

NOTICE AND AGENDA OF REGULAR MEETING

GROUNDWATER SUSTAINABILITY AGENCY
FOR THE CENTRAL MANAGEMENT AREA
IN THE SANTA YNEZ RIVER GROUNDWATER BASIN

WILL BE HELD AT THE
BUELLTON CITY HALL – CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS*
140 WEST HIGHWAY 246, BUELLTON, CALIFORNIA
AT **10:00 A.M.**, MONDAY, NOVEMBER 15, 2021

***AS PER SANTA BARBARA COUNTY HEALTH OFFICER ORDER NO. 2021-10.5
IN PERSON ATTENDEES MUST WEAR FACE COVERINGS AT ALL TIMES WHILE ATTENDING
THE MEETING IN AN INDOOR PUBLIC SETTING**

Remote participation also available via ZOOM

You do NOT need to create a ZOOM account or login with email for meeting participation.

ZOOM.us - “Join a Meeting”

Meeting ID: 829 5556 3156 Meeting Passcode: 767083

DIRECT LINK: <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/82955563156?pwd=UzBWdStPcDRRZForMU9sUDVxU1VTZz09>

DIAL-IN NUMBER: 1-669-900-9128

PHONE MEETING ID: 829 5556 3156 # Meeting Passcode: 767083#

If your device does not have a microphone or speakers, you can call in for audio with the phone number and Meeting ID listed above to listen and participate while viewing the live presentation online.

In the interest of clear reception and efficient administration of the meeting, all persons participating remotely are respectfully requested to mute their line after logging or dialing-in and at all times unless speaking.

Teleconference Meeting During Coronavirus (COVID-19) Pandemic: As a result of the COVID-19 pandemic, this meeting will be available via teleconference as recommended by Santa Barbara County Public Health, authorized by State Assembly Bill 361, and Resolution CMA-2021-001 (passed on 10/20/2021).

Important Notice Regarding Public Participation in Teleconference Meeting: Those who wish to provide public comment on an Agenda Item, or who otherwise are making a presentation to the GSA Committee, may participate in the meeting using the remote access referenced above. **Those wishing to submit written comments instead, please submit any and all comments and materials to the GSA via electronic mail at bbuelow@syrwcd.com.** All submittals of written comments must be received by the GSA no later than **Friday, November 12, 2021**, and should indicate “**November 15, 2021 GSA Meeting**” in the subject line. To the extent practicable, public comments and materials received in advance pursuant to this timeframe will be read into the public record during the meeting. Public comments and materials not read into the record will become part of the post-meeting materials available to the public and posted on the SGMA website.

AGENDA ON NEXT PAGE

GROUNDWATER SUSTAINABILITY AGENCY
FOR THE **CENTRAL MANAGEMENT AREA**
IN THE SANTA YNEZ RIVER GROUNDWATER BASIN

MONDAY, NOVEMBER 15, 2021, 10:00 A.M.

AGENDA OF REGULAR MEETING

- I. Call to Order and Roll Call
- II. Consider findings under Government Code section 54953(e)(3) to authorize continuing teleconference meetings under Resolution CMA-2021-001
- III. Additions or Deletions to the Agenda
- IV. Public Comment (Any member of the public may address the Committee relating to any non-agenda matter within the Committee’s jurisdiction. The total time for all public participation shall not exceed fifteen minutes and the time allotted for each individual shall not exceed five minutes. No action will be taken by the Committee at this meeting on any public item.) *Staff recommends any potential new agenda items based on issues raised be held for discussion under Agenda Item “CMA GSA Committee requests and comments” for items to be included on the next Agenda.*
- V. Review and consider approval of meeting minutes of October 25, 2021
- VI. Review and consider approval of Financial Statements and Warrant List
- VII. Review and consider approval of Resolution CMA-2021-002 authorizing the CMA GSA Chairperson to sign the Santa Ynez River Valley Groundwater Basin Coordination Agreement.
- VIII. Update and discussion on Draft CMA GSP and Future Governance Options
- IX. Review and discuss Scope of Work and Costs for Stetson to prepare CMA Annual Report
- X. Next planned “Special” CMA GSA Meeting to consider GSP adoption Monday, January 3, 2022 at 10:00 AM
- XI. Consideration of additional “Special CMA GSA Meeting” December 6 or 13, 2021 at 10:00 A.M.
- XII. CMA GSA Committee requests and comments
- XIII. Adjournment

[This agenda was posted 72 hours prior to the scheduled special meeting at 3669 Sagunto Street, Suite 101, Santa Ynez, California, and <https://www.santaynezwater.org> in accordance with Government Code Section 54954. In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, if you need special assistance to review agenda materials or participate in this meeting, please contact the Santa Ynez River Water Conservation District at (805) 693-1156. Notification 72 hours prior to the meeting will enable the GSA to make reasonable arrangements to ensure accessibility to this meeting.]

Groundwater Sustainability Agency for the Central Management Area in the Santa Ynez River Valley Groundwater Basin

RESOLUTION CMA-2021-001

RESOLUTION INITIALLY AUTHORIZING REMOTE TELECONFERENCE MEETINGS UNDER AB 361

WHEREAS, meetings of the governing Committee (“Committee”) of the **Groundwater Sustainability Agency for the Central Management Area in the Santa Ynez River Valley Groundwater Basin** (CMA GSA) are open and public, as required by the Ralph M. Brown Act (Cal. Gov. Code 54950 – 54963), so that any member of the public may attend, participate, and watch the CMA GSA conduct its business;

WHEREAS, Government Code section 54953(e), added by Assembly Bill 361 (2021) (“AB361”), provides for remote teleconferencing participation in meetings by members of a legislative body, without compliance with the requirements of Government Code section 54953(b)(3), subject to certain conditions and requirements; and

WHEREAS, the CMA GSA wishes to invoke the provisions of AB361 to authorize teleconference meetings subject to the provisions of Government Code section 54953(e);

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that:

Section 1. Findings. The Committee hereby finds as follows:

- (a) As provided by Government Code section 54953(e)(1), a proclaimed state of emergency exists under the California Emergency Services Act, as declared by the Governor on March 4, 2020.
- (b) As provided by Government Code section 54953(e)(1), the County of Santa Barbara Health Department has imposed or recommended measures to promote social distancing, specifically Santa Barbara County Health Order No. 2021-10.5 (see also Santa Barbara County Public Health Department Health Officials AB 361 Social Distance Recommendation issued September 28, 2021).

Section 2. Procedures for Teleconference Meetings. The CMA GSA shall hold meetings to allow for teleconference participation pursuant to the requirements of Government Code section 54953(e).

Section 3. Effective Date. This resolution shall take effect immediately upon its adoption.

