

# Scoring Committee

## Meeting Minutes

---



Thursday, December 7, 2023

9:00am – 12:00pm

WebEx Hybrid Meeting

LA County Public Works Headquarters

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

### Committee Members Present:

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

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

David Diaz, Active SGV (Community Investments)

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

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

TJ Moon, LA County Public Works (Water Quality), Vice-Chair

### Committee Members Absent:

No Committee Members were absent.

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

---

## **1) Welcome and Introductions**

Vice-Chair TJ Moon welcomed Committee Members and called the meeting to order.

Los Angeles County Flood Control District (District) staff conducted a brief tutorial on WebEx. Committee Members made self-introductions and a quorum was established.

## **2) Approval of Meeting Minutes from November 27, 2023**

District staff presented the meeting minutes from the November 27, 2023 meeting. Member Esther Rojas motioned to approve the meeting minutes. The motion was seconded by Member Dave Sorem. The Committee voted to approve the November 27, 2023 meeting minutes with 4 votes in favor, 1 in abstention, and 1 absent at the time of vote (approved, see vote tracking sheet).

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

District staff provided an update, noting:

- The next Regional Oversight Committee (ROC) meeting is scheduled for December 7 at 1:00pm. The ROC will meet to discuss the draft Biennial Progress Report and consider initiating a public comment period. If the ROC approves the draft Biennial Report, the public comment period webpage will be accessible in the [SCW Program website](#), under the Committees tab. The Scoring Committee is welcome to attend, either virtually or in-person, at the Public Works Headquarters. Meeting details can be found on the SCW Program website.
- The Report Back, dated November 27, from the July 25 Board Motion has been prepared in parallel with the Biennial Report. It is posted on the [SCW Program website](#) under the Resources tab.

## **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.

There were no public comments.

# Scoring Committee Meeting Minutes



## 5) Discussion Items:

### a) Ex Parte Communication Disclosure

There were no ex parte communication disclosures.

### b) Rescoring 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 captures a project's evaluation by the Scoring Committee.

<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	
Water Supply Part 1	10	0	See Below
Water Supply Part 2	9	0	See Below
Community Investment	5	5	
Nature-Based Solutions	14	14	
Leveraging Funds Part 1	0	0	
Leveraging Funds Part 2 (Community Support)	0	1	See Below
<b>Conclusion:</b> The project received 60 points and will move to the WASC for consideration.			
<b>Discussion:</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>Water Supply:</u> Upon inquiry, Larry Tortuya (CWE) clarified that the Water Supply points claimed for the project are not based on infiltrated water, but water diverted to a Sanitary Sewer Facility for reuse. Tortuya stated that the applicant did not provide documentation from the Sanitary Sewer Facility confirming if there is capacity to divert flows. Upon inquiry, Tortuya noted that the project would be connecting to an 8-inch sewer line, maintained by the City of Torrance. Chair Bruce Reznik noted that the topic of Water Supply Benefits gained through sanitary sewer diversions has been a long-standing issue for the Committee, and discussions about water flows needed for water reuse projects should be discussed in the future. Wilson Mendoza (City of Torrance) added that, in discussions with Los Angeles County Sanitation Districts, the City was informed that a support letter could not be given until a deposit for a capacity study was received and an agreement was in place. The Committee did not grant any points to the project under the Water Supply Criteria.</li> <li><u>Leveraging Funds Part 2:</u> Chair Reznik noted that the proponent has shared an additional letter of support from the Torrance Farmers Market. Tortuya clarified that the letter of support from the Farmer's Market Manager was dated July 23, 2023, but was not previously included in the initial application. District staff indicated that because the letter of support was received prior to the application submission, the information does not constitute a substantive change and can be used in the Committee's evaluation. Member David Diaz commented that a SCW Program goal is to gain strong community support from the outset of the project and expressed a desire to see more robust community engagement from the project. The Committee granted the project 1 point.</li> </ul>			
Full discussion on the first scoring of this project is available to review in the Scoring Committee minutes from October 23, 2023, posted on the SCW Program website.			

