



AGENDA

REGULAR MEETING OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF CARPINTERIA GROUNDWATER SUSTAINABILITY AGENCY

**CARPINTERIA VALLEY WATER DISTRICT
1301 SANTA YNEZ AVENUE
CARPINTERIA, CA 93013**

Wednesday, May 28, 2025 at 5:45 p.m.

Join Zoom Meeting

<https://us06web.zoom.us/j/81713959598?pwd=gAkmkuDvrdb3azDA9ugsBBBQS63thA.1>

Meeting ID: 817 1395 9598

Passcode: 730284

or

Dial by Phone: 1-669-444-9171

- 1. CALL TO ORDER**
- 2. PUBLIC FORUM (Any person may address the Board of Directors on any matter within its jurisdiction which is not on the agenda).**
- 3. CONSENT AGENDA**
 - A. **Minutes for the Regular Meeting of the Board held on April 23, 2025**
 - B. **Disbursement Report for April 11, 2025 – May 10, 2025**
- 4. UNFINISHED BUSINESS – none**
- 5. NEW BUSINESS –**
 - A. **Update on Audit proposal from CLA (for information, Executive Director McDonald)**
 - B. **Listening Sessions summary (for information, Executive Director McDonald)**
- 6. EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR REPORTS (for information) –**
 - A. **Financials**
- 7. ADJOURNMENT**

****Indicates attachment of document to agenda packet.**

The above matters are the only items scheduled to be considered at this meeting.

Note: The above Agenda was posted at Carpinteria Valley Water District Administrative Office in view of the public no later than 5:00 p.m., May 25, 2025. The Americans with Disabilities Act provides that no qualified individual with a disability shall be excluded from participation in, or denied benefits of, the District's programs, services, or activities because of any disability. If you need special assistance to participate in this meeting, please contact the District Office at (805) 684-2816. Notification at least twenty-four (24) hours prior to the meeting will enable the District to make appropriate arrangements. Materials related to an item on this Agenda submitted to the Board of Directors after distribution of the agenda packet are available for public inspection in the Carpinteria Valley Water district offices located at 1301 Santa Ynez Avenue, Carpinteria during normal business hours, from 8 am to 5 pm.

**Indicates attachment of document to agenda packet.

	MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS	
	CARPINTERIA GROUNDWATER SUSTAINABILITY AGENCY	
	April 23, 2025	
	Chairman Van Wingerden called the Regular meeting of the Carpinteria Groundwater Sustainability Agency Board of Directors held in the Carpinteria Valley Water District board room to order at 5:34 p.m., Wednesday April 23, 2025	
	Directors Present; O'Connor, Balch, Holcombe, Roberts and Van Wingerden	
	Others Present: Bob McDonald	
	Junajoy Frianeza Norma Rosales Lisa Silva Maso Motlow Miranda Everitt Oliver Browne	Scott Van Der Kar Will Carleton Alan Soicher Shirley Johnson Brett Bovee Denny Han Andrew Hart
PUBLIC FORUM	No one from the public addressed the Board.	
CONSENT AGENDA A. Minutes B. Disbursement Report C. Quarterly Report	Director Holcombe moved, and Director Balch seconded the motion to approve the consent agenda. The motion carried by a 5-0 vote. The motion was approved by roll call as follows; Ayes: O'Connor, Holcombe, Balch, Roberts and Van Wingerden Nays : none Absent: none	
ENGAGEMENT OF CLA	Executive Director McDonald presented to consider Engagement of CLA for Fiscal Year 25-27 audit periods in an amount not to exceed \$54,600. Will be brought back to the next meeting with further information.	
PUBLIC FORUM	Scott Van Der Kar addressed the Board regarding the upcoming GSA Listening session and encouraging everyone to join.	
ADJOURNMENT	Chairman Van Wingerden adjourned the meeting at 5:39 p.m.	
	Lisa Silva, Board Secretary	



Monthly Disbursement Report
Carpinteria Groundwater Sustainability Agency

Payment Date: 04/11/25 - 05/10/25

CARPINTERIA GSA

Disbursement Report

Carpinteria Groundwater Sustainability Agency Account

Vendor	Description	Payment Number	Payment Date	Payment
915 ELM AVENUE CVL, LLC				53.94
	SUPPLIES	2182	5/7/2025	53.94
COASTAL VIEW NEWS				370.00
	PUBLIC NOTICE - 041025	2177	4/25/2025	370.00
FRUIT GROWERS LABORATORY, INC				517.00
	INORGANIC ANALYSIS - GSA WELLS SAMPLING	2183	5/7/2025	517.00
GEORGE LEHTINEN				87.04
	REIMBURSE FOR EL CARRO MONITORING WELL POWER	2180	4/25/2025	87.04
GROUNDWATER SOLUTIONS, INC.				9,178.75
	GSI - GSA WATER YR 2024 ANNUAL REPORT	2176	4/15/2025	9,178.75
HD SUPPLY, INC				412.32
	SUPPLIES	2184	5/7/2025	412.32
MYERS, WIDDERS, GIBSON JONES & FEINGOLD, LLP				171.50
	GENERAL COUNSEL - MARCH	2178	4/25/2025	171.50
RUTAN & TUCKER, LLP				79.00
	GENERAL COUNSEL - MARCH	2179	4/25/2025	79.00
STAPLES BUSINESS CREDIT				44.65
	OFFICE SUPPLIES	2181	5/7/2025	44.65
US BANK				333.91
	04 2025 BANK ANALYSIS FEE	DFT0002009	4/14/2025	333.91
			Total: \$	11,248.11



STAFF REPORT

To: CGSA Board of Directors
From: Bob McDonald, Executive Director
Date: May 22, 2025
Written by: Norma Rosales, Treasurer

For Information: This memo is to provide an update regarding the Carpinteria Groundwater Sustainability Agency (CGSA) audit and its treatment under the District's financial reporting.

Background: The CGSA was previously audited separately from the District, with its own independent engagement and financial statements. With the transition to a new audit firm this fiscal year, a comprehensive evaluation was conducted to assess the reporting relationship between CGSA and the District in accordance with Governmental Accounting Standards Board (GASB) guidance.

Analysis:

As part of the fiscal year audit process, our new audit firm has conducted an evaluation of the CGSA and determined that it should be reported as a component unit of the District. This conclusion was reached after a joint review using the GASB Statement No. 97 checklist, which sets the criteria for identifying component units. The determination is primarily based on the fact that the CGSA and the District share the same Board of Directors, thus meeting the "common board" criterion for inclusion.

As a result of this determination, the prior year financial statements of the District will need to be restated to reflect the inclusion of the CGSA as a component unit. However, although the CGSA will now be treated as a component unit, we have elected to continue presenting separate financial statements for CGSA. A note disclosure will be added to the District's financial statements to explain this presentation and clarify the CGSA's status as a component unit with separately issued financials.

Because of this new reporting approach, the CGSA Board will not need to engage the CLA audit firm separately. Instead, we will bring back the CLA engagement item for Board consideration under the District, with an updated proposal that reflects the inclusion of CGSA within the scope of work.

