

# California State Assembly



## AGENDA

**Joint Hearing**  
**Assembly Budget Subcommittee No. 4**  
**on Climate Crisis, Resources, Energy, and Transportation**  
**AND**  
**Assembly Committee on Water, Parks, and Wildlife**

**Assemblymembers Steve Bennett & Diane Papan, Chairs**

**Wednesday, February 21, 2024**  
**9:00 A.M. – State Capitol, Room 444**

---

### Oversight Hearing

*Water We Doing with Groundwater:  
Evaluating Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA) Implementation*

- I. Welcoming Remarks and Introductions**
- II. Panel 1: Departments**
  - Sonja Petek, Principal Fiscal and Policy Analyst, Legislative Analyst's Office
  - Paul Gosselin, Deputy Director, Sustainable Groundwater Management Office, Department of Water Resources
  - James Nachbaur, Director, Office of Research, Planning, and Performance, State Water Resources Control Board
  - Tina Leahy, Attorney, Office of the Chief Counsel, State Water Resources Control Board
- III. Panel 2: Groundwater Sustainability Agency Stakeholders**
  - Jennifer Harder, Professor, McGeorge School of Law
  - Jeff Pratt, Executive Officer, Fox Canyon Groundwater Management Agency
- IV. Public Comment**

**Background****The Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA)**

Enacted nearly 10 years ago, SGMA's purpose is to reverse the adverse impacts caused by groundwater overdraft and to protect this important resource for future use by California's economy, communities, and ecosystems. An over-arching principle of SGMA is local control; the stated legislative intent is "to manage groundwater basins through the actions of local government agencies to the greatest extent feasible, while minimizing state intervention to only when necessary to ensure that local agencies manage groundwater in a sustainable manner" [Water Code § 10720.1(i)]. Thus, SGMA requires local agencies in groundwater basins designated as medium- or high-priority by the Department of Water Resources (DWR) to form a groundwater sustainability agency (GSA) and develop a groundwater sustainability plan (GSP) to achieve sustainable groundwater management within a 20-year time. SGMA permits multiple GSAs and GSPs in a basin so long as the GSAs enter into a "coordination agreement" so that GSPs are consistent and the basin is jointly managed.

GSAs achieve "sustainable management" by avoiding six "undesirable results:" 1) chronic lowering of groundwater levels; 2) reduction of groundwater storage; 3) seawater intrusion; 4) degraded water quality; 5) land subsidence; and 6) depletions of interconnected surface waters. "Undesirable results" must also be "significant and unreasonable" in order to violate the standard of sustainable management.

DWR conducts an initial review of a GSP and determines whether a GSP is "approved," "incomplete," or "inadequate." Approved basins may implement their plans, subject to periodic state review; incomplete basins have six months to correct deficiencies identified by DWR; and inadequate basins are referred to the State Water Resources Control Board (State Water Board) for possible designation as a "probationary" basin subject to interim state management (or "state intervention"). Even after the initial review, DWR has an ongoing role as DWR must review GSPs at least every five years to assess progress towards achieving sustainable management (Water Code § 10733.8).

"State intervention," when local agencies stumble, is another guiding principle of the law and the State Water Board takes the lead in carrying out this aspect of SGMA. After a basin is referred to the State Water Board, it can designate a basin as "probationary" following a public hearing at which it finds a GSP is inadequate or is not being implemented adequately (Water Code § 10735.2). If a basin is designated as "probationary," the basin has 180 days to correct deficiencies identified by the State Water Board. If the basin does not address deficiencies in the allotted time, the State Water Board may develop its own interim plan for the basin and manage the basin on an interim basis.

### A Budget for Water

There is no question that SGMA is a significant undertaking that will require an ongoing commitment of resources for more than two decades (and likely beyond). This takes the form of technical support, local assistance, and, in some cases, state management of a basin.

According to the LAO’s 2023-24 overview of the DWR budget, the state has provided more than \$800 million since 2014-15 for SGMA implementation activities. This includes:

- **State Operations.** DWR has received \$314 million (\$84 million from Proposition 68 bond funds and \$229 million from the General Fund) to support state management of the SGMA program.
- **Local Planning Grants.** The state has provided \$93 million in Proposition 1 bond funds for planning grants, which supported local agencies as they formed GSAs and developed their GSPs.
- **Local Implementation Grants.** The state has provided \$430 million (\$134 million from Proposition 68 bond funds and \$296 million from the General Fund) for local implementation grants. Examples of grant-funded activities include developing ways to inject surface water into aquifers, expanding conveyance infrastructure to increase recharge, installing monitoring wells, and developing or upgrading infrastructure to increase the use of recycled water.

