

# Scoring Committee

## Meeting Minutes

---



October 17, 2022  
9:00am - 12:00pm  
WebEx Meeting

### Committee Members Present:

Bruce Reznik, LA Waterkeeper (Nature-Based Solutions/Water Quality), Chair  
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:

Dave Sorem, Mike Bubalo Construction Co., Inc (Water Quality)

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

---

## **1. Welcome and Introductions**

District staff conducted a brief tutorial of 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 October 6, 2022**

Meeting Minutes from October 6, 2022 were not ready at the time of this meeting; voting on these minutes will occur at the next scheduled Scoring Committee meeting.

## **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 were 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 preliminary count of applications is as follows: 33 Infrastructure Program (IP), 4 Scientific Study (SS), and 4 Technical Resource Program (TRP) applicants.
- Quarterly Reports for IP and SS 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.
- Attending meetings regularly is a requirement for WASC members under Article 5 of the WASC Operating Guidelines. An absence of two consecutive meetings or more than five meetings in one

# Scoring Committee

## Meeting Minutes

---



year will be considered failure to attend meetings and may result in the absentee member's removal from the WASC. 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.

#### **4. Public Comment Period for Non-Agenda Items**

District staff compiled all public comment cards received by 5:00pm the day before the meeting 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 displayed on screen. Chair Reznik welcomed public members to provide verbal comment to the cards if present.

Lorena Matos (LA Sanitation) voiced support for the Sylmar Channel Project and mentioned that public meetings were held in 2021 and May 2022, which surveyed participants from the community. It was noted that the Sylmar Neighborhood Council supports this project but not opening the project location for public access.

Francisco Romero (Promesa Boyle Heights) provided a comment supporting the Hollenbeck Park Lake Rehabilitation Project and emphasized the community support and engagement efforts.

Jose Hernandez (Council District 7) voiced support for the Sylmar Channel Project and remarked that Council District 7 hopes the project addresses the public's safety concerns.

#### **5. Discussion Items:**

##### **a) Ex Parte Communication Disclosure**

Vice-Chair T.J. Moon met with the City of Santa Clarita about the Via Princessa Project and met with District staff.

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

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

The tables below for each project contain information recorded on the Scoring Rubric during the Scoring Committee meeting. The Scoring Rubric, as noted and recorded during the meeting, captures a project's evaluation by the Scoring Committee.

# Scoring Committee Meeting Minutes



<b>Project:</b> Emerald Necklace John Muir High School Campus Natural Infrastructure Improvement Project			<b>WASC(s):</b> ULAR
Category	Applicant Score	Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Part 1	14	14	
Water Quality Part 2	30	30	
Water Supply Part 1	0	0	
Water Supply Part 2	0	0	
Community Investment	5	5	
Nature-Based Solutions	10	10	
Leveraging Funds Part 1	3	3	
Leveraging Funds Part 2 (Community Support)	4	4	See below
<b>Conclusion:</b> The project received 66 points.			
<b>Discussion:</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>Leveraging Funds Part 2 (Community Support)</u>: Letters of support for the project are addressed to other funding sources. Member Diaz asked the committee if that is acceptable, especially since many of the projects today also have these types of letters. Chair Reznik and Vice-Chair Moon confirmed that these types of letters have been acceptable so long as the project has not drastically changed and the length of time since the letter was dated is not too great.</li> </ul>			

<b>Project:</b> Green Street Demonstration Project on Main Street			<b>WASC(s):</b> ULAR
Category	Applicant Score	Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Part 1	20	20	See below
Water Quality Part 2	30	30	See below
Water Supply Part 1	0	0	
Water Supply Part 2	0	0	
Community Investment	5	5	
Nature-Based Solutions	10	10	
Leveraging Funds Part 1	3	3	
Leveraging Funds Part 2 (Community Support)	4	4	
<b>Conclusion:</b> The project received 72 points.			
<b>Discussion:</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>Water Quality</u>: The calculated 24-hour storm capacity is 2.5 times greater than the 85<sup>th</sup> percentile storm capacity. This has historically been allowed, but Vice-Chair Moon has notified SCWP staff that the maximum calculated 24-hour storm capacity should be capped at the 85<sup>th</sup></li> </ul>			

# Scoring Committee Meeting Minutes



percentile storm capacity. The project will receive full points, but if this policy were enacted, fewer points would be awarded.

Project: Hollenbeck Park Lake Rehabilitation Project		WASC(s): ULAR	
Category	Applicant Score	Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Part 1	14	Unable to score	See below
Water Quality Part 2	30	Unable to score	See below
Water Supply Part 1	0	0	
Water Supply Part 2	12	Unable to score	See below
Community Investment	10	5	See below
Nature-Based Solutions	12	12	
Leveraging Funds Part 1	3	3	
Leveraging Funds Part 2 (Community Support)	4	3	See below

**Conclusion:** The project is currently unable to be scored .

**Discussion:**

- Water Quality: The drainage area map appeared to not accurately reflect a drainage area due to the multiple gaps and the SC requested the applicant revise accordingly.
- Water Supply: There was no letter from a groundwater master and Chair Reznik recommended the applicant attempt to get one. Vice-Chair Moon noted that there are no infiltration tests, and the borings are not on the project site. The design flow per drywell is high considering the geotechnical report’s recommended flow. The committee requests that the project applicant provide an onsite geotechnical report. Member Matt Stone noted that the application says the lake used to infiltrate water but has since become silt laden. Member Stone requests the project applicant clarify how much infiltration is associated with the lake versus the drywells. The project applicant replied and will provide clarification on the drainage area. The applicant noted that there are a couple test borings 100-500 feet from the proposed drywell locations, and that the submitted infiltration flow rate is higher than the geotechnical report’s recommendation because the drywells are dual chamber. Vice-Chair Moon noted that onsite geotechnical tests are still needed and because each drywell only has one pretreatment unit, clarification on the infiltration rate is still needed.
- Community Investment: Chair Reznik removed 5 points because the project does not provide greening on a school campus, only nearby to a school.
- Leveraging Funds Part 2 (Community Support): Letters of support were received but additional community outreach and engagement efforts should be conducted in the future.

