

Scoring Committee

Meeting Minutes



Monday, July 13, 2026

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)

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

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

Committee Members Absent:

Dave Sorem, Mike Bubalo Construction Company (Water Quality)

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

1) Welcome and Introductions

TJ Moon, Vice-Chair of the Scoring Committee, welcomed Committee Members and called the meeting to order. Committee Members introduced themselves, 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 December 15, 2025

Public Works staff presented the meeting minutes from the December 15 meeting. Member David Diaz motioned to approve the December 15 meeting minutes, seconded by Member Esther Rojas. The Committee voted to approve the meeting minutes, with four votes in favor, one in abstention, and one Member absent at the time of voting (approved, see vote tracking sheet).

3) Committee Member and Program Updates

Chair Bruce Reznik (attending virtually) provided updates, including having recently joined the Regional Oversight Committee (ROC). Chair Reznik noted that a replacement for his seat on the Scoring Committee will need to be appointed by the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors. Chair Reznik provided updates on various outreach and engagement activities for the Safe, Clean Water (SCW) Program recently facilitated by LA Waterkeeper.

Public Works staff provided updates, noting:

- The ROC has recommended all nine Fiscal Year 2026-2027 (FY26-27) Stormwater Investment Plans (SIP) to the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors for approval.
- Reminder that the 2026 Call for Projects for the FY27-28 SIP has a submission deadline of July 31, 2026.

4) Ex Parte Communications Disclosure

There were no ex-parte communication disclosures.

5) Public Comment Period

One public comment card was received before the deadline and posted on the [SCW Program event's page](#).

Scoring Committee

Meeting Minutes



Maggie Gardner (OurWaterLA) provided public comment reinforcing OurWaterLA's response to the Scoring Revisions Public Survey, noting the many Program guidance documents, overall Program complexity, lack of scoring transparency, and whether the Program is addressing the most pressing water-related issues.

Samuel Brown (Nature for All) provided public comment sharing ideas to incorporate Community Strengths and Needs Assessment (CSNA) data into project scoring, to ensure that project benefits are tied to documented community needs.

Bryan Matsumoto (Nature for All) provided public comment, noting the resource-intensive Call for Projects application process, the Program's cost-effectiveness metrics, Technical Resource Program Project (TRP) accessibility limitations and requirements for letters of non-objection and early Operations and Maintenance (O&M) requirements. Matsumoto commented that smaller cities, community-based organizations, or Tribal entities may not have the resources to handle these demands.

Annelisa Moe (OurWaterLA) provided public comment sharing ideas to incorporate CSNA data, Disadvantaged Community priorities, Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) compliance outcomes, and long-term watershed resilience into project scoring. Moe suggested rebalancing scoring categories with metric-based and graduated scoring, introducing minimum expectations for scoring categories, and improved accessibility for less resourced applicants.

6) Presentations and Discussion Items

a) FY26-27 Scoring Committee Memo

Emily Ng (Stantec, Regional Coordination) presented a recap of the FY26-27 Scoring Committee Memo. The full [memo](#) and [presentation slides](#) are available on the SCW Program website.

Upon inquiry, Ng and Public Works staff clarified that Infrastructure Program (IP) Projects that have previously received construction funding from the SCW Program and are returning with an O&M-only request for up to 5 years will apply through a streamlined application process where previous final scores from the Scoring Committee will be carried over and verified by the Scoring Committee. After the fifth year, a new O&M-Only application will need to be submitted through the streamlined process.

Upon inquiry, Ng clarified that the "base plus bonus" system of scoring recommended by the Scoring Committee was related to conversations about expending the SCW Program Ordinance definition of Water Supply Benefit and including different thresholds or weights for scoring sections.

Vice-Chair Moon suggested expanding the definition of the Water Supply Benefit in the Scoring Criteria to include environmental Water Supply Benefits for Watershed Areas that do not infiltrate.

b) Summary of FY26-27 Stormwater Investment Plans

Ng presented a summary of FY26-27 Stormwater Investment Plans. [Presentation slides](#) are available on the SCW Program website.

Vice-Chair Moon commented that most IP Projects that met the scoring threshold score received at least partial funding from their respective Watershed Area Steering Committees (WASCs). Chair Reznik commented that Project Applicants may have chosen to apply to WASCs with more available funds, which may have contributed to most IP Projects being funded. Ng added that WASCs also communicated with continuing IP Projects and Scientific Studies to reallocate funds within the 5-year SIP to provide more flexibility to fund new IP Projects, TRP Project Concepts, and Scientific Studies.

Vice-Chair Moon inquired as to whether there will be any upcoming Scientific Studies which may inform changes to Scoring Criteria, such as Scientific Studies concerning Best Management Practices (BMP) efficacy. Public Works staff responded that they would defer the question to the Strategic Advancement Section (SAS) to provide an update at a future Scoring Committee meeting.

Scoring Committee

Meeting Minutes



Upon inquiry, Public Works staff clarified that there is not a “cap” on how much funding WASCs can choose to roll over to future fiscal years; this is up to the discretion of each WASC.

c) Overview of FY27-28 Call for Projects – Infrastructure Program Projects Scoring Strategies

Brad Wardynski (Craftwater) presented the Overview of FY27-28 Call for Projects – Infrastructure Program Project Scoring Strategies. [Presentation slides](#) are available on the SCW Program website.

