



SHANDON-SAN JUAN WATER DISTRICT

SHANDON-SAN JUAN GSA

MEETING AGENDA

December 8, 2025

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the Board of Directors of the Shandon-San Juan Water District/Shandon-San Juan Groundwater Sustainability Agency will hold a special meeting at **9:00 A.M.** on **Monday, December 8, 2025**, at the Illy Lodge at Illy Sunnyslope Farms located at 3385 Truesdale Rd., Shandon, CA 93461. Virtual options are available for public participation.¹

Alternate Locations: Director Miller will participate in the meeting via video conference from 132 E. Carrillo Street, Santa Barbara, CA 93101.

Virtual Options for Public Participation:

<https://us06web.zoom.us/j/81384828713?pwd=5jBzq7ATL9rAdRzK7GvzsBG7p6r5qg.1>

Meeting ID: 813 8482 8713 **Passcode:** 511022 **Dial:** (669) 900-6833

To view supporting documents, go to: <https://www.ssjwd.org/agendas-minutes>

1. **Call to Order**
2. **Roll Call**
3. **Public Comment**
4. **Consent Agenda**
 - a. Meeting Minutes – September 24, 2025 SSJWD Regular Meeting
 - b. Secretary/Treasurer's Report – December 5, 2025
5. **Director's Reports**
 - a. WRAC Meeting Held December 3, 2025
6. **Consider Possible Action Regarding Paso Robles Area Groundwater Authority (PRAGA)**
 - a. Re-Cap of PRAGA Meeting on December 1, 2025 – Key Discussions and Decisions
 - b. Update from SSJWD Consultants – Randy Diffenbaugh and Confluence Engineering Solutions
 - c. Update on Regional Groundwater Stakeholder Group
 - d. Discuss Plans for Community Outreach – Altum Aqua Logic and Tripepi Smith
 - e. Next PRAGA Meeting is January 28, 2026
7. **Consider PRAGA's Request for Financial Contribution**

PRAGA is requesting financial contributions from the member GSAs to support continued operations through June 2026. SSJGSA's share of the contribution is \$63,000. Consider requesting milestones from PRAGA.

 - a. February 2026 – annotated draft budget for FY 2026-27
 - b. March 2026 – outline of funding mechanism
 - c. April 2026 – annotated final budget for FY 2026-27
8. **Discuss Following Component of Multi-Benefit Irrigated Land Repurposing (MILR) Program Related to SSJWD's Assessments for FY 2026-27**
 - a. Consider Development of Policy for Evaluating Requests for Assessment Changes (Irrigated to Non-Irrigated Acreage)

¹ SSJGSA/SSJWD will make reasonable efforts to make the meeting accessible virtually; however, if one of the virtual options are unavailable due to technological issues, you are invited to take advantage of the other options, including in-person attendance.

9. Next Regularly Scheduled Meeting – January 28, 2026 at 9am

10. Adjourn

***NOTE:** In compliance with the American with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. Sec. 12132), if you need special assistance to access the meeting room or otherwise participate at this meeting, including auxiliary aids or services, please contact Bertoux & Co. 930 Nysted Dr. St. A Solvang, CA 93463 805-451-0841 admin@ssjwd.org. Notification of at least forty-eight (48) hours prior to the meeting will help enable reasonable arrangements to ensure accessibility to the meeting. Copies of Meeting Documents can be found on our District Website <https://www.ssjwd.org/> or requested by contacting Bertoux & Co. 930 Nysted Dr. St. A Solvang, CA 93463 805-451-0841 admin@ssjwd.org.*



SHANDON-SAN JUAN WATER DISTRICT

SHANDON-SAN JUAN GSA

UNAPPROVED MEETING MINUTES September 24, 2025 Regular Meeting

The Board of Directors of the Shandon-San Juan Water District (SSJWD) and Shandon-San Juan Groundwater Sustainability Agency (SSJGSA) held a regularly scheduled meeting on Wednesday, September 24, 2025, at 8:00am at the Illy Lodge at Illy Sunnyslope Farms located at 3385 Truesdale Rd., Shandon, CA 93461. As a courtesy, virtual options were made available for public participation. The agenda and all supporting documents were posted at <https://www.ssjwd.org/agendas-minutes>.