Section 4. Renewal. Pursuant to Government Code section 54953(e)(3), the CMA GSA may consider findings regarding the state of emergency every 30 days.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the governing Committee of the CMA GSA on October 20, 2021 by the following roll call vote:

AYES: Ed Andrisek, Art Hibbits
NOES: None
ABSENT: None
ABSTAINED: None

ATTEST:



William J. Buelow, Secretary





Public Health Administration

300 North San Antonio Road ♦ Santa Barbara, CA 93110-1316
805/681-5100 ♦ FAX 805/681-5191

Van Do-Reynoso, MPH, PhD *Director*
Suzanne Jacobson, CPA *Chief Financial Officer*
Paige Batson, MA, PHN, RN *Deputy Director*
Darrin Eisenbarth *Deputy Director*
Dana Gamble, LCSW *Interim Deputy Director*
Polly Baldwin, MD, MPH *Medical Director*
Henning Ansorg, MD *Health Officer*

HEALTH OFFICIALS AB 361 SOCIAL DISTANCE RECOMMENDATION

Issued: September 28, 2021

COVID-19 disease prevention measures, endorsed by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, include vaccinations, facial coverings, increased indoor ventilation, handwashing, and physical distancing (particularly indoors).

Since March 2020, local legislative bodies-such as commissions, committees, boards, and councils- have successfully held public meetings with teleconferencing as authorized by Executive Orders issued by the Governor. Using technology to allow for virtual participation in public meetings is a social distancing measure that may help control transmission of the SARS-CoV-2 virus. Public meetings bring together many individuals (both vaccinated and potentially unvaccinated), from multiple households, in a single indoor space for an extended time. For those at increased risk for infection, or subject to an isolation or quarantine order, teleconferencing allows for full participation in public meetings, while protecting themselves and others from the COVID-19 virus.

Utilizing teleconferencing options for public meetings is an effective and recommended social distancing measure to facilitate participation in public affairs and encourage participants to protect themselves and others from the COVID-19 disease. This recommendation is further intended to satisfy the requirement of the Brown Act (specifically Gov't Code Section 54953(e)(1)(A)), which allows local legislative bodies in the County of Santa Barbara to use certain available teleconferencing options set forth in the Brown Act.

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Ansorg", written over a horizontal line.

Henning Ansorg, MD
Public Health Officer
County of Santa Barbara

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Van Do-Reynoso", written over a horizontal line.

Van Do-Reynoso, MPH, PhD
Public Health Director
County of Santa Barbara

DRAFT MEETING MINUTES

Groundwater Sustainability Agency for the Central Management Area in the Santa Ynez River Groundwater Basin October 25, 2021

A special meeting of the Groundwater Sustainability Agency (GSA) for the Central Management Area (CMA) in the Santa Ynez River Groundwater Basin was held on Monday, October 25, 2021 at 10:00 a.m. As a result of the COVID-19 emergency, this meeting occurred solely via teleconference in accordance with the latest Santa Barbara County Health Officer Order, as authorized by State Assembly Bill 361, and Resolution CMA-2021-001 (passed on 10/20/2021).

GSA Committee Directors Present: Ed Andrisek and Art Hibbits

Alternate GSA Committee Director Present: Cynthia Allen and Meighan Diethofer

Staff Present: Bill Buelow, Rose Hess, Amber Thompson, Matt Young, and Kevin Walsh

Others Present: Bryan Bondy, Doug Circle, Sean Diggins, Larry Lahr, Deby Laranjo, Curtis Lawler (Stetson Engineers), Sharyne Merritt, Steve Slack (CDFW), and Brett Stroud (Young Wooldridge)

I. Call to Order and Roll Call

CMA GSA Committee Director Ed Andrisek called the meeting to order at 10:02 a.m. and asked Mr. Bill Buelow to do roll call. CMA GSA Committee Directors Andrisek and Hibbits were present in person. A quorum was met.

II. Introductions and Review of SGMA in Santa Ynez River Valley Basin

Mr. Buelow announced names of phone and video attendees.

Mr. Buelow reviewed history of the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA) requirements and Groundwater Sustainability Plan (GSP) development milestones in the Santa Ynez River Basin.

III. Additions or Deletions, if any, to the Agenda

No additions or deletions were made.

IV. Public Comment

There was no public comment.

V. Review and consider approval of meeting minutes of August 23, and October 20, 2021

The minutes of the GSA Committee meetings on August 23 and October 20, 2021 were presented for GSA Committee approval. There were no comments or discussion.

GSA Committee Director Art Hibbits made a MOTION to approve the minutes of August 23 and October 20, 2021, as presented. GSA Committee Director Ed Andrisek seconded the motion, and both sets of minutes passed unanimously.

VI. Review comment letter from Santa Ynez Water Group legal counsel dated 09-21-2021

Mr. Buelow introduced a comment letter received from Joseph D. Hughes, attorney with Klein DeNatale Goldner, on behalf of the Santa Ynez Water Group, expressing concerns on landowner representation, implementation of Projects and Management Actions, and consideration of overlying groundwater rights. Discussion followed.

CMA GSA Committee Director Art Hibbits disagreed with many comments in the letter and would Santa Ynez Water Group to provide supporting evidence for their statements. He requested that staff respond to the letter and advise the GSA Committee of the response.

VII. Receive update on SGMA Stakeholder Outreach

Mr. Buelow reviewed stakeholder outreach efforts made on behalf of the GSAs. Press Releases were sent out. Paid advertisements were placed in three local newspapers: Lompoc Record, Santa Barbara News Press and Santa Ynez Valley News. In addition, SGMA Newsletter Issue # 5, published in English and Spanish, was distributed by member agencies with utility billings. A request was made to KCLU, local public radio, to add GSPs public comment periods to the Community Calendar. There were no comments or discussion.

VIII. Receive update from Citizen Advisory Group meeting of October 8, 2021

Ms. Sharyne Merritt presented the CMA Citizen Advisory Group (CAG) Memorandum dated October 8, 2021, which she prepared on behalf of the CMA CAG, regarding the CMA CAG's review and discussion of Public Draft CMA GSP and future governance. Discussion followed.

- Alternate CMA GSA Committee Director Meighan Dietenhofer asked Ms. Merritt to explain about other methods of water pumping measurement allowed by State other than meters. Ms. Merritt explained about some alternate methods using specific algorithms.
- CMA GSA Committee Director Art Hibbits asked Mr. Matt Young to verify if well logs reported to Santa Barbara County are available for use in SGMA. Mr. Young confirmed that Santa Barbara County Environmental Health and Safety keeps track of well construction information on wells since a specific date. However, construction details for older wells are not available.

