

**Table B-1
Groundwater Basin Management**

Groundwater Basin	Governance Type	Characteristics
Ventura County Basins Oxnard Plain, Oxnard Forebay, Santa Rosa, East, West, and South Las Posas Basins	Managed via 1982 State statute creating the Fox Canyon Groundwater Management Agency	Specifies the establishment of a representative board of directors to govern the Fox Canyon GMA. Specifies the scope of the GMA to planning, managing, controlling, preserving, and regulating the extraction and use of groundwater within its service territory, and may adopt ordinances to carry out these purposes. Statute recognizes conjunctive use of surface and groundwater and long-term storage of water in a groundwater basin. Requires the preparation and implementation of a groundwater management plan. The GMA adopted its Groundwater Management Plan in 1985 and updated the plan in 2006.
Upper Los Angeles River Area Basins	Adjudicated in 1979. Prior stipulated judgments from 1958 through 1965 are merged into the 1979 judgment	The judgment distinguishes the San Fernando, Sylmar, Verdugo and Eagle Rock basins, finds them to be separate basins and sets out separate and distinct rights within each basin. The judgment sets out the separate conditions of the basins with respect to overdraft and safe yield and sets out the rights of the parties to surface and groundwater. Judgment expressly recognizes stored water -- imported or reclaimed water that is intentionally spread or safe yield water that is stored in-lieu and provides for separate accounting and recapture subject to specific requirements. Judgment provides for appointment of a watermaster and specifies powers and duties of the watermaster. Judgment establishes an administrative committee.
Central Basin	Adjudicated in 1965 and amended in 1991	The judgment sets out the annual pumping rights of each of the parties; appoints DWR as watermaster; specifies the duties, powers and responsibilities of watermaster; provides for carryover of 20% of annual pumping rights for one year, or 35% carryover under the 'drought carryover' provisions; 20% overpumping to be paid back the following year, or prorated over the following 5 years under specified conditions; provides for an exchange pool wherein a right not used by one party can be made available to another. Judgment makes no provision for storage and recapture of stored water beyond the specified extraction right and specifies that 'no party...has any right to extract ground water from Central Basin except as herein affirmatively determined.'

Table B-1 (continued)
Groundwater Basin Management

Groundwater Basin	Governance Type	Characteristics
West Coast Basin	Adjudicated in 1977 and most recently amended in 1989	The judgment sets out the annual pumping rights of each party, provides for carryover of 10% of annual pumping rights for one year, overpumping of 10% to be replaced the following year, an exchange pool wherein a right not used by one party can be made available to another, emergency overpumping up to a total of 10,000AF under specified conditions, and appoints DWR as watermaster.
Santa Monica Basin	Unadjudicated	The primary producer in the basin is the city of Santa Monica.
Hollywood Basin	Unadjudicated	Ordinances adopted by the city of Beverly Hills address dewatering of groundwater.
Main San Gabriel Basin	Adjudicated in 1973 and as amended in 1989	Judgment defines natural safe yield under 1967 cultural conditions, specifies annual pumping rights, allows one year for carry-over of unused water rights, enjoins unauthorized recharge, restricts export of groundwater. Judgment establishes watermaster to administer the judgment including assumption of Make-Up obligation on behalf of the basin, storage of supplemental water, and concern with water quality matters. Judgment provides for determination of annual operating safe yield, specifies basin operating criteria that replacement water shall not be spread when the water level at the Key Well exceeds elevation 250 and that replacement water shall be spread as practicable to maintain the water level at the Key Well above elevation 200. Judgment Exhibit H estimates that a usable volume of 400,000 AF of storage space within the operating range of elevations 200 to 250. Judgment allows overproduction of rights, but this production incurs replacement water assessment.
Puente Basin	Adjudicated in 1986	Judgment provides for a watermaster, and authorizes the watermaster to determine the annual operating safe yield and the annual pumping rights. The judgment provides for carryover of 100% of pumping rights, excess pumping of up to 10%, and restricts exportation of groundwater. The judgment makes no provisions for storage of surplus water supplies within the basin.