# Scoring Committee Meeting Minutes



<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	11	See Below
Water Quality Part 2	30	30	
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 received 65 points and will move to the WASC for consideration.			
<b>Discussion:</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Water Quality:</b> Vice-Chair Moon noted that the applicant has provided clarifying language about infiltration infeasibility due to high groundwater levels, and that this project is essentially a treat-and-release project. The applicant incorporated impermeable liners and an underdrain into the resubmittal and fixed the 85<sup>th</sup> percentile calculation to a capacity from 11.2 acre-feet to 2.3 acre-feet. Committee members also noted that the project's treatment capacity is greater than the 85<sup>th</sup> percentile and proposed that the Committee cap treatment capacity at 85<sup>th</sup> for Water Quality Part 1. The Committee confirmed the points.</li> <li><b>Community Investment:</b> The Committee expressed doubt the project will provide a flood control benefit, given how small the project's capacity is compared to the Committee's familiarity with flooding in the project area. Jesse Williams (Jacobs) shared that there is localized flooding, which ends up ponding in the low end of the school grounds. These areas are ponded for weeks at a time, impacting the community's use of the space. In addition to water treatment, Williams noted that project would improve the drainage and reduce ponding. Member Diaz noted that localized flooding, a named Community Investment Benefit, is a challenge at the school, and this project would likely help. The Committee confirmed the points.</li> </ul> <p>Full discussion on the first scoring is available to review in the Scoring Committee minutes from October 23, 2023, posted on the SCW Program website.</p>			

<b>Project:</b> Baldwin Vista Green Streets Project			<b>WASC(s):</b> Central Santa Monica Bay (CSMB)
<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	30	
Water Supply Part 1	0	0	
Water Supply Part 2	0	0	
Community Investment	5	5	
Nature-Based Solutions	10	10	

# Scoring Committee Meeting Minutes



Leveraging Funds Part 1	0	0	
Leveraging Funds Part 2 (Community Support)	4	3	
<b>Conclusion:</b> The project received 68 points and will move to the WASC for consideration.			
<b>Discussion:</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>Water Quality:</u> The applicant provided nearby geotechnical information confirming acceptable groundwater levels around the proposed drywell locations. Borings were located 1,000 feet away. Vice-Chair Moon confirmed the score. Committee Members reiterated the desire to cap capacity to the 85<sup>th</sup> percentile in the Projects Module, as to avoid manipulation of cost-effectiveness points in the future.</li> </ul> <p>Full discussion on the first scoring is available to review in the Scoring Committee minutes from October 23, 2023, posted on the SCW Program website.</p>			

<b>Project:</b> Green Street Demonstration Project on Main Street		<b>WASC(s):</b> Upper Los Angeles River (ULAR)	
<b>Water Supply Scoring Pilot:</b> Yes			
<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	30	30	
Water Supply Part 1	6	6	See Below
Water Supply Part 2	4	4	
Community Investment	5	5	
Nature-Based Solutions	10	10	
Leveraging Funds Part 1	6	6	
Leveraging Funds Part 2 (Community Support)	4	3	
<b>Conclusion:</b> The project received 84 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 applicant provided additional geotechnical information from the Los Angeles County Public Works Headquarters building. Chris Carandang (Paradigm Environmental) clarified that the project submitted two infiltration test locations. The Public Works Headquarters building is 0.75 miles away from the project and the other site is 1.5 miles away. The Committee discussed geotechnical site-specific requirements and proposed that future applicants submit geotechnical information from within 500 feet of the project but noted cost implications for applicants. Member Matt Stone suggested requiring a two-stage application for design and construction. Vice-Chair Moon confirmed the score.</li> <li><u>Water Supply:</u> Member Rojas confirmed that a letter was provided from the Watermaster and confirmed the points.</li> </ul> <p>Full discussion on the first scoring is available to review in the Scoring Committee minutes from November 2, 2023, posted on the SCW Program website.</p>			

