

Minutes for the Santa Monica Basin Groundwater Sustainability Agency

October 15 at 9:00 AM

Board of Directors			
Attending	Agency	Board Member	Alternate
	City of Beverly Hills	Robert Welch	Vince Damasse
	City of Culver City	Sean Singletary	
	City of Los Angeles Department of Water and Power	Jesus Gonzalez	John Huynh, Vice Chair
	County of Los Angeles	Gina Natoli	
	City of Santa Monica	Sunny Wang, Chair	Christopher Dishlip

Meeting Minutes

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 9:15 AM by Chair Wang.

2. Roll Call and Determination of a Quorum

Director Welch, City of Beverly Hills

Director Singletary, City of Culver City

Director Natoli, County of Los Angeles

Vice Chair Huynh, City of Los Angeles Department of Water and Power

Chair Wang, City of Santa Monica

Quorum was determined

3. Pledge of Allegiance

Chair Wang led the Pledge of Allegiance.

4. Disclosure of ex parte communications for board members

There was no ex parte communication to disclose.

5. Consent Items

A. Approval of Minutes of July 16, 2025, Special Meeting

The Board had no comments or revisions to the minutes. There was a **motion** made by **Director Natoli** to **approve the meeting minutes**. The motion was **seconded** by **Director Welch**. A roll call vote was taken and the motion passed unanimously.

6. Public Forum

No public comments were received.

7. Informational Items

7A. Standing Item: Report on Well Permit Requests in the Santa Monica Subbasin

Dr. Jill Weinberger with Dudek, a consultant for the Groundwater Sustainability Agency, explained that this item was included on the agenda as a standing item to ensure that the Board is kept abreast of any new well development within the basin. Dr. Weinberger and Lisette Gold, GSA Secretary indicated that there were no new well development applications within the Santa Monica sub-basin with the exception of a geo-thermal well application within the City of Beverly Hill, however, those wells do not fall under the GSA purview.

Public Comment on 7.A

No public comments were received.

7B. Update on coordination with Los Angeles County on Well Permits and Potential Basin Impacts

Dr. Weinberger discussed that this coordination is still occurring. It has not been formalized but it is a productive informal relationship that is being maintained. Neither party feels the need to change the relationship at this time as there is a good, ongoing flow of information.

Public Comment on 7.B

No public comments were received.

7C. Status Update on Seawater Intrusion Monitoring Well

Dr. Weinberger gave a synopsis of the background of the need to fill a data gap that was noted in the groundwater sustainability plan to provide a more coastally proximate seawater intrusion monitoring well. About a year ago the board commenced discussion on an opportunity to fill this gap and identify trends in groundwater quality (chloride concentration closer to the coast). Increases in chloride concentration could be an indication of seawater intrusion. Therefore, the City of Santa Monica met with the USGS in September. At that meeting, it was stated that the USGS would be drilling a well up to 1,000 feet below land surface, which would be a single borehole, with up to 6 individual

well casings completed within it. The individual casings would be set at different depths within the subsurface to identify groundwater elevations and quality at depth. The greater precision associated with this approach allows for a better understanding of and determination of what types of groundwater production could be causing seawater intrusion, if seawater intrusion is identified. Dr. Weinberger stated that these types of well are standard procedure for the USGS.

The location of the monitoring well was discussed in the context of the need for it to be close to the USGS survey line and to avoid inundation during high tide. The USGS seismic survey is not an earthquake seismic survey, but a surface level assessment that provides an understanding of subsurface sediment layers. Drilling a well along the survey line would be most instructive to illuminate broader information about the subbasin. USGS will monitor the impact of tides on the potential sites adjacent to the seismic survey line to inform eventual well drilling in the next 2 to 4 years. The USGS was going to provide the City of Santa Monica with a scope of work, but the government shut down prevented that from happening in time for the board meeting.

The GSA Board had questions as to the timing of the well being drilled vis-à-vis the identification of this data gap identified in the GSP and the first periodic evaluation of the GSP. The actual well completion would be outside of the 5-year timeline for completing the first periodic evaluation. Dr. Weinberger explained that she expected DWR to be understanding of that.