We will continue to coordinate with the auditors to ensure compliance with all applicable reporting requirements and will provide further updates as needed.

Fiscal Impact:

CLA will invoice the District for the full cost of the audit, which will include both the District and the CGSA. The District will then seek reimbursement from the CGSA for its proportional share of the audit expense.

Recommendation: This item is for informational purposes only. No action is required by the Board at this meeting.

Sample Motion: N/A



STAFF REPORT

To: CGSA Board of Directors

From: Bob McDonald, Executive Director

Date: May 20, 2025

Written by: Danielle Harmon, GIS Program Manager

Subject: CGSA *Well Registration and Metering Policy* Listening Sessions Summary: March 31, April 14, and April 28 Comments & Questions and Staff's Current Focus

Background: The CGSA held three listening sessions in the months of March and April to receive community feedback on the development of the CGSA's *Well Registration and Metering Policy* (Policy). CGSA staff and the Executive Director presented various topics that need to be addressed prior to policy development to get input and comments from stakeholders. **Table 1** summarizes the number of attendees for each meeting.

Table 1. Number of attendees

Listening Session	In-Person Attendees	Online Attendees	Total Attendees
#1 – March 31	9	10	19
#2 – April 14	6	9	15
#3 – April 28	4	8	12

Summary of Key Topics & Associated Questions & Comments: CGSA staff have categorized all questions and comments made from in-person and online attendees across the 8 topics that were addressed across the three sessions. These include:

- Policy & Implementation Timeline
- Well Registration Requirements
- Well Metering Requirements
- Well Status & Location
- Data Collection
- Exemptions
- Fees & Billing

- Non-Compliance & Enforcement

Questions and comments that are displayed in bolded blue text require follow up research, staff time, or additional data to be provided from contractors or vendors. A description of CGSA staff actions and additional information that has been received are included below these questions. If additional information is needed, staff will continue pursuing this data to incorporate and consider in the Policy's development.

The purpose of this memo is for the CGSA Board to review questions and comments that we received and read through the responses from the Executive Director and CGSA staff. After reviewing the memo and the information that has been exchanged, the Board has the opportunity to ask additional follow-up questions, request additional information, or propose other suggestions in addition to or in lieu of the CGSA's responses. Please review the questions, comments, and their associated responses and let staff know if the response should be amended, further evaluated, or if additional information is required.

Policy & Implementation Timeline: Questions & Comments

No questions or comments were received on implementation timeline-related information that was presented

Well Registration Requirements: Questions & Comments

- **Comment: Attendee pointed out that the Ojai Basin and Fox Canyon Registration forms that were shown as examples are not complex enough for shared-well scenarios. (Listening Session #1)**
 - **CGSA Response: The Executive Director responded and said that we can add additional sheets to the CGSA's Registration form to accommodate data collection for shared-well scenarios. Staff are currently drafting a registration form that will be an attachment or appendix of the *Well Registration and Metering Policy* and it will be provided on the website once the Policy is adopted.**
- Comment: Attendee made a comment that the registration of new wells could be handled through the County permitting process. (Listening Session #1)
 - CGSA Response: The Executive Director responded, stating that the CGSA believes the County has a handle on the program and we will utilize this process. The County has agreed to pass along metering policy information through their permitting process. If the CGSA cannot get data from the County, CGSA staff would follow up with the owner to obtain completed paperwork and any additional information.

Well Metering Requirements: Questions & Comments

- Comment: Attendee made a comment regarding the proposed meter accuracy and calibration requirements. The attendee was concerned that if the property owner fails to perform accuracy testing and their fees resort to being calculated using the crop factors, that the owner may continue to not comply with accuracy testing and use the calculated groundwater fee instead. The attendee suggested to use a value or method that will make it cost them more if they do not perform accuracy testing and calibration. (Listening Session #1)
- Comment: Attendee made a comment that they believed all new wells required a meter, but then clarified that the private pumper would need to then register the meter with the CGSA. (Listening Session #1)
 - CGSA Response: The Executive Director clarified that all we need from the County is the notification that there is a new well and then CGSA staff can get the registration portion from the County or owner. At some point, there will need to be coordination on the meter with the owner so that it can be connected to the proposed AMI system so that the metered information is reported to the Badger/BEACON system. The CGSA won't be able to avoid contacting the owner in the permit process, they will need to be involved, and they will also be responsible for filling out well registration paperwork.
- Question: Who is responsible for the installation of the meter? (Listening Session #1).
 - CGSA Response: CGSA Executive Director responded in the meeting that the meter installation would be the responsibility of the property owner. He mentioned that there are \$500 grants from Santa Barbara County's Well Metering Assistance Program (WMAAP) for the installation of meters on existing wells. More information is provided here: <https://www.countyofsb.org/2568/Well-Metering-Assistance-Program-WMAAP>. The assistance program will become available to private well owners after the CGSA adopts a Policy and the Policy is received by the Santa Barbara County Water Agency. Their site notes that the funding is provided on a first-come first serve basis to qualifying participants.
- Question: The County is granting \$500 per meter right now, that has already been approved? (Listening Session #2)
 - CGSA Response: The Executive Director responded that the money is not available to Carpinteria at this time; however, after a Policy is adopted then it will become available.
- **Question: Does the \$500 per meter apply to new meters, or does it apply retroactively to existing meters? (Listening Session #2)**

- **CGSA Response: The CGSA did not have this answer at the meeting, but CGSA staff have since e-mailed pwWMAPinformation@countyofsb.org to gain clarification.**
- Question: If the water meter isn't up to speed [passing meter accuracy testing to plus or minus 5%] you're telling me we have to go back to estimating groundwater use? (Listening Session #2)
 - CGSA Response: The Executive Director clarified that the CGSA would resort back to using crop factors using the highest crop factor from a historical period to estimate groundwater use just for that one well if their meter is not replaced or recalibrated in the Policy's specified timeframe. Fox Canyon, for example doubles the groundwater fees if a meter is not installed so that there is incentive to install the meter instead. Similarly, the CGSA would use the highest crop factor method to incentivize getting an accurate meter in place if they exceed the timeframe outlined in the Policy.
- Question: Regarding the well flows and having the meter sized appropriately, have you determined how you are going to do that? I know on our wells the pipe size doesn't have anything to do with the flow. We have 50gpm with a 3" pipe. So my suggestion is to use the pump/motor information and what the maximum output is and the level of the water. It is going to be a little tricky. It's just important to think ahead for how that appropriateness is going to be figured out. (Listening Session #2)
 - CGSA Response: The Executive Director stated that the CGSA's main concern is velocities in the pipeline. If you have a 3" pipe and you're pushing 500 gallons per minute through a meter, the meter is not going to be able to measure reasonably. What we don't want is to have people looking at a 3" pipe and just assuming that it needs a 3" meter because that's not always the case. The property owner needs to look at the well output and demonstrate to the CGSA that their meter is appropriately sized.
- Question: What is an insertion-style meter, I'm not familiar with them? (Listening Session #2)
 - CGSA Response: The Executive Director explained that an insertion-style meter is a rod with a paddle wheel on it. You put a saddle on the pipe with a water connection and you drill a hole and then insert it. The problem with these insertion meters is that they have to be placed exactly in the right position within the pipe and you have to know the exact inside diameter of the pipe to get it to calibrate. This is not going to be a meter that is

approved due to the information that you need to ensure it was installed properly.

