

Monday, December 1, 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)

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

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 November 10, 2025

Public Works staff presented the meeting minutes from the November 10 meeting. Member Dave Sorem motioned to approve the November 10 meeting minutes, seconded by Chair Reznik. The Committee voted to approve the meeting minutes, with five votes in favor and one absent at the time of voting (approved, see vote tracking sheet).

3) Committee Member and Program Updates

Public Works staff provided updates, noting:

- The rescoring meeting is scheduled for December 15. Meeting details will be posted on the <u>SCW Program website</u>.
- 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

Vice-Chair TJ Moon disclosed communications with the Project applicant for the West Los Angeles College Stormwater Improvements Project.

5) Public Comment Period

Michael Scaduto (Los Angeles Sanitation and Environment) expressed support for the Campus-Community Connection: University of California, Los Angeles' (UCLA) Mobility, Stormwater Capture, and Greening Project. Scaduto noted that the Project area would be a highly visible corridor during the 2028 Olympics given its proximity to other City of Los Angeles facilities that are hosting events. Scaduto highlighted that the City of Los Angeles is in support of the Project, which is a collaboration between the City of Los Angeles, UCLA, and Los Angeles Metro.

6) Presentations and Discussion Items:

Scoring Committee

Meeting Minutes



a. Scoring of FY26-27 Infrastructure Program Projects

Mike Antos (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: Campus-Community Connection: UCLA's Mobility,
Stormwater Capture, and Greening 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 |
|------------------------|-----------------|----------------------------|-----------|
| | | Score | |
| Water Quality Part 1 | 7 | 7 | See below |
| Water Quality Part 2 | 20 | 20 | See below |
| Water Supply Part 1 | 4 | 4 | See below |
| Water Supply Part 2 | 5 | 5 | |
| Community Investment | 10 | 10 | See below |
| Nature-Based Solutions | 10 | 10 | |
| Leveraging Funds | 6 | 6 | |
| Community Support | 4 | 4 | |
| TOTAL | 66 | 66 | |

Conclusion: The Project received 66 points and will move to the WASC for consideration.

- Water Quality: Vice-Chair Moon noted that the Project has different pollutant targets for various drainage areas. Part of the variations include areas that only target trash capture and other areas that only infiltrate through drywells. Vice-Chair Moon commented that the Projects Module does not have the option to exclusively target trash, making it difficult to accurately estimate pollutant capture. The Project intends to capture 0.4 inches of stormwater, and Vice-Chair Moon noted that this range of flow typically is classified as a dry weather project to increase points, but the Project applicant classified the Project as wet weather with a 33% zinc removal rate, which caused concern because wet weather capture is being infiltrated by portions of the area, not the entire area. Additionally, Vice-Chair Moon mentioned that groundwater was found at 30 feet (ft), which may limit the drywell design. Member Sorem agreed with Vice-Chair Moon on the separation of their design, indicating that typical designs use hydrodynamic separators, then outlet flows pass through a filtering system before infiltrating into the aquifer. Member Sorem noted that viewing the geotechnical report would be useful. Vice-Chair Moon mentioned that the Project applicant indicated devices that pick-up trash and treat stormwater. Vice-Chair Moon recommended considering these devices for the final design.
- Water Supply: Vice-Chair Moon mentioned that UCLA is located in the Santa Monica Groundwater Management Authority (GMA). Based on information provided at previous Scoring Committee meetings, the Committee decided that Water Supply points are eligible to be received. Vice-Chair Moon asked Public Works staff to update the net countable supply ratio in the Supplemental



<u>Guidance to Support Feasibility Study Guidelines</u> for the Santa Monica GMA. Vice-Chair Moon also mentioned that a letter from the GMA will be required for construction.

 <u>Community Investment:</u> The Project applicant leveraged \$1.1 million and included multiple letters of support.

Chair Reznik recused himself from scoring this Project.