# Scoring Committee Meeting Minutes



<b>Project:</b> McCambridge Park Stormwater Capture Multi-Benefit Project		<b>WASC(s):</b> ULAR	
<b>Category</b>	<b>Applicant Score</b>	<b>Committee Score</b>	<b>Notes</b>
Water Quality Part 1	7	7	
Water Quality Part 2	30	30	
Water Supply Part 1	0	0	
Water Supply Part 2	5	5	
Community Investment	5	5	
Nature-Based Solutions	10	10	
Leveraging Funds Part 1	3	3	See below
Leveraging Funds Part 2 (Community Support)	4	2	See below
<b>Conclusion:</b> The project received 62 points.			
<b>Discussion:</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Leveraging Funds Part 1:</u> Chair Reznik noted it isn't clear if leveraging funds were from local return funds or not, but it's not going to change its score.</li> <li>• <u>Leveraging Funds Part 2 (Community Support):</u> Letters of support were received but are more future based due to the project requesting design funds only. Because this project went through the TRP, Member Diaz noted that the applicant had ample opportunity to conduct more than one community engagement event.</li> </ul> <p>The committee noted that the Project Portal tool may require viewers to adjust filters or zoom in to view this design project properly, in addition to the McCambridge TRP report.</p>			

<b>Project:</b> Mission Mile Sepulveda: A Climate Resilient Urban Greenway to Cultural Connections Project		<b>WASC(s):</b> ULAR	
<b>Category</b>	<b>Applicant Score</b>	<b>Committee Score</b>	<b>Notes</b>
Water Quality Part 1	7	7	
Water Quality Part 2	30	30	
Water Supply Part 1	0	0	
Water Supply Part 2	5	5	
Community Investment	5	5	
Nature-Based Solutions	11	11	
Leveraging Funds Part 1	6	6	
Leveraging Funds Part 2 (Community Support)	4	4	
<b>Conclusion:</b> The project received 68 points.			
<b>Discussion:</b> No discussion items.			

# Scoring Committee Meeting Minutes



Project: South Pasadena Huntington Drive Regional Green Street		WASC(s): ULAR	
Category	Applicant Score	Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Part 1	20	Unable to score	See below
Water Quality Part 2	30	Unable to score	See below
Water Supply Part 1	3	Unable to score	See below
Water Supply Part 2	9	Unable to score	See below
Community Investment	5	5	
Nature-Based Solutions	10	10	
Leveraging Funds Part 1	6	3	See below
Leveraging Funds Part 2 (Community Support)	4	1	See below
<b>Conclusion:</b> The project is currently unable to be scored.			
<b>Discussion:</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Water Quality:</u> The 85<sup>th</sup> percentile storm capacity was calculated inconsistently throughout the application (page 173 has 10.2, but page 566 has 42.8). The drainage area is also inconsistent. Vice-Chair Moon requested the applicant to clarify these two values. The calculation for the drywell capacity is unclear, specifically the infiltration capacity per drywell (page 174 has 0.6 cfs). Requested clarification from applicant. The calculated 24-hour storm capacity is also much larger than the 85<sup>th</sup> percentile storm capacity.</li> <li>• <u>Water Supply:</u> The dry weather flow was on the high end but acceptable. The annual maintenance (O&amp;M) cost is on the low side and may be worth revisiting. The cost effectiveness of the project is affected by water quality aspects, and therefore cannot be scored.</li> <li>• <u>Leveraging Funds Part 1:</u> Member Diaz requested clarification on funding that has not yet been received. Chair Reznik clarified with District staff that the SCWP guidelines do not detail a specific policy regarding funding that still needs to be committed. Mike Antos (Stantec, Regional Coordination) noted that the Scoring Committee is responsible for scoring based on the matching funds that have been secured, which is 25% for this project, and the WASC would be responsible for evaluating the likelihood of securing funds not yet committed.</li> <li>• <u>Leveraging Funds Part 2 (Community Support):</u> All community meetings were city council based. As a project that went through the TRP, Member Diaz noted that more community engagement efforts could have occurred.</li> </ul> <p>Vice-Chair Moon noted that in general, O&amp;M costs may require additional guidance because of the inconsistent trends seen throughout multiple applications.</p> <p>District staff noted that this project did go through the TRP, but the project applicant has changed the concept that was developed by the Technical Assistance Team.</p>			

Project: Sylmar Channel Project		WASC(s): ULAR	
Category	Applicant Score	Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Part 1	20	Unable to score	See below
Water Quality Part 2	30	Unable to score	See below
Water Supply Part 1	6	Unable to score	See below

# Scoring Committee Meeting Minutes



Water Supply Part 2	9	Unable to score	See below
Community Investment	5	5	
Nature-Based Solutions	10	10	
Leveraging Funds Part 1	6	6	See below
Leveraging Funds Part 2 (Community Support)	4	3	See below

**Conclusion:** The project is currently unable to be scored.

**Discussion:**

- Water Quality: Applicant must provide the onsite geotechnical report and justification for the infiltration rate and the channel flow rate. The 24-hour storm capacity is four times greater than the 85<sup>th</sup> percentile storm capacity.
- Water Supply: The infiltration rate affects the total cost effectiveness and therefore this section cannot be scored. The applicant should also clarify why their own life cycle cost analysis was used and how that method is different from the application system's method. The project applicant commented that clarifying information will be provided.
- Leveraging Funds Part 1: Chair Reznik awards all points but would like clarification on what funding is secured.
- Leveraging Funds Part 2 (Community Support): Member Diaz noted that more outreach and engagement can be conducted in the future. The project applicant noted that two virtual workshops occurred in 2021 and 2022.

