

# Scoring Committee

## Meeting Minutes

---



Monday, October 23, 2023

9:00am – 12:00pm

WebEx Hybrid Meeting

LA County Public Works Headquarters

1st Floor (Courtyard) Conference Room B 900 S. Fremont Ave, Alhambra, CA 91803

### 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)

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

### Committee Members Absent:

Matt Stone, Santa Clarita Valley Water Agency (Water Supply)

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

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

---

## **1. Welcome and Introductions**

Los Angeles County Flood Control District (District) staff conducted a brief tutorial on WebEx.

Bruce Reznik, Chair of the Scoring Committee, acknowledged the recent passing of significant local water leaders Mark Abramson and Cindy Montañez.

Chair Reznik welcomed Committee Members and called the meeting to order. Committee Members present made self-introductions. District staff noted that no discussions may be held until a quorum is established. Member David Diaz joined meeting and a quorum was established.

## **2. Approval of Meeting Minutes from October 5, 2023**

District staff presented the meeting minutes from the October 5, 2023 meeting. Member Diaz motioned to approve the meeting minutes. The motion was seconded by Vice-Chair TJ Moon. The Committee voted to approve the October 5, 2023 meeting minutes, with 4 votes in favor (approved, see vote tracking sheet).

## **3. Committee Member and District Updates**

District staff provided an update, noting:

- The first term for the Scoring Committee and Watershed Area Steering Committee (WASC) Community Stakeholder seats ended with the end of the last fiscal year. The Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors (Board) is to appoint WASC Community Stakeholder seats for the next term. Appointments to begin as early as by end of the year.
- Fiscal Year (FY) 2023-24 Q1 (July-September) is due November 15. Quarterly reports must still be completed even if there was no activity done on the project or the Transfer Agreement has not been executed for projects included in the FY22-23 Stormwater Investment Plan (SIP).
- FY23-24 Transfer Agreements/Addendum distribution began the third week of October.
- The Project Modification Guidelines are finalized. The purpose of this document is to provide more specific guidance to WASCs, applicants, recipients, and other interested stakeholders when modifications to a Project, project concept or study are proposed. The deadline to submit the Project Modification Request (PMR) form for the current fiscal year has been extended to November 30. The Project Modification Guidelines can be found in the Adaptive Management section in the Regional Program dropdown of the SCW Program website. The October 23

# Scoring Committee Meeting Minutes



implementation update has additional supporting information. The District also hosted an information session on October 19 to help with the process. Its recording is available on the SCWP website.

- Municipal progress/expenditure reports are due December 31 for activities between July 2022 through June 2023.
- The Regional Oversight Committee (ROC) shall biennially prepare a SCWP Progress Report for the Board every two years, which includes a summary of the progress of the Regional Program, Municipal Program, and the District Program. The ROC has been meeting to discuss the Biennial Report Draft and initiate public comment period. The next ROC meeting is on October 26 at 1:00 pm, and all Committee Members are invited to attend to provide input. Meeting details can be found on the SCW Program website.
- The [Bids and Schedules](#) page provides information on upcoming bid opportunities and construction schedules provided by SCW Regional and Municipal Project Developers in the Reporting Module.
- The [Reporting Repository](#) page contains reports from the Regional and Municipal Programs such as Project Applications, Executive Summaries, and Progress Reports (Annual & Quarterly).
- The [Spatial Data Library](#) instructional video and guide PDF are now available on the Spatial Data Library website. The library is a collection of 40+ public datasets relevant to the SCW Program. It is periodically updated to include new project information and other changes.

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

District staff compiled all public comment cards received by 5:00pm the day before the meeting, uploaded them to the SCW Program website, and displayed them on-screen.

No public comment cards were received before the meeting. There were no other public comments.