- **Question: Are there going to be enough qualified calibration contractors out there that have the technology to calibrate efficiently and economically?**

(Listening Session #2)

- **CGSA Response: Fox Canyon Groundwater Management Agency has a list of 9 approved contractors. CGSA staff have reached out to these companies to get estimates and check whether they can also serve the Carpinteria area. A table with the current information that they have provided is shown below. Staff will continue to try and follow up with the other companies that have not yet responded and seek out other local companies that provide this service.**

Contractor	Cost/test	Cost/year (if required every 3 years)	Scheduling	Willing to test in Carpinteria?
CJ Precision Inc.	\$350-400	\$117-133	1-2 weeks out	Yes
	(\$350 for multiple tests lined up)			
Dick Munns Company				No - we are outside of their radius
Henshel Pump Test LLC	\$200	\$66	2-3 weeks out	Yes
McCall's Meters	\$255-265	\$85-88	A few weeks lead time	Yes

- **Question: I'm not concerned about the transmitter system, but more concerned with the every 3-years calibration requirement on the meters. Can we stagger implementation so everyone is not trying to calibrate at the same time?**

(Listening Session #2)

- **CGSA Response: The Executive Director said yes. We can set this up similar to the backflow device testing system. For backflow device testing, each device is set up with its own unique test month rather than one fixed deadline for everyone. We can stagger the well calibration due dates similarly.**
- **Question: Regarding well meter calibration, CVWD would calibrate their meters and test them as well? (Listening Session #2)**

- CGSA Response: The Executive Director stated that yes, CVWD does their testing through Siemens and we do a bench test.
- Comment: The sooner you have a meter the sooner you can prove whether you're being charged accurately through the property taxes or not. (Listening Session #2)
- Question: Are you able to calibrate those [insertion style meters]? (Listening Session #3)
 - CGSA Response: The Executive Director responded stating that no, those meters are very difficult to calibrate because you're assuming a certain water profile on the inside of the pipe. Water moves through a pipe, and it's actually moving faster in the center than on the edges. It's kind of a cone shape so it's an average between all conditions. If you have a small tubercle on the pipe it throws the shape of the cone off.
- Question: So if they're not calibratable, they [the meters] are out?
 - CGSA Response: The Executive Director stated that many meters are not calibratable – you end up just having to replace them when they don't work anymore. If you have a propeller meter, for example, and the bearings start to wear out, you can't calibrate that you just have to take the old one out and put a new one in.
- Question: How many wells are going to be tested [for meter accuracy]? (Listening Session #3)
 - CGSA Response: CGSA staff responded stating that it depends how many wells are active once everyone starts submitting their registration forms. At the last meeting (Listening Session #2) we mentioned that we knew of over 150 active wells. There are some properties that we know are pumping, but we're not sure which well is actually in use or whether they are sharing a well with a neighbor. The total number is unknown at this time.
- Comment: It would be a great service from the District [CGSA] to the farmers to do this [meter accuracy testing]. (Listening Session #3)
 - CGSA Response: The Executive Director Responded that the CGSA can definitely add that into the input.
- Question: So, that will be reported to the CGSA if the meter is inaccurate? (Listening Session #3)
 - CGSA Response: CGSA staff responded that prior to the calibration deadline, like annual backflow testing, the CGSA would send some sort of notice or letter stating you have 30 days to have the accuracy test completed, please fill out this calibration form and here's the list of testers – submit the test by this date. You would need to submit the pass or fail

information showing whether the meter meets the accuracy requirements. If it passes, then we scan the results into our system and you can continue using that meter. If it does not pass and meet the plus or minus 5% accuracy requirement then that would start the timeframe for you to work on calibrating or replacing the meter.

- Question: Wouldn't it be a pretty good idea if the District [CGSA] supplies those [meters], and you know, maintains them and all of that?
 - CGSA Response: The Executive Director responded, saying whether the CGSA pays for the meters or the property owner pays for the meters, the property owner is not avoiding the cost. It's either incorporated into the CGSA's budget and the CGSA fees become higher, or the property owner pays for the meter and installation and has more control over who does the work, which compatible meter they install, etc.
- Question: What kind of meters are you talking about? I'm sorry if this is naïve, but what are you talking about? Are you talking about \$6,000 satellite meters? What are you talking about? If I have a well and it has a meter, can I just report on paper what my meter is on the first of every month? (Listening Session #3)
 - CGSA Response: The Executive Director responded stating that we are not going to allow self-reporting of meter reads because of the problems with that system that Ojai Basin has had.
 - Response back: So what are you going to allow?
 - CGSA Response back: What we are proposing is that you have a meter that has a compatible register that has an electrical signal that comes out of the register. They're not that much more expensive than just a regular mechanical meter. These would be connected to a CGSA-owned endpoint/data transmitter that would transmit the data back into our database and we would collect the reads.
- **Comment: There is an alternative [to installing meters and endpoints/data transmitters]. Powell Energy, which I just sent the link to, measures water use by testing wells and then tying into the electricity use and coming up with monthly usage. And the state, because I have a second farm along the Santa Ynez River, the state permits us to use Powell as a measurement for how much water we are using and it costs \$300/month. (Listening Session #3)**
 - **CGSA Response: CGSA staff are following up to gain additional information from the AgMonitor.com link that the attendee provided to determine if this can be approved as an alternate method of reporting meter reads.**
- **Question: Do you have quotes [meter and meter installation quotes]? I mean do you have actual quotes? (Listening Session #3)**

- **CGSA Response: The Executive Director responded that we have several farmers that have given us information from their recent meter installations. One quoted about \$1,000 per meter and the other stated that theirs were around \$2,000 per meter. The CGSA is currently obtaining quotes from meter companies. We are in the process of developing an acceptable meter list and we will put current prices on those from the vendors.**
- Question: Is there an option for a saddle-mounted mag meter? (Listening Session #3)
 - CGSA Response: The Executive Director responded, stating that those meters, also commonly referred to as strap-on mag meters, are approved.
- Comment: It depends on the manufacturer but the quote that I gave was for a brand new installation like a retrofit of a 4" pipe with a Seametrics mag meter. So those for a new installation to retrofit is somewhere between \$4,000 and \$6,000. (Listening Session #3)
- **Question: Question about calibration and the 3-year requirement instead of the 5-year requirement. Most manufacturers recommend a minimum of a 5-year. I understand the need for calibration, the question is why 3 years instead of 5? (Listening Session #3)**
 - **CGSA Response: The Executive Director responded stating that 3 years was being used to model our policy after Fox Canyon, but CGSA staff will look into meter performance curves to see if we can approve of 5-year periods in the policy instead and spread this requirement out.**
- Question: So as far as cost of these meters, wouldn't it be cheaper for the water District [CGSA] to acquire a volume of these things? And we buy them from you guys instead of going here and there? (Listening Session #3)
 - CGSA Response: The Executive Director responded saying perhaps. However, the CGSA does not want to limit the property owner to a specific make or model and allow them to seek out a meter of their choice so long as it is compatible with the AMI endpoint/data transmitter and not an insertion-style meter.
- **Question: How do I know what size meter to use? (Listening Session #3)**
 - **CGSA Response: The Executive Director responded stating that each meter has a flow range. The property owner needs to at least be able to estimate what the flow coming out of the well is. The CGSA will generate a list of suggested meters as well as provide the flow range of the meters on this list.**