- CMA GSA Committee Director Ed Andrisek asked about stream gauges. Mr. Curtis Lawler confirmed consultants have access to a stream gauge as water enters the CMA but does not have one measuring water as it flows from the CMA to the WMA. He said that staff and consultants discussed possibility of a new stream gauge to measure flow out of the CMA but explained the project could incur extensive costs, including annual maintenance costs. Mr. Buelow added that Committee Member direction would be needed to incur that type of expense.
- Mr. Larry Lahr recalled that the CMA CAG suggested that Groundwater Dependent Ecosystem Sustainable Management Criteria levels should be the same levels as the Surface Water Depletion levels.
- Ms. Merritt recalled the CMA CAG discussed if wells located in river zone could be monitored for SGMA. Mr. Buelow clarified that some wells located in the river area (Santa Ynez River Water Conservation District’s Zone A) may pull surface water from river alluvium while some wells are deeper and pump from groundwater. The wells pumping groundwater are subject to SGMA.
- Deby Laranjo and Sean Diggins, CMA CAG members, said the memo captured most of CMA CAG concerns and questions from the meeting.
- CMA GSA Committee Member Art Hibbits asked for clarification on when the CMA CAG memo mentioned adding monitoring wells, specifically if the CAG meant drill a monitoring well, at extreme expense, or add existing wells to the monitoring well network. Discussion followed. Mr. Lawler confirmed that a few landowners have volunteered use of their existing wells be added into the monitoring network. Data is being collected to determine if those wells are sufficient. He clarified that the preference and current plan is to add existing wells to the monitoring network.
- CMA GSA Committee Director Ed Andrisek asked if reports on stream gauges should add to agendas as a regular item. Mr. Buelow advised the updates will be brought to the committee regularly on quarterly basis or more often if needed. He added that stream gauge costs are being collected and will be presented to committee members for direction at a future meeting. Mr. Lawler explained costs of a new stream gauge plus the labor required for maintenance which can cost approximately \$20,000/year. CMA GSA Committee Member Art Hibbits expressed concerned with costs of adding a stream gauge if it is not placed on a main tributary.
 - Mr. Bryan Bondy agreed with CMA GSA Committee Member Art Hibbits and recommended the GSA Committee look at the overall budget before initiating one-off costs which can be considerable. He said a new stream gauge is a “would like” item not “must have” item.

IX. Workshop and Q&A on Public Draft CMA GSP and Future Governance Options

Mr. Curtis Lawler (Stetson Engineers) presented slides “October 25 2021, GSA 2021 Special Meeting, Draft Groundwater Sustainability Plan” for the CMA and gave an

overview of components and efforts involved with creating the Public Draft Groundwater Sustainability Plan (GSP) in the CMA as well as next steps of the process. Discussion followed.

- CMA GSA Committee Member Ed Andrisek asked if GSP submission deadlines have any flexibility, given the COVID pandemic. Mr. Buelow said deadlines were set by SGMA law and would require a legislative act to change which is not expected. Mr. Brett Stroud, Young Wooldridge, confirmed there is no pending legislation to change SGMA law or GSP due dates.
- Ms. Sharyne Merritt thanked Mr. Buelow and Mr. Matt Young for their presentation to the Santa Barbara County Agriculture Advisory Committee.
- Ms. Merritt asked if outreach was made to farm bureau and vintners. She requested that outreach efforts be made so that metering and fees are not a surprise to those stakeholders.
- Ms. Merritt asked if there will be consideration of additional directors for the CMA GSA Committee, including small water purveyors in the area, an environmental director, and an agricultural director.
- Ms. Merritt asked if implementation of SGMA GSP will impact installation of new wells and future growth of City of Buellton. Rose Hess clarified the Urban Growth Boundary restrictions for growth will expire in two years.
- CMA GSA Committee Member Art Hibbits asked if there are any examples of DWR responses to other submitted GSPs.
 - Mr. Matt Young reported that Cuyama received DWR comments on four areas needing revisions. He anticipated, by January, future revisions will be needed but the Basin will have 180 days to provide those revisions to DWR.
 - He added that consultants reviewed GSPs that were approved, denied, and had revisions required.
 - Mr. Young gave a brief update on the San Antonio Basin, as it is on the same due date track as the Santa Ynez Basin. He stated that GSI created their GSP and it is similar to the EMA GSP. However, San Antonio has numerous Groundwater Dependent Ecosystems unlike any in the management areas of the Santa Ynez Basin. Another difference is that San Antonio Basin independent irrigators formed a water district and there are no large urban areas, so the GSP is focused on agriculture versus urban interests.
 - Mr. Brett Stroud shared that DWR comments have some form of objective measurement as a theme.

- CMA GSA Committee Member Art Hibbits asked if other submitted GSPs require meters.
 - Mr. Young reported that Cuyama required meters because local growers preferred metering to using remote sensor data.
 - Mr. Buelow pointed out that the CMA has a lot of small, de minimis, pumpers that may be not required to install a meter although their aggregate pumping adds up to a significant amount. The GSA Committee will need to decide on a good alternative to metering for those de minimis pumpers.
 - He added that the Santa Ynez River Water Conservation District's has been working on these alternative methods so there is no need to reinvent.

Mr. Brett Stroud (Young Wooldridge) discussed options from his presentation "Santa Ynez River Groundwater Basin Governance and Funding Proposals" presented on August 23, 202. Discussion followed.

- Mr. Stroud explained that the CMA CAG memorandum supported a hybrid model of governance. He explained that forming a JPA could split coordinated costs affecting all three GSAs between the three GSAs. He emphasized that the Joint Exercise of Powers Act is very flexible so that all decision making could be left at local GSA level while certain costs can be shared. He suggested that a Single JPA (3 GSAs fall under one umbrella to share some costs) seemed to be most popular option during the other management areas GSA meetings. He further explained the least favored option was having three separate JPAs where management areas in Basin would not share any costs.
- Mr. Buelow requested committee members for guidance to staff regarding future governance. He asked if there was anything else the committee would like worked on with other two management areas. He reported that member agency staff currently have governance meetings monthly.
 - CMA GSA Committee Member Art Hibbits asked what is the most effective cost method going forward? He said he preferred creating a JPA to share costs versus the CMA being alone. Mr. Buelow agreed that most thoughts were to keep governance simple and with modest cost.
- Mr. Buelow added that initiating metering requirement, completing a required rate study, and developing SGMA fees program, that SGMA independent funding could take a year. However, right now, the information needed is how will governance structure be done, how will the GSAs relate to other GSA in the Basin, establish budgets and determine where funds needed will come from in the meantime.
- CMA GSA Committee Member Ed Andrisek asked for clarification on whose voice should be listened to since there are so many differing opinions. Mr. Buelow explained that the SGMA law states that the GSA needs to consider all stakeholders

when creating the GSP, but that ultimate decision making is given to the GSA Committee as the governing body. CMA GSA Committee Member Ed Andrisek asked for template and example of pitfalls from other basins to learn from. He mentioned since SB-88 had a roll-out for required meters, we could follow that model as a template.

- Mr. Lawler added the GSP from Santa Cruz and Salinas were accepted by DWR and both GSPs required meters. He said that meters seemed to be the preferred method in order to have good records.
- Alternate CMA GSA Committee Director Meighan Diethofer preferred that future governance should be made as efficient as possible.
- There was no public comment.

