

Scoring Committee Meeting Minutes



April 6, 2023

9:00am – 12:00pm

WebEx Hybrid Meeting

In-Person Location: LA County Public Works Headquarters, 1st Floor (Courtyard) Conference Room B
900 S. Fremont Ave, Alhambra, CA 91803

Committee Members Present:

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)

Esther Rojas, Water Replenishment District (Water Supply/Community Investments/Nature-Based Solutions)

Committee Members Absent:

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

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

1. Welcome and Introductions

LA County Flood Control District (District) staff conducted a brief tutorial on WebEx. TJ Moon, Vice-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 December 1, 2022

Motion to approve the meeting minutes by Member Dave Sorem, seconded by Member David Diaz. The Committee voted to approve the meeting minutes, with five votes in favor (approved, see vote tracking sheet).

3. Committee Member and District Updates

District staff provided an update:

- District staff gave a presentation on the Future Governance of Committee Meetings, which described the specific requirements for attending meetings virtually. The presentation is attached at the end of these minutes.
- All six Committee Member seats are up for re-selection this year. The current term ends at the end of this fiscal year. Committee Members are appointed by the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisor's (Board) Commission Services Division. Individuals interested in being reappointed as a Committee Member should submit the Interest to Serve Form or notify District staff via email.

4. Public Comment Period for Non-Agenda Items

There were no public comment during this period.

5. Discussion Items:

a) Ex Parte Communication Disclosure

Scoring Committee

Meeting Minutes



Vice-Chair Moon disclosed a conversation involving Ted Gerber from the City of South Pasadena and District staff. Vice-Chair Moon and District staff explained to the project applicant why the project did not pass the Scoring Criteria during this past round of scoring. The project applicant intends to reapply next year.

b) Assessment of previous submissions

This agenda item was skipped.

c) SCWP/Scoring Improvements (Scoring Criteria, Application Process/Project Module)

- i. **FY22-23 Scoring Memo**
- ii. **Summary of FY23-24 submitted comments and recommendations**
 - i. **FY23-24 Scoring Memo**

Ryanna Fossum (Stantec, Regional Coordination) presented a draft version of the FY22-23 Scoring Committee Comment Memo, which details the Scoring Committee Members' comments that were collected during the Round 4 scoring process. The final version of the memo will provide guidance for future Scoring Committee Members and project applicants. Themes in the memo included:

- Variation in Infrastructure Project Submittal Type
- Water Quality Benefits
- Water Supply Benefits
- Community Investment Benefits
- Nature-Based Solutions
- Leveraging Funds and Community Support

The Committee set expectations for this discussion's outcome. The SCWP is meant to be adaptively managed, meaning that potential areas for improvement that surface in Scoring Committee discussions, WASC comments, public comments, or as an outcome of the Metrics and Monitoring Study (MMS) may be considered for implementation in future funding rounds. The process for evaluating and carrying out such changes is overseen by the District. Any potential updates to the Feasibility Study Guidelines (FSG) would require a 30-day public review period.

Rather than causing immediate change, outcomes from this discussion are intended to provide guidance to future Scoring Committee deliberations. District staff confirmed that any changes that are made to scoring practices would be made known to the Scoring Committee and to project applicants well before the project application deadline.

The Committee requested that the draft memo be updated and finalized with the contents of the discussions during this meeting, with a focus on ensuring the recommendations made by the Committee accompany the record of the comments made during deliberations. Recommendations from Rounds 1, 2, and 3 should also be incorporated in the draft memo.

Below are minutes of the discussion about the sections of the draft report.

• Variation in Infrastructure Project Submittal Type

The Committee described the difficulties associated with evaluating projects that submit Infrastructure Program (IP) applications for design funding only, as well as previously funded projects that submit applications for Operations and Maintenance (O&M) funding only. Those types of project applications may warrant a slightly different scoring approach, or weighted scoring system. For example, the Committee recommended projects applying for O&M funding be required to submit monitoring results instead of modeled water quality results (which are required of applicants seeking design or construction funding). Another example was that projects requesting construction funds should submit 90% or similar

Scoring Committee

Meeting Minutes



design plans and site-specific geotechnical reports. Vice-Chair Moon will send District staff a list of specific recommendations and encouraged other Committee Members to do the same.

