

Central Santa Monica Bay Watershed Area Steering Committee (WASC) Meeting Minutes



Tuesday, April 1, 2025
1:00pm – 4:00pm
Culver City Hall, Patacchia Room
9770 Culver Blvd, Culver City, CA 90230
WebEx Meeting

Committee Members Present:

*Daniel Bradbury, Los Angeles County Flood Control District (Agency)
*Augustine Han, West Basin Municipal Water District (Agency)
*Conor Mossavi, Los Angeles City Water & Power (Agency)
Susie Santilena, Los Angeles City Sanitation and Environment (Agency), Co-Chair
*Darryl Ford, Los Angeles City Recreation and Parks (Agency)
Rita Kampalath, Los Angeles County Chief Sustainability (Community), Co-Chair
Ion Cretu, PSOMAS (Community)
Gloria Medina, SCOPE (Community)
Bruce Reznik, Los Angeles Waterkeeper (Community)
Zoe Cunliffe, Black Women for Wellness (Community)
Josette Descalzo, Beverly Hills/West Hollywood (Municipal)
*Javier De La Cruz, Culver City (Municipal)
*Ryan Jackson, Los Angeles (Municipal)
Geremew Amenu, Los Angeles County (Municipal)
Stephanie Gebhardt Rath, Heal the Bay (Watershed Coordinator, non-voting member)
Vanessa Boudreau, S. Groner Associates (Watershed Coordinator, non-voting member)

*Committee Member Alternate

Committee Members Absent:

Roberto Perez, Los Angeles (Municipal)
Rafael Prieto, Los Angeles (Municipal)
Joshua Carvalho, Santa Monica (Municipal)

See attached sign-in sheet for full list of attendees.

1) Welcome and Introductions

Rita Kampalath, Co-Chair of the Central Santa Monica Bay (CSMB) Watershed Area Steering Committee (WASC), welcomed Committee Members, shared housekeeping items, and called the meeting to order.

Los Angeles County Public Works (Public Works) staff facilitated the roll call of Committee Members. A quorum was established.

2) Approval of Meeting Minutes from March 4, 2025

Co-Chair Susie Santilena motioned to approve meeting minutes from March 4, 2025, seconded by Member Bruce Reznik. The Committee voted to approve the March 4, 2025, minutes, with 10 votes in favor, 2 votes in abstention, and 2 members absent at the time of voting (approved, see vote tracking sheet attached).

Central Santa Monica Bay

Watershed Area Steering Committee (WASC)

Meeting Minutes



3) Watershed Coordinator Updates

Watershed Coordinators Vanessa Boudreau and Stephanie Gebhardt Rath Presented on Interim Disadvantaged Community Programming Guidelines, an overview of funded CSMB Projects, and overall efforts in validating Disadvantaged Community benefiting projects. Presentation slides can be found on the [SCW Program website](#).

Mike Antos (Stantec, Regional Coordination) highlighted the importance of Disadvantaged Community benefit claims but highlighted that the claim is not a decision-making factor for Technical Resource Program (TRP) projects. The WASC discusses claims when Infrastructure Program (IP) projects are proposed, but the WASC does not have the responsibility to evaluate Disadvantaged Community benefits claims for TRPs.

4) Ex parte Communication Disclosure

Co-Chair Santilena disclosed meeting with Watershed Coordinators to discuss the letter of recommendation request submitted to the City of Los Angeles by the Hayden Tract Community Greenbelt TRP (herein referred to as the Hayden Tract TRP) Project Proponents, specifically due to the letter being requested outside the normal process that the City of Los Angeles has adopted for letters of support within the Safe, Clean Water Program. Co-Chair Santilena and the Watershed Coordinators discussed how to handle the late submission, and after discussion with the Project Proponents, it was expressed that there was still a desire to pursue the letter from the City although the letter would not be viewed by the WASC before Stormwater Investment Plan (SIP) deliberations.

Member Ion Cretu disclosed attending the City and County Engineer Association meeting, where Member Javier De La Cruz was also present and discussed the Washington Boulevard Stormwater and Urban Runoff Diversion (hereafter referred to as the Washington Boulevard Project) Project Modification Request (PMR).

5) Public Comment Period

There were no public comments.

