

Scoring Committee

Meeting Minutes



Wednesday, November 17, 2021
10:00 AM – 1:00 PM
WebEx Meeting

Committee Members Present:

Bruce Reznik, LA Waterkeeper, Chair
Dave Sorem, Mike Bubalo Construction Co., Inc
TJ Moon, LA County Public Works, Vice-Chair
Kirsten Schwarz, UCLA
David Diaz, Active SGV

Committee Members Absent:

Matt Stone, Santa Clarita Valley Water Agency

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

1. Welcome and Introductions

District staff conducted a brief tutorial of the WebEx platform. Bruce Reznik, Chair of the Scoring Committee, welcomed Committee Members and called the meeting to order. All Committee Members made self-introductions and a quorum was established.

2. Approval of Meeting Minutes from October 19, 2021 and revised Meeting Minutes from October 5, 2021

District staff provided the meeting minutes from the previous meetings. Motion to approve the meeting minutes by Vice Chair TJ Moon, seconded by Member Dave Sorem. Member Sorem abstained from approving the October 19th minutes due to his absence. The Committee voted to approve the October 19th, 2021 meeting minutes and revised meeting minutes from October 5th, 2021 (approved, see vote tracking sheet).

3. Committee Member and District Updates

District Staff provided an update:

- The District has initiated the process of sending fund transfer agreements. Addendums for Year 1 projects are already out and initial agreements for Year 2 projects were distributed.
- Regional program project proponents are required to submit quarterly reports and annual. The last quarterly report was due November 15th.
- Webinars were conducted on November 15 and 18 to review the online reporting module for the annual report, which is due December 31, 2021. The recordings and Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) will be posted on the District website at: <https://safecleanwaterla.org/municipalities/>
- On November 2, the Board of Supervisors voted to continue meeting virtually, acting under the authority of Assembly Bill 361 which authorizes public committees to meet without complying with all the teleconferencing requirements of the Brown Act when the situation warrants it. The Board is reviewing every 30 days and will act to cover all the commissions and committees under their authority.

Chair Reznik presented with Lisa Rap from City of Lakewood at the California Stormwater Quality Association (CASQA) conference and shared that the Accelerate Resilience LA (ARLA) is developing

Scoring Committee

Meeting Minutes



additional metrics around Safe, Clean Water Program and how to prioritize investments. They will be launching a county-wide effort next year.

4. Public Comment Period for Non-Agenda Items

Terrick Gutierrez (Public Member) spoke in support of Destination Crenshaw, a reparative development project that will transform a 1.3-mile stretch of Crenshaw Boulevard into a commercial corridor linked by community spaces and pocket parks. The project will also reforest the corridor and commission works of art by local Black artists. The project focuses on workforce development through economic development, job creation and environmental healing while elevating Black art and culture. The Angeles Mesa Green Infrastructure Corridor Project will build on Destination Crenshaw's work. The project will add new trees and landscaping features in the nearby residential areas, create walkable connections to nearby schools, capture stormwater, and contribute to long-term sustainability of the community and region. Destination Crenshaw fully supports LA San's request for funding for this project. (see attached public comment form)

Roberto Perez (Public Member) spoke on behalf of the Park Mesa Heights community in support of the Angeles Mesa Green Infrastructure Corridor Project. The Park Mesa Heights community is burdened by construction along the Metro Crenshaw line. Council members are in support of improving the quality of life for their residents by advancing long-term sustainability through the construction of the Infrastructure Corridor. (see attached public comment form)

Fernando Navarrete, Public Works Deputy for LA City Council Member Joe Buscaino, spoke in support of the Wilmington-Anaheim Green Infrastructure Corridor Project. Navarrete shared that the community lacks adequate tree canopy, and the project will help increase stormwater capture and improve streets, especially for those with disabilities. The project aligns with the City's goal to further environmental justice.