# Scoring Committee Meeting Minutes



<b>Project:</b> Osborne Street Stormwater Capture Green Street Project			<b>WASC(s):</b> Upper Los Angeles River (ULAR)
<b>Water Supply Scoring Pilot:</b> Yes			
Category	Applicant Score	Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Part 1	20	7	See Below
Water Quality Part 2	30	30	
Water Supply Part 1	6	6	See Below
Water Supply Part 2	6	6	
Community Investment	10	10	
Nature-Based Solutions	11	11	
Leveraging Funds Part 1	3	3	
Leveraging Funds Part 2 (Community Support)	4	4	
<b>Conclusion:</b> The project received 77 points and will move to the WASC for consideration.			
<b>Discussion:</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Water Quality:</b> Vice-Chair Moon noted the applicant clarified the project location in relation to the geotechnical information previously provided. The application revised the capacity and capped it at the 85<sup>th</sup> percentile at 5.1 inches/ hour, which lowered the score. The applicant provided a revised exhibit with geotechnical information from about 1,000 feet away which is sufficient.</li> <li><b>Water Supply:</b> Curtis Fang (Geosyntec) clarified that for Water Supply Benefit, the applicant elected to use the Alternative Water Supply Scoring Pilot and attached the Alternate Water Supply Pilot rubric. With the alternate rubric, the resubmitted project should score 6 points for Water Supply Part 1 and 6 points for Water Supply Part 2. A letter from the Upper Los Angeles River Watermaster was submitted with the original application, which acknowledged that infiltration could benefit Water Supply. Member Rojas noted that the letter is sufficient to confirm Water Supply points.</li> </ul> <p>Full discussion on the first scoring is available to review in the Scoring Committee minutes from November 2, 2023, posted on the SCW Program website.</p>			

<b>Project:</b> Reservoir Park Stormwater Capture Project			<b>WASC(s):</b> Lower San Gabriel River (LSGR)
<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	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	0	0	
Leveraging Funds Part 2 (Community Support)	4	2	
<b>Conclusion:</b> The project received 67 points and will move to the WASC for consideration.			

# Scoring Committee Meeting Minutes



## **Discussion:**

- **Water Quality:** Vice-Chair Moon noted that the applicant did not provide site-specific geotechnical information but used data from nearby buildings 0.33 and 0.5 miles away from the project location. This data indicated that infiltration rates were higher than previously assumed, at 8 inches/ hour. With a high margin of safety, the applicant used 0.3 inches/ hour when calculating capacity. Vice-Chair Moon reiterated that site-specific data is preferred but acknowledged that infiltration is likely at the project site and confirmed points. In addition, Vice-Chair Moon noted that if the infiltration rate at the park is very high, the applicant may be able to eliminate the treat-and-release approach and potentially save money on the project.

Full discussion on the first scoring is available to review in the Scoring Committee minutes from November 27, 2023, posted on the SCW Program website.

## **c) Meeting Schedule**

The Committee agreed to cancel the January 4 meeting and meet on February 1, 2024 9:00am – 12:00pm. Upon inquiry, District staff shared that the SCW Program plans to complete project presentations to WASCs in January and February. District staff additionally shared that Project Modification Requests (PMRs) may be sent to the Scoring Committee to evaluate early next year. District staff also shared that there were 43 PMRs submitted, 21 of which are from ULAR. If projects are deemed to have minor modifications, they will not be brought to WASC. For those that are brought to the WASC, the WASC will decide which require a Scoring Committee review.

Member Stone asked for more information regarding the Committee's PMR review. The Committee expressed a desire for District staff to present on PMRs and offer background and guidance. Committee Members agreed to meet in February for a recap discussion of Round 5 Scoring, PMR guidance presentation by District staff, and PMR evaluations, if available.

## **6) Public Comment Period for Agenda Items**

Michael Scaduto (City of Los Angeles) thanked the Scoring Committee for their work on scoring this round of projects. Scaduto acknowledged that the decline in projects submitted in some Watershed Areas and shared that projects costs, including TRP costs, have increased substantially, with many of those costs being incurred by cities. Additional refinements to the Feasibility Study guidance around site specific geotechnical analysis would be helpful for applicants. Regarding PMRs, the initial package of projects submitted for Round 1 were developed in six months with minimal due diligence, using escalation rates of 3-5% rather than today's use of 12-15%. Using minimum industry standards for cost escalation would be helpful for future applications.

Merrill Taylor (Craftwater) provided public comment regarding project sizes. Taylor commented that an 85<sup>th</sup> percentile water quality cap would limit potential flood control abilities, and that the Committee should allow for variable sizes. When considering caps on size, Taylor urged the Committee to be mindful that larger and smaller projects can provide good benefits for wet and dry weather projects.

Chair Reznik agreed and noted that the SCW Program should ensure that other community benefits are addressed around flood control. Chair Reznik suggested the Committee consider this further after the Biennial Report.

