2,048.00	2,048.00	18.00	115.62	52.68	
15	E&B Natural Resources	22.04	22.41	23.01	21.44	24.35	24.26	25.99
16	Feinstein Investments/JR Investments	174.25	174.25	78.80	51.33	268.88	544.87	1,079.95
17	Grimmway Enterprises, Inc.	10,184.00	10,454.70	9,401.10	17,213.27	12,251.88	13,379.35	9,774.10
18	Harrington Farms	135.00	135.00	196.94	135.84	111.19	162.68	200.40
19	Highland Vineyard SB, LLC	-	1,180.69	1,004.77	1,675.78	1,832.00	1,546.46	729.13
20	M&A Family Farms	20.93	20.93	20.93	20.93	20.93	31.81	31.87
21	JHP Global/Joo Capital	391.50	391.50	356.40	347.02	365.28	354.30	371.06
22	Karam Pistachio Farm	-	-	-	305.52	480.38	511.82	591.15
23	Kern Ridge Growers, LLC	1,558.04	1,544.00	1,587.08	3,033.23	2,673.37	2,770.28	2,957.29
24	Lear Real Estate Enterprises	-	457.60	290.40	492.91	568.21	460.76	429.65
25	Lucky Dog Ranch	284.05	328.90	287.04	344.25	343.00	350.00	382.60
26	Belden Family Trust	272.80	264.00	237.60	585.35	113.30	349.29	410.74
27	Sunridge Nurseries	364.00	446.40	553.26	1,141.22	1,032.00	462.89	462.89
28	Sunrise Olive Ranch, LLC	1,075.00	1,075.00	1,924.74	1,761.57	1,726.11	1,825.17	2,060.03
29	The Ranch	72.87	18.63	18.50	18.50	18.50	18.50	18.50
30	Triangle E. Farms	981.90	514.37	358.11	234.27	580.75	527.43	586.18
31	Tri-County Pistachio	941.85	832.70	911.95	1,876.00	1,118.00	1,090.00	999.23
32	Yeguada Trujillo			20.00	220.00	36.00	33.05	110.54
33	El Rancho Espanol	3.99	1.53	0.34	DM	DM	3.17	3.96
	Other (De Minimis)	56.48	14.21	7.92	24.49	30.94	11.81	9.42
Total Base-Wide Reported Pumping		27,456	31,270	29,389	44,425	34,387	37,338	32,996

Cuyama Basin 2025 Allocations vs Reported Use

Grouping	Subgroup/ Farming Unit Components	Area in 2025-2029 CMA + Farming Unit (Acres)	2025 Allocations (AF)	Reported Pumping (AF)	Percent Used	
1	2961 Highway LLC/Yeguada Trujillo	n/a	468.0	792.14	110.54	14%
2	Ann Buck	n/a	40.0	139.88	116.20	83%
3	Bolthouse Farms, Inc.	Total Wm. Bolthouse Farms	13,495.20	19,184.47	9,453.64	49%
		<i>Belden Family</i>		7,323.15		
		<i>Bolthouse Land Company</i>		10,657.16		
		<i>Bolthouse Properties</i>		501.08		
		<i>Cuyama Solar</i>		124.99		
		<i>Lear Real Estate Enterprises</i>		578.09		
4	CCSH Farms	n/a	40.0	135.50	124.40	92%
5	David Lewis	n/a	85.1	120.00	35.75	30%
6	Double H Farming, LLC (formerly Triple H)	n/a	38.5	138.89	118.70	85%
7	Duncan Family Farms, LLC/Aguila G Boys	n/a	132.2	185.88	-	
8	Grimmway Enterprises, Inc	Total Grimmway	13,474.00	16,847.83	9,774.10	58%
		<i>Caliente Ranch Cuyama</i>		1,709.12		
		<i>Diamond Farming Co</i>		3,701.57		
		<i>Lapis Land Company</i>		4,555.19		
		<i>Ruby Land Company</i>		6,881.94		
9	Harrington Family Trust	n/a	151.5	20.22	0.00	0%
10	Hoekstra Family Trust	n/a	460.4	1,061.03	300.59	28%
11	JHP Global/Joo Capital	n/a	892.3	670.64	371.06	55%
12	Kern Ridge Growers, LLC	Total Kern Ridge Growers	1,909.10	2,479.24	1,964.74	79%
		<i>Daria Trust</i>		78.90		
		<i>Farry Michael</i>		382.54		
		<i>Kern Ridge Growers LLC</i>		2,017.81		
13	Sunrise Olive Ranch, LLC	Total Sunrise Olive Ranch	934.20	1,953.22	2,060.03	105%
		<i>Reinhard, Carl Jr. (et al)</i>		22.74		
		<i>Sunrise Ranch Properties</i>		1,930.48		
14	Tri-County Pistachio	n/a	192.0	467.12	472.62	101%
	Other	n/a	n/a	98.52		
	Total		32,312.51	44,294.60	24,902.37	56%