<b>Project:</b> Long Beach Municipal Urban Stormwater Treatment (LB MUST) - Phase 2		<b>WASC(s):</b> LLAR	
Category	Applicant Score	Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Part 1	20	20	
Water Quality Part 2	20	20	
Water Supply Part 1	0	0	
Water Supply Part 2	2	2	
Community Investment	10	5	See below
Nature-Based Solutions	14	14	
Leveraging Funds Part 1	3	3	
Leveraging Funds Part 2 (Community Support)	4	1	See below

**Conclusion:** The project received 65 points.

**Discussion:**

- Community Investment: The project is a dry weather project, and the Committee has set precedent for not allowing dry weather projects to claim flood prevention benefits. The project applicant commented that the project elements will eliminate localized flooding issues. This phase of the project is critical in connecting green spaces in the area. The applicant also clarified that the project has the capability to capture wet weather first flush events.

# Scoring Committee Meeting Minutes



- Leveraging Funds Part 2 (Community Support):** There was only one non-elected letter of support. Member Diaz noted that based on the application, more community engagement could have occurred. The project applicant noted that the project was awarded Envision Platinum from the Institute of Sustainable Infrastructure, that the community has been involved in master plan meetings regarding the light industrial parcel of land in addition to previous outreach in phase 1, and that a letter of support from Friends of the LA River could also be obtained. Chair Reznik and Member Diaz appreciated the clarifying information from the project applicant but noted that the score is based on the documentation present in the application. Because the project still passes the point threshold, Chair Reznik recommends that the project applicant provide the additional information to the WASC.

Project: Spane Park		WASC(s): LLAR	
Category	Applicant Score	Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Part 1	20	20	
Water Quality Part 2	30	20	See below
Water Supply Part 1	3	Unable to score	See below
Water Supply Part 2	12	Unable to score	See below
Community Investment	10	5	See below
Nature-Based Solutions	10	10	
Leveraging Funds Part 1	0	0	
Leveraging Funds Part 2 (Community Support)	4	3	See below

**Conclusion:** The project is currently unable to be scored.

- Discussion:**
- Water Quality:** The project does not meet the 85<sup>th</sup> percentile storm capacity as a wet weather project. Vice-Chair Moon recommended the project applicant reclassify the project as dry weather.
  - Water Supply:** Vice-Chair Moon requested the applicant to revise the annual O&M cost of \$20, which will affect the project’s cost-effectiveness. The Water Replenishment District’s letter was generic and does not specify aquifer recharge. Member Stone recommends an updated letter be obtained but recognizes the difficulty in doing so within one week.
  - Community Investment:** If reclassifying as a dry weather project as recommended, flood prevention benefits are not able to be claimed.
  - Leveraging Funds Part 2 (Community Support):** There were two outreach events, but Member Diaz commented that additional outreach and engagement could be conducted.

The Committee will vote to send scorable projects with passing scores to their respective WASCs and to allow unable to be scored 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) Process Change – scoring projects and voting recommendation(s) on same day**



# Scoring Committee

## Meeting Minutes



District staff noted that the Scoring Committee currently uses two separate meetings, one to score projects and the second to vote to send scorable projects with passing scores to WASCs or to vote to request clarifying information from project applicants. The proposed process change will allow the Scoring Committee to score projects and vote on sending recommended projects to their respective WASCs or back to the applicants for clarifying information during the same meeting. Chair Reznik noted that this is especially important for WASCs with a larger number of potential projects, such as the Upper Los Angeles River (ULAR), to provide the WASC additional time to deliberate on the SIP.

Antos commented that the Scoring Committee has the capacity to send projects to the WASC on the same day they are discussed by passing a motion to do so and that the Committee does not need to formally vote to approve this process change.

### 6. Public Comment Period for Agenda Items

Nate Hayward (Council District 14) voiced strong support for the Hollenbeck Lake project, noting that the revitalization of Hollenbeck has been ongoing for at least eight years. The nearby community has faced many environmental injustices, such as the construction of the I-5 freeway. The project has received \$7 million from the State of California and Hayward noted that Measure W funds would allow the project to continue to address water quality issues.

Anthony Espinoza, representing City of Los Angeles District 7 Councilwoman Monica Rodriguez, voiced support for the Mission Mile Sepulveda: A Climate Resilient Urban Greenway to Cultural Connections Project and the Sylmar Channel project.

John Hunter (Project Applicant for Spane Park) requested clarification on the project score for the Leveraging Funds Part 2 (Community Support) section and noted that additional clarifying information will be submitted.

### 7. Voting Items

- a) **From 10/06/22 SC Meeting:** Send below scorable projects with passing scores to WASCs:
- i. Bowtie Demonstration Project (updated)
  - ii. Brookside Park Stormwater Capture Project
  - iii. Eagle Rock Boulevard: A Multi-Modal Stormwater Capture Project

Member Stone motioned to send the above projects to WASCs, seconded by Vice-Chair Moon. The motion is approved, with four votes in favor (approved, see vote tracking sheet).

- b) **From 10/06/22 SC Meeting:** Allow project applicants, for the below projects that were unable to be scored, one week to provide clarifying information to the Scoring Committee:
- i. Via Princessa Park and Regional BMP Project
  - ii. Cornell – Mulholland Highway Green Improvement Project
  - iii. Arroyo Seco Projects
  - iv. California Avenue and Adjacent Streets Stormwater Capture Project
  - v. Earvin “Magic” Johnson Park Operation and Maintenance Project

Vice-Chair Moon motioned to send the above projects back to the project applicants for clarifying information, seconded by Member Stone. The motion is approved, with four votes in favor (approved, see vote tracking sheet).

- c) **From Today:** Send below scoreable projects receiving a passing score today to WASCs:
- i. Emerald Necklace John Muir High School Campus Natural Infrastructure Improvement Project
  - ii. Green Street Demonstration Project on Main Street
  - iii. McCambridge Park Stormwater Capture Multi-Benefit Project

# Scoring Committee Meeting Minutes



- iv. Mission Mile Sepulveda: A Climate Resilient Urban Greenway to Cultural Connections Project
- v. Long Beach Municipal Urban Stormwater Treatment (LB MUST) - Phase 2

Vice-Chair Moon motioned to send the above projects to the WASC, seconded by Member Diaz. The motion is approved, with four votes in favor (approved, see vote tracking sheet).