## **7) Voting Items**

- a) From Today:** Send scoreable projects receiving a passing score to Watershed Area Steering Committees (WASCs).
  - i. Dominguez Channel Parkway BMPs Prioritization Project
  - ii. South El Monte High School Stormwater Improvement Project

# Scoring Committee

## Meeting Minutes

---



- iii. Baldwin Vista Green Streets Project
- iv. Green Street Demonstration Project on Main Street
- v. Osborne Street Stormwater Capture Green Street Project
- vi. Reservoir Park Stormwater Capture Project

Member Sorem motioned to send the above projects to the WASCs, seconded by Vice-Chair Moon. The motion was approved, with 6 votes in favor (approved, see vote tracking sheet).

### **8) Items for Next Agenda**

The next meeting is scheduled for February 1, 2024 9:00am – 12:00pm. See the SCW Program website for meeting details. Items on the Agenda include:

- a) Assessment of previous submissions and scoring
- b) Review of Scoring Committee role in reviewing Project Modifications Requests
- c) Undertaking any PMR scoring, if available in time

Upon inquiry, Chair Reznik shared that Committee Members can view the Draft Biennial Report on the [SCW Program website](#). Chair Reznik noted the report is brief and includes many attachments.

Member Sorem asked the Committee if the County Water Plan addressed the SCW Program. Chair Reznik mentioned that the County Water Plan addresses the goal of using a strategic approach to move the County towards 80% local water supplies by 2045, with a large component from stormwater capture. Mike Antos (Stantec, Regional Coordination) shared that stormwater capture target of 300,00 acre-feet, that was advocated by Water Supply Working Group on the ROC, is included in the County Water Plan. Antos additionally shared that the report back to Supervisor Horvath's motion to accelerate implementation of the SCW Program is now posted on the [SCW Program website](#). Chair Reznik announced that LA Waterkeeper, Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC), and Our Water LA (OWLA) are crafting recommendations on SCW Program in the hopes of supporting the ROC's goal setting work.

Member Sorem additionally shared about an upcoming conversation with Senator Alex Padilla on December 17 with Rebuild SoCal Partnership regarding infrastructure funding in Southern California. Chair Reznik suggested that it might be helpful to align with Infrastructure LA and Infrastructure Justice LA.

### **9) Adjournment**

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



**SCORING COMMITTEE MEETING - December 7, 2023**

Member Type	Quorum Present		Voting Items	
	Member	Voting?	Approval of 11/27 Meeting Minutes	From Today 12/7 SC mtg: Send scoreable projects receiving a passing score to WASCs
Water Supply	Matt Stone	x	Y	Y
Water Supply / Community Investments / Nature-Based Solutions	Esther Rojas	x	Y	Y
Community Investments	David Diaz	x	A	Y
Nature-Based Solutions / Water Quality	<b>Bruce Reznik</b>	x	Not Present	Y
Water Quality	Dave Sorem	x	Y	Y
Water Quality	<b>TJ Moon</b>	x	Y	Y
Total Non-Vacant Seats	6	Yay (Y)	4	6
Total Voting Members Present	6	Nay (N)	0	0
		Abstain (A)	1	0
		Total	5	6
			Approved	Approved

Other Attendees	
Alonso	Kristina Kreter
Alyssa	Larry - CWE
Ava Farriday	Lena Luna - El Monte Union HSD
Carlos Moran- ULAR WC	Maggie Gardner
Chris Carandang	Mark
Christine McLeod	Mark Nguyen
Curtis F	Merrill Taylor
Curtis Fang	Mikaela Randolph
David Dolphin	Mossavi, Conor
Donna T	Nancy Shrodes she/her
Gina- StreetsLA	Paige Bistromowitz
Ida Meisami LASAN	Richard Watson
James Flannigan	Sara
Jason Casanova, CWH	Seta
Jesse Williams he/him/his	Sofia Cardenas
Joe Venzon - LA County	Sunshine Saucedo
Johanna Chang	Thom Epps
John Bodenchak	Valeria Arteaga
Judi Miller	Wilson Mendoza
Kevin Ho	paul shadmani