Figure 6

### Sustainable Groundwater Management Act Resource History

(In Millions)

|                       | 2014-15 Through 2021-22 |                |              | 2022-23        |              | Totals       |
|-----------------------|-------------------------|----------------|--------------|----------------|--------------|--------------|
|                       | Proposition 1           | Proposition 68 | General Fund | Proposition 68 | General Fund |              |
| State operations      | —                       | \$68           | \$203        | \$16           | \$27         | \$314        |
| Planning grants       | \$93                    | —              | —            | —              | —            | 93           |
| Implementation grants | —                       | 134            | 180          | —              | 116          | 430          |
| <b>Totals</b>         | <b>\$93</b>             | <b>\$202</b>   | <b>\$383</b> | <b>\$16</b>    | <b>\$143</b> | <b>\$837</b> |

In addition, the Legislature has provided the State Water Board with resources for SGMA implementation. Initially, the 2014-15 budget provided \$1.9 million ongoing General Fund to support 10 positions. Since then, they have grown to 40 positions, 18 of which are supported by ongoing General Fund, and 22 are funded via non-ongoing General Fund.

The 2023-24 budget made some adjustments to SGMA investments including the following changes. First, it reduced funding by \$60 million that was planned for 2023-24 SGMA local assistance grants. Second, it added \$14 million General Fund to DWR for 11 new ongoing positions. This investment backfilled expiring bond funds to continue supporting 29 existing positions. The 2023-24 budget also allocated \$4.8 million General Fund in 2023-24 and 2024-25 to the Water Board for 19 positions. According to the State Water Board, the cost of these positions may be covered by fees (starting in 2025-26) on groundwater extractors in unmanaged areas; however, the Legislature should request follow-up information on the likelihood of this happening.

As SGMA implementation progresses, the State Water Board will play an intervening role if revised GSPs are determined inadequate. To recover programmatic costs, the State Water Board adopted fees associated with extraction reporting required in areas out of compliance with SGMA (see below).

| <b>Fee Category</b>                                       | <b>Fee Amount</b>                      | <b>Fee schedule<br/>Parties Fee Applies To</b>   |
|---|--|--|
| Base filing fee   | \$300 per well                         | All extractors required to report  |
| Unmanaged area <sup>a</sup> rate if extraction is metered | \$10 per acre-foot extracted           | Extractors in unmanaged areas  |
| Unmanaged area rate if extraction is unmetered            | \$25 per acre-foot extracted           | Extractors in unmanaged areas  |
| Rate for basins in probation                              | \$40 per acre-foot extracted           | Extractors in probationary basins  |
| Rate for basins subject to an interim plan                | \$55 per acre-foot extracted           | Extractors in probationary basins where the State Water Board determines an interim plan is required   |
| De minimis fee  | \$100 per well                         | Parties that extract, for domestic purposes, two acre-feet or less per year from a probationary basin, if the State Water Board decides the extractions will likely be significant |
| Late fee  | 25% of total fee amount per month late | Extractors that do not file annual extraction reports by the due date  |

According to the State Water Board in 2023, current fee revenue has been limited but is expected to increase given the information gleaned from GSPs deemed inadequate thus far. However, the amount of revenue is difficult to predict, and the time the state will receive these funds will lag compared to when state intervention work begins. The State Water Board anticipates that tens of thousands of groundwater pumpers may be required to report and that the first reports will be due as early as February 2025.

For GSAs, SGMA provides them authority to impose fees to fund the costs of the GSA including preparation, adoption, and amendment of a GSP, and investigations, inspections, compliance assistance, enforcement, and program administration. Fees may also be used for:

- Administration, operation, and maintenance
- Acquisition of lands or other property, facilities, and services
- Supply, production, treatment, or distribution of water

### **Classification of California's groundwater basins**

DWR delineates 515 groundwater basins in [California's Ground Water Update](#) (formerly Bulletin 118). These basins are then categorized as "high," "medium," "low," or "very low" priority based on specified criteria including population, rate of population growth, and number of wells. Generally, SGMA applies to "high" and "medium" priority basins, with some exceptions. Based on these categorizations, 94 of 515 basins must comply. These 94 basins when combined with basins managed pursuant to a groundwater adjudication account for 98% of groundwater extraction, 83% of the population, and 88% of irrigated agricultural acres in the state (DWR, 2020). Basins that were already actively managing their groundwater resources at the time of SGMA's passage were permitted to submit an "alternative" plan to DWR for review to ensure the plan met the objectives of SGMA. The basins that were already adjudicated or in the process of being adjudicated also were not required to form a GSA or develop a GSP. In addition, DWR identified a total of 21 "critically overdrafted" groundwater basins as required by SGMA. DWR classifies the 515 groundwater basins as follows:

- 46 basins as high priority (20 of these are also critically overdrafted basins)
- 48 basins as medium priority
- 11 basins as low priority
- 410 basins as very low priority (1 of these is also a critically overdrafted basin)

### **GSP Assessments by the Numbers**

In total (both critically overdrafted and non-critically overdrafted basins) to date there are:

- 71 approved basins
- 13 incomplete basins
- 6 inadequate basins

Non-critically overdrafted basins categorized as medium and high priority had to submit their GSPs by January 31, 2022. On January 18, 2024, DWR completed reviews for those basins and concluded that 13 were "incomplete." Several basins categorized as low and very low have

also submitted GSPs to DWR, although not required by SGMA, and are currently being reviewed by DWR.