Well Status & Location: Questions & Comments

- Question: What happens if there's a lack of data on older wells and what do we do about unknowns as an owner, such as when filling out Well Registration paperwork? (Listening Session #1)
 - CGSA Response: The Executive Director responded that the CGSA will work with the landowner to get the data that we need. We will collect as much data as possible and work to fill in the gaps.
- Question: As the CGSA has been working to identify who has a well, are Edison records available to the CGSA? (Listening Session #1)
 - CGSA Response: The Executive Director stated in the meeting that the CGSA does not have access to SCE records. CVWD & CGSA staff have been working on well data in this basin for years. This includes doing surveys and putting boots on the ground. We have combed through Santa Barbara County's well records and put in public records requests to Santa Barbara County's Environmental Health Services department to check their well permitting records as well.
- Question: How many wells are estimated to be in the basin? (Listening Session #1)
 - CGSA Response: CGSA staff stated that they believed there were around 400 wells in the basin. Well Status & Location was a topic that was going to be covered in Listening Session #2. In Listening Session #2 we presented a few maps showing well quantity and the CGSA's current understanding of well status in the basin. The CGSA has record of 411 wells intersecting the basin boundary or that are close to the perimeter that will need to be surveyed and have their logs examined to see if they are inside or outside of the basin. Of these 411 well records, it is currently understood that:
 - 32 are officially destroyed
 - 164 are known to be active
 - 3 are known active CVWD Production wells
 - 73 are known to be inactive
 - 10 are known inactive CVWD wells or CVWD monitoring-specific wells
 - 129 wells are of unknown statusCGSA staff will continue to review old paperwork and correspond with property owners, the Department of Water Resources, and USGS to get a better understanding of the wells of unknown status.

- Question: With CVWD monitoring wells shown as 10, are those separate wells? I know that a lot of private pumpers cooperate in the monitoring program? (Listening Session #2)
 - CGSA Response: The 10 CVWD wells that were shown as monitoring wells on the map included both inactive CVWD production wells that are monitored as well as wells that were specifically drilled to monitor groundwater levels. These include 3 sentry wells off of Santa Claus Lane, the recently drilled 3 El Carro Park Monitoring wells, and Santa Ynez monitoring well at the District Yard, inactive El Carro Well #2 at the active El Carro Well site, inactive High School Well, and inactive Lyons Well.
- Comment: Attendee made comment that they would think that the crop factors and estimates that we have done would give us a pretty good idea of who is using groundwater and who isn't using groundwater. (Listening Session #2)
 - CGSA Response: CGSA staff responded that we are very confident in who is using groundwater; however, we may not know which well on the property is the active well. There could be multiple wells on the property and we may not know if one or multiple are being used.
- Question: Does the County notify you [the CGSA] when a property owner abandons a well? Do you get notified? Sorry, destroyed, do you get notified when a well is destroyed?
 - CGSA Response: The Executive Director responded by stating that we have worked with the County over the years to communicate better and we believe that we will be notified of all destructions in the future. The activity of properly destroying a well requires a permit so we should theoretically get notified from the County.
- Comment: Attendee made comment stating that it would be nice if in this process there could be an effort to have well abandonment and destruction pooled in a way that would make it more economical for landowners to properly destroy unused wells. (Listening Session #2)
 - CGSA Response: The Executive Director responded by stating that in 2002 there was a grant that was received, and several wells were destroyed. This is something that the CGSA is interested in exploring. Destroying abandoned wells, especially those with casings in poor condition, helps to protect groundwater quality.
- Question: Are there more grants available to destroy wells in the valley? (Listening Session #2)
 - CGSA Response: The Executive Director responded by stating that these grants come and go, but it is something that the CGSA will watch for.
- Question: How does Fox Canyon handle inactive wells? (Listening Session #2)

- CGSA Response: CGSA staff responded stating that they have an Annual Flowmeter Exemption form that must be completed and submitted.
- Question: Does Fox Canyon charge an inactive well fee? (Listening Session #2)
 - CGSA Response: CGSA staff clarified that there is no inactive well fee for Fox Canyon's Groundwater Management Agency, just the annual form.
- Question: How would the CGSA handle wells that are used just for fire control that are not used for agriculture? The other thought would be, I know a property for sale where they will do a development and drill wells but have them capped. The wells may sit capped for years, but it's still basically a new well, it's just not used. How would you approach both of those situations? I'm just thinking that there may be a real advantage to the community to have a fire well that is on a generator or something to that effect because when the power is out and a fire is coming through and there's no power – it's just one of those things to recognize as a possibility. (Listening Session #2)
 - CGSA Response: The CGSA is proposing to have an Annual Flowmeter Exemption Form that would be required to be submitted annually and has proposed a \$35 processing fee per inactive well just to cover staff time for that update in the database and potential site visits to follow up and confirm the well status on site. The CGSA is also proposing that Edison bills be required to be submitted for the billing period showing that there was no power used at the well during that time. If no Edison meter is present, then photos would be required to be submitted showing the empty casing with no pump.
- Question: How about well shafts that don't have a pump? Obviously there's nothing to report. (Listening Session #2)
 - CGSA Response: Those would be considered inactive wells. The requirement would just be to fill out the Annual Flowmeter Exemption Form.
- Question: Do you have to put a meter on it [an inactive well]? (Listening Session #3)
 - CGSA Response: If you submit the Annual Flowmeter Exemption Form every year stating that it's an inactive well, in that situation, you would not be required to install a meter. As soon as you re-activate that well and start using it again, you would need to notify the CGSA and install a meter according to the Policy.

