Stantec

Memo

To:	Safe, Clean Water Program 900 South Freemont Ave Alhambra, CA 91803	From:	Mike Antos, Tori Klug Stantec Consulting Inc. 300 North Lake Avenue #400 Pasadena, CA 91101
File:	File Name	Date:	April 18, 2022

Reference: Scoring Committee Systemic Comments

PURPOSE AND BACKGROUND

At the October 5, 2021 Scoring Committee meeting, Chair Bruce Reznik requested that note-takers keep a list of the items discussed regarding the Safe Clean Water Program (SCWP) scoring system. The following memorandum includes a list of systemic updates discussed or mentioned during Scoring Committee meetings since August 2021.

At March 14, 2022 Scoring Committee meeting, the committee reviewed the summary materials here, and further refined their feedback about each category of comments.

COMMITTEE'S ABILITY TO SCORE BASED ON SUBMITTALS

The following comments reflect the Committee's understanding of how it seeks additional information when a submittal is insufficient to verify the score, and what can and cannot happen during the back-and-forth with project proponents.

- December 9, 2021 - The Scoring Committee can only ask for clarifying information when planning to rescore projects. They cannot give guidance for improving projects. Applicants cannot make revisions after submitting (District staff).
- December 9, 2021 - For projects that are being rescored, funding requests cannot be changed from the original submittal (Vice Chair Moon).
- December 9, 2021 - Points requested by the applicant cannot be increased due to an update in the project (comment by Vice Chair Moon, concurrence from Chair Reznik and District staff).

Notes from Scoring Committee Review, March 14, 2022

The Scoring Committee is not meant to be a working group; it is meant to validate the scores of projects. Information clarifications will likely be required, but projects cannot be fundamentally reworked.

The Scoring Committee expressed interest in having both the District's completeness check and the WASCs' reviews filter out projects not ready for scoring. SCWP may consider making pre-submittal workshops mandatory to get projects as final as possible before they reach the Committee. In addition, the Committee would like to treat incomplete submittals with more finality, rather than having back and forth correspondence regarding how to complete projects. District staff may also consider specifying the portions of the projects that are to be re-scored before they get sent to the Committee.

Reference: **Scoring Committee Systemic Comments**

PROJECTS DESIGNED TO EARN POINTS

The following comments reflect the Scoring Committee's thinking about projects that they deem to be designed or documented in such a way to earn high numbers of points, rather than designed towards the technical merits of the potential project.

- October 19, 2021- Applicants are encouraged to focus on their presentations to the WASC, instead of focusing on raising their scores beyond 60 points, because it is not necessary to exceed the 60-point minimum (Chair Reznik).
- January 10, 2022 - The Scoring Criteria encourages applicants to overbuild/overdesign projects to receive Water Quality and Water Supply Benefits. (Chair Reznik).

Notes from Scoring Committee Review, March 14, 2022

The Scoring Committee wishes to make holistic comments about each project reviewed to benefit the WASCs and have those comments captured by notetakers and shared with the WASCs.

VARIATION IN INFRASTRUCTURE SUBMITTAL TYPES

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

- October 19, 2021 - Projects submitting for only Operations and maintenance (O&M) funding should be evaluated with a separate criteria (comment by Chair Reznik, concurrence from Vice Chair Moon).
- October 19, 2021 - Scoring should be based on O&M costs, rather than original project costs. Clearer direction needs to be provided (Vice Chair Moon).
- October 19, 2021 - [A] project [that is seeking only O&M funding] does not need to be modeled because it has already been constructed (Vice Chair Moon).
- January 10, 2022 - Evaluation of the Water Quality and Water Supply scores will be / is more relaxed for projects seeking design-only funding (Member Matt Stone and Vice Chair Moon).
- January 10, 2022 - Design-only projects should be assessed under a different Scoring Criteria (Chair Reznik).

Notes from Scoring Committee Review, March 14, 2022

The Scoring Committee feels strongly that the Infrastructure Program application process does not sufficiently manage the three types of project submittals: design, construction, and O&M. The Committee believes a slightly different Scoring Criteria should be used for each IP submittal 'type'.

Reference: **Scoring Committee Systemic Comments**

EVALUATING WET WEATHER VS. DRY WEATHER FOCUS

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

- October 5, 2021 - The Scoring Criteria does not factor the cost-effectiveness of dry weather projects. Cost needs to be considered, like wet weather projects (comment by Member David Sorem, concurrence by Vice Chair TJ Moon).
- October 19, 2021 - Need clearer criteria to determine whether large drainage projects apply as wet weather or dry weather projects (Chair Reznik).

