

Scoring Committee Meeting Minutes



Monday, November 10, 2025

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:

Greg Pierce, UCLA Luskin Center for Innovation (Water Supply)

David Diaz, Active SGV (Community Investments)

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

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

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

Committee Members Not Present

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

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

1) Welcome and Introductions

Bruce Reznik, Chair of the Scoring Committee, welcomed Committee Members and called the meeting to order. Committee Members made self-introductions and a quorum was established. Los Angeles County Public Works (Public Works) staff conducted a brief tutorial on WebEx.

2) Approval of Meeting Minutes from October 20, 2025 and October 27, 2025 (if available)

Public Works staff presented the meeting minutes from October 20 and October 27. Member David Diaz motioned to approve the October 20 meeting minutes, seconded by Member Greg Pierce. The Committee voted to approve the meeting minutes, with five votes in favor (approved, see vote tracking sheet). Member Diaz motioned to approve the October 27 meeting minutes, seconded by Member Pierce. The Committee voted to approve the meeting minutes, with five votes in favor (approved, see vote tracking sheet).

3) Committee Member and Program Updates

Public Works staff provided updates, noting:

- The Science Symposium is scheduled for November 12 from 1:00pm to 4:00pm at Public Works Headquarters. In-person registration has closed, but participants can still register to attend virtually. Event registration link and details are posted on the [SCW Program website](#).
- The upcoming Regional Oversight Committee (ROC) meeting is scheduled for December 10 at 1:00pm where the ROC will discuss the Draft Biennial Progress Report, open the 30-day Public Comment Period, and discuss next steps for the Initial Watershed Plans.

4) Ex Parte Communications Disclosure

There were no ex parte communication disclosures.

5) Public Comment Period

There were no public comments.

6) Presentations and Discussion Items:

a. Scoring of FY26-27 Infrastructure Program Projects

Scoring Committee

Meeting Minutes



Ryanna Fossum (Stantec, Regional Coordination) provided a summary of each Infrastructure Program (IP) Project scored during the Scoring Committee meeting. Presentation slides are available on the [SCW Program website](#).

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.

| | | | |
|--|-----------------|-----------------------------------|-----------|
| Project: Memorial Park Multi-Benefit Stormwater Capture | | WASC(s): Central Santa Monica Bay | |
| Application Type: Construction and O&M | | | |
| Water Quality Scoring Pilot: Yes | | | |
| Water Supply Scoring Pilot: Yes | | | |
| Category | Applicant Score | Scoring Committee Score | Notes |
| Water Quality Part 1 | 9 | 9 | See below |
| Water Quality Part 2 | 30 | 30 | See below |
| Water Supply Part 1 | 7 | 7 | See below |
| Water Supply Part 2 | 9 | 9 | |
| Community Investment | 5 | 5 | |
| Nature-Based Solutions | 13 | 13 | |
| Leveraging Funds | 6 | 6 | |
| Community Support | 4 | 4 | See below |
| TOTAL | 83 | 83 | |
| Conclusion: The Project received 83 points and will move to the WASC for consideration. | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"><u>Water Quality</u>: Vice-Chair TJ Moon noted the geotechnical report indicated a high infiltration rate of 60 inches per hour (in/hr) but the Project applicant used an infiltration rate of 8.5 in/hr, which is more reasonable. Vice-Chair Moon also noted that the claim of 100% reduction of bacteria and zinc is not realistic, and that 80% to 90% is a more realistic percentage for pollutant reduction.<u>Water Supply</u>: Vice-Chair Moon noted that there is a new Groundwater Management Authority (GMA) in the City of Santa Monica that allows a small portion of the Central Santa Monica Bay (CSMB) Watershed Area to infiltrate water. The Project applicant included a letter of support from the Santa Monica GMA. Vice-Chair Moon noted potential equity impacts if only a portion of the CSMB Watershed Area will be eligible to receive Water Supply points, and that Member Esther Rojas would like to review the Santa Monica GMA letter more closely. Vice-Chair Moon also suggested that the Supplemental Guidance to Support Feasibility Study Guidelines be updated to include this infiltration eligibility for portions of the CSMB Watershed Area. Chair Reznik noted that the CSMB WASC will likely want to hear more information on the Santa Monica GMA updates and letter from the Project applicant when presenting to the WASC.<u>Community Support</u>: Member Diaz noted the strong community engagement efforts with three workshops, 100 attendees each, and the dedicated youth outreach efforts. Member Diaz reiterated that the Project should continue robust engagement in future outreach. Chair Reznik highlighted the Project's creative approach of redeveloping an existing Public Works maintenance yard into a baseball field by removing impervious area and adding 2.9 acres of new green space with over 160 new trees. | | | |