- d) **From Today:** Allow project applicants, for the below projects that were unable to be scored today, one week to provide clarifying information to the Scoring Committee:
  - i. Hollenbeck Park Lake Rehabilitation Project
  - ii. South Pasadena Huntington Drive Regional Green Street
  - iii. Sylmar Channel Project
  - iv. Spane Park

Vice-Chair Moon motioned to send the above projects back to the project applicants for clarifying information, seconded by Member Stone. The motion is approved, with four votes in favor (approved, see vote tracking sheet).

## 8. Items for Next Agenda

The next meeting is scheduled for November 3, 2022, 9:00am - 12:00pm. See the SCWP website for meeting details. Items on the Agenda include:

- a) Findings to Continue Teleconference Meetings Under Assembly Bill 361
- b) Scoring of Feasibility Studies

LSGR	1	Artesia Park Urban Runoff Capture Project
	2	Heartwell Park at Palo Verde Channel Stormwater Capture Project
	3	La Habra Heights Stormwater Treatment and Reuse System The Park Hacienda Road
	4	La Mirada Creek Park Project
	5	Progress Park Stormwater Capture Project
CSMB	6	Baldwin Vista Green Streets Project
	7	Imperial Highway Green Infrastructure Project

## 9. Adjournment

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

## SCORING COMMITTEE MEETING - October 17, 2022

Member Type	Quorum Present		Voting Items			
	Member	Voting?	From 10/17 SC Mtg.: Send projects w/ passing scores to WASCs	From 10/17 SC Mtg.: Send Unscorable Projects to applicants for clarifying information	From 10/6 SC Mtg.: Send projects w/ passing scores to WASCs	From 10/6 SC Mtg.: Send Unscorable Projects to applicants for clarifying information
Water Supply	Matt Stone	x	y	y	y	y
Community Investments Benefits	David Diaz	x	y	y	y	y
Nature-Based Solutions / Water Quality	<b>Bruce Reznik</b>	x	y	y	y	y
Water Quality	Dave Sorem					
Water Quality	<b>TJ Moon</b>	x	y	y	y	y
Total Non-Vacant Seats	5	Yay (Y)	4	4	4	4
Total Voting Members Present	4	Nay (N)	0	0	0	0
		Abstain (A)	0	0	0	0
		Total	4	4	4	4
			Approved	Approved	Approved	Approved

Other Attendees	
Alexis Holmdal	Ida Meisami-Fard
Alfredo Magallanes	Jack Mikesell
Ana Rivera	Janeth Rodriguez-Livesey
Ana Tabuena-Ruddy	Joe Venzon - LA County
Andrew Kim	John Hunter
Anh Ta	Jonathan Guerrero
Ann Bechtel	Jose Hernandez
Annelisa Moe	Julie Allen
Anthony Espinoza	Kevin Ho
Aric Martinez	Latoya Waters
Benny Kona	Lorena Matos
Brenda Ponton	Maggie Gardner
Brett Perry	Mara Luevano
Carlos Moran	Mark Nguyen
Carmen Andrade	Merrill Taylor
Cherise Thompson	Michael Scaduto
Chris Carandang	Michelle Kim
Christine McLeod	Mike Rudd
Claire Robinson	Nabih
Colin Averill	Nancy Shrodes
Colleen Mitchell	Nate Hayward
Dan Duncan	Nathan Schreiner
DAVID DOLPHIN	Oliver Galang
Diana Bear	Paige Bistromowitz
Donna Tran	Paola Bassignana
Duong Do	Phuoc Le
Dustin Bambic	Ryanna Fossum
Ed Othmer	Seiko Oishi
Eddie Viiiegas	Serena Zhu
Eugene Serrano	Sunshine Saucedo
Francisco Romero	Susie Santilena
Giselle Ramirez	Thom Epps
Gus Orozco	Valeria Arteaga
Heather Merenda	

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2023-2024



<b>Watershed Area</b>	Central Santa Monica Bay
<b>Project Name</b>	Baldwin Vista Green Streets Project
<b>Project Lead</b>	City of Los Angeles, Department of Public Works, LA Sanitation and Environment
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$6,097,900
<b>Project Type</b>	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	20		•
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	30		•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	0	13		•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	2	12		•
<b>Community Investment</b>	5	10		•
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	10	15		•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	0	6		•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	4		•
<b>TOTALS</b>	71	110		•

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2023-2024



<b>Watershed Area</b>	Central Santa Monica Bay
<b>Project Name</b>	Imperial Highway Green Infrastructure Project
<b>Project Lead</b>	City of Los Angeles, Department of Public Works, LA Sanitation and Environment
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$5,232,000
<b>Project Type</b>	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	0	20		•
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	30		•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	0	13		•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	0	12		•
<b>Community Investment</b>	10	10		•
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	14	15		•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	6	6		•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	4		•
<b>TOTALS</b>	64	110		•

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2023-2024



<b>Watershed Area</b>	Lower Los Angeles River
<b>Project Name</b>	Spane Park
<b>Project Lead</b>	City of Paramount
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$18,913,128
<b>Project Type</b>	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	<b>20</b>	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 27 ac-ft capacity</li> <li>• Recommendation to score project as a dry weather project and to reclassify as dry</li> </ul>
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	<b>30</b>	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	3	<b>13</b>	Unable to score	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• WRD letter - not clear project would recharge aquifer</li> <li>• Pg 41 applicant should revise O&amp;M cost (incorrect Annual Maintenance \$20.00)</li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	12	<b>12</b>	Unable to score	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>
<b>Community Investment</b>	10	<b>10</b>	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	10	<b>15</b>	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	N/A	<b>6</b>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	<b>4</b>	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Two outreach meetings</li> </ul>
<b>TOTALS</b>	89	<b>110</b>	Unable to score	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2023-2024



<b>Watershed Area</b>	Lower Los Angeles River
<b>Project Name</b>	Long Beach Municipal Urban Stormwater Treatment (LB MUST) - Phase 2
<b>Project Lead</b>	City of Long Beach
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$10,387,527
<b>Project Type</b>	Dry