I. Call to Order

Vice President Sinton called the meeting to order at 8:04am on Wednesday, September 24, 2025.

II. Roll Call

Directors Present: Marshall Miller
 Ray Shady
 Steve Sinton
 Matt Turrentine

Directors Absent: Willy Cunha

III. Public Comment

No public comment.

IV. Consent Agenda

The following motion was made by Director Turrentine, seconded by Director Sinton, and passed 4-0 with a roll call vote.

MOTION – Approve the minutes from the August 13, 2025 Board meeting and the Secretary/Treasurer’s Report dated September 18, 2025, as presented.

V. Paso Robles Area Groundwater Authority (PRAGA) & SGMA Implementation Updates

A. Re-Cap of PRAGA Meeting on August 18, 2025:

- Board action to address the existing commitment deficit and request GSA contributions to fund PRAGA through December 2025.
- Approval of an On-Call Contract with Land IQ – not to exceed \$35,000
- Update on Administrative Items – PRAGA working to develop bylaws and Conflict of Interest Code. Executive Director recruitment is underway.

B. Multi-Benefit Irrigated Land Repurposing (MILR) Program Update:

- Farm unit delineation – Complete
- Spatial database – In progress. Includes farm units and other data of interest.
- Outreach – In progress. Held meetings with winegrape growers to explain program. Individual outreach if needed.
- Program Interest Form – In progress. Mechanism for irrigators to enroll land in the MILR program. First draft at County for review.

- Enabling Ordinance – In progress. First draft at County and PRAGA staff for review.
- Fallowed Land Registry Platform – In progress. RFP issued and proposals due September 24, 2025.

C. \$7.6 million GSP Implementation Grant Fund Expenditures: PRAGA will provide a presentation at their September 24, 2025 meeting. For reference, a copy of the presentation was included in SSJGSA's agenda packet. Highlights include:

- In 2022, Paso Basin was awarded a \$7.6 million grant from the California Department of Water Resources for the implementation of its Groundwater Sustainability Plan (GSP). The County holds the grant agreement with DWR.
- In April 2025, Amendment No. 1 to the grant agreement was executed, extending the grant deadline from April 2025 to April 2026. To date, \$5.16 million has been invoiced.
- Completed Projects - Blended Water Supply Engineering and Feasibility Analysis, State Water Project Engineering and Feasibility Analysis, Cost of Service Rate Study, City of Paso Robles Recycled Water Project, San Miguel CSD Recycled Water Project (pre-construction phase).
- Projects in Progress – Multi-Benefit Irrigated Land Repurposing (MILR) Program / Fallowed Land Registry, Domestic Well Mitigation Program, Monitoring Data Gaps, Well Verification Program.

VI. Consider PRAGA's Request and Invoice for Financial Contribution

On August 18, 2025, the Paso Robles Area Groundwater Authority (PRAGA) Board of Directors approved a request for \$300,000 in additional contributions from its member Groundwater Sustainability Agencies (GSAs) to fund operations through December 2025. This action was taken pursuant to Section 7.1 of the JPA Agreement, which provides that, upon a 3/4 vote of the PRAGA Board, members agree to contribute additional funding based on the percentage shares established in the FY 2024-2025 PBCC Budget.

SSJGSA's share of the contribution is \$63,000. The SSJGSA Board discussed the necessity of this contribution to ensure PRAGA can continue essential operations through the end of 2025, including required SGMA compliance activities, technical support, and administrative functions. The SSJGSA Board directed the Secretary/Treasurer to pay PRAGA Invoice #26-004 in the amount of \$63,000. The SSJGSA Board anticipates an additional funding request from PRAGA to extend operations to June 2026 once a revised budget for FY 2025-26 is adopted by PRAGA.

VII. Next Meeting

The next regularly scheduled meeting is on Wednesday, October 22, 2025 at 9am.

VIII. Adjourn

Vice President Sinton adjourned the meeting at 8:34am.

