

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Committee



---

### **Meeting Minutes:**

Wednesday, January 6, 2021

1:00pm - 4:00pm

WebEx Meeting

### **Attendees**

#### Committee Members Present:

Matt Stone

J.R. De Shazo

Jill Sourial

Bruce Reznik

TJ Moon

Dave Sorem

#### Committee Members Not Present:

None

### **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 a quorum was established.

Bruce Reznik noted: Meeting Minutes for December 21, 2020 will be reviewed and/or approved at the January 12, 2021 meeting.

### **2) Committee Member and District Updates**

Kirk Allen provided the District update, noting: the Watershed Coordinator (WC) interviews and selection process is moving forward; 2 out of the 9 WASCs have voted and selected their WCs. Additionally, at the Regional Oversight Committee meeting, to be hosted on January 28, 2021, there will be a discussion about Water Supply Benefits and prioritization of Nature-Based Solutions. On February 25, 2021, the same Committee will be discussing Disadvantaged Community Benefits and Community Engagement guidance. Kirk Allen further noted that the Safe, Clean Water Program's project reporting module is nearing final development. Reporting features will provide updated information on watersheds, projects and community benefits. Finally, cities are reminded to provide their executed fund Transfer Agreements and required documentation, including environmental documents; if applicable, to the District.

### **3) Public Comment Period for Non-Agenda Items**

No public comments received.

### **4) Discussion Items:**

- a) Ex Parte Communications Disclosure

Committee members had no ex parte communications to disclose.

- b) Scoring of Feasibility Studies

*(See attached scoring rubric)*

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Committee



RH	1	Alhambra Wash Dry-Weather Diversion
	2	East LA College Northeast Drainage Area and City of Monterey Park Biofiltration Project
	3	Eaton Wash Dry-Weather Diversion
	4	Merced Ave Greenway (Phase I - South Residential Corridor)
	5	Mt. Lowe Median Stormwater Capture Project
	6	Plymouth School Neighborhood Stormwater Capture Demonstration Project
	7	Rio Hondo Ecosystem Restoration Project
	8	Rubio Wash Dry-Weather Diversion
USGR	9	Fairplex
	10	FINKBINER PARK STORMWATER CAPTURE PROJECT
	11	Larkin Park
	12	Lone Hill Park
	13	Washington Park
	14	Zamora Park Renovation Project

### 5) Meeting Schedule

Next scheduled meeting is for January 12, 2021 9:00am to 12:00pm. The Committee will be reviewing Infrastructure Projects from Lower San Gabriel River Watershed and South Santa Monica Bay Watershed Areas.

Additionally, moving forward with scheduling the following meetings for project scoring reconsiderations: January 25, 2021 from 1:00pm to 4:00pm and January 27, 2021 as a tentative backup date from 1:00pm to 3:00pm to conclude all project reconsiderations.

### 6) Public Comment Period for Agenda Items

No public comments received.

### 7) Voting items:

None. Approval of prior meeting minutes and official scoring for IP Projects scored on January 5<sup>th</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup> will be to January 12<sup>th</sup>.

### 8) Adjournment

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

## SCORING COMMITTEE MEETING - January 6, 2021

Member Type	Quorum Present		Items
	Member	Voting?	Meeting Minutes
Water Supply	Matt Stone	X	
Water Supply / Water Quality	<b>J.R. De Shazo</b>	X	
Nature-Based Solutions / Community Investments Benefits	Jill Sourial	X	
Nature-Based Solutions / Water Quality	<b>Bruce Reznik</b>	X	
Water Quality	Dave Sorem	X	
Water Quality	TJ Moon	X	
Total Non-Vacant Seats	6	Yay (Y)	0
Total Voting Members Present	6	Nay (N)	0
		Abstain (A)	0
		Total	0
			Not Approved