Donald Moorer, Principal of Crenshaw High School, submitted a public comment form in support of the Angeles Mesa Green Infrastructure Project. The school is in a neighborhood with some of the greatest economic hardships and environmental hazards in the state of California. The project will make streets surrounding the school safer, more beautiful, and more sustainable. Moorer is excited to work together to design a project that maximizes benefits to the neighborhood and to the environment. (see attached public comment form)

5. Discussion Items:

a. Ex Parte Communication Disclosure

Vice Chair Moon met with Geosyntec Consultants regarding the Descanso Garden project to clarify the scoring of that project proposal. Vice Chair Moon also exchanged emails with Daniel Apt regarding the LA Harbor College project as well.

Member Sorem participated in a Zoom meeting with the LA County Flood Control District to discuss Measure W.

b. Scoring of Feasibility Studies

Central Santa Monica Bay (CSMB)

1. Angeles Mesa Green Infrastructure Corridor Project

Water Quality: Vice Chair Moon disagreed with the application's calculations. If the applicant would like to use the infiltration facility BMP, they need to provide justification for how the numbers were calculated. The Vice Chair recommends switching to the infiltration well BMP and indicating the number of dry wells and the capacity. The Vice Chair also pointed out that

Scoring Committee

Meeting Minutes



the applicant is asking for construction funding, but they did not provide a geotechnical study. The applicant is claiming NRCS soil with poor infiltration (>1 inch per hour), but the assumptions in the calculations are that each drywell will infiltrate 0.5 CFS. Manufacturer's specs point out only 0.25 CFS max per dry well. Vice Chair Moon suggests creating a new monitoring plan for each project especially when asking for construction funding and noted that the effective drawdown rate should be recalculated for infiltration wells.

Water Quality Part 1 can still be awarded 20 points, but Part 2 of the analysis needs to be redone, so they are unable to score it.

Brett Perry of LA San expressed willingness to provide additional information and mentioned that Attachment 2.1 should provide some clarification on calculations. Vice Chair Moon specified that the Scoring Committee needs to see more information on dry well infiltration rates, or suggests they use Dry Well BMP for simplicity. Michael Scaduto of LA San asked for additional clarification and guidance about the specific information that they should provide in their application.

The Scoring Committee was unable to score the Water Quality Criteria.

Water Supply: The CSMB Watershed Area does not confer Water Supply Benefits because there is no unconfined aquifer. The applicant did not provide a water supply letter, so they receive 0 points for Water Supply Part 2.

Member David Diaz asked whether the Committee should continue to score the project if one of the criteria is unscorable. Chair Reznik replied that the Scoring Committee should continue to score the project so that the applicant can receive feedback on the entire application to better inform their reapplication.

Community Investment: Member Schwarz awarded 5 points, noting the flood management and greenway planning benefits but the lack of improvements to public waterways or recreational opportunities. The Member noted that it's unclear whether the project provides direct improvements to the school. The project received points for addressing the local heat island effect and increasing vegetation. Given that the project is not on a school campus, Member Diaz and Chair Reznik both agreed to 5 points.

Nature-Based Solutions: The project's design mimics infiltration and uses native, drought-tolerant plants. Member Diaz and Chair Reznik both agreed to award 10 points.

Leveraging Funds Part 1: Applicant did not claim points.

Leveraging Funds Part 2 (Community Support): The project is located within a disadvantaged community (DAC) that has very high park needs. The project received a support from the community and a robust plan for the future is in place. Member Schwarz awarded 3 points. Chair Reznik originally awarded 0 points for the lack of access to waterways and absence of recreation enhancements, but the Committee agreed to award 3 points because of the robust future plan.

Conclusion: The project was deemed unable to score and awaits additional information from the applicant.



2. Edward Vincent Jr. Park Stormwater Improvements Project

Water Quality: Stormwater improvements will divert stormwater into 3 different BMPs: infiltration BMP facility, dry creek BMP and a bioretention BMP. Vice Chair Moon confirmed the applicants' score of 14 points for Part 1 and 30 points for Part 2. Member Sorem agreed.

Water Supply: The Committee confirmed the applicant score of 0 for Parts 1 and 2.

Community Investment: Member Schwarz assigned 10 points for access to waterways, recreational opportunities, and heat island reduction/shade. Member Diaz asked if there is a tree trunk size required to claim points.