Critically overdrafted basins were required to submit GSPs to DWR in January 2020 and in January 2022, DWR initially determined that 12 of the basins were “incomplete;” after corrections, DWR ultimately deemed that six of the 21 critically overdrafted basins had inadequate GSPs (subbasins Delta-Mendota, Chowchilla, Tulare Lake, Kaweah, Tule, and Kern County have inadequate GSPs). The most common deficiencies in the inadequate GSPs are lack of coordination between GSAs, lack of consideration for protecting domestic wells, insufficient prevention of subsidence, lack of justification for water quality thresholds, and lack of monitoring to avoid depletions of interconnected surface waters and are discussed in more detail below.

The “inadequate” determinations for these basins triggered intervention by the State Water Board. These basins are awaiting public hearings before the State Water Board to determine whether the basins shall be designated as “probationary.” The first of these hearings for the Tulare Lake Subbasin is scheduled for Tuesday, April 16, 2024.

### **Non-critically Overdrafted Basins: Challenges and Issues**

Of the 73 required GSPs submitted for non-critically overdrafted basins, DWR has determined that 58 are adequate and the GSAs in these basins can proceed with implementing their GSPs subject to annual reporting to DWR and five-year assessments by DWR to ensure the basins are on track to achieve sustainable groundwater management. The GSPs for two basins are still under review due to recent prioritization status change (see Table 1).

For the remaining 13 basins, DWR has determined that their GSPs are “incomplete” and the GSAs that submitted these GSPs have 180 days to address deficiencies and make corrections to their GSPs in order to receive an “adequate” determination. If the GSAs in these “incomplete” basins do not make sufficient changes to their GSPs in this period, the GSPs will be deemed “inadequate” and referred to the State Water Board for potential designation as a “probationary” basin. Given the scope and nature of the deficiencies identified in DWR’s assessments of these “incomplete” GSPs, these GSAs have their work cut out for them over the next few months. Below are some of the common deficiencies identified by DWR in its assessments of the “incomplete” basins:

- *Lack of sufficient analysis of overdraft and justification for management criteria.* A common theme is that these GSPs do not adequately assess overdraft in their basins and do not provide sufficient detail or analysis to justify their selection of groundwater levels that the basin will be managed to; in most cases these GSPs contemplate further significant declines in groundwater levels but fail to explain how these declines will not

result in “undesirable results.” The following from a DWR assessment is a typical critique of these GSPs: “Generally, descriptions of minimum thresholds are not provided with sufficient supporting information to allow Department staff to evaluate whether the criteria are reasonable or whether operating the Basin to avoid those thresholds is consistent with avoiding undesirable results, in part due to defined undesirable results in the Plan being insufficiently detailed.”

- *Failure to consider beneficial users and uses of groundwater.* SGMA requires that a GSA consider the interests of all beneficial users and uses of groundwater in the basin when developing a GSP (Water Code § 10723.2). This is another deficiency that is cross-cutting in the “incomplete” GSPs. They consistently fail to demonstrate how, or if, the interests of all groundwater users were considered when defining undesirable results and management criteria in the GSP.
- *Failure to define and address chronic lowering of groundwater levels.* This is one of the six undesirable results and is often used as a proxy for assessing whether other undesirable results are occurring. The majority of the “incomplete” GSPs fail to adequately analyze or address this issue and, in many cases, allow for significant further declines in groundwater levels without triggering undesirable results. In one egregious case DWR notes: “Staff has not encountered any other Plan that has proposed to manage a basin to allow an up to 250-foot decline in groundwater levels from 2015 levels, and although this does not necessarily or by itself preclude such an approach, it is the GSA’s responsibility to fully describe and support this approach in the GSP and it is this aspect of the GSP that staff has found lacking.”
- *De-watering of groundwater wells.* The failure to address significant de-watering of groundwater wells is another common refrain in the DWR assessments of the “incomplete” GSPs for non-critically overdrafted basins. As groundwater levels decline, some wells are de-watered because the depth of the groundwater level is greater than the depth of the well. Domestic wells are especially at risk because they are typically shallower than wells used to produce irrigation water for agriculture. Many of these GSPs contemplate further groundwater level declines that will dry out more than 20% of the wells in the basin. DWR repeatedly questions how this is *not* an undesirable result: “The GSA has elected to establish a threshold that will allow up to 20 percent of currently functioning domestic wells (up to 1,062 wells) to go dry without causing an undesirable result, and the GSA has not explained how it determined the current and projected well outages in the Subbasin are not considered undesirable results, even though those conditions appear to meet the definition of an undesirable result provided in the GSP.”

- *Projects and management actions.* This section of the GSP is in some ways the most important as it is supposed to describe the actions the GSA will implement to mitigate and/or reverse overdraft. However, this is another area that DWR consistently finds lacking in its assessments of the “incomplete” GSPs for the non-critically overdrafted basins. Lack of detail on or commitment to actual implementation of identified projects and management actions is a recurring deficiency of these GSPs: “The GSAs do not appear to have an urgency to implement the necessary projects and management actions to mitigate overdraft and Department staff are concerned that continued overdraft will exacerbate the current problems the basin is experiencing, which include dry wells and worsening land subsidence.”

