

# Cuyama Basin Groundwater Sustainability Agency Board of Directors Meeting

July 6, 2022

## Meeting Minutes

### PRESENT:

Yurosek, Derek – Chair  
Chounet, Paul – Vice Chair  
Bantilan, Cory – Secretary  
Vickery, Matt – Treasurer  
Albano, Byron  
Compton, Lynn  
Scrivner, Zack  
Anselm, Arne  
Stoller, Lorena  
Williams, Das  
Wooster, Jane  
Beck, Jim – Executive Director  
Hughes, Joe – Legal Counsel

### ABSENT:

#### 1. Call to Order

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

CBGSA Executive Director Jim Beck reminded meeting attendees to use the Microsoft Teams chat feature for indicating to staff that they have a question only and not to comment in the chat.

#### 2. Introduction of New Director

Chair Yurosek welcomed new Director Arne Anselm.

#### 3. Roll Call

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

#### 4. Pledge of Allegiance

The pledge of allegiance was led by Chair Yurosek.

#### 5. Report of General Counsel

Legal Counsel Joe Hughes addressed conflict of interest within the Board from those who filed the adjudication. Legal Counsel Hughes went on to explain that the policy that is implemented affects every groundwater consumer across the basin, not just those on the Board.

**6. Standing Advisory Committee (SAC) Meeting Report**

SAC Chair Brenton Kelly provided a report on the June 28, 2022, SAC meeting and is included below:

***Standing Advisory Committee Report******Meeting Date: June 30th, 2022****Submitted to the CBGSA Board on July 6th, 2022**By Brad DeBranch, SAC Vice-Chair*

*The Standing Advisory Committee met on June 30th, both in person and by teleconference. Quorum was established by five committee members (four present in-person and one present via teleconference). GSA staff including Taylor Blakslee, Joshua Montoya, and Alex Dominguez were present in-person with additional staff online including Jim Beck and Brian Van Lienden. Public participation consisted of approximately 15-20 members throughout the 5-hour meeting. The SAC received and accepted a letter dated June 22nd from Committee member Roberta Jaffe who was unable to attend the meeting. The SAC's feedback and recommendations are summarized below per each item of discussion.*

***Item 6.a. Review of Amended Groundwater Sustainability Plan (GSP)***

*Staff provided the next steps for moving the amended GSP forward and resubmitting to DWR later this month. One committee member expressed concerns over the GSP's failure to manage and balance the basin as a whole. That point was supported by another committee member but was also met by opposition from SAC members who questioned the hydrogeologic connectivity between certain regions of the basin.*

***Item 6.b. Update on Model Refinement***

*Woodard & Curran (W&C) provided an update on the latest modeling effort including the updated CBWRM 0.20 model which now includes additional data from 2017 to 2021, updated crop ET factors, updated model calibration parameters and updated historical and projected water budget estimates. Although this item was informational only, several comments were made related to the model elements including transmissivity and conductivity. In light of the recently conducted pump (aquifer) test performed this spring in the Ventucopa area, W&C modeling staff provided insight that the conductivity observed as a result of the study was much higher than originally modeled. A brief discussion ensued on the model's remaining imbalance of 1,400AF outside the central management area. Public comment was received on concerns of the growing operations in the northwest portion of the basin and groundwater levels being allowed to decline without being considered a management area.*

***Item 6.c. Direction on Central Management Area Policies***

- 1. Pumping Reduction Baseline*** – *Staff presented the calculations for formulating the baseline pumping reductions. In addition to the Cuyama Community Service District (CCSD), SAC discussed the need to confirm and/or consider excluding other residential or community areas such as Old Cuyama and the Cuyama Elementary School from the pumping reduction.*

**2. CCSD Pumping Reduction Exemption** – The SAC is supportive of staff's recommendation of the following assessment: 1) determine the historic period for pumping in the CCSD, 2) determine the allowance for future changes in the population in the CCSD service area, and 3) confirm the irrigated parcels within the CCSD that are part of the allocation.

**3. Allocation Methodology** – Related to the 2023 and 2024 Central Management Area allocation, the SAC discussed the landowner variance policy process for landowners to identify inaccuracies in Appendix "B". As of this meeting the landowner allocation list had not yet been distributed to the Committee. One member of the SAC provided staff with feedback on potentially holding two separate variance processes for each year to allow for change in operations and plans, and to also consider removing the processing fee to encourage more landowner participation. Through further SAC dialogue and public comment, staff confirmed that changes to Central Management Area allocation, including individual landowner changes, will impact all other landowner allocations and that it is possible for a landowner to end up with zero water allocation based on the historic pumping analysis. The SAC approved a motion by 5-0 vote to support staff's proposed variance policy and procedures as presented.