Scoring Committee

Meeting Minutes



| Project: San Vicente Streetscape Plaza | | WASC(s): Central Santa Monica Bay | |
|---|-----------------|-----------------------------------|-----------|
| Application Type: Design Only | | | |
| Water Quality Scoring Pilot: No | | | |
| Water Supply Scoring Pilot: Yes | | | |
| Category | Applicant Score | Scoring Committee Score | Notes |
| Water Quality Part 1 | 20 | 20 | See below |
| Water Quality Part 2 | 20 | 20 | |
| Water Supply Part 1 | 1 | 1 | See below |
| Water Supply Part 2 | 1 | 1 | |
| Community Investment | 5 | 5 | |
| Nature-Based Solutions | 11 | 11 | See below |
| Leveraging Funds | 0 | 0 | See below |
| Community Support | 2 | 2 | See below |
| TOTAL | 60 | 60 | See below |
| Conclusion: The Project received 60 points and will move to the WASC for consideration. | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <u>Water Quality</u>: Vice-Chair Moon expressed concerns regarding the geotechnical report, which found groundwater present at 5 feet (ft) below the ground surface. Vice-Chair Moon noted that high groundwater would make the Project infeasible given that the proposed underground bioretention cells required 5 ft of clearance below the ground, and 10 ft between the bottom of the cell and the groundwater, which in this case, already runs through the groundwater. Vice-Chair Moon also noted that the Project is requesting design funds only and recommended the Project applicant investigate further on the feasibility of stormwater infiltration. Member Dave Sorem commented on previous experience in this area, noting high groundwater levels and how numerous drywells would be required at 50-ft intervals. Member Sorem also noted possible infiltration to be under 40 to 60 ft of clay layer. The Committee discussed that the CSMB WASC should ultimately decide whether the Project is feasible despite requiring the redesign of stormwater elements. The Committee also noted that Water Quality and Water Supply Benefits could be obtained in a more cost-effective manner, such as a low flow diversion with a pump to the sanitary sewer. Chair Reznik explained that the Project first approached the CSMB WASC as a park project hoping to implement stormwater elements.• <u>Water Supply</u>: Vice-Chair Moon noted that Projects capturing water to be used in bioretention cells for irrigation have not been awarded Water Supply points in the past but could be justified. However, there are regulations requiring stormwater treatment before irrigation use, which the Project application did not mention. Vice Chair Moon expressed design and treatment concerns if the Project applicant plans to apply for construction funds.• <u>Nature-Based Solutions</u>: Member Diaz mentioned the planting of 20 new trees and the removal of pavement.• <u>Leveraged Funding</u>: Chair Reznik noted that this Project could potentially be a good candidate to leverage other County funding, including County Measures M and A. Fossum reminded the Committee that Projects that return to the WASC for SIP consideration will receive a Funding Assessment outlining potential funding sources for leveraged funding. | | | |

Scoring Committee

Meeting Minutes



- Community Support: Member Diaz noted that the Project applicant has conducted strong community engagement for a design-only application.