Other Attendees	
Susie Santilena	Jason Casanova
A M	Jason Fussel
Alex Tachiki	Jow Venzon
Alexis Holmdal	Joshua Nelson
Aric Torreyson	Katie Harrel
Brad Parks	Katie M
Brenda Morales	Lonnie Chung
Brett Perry	Lorena Matos
Carlos Moran	Michael Ackerman
Chris Jansen	Oliver Galang
Claire Robinson	Shahram Kharaghani
Conor Mossavi	Sheila Brice
Cristian Duran	Simon Fowell
D Livesey	Thom Epps
Daniel Apt	Thuan Nguyen
Ed Suher	Tristin Hogan
Edna Robidas	Vik Bapna
Eva Malis	Wendy Dinh
Fernando Villaluna	Michelle Kim
Iwen Tseng	Ariella Dahlin
James Cramsie	Sharon Gallant

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



<b>Watershed Area</b>	Rio Hondo
<b>Project Name</b>	Alhambra Wash Dry-Weather Diversion
<b>Project Lead</b>	San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments (SGVCOG), Mark Christoffels
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$2,737,180
<b>Project Type</b>	Dry

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	<b>20</b>	20	•
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	20	<b>30</b>	20	•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	0	<b>13</b>	0	•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	0	<b>12</b>	0	•
<b>Community Investment</b>	5	<b>10</b>	Unable to score	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would be beneficial to see additional details and justification as project is asking for construction funding.</li> <li>• Applicant using enhanced walking under shade as a recreational benefit, may be more geared towards habitat benefit.</li> <li>• Unclear if this area is high in pedestrian traffic.</li> <li>• Applicant to provide additional documents to show planting plan, and clarify number of trees.</li> </ul>
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	10	<b>15</b>	Unable to score	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Very little detail provided to justify nature-based solution benefits claimed.</li> <li>• Unclear if benefits will be provided, listed as potential within application</li> </ul>
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	6	<b>6</b>	Unable to score	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Match percentage appears inconsistent. Unclear if \$200k is missing.</li> <li>• Applicant noted cost share is associated only with capital cost and not O&amp;M.</li> </ul>
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	<b>4</b>	4	•
<b>TOTALS</b>	65	<b>110</b>	Unable to score	•

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



<b>Watershed Area</b>	Rio Hondo
<b>Project Name</b>	East Los Angeles College Northeast Drainage Area and City of Monterey Park Biofiltration Project
<b>Project Lead</b>	East Los Angeles College/Build LACCD
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$532,618
<b>Project Type</b>	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather  Part 1	11	20	11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Website not able to model wetlands. Applicant provides a draw down rate, but there is no diversion or infiltration. Should be zero. Reduces ratio</li> <li>Applicant noted drawdown rate is associated with filtration</li> <li>Applicant to provide justification for filtration drawdown rate comparison.</li> </ul>
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	25	30	25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project is larger than the 85<sup>th</sup> percentile. Should have maximized pollutant capture.</li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	0	13	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	0	12	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Community Investment</b>	5	10	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unclear how the project is enhancing the school and improve local head island effect. Are these new plantings to provide school improvement and heat island?</li> <li>Applicant noted site has some existing vegetation, and project will include new native plantings.</li> <li>Applicant notes improvements will be to both the school and the transit center.</li> <li>Applicant to provide additional detail and plans to the WASC.</li> </ul>
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	10	15	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Application notes reduction of impermeable area, would be beneficial to see detail on this.</li> </ul>
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	6	6	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	4	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>TOTALS</b>	61	110	61 Held	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SC holding pending additional detail</li> </ul>

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



<b>Watershed Area</b>	Rio Hondo
<b>Project Name</b>	Eaton Wash Dry-Weather Diversion
<b>Project Lead</b>	San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments (SGVCOG), Mark Christoffels
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$1,894,220
<b>Project Type</b>	Dry