**RULES AND REGULATIONS FOR
THE TRANSFER OF GROUNDWATER ALLOCATIONS**

Adopted: January 1, 2026

ARTICLE I GENERAL PROVISIONS

1.01 Authority. The Cuyama Basin Groundwater Sustainability Agency (**GSA**) may adopt rules, regulations, ordinances, and resolutions for the purpose of implementing the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (**SGMA**), in compliance with any procedural requirements applicable to the adoption of such rule, regulation, ordinance, or resolution by the GSA. (Wat. Code, § 10725.2, subd. (b).)

1.02 Purpose. The purpose of these Rules and Regulations is to provide for the sustainable management of groundwater within the boundaries of the GSA.

1.03 Groundwater Sustainability Plan. The intent of these Rules and Regulations is to implement the provisions of the GSA's Groundwater Sustainability Plan (**GSP**). These Rules and Regulations may be amended at any time, as deemed necessary by the GSA's Board of Directors (**Board**), to achieve consistency with that GSP and groundwater sustainability within the GSA's boundaries.

1.04 Effective Date and Amendments Hereto. These Rules and Regulations shall become effective upon adoption by the Board, and may be added to, amended and/or repealed at any time by later resolution of the Board with any such additions, amendments, and/or repeals becoming effective upon adoption of the resolution, or as otherwise specified by the Board. However, adoption of these Rules and Regulations will not affect the effective date of any of the GSA's policies existing as of the date the Board adopts these Rules and Regulations.

1.05 Actions Against the GSA. Nothing contained in these Rules and Regulations may be deemed a waiver by the GSA or estop the GSA from asserting any defenses or immunities from liability as provided by law, including those provided in Division 3.6 of Title 1 of the Government Code.

1.06 Severability. If any provision of these Rules and Regulations, or the application thereof to any person or circumstance, is held invalid, the remainder of these Rules and Regulations, and the application of its provisions to other persons or circumstances, shall not be affected thereby.

ARTICLE II TRANSFER OF GROUNDWATER ALLOCATION

2.01 Transfer of Groundwater Allocation. A landowner may transfer its groundwater allocation to another landowner, subject to the following terms and conditions:

- a. The transferring-landowner and the receiving-landowner shall each hold title to real property located within the 2025 – 2029 Central Management Area (including those parcels of real property made part of the Central Management Area via the creation of a Farming Unit), as that area is depicted in the map attached hereto and incorporated herein as **Exhibit A**.

- b. The transferring-landowner and the receiving-landowner shall each be in good standing with the GSA. “Good standing” means the landowner does not owe any outstanding fee or penalty to the GSA and is up to date with any and all applicable reporting requirements (e.g., groundwater extraction facility registration; groundwater extraction reporting; etc.).
- c. The transferred groundwater allocation shall be used solely within the Central Management Area.
- d. The transfer shall terminate on or before December 31, 2029.
- e. The transfer shall not cause an exceedance of any Minimum Threshold, as that term is defined within the GSP (as may be amended from time to time) as determined by GSA staff.
- f. The transfer shall be memorialized in writing using the Groundwater Allocation Transfer Form attached hereto and incorporated herein as **Exhibit B** and submitted to the GSA. If the transferring-landowner is party to a Farming Unit, as recognized by the GSA, each landowner party to that Farming Unit must execute the previously mentioned Groundwater Allocation Transfer Form.