Vice-Chair Moon recommends the Project applicant to design for a low flow diversion and to implement park elements separately. Vice Chair Moon also recommends the CSMB WASC to obtain clarification from the Project applicant on the feasibility of stormwater infiltration.

| Project: Syd Kronenthal Park Stormwater Capture Project | | WASC(s): Central Santa Monica Bay | |
|---|-----------------|--|-----------|
| Application Type: Design Only | | | |
| Water Quality Scoring Pilot: No | | | |
| Water Supply Scoring Pilot: No | | | |
| Category | Applicant Score | Scoring Committee Score | Notes |
| Water Quality Part 1 | 7 | 7 | See below |
| Water Quality Part 2 | 30 | 30 | |
| Water Supply Part 1 | 10 | 10 | See below |
| Water Supply Part 2 | 12 | 12 | |
| Community Investment | 5 | 5 | See below |
| Nature-Based Solutions | 5 | 5 | |
| Leveraging Funds | 6 | 6 | See below |
| Community Support | 0 | 0 | See below |
| TOTAL | 75 | 75 | See below |
| Conclusion: The Project received 75 points and will move to the WASC for consideration | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <u>Water Quality:</u> Vice-Chair Moon noted that the Project diverts dry weather run-off from the Ballona Creek, and that the Committee recently scored the Ballona Creek Total Maximum Daily Load Operations and Maintenance Project (Ballona Creek TMDL Project) located downstream of the Ballona Creek. Chair Reznik noted that SCW Program funds have already been spent on the Ballona Creek TMDL Project, but this Project’s park components have more multi-benefits because the proposed subterraneous irrigation system can be used to irrigate the park. Vice-Chair Moon noted that the Project would double count Water Quality and Water Supply Benefits with the Ballona Creek TMDL Project capturing the same water downstream. Vice-Chair Moon and Member Sorem recommend diverting water for irrigation at the park and focusing on the 77-acre drainage area instead of the additional low flow diversion proposed upstream. Vice-Chair Moon noted that treating a smaller drainage area would also reduce the pumping and permitting requirements.<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Chris Carandang (Paradigm, Project applicant) explained that the Project applicant designed a hybrid project that captures full wet-weather flows given the large size of the park. Originally, the Project was intended to capture flows from Adam’s Channel but was asked by the Los Angeles Flood Control District to move the proposed diversion location to Ballona Creek. Carandang also noted discussions with the Project Developer of the Ballona Creek TMDL Project, confirming that the Project would not negatively impact the Ballona Creek TMDL Project. | | | |

Scoring Committee

Meeting Minutes



- **Water Supply:** Chair Reznik commented that the majority of Water Supply points are based on sending captured flows to Hyperion Water Reclamation Plant (Hyperion) for future reuse. Chair Reznik commented that both Projects diverting from Ballona Creek would double count the amount of Water Supply Benefits being sent to Hyperion. Chair Reznik also made a general comment that Water Supply points gained from sending water to Hyperion may no longer be valid given the new expected completion date of 2056, which passes the 30-year Project's useful life mentioned in the SCW Program guidance. The Committee noted that this situation is an example of why Watershed Planning is critical and requested for a layout of all projects to avoid redundancy. The Committee also noted that the Scoring Committee scores Projects independent of regional context with the intent of having the WASCs strategically make their deliberation. Chair Reznik noted that the CSMB WASC has many Projects to deliberate this year and potential redundancy of benefits will likely be discussed during SIP deliberations.
- **Community Investment:** Member Diaz highlighted the uniqueness of the proposed community garden.
- **Leveraging Funds:** Member Diaz mentioned the \$760k leveraging funds.
- **Community Support:** Member Diaz noted that the Project did not claim any community support. Member Pierce noted that extensive engagement was conducted in the overall Culver City Parks Plan and Community Support points could have likely been claimed. Member Pierce also noted that in-person meetings were held at the recreation center, but no letters of support were submitted.

The Committee recommends the CSMB WASC to consider and discuss the potential of double counting Water Quality and Water Supply Benefits.

