Scoring Committee
Meeting Minutes

Monday, October 19, 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)
Dave Sorem, Mike Bubalo Construction Co. Inc. (Water Quality), Vice-Chair
TJ Moon, Los Angeles County Public Works (Water Quality), Chair

Committee Members Absent:

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

---

1) Welcome and Introductions

TJ Moon, 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 September 28, 2026

Public Works staff presented the meeting minutes from the September 28 meeting. Member Esther Rojas motioned to approve the September 28 meeting minutes, seconded by Vice-Chair Dave Sorem. The Committee voted to approve the meeting minutes, with five votes in favor, no votes opposed, and no abstentions (approved, see vote tracking sheet).

3) Committee Member and Program Updates

Chair TJ Moon provided un update that the Board of Supervisors will approve the Fiscal Year 2026-2027 (FY26-27) Stormwater Investment Plans (SIPs) on October 20th, 2026.

Public Works staff provided updates, noting:

- The Regional Oversight Committee's next meeting will be held on November 18, where the ROC will receive updates on the Biennial Progress Report Updates, Initial Watershed Plans Influence Report, and District Grants Program Updates.

4) Ex Parte Communication Disclosure

There were no ex-parte communication disclosures.

5) Public Comment Period

There were no public comments.

6) Discussion Items

a. Scoring of FY26-27 Infrastructure Program Projects

Mike Antos (Stantec, Regional Coordination) provided a brief overview of the Los Cerritos Channel Reactive Filter Media Pilot Filtration Project. Full presentation slides are available on the SCW Program Website.

Project: Los Cerritos Channel Reactive Filter Media Pilot Filtration	**WASC(s):** Lower San Gabriel River (LSGR)
Application Type: IP – Design Only	**Captures:** Dry Weather
Water Quality Scoring Pilot: Yes	
Water Supply Scoring Pilot: No	
Community Investment Benefit Scoring Pilot: Yes	

Category	Applicant Score	Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Part 1	20	20	See below
Water Quality Part 2	20	20	See below
Water Supply Part 1	0	0	
Water Supply Part 2	0	0	
Community Investment	8	8	See below
Nature-Based Solutions	10	10	See below
Leveraging Funds	0	0	
Community Support	3	2	See below
TOTAL	61	60	See below

Conclusion: The Project received 60 points and will move to the WASC for consideration.

Discussion:

- Water Quality:

Chair TJ Moon noted the Project would capture water from an area of 5,600 acres using low-flow diversion to a treatment reactive filter media unit, using biochar and other natural materials . Chair Moon commented that Reactive Filter Media (RFM) is a fairly new technology and noted that the applicant wants to test this technology for removal of copper, zinc, and bacteria. Chair Moon commented that the Project would be using a combination of materials diverted from landfills and expressed concern as to whether RFM will be an effective treatment method. Chair Moon noted that while RFM is a slow process and may not be able to handle very large flows, this Project would be a great test of efficacy and whether RFM could be used for other projects. The Project would treat 100% of the dry-weather flow.

Vice-Chair Dave Sorem questioned how long the filter would last and noted that the levels of testing the Project is proposing are high for a design-phase project. Vice-Chair Sorem noted that the Safe, Clean Water (SCW) Program should explore RFM's potential environmental benefits.

Chair Moon asked whether a portion of the requested funding would be used to evaluate RFM efficacy before constructing the whole Project to ensure it works.

- Water Supply:

Member Esther Rojas noted that the Project is treat-and-release and so does not provide any Water Supply Benefits.

- Community Investment:

Member David Diaz mentioned that the proposal claimed five Community Investment Benefits and incorporated community concerns raised through the Community Strengths and Needs Assessment (CSNA) in the design.

- Nature-Based Solutions:

Member Diaz noted that the Project will be adding 50 new trees and about 50,000 square feet of native planting, which would constitute approximately 45% of the Project limits.

- Leveraging Funds:

No points were requested by the applicant for Leveraging Funds.

- Community Support:

Member Diaz highlighted two community events conducted, with 48 residents engaged. Member Diaz drew attention to the fact that the two events took place just before the application was submitted. The Project received some letters of support from residents and one from a City of Long Beach department that was listed as a collaborator on the application. Member Diaz suggested two points because the Project is also part of a larger community master plan and visioning exercise but emphasized the desire to see more engagement.

Member Greg Pierce agreed that awarding only two points was appropriate due to the low number of community members engaged right before the submission deadline.

Richard Watson (Consultant to the Los Cerritos Watershed Management Group) commented that Reactive Filter Media (RFM) has been developed and used extensively in Australia and for this Project will be manufactured in Los Angeles or Orange County. Watson explained that the RFM would initially target TMDL compliance for copper and zinc and eventually address bacteria and other pathogens.