Project: Arrow Highway Beautification and Stormwater
Capture Project

WASC(s): Upper San Gabriel River

Application Type: Design Only

Water Quality Scoring Pilot: Yes

Water Supply Scoring Pilot: No

| water dupply dearing rinot. No | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------|---|----|-----------|--|--|--|--|
| Category | Applicant Score Scoring Committee Score | | Notes | | | | |
| Water Quality Part 1 | 14 | 14 | See below | | | | |
| Water Quality Part 2 | 30 | 30 | See below | | | | |
| Water Supply Part 1 | 0 | 0 | See below | | | | |
| Water Supply Part 2 | 0 | 0 | | | | | |
| Community Investment | 5 | 5 | See below | | | | |
| Nature-Based Solutions | 10 | 10 | | | | | |
| Leveraging Funds | 0 | 0 | | | | | |
| Community Support | 2 | 2 | | | | | |
| TOTAL | 61 | 61 | | | | | |

Conclusion: The Project received 61 points and will move to the WASC for consideration.

- <u>Water Quality</u>: Vice-Chair Moon noted that the MS4 permit requires treat and release projects to be sized 1.5 times the 85th percentile storm, noting that the Project is treating only the 85th percentile storm. The Committee discussed the validity of pollutant efficiencies claimed and commented that quantifiable pollutant removal data is not yet exist for treat-and-release Best Management Practices (BMPs). The Committee made a general comment that it would be great to see a Scientific Study on the effectiveness of treat and release removal benefits would be great to see since Projects have been claiming high treatment percentages.
- <u>Water Supply</u>: Vice-Chair Moon indicated that infiltration is not feasible due to a contaminated aquifer, which results in no Water Supply points.
- <u>Community Investment</u>: Member Pierce noted the quantity and specificity of Community Investment Benefits are adequately described in the application.

Member Diaz recused himself from scoring this Project.

Project: ESGVWMG Drywells Project

Application Type: Construction and O&M Funding

Water Quality Scoring Pilot: Yes



| Water Supply Scoring Pilot: Yes | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|-----------------|---|-----------|--|--|--|
| Category | Applicant Score | Applicant Score Scoring Committee Score | | | | |
| Water Quality Part 1 | 20 | 20 | See below | | | |
| Water Quality Part 2 | 16 | 16 | | | | |
| Water Supply Part 1 | 10 | Unable to Score | See below | | | |
| Water Supply Part 2 | 4 | Unable to Score | See below | | | |
| Community Investment | 2 | 2 | | | | |
| Nature-Based Solutions | 10 | 5 | See below | | | |
| Leveraging Funds | 3 | 3 | | | | |
| Community Support | 2 | 0 | See below | | | |
| TOTAL | 67 | Unable to Score | | | | |

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

- Water Quality: Vice-Chair Moon noted that the Project application's Executive Summary states that
 this is a dry weather project but it was submitted as a wet weather project. The Project was scored
 as a wet weather project.
- Water Supply: Vice-Chair Moon noted that the dry weather flow calculated runoff needs to be verified and currently represents an inflated number. The calculation of 0.00003 cubic feet per second (cfs) per developed acres times 26 acres of impervious area should equal roughly 0.0008 cfs, not 0.04 cfs. The Committee noted that the Project applicant did not apply the net countable supply ratio for Water Supply per the Supplemental Guidance to Support Feasibility Study Guidelines. The Committee requested that the Project applicant apply the net countable supply ratio for Water Supply and provide the correct calculations and clarifications. The Committee also noted that there was no letter of support from the Six Basins Watermaster and requested the Project applicant to provide the letter of support.
- <u>Nature-Based Solutions</u>: Member Pierce noted that the claim of "over two to four trees" is an inadequate description.
- <u>Community Support</u>: Member Pierce and Chair Reznik noted that no details of community support were included.