**4. Changed Water Use Inside the Central Management Area** – Recommendation provided pursuant to Allocation Methodology/Variance Policy discussion in previous topic.

**5. Central Management Area Boundary (Hydro vs. Operational)** – Staff presented the four (4) operational management area boundary maps and provided insight on the methodology and criteria of each one. Initial SAC feedback on the maps included concerns on numerous well locations that likely do not represent current field conditions. A motion was made recommending Option #2 but didn't gain a second. The SAC did not reach a consensus on a particular operational boundary however, comments made by the SAC generally supported the desire to produce a boundary that represents of the Central Management Area contour boundary as close as possible. A hybrid approach was briefly discussed in order to achieve such a boundary. Staff informed the Committee that regardless of the boundary chosen, the sustainable yield will remain the same and proportionately attributed to the lands within the Central Management Area.

**6. Management Area Criteria Evaluation** – No comment from SAC.

**7. Management Area Update** – No comment from SAC.

**8. Administration of Pumping Reduction** – The SAC approved a motion by 5-0 vote to adopt staff's proposed Administration of Pumping Reduction policy and procedures.

**9. Non-Compliance/Over Pumping Enforcement** – The SAC approved a motion by 5-0 vote to adopt staff's proposed Non-compliance/Over Pumping Enforcement policy and procedures.

**Item 6.d. Direction on GSA Well Permit Policy**

*In response to the Governor’s Executive Order as well as the GSA Board’s direction on May 4th, staff presented the proposed well requirements and criteria for new and modified wells within the entire basin. Related to modifications to existing wells there was much discussion on staff’s proposal conditioning the well to be no larger or deeper than the existing well, and no greater than 100 feet away from the existing well. The committee was generally divided on the criteria for modifications to an existing well; however, three (3) committee members did speak in favor of allowing increased well depths. Discussion ensued about the distance away from the existing well and whether or not that defines a replacement well or a new well; no consensus was reached. For construction of new wells, there was some support by SAC on staff’s recommended parameters, but others felt the parameters may be too restrictive and broad to make an assessment for well permitting purposes.*

*Respectfully Submitted,  
Brad DeBranch  
SAC Vice-Chair*

**CONSENT AGENDA**

**7-10. Consent Agenda**

Chair Yurosek asked if any Directors wanted to move any of the consent items out to discuss in more detail. No request was made and Chair Yurosek asked if there was a motion for consent agenda item nos. 7-10.

**MOTION**

Director Chounet made a motion to approve the consent agenda items 7-10. The motion was seconded by Director Bantilan, a roll call vote was made and passed with 88%.

AYES:	Yurosek, Chounet, Bantilan, Vickery, Albano, Scrivner, Anselm, Stoller, Williams, Wooster
NOES:	None
ABSTAIN:	None
ABSENT:	Compton

**ACTION ITEMS**

**11. Penalty Hearing Regarding Compliance with Meter Installation Requirement**

Executive Director Beck provided an overview of the penalty hearing regarding compliance with the meter installation requirement.

Cindy Holloway stated this property is her mother’s and she is taking it over. Ms. Holloway stated there were family issues and the property was given with minimal direction and little documentation. However, she noted a meter was installed by the March 31<sup>st</sup> deadline.

Director Wooster asked if Ms. Holloway pumped any water in 2021. Ms. Holloway replied there was very minimal pumping.

Director Chounet said he believes this is a documentation issue and not a non-compliance issue.

**MOTION**

Director Bantilan made a motion to waive the penalty fee, provided documentation is provided indicating a meter was installed prior to March 31, 2022. The motion was seconded by Vice Chair Chounet, a roll call vote was made and passed with 100%.

AYES:	Yurosek, Chounet, Bantilan, Vickery, Albano, Compton, Scrivner, Anselm, Stoller, Williams, Wooster
NOES:	None
ABSTAIN:	None
ABSENT:	None

**12. Review of Amended Groundwater Sustainability Plan**

Executive Director Beck reported that the amended Groundwater Sustainability Plan (GSP) was reviewed at the last Board meeting. Mr. Blakslee provided an overview of the GSP resubmittal process and noted this will be considered for Board approval during the upcoming public hearing.

