

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Committee



---

### **Meeting Minutes:**

Wednesday, January 12, 2021  
9:00am – 12:00pm  
WebEx Meeting

### **Attendees**

#### Committee Members Present:

Matt Stone	Bruce Reznik
J.R. De Shazo	TJ Moon
Jill Sourial	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.

### **2) Approval of Meeting Minutes from December 21, 2020**

The District provided copies of the meeting minutes for December 21, 2020. Bruce Reznik asked the committee members for comments or revisions.

J.R. De Shazo made a motion to approve the meeting minutes. Jill Sourial seconded the motion. The Committee voted to approve the meeting minutes from December 21, 2020 (unanimous, see Voting Tracking Sheet)

### **3) Approval of Meeting Minutes from January 5, 2021**

The District provided copies of the meeting minutes for January 5, 2021. Bruce Reznik asked the committee members for comments or revisions.

J.R. De Shazo made a motion to approve the meeting minutes. Dave Sorem seconded the motion. The Committee voted to approve the meeting minutes from January 5, 2021 (unanimous, see Voting Tracking Sheet).

### **4) Approval of Meeting Minutes from January 6, 2021**

The District provided copies of the meeting minutes for January 6, 2021. Bruce Reznik asked the committee members for comments or revisions.

J.R. De Shazo made a motion to approve the meeting minutes. Dave Sorem seconded the motion. The Committee voted to approve the meeting minutes from January 6, 2021 (unanimous, see Voting Tracking Sheet).

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

Kirk Allen provided the District updates, noting: District has received 76 executed Transfer Agreements to date. However, there are 10 Transfer Agreements that are outstanding. Cities were reminded to submit their Transfer Agreements along with required documentation, Annual Plans, authorizations, and direct deposit certifications. Cities that have already submitted can contact the District for a status update. As for Regional Transfer Agreements, the District is continuing to receive executed Transfer Agreements and is

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Committee



---

currently reviewing the Scopes of Work (Exhibit A). Additionally, Regional Transfer Agreements applicants were reminded to submit CEQA documentation (if applicable) for District review and determination. The District will be executing the Transfer Agreements upon complete submissions. Finally, this is the last scheduled project scoring Committee meeting, after today's scoring all Infrastructure Program Project reviews will be completed. Applicants that need to provide clarifying information are requested to submit information through the Project Portal. The District will provide a list of those projects to the Scoring Committee for review and scoring. Multiple meetings may be required to score all the projects. Watershed Coordinators (WC) for three Watershed Areas have been selected, as follows: North Santa Monica Bay WASC selected Melina Sempill Watts Consulting LLC., South Santa Monica Bay WASC selected Heal the Bay, and Santa Clara River WASC selected TreePeople Inc. At upcoming WASC meetings, the remaining WC will be selected. There will be a total of 12 contracts for WC services.

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

A member of the Public asked a question (See Public Comment Card).

TJ Moon addressed the Public Comment card noting that several questions have been received regarding the Geotechnical information being requested. The intent is to verify the applicant's infiltration rate number. Geotechnical testing is probably the best, however; existing data from nearby projects using existing soil borings would be acceptable depending on the Best Management Practices (BMP). Member of the Public asked if NRCS data can be used NRCS data is for surface infiltration rates. For example, if surface features are above ground, like green street elements, then the NRCS data could perhaps be used, if it is reputable. However, in the case of dry wells in the streets or some sort of infiltration basin that goes 50 ft. deep, then NRCS data is not appropriate. In this case, other justification to confirm your infiltration rate number would be necessary. Again, it depends on the BMP being submitted. Geotechnical information would be best, or nearby project soil information is also acceptable. Dave Sorem reiterated that there is enough readily available information if a Geotechnical Report is not provided. LA County Public Works has soil reports on most projects and readily available.

Member of the Public asked: Is data being required that shows infiltration rates at a depth below the surface?

TJ Moon addressed the Public Comment noting that it depends on the proposed BMP. For example, if proposing a 100 ft. drywell a soil report would be necessary.