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	<b>20</b>	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Meets Title 22 standards for water treatment</li> </ul>
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	20	<b>30</b>	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Dry weather; captures &gt;200 Acres</li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	0	<b>13</b>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	2	<b>12</b>	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>81.6 AF/year</li> </ul>
<b>Community Investment</b>	10	<b>10</b>	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Dry weather project, no flood benefit</li> </ul>
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	14	<b>15</b>	14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	3	<b>6</b>	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	<b>4</b>	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Only 1 non-elected letter of support</li> </ul>
<b>TOTALS</b>	73	<b>110</b>	65	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Projects meets minimum points threshold</li> </ul>

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2023-2024



<b>Watershed Area</b>	Lower San Gabriel River
<b>Project Name</b>	Heartwell Park at Palo Verde Channel Stormwater Capture Project
<b>Project Lead</b>	City of Long Beach
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$3,313,865
<b>Project Type</b>	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	<b>20</b>		•
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	20	<b>30</b>		•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	0	<b>13</b>		•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	5	<b>12</b>		•
<b>Community Investment</b>	10	<b>10</b>		•
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	10	<b>15</b>		•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	0	<b>6</b>		•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	<b>4</b>		•
<b>TOTALS</b>	69	<b>110</b>		•



# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2023-2024



<b>Watershed Area</b>	Lower San Gabriel River
<b>Project Name</b>	Artesia Park Urban Runoff Capture Project
<b>Project Lead</b>	City of Artesia
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$1,568,876
<b>Project Type</b>	Dry

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	20		•
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	20	30		•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	0	13		•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	5	12		•
<b>Community Investment</b>	5	10		•
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	12	15		•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	N/A	6		•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	4		•
<b>TOTALS</b>	66	110		•

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2023-2024



<b>Watershed Area</b>	Lower San Gabriel River
<b>Project Name</b>	La Habra Heights Stormwater Treatment and Reuse System The Park Hacienda Road
<b>Project Lead</b>	City of La Habra Heights
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$705,348
<b>Project Type</b>	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	<b>20</b>		•
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	25	<b>30</b>		•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	0	<b>13</b>		•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	0	<b>12</b>		•
<b>Community Investment</b>	10	<b>10</b>		•
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	10	<b>15</b>		•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	3	<b>6</b>		•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	<b>4</b>		•
<b>TOTALS</b>	72	<b>110</b>		•

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2023-2024



<b>Watershed Area</b>	Lower San Gabriel River
<b>Project Name</b>	La Mirada Creek Park Project
<b>Project Lead</b>	City of La Mirada
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$6,616,197
<b>Project Type</b>	Dry

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	<b>20</b>		•
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	20	<b>30</b>		•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	6	<b>13</b>		•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	5	<b>12</b>		•
<b>Community Investment</b>	10	<b>10</b>		•
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	14	<b>15</b>		•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	0	<b>6</b>		•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	N/A	<b>4</b>		•
<b>TOTALS</b>	75	<b>110</b>		•

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2023-2024



<b>Watershed Area</b>	Lower San Gabriel River
<b>Project Name</b>	Progress Park Stormwater Capture Project
<b>Project Lead</b>	City of Paramount
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$2,161,744
<b>Project Type</b>	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	<b>20</b>		•
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	<b>30</b>		•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	0	<b>13</b>		•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	5	<b>12</b>		•
<b>Community Investment</b>	10	<b>10</b>		•
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	10	<b>15</b>		•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	N/A	<b>6</b>		•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	<b>4</b>		•
<b>TOTALS</b>	79	<b>110</b>		•

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2023-2024



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

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	11	<b>20</b>	11 to verify	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4.89 ac impervious area very low</li> <li>Clarify capital cost, overestimated O&amp;M</li> </ul>
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	25	<b>30</b>	25	•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	0	<b>13</b>	0	•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	0	<b>12</b>	0	•
<b>Community Investment</b>	5	<b>10</b>	5	•
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	10	<b>15</b>	10	•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	6	<b>6</b>	Unable to Score	• Secured funding not clear
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	<b>4</b>	1	• Few letters of support, but lacking participatory engagement
<b>TOTALS</b>	61	<b>110</b>	Unable to Score	

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2023-2024



<b>Watershed Area</b>	Rio Hondo
<b>Project Name</b>	Burke Heritage Park & Marengo Yard Stormwater Capture Project
<b>Project Lead</b>	City of Alhambra
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$4,424,118
<b>Project Type</b>	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	20		•
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	30		•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	0	13		•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	0	12		•
<b>Community Investment</b>	5	10		•
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	10	15		•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	0	6		•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	4		•
<b>TOTALS</b>	69	110		•

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2023-2024



<b>Watershed Area</b>	Rio Hondo
<b>Project Name</b>	El Monte Norwood Elementary School Stormwater Capture Project
<b>Project Lead</b>	Edna Robidas (Trust for Public Land)
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$9,828,559
<b>Project Type</b>	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	14	20		•
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	30		•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	0	13		•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	2	12		•
<b>Community Investment</b>	5	10		•
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	12	15		•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	N/A	6		•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	4		•
<b>TOTALS</b>	67	110		•

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2023-2024



<b>Watershed Area</b>	Rio Hondo
<b>Project Name</b>	Kinneloa Yard Stormwater Capture Project Preliminary Design and Feasibility Study
<b>Project Lead</b>	City of Pasadena
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$2,292,762
<b>Project Type</b>	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	<b>20</b>		•
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	<b>30</b>		•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	0	<b>13</b>		•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	0	<b>12</b>		•
<b>Community Investment</b>	10	<b>10</b>		•
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	10	<b>15</b>		•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	N/A	<b>6</b>		•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	<b>4</b>		•
<b>TOTALS</b>	74	<b>110</b>		•



# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2023-2024



<b>Watershed Area</b>	Rio Hondo
<b>Project Name</b>	Merced Avenue Stormwater Capture Project
<b>Project Lead</b>	City of El Monte
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$9,799,210
<b>Project Type</b>	Dry

