

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Committee



Meeting Minutes:

Monday, December 21, 2020

1:00pm - 5:00pm

WebEx Meeting

Attendees

Committee Members Present:

Matt Stone

Jill Sourial

Bruce Reznik

TJ Moon

Dave Sorem

Committee Members Not Present:

JR De Shazo

1) Welcome and Introductions

Bruce Reznik, the Chair of the Scoring Committee, called the meeting to order. All committee members in attendance made self-introductions, and quorum was established.

2) Approval of Meeting Minutes from December 8, 2020

The District provided a copy of the meeting minutes from the previous meeting. Bruce Reznik asked the committee members for comments or revisions.

TJ Moon made a motion to approve the meeting minutes. Matt Stone seconded the motion. The Committee voted to approve the meeting minutes (Approved, See Vote Tracking Sheet).

3) Committee Member and District Updates

No Member or District Updates.

4) Public Comment Period for Non-Agenda Items

No public comments received.

5) Discussion Items:

a) Ex Parte Communications Disclosure

Bruce Reznik is part of the Our Water LA Coalition and has had general discussions outside regarding projects and the scoring of projects; and he was approached by SEITech, Metro, and Geosyntech to discuss the scoring committee comments on that project. Bruce Reznik let the parties know they can bring questions forward during committee meetings.

TJ Moon noted that two projects to be scored today were County projects, and that he had also talked to SEITech and Geosyntech regarding their scoring committee comments.

Jill Sourial noted that she also had conversations with Metro regarding their project.

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Committee



b) Scoring of Feasibility Studies

(See attached scoring rubric)

ULAR	1	Altadena - Lake Avenue Green Improvement
	2	Altadena Mariposa Green Street Demonstration Project
	3	Arroyo Seco-San Rafael Treatment Wetlands
	4	Broadway-Manchester Multi-Modal Green Streets Project
	5	David M. Gonzales Recreation Center Stormwater Capture Project
	6	Lincoln Park Neighborhood Green Street Network
	7	Los Angeles Pierce College Northeast Campus Stormwater Capture & Use and Biofiltration Project
	8	Metro Orange Line a Water Infiltration and Quality Project
	9	North Hollywood High School
	10	Northridge Middle School
	11	Thomas Jefferson High School Comprehensive Modernization Project
	12	Valley Plaza Park Stormwater Capture Project (HELD FOR NEXT MEETING)
	13	Victory ES – DROPS (HELD FOR NEXT MEETING)
	14	Westmont - Vermont Avenue Green Improvement (HELD FOR NEXT MEETING)
	15	Woodlake ES - LID Project (HELD FOR NEXT MEETING)

c) Meeting Schedule

Bruce Reznik announced that next meeting is scheduled for January 5 and the committee will be reviewing the Infrastructure Projects from Upper LA River Watershed Area that could not be scored today, as well as projects from Lower LA River, and North Santa Monica Bay.

6) Public Comment Period for Agenda Items

Three comment cards received (See attached).

A member of the public noted that the Los Angeles City Council member Harris Dawson supports the Broadway Manchester Multi-Modal project, and noted that the community served by this project will benefit greatly from this project.

A member of the public noted that he is part of Coalition Coco which supports the Broadway Manchester Multi Modal Project. The project will provide a benefit to the disadvantaged community along the Broadway Manchester corridor.

A member of the public requested the committee reconsider the scoring on the Ballona Creek Treatment and the Ballona Creek Diversion projects put forward by SEITech. Bruce Reznik noted that additional discussion would follow during voting on item 7.

A member of the public noted that Burton Tech Highschool supports the Broadway Manchester Multi Modal Project, which will benefit its students and the parents of those students.

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Committee



7) Voting items:

- a) Approval of Official Scoring for IP Projects scored on December 1 and 8, 2020

Voting item was modified by committee to read: Forward on all projects 60+ points to the WASCs, and to revise LASAN Ballona project to 80 points.

Dave Sorem made a motion to approve the meeting minutes. TJ Moon seconded the motion. The Committee voted to approve (unanimous; see Vote Tracking Sheet).

- b) Defer Official Scoring to future meeting for more information to be provided

Voting item was modified by committee to read: Allow all projects that fell below 60 pts to provide updates, 5 projects have 1 week to update.

Dave Sorem made a motion to approve the meeting minutes. TJ Moon seconded the motion. The Committee voted to approve the meeting minutes (unanimous; see Vote Tracking Sheet).

8) Items for next agenda

Next agenda will include the list of projects to score.

Bruce Reznik noted that committee will be voting to report official scores from the previous meetings.

9) Adjournment

Bruce Reznik thanked the committee members and public for their time and participation and adjourned the meeting.