**13. Update on Model Refinement**

Mr. Van Lienden provided an update on the model refinement tasks that were developed for the GSP and reviewed the four technical meetings that were held. He provided an overview of the model calibration statistics and the observed groundwater levels versus simulated groundwater levels.

Director Vickery asked Mr. Van Lienden how the sustainable yield allocation of 9,400 acre feet (AF) per year was estimated. Mr. Van Lienden replied that it was estimated by using the Board direction to only reduce pumping in the Central Management Area (CMA).

Director Bantilan asked if there are areas where water level change has increased. Woodard & Curran modeler Sercan Ceyhan replied most locations showed a negative decline.

Director Wooster said the northeastern part of the map reporting the change in groundwater levels is mostly using surface water and should not be reported in a map indicating change in groundwater. Mr. Van Lienden replied this area is the least confident in the model since there is minimal data.

Director Vickery asked if pumping was reduced in Ventucopa, would it increase the rate of recharge in the Central Management Area. Mr. Ceyhan replied it is difficult to give a definitive answer due to lack of data. Director Vickery emphasized the importance of addressing this data gap for the Board to be able to make more informed decisions.

Director Albano described the difficulty for a landowner who has a sustainable yield a few thousand feet above the CMA to be forced to reduce pumping due to sustainability issues in the

CMA. Director Vickery disagreed and added data gaps need to be addressed to show the connection of water upstream and downstream to be able to make a more informed decision. Director Wooster agreed with Director Vickery about needing to address the data gap.

**14. Direction on Central Management Area Policies**

Executive Director Beck provided background on the development of policies in the CMA and Mr. Blakslee provided background on the direction received by the Board for CMA policies and reviewed a new policy point regarding pumping reduction exemption for the Cuyama Community Services District (CCSD) per the GSP.

**1. Pumping Reduction Baseline/Starting Point**

Mr. Blakslee stated the first question for the policy issue is to identify the baseline or starting point for pumping reduction. He reviewed how the maximum annual pumping in the CMA was calculated.

Director Bantilan asked if the allocation of 9,400 acre-feet per year (AFY) could be recalculated. Mr. Van Lienden replied that it could be recalculated if instructed by the Board.

Director Vickery asked for clarification on the 9,400 AFY number. Mr. Van Lienden replied that the model bases inflow and outflow of the CMA boundary. Director Vickery asked if the 9,400 AFY would be revisited during the 2025 GSP update and Mr. Beck confirmed it would.

Chair Yurosek cautioned the Board on setting additional reductions that impact the CMA because the model is fluid.

**2. CCSD Pumping Reduction Exemption**

Mr. Blakslee provided an overview of the CCSD pumping reduction exemption and Executive Director Beck added there could be an addition to the 172 AF historic pumping by the CCSD of roughly 20 AF to account for other residential use as estimated by the model.

**MOTION**

Vice Chair Chounet made a motion to use 2021 modeled pumping in the Central Management Area operational boundary as the baseline with a reduction of 192 acre-feet to account for the CCSD’s historic pumping from 1998-2021 and other residential use in the CMA boundary to be confirmed by staff. The motion was seconded by Director Bantilan, a roll call vote was made and passed with 100%.

AYES: Yurosek, Chounet, Bantilan, Vickery, Albano, Compton, Scrivner, Anselm, Stoller, Williams, Wooster  
 NOES: None  
 ABSTAIN: None  
 ABSENT: None

3. Allocation Methodology

Mr. Blakslee provided an overview of the draft allocation methodology for historic water use for 2023 and 2024. He provided an overview of the methodologies used for the water use estimate. Mr. Blakslee reviewed the draft variance process and the draft variance request form for landowners to use.

Director Wooster agreed with the variance process. She expressed the need to make this known to all landowners. Mr. Beck replied that a short narrative can be put together to clarify for landowners since the raw data may be difficult to follow. Director Wooster expressed the concern for landowners to pay \$250 for the variance process when the model was inaccurate. Mr. Beck replied this is a proposed draft and the Board can choose to remove the application fee.

Director Albano suggested every allocation is reviewed by an ad hoc committee and presented to the Board.

Director Vickery clarified this policy is only for 2023 and 2024 then it will be revisited for 2025. Director Albano expressed his concern for incorrect allocations during 2023 and 2024 and the fact there is no process to challenge those who have been given a higher allocation.