| Project: ESGVWMG Drywe | WASC(s): Upper San Gabriel River | | | | |
|----------------------------|----------------------------------|-----|-------------------------|-----------|--|
| Application Type: Design C | Only | | | | |
| Water Quality Scoring Pilo | t: Yes | | | | |
| Water Supply Scoring Pilo | t: Yes | | | | |
| Category | Applicant Score | Sco | ring Committee Score | Notes | |
| Water Quality Part 1 | 20 20 | | | | |
| Water Quality Part 2 | 20 20 | | | | |
| Water Supply Part 1 | 12 Unable to Score See below | | | | |
| Water Supply Part 2 | 9 | Ur | nable to Score | See below | |



| Community Investment | 2 | 2 | |
|------------------------|----|-----------------|--|
| Nature-Based Solutions | 10 | 5 | |
| Leveraging Funds | 0 | 0 | |
| Community Support | 2 | 0 | |
| TOTAL | 75 | Unable to Score | |

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

Water Supply: Vice-Chair Moon noted that the net countable supply ratio for Water Supply from the Supplemental Guidance to Support Feasibility Study Guidelines was not applied and that the dry weather calculation of 0.0003 cfs times 363 acres should be 0.1 cfs, not 0.3 to 0.4 cfs. Vice-Chair Moon requested that the Project applicant apply the net countable supply ratio for Water Supply and provide the correct calculations. The Committee also requested a letter of support from the Six Basins Watermaster.

Project: Ganesha Park Stormwater Capture Project

WASC(s): Upper San Gabriel
River

Application Type: Construction and O&M Funding

Water Quality Scoring Pilot: Yes

Water Supply Scoring Pilot: Yes

| Trans. Capp., Cooking the second | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|-----------------|----------------------------|-----------|--|--|--|--|
| Category | Applicant Score | Scoring Committee Score | Notes | | | | |
| Water Quality Part 1 | 15 | 15 To Verify | See below | | | | |
| Water Quality Part 2 | 28 | 28 | See below | | | | |
| Water Supply Part 1 | 4 | Unable to Score | See below | | | | |
| Water Supply Part 2 | 7 | Unable to Score | See below | | | | |
| Community Investment | 10 | 10 | See below | | | | |
| Nature-Based Solutions | 10 | 10 | | | | | |
| Leveraging Funds | 3 | 3 | | | | | |
| Community Support | 4 | 4 | | | | | |
| TOTAL | 81 | Unable to Score | | | | | |

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

• Water Quality: Vice-Chair Moon noted that the Project is difficult to score because of all the various components, such as multiple diversion points, treat-and-release, and infiltration components. Vice-Chair Moon mentioned that the Project applicant provided a geotechnical report but the infiltration rate varies between 0.3 and 12 inches/hour (in/hr), with 5.3 acre-ft of storage. The Project is claiming 16 in/hr infiltration rates. Member Sorem agreed with Vice-Chair Moon that not all water will be infiltrated and that reduction factor needs to be considered. Member Sorem also noted that at most, through soil reports, infiltration rates of 8 in/hr have been obtained. Member Sorem explained that the Project applicant may combine two infiltration rates for a total of 16 in/hr. Member Sorem



requested that the Project applicant provide calculations to confirm the percolation test results since it exceeds the infiltration rate in the geotechnical report.

- Merrill Taylor (Craftwater, Project applicant) explained that Attachment H shows the calculations of a representative rate combining infiltrative and filtered flow. The 16 in/hr is a combination of the infiltration rate and the treated train system. Member Sorem explained that calculations should be verified noting that the 24-hour storm is roughly 20 acre-ft, but the 5.3 storage acre-ft should be removed, giving roughly 15 acre-ft.
- Water Supply: Vice-Chair Moon noted that the letter of support from Six Basins Watermaster confirms
 the claim that the Project could increase the yield of the basin but does not provide a specific volume.
 The Committee questioned the Water Supply points being generated from the Projects Module and
 requested clarification from the Project applicant.
 - Pauline Nguyen (Craftwater, Project applicant) noted that the Water Supply Scoring Pilot was used ranging from 1 to 13 points. Based on the calculated lifecycle cost and captured volume, it resulted in 4 points.