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	<b>20</b>	20	•
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	20	<b>30</b>	20	•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	0	<b>13</b>	0	•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	0	<b>12</b>	0	•
<b>Community Investment</b>	5	<b>10</b>	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would be beneficial to see additional details and justification as project is asking for construction funding.</li> <li>• Application notes benefits are potential. With construction funds, more detail should be available.</li> <li>• Applicant to provide graphic and counts for detailed plantings and improvements</li> </ul>
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	10	<b>15</b>	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Application notes reduction of impermeable area, would be beneficial to see detail on this.</li> <li>• Unclear if swale is included in the project, as it is called out as a potential improvement.</li> <li>• Applicant to provide clarity if these natural features will be included in the project.</li> </ul>
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	6	<b>6</b>	6	•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	<b>4</b>	4	•
<b>TOTALS</b>	65	<b>110</b>	57	•

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



<b>Watershed Area</b>	Rio Hondo
<b>Project Name</b>	Merced Ave Greenway (Phase I - South Residential Corridor)
<b>Project Lead</b>	City of South El Monte
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$3,234,694
<b>Project Type</b>	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	11	<b>20</b>	11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Capacity is an aggregate of all BMPs in project. Confirmed.</li> </ul>
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	20	<b>30</b>	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	0	<b>13</b>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	0	<b>12</b>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Community Investment</b>	10	<b>10</b>	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Applicant did a very good job at justifying the various benefits provided.</li> </ul>
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	10	<b>15</b>	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	6	<b>6</b>	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SC recognized a good collection of cost match and leveraging other funding sources</li> </ul>
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	<b>4</b>	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>TOTALS</b>	61	<b>110</b>	61	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



<b>Watershed Area</b>	Rio Hondo
<b>Project Name</b>	Mt. Lowe Median Stormwater Capture Project
<b>Project Lead</b>	Los Angeles County
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$800,000
<b>Project Type</b>	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	11	20	11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is a challenge to model drywells in the SCW website. Applicant using creative inputs to match the capacity of the drywell.</li> </ul>
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	30	30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	0	13	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	0	12	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Community Investment</b>	5	10	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	10	15	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	6	6	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	4	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Only letter of support is from a town council.</li> <li>Applicant noted the Altadena town council functions primarily as a neighborhood council.</li> <li>SC recognizes that more clarity is required by the ROC and District to specify intent for what constitutes Strong Community Support.</li> </ul>
<b>TOTALS</b>	66	110	66	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>



# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



<b>Watershed Area</b>	Rio Hondo
<b>Project Name</b>	Plymouth School Neighborhood Stormwater Capture Demonstration Project
<b>Project Lead</b>	Amigos de los Rios (AdIR), Claire Robinson
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$559,162
<b>Project Type</b>	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather  Part 1	20	<b>20</b>	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 3 in/hr seems high. Would be beneficial to see justification.</li> <li>• No Geotech report provided in this report to justify infiltration rate. Even with zero rate, still scores 20 pts.</li> </ul>
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	<b>30</b>	30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	0	<b>13</b>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	0	<b>12</b>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>
<b>Community Investment</b>	5	<b>10</b>	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Unclear if flooding benefit is justified. Does not impact score.</li> <li>• Applicant noted that flooding does occur at the site, and the project will remove the surface water during flooding.</li> </ul>
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	11	<b>15</b>	11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	3	<b>6</b>	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	<b>4</b>	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SC recognizes the strong community support for this project.</li> </ul>
<b>TOTALS</b>	73	<b>110</b>	73	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



<b>Watershed Area</b>	Rio Hondo
<b>Project Name</b>	Rio Hondo Ecosystem Restoration Project
<b>Project Lead</b>	City of Monrovia
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$2,329,375
<b>Project Type</b>	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	<b>20</b>	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project is undersized for the 85<sup>th</sup> percentile storm, should be classified as dry-weather project. Would not impact score.</li> </ul>
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	20	<b>30</b>	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Applicant used their own modeling. As project is asking for design funds, assumptions are reasonable.</li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	10	<b>13</b>	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Applicant used their own modeling.</li> <li>There's no letter from the groundwater master endorsing the project</li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	12	<b>12</b>	12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Community Investment</b>	5	<b>10</b>	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project appears to provide more benefits than were claimed, such as reducing heat island effect, shade, and providing trees.</li> <li>Unclear if project provides flood benefit.</li> </ul>
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	10	<b>15</b>	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	0	<b>6</b>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	<b>4</b>	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>TOTALS</b>	81	<b>110</b>	81	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