Chair Yurosek emphasized the importance of the Board making a decision today.

Stakeholder Jim Wegis said he has a well in the basin that serves land in and outside of the basin. Executive Director Beck replied the model was determined based on parcels not on individual wells. Executive Director Beck stated the Board has not yet addressed the issue of a well outside the CMA pumping into the CMA.

**MOTION**

Director Anselm made a motion approve staff recommendation with direction for staff to look into preparing a narrative that explains the process of how allocations are developed. The motion was seconded by Director Bantilan, a roll call vote was made and passed with 93%.

AYES:	Yurosek, Chounet, Bantilan, Vickery, Compton, Scrivner, Anselm, Stoller, Williams, Wooster
NOES:	Albano
ABSTAIN:	None
ABSENT:	None

4. Changed Water Use Inside the Central Management Area

Executive Director Beck informed the Board that potential changed water use in the CMA would be considered in the context of the Variance Policy.

Director Anselm noted that a variance is appropriate.

---

*Chair Yurosek adjourned for recess at 4:53 p.m. and reconvened for public hearing.*

---

5. Central Management Area Boundary (Hydrologic vs Operational)

Executive Director Beck provided an overview of the four (4) different options for determining the boundary for the CMA which is provided in the Board packet.

Director Wooster stated option four should be excluded due to some parcels being composed of hundreds of acres and Director Anselm agreed.

Director Bantilan said he would be in favor of option three, but if it was based on irrigated land inside the boundary.

Director Vickery said option three makes the most sense.

Director Albano stated option four would be the best option.

Vice Chair Chounet said in all the models the CCSD is partly in and partly out.

Director Bantilan asked if fallowed lands would be included in the CMA would there be an increase allocation across the CMA. Executive Director Beck replied it would be a very minimal increase.

Director Stoller said option three would be the best.

Director Anselm made a motion to select option 3 where 50% or more of the parcel is in the hydrologic boundary or if 500 acres or more of a parcel are in the boundary then the whole parcel is in the hydrologic boundary. The motion was not seconded.

Director Albano said if a well is in the management area, then a landowner should be able to pump outside the boundary. He explained it would be beneficial to expand the overall boundary.

Director Wooster made a motion to adopt option three. The motion was seconded by Director Vickery. The motion did not pass.

Director Bantilan made a motion to adopt option 3 where 50% or more of the parcel is in the hydrologic boundary or if more than 50 irrigated acres of a parcel are in the boundary then the whole parcel is in the hydrologic boundary. The motion was not seconded.



**MOTION**

Director Anselm made a motion to select option 3 where 50% or more of the parcel is in the hydrologic boundary or if 1,000 acres or more of a parcel are in the hydrologic boundary then the whole parcel is in the boundary. The motion was seconded by Director Wooster, a roll call vote was made and passed with 77%.

AYES: Yurosek, Chounet, Vickery, Albano, Compton, Scrivner, Anselm, Stoller, Wooster  
 NOES: Elliot, Bantilan  
 ABSTAIN: None  
 ABSENT: None

Executive Director Beck asked the Board for direction on changing the baseline pumping based on the updated boundary or using the numbers based on the existing hydrologic boundary.

Director Vickery asked what will need to be done to make the change. Mr. Van Lienden replied it could be done within a day and its cost are covered by the grant.

**MOTION**

Director Bantilan made a motion to recalculate the baseline and sustainability numbers based on the operational boundary. The motion was seconded by Director Anselm, a roll call vote was made and passed with 88%.

AYES: Yurosek, Chounet, Bantilan, Vickery, Albano, Compton, Scrivner, Anselm, Stoller, Wooster  
 NOES: Elliot  
 ABSTAIN: None  
 ABSENT: None

6. Management Area Criteria Evaluation  
 Executive Director Beck provided an update that an Ad Hoc Committee will be formed to develop potential options for management area criteria.
7. Management Area Update  
 Executive Director Beck informed the Board that the management area designations will be considered when the model is updated.
8. Administration of Pumping Reduction  
 Mr. Blakslee provided an overview of the process for administration of pumping reduction which is provided in the Board packet.

Director Albano directed staff to be cognizant that there may be wells that serve multiple parcels. Director Vickery agreed with Director Albano and stated wells do not irrigate according to APN's.

Chair Yurosek said one well could serve multiple parcels and suggested meeting with the water district to discuss this issue.