2.02 Process. Upon submission of the Groundwater Allocation Transfer Form, the GSA staff shall review the transfer to ensure compliance with these Rules and Regulations. Within 30 days of submission, the GSA staff shall inform the participating landowners of its findings approving the transfer, denying the transfer, or requesting additional information regarding the transfer. If the GSA staff denies the transfer, the participating landowners may appeal the decision to the Board. The Board’s decision shall be final.

2.03 Carryover of Groundwater Allocation Prohibited. If a landowner uses less than its allocation, including any additional amounts received via transfer, during any particular year (i.e., January 1 through December 31), that landowner may not carryover any such unused portion to the next year.

ARTICLE III

ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF THE PARTICIPATING PARTIES

3.01 Acknowledgment of the GSA’s Ongoing Authority. The Board has the authority to implement adaptive management actions at any time based on changing conditions within the Basin. The GSA will continue to monitor representative wells and Basin conditions. If data indicates that a previously approved transfer is contributing to one or more Undesirable Results including, but not limited to, the exceedance of Minimum Thresholds, the GSA may take corrective

action. Such corrective actions include but not limited to restricting pumping, modifying allocations, or suspending future transfers as necessary to protect the sustainability of the Basin.

ARTICLE IV PENALTIES AND FEES

4.01 Failure to Comply. The GSA shall not recognize or otherwise account for any transfer not memorialized using the GSA's Groundwater Allocation Transfer Form and approved by the GSA, as set forth herein.

4.02 SGMA Penalties. Upon violation of any provision of these Rules and Regulations by a landowner, the GSA shall impose a penalty of \$1,000, plus \$100 for each additional day upon which the violation continues if the landowner fails to comply within 30 days after being made aware of the violation by the GSA. Notwithstanding the foregoing, the GSA may petition the Superior Court for a temporary restraining order, preliminary or permanent injunction, or such other equitable relief as may be appropriate. The right to petition for injunctive relief is an additional right to those, which may be provided elsewhere in these Rules and Regulations or otherwise allowed by law.

EXHIBIT A




EXHIBIT B
GROUNDWATER ALLOCATION TRANSFER FORM
(For Landowner Use)

Instructions: If you're interested in transferring a groundwater allocation, complete the following form and submit the signed form to tblakslee@hgcpm.com for CBGSA review. GSA Staff will provide determination regarding transfer requests within 30 days.

Name of Transferring-Landowner: _____

Parcels from which the Allocation is Leaving: _____

Name of Receiving-Landowner: _____

Parcels to which the Allocation is Going: _____

Please refer to the map in Attachment 1 to indicate parcel locations.

Amount of Water Being Transferred: _____


Term of Transfer: _____

Signature of Transferring-Landowner: _____

Signature of Receiving-Landowner: _____

ATTACHMENT 1

Map Instructions: Please indicate with an “X” where the transferred water is leaving and going.



GROUNDWATER ALLOCATION TRANSFER FORM, CONTINUED

(For Cuyama Basin GSA Staff Use)

Name of Transferring-Landowner: _____

Name of Receiving-Landowner: _____

Date Form Received: _____

1. Does the transferring-landowner hold title to real property within the CMA?

YES NO

2. Does the receiving-landowner hold title to real property within the CMA?

YES NO

3. Is the transferring-landowner in good standing with the GSA?

YES NO

If "NO," what corrective action is needed on part of the transferring-landowner?

4. Is the receiving-landowner in good standing with the GSA?

YES NO

If "NO," what corrective action is needed on part of the receiving-landowner?

