

Scoring Committee

Meeting Minutes



December 9, 2021
9:00 AM – 12:00 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
Matt Stone, Santa Clarita Valley Water Agency

No Committee Members were absent.
See attached sign-in sheet for full list of attendees.

1. Welcome and Introductions

District Staff conducted a brief tutorial on WebEx. 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 November 17, 2021, and November 22, 2021

District staff provided the meeting minutes from the previous meetings. Motion to approve the meeting minutes by Member and Vice Chair TJ Moon, seconded by Member Kirsten Schwarz. Committee voted to approve the November 17, 2021 meeting minutes and the November 22, 2021 meeting minutes (approved, see vote tracking sheet).

3. Committee Member and District Updates

District staff provided an update:

- Funds transfer process is initiated; currently setting up transfer agreements for the Round 2 projects and addendums for projects that will continue to receive funding.
- Staff reminded project proponents and Watershed Coordinators to submit quarterly reports, which will be summarized and presented to the WASC at upcoming meetings.
- Form 700 conflict of interest paperwork will be due in April.
- The Board of Supervisors are acting under the authority of AB 361 and have voted to continue holding virtual meetings.

4. Public Comment Period for Non-Agenda Items

Chair Reznik opened the floor for public comments. No public comments were received.

5. Discussion Items:

a. Ex Parte Communication Disclosure

Vice Chair TJ Moon met with the Hartwell Park at Palos Verde Channel Project to discuss scoring. The Vice Chair also met with Daniel App regarding scoring for the LA College projects and with Geosyntec regarding scoring for the Fulton Park Project.

Member Matt Stone received emails about Hartwell Park at Palos Verde Channel Project and provided comments back.

b. Scoring of Feasibility Studies

Central Santa Monica Bay (CSMB)

1. Ladera Heights – W Centinela Ave Green Improvement

Water Quality Part 1 and 2 were awarded 20 and 25 points respectively.

The project received 72 points.

Upper Los Angeles River (ULAR)

1. Acacia Avenue Storm Drain Infiltration Project

Vice Chair Moon had requested additional information on the numbers provided in the portal. The applicant provided the geotechnical report and a letter justifying the Water Supply Benefits of 42 AFY claimed. The number of dry wells was reduced following geotechnical study, so the budget request was revised accordingly. The District noted that the original submittal of \$2.08 million would remain the same and the applicant can clarify their ask during the reporting process. Vice Chair Moon noted that if they were to go with the \$2.08 million, their Water Quality score would be affected. The District clarified that they do not want future applications to tweak numbers after submittal to meet a threshold. They would like to see the original calculations. Chair Reznik proposed the applicant re-run the numbers as originally proposed for scoring in January. The District agreed with that path forward. Vice Chair Moon noted that at least three applicants have changed their requests. The Vice Chair expressed concern about evaluating a cost estimate that is now understood to be incorrect.

Member Dave Sorem clarified that the applicant improved their technical estimates based on an improved understanding of infiltration rates which resulted in an adjustment to the number of dry wells, which impacted the budget. District staff stated that the Scoring Committee can only ask for clarifying information—they cannot function as a working group for improving projects. Applicants cannot make revisions after submittal.

Vice Chair Moon noted that in previous cases, the Committee has not allowed applicants to change their projects following submittal. The project would not pass the Scoring Committee with the originally submitted cost estimate. The Vice Chair suggests re-submitting in July. Chair Reznik agreed and recommended deferring to District recommendation.

The project is unable to be scored.

2. Alexandria Park Stormwater Capture Project

Member Schwarz noted that the applicant has addressed the waterway access question. The Member still finds the application confusing, regarding removal of impermeable area and displacement. The Member has concerns about points claimed for the removal of impermeable area from the temporary tiny home area.

Project applicant, Peter Tonthat, was asked to provide clarification. Mr. Tonthat stated that the tiny home village has a three-year permit as a temporary facility. At the end of the permit,



the tiny home village will be vacated. This project will be situated on the site afterwards and will remove impervious surface as part of the excavation and installation of the infiltration gallery.

Member Schwarz noted that some of the impervious surface removal claimed in the application assumes that the Tiny Home Village will be vacated, so it relies on a loss of affordable housing. Member Diaz expressed caution that the three-year permit may be extended because of the ongoing housing crisis and concurs that awarding full points for impervious surface removal is not appropriate. Both Members recommended 10 of 15 points for Nature-Based Solutions.