*Note: when the Assembly Water, Parks, and Wildlife Committee reviewed the GSP assessments for critically overdrafted basins two years ago, the most common deficiencies were governance coordination, domestic well protection, land subsidence correction, water quality examination, and interconnected surface water depletion.*

## **Groundwater Adjudications**

When disputes arise over water and rights usage, groundwater users can ask the court to “adjudicate” and define the rights that various entities have to use groundwater resources. Adjudications can cover an entire basin, a portion of a basin, or a group of basins. The court typically limits pumping to the “safe yield” of the basin, which is the rate at which groundwater can be withdrawn without long-term decline of water levels or other undesirable effects (e.g., subsidence, see below). Through adjudication, the courts can assign specific water rights to users and can compel the cooperation of pumpers who might otherwise refuse to limit their pumping. Watermasters are usually appointed by the court to ensure that pumping conforms to the limits defined by the decision. This litigation is often time-consuming and costly.

SGMA does not apply to adjudicated basins. As of 2020, portions of 38 groundwater basins had been adjudicated (see Table 2). SGMA explicitly identifies 26 completed adjudications (some of these cover portions of multiple basins hence the mismatch between number of basins adjudicated and number of adjudications) and three pending adjudications. Most of these adjudications occurred in southern California. Portions of five groundwater basins are currently being adjudicated:

- Santa Clara Valley – Oxnard (No. 4-001.2) and Pleasant Valley (No. 4-006) groundwater basins, commenced in December 2022.
- Cuyama Valley groundwater basin (No. 3-013), commenced in March 2022.
- Indian Wells groundwater basin (No. 6-054), commenced in November 2021.



- Upper Ventura River (No. 4-003.01), Ojai Valley (No. 4-002), Lower Ventura River (No. 4-003.02), and Upper Ojai Valley (No. 4-001) groundwater basins, commenced in November 2019.
- Las Posas Valley groundwater basin (No. 4-008), commenced in November 2018.

An additional adjudication in the Borrego Valley groundwater subbasin (No. 7-024.1) commenced in July 2020; the court approved a stipulated judgment to settle this adjudication on April 8, 2021 and the case is no longer active.

The Committees will be hearing from one of the parties involved in the *Las Posas Valley Water Rights Coalition v. Fox Canyon Groundwater Management Agency* adjudication at today's hearing. This adjudication occurred in the Las Posas groundwater basin which is located in Ventura County and underlies the Las Posas Valley, a drainage area that encompasses 42,000 acres of land and extends from Simi Valley and Moorpark west to Camarillo. The basin is designated as a high-priority basin by DWR. In 2018, a group of agricultural landowners that overlie the Las Posas Groundwater Basin filed a comprehensive groundwater adjudication lawsuit to determine the rights to extract groundwater from the basin.

As part of its role as a groundwater sustainability agency, Fox Canyon Groundwater Management Agency had limited the amount of water landowners could pump from the basin based on its groundwater sustainability plan. The move, the plaintiffs argued, was invalid and interfered with their water rights. The lawsuit sought a court adjudication of groundwater rights against all persons or entities that either extract or pump groundwater from the basin, including agricultural, commercial, domestic, and mutual water company users.

The court adjudication was split into three phases with the initial complaint beginning in 2018, and court proceedings ending in 2023. The judgment established different groundwater allocations compared to those established under Fox Canyon Groundwater Management Agency's GSP. The court judgment also appointed Fox Canyon Groundwater Management Agency as the watermaster to implement these new allocations as the physical solution determined by the Court. The case is among the first adjudications brought since the passage of SGMA.

This agenda and other publications are available on the Assembly Budget Committee's website at: [Sub 4 Hearing Agendas | California State Assembly](#). You may contact the Committee at (916) 319-2099. This agenda was prepared by Pablo Garza and Stephanie Mitchell with Assembly Water, Parks, and Wildlife Committee and Christine Miyashiro with the Assembly Budget Committee.