6) Discussion

a. CSMB Project Prioritization and Selection Discussion for populating the FY25-26 Stormwater Investment Plan (SIP)

Public Works staff facilitated a discussion around CSMB Project Prioritization and Selection Discussion for populating the Fiscal Year 2025 – 2026 (FY25-26) SIP.

In advance of SIP Deliberation, a summary of resources document was posted on the [SCW Program website](#). The outcome of SIP deliberation includes programming newly submitted concepts and studies, including one or no additional funding requests in a Project Modification Request (PMR), reallocating annual funding projections, and/or omitting from recommended SIP any continuing projects that do not meet SCW Program or Committee goals.

To ensure full realization of anticipated benefits, Public Works staff recommended prioritizing funding for continuing projects and studies that are in final implementation stages. Additionally, Public Works staff recommended the WASC apply a monetary cap of 80% to the 4-year projections, to ensure available revenue for new project submissions and potential future PMRs.

Public Works staff shared preliminary project rankings from WASC Members, with one ranking per Committee seat, and received 15 responses. The rankings serve as a guide to inform the SIP deliberations

Central Santa Monica Bay Watershed Area Steering Committee (WASC) Meeting Minutes



and will assist in discussions. Public Works contacted Project Developers about potential funding adjustments and invited Project Developers to be available for questions.

Based on rankings and feedback, Public Works staff prepared several scenarios for discussion through the SIP tool and shared these scenarios to the WASC:

- Baseline scenario with no new projects, reflecting the WASC's status at the end of the previous year.
- All considered projects, including continuing IPs/Scientific Studies (SSs) and new applications.
- All considered projects, plus the Washington Boulevard Project PMR and the Edward Vincent Jr. Park Stormwater Improvements Project (hereafter referred to as the Edward Vincent Project) PMR.
- All considered projects with potential future IP costs.
- All continuing IPs/SSs with different combinations of the most preferred new SSs and TRPs, based on the preliminary project rankings, including those with and without PMR requests.
- All considered projects, plus the City of Los Angeles potential funding adjustments, including those with and without PMR requests

Public Works staff highlighted that out of the nine WASCs that the Data-Driven Resource Optimization and Planning System for Los Angeles County Scientific Study (SS) (herein referred to as the DROPS SS) applied in, two WASCs approved the DROPS SS, three WASCs denied the DROPS SS, and four WASCs have yet to reach a final decision. Out of the five WASCs that the Depave LA: Prioritizing Parking Lots for Green Retrofitting Council for Watershed Health SS (herein referred to as the Depave LA SS) applied in, one WASC approved the Depave LA SS, two WASCs denied the Depave LA SS, and two WASCs have yet to reach a final decision.

Member Reznik expressed general support for the two SSs. Member Reznik explained that the reason some TRPs were ranked lower was likely due to non-governmental organization (NGO) involvement, as NGOs and community-based organizations (CBOs) typically require more assistance. Member Reznik expressed support for funding TRPs and commented that while the Edward Vincent Project was expensive, it was highly beneficial and particularly community driven. Member Reznik stated that there were concerns about the Washington Boulevard Project PMR, particularly due to the significant change in its scope and funding request.

Co-Chair Kampalath remarked that the TRPs and SSs were well-structured with clear objectives.

Member Augustine Han mentioned that consideration for future Water Supply was very important to the West Basin Municipal Water District (West Basin) and commented that the PMRs did not consider discharge to sanitary sewers. In considering future projects, Member Han commented that there is an opportunity to focus on projects that develop future Water Supply.

Member Zoe Cunliffe agreed with Member Reznik's perspective on the TRPs, particularly highlighting the Western Gage Green Alleys Project, which was well-informed by the local community and beneficial for Disadvantaged Communities.

Member Conor Mossavi echoed Member Han's comments as a representative of another water supply agency, noting that the Washington Boulevard Project PMR lacked Water Supply benefits, which had initially been included but were now proposed to be eliminated.

Co-Chair Santilena highlighted the idea of considering TRPs and how a TRP aligns with the needs of specific areas. Co-Chair Santilena referenced past conversations about California Greenworks, the Project

Central Santa Monica Bay

Watershed Area Steering Committee (WASC)

Meeting Minutes



Proponent for the Hayden Tract TRP, where there was a suggestion to prioritize TRPs to ensure projects were thoroughly planned before moving forward with infrastructure initiatives. The importance of balancing equity among agencies was highlighted, especially when some municipalities may need more resources for TRPs.