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	20		•
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	20	30		•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	0	13		•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	0	12		•
<b>Community Investment</b>	5	10		•
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	12	15		•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	3	6		•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	4		•
<b>TOTALS</b>	64	110		•

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2023-2024



<b>Watershed Area</b>	Santa Clara River
<b>Project Name</b>	Via Princessa Park and Regional BMP Project
<b>Project Lead</b>	Heather Merenda, City of Santa Clarita Environmental Services Division
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$20,079,768
<b>Project Type</b>	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	<b>20</b>	Unable to score	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Volume of storage assumes open space. Volume should be a lot less (pipe), effecting total capacity. 9 ac-ft vs 17 ac-ft</li> </ul>
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	<b>30</b>	Unable to score	
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	13	<b>13</b>	Unable to score	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.5 inches, not 118 (stormwater treat in 24 hours)</li> <li>Maintenance cost low, effecting cost-effectiveness</li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	12	<b>12</b>	Unable to score	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2 cfs inflating water supply values (based on standing water)</li> </ul>
<b>Community Investment</b>	5	<b>10</b>	5	•
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	10	<b>15</b>	10	•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	3	<b>6</b>	3	•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	<b>4</b>	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No clear indication of commitment in letters of support. Unclear if engaged with mobile home residents. Good indication showing needs of community.</li> </ul>
<b>TOTALS</b>	97	<b>110</b>	Unable to score	•

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2023-2024



<b>Watershed Area</b>	South Santa Monica Bay
<b>Project Name</b>	Wilmington-Anaheim Green Infrastructure Corridor Project
<b>Project Lead</b>	City of Los Angeles, Department of Public Works, LA Sanitation and Environment
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$10,274,500
<b>Project Type</b>	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	14	20		•
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	30		•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	0	13		•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	5	12		•
<b>Community Investment</b>	5	10		•
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	11	15		•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	0	6		•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	4		•
<b>TOTALS</b>	69	110		•

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2023-2024



<b>Watershed Area</b>	South Santa Monica Bay
<b>Project Name</b>	Beach Cities Green Streets Project
<b>Project Lead</b>	City of Torrance
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$5,366,953
<b>Project Type</b>	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	20		•
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	30		•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	0	13		•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	2	12		•
<b>Community Investment</b>	5	10		•
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	10	15		•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	3	6		•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	4		•
<b>TOTALS</b>	74	110		•

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2023-2024



<b>Watershed Area</b>	South Santa Monica Bay
<b>Project Name</b>	Glen Anderson Park Regional Stormwater Capture Green Streets
<b>Project Lead</b>	City of Redondo Beach
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$782,000
<b>Project Type</b>	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	20		•
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	30		•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	0	13		•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	0	12		•
<b>Community Investment</b>	5	10		•
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	14	15		•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	N/A	6		•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	4		•
<b>TOTALS</b>	73	110		•

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2023-2024



<b>Watershed Area</b>	South Santa Monica Bay
<b>Project Name</b>	Machado Lake Ecosystem Rehabilitation (MLER) Operations and Maintenance
<b>Project Lead</b>	City of Los Angeles, Department of Public Works, LA Sanitation and Environment
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$3,200,000
<b>Project Type</b>	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	<b>20</b>		•
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	25	<b>30</b>		•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	0	<b>13</b>		•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	9	<b>12</b>		•
<b>Community Investment</b>	10	<b>10</b>		•
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	10	<b>15</b>		•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	3	<b>6</b>		•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	<b>4</b>		•
<b>TOTALS</b>	81	<b>110</b>		•

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2023-2024



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

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	11	20	11 to verify	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Discrepancy pg 83 and application--Hydrology 437 vs 444</li> <li>Drawdown rate clarification</li> <li>Clarification on 16.36 ac-ft capacity</li> </ul>
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	30	30 to verify	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>More detail to verify numbers</li> <li>Reirrigation use vs infiltrated</li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	0	13	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pg 266 letter from watermaster</li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	5	12	5 to verify	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Community Investment</b>	10	10	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Flood prevention benefits not demonstrated</li> </ul>
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	10	15	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	N/A	6	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Potential future Caltrans cost share</li> </ul>
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	4	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Additional support at this point of project.</li> </ul>
<b>TOTALS</b>	70	110	To Verify	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2023-2024



<b>Watershed Area</b>	Upper Los Angeles River
<b>Project Name</b>	Bowtie Demonstration Project (Updated)
<b>Project Lead</b>	The Nature Conservancy
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$7,164,575
<b>Project Type</b>	Dry

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	<b>20</b>	20	•
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	20	<b>30</b>	20	•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	0	<b>13</b>	0	•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	0	<b>12</b>	0	•
<b>Community Investment</b>	10	<b>10</b>	5	• No flood benefits
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	10	<b>15</b>	10	•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	3	<b>6</b>	3	• Continuing to pursue grant funding
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	<b>4</b>	4	• Strong demonstrations of engagement
<b>TOTALS</b>	67	<b>110</b>	62	•



# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2023-2024



<b>Watershed Area</b>	Upper Los Angeles River
<b>Project Name</b>	Brookside Park Stormwater Capture Project
<b>Project Lead</b>	City of Pasadena
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$2,198,612
<b>Project Type</b>	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	<b>20</b>	20	•
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	<b>30</b>	30	•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	0	<b>13</b>	0	•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	5	<b>12</b>	5	•
<b>Community Investment</b>	5	<b>10</b>	5	•
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	10	<b>15</b>	10	•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	N/A	<b>6</b>	0	•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	N/A	<b>4</b>	0	•
<b>TOTALS</b>	70	<b>110</b>	70	•