**Table 1**  
**Non-critically Overdrafted Basins**  
**Summary of Ground Water Sustainability Plan Status**

| Basin  | Overlying Counties    | Number of GSPs | Number of GSAs | Adjudicated? | DWR Determination                    | GSP areas of insufficiency per DWR  |
|--|-----------------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|--------------------------------------|---|
| 1-002.01 Klamath River Valley, Tulelake      | Modoc, Siskiyou       | 1              | 4              |              | Incomplete                           | Chronic lowering of groundwater levels  |
| 1-003 Butte Valley                           | Siskiyou              | 1              | 1              |              | Incomplete                           | Assessment of overdraft conditions and mitigation, chronic lowering of groundwater levels |
| 1-004 Shasta Valley, Shasta Valley           | Shasta, Siskiyou      | 1              | 1              |              | Approved                             | N/A   |
| 1-005 Scott River Valley                     | Siskiyou              | 1              | 1              | final        | Approved                             | N/A   |
| 1-010 Eel River Valley                       | Humboldt              | 1              | 1              |              | Approved                             | N/A   |
| 1-052 Ukiah Valley                           | Mendocino             | 1              | 1              |              | Approved                             | N/A   |
| 1-055.01 Santa Rosa Valley, Santa Rosa Plain | Sonoma                | 1              | 1              |              | Approved                             | N/A   |
| 2-001 Petaluma Valley                        | Sonoma                | 1              | 1              |              | Approved                             | N/A   |
| 2-002.01 Napa-Sonoma Valley, Napa Valley     | Napa                  | 1              | 1              |              | Approved                             | N/A   |
| 2-002.02 Napa-Sonoma Valley, Sonoma Valley   | Sonoma                | 1              | 1              |              | Approved                             | N/A   |
| 2-009.01 Santa Clara Valley, Niles Cone      | Alameda               |                | 1              |              | Approved Alternative (Existing Plan) | N/A   |
| 2-009.02 Santa Clara Valley, Santa Clara     | Santa Clara           |                | 1              |              | Approved Alternative (Existing Plan) | N/A   |
| 2-009.04 Santa Clara Valley, East Bay Plain  | Alameda, Contra Costa | 1              | 2              |              | Approved                             | N/A   |

| Basin  | Overlying Counties    | Number of GSPs | Number of GSAs | Adjudicated? | DWR Determination                                   | GSP areas of insufficiency per DWR |
|--|-----------------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|---|------------------------------------|
| 2-010 Livermore Valley                             | Alameda, Contra Costa |                | 1              |              | Approved Alternative (Analysis of Basin Conditions) | N/A                                |
| 3-003.01 Gilroy-Hollister Valley, Llagas Area      | Santa Clara           |                | 1              |              | Approved Alternative (Existing Plan)                | N/A                                |
| 3-003.05 Gilroy-Hollister Valley, North San Benito | San Benito            | 1              | 2              |              | Approved  | N/A                                |
| 3-004.02 Salinas Valley, East Side Aquifer         | Monterey              | 1              | 1              |              | Approved  | N/A                                |
| 3-004.04 Salinas Valley, Forebay Aquifer           | Monterey              | 1              | 2              |              | Approved  | N/A                                |
| 3-004.05 Salinas Valley, Upper Valley Aquifer      | Monterey              | 1              | 1              |              | Approved  | N/A                                |
| 3-004.09 Salinas Valley, Langley Area              | Monterey              | 1              | 1              |              | Approved  | N/A                                |
| 3-004.10 Salinas Valley, Corral De Tierra Area     | Monterey              | 1              | 2              |              | Approved  | N/A                                |
| 3-007 Carmel Valley                                | Monterey              |                | 1              |              | N/A*  | N/A                                |
| 3-009 San Luis Obispo Valley                       | San Luis Obispo       | 1              | 2              |              | Approved  | N/A                                |
| 3-014 San Antonio Creek Valley                     | Santa Barbara         | 1              | 1              |              | Approved  | N/A                                |
| 3-015 Santa Ynez River Valley                      | Santa Barbara         | 3              | 3              |              | Approved  | N/A                                |
| 3-018 Carpinteria                                  | Santa Barbara         | 1              | 1              |              | Not Submitted <sup>†</sup>                          | N/A                                |

| Basin  | Overlying Counties | Number of GSPs | Number of GSAs | Adjudicated? | DWR Determination               | GSP areas of insufficiency per DWR  |
|--|--------------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|---------------------------------|---|
| 3-027 Santa Margarita  | Santa Cruz         | 1              | 1              |              | Approved                        | N/A   |
| 3-049 Montecito  | Santa Barbara      | 1              | 1              |              | Review in Progress <sup>†</sup> | N/A   |
| 4-002 Ojai Valley  | Ventura            | 1              | 1              | pending      | Approved                        | N/A   |
| 4-003.01 Ventura River Valley, Upper Ventura River               | Ventura            | 1              | 1              | pending      | Approved                        | N/A   |
| 4-004.03 Santa Clara River Valley, Mound                         | Ventura            | 1              | 1              |              | Approved                        | N/A   |
| 4-004.05 Santa Clara River Valley, Fillmore                      | Ventura            | 1              | 1              |              | Incomplete                      | Chronic lowering of groundwater levels, depletions of interconnected surface waters                                     |
| 4-004.06 Santa Clara River Valley, Piru                          | Ventura            | 1              | 1              |              | Incomplete                      | Chronic lowering of groundwater levels, depletions of interconnected surface waters                                     |
| 4-004.07 Santa Clara River Valley, Santa Clara River Valley East | Los Angeles        | 1              | 1              |              | Approved                        | N/A   |
| 4-008 Las Posas Valley   | Ventura            | 1              | 3              | pending      | Approved                        | N/A   |
| 4-011.01 Coastal Plain Of Los Angeles, Santa Monica              | Los Angeles        | 1              | 1              |              | Approved                        | N/A   |
| 5-004 Big Valley   | Lassen, Modoc      | 1              | 2              |              | Incomplete                      | Assessment of overdraft conditions and mitigation, chronic lowering of groundwater levels, degradation of water quality |
| 5-006.03 Redding Area, Anderson                                  | Shasta             | 1              | 1              |              | Approved                        | N/A   |