Data Collection Questions & Comments

- Questions: Multiple questions from online regarding sharing the well-use data with owners and owners getting daily or more frequent updates. (Listening Session #1)
 - CGSA Response: The Executive Director responded, stating that the data collection topic would be covered in the second listening session. Staff are proposing to use the Badger/BEACON system that CVWD uses for its water meters where the owner would have access to daily updates. The Badger/BEACON system is configured to have data transmitted from the meter to the Cloud multiple times on weekdays and once per day on the weekends. The data that is transmitted shows metered water use in detail down to 15-minute intervals.
- Question: Attendee asked about how many agricultural CVWD water users were using the Badger/BEACON AMI EyeOnWater system? (Listening Session #1)
 - CGSA Response: The Executive Director responded and estimated that under 20% of the of the agricultural account holders were using the EyeOnWater system, and went on to explain that this is pretty typical. Overall, only about 15-18% of all CVWD customers are using the EyeOnWater System. Back at the office the final numbers were obtained. There are 382 agricultural accounts and 107 of these accounts are signed up for EyeOnWater (28%).
- Comment: Attendee commented that it will be an issue when well owners already have meters that may or may not be compatible with the Badger/BEACON system. They suggested, instead, taking photos of a calibrated meter and submitting the photo annually for water use reporting rather than using the AMI system if the meter is not compatible or installing one is not easy. (Listening Session #1)
 - CGSA Response: The Executive Director responded at the meeting stating that the AMI system is compatible with most meters that were shown, but there may need to be some modifications, for example, if the meter is not electronic a new register may need to be purchased, or the meter may need to be replaced with a compatible meter. The CGSA is not proposing self-reporting of meter reads because we have heard about Ojai Basin's experience with property owners not reporting using their self-reporting system.
- Question: Who is going to take on the cost of the AMI system? (Listening Session #1)

- CGSA Response: The CGSA is currently proposing that the CGSA supplies the endpoints/data transmitters that would be connected to the private well owner's meters and the software system is already in place. The CGSA would be charged a small monthly fee for the transmitters to send data to the Badger/BEACON online system. These monthly meter reading fees would be incorporated into the budget.
- **Question: Will the CGSA do any test samples or pick a few private wells to test the system and the software? Something such as a pilot program? (Listening Session #1)**
 - **CGSA Response: The Executive Director responded by stating that this is something that we could do early on. The CGSA is very confident that we can get the system to work with compatible meters since it is already currently working on CVWD water meters, but the CGSA will consider a test/pilot study.**
- Comment: Property owner in attendance stated that they recently installed new meters on their wells and it was about \$1,000 per installation with the purchase of the meter, parts, and installation costs. This was when doing the installation themselves and was for mechanical meters. (Listening Session #1)
- Comment: Property owner in attendance knows a well driller that installed a Seametrics water meter in Ventura County and private testing of the meter showed that it maintained high accuracy over time. (Listening Session #1)
- Question: Who is covering the data transmission equipment? (Listening Session #1)
 - CGSA Response: The CGSA is proposing to cover the cost of the endpoint/data transmitter equipment as well as the cost of obtaining the data daily and maintaining the database.
- Question: When would the data transmission equipment be installed on the meters? (Listening Session #1)
 - CGSA Response: The Executive Director responded by saying that as soon as the Policy is in place the process can start. If there are existing meters on wells and a property owner wants us to come out and connect a data transmitter, they can fill out their Well Registration Form with compatible well meter details and proof of the meter's accuracy. Then, CGSA staff can coordinate to install a data transmitter.
- Question: So, the well meter information will feed into the same EyeOnWater System – everyone can access their own data? (Listening Session #2)
 - CGSA Response: Yes, if you own the meter and the well you will have access to the water use information for that particular well.

- Question: What does AMI stand for? (Listening Session #2)
 - CGSA Response: This stands for Automated Metering Infrastructure. It is an acronym that describes a system where a data transmitter is connected and sends data to a central location. The water District's AMI system has a data transmitter connected to a meter. The meter's water use data is sent using cellular data to the cloud where it becomes available to CVWD staff and customers in an online portal called EyeOnWater. This is the same system that is being proposed by the CGSA for the well metering policy.
- Question: Is the District [CGSA] prepared to maintain these endpoints? Since we are already doing it to our own [CVWD] meters? (Listening Session #2)
 - CGSA Response: The Executive Director responded yes, CVWD staff will do this work for the CGSA. The idea behind using water District staff to do the work for the CGSA is it's an effort to be efficient and not have to hire dedicated staff because there is currently not a full-time position needed, at least now for now. CVWD staff will continue to do CGSA-related work and record this in their Time Entry and then the water District will bill the CGSA for their hours of work.
- Question: When the endpoint goes out or needs work, the CGSA will be notified by the EyeOnWater system right? Will it be a separate system? (Listening Session #2)
 - CGSA Response: The CGSA will use the same EyeOnWater system but the data will be housed in a separate database.
- Question: So, the residential customers have three AMI pumping points, which is the three District wells, and if you have all of the other private pumpers with the AMI system who pays for those? (Listening Session #2)
 - CGSA Response: The CGSA would own and maintain the AMI system for the private pumpers
 - Attendee Response back: So does that mean that the residential customers pay a portion of the CGSA costs through the amount that the District uses and that also includes agricultural delivery and residential so the residential will pay a portion of the AMI cost for all the private pumpers?
 - CGSA Response: The Executive Director responded stating yes, by way of the budget. The CGSA 's budget has various costs including equipment, so everybody who pumps water from the groundwater basin will be pitching in for that. The District will be pumping on order of 1,000 acre-feet.
- Question: So the AMI system would be supplied by the CGSA, the meters just have to be compatible? (Listening Session #2)

- CGSA Response: Yes.
- Question: So there are other technologies out there, but none of those have been proven to be accurate enough to replace a meter. The Edison meter converting that power usage to acre-feet or other methods. My understanding is, I really don't know enough about that technology out there, but is a meter the way to go?
 - CGSA Response: The Executive Director responded, stating that a property owner invited him to see how that system works. Oftentimes that system is used to gain efficiency in terms of their pump and where they are applying water. The problem with that system, from our perspective, is, you can have changes happening within the pumping system that affect the relationship between the power consumption and the actual volume. Very slight changes can dramatically affect that. If you are going to buy a software system that tries to estimate that you're probably going to be off, and it's probably going to cost as much if not more to maintain that software system than a meter.
- Question: So, as that is concerned [the endpoint] there is no cost to the property owner? (Listening Session #3)
 - CGSA Response: Yes, that is correct.
- Question: Clarification, are you saying we need a plug next to the thing [meter] there [for the data transmitter]? (Listening Session #3)
 - CGSA Response: The Executive Director responded, stating that the meter has to be AMI compatible so there needs to be wires coming off the meter that will feed an electrical signal into a transmitter. These AMI endpoints/data transmitters have batteries in them so they can collect the data. Typically, a meter that is going to send a signal out to a transmitter will have a battery in it, so you don't need electricity at the site. We do not anticipate the need for electricity unless you put in an electric meter.
- Comment: Attendee made a comment about potentially using satellite-based ET. I understand it doesn't necessarily work for all of it because of the greenhouses that you guys have, but if you planned on doing something like satellite-based ET and had an opt-in for a meter if the property owner believes their satellite-based ET is incorrect it seems like it would alleviate a lot of the fines and problems and access issues and the contingencies that you guys are planning on. But maybe it just doesn't work there [Carpinteria]. (Listening Session #3)
 - CGSA Response: The Executive Director responded stating that we looked at satellite-based ET and we got a lot of feedback that people did not like that approach. We were looking at that approach to improve our crop-based estimates and we got a company on board that were experts in remote sensing and red-band analysis and tried to estimate with ET, but

we were getting wild results. We kept trying to update and improve the model to get close to reasonable results, but we just never got there. I think we concluded that either the method doesn't work here, or the method has a lot of problems that need to be worked out.