The Committee discussed the potential outcomes of separating design only projects from construction projects in the SCWP application process. The Committee noted concerns related to funding too many design projects, because there is no guarantee that those projects will be constructed, either due to the developer shelving the project or because the available funding pool for construction may have dwindled by the time a design project returns for those funds. It may be useful to have a conversation with municipalities on this topic, recognizing that there are other funding programs that award design only projects.

Ultimately, Vice-Chair Moon reflected that the Watershed Area Steering Committees (WASCs) are responsible for deciding how many design only projects receive funding, and the Scoring Committee is responsible for confirming whether a project meets the eligibility threshold, including its feasibility for construction.

- **Water Quality Benefits**

The Committee discussed how to standardize calculations in the application so that projects can be more easily compared to one another. District staff is preparing to adjust the project module to cap the water quality benefits at 120% of the 85th percentile capacity. This would prevent applicants from oversizing a project to receive more points. In the updated module, project applicants will need to submit the project's 85th percentile storm capacity and supply calculations. District staff's eventual goal is for the module to calculate a project's 85th percentile storm capacity automatically.

The Committee expressed difficulty in assessing whether a project should be designated as a 'wet weather' or 'dry weather' project. There have been projects with large drainage areas that capture more than the dry weather runoff, but not the entire 85th percentile wet weather runoff. Recommendations discussed include a load-based criteria (proposed by the Scoring Committee after Round 1), which would allow projects to be categorized as either a dry weather, wet weather, or a load-based project. Another possibility discussed was to include a sliding scale for projects that capture quantities between dry and wet weather runoff volume. The Committee felt it is inaccurate for a project to be designated 'dry weather' when it captures more than the dry weather capacity. It is also not accurate for a project that doesn't capture the entire 85th percentile storm drainage area runoff to be classified as a wet weather project.

The Committee shared that dry weather calculations need to be standardized across projects and should allow the module's calculations to be superseded by monitoring data, if available. District staff will investigate standardizing the process for the flow calculation that is input by the applicant, since the module already has a standard number of dry days built in.

The Committee reiterated a recommendation that site-specific geotechnical reports should be required for projects that apply for construction funding. Geotechnical reports for properties adjacent to the project site should not be accepted for projects applying for construction funds.

District staff mentioned that more substantial changes, such as allowing multiple best management practice (BMP) types to be evaluated in the module may not be implemented until a future funding round.

- **Water Supply Benefits**

The Committee discussed how to award water supply benefit points for projects that propose groundwater recharge. The committee believes that the watermasters are unable to provide letters of concurrence unless projects definitively prove groundwater recharge will occur.

Scoring Committee

Meeting Minutes



The Committee acknowledged that not all Watershed Areas have groundwater aquifers, meaning some Watershed Areas are appropriate for infiltration projects and others are not. As a result, projects that can recharge to a groundwater aquifer more easily arrive at a qualifying score without addressing the other benefit categories and program goals.

Member Esther Rojas and Member Matt Stone, who both focus on water supply elements of submitted projects, concluded that in order to match the guidelines of the SCWP, they believe it is preferable to only award groundwater recharge points to projects that demonstrate direct proof of recharge. The members also suggested that it is not useful to incentivize projects to recharge at a site in a watershed area where conveyance of water to an infiltrative area may make more sense. Additionally, the members shared their belief that the intent of the SCWP's water supply benefit is for the newly conserved water to be accessible.

The Committee concluded that either the ordinance needs to redefine activities that generate a SCWP water supply benefit, or the scoring criteria must be adjusted. Committee Members shared that possible ways to adjust the scoring criteria include establishing different scoring thresholds for different Watershed Areas, creating a "base plus bonus" system of scoring, and/or assigning weights to different scoring categories.