#### 5. Discussion Items:

##### a) Ex Parte Communication Disclosure

Chair Reznik disclosed involvement in recent meetings about the Biennial Report. Chair Reznik additionally shared that the Central Santa Monica Bay (CSMB) WASC Watershed Coordinators gave a brief presentation on the Torrance Airport Stormwater Basin Project. It was noted that LA Waterkeeper has engaged in cost share efforts with Caltrans. Chair Reznik will share more information as it becomes available.

##### b) Scoring of FY24-25 Infrastructure Program Projects

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

<b>Project:</b> Lynwood City Park Stormwater Capture Project			<b>WASC(s):</b> Lower Los Angeles River (LLAR)
<b>Water Supply Scoring Pilot:</b> No			
Category	Applicant Score	Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Part 1	20	20	
Water Quality Part 2	25	25	
Water Supply Part 1	0	0	See Below
Water Supply Part 2	9	0	See Below

# Scoring Committee Meeting Minutes



Community Investment	10	5	See Below
Nature-Based Solutions	12	12	
Leveraging Funds Part 1	0	0	
Leveraging Funds Part 2 (Community Support)	4	2	See Below
<b>Conclusion:</b> The project received 64 points and will move to the WASC for consideration.			
<b>Discussion:</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>Water Supply:</u> Vice-Chair Moon shared some of the limitations of the Watershed Management Modeling System (WMMS), which is used to model infiltration rates for different projects. Vice-Chair Moon noted that the model is assuming that all water will be infiltrated into the aquifer, but since the project is treat-and-release, there should not be any water supply benefits attributed to the project, as it cannot be assumed that all the released water will be infiltrated.</li> <li><u>Community Investment:</u> Member Diaz noted that no points for greening of schools can be awarded as the project is adjacent to a school, but not directly on school property.</li> <li><u>Leveraging Funds Part 2:</u> Member Diaz noted that the project received three letters of support and had one tabling event.</li> </ul>			

<b>Project:</b> Agoura Hills Stormwater Diversion Project		<b>WASC(s):</b> North Santa Monica Bay (NSMB)	
<b>Water Supply Scoring Pilot:</b> No			
<b>Category</b>	<b>Applicant Score</b>	<b>Committee Score</b>	<b>Notes</b>
Water Quality Part 1	20	20	See Below
Water Quality Part 2	20	20	See Below
Water Supply Part 1	13	13	See Below
Water Supply Part 2	12	12	
Community Investment	2	2	
Nature-Based Solutions	0	0	
Leveraging Funds Part 1	3	3	See Below
Leveraging Funds Part 2 (Community Support)	4	2	
<b>Conclusion:</b> The project received 72 points and will move to the WASC for consideration.			
<b>Discussion:</b>			

# Scoring Committee Meeting Minutes



- **Water Quality:** Vice-Chair Moon noted that the project constitutes of ten gravity-fed low-flow diversions. Vice-Chair Moon shared that low-flow diversions are typically pumped and expressed concern about the flow reaching the sewer system by gravity. Vice-Chair Moon highlighted that Las Virgenes Municipal Water District submitted a letter of support and accepted the score of 20 points for Water Quality Part 1. Vice-Chair Moon highlighted that the project has a tributary area greater than 200-acres, accepting the score of 20 points for Water Quality Part 2.
- **Water Supply:** Vice-Chair Moon accepted the applicant score for Water Supply, noting that water will be taken to Tapia Water Reclamation Facility until the Pure Water Project Las Virgenes-Triunfo has been completed. Chair Reznik commented that it appears that Las Virgenes Municipal Water District is hoping to recycle 100% of the water through the Pure Water Project. Jessica Forte (City of Agoura Hills) confirmed Chair Reznik’s understanding and noted that currently, recycled water is used for landscaping, but eventually, when the Pure Water Project is completed, the recycled water will also serve as a source of drinking water.
- **Community Investment:** Member Diaz commented that the points claimed for recreational enhancements at Lake Lindero Gold Course were a slight exaggeration but granted the project 2 points.
- **Leveraging Funds:** Member Diaz noted that project developers secured \$1.2 million from the Department of Water Resources and agreed with the 3 points for Leveraging Funds Part 1. Member Diaz awarded the project 2 points for Leveraging Funds Part 2, noting that although some outreach efforts were held, it was not clear how input would then be incorporated into the design.
- Forte commented that other community outreach efforts involved participation in different public events, including concerts, but it was difficult to get the public invested and excited about the project.