Upon inquiry, Wardynski clarified that the proposed Community Investment Benefits Scoring Pilot applies to project applications, and the [Supplemental Guidance to Support Feasibility Study Guidelines](#) contains different requirements for different phase projects.

Wardynski provided more detail about how the scoring strategies differ by application type (i.e., Design-Only, Construction, O&M previously funded, and O&M separately funded). Several members of the Scoring Committee expressed desire to see more quantitative Scoring Criteria in the future. Upon inquiry, Public Works staff clarified that while Project Applicants can request construction and O&M funding in the same application, O&M-only funding may be granted for a maximum of five years per application.

Upon inquiry, Public Works staff clarified that TRP funding generally should be used to complete a Feasibility Study. If/once feasibility is determined, Project Applicants may apply for design and/or construction funding through the Infrastructure Program. Public Works staff clarified that TRP guidance is being developed.

Chair Reznik expressed support for the new Community Investment Benefits Scoring Adaption Pilot Rubric and hopes to see it implemented in 2027 Scoring Criteria Revisions. Chair Reznik also expressed desire to see improvements for the Water Supply scoring. Chair Reznik commented that the Scoring Reference Sheet is going to be a helpful tool for Scoring Committee members in the future.

d) FY28-29 (2027) Scoring Criteria Revisions Engagement

Public Works staff and Sam Acker (Craftwater) presented the FY28-29 (2027) Scoring Criteria Revisions Engagement. [Presentation slides](#) are available on the SCW Program website.

Member Diaz asked how leveraged funding will be factored into scope considerations and guardrails. Acker responded that leveraged funding might be used as an eligibility criterion rather than a scoring criterion. Acker mentioned that the list of guardrails presented is not an exhaustive list and there are not explicit guardrails at this time.

Upon inquiry, Public Works SAS staff clarified that 38 responses to the 2027 Scoring Revisions Public Survey have been recorded across all nine watershed areas to date. The mailing list included approximately 260 people. Public Works SAS staff clarified that the survey is open to the public but is targeted towards those involved in the SCW Program. Upon inquiry, Public Works staff clarified the breakdown of survey responders by type (e.g., WASC and ROC Members, Watershed Coordinators, project developers, and municipal staff).

Upon inquiry, Public Works SAS staff clarified that the Chief Engineer has the discretion to revise or reweigh the Scoring Criteria. Public Works staff commented that per the Ordinance, every project must have a Water Quality Benefit in addition to Water Supply or Community Investment Benefit. Upon inquiry, Public Works staff clarified that Scoring Criteria’s distribution can be reallocated. Acker mentioned an opportunity to allocate Nature-based Solutions points into other categories, as an example. Member Diaz asked how anti-displacement or workforce support could be factored into scoring. Public Works SAS staff responded that the Program currently includes anti-displacement measures in the project application per the Feasibility Study Guidelines, but that they are not part of the Scoring Criteria, but could potentially be worked into expanded Community Investment Benefits criteria. Member Diaz commented that anti-displacement is an active part of project development and scoring should reflect this. Member Diaz expressed desire to look at how Workforce Development is incorporated into project development.

Scoring Committee

Meeting Minutes



Chair Reznik commented that anti-displacement components of Project applications are often not in-depth, so the Scoring Committee should be clear about what information it wants to see, such as having a minimum threshold. Chair Reznik added that having local, community-based input should be a baseline requirement.

In response to the discussion question, “Which concepts (“Main” and/or “Modifier”) do you think will be most impactful to differentiating scoring?,” Chair Reznik pointed out that “Main” concepts are watershed-specific, and needs for each watershed are different. Chair Reznik added that promoting partnerships would help some watersheds meet targets. Chair Reznik expressed support to see more Nature-based Solutions and questioned what would be the best way to encourage their use.

Vice-Chair Moon commented that implementing watershed-specific Scoring Criteria could become confusing, and that minimum thresholds for categories should be set so that Projects do not pass the overall threshold with no points earned in certain categories such as Community Investment Benefits. Vice-Chair Moon shared the idea that a simpler version of the application could be developed for simpler, small-scale Projects. Vice-Chair Moon commented that Projects will not be able to pivot quickly enough once new Scoring Criteria are developed to meet the July 31, 2027 deadline. Public Works SAS staff clarified that the public comment version of the document, anticipated to be released in January 2027, will likely be consistent with final Scoring Criteria.

Vice-Chair Moon requested updates from the Public Works SAS on this topic be given at each future Scoring Committee meeting. Member Esther Rojas requested training for updated Scoring Criteria.

e) Presentation of Initial Watershed Plans

Public Works SAS staff presented the Initial Watershed Plans. [Presentation slides](#) are available on the SCW Program website.

Upon inquiry, Public Works SAS staff clarified that as of 2025, no green space has been constructed at schools through the SCW Program to date.

Upon inquiry, Public Works SAS staff clarified that the revised Scoring Criteria will capture the current metrics for tracking SCW Program progress.