Table B-1 (continued)
Groundwater Basin Management

Groundwater Basin	Governance Type	Characteristics
Raymond Basin	Adjudicated in 1943. Judgment modified and restated in 1984	Judgment specifies safe yield in the Eastern and Western units of the basin, addresses rights to capture surface water for spreading and percolation and rights to recapture spread water, specifies groundwater pumping rights of the parties, allows for 10% overpumping to be made up in the following year, and 10% carryover for one year. Judgment establishes the Raymond Basin Management Board as watermaster with specified powers and responsibilities including: protecting the long-term quantity and quality of the groundwater supply, utilizing the groundwater storage capacity of the basin for the maximum advantage of the parties, integrating surface and groundwater supplies, and mutual cooperation.
Six Basins	Adjudicated in 1998	Judgment sets out the safe yield for Six Basins inclusive of active spreading and imported water return flows. Establishes procedure for setting annual operating safe yield for 4 of the 6 basins (Canyon, Upper and Lower Claremont Heights, and Pomona basins), allows overproduction but with obligation for replacement water, establishes annual surface water and groundwater production rights, provides for storage and recovery beyond annual production rights, establishes a watermaster, allows portability of rights within the 4 basins subject to specified conditions, and sets out priorities for use of groundwater storage capacity.
Orange County Basin	Managed via 1933 State statute, as amended, creating the Orange County Water District	The OCWD Act establishes the Orange County Water District and sets out its powers for the purpose of managing the groundwater basin and managing, replenishing, regulating, and protecting groundwater supplies including: provide for conjunctive use of ground and surface waters; regulate and control the storage of water and use of groundwater basin storage space; purchase and import water; appropriate and acquire water and water rights; determine the Basin Pumping Percentage; levy a basin equity assessment on parties who produce more than the BPP; prevent interference with basin water, water rights, impacts to water quality, and unlawful exportation of basin water; and to be a party to all groundwater storage agreements within the basin. The Act specifies that use of the groundwater basin for replenishing and managing the groundwater supplies shall have priority over use of the groundwater basin for storage of water. OCWD manages the basin utilizing its Groundwater Management Plan prepared in 1989 and 1990, updated in 1994 and 2004.

Table B-1 (continued)
Groundwater Basin Management

Groundwater Basin	Governance Type	Characteristics
San Juan Basin	Unadjudicated	Informally managed by San Juan Basin Authority, however, private producers do not participate or report to San Juan Basin Authority. Groundwater pumping rights governed by State Water Resources Control Board water rights.
Chino Basin	Adjudicated in 1978	Judgment appoints Chino Basin Watermaster to administer and enforce the Judgment and any subsequent instructions or orders of the Court. Judgment provides numeric value for natural safe yield and allocates this natural safe yield among three pools of producers. The judgment also provides for 5,000AFY (200,000 AF of controlled overdraft averaged over 40 years (operating safe yield)). Pumping in excess of safe yield is allowed, but incurs a replenishment obligation. The judgment expressly provides for groundwater storage and conjunctive use. The Court directed the Watermaster to develop the Optimum Basin Management Program (OBMP) addressing enhancement of basin water supplies, protection and enhancement of water quality, enhancement of basin management, and equitable financing of the OBMP. In 2004, the Water Quality Control Board, Santa Ana Region, incorporated the Maximum Benefit Basin Plan into its Water Quality Control Plan for the Santa Ana River Basin.
Cucamonga Basin	Adjudicated in 1959	Judgment specifies water rights for individual groundwater producers and specifies the amount that can be exported to non-overlying areas for use by individual producer. Judgment specifies requirement for spreading. No annual report is prepared to document implementation of judgment requirements.
Riverside Basin	Adjudicated in 1959 and superseded in 1969 and effective 1971	Judgment distinguishes the portions of Riverside Basin in San Bernardino and Riverside counties and sets out the average annual extraction for each portion of the Riverside Basin. Judgment establishes a watermaster to administer and enforce the judgment provisions. Judgment provisions for extraction without replenishment obligation: extraction from the San Bernardino County portion for use <i>outside</i> San Bernardino Valley and from the Riverside County portion is each limited over 5 years to 5 times the annual average. Replenishment is required if the extraction in any year is 20% more than the annual average in a basin portion. Extractions from the Riverside Basin within San Bernardino County for use <i>within</i> San Bernardino Valley are not limited except that static water levels in the area shall not fall below a specified water elevation. Judgment specifies that it does not limit rights to spread, store and recapture imported water.

Table B-1 (continued)
Groundwater Basin Management

Groundwater Basin	Governance Type	Characteristics
Arlington Basin	Unadjudicated	There are no formal restrictions on basin production. Western MWD reports on basin water extractions and operates the Arlington Desalter.
Temescal Valley Basins— Temescal, Bedford, Coldwater, Lee Lake basins	Unadjudicated	The city of Corona is preparing a groundwater management plan for Temescal Basin estimated for completion in 2007. Temescal Valley Basins subject to 1970 Santa Ana River Judgment requiring minimum annual average adjusted baseflow at Prado Dam.
Elsinore Basin	Groundwater Management Plan adopted in 2004	The Groundwater Management Plan addresses basin hydrogeology, geology, groundwater balance, water quality and identifies groundwater management issues, groundwater management strategies, reviews alternatives, presents an implementation plan and a basin monitoring plan.
West San Jacinto Basins	Groundwater Management Plan adopted in 1995	The Groundwater Management Plan addresses active recharge, recovery of degraded groundwater to be blended with imported water, recovery of brackish water, conjunctive use, and agricultural groundwater exchange.
Hemet-San Jacinto Basins	Canyon and San Jacinto Upper Pressure subject to the 1954 Fruitvale Judgment. Other basins are unadjudicated.	Groundwater management plan in process for the Hemet-San Jacinto Basins and will supersede the Fruitvale Judgment. The Groundwater Management Plan addresses reducing groundwater production, implementing the San Jacinto River Recharge and Recovery Project, groundwater replenishment, in-lieu water use, additional water conservation measures and water monitoring.
Temecula-Murrieta Basin	Adjudicated by the Court with decree with decree entered on April 6, 1966	The Temecula-Murrieta Basin is part of the Santa Margarita watershed and subject to the Santa Margarita River adjudication. Judgment does not quantify water rights, but specifies certain operational requirements and facts, defines the scope of the watershed and lands and current owners within the jurisdiction of the court, and retains continuing jurisdiction for the court to quantify the water rights at a future time. Since the judgment was entered, several memoranda and agreements have been adopted for operations throughout the watershed basin. There are pending lawsuits concerning water rights and stream flows in the Santa Margarita River watershed.
Lower Santa Margarita River Basins		Adjudication administered by the Court and the Santa Margarita River Watermaster with assistance from the Watershed Steering Committee. See discussion of Temecula-Murrieta Basin.