The Committee also requested clarification on the Water Supply points calculated by the Projects Module

Nguyen explained that the Water Supply Scoring Pilot was used and resulted in 7 points. Nguyen explained that the net countable supply ratio was not applied because this area of Ganesha Park is not upstream of any facilities mentioned in the <u>Supplemental Guidance to Support Feasibility Study Guidelines</u>. However, Vice-Chair Moon noted that the Project, which drains to San Jose Creek, may ultimately drain to the Rio Hondo Spreading Grounds, and therefore, requested that the Project applicant confirm the downstream facility and apply the net countable supply ratio accordingly.

Antos noted that the SCW Program has previously reviewed Projects that create new water for a groundwater basin but potentially takes away water from a different groundwater basin. In a previous situation, the two watermasters were able to coordinate letters of support, but it is not the case in this scenario.

Community Investment: Member Pierce confirmed that there was good detail for each of the benefits claimed, recognizing the efforts put into the Nature-Based Solutions (NBS) and recreational benefits. Member Pierce indicated 36 new trees, 42,000 square-feet of new vegetation, a pedestrian bridge, walking and seating areas, sports fields, and other recreational items. Chair Reznik highlighted the Project's trail elements and commented on the SCW Program's general challenge of eliminating hardscape. Chair Reznik encouraged Project applicants with greening components to collaborate with ShadeLA's effort of greening Los Angeles in preparation for the 2028 Olympics.

Member Diaz recused himself from scoring this Project.

Project: Garvey Avenue Grade Separation Drainage Improvement Operations and Maintenance

WASC(s): Upper San Gabriel River

Application Type: Construction and O&M Funding

Water Quality Scoring Pilot: Yes

Water Supply Scoring Pilot: Yes

| Category | Applicant Score | Scoring Committee Score | Notes |
|----------------------|-----------------|----------------------------|-----------|
| Water Quality Part 1 | 4 | 4 | See below |
| Water Quality Part 2 | 30 | 30 | |
| Water Supply Part 1 | 4 | Unable to Score | See below |



| Water Supply Part 2 | 4 | Unable to Score | See below |
|------------------------|----|-----------------|-----------|
| Community Investment | 5 | Unable to Score | See below |
| Nature-Based Solutions | 10 | Unable to Score | See below |
| Leveraging Funds | 0 | Unable to Score | See below |
| Community Support | 4 | 4 | |
| TOTAL | 61 | Unable to Score | |

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

- Water Quality: Vice-Chair Moon noted that this Project was previously approved in Call for Projects
 Round 1 and now requesting funding for O&M. Vice-Chair Moon posed a general question as to
 whether the SCW Program should have a set policy on whether previously funded SCW Program
 Infrastructure Program Projects should automatically pass the scoring threshold when returning for
 O&M funding requests.
- Water Supply: Vice-Chair Moon noted that the net countable supply ratio from the <u>Supplemental Guidance to Support Feasibility Study Guidelines</u> was not applied and the letter of support from the watermaster did not confirm if new water is being generated. Member Rojas requested the Project applicant apply the net countable supply ratio and provide detailed calculations to validate the claimed benefits.
- <u>Community Investment</u>: Member Diaz noted that O&M Projects are difficult to evaluate this category
 given that the Project is already constructed. The Committee requested more specific details on
 claimed benefits.
- <u>Nature-Based Solutions:</u> Chair Reznik requested clarification on whether native landscaping was included. Member Pierce noted that it was unclear whether the specified ornamental landscaping provided the claimed benefit and requested more detail on the planted vegetation and how it yields to claimed benefits.
- <u>Leveraging Funds</u>: Vice-Chair Moon noted that the Project includes roadway grade separation and suggested the Project applicant investigate whether leveraging funds available from the roadway effort is available in order to receive more points. Public Works staff noted that returning SCW Program Project applicants requesting O&M funding have included construction funds as leveraged funds. The Committee ultimately requested the Project applicant provide a breakdown of all project costs by funding source. Antos noted that the original application in Call for Projects Round 1 did not claim any leveraged funds.