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2023-2024



<b>Watershed Area</b>	Upper Los Angeles River
<b>Project Name</b>	California Avenue and Adjacent Streets Stormwater Capture Project
<b>Project Lead</b>	City of Glendale
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$2,970,899
<b>Project Type</b>	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	<b>20</b>	20	•
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	25	<b>30</b>	25	•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	10	<b>13</b>	Unable to score	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pg29 160 ac assuming 0.15 cfs of constant dry-weather flow inflating WS number. Dry-weather assumption to be 0.1 in/day.</li> <li>• Will change cost-effectiveness</li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	5	<b>12</b>	Unable to score	•
<b>Community Investment</b>	5	<b>10</b>	5	•
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	12	<b>15</b>	12	•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	3	<b>6</b>	3	•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	<b>4</b>	1	•
<b>TOTALS</b>	84	<b>110</b>	Unable to score	•

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2023-2024



<b>Watershed Area</b>	Upper Los Angeles River
<b>Project Name</b>	Eagle Rock Boulevard: A Multi-Modal Stormwater Capture Project
<b>Project Lead</b>	City of Los Angeles, Department of Public Works, StreetsLA
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$7,632,723
<b>Project Type</b>	Dry

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	<b>20</b>	20	•
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	20	<b>30</b>	20	•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	0	<b>13</b>	0	•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	0	<b>12</b>	0	•
<b>Community Investment</b>	5	<b>10</b>	5	•
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	10	<b>15</b>	10	•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	6	<b>6</b>	6	• \$16M of matching funds
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	<b>4</b>	4	• Multiple community partners
<b>TOTALS</b>	65	<b>110</b>	65	•

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2023-2024



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

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather  Part 1	11	20	Unable to score	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>O&amp;M funding request. Close look at O&amp;M report (pg 85) for how project is performing (pollutant reduction numbers, how much flow captured)</li> <li>Discrepancy 22 ac-ft and 7 ac-ft capacity</li> </ul>
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	30	Unable to score	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reclassify as dry weather</li> <li>Use user input value</li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	0	13	0	•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	5	12	Unable to score	•
<b>Community Investment</b>	5	10	5	•
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	10	15	10	•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	6	6	6	•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	4	4	•
<b>TOTALS</b>	71	110	Unable to score	• If Dry Weather: 40 points for WQ & 2 points for WS Part 2

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2023-2024



<b>Watershed Area</b>	Upper Los Angeles River
<b>Project Name</b>	Emerald Necklace John Muir High School Campus Natural Infrastructure Improvement Project
<b>Project Lead</b>	Claire Robinson, Amigos de los Rios
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$1,891,500
<b>Project Type</b>	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	14	20	14	• $1.4 \text{ AF}/\$1.7 = 0.82$
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	30	30	•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	0	13	0	•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	0	12	0	•
<b>Community Investment</b>	5	10	5	• 4 benefits
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	10	15	10	•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	3	6	3	•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	4	4	•
<b>TOTALS</b>	66	110	66	• Project meets minimum points threshold

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2023-2024



<b>Watershed Area</b>	Upper Los Angeles River
<b>Project Name</b>	Green Street Demonstration Project on Main Street
<b>Project Lead</b>	City of Alhambra
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$3,773,000
<b>Project Type</b>	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	<b>20</b>	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5.1 AF</li> </ul>
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	<b>30</b>	30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Primary Pollutant: 96% reduction of Zinc</li> <li>Secondary Pollutant: trash</li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	0	<b>13</b>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	0	<b>12</b>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Community Investment</b>	5	<b>10</b>	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	10	<b>15</b>	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	3	<b>6</b>	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	<b>4</b>	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Strong community engagement</li> </ul>
<b>TOTALS</b>	72	<b>110</b>	72	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project meets minimum points threshold</li> </ul>

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2023-2024



<b>Watershed Area</b>	Upper Los Angeles River
<b>Project Name</b>	Hollenbeck Park Lake Rehabilitation Project
<b>Project Lead</b>	City of Los Angeles, Department of Public Works, LA Sanitation and Environment
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$25,161,316
<b>Project Type</b>	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	14	<b>20</b>	Unable to Score	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Drainage area does not appear complete – pockets of missing drainage area</li> </ul>
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	<b>30</b>	Unable to Score	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	0	<b>13</b>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No letter from groundwater master</li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	12	<b>12</b>	Unable to Score	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No project specific geotechnical information (infiltration rate)</li> </ul>
<b>Community Investment</b>	10	<b>10</b>	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Near schools, but not greening of a school</li> </ul>
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	12	<b>15</b>	12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Addition of 50 trees</li> <li>Constructed wetlands</li> </ul>
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	3	<b>6</b>	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	<b>4</b>	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>TOTALS</b>	85	<b>110</b>	Unable to score	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2023-2024



<b>Watershed Area</b>	Upper Los Angeles River
<b>Project Name</b>	McCambridge Park Stormwater Capture Multi-Benefit Project
<b>Project Lead</b>	City of Burbank Public Works Department
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$2,930,000
<b>Project Type</b>	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	7	20	7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>18.3 ac-ft capacity</li> </ul>
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	30	30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	0	13	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	5	12	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>146 AF/year</li> </ul>
<b>Community Investment</b>	5	10	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	10	15	10	
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	3	6	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	4	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Design only</li> <li>TRP project - had opportunity for more community engagement</li> </ul>
<b>TOTALS</b>	64	110	62	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project meets minimum points threshold</li> </ul>



# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2023-2024



<b>Watershed Area</b>	Upper Los Angeles River
<b>Project Name</b>	Mission Mile Sepulveda: A Climate Resilient Urban Greenway to Cultural Connections Project
<b>Project Lead</b>	City of Los Angeles, Department of Public Works, StreetsLA
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$22,914,301
<b>Project Type</b>	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	7	20	7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>18.7 AF capacity/\$46M = 0.41</li> </ul>
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	30	30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Primary Pollutant: Zinc &gt;80% reduction</li> <li>Secondary Pollutant: Cu &gt; 80% reduction</li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	0	13	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	5	12	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>124 ac-ft / year</li> </ul>
<b>Community Investment</b>	5	10	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	11	15	11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	6	6	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	4	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>TOTALS</b>	68	110	68	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project meets minimum points threshold</li> </ul>