Regional Coordinator Fossum noted that the Metrics and Monitoring Study (MMS) will be investigating how to lower or recalibrate the cost effectiveness for water supply benefits, in addition to evaluating the options of the North Santa Monica Bay Watershed Area, which does not have suitable potential for groundwater recharge.

The Committee clarified its position on a Round 3 Scoring Memo comment, concerning whether a project that creates new water demand and meets that demand with captured runoff can claim water supply benefits. If a project is claiming a water supply benefit by offsetting a new potable demand, the applicant should provide an analysis of supply and demand impacts of the project, as described in the 2022 Interim Guidance on Water Supply.

- **Community Investment Benefits**

The Committee concluded that school greening benefits will be evaluated on a per project basis for projects not located on a school campus. Generally, if a project has a joint use agreement with a school, the project may receive school greening credit.

The Committee agreed to evaluate projects that capture less than the 85th percentile storm as unable to claim flood protection benefits. This issue arose for projects that captured more than the dry weather capacity but had large drainage areas and were unable to capture the 85th percentile storm.

- **Nature-Based Solutions**

The Committee discussed and determined that artificial turf will not be considered a nature-based solution. Though artificial turf is green year-round, aids water conservation, and is technically a permeable surface, its negative ecological effects led to this determination.

The Committee then discussed how the percentage-based metric of impermeable surface removed has allowed project applicants to inflate this criteria's scores by specifying a small project area. For example, using only the area of sidewalks in a green streets project rather than the entire affected area would increase the percentage of impermeable surface removed. The original intent for the impermeable surface metric being a percentage was to standardize across projects with varying project area sizes. The Committee concluded that future Committee Members should be made aware of this tactic and the

Scoring Committee

Meeting Minutes



project application should be required to submit a description of impermeable surface removed relative to the total project area.

- **Leveraging Funds and Community Support Benefits**

The Committee confirmed that it can only evaluate secured leveraged funds. Funds that are merely “likely” to be secured will not count. Member Diaz also explained that letters of support for a project should be recent and addressed to the SCWP, instead of reusing letters of support addressed to other organizations.

The Committee agreed to recommend that the scoring system be adjusted so that certain categories are not optional. For example, the category for Leveraging Funds and Community Support (Part 2) is only worth five points, so project applicants can neglect community engagement and still pass the scoring threshold. The Committee felt that this should not be the case, as intentional community outreach and engagement should be centered in SCWP project development.

Agenda Item 5.b) District staff summarized that in the Round 4 Call for Projects, 33 Infrastructure Program projects were submitted and 30 passed the District’s completeness check. The total funding requested amounted to \$232 million, split across 20 wet weather projects and 10 dry weather projects. A variety of BMP options were represented—four bioretention projects, three biofiltration projects, four infiltration wells, ten infiltration facilities, eight treatment projects, and one diversion to sanitary sewer. Twenty-five of the projects were programmed into Stormwater Improvement Plans (SIP), which will be evaluated at a future Regional Oversight Committee (ROC) meeting. The SCWP SIP Tool displays the finalized SIPs for each WASC and all SIP transmittals will be posted on the Regional Oversight Committee’s webpage. District staff will consider adding information such as a project’s responsible agency and design status to the SCWP reporting tool in order to aid contractors going to bid for projects nearing design completion.

- d) Meeting Schedule**

District staff will send out a poll to confirm next month’s meeting time.

6. Public Comment Period for Agenda Items

There were no public comments.

7. Voting Items

There were no voting items.

8. Items for Next Agenda

The next meeting is tentatively scheduled for May. See the SCWP website for meeting details. Items on the Agenda include:

- a) Updated FY23-24 Scoring Memo

District staff will provide a summary of module and/or process changes to the Committee before applicant outreach and information sessions begin for the next funding round.

9. Adjournment

Vice-Chair Moon thanked the Committee and District staff and adjourned the meeting.