Chair Reznik reiterated their concern for how the impervious surface area point calculation allows projects to creatively adjust numbers to gain points. Chair Reznik also noted that the Scoring Committee is not empowered to pursue judgement on larger policy issues (like housing) and suggests the Committee include a note to the WASC to convey these concerns. The Chair also reflected that the project is removing some impervious surface, so zero points would not be appropriate either.

Member Schwarz noted that throughout the proposal the applicant differentiates between the tiny homes and the project when it is advantageous, but they talk about removal of impermeable area in the tiny home area like it is associated with the project. The way they talk about the relationship between the two is inconsistent. In addition, it is hard to make the argument that housing will not be affected by the project. It may be helpful to hear from folks involved with the Tiny Home Village to determine whether there is any possibility that the homes will remain after three years.

Member Stone noted that because construction is not scheduled until 2025, the applicant may want to use this feedback to submit another application.

The project received 59 points and does not meet the 60-point threshold.

3. California Avenue and Adjacent Streets Stormwater Capture Project

The applicant originally requested \$5.3 million but updated their request to \$9.3 million. The applicant will need to resubmit the project in next call for projects. Member Stone noted that the applicant submitted a general letter from the Upper Los Angeles River Area (ULARA) Watermaster and expressed that a letter specific to the project from the Watermaster would be more valuable to the Committee's deliberation.

The project is unable to be scored.

4. Jackson Elementary School Campus Greening and Stormwater Quality Improvement Project

The applicant confirmed the dry well information, dry well rate, and zinc reduction. They also updated the water supply benefits claimed. The project will cost \$3.2 million. Vice Chair Moon concluded that the applicant provided the information requested by the Committee. Member Sorem agreed.

Project received 75 points.



5. North Hollywood Park Stormwater Capture Project

The applicant provided justification for the values requested by the Committee. Member Stone noted that a letter of support from Los Angeles Department of Water and Power was not included, despite being requested. 15 points would have been awarded otherwise.

The project received 65 points.

6. Watts Civic Center Serenity Greenway

The applicant adjusted the funding request by about \$5,000. The Committee noted that the funding request cannot be changed from the original during resubmittal. Vice Chair Moon noted that the application used cubic yards instead of cubic feet, which seems to be a typo. The applicant plans to divert from a large watershed but has a 7.3-acre drainage area capacity in the proposed system. In reality, it will drain into thousands of acres. Member Sorem agreed. The Committee suggested reclassifying as a dry weather project due to the cost effectiveness ratio as a wet weather project. The project applicant commented that the project does drain from a 74-acre area, but only a portion of that water will be used. Water will go into a wet well and only a portion of that flow will be used. Vice Chair Moon noted several metrics are “to be determined” throughout application and suggested making it a dry weather project. Measurements will be needed for final design.

Vice Chair Moon said it would be a dry weather project if it used all of the water from the 74-acre capture area. If the infiltration rate was increased, the project could potentially serve all 74 acres. The Vice Chair thinks more geotechnical studies are needed to justify the infiltration rate and to justify applying as a wet weather project. It is guaranteed that all dry weather runoff would be captured. As a dry weather project, it was awarded 40 of 50 points for Water Quality and 0 for Water Supply Criteria.

Regarding Community Investment, Member Schwarz did not assign points for flood management. Points were awarded for increasing shade, but Member Schwarz encouraged the applicant to include details such as number of trees. 5 of 20 points for Community Investment recommended by Member Schwarz. The Committee awarded the full 15 points for Nature-Based Solutions. Member Schwarz suggested awarding 2 or 3 points of 4 for Leveraging Funds. Member Diaz agreed with the Community Investment and Nature-Based Solutions scores. The Member was willing to award 4 of 4 points for Leveraging Funds because the applicant included feedback from partners and letters of support. Chair Reznik agreed with the Community Investment and Nature-Based Solutions scores. The Chair was between 2 and 3 in the Leveraging Funds Criteria. The Committee decided to award 4 points for Leveraging Funds.

The project received 64 points.

7. Winery Canyon Channel and Descanso Gardens Stormwater Capture and Reuse Project

The applicant provided revised modeling. Vice Chair Moon said that all of the Water Quality Benefits claimed are justified. Member Sorem agreed. Member Stone noted that a calculation for water supply was not provided and neither was a letter from Rain and Basin. It is not clear whether the project will rely on irrigation, infiltration, etc. The project applicant, Mike Rudd, clarified that the water would be used onsite to offset potable water. The project would use 65 acre-feet per year. Infiltration would only be used if the cistern and lake were full during a rainfall event. Then, the water would go to the dry wells. Member Sorem confirmed that



Rudd's clarifications answered their remaining questions. 2 of 2 points were awarded for Water Supply Criteria.