Watson noted that RFM replacement should occur about every 12-15 years per manufacturer guidelines, but many projects have seen RFM remain functional for longer. Watson added that RFM does not contain silt or clay, which helps reduce clogging.

Watson shared that the Project is fairly complicated due to the method of flow collection and pretreatment between two sites. Watson commented that the Project is specifically thinking about how to make RFM work for specific local pollutant loads. The applicants consider the Project a long-term pilot to demonstrate the viability of the technology. Watson noted that the goal of the Project is to treat stormwater and return it to the channel. Watson expressed hope that the Project could be replicated at other sites in the future, including further sites where RFM may be used for filtration.

Vice-Chair Sorem asked what the Project's expected flow rate is. Merrill Taylor (Craftwater) responded that the expected flow rate is 4 cubic feet per second (cfs) for both filters.

Vice-Chair Sorem asked how often the applicant planned to test effluent after pretreatment and treatment. Taylor responded that the team would develop a monitoring plan as part of the design, with the goal to test in exceedance of minimum SCW Program requirements and take samples throughout the dry and wet seasons. Watson noted that the team has a monitoring consultant who would also conduct monitoring.

Chair Moon asked whether the applicant expected to test the RFM during the design phase or wait until construction. Watson responded that the applicant team does not expect to test during the design phase. Watson clarified that they are hoping to test for viruses and pathogens if possible, due to the community health impacts.

Antos provided a brief overview of the Long Beach Island – Harco Street, et al. Green Streets Project. Full presentation slides are available on the SCW Program Website.

Project: Long Beach Island – Harco Street, et al. Green Streets	**WASC(s):** Lower San Gabriel River (LSGR)
Application Type: Design Only	**Captures:** Wet Weather
Water Quality Scoring Pilot: No	
Water Supply Scoring Pilot: No	
Community Investment Benefit Scoring Pilot: No	

Category	Applicant Score	Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Part 1	20	20	See below
Water Quality Part 2	30	30	See below
Water Supply Part 1	0	0	
Water Supply Part 2	2	0	See below
Community Investment	5	5	See below
Nature-Based Solutions	5	5	See below
Leveraging Funds	6	Unable to score	See below
Community Support	3	0	See below
TOTAL	71	Unable to score	See below

Conclusion: Incomplete

Discussion:

- Water Quality:

Chair Moon noted that this Project proposes a treat-and-release Best Management Practice (BMP) and claimed treatment of the 90th percentile volume to account for inefficiencies with treat-and-releases. Chair Moon expressed the desire to see the SCW Program website account for these inefficiencies. Chair Moon noted that there is a school at the downstream end of the Project and questioned whether flows could be diverted there and handled more effectively through a school greening project.

Vice-Chair Sorem agreed with Chair Moon's comments.

- Water Supply:

Member Rojas agreed with the applicant score of zero points for Water Supply Part 1, since the applicant is not claiming any Water Supply Benefit. Member Rojas noted that the Portal designated two points for Water Supply Part 2 due to the 5.4 acre-feet they are capturing from the treat- and-release mechanism. Chair Moon questioned the applicant's claim. Given that the project is not claiming any Water Supply Benefits, Member Rojas suggested changing the score for Water Supply Part 2 to zero points.

- Community Investment:

Member Diaz expressed a desire for applicants to include more detailed information regarding community investment and support. Member Diaz noted that the community investment and support details in this application were minimal. Member Diaz noted that the Project claimed three Community Investment Benefits so should be five points.

- Nature-Based Solutions:

Member Diaz noted that the Project would remove approximately 20,000 square feet of impervious concrete and replace it with permeable Stormcrete and confirmed the five points.

- Leveraging Funds:

Member Diaz highlighted that the applicant claimed over $8 million in leveraged funds but provided no supporting documentation. Member Diaz noted that while the application claimed the County has committed to matching funds, this section should be marked as incomplete for lack of supporting information.

- Community Support:

Member Diaz noted that the Project held one event with about 15 attendees. Citing the limited engagement and lack of detail, Member Diaz recommended awarding zero points.

Member Pierce noted that the Project did not have good community support and agreed with awarding zero points.

David Lee (Project team) agreed to provide documentation clarifying the Project's leveraged funds. Lee shared that the school is in the City of Long Beach's jurisdiction, and the applicant team tried to keep the project in the County's jurisdiction. Lee mentioned that the City of Long Beach is interested in providing a letter of support and potential financial support.