Co-Chair Santilena confirmed with Christopher Tull (California Data Collaborative, Project Proponent) that data from Watershed Planning efforts could inform the DROPS SS. Tull agreed that if the Watershed Planning results were in a format that could be easily integrated into GIS systems, such as priority areas for different goals, that information would be valuable for informing DROPS SS. Watershed Planning Public Works staff added that the Watershed Planning team's efforts focused on identifying broad Opportunity Areas and establishing targets based on regional priorities and the SCW Program's goals. These plans would highlight areas of opportunity through maps but would not go down to specific project or parcel levels. The Initial Watershed Plans and tools are expected to be published in early 2026, and Adaptive Plans will be developed over the next three to five years.

Member Descalzo asked Tull to summarize why some of the WASCs did not choose to fund the DROPS SS, and to address how that lack of support might impact the SS. Tull responded by outlining a few key reasons for the lack of support. For example, in certain WASCs like Rio Hondo, Committee Members felt sufficient tools existed, such as the tool in the preSIP: A Platform for Watershed Science and Project Collaboration SS. In addition, some WASCs expressed concern about Water Supply issues, particularly because the DROPS SS, led by water supply agencies, was not aligned with their Watershed Areas' focus on recharge. Tull also addressed the impact of having limited WASC support and funding, explaining that, regardless of full support, the DROPS tool would still be developed through collaboration with a user group to prioritize its features. However, with reduced funding, the Project Proponents would have to cut from the lower priority items on the list, which would reduce the overall scope of work. With fewer WASCs supporting the project, the team would focus more on the priorities and feedback from stakeholders in those specific WASCs that do fund the SS.

Public Works staff clarified that once a Project Application is submitted for funding approval, it cannot be modified. Therefore, any benefits promised in the Project Application must be delivered if the funding is approved. It was emphasized that if the Project Application was for funding across multiple WASCs, the Applicant would still be required to deliver the promised benefits for each specific WASC where funding is received, even if not all the WASC decide to support the project. Regional Coordination proceeded to add each WASC is considered a separate entity, so the applicant must fulfill the commitments made to each WASC that agreed to support them. Public Works staff further explained that if the project scope needs to be adjusted due to limited funding, the Applicant would still be expected to deliver what was originally promised to the WASCs that funded the project. Tull responded, acknowledging that while the project was designed as a Countywide initiative, it would be challenging to scale down the benefits to just a few Watershed Areas without impacting the overall project. Tull noted that the benefits could be scaled by adjusting the functionality or prioritizing certain watershed needs, but the project's broad scope makes it difficult to fully isolate the benefits for each individual WASC.

Member Han inquired about what would occur if the Depave LA SS was not funded by all WASCs it applied to. Craig Doberstein (Herrera, Project Applicant) explained that one part of the SS is focused on developing a tool to help future proponents prioritize and screen parcels, aiming to identify key areas for development, and the second part of the project involves creating a toolkit to assist future proponents in efficiently proposing TRPs. This toolkit is intended to make the process more accessible, particularly for smaller and more diverse groups. The Project Application outlines that if four or more WASCs fund the SS, the full suite of toolkit elements will be developed. If fewer WASCs fund the SS, the WASCs will work with the project team to select priority elements. This approach is designed to be flexible and scalable, with the option for

Central Santa Monica Bay Watershed Area Steering Committee (WASC) Meeting Minutes



the toolkit's development to be guided by the WASCs themselves or a separate technical advisory committee. Doberstein clarified that during other WASC SIP deliberations where the SS was not funded, the project was not reviewed in-depth, and funding decisions were made based on survey rankings.

Committee Members discussed PMRs and worked through scenarios through the SIP deliberation tool. Upon discussion of the Washington Boulevard Project PMR, Member Han acknowledged the sensitivity surrounding the project, especially considering the rising costs and potential benefits to the community. Member Han highlighted that escalating cost is a common issue faced by various agencies, and noted that the project's potential benefits are crucial for disadvantaged communities, particularly in light of the State's water supply concerns due to changing hydrology. Member Han noted that the State also has a goal to meet 1.8 million acre-feet of recycled water by 2040. Member Han expressed that West Basin's main concern was the potential loss of Water Supply benefits.