Member Schwarz awarded 5 of 5 points for Community Investments and the full 10 points for Nature-Based Solutions. The Member awarded 5 of 7 points for Leveraging Funds. The Members expressed concern regarding public access to the Gardens. Julian Brook, Executive Director of Descanso Gardens, commented. There is an admissions fee, but the third Tuesday of each month is free. EBT cardholders can enter the for free every day. Brook also noted that school programs are free and one fifth of the schools that visit are Title 1. Chair Reznik agreed with Member Schwarz's scores for Community Investment and Nature-Based Solutions. The Chair suggested awarding 5 or 6 points for Leveraging Funds. Member Diaz agreed with Chair Reznik. The Chair pushed for 6, since they are a nonprofit and the project provides a good opportunity for public-private partnership.

The project received 64 points.

8. LA Crescenta Green Improvement Project

Vice Chair Moon noted that the pollutant metrics were confirmed, so the scoring can be finalized.

The project received 65.

South Santa Monica Bay (SSMB)

1. Fulton Playfield Multi-Benefit Infiltration Project

Vice Chair Moon noted that previously, the infiltration ranged from 0.25 to 1 and the applicant had used a value of 1 in their analysis. The Vice Chair had recommended using the average or the lower rate of 0.25 to be conservative. The Vice Chair had also asked for an explanation of how the system works. The applicant has provided an explanation and adjusted the drawdown rate. The update caused water quality score to decrease by 5 points. 45 of 50 points were awarded for Water Quality. Member Sorem agreed.

The project received 63 points.

2. LA Harbor College Central and West Campus Underground Infiltration and Biofiltration Project

The applicant provided geotechnical information to justify the water quality metrics and the effective drawdown rate was recalculated. The applicant updated their water quality score, from 27 to 41. The basin dimensions in the application were also updated from 2.09 to 2.3. Vice Chair Moon recommended awarding the original 27 points because points cannot be increased due to an update to the project. Chair Reznik agreed.

The applicant claimed full points for impermeable area due to removal of area in parking lot. Member Schwarz noted that the Committee wasn't sure if that area should be considered part of the project. They did not see a clear calculation. Member Schwarz recommended awarding 1 point for impermeable area removal. Nature-Based Solutions score changed from 10 to 11. A letter from the Regional Oversight Committee was not included. Member Schwarz recommended 5 of 10 points for Community Investment and 7 of 10 points for Leveraging Funds. Member Diaz agreed with all three scores.

Scoring Committee

Meeting Minutes



The Committee asked the District if the applicant's proposed score can change. The District explained that they cannot change application information to maximize points. They may submit a stronger application in a later call for applications.

The project received 51 points and does not meet the 60-point threshold.

3. Wilmington-Anaheim Green Infrastructure Corridor Project

Member Stone noted that the project just surpasses the 100-acre threshold. Vice Chair Moon added that a desktop geotechnical analysis and other additional information was provided, so the project may be scored. Member Stone noted that the Water Replenishment District (WRD) letter did not express support for this specific project. Member Stone recommends awarding 0 of 5 points for Water Supply. Vice Chair Moon recommends the full 37 points for Water Quality but asks that a more fleshed out geotechnical report be submitted next time.

Seth Carr from the City of Los Angeles commented and clarified that the Feasibility Report was provided to WRD for their letter. Mr. Carr assumed the individual support letter would be needed during the design phase and is not sure what more could have been done. An element of the project, a bioswale, was included in the Saint Peter and Paul Catholic school. Trees may be included there as well. The applicant will work with the school during the design phase to see what they are comfortable with.

Member Schwarz said that with the school component, the project will still have 5 of 10 points for community investment. Member Stone noted that they still cannot whether the project provides a water supply benefit. Previous applicants have provided materials to demonstrate why basin recharge would benefit nearby wells.

The project received 56 points and does not meet the 60-point threshold.

6. Public Comment Period for Agenda Items

Chair Reznik opened the floor for public comments.

Shahriar Eftekhazadeh (SEITec) commented regarding the North Hollywood Park Stormwater Capture Project. They did not see a requirement for a letter about Water Supply Criteria for Los Angeles Department of Water and Power. Chair Reznik replied that a letter from a water master or water agency is needed to show that the project will be beneficial. District staff noted that the requirement is located in the second sub-bullet of the feasibility guidelines section 3.2 on Water Supply Benefits.

Sarkis Oganessian (City of Glendale) commented about the City of Glendale projects. They were initially asked to provide supporting geotechnical data and clarify costs. In considering the Committee's comments, the City conducted additional site-specific research that supported updated infiltration characteristics and construction costs. The improved infiltration rates reduced the total project costs. In making updates in the online portal, they were asked to update water quality information. There was no guidance showing that pricing could not be changed. The City of Glendale feels they have produced competitive projects with more efficient facilities and improved construction costs. They believe the projects should be considered for this round. Mr. Oganessian thanked the Committee for their time and consideration.

Chair Reznik deferred to the District and the Committee. District staff said the application updates went beyond clarification of information – the application itself was updated and reworked. The feedback from the Scoring Committee can be used to make a stronger application in the future or be used for the TRP route. Member Sorem understands the District's point but does not want to see them penalized for decreasing their project costs. Vice Chair Moon said that other applications would need to be allowed the

Scoring Committee

Meeting Minutes



opportunity to change their application if they allowed the City of Glendale. Chair Reznik said the Committee has time to think on it before scores are approved at the next meeting in January. The Chair suggested District staff direct the Committee towards language regarding re-submissions if that exists. Mr. Oganessian noted that the number of infiltration facilities was not reduced – the facilities were made more efficient. They also noted that they would not have made the facilities more efficient if they had known that would remove their project from consideration.

Phuoc Le (City of Los Angeles) commented regarding the Wilmington-Anaheim Green Infrastructure Corridor Project. Mr. Le asked if a letter from another Agency could be acquired to increase points. The District questioned why the letter was not originally included. Vice Chair Moon said they do not think an unconfined aquifer exists in the Wilmington area, so no projects in that area can claim that benefit. The Vice Chair recommends providing matching funds to increase points in the future.

Sheila Brice provided public comment as part of the team that helped Glendale develop the two projects under consideration and affirmed that the team was unaware that they could not adjust the project as they responded to the Scoring Committee's request for information. Ms. Brice concluded by thanking the Committee and requested the projects be considered this round.

Member Stone noted the California Avenue project proponents have a similar issue with the ULARA Watermaster general letter. A more project-specific concurrence about increased aquifer recharge from the watermaster would be needed for the Scoring Committee to allocate groundwater recharge water supply points.

7. Voting Items:

- a. Send all projects with passing scores from the November 22, 2021 Scoring Committee meeting to their respective WASCs
 - i. Apollo Park Stormwater Capture Project
 - ii. Willow Springs Park Wetland Restoration and Expansion Project
 - iii. Vincent Lugo Park Stormwater Capture Project
 - iv. Pico Canyon Park Stormwater Improvements Project
 - v. Glendora Avenue Green Streets
 - vi. Marchant Park
 - vii. Pelota Park

- b. Contact and allow all unscorable project applicants 1 week to provide clarifying information to Scoring Committee
 - i. Salt Lake Park Infiltration Cistern

Member Sorem motioned to send the projects to their respective WASCs and to contact unscorable project applicants. Member Schwarz seconded. The Committee voted. Motion approved.

8. Items for Next Agenda

The next meeting is scheduled for January 10, 2022, 1 – 4 PM. See SCW website for meeting details.

- a. Scoring of Resubmitted Feasibility Studies

9. Adjournment

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

SCORING COMMITTEE MEETING - December 9, 2021

Member Type	Quorum Present		Voting Items	
	Member	Voting?	11/17 & 11/22 Meeting Minutes	Voting Item 7a + 7b
Water Supply	Matt Stone	x	A	A
Water Quality / Community Investments Benefits / Nature-Based Solutions	Kirsten Schwarz	x	Y	Y
Community Investments Benefits	David Diaz	x	Y	Y
Nature-Based Solutions / Water Quality	Bruce Reznik	x	Y	Y
Water Quality	Dave Sorem	x	Y	Y
Water Quality	TJ Moon	x	Y	Y
Total Non-Vacant Seats	6	Yay (Y)	5	5
Total Voting Members Present	6	Nay (N)	0	0
		Abstain (A)	1	1
		Total	6	6
			Approved	Approved

Other Attendees	
Art Castro	Margaret Novak
Brad Parks	Mary Breckell
brett perry	Mathew Hudson
Cesar Roldan	Michael Drennan
Clarasophia Gust	Michael Scaduto
Conor Mossavi	Michele Farmer
Curtis Fang	Mikaela Randolph
Daniel Rydberg	Mike Rudd
David Pohl	Mujahid, Michael
Eileen Alduenda	Noel Le
Elizabeth Gallo	Oliver Galang
emily ramos	Paul Senker
geraldine trivedi	Peter Tonthat
Ghina M Yamout	Phuoc Le
Gus Orozco	Rafael Piamonte
Heather Merenda	Sarkis Oganessian
ilene ramirez	Scott Struck
jayden Smith	SETH CARR
Jill Zander	Shahriar Eftekhazadeh
Jillian Brickey	Sheila Brice
Johanna Chang	Somer Sherwood-White
Jonathan Lee	Taylor McCauley
Jose Rodriguez	Thom Epps
Juliann Rooke	Tori Klug
Kara Plourde	Wendy Dinh
Laureen Abustan	
Lorena Matos	

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2022-2023



Watershed Area	Central Santa Monica Bay
Project Name	Ladera Heights - W Centinela Ave Green Improvement
Project Lead	Los Angeles County Public Works
Total Funding Requested	\$500,000
Project Type	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	20	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Series of drywells (67) and bioswales
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	5	10	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Quantified amount of trees and bioswales Engagement more about informing community than outreach 6 trees not adequate for heat island effect reduction
Nature-Based Solutions	14	15	14	<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	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not strong community support
TOTALS	74	110	72	<ul style="list-style-type: none">

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2022-2023



Watershed Area	Upper Los Angeles River
Project Name	Acacia Avenue Storm Drain Infiltration Project
Project Lead	City of Glendale
Total Funding Requested	\$2,086,500
Project Type	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	20		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Request for additional details, need additional justification Revised budget request and reduced number of dry wells
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	25	30		<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Water Supply Part 1	0	13		<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Water Supply Part 2	2	12		<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Community Investment	5	10	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Nature-Based Solutions	10	15	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Leveraging Funds Part 1	N/A	6	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Leveraging Funds Part 2	0	4	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
TOTALS	62	110	Unable to score	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Applicant can resubmit or be considered for TRP

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2022-2023



Watershed Area	Upper Los Angeles River
Project Name	Alexandria Park Stormwater Capture Project
Project Lead	Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (LADWP)
Total Funding Requested	\$7,019,000
Project Type	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	7	20	7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Close to capturing 85th % storm. Recommendation to change size of BMP to obtain additional points
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	20	30	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Water Supply Part 1	0	13	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Water Supply Part 2	2	12	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Community Investment	10	10	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Design not clear on access to waterways Need additional information Concerns over displacement of tiny home village Does project truly increase pervious area? Have addressed access to waterways Concern over impermeable area
Nature-Based Solutions	15	15	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Issue with removal of affordable housing
Leveraging Funds Part 1	6	6	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	4	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
TOTALS	64	110	59	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does not meet points threshold

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2022-2023



Watershed Area	Upper Los Angeles River
Project Name	California Avenue and Adjacent Streets Stormwater Capture Project
Project Lead	City of Glendale
Total Funding Requested	\$5,320,000
Project Type	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	20		• Needs more information
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	20	30		•
Water Supply Part 1	3	13		•
Water Supply Part 2	5	12		•
Community Investment	5	10	5	•
Nature-Based Solutions	10	15	10	•
Leveraging Funds Part 1	N/A	6	0	•
Leveraging Funds Part 2	0	4	0	•
TOTALS	63	110	Unable to score	• Will need to submit in next call for projects round

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2022-2023



Watershed Area	Upper Los Angeles River
Project Name	Jackson Elementary School Campus Greening and Stormwater Quality Improvement Project
Project Lead	Amigos de los Rios (ADLR) and Pasadena Unified School District (PUSD)
Total Funding Requested	\$3,018,148
Project Type	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	20	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cannot calculate scores with given data in application Provided requested information
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	30	30	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Water Supply Part 1	0	13	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Water Supply Part 2	0	12	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Community Investment	5	10	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increase due to active community use of school
Nature-Based Solutions	11	15	11	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Leveraging Funds Part 1	0	6	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	4	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strong community support
TOTALS	70	110	75	<ul style="list-style-type: none">

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2022-2023



Watershed Area	Upper Los Angeles River
Project Name	North Hollywood Park Stormwater Capture Project
Project Lead	SEITec
Total Funding Requested	\$68,229,081
Project Type	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	20	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Request for additional information to demonstrate how various values were calculated Provided requested app justification values
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	25	30	25	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Water Supply Part 1	3	13	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No letter of support attached from LADWP, if provided would have awarded 15 pts for Water Supply 1+2
Water Supply Part 2	12	12	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Community Investment	10	10	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No points for enhancing access to waterway and greening of school
Nature-Based Solutions	15	15	15	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Leveraging Funds Part 1	N/A	6	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	4	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> One way outreach. Need clarity on entities supporting project
TOTALS	89	110	65	<ul style="list-style-type: none">

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2022-2023



Watershed Area	Upper Los Angeles River
Project Name	Watts Civic Center Serenity Greenway
Project Lead	City of Los Angeles, Council District 15
Total Funding Requested	\$2,664,000
Project Type	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	20	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Applicant should provide additional information to justify inconsistencies in values throughout the application No geotech report to justify infiltration rate Changed funding request Recommend classifying project as dry weather Wet weather info unknown until there is more geotech data
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	30	20	•
Water Supply Part 1	0	13	0	•
Water Supply Part 2	0	12	0	•
Community Investment	10	10	5	• Points for increasing trees and shade
Nature-Based Solutions	15	15	15	•
Leveraging Funds Part 1	0	6	0	•
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	4	4	• Strong community support
TOTALS	79	110	64	•

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2022-2023



Watershed Area	Upper Los Angeles River
Project Name	Winery Canyon Channel and Descanso Gardens Stormwater Capture and Reuse Project
Project Lead	Descanso Gardens Guild, Inc.; City of La Canada Flintridge
Total Funding Requested	\$6,848,600
Project Type	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	11	20	11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provided requested supporting info
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	30	30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to add a drawdown rate in app • Revised calcs requested
Water Supply Part 1	0	13	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
Water Supply Part 2	2	12	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
Community Investment	5	10	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
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	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Several letters of support from conservation groups
TOTALS	65	110	64	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2022-2023



Watershed Area	Upper Los Angeles River
Project Name	La Crescenta Green Improvement Project
Project Lead	County of Los Angeles
Total Funding Requested	\$1,500,000
Project Type	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	20	20	•
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	20	30	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to adjust drawdown rate • Provided requested justification
Water Supply Part 1	0	13	0	•
Water Supply Part 2	2	12	2	•
Community Investment	5	10	5	•
Nature-Based Solutions	10	15	10	•
Leveraging Funds Part 1	6	6	6	•
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	4	2	•
TOTALS	67	110	65	•

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2022-2023



Watershed Area	South Santa Monica Bay
Project Name	Fulton Playfield Multi-Benefit Infiltration Project
Project Lead	City of Redondo Beach
Total Funding Requested	\$4,292,138
Project Type	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	20	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recommend using a lower more conservative infiltration rate (0.25 cfs). Update application. Adjusted drawdown rate to 0.25 cfs
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	30	25	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Water Supply Part 1	6	13	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Water Supply Part 2	5	12	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Community Investment	10	10	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not part of a school
Nature-Based Solutions	15	15	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Leveraging Funds Part 1	0	6	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	4	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Outlined community identified needs
TOTALS	90	110	63	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Add explanation of how detention basin works

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2022-2023



Watershed Area	South Santa Monica Bay
Project Name	Los Angeles Harbor College Central and West Campus Underground Infiltration and Biofiltration Project
Project Lead	Los Angeles Community College District & BuildLACCD
Total Funding Requested	\$3,152,758
Project Type	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	7	20	7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Need justification of how effective drawdown rate and stormwater use was determined Provided requested geotech info
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	20	30	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Water Supply Part 1	0	13	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Water Supply Part 2	0	12	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Community Investment	10	10	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minimal park space and recreation enhancement
Nature-Based Solutions	15	15	11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Removal of impermeable area
Leveraging Funds Part 1	6	6	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	4	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Have not engaged benefitting DACs Need to provide referenced letter of support
TOTALS	62	110	51	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does not meet points threshold

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2022-2023



Watershed Area	South Santa Monica Bay
Project Name	Wilmington-Anaheim Green Infrastructure Corridor Project
Project Lead	City of Los Angeles, Bureau of Sanitation and Environment
Total Funding Requested	\$12,808,258
Project Type	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	7	20	7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Need verification of how infiltration rate was determined No geotech report or plans provided
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	30	30	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Water Supply Part 1	0	13	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Water Supply Part 2	5	12	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Need to provide proof of water supply benefit General letter of support from WRD
Community Investment	10	10	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project not in a school
Nature-Based Solutions	11	15	11	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Leveraging Funds Part 1	N/A	6	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	4	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
TOTALS	67	110	56	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does not meet points threshold