X. Next Regular CMA GSA Meeting: Monday, November 15, 2021, 10:00 AM

Mr. Buelow announced the next CMA GSA Committee Regular Meeting will be Monday, November 15, 2021, 10:00 AM. The CMA GSA Committee Directors unanimously agreed to hold the meeting using the hybrid approach with in-person participation at the Buellton City Council Chambers and ZOOM video/teleconference available for public participation as well.

XI. CMA GSA Committee requests and comments

CMA GSA Director Art Hibbits requested staff responses to the three issues raised by Ms. Sharyne Merritt during this meeting and staff response to the letter received from the attorney representing the Santa Ynez Water Group.

CMA GSA Committee Member Ed Andrisek requested a SantaYnezWater.org website visits report.

XII. Adjournment

CMA GSA Director Art Hibbits adjourned the meeting at 12:05 p.m.

Ed Andrisek, Chairman

William J. Buelow, Secretary

SYRWCD CMA
BALANCE SHEET
SEPTEMBER 30, 2021

Assets

Current Assets

Mechanics Bank #5472 \$83,865.38
Other Current Assets 1,000.00

TOTAL Current Assets 84,865.38

TOTAL Assets \$84,865.38

Liabilities AND Equity

TOTAL Liabilities .00

Net Position

Retained Earnings 148,763.63
Retained Earnings-Current Year (63,898.25)

TOTAL Net Position 84,865.38

TOTAL Liabilities AND Equity \$84,865.38

SYRWCD CMA
INCOME STATEMENT
FOR THE 3 PERIODS ENDED SEPTEMBER 30, 2021

	QUARTER TO DATE		YEAR TO DATE	
	ACTUAL	PERCENT	ACTUAL	PERCENT
TOTAL Revenue	\$.00	.0 %	.00	.0
Gross Profit	.00	.0	.00	.0
Expenses:				
Consultants				
Stakeholder Engagement	3,347.00	.0	3,347.00	.0
GSP - HCM	1,086.50	.0	1,086.50	.0
GSP - Water Budget, GW Models	1,303.00	.0	1,303.00	.0
GSP - Monitor/Measure	3,406.25	.0	3,406.25	.0
GSP - Sustainable Mgt Criteria	8,995.50	.0	8,995.50	.0
GSP - Projects/Mgt Actions	7,594.50	.0	7,594.50	.0
GSP - GSP Doc	19,348.00	.0	19,348.00	.0
GSP-AEM Survey	18,817.50	.0	18,817.50	.0
TOTAL Consultants	63,898.25	.0	63,898.25	.0
TOTAL Expenses	63,898.25	.0	63,898.25	.0
Net Income from Operations	(63,898.25)	.0	(63,898.25)	.0
Earnings before Income Tax	(63,898.25)	.0	(63,898.25)	.0
Net Income (Loss)	\$(63,898.25)	.0 %	(63,898.25)	.0

**GROUNDWATER SUSTAINABILTY AGENCY FOR THE
CENTRAL MANAGEMENT AREA (CMA)
IN THE SANTA YNEZ RIVER VALLEY GROUNDWATER BASIN**

JULY 2021 WARRANT LIST FOR COMMITTEE APPROVAL

<u>NUMBER</u>	<u>DATE</u>	<u>PAYEE</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>	<u>AMOUNT</u>
			NONE	\$ -
MONTH TOTAL				\$ -

AUGUST 2021 WARRANT LIST FOR COMMITTEE APPROVAL

<u>NUMBER</u>	<u>DATE</u>	<u>PAYEE</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>	<u>AMOUNT</u>
1037	08/12/21	Stetson Engineers	June 2021 Engineering Service (Task Order #2 & AEM work)	\$ 37,744.75
MONTH TOTAL				\$ 37,744.75

SEPTEMBER 2021 WARRANT LIST FOR COMMITTEE APPROVAL

<u>NUMBER</u>	<u>DATE</u>	<u>PAYEE</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>	<u>AMOUNT</u>
1038	09/15/21	Stetson Engineers	July 2021 Engineering Service (Task Order #2 & AEM work)	\$ 26,153.50
MONTH TOTAL				\$ 26,153.50

TOTAL THIS QUARTER: \$ 63,898.25

**Groundwater Sustainability Agency for the Central Management
Area in the Santa Ynez River Valley Groundwater Basin**

RESOLUTION CMA-2021-002

**RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE CHAIRPERSON TO SIGN THE SANTA YNEZ
RIVER VALLEY GROUNDWATER BASIN COORDINATION AGREEMENT**

WHEREAS, the Groundwater Sustainability Agency for the Central Management Area in the Santa Ynez River Valley Groundwater Basin (“GSA”), formed by Memorandum of Agreement dated January 11, 2017 (“MOA”), is the exclusive GSA for the Central Management Area of the Santa Ynez River Valley Groundwater Basin (Bulletin 118 Basin No. 3-015) (“Basin”);

WHEREAS, the GSA has prepared a Groundwater Sustainability Plan (“GSP”) for the Central Management Area;

WHEREAS, Water Code section 10727.6 requires each GSA to “coordinate with other agencies preparing a groundwater sustainability plan within the basin to ensure that the plans utilize the same data and methodologies”;

WHEREAS, Water Code section 10727(b)(3) requires that multiple GSPs implemented by multiple GSAs must be coordinated pursuant to a coordination agreement that covers the entire Basin;

WHEREAS, in February 2020, the individual member agencies of the three GSAs in the Basin executed that Intra-Basin Administrative Agreement for Implementation of the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act in the Santa Ynez River Valley Groundwater Basin, dated February 26, 2020 (“Intra-Basin Agreement”);

WHEREAS, in the Intra-Basin Agreement, the member agencies of the Parties agreed to develop and execute a Coordination Agreement in accordance with Water Code sections 10727(b)(3), 10727.6, and 10733.4(b)(3), and California Code of Regulations, title 23, Section 357.4;

WHEREAS, a Coordination Agreement has been prepared in consultation with staff of the member agencies of all three GSAs in the Basin and presented to this GSA for approval; and

WHEREAS, the GSA finds that the Coordination Agreement complies with the requirements of the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (“SGMA”).

NOW THEREFORE, the GSA hereby resolves as follows:

- 1) Each of the recitals above is true and correct and is incorporated herein by reference.
- 2) The GSA finds that that the Coordination Agreement complies with the requirements of SGMA.