Nature-Based Solutions: Member Schwarz assigned 10 points for flood management and flood risk mitigation, the planting of 30 new native trees and vegetation, and the installation of a new walking paths and boardwalk over the bioretention area. Member Schwarz noted that the project also mimics infiltration.

Leveraging Funds Part 1: Applicant did not claim points.

Leveraging Funds Part 2 (Community Support): The project is located within a DAC that has great park needs. The applicant held three workshops and obtained 16 letters of support. Member Schwarz awarded 3 points. Member Diaz and Chair Reznik proposed awarding 4 points and Member Schwarz concurred.

Conclusion: The project received 68 points.

3. West Los Angeles College Soccer Field Basin Dry Well Project

Water Quality: Vice Chair Moon believes the storage volume calculations need to be updated. Vice Chair Moon asked the applicant to confirm total capacity is 1.5 CFS, not 3.3 CFS. Member Sorem agreed that the project cannot be scored. Vice Chair Moon noted their appreciation for the applicant showing their calculations in the application.

Water Supply: The project did not claim Water Supply Benefits; Vice Chair Moon concurs.

Community Investment: Member Diaz is unsure mitigation will effectively reduce flooding at the soccer field, but still awarded 5 points. Chair Reznik and Member Schwarz also expressed concerns, but agreed to award 5 points.

Nature-Based Solutions: Member Diaz and Member Schwarz agreed to award 5 points.

Leveraging Funds Part 1: Member Diaz, Member Schwarz, and Chair Reznik agreed to award 6 points.

Leveraging Funds Part 2 (Community Support): The Committee awarded 1 point because not much outreach has occurred. Member Schwarz noted that the letter of support referenced in the application was not included; Chair Reznik requested the applicant share the letter. Committee members recommend getting support from students, the soccer team, etc.

Conclusion: The project was deemed unable to score until applicant comes back with requested additional information as noted above.



Lower San Gabriel River

4. Stormwater Treatment and Reuse (STAR) System Hacienda Park

Water Quality: Vice Chair Moon recommended adjusting drainage capture area from 4.2 acres to 3.8 acres and requested the applicant provide validation for the drawdown rate and zero out stormwater use. Vice Chair Moon was not able to score Part 1 but concurred with the applicant's score of 25 points for Part 2.

Water Supply: The applicant did not claim Water Supply Benefits.

Community Investment: Member Schwarz agreed with the applicant's self-score of 5 points but disagreed that the project provides recreation enhancements or irrigation use benefits. Member Diaz concurred.

Nature-Based Solutions: Committee members agreed with the applicant's score of 10 points but had questions about soils and native vegetation use.

Leveraging Funds Part 1: Committee members agreed with the applicant's score of 3 points.

Leveraging Funds Part 2 (Community Support): The applicant needs to provide details about support from community representatives. Only 1 letter of support from a resident was provided. Member Schwarz awarded 1 point.

Conclusion: The project was deemed unable to score. Chair Reznick mentioned the application is improving since it was initially submitted.

5. Artesia Park Stormwater Capture Project

The project will divert stormwater runoff from an existing drain. The groundwater table is at 10 feet, so they cannot infiltrate on-site. The project will treat and release the water back into the storm drain and divert some runoff into a streambed at the park.

Water Quality: The applicant indicated that the project should be scored as a dry-weather project because area is too large for a wet-weather project. Vice Chair Moon concurred with the applicant's scores of 20 points for Part 1 and 20 points for Part 2.

Water Supply: Vice Chair Moon mentioned this is a treated release project. It's not clear how the water will be used, so the Committee awarded 0 points. Member Sorem and Chair Reznik agreed. More information about potential sewer diversion could have allowed the project to claim Water Supply Benefits. Chair Reznik noted that when a project is reclassified from wet weather to dry weather, it will not receive flood reduction credit in Community Investment Criteria.

Community Investment: Member Diaz noted that the project only provides passive recreation benefits and so to be consistent across the program, the Committee should only award 5 points. Member Schwarz highlighted that the trees to be planted may only be replacing those lost during construction and agreed to only award 5 points. Chair Reznik would prefer to see more detail about community investment but noted that the project is only requesting design funding. The applicant needs to provide details about net gain for heat island reduction due to trees.