| Basin                                   | Overlying Counties | Number of GSPs | Number of GSAs | Adjudicated? | DWR Determination | GSP areas of insufficiency per DWR   |
|---|--------------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|-------------------|--|
| 5-006.04 Redding Area, Enterprise       | Shasta             | 1              | 1              |              | Approved          | N/A  |
| 5-012.01 Sierra Valley, Sierra Valley   | Plumas, Sierra     | 1              | 2              |              | Approved          | N/A  |
| 5-015 Big Valley                        | Lake               | 1              | 1              |              | Approved          | N/A  |
| 5-021.50 Sacramento Valley, Red Bluff   | Tehama             | 1              | 1              |              | Incomplete        | Basis for selection of groundwater management levels, impacts to beneficial users and uses of groundwater, assessment of overdraft conditions and mitigation |
| 5-021.51 Sacramento Valley, Corning     | Glenn, Tehama      | 1              | 3              |              | Incomplete        | Assessment of overdraft conditions and mitigation, chronic lowering of groundwater levels  |
| 5-021.52 Sacramento Valley, Colusa      | Colusa, Glenn      | 1              | 4              |              | Incomplete        | Assessment of overdraft conditions, basis for selection of groundwater levels  |
| 5-021.54 Sacramento Valley, Antelope    | Tehama             | 1              | 1              |              | Incomplete        | Basis for selection of groundwater management levels, degradation of groundwater quality   |
| 5-021.56 Sacramento Valley, Los Molinos | Butte, Tehama      | 1              | 1              |              | Incomplete        | Basis for selection of groundwater management levels, impacts to beneficial users and uses of groundwater  |
| 5-021.57 Sacramento Valley, Vina        | Butte, Tehama      | 1              | 2              |              | Approved          | N/A  |
| 5-021.60 Sacramento Valley, North Yuba  | Yuba               | 1              | 3              |              | Approved          | N/A  |

| Basin  | Overlying Counties         | Number of GSPs | Number of GSAs | Adjudicated? | DWR Determination | GSP areas of insufficiency per DWR  |
|--|----------------------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|-------------------|---|
| 5-021.61<br>Sacramento Valley, South Yuba      | Yuba                       | 1              | 1              |              | Approved          | N/A   |
| 5-021.62<br>Sacramento Valley, Sutter          | Sutter                     | 1              | 9              |              | Approved          | N/A   |
| 5-021.64<br>Sacramento Valley, North American  | Sacramento, Sutter, Placer | 1              | 5              |              | Approved          | N/A   |
| 5-021.65<br>Sacramento Valley, South American  | Sacramento                 | 1              | 11             |              | Approved          | N/A   |
| 5-021.66<br>Sacramento Valley, Solano          | Sacramento, Solano, Yolo   | 1              | 11             |              | Approved          | N/A   |
| 5-021.67<br>Sacramento Valley, Yolo            | Yolo                       | 1              | 1              |              | Approved          | N/A   |
| 5-021.69<br>Sacramento Valley, Wyandotte Creek | Butte                      | 1              | 1              |              | Approved          | N/A   |
| 5-021.70<br>Sacramento Valley, Butte           | Glenn                      | 1              | 13             |              | Approved          | N/A   |
| 5-022.02 San Joaquin Valley, Modesto           | Stanislaus                 | 1              | 2              |              | Incomplete        | Chronic lowering of groundwater levels, projects and management actions   |
| 5-022.03 San Joaquin Valley, Turlock           | Merced, Stanislaus         | 1              | 2              |              | Incomplete        | Chronic lowering of groundwater levels, projects and management actions   |
| 5-022.10 San Joaquin Valley, Pleasant Valley   | Fresno, Kings              | 1              | 3              |              | Incomplete        | Chronic lowering of groundwater levels, assessment of overdraft conditions and mitigation, degradation of water quality |