Public Works staff explained that Watershed Planning Tool addresses downstream and upstream effects from multiple projects to an extent. Fossum noted that the Watershed Planning Tool (Tool) will eventually display existing Projects and submitted Projects geographically for future Project applicants to see where existing project locations along a waterbody. The Tool can be used for SIP deliberation as a beta version this year and would be a tool for the WASC continue to be used by the WASCs in future Call for Projects. The Tool is currently available on the [SCW Program website](#).

| | | | |
|--|-----------------|-----------------------------------|-----------|
| Project: View Park – Windsor Hills Green Alley Project | | WASC(s): Central Santa Monica Bay | |
| Application Type: Design only | | | |
| Water Quality Scoring Pilot: Yes | | | |
| Water Supply Scoring Pilot: Yes | | | |
| Category | Applicant Score | Scoring Committee Score | Notes |
| Water Quality Part 1 | 10 | 10 | |
| Water Quality Part 2 | 30 | 30 | |
| Water Supply Part 1 | 3 | 0 | See below |
| Water Supply Part 2 | 4 | 0 | |
| Community Investment | 2 | 0 | See below |
| Nature-Based Solutions | 10 | 5 | See below |
| Leveraging Funds | 6 | 6 | |
| Community Support | 1 | 0 | See below |

Scoring Committee

Meeting Minutes



| | | | |
|--|----|----|-----------|
| TOTAL | 66 | 51 | See below |
| Conclusion: The Project received 51 points and will not move to the WASC for consideration. | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Water Supply:</u> Vice-Chair Moon noted that the Project is not located in a managed aquifer but might be near the boundary of the Santa Monica GMA. Vice Chair Moon informed the Project applicant that they can review the boundary of the Santa Monica GMA and resubmit, if they wish, noting the Project still may not meet the minimum point threshold. <u>Community Investment:</u> Member Pierce commented on the minimal Community Investment Benefits and that capturing the 85th percentile storm is not enough justification to claim localized flood risk benefits. <u>Nature-Based Solutions:</u> Chair Reznik noted that there are no natural materials being proposed in the Project, and poorest pavement and drywalls are not natural materials. <u>Community Support:</u> Member Pierce noted that the Homeowner Association involvement is not adequate for robust local community support. <p>Chair Reznik noted that the Project is described as semi-regional working towards goals to bundle a set of smaller-scaled projects.</p> | | | |

| Project: Franklin D. Roosevelt Park Regional Stormwater Capture Operation and Maintenance Project | | WASC(s): Upper Los Angeles River | |
|---|-----------------|---|-----------|
| Application Type: O&M Only | | | |
| Water Quality Scoring Pilot: No Yes | | | |
| Water Supply Scoring Pilot: No | | | |
| Category | Applicant Score | Scoring Committee Score | Notes |
| Water Quality Part 1 | 14 | 18 | See below |
| Water Quality Part 2 | 0 | 12 | |
| Water Supply Part 1 | 13 | 13 | See below |
| Water Supply Part 2 | 12 | 12 | |
| Community Investment | 5 | 5 | |
| Nature-Based Solutions | 11 | 11 | |
| Leveraging Funds | 6 | 6 | |
| Community Support | 3 | 3 | |
| TOTAL | 64 | 80 | |
| Conclusion: The Project received 80 points and will move to the WASC for consideration. | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <u>Water Quality:</u> The Committee used the Water Quality Scoring Pilot to score the Project.• <u>Water Supply:</u> Vice-Chair Moon noted that, for future O&M applications, actual monitoring data should be required and supersede any Water Quality or Water Supply calculations. The Committee also requested construction photos be required in future O&M applications. | | | |

| | |
|--|---|
| Project: Arroyo Park Infiltration Gallery | WASC(s): Upper Los Angeles River |
|--|---|