- 3) The GSA hereby authorizes and instructs its Chairperson to execute the Coordination Agreement in substantially the form presented to the GSA, subject to such minor changes as are approved by the Chairperson.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the governing Committee of the CMA GSA on November 15, 2021 by the following roll call vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

ABSTAINED:

ATTEST:

Ed Andrisek, Jr., Chairman

William J. Buelow, Secretary

Santa Ynez River Valley Groundwater Basin Coordination Agreement

This Coordination Agreement (“Agreement”) is made by and between the Santa Ynez River Valley Groundwater Basin Western Management Area Groundwater Sustainability Agency (“WMA GSA”), the Santa Ynez River Valley Groundwater Basin Central Management Area Groundwater Sustainability Agency (“CMA GSA”), and the Santa Ynez River Valley Groundwater Basin Eastern Management Area Groundwater Sustainability Agency (“EMA GSA”) pursuant to the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (Water Code, div. 6, part 2.74) (“SGMA”). WMA GSA, CMA GSA, and EMA GSA are referred to herein collectively as the “Parties” and individually as a “Party” or a “GSA.” This Agreement shall be effective as of January 1, 2022 (“Effective Date”).

Recitals

A. WHEREAS, SGMA requires all groundwater basins designated as high or medium priority by the California Department of Water Resources (“DWR”) to be managed by one or more Groundwater Sustainability Agencies (“GSAs”) pursuant to one or more Groundwater Sustainability Plans (“GSPs”).

B. WHEREAS, the Santa Ynez River Valley Groundwater Basin (DWR Bulletin 118 Basin Number 3-015) (“Basin”) has been designated as a medium-priority basin by DWR.

C. WHEREAS, the WMA GSA was formed by the City of Lompoc, the Vandenberg Village Community Services District, the Mission Hills Community Services District, the Santa Ynez River Water Conservation District, and the Santa Barbara County Water Agency pursuant to that Memorandum of Agreement for Formation of a Groundwater Sustainability Agency for the Western Management Area in the Santa Ynez River Valley Groundwater Basin Under the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act, dated January 11, 2017 (“WMA MOA”).

D. WHEREAS, the CMA GSA was formed by the City of Buellton, the Santa Ynez River Water Conservation District, and the Santa Barbara County Water Agency pursuant to that Memorandum of Agreement for Formation of a Groundwater Sustainability Agency for the Central Management Area in the Santa Ynez River Valley Groundwater Basin Under the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act, dated January 11, 2017 (“CMA MOA”).

E. WHEREAS, the EMA GSA was formed by the City of Solvang, the Santa Ynez River Water Conservation District, Improvement District No. 1, the Santa Ynez River Water Conservation District, and the Santa Barbara County Water Agency pursuant to the Memorandum of Agreement for Formation of a Groundwater Sustainability Agency for the Eastern Management Area in the Santa Ynez River Valley Groundwater Basin Under the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act, dated April 27, 2017 (“EMA MOA”).

F. WHEREAS, each Party is authorized to prepare and adopt a GSP under SGMA for a portion of the Basin, and pursuant to the WMA MOA, the CMA MOA, and the EMA MOA, each Party determined to prepare a separate GSP for its respective Management Area in the Basin.

G. WHEREAS, in February 2020, the individual member agencies of the Parties executed that Intra-Basin Administrative Agreement for Implementation of the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act in the Santa Ynez River Valley Groundwater Basin, dated February 26, 2020 (“Intra-Basin Agreement”).

H. WHEREAS, Water Code section 10727.6 requires each GSA to “coordinate with other agencies preparing a groundwater sustainability plan within the basin to ensure that the plans utilize the same data and methodologies.”

I. WHEREAS, Water Code section 10727(b)(3) requires that multiple GSPs implemented by multiple GSAs must be coordinated pursuant to a coordination agreement that covers the entire Basin.

J. WHEREAS, in the Intra-Basin Agreement, the member agencies of the Parties agreed to develop and execute this Agreement in accordance with Water Code sections 10727(b)(3), 10727.6, and 10733.4(b)(3), and California Code of Regulations, title 23, Section 357.4.

K. WHEREAS, throughout the process of developing the three GSPs for the Basin, numerous activities were undertaken within each Management Area and among the Management Areas and Parties pursuant to Water Code section 10727.6 to coordinate on a full range of topics relevant to SGMA, including, without limitation, the following:

1. Shared data and methodologies for the topics listed in Water Code section 10727.6
2. Description of geologic units in each Management Area
3. Description of principal aquifers and proposed management under SGMA
4. Methodology for assessing factors such as agricultural and municipal water demands, groundwater and surface water production, irrigation return flow, irrigation efficiencies, crop water use factors, mountain front recharge, stream infiltration, septic return flow, evapotranspiration, municipal water use (inside and outside), non-municipal domestic water use, and discharge from wastewater treatment plants, including manner of disposal
5. Groundwater model domain, layering, layer elevations and thicknesses, ground surface digital elevation model, and numerical model code
6. Precipitation and streamflow data including existing and discontinued gauges
7. Historical water level data
8. Deliveries and use of imported State Water Project (“SWP”) water
9. Deliveries and use of Cachuma Project water
10. Diversions and use of Santa Ynez River water
11. Phreatophyte water use
12. Parameters for each principal aquifer, including transmissivity, storativity, and porosity
13. Land use survey datasets and trends throughout the Basin
14. Groundwater flux between Management Areas and the adjacent groundwater basin

15. Base period for water budgets
16. Mountain front recharge
17. Geophysical investigations
18. Criteria for selection of monitoring networks and sustainable management criteria
19. Estimates of funding needs for implementation of the GSPs

L. WHEREAS, consultants for the Parties, including GSI Water Solutions, Inc., Stetson Engineers Inc., and Geosyntec Consultants, participated in at least 35 meetings to discuss the development and coordination of technical elements of the three GSPs for the Basin, in addition to numerous meetings of Citizens' Advisory Groups in each Management Area.

Agreement

Now, therefore, the Parties agree as follows:

Article 1. Purpose

The purpose of this Agreement is to comply with SGMA coordination agreement requirements, ensure that the multiple GSPs within the Basin have been prepared utilizing the same data and methodologies for designated assumptions, as required under Water Code section 10727.6 and California Code of Regulations, title 23, sections 350 et seq. ("SGMA Regulations"), and ensure that the elements of the GSPs are appropriately coordinated to support sustainable groundwater management throughout the Basin.

The Parties intend that this Agreement be a description of how the multiple GSPs, developed by the individual GSAs, are implemented together to satisfy the requirements of SGMA. Each Party will include this Agreement as part of its individual GSP.

Article 2. Plan Manager and Point of Contact – § 357.4(b)(1)

§2.1 Designation of Plan Manager

- (a) The Parties designate the current Groundwater Program Manager of the Santa Ynez River Water Conservation District ("SYRWCD") to serve as the Plan Manager for the GSAs, as defined in SGMA Regulations section 351(z). In the event (i) said Plan Manager ceases to be employed by SYRWCD, (ii) SYRWCD elects to discontinue said designation of Plan Manager, or (iii) any Party requests the designation of a new Plan Manager, the Parties shall consider the designation of a new Plan Manager.
- (b) The designation of a new Plan Manager requires unanimous agreement by the Parties. Any failure to obtain unanimous agreement shall be subject to the dispute resolution procedures set forth in this Agreement.

