

**CENTRAL MANAGMENT AREA  
CITIZEN ADVISORY GROUP  
MEMORANDUM**

---

DATE: May 13, 2021

TO: CMA GSA Committee

FROM: CMA Citizen Advisory Group  
(representative Cindy Douglas)

SUBJECT: Review and Discussion Draft Water Budget Technical Memorandum

---

**Attendees**

CMA CAG Members in attendance: Deby Laranjo, Sharyne Merritt, Cindy Douglas, Larry Laehr, Len Fleckenstein, Sean Diggins

Staff in attendance: Bill Buelow (SYRWCD) and Matt Young (County of Santa Barbara);  
Consultants in attendance: Curtis Lawler (Stetson Engineers),

**Purpose**

The CMA GSA Committee requested staff for the GSA agencies to coordinate meetings of the CMA CAG. Through a coordinated effort, the CAG held a meeting via teleconference due to the COVID-19 restrictions. The meeting was held on May 13, 2021. The purpose of the meetings was for the CMA CAG (CAG) to review the Draft Water Budget Technical Memorandum. The Memorandum was prepared by the Stetson Engineer's team. A copy of the documents was made available to the CAG prior to the meeting at [www.SantaYnezWater.org](http://www.SantaYnezWater.org).

**CAG Comments on the Draft Water Budget Technical Memorandum:**

Each member of the CAG was given the opportunity to ask questions or make comments on the Draft Water Budget. Discussion occurred with each question and comment by various members of the CAG, Staff and Consultants. Below is a summary of the comments and questions by topic:

**Groundwater vs. Surface Water**

- The CAG discussed the interaction between groundwater and surface water in the GSP. There was a robust discussion about how clarifying the text to make clear how surface water relates to groundwater.

- Page 8 Section 1.8, a question was asked to clarify areas where surface water and groundwater may interact in the CMA.
- A discussion continued about a forecasted increase in groundwater pumping in the future due to drought and/or rising temperatures, and fluctuations of pumping in the past when there were droughts and rainy periods.
  - Curtis added that to get better data on groundwater pumped, meters will be required in the future. The SGMA water budget states that the surface water does contribute to the groundwater and therefore must be defined and described.
- The CAG discussed that within the CMA the Santa Ynez Riverbed flows over bedrock and is a component of the surface water component of the overall Water Budget.
- Text should be clarified on page 26, surface water vs. groundwater.
- What is the total number of groundwater wells contributed to the data.
  - Consultants indicated there is a lack of groundwater wells for monitoring in the CMA but that there may be more added in the future.
- How were tributary inflows were measured?
  - Used available gauge data where available.

#### Future Water Budget Assumptions

- Page 38, Section 4.1.1, is the assumption regarding future crop acreage accurate? There was follow-on discussion regarding agriculture groundwater pumping over time has stayed steady.
- Why was 2018 used for future demand on Table 4-1? Discussion ensued.
  - Response, the chosen number was a long-term average, and the timeframe was consistent with the other management areas.

#### Agricultural Return Flows

- Page 15, additional information was requested on the application and efficiency rates stated in the document how they related to the water budget.
- CAG asked staff to provide citations and references on the efficiency rates provided in the Water Budget.
- CAG members mentioned that cannabis acreage planted and planned for planting is available through the County.

#### Current and Future Agricultural Demand

- Some of the CAG members agreed with the assumption made in the Water Budget, there will be no significant growth in agriculture acreage as described in the future water budget.
- However, the future demand seems to be too high in Table 4-1.
  - Staff mentioned there was an error in the table that will be updated.
  - There was further discussion that some of the projected increase was due to climate change assumptions.
  - Staff discussed that SGMA allows for adaptive management and is not a static document.
- The CAG discussed how the future projections will be used to set policy and that the future estimates are a tool used to do that.
- What is Mountain Front Recharge and how is it calculated?

- Staff discussed how the parameters of recharge are difficult to measure except river flow.

#### Sub flow and Inflow Assumptions

- There was robust discussion on the assumptions used to calculate groundwater sub flows.
- CAG asked how these were calculated and there was a discussion about uncertainty related to these parameters.
- CAG asked how the tributary inflows were calculated.
- CAG pointed out that there seems to be an error on Table 3-3.

Various additional comments were provided from members of the public that were in attendance. Below are several examples of the comments provided.

- Bryan Bondy (Santa Ynez Water Group) reiterated that he had submitted comments on behalf of the Water Group and there were some apparent calculation errors that should be checked between some of the tables. Bryan asked that the Consultants follow-up on any resolution.
- Steve Slack (CDFW) thanked the CAG for good comments and said he learned a lot.