# 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	20	Unable to Score 20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern that geotechnical report did not include investigation near all proposed BMP locations</li> <li>Applicant provided nearby geotech information, confirming there was not high groundwater around proposed dry well locations. Borings were located 1,000 ft away.</li> </ul>
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	30	Unable to Score 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	0	12	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	0	6	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	4	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>TOTALS</b>	69	110	Unable to Score 68	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Meets minimum threshold score</li> </ul>

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2024-2025



<b>Watershed Area</b>	Lower San Gabriel River
<b>Project Name</b>	Reservoir Park Stormwater Capture Project
<b>Project Lead</b>	City of Signal Hill
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$6,676,878
<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	20	Unable to Score 20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provided geotechnical data is limited for a project seeking construction funds</li> <li>• Request for additional geotechnical data</li> <li>• Request for infiltration test data</li> <li>• <b>Provided nearby geotechnical information, 0.3 to 0.5 miles away from the project location, showing a feasible infiltration rate</b></li> <li>• <b>Assumption of very conservative reduction factor for infiltration, having a site specific geotech rate will potentially lower costs due to elimination of treat and release elements.</b></li> </ul>
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	30	Unable to Score 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	•
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	10	15	10	•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	0	6	0	•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	4	2	•
<b>TOTALS</b>	69	110	Unable to Score 67	• <b>Meets minimum points threshold</b>

# 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	20	Unable to Score 11	<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> <li>Provided clarifying language about infiltration infeasibility and applicant will use a combination of underdrain and liner as a treat and release BMP.</li> </ul>
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2  Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	30	Unable to Score 30	<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> <li>Applicant fixed the 85<sup>th</sup> percentile capacity figure</li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	0	13	0	•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	0	12	0	•
<b>Community Investment</b>	10	10	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Community Investment points may change due to additional WQ data</li> <li>Concern over whether the project will be able to address localized flooding</li> </ul>
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	10	15	10	•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	0	6	0	•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	4	4	•
<b>TOTALS</b>	65	110	Unable to Score 65	<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	<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	10	<b>13</b>	Unable to Score <b>0</b>	• Request for additional information to verify Water Supply claim
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	9	<b>12</b>	Unable to Score <b>0</b>	• <b>Did not provide documentation from LA County Sanitation Districts that there is capacity to divert flows.</b>
<b>Community Investment</b>	5	<b>10</b>	5	•
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	14	<b>15</b>	14	•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	0	<b>6</b>	0	•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	0	<b>4</b>	<b>1</b>	• <b>Provided a letter of support that was previously not included</b> • <b>SC is concerned with the lack of community engagement</b>
<b>TOTALS</b>	78	<b>110</b>	Unable to Score <b>60</b>	• <b>Meets minimum points threshold</b>

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2024-2025



<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>	\$2,027,000
<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	20	20	Unable to Score 20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern over infiltration rate being too low (0.25 in/hr) to feasibly infiltrate.</li> <li>Request for additional geotech data to justify dry wells</li> <li>Applicant provided geotech information from sites located .75 to 1.5 miles away from the proposed project site</li> </ul>
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	30	Unable to Score 30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	6	13	Unable to Score 6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No letter from Watermaster provided.</li> <li>Letter provided from Watermaster</li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	4	12	Unable to Score 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></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	<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	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>One way engagement</li> </ul>
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>110</b>	Unable to Score 84	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Meets minimum point threshold</li> </ul>

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2024-2025



<b>Watershed Area</b>	Upper Los Angeles River
<b>Project Name</b>	Osborne Street Stormwater Capture Green Street Project
<b>Project Lead</b>	City of Los Angeles Bureau of Street Services (StreetsLA)
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$9,500,000
<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	20	20	Unable to Score 7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Recommendation to adjust project infiltration rate to 0.59 cfs and capacity based on design storm.</li> <li>Adjust submitted map to show location of the project in relation to the existing dry wells</li> <li><b>Provided clarifying information identifying the location of the geotechnical data in relation to the project site.</b></li> </ul>
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	30	Unable to Score 30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	6	13	Unable to Score 6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Provided a Letter from the Watermaster</b></li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	6	12	Unable to Score 6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Community Investment</b>	10	10	10	<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	3	6	3	<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>Robust community outreach and engagement</li> </ul>
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>110</b>	Unable to Score 77	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Meets minimum points threshold</b></li> </ul>