§2.2 Responsibilities of Plan Manager

- (a) The Plan Manager shall serve as the point of contact for DWR as specified in SGMA Regulations section 357.4(b)(1).

- (b) The Plan Manager shall submit or direct the submittal of all GSPs, GSP amendments, supporting information, monitoring data, other pertinent information, annual reports, and periodic evaluations to DWR as required by SGMA and the SGMA Regulations.
- (c) The Plan Manager has no authority to take any action on behalf of the GSAs or a particular GSA without the specific direction and authority of the GSAs or the particular GSA, respectively.

Article 3. Responsibilities and Procedures – § 357.4(b)(2)

§3.1 Responsibility of the Parties

The Parties shall work collaboratively to comply with SGMA, the SGMA Regulations, and this Agreement in the implementation of their GSPs. This Agreement does not otherwise affect each Party's responsibility to implement the terms of its respective GSP. Rather, this Agreement is a mechanism through which the Parties will coordinate portions of the multiple GSPs to ensure such GSP coordination complies with SGMA and the SGMA Regulations.

§3.2 Procedure for Timely Exchange of Information

The Parties will continue to exchange information through collaboration and/or informal requests made among staff for the member agencies of the Parties. Nothing in this Agreement shall be construed to prohibit any Party from requesting or exchanging information with any other Party by any other informal or formal means.

§3.3 Procedure for Dispute Resolution

- (a) The Parties agree to mediate any claim or dispute arising under this Agreement or concerning a Party's compliance with the requirements of SGMA before filing any court action ("Dispute"). Any Party may elect not to mediate a Dispute, but if a Party commences a court action without first attempting to resolve the matter through mediation that Party will not be entitled to recover attorneys' fees or costs, even if such fees or costs would otherwise be available to that Party in any such action. A Party will satisfy the requirement for "first attempting to resolve the matter through mediation" by proceeding or otherwise participating in accordance with the entire process set forth in this article.
- (b) In the event of a Dispute, or where the Parties cannot reach agreement on any matter arising under this Agreement or concerning a Party's compliance with the requirements of SGMA, any Party may issue a Notice of Dispute to the other Parties that describes in detail the claim or disputed matter. Within twenty (20) calendar days from the date of the Notice of Dispute, at least one meeting shall be conducted among the Parties who choose to participate as a good faith attempt to resolve the Dispute informally ("Informal Dispute Resolution").
- (c) In the event the Dispute is not resolved through Informal Dispute Resolution within forty-five (45) calendar days from the date of the Notice of Dispute, the Party that issued the initial Notice of Dispute shall provide

a separate written notification to all Parties that participated in the Informal Dispute Resolution process which identifies three mediator candidates, each of whom must be an attorney, engineer, or hydrogeologist experienced and familiar with SGMA, to mediate the Dispute (“Formal Dispute Resolution”). All mediator candidates must be unbiased neutrals who are not participants in any of the GSAs in the Basin and who are not officials, officers, employees, contractors, consultants, or agents of any of the Parties to this Agreement or a Parties’ member agencies. Within ten (10) days of receiving a written notification initiating Formal Dispute Resolution, all Parties that elect to participate in such Formal Dispute Resolution may provide a written response consenting to one or more of the mediator candidates or identifying up to three additional qualified neutral mediator candidates. Thereafter, if a mediator is not mutually agreed upon by said participating Parties from the combined list within fifteen (15) calendar days, each Party will submit two potential mediators that they would approve and a mediator will be picked by a non-Party through random selection from the Parties' combined lists of remaining mediators. Once initiated, the Formal Dispute Resolution will conclude within forty-five (45) calendar days.

- (d) Mediation fees, if any, will be equally divided among the Parties that elect to participate in a mediation. Each Party involved in the mediation will be responsible for its own attorneys’ fees and costs.
- (e) This article shall not preclude any Party from meeting and conferring with any other Party or Parties to mutually resolve a Dispute prior to requesting or participating in the mediation processes described in this article. This article shall not preclude any Party from seeking a preliminary injunction or other interlocutory relief if necessary to avoid irreparable harm or damages.
- (f) For purposes of this article, the Parties agree that up to two (2) representatives from each member agency of each Party may participate in any meetings or discussions related to Informal Dispute Resolution or Formal Dispute Resolution processes.
- (g) If the Parties to this Agreement enter into any agreement for the joint exercise of powers or amendment to the Inter-Basin Agreement, they may provide in such agreement or amendment for dispute resolution procedures that may replace, revise, or supplement the procedures in this article.

Article 4. Groundwater Level Data and Monitoring Network – § 357.4(b)(3)(A)

§4.1 Coordinated Monitoring Networks

The Parties have developed coordinated monitoring networks in accordance with SGMA Regulations sections 354.32 through 354.40. The monitoring networks comprise wells included in the California Statewide Groundwater Elevation Monitoring (“CASGEM”) Program and other existing monitoring networks maintained by federal, state, and local agencies. Wells were selected

based on their adequacy under DWR's regulations and Best Management Practices. A map of the combined network, as well as a table of the included wells, is attached hereto as Appendix 1. A Party may add or remove wells from the monitoring network in its respective GSP by providing written notice to the other Parties and to the Plan Manager. The coordinated monitoring networks are intended to accomplish the following objectives:

- (a) demonstrate progress toward achieving measurable objectives described in the respective GSPs;
- (b) monitor potential impacts to beneficial uses and users of groundwater in the Basin;
- (c) monitor changes in groundwater conditions relative to measurable objectives and minimum thresholds described in the respective GSPs; and
- (d) monitor and quantify annual changes in water budget components.

§4.2 Groundwater Elevation Data

Groundwater elevation data to be used for the purposes of estimating changes in groundwater storage, evaluating sustainable management criteria, preparing annual reports, and measuring groundwater sustainability will be collected via the coordinated monitoring networks described in article 4.1 above and Appendix 1 to this Agreement.

Article 5. Coordinated Water Budgets – § 357.4(b)(3)(B)

§5.1 Coordinated Budgets

In accordance with SGMA Regulations section 354.18, the Parties have prepared coordinated water budgets for the Basin, relying on common assumptions and sources of data. The historical water budget in each GSP uses data from water years 1982-2018. The current water budget in each GSP uses data from water years 2011-2018. The projected water budget in each GSP analyzes conditions for water years 2018-2072.

§5.2 Groundwater Extraction Data

Groundwater extractions within the boundaries of the SYRWCD are subject to reporting requirements imposed by SYRWCD under the Water Conservation District Act (Wat. Code, §§ 74000, *et seq.*). The water budgets utilize those reported numbers within those boundaries. For lands outside the boundaries of SYRWCD, the water budgets estimate extractions by calculating crop evapotranspiration for particular land uses, relying on the same crop duty factors used by the SYRWCD. In addition, for small public water systems (pumping outside of SYRWCD), reported pumping data was utilized from the California Drinking Water Information Clearinghouse ("DRINC"). All Management Areas currently have plans to require well metering, or an alternative approved method, to increase the accuracy of reported groundwater extraction data.