<b>Project:</b> South El Monte High School Stormwater Improvement Project		<b>WASC(s):</b> Rio Hondo (RH)	
<b>Water Supply Scoring Pilot:</b> No			
Category	Applicant Score	Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Part 1	11	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	0	0	
Community Investment	10	10	See Below
Nature-Based Solutions	10	10	
Leveraging Funds Part 1	0	0	
Leveraging Funds Part 2 (Community Support)	4	4	
<b>Conclusion:</b> The project could not be scored and is awaiting additional information from the applicant.			
<b>Discussion:</b>			

# Scoring Committee

## Meeting Minutes



- Water Quality: Vice-Chair Moon shared that the biggest concern in this project's application was the lack of a geotechnical report. Vice-Chair Moon referenced page 15 of the application, which notes a groundwater level historical high of 5 feet (ft) below the surface, which is very shallow and would make it very difficult to implement what is being proposed. Additionally, Vice-Chair Moon shared that an infiltration rate of 0.29 (inches per hour) in/hr is indicated, but without a geotechnical report, further justification is required.
  - Jesse Williams (Jacobs), a representative of the Technical Assistance Team assigned via the TRP award to this project concept, confirmed that the groundwater level historical high of 5ft below the surface is accurate. Since the level is very shallow, the design was made assuming that there would be no infiltration. The design also includes underdrains and other engineering solutions that would still provide the necessary effective drawdown to avoid bioswale concerns. Williams noted that the project map shows an area intended for a future water supply component, but that it is not included at this time.
  - Vice-Chair Moon noted that project plans depict underdrains, which, according to City of Los Angeles standards, require a 10ft distance from the high groundwater level. With the stated groundwater level of 5ft below the surface, it is not possible to complete the project elements being proposed.
  - Williams noted that due to the lack of geotechnical data, the proposal includes both underdrains and liners, an engineering solution designed for the worst-case scenario.
  - District staff asked for confirmation about the indicated infiltration rate of 0.29 in/hr. Williams clarified that the water is drawing down to the underdrains and a storm drain on the southwest corner of the campus. No water supply benefits are claimed.
  - Vice-Chair Moon commented that the inclusion of liners should prevent groundwater going into the BMP and accepted the proposition.
  - Vice-Chair Moon shared uncertainty about whether the project should be considered an 85<sup>th</sup> percentile project. Williams noted that the design was made to meet the 85<sup>th</sup> percentile storm volume without the harvesting component and it is intended for it to capture a little more than the 85<sup>th</sup> percentile storm volume. Vice-Chair Moon referenced page 22 of the project application, which notes an 85<sup>th</sup> percentile storm volume of 11.2 acre-feet (AF) and noted that the total estimated inflow of the project and flow capacity indicated (4.2 AF) do not capture the full 85<sup>th</sup> percentile. Williams noted that confusion may be due to wording used in the application.
  - Chair Reznik suggested marking the project as "unable to score." Vice-Chair Moon offered to meet with Williams a later time to further discuss the project and answer any lingering questions. Vice-Chair Moon summarized requests for additional information, noting the need to confirm that this is an 85<sup>th</sup> percentile project and the appropriate documentation to support the claim, as well as BMP design documentation to ensure the liner is appropriate. District staff noted that during completeness checks, the District reached out to project applicants to confirm the claimed 4.2 AF. District staff will review correspondence with project developers about the topic.
- Member Diaz asked District staff if a geotechnical report is a requirement and if it is something the District looks for during completeness checks. District staff added that a lot of applications submit a feasibility study with limited geotechnical data. District staff noted that there are efforts to reframe the scope so that there is an emphasis in geotechnical data in future rounds.
- Community Investment: Vice-Chair Moon noted that what is claimed for Community Investment may change depending on whether there is confirmation that this is an 85<sup>th</sup> percentile project.