<b>Watershed Area</b>	Rio Hondo
<b>Project Name</b>	Rubio Wash Dry-Weather Diversion
<b>Project Lead</b>	San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments (SGVCOG), Mark Christoffels
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$2,977,080
<b>Project Type</b>	Dry

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	<b>20</b>	20	•
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	20	<b>30</b>	20	•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	0	<b>13</b>	0	•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	0	<b>12</b>	0	•
<b>Community Investment</b>	5	<b>10</b>	2	• Walking claimed for recreation without more details on how much of a benefit is provided.
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	10	<b>15</b>	10	• Unclear if swale will be provided or not. There is only a potential of the trees and swale. • Applicant to provide schematic to show what benefits will be provided.
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	6	<b>6</b>	6	• Unclear where the remaining \$200k are to make a full 50/50 match. • Applicant to provide clarity on cost match.
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	<b>4</b>	4	•
<b>TOTALS</b>	65	<b>110</b>	65 Held	• Held pending additional information to SC.

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



<b>Watershed Area</b>	Upper San Gabriel River
<b>Project Name</b>	Fairplex
<b>Project Lead</b>	East San Gabriel Valley Watershed Management Group
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$31,900,000
<b>Project Type</b>	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather  Part 1	20	<b>20</b>	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No Geotech report provided to justify draw down rate. Plans provided in application show boring logs exist for the site. May be able to use these logs to estimate draw down rate.</li> <li>Applicant used custom value for capacity that is less than modeled 24-hour capacity.</li> <li>As application is requesting construction funds, justification for draw down rate needed.</li> </ul>
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	<b>30</b>	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	0	<b>13</b>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	12	<b>12</b>	Unable to score	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unclear if sections of the application are missing, or if justification is not provided.</li> </ul>
<b>Community Investment</b>	2	<b>10</b>	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	5	<b>15</b>	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	0	<b>6</b>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Leveraging Funds</b>  Part 2	4	<b>4</b>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Applicant included no letters of support, only a pending letter from the LA County Fair Association. Landowner or business letters of support do not meet the intent of strong community support.</li> </ul>
<b>TOTALS</b>	73	<b>110</b>	Unable to score	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SC holding project pending additional justification from applicant</li> </ul>

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



<b>Watershed Area</b>	Upper San Gabriel River
<b>Project Name</b>	FINKBINER PARK STORMWATER CAPTURE PROJECT
<b>Project Lead</b>	City of Glendora
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$2,581,286
<b>Project Type</b>	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	<b>20</b>	20	•
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	<b>30</b>	30	• Project is slightly larger than the 85 <sup>th</sup> percentile
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	0	<b>13</b>	0	•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	9	<b>12</b>	9	• Applicant only includes a request letter to the Groundwater Master, but project is currently in design phase so full details not yet available.
<b>Community Investment</b>	5	<b>10</b>	5	• Project could have taken credit for enhancing recreation.
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	12	<b>15</b>	12	•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	0	<b>6</b>	0	• Applicant did not take credit for match funds.
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	<b>4</b>	0	• Project includes a letter of support only from a city community service office. As a city department, this does not meet the intent of a strong community support such as a CBO, NGO, or other community group.
<b>TOTALS</b>	80	<b>110</b>	76	•

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



<b>Watershed Area</b>	Upper San Gabriel River
<b>Project Name</b>	Larkin Park
<b>Project Lead</b>	East San Gabriel Valley Watershed Management Group
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$23,100,000
<b>Project Type</b>	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather  Part 1	20	<b>20</b>	Unable to score	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No Geotech report provided to justify drawdown rate.</li> <li>Applicant used a custom value for their capacity which is higher than the website generated value.</li> <li>Applicant to provide justification for draw down rate and 24-hour capacity.</li> </ul>
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	<b>30</b>	Unable to score	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	0	<b>13</b>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b>  Part 2	9	<b>12</b>	Unable to score	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Score will change if modifications are made to draw down rate and 24-hour capacity.</li> <li>The watermaster has provided a conditional letter of support, with concerns about high groundwater table.</li> </ul>
<b>Community Investment</b>	2	<b>10</b>	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	10	<b>15</b>	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	0	<b>6</b>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Leveraging Funds</b>  Part 2	4	<b>4</b>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Letter provided by the Mayor of Claremont, which focuses only on MS4 compliance vs providing community benefits.</li> </ul>
<b>TOTALS</b>	75	<b>110</b>	Unable to score	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