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2023-2024



<b>Watershed Area</b>	Upper Los Angeles River
<b>Project Name</b>	South Pasadena Huntington Drive Regional Green Street Project
<b>Project Lead</b>	City of South Pasadena
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$2,986,000
<b>Project Type</b>	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	<b>20</b>	Unable to score	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clarification needed for the project drainage area</li> <li>Pg 173; pg 566 discrepancy</li> </ul>
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	<b>30</b>	Unable to score	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unclear how dry well infiltration rates determined</li> <li>Pg 174; how was 0.6 cfs calculated</li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	3	<b>13</b>	Unable to score	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>\$2,100/AF</li> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	9	<b>12</b>	Unable to score	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>261 AF/year</li> </ul>
<b>Community Investment</b>	5	<b>10</b>	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	10	<b>15</b>	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	6	<b>6</b>	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>\$1M committed</li> </ul>
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	<b>4</b>	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Former TRP – opportunity for more community engagement</li> </ul>
<b>TOTALS</b>	87	<b>110</b>	Unable to score	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2023-2024



<b>Watershed Area</b>	Upper Los Angeles River
<b>Project Name</b>	Sylmar Channel Project
<b>Project Lead</b>	City of Los Angeles, Department of Public Works, LA Sanitation and Environment
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$5,005,515
<b>Project Type</b>	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	<b>20</b>	Unable to score	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>0.5 cfs infiltration rate without any onsite geotechnical tests</li> </ul>
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	<b>30</b>	Unable to score	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Onsite geotechnical report requested for dry wells and channel</li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	6	<b>13</b>	Unable to Score	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Life cycle cost discrepancy pg 49</li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	9	<b>12</b>	Unable to Score	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Community Investment</b>	5	<b>10</b>	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>45 trees, pedestrian paths</li> </ul>
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	10	<b>15</b>	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	6	<b>6</b>	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>One virtual workshop</li> <li>Letter of support from CBO</li> </ul>
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	<b>4</b>	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>TOTALS</b>	90	<b>110</b>	Unable to score	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>



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



Officers

*President: Andres Rubalcava  
Vice President of Administration: Brielle Acevedo  
Vice President of Communications: Donald Zelaya  
Treasurer: George Ortega  
Secretary: Kathy Bloom*

September 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2022

**SCWP Regional Oversight Committee Members**  
**SCWP Scoring Committee Members**  
**SCWP ULAR Watershed Area Steering Committee Members**  
c/o Los Angeles County Public Works  
900 S. Fremont Avenue  
Alhambra, CA 91803  
email: [san.safecleanwater@lacity.org](mailto:san.safecleanwater@lacity.org)

**Subject:** Sylmar Channel Project - Safe Clean Water Program

Dear Committee Members,

On behalf of Sylmar Neighborhood Council, I am writing to express our **conditional** support for LA Sanitation and Environment's proposed Sylmar Channel Project for funding consideration by the Safe, Clean Water Program (SCWP).

The Sylmar Channel is in desperate need of attention due to the lack of proper maintenance by the City of Los Angeles. There are over grown trees and vegetation, trash and debris that has not seen upkeep in a number of years. The neighbors along the channel have been dealing with these conditions for a number of years.

We appreciate LA Sanitation and Environment's public engagement on this project. The Council Office presented information to the Sylmar Planning and Land Use Committee at their June 8th, 2022 public meeting. A number of residents and stakeholders spoke of their concerns regarding the plan. The major concern is public access as it will invade the privacy of their back yards, invite homeless and others into the area as well as increase trash, maintenance and noise impacts to the channel and

hence their property. The other concern is the disrepair of fencing along the drainage easement. This lack of maintenance and non-existent fencing in some areas allows trespassers to access the Channel and set up camps and live creating health, fire and safety issues.


Sylmar supports elements of the plan to improve the conditions of the current channel allowing enhanced infiltration to increase ground water reserves, adding green elements to improve the air quality in the area and reduce the heat island effect as well as reducing localized flooding, and removing pollutants from the LA River. **We however, do not support PUBLIC ACCESS to the area.**

The Sylmar Neighborhood Council on behalf of the adjoining residents will **only support this project on the condition that the public will not have access to the channel and the project includes fencing along both sides of the easement preventing public access.** Fencing will need to be coordinated with existing neighbors to the Channel. As a Community we believe in the other goals of the Safe Clean Water Program as it would enhance our environment and improve current conditions.

We appreciate the City of Los Angeles' dedication to ensuring a safe, clean, and sustainable water future for all Angelenos.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,



Peter W. Postlmayr  
Member and Planning and Land Use Chair

Live polls




On a scale of 1–5, how do you rate the pedestrian path feature? | En una escala de 1 a 5, ¿cómo valora la característica del sendero peatonal? 14 👤

Can we expect to see your ongoing support on this project? | ¿Podemos esperar su apoyo continuo en este proyecto? 14 👤

What project features are more important for you? | ¿Qué características del proyecto son más importantes para usted? 13 👤 >

What project features are more important for you? | ¿Qué características del proyecto son más importantes para usted?



Live polls



On a scale of 1–5, how do you rate the pedestrian path feature? | En una escala de 1 a 5, ¿cómo valora la característica del sendero peatonal? 14 👤

Can we expect to see your ongoing support on this project? | ¿Podemos esperar su apoyo continuo en este proyecto? 14 👤 >

What project features are more important for you? | ¿Qué características del proyecto son más importantes para usted? 13 👤

Can we expect to see your ongoing support on this project? | ¿Podemos esperar su apoyo continuo en este proyecto?



Live polls




On a scale of 1–5, how do you rate the pedestrian path feature? | En una escala de 1 a 5, ¿cómo valora la característica del sendero peatonal? 14 👤 >

Can we expect to see your ongoing support on this project? | ¿Podemos esperar su apoyo continuo en este proyecto? 14 👤

What project features are more important for you? | ¿Qué características del proyecto son más importantes para usted? 13 👤

On a scale of 1–5, how do you rate the pedestrian path feature? | En una escala de 1 a 5, ¿cómo valora la característica del sendero peatonal?



## Community Meeting Flyer (English and Spanish)