| Basin  | Overlying Counties                 | Number of GSPs | Number of GSAs | Adjudicated? | DWR Determination                                   | GSP areas of insufficiency per DWR |
|--|------------------------------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|---|------------------------------------|
| 5-022.15 San Joaquin Valley, Tracy             | Alameda, Contra Costa, San Joaquin | 1              | 6              |              | Approved  | N/A                                |
| 5-022.16 San Joaquin Valley, Cosumnes          | Sacramento, San Joaquin            | 1              | 7              |              | Approved  | N/A                                |
| 5-022.18 San Joaquin Valley, White Wolf        | Kern                               | 1              | 1              |              | Approved  | N/A                                |
| 5-022.19 San Joaquin Valley, East Contra Costa | Contra Costa                       | 1              | 7              |              | Approved  | N/A                                |
| 6-005.01 Tahoe Valley, Tahoe South             | El Dorado                          |                | 2              |              | Approved Alternative (Existing Plan)                | N/A                                |
| 7-021.01 Coachella Valley, Indio               | Imperial, Riverside, San Diego     |                | 6              |              | Approved Alternative (Existing Plan)                | N/A                                |
| 7-021.02 Coachella Valley, Mission Creek       | Riverside                          |                | 4              |              | Approved Alternative (Existing Plan)                | N/A                                |
| 7-021.04 Coachella Valley, San Geronio Pass    | Riverside                          | 1              | 3              |              | Approved  | N/A                                |
| 8-001 Coastal Plain Of Orange County           | Orange                             |                | 1              |              | Approved Alternative (Analysis of Basin Conditions) | N/A                                |
| 8-002.07 Upper Santa Ana Valley, Yucaipa       | Riverside, San Bernardino          | 1              | 1              |              | Approved  | N/A                                |
| 8-002.09 Upper Santa Ana Valley, Temescal      | Riverside                          | 1              | 1              |              | Approved  | N/A                                |
| 8-004.01 Elsinore, Elsinore Valley             | Riverside                          | 1              | 1              |              | Approved  | N/A                                |

| Basin   | Overlying Counties | Number of GSPs | Number of GSAs | Adjudicated? | DWR Determination | GSP areas of insufficiency per DWR |
|---|--------------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|-------------------|------------------------------------|
| 8-005 San Jacinto                                       | Riverside          | 1              | 1              | final        | Approved          | N/A                                |
| 9-007.01 San Luis Rey Valley, Upper San Luis Rey Valley | San Diego          | 1              | 1              |              | Approved          | N/A                                |
| 9-010 San Pasqual Valley                                | San Diego          | 1              | 1              |              | Approved          | N/A                                |

*\* Carmel Valley (3-007) no longer needs to submit a GSP as the basin is covered by a subterranean stream determination under State Water Board jurisdiction*

*† Both Carpinteria (3-018) and Montecito (3-049) were more recently categorized as SGMA basins and so are under an alternative timeline for GSP submission*

Information compiled by Assembly Water, Parks, and Wildlife Committee staff

Last Updated: 2/16/2024



**Table 2**  
**Adjudicated Areas**

| Basin  | Overlying Counties                            | Adjudication Status (portion or entirety of basin)  | Critical Overdraft? | SGMA 2019 Basin Prioritization |
|--|---|---|---------------------|--------------------------------|
| 1-005 Scott River Valley                           | Siskiyou                                      | Adjudicated (1980)  | No                  | Medium                         |
| 3-004.08 Salinas Valley, Seaside Area              | Monterey                                      | Adjudicated (2006)  | No                  | Very Low                       |
| 3-008.01 Los Osos Valley, Los Osos Area            | San Luis Obispo                               | Adjudicated (2018)  | Yes                 | Very Low                       |
| 3-012.01 Santa Maria, Santa Maria                  | San Luis Obispo                               | Adjudicated (2008)  | No                  | Very Low                       |
| 3-013 Cuyama Valley                                | Kern, San Luis Obispo, Santa Barbara, Ventura | Current<br><i>Bolthouse Land Company, LLC et al. v. All Persons Claiming a Right to Extract or Store Groundwater in the Cuyama Valley Groundwater Basin</i> | Yes                 | High                           |
| 3-016 Goleta                                       | Santa Barbara                                 | Adjudicated (1989)  | No                  | Very Low                       |
| 4-001 Upper Ojai Valley                            | Ventura                                       | Current<br><i>Santa Barbara Channelkeeper v. SWRCB, et al.</i>  | No                  | Very Low                       |
| 4-002 Ojai Valley                                  | Ventura                                       | Current<br><i>Santa Barbara Channelkeeper v. SWRCB, et al.</i>  | No                  | High                           |
| 4-003.01 Ventura River Valley, Upper Ventura River | Ventura                                       | Current<br><i>Santa Barbara Channelkeeper v. SWRCB, et al.</i>  | No                  | Medium                         |
| 4-003.02 Ventura River Valley, Lower Ventura River | Ventura                                       | Current<br><i>Santa Barbara Channelkeeper v. SWRCB, et al.</i>  | No                  | Very Low                       |
| 4-004.02 Santa Clara River Valley, Oxnard          | Ventura                                       | Current<br><i>OPV Coalition et al. v. Fox Canyon Groundwater Management Agency et al.</i>   | Yes                 | High                           |
| 4-004.04 Santa Clara River Valley, Santa Paula     | Ventura                                       | Adjudicated (1996)  | No                  | Very Low                       |
| 4-006 Pleasant Valley                              | Ventura                                       | Current<br><i>OPV Coalition et al. v. Fox Canyon Groundwater Management Agency et al.</i>   | Yes                 | High                           |
| 4-008 Las Posas Valley                             | Ventura                                       | Current<br><i>Los Posas Basin v. Fox Canyon Adjudication</i>  | No                  | High                           |