Upon inquiry, Public Works SAS staff clarified that the charts shown on screen differentiate between any form of stormwater capture and stormwater capture to an unconfined aquifer for drought preparedness targets.

Upon inquiry, Public Works SAS staff clarified that the “minimum level of achievement” is a way to measure a project’s meaningful engagement.

Upon inquiry, Public Works SAS staff clarified that the Upper San Gabriel River Watershed Area contains significant built infrastructure to capture runoff, so there is limited opportunity for Water Supply-focused SCW Program Projects, but there may be opportunity for Water Quality-focused Projects. Vice-Chair Moon commented that there may not be much opportunity for Water Quality Projects in the San Gabriel Mountains, as this area is mostly pervious and Water Quality is already better compared to other Watershed Areas. Vice-Chair Moon commented that the map showing opportunity for Water Supply Projects in the North Santa Monica Bay Watershed Area may be misleading, as the Watershed Area does not have any unconfined aquifers. Public Works SAS staff indicated that they would investigate these items further, reevaluate the data, and provide justification to the Committee.

Member Rojas commented that the map presented for opportunities to help increase return on investments by SCW Program may be misleading, as Water Supply and Water Quality are influenced heavily by the geography of each area.

7) Public Comment Period

There were no additional public comments.

Scoring Committee

Meeting Minutes



8) Voting Items

There were no voting items.

9) Items for Next Agenda

A survey was sent out to Committee Members regarding availability. Members filled out the survey to confirm availability for future Scoring Committee meetings.

The next meeting is tentatively set for Monday, September 28th, 2026, based on survey responses. The next meeting will include the following agenda items:

- Scoring Committee Roles and Responsibilities
- Selection of Chair, Co-Chairs, and/or Vice Chair
- Summary of FY27-28 IP Project Applications
- Scoring of FY27-28 IP Project Applications

10) Adjournment

Vice-Chair Moon thanked Committee Members, staff, and the Public and adjourned the meeting.

SCORING COMMITTEE MEETING - July 13, 2026			
	Quorum Present		
Member Type	Member	Present?	12/15/2025 Meeting Minutes
Community Investments	Gregory Scott Pierce	x	a
Water Supply / Community Investments / Nature-Based Solutions	Esther Rojas	x	y
Nature-Based Solutions / Community Investments	David Diaz	x	y
Nature-Based Solutions / Community Investments / Water Quality	<u>Bruce Reznik</u>	x	y
Water Quality	Dave Sorem		
Water Quality	TJ Moon	x	y
Total Non-Vacant Seats	6	Yay (Y)	4
Total Voting Members Present	5	Nay (N)	0
		Abstain (A)	1
		Recused (R)	0
		Total	5
			Approved

Attendees

Scoring Committee Meeting July 13, 2026

Alexander Iglesias Rosales - LACPW	Emily Ng - Regional Coordination	Pearl Azizian
Alexia Skrbic - Heal the Bay	Eric Bonilla - LACPW	Sam Acker
Alonso Garcia - Watershed Health	Fred Gonzalez - LACPW	Samuel Brown
Amanda Begley - Tree People	Grey Crisanto- LACPW	Scoring AV
Andrew Kim - LACPW	Jenna Cobb - LACPW	Scoring Committee AV
Annelisa Moe - Heal the Bay	Jenny Chau - LACPW	Sia Arguello
Anthony Barreras - LACPW	JonPaul Sarro - LACPW	Stacy Luell
Becca Ayala - ARLA	Jose Castro - LACPW	Stephanie Gebhardt Rath
Brad Wardynski	Jose Luis Escajeda - LACPW	Tara Dales
Bruce Reznik	Kevin Te - LACPW	Thom Epps
Bryan Matsumoto - Nature for All	Kristina Kreter	Timothy Lim
CV	Larry Tran - LACPW	Uriel Cobian
Call-in User_1	Maggie Gardner	Valeria Mena
Call-in User_2	Marisela Velasquez - Safe, Clean Water Program	Veronica Carrillo
Call-in User_3	Marisol	Wayne Lee
Call-in User_4	Mei-Lin Hanna (JLHA)	Wendy Dinh
Conor Mossavi	Melina Watts	Zulia Linares (JLHA)
Craig Doberstein	Michael Ku	kmoreno
David Coghiel - LACPW	Nancy Shrodes	Michael Scaduto
David Lee - LACPW	Omar Abdelhadi	Susie Santilena
Dee Corhiran - Safe, Clean Water	Pablo Forni - LACPW	

Scoring Committee Meeting

COMMITTEE MEMBER SIGN-IN



Member Name	Municipality/ Organization	Email Address	Signature
Bruce Reznik	LA Waterkeeper	bruce@lawaterkeeper.org	
Dave Sorem	Mike Bubalo Construction Co., Inc.	dave@bubalo.com	
David Diaz	Active SGV	david@activesgv.org	
Esther Rojas	Water Replenishment District	erojas@ wrd.org	
Gregory Scott Pierce	UCLA	gpierce@luskin.ucla.edu	
Taejin Moon	LA County Public Works	TMOON@dpw.lacounty.gov	