# Scoring Committee Meeting Minutes



<b>Project:</b> Washington Park Stormwater Capture Project			<b>WASC(s):</b> RH
<b>Water Supply Scoring Pilot:</b> No			
Category	Applicant Score	Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Part 1	20	20	See Below
Water Quality Part 2	30	20	
Water Supply Part 1	0	0	
Water Supply Part 2	5	0	See Below
Community Investment	10	5	See Below
Nature-Based Solutions	14	14	
Leveraging Funds Part 1	0	0	
Leveraging Funds Part 2 (Community Support)	4	3	
<b>Conclusion:</b> The project received 62 points and will move to the WASC for consideration.			
<b>Discussion:</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Water Quality:</u> Vice-Chair Moon noted that the application claims to be capturing only 67% of the 85<sup>th</sup> percentile storm volume and treating only 38% of the volume. Since only 0.21 in/hr is being treated when there is an infiltration rate of 0.28 in/hr, Vice-Chair Moon suggested classifying the project as a dry weather project instead. Under a dry-weather project classification, Vice-Chair Moon agrees with the recommended 20 points for Water Quality.</li> <li>• <u>Water Supply:</u> Member Esther Rojas noted that the 5 points claimed under this category reference a letter that clearly states that the project does not create any additional water, but rather only diverts flows. Member Rojas awarded the project 0 points for Water Supply.</li> <li>• <u>Community Investment:</u> Member Diaz noted that some of the benefits claimed are questionable, including access to waterways and streams, as well as benches for recreational opportunities, thus awarding the project 5 points.</li> <li>• <u>Leveraging Funds Part 2:</u> Member Diaz appreciated community outreach efforts but noted that it was difficult to see a direct connection to the project.</li> <li>• Christian Herencia (WSP) confirmed that the treatment rate of 0.21 in/hr is correct and asked for clarification on the disagreement with the community investment efforts. Chair Reznik noted that without a green school or flood control, the total points awarded under the Community Investment category would be 5 points at most.</li> </ul>			

<b>Project:</b> Dominguez Channel Parkway BMPs Prioritization Project			<b>WASC(s):</b> South Santa Monica Bay (SSMB)
<b>Water Supply Scoring Pilot:</b> No			
Category	Applicant Score	Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Part 1	20	20	
Water Quality Part 2	20	20	

# Scoring Committee Meeting Minutes



Water Supply Part 1	10	Unable to Score	See Below
Water Supply Part 2	9	Unable to Score	See Below
Community Investment	5	5	
Nature-Based Solutions	14	14	
Leveraging Funds Part 1	0	0	
Leveraging Funds Part 2 (Community Support)	0	0	

**Conclusion:** The project could not be scored and is awaiting additional information from the applicant.

**Discussion:**

- Water Supply: Member Rojas expressed disagreement with the scoring for the Water Supply Benefits, noting that the application did not specify the portion of flow being diverted to the treatment facility. Member Rojas added that the application claimed groundwater recharge without having done the analysis required to prove that is the case. Member Rojas added that it is unclear whether the water captured and sent to the treatment facility is really a new water supply, or if it would have been captured regardless. Project applicants have the opportunity to provide supplemental information to demonstrate that the project results in a new water supply source.
- Nature-Based Solutions: Committee Members requested for clarification on the claim for Nature-Based Solution points. Larry Tortuya (CWE) clarified that the majority of the project consists of removing and replacing to avoid any impacts on the construction area. Tortuya added that what is being removed is being replaced with impervious, which is the basis of the claim for Nature-Based Solution points.