Nature-Based Solutions: Member Diaz agreed with applicant score of 12 points. Member Schwarz agreed. Vice Chair Moon mentioned that there is a parking lot area that the applicant could use to gain an extra point.



Leveraging Funds Part 1: The project did not leverage funds and was therefore awarded 0 points.

Leveraging Funds Part 2 (Community Support): Member Diaz did not think the project conducted robust community outreach and was therefore open to awarding 1 or 2 points. Member Schwarz awarded 2 points. Noted that there are 2 letters of support.

Conclusion: The project was deemed unable to score. Applicant to provide additional information on the potential sewer diversion.

6. Bellflower Simms Park Stormwater Capture Project (Construction)

Water Quality: Vice Chair Moon confirmed applicant's scores for Part 1 and Part 2. Part 2 is only 25 points because the capture volume is a little bit short of the 85th percentile.

Water Supply: No infiltration is possible because of the high groundwater level. The project will have to treat and release or use on-site. The project will also have a permeable parking lot with bioswales.

Vice Chair Moon mentioned the project should not be awarded points for replacing grass turf with artificial turf, nor should they be awarded points for the dry weather runoff being collected at a downstream park (Mayfair Park). Vice Chair Moon needs more information. As described, the project is seeking credit for Water Supply Benefits while a different park is collecting the runoff. 0 points were awarded. Member Sorem agreed.

Community Investment: Member Schwarz gave points for flood management, bioswales, native habitat and heat island reduction. For increasing the number of trees and shade, it is unclear if the trees planted are just replacing those that are lost. Chair Reznik and Members Schwarz and Diaz agreed with the 5 points claimed by the applicant.

Nature-Based Solutions: Member Schwarz agreed to award 12 points for the use of bioswales and native vegetation, and the removal of impermeable area.

Leveraging Funds Part 1: The project had a small amount of cost share, but not enough to receive points.

Leveraging Funds Part 2 (Community Support): The applicant conducted two outreach events but did not provide details on how feedback was incorporated. The applicant did provide letters of support. Member Schwarz suggested awarding 2-3 points. Member Diaz would have liked to see more participatory engagement and suggested awarding 1-2 points. Chair Reznik agreed with 2 points.

Conclusion: The project received 64 points.

7. Heartwell Park at Clark Channel Stormwater Capture Project

Water Quality: The applicant is only requesting Phase 1 funding, but the benefits claimed in the application assume completion of the full project. The applicant claims 92% pollutant reduction whereas module gives 76%, because they represent reduction in captured water only. This does not align with how other projects are scored. Vice Chair Moon concurred with the Part 1 score of 20 points and recommends reducing Part 2 to 25 points, given the noted pollutant reduction discrepancies. Chair Reznik asked for clarification about how the applicant's assumption of full implementation (for Phase 1 and Phase 2 of the project) would impact the cost-effectiveness score. Vice Chair Moon could not deduce which project

Scoring Committee

Meeting Minutes



elements would be achieved in Phase 1 versus Phase 2 and is therefore unable to assess how incorporating Phase 2 costs—or removing Phase 2 benefits—would impact the score.

Water Supply: Vice Chair Moon awarded 0 points for Part 1 and suggested awarding 2 points for Part 2; Member Sorem agreed.

Per Member Stone's note to Vice Chair Moon, Member Stone noted the applicant claims the project will replenish the pond to provide a Water Supply Benefit and wants to use those water to supplement irrigation, but there is already recycled water at the park. The applicant is asking for full construction funding. Member Stone questioned whether this situation should count towards a Water Supply Credit. Vice Chair Moon questioned whether the project should receive the Water Supply Benefit if it offsets recycled water, rather than potable water.

Chair Reznik clarified that the lake is currently refilled using potable water. Chair Reznik also noted that the applicant is using calculations for the entire cost of the project, which could offset the cost benefit when split into separate phases.