Member Reznik also discussed the Washington Boulevard Project PMR's scope and funding, noting that while inflation played a part, there were significant modifications, including a change in location and Water Supply focus. It was also emphasized that the changes prompted may need to be reassessed by the WASC. Despite the changes, Co-Chair Santilena acknowledged that some positive aspects remained, such as an increase in the drainage area and Water Quality improvements. Co-Chair Santilena pointed out that the project's new, modified location included disadvantaged community areas.

The WASC discussed specific types of projects that should be prioritized for Water Supply. Member Mossavi pointed out that projects claiming Water Supply benefits, such as infiltration systems, might not always connect to usable aquifers, which impacts effectiveness. It was emphasized that there is a priority within the Scoring Committee's assessment of these projects to determine a project's actual Water Supply benefits. Member Geremew Amenu inquired if there was a particular project being proposed that the WASC thought was a stronger example of Water Supply benefits, to which Member Han highlighted that the Washington Boulevard Project was initially planned with a Water Supply benefit in mind, but later modifications were made that removed this promised benefit. Member Han noted that the project initially mentioned on-site retention and treatment processes, and the PMR now mentions that water will be discharged into the municipal separate storm sewer system (MS4). It was specified that while the water supply benefit is no longer part of the project, there will still be water quality benefits resulting from the on-site treatment.

Upon continued discussion and testing potential scenarios with the SIP Tool, Antos explained that there are the four decisions available to the Committee regarding PMRs. The first is for the WASC to accept the proposed changes to the project but without allocating additional funds. The second is for the WASC to reject the proposed changes and maintain the original project, not approving the modifications. The third is to accept the proposed changes and the changed funding request. The fourth is to accept the proposed changes with only partial funding of the full request.

Upon inquiry of what would occur to the Washington Boulevard Project without support from the CSMB WASC, Katie Harrel (CWE, Project Proponent) explained that the project's scope was changed due to high bid prices, with the goal of improving Water Quality at a more affordable cost. The new approach reduces the need for a large storage system by incorporating a treatment option that allows for simultaneous water treatment and discharge during storms. If the changes are not approved, the project might be delayed or canceled, as the original approach would require a full storage system, which remains unaffordable without additional funding. Despite the changes, the project's location has remained the same, with only the storage system being adjusted. The project, now estimated at \$16.5 million, is partially funded by a combination of the SCW Program, a private partnership with Costco, and other sources like the Los Angeles Open Space District, with a total of \$7.6 million requested from the CSMB WASC.

Central Santa Monica Bay

Watershed Area Steering Committee (WASC)

Meeting Minutes



The WASC emphasized the importance of leveraging public and private funding. Despite some challenges, including negotiating with Costco for additional contributions and a stable grant from the County, the project intends to bring long-term benefits to the community, especially in reducing wastewater treatment costs. However, some concerns were raised about the trend of cost increases in such projects, particularly as construction costs continue to rise. While sympathetic to the pandemic's impact on costs, Committee Members expressed caution about setting a precedent for future projects to seek additional funding after initial bids, which would affect overall project management and expectations for future funding requests.

Committee members returned to a discussion of the SSs, expressing concern over the DROPS SS, given its potential redundancy with other tools. Member Reznik pointed out the challenge of understanding the SS's broader utility and questioned if the SS duplicated efforts already in place. Member Reznik expressed being initially hesitant to support the SS due to potential scope changes without full funding from all WASCs. Member Darryl Ford expressed support for considering SSs in general, acknowledging that while some tools may end up redundant, those tools also could offer unforeseen benefits. Member Descalzo emphasized the importance of regional support for such studies, and expressed concern if the broader region was not aligned in supporting the SS.

Committee Members expressed support for the Depave LA SS, especially regarding transforming parking lots into water-permeable areas. Member Han recognized the substantial thought and outreach already invested in this SS, while others acknowledged its potential for water recycling and meeting regulatory compliance goals. Co-Chair Kampalath raised concerns about the relatively small amount of funding available, but noted that, compared to other regions, this project might offer more immediate benefits to the CSMB Watershed Area. Overall, Committee Members expressed support that the SS could complement existing efforts rather than be duplicative. Some Committee Members were neutral but acknowledged the SS's longer-term benefits, including the potential for further development if the SS received partial funding.