Chair Yurosek directed staff to refine the process for review on September 7, 2022 and the Board agreed with this direction.

9. Non-Compliance/Over-Pumping Enforcement

Legal Counsel Hughes provided an overview of potential non-compliance/over pumping enforcement which is provided in the Board packet.

Director Anselm asked how the fees would be utilized. Legal Counsel Hughes replied that SGMA states these fees can be used for SGMA-related activities.

Director Albano stated the fees are too high and explained what other basins are doing. He noted for 2023 the fee should be reduced to \$150 AF. Director Bantilan added this would be a perfect instance for landowners to use the variance report to request changes to the fee. Director Chounet agreed with Director Albano regarding the fees being too high.

Director Vickery agreed with the fees as presented and said the fees could be used to help the CMA work toward compliance.

Chair Yurosek expressed the difficulty in establishing a fee when there is a lack of data and said there are legal implications.

-----  
*Director Das Williams rejoined the meeting at 6:22 p.m.*  
-----

**MOTION**

Director Bantilan made a motion to use staff recommendation with the addition that any over-pumping fees collected are to be used for projects in the CMA. The motion was seconded by Director Vickery, a roll call vote was made and passed with 82%.

AYES: Yurosek, Bantilan, Vickery, Compton, Scrivner, Anselm, Stoller,  
Williams, Wooster  
NOES: Albano, Chounet  
ABSTAIN: None  
ABSENT: None

**15. Direction on GSA Well Permit Policy**

Mr. Blakeslee provided an overview of the proposed well permit process including discussion for new and modified well requirements. Executive Director Beck reviewed the proposed well permit GSA study requirement for modifications to existing wells and construction of new wells.

Director Wooster asked what defines a “de minimis” user. Legal Counsel Alex Dominguez

provided an overview of the definition of “de minimis” according to SGMA and the Governor’s Executive Order.

Director Wooster expressed concern for instances where there are earthquakes that cause the well to break and the difficulty to replace those wells with this permit policy.

Director Bantilan said the most important thing is not the number of pumps, but the amount of water that is being pumped. He continued to note the policy is too restrictive. Director Vickery agreed with Director Bantilan. Director Albano agreed the policy is too restrictive.

Director Chounet stated if there is a replacement well then it should be required for landowners to seal their old well.

Chair Yurosek asked for an update on the Assembly Bill 2201. Mr. Dominguez provided an update on the bills progress through the assembly and stated it has not been completely passed and he will continue to monitor the bill. Chair Yurosek asked if how many wells are currently pending approval. Mr. Blakslee replied there are no known wells pending approval.

Matt Young provided an update on Santa Barbra County’s progress in the development of the well permit policy. He noted de minimis users do not need to go through the review process and continued to explain there is an acknowledgement form a landowner must fill out.

Stakeholder Guy Lingo said although he is not in the CMA, the policy affects the basin. He said replacement wells should not be limited by depth.

Stakeholder Jim Wegis said this process is difficult to understand and it should be made simple.

The Board discussed the policy of replacing an existing well and concluded it must demonstrate a replacement well is of the same capacity and same intended use. Staff is to provide a recommendation at the Board meeting on September 7, 2022. The Board also discussed that the construction of a new well will require a hydrologic study that demonstrates the extractions will not cause groundwater levels to fall below minimum thresholds at nearby representative monitoring wells, all permit applications must demonstrate they do not impact water quality standards set in the GSP, and well permit acknowledges an allocation is being established and pumping will be limited in the CMA for 2023 and 2024. The applicant will prepare those reports to be reviewed with an Ad Hoc Committee and be brought to the Board for a final decision.

#### **16. Direction on Effort to Identify Potential Non-Reporting Pumpers**

Mr. Blakeslee provided an overview of the process that was reviewed with the Ad Hoc Committee and the analysis staff is performing.

Director Wooster stated there is an app called “Onex” that will provide all the information from a parcel.

**17. Consider for Approval Resolution No. 2022-071 Authorizing the Submission of FY 21-22 and FY 22-23 Delinquent Groundwater Extraction Fees to County Tax Collectors for Collection**

Mr. Dominguez reviewed the process for resolution No. 2022-071 Authorizing the Submission of FY 21-22 and FY 22-23 Delinquent Groundwater Extraction Fees to County Tax Collectors for Collection.