Community Investment: Members Diaz and Schwarz agreed to award 10 points. Member Schwarz noted that the project appears to add a new recreational path. Chair Reznik questioned the flood reduction benefit, but ultimately agreed to award 10 points.

Nature-Based Solutions: Members Diaz and Schwarz agreed to award 10 points.

Leveraging Funds Part 1: The project did not provide cost share, so 0 points were awarded.

Leveraging Funds Part 2 (Community Support): Member Diaz noted that although it is a large project, minimal engagement has been documented. Member Diaz suggested awarding toward 1-2 points. Member Schwarz concurred with 1-2 points and noted that there has been no engagement with the adjacent DAC. Member Schwarz encouraged more participatory engagement methods. Chair Reznik also voiced a desire to see more engagement for a project this large. The Committee agreed to award 1 point.

Conclusion: Project applicant Richard Watson voiced that they wanted to be sensitive to the limited availability of funds but did not answer the question about what benefits would be achieved through Phase 2 only. Member Sorem asked about the amount that would be captured with only Phase 1, and Vice Chair Moon and Chair Reznik asked for clarity on what is represented in Phase 1. Chair Reznik asked Vice Chair Moon and Member Sorem how the cost effectiveness score would change if they used the full Phase 1 and Phase 2 cost. Vice Chair Moon shared that water supply points would go down to 0, and there may be an impact to the community investments score, related to flood reduction benefit.

The project received 68 points.

8. Heartwell Park at Palo Verde Channel Stormwater Capture Project

Water Quality: The applicant did their own modeling. They claim 52% pollutant reduction benefits, whereas the module only indicates 45% because the project only reduces pollutants in the captured water. Vice Chair Moon recommends classifying this as a dry weather project, but still awards 20 points for Part 2. Vice Chair Moon noted that the Community Investment Credit may be reduced because of the loss of the flood reduction benefit.

Water Supply: Vice Chair Moon stated the application is not clear on how flows will be utilized. When asking for construction funding, plans should be clearer. Will the project have onsite irrigation or sewer diversion?

Scoring Committee

Meeting Minutes



Community Investment: Member Schwarz assigned 5 points. Member Schwarz did not award points for recreation and noted that flood reduction benefit points need to be removed since it's now classified as a dry weather project. Member Schwarz also noted that there are only 4 additional trees, not 8.

Nature-Based Solutions: Members Schwarz and Diaz awarded 10 points for the biofiltration basin and addition of native trees and shrubs.

Leveraging Funds Part 1: The project did not provide cost share so 0 points were awarded.

Leveraging Funds Part 2 (Community Support): The applicant did not conduct any specific outreach with the nearby DAC. The only documented outreach was one-way. The Members expressed a desire for adopting a more participatory engagement methodology. Members Schwarz and Diaz agreed that 1 point should be awarded.

Conclusion: The project was deemed unable to score. Need more information to score Water Supply Criteria.

Oliver Galang (Craftwater Consultants) clarified the water supply will be from a sanitary sewer. The Phase 1 component will give the city options to do an initial dry weather project and Phase 2 would be bioretention.

Chair Reznik asked where the runoff will be directed. Oliver Galang and Richard Watson replied that the runoff will be conveyed to the City of Long Beach's water resources program.

Chair Reznik suggested rescoring the project in December and noted that further discussion can be held separately after this meeting.

9. Lakewood Equestrian Center

Water Quality: Due to high groundwater levels, the project cannot infiltrate on-site and will instead provide treated release. Vice Chair Moon concurred with the applicant's scores for Parts 1 and 2.

Water Supply: Vice Chair Moon concurred with the applicant's score and noted that they should confirm, when requesting construction funds.

Community Investment: Member Diaz expressed uncertainty about the recreational benefit and is torn between awarding 5 and 10 points. Member Schwarz awarded 5 points, noting that some trails will be made ADA accessible, but the other benefits are less clear. In particular, it is unclear whether there will be a net gain of vegetation or trees. Chair Reznik and Member Diaz concurred with awarding 5 points.

Nature-Based Solutions: Members Diaz and Schwarz awarded 10 points.