Scoring Committee

Meeting Minutes



| Application Type: Design Only | | | |
|--|-----------------|-------------------------|-----------|
| Water Quality Scoring Pilot: Yes | | | |
| Water Supply Scoring Pilot: Yes | | | |
| Category | Applicant Score | Scoring Committee Score | Notes |
| Water Quality Part 1 | 8 | 8 | |
| Water Quality Part 2 | 30 | 30 | See below |
| Water Supply Part 1 | 6 | Unable to Score | See below |
| Water Supply Part 2 | 5 | 5 | |
| Community Investment | 5 | Unable to Score | See below |
| Nature-Based Solutions | 10 | Unable to Score | See below |
| Leveraging Funds | 0 | 0 | |
| Community Support | 4 | 4 | See below |
| TOTAL | 68 | Unable to Score | |
| Conclusion: The Project could not be scored and is awaiting additional information from the applicant. | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Water Quality:</u> Vice-Chair Moon noted this Project is a 85th percentile capture project, with 80% capture for copper and zinc, and confirmed 65 acre-ft of captured runoff. • <u>Water Supply:</u> Member Sorem noted that the proposed storage containers often affect the infiltration rate slightly but the Project could address this during the design phase. Vice-Chair Moon requested the Project applicant to confirm whether the Net Countable Supply Ratio for the Upper Los Angeles River WASC was applied in the Project application, as detailed in the Supplemental Guidance to Support Feasibility Study Guidelines. • <u>Community Investment:</u> Member Pierce noted that four Community Investment Benefits are claimed but minimal details are provided to justify benefits claimed. Member Pierce commented that while no quantifiable metrics are provided, letters of support do exist, which point to the potential of substantial Community Investment Benefits. • <u>Nature-Based Solutions:</u> Chair Reznik noted that more quantifiable details would be useful and requested that the Project applicant provide clarifying information before the rescoring. • <u>Community Support:</u> Chair Reznik noted that there are strong letters of support and that the Project applicant is transparent about community organizations voicing concerns about the Project. Issues include potential disturbance to ongoing natural stream restoration and native habitat restoration efforts, and the capacity for the City of Los Angeles to maintain additional parks. Chair Reznik noted that the Project is seeking design-only funds so concerns may be addressed during the design phase. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Jon Abelson (Stantec, Project applicant) explained that the community concerns relate to the diversion of the Arroyo Seco. The Project is part of a larger suite of Projects that consists of the Arroyo Seco-San Rafael Treatment Wetlands (funded partially with Caltrans), the San Pascual Wetland and Infiltration Gallery, and an infiltration facility downstream. As there are concurrent projects for the restoration of the Arroyo Seco, concerns revolve around in-stream flows. Abelson noted that there is an existing diversion structure within the Arroyo Seco that connects to an offline infiltration gallery, and that the Project applicant is working with these Project proponents to construct natural treatment facilities downstream. Member Pierce noted that the conflicts presented are being addressed and that community concerns are not a specific Scoring Criteria component, leaving it up to the WASC to further evaluate. | | | |