SCORING COMMITTEE MEETING - April 6, 2023

Member Type	Quorum Present		Items
	Member	Voting?	12/1/2022 Meeting Minutes
Water Supply	Matt Stone	x	Y
Water Supply / Community Investments / Nature-Based Solutions	Esther Rojas	x	Y
Community Investments	David Diaz	x	Y
Nature-Based Solutions / Water Quality	Bruce Reznik		Not Present
Water Quality	Dave Sorem	x	Y
Water Quality	TJ Moon	x	Y
Total Non-Vacant Seats	6	Yay (Y)	5
Total Voting Members Present	5	Nay (N)	0
		Abstain (A)	0
		Total	5
			Approved

Other Attendees	
Andrea Prado Iriarte	Marisol Ibarra
Andrew Kim	Mark Nguyen
Aric Martinez JLHA	Mike Scaduto
Christopher Vong	Mossavi, Conor
Daniel Rydberg	Paige Bistromowitz
Donna T	Raina
Gabriela Gonzalez	Richard Watson
Janet Rodriguez Livese	Samuel Linn
Jason Casanova	Shirley Fontanie
Jason W. Jones	Sienna Saucedo
Johanna Chang	Stacy Luell
Joyce Amaro	Susie Santilena
Julie Allen	Thom Epps
Lorena Matos	Tori Klug
M. Scaduto	Yen Pham
Maggie Gardner	

**Future Governance Committee
Meetings**



SAFE CLEAN WATER PROGRAM



Timeline and Where We Are Today

- March 2020 – Governor proclaimed a State of Emergency for California as a result of the threat of COVID-19
- September 2021 - Assembly Bill (AB) 361 signed into law to continue suspending Brown Act teleconference requirements when a local agency meets during a declared state of emergency, or local officials continue to recommend measures to promote social distancing.
- October 17, 2022 – Governor announced that the COVID-19 State of Emergency will end on February 28, 2023





Future Committee Meetings

- Starting March 1, to ensure quorum and effective communication during critical SIP deliberations such that all committee members can participate equally, committee members are highly encouraged to attend **in person** or send an alternate to attend in their place.
- If the meeting venue can accommodate hybrid meetings, committee members may have the option to attend virtually in compliance with the **Brown Act** or modified Brown Act per **AB2449**.
 - The District will send a survey prior to each meeting to confirm quorum and solicit required information for teleconferencing, if needed.
 - For meeting venue recommendations, please contact the District.





Brown Act Requirements

- Brown Act teleconference requirements:
 - Notice each teleconference location committee members attend from on the agenda
 - Post agenda at all teleconference locations
 - Each teleconference location to be accessible to the public
 - Members of the public may address the committee at each teleconference location





AB2449 Requirements

- AB2449 teleconference requirements - Board member's teleconference location does not need to be posted on the meeting notice or agenda, and does not have to be open to the public. However:
 - Quorum must participate in the meeting from a single physical location
 - Committee member must submit a disclosure of "just cause"
 - Committee member must participate remotely by audio *and* video
 - May not participate remotely under "just cause" more than two meetings within a calendar year
 - And may not participate remotely for any reason for more than three consecutive months or for 20 percent of the regular meetings within a calendar year.





Future SCW Committee Meetings

Questions?



Scoring Committee Memo

Comments and recommendations shared during Round 4 project scoring

4/6/23



SAFE CLEAN WATER L.A.



Summary Themes

- Variation in infrastructure project submittal types
- Standardized parameters for water quality calculations and ability to score projects with multiple BMP types
- Ability to earn water supply points
- Eligible community investment benefits
- Nature-based solutions
- Leveraged funding and community support letters



SAFE CLEAN WATER L.A.