Leveraging Funds Part 1: Member Diaz awarded 3 points.

Leveraging Funds Part 2 (Community Support): Member Diaz noted that the applicant documented how feedback from the community was incorporated in the design and suggested awarding 4 points. Chair Reznik and Member Schwarz agreed that the project is exemplary in how it conducted community engagement and incorporated feedback into the design.

Conclusion: The project received 72 points.



10. York Field Stormwater Capture Project

Water Quality: Vice Chair Moon concurred with the applicant's scores for Parts 1 and 2 (20 points each).

Water Supply: Vice Chair Moon mentioned potential sewer diversion. The applicant is only asking for design funding; points related to construction will be evaluated when the project applies for construction funding.

Chair Reznik noted that the water supply is partly infiltrated in Central Basin and partly diversion to wastewater treatment plant that treats 37.5 million gallons per day (mgd) and only recycles 5 mgd so getting more water won't necessarily lead to more recycled water. The Chair agreed to award 2 points, but suggested the Committee think through the policy surrounding how to credit stormwater diversion to treatment county as a Water Supply Benefit when the treatment plant isn't recycling 100% of the water it treats.

Community Investment: Member Schwarz concurred with the 5 points claimed by the applicant.

Nature-Based Solutions: Members Schwarz and Diaz awarded 11 points.

Leveraging Funds Part 1: The Committee agreed to award the 3 points claimed by the applicant.

Leveraging Funds Part 2 (Community Support): Member Schwarz noted that the applicant is planning future outreach activities and provided 7 letters of support. Members Schwarz and Diaz proposed awarding 2-3 points. Chair Reznik agreed to award 3 points.

Conclusion: The project received 64 points.

c. Meeting Schedule

November 22nd meeting confirmed. The November 23rd hold was released – there will be no meeting that day. The December 9th meeting will be focused on rescored projects.

Per District staff proposal, a second (and final) rescored meeting will be held on January 10th, 2022 from 1:00 – 4:00 PM.

6. Public Comment Period for Agenda Items

There were no public comments.

7. Voting Items

Vice Chair Moon introduced a motion to send all projects to their WASCs for consideration. Seconded by Member Schwarz, the motion passed.

- a. Send all projects with passing scores from the October 19, 2021 Scoring Committee meeting to their respective WASCs
 - i. Echo Park Lake Rehabilitation Operation and Maintenance
 - ii. Downtown Lomita Multi-Benefit Stormwater Project
 - iii. Hermosa Beach Multi-Benefit Parking Lot Greening Project (Lot D)
 - iv. Machado Lake Ecosystem Rehabilitation (MLER) Operations and Maintenance
 - v. West Rancho Dominguez - San Pedro Street Green Improvement
 - vi. Liberty Canyon Road Green Improvement

Scoring Committee

Meeting Minutes



- b. Contact and allow all unscorable project applicants 1 week to provide clarifying information to Scoring Committee
 - i) La Crescenta Green Improvement Project
 - ii) Fulton Playfield Multi-Benefit Infiltration Project
 - iii) LA Harbor College Central & West Campus Underground Infiltration & Biofiltration Project
 - iv) Wilmington-Anaheim Green Infrastructure Corridor Project

8. Items for Next Agenda

- a. Scoring of Feasibility Studies for LLAR, RH, SCR and USGR.

9. Adjournment

Chair Reznik thanked committee members and district staff and adjourned the meeting.

SCORING COMMITTEE MEETING - November 17, 2021

Member Type	Quorum Present		Voting Items	
	Member	Voting?	10/19 & rev-10/05 Meeting Minutes	Voting Item 7a & 7b
Water Supply	Matt Stone			
Water Quality / Community Investments Benefits / Nature-Based Solutions	Kirsten Schwarz	x	Y	Y
Community Investments Benefits	David Diaz	x	A (10/19) Y (10/5)	A
Nature-Based Solutions / Water Quality	<u>Bruce Reznik</u>	x	Y	Y
Water Quality	Dave Sorem	x	Y	Y
Water Quality	TJ Moon	x	Y	Y
Total Non-Vacant Seats	6	Yay (Y)	4	4
Total Voting Members Present	5	Nay (N)	0	0
		Abstain (A)	0	1
		Total	4	5
			Approved	Approved