| Basin   | Overlying Counties                | Adjudication Status (portion or entirety of basin) | Critical Overdraft? | SGMA 2019 Basin Prioritization |
|---|-----------------------------------|--|---------------------|--------------------------------|
| 4-011.03 Coastal Plain Of Los Angeles, West Coast | Los Angeles                       | Adjudicated (1966)                                 | No                  | Very Low                       |
| 4-011.04 Coastal Plain Of Los Angeles, Central    | Los Angeles                       | Adjudicated (1965)                                 | No                  | Very Low                       |
| 4-012 San Fernando Valley                         | Los Angeles                       | Adjudicated (1979)                                 | No                  | Very Low                       |
| 4-013 San Gabriel Valley                          | Los Angeles                       | Adjudicated (1973)                                 | No                  | Very Low                       |
| 4-023 Raymond                                     | Los Angeles                       | Adjudicated (1944)                                 | No                  | Very Low                       |
| 5-027 Cummings Valley                             | Kern                              | Adjudicated (1966)                                 | No                  | Very Low                       |
| 5-028 Tehachapi Valley West                       | Kern                              | Adjudicated (1966)                                 | No                  | Very Low                       |
| 5-080 Brite Valley                                | Kern                              | Adjudicated (1966)                                 | No                  | Very Low                       |
| 6-012.01 Owens Valley, Owens Valley               | Inyo, Mono                        | Adjudicated (1991)                                 | No                  | Low                            |
| 6-037 Coyote Lake Valley                          | San Bernardino                    | Adjudicated (1990)                                 | No                  | Very Low                       |
| 6-038 Caves Canyon Valley                         | San Bernardino                    | Adjudicated (1990)                                 | No                  | Very Low                       |
| 6-040 Lower Mojave River Valley                   | San Bernardino                    | Adjudicated (1990)                                 | No                  | Very Low                       |
| 6-041 Middle Mojave River Valley                  | San Bernardino                    | Adjudicated (1990)                                 | No                  | Very Low                       |
| 6-042 Upper Mojave River Valley                   | San Bernardino                    | Adjudicated (1990)                                 | No                  | Very Low                       |
| 6-043 El Mirage Valley                            | San Bernardino                    | Adjudicated (1990)                                 | No                  | Very Low                       |
| 6-044 Antelope Valley                             | Kern, Los Angeles, San Bernardino | Adjudicated (2015)                                 | No                  | Very Low                       |
| 6-045 Tehachapi Valley East                       | Kern                              | Adjudicated (1971)                                 | No                  | Very Low                       |
| 6-047 Harper Valley                               | Kern, San Bernardino              | Adjudicated (2000)                                 | No                  | Very Low                       |

| Basin  | Overlying Counties         | Adjudication Status (portion or entirety of basin)   | Critical Overdraft? | SGMA 2019 Basin Prioritization |
|--|----------------------------|--|---------------------|--------------------------------|
| 6-054 Indian Wells Valley                            | Inyo, Kern, San Bernardino | Current<br><i>Indian Wells Valley Water District v All Persons Who Claim a Right to Extract Groundwater in the Indian Wells Valley Groundwater Basin, ect., et al.</i> | Yes                 | High                           |
| 6-089 Kane Wash Area                                 | San Bernardino             | Adjudicated (2000)   | No                  | Very Low                       |
| 7-012 Warren Valley                                  | San Bernardino             | Adjudicated (1977)   | No                  | Very Low                       |
| 7-019 Lucerne Valley                                 | San Bernardino             | Adjudicated (2000)   | No                  | Very Low                       |
| 7-024.01 Borrego Valley, Borrego Springs             | San Diego                  | Adjudicated (2020, stipulated)   | Yes                 | High                           |
| 8-002.01 Upper Santa Ana Valley, Chino               | San Bernardino             | Adjudicated (1975)   | No                  | Very Low                       |
| 8-002.02 Upper Santa Ana Valley, Cucamonga           | San Bernardino             | Adjudicated (1958)   | No                  | Very Low                       |
| 8-002.03 Upper Santa Ana Valley, Riverside-Arlington | Riverside, San Bernardino  | Adjudicated (1969)   | No                  | Very Low                       |
| 8-002.04 Upper Santa Ana Valley, Rialto-Colton       | Riverside, San Bernardino  | Adjudicated (1924)   | No                  | Very Low                       |
| 8-002.06 Upper Santa Ana Valley, San Bernardino      | San Bernardino             | Adjudicated (1924)   | No                  | Very Low                       |
| 8-002.08 Upper Santa Ana Valley, San Timoteo         | San Bernardino             | Adjudicated (2004)   | No                  | Very Low                       |
| 8-005 San Jacinto                                    | Riverside                  | Adjudicated (1954)   | No                  | High                           |
| 9-004 Santa Margarita Valley                         | San Diego                  | Adjudicated (1963)   | No                  | Very Low                       |
| 9-005 Temecula Valley                                | Riverside, San Diego       | Adjudicated (1963)   | No                  | Very Low                       |
| 9-006 Cahuilla Valley                                | Riverside                  | Adjudicated (1963)   | No                  | Very Low                       |

Information compiled by Assembly Water, Parks, and Wildlife Committee staff

Last Updated: 2/16/2024