5. Is the transferred groundwater allocation proposed for use solely within the CMA?

YES NO

6. Does the transfer terminate on or before December 31, 2029?

YES NO

7. Will the transfer cause any Undesirable Results?

YES NO

If "YES," please explain: _____

THIS TRANSFER IS HEREBY:

APPROVED

DENIED

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION/CORRECTIVE ACTION NEEDED: _____



TO: Board of Directors
Agenda Item No. 12a

FROM: Brian Van Lienden, Woodard & Curran

DATE: March 4, 2026

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

Update on Groundwater Sustainability Plan Activities

Brian Van Lienden



Jan-Feb Accomplishments

- ✓ Completed an addendum to the Cuyama Basin fault investigation report and posted to Cuyama Basin website
- ✓ Developed draft Annual Report for Water Year 2024-2025
- ✓ Developed quarterly groundwater level conditions report for Jan 2026
- ✓ Assisted with response to DWR request for information on 2025 GSP
- ✓ Performed DMS data updates
- ✓ Prepared documentation for grant reporting



TO: Board of Directors
Agenda Item No. 13b

FROM: Brian Van Lienden, Woodard & Curran

DATE: March 4, 2026

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

Update on Grant-Funded Projects



Brian Van Lienden



Update on Grant Funded Projects

- CIMIS station installation:
 - Amended grant agreement allows for reimbursement of work completed through March 2026
 - CIMIS stations are currently anticipated to be installed by March 2026
- Work on all other technical grant components is complete as of the end of June 2025

Sites for New CIMIS Stations



Cuyama Orchards

Status:

- Installation quote approved by Board on Mar 5th

Current Status:

- Installation quote approved by Board on July 9th



Sunridge Nurseries



TO: Board of Directors
Agenda Item No. 13c

FROM: Brian Van Lienden, Woodard & Curran

DATE: March 4, 2026

SUBJECT: Update on January 2026 Groundwater Level Conditions Reports

Recommended Motion

None – information only.

Discussion

The quarterly Groundwater Conditions– Cuyama Valley Groundwater Basin January 2026 report is summarized in **Attachment 1**. The detailed January 2026 Groundwater Conditions Report is provided as **Attachment 2**.

Cuyama Basin Groundwater Sustainability Agency

Update on Quarterly Groundwater Conditions Report

Brian Van Lienden

*January 2026
Report*


Groundwater Levels Monitoring Network – Summary of Current Conditions

- Monitoring data from July 2025, October 2025, and January 2026 for representative wells is included in the Groundwater Conditions report
- 46 of 47 representative monitoring wells have a measurement this quarter
 - one well (830) was last measured in July 2024
- 0 wells are below the updated minimum threshold based on latest measurement


Summary of Groundwater Well Levels as Compared To Sustainability Criteria

- 0 well is currently below the updated minimum threshold (MT)
 - 0 wells (2%) has been below the MT for at least 24 months
 - 0 wells dropped below the MT in January 2026
 - 0 wells moved above the MT in January 2026*

*Well 610 has an updated MT per Board direction in Jan 2026 and no longer shows as below the MT






Current Status of Representative Monitoring Wells



Legend	Highways	Representative Monitoring Network Wells and Status	
	Cuyama River	Above MO	Below MT
Streams	More than 10% Above MT	No available data this period	
Cuyama Basin	Within Adaptive Mangement Zone		

Updated Hydrographs for Selected Monitoring Wells





Groundwater Conditions Report: Cuyama Valley Groundwater Basin

January 2026

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION	PAGE NO.
1. INTRODUCTION	1
2. SUMMARY STATISTICS	1
3. CURRENT CONDITIONS	2
4. HYDROGRAPHS	10
5. MONITORING NETWORK UPDATES	16

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 October 2025	9
Figure 2: Southeast Region – Well 89	10
Figure 3: Eastern Region – Well 62.....	11
Figure 4: Central Region – Well 91	12
Figure 5: Central Region – Well 74	13
Figure 6: Western Region – Well 571	14
Figure 7: Northwestern Region – Well 841	15