§5.3 Surface Water Supply

The water budgets utilize streamflow gages for the Santa Ynez River and certain tributaries maintained by the United States Geological Survey. For data regarding the Cachuma Project (including releases from Bradbury Dam), the water budgets use data from the United States Bureau

of Reclamation. For data regarding State Water Project deliveries, the water budgets use data from the Central Coast Water Authority (“CCWA”).

§5.4 Total Water Use

Total water use in the water budgets is calculated using assumptions based on historical estimates provided in Stetson Engineers (1992) *Santa Ynez River Water Conservation District, Water Resources Management Planning Process, Phase I: Baseline Data and Background Information* and groundwater extraction data reported to the SYRWCD. In addition, surface water use for State Water Project and Cachuma Project deliveries are based on records from the CCWA and Reclamation, respectively.

§5.5 Change in Groundwater Storage

The water budgets calculate change in groundwater storage using the data described in this article. For deep percolation of precipitation, the water budgets use the United States Geological Survey’s Basin Characterization Model (May 2017; Retrieved October 2020). For subsurface inflows and outflows, modeling was coordinated between the GSAs and the flows across Management Area boundaries are consistently accounted for across the water budgets. Change of groundwater in storage in each Management Area is calculated by 1) developing water level elevation contour maps using representative wells for each reporting period, 2) computing a change in elevation between reporting periods, 3) computing the volume of aquifer this represents, and 4) multiplying a storage coefficient value by the aquifer volume to compute the volumetric change in storage (positive or negative relative to the previous reporting period).

Article 6. Sustainable Yield and Undesirable Results – § 357.4(b)(3)(C)

§6.1 Determination of Sustainable Yield

Sustainable yield is defined in SGMA as “the maximum quantity of water, calculated over a base period representative of long-term conditions in the basin and including any temporary surplus that can be withdrawn annually from a groundwater supply without causing an undesirable result.” As further set forth in the GSPs, each Party has estimated the sustainable yield of its respective Management Area in the Basin by using a calculated water budget and related adjustments based on particular circumstances in each Management Area that may create undesirable results as defined by SGMA and established by the respective GSAs in the Basin.

§6.2 Estimate of Sustainable Yield

The respective GSPs estimate the sustainable yield of the Basin to be 42,070 acre-feet per year (AFY), with 12,870 AFY in the EMA, 2,800 AFY in the CMA, and 26,400 AFY in the WMA. This estimate is subject to future revision based on changes in conditions and additional data regarding water budget components and the potential for undesirable results in the respective Management Areas.

Article 7. Process for Submissions to DWR – § 357.4(d)

§7.1 GSP and Coordination Agreement Submission

The Parties shall submit their respective GSPs to DWR through the Plan Manager in accordance with SGMA and the SGMA Regulations. In accordance with SGMA Regulations section 357.4(c), the Parties intend that adherence to the provisions and procedures set forth in

articles 1 through 7 of this Agreement, along with adherence to the provisions and procedures of the Intra-Basin Agreement and the respective GSPs, will provide the necessary platform and mechanisms to ensure that the GSPs, implemented together, will satisfy the requirements of SGMA (including but not limited to Water Code sections 10727.2, 10727.4, and 10727.6) and ensure sustainable groundwater management for the entire Basin.

§7.2 Periodic Evaluations and Plan Amendments

The periodic evaluations required by SGMA Regulations section 356.4, as well as any amendments to any GSP, shall be submitted to DWR through the Plan Manager. A Party intending to amend its GSP shall endeavor in good faith to provide the other Parties with as much advance notice of such activity as practically possible, but in any event no less than what SGMA and the SGMA Regulations require for public notice.

§7.3 Monitoring Data

As provided by SGMA Regulations section 354.40, the Plan Manager shall submit monitoring data on forms provided or approved by DWR and included in the Annual Reports.

§7.4 Annual Reports

Each Party, for its respective GSP, shall endeavor to provide the data and information required by SGMA Regulations section 356.2 to the Plan Manager by January 31 of the year in which an Annual Report is due. Draft annual reports shall be provided by the Plan Manager to the Parties for approval, and the final reports shall be submitted to DWR by the Plan Manager after final approval by the Parties.

Article 8. Coordinated Data Management Systems – § 357.4(e)

The Parties have developed two separate Data Management Systems, one for the EMA and the other for the CMA and WMA, that are capable of storing and reporting information relevant to the development and implementation of the respective GSPs, including Basin monitoring. The Parties will coordinate with the Plan Manager to ensure that these systems collect, store, and report the data necessary for implementation of the GSPs and reporting to DWR.

Article 9. Adjudicated Areas and Adopted Alternatives - § 357.4(f)

As of the Effective Date of this Agreement, no portions of the Basin have been adjudicated or have submitted an alternative to a GSP for DWR approval pursuant to Water Code section 10733.6.

Article 10. Duration, Modification, and Termination

§10.1 Duration of Agreement

This term of this Agreement shall begin on the Effective Date and continue until modified or terminated as provided for in this article.

§10.2 Review and Modification

This Agreement shall be reviewed by the Parties as part of each five-year assessment of the GSPs and may be supplemented, amended, or modified only by the unanimous written agreement of the Parties.

§10.3 Adding Parties

By unanimous written agreement of the existing Parties, a new or additional GSA or GSAs may be added to this Agreement if such entity or entities will submit a GSP within the Basin.

§10.4 Termination/Withdrawal

This Agreement may be terminated by the unanimous written approval of the Parties. Upon thirty (30) calendar days written notice to the other Parties, any Party may withdraw from this Agreement, and the Agreement shall remain in effect for the remaining Parties.

Article 11. Groundwater Rights

The Parties agree that nothing in this Agreement represents or should be construed as the determination of any claim or assertion of a groundwater right; specifically, the Parties agree that the coordinated water budget information or data does not amount to an allocation, or otherwise represent a determination, validation, or denial of any claimed or asserted groundwater right.

Article 12. General Provisions

§12.1 Entire Agreement

This Agreement incorporates the entire and exclusive agreement of the Parties with respect to the matters described herein and supersedes all prior negotiations and agreements (written, oral, or otherwise) related thereto; provided, however, this Agreement does not amend or modify the WMA MOA, the CMA MOA, the EMA MOA, or the Intra-Basin Agreement, as those documents may be amended or supplemented. The Recitals set forth above are hereby incorporated into this Agreement.

§12.2 Execution in Counterparts

This Agreement may be executed in two or more counterparts, each of which will be deemed an original, but all of which together will constitute one and the same instrument.

§12.3 Notices

Any formal notice required or other formal communication given under the terms of this Agreement will be in writing to all of the Parties and will be given personally, by electronic mail (email), by certified mail (postage prepaid and return receipt requested), or by express courier (with confirmation of receipt). The date of receipt of any written notice provided hereunder will be the date of actual personal service, email, or courier service, or three days after the postmark on certified mail.