<b>Project:</b> Torrance Airport Stormwater Basin Project			<b>WASC(s):</b> SSMB
<b>Water Supply Scoring Pilot:</b> Yes			
Category	Applicant Score	Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Part 1	11	11	
Water Quality Part 2	30	30	See Below
Water Supply Part 1	7	7	See Below
Water Supply Part 2	7	7	
Community Investment	5	5	
Nature-Based Solutions	10	10	
Leveraging Funds Part 1	0	0	
Leveraging Funds Part 2 (Community Support)	4	2	See Below

# Scoring Committee Meeting Minutes



**Conclusion:** The project received 72 points and will move to the WASC for consideration.

**Discussion:**

- Water Quality: Vice-Chair Moon confirmed that the project is an 85<sup>th</sup> percentile project and agreed with the applicant score.
- Water Supply: District staff noted that the project applicant opted for the project to be scored using the Alternate Water Supply Scoring Pilot. District staff clarified that the Metrics and Monitoring Study (MMS) developed the Alternate Water Supply Scoring Pilot using data from different project costs to adapt the scale and make it easier for smaller projects to receive points. Chair Reznik pointed out that the multi-benefit nature of the projects makes it difficult to determine the exact amount of money that benefits Water Supply. Since the Water Supply Benefit points are based on project cost, Chair Reznik noted that it might not be the most accurate scoring method. Member Rojas noted that the application provides enough detail to support the claim for Water Supply and accepted the applicant score of 7 points.
- Leveraging Funds Part 2: Member Diaz expressed difficulty in scoring this section due to the way an active airport impacts surrounding communities. Member Diaz noted that the applicant clearly stated outreach efforts with airport employees and administration, but not with community members, who Member Diaz does not think would support a project taking place at an active airport. Chair Reznik concurred with Diaz’s opinion and scoring.

<b>Project:</b> Baldwin Vista Green Streets Project			<b>WASC(s):</b> Central Santa Monica Bay (CSMB)
<b>Water Supply Scoring Pilot:</b>			
Category	Applicant Score	Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Part 1	20	Unable to Score	See Below
Water Quality Part 2	30	Unable to Score	
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	0	0	
Leveraging Funds Part 2 (Community Support)	4	3	
<b>Conclusion:</b> The project could not be scored and is awaiting additional information from the applicant.			
<b>Discussion:</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Water Quality:</u> Vice-Chair Moon expressed concern over the limited geotechnical data submitted for the project, which only included a information on a portion of the drainage area. Vice-Chair Moon was also concerned over the discrepancy between the user inputted 85<sup>th</sup> percentile storm volume of 3.9 acre-feet and the Project Module generated 24-hr capacity of 14.24 acre-feet,.</li> </ul>			





- A City of Los Angeles Sanitation and Environment (LASAN) representative commented that two rounds of geotechnical analysis were completed for this project. The geotechnical analysis found high groundwater levels on the west side, which is why the infiltration elements of the project were relocated to the east side, which had better percolation rates and no high groundwater. Because many drywells are proposed for the project and there is limited budget, LASAN has been selective of the locations where analysis has been performed. Vice-Chair Moon expressed concern about not having enough geotechnical to verify the feasibility of the dry wells.
- Community Investment: Member Diaz asked LASAN to confirm whether the project intends to build a bike lane. LASAN representative responded that the project does not include a bike lane, but will improve the street right of way through the addition of shade. Member Diaz noted that it is difficult to accept that the project improves bikeability, without the creation/enhancement of a bike lane, however, the project does improve walkability.

## 6. Public Comment Period for Agenda Items

Kathleen McGowan (McGowan Consulting) provided public comment on the Torrance Airport Stormwater Basin Project. McGowan expressed appreciation for the passing score and thanked LA Waterkeeper for their work with Caltrans to generate leverage funding. McGowan clarified that the Project does not benefit Torrance Airport directly, therefore a lot of engagement has focused on working with airport-related individuals to better understand how the project will be less impactful for them. McGowan recognized the airport impacts the community and will do outreach around the project to mitigate construction impacts.