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



With the adjustment to the Well 610 minimum threshold that was approved at the January 2026 SBGSA Board meeting, there are currently no wells with groundwater levels exceeding the updated 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, 0% of representative monitoring wells (i.e. 0 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	Jul-25	Oct-25	Jan-26	Last Year		Elevation Change
		GWL (ft. msl)	GWL (ft. msl)	GWL (ft. msl)	GWL (ft. msl)	Month/Year	
72	Central	2020	2027	2044	2038	Jan-25	6
74	Central	1952	1951	1951	1950	Jan-25	1
77	Central	1749	1783	1793	1790	Jan-25	3
91	Central	1798	1796	1800	1804	Jan-25	-4
95	Central	1871	1869	1869	1868	Jan-25	1
96	Central	2295	2268	2269	2268	Jan-25	1
99	Central	2129	2195	2171	2210	Jan-25	-39
102	Central	1684	1668	1769	1765	Jan-25	4
103	Central	2056	2058	2061	2057	Jan-25	4
112	Central	2046	2046	2046	2046	Jan-25	0
114	Central	1881	1880	1879	1881	Jan-25	-2
316	Central	1797	1794	1798	1803	Jan-25	-5
317	Central	1799	1796	1800	1805	Jan-25	-5
322	Central	2126	2194	2165	2209	Jan-25	-44
324	Central	2156	2198	2185	2208	Jan-25	-23
325	Central	2190	2204	2196	2209	Jan-25	-13
420	Central	1748	1782	1792	1789	Jan-25	3
421	Central	1772	1781	1791	1794	Jan-25	-3
474	Central	2236	2236	2236	2237	Jan-25	-1
568	Central	1876	1875	1877	1878	Jan-25	-1

Well	Region	Jul-25	Oct-25	Jan-26	Last Year		Elevation Change
		GWL (ft. msl)	GWL (ft. msl)	GWL (ft. msl)	GWL (ft. msl)	Month/Year	
604	Central	1645	1655	1673	1669	Jan-25	4
935	Central	1753	1777	1793	1794	Jan-25	-1
609	Central	1747	1748	1749	1734	Jan-25	15
610	Central	1795	1795	1801	1805	Jan-25	-4
612	Central	1815	1831	1837	1806	Jan-25	31
613	Central	1783	1821	1816	-	-	-
615	Central	1797	1800	1803	1798	Jan-25	5
629	Central	1787	1823	1821	1803	Jan-25	18
633	Central	1792	1808	1844	-	-	-
62	Eastern	2831	2830	2838	-	-	-
85	Eastern	2908	2908	2908	2909	Jan-25	-1
100	Eastern	2924	2919	2935	2932	Jan-25	3
101	Eastern	2679	2680	2687	2673	Jan-25	14
841	Northwestern	1710	1692	1703	1706	Jan-25	-3
845	Northwestern	1640	1632	1641	1644	Jan-25	-3
2	Southeastern	3693	3690	3701	3699	Jan-25	2
89	Southeastern	3422	3406	3411	3411	Jan-25	0
106	Western	2177	2177	2178	2177	Jan-25	1
107	Western	2417	2415	2414	2420	Jan-25	-6
117	Western	1944	1944	1966	1944	Jan-25	22
118	Western	2213	2213	2213	2213	Jan-25	0

Well	Region	Jul-25	Oct-25	Jan-26	Last Year		Elevation Change
		GWL (ft. msl)	GWL (ft. msl)	GWL (ft. msl)	GWL (ft. msl)	Month/Year	
571	Western	-	2220	2222	2227	Jan-25	-5
573	Western	2016	2016	2016	2016	Jan-25	0
830	Far-West Northwestern	-	-	-	-	-	-
832	Far-West Northwestern	1608	1607	1606	1608	Jan-25	-2
833	Far-West Northwestern	1320	1430	1434	1439	Jan-25	-5
836	Far-West Northwestern	1479	1478	1479	1480	Jan-25	-1



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 BGS)	Date						
72	Central	126	1/22/2026	373	369	328	790	Above Measurable Objective	No
74	Central	240	1/21/2026	322	321	309	-	Above Measurable Objective	No
77	Central	490	1/21/2026	514	509	464	980	More than 10% above Minimum Threshold	No
91	Central	680	1/21/2026	730	725	681	980	Above Measurable Objective	No
95	Central	588	1/23/2026	597	594	562	805	More than 10% above Minimum Threshold	No
96	Central	339	1/22/2026	369	368	361	500	Above Measurable Objective	No
99	Central	333	1/22/2026	379	378	368	750	Above Measurable Objective	No
102	Central	274	1/20/2026	470	466	432	-	Above Measurable Objective	No
103	Central	226	1/21/2026	379	374	324	1030	Above Measurable Objective	No
112	Central	83	1/23/2026	102	102	100	441	Above Measurable Objective	No
114	Central	47	1/23/2026	58	58	56	58	Above Measurable Objective	No
316	Central	681	1/21/2026	731	726	682	830	Above Measurable Objective	No
317	Central	680	1/21/2026	700	695	650	700	More than 10% above Minimum Threshold	No
322	Central	339	1/22/2026	387	386	378	850	Above Measurable Objective	No
324	Central	319	1/22/2026	365	364	353	560	Above Measurable Objective	No
325	Central	308	1/22/2026	331	330	323	380	Above Measurable Objective	No
420	Central	491	1/21/2026	514	509	464	780	More than 10% above Minimum Threshold	No