### **7) Discussion Items:**

#### **a) Ex Parte Communications Disclosure**

Bruce Reznik is part of Our Water LA and has received outside communication regarding projects that need to go through the re-scoring process, however, he has not addressed any communication received and will be able to be more specific in the next Committee meeting.

#### **b) Scoring of Feasibility Studies**

*(See attached scoring rubric)*

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Committee



LSGR	1	Stormwater Treatment and Reuse System (STAR System) Hacienda Park
	2	Artesia Park Stormwater Capture Project
	3	Bellflower Simms Park Stormwater Capture Project
	4	Cerritos Sports Complex
	5	Heartwell Park at Palo Verde Channel
SSMB	6	Beach Cities Green Streets Project
	7	Portuguese Bend Landslide Complex Mitigation Project
	8	SSMB Water Quality Enhancement: 28th Street Storm Drain Infiltration Project
	9	Stormwater Basin Expansion Project
	10	Torrance Airport Storm Water Basin Project, Phase 2 Construction

### 8) Meeting Schedule

Next meeting is scheduled for January 25, 2021 from 1PM to 4PM for rescoring considerations. Bruce Reznik noted that calendar reminders will need to be updated as the original time was from 1PM to 3PM with the understanding that a few Committee members will be signing off at 3PM.

Tentative meeting, if necessary, January 27, 2021 from 1PM to 4PM to complete any rescoring considerations if not completed at the January 25, 2021 meeting.

### 9) Public Comment Period for Agenda Items

No public comments received.

### 10) Voting items:

- a) Send all passing scores from January 5 and 6, 2021 to the WASCs

J.R. De Shazo made a motion to send passing scores from January 5, 2021 and January 6, 2021 to the WASCs. Dave Sorem seconded the motion. The Committee voted to approve the motion. (unanimous, see Voting Tracking Sheet)

- b) Contact and allow all non-passing or unscorable project applicants 1 week to provide clarifying information to the Scoring Committee.

Dave Sorem made a motion to contact and allow all non-passing or unscorable project applicants 1 week to provide clarifying information to Scoring Committee. J.R De Shazo seconded the motion. The Committee voted to approve the motion. (unanimous, see Voting Tracking Sheet)

### 11) Adjournment

Mr. Bruce Reznik reminded Committee members that the next meeting will be held on January 25, 2021 and calendar reminders will be updated. Members that will be signing off early were advised to provide scores to J.R. De Shazo (Vice Chair) in advance.

TJ Moon requested confirmation on the amount of time applicants will have to resubmit clarifying information and when Committee members will be notified. Kirk Allen stated that applicants have 1

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Committee



---

business week to respond and that the Committee would receive a notification at the end of the week and will also be posted on the website. Bruce Reznik recommended providing applicant's clarifying information as it is received. Kirk Allen noted request.

Bruce Reznik requested a motion and second to adjourn.

J.R. De Shazo made a motion to adjourn. Jill Sourial seconded the motion.

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

Meeting adjourned.

## SCORING COMMITTEE MEETING - January 12, 2021

Member Type	Quorum Present		Voting Items				
	Member	Voting?	Meeting Minutes Dec-21	Meeting Minutes Jan-5	Meeting Minutes Jan-6	Voting Item 9a	Voting Item 9b
Water Supply	Matt Stone	X	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Water Supply / Water Quality	<b>J.R. De Shazo</b>	X	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Nature-Based Solutions / Community Investments Benefits	Jill Sourial	X	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Nature-Based Solutions / Water Quality	<b>Bruce Reznik</b>	X	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Water Quality	Dave Sorem	X	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Water Quality	TJ Moon	X	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Total Non-Vacant Seats	6	Yay (Y)	6	6	6	6	6
Total Voting Members Present	6	Nay (N)	0	0	0	0	0
		Abstain (A)	0	0	0	0	0
		Total	6	6	6	6	6
			Approved	Approved	Approved	Approved	Approved