**MOTION**

Vice Chair Chounet made a motion to approve Resolution No. 2022-071 Authorizing the Submission of FY 21-22 and FY 22-23 Delinquent Groundwater Extraction Fees to County Tax Collectors for Collection. The motion was seconded by Director Bantilan, a roll call vote was made and passed with 82%.

- AYES: Yurosek, Chounet, Bantilan, Vickery, Albano, Scrivner, Anselm, Stoller, Williams
- NOES: None
- ABSTAIN: None
- ABSENT: Compton, Wooster

**18. Approve Change Order for the Hallmark Group**

Mr. Blakslee reviewed the change order for the Hallmark Group and explained the out-of-scope activities and the higher than expected level of effort.

**MOTION**

Director Bantilan made a motion to approve change order for the Hallmark Group. The motion was seconded by Director Anselm, a roll call vote was made and passed with 88%.

- AYES: Yurosek, Chounet, Bantilan, Vickery, Albano, Scrivner, Anselm, Stoller, Williams, Wooster
- NOES: None
- ABSTAIN: None
- ABSENT: Compton

**19. Direction on Upcoming DWR SGMA Round 2 Grant Funding Opportunity**

Mr. Blakslee reviewed the grant funding opportunity and let the Board know it will cost approximately \$40,000 to apply for this grant and it is a competitive grant.

The Board directed staff to track if there are projects that meet the criteria for the grant and determine the level of competition for the grant.

**20. Direction on Public Workshop Format**

Executive Director Beck reviewed the proposed community workshop and SAC feedback.

Chair Yurosek stated a key topic should be the CMA and anything else that has been implemented for 2023.

Director Wooster said September on a weekday would be best due to everyone finishing their

vacations and school being back in session.

The Board made a consensus to hold the workshop in August to give landowners an opportunity to ask questions before the submittal of the Variance Forms due September 1, 2022.

## **REPORT ITEMS**

### **21. Administrative Updates**

- a. Report of the Executive Director**  
Nothing to report.

### **22. Technical Updates**

- a. Update on Groundwater Sustainability Plan Activities**  
Mr. Van Lienden provided an update on the accomplishments done from May and June.
- b. Update on Adaptive Management Analysis**  
Mr. Van Lienden reviewed the adaptive management analysis approach which is provided in the Board packet.
- c. Administration of Grant-Funded Projects**  
This item was deferred.
- d. Update on Monitoring Network Implementation**  
This item was deferred.

- 23. Report of the Ad Hoc Committee**  
Nothing to report.

- 24. Directors' Forum**  
No comments

- 25. Public Comment for Items Not on the Agenda**  
Stakeholder Dave Lewis said the CMA maps were just made available in the Board packet and there are a lot of parcels in the map. He expressed the map holds a lot of weight for the small farmers like himself. Mr. Lewis asked the Board to have consideration for small farmers.

- 26. Correspondence**  
Nothing to report.

**PUBLIC HEARING**

**27. Public Hearing – Proposed Amended Groundwater Sustainability Plan**

Chair Yurosek began the public hearing at 5:00 p.m.

Mr. Blakslee read a letter from SAC member Robbie Jaffe which is included in the Board packet.

Bolthouse representative Dan Clifford said the GSP does not have the authority to determine water rights.

No additional public comments were made.

**28. Consider for Approval Resolution No. 2022-072 Adopting an Amended Groundwater Sustainability Plan**

Executive Director Beck reported the technical memorandum addressed the four corrective actions and amended its GSP accordingly.

-----  
*Director Das Williams left the meeting and Alternate Darcel Elliot took her place at 5:04 p.m.*  
-----

**MOTION**

Vice Chair Chounet made a motion to adopt Resolution No. 2022-072 Adopting an Amended Groundwater Sustainability Plan. The motion was seconded by Director Anselm, a roll call vote was made and passed with 88%.


AYES: Yurosek, Chounet, Bantilan, Vickery, Albano, Compton, Scrivner,  
Anselm, Stoller, Elliot, Wooster  
NOES: None  
ABSTAIN: None  
ABSENT: None

**29. Adjourn**


Chair Yurosek adjourned the meeting at 7:49 p.m.

-----  
Minutes approved by the Board of Directors of the Cuyama Basin Groundwater Sustainability Agency the 7<sup>th</sup> day of September 2022.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE  
CUYAMA BASIN GROUNDWATER SUSTAINABILITY AGENCY

Chair:  \_\_\_\_\_

ATTEST:

Secretary:  \_\_\_\_\_