Other Attendees	
Amanda Zeidner	Michelle Staffield
Annelisa Moe	Oliver Galang
Ashleigh Townsen	Richard Watson
Brad Parks	Roberto Perez
Brenda Ponton	Seth Carr
Brett Perry	Shahram Kharaghani
Bryce Lee	Sheila Brice
Cameron Castillo	Simon Fowell
Chris Carandang	Sunshine Saucedo
Christopher Rochfort	Susie Santilena
Daniel Apt	Terrick Gutierrez
Dustin Bambic	Trevor Davis
Fernando Navarrette	Vicki Smith
Greg de Vinck	Vik Bapna
Gustavo Orozco	Wendy Dinh
Ilene Ramirez	Yale
Jacky Cervantes	Cecilla Salazar
Jason Casanova	Conor Mossavi
Jasenia Maldonado	Curtis Fang
Jim Rasmus	Greg Sands
John Hunter	Jacqueline Mak
Katie	Michelle Kim
Lorena Matos	Thom Epps
Mary Breckell	Wataru Kumagai
Michael Scaduto	

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2022-2023



Watershed Area	Central Santa Monica Bay
Project Name	Angeles Mesa Green Infrastructure Corridor Project
Project Lead	City of Los Angeles, LA Sanitation and Environment
Total Funding Requested	\$8,401,432
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"> • Need storage volume justification • Recommend using 'Dry Well' BMP type
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"> • Need justification for 0.5 cfs, since dry well manufacturer spec has max rate of 0.25 cfs • Recommend a new monitoring plan specific to project
Water Supply Part 1	0	13	0	•
Water Supply Part 2	5	12	0	•
Community Investment	10	10	5	• No points for greening schools
Nature-Based Solutions	10	15	10	•
Leveraging Funds Part 1	N/A	6	0	•
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	4	3	• Robust future plan
TOTALS	79	110	Unable to score	•

- TO BE VOTED BY SCORING COMMITTEE -

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2022-2023



Watershed Area	Central Santa Monica Bay
Project Name	Edward Vincent Jr. Park Stormwater Improvements Project
Project Lead	City of Inglewood
Total Funding Requested	\$4,270,000
Project Type	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	14	20	14	•
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	5	12	0	• No water supply support letter, no recharge potential
Community Investment	10	10	10	•
Nature-Based Solutions	10	15	10	•
Leveraging Funds Part 1	N/A	6	0	•
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	4	4	• Had 3 workshops, 16 letters of support
TOTALS	73	110	68	•

- TO BE VOTED BY SCORING COMMITTEE -

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2022-2023



Watershed Area	Central Santa Monica Bay
Project Name	West Los Angeles College Soccer Field Basin Dry Well Project
Project Lead	Los Angeles Community College District & BuildLACCD
Total Funding Requested	\$399,967
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"> Confirm total capacity is 1.5 cfs
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	25	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	5	15	5	<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	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would be great to get support from students, soccer team, etc Missing letter of support
TOTALS	65	110	Unable to score	<ul style="list-style-type: none">

- TO BE VOTED BY SCORING COMMITTEE -

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2022-2023



Watershed Area	Lower San Gabriel River
Project Name	Stormwater Treatment and Reuse System (STAR System) Hacienda Park (re-submittal with leveraged funds)
Project Lead	City of La Habra Heights
Total Funding Requested	\$644,000
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"> • 0 out stormwater use • Provide documentation for drawdown rate • Drainage area incorrect
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	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	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No irrigation use
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	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vague details on community meetings/outreach • Only 1 letter of support from resident
TOTALS	72	110	Unable to score	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •

- TO BE VOTED BY SCORING COMMITTEE -

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2022-2023



Watershed Area	Lower San Gabriel River
Project Name	Artesia Park Stormwater Capture Project
Project Lead	City of Artesia
Total Funding Requested	\$1,250,502
Project Type	Dry