Accepted:

Stephanie Bertoux, Secretary
December 5, 2025



SHANDON-SAN JUAN WATER DISTRICT

SHANDON-SAN JUAN GSA

Secretary/Treasurer's Report: September 19, 2025 – December 5, 2025

Date: December 5, 2025

To: Shandon-San Juan Water District Board of Directors

From: Stephanie Bertoux, District Secretary/Treasurer/Assessor

Assessments and Income:

SSJWD levied assessments for FY 2025-26 totaling \$401,140.26 that are due on February 13, 2026. Income for the period totaled \$74,766.63. The remaining balance is \$326,374.23.

Expenses:

Expenses for the period totaled \$93,979.12.

- SSJWD Expenses - \$30,979.12
- PRAGA – Member GSAs made financial contributions to PRAGA to support continued operations through December 2025. SSJGSA's share of the contribution was \$63,000.

FY 2025-26 Budget Summary

See attached budget summary.

District Assets as of December 5, 2025:

Total Cash Position: \$697,725.62

- Bank Balance: After paying expenses noted above (\$93,979.12), the District has a cash position of \$129,888.02
- Investment Account Balance: \$549,837.60
 - \$400,000 – initial investment authorized by SSJWD Board on July 1, 2024.
 - \$120,000 – investment authorized by SSJWD Board on January 22, 2025.
 - \$29,837.60 – earned July 1, 2024 – November 30, 2025 (reinvested)

LAFCO Municipal Service Review

LAFCO is responsible for conducting Municipal Service Reviews (MSRs) on a routine basis for all districts within the County. In alignment with LAFCO's approved FY 2025–26 workplan, the MSR process for the Shandon-San Juan Water District is available for public comment. The LAFCO Public Hearing is scheduled for December 18, 2025 at 9am.

Board Training & Certifications

- Form 700s (Conflict of Interest Statements) are due April 1 of each year. Directors must file with the County of SLO and the FPPC.
 - County of SLO – file electronically with Netfile. Each Director should have received an email from the County. <https://www.netfile.com/filer> Select Local Filer Log In from the white, pull down Log-In Button in top right corner.
 - With SB1156 now in effect (as of January 1, 2025), Board members are required to file Form 700s with the Fair Political Practices Commission (FPPC) in addition to the County of SLO. The

SSJWD account is set up. Each Director should have received an email from FPPC with log-in information. <https://form700.fppc.ca.gov/>

- Ethics Training is required every two years. <https://localethics.fppc.ca.gov/login.aspx>.
- Anti-Sexual Harassment Training is required every two years. <https://calcivilrights.ca.gov/shpt/>

Director	COI – Form 700 FPPC (Due by April 1, 2025)	COI – Form 700 County of SLO (Due by April 1, 2025)	Ethics Training (Required Every 2 Years)	Anti-Sexual Harassment Training (Required Every 2 Years)
Willy Cunha	DONE	DONE	Next Due Date 03/18/27	Next Due Date 03/18/27
Marshall Miller	DONE	DONE	NEED TO COMPLETE	NEED TO COMPLETE
Ray Shady	DONE	DONE	NEED TO COMPLETE	Next Due Date 09/23/26
Steve Sinton	DONE	DONE	Next Due Date 06/24/27	NEED TO COMPLETE
Matt Turrentine	DONE	DONE	Next Due Date 05/07/27	Next Due Date 05/07/27