| Project: San Jose Creek Gr | Project: San Jose Creek Greenway Project | | | | | | |
|----------------------------|--|---|----|--|--|--|--|
| Application Type: Design C | Only | | | | | | |
| Water Quality Scoring Pilo | t: Yes | | | | | | |
| Water Supply Scoring Pilo | t: Yes | | | | | | |
| Category | Applicant Score | Applicant Score Scoring Committee Score | | | | | |
| Water Quality Part 1 | 20 | 2 | 20 | | | | |
| Water Quality Part 2 | 20 20 | | | | | | |
| Water Supply Part 1 | 3 | 3 See below | | | | | |
| Water Supply Part 2 | 7 | | 7 | | | | |

Scoring Committee

Meeting Minutes



| Community Investment | 5 | 5 | See below |
|------------------------|----|----|-----------|
| Nature-Based Solutions | 10 | 10 | |
| Leveraging Funds | 0 | 0 | |
| Community Support | 4 | 4 | See below |
| TOTAL | 69 | 69 | |

Conclusion: The Project received 69 points and will move to the WASC for consideration.

- <u>Water Supply</u>: Vice-Chair Moon noted that the Project includes a sanitary sewer diversion. The Committee requested the Project applicant provide a letter of support from the appropriate Sanitation District if the Project returns for a construction funding request.
- <u>Community Investment</u>: Member Pierce noted the Project includes a bike path, vegetation, and other recreational amenities, and commended the level of detail and specificity.
- <u>Nature-Based Solutions</u>: Chair Reznik suggested partnering with ShadeLA and expressed approval in seeing more transportation projects incorporate greening elements.
- <u>Community Support</u>: Member Pierce noted strong letters of support. Chair Reznik noted his appreciation for partnership between different agencies and community organizations. Chair Reznik discussed whether the SCW Program should automatically award points if a Project formally partners with a community-based organization.

Member Diaz recused himself from scoring this Project.

7) Public Comment Period

There were no public comments.

8) Voting Items

Member Diaz motioned to send the Campus-Community Connection: UCLA's Mobility, Stormwater Capture, and Greening Project to WASC, seconded by Vice-Chair Moon. The Committee voted to approve the motion, with five votes in favor and Chair Reznik recused himself from the vote.

Member Rojas motioned to send the following two scorable projects receiving a passing score to WASC, seconded by Member Pierce. The Committee voted to approve the motion, with five votes in favor and Member Diaz recused himself from the vote.

- Scorable Projects with a Passing Score
 - o Arrow Highway Beautification and Stormwater Capture Project
 - San Jose Creek Greenway Project

Member Sorem motioned to allow Project applicants of the following three unscoreable projects one week to provide clarifying information to the Scoring Committee, seconded by Vice-Chair Moon. The Committee voted to approve the motion, with six votes in favor.

- Unscoreable Projects
 - o ESGVWMG Drywells Project
 - ESGVWMG Drywells Project (Design Only)
 - Garvey Avenue Grade Separation Drainage Improvement Operations and Maintenance

Chair Reznik motioned to allow Project applicant of the Ganesha Park Stormwater Capture Project 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 and Member Diaz recused himself from the vote.

9) Items for Next Agenda



The next meeting is scheduled for December 15, 2025 from 9:00am – 12:00pm, held in person and virtually. Items on the next agenda include:

a. Rescoring of FY26-27 Infrastructure Program Projects

Chair Reznik stated a preference for Project applicants to attend Scoring Committee meeting in-person for rescoring.