Table B-1 (continued)
Groundwater Basin Management

Groundwater Basin	Governance Type	Characteristics
San Luis Rey River Valley Basins	Unadjudicated	The San Luis Rey River Valley basins are informally managed by the San Luis Rey Watershed Council. The Council adopted the San Luis Rey Watershed Management Guidelines in 2000.
San Dieguito River Basins	Unadjudicated	The San Dieguito Basin Task Force is evaluating feasibility of groundwater management.
Lower and Middle Sweetwater Basins and San Diego Formation	Unadjudicated	Managed pursuant to Sweetwater Authority Interim Groundwater Management Plan adopted in 2001. The Interim Plan sets out groundwater management strategies: maintain groundwater levels, protect groundwater quality, monitor seawater intrusion, monitor groundwater quality and quantity; and implementation and data collection and management directives.
Lower Tijuana River Basin	Managed	Groundwater management plan adopted in 1995.
Mission Valley Basin	Unadjudicated	Conceptual groundwater management plan developed.
Santee-El Monte, San Mateo, San Onofre, Las Flores/Las Pulgas basins	Unadjudicated	No management structure for these basins.

Sources for Table B-1, Groundwater Basin Management

California Water Service Company, et al., vs. City of Compton, et al., Superior Court of the County of Los Angeles. Case No. 506,806 Amended Judgment (Declaring and establishing water rights in the West Coast Basin, imposing a physical solution therein and in joining extraction therefrom in excess of specified quantities.), March 21, 1980.

Central and West Basin Water Replenishment District etc., v. Charles E. Adams, et al., and City of Lakewood, v. Charles E. Adams, et al., Superior Court of the County of Los Angeles. Case No. 786,656 Second Amended Judgment (Declaring and establishing water rights in Central Basin and enjoining extractions therefrom in excess of specified quantities.) May 6, 1991.

Chino Basin Municipal Water District v. City of Chino, et al., Superior Court of the County of San Bernardino. Case No. 164327 Judgment. Jan 30, 1978

City of Beverly Hills. Agenda Report: An Ordinance of the City of Beverly Hills Relating to the removal of groundwater and amending the Beverly Hills municipal code. August 21, 2006.

The City of Los Angeles vs. City of San Fernando, et al., Superior Court of the County of Los Angeles. Case No. 650079 Judgment. January 26, 1979.

City of Pasadena, vs. City of Alhambra et al., Superior Court of the County of Los Angeles. Case No. Pasadena C-1323 Judgment (As Modified and Restated March 26, 1984).

Elsinore Basin Groundwater Management Plan. Elsinore Valley Municipal Water District. June 2003.

Fox Canyon Groundwater Management Agency Act. September 13, 1982. Chapter 1023 of Statutes of 1982.

Groundwater Management Plan, Fox Canyon Groundwater Management Agency. October 2006.

Groundwater Management Plan, Orange County Water District. March 2004.

Groundwater Management Plan, West San Jacinto Groundwater Basin, Eastern Municipal Water District (Eastern MWD), 1995.

Hemet-San Jacinto Water Management Area 2005 Annual Report, Eastern Municipal Water District (Eastern MWD), 2006.

Orange County Water District Act, as amended and effective January 1, 2003. West's Annotated California Codes, Water Code Appendix, Chapter 40, as amended; and Derring's California Codes, Annotated, Water—Uncodified Acts, Act 5683, as amended.

Appendix B
Summary of Groundwater Basin Management

Puente Basin Water Agency et al., vs. The City of Industry, et al., Superior Court of the County of Los Angeles. Case No. C 369 220 Judgment. [no signature or filing date on copy]

Resolution of the Governing Board of Sweetwater Authority Adopting an Interim Groundwater Management Plan. Resolution 01-19. November 9, 2001.

Santa Margarita River Watershed Annual Watermaster Report Water Year 2004-05. United States v. Fallbrook Public Utility District, et al., August 2006.

Southern California Water Company vs. City of La Verne, et al., Superior Court of the County of Los Angeles. Case No. ___ Judgment (Complaint Filed, September 28, 1998)

Upper San Gabriel Valley Municipal Water District vs. City of Alhambra, et al., Superior Court of the County of Los Angeles. Case No. 924128 Amended Judgment. August 24, 1989.

Western Municipal Water District of Riverside County vs. East San Bernardino County Water District, et al., Superior Court of the County of Riverside. Case No. 78426 Judgment. April 17, 1969.-