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	20	20	•
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	20	30	20	•
Water Supply Part 1	0	13	0	•
Water Supply Part 2	5	12	Unable to score	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not clear how water will be used. • Provide more detail regarding sewer diversion
Community Investment	10	10	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Passive recreation • Need to detail net gain for heat island reduction due to trees
Nature-Based Solutions	12	15	12	•
Leveraging Funds Part 1	N/A	6	0	•
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	4	2	• No robust community outreach
TOTALS	71	110	Unable to score	•

- TO BE VOTED BY SCORING COMMITTEE -

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2022-2023



Watershed Area	Lower San Gabriel River
Project Name	Bellflower Simms Park Stormwater Capture Project (Construction)
Project Lead	City of Bellflower
Total Funding Requested	\$15,666,700
Project Type	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	20	20	•
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	25	30	25	•
Water Supply Part 1	0	13	0	•
Water Supply Part 2	2	12	0	• Lacks detail for Mayfair Park diversion
Community Investment	5	10	5	• Lacks clarity on net tree gain
Nature-Based Solutions	12	15	12	•
Leveraging Funds Part 1	0	6	0	•
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	4	2	• No details on outreach
TOTALS	68	110	64	•

- TO BE VOTED BY SCORING COMMITTEE -

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2022-2023



Watershed Area	Lower San Gabriel River
Project Name	Heartwell Park at Clark Channel Stormwater Capture Project
Project Lead	City of Long Beach
Total Funding Requested	\$23,874,000
Project Type	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	20	20	•
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	30	25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pollutant reduction number not accurate, use online number • Recommend using trash as secondary pollutant
Water Supply Part 1	0	13	0	•
Water Supply Part 2	2	12	2	•
Community Investment	10	10	10	• New recreational benefit
Nature-Based Solutions	10	15	10	•
Leveraging Funds Part 1	N/A	6	0	•
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	4	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lacks community outreach detail • No specific outreach with adjacent DAC
TOTALS	76	110	68	•

- TO BE VOTED BY SCORING COMMITTEE -

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2022-2023



Watershed Area	Lower San Gabriel River
Project Name	Heartwell Park at Palo Verde Channel Stormwater Capture Project
Project Lead	City of Long Beach
Total Funding Requested	\$10,695,000
Project Type	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	20	20	•
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	20	30	20	• Recommend classifying as dry weather project
Water Supply Part 1	0	13	0	•
Water Supply Part 2	5	12	Unable to score	• Not clear on how flows will be utilized
Community Investment	10	10	5	• No points for recreational opportunities
Nature-Based Solutions	10	15	10	•
Leveraging Funds Part 1	N/A	6	0	•
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	4	1	• No specific outreach to nearby DAC • One way exchange of info
TOTALS	69	110	Unable to score	•

- TO BE VOTED BY SCORING COMMITTEE -

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2022-2023



Watershed Area	Lower San Gabriel River
Project Name	Lakewood Equestrian Center
Project Lead	City of Lakewood
Total Funding Requested	\$1,114,794
Project Type	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	20	20	•
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	25	30	25	•
Water Supply Part 1	0	13	0	•
Water Supply Part 2	5	12	5	• Confirm when requesting construction funds
Community Investment	10	10	5	• Unclear if there is a net gain for vegetation/trees
Nature-Based Solutions	10	15	10	•
Leveraging Funds Part 1	3	6	3	•
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	4	4	•
TOTALS	77	110	72	•

- TO BE VOTED BY SCORING COMMITTEE -

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2022-2023



Watershed Area	Lower San Gabriel River
Project Name	York Field Stormwater Capture Project
Project Lead	City of Whittier
Total Funding Requested	\$1,873,720
Project Type	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	20	20	•
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	20	30	20	•
Water Supply Part 1	0	13	0	•
Water Supply Part 2	2	12	2	• Confirm when requesting construction funding
Community Investment	5	10	5	•
Nature-Based Solutions	11	15	11	•
Leveraging Funds Part 1	3	6	3	•
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	4	3	• No specific outreach to DAC
TOTALS	65	110	64	•

- TO BE VOTED BY SCORING COMMITTEE -