Notes from Scoring Committee Review, March 14, 2022

The Scoring Committee feels that having a scaled point system might help projects get points for partial pollutant reduction in situations where large drainage areas are being partially managed by a project.

PERMUTATIONS OF WATER SUPPLY BENEFITS

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

- October 5, 2021 - A project's capacity to capture a large amount of water should not be held against applicants when a project is well-sited and has a good permeable surface (Vice Chair Moon).
- October 5, 2021 - Need to determine how to assess the offsetting of existing potable water use while providing water for additional vegetation (although it is a valuable form of community investment) (Chair Reznik).
- October 19, 2021 - Should offsetting new demand count towards a project's Water Supply Benefit? (Chair Reznik)
- October 19, 2021 - Net Water Supply Benefits should be considered. For example, it should be assessed whether the project offsets an existing need or if it simply offsets needs generated by the project itself (i.e., through new plantings).
- November 17, 2021 - In regard to the Water Supply credit for partial infiltration and partial diversion to water recycling – the Committee should consider how diversion to recycling will augment Water Supply if capacity of treatment facilities is (currently) already fully accounted for (Chair Reznik).

Notes from Scoring Committee Review, March 14, 2022

The Scoring Committee will employ the new draft Interim Guidance about groundwater and recycled Water Supply Benefits.

Reference: **Scoring Committee Systemic Comments**

NATURE-BASED SOLUTIONS

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

- October 5, 2021 - Applicants should be asked whether trees being removed will be replaced (Member Kristen Schwarz).
- October 5, 2021 - Not enough points are awarded for connectivity between habitat patches or between community areas with open space (Chair Reznik and Member Schwarz).
- October 5, 2021 - Generally disappointed by the amount of hardscape removed in projects across the SCWP (Chair Reznik).
- October 19, 2021 - Points awarded for impervious surface removal should be based on actual square footage, rather than a percentage (Chair Reznik).
- October 19, 2021 - For Nature-Based Solutions, the Scoring Criteria should consider the size of impermeable surface removed, rather than the percentage, because proponents limit project area to receive maximum impermeable surface reduction points (Chair Reznik).
- November 22, 2021 - Why is the boundary for impervious surface counted toward the total benefit?

Notes from Scoring Committee Review, March 14, 2022

The Scoring Committee sees the awarding of points within wants to make sure that significant points are awarded to projects removing a significant amount of hardscape. The impervious surface calculation is a major issue. Additional details regarding addition of trees would be helpful. The Committee would like to be able to assign points for projects that connect habitats and community hubs. The Committee also want to pay more attention to the net benefits of projects.

OTHER ITEMS

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

Community Engagement

- October 19, 2021 - The Community Engagement Assessment for developing projects should reflect what applicants have already done in addition to what they should plan to do if/when they receive SCWP funding.

Notes from Scoring Committee Review, March 14, 2022

The Scoring Committee hopes that more information can be requested of the applicants -- number of community members contacts, community demographics, demonstration of representation from the neighborhood, and demonstration by applicants of strong local support.

Reference: **Scoring Committee Systemic Comments**

School Greening Projects / Goal

- October 5, 2021 - A project that is adjacent to a school, rather than within a school, should not receive points for achieving school greening (Chair Reznik).

Displacement

- October 5, 2021 - The Scoring Criteria does not address projects' impacts on displaced communities.

Notes from Scoring Committee Review, March 14, 2022

Applicants are required to disclose information about anti-displacement. SCWP needs to determine how this information will be used.

Infrastructure capacity

- January 10, 2022 - Los Angeles Sanitation requests that a sewer capacity study be a required component of the feasibility study (Member Stone).

Leverage Funding

- October 5, 2021 - The Scoring Criteria for Leveraging Funds points is too rigid. A project with 24.5% shouldn't get zero, while a project with 25% gets 3 (Member David Diaz).

Notes from Scoring Committee Review, March 14, 2022

The Scoring Committee shared that job creation does not contribute to application score, and that the program likely should start weighing the climate-related pros and cons of projects. For example, some projects require a significant amount of pumping which uses energy which may be producing GHG.

IDENTIFYING EXEMPLARS:

The following are examples of the Scoring Committee members identifying an element of a project that has one or more elements that were exemplary.

- October 5, 2021 - The project advisory committee that Amigos de los Rios assembled for the Jackson Elementary Project is a great example of community engagement prior to project submittal (Chair Reznik).

- October 5, 2021 - Bilingual materials used for the Whitsett Fields Park North Stormwater Capture Project (Member Schwarz).

Notes from Scoring Committee Review, March 14, 2022

This item was not discussed for lack of time.