- CGSA Response: CGSA staff added that, the covered nurseries were a big issue because even if you could calibrate a model that worked for the majority of properties like avocado and cherimoya parcels, then would just covered nursery properties require meters?
- CGSA Response: The Executive Director added that pastures were also a big problem as well, so the CGSA is less likely to go that route at this point.
- Comment: We have a meter on the two wells that are in the basin that we monitor and this last go around for the appeal period, and I shared this at the GSA meeting. I estimated 7 months' worth of data from those two meters. And, based on the estimates of the property, avocados, cherimoyas, that you had come up with, which were pretty darn close to what I think is out there on our properties. But these two properties that these wells serve are very different. One's north facing, one is south facing, different slopes, different just microclimates even though they're within a mile of each other. And between those uh two wells, according to my estimates, and I shared this, the calculation of what I owed to the GSA for the one well was \$400 and some dollars too high based on the actual gallons that I found out from my meter, and the other one was about \$400 and some dollars too low. So, I didn't do the appeal, but my point here is: that unless you're measuring the gallons with a pretty accurate meter, these estimates with ET or whatever else with those microclimates - it gets to be a bit of a guessing game. (Listening Session #3)
 - CGSA Response: The Executive Director responded, stating that yes, it's an average. It averaged out in your case, but if you're a property on the south facing slope you might be getting charged a lot more than your actual use.

Exemptions Questions & Comments

- What potential exemptions might there be? (Listening Session #1)
 - CGSA Response: This was covered in listening session #2. The CGSA proposes to only allow exemptions on meters for inactive wells and de minimis wells under SGMA. It is proposed that inactive well owners will need to fill out an annual exemption form/ affidavit annually with photos of the well and submit additional proof of the well's status including SCE bills showing no power used at the well during the billing period.

Fees & Billing Questions & Comments

- Question: What are the CGSA's current expenses, current budget, and what do future budgets look like? (Listening Session #2)
 - CGSA Response: CGSA Executive Director responded in the meeting stating that the current budget includes debt repayment to CVWD to money that was borrowed in the initial years after the CGSA formation and that eventually that debt will be paid back. The CGSA is working to continue to operate sustainably financially. All budget information is publicly available at carpgsa.org under Public Information, Financial.
- Question: Will costs go up as the GSP is implemented? (Listening Session #1)
 - CGSA Response: CGSA Executive Director responded in the meeting stating that future costs depend on what is implemented from the GSP. Different projects and management actions must be ranked in the GSP and the projects have very different costs associated with them.
- Comment: An in-person attendee also attended a Santa Ynez Groundwater Agency meeting and commented that there were varying budgets across GSAs/GMAS. (Listening Session #1)
- Question: For a shared well scenario with a well located on an independent parcel, who would be billed for the well's use? (Listening Session #1)
 - CGSA Response: CGSA staff responded in the meeting that the fees would be assessed to the owner of the parcel according to the County's records. It would appear on that parcel's tax statement.
- Comment: An attendee knows of two instances where property owners were billed for groundwater on their tax statements and they don't have a well. They are questioning some of the assumptions that were made and stated that meters would clear up some of the misinformation and assumptions that are out there. They also commented that it is really important for growers to participate in this process. (Listening Session #1)
 - CGSA Response: CGSA staff responded in the listening session that the CGSA model assumed that if water demand for the crops was higher than CVWD metered use for the property that they were getting additional water from an additional source, assumed to be groundwater. These assumptions were the reason that the CGSA mailed letters to the property owners showing them the assumptions and giving them an opportunity to correct the CGSA if these assumptions were incorrect. Many property owners have given us tours of their property showing areas with reduced crop acreages or damaged trees, provided Casitas Municipal Water District or Rincon Road & Water Works water statements, provided SCE

bills showing their well was inactive, stated that they have riparian rights rather than wells, etc. The CGSA did not just calculate groundwater estimates for properties with known wells on the parcel because it is known that there are many well-sharing agreements that cross property lines. If the CGSA only looked at the parcel where the well resides, the CGSA would miss out on a lot of groundwater users. This is why the notification letters and communication with property owners have been critical.

- **Question: On slide 12, are you going to charge for that [water extraction estimates for well development/rehab]? (Listening Session #2)**
 - **CGSA Response: The Executive Director responded that yes, it would be included in the total volume. Oftentimes when you are developing a well you're pumping a lot of water. It is the intent that this would be added to the well's monthly metered water use and charged for using a Well Flushing Estimation Form. Staff are currently drafting a Well Flushing Estimation Form that will be an attachment or appendix of the Well Registration and Metering Policy and will be provided on the website once the Policy is adopted.**
- Comment: It seems like installing the meters and all the work that the District [CGSA] is doing would definitely raise the cost of raising the crop. We have the \$500 non-operational fees for meter use and then there will be an additional fee for the wells and the District [CGSA] for maintenance and monitoring and as well. (Listening Session #2)
 - CGSA Response: The Executive Director clarified that the \$500 example that was shown in the slides was for the Ojai Basin inactive well fees so the CGSA would not be charging that. The CGSA is proposing a \$35 processing fee for inactive wells and an Annual Flowmeter Exemption Form that must be submitted.
- Comment: This brings up a really good point of people maybe not recognizing that they are already being charged based on an estimate/guestimate amount on their property tax bill. It could be with the installation of the meters that it will be accurate and it may be less than what they are paying. Some will pay more, some will pay less. (Listening Session #2)
- Comment: I wonder as far as some of the fees go if you have the authority, and I would think through the property tax system that you would, or the County would, put a lien on the property. Where a lien is not often not as punitive as the fees, but it gets you where you want to go where when that land changes hands or they pull a permit for something they've got this clouded title or a red flag on the

title and it could be maybe a less expensive way to enforce the rules. (Listening Session #3)

- Question: Am I understanding correctly that we are being billed monthly or is this going to be twice a year on the property tax? (Listening Session #3)
 - CGSA Response: The Executive Director responded, stating it will be collected twice a year on the property tax statements. The CGSA submits the data once a year and then the county collects it in pieces.
- Question: Given the current system that we have where you're doing the estimated water use, what's the charge per-acre foot that we are currently paying on that system? (Listening Session #3)
 - CGSA Response: \$79 per acre-foot.
- Question: Once you get the metering system in place and work out all the bugs, how much will that [the fee] be? (Listening Session #3)
 - CGSA Response: The Executive Director responded that it depends on the budget. What the CGSA does is it takes the annual budget and divides it by the number of acre-feet pumping. It could be that the values coming in are going to be much higher than we thought or they could be much lower than we thought, so it can vary depending on that number.
- Question: Is the money that you are now receiving based on this policy and how we're [property owners are] paying for this extraction of water, is that a new form of funding for you? And if so, is that being applied to any specific part of the budget? (Listening Session #3)
 - CGSA Response: The Executive Director responded, stating that the CGSA fees, currently based on estimated extraction using crop factors, are the only form of funding. GSAs, by state law, must be self-funded. There's no other funding.
- Question: So, the CGSA's anticipated revenue is going to be whatever your budget is, I mean you're going to aim your revenue at that figure, correct? (Listening Session #3)
 - CGSA Response: The Executive Director responded yes, stating that the CGSA has been doing this for five years now and has gotten pretty close to where we think we're going to be. Of course, inflation happens, and everything gets more expensive over time. We're not going to say that it's always going to be what it is, but we feel like we're close to equilibrium on the budget. We're not going up quickly or down quickly.
- Question: For your previous source of funds, where did you get your money to operate originally? (Listening Session #3)

- CGSA Response: The Executive Director responded stating that loans were used, and that this would be the last year that we have the loans for operating the CGSA for the first three years.