§12.4 Counsel

The Parties recognize that as of the Effective Date, independent legal counsel has not been retained to represent any of the three Parties. The Parties agree that the participation of counsel for any individual member agency of a Party in matters related to this Agreement will not be construed to create an attorney-client relationship or a duty of loyalty between the attorney and any Party, and no such relationship will be deemed to arise by implication as a result of this Agreement. The provisions of this article will not be affected in the event that any or all of the Parties determine(s) to retain independent legal counsel.

Date: _____

Western Management Area GSA

By:

Its: Chairperson

Date: _____

Central Management Area GSA

By:

Its: Chairperson

Date: _____

Eastern Management Area GSA

By:

Its: Chairperson

DRAFT

**Project Scope and Estimated Costs for
Santa Ynez River Valley Groundwater Basin –
Western Management Area and Central Management Area
Sustainable Groundwater Management Act Annual Report
for Water Year 2021**

Summary

The Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA) requires annual reports which cover the conditions of the previous water year (WY)¹ starting April 1st each year after the adoption of the plan. Santa Ynez River Valley Groundwater Basin is a medium priority groundwater basin and will have a plan adopted in January 2022, with the first annual report due immediately after the plan is adopted, on April 1st 2022. This scope and cost estimate was developed as combined for the Western Management Area (WMA) and Central Management Area (CMA) of the Santa Ynez River Valley Groundwater Basin.

SGMA Annual Report Project Phases

- Data collection effort and updating effort related to collecting data related to groundwater levels, production, and surface water. Data would be updated and posted into the Santa Ynez data management system (at SYWATER.info). Estimated to take around \$7.5K of effort.
- Analysis effort to convert groundwater level information into projected groundwater level contours for the management areas and estimates of updated storage calculations. Estimated to take around \$10K of effort.
- Submission of data to DWR on the required annual report components as part of DWR's Annual Reports Module. These components include quantifying groundwater extraction by water use type, methodology used to quantify groundwater extraction, identifying sources of surface water supply, and groundwater levels at wells. Estimated to take around \$7.5K of effort.
- The text and content of the SGMA annual report is described in the regulations (23 CCR § 356.2. Annual Reports). It includes provisions describing general information summarizing the basin, hydrologic conditions in the basin including groundwater elevations, hydrographs, contour maps, summary of extraction data, surface water quantities, available surface water supplies, total water use, and storage maps. A final section includes summarizing updates related to projects and management actions from the groundwater sustainability plan. Additional supporting information may be provided as appendices.

As the first the report on Water Year 2021 will be the first report of series of annual reports, it is expected that a higher effort will be required when compared to subsequent reports. This would include sending the report to a technical editor. Drafting text and creating maps and figures is estimated to take around \$25K of effort.

¹ SGMA water years run October 1st through September 30th

- Meeting and presentation on the SGMA Annual Report. This is expected to include putting together a presentation slideshow for publication in a meeting packet as well as presentation of the results. The amount of effort required for this step is estimated around \$10K.

Proposed Timeline

Date	Actor	Action
November 2021	Stetson	Review water year end (October 2021) water level data collected by County.
December 2021	Stetson	Review water quality data collected by USGS on behalf of District and County of Santa Barbara.
Jan 3-14, 2022	Stetson	Data collection and update work.
Jan 14	District	District to provide Pumping data through Oct. 1, 2021
Jan 24-Feb 4	Stetson	Stetson to put together draft texts. Send to technical editor.
Feb 9	Editor	Stetson to receive technical edit.
Feb 11	Stetson	Stetson to provide Draft Report to District
Feb 16	Stetson	Provide Presentation draft for District Review on Feb 11
Feb 18	District	District to provide Comments on Presentation
Feb 22	Stetson	Stetson to provide finalized Presentation
March 1 – March 4	GSA	Meeting with GSA, Stetson to Present
March 4	GSA	All GSA Comments Submitted to Stetson
March 11	Stetson	Stetson to provide Draft incorporating comments to District
March 18	District	District Final Review
March 25	Stetson	Stetson to Address items from Final Review
March 29	Stetson	Submission of Final Document to DWR
April 1	-	Last Day for Submission of report to DWR

Estimated Costs

Overall expectation is that the amount of effort required for development of the first SGMA annual report will be \$60K combined for the Western Management Area and the Central Management Area. With the Western Management Area report with six subareas expected to be around \$35K of the total, and the Central Management Area of two subareas expected to be around \$25K of the total. Much of this effort will be related to the development of the document text.

The basis for this estimate is the cost for past submitted SGMA annual reports for WY2019 and WY2020. This estimate for Santa Ynez WMA and CMA takes into account that the WMA and CMA is significantly more complex of an area and generally requires more effort than the comparison basin. We think that this estimate would cover most potential sources of overages. A lower estimate has a higher probability of potential overages.

Key Assumptions and Expectations

- Expected results would be similar to Annual Reports for critically over drafted basins such as 2019 Indian Wells Valley.
- Field data collection will be through other projects. Stetson is not conducting additional fieldwork to collect data to support this effort.
- Costs are related to the report, not inclusive of any additional project and management actions that may be included in the annual report as appendices to show progress towards the GSP goal.
- District would provide updated groundwater pumping data through at least end of the District 2021 Fiscal Year (June 30, 2021). Volumes for pumping for the remaining three months (July 1 through September 30) would likely need to be projected for fiscal year total.
- Finalization of GSP document and submission to DWR in late January 2022 will not unduly conflict with the collection and writing effort of this SGMA annual report.
- The estimated costs may include around \$5- 10K of savings due to synergy expected from completing the CMA and WMA plans together (total estimated costs \$50-\$60K).
- Stetson staff is expecting to attend the meetings remotely. Travel, if required, would be expected to add around \$4K for related expenses per presenter.

Legal Requirements

CALIFORNIA CODE OF REGULATIONS TITLE 23, GROUNDWATER SUSTAINABILITY PLANS:
ARTICLE 7. Annual Reports and Periodic Evaluations by the Agency

§ 356.2. Annual Reports

Each Agency shall submit an annual report to the Department by April 1 of each year following the adoption of the Plan. The annual report shall include the following components for the preceding water year:

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

(b) A detailed description and graphical representation of the following conditions of the basin managed in the Plan:

(1) Groundwater elevation data from monitoring wells identified in the monitoring network shall be analyzed and displayed as follows:

(A) Groundwater elevation contour maps for each principal aquifer in the basin illustrating, at a minimum, the seasonal high and seasonal low groundwater conditions.

(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) 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.

(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.

(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.

(5) Change in groundwater in storage shall include the following:

(A) Change in groundwater in storage maps for each principal aquifer in the basin.

(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.

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

Note: Authority cited: Section 10733.2, Water Code.

Reference: Sections 10727.2, 10728, and 10733.2, Water Code