Scoring Committee

Meeting Minutes



| Project: Calles Verdes at Workman St | | WASC(s): Upper Los Angeles River | |
|---|-----------------|----------------------------------|-----------|
| Application Type: Design Only | | | |
| Water Quality Scoring Pilot: No | | | |
| Water Supply Scoring Pilot: No | | | |
| Category | Applicant Score | Scoring Committee Score | Notes |
| Water Quality Part 1 | 20 | 14 To Verify | See below |
| Water Quality Part 2 | 30 | Unable to Score | See below |
| Water Supply Part 1 | 0 | Unable to Score | See below |
| Water Supply Part 2 | 2 | Unable to Score | See below |
| Community Investment | 5 | Unable to Score | See below |
| Nature-Based Solutions | 12 | Unable to Score | See below |
| Leveraging Funds | 0 | 0 | |
| Community Support | 4 | 4 | See below |
| TOTAL | 73 | Unable to Score | |
| Conclusion: The Project could not be scored and is awaiting additional information from the applicant. | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <u>Water Quality</u>: Vice-Chair Moon noted inconsistencies and contradictions between the Project application and its Executive Summary upload. Vice-Chair Moon requested that the calculated cost effectiveness ratio, type of funding being requested, projected scores, and total construction costs be verified to address inconsistencies. For example, Water Quality Part 2, Vice-Chair Moon noted that 25 points are claimed in the Executive Summary but 30 points are claimed in the Projects Module. Vice Chair Moon requested the Project applicant to clarify.• <u>Water Supply</u>: Vice-Chair Moon appreciated that dry weather flows were calculated using monitoring data, requesting it be a requirement for future Project applications. Vice-Chair Moon confirmed with Public Works staff that the Projects Module does not automatically apply the Net Countable Supply Ratio as described in the Supplemental Guidance to Support Feasibility Study Guidelines. Vice-Chair Moon requested that the Project applicant adjust the calculation and resubmit accordingly.• <u>Community Investment</u>: Chair Reznik noted that to be consistent with other Projects scored, more supporting information is needed for the benefits claimed.• <u>Nature-Based Solutions</u>: Member Pierce noted that the claim for Nature-Based Solutions lacked adequate justification, such as how new vegetation and tree box filters would provide shade. Chair Reznik noted that more details would be appreciated.• <u>Community Support</u>: Chair Reznik noted that previous partnership with a community-based organization or non-governmental organization has historically been adequate proof of meaningful engagement. Member Diaz requested the Project applicant to clarify budget for future engagement as it does not show a breakdown.<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Katie Harrel (Craftwater, Project applicant) mentioned Tree People as a collaborator for the community engagement, who will be assisting in future outreach. Harrel noted that part of the community engagement also involves alleviating flooding in within the area for | | | |

Scoring Committee Meeting Minutes



residents. Harrel also clarified that the budget for future community engagement is integrated into the design budget, which is approximately \$50k.

Member Diaz requested that future Project applicants provide a budget breakdown of Community Investment Benefits. Public Works staff clarified that cost and schedule breakdowns are currently requested in the Project applications.

| Project: Jake Kuredjian Park Stormwater Improvements Project | | WASC(s): Santa Clara River | |
|--|-----------------|---------------------------------|-----------|
| Application Type: Design Only | | | |
| Water Quality Scoring Pilot: No -Yes | | | |
| Water Supply Scoring Pilot: No | | | |
| Category | Applicant Score | Scoring Committee Score | Notes |
| Water Quality Part 1 | 14 | 16 | |
| Water Quality Part 2 | 30 | 30 | |
| Water Supply Part 1 | 0 | 0 | |
| Water Supply Part 2 | 9 | 9 | |
| Community Investment | 5 | Unable to Score 5 | See below |
| Nature-Based Solutions | 10 | 10 | |
| Leveraging Funds | 6 | 6 | |
| Community Support | 0 | 0 | |
| TOTAL | 74 | 76 | |
| Conclusion: The Project received 76 points and will move to the WASC for consideration. | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">Community Investment: The Committee previously requested that the Project applicant provide more information to substantiate the Community Investment benefits claimed, including clarifying the appropriate recreational amenities being proposed. The Committee agreed that the Project applicant's clarifying information was adequate to receive the 5 points. | | | |

7) Public Comment Period

There were no public comments.

8) Voting Items

Member Sorem motioned to send five scorable projects receiving a passing score to WASCs, seconded by Vice-Chair Moon. The Committee voted to approve the motion, with five votes in favor.

- Scorable Projects with a Passing Score
 - Memorial Park Multi-Benefit Stormwater Capture
 - San Vicente Streetscape Plaza
 - Syd Kronenthal Park Stormwater Capture Project
 - Franklin D. Roosevelt Park Regional Stormwater Capture Operation and Maintenance
 - Jake Kuredjian Park Stormwater Improvements Project

Scoring Committee

Meeting Minutes



Vice-Chair Moon motioned to allow Project applicant of Calles Verdes at Workman St one week to provide clarifying information to the Scoring Committee, seconded by Member Sorem. The Committee voted to approve the motion, with five votes in favor.

Member Pierce motioned to allow Project applicant of Arroyo Park Infiltration Gallery one week to provide clarifying information to the Scoring Committee, seconded by Member Sorem. The Committee voted to approve the motion, with four votes in favor and Member Diaz recused himself from the vote.