Variation in project submittal type

- Separate applications for projects seeking design with multiple phases is encouraged
- Whether separate criteria is needed to evaluate:
 - Design-only requests
 - O&M-only requests
 - Design, implementation, **and** O&M funding requests
- How to evaluate design-only projects that propose a variety of alternatives



Water Quality Benefits

- Standardization across applicant submissions is encouraged
 - Projects should cap the maximum calculated 24-hour storm capacity at the 85th percentile
 - Provide clearer parameters for dry weather calculations (field measurements or standard cfs/ acre; # dry days/ year; 72-hour duration after wet weather event)
 - Require site-specific geotechnical data

A.1 Wet + Dry Weather Water Quality Benefits	50 points max	The Project provides water quality benefits				
	20 points max	<p>A.1.1: For Wet Weather BMPs Only: Water Quality Cost Effectiveness (Cost Effectiveness) = (24-hour BMP Capacity)² / (Capital Cost in \$Millions)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <0.4 (acre feet capacity / \$-Million) = 0 points 0.4-0.6 (acre feet capacity / \$-Million) = 7 points 0.6-0.8 (acre feet capacity / \$-Million) = 11 points 0.8-1.0 (acre feet capacity / \$-Million) = 14 points >1.0 (acre feet capacity / \$-Million) = 20 points <p>¹. Management of the 24-hour event is considered the maximum capacity of a Project for a 24-hour period. For water quality focused Projects, this would typically be the 85th percentile design storm capacity. Units are in acre-feet (AF).</p>				
- OR -	30 points max	<p>A.1.2: For Wet Weather BMPs Only: Water Quality Benefit - Quantify the pollutant reduction (i.e. concentration, load, exceedance day, etc.) for a class of pollutants using a similar analysis as the E/WMP which uses the Districts Watershed Management Modeling System (WMMS). The analysis should be an average percent reduction comparing influent and effluent for the class of pollutant over a ten-year period showing the impact of the Project. Modeling should include the latest performance data to reflect the efficiency of the BMP type.</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;"><u>Primary Class of Pollutants</u></td> <td style="text-align: center;"><u>Second or More Classes of Pollutant</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> >50% = 15 points >80% = 20 points <p>(20 Points Max)</p> </td> <td> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> >50% = 5 points >80% = 10 points <p>(10 Points Max)</p> </td> </tr> </table>	<u>Primary Class of Pollutants</u>	<u>Second or More Classes of Pollutant</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> >50% = 15 points >80% = 20 points <p>(20 Points Max)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> >50% = 5 points >80% = 10 points <p>(10 Points Max)</p>
	<u>Primary Class of Pollutants</u>	<u>Second or More Classes of Pollutant</u>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> >50% = 15 points >80% = 20 points <p>(20 Points Max)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> >50% = 5 points >80% = 10 points <p>(10 Points Max)</p>					
A.2 Dry Weather Only Water Quality Benefits	20 points	A.2.1: For dry weather BMPs only, Projects must be designed to capture, infiltrate, treat and release, or divert 100% (unless infeasible or prohibited for habitat, etc) of all tributary dry weather flows.				
	20 points max	<p>A.2.2: For Dry Weather BMPs Only. Tributary Size of the Dry Weather BMP</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <200 Acres = 10 points >200 Acres = 20 points 				



SAFE CLEAN WATER L.A.



Water Quality Benefits

- Projects should not be over-designed to treat more water than required
- More guidance needed to assess whether a project is dry weather or wet weather
- Evaluation of BMP types
 - Project module should allow projects with multiple BMP types to be assessed
 - How to evaluate non-infiltration BMPs (e.g. treat-and-release)