Chair Reznik added that a discussion about Adaptive Management and post-scoring will occur during the December 15 meeting. Public Works staff requested that Committee Members come prepared with notes for this discussion item.

10) Adjournment

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

| | SCORING COMMITTEE MEETING - December 1, 2025 | | | | | | |
|--|--|-------------|-------------------------------|---|---|---|--|
| | Quorum Pre | esent | | | | | |
| Member Type | Member | Voting? | 11/10/2025 Meeting Minutes | From today, 12/1/25, send UCLA Campus receiving a passing score to WASC | From today, 12/1/2025, allow Arrow Hwy and San Jose Creek receiving a passing score to WASC | From today, 12/1/2025, allow ESGV Construction and Design and Garvey Ave. 1 week to provide clarifying information to Scoring Committee | From today, 12/1/2025, allow Ganesha Park 1 week to provide clarifying information to Scoring Committee |
| Community Investments | Gregory Scott Pierce | х | Υ | Υ | Υ | Υ | Υ |
| | Esther Rojas | х | Not Present | Υ | Υ | Υ | Υ |
| Nature-Based Solutions / Community Investments | David Diaz | х | Y | Y | R | Y | R |
| | Bruce Reznik | х | Y | R | Y | Y | Y |
| | Dave Sorem | х | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y |
| | TJ Moon | х | Υ | Y | Y | Y | Y |
| Total Non-Vacant Seats | 6 | Yay (Y) | 5 | 5 | 5 | 6 | 5 |
| Total Voting Members Present | 6 | Nay (N) | | Ů. | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | Abstain (A) | Ö | Ö | 0 | Ö | Ó |
| | | Recused (R) | Ö | 1 | 1 | Ö | 1 |
| | | Total | 5 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 |
| | | | Approved | Approved | Approved | Approved | Approved |

Attendees Scoring Committee Meeting November 10, 2025

Andrew Kim - LACPW Anthony Ortega Pomona Armando Nunez-Fausto - LACPW Call-in User_1

Call-in User_2

Christopher Vong

Conor Mossavi Curtis Fang

David Coghiel

Dee Corhiran - LACPW

Drew Ready

Emily Ng - Regional Coordination

Jack

James - Day One

James Powell Jan Jason Casanova

Joe Venzon - LACPW

Jonathan Abelson

Jorge - Pomona WRD

Leslie Martinez - LACPW

Linet Khechatoorian

Maggie Gardner

Marisela Velasquez - LACPW

Mark Galanty

Mark Nguyen Mei-Lin Hanna (JLHA)

Michael Ku

Michael Scaduto

Mike Antos - Regional Coordination

Oliver Galang - Craftwater

Omar Abdelhadi - LACPW

Pablo Forni - LACPW

Pauline Nguyen - LACPW

Ryanna Fossum - Regional Coordination

SC AV

Stephanie Gebhardt Rath

Susan Painter

Susie Santilena - LA City

Thom Epps - LACPW

Uriel Cobian - LACPW

Valeria Mena

Vanessa Boudreau

Scoring Committee Meeting COMMITTEE MEMBER SIGN-IN



| Member Name | Municipality/ Organization | Email Address | Signature |
|----------------------|-------------------------------|---------------|-----------|
| Bruce Reznik | LA Waterkeeper | | 1001 |
| Dave Sorem | Mike Bubalo Construction Co., | | Tam A |
| David Diaz | Active SGV | | 11/1 |
| Esther Rojas | Water Replenishment District | | miller |
| Gregory Scott Pierce | UCLA | | |
| Taejin Moon | LA County Public Works | | tan |
| | | | |

Scoring Committee Meeting PUBLIC SIGN-IN



| First Name | Last Name | Municipality/Organization | Email Address |
|------------|-----------|---------------------------|---------------|
| Bonny | Bentzan | XLLA | |
| FELIPE | VAZQUEZ | LA METRO | |
| MERGIL | TMINE | Craftwater | |
| Courtney | Semlow | Craftwater | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |