

Scoring Committee

Meeting Minutes



October 6, 2022
9:00am - 12:00pm
WebEx Meeting

Committee Members Present:

Bruce Reznik, LA Waterkeeper (Nature-Based Solutions/Water Quality), Chair
Dave Sorem, Mike Bubalo Construction Co., Inc (Water Quality)
TJ Moon, LA County Public Works (Water Quality), Vice-Chair
David Diaz, Active SGV (Community Investments)
Matt Stone, Santa Clarita Valley Water Agency (Water Supply)

Committee Members 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 September 1, 2022

District Staff presented the meeting minutes from the previous meeting. Motion to approve the meeting minutes by Vice-Chair TJ Moon, seconded by Member David Diaz. The Committee voted to approve the September 1, 2022 meeting minutes, with four votes in favor and one in abstention (approved, see vote tracking sheet).

3. Committee Member and District Updates

District staff provided an update:

- On September 27, 2022, the Board of Supervisors (Board) 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. The Board is reviewing its position every 30 days.
- On September 27, 2022, the Board reopened the Board hearing room to the public. Special guidelines will be in place, including masking required for all attendees and occupancy is limited to 100 public attendees. Enhanced air filtration equipment has been installed in the Board hearing room.
- On October 4, 2022, all nine Stormwater Investment Plans (SIPs) were approved by the Board.
- The Round 4 Call for Projects for Fiscal Year 2023-2024 (FY23-24) closed on July 31, 2022. The total count of applications is as follows: 33 Infrastructure Program (IP), 4 Scientific Study (SS), and 4 Technical Resource Program (TRP) applicants.
- Quarterly Reports from project developers are due on November 15, 2022 and will be discussed at future WASC meetings. Past-due reports must still be completed even if no project activities have occurred.
- As a reminder to project developers that have received or will be receiving Safe, Clean Water Program (SCWP) funds, part of the transfer agreement includes abiding by the County's local and targeted worker hire policy or a similar policy. Depending on the cost of the project, a Project Labor Agreement will be required from one of the financial partners.

Scoring Committee

Meeting Minutes



- Attending meetings regularly is a requirement for Scoring Committee members under Article 5 of the Operating Guidelines. An absence of two consecutive meetings or more than five meetings in one year will be considered failure to attend meetings and may result in the absentee member's removal from the SC. If attendance by the Primary member is not possible for a particular meeting, it is requested that the Alternate Member be present at the meeting.
- Every Committee Member is required to fill out Form 700. A Form 700 is required when a member is assuming office for the first time (part of the onboarding process), continuing to serve on a committee (annual requirement), or leaving a committee (part of the offboarding process). District Staff will contact individuals who need to fill out these forms.

Chair Reznik shared an update that Kirsten Schwarz has resigned from the Scoring Committee and District staff will facilitate the process of identifying a replacement.

4. Public Comment Period for Non-Agenda Items

District staff compiled all public comment cards received by 5:00pm the day before the meeting, loaded them to the SCWP website, and displayed them on-screen. Speaker cards or other correspondence received after 5:00pm will be added to the minutes.

Three comment cards were received and Chair Reznik summarized each letter.

Michael Sweeney (Eagle Rock Neighborhood Council) voiced support for the Eagle Rock Boulevard: A Multi-Modal Stormwater Capture Project.

5. Discussion Items:

a) Ex Parte Communication Disclosure

Vice-Chair Moon disclosed that he had answered an email from a project applicant, the Cordoba Corporation, regarding the website module. District Staff was included in this correspondence.

As part of Our Water LA, Chair Reznik disclosed meetings with various departments from the City of Los Angeles and the County of Los Angeles that covered some of the projects for discussion today.

b) Scoring of Feasibility Studies

The tables below for each project contains information recorded on the scoring rubric sheet during the scoring committee meeting. The scoring rubric sheet, as recorded during the meeting, captures a project's evaluation by the Scoring Committee.

Scoring Committee Meeting Minutes



Project: Via Princessa Park and Regional BMP Project			WASC(s): SCR
Category	Applicant Score	Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality	Part 1: 20 Part 2: 30	Unable to score	See below
Water Supply	Part 1: 13 Part 2: 12	Unable to score	See below
Community Investment	5	5	
Nature-Based Solutions	10	10	
Leveraging Funds Part 1	3	3	
Leveraging Funds Part 2 (Community Support)	4	2	See below
Conclusion: The project is unable to be scored.			
Discussion:			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Water Quality:</u> Vice-Chair Moon noted that the inches of stormwater treated in 24 hours is calculated incorrectly. The result should be around 1-1.5 inches and the calculation should use a hydrograph. Vice-Chair Moon requests that the applicant recalculate, as the result affects the project score. Vice-Chair Moon also mentioned that the cost of operation and maintenance (O&M) is notably low, and requests that the applicant recalculate O&M since this value affects cost effectiveness. • <u>Water Supply:</u> Vice-Chair Moon noted that the volume of storage assumes open space but should instead be the volume of the perforated pipe being used for infiltration. The resulting volume should be less, which affects total capacity, so this must be recalculated before scoring. The applicant also assumes an inflow rate that is too high, which inflates the water supply benefits. Vice-Chair Moon requests that the applicant confirm the representative dry weather flow. Member Stone agreed with Vice-Chair Moon, commenting that the Committee is unable to score this section until water supply estimates are recalculated. • <u>Leveraging Funds Part 2 (Community Support):</u> Member Diaz noted that while there was engagement in 2008 and again recently, there are no clear letters of support or commitments from the contacted organizations listed in the application. Communication is apparent with the mobile home community's manager, but it is less clear that communication extended to actual residents. 			

Project: Cornell – Mulholland Highway Green Improvement Project			WASC(s): NSMB
Category	Applicant Score	Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality	Part 1: 11 Part 2: 25	Part 1: 11 – to verify Part 2: 25	See below
Water Supply	Part 1: 0 Part 2: 0	Part 1: 0 Part 2: 0	
Community Investment	5	5	
Nature-Based Solutions	10	10	
Leveraging Funds Part 1	6	Unable to score	See below

Scoring Committee Meeting Minutes



Project: Cornell – Mulholland Highway Green Improvement Project		WASC(s): NSMB	
Leveraging Funds Part 2 (Community Support)	4	1	See below
Conclusion: The project is unable to be scored.			
Discussion:			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Water Quality:</u> Vice-Chair Moon noted that the calculations for distributed BMP were slightly unclear but generally seemed appropriately sized. Because the applicant is requesting design funds only, Vice-Chair Moon is comfortable with their score. Vice-Chair Moon noted that the impervious area seems very low compared to the total capture area. Member Dave Sorem noted that the cost effectiveness ratio is on the border of 0.6. Points awarded under Water Quality Part 1 would drop from 11 to 7, should construction costs increase. There are concerns that capital construction costs may be underestimated and O&M costs may be overestimated. <u>Leveraging Funds Part 1:</u> Member Diaz noted that is unclear how much funding is already secured and would need clarification before confirming the score. <u>Leveraging Funds Part 2 (Community Support):</u> The project received letters of support, but engagement does not seem community led or include participatory engagement. <p>Chair Reznik recognized the difficulty of generating qualifying projects in the NSMB watershed area but maintained that this project falls short on multiple categories. The Committee noted that NSMB needs a separate scoring system and suggested the MMS study should help.</p>			

Project: Arroyo Seco Projects		WASC(s): ULAR	
Category	Applicant Score	Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality	Part 1: 11 Part 2: 30	Part 1: 11 – to verify Part 2: 30 – to verify	See below
Water Supply	Part 1: 0 Part 2: 05	Part 1: 0 Part 2: 5 – to verify	See below
Community Investment	10	5	See below
Nature-Based Solutions	10	10	
Leveraging Funds Part 1	0	0	See below
Leveraging Funds Part 2 (Community Support)	4	2	See below
Conclusion: The project received 63 points, but the Scoring Committee will rescore this project to verify final points.			
Discussion:			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Water Quality:</u> Vice-Chair Moon noted the application is difficult to follow since there was no description of the overall schematic to explain how the pipes and facilities are all connected in this distributed approach. Hydrology areas did not match throughout the application. The drawdown rate also requires clarification. More details are required for irrigation and reuse. Vice-Chair Moon requested that the applicant provide separate documentation for all calculations conducted in the report. Vice-Chair Moon otherwise agrees with the scoring but would prefer to see verification from the applicant. Project Applicant gave a response to these concerns and noted that clarifying information will be submitted. 			

Scoring Committee Meeting Minutes



Project: Arroyo Seco Projects	WASC(s): ULAR
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Water Supply:</u> The Committee noted that although the project does not create new water supply because the water is captured downstream by a spreading ground, there's a precedent to award points if new capacity is generated. There was a concern about the direction of flow for the project and whether the flow would require a pump station if flowing north. • <u>Community Investment:</u> The applicant does not adequately justify flood prevention benefits. • <u>Leveraging Funds Part 1:</u> Caltrans has indicated support for the project. The Committee suggested obtaining a dollar figure from Caltrans. • <u>Leveraging Funds Part 2 (Community Support):</u> A good list of non-governmental organizations were engaged, but there is not sufficient documentation of communication with Arroyo Seco groups. The project applicant responded that Arroyo Seco and Friends of South Pasadena were engaged and had significant concerns related to the decreased flows and the project was amended accordingly by planning to daylight storm drains instead of creating underground structures and creating a fifth section near the Friends of South Pasadena. <p>The Committee noted that this project would have been better suited to apply for design funding only, rather than design and construction funds. Mike Antos (Stantec, Regional Coordination) shared that the project went through the TRP and has been reviewed in that capacity. The Committee concluded that points will be verified during rescoring. The project would benefit from preliminary engineering drawings.</p>	

Project: Bowtie Demonstration Project (Updated)		WASC(s): ULAR	
Category	Applicant Score	Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality	Part 1: 20 Part 2: 20	Part 1: 20 Part 2: 20	
Water Supply	Part 1: 0 Part 2: 0	Part 1: 0 Part 2: 0	
Community Investment	10	5	See below
Nature-Based Solutions	10	10	
Leveraging Funds Part 1	3	3	See below
Leveraging Funds Part 2 (Community Support)	4	4	See below
Conclusion: The project received 62 points.			
Discussion:			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Community Investment:</u> The project is a dry weather project. The Committee has set precedent for not allowing dry weather projects to claim flood prevention benefits. • <u>Leveraging Funds Part 1:</u> Chair Reznik noted that the funding requested does not match the funding needed and clarified with the project applicant that additional funds will be pursued in the future. The project applicant responded that funds have been secured and spent on this project already and that they are actively fundraising and pursuing grant funds. Chair Reznik encouraged the applicant to mention this when presenting to the WASC, to prevent confusion. • <u>Leveraging Funds Part 2 (Community Support):</u> The Committee commended the project's community engagement effort. 			

Scoring Committee Meeting Minutes



Project: Brookside Park Stormwater Capture Project			WASC(s): ULAR
Category	Applicant Score	Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality	Part 1: 20 Part 2: 30	Part 1: 20 Part 2: 30	
Water Supply	Part 1: 0 Part 2: 5	Part 1: 0 Part 2: 5	
Community Investment	5	5	
Nature-Based Solutions	10	10	See below
Leveraging Funds Part 1	0	0	
Leveraging Funds Part 2 (Community Support)	0	0	
Conclusion: The project received 70 points.			
Discussion:			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Nature-Based Solutions:</u> Chair Reznik noted that the Interim Guidance has provided stricter guidance on what constitutes as a nature-based solution but is comfortable awarding 10 points. 			

Project: California Avenue and Adjacent Streets Stormwater Capture Project			WASC(s): ULAR
Category	Applicant Score	Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality	Part 1: 20 Part 2: 25	Part 1: 20 Part 2: 25	
Water Supply	Part 1: 10 Part 2: 5	Unable to score	See below
Community Investment	5	5	
Nature-Based Solutions	12	12	See below
Leveraging Funds Part 1	3	3	
Leveraging Funds Part 2 (Community Support)	4	1	See below
Conclusion: The project is unable to be scored.			
Discussion:			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Water Supply:</u> The average dry weather inflow was inflated. The Committee requests the applicant revisit this calculation after reviewing wet and dry weather definitions from the applicable TMDL. For a site of this size, the dry weather inflow should be zero, which would also affect the cost effectiveness. <u>Nature-Based Solutions:</u> Chair Reznik again noted that Interim Guidance has provided stricter guidance on what constitutes as a nature-based solution but is comfortable awarding the 12 points. <u>Leveraging Funds Part 2 (Community Support):</u> There were some letters of support, but the project appears to be primarily driven by the city. The project applicant noted additional 			

Scoring Committee Meeting Minutes



Project: California Avenue and Adjacent Streets Stormwater Capture Project	WASC(s): ULAR
community engagement efforts, but District Staff provided a reminder that only clarifying information can be added to the application, not new information.	

Project: Eagle Rock Boulevard: A Multi-Modal Stormwater Capture Project		WASC(s): ULAR	
Category	Applicant Score	Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality	Part 1: 20 Part 2: 20	Part 1: 20 Part 2: 20	
Water Supply	Part 1: 0 Part 2: 0	Part 1: 0 Part 2: 0	
Community Investment	5	5	
Nature-Based Solutions	10	10	
Leveraging Funds Part 1	6	6	
Leveraging Funds Part 2 (Community Support)	4	4	See below
Conclusion: The project received 65 points.			
Discussion:			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Leveraging Funds Part 2 (Community Support):</u> The Committee commended the level of community engagement conducted for the municipal project. 			

Project: Earvin "Magic" Johnson Park Operation and Maintenance Project		WASC(s): ULAR	
Category	Applicant Score	Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality	Part 1: 11 Part 2: 30	Unable to score	See below
Water Supply	Part 1: 0 Part 2: 5	Unable to score	See below
Community Investment	5	5	
Nature-Based Solutions	10	10	
Leveraging Funds Part 1	6	6	
Leveraging Funds Part 2 (Community Support)	4	4	
Conclusion: The project is unable to be scored.			
Discussion:			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Water Quality:</u> Vice-Chair Moon appreciated that the O&M report included actual monitoring results for pollution reduction. Vice-Chair Moon recommends the applicant to use the O&M report results to override pollution data in the project module. This would help increase the water quality score to 40. 			

Scoring Committee Meeting Minutes



Project: Earvin “Magic” Johnson Park Operation and Maintenance Project	WASC(s): ULAR
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Water Supply:</u> There was a discrepancy in the application on the storage capacity and Vice-Chair recommended that the project be reclassified as dry weather. The project applicant clarified that the project captures both dry and wet weather flows. The applicant will provide more clarifying information. Vice-Chair Moon requests that the project applicant update the storage capacity throughout the application. This would decrease the water supply score to 2. <p>Member Diaz noted that it is difficult to score O&M projects using the current scoring criteria. Chair Resnik concurred and acknowledged the importance of O&M in sustaining the community benefits of a project. The project applicant confirmed with the Committee that although the project would surpass the 60-point threshold without water supply benefits, the applicant would prefer to provide clarifying information for the Committee to rescore.</p>	

The Committee will vote to send scorable projects with passing scores to their respective WASCs and to allow unscorable or verification needed projects 1 week to provide clarifying information to the Committee at the next meeting. District will email instructions to the Applicants regarding rescoring.

c) Scoring Schedule

i. Second November meeting on November 8th or 9th

The Scoring Committee confirmed that the second November meeting will be held on November 9th from 2:00pm - 5:00pm.

ii. Findings to Continue Teleconference Meetings Under Assembly Bill 361

The Committee will continue to meet via teleconference.