A.1 Wet + Dry Weather Water Quality Benefits	50 points max	The Project provides water quality benefits				
	20 points max	<p>A.1.1: For Wet Weather BMPs Only: Water Quality Cost Effectiveness (Cost Effectiveness) = (24-hour BMP Capacity)¹ / (Capital Cost in \$Millions)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <0.4 (acre feet capacity / \$-Million) = 0 points • 0.4-0.6 (acre feet capacity / \$-Million) = 7 points • 0.6-0.8 (acre feet capacity / \$-Million) = 11 points • 0.8-1.0 (acre feet capacity / \$-Million) = 14 points • >1.0 (acre feet capacity / \$-Million) = 20 points <p>¹. Management of the 24-hour event is considered the maximum capacity of a Project for a 24-hour period. For water quality focused Projects, this would typically be the 85th percentile design storm capacity. Units are in acre-feet (AF).</p>				
- OR -	30 points max	<p>A.1.2: For Wet Weather BMPs Only: Water Quality Benefit - Quantify the pollutant reduction (i.e. concentration, load, exceedance day, etc.) for a class of pollutants using a similar analysis as the E/WMP which uses the Districts Watershed Management Modeling System (WMMS). The analysis should be an average percent reduction comparing influent and effluent for the class of pollutant over a ten-year period showing the impact of the Project. Modeling should include the latest performance data to reflect the efficiency of the BMP type.</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;"><u>Primary Class of Pollutants</u></td> <td style="text-align: center;"><u>Second or More Classes of Pollutant</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • >50% = 15 points • >80% = 20 points (20 Points Max) </td> <td> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • >50% = 5 points • >80% = 10 points (10 Points Max) </td> </tr> </table>	<u>Primary Class of Pollutants</u>	<u>Second or More Classes of Pollutant</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • >50% = 15 points • >80% = 20 points (20 Points Max) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • >50% = 5 points • >80% = 10 points (10 Points Max)
	<u>Primary Class of Pollutants</u>	<u>Second or More Classes of Pollutant</u>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • >50% = 15 points • >80% = 20 points (20 Points Max) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • >50% = 5 points • >80% = 10 points (10 Points Max) 					
A.2 Dry Weather Only Water Quality Benefits	20 points	A.2.1: For dry weather BMPs only, Projects must be designed to capture, infiltrate, treat and release, or divert 100% (unless infeasible or prohibited for habitat, etc) of all tributary dry weather flows.				
	20 points max	<p>A.2.2: For Dry Weather BMPs Only. Tributary Size of the Dry Weather BMP</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <200 Acres = 10 points • >200 Acres = 20 points 				



SAFE CLEAN WATER L.A.



Water Supply Benefits

- Clarification on whether to give partial points for projects that demonstrate the intent for recharge in regions with deep aquifers
- Lowering threshold for earning water supply cost effectiveness points

B. Significant Water Supply Benefits	25 points max	The Project provides water re-use and/or water supply enhancement benefits
	13 points max	<p>B1. Water Supply Cost Effectiveness. The Total Life-Cycle Cost² per unit of acre foot of Stormwater and/or Urban Runoff volume captured for water supply is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • >\$2500/ac-ft = 0 points • \$2,000–2,500/ac-ft = 3 points • \$1500–2,000/ac-ft = 6 points • \$1000–1500/ac-ft = 10 points • <\$1000/ac-ft = 13 points <p>². Total Life-Cycle Cost: The annualized value of all Capital, planning, design, land acquisition, construction, and total life O&M costs for the Project for the entire life span of the Project (e.g. 50-year design life span should account for 50-years of O&M). The annualized cost is used over the present value to provide a preference to Projects with longer life spans.</p>
	12 points max	<p>B2. Water Supply Benefit Magnitude. The yearly additional water supply volume resulting from the Project is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <25 ac-ft/year = 0 points • 25 - 100 ac-ft/year = 2 points • 100 - 200 ac-ft/year = 5 points • 200 - 300 ac-ft/year = 9 points • >300 ac-ft/year = 12 points



Nature-based Solutions

- Clarify stance on artificial turf
- Update impermeable surface calculation of points: based on total size of removed area rather than percentage of removed area

D. Nature-Based Solutions	15 points max	The Project implements Nature-Based Solutions
	15 points	D1. Project: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implements natural processes or mimics natural processes to slow, detain, capture, and absorb/infiltrate water in a manner that protects, enhances and/or restores habitat, green space and/or usable open space = 5 points • Utilizes natural materials such as soils and vegetation with a preference for native vegetation = 5 points • Removes Impermeable Area from Project (1 point per 20% paved area removed) = 5 points



SAFE CLEAN WATER L.A.



Leveraging Funds and Community Support

- The SC is only responsible for evaluating **secured** leveraged funds.
- Letters of support can be addressed to other funding sources.