Upon inquiry, Tull emphasized the value of collaborating with Flood Control Agencies, recognizing that many projects could complement each other. Member Gloria Medina raised concerns about certain projects' locations, especially those near oil fields, such as the Hayden Tract TRP, and the potential for contamination or pollution. While there was no specific objection, WASC Members agreed that hydrology studies and environmental impacts should be further evaluated in sensitive areas.

The WASC discussed funding strategies, with Co-Chair Santilena expressing concerns over partial funding for projects and the impact to timelines. There was a consensus that full funding was preferable, though Public Works staff pointed out that Project Applicants could still proceed with partial funding if necessary. Antos discussed the flexibility of the funding process, noting that unused funds from previous years could be rolled over, which could prevent any loss of potential impact. The idea of allowing projects to explore different funding options was also supported by the WASC, with some Committee Members suggesting that this could help in uncovering opportunities that may not initially have been considered by Project Proponents.

Committee Members acknowledged the importance of TRPs and SSs for establishing concepts for future projects. Member Han highlighted the long-term value of TRPs, even if their full potential was not immediately apparent. It was noted that the TRP projects under consideration were relatively small but important, especially for building momentum for future initiatives.

There was overall agreement that funding decisions should balance immediate needs with long-term sustainability. As more projects come back for future funding requests, the WASC agreed on the necessity of ensuring that projects have access to future funding to meet goals, including operations and maintenance (O&M) costs. The discussion concluded with an acknowledgment of the forthcoming pipeline of projects.

Central Santa Monica Bay

Watershed Area Steering Committee (WASC)

Meeting Minutes



Co-Chair Santilena highlighted the potential for additional TRPs or SSs to emerge and emphasized the importance of maintaining an open avenue for further exploration.

Co-Chair Santilena inquired if the DROPS SS Applicants would return to the WASCs in future years to request funding, to which Tull mentioned that securing initial funding would be enough to get the project started and create significant impact, even if the funding does not initially cover the entire scope. Tull commented that prioritizing elements would ensure that even partial funding could lead to more than half of the anticipated benefits. Tull also mentioned that the SS's overall goal is to develop long-term, sustainable tools for the County and all WASCs, not just a one-time project.

Member Amenu sought clarification about the duration of the DROPS SS, and it was confirmed that the project was initially planned for one year. Additionally, it was clarified that the Depave LA SS, on the other hand, was planned for two years, mainly due to the level of engagement required.

Member Daniel Bradbury expressed concern about the Hayden Tract TRP, noting potential physical overlap with other projects in Culver City. Member Bradbury clarified with Co-Chair Santilena that the letter of non-objection mentioned earlier was being developed and will not be ready before SIP deliberations are complete. Co-Chair Santilena confirmed that while the letter has not been finalized, the project intends to move forward. Member Bradbury also commented on the importance of collaborating with Los Angeles County Flood Control (LACFCD) District early in the process and that more review will be needed for intensive infrastructure, such as underground infiltration systems, given the project's proximity to a flood control channel. While the LACFCD supports green biofiltration methods, Member Bradbury noted that there is some caution regarding large-scale underground installations or pumping stations.

Michael Berns (California Greenworks, Project Developer) specified that the projects within Culver City and the Hayden Tract TRP location are meant to complement each other. Berns also expressed support for including LACFCD in the planning process. Berns also explained that Hayden Tract TRP is coordinating with other projects that intersect or are along the area of the project site.

Member Medina confirmed with Berns that the Hayden Tract TRP site does not intend to encroach near the oil drilling sites nearby. Berns also acknowledged the need for additional studies, such as hydrology and geotechnical assessments, similar to those conducted for the Blackwelder Project. These studies would help identify how to address potential concerns related to the nearby oil fields.

Member Bradburry sought feedback from representatives of Culver City, asking if there were any concerns regarding the Hayden Tract TRP. Member De La Cruz clarified that there were no direct impacts, as the project is adjacent to Culver City's bike lane initiative, and that the projects complement each other. Berns elaborated on the broader connectivity benefits of these projects, particularly in terms of improving access for disadvantaged communities. Berns highlighted the connectivity between the Hayden Tract TRP and other Culver City projects, and commented plans to integrate with other initiatives like "Streets for All" and benefit areas both upstream and downstream. The inclusion of a bike path would prioritize pedestrian accessibility, ensuring that the projects complement and enhance existing infrastructure and community connections.

Committee Members continued discussing potential SIP scenarios. Member Han emphasized the value of these SSs and TRPs as tools to deepen understanding even if benefits are not immediately clear. It was pointed out that while some of the results may not be fully understood now, the results could become crucial for decision-making in the future. Member Han also highlighted that the allocation percentages for projects tend to increase over time, and having TRPs and SSs available could be beneficial when making decisions in the future.

Central Santa Monica Bay Watershed Area Steering Committee (WASC) Meeting Minutes



Antos highlighted that within the SIP Programming Guidelines, there exists a commitment to project completion. Public Works staff also noted that for TRPs there may be potential funding requests in the future, and although the initial funding amounts might be small, the Project Proponents could return to the WASC for design and construction funding.

Committee members questioned whether there was a downside to exceeding the 80% funding threshold for the current fiscal year, with the concern that it might limit future flexibility. Antos clarified that the rollover funds from this year would simply help fund next year's projects, commenting that there would be no significant disadvantage to surpassing the 80% mark in the current year.

Co-Chair Kampalath believed it was important to build a pipeline of projects, rather than just focusing on new implementation projects each year. It was expressed that there was support for funding projects from diverse proponents, particularly when projects proposed to the CSMB WASC are not led by city partners, as this could lead to a wider range of innovative ideas.

Upon inquiry, Watershed Coordinators noted that the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and other entities have shown interest in submitting TRP applications. Watershed Coordinator Boudreau has also been in discussions with the Project Developers of Fern Dell Restoration and Stormwater Capture TRP, which is planning to submit for design and intends to approach the project in phases. Project Developers for Syd Kronenthal Park Stormwater Capture Project are also interested in applying for funding and have been involved in TRP meetings. Watershed Coordinator Boudreau also noted that the Edward Vincent Project has already been approved for IP funding, but the situation with the Hollywood Bowl Stormwater Quality Improvement and Sustainability Project remains uncertain, as there has been no activity for the past year.

Public Works staff emphasized the importance of saving 20% of the budget to account for potential future needs, including O&M needs that may arise. This recommendation stems from the recognition that fully constructed projects without maintenance funds would render the initial investment ineffective. While design and construction projects are often difficult to fund from other sources, Public Works staff commented that ensuring ongoing funding for O&M is crucial. The suggestion to save 20% serves as a safeguard for potential funding requests, including unforeseen costs like PMRs and new projects. Public Works staff explained that there are various hypothetical scenarios to consider, such as the potential return of projects like the Washington Boulevard Project due to inflation and construction cost increases, highlighting the complexity of future project funding.

7) Public Comment Period

There were no public comments.

8) Voting Items

- a. Approve final FY25-26 SIP recommendations for the CSMB Watershed Area and submission to the Regional Oversight Committee (ROC) for review**

Co-Chair Santilena motioned to include the Scenario with Depave LA SS, 3 TRPs (Excluding the Fox Hills Park Multi-Benefit Stormwater Capture Project (herein referred to as the Fox Hills TRP)) and 2 PMRs with full funding ask to be in the FY25-26 SIP, seconded by Member Reznik. The Committee voted to approve the motion with 13 votes in favor, 1 vote opposed, 0 votes in abstention, and 0 Members absent at the time of voting (approved, see vote tracking sheet attached).

Central Santa Monica Bay Watershed Area Steering Committee (WASC) Meeting Minutes



Member Descalzo motioned to include the DROPS SS in the FY25-26 SIP, seconded by Member Ford. The Committee voted to approve the motion, with 12 votes in favor, 2 votes opposed, 0 votes in abstention, and 0 Members absent at the time of voting (approved, see vote tracking sheet attached).

Member Bradbury motioned to include the Fox Hills TRP in the FY25-26 SIP, seconded by Member Han. The Committee voted to not approve the motion, with 6 votes in favor, 7 votes opposed, 1 vote in abstention, and 0 Members absent at the time of voting (approved, see vote tracking sheet attached).

Co-Chair Kampalath motioned to approve the Final Fiscal Year 2025-2026 SIP for CSMB Watershed Area including Watershed Coordinators and approve submission to the ROC for review (funding scenario "2 SSs, 3 TRPs (Excluding the Fox Hills TRP), 2 PMRs w/ Full Funding Ask"), seconded by Member Reznick. The Committee voted to approve the motion, with 13 votes in favor, 1 vote in abstention, and 0 Members absent at the time of voting (approved, see vote tracking sheet attached).

9) Items for Future Agenda

The next meeting will be on May 6, held in person at Culver City Hall and online via WebEx. See the [SCW Program website](#) for meeting details.

10) Adjournment

Co-Chair Kampalath thanked WASC Members and the public for their attendance and participation and adjourned the meeting.

CENTRAL SANTA MONICA BAY WASC MEETING - April 1, 2025										
		Quorum Present				Voting Items				
Member Type	Organization	Primary Member	Attendance: In-person ("x" for present)	Alternate Member	Attendance: In-person ("x" for present)	Vote to approve March 4, 2025 Meeting Minutes	Inclusion of the Scenario: Depave LA, 3 TRPs (No Fox Hills), and 2 PMRs with full funding ask to be in the SIP	Inclusion of DROPS in the SIP	Inclusion of Fox Hills to be in the SIP	Approve the Final Fiscal Year 2025-2026 Stormwater Investment Plan for CSMB Watershed Area including Watershed Coordinators and approve submission to the ROC for review (funding scenario "2 SS, 3 TRP (No Fox Hills), 2 PMR w/ Full Funding Ask")
Agency	Los Angeles County Flood Control District	Marcela Benavides		Daniel Bradbury	x	y	y	y	y	y
Agency	West Basin Municipal Water District	Matthew Veeh		Augustine Han	x	y	n	y	y	a
Agency	Los Angeles City Water & Power	Art Castro		Conor Mossavi	x	y	y	y	n	y
Agency	Los Angeles City Sanitation and Environment	Susie Santilena	x	Hubertus Cox		y	y	y	n	y
Agency	Los Angeles City Recreation & Parks	Cathie Santo Domingo		Darryl Ford	x	y	y	y	n	y
Community Stakeholder	Los Angeles County Chief Sustainability Office	Rita Kampalath	x	Rebecca Ferdman		y	y	y	y	y
Community Stakeholder	PSOMAS / Business Sector	Ion Cretu	x			y	y	y	y	y
Community Stakeholder	SCOPE	Gloria Medina	x	Tanya Borja		a	y	n	n	y
Community Stakeholder	Los Angeles Waterkeeper	Bruce Reznik	x	Maggie Gardner		y	y	y	n	y
Community Stakeholder	Black Women for Wellness	Zoe Cunliffe	x	Tianna Shaw-Wakeman		Not present during vote	y	y	n	y
Municipal Members	Beverly Hills / West Hollywood	Josette Descalzo	x	Matthew Magener		y	y	y	y	y
Municipal Members	Culver City	Sean Singletary		Javier De La Cruz	x	y	y	y	y	y
Municipal Members	Los Angeles	Roberto Perez								
Municipal Members	Los Angeles	Rafael Prieto		Blayne Sutton-Wills						
Municipal Members	Los Angeles	Michelle Barton		Ryan Jackson	x	a	y	y	n	y
Municipal Members	Los Angeles County	Geremew Amenu	x	Lara Awad		Not present during vote	y	n	a	y
Municipal Members	Santa Monica	Joshua Carvalho		Selim Eren						
Watershed Coordinator	Heal the Bay	Stephanie Gebhardt Rath	x							
Watershed Coordinator	SGA Marketing	Vanessa Boudreau	x							
Total Non-Vacant Seats		17			Yay (Y)	10	13	12	6	13
Total Voting Members Present		14			Nay (N)	0	1	2	7	0
Agency		5			Abstain (A)	2	0	0	1	1
Community Stakeholder		5			Total	12	14	14	14	14
Municipal Members		4				Approved	Approved	Approved	Not Approved	Approved

Attendees
Central Santa Monica Bay WASC Meeting
April 1, 2025

Aleigh Lewis	Franci Levine-Grater	Marisol Ibarra
Alexander Iglesias Rosales	Jessy Shelton	Michael Berns
Alexia Skrbic	Johanna Chang	Michelle Reed
Ali Sharbat	Jon Ball	Mike Antos
Angineh Shahnazarian	Josafat Flores	Nancy Ngugi
Anh Ta	Katie Harrel	Naomi Diep
Aric Martinez	Kevin Ho	Pearl Azizian
Bhetsua Tinoco Lima	Lara Awad	Randall Wall
Brenda Ponton	Linet Khechatoorian	Richard Watson
Brett Perry	Lisa (Jin) Kim	Samantha Torres
Carlos Rodriguez	Luis Perez	Sean Phan
Christopher Tull	Luke Ginger	Sean Singletary
Duane Border	Michael Scaduto	Stacy Luell
Eric Bonilla	Marcela Benavides	Wendy Dinh

Central Santa Monica Bay

Watershed Area Steering Committee Meeting

COMMITTEE MEMBER AND ALTERNATE SIGN-IN: **APRIL 1, 2025**



Member Type	Member Name	Municipality/ Organization	Role	Signature
Agency	Marcela Benavides	Los Angeles County Flood Control District	P	
Agency	Daniel Bradbury	Los Angeles County Flood Control District	A	
Agency	Matthew Veeh	West Basin Metropolitan Water District	P	
Agency	Augustine Han	West Basin Metropolitan Water District	A	
Agency	Art Castro	Los Angeles City Water & Power	P	
Agency	Conor Mossavi	Los Angeles City Water & Power	A	
Agency	Susie Santilena	Los Angeles City Sanitation and Environment	P	
Agency	Hubertus Cox	Los Angeles City Sanitation and Environment	A	
Agency	Cathie Santo Domingo	Los Angeles City Recreation & Parks	P	
Agency	Darryl Ford	Los Angeles City Recreation & Parks	A	
Community Stakeholder	Rita Kampalath	Los Angeles County Chief Sustainability Office	P	
Community Stakeholder	Rebecca Ferdman	Los Angeles County Chief Sustainability Office	A	
Community Stakeholder	Ion Cretu	PSOMAS / Business Sector	P	
Community Stakeholder	Gloria Medina	SCOPE	P	
Community Stakeholder	Tanya Borja	SCOPE	A	
Community Stakeholder	Bruce Reznik	Los Angeles Waterkeeper	P	
Community Stakeholder	Maggie Gardner	Los Angeles Waterkeeper	A	
Community Stakeholder	Zoe Cunliffe	Black Women for Wellness	P	
Community Stakeholder	Tianna Shaw-Wakeman	Black Women for Wellness	A	
Municipal Member	Josette Descalzo	Beverly Hills / West Hollywood	P	
Municipal Member	Matthew Magener	Beverly Hills / West Hollywood	A	
Municipal Member	Sean Singletary	Culver City	P	
Municipal Member	Javier De La Cruz	Culver City	A	
Municipal Member	Roberto Perez	Los Angeles	P	

Central Santa Monica Bay

Watershed Area Steering Committee Meeting

COMMITTEE MEMBER AND ALTERNATE SIGN-IN: **APRIL 1, 2025**



Member Type	Member Name	Municipality/ Organization	Role	Signature
Municipal Member	Rafael Prieto	Los Angeles	P	
Municipal Member	Blayne Sutton-Wells	Los Angeles	A	
Municipal Member	Michelle Barton	Los Angeles	P	
Municipal Member	Ryan Jackson	Los Angeles	A	<i>[Signature]</i>
Municipal Member	Geremew Amenu	Los Angeles County	P	
Municipal Member	Lara Awad	Los Angeles County	A	
Municipal Member	Joshua Carvalho	Santa Monica	P	
Municipal Member	Selim Eren	Santa Monica	A	
Watershed Coordinator	Stephanie Gebhardt Rath	Heal the Bay	WC	<i>[Signature]</i>
Watershed Coordinator	Vanessa Boudreau	SGA Marketing	WC	<i>[Signature]</i>

Central Santa Monica Bay
Watershed Area Steering Committee Meeting
PUBLIC SIGN-IN: APRIL 1, 2025



First Name	Last Name	Municipality/Organization	Email Address
Anna	Groehnert	City of Inglewood	agroehnert@cityofinglewood.org
Chay	Dobesfahr	Henners	cdobesfahr@hennersinc.com