6. Public Comment Period for Agenda Items

Nate Hayward (Council District 14) provided comment thanking the Committee for their evaluation and score for the Eagle Rock Boulevard: A Multi-Modal Stormwater Capture Project.

7. Voting Items

a) Findings to Continue Teleconference Meetings Under Assembly Bill 361

District staff confirmed that a vote is not necessary at this time.

This will be a standing agenda item and voting may be skipped if the Board approves AB 361. If the Board does not approve AB 361, the Committee members will vote whether to continue teleconferencing. The Committee will be allowed to vote separately during a state of emergency.

8. Items for Next Agenda

The next meeting is scheduled for October 17, 2022, 9:00am - 12:00pm. See the SCWP website for meeting details. Items on the Agenda include:

a) Scoring of Feasibility Studies

ULAR	1	Emerald Necklace John Muir High School Campus Natural Infrastructure Improvement Project
	2	Green Streets Demonstration Project on Main Street

Scoring Committee Meeting Minutes



	3	Hollenbeck Park Lake Rehabilitation Project
	4	McCambridge Park Stormwater Capture Multi-Benefit Project
	5	Mission Mile Sepulveda: A Climate Resilient Urban Greenway to Cultural Connections Project
	6	South Pasadena Huntington Drive Regional Green Street Project
	7	Sylmar Channel Project
LLAR	8	Long Beach Municipal Urban Stormwater Treatment (LB MUST) – Phase 2
	9	Spane Park

9. Adjournment

Chair Reznik thanked Committee Members and District staff and adjourned the meeting.

SCORING COMMITTEE MEETING - October 6, 2022

Member Type	Quorum Present		Items
	Member	Voting?	9/1/2022 Meeting Minutes
Water Supply	Matt Stone	x	Y
Community Investments Benefits	David Diaz	x	Y
Nature-Based Solutions / Water Quality	Bruce Reznik	x	Y
Water Quality	Dave Sorem	x	A
Water Quality	TJ Moon	x	Y
Total Non-Vacant Seats	5	Yay (Y)	4
Total Voting Members Present	5	Nay (N)	0
		Abstain (A)	1
		Total	5
			Approved

Other Attendees	
Alexandro Garcia	Kevin Ho
Alice Roth	Kimberly Goins
Amanda Begley	Leslie Frazier
Ana Tabuena-Ruddy	Lorena Matos
Andrew Kim	Maggie Gardner
Ann Bechtel	Marissa Caringella
benny kona	Mark Nguyen
brett perry	Merrill Taylor
cherise thompson	MICHAEL DRENNAN
Chris Mote	Michael Scaduto
Christine McLeod	Michael Sweeney
Conor Mossavi	Michelle Staffield
Dan Duncan	Mikaela Randolph
Daniel Rydberg	Nancy Shrodes
Darin Seegmiller	Nate Hayward
Darin Son	Nathan Schreiner
Debrah Garcia	Oliver Cramer
Donna Tran	Oliver Galang
Duong Do	Paige Bistromowitz
Eugene Serrano	phuoc le
Felicia Yin	Rafael Piamonte
Gurjot Kohli	Ryanna Fossum
Heather Merenda	Sarai Jimenez
I EC	Sarkis Oganesyian
Ida Meisami-Fard	Seiko Oishi
Jackie Lillio	Serena Zhu
jillian brickey	Shona Ganguly
Joe Venzon - LA County	Susie Santilena
Jonathan Abelson	Thom Epps, Craftwater
Josafat Flores	Veronica Carrillo
Jose Luis Escajeda	wendy dinh
Joyce Amaro	