SHANDON-SAN JUAN WATER DISTRICT

BUDGET V. ACTUAL YTD

December 5, 2025

INCOME	2025-26 BUDGET	2025-26 YTD ACTUAL	BUDGET REMAINING
Assessments (Collected)	\$401,140.26	\$74,766.63	\$326,373.63
Total Income	\$401,140.26	\$74,766.63	\$326,373.63
ANNUAL EXPENSES	2025-26 BUDGET	2025-26 YTD ACTUALS	BUDGET REMAINING
Accounting / Annual Audit	\$6,200.00	\$0.00	\$6,200.00
Administration / Contract Labor			
Stephanie Bertoux	\$17,500.00	\$5,968.75	\$11,531.25
Randy Diffenbaugh	\$25,000.00	\$9,525.00	\$15,475.00
Bank Fees	\$30.00	\$0.00	\$30.00
Board Training	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Checks/Stamps/QBO	\$105.00	\$0.00	\$105.00
District General Election	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Insurance	\$2,600.00	\$2,478.84	\$121.16
LAFCO Fees for Special Districts	\$910.00	\$0.00	\$910.00
Legal Fees	\$25,000.00	\$11,726.32	\$13,273.68
P.O. Box Fees	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Public Notices	\$108.00	\$120.00	(\$12.00)
Taxes Withheld (Bank Account)	\$10.00	\$1.51	\$8.49
Website Fees/Email Accounts/Domain Name	\$1,067.70	\$0.00	\$1,067.70
TOTAL OPERATING	\$78,530.70	\$29,820.42	\$48,710.28
GSP IMP., STUDIES, AND PROJECTS	2025-26 BUDGET	2025-26 YTD ACTUALS	BUDGET REMAINING
Applications to SWRCB	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Project Consulting	\$50,000.00	\$963.75	\$49,036.25
Flood Water Capture & Recharge Study	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
GSP Economic Impact Study	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Monitoring Network	\$55,000.00	\$39,263.75	\$15,736.25
On-Call Hydrogeologic Services	\$30,000.00	\$9,840.00	\$20,160.00
PRAGA Budget - SSJGSA Share	\$0.00	\$63,000.00	(\$63,000.00)
PRAGA - Rural Domestic/De Minimis Users	\$2,500.00	\$0.00	\$2,500.00
Public Outreach	\$12,882.50	\$2,682.50	\$10,200.00
Public Funding Consultant	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
TOTAL PMAs AND STUDIES	\$150,382.50	\$115,750.00	\$34,632.50
TOTAL	2025-26 BUDGET	2025-26 YTD ACTUALS	BUDGET REMAINING
Total Income	\$401,140.26	\$74,766.63	\$326,373.63
Expenses	\$228,913.20	\$145,570.42	\$83,342.78
Contingency (10% of Expenses)	\$22,891.32	\$0.00	\$22,891.32

PASO ROBLES AREA GROUNDWATER AUTHORITY

To: Board of Directors

From: Taylor Blakslee / Steve Sinton

Date: October 22, 2025

Subject: Agenda Item #7 – Presentation from Regional Groundwater Stakeholder Group

Recommendation

None; information only.

Discussion

Following the Proposition 218 protest in August 2025, a group of regional groundwater stakeholders convened to discuss challenges related to basin funding and governance under the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA).

The group, facilitated by Steve Sinton, included landowners, agricultural representatives, and individuals with differing perspectives on the prior funding/governance effort.

The summary from the group's findings and proposed recommendations is provided as **Attachment 1** for the Board's consideration and discussion.

* * *

From: Steve Sinton

Date: 10-15-2025

A group of invited overlying landowners and stakeholders met twice for several hours to address the issues arising from the failure of the Prop 218 vote. The group included several landowners who opposed the Prop 218 proposal. The following is based on consensus among those landowners and stakeholders about how the GSAs and the Board of PRAGA should proceed.

MISSION

Our committee agrees that the governing entity needs to be focused on SGMA compliance. Things like projects should be left to other entities to pursue.

OUTREACH & RESPONSIVENESS

We agreed that communication was hugely insufficient on the need for a JPA, the need for a larger budget and what GSA responsibilities would be turned over to the JPA. None of the entities involved have successfully eliminated confusion over the requirements of SGMA, what the GSAs really do or how they function, or why any of this is necessary. Even when interested landowners sought clarification and specifics about the 218 proposal, they felt that their interests and concerns were not addressed. It is also a concern that the County GSA never held a meeting where its constituent irrigators could ask questions or express concerns and frustrations.

While the mechanism for effective outreach remains unclear, the need is glaring. We need a concrete and effective strategy on how to improve the understanding of everything to do with SGMA and our governing agencies. Furthermore, anyone who seeks information needs to receive a clear and complete answer. Without that, trust will remain low and additional support beyond reach.