Lee confirmed that the project had only conducted one community event prior to submitting their application but have since conducted more outreach and coordinated with the Lower San Gabriel River Watershed Coordinator. Lee noted that the Project received a letter of support from the Moore Institute for Plastic Pollution Research and expects to receive additional letters of support from Algalita Marine Research and Education and Cal State Long Beach. Lee highlighted that the Project plans to reach out to the school in the future. Chair Moon noted the importance of reaching out to the school during project development, since the school and school community are the largest stakeholders.

Chair Moon and Member Rojas confirmed that scores will not be shared with the WASC so that Members will avoid ranking projects according to score during SIP deliberations. Public Works staff stated that scoring rubrics will not be part of the WASCs' supplemental guidance materials.

Chair Moon asked how the Scoring Committee's comments would be conveyed to the WASC if the rubrics were not shared. Antos shared that while project developers were previously given a slide deck template

that included a section breaking down the project's score, this section has since been removed. Public Works staff are determining the best way to communicate Scoring Committee comments to the WASC. Chair Moon called attention to the value of highlighting Scoring Committee comments at WASC meetings through Regional Coordination or Watershed Coordinators. Public Works staff confirmed that they would explore the logistics of including these comments in SIP deliberation discussions.

Antos provided a brief overview of the Washington Park Stormwater Capture Project. Full presentation slides are available on the SCW Program Website.

Project: Washington Park Stormwater Capture Project	**WASC(s):** Upper San Gabriel River (USGR)
Application Type: IP – Design Only	**Captures:** Dry Weather
Water Quality Scoring Pilot: Yes	
Water Supply Scoring Pilot: Yes	
Community Investment Benefit Scoring Pilot: Yes	

Category	Applicant Score	Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Part 1	20	20	See below
Water Quality Part 2	20	20	See below
Water Supply Part 1	5	5	See below
Water Supply Part 2	6	6	See below
Community Investment	6	6	See below
Nature-Based Solutions	10	10	See below
Leveraging Funds Part	0	0	See below
Community Support	3	3	See below
TOTAL	70	70	See below

Conclusion: The Project received 70 points and will move to the WASC for consideration.

Discussion:

- Water Quality:

Chair Moon noted that the Project seems like a wet-weather project, since it incorporates a 7.4-acre-foot infiltration gallery and has an infiltration rate of 0.6 inches per hour. However, this Project is classified as a dry-weather project due to the large 373-acre drainage area, as it would capture half of an 85th percentile storm.. Chair Moon stated that Project has completed preliminary borings but a full Geotech study will be needed for further funding requests. Vice-Chair Sorem agreed with Chair Moon's assessment of this Project and the points awarded.

Chair Moon clarified that the Project narrative claimed a 2,000-acre drainage area, but the application only claimed a 373-acre feet area. Chair Moon requested that the applicant clarify this difference. Merrill

Taylor (Craftwater) explained that originally the Project evaluated two drainage areas but ultimately settled on just the 373-acre drainage area. Both values are discussed in the Project narrative, which likely led to this confusion. Taylor noted that all values included in the application are reflective of the 373-acre drainage area.

- Water Supply:

Member Rojas noted the contradiction between the stormwater capture amounts claimed in the application and the lack of completed testing. Member Rojas commented that the Project would need infiltration and percolation testing to confirm infiltration, given the soil variability in the area. Member Rojas noted their agreement with the scores for the design phase but noted that applications for construction funding will need to include a letter from Chino Basin Watermaster or test results confirming infiltration feasibility.

- Community Investment:

Member Diaz commented that the applicant referenced the CSNA and how community feedback had been included in Project design. Member Diaz noted that the Project claimed four Community Investment Benefits alongside ideas about how to include non-traditional amenities into the park.

- Nature-Based Solutions:

Member Diaz noted that the Project would plant 33 trees, 30,000 square feet of tree canopy, and 25,000 square feet of shrub coverage.

- Leveraging Funds:

The Project is not claiming any points for leveraged funds.

- Community Support:

Member Diaz highlighted time-intensive canvassing in the surrounding neighborhood, letters of support received from community groups, outreach events conducted, and bilingual outreach.

Member Pierce agreed with Member Diaz's points.

Vice-Chair Sorem requested further explanation of the operations and maintenance (O&M) costs and hourly breakdown. Vice-Chair Sorem commented that the O&M costs seemed high for the total hours of O&M per year. Taylor confirmed that the costs initially seemed low, but after examining average costs of other projects, the team raised the O&M projections to account for unknown variability and better spending. Taylor stated that the Project team would be continuing to look at the O&M costs moving forward.

Chair Moon commented that O&M costs are included in the calculation for the Water Supply Part 2 score, and low O&M costs lead to higher scores.

Chair Moon asked the SCW team to create a database of actual O&M costs to support more accurate estimates for scoring and funding projections. Member Rojas noted the need for