Oliver Galang (Craftwater) provided public comment clarifying on the Torrance Airport Stormwater Basin Project's Nature-Based Solutions discussion. Galang cited that the Committee made a comment earlier in the meeting that the Nature-Based Solution Benefits, regarding impermeable area for the project, was based on the disturbed area. Galang asked the Committee for clarification on if the score is based on disturbed area only. Chair Reznik responded that one of the shortcomings of the SCW Program is that the SCW Program has not converted more areas to green space. The Biennial Report may have more information on this guidance.

Larry Tortuya (CWE) provided public comment on the Dominguez Channel Parkway BMPs Prioritization Project. Tortuya shared additional calculations to estimate a specific water supply volume, which is what Member Rojas requested. District staff noted that the project will have a week to submit supplemental information as requested by the Scoring Committee. District staff will follow-up via email with additional information on the submittal process.

Dawn Petschauer (City of Pasadena) provided public comment on the Washington Park Stormwater Capture Project. Petschauer responded to the Committee's earlier discussion and recommendation for the project to be recategorized as a dry-weather project. Petschauer explained that the project intends to be a wet weather project due to large BMPs. Petschauer additionally highlighted community engagement and outreach efforts. Petschauer noted that community members expressed requests that the project does not disturb current park activities. The project responded to community feedback by moving to an area with a lot of green space. Washington Park Stormwater Capture Project includes wet weather, water quality, and recreational benefits. Petschauer additionally noted that the community specifically expressed interest in improved passive recreational benefits, such as bird watching.

Brent Maue (City of Pasadena) also spoke on behalf of the Washington Park Stormwater Capture Project, underscoring that the community expressed a strong request that the park's green space remain the same. Maue added that the project is capturing water to infiltrate into the Raymond Basin. Maue noted that although the target aquifer is different from the Main San Gabriel or Central Basin, it is still a basin where water levels continue to drop and where the project will have a positive impact.

Christian Herencia (WSP) provided public comment on the Washington Park Stormwater Capture Project and asked the Committee if funding requests are different for dry-weather and wet-weather projects. Chair

# Scoring Committee

## Meeting Minutes

---



Reznik noted that although reclassifying the project as a dry-weather project was made during the scoring, the project passed the 60-point threshold and is moving forward. District staff noted that if there is supplemental information project developers would like submit it would need to be within a week and would have to go through rescoring in early December. Chair Reznik noted that this process is not necessary, since the project passed the scoring and WASCs tend to not evaluate projects based on individual points earned.

Mike Scaduto (LASAN) provided public comment on the Baldwin Vista Green Streets Project. Scaduto shared that attempting to do geotechnical analysis through the entire watershed may be problematic. Scaduto shared confidently that the geotechnical information that is available and that was provided is enough to ensure that the project will be successful. Vice-Chair Moon clarified that new geotechnical analysis is not being requested, but rather the existing geotechnical data should be provided to better support the claimed values. Vice-Chair Moon concluded that scoring can be completed after the appropriate geotechnical is shared to confirm the stated groundwater levels.

### 7. Voting Items

- a) **From Today:** Send scoreable projects receiving a passing score to Watershed Area Steering Committees.
  - i. Lynwood City Park Stormwater Capture Project
  - ii. Agoura Hills Stormwater Diversion Project
  - iii. Washington Park Stormwater Capture Project
  - iv. Torrance Airport Stormwater Basin Project

Member Diaz motioned to send the above projects to the WASC, seconded by Vice-Chair Moon. The motion is approved, with 4 votes in favor (approved, see vote tracking sheet).

- b) **From Today:** Allow Project Applicants with unscorable projects 1 week to provide clarifying information to Scoring Committee
  - i. South El Monte High School Stormwater Improvement Project
  - ii. Dominguez Channel Parkway BMPs Prioritization Project
  - iii. Baldwin Vista Green Streets Project

Member Rojas motioned to send the above projects back to the project applicants for more clarifying information, seconded by Vice-Chair Moon. The motion is approved, with 4 votes in favor (approved, see vote tracking sheet).