Well	Region	Current Month		Minimum Threshold	Within 10% Minimum Threshold	Measurable Objective	Well Depth	Status	GSA Action Required?
		GWL (DTW BGS)	Date						
421	Central	492	1/21/2026	514	509	466	620	More than 10% above Minimum Threshold	No
474	Central	130	1/23/2026	197	195	178	213	Above Measurable Objective	No
568	Central	35	1/22/2026	47	47	46	188	Above Measurable Objective	No
604	Central	444	1/22/2026	544	540	505	924	Above Measurable Objective	No
935	Central	438	1/22/2026	504	501	475	745	Above Measurable Objective	No
609	Central	418	1/22/2026	499	495	462	970	Above Measurable Objective	No
610*	Central	640	1/22/2026	673	670	643	780	Above Measurable Objective	No
612	Central	435	1/22/2026	513	511	490	1070	Above Measurable Objective	No
613	Central	512	1/22/2026	578	575	550	830	Above Measurable Objective	No
615	Central	520	1/22/2026	588	585	556	865	Above Measurable Objective	No
629	Central	559	1/22/2026	613	610	581	1000	Above Measurable Objective	No
633	Central	520	1/22/2026	605	600	551	1000	Above Measurable Objective	No
62	Eastern	81	1/21/2026	212	210	187	212	Above Measurable Objective	No
85	Eastern	141	1/21/2026	200	198	176	233	Above Measurable Objective	No
100	Eastern	74	1/21/2026	186	183	157	284	Above Measurable Objective	No
101	Eastern	60	1/21/2026	138	136	115	200	Above Measurable Objective	No
841	Northwestern	58	1/20/2026	203	198	153	600	Above Measurable Objective	No
845	Northwestern	70	1/20/2026	203	198	153	380	Above Measurable Objective	No
2	Southeastern	20	1/21/2026	52	50	35	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 BGS)	Date						
89	Southeastern	24	1/21/2026	62	60	42	125	Above Measurable Objective	No
106	Western	140	1/23/2026	164	163	152	228	Above Measurable Objective	No
107	Western	79	1/22/2026	122	120	103	200	Above Measurable Objective	No
117	Western	133	1/21/2026	163	162	154	212	Above Measurable Objective	No
118	Western	50	1/21/2026	72	37	42	500	More than 10% above Minimum Threshold	No
571	Western	94	1/21/2026	142	140	118	280	Above Measurable Objective	No
573	Western	66	1/23/2026	93	88	42	404	More than 10% above Minimum Threshold	No
830	Far-West Northwestern	-	-	63	63	60	77	No available data this period (Above MO in July 2024)	No
832	Far-West Northwestern	34	1/22/2026	50	49	35	132	Above Measurable Objective	No
833	Far-West Northwestern	22	1/22/2026	48	44	10	504	More than 10% above Minimum Threshold	No
836	Far-West Northwestern	30	1/22/2026	49	45	10	325	More than 10% above Minimum Threshold	No

Note: Wells only count towards the identification of undesirable results if the level measurement is below the minimum threshold for 24 consecutive months.

*MT and MO for well 610 have been updated per direction of the CBGSA Board at their January 2026 meeting

Figure 1: Groundwater Level Representative Wells and Status in January 2026



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



5. MONITORING NETWORK UPDATES

As shown in Table 2, there is one well with no measurement during the current monitoring period. These “no measurement codes” can have different causes as described below.

- Landowner changed and an access agreement has not been established with the current landowner:
 - Well 830



**Woodard
& Curran**

woodardcurran.com