Other Attendees	
Alexis Holmdal	Nick S
Alison Sweet	Oliver Galang
Brenda Ponton	Phuoc Le
Bryce Lee	Richard Watson
Carmen Andrade	Scorr Struck
Christine McLeod	Thom Epps
Conor Mossavi	Vik Bapna
Curtis Fang	Brett Perry
Dustin Bambic	Chris Carandang
Gustavo Orozco	Michael Omary
Ilene Ramirez	Katie M
Jacqueline Mak	Paul Glenn
James Cramsie	Y Liu
Joe Venzon	D L
John Hunter	Humphrey Egezeze
Lisa Skutecki	Katie Harrel
Lorena Matos	Shahriar Eftekhazadeh
Lynda Bybee	Susie Santilena
Maritsa Garcia	Prem Kumar
Mike Antos	
Mo Estepa	

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



<b>Watershed Area</b>	Lower San Gabriel River
<b>Project Name</b>	Stormwater Treatment and Reuse System (STAR System) Hacienda Park
<b>Project Lead</b>	City of La Habra Heights
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$859,000
<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	20	20 To be confirmed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Oversized for 85<sup>th</sup> percentile</li> <li>p.16: Unclear what drawdown rate of 11.8 in/hr is from. No Geotech provided.</li> <li>p.16 Unclear what the 24-hour capacity is from.</li> <li>Applicant to verify these two figures. And to confirm if these are from evapotranspiration.</li> </ul>
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	25	30	25 To be confirmed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Applicant used their own modeling system, would be better for consistency to use WMMS.</li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	0	13	0	•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	0	12	0	•
<b>Community Investment</b>	10	10	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Access to waterway, is a viewing terrace considered access. Committee will need to provide additional clarity for future applications.</li> </ul>
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	10	15	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unclear if the STAR system is natural. Committee discussion noted it's similar to modular wetlands.</li> <li>Would be beneficial to know how much of the vegetation is new vegetation.</li> </ul>
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	0	6	0	•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	4	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Single letter from a resident. Intent for strong community support is geared more towards community groups.</li> </ul>
<b>TOTALS</b>	69	110	69 To Be Confirmed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No budget shown for O&amp;M? Applicant to confirm this and other info requests.</li> </ul>

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



<b>Watershed Area</b>	Lower San Gabriel River
<b>Project Name</b>	Artesia Park Stormwater Capture Project
<b>Project Lead</b>	City of Artesia
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$1,250,502
<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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project not quite dry or wet. Classification as dry weather.</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	5	<b>12</b>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Potential for irrigation listed in application, unclear if this will be built or not. Applicant also claims groundwater recharge.</li> <li>Applicant to provide calculation for irrigation demand and amount of stormwater benefit claimed</li> <li>p.100 of application does not indicate how the project dry weather would provide irrigation demand</li> </ul>
<b>Community Investment</b>	10	<b>10</b>	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Dry weather project claiming flood benefit. Applicant provides detailed justification for this benefit.</li> <li>Improved access to water ways claimed due to creation of ephemeral stream. Committee discussion noted this does not meet the intent of this CI benefit.</li> </ul>
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	12	<b>15</b>	12	<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>	71	<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>	Lower San Gabriel River
<b>Project Name</b>	Bellflower Simms Park Stormwater Capture Project
<b>Project Lead</b>	City of Bellflower
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$2,141,987
<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	25	<b>30</b>	25	• Project slightly just below 85 <sup>th</sup> percentile score.
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	0	<b>13</b>	0	•
<b>Water Supply</b>  Part 2	2	<b>12</b>	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supply is noted as potential irrigation. Unclear if this will be incorporated.</li> <li>• p.144 Modeled dry weather flow does not appear to meet irrigation demand. Application notes removal of turf. Is demand being removed?</li> <li>• Applicant provided clarification on supply benefit.</li> </ul>
<b>Community Investment</b>	5	<b>10</b>	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More detail would be beneficial for the CI benefits claimed.</li> <li>• Artificial turf may cause issues with heat island and injuries. Community feedback requested year round play. Does not impact score.</li> </ul>
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	12	<b>15</b>	12	• Artificial turf used for project.
<b>Leveraging Funds</b>  Part 1	3	<b>6</b>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prop 68 funding is not yet approved. Committee discussion noted that additional scoring guidance should be provided on this topic by ROC, District, or SC.</li> <li>• Applicant noted that grant is not guaranteed, and is being reapplied for from a previous declined application.</li> </ul>
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	<b>4</b>	4	•
<b>TOTALS</b>	71	<b>110</b>	68	•



# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



<b>Watershed Area</b>	Lower San Gabriel River
<b>Project Name</b>	Cerritos Sports Complex
<b>Project Lead</b>	City of Cerritos
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$2,408,000
<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	10	<b>13</b>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Applicant notes only the potential for water supply. Unclear if this is going to be constructed and realized. P. 116, 117: Benefits claimed for sewer discharge, on-site irrigation, and recharge.</li> <li>• Groundwater recharge not applicable for this project.</li> <li>• Application is for design funding.</li> <li>• Applicant noted large amount of water used for irrigation.</li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	12	<b>12</b>	12	• Would be beneficial to see additional detail for the CI benefits.
<b>Community Investment</b>	10	<b>10</b>	5	• Application claims flood benefit as a dry weather. Would not get flood benefit.
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	12	<b>15</b>	12	•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	0	<b>6</b>	0	•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	0	<b>4</b>	0	•
<b>TOTALS</b>	84	<b>110</b>	69	•

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



<b>Watershed Area</b>	Lower San Gabriel River
<b>Project Name</b>	Heartwell Park at Palo Verde Channel
<b>Project Lead</b>	City of Long Beach
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$1,539,676
<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>Applicant applied for wet weather, should be reclassified as Dry weather. Project is significantly smaller than the 85<sup>th</sup> percentile. Would preserve the same 40 points.</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	5	<b>12</b>	5 To Be Confirmed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Applicant used their own value for water supply. Unclear if supply to be used for irrigation?</li> <li>Golf course is currently served with recycled water. Unclear if conversion from recycled to stormwater yields new supply.</li> <li>Applicant noted that recycled supply does not meet the needs of the golf course. New stormwater provides irrigation water with the option for discharge to sewer.</li> <li>Applicant to provide additional clarification on supply benefit.</li> </ul>
<b>Community Investment</b>	5	<b>10</b>	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>With dry weather reclassification would not be able to claim Flood Benefit. Does not impact score.</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>	64	<b>110</b>	64 To Be Confirmed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



<b>Watershed Area</b>	South Santa Monica Bay
<b>Project Name</b>	Beach Cities Green Streets Project
<b>Project Lead</b>	City of Torrance
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$2,595,000
<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	20	Unable to Score	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Applicant aggregating all numbers of the 7 locations.</li> <li>Would be beneficial to see details on how the project parameters were aggregated.</li> <li>Infiltration rate is an aggregate number, but no detail to justify</li> <li>Applicant to provide additional detail and justification to claim WQ benefit.</li> </ul>
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	30	Unable to Score	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Application claims 85<sup>th</sup> percentile capture, but there's no documentation on what the 85<sup>th</sup> percentile is.</li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b>  Part 1	3	13	Unable to Score	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Application claims supply benefit but there is not groundwater recharge in the beach cities. There's no information on any discharge to sewer or other supply options.</li> <li>Insufficient information to justify.</li> <li>Application notes site is located at a seawater barrier, and would contribute to the barrier.</li> <li>Applicant to provide additional detail and justification to claim supply benefit.</li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	2	12	Unable to Score	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Community Investment</b>	5	10	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Would be beneficial to see more detail and justification, such as the type of trees planted.</li> </ul>
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	10	15	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Application notes replacement of pavement with pervious pavement, but there's no points claimed.</li> </ul>
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	6	6	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Cost share appears to be just less than 50%, unclear how full points awarded. Missing \$45k somewhere.</li> </ul>
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	0	4	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>TOTALS</b>	76	110	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>	South Santa Monica Bay
<b>Project Name</b>	Portuguese Bend Landslide Complex Mitigation Project
<b>Project Lead</b>	City of Rancho Palos Verdes
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$1,875,000
<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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project is more a landslide mitigation project. Applicant classifies as a dry weather project.</li> <li>A portion of the project aims to seal fissures in hillside. Is this a SCW eligible expenditure.</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	2	<b>12</b>	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project to capture flows and divert to sewer. Is this diversion recycled downstream? Application is only asking for design currently.</li> </ul>
<b>Community Investment</b>	10	<b>10</b>	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project classified as a dry weather project, not clear if Flood benefit can be claimed.</li> <li>Project discusses groundwater dewatering, unclear if this is a CI benefit.</li> <li>Unclear if trails are new or existing that go to the coast.</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>	66	<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>	South Santa Monica Bay
<b>Project Name</b>	South Santa Monica Bay Water Quality Enhancement: 28th Street Storm Drain Infiltration Project
<b>Project Lead</b>	City of Manhattan Beach (Mamerto Estepa Jr., Prem Kumar, and Shawn Igoe)
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$17,620,030
<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	25	<b>30</b>	25	•
Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2				
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	6	<b>13</b>	0	• Providing supply directly into a tidal zone does not qualify for supply.
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	12	<b>12</b>	0	•
<b>Community Investment</b>	2	<b>10</b>	2	• Reduction of Heat island from 3 trees does not seem justifiable.
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	13	<b>15</b>	13	•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b>  Part 1	3	<b>6</b>	3	• 23% match appears to be lower than the bar to reach 3 points. • Applicant noted that there's a module discrepancy of present value vs life cycle cost values. • Committee noted application claims monitoring and O&M. • Does not impact score.
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	<b>4</b>	4	•
<b>TOTALS</b>	85	<b>110</b>	67	•

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



<b>Watershed Area</b>	South Santa Monica Bay
<b>Project Name</b>	Stormwater Basin Expansion Project
<b>Project Lead</b>	City of Torrance
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$4,505,000
<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>Project already exists with some capacity, unclear if only delta capacity should be considered.</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	13	<b>13</b>	Unable to Score	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unclear if all benefit is from recharge, located in Torrance near the coast. Would not reach usable groundwater. Suggest using only irrigation supply. Is recharge of the barrier eligible. More detail needed to justify if barrier benefit provided.</li> <li>Unclear again if only delta benefit is included.</li> <li>Applicant noted that this area contains a well, so project is providing benefit vs to barrier protection.</li> <li>More detail on the exact benefit is needed in application</li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	12	<b>12</b>	Unable to Score	<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></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	0	<b>4</b>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>TOTALS</b>	90	<b>110</b>	65	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Applicant to provide justification on supply benefit to the WASC.</li> </ul>

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



<b>Watershed Area</b>	South Santa Monica Bay
<b>Project Name</b>	Torrance Airport Storm Water Basin Project, Phase 2 Construction
<b>Project Lead</b>	City of Torrance
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$12,000,000
<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>	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Applicant provided their own WQ modeling.</li> <li>Construction costs seem low.</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	6	<b>13</b>	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sewer diversion for downstream recycling.</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>	2	<b>10</b>	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	0	<b>15</b>	0	<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>Letters are from Cities and the County, and are for a 2016 proposition application, not for SCW project. Does not meet the intent of the strong community support.</li> </ul>
<b>TOTALS</b>	74	<b>110</b>	70	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>



# Public Comment Form

Name:\* Alexis Holmdal Organization\*: Stantec  
Email\*: alexis.holmdal@stantec.com Phone\*: 617-314-7117  
Meeting: Scoring Committee: January 12 Meeting Date: 1/11/2021

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](mailto: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](mailto: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

Can the Scoring Committee please confirm that we can use publicly available information that has been published by reputable agencies (such as saturated hydraulic conductivity from NRCS) to estimate infiltration rates for a feasibility study being submitted to the Safe, Clean Water Program?

If using publicly available information is not sufficient, can the Scoring Committee please explain where it states in the "Safe, Clean Water Program: Feasibility Study Guidelines" guidance document that in-situ infiltration testing is required prior to project submission?