Non-Compliance & Enforcement Questions & Comments

- Question: So at this point, you haven't decided if it's [metering] mandatory yet? (Listening Session #2)
 - CGSA Response: The Executive Director responded, stating that what will happen is we will develop a policy document after these listening sessions and present it to the CGSA Board. We will give the feedback that we received from the public to the CGSA Board for their review. We will have a Public Hearing, where anyone from the public can come and make comments. Then, the Board will have to decide whether to adopt the Policy as is or make revisions.
- Question: So, is that how it works? [Metering] It's voluntary but if you don't have a meter then you estimate? (Listening Session #2)
 - CGSA Response: The Executive Director responded, stating yes, and we've been doing it that way. When we know you have a well or suspect that you have a well we look at the acreage of various crops, calculate a crop factor for those crops, look at your water meter and say okay so much water came from the meter, and therefore the rest has to be coming from the well. The CGSA is proposing to use crop calculations for those that are not in compliance with the metering policy; however, the crop factor will be one crop factor independent of crop type and it will be the highest crop factor from a historical period. This will be done to incentivize meters and compliance.
- Question: Is the next listening session [Listening Session #3] the last opportunity for public input? (Listening Session #2)
 - CGSA Response: The Executive Director stated that, no, there will be a comment period after. The final opportunity will be at the public hearing in which we present the policy. This will be at City Hall. As we approach June we will be advertising that public hearing.
- Question & Comment: All of these penalties are for the farmers it looks like. All costs are attributed to the farmer. What about the District [CGSA]? We have a very difficult situation with Fox Canyon and nothing happens on time, yet you still pay a price at the end. There should be something in place that says if the District is at fault, then these things are reversed and you get a credit. There

should be consequences for the District [CGSA] if there is a shortcoming on their part. (Listening Session #3)

- CGSA Response: The Executive Director stated that any fee that is a penalty fee, regardless of whether it is based on recovery of staff time or is a fee motivated to make someone comply, will be subject to appeal. We will have a process in place for challenging those fees if someone doesn't believe that they are fairly applied. They would go to the CGSA Board and they would hear the case and then make a decision. We are going to create this policy. It is not set in stone. We can always modify the policy if we realize something isn't working or needs to be done differently to be more efficient. We are trying to get as close as we can right now as we develop this process, but we are certainly going to learn. The more that we understand about these processes and see how things work, we will also see what does not work and we can continue to modify and improve the policy.
- Comment & Question: A lot of wells are in remote locations and, as far as vandalism and the like, I'm not comfortable saying the well owner is responsible for things that happen to his well or meter or the electronics. Is he going to have to build a fenced cage around this thing or what? We're out there, we're growing trees, we're doing our orchard, we have our valves and our hoses and everything else, and you're requiring us to add a valuable piece of equipment out there on a well that has typically just been sitting out there with power going to it. So, I think there's a little bit more to be understood about who's responsible for what damage and it kind of comes back to Jerry's comment about, you know, is it really the landowner's fault, is it really the District's fault, is it some vandal's fault? How are these going to be handled. (Listening Session #3)
 - CGSA Response: The CGSA can work on incorporating language into the Policy clarifying tampering fees and when they might apply.

Additional Questions & Comments

- Comment: It was suggested that the CGSA combine efforts with the total nitrogen applied reporting if possible. (Listening Session #1)
- Question: How many wells participate in the CGSA's monitoring program [groundwater elevation measurements and water quality sampling]? (Listening Session #2)
 - CGSA Response: CGSA staff responded at the meeting stating they believed that there were probably between 50 and 60 wells in total with about 40 participating in the sampling that we do in the spring and fall. It

was stated that staff recently began reporting about 30-32 groundwater elevations to the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA) portal online. These are wells that we go and check at the end of every even month and record the water elevations. Back in the office staff checked and there are 30 wells that staff check elevations for every other month including some CVWD-owned wells and private wells. There are 45 wells that staff coordinate water quality samples for in the spring and fall, including some CVWD-owned wells, and staff also collect samples from 6 creeks (Toro, Arroyo Paredon, Santa Monica, Carpinteria, Gobernador, and Rincon). Some wells are monitored for both elevation and water quality. Staff also confirmed that 32 groundwater elevation monitoring wells will be reported to the CGSA's SGMA portal.

- Question: I've seen old maps of petroleum wells, are those wells impacting anything in our [the CGSA's] process? (Listening Session #2)
 - CGSA Response: The Executive Director responded that that these oil wells, commonly referred to as "wildcat wells", typically aren't left open and if there is a casing it has very small diameter. CVWD and the CGSA have not come across one, but yes, they are shown on USGS maps.
- Question: At this point there's no indication that there will be an allocation process for each well or each acre? (Listening Session #2)
 - CGSA Response: The Executive Director responded, stating no, not at this point. We are at the beginning of a 20-year process so that would be pretty far down the road if that were to happen. Right now, we're trying to understand whether the basin is going to recover just naturally from the rainfall that occurs or is it going to continue to be lower. One of the big threats that we have is seawater intrusion coming into the basin so we're really looking at that to make sure that does not advance any further.
- Question: With all the testing that you [the CGSA] are doing, are you finding that the water table is coming up? (Listening Session #2)
 - CGSA Response: The Executive Director responded that yes, we are definitely seeing it come up. (The property owner stated in response that they had seen their well increase substantially, by about 25 feet).
- Comment: In Carpinteria, we may have more wells to monitor than Fox Canyon because they have bigger wells over there. It would be interesting to see how we compare to Ojai or Fox Canyon once we get the flow data. (Listening Session #2)
- Question: Didn't the water District do a study that a private pumper that watered for less than 10 acres of crops it might be cheaper to use District water than their well? (Listening Session #2)