9) Items for Next Agenda

The next meeting is scheduled for December 1, 2025, from 9:00am – 12:00pm, held in person and virtually. Items on the next agenda include:

- a. Scoring of FY26-27 Infrastructure Program Projects

10) Adjournment

Chair Reznik thanked Committee Members, staff, and the Public and adjourned the meeting.

| SCORING COMMITTEE MEETING - November 10, 2025 | | | | | | | |
|--|----------------------|-------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|--|--|---|
| Member Type | Quorum Present | | Voting Items | | | | |
| | Member | Voting? | 10/20/2025 Meeting Minutes | 10/27/2025 Meeting Minutes | From today, 11/10/25, send scoreable projects receiving a passing score to WASCs | From today, 11/10/2025, allow Project Applicant of Calles Verdes at Workman St 1 week to provide clarifying information to Scoring Committee | From today, 11/10/2025, allow Project Applicant of Arroyo Park Infiltration Gallery 1 week to provide clarifying information to Scoring Committee |
| Community Investments | Gregory Scott Pierce | x | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y |
| Water Supply / Community Investments / Nature-Based Solutions | Esther Rojas | | | | | | |
| Nature-Based Solutions / Community Investments | David Diaz | x | Y | Y | Y | Y | R |
| Nature-Based Solutions / Community Investments / Water Quality | Bruce Reznik | x | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y |
| Water Quality | Dave Sorem | x | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y |
| Water Quality | TJ Moon | x | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y |
| Total Non-Vacant Seats | 6 | Yay (Y) | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 4 |
| Total Voting Members Present | 5 | Nay (N) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | Abstain (A) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | Recused (R) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| | | Total | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| | | | Approved | Approved | Approved | Approved | Approved |

Attendees

Scoring Committee Meeting November 10, 2025

| | | |
|----------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Alex Nazarchuk | Dylan Bachar, City of West Hollywood | Lisa (Jin) Kim - LACPW |
| Alexia | Eileen Alduenda | Marisela Velasquez - LACPW |
| Alonso Garcia | Emily Ng - Regional Coordination | Mark Nguyen |
| Amanda Begley | Eric Bonilla - LACPW | Mayra Cabrera - LACPW |
| Andrew Kim | Eric Wilson, TreePeople | Michael Ku |
| Aric Martinez | Geremew Amenu | Michelle Staffield |
| Christopher Vong | Jacqueline Stone - LACPW | Ric Abramson |
| Call-in User_1 | Jan Dyer | Ryanna Fossum - Regional Coordination |
| Cherise Thompson | Joe Venzon - - LACPW | Scoring AV |
| Chris Carandang | Jon Abelson | Sean Singletary - Culver City |
| Chris Lee | Jonathan M - Santa Monica | Selim Eren - City of Santa Monica |
| Conor Mossavi | Jonathan Ontiveros - LACPW | Stacy Luell |
| Dave Mercier | Josafat Flores | Stephanie Gebhardt Rath |
| David Coghiel | Jose L. Escajeda | Thomas Le - LACPW |
| David Lee | Jsoliz | Thuan Nguyen - LACPW |
| Dee Corhiran - LACPW | Katie Harrel - CWE | Wayne Lee - LACPW |
| Diego Carrizo | Kristina Kreter | Susie Santilena |
| Drew Ready - CWH | Lara Awad | Valeria Mena |

Scoring Committee Meeting

PUBLIC SIGN-IN







SAFE CLEAN WATER

[illegible]

Scoring Committee Meeting

COMMITTEE MEMBER SIGN-IN



| Member Name | Municipality/ Organization | Email Address | Signature |
|----------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------|---|
| Bruce Reznik | LA Waterkeeper | |  |
| Dave Sorem | Mike Bubalo Construction Co., Inc. | | |
| David Diaz | Active SGV | |  |
| Esther Rojas | Water Replenishment District | | |
| Gregory Scott Pierce | UCLA | |  |
| Taejin Moon | LA County Public Works | |  |