Previous efforts at outreach going back to the effort to create one water district for the entire basin have been failures. Our committee consulted with an outside experts on SGMA and were told that we need at least 10 face to face meetings with a brief PowerPoint presentation on the law, the Department of Water Resources determination that we are in critical overdraft, how that impacts all of us (regardless of what you may think is the real condition of the Basin), and what that requires of us. We need to emphasize that surrendering our management to the State will be expensive and still not relieve us from the obligation to bring the Basin into sustainability. We need to explain the economic impact of simply cutting pumping to meet sustainability. Following that, we were advised to continue each meeting in a workshop or study session format with staff and consultants answering most questions. While workshops have not been effective in the past and we know that there will continue to be campaigns of misinformation, we don't have good alternatives to convey what we are required to do.

FINANCIAL

We agreed that the budget for whatever entity ends up governing the basin should be for the minimum necessary to comply with SGMA*. We also agreed that it should finish three existing activities:

- 1) the MILR following program, even if it requires some funding beyond the available grant funds;
- 2) the work of Land IQ, with easy access to the data, so we know how much water is being used;
- 3) well monitoring and an effective way of allowing access to water level information to landowners, the State and the public.

These three items are seen not as projects, but as necessary programs to allow us to understand and report what is really happening in the Basin.

Finally, provide details on exactly what are the expected costs of the appropriate activities for this entity.

Until a new management entity is established, expenses should be kept to a minimum and funding from the four GSAs should be clarified. Outside services should be retained only as necessary to meet the core mission. Efforts to produce a new budget should be put on hold, except to the extent necessary to explain during outreach the costs that it will take to achieve the core responsibilities of the management entity.

Independently, there is the question of who should have the financial responsibility for getting the Basin to sustainability. While there may be a temptation to excuse those most likely to oppose future funding efforts, the right approach is to include everyone who uses the groundwater with the right to have a voice in groundwater management decisions. The amount of financial contribution should logically be adjusted to reflect water use and future benefit. Based on that, de minimis users should only expect to pay a minimal amount, but still have an opportunity to effectively participate in the management of the basin. Those users include owners of rural residential properties and grazing lands. Irrigated agricultural users will necessarily pay most of the costs of groundwater management and therefore need sufficient representation that they can prevent management decisions that are unfair, inappropriate or too expensive for irrigated agriculture.

MANAGEMENT

We have concluded that a new entity should be created to replace PRAGA. This is based on the loss of trust in the current JPA and its limited governing structure. This new entity should only be agreed upon after patient and full discussion of a new governing structure and clear vision of what will be done. This must start with reaching out to as many people as possible through informative workshops that include the opportunity for genuine input and any other contact, such as open house opportunities with staff, consultants or GSA Board members. We need to take the time necessary to develop understanding and at minimum, a clear consensus of is needed. We agreed that a Proposition 26 approach to funding will seriously harden opposition to the necessary work of bringing the basin into sustainability.

We have agreed that the management entity should be a coalition with more inclusive representation that is dedicated to balancing the Basin. The structure of that will be difficult, but we believe that when qualified candidates (own property over the groundwater basin) are available, the board should include someone from ranching, as that is the largest land use overlying the Basin, and rural residential landowners, who face the greatest risk from groundwater declines. Agricultural organizations should be represented. Unless the management is under a single, unified GSA, there should be at least one representative from each involved GSA, and possibly two representatives, but those representatives shouldn't have to be an elected person. Irrigated agriculture should have a majority of its representatives personally engaged in farming.

Based on internal discussions and the guidance of the outside resources, we believe that the new management entity should create advisory committees of stakeholders. The committees could consist of de minimis users, non-irrigated agriculture, irrigated agriculture or some combination of those and others. The point is to give overlying landowners a real voice, so perhaps each advisory committee could have one seat on the governing Board. The Board's staff would presumably coordinate with the advisory committees to ensure good communication. We also believe that the Board needs to give its staff's advice great weight and any decisions made that differ significantly from that advice should be openly and thoroughly explained.

Some remaining questions:

What do we think would be the best management structure – one GSA, go back to something like the coordinating committee, or something like the JPA with more representative and responsive governance? Most of the State has gone with the JPA approach and we think that it is acceptable if reconstituted to be more inclusive. However, the use of "JPA" has become a lightning rod and must be replaced.