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2023-2024



Watershed Area	North Santa Monica Bay
Project Name	Cornell – Mulholland Highway Green Improvement Project
Project Lead	Los Angeles County Public Works
Total Funding Requested	\$350,000
Project Type	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	11	20	11 to verify	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 4.89 ac impervious area very low Clarify capital cost, overestimated O&M
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	0	12	0	•
Community Investment	5	10	5	•
Nature-Based Solutions	10	15	10	•
Leveraging Funds Part 1	6	6	Unable to Score	• Secured funding not clear
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	4	1	• Few letters of support, but lacking participatory engagement
TOTALS	61	110	Unable to Score	

- TO BE VOTED BY SCORING COMMITTEE -

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2023-2024



Watershed Area	Santa Clara River
Project Name	Via Princessa Park and Regional BMP Project
Project Lead	Heather Merenda, City of Santa Clarita Environmental Services Division
Total Funding Requested	\$20,079,768
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"> Volume of storage assumes open space. Volume should be a lot less (pipe), effecting total capacity. 9 ac-ft vs 17 ac-ft
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	30	Unable to score	
Water Supply Part 1	13	13	Unable to score	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1.5 inches, not 118 (stormwater treat in 24 hours) Maintenance cost low, effecting cost-effectiveness
Water Supply Part 2	12	12	Unable to score	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2 cfs inflating water supply values (based on standing water)
Community Investment	5	10	5	•
Nature-Based Solutions	10	15	10	•
Leveraging Funds Part 1	3	6	3	•
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	4	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No clear indication of commitment in letters of support. Unclear if engaged with mobile home residents. Good indication showing needs of community.
TOTALS	97	110	Unable to score	•

- TO BE VOTED BY SCORING COMMITTEE -

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2023-2024



Watershed Area	Upper Los Angeles River
Project Name	Arroyo Seco Projects
Project Lead	City of South Pasadena
Total Funding Requested	\$33,995,086
Project Type	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	11	20	11 to verify	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discrepancy pg 83 and application--Hydrology 437 vs 444 Drawdown rate clarification Clarification on 16.36 ac-ft capacity
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	30	30 to verify	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> More detail to verify numbers Reirrigation use vs infiltrated
Water Supply Part 1	0	13	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pg 266 letter from watermaster
Water Supply Part 2	5	12	5 to verify	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Community Investment	10	10	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Flood prevention benefits not demonstrated
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"> Potential future Caltrans cost share
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	4	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Additional support at this point of project.
TOTALS	70	110	To Verify	<ul style="list-style-type: none">

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2023-2024



Watershed Area	Upper Los Angeles River
Project Name	Bowtie Demonstration Project (Updated)
Project Lead	The Nature Conservancy
Total Funding Requested	\$7,164,575
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	0	12	0	•
Community Investment	10	10	5	• No flood benefits
Nature-Based Solutions	10	15	10	•
Leveraging Funds Part 1	3	6	3	• Continuing to pursue grant funding
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	4	4	• Strong demonstrations of engagement
TOTALS	67	110	62	•

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2023-2024



Watershed Area	Upper Los Angeles River
Project Name	Brookside Park Stormwater Capture Project
Project Lead	City of Pasadena
Total Funding Requested	\$2,198,612
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	30	•
Water Supply Part 1	0	13	0	•
Water Supply Part 2	5	12	5	•
Community Investment	5	10	5	•
Nature-Based Solutions	10	15	10	•
Leveraging Funds Part 1	N/A	6	0	•
Leveraging Funds Part 2	N/A	4	0	•
TOTALS	70	110	70	•

- TO BE VOTED BY SCORING COMMITTEE -

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2023-2024



Watershed Area	Upper Los Angeles River
Project Name	California Avenue and Adjacent Streets Stormwater Capture Project
Project Lead	City of Glendale
Total Funding Requested	\$2,970,899
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	10	13	Unable to score	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pg29 160 ac assuming 0.15 cfs of constant dry-weather flow inflating WS number. Dry-weather assumption to be 0.1 in/day. • Will change cost-effectiveness
Water Supply Part 2	5	12	Unable to score	•
Community Investment	5	10	5	•
Nature-Based Solutions	12	15	12	•
Leveraging Funds Part 1	3	6	3	•
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	4	1	•
TOTALS	84	110	Unable to score	•

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2023-2024



Watershed Area	Upper Los Angeles River
Project Name	Eagle Rock Boulevard: A Multi-Modal Stormwater Capture Project
Project Lead	City of Los Angeles, Department of Public Works, StreetsLA
Total Funding Requested	\$7,632,723
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	0	12	0	•
Community Investment	5	10	5	•
Nature-Based Solutions	10	15	10	•
Leveraging Funds Part 1	6	6	6	• \$16M of matching funds
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	4	4	• Multiple community partners
TOTALS	65	110	65	•

- TO BE VOTED BY SCORING COMMITTEE -

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2023-2024



Watershed Area	Upper Los Angeles River
Project Name	Earvin "Magic" Johnson Park Operation and Maintenance Project
Project Lead	Los Angeles County Public Works
Total Funding Requested	\$1,625,000
Project Type	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	11	20	Unable to score	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> O&M funding request. Close look at O&M report (pg 85) for how project is performing (pollutant reduction numbers, how much flow captured) Discrepancy 22 ac-ft and 7 ac-ft capacity
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"> Reclassify as dry weather Use user input value
Water Supply Part 1	0	13	0	•
Water Supply Part 2	5	12	Unable to score	•
Community Investment	5	10	5	•
Nature-Based Solutions	10	15	10	•
Leveraging Funds Part 1	6	6	6	•
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	4	4	•
TOTALS	71	110	Unable to score	• If Dry Weather: 40 points for WQ & 2 points for WS Part 2

- TO BE VOTED BY SCORING COMMITTEE -



Public Comment Form

Name:* _____ Organization*: _____

Email*: _____ Phone*: _____

Meeting: _____ Date: _____

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

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

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

Comments



Public Comment Form

Name:* _____

Organization*: _____

Email*: _____

Phone*: _____

Meeting: _____

Date: _____

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

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

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

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

Comments



September 29, 2022

To: Los Angeles County Safe Clean Water Program

Attention: Upper LA River Watershed Area Committee; Scoring Committee; Regional Oversight Committee

Subject: Hollenbeck Park Lake Rehabilitation Project - Fiscal Year 22 - 23 Stormwater Investment Plan Consideration

RE: Support of City of Los Angeles Sanitation and Environment's (LASAN) Hollenbeck Park Lake Rehabilitation Project

Dear Committee Members,

On behalf of Social Model Recovery Systems (SMRS) and our Coalition the Friends of Hollenbeck Park, we are writing to express support of the City of Los Angeles Sanitation and Environment's (LASAN) Hollenbeck Park Lake Rehabilitation Project for funding consideration by the Safe, Clean Water Program (SCWP).

The SMRS team has built a strong Coalition, made up of the Friends of Hollenbeck Park, which includes residents, city and state representatives, law enforcement, neighborhood watch, and community-based organizations. Our Coalition members are at the forefront of shaping policy campaign in their community. Since 2013, we have conducted hundreds of environmental scans and surveyed community members living around and Hollenbeck Park; the findings continue to show that the lake is an issue.

Hollenbeck Park is an important green open space and heavily utilized park by the Boyle Heights community in general and by residents and youth we work with directly. The project's proposed improvements are greatly needed and we want those critical environmental changes to happen.

The Hollenbeck Park Lake Rehabilitation Project is needed in our community and it will provide educational opportunities to learn about urban stormwater and water resources, inspiring more community members to be ambassadors of change and advocates for the environment. Hollenbeck Park is considered a community treasure and it deserves all the benefits that this project will provide.

For these reasons and more, we strongly support selecting LASAN's Hollenbeck Park Lake Rehabilitation Project for SCWP funding.

Thank you for the consideration,

Dina Cruz
Project Coordinator
Social Model Recovery Systems



Public Comment Form

Name:* _____ Organization*: _____

Email*: _____ Phone*: _____

Meeting: _____ Date: _____

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

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

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

Comments