- CGSA Response: The Executive Director responded stating that yes, the cost of entry for a well typically requires more than 10 acres of crops to break even.
 - Comment from another attendee: But then you would have to deal with the chlorine and the other stuff that you guys put in it. We don't always want that.
- Comment: Putting a positive spin on this whole process and just remembering that we really are trying to make the basin sustainable and some of these other things are out on the periphery of that focus and so that's where my concern is. So just going down my list. I'm one that participates in this well monitoring program. I don't know how many people that you want to have on that but I would like to see whatever you do encourage as many participants in that program because, to me, those are monitoring wells throughout the basin and the information that you get from those for free rather than, you know, wondering what's happening over there in the basin you can have a landowner help you do that. And that's how I feel – I participate in it. And there are things like depth of the well, you know, are they 250-foot wells, and not even affecting the basin or affecting the basin in a certain way. I think there's a lot to learn there. I also and um somewhat responding to Shirley's comment coming from the residential community, but I would say also coming from the water District's perspective but there is a tremendous benefit to open agriculture and percolation basins and how water gets into the basin. Recharge. And landowners are the ones who provide the lion's share of how the water gets into the basin and I think that needs to be recognized as an important part of of um – you know we're not just those of us with wells, we are not just extracting water. Our land is also putting water back in. Abandoned wells, for one thing, I see that as a somewhat distraction from the question at hand and that is what's happening with the sustainability of the basin. Um my experience with abandoned well is, okay, they are abandoned they are sitting over there in the corner of the property they have been like that for 50 years maybe. They're really not affecting the groundwater. (Listening Session #3)
- Comment: Part of the approach that I am trying to convey is that you say you don't want to make this punitive, but we want to get as much participation and goodwill by doing so as possible. And so, with that in mind, I would suggest phasing in some of this stuff as you can and focus on the groundwater sustainability part of it and trail this other stuff in over a timeline where it doesn't hit the landowner all in one big slug of you've got to do this, and you've got to do that. Another benefit, and I think Danielle touched on it, I think both of you, as far as the benefit of maybe a phase in is that you're monitoring what is going on in

these other Districts and you're not reinventing the wheel on this, which is great. So, some of these problems that we're anticipating, they hopefully will come up with solutions that we can, you know, piggy-back on. And what you see as a problem and a solution and a fee right now, a year from now that may not be the best way to handle it. So, the phase in especially if those things are "well we're not really sure how this should be handled." Maybe put those at the end of the timeline as far as phasing those in. (Listening Session #3)

- Comment: It's great to hear the views of other people that we haven't heard a lot from and there's a lot of good comments out there, I'm sure. But, just an impression that I have from the landowner's point of view, is that, and this is with regard to sharing costs and meter responsibility and that sort of thing. A lot of landowners feel that they paid for the water under their property when they bought the land. You know, the groundwater is a valuable asset that we pay for when we buy the land. We're now being told that we need to make the basin sustainable for the benefit of the entire community. So, now it is being removed from something that we own that we have control over to something that really benefits the whole basin. That's what the whole sustainability groundwater idea is. Because we're all using it. So, I think that if you think along those lines, from the perspective of the landowner there is an argument to be made for a more general covering of the costs by as many people including the residential people because the benefit is there. I mean, who is it benefitting? It's benefitting everybody that draws out of this basin. (Listening Session #3)
 - CGSA Response: The Executive Director responded, stating that the water District is the proxy for the residential users because CVWD pays the same fee that all of the pumpers pay. The CGSA approached this initially as an acreage-based fee, in which all the parcels that were residential or commercial or agricultural, even if they didn't have access to a well, were paying a per-acre fee and the feedback was that this was not a "fair" way to do this. The Doctrine of Water Rights in California, in particular groundwater, is that no one owns the water. You have a right to access the water. The water is in the groundwater basin, it's provided by natura, and because you have this patch of land you have the right to drill a well over your land and use a correlative amount of water – it's called the Doctrine of Correlative Use – to benefit your land. Groundwater is a common pool resource where everybody in an area is sharing this resource, and if it's not managed correctly there's a race to the bottom of those resources.
- Comment: Just to be clear, the CGSA and the water District are separate entities, and the administration of the GSA is handled by the water District, but they are separate. (Listening Session #3)



Carpinteria Groundwater Sustainability Agency

Statement of Revenues and Expenses

(unaudited)

For Fiscal: 2024-2025 | Period Ending: 3/31/2025

% of Year to Date: 75.00%

Account	Name	Current Total Budget	YTD Activity	Budget Remaining	% Used
OPERATIONS					
Revenues					
20-4315	ASSESSMENT REVENUE	485,000	438,547	46,453	90.4%
20-4319	WELL VERIFICATION FEE	-	1,000	(1,000)	-
Revenue Total:		485,000	439,547	45,453	90.6%
Expenses					
20-550-6806	GSA WTR QUALITY & TESTING	30,000	14,604	15,396	48.7%
20-560-6307	GSA GROUNDWATER PROF SVCS	50,000	11,950	38,050	23.9%
20-550-6308	GSA ANNUAL REPORTING	30,000	25,630	4,370	85.4%
20-560-6607	GSA SUPPLIES & EQUIPMENT	3,708	395	3,313	10.7%
20-570-6009	FICA-SOCIAL SECURITY	-	61	(61)	0.0%
20-570-6025	GSA PERSONNEL	134,252	99,000	35,252	73.7%
20-570-6117	GSA DIRECTORS FEES	7,200	4,180	3,020	58.1%
20-570-6118	GSA ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES	4,000	986	3,014	24.6%
20-570-6309	GSA ADMIN PROF SERVICES	60,000	16,400	43,600	27.3%
20-570-6310	GSA LEGAL PROFESSIONAL SERVICES	10,000	5,214	4,786	52.1%
20-599-7313	INTEREST EXPENSE	10,000	-	10,000	0.0%
Expense Total:		339,160	178,419	160,741	52.6%
Operating Surplus (Deficit):		145,840	261,129	(115,289)	179.1%



Carpinteria Groundwater Sustainability Agency

Statement of Net Position (unaudited)

As Of: 3/31/2025

Account	Name	Balance	
Assets			
20-1029	CGSA CHECKING	519,501	
21-1236	GRANT REIMB RECEIVABLE	191,081	
20-1245	ASSESSMENTS RECEIVABLE	5,272	
20-1420	PREPAYMENTS	6,000	
21-1821	CONSTRUCTION IN PROGRESS	-	
20-1755	EL CARRO MONITORING WELL	759,314	
	Total Assets:	1,481,168	<u>\$ 1,481,168</u>
Liabilities			
20-2000	ACCOUNTS PAYABLE - CGSA	975	
20-2032	STATE TAX PAYABLE	-	
20-2033	FEDERAL TAX PAYABLE	-	
20-2034	FICA PAYABLE	-	
20-2205	RETENTIONS PAYABLE	-	
20-2250	CVWD PROMISSORY NOTE	38,760	
20-2523	DUE TO CVWD	598,926	
	Total Liability:	638,661	
Fund Balance			
	CGSA FUND BALANCE	593,108	
	Total Fund Balance:	593,108	
	Total Beginning Equity:	593,108	
	Total Revenue	439,547	
	Total Expense	190,149	
	Revenues Over/Under Expenses	249,399	
	Total Equity and Current Surplus (Deficit):	842,507	
	Total Liabilities, Equity and Current Surplus (Deficit):		<u>\$ 1,481,168</u>