*On the budget, what is our tolerance for a cushion to cover unexpected expenses? What do we mean by complying with SGMA? Can we fully achieve sustainability, including bringing the basin into balance, with a budget that is limited to MILR and filing the necessary reports? If not, are we willing to accept cutbacks in pumping? Those questions should be raised with the stakeholders before any decisions are made by the Board.

SHANDON-SAN JUAN WATER DISTRICT

BUDGET FOR FY 2025-26

Adopted June 27, 2025

INCOME	2024-25 BUDGET \$35/Irr. Acre	2024-25 YTD	2025-26 BUDGET \$35/Irr. Acre
Assessments (Collected)	\$401,140.26	\$400,378.16	\$401,140.26
Interest Earned (Bank Account)	\$0.00	\$26.33	\$0.00
PRIOR	\$5,635.17	\$5,635.17	\$0.00
Total Income	\$406,775.43	\$406,039.66	\$401,140.26
ANNUAL EXPENSES	2024-25 BUDGET	2024-25 YTD	2025-26 BUDGET
Accounting / Annual Audit	\$6,200.00	\$6,050.00	\$6,200.00
Administration / Contract Labor			
Stephanie Bertoux	\$15,000.00	\$14,250.00	\$17,500.00
Randy Diffenbaugh	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$25,000.00
Bank Fees	\$30.00	\$30.00	\$30.00
Board Training	\$1,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Checks/Stamps/QBO	\$105.00	\$483.69	\$105.00
District General Election	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Insurance	\$2,700.00	\$2,478.84	\$2,600.00
LAFCO Fees for Special Districts	\$884.78	\$884.78	\$910.00
Legal Fees	\$45,000.00	\$18,885.25	\$25,000.00
P.O. Box Fees	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Public Notices	\$108.00	\$60.00	\$108.00
Taxes Withheld (Bank Account)	\$50.00	\$6.28	\$10.00
Website Fees/Email Accounts/Domain Name	\$925.00	\$1,067.70	\$1,067.70
TOTAL OPERATING	\$72,002.78	\$44,196.54	\$78,530.70
Percentage of Expenses	21%	13%	34%
GSP IMP., STUDIES, AND PROJECTS	2024-25 BUDGET	2024-25 YTD	2025-26 BUDGET
Applications to SWRCB	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Project Consulting	\$50,000.00	\$90,947.60	\$50,000.00
Flood Water Capture & Recharge Study	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
GSP Economic Impact Study	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Monitoring Network	\$65,000.00	\$50,700.00	\$55,000.00
On-Call Hydrogeologic Services	\$30,000.00	\$12,557.75	\$30,000.00
**PBCC/PRAGA Budget - SSJGSA Share			
GSP Annual Report	\$20,141.00	\$20,141.00	\$0.00
Periodic Evaluation (5-Year Update)	\$53,342.14	\$53,342.14	\$0.00
Unused PBCC Funds to PRAGA	\$47,719.00	\$47,719.00	\$0.00
PRAGA - Rural Domestic/De Minimis Users	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$2,500.00
Public Outreach	\$12,882.50	\$8,680.00	\$12,882.50
Public Funding Consultant	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
TOTAL PMAs AND STUDIES	\$279,084.64	\$284,087.49	\$150,382.50
Percentage of Expenses	79%	87%	66%
TOTAL	2024-25 BUDGET	2024-25 YTD	2025-26 BUDGET
Total Income	\$406,775.43	\$406,039.66	\$401,140.26
Expenses	\$351,087.42	\$328,284.03	\$228,913.20
Contingency (10% of Expenses)	\$35,108.74	\$0.00	\$22,891.32
Total Expenses	\$386,196.16	\$328,284.03	\$251,804.52
YE Balance	\$20,579.27	\$77,755.63	\$149,335.74

**SSJGSA Share of PBCC/PRAGA Budget for FY 24-25 - 20.2% - \$121,202.14. No Contribution for FY 25-26 - assumes passage of Prop 218.

GSP Annual Report - \$20,141

Periodic Evaluation (5 Year Update) - \$53,342.14

Unspent Funds to PRAGA per JPA Agreement - \$47,719