### 8. Items for Next Agenda

The next meeting is scheduled for November 2, 2023, 9:00am – 12:00pm. See the SCWP website for meeting details. Items on the Agenda include:

- a) Scoring of FY24-25 Infrastructure Projects ([Project Scoring Schedule](#))

### 9. Adjournment

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

**SCORING COMMITTEE MEETING - October 23, 2023**

Member Type	Quorum Present		Voting Items		
	Member	Voting?	10/5 Meeting Minutes	From today, 10/23 SC mtg: Send projects receiving a passing score to WASCs	From today, 10/23 SC mtg: Allow Project Applicants with unscorable projects 1 week to provide clarifying information
Water Supply	Matt Stone				
Water Supply / Community Investments / Nature-Based Solutions	Esther Rojas	x	y	y	y
Community Investments	David Diaz	x	y	y	y
Nature-Based Solutions / Water Quality	<b>Bruce Reznik</b>	x	y	y	y
Water Quality	Dave Sorem				
Water Quality	<b>TJ Moon</b>	x	y	y	y
Total Non-Vacant Seats	6	Yay (Y)	4	4	4
Total Voting Members Present	4	Nay (N)	0	0	0
		Abstain (A)	0	0	0
		Total	4	4	4
			Approved	Approved	Approved

Other Attendees	
Merrill Taylor	Kara Plourde
Kathleen McGowan	Kelly Fisher
Jesse Williams	Kevin H
Judi Miller	Kristina Kreter
Lena Luna	Lara Awad
Adriana Ortega	Larry Tortuya - CWE
Alonso	Lorena Matos
Andrea Prado Iriarte	M. Scaduto
Andrew Kim	Maggie Gardner
Anthony Vidal	Marisela Velasquez
Ava Farriday	Mark
Brent Maue	Mark Nguyen
Carlos Moran	Megan Kung
Charlotte Bloemsma	Mei-Lin
Christine McLeod	Michelle Kim JLHA
Curtis Fang	Michelle Staffield
Dawn Petschauer	Mikaela Randolph
Donna T	Nancy Shrodes she/her
Drew Ready CWH	Oliver Galang Craftwater
Fernando Villaluna	Pablo Forni
Gina L	Paige Bistromowitz
Ida Meisami LASAN	Rachel Williams
Jacqueline Mak	Richard Watson
James Flannigan	River Nguyen
Jason Casanova, CWH	Sofia Cardenas
Jessica Forte	Susan Robinson
Joe Venzon - LA Coun	Thom Epps Craftwater
Johanna Chang	Valeria Arteaga
John Bodenchak	Wilson Mendoza
John Hunter	YW
Joyce Amaro	christian herencia
Julie Millett	janet L

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2024-2025



<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 (LASAN)
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$9,076,647
<b>Project Type</b>	Wet
<b>WS Scoring Pilot</b>	<b>NO</b>

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>Concern that geotechnical report did not include investigation near all proposed BMP locations</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></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	0	<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></li> </ul>
<b>TOTALS</b>	69	<b>110</b>	Unable to Score	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2024-2025



<b>Watershed Area</b>	Lower Los Angeles River
<b>Project Name</b>	Lynwood City Park Stormwater Capture Project
<b>Project Lead</b>	City of Lynwood
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$22,200,000
<b>Project Type</b>	Wet
<b>WS Scoring Pilot</b>	<b>NO</b>

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	0	<b>13</b>	0	• Primarily a treat and release project
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	9	<b>12</b>	0	• Project not anticipated to recharge an aquifer
<b>Community Investment</b>	10	<b>10</b>	5	• No points for greening of schools for vegetation implemented adjacent to a school
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	12	<b>15</b>	12	•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	0	<b>6</b>	0	•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	<b>4</b>	2	• 3 letters of support • 1 tabling event
<b>TOTALS</b>	80	<b>110</b>	64	• Meets minimum points threshold

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2024-2025



<b>Watershed Area</b>	North Santa Monica Bay
<b>Project Name</b>	Agoura Hills Stormwater Diversion Project
<b>Project Lead</b>	City of Agoura Hills (Jessica Forte and Kelly Fisher)
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$2,972,449
<b>Project Type</b>	Dry
<b>WS Scoring Pilot</b>	<b>NO</b>

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>Low flow diversion</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>&gt; 200 acres</li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	13	<b>13</b>	13	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Flows will go to Tapia Water Reclamation Plant until Las Virgenes Municipal Water District's PURE Water system is up and running</li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	12	<b>12</b>	12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Community Investment</b>	2	<b>10</b>	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	0	<b>15</b>	0	<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>\$1.2M secured from DWR</li> </ul>
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	<b>4</b>	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>TOTALS</b>	74	<b>110</b>	72	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Meets minimum points threshold</li> </ul>

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2024-2025



<b>Watershed Area</b>	Rio Hondo
<b>Project Name</b>	South El Monte High School Stormwater Improvement Project
<b>Project Lead</b>	El Monte Union High School District
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$8,753,600
<b>Project Type</b>	Wet
<b>WS Scoring Pilot</b>	<b>NO</b>

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	11	<b>20</b>	Unable to Score	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern over no provided geotechnical report with infiltration tests and results.</li> <li>High ground water concern</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>Project relies on filtration and not infiltration.</li> <li>85<sup>th</sup> percentile storm volume needs to be confirmed (11.2 AF)</li> </ul>
<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>	10	• Community Investment points may change due to additional WQ data
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	10	<b>15</b>	10	•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	0	<b>6</b>	0	•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	<b>4</b>	4	•
<b>TOTALS</b>	65	<b>110</b>	Unable to Score	•

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2024-2025



<b>Watershed Area</b>	Rio Hondo
<b>Project Name</b>	Washington Park Stormwater Capture Project
<b>Project Lead</b>	City of Pasadena
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$12,649,271
<b>Project Type</b>	Wet
<b>WS Scoring Pilot</b>	<b>NO</b>

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>Recommendation to classify Project as a dry weather project since only treating 0.21 in/hr</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	0	<b>13</b>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	5	<b>12</b>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No new water is being captured</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>	14	<b>15</b>	14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	0	<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></li> </ul>
<b>TOTALS</b>	83	<b>110</b>	62	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Meets minimum points threshold</li> </ul>



# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2024-2025



<b>Watershed Area</b>	South Santa Monica Bay
<b>Project Name</b>	Dominguez Channel Parkway BMPs Prioritization Project
<b>Project Lead</b>	City of Torrance
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$5,007,374
<b>Project Type</b>	Dry
<b>WS Scoring Pilot</b>	<b>NO</b>

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	20	20	•
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	20	30	20	•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	10	13	Unable to Score	• Request for additional information to verify Water Supply claim
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	9	12	Unable to Score	•
<b>Community Investment</b>	5	10	5	•
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	14	15	14	•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	0	6	0	•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	0	4	0	•
<b>TOTALS</b>	78	110	Unable to Score	•

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2024-2025



<b>Watershed Area</b>	South Santa Monica Bay
<b>Project Name</b>	Torrance Airport Stormwater Basin Project
<b>Project Lead</b>	City of Torrance
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$19,190,402
<b>Project Type</b>	Wet
<b>WS Scoring Pilot</b>	<b>YES</b>

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	11	<b>20</b>	11	•
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	<b>30</b>	30	• 85 <sup>th</sup> percentile storm project
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	<b>7</b>	<b>13</b>	7	• Provided clear and detailed information on Water Supply
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	<b>7</b>	<b>12</b>	7	•
<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	0	<b>6</b>	0	•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	<b>4</b>	2	• Outreach was mostly to airport organizations and not the local community.
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>110</b>	72	• Meets minimum points threshold