SCORING COMMITTEE MEETING - December 21, 2020

Member Type	Quorum Present		Voting Items		
	Member	Voting?	Meeting Minutes	Voting Item 7a (forward on all projects 60+ points to the WASCs, and to revise LASAN Ballona project to 80 points)	Voting Item 7b (Allow all projects that fell below 60 pts to provide updates, 5 projects have 1 week to update)
Water Supply	Matt Stone	X	Y	Y	Y
Water Supply / Water Quality	J.R. De Shazo				
Nature-Based Solutions / Community Investments Benefits	Jill Sourial	X	A	A	Y
Nature-Based Solutions / Water Quality	Bruce Reznik	X	Y	Y	Y
Water Quality	Dave Sorem	X	Y	Y	Y
Water Quality	TJ Moon	X	Y	Y	Y
Total Non-Vacant Seats	6	Yay (Y)	4	4	5
Total Voting Members Present	5	Nay (N)	0	0	0
		Abstain (A)	1	1	0
		Total	5	5	5
			Approved	Approved	Approved

Other Attendees	
Ana Tabuena	Karen Lee
Art Castro	Katie M
Brenda Morales	Ken Susilo
Brett Perry	Lorena Matos
Carmen Andrade	Melissa Levitt
Chris Carandang	Mohammad Baig
Christine McLeod	Noel Le
Conor Mossavi	Oliver Galang
Craig Reiter	Pamela Ku
Curtis Fang	Paul Glenn
David Angel	Peter Tonthat
Eva Malis	Phoc Le
Gerald Barrera	Ron Canedy
Haris Harouny	Shahriar Eftekhadeh
Ilene Ramirez	Sheila Brice
Isaac Giliard	Tara Liampetchakul
Jae Ko	Thom Epps
Johanna Chang	Vik Bapna
Juan Diaz-Carreras	Wendy Dinh

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



Watershed Area	Upper Los Angeles River
Project Name	Altadena - Lake Avenue Green Improvement
Project Lead	Los Angeles County Public Works
Total Funding Requested	\$500,000
Project Type	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	20	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SCW Projects module is not suited to design dry wells. Applicant using their own methodology.
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	25	30	25	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Water Supply Part 1	3	13	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No letter from water master to confirm usable aquifer water benefit (Unclear if Letter Required at early design phase) Raymond basin does augment GW
Water Supply Part 2	5	12	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Community Investment	5	10	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would be beneficial to see more of the details for CI benefits in a later phase of design.
Nature-Based Solutions	12	15	12	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Leveraging Funds Part 1	6	6	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Leveraging Funds Part 2	0	4	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
TOTALS	76	110	76	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would be beneficial to see the letter confirmation from Raymond Basin Watermaster

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



Watershed Area	Upper Los Angeles River
Project Name	Altadena Mariposa Green Street Demonstration Project
Project Lead	Amigos de los Rios, Claire Robinson
Total Funding Requested	\$739,772
Project Type	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	20	Unable to Score	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Water is captured from the storm drain system but only under large flood event. Project is not designed to capture first flush of the storm drain. Application currently assumes capture of the full tributary area, but flow is bypassing the site. Applicant noted that storm drain will fill to capacity by the time upstream flows reach the project site, and most will end up as surface flow. Additional information needed to confirm water quality benefits.
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	30	Unable to Score	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Water Supply Part 1	0	13	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Water Supply Part 2	0	12	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Community Investment	5	10	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Nature-Based Solutions	11	15	11	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Leveraging Funds Part 1	0	6	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	4	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Significant number of letters of support. Exemplary community outreach and engagement.
TOTALS	70	110	Unable to Score	<ul style="list-style-type: none">

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



Watershed Area	Upper Los Angeles River
Project Name	Arroyo Seco-San Rafael Treatment Wetlands
Project Lead	City of Pasadena
Total Funding Requested	\$4,771,357
Project Type	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	20	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SCW Projects Module is not well suited to modeling wetland projects. • Applicant has combined both projects together into the module with a high infiltration, assumes rate 6cfs treatment and 5.18 in/hr draw down rate (proxy for evapotranspiration) • Project should be reclassified a dry weather project. • Applicant noted treatment is through a filter unit, so rates are high as a result • San Rafael site treats 85th, but 2nd site does not.
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	20	30	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
Water Supply Part 1	0	13	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
Water Supply Part 2	5	12	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No letter from groundwater master to confirm supply benefit.
Community Investment	10	10	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
Nature-Based Solutions	12	15	12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
Leveraging Funds Part 1	3	6	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	4	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very good diversity for letters of support.
TOTALS	74	110	74	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For WASC consideration, provide letter from groundwater master to confirm supply benefit

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



Watershed Area	Upper Los Angeles River
Project Name	Broadway-Manchester Multi-Modal Green Streets Project
Project Lead	City of Los Angeles Bureau of Street Services (StreetsLA)
Total Funding Requested	\$11,719,000
Project Type	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	11	20	11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No justification for 1.15 in/hr draw down rate. Storage alone however could capture 85th percentile volume.
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	30	30	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Water Supply Part 1	0	13	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Water Supply Part 2	5	12	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Applicant used their own 100AFY vs 43AFY from the module. Needs better justification than existing spreadsheet. Recommend using the website generated number. Applicant noted that supply includes irrigation as well, which the website is unable to model. The site has a smart system in place to tackle potable vs storm supply. Applicant notes that (25 acres 6 are new) additional acres of landscaping are being constructed to pull from this system. Committee notes that offsetting potable supply for stormwater provides SCW supply benefit.
Community Investment	10	10	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Application noted greening of schools, but is located in a median adjacent to a school. Would be beneficial to get confirmation from the School that they are aware of the project and is involved with the design. Applicant has a letter from the principal of the school. Plant pallet was chosen by the community, strong community engagement.
Nature-Based Solutions	10	15	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Leveraging Funds Part 1	3	6	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	4	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Very good example of a community project.
TOTALS	73	110	73	<ul style="list-style-type: none">

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



Watershed Area	Upper Los Angeles River
Project Name	David M. Gonzales Recreation Center Stormwater Capture Project
Project Lead	Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (LADWP)
Total Funding Requested	\$19,363,000
Project Type	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	20	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project captures slightly more than the 85th percentile storm
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	30	30	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Water Supply Part 1	0	13	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Water Supply Part 2	12	12	12	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Community Investment	10	10	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would be beneficial to see a letter of support from the school that benefit is provided for greening of schools.
Nature-Based Solutions	15	15	15	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Leveraging Funds Part 1	6	6	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	4	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
TOTALS	97	110	97	<ul style="list-style-type: none">

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



Watershed Area	Upper Los Angeles River
Project Name	Lincoln Park Neighborhood Green Street Network
Project Lead	City of Los Angeles Sanitation and Environment
Total Funding Requested	\$18,634,578
Project Type	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	20	Unable to Score	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SCW Website not well suited for dry well projects. • Project is oversized, ~5x larger than the 85th percentile storm. Appears to be an error • No Geotech provided to justify the infiltration rate. • It is likely designed for the 85th percentile storm. $8.5/16 = \sim 0.5$ • Applicant notes that the high capacity takes into consideration the infiltration rate. • Storage volume in application leads to ~1ac-ft per drywell, which seems oversized • Application to provide additional clarity
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	30	Unable to Score	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a discrepancy of the drainage area in the application and the report.
Water Supply Part 1	0	13	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
Water Supply Part 2	2	12	Unable to Score	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
Community Investment	10	10	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would be beneficial to see a letter of support from the school that benefit is provided for greening of schools. • May have been able to claim access
Nature-Based Solutions	10	15	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
Leveraging Funds Part 1	0	6	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
Leveraging Funds Part 2	0	4	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
TOTALS	72	110	Unable to Score	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applicant to provide additional clarity

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



Watershed Area	Upper Los Angeles River
Project Name	Los Angeles Pierce College Northeast Campus Stormwater Capture & Use and Biofiltration Project
Project Lead	Los Angeles Community College District & BuildLACCD
Total Funding Requested	\$5,243,675
Project Type	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	20	11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discrepancy in drainage area in application and the appendicies Application uses a 1 in/hr draw down rate for irrigation. Recommend using 0 in/hr. 7.5/9.8 = 11 pts Insufficient information, recommend providing additional clarity
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	30	30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project does capture the 85th
Water Supply Part 1	0	13	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Water Supply Part 2	5	12	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Insufficient information, recommend providing additional clarity re-running model
Community Investment	10	10	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enhancement of schools not really provided by converting field irrigation to stormwater. Would be covered under supply. Would be beneficial to see additional justification for heat island, plant palette, and others.
Nature-Based Solutions	10	15	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Leveraging Funds Part 1	3	6	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	4	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
TOTALS	82	110	63	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Additional information to be provided to WASC

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



Watershed Area	Upper Los Angeles River
Project Name	Metro Orange Line a Water Infiltration and Quality Project
Project Lead	Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
Total Funding Requested	\$34,515,458
Project Type	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	20	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Applicant uses ~2.5x the 85th percentile volume, looks to be using peak flow, vs the shape of the hydrograph to estimate what drywells can take in. Does not impact score Applicant to provide additional clarity.
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	20	30	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Water Supply Part 1	3	13	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Water Supply Part 2	12	12	12	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Community Investment	5	10	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Applicant claims improving access to waterway but did not provide adequate justification. Unclear how much planting is present in the project. Would be beneficial to see planting palette.
Nature-Based Solutions	10	15	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide the WASC additional details on the nature based elements of this project.
Leveraging Funds Part 1	3	6	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	4	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
TOTALS	77	110	74	<ul style="list-style-type: none">

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



Watershed Area	Upper Los Angeles River
Project Name	North Hollywood High School
Project Lead	Los Angeles Unified School District
Total Funding Requested	\$3,154,945
Project Type	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	20	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Overdesigned for 50-year flood event. ~3x greater the 85th percentile storm.
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	30	30	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Water Supply Part 1	0	13	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Water Supply Part 2	0	12	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Community Investment	10	10	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Nature-Based Solutions	10	15	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Leveraging Funds Part 1	0	6	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	4	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Letter provided by the North Hollywood Community Gardens is part of the same school. Would be beneficial to see additional letters of support
TOTALS	74	110	74	<ul style="list-style-type: none">

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



Watershed Area	Upper Los Angeles River
Project Name	Northridge Middle School
Project Lead	Los Angeles Unified School District
Total Funding Requested	\$1,920,084
Project Type	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	20	7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inconsistent drainage area from the application and the appendices. 2.5 in/hr is the highest range vs an average of the two borings done. Would be beneficial to use the average infiltration rate between borings. $1.9AF/\\$3.3M = 0.57 = 7pts$
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	30	30	•
Water Supply Part 1	0	13	0	•
Water Supply Part 2	0	12	0	•
Community Investment	10	10	10	• Would have been beneficial to see the plantings given the project is already constructed.
Nature-Based Solutions	10	15	10	•
Leveraging Funds Part 1	3	6	3	•
Leveraging Funds Part 2	0	4	0	•
TOTALS	73	110	60	•

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



Watershed Area	Upper Los Angeles River
Project Name	Thomas Jefferson High School Comprehensive Modernization Project
Project Lead	Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD)
Total Funding Requested	\$1,980,560
Project Type	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	20	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project is overdesigned for flooding, 5x greater than the 85th percentile storm.
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	30	30	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Water Supply Part 1	0	13	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Water Supply Part 2	0	12	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Community Investment	10	10	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> More detail and justification would have been beneficial. Unclear what recreational benefits are being provided as part of the project. Does not impact score. Unclear what "natural turf" meant within the application Applicant noted plantings plan is available. To be provided to WASC
Nature-Based Solutions	11	15	11	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Leveraging Funds Part 1	0	6	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	4	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
TOTALS	75	110	75	<ul style="list-style-type: none">



Public Comment Form

Name:* _____ Organization*: _____

Email*: _____ Phone*: _____

Meeting: _____ Date: _____

LA County Public Works may contact me for clarification about my comments

*Per Brown Act, completing this information is optional. At a minimum, please include an identifier so that you may be called upon to speak.

Phone participants and the public are encouraged to submit public comments (or a request to make a public comment) to SafeCleanWaterLA@dpw.lacounty.gov. All public comments will become part of the official record.

Please complete this form and email to SafeCleanWaterLA@dpw.lacounty.gov by at least 5:00pm the day prior to the meeting with the following subject line: "Public Comment: [Watershed Area] [Meeting Date]" (ex. "Public Comment: USGR 4/8/20").

Comments



Public Comment Form

Name:*	_____	Organization*:	_____
Email*:	_____	Phone*:	_____
Meeting:	_____	Date:	_____

LA County Public Works may contact me for clarification about my comments
*Per Brown Act, completing this information is optional. At a minimum, please include an identifier so that you may be called upon to speak.

Phone participants and the public are encouraged to submit public comments (or a request to make a public comment) to SafeCleanWaterLA@dpw.lacounty.gov. All public comments will become part of the official record.
Please complete this form and email to SafeCleanWaterLA@dpw.lacounty.gov by at least 5:00pm the day prior to the meeting with the following subject line: "Public Comment: [Watershed Area] [Meeting Date]"
(ex. "Public Comment: USGR 4/8/20").

Comments



Public Comment Form

Name:* _____ Organization*: _____

Email*: _____ Phone*: _____

Meeting: _____ Date: _____

LA County Public Works may contact me for clarification about my comments

*Per Brown Act, completing this information is optional. At a minimum, please include an identifier so that you may be called upon to speak.

Phone participants and the public are encouraged to submit public comments (or a request to make a public comment) to SafeCleanWaterLA@dpw.lacounty.gov. All public comments will become part of the official record.

Please complete this form and email to SafeCleanWaterLA@dpw.lacounty.gov by at least 5:00pm the day prior to the meeting with the following subject line: "Public Comment: [Watershed Area] [Meeting Date]"
(ex. "Public Comment: USGR 4/8/20").

Comments