Public Comment on 7.C

Dr. Margot Griswold and Patricia McPherson gave public comments.

7D. Update on GSP Implementation Tasks

Dr. Weinberger gave an update on GSP Implementation Tasks. She stated that the requirements ensure that the board and the GSA continue to work towards filling data gaps and addressing the recommended corrective actions that came back when DWR approved the GSP. The Board hears regular updates on what is happening in the sub-basin. Dudek has prepared the annual reports, submitted those to DWR, and the GSA has received letters from DWR stating that the annual reports comply with their regulations and there is no need to change the annual reports at this time. The GSP requirements are to ensure that the board and the GSA continue to work towards filling data gaps and addressing the recommended corrective actions that came back when DWR approved the GSP. She explained that all basins received corrective actions given that the GSPs and the process is new statewide so there are ongoing improvements to the implementation of SGMA. The GSP requirements are to ensure that the board and

Minutes for the Santa Monica Basin Groundwater Sustainability Agency - October 15, 2025

the GSA continue to work towards filling data gaps and address the recommended corrective actions that came back when DWR approved the GSP.

She reminded the board that they have been active in the process and have requested and received updates on GSP implementation status and tasks, reviewed the governance structure, undertaken revisions to the bylaws to improve governance structure, formed an ad hoc subcommittee, and have begun to adopt cost-sharing agreements for at least a portion of the administrative costs. The GSA is also receiving direct reporting from some of the groundwater extractions from private pumpers in the sub-basin, which hadn't been done before. With the groundwater extraction ordinance in place, the GSA will have metering of groundwater extractions through time.

The recommended corrective actions were discussed. The corrective action item related to seawater intrusion will likely require a conversation with DWR. As discussed earlier on, the need for the USGS groundwater monitoring well is the best source of information to track this item. The GSA has addressed other recommended corrective actions, including adding land subsidence maps to the annual reports to DWR, and will clarify language to address the remaining recommended corrective actions in the periodic evaluation. In summary, the Board is making good progress on all items.

Public Comment on 7.D

No public comments were received

7E. First Periodic Evaluation of the Groundwater Sustainability Plan

Dr. Weinberger gave an overview on the periodic evaluation of the GSP and the timeline of ongoing GSP implementation work. When the GSP was approved, DWR's recommended corrective actions were added to the list of core activities for GSP implementation. These recommended corrective actions were discussed in item 7D.

Dr Weinberger discussed technical and administrative components of the periodic evaluation. The periodic evaluation has a firm deadline of January 27th to remain in compliance with SGMA. The purpose of this item is to inform the board on the requirements of the periodic evaluation. At the next meeting Dr. Weinberger will discuss individual topics from the periodic evaluation. By this time next year, there will be a draft of the periodic evaluation so that there is enough time to review, comment, and get it to DWR by January 27th.

Public Comment on 7.E

Dr. Margot Griswold and Patricia McPherson commented.

F. Update from the Alternative Governance Structures Ad-Hoc Subcommittee

No comments on item 7.F.

Public Comment on 7.F

Patricia McPherson commented.

8. Action Items

8A. Election of Vice Chairperson

Dr. Weinberger provided background on the item, stating that Chair Wang from the City of Santa Monica is the current chairperson, so according to the bylaws, Chair Wang would rotate off the chairperson role and the representative from LADWP would rotate into that chairperson role, and then at this meeting the board would rotate and elect the next vice chair. The order of the rotation is Culver City, LADWP, Beverly Hills, Santa Monica, and County of Los Angeles. Next in order is Beverly Hills, however there is an option to decline the role in the bylaws. Beverly Hills respectfully declined the role. There was a motion by Chair Wang for the City of Santa Monica to take the Vice Chair position. There was roll call taken, and the motion passed unanimously.

Public Comment on 8.A

No public comments were received.

9. Solicitation of Items to be Discussed at the Next Regular Board Meeting

Director Natoli requested the following items to be agendized: 1) an update on the GSA's oversight authority for construction. The following meetings will be held on Teams instead of the Zoom platform.

Public Comment on 9

The board received no public comment.

10. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 10:26 AM.