<b>Watershed Area</b>	Upper San Gabriel River
<b>Project Name</b>	Lone Hill Park
<b>Project Lead</b>	East San Gabriel Valley Watershed Management Group
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$9,900,000
<b>Project Type</b>	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather  Part 1	20	<b>20</b>	Unable to score	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No Geotech report provided to justify drawdown rate.</li> <li>Applicant used their own custom value for their 24-hour capacity.</li> <li>Applicant to provide justification for these values.</li> </ul>
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	<b>30</b>	Unable to score	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	0	<b>13</b>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b>  Part 2	5	<b>12</b>	Unable to score	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will change if modifications are made to draw down rate and 24-hour capacity.</li> <li>Applicant is in the process of retrieving a letter of support from Groundwater Master.</li> </ul>
<b>Community Investment</b>	5	<b>10</b>	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Additional graphics and planting palette would be good to see.</li> <li>Parking lot may have the potential for pervious pavement.</li> </ul>
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	10	<b>15</b>	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	0	<b>6</b>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Leveraging Funds</b>  Part 2	4	<b>4</b>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Letter of support from Mayor, with a focus on community benefits. Intent is for a community group to provide this letter of support.</li> </ul>
<b>TOTALS</b>	74	<b>110</b>	Unable to score	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



<b>Watershed Area</b>	Upper San Gabriel River
<b>Project Name</b>	Washington Park
<b>Project Lead</b>	East San Gabriel Valley Watershed Management Group
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$48,400,000
<b>Project Type</b>	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	<b>20</b>	Unable to score	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No Geotech report provided to justify drawdown rate and custom higher 24-hour capacity.</li> <li>Applicant to provide Geotech information to justify these values.</li> </ul>
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	<b>30</b>	Unable to score	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>85<sup>th</sup> percentile calculation seems low. Most of the tributary area is urban. Applicant to provide additional clarity for why 85<sup>th</sup> seems low.</li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	0	<b>13</b>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	12	<b>12</b>	Unable to score	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will change if modifications are made to the drawdown rate and 24-hour capacity</li> <li>Letter of support was not provided from Raymond Basin</li> </ul>
<b>Community Investment</b>	5	<b>10</b>	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Additional graphics and planting palette would be good to see.</li> <li>Parking lot may have the potential for pervious pavement.</li> </ul>
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	10	<b>15</b>	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	0	<b>6</b>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	<b>4</b>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Letter provided from council, with a focus on community benefits. Did council provide community input? Letters from elected officials are beneficial, but intent is to come from a community group.</li> </ul>
<b>TOTALS</b>	81	<b>110</b>	Unable to score	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>



# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



<b>Watershed Area</b>	Upper San Gabriel River
<b>Project Name</b>	Zamora Park Renovation Project
<b>Project Lead</b>	City of El Monte
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$2,000,000
<b>Project Type</b>	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather  Part 1	20	<b>20</b>	Unable to score	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No dimensions provided for the basins, unclear how capacity was calculated.</li> <li>24-hour capacity seems excessively high</li> <li>Applicant to provide details and justification for the capacity.</li> </ul>
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	<b>30</b>	Unable to score	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	0	<b>13</b>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	0	<b>12</b>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Community Investment</b>	5	<b>10</b>	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bus stop enhancements are not on the school property. Does not change score.</li> <li>Applicant noted that students use the city bus at this site.</li> </ul>
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	13	<b>15</b>	13	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	6	<b>6</b>	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	<b>4</b>	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>TOTALS</b>	78	<b>110</b>	Unable to score	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>