E. Leveraging Funds and Community Support	10 points max	The Project achieves one or more of the following:
	6 points max	E1. Cost-Share. Additional Funding has been awarded for the Project. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • >25% Funding Matched = 3 points • >50% Funding Matched = 6 points
	4 points	E2. The Project demonstrates strong local, community-based support and/or has been developed as part of a partnership with local NGOs/CBOs.



SAFE CLEAN WATER L.A.



To:	Safe, Clean Water Program 900 South Fremont Ave Alhambra, CA 91803	From:	Mike Antos, Ryanna Fossum Stantec Consulting Inc 300 North Lake Avenue, #400 Pasadena, CA 91101
		Date:	January 30, 2023

Reference: Scoring Committee Comments and Recommendations during Safe Clean Water Program Call for Projects Fiscal Year 2023-2024

PURPOSE AND BACKGROUND

At the November 3, 2022 Scoring Committee Meeting, Chair Bruce Reznik requested that note-takers keep a list of the items discussed regarding the Safe Clean Water Program (SCWP) scoring system. The following memorandum includes a list of systemic updates discussed or mentioned during Scoring Committee meetings for Round 4 Projects (Fiscal Year 2023-2024).

Previous comments and feedback about the scoring system discussed during the prior round of project scoring are included in this [memo](#), dated April 18, 2022.

VARIATION IN INFRASTRUCTURE SUBMITTAL TYPES

The following comments reflect the Scoring Committee's thinking about how projects submitted for design funding only or a previously or concurrently implemented project seeking only Operations and Maintenance (O&M) funding are difficult to evaluate alongside projects seeking design, construction, and O&M funding.

- September 1, 2022 – There is not yet guidance to help evaluate design-only projects that propose a variety of alternatives. An audit to compare benefits promised and benefits realized for projects that received SCWP funding may be needed (Member Matt Stone).
- October 6, 2022 – As noted in previous rounds of scoring, it is difficult to score O&M projects using the current Scoring Criteria (comment by Member Diaz and concurrence by Chair Reznik).
- November 3, 2022 – As noted in previous rounds of scoring, projects that apply for both design and construction funding should submit separate applications, especially if there are multiple phases of the project (Committee Members).
- November 3, 2022 – As noted in previous rounds of scoring, evaluation of projects seeking design-only funding is typically more lenient than projects seeking both design and construction funding (Chair Reznik).
- December 1, 2022 – Projects requesting a small amount for design only projects and then later requesting a large amount for construction should be considered together (design + construction) during the scoring process as it relates to the cost benefit ratio of a project (Committee Members).

WATER QUALITY BENEFITS

January 30, 2023

Safe, Clean Water Program

Page 2 of 4

Reference: Scoring Committee Comments and Recommendations during Safe Clean Water Program Call for Projects Fiscal Year 2023-2024

The following comments reflect the Scoring Committee considering the issues around assessing a project as providing wet weather Water Quality Benefits as opposed to dry weather Water Quality Benefits and practices to standardize project applications for assessment.

- September 1, 2022 – More guidance is needed to assess whether projects are dry weather or wet weather (Vice Chair TJ Moon).
- October 17, 2022 – The maximum calculated 24-hour storm capacity should be capped at the 85th percentile storm capacity. This cap will reduce the points historically awarded to applicants that use a larger capacity in calculations (Vice Chair Moon).
 - Concerns about inaccurate system capacity calculations that go above the 85th percentile storm capacity were raised again at the November 3rd and November 9th Scoring Committee Meetings.
- November 3, 2022 – Projects with treat-and-release or propriety BMPs should be evaluated with the results of the Metrics and Monitoring Study instead of being treated as an infiltration basin in the SCW module (Vice Chair Moon).
- November 9, 2022 -- The Project Module and Scoring Criteria are not equipped to allow applicants to input multiple structural Best Management Practice (BMP) types (e.g. dry wells and treat-and-release) (Vice Chair Moon).
- December 1, 2022 – Some form of standardization for dry weather should be created for future applications. Field measurements are ideal but using a standard authority's cubic feet per second (cfs) per acre could also be considered. The number of dry days in a year assumed in an application should also be standardized. If an applicant uses a 24-hour duration instead of the standard 72-hour duration used after a wet weather event to mark when dry weather begins, they should provide justification. (Vice Chair Moon).
- December 1, 2022 – Projects should not be designed to treat more water than required, as it increases the cost and use of SCWP funds (Vice Chair Moon).
- December 1, 2022 – For future applications, site-specific geotechnical data should be required and may be a step in the District's preliminary verification process (Vice Chair Moon).

WATER SUPPLY BENEFITS

The following comments reflect the Scoring Committee considering how Water Supply Benefits can be assessed and considered for other-than infiltration to groundwater.

- November 3, 2022 – Water supply cost effectiveness points are difficult to earn (Chair Reznik)
- November 3, 2022 – The Scoring Committee should consider whether projects located in Watershed Areas with very deep aquifers should be awarded Water Supply Benefit points for interventions that intend to recharge the aquifer (such as concrete removal), even if no direct path to the aquifer is specified (comment by Member Stone and concurrence by Member Esther Rojas).

Reference: Scoring Committee Comments and Recommendations during Safe Clean Water Program Call for Projects Fiscal Year 2023-2024

- In the past, no points have been awarded to projects in Watershed Areas with very deep aquifers, but the Scoring Committee has given partial points to projects that demonstrate the intent for recharge in regions where aquifers are present (Vice Chair Moon).

COMMUNITY INVESTMENT BENEFITS

The following comments reflect the Scoring Committee considering how school greening and flood protection benefits can be considered for Community Investment Benefits.

- October 17, 2022 – As noted in previous rounds of scoring, school greening points should only be awarded to projects that directly green school campuses (Chair Reznik).
- November 3, 2022 – The Scoring Committee should consider whether school greening points may be awarded to projects that are not located on school property but located on property which the school uses or intends to use (Chair Reznik).
- November 3, 2022 – Flood protection benefits cannot be awarded to dry weather projects for Community Investment points (comment by Member David Diaz and concurrence by Chair Reznik).
- November 9, 2022 – More discussion is needed to decide whether all wet weather projects confer flood protection benefits, or just those which treat the 85th percentile storm (comment by Vice Chair Moon).

NATURE-BASED SOLUTIONS

The following comments reflect the Scoring Committee considering the elements of Nature-Based Solutions Benefits.

- November 3, 2022 – The Committee's stance on artificial turf as a nature-based solution should be discussed (Chair Reznik).
- November 3, 2022 – Because removal of impermeable surfaces is expressed as a percentage, applicants can game the Scoring Criteria by reducing the overall project area and inaccurately represent claimed benefits (Chair Reznik).
- December 1, 2022 – There may be a gradient point scale developed for points awarded for percent reduction in impervious area (District Staff).

LEVERAGING FUNDS AND COMMUNITY SUPPORT

The following comments reflect the Scoring Committee considering the elements of Leveraged Funds and Community Support Criteria.

- October 17, 2022 – The Scoring Committee is only responsible for evaluating leveraged funds that have been secured. The Watershed Area Steering Committees would be responsible for evaluating the likelihood of securing funds not yet committed (District Staff).
- October 17, 2022 – It is acceptable to evaluate letters of support for projects that are addressed to other funding sources, so long as the project has not drastically changed and the length of time since

January 30, 2023

Safe, Clean Water Program

Page 4 of 4

Reference: Scoring Committee Comments and Recommendations during Safe Clean Water Program Call for Projects Fiscal Year 2023-2024

the letter was dated is not too great (comment by member Diaz and concurrence by Chair Reznik and Vice Chair Moon).

OTHER ITEMS

The following comments reflect other issues raised by members of the Scoring Committee that were not similar to the categories identified above.

Considerations for North Santa Monica Bay Watershed Area

- October 6, 2022 – It has been difficult to generate qualifying projects in the North Santa Monica Bay Watershed Area, and a separate scoring system should be considered (comment made by Chair Reznik).

Estimates of O&M costs vary

- October 17, 2022 - Inconsistent estimates of O&M costs across applications make it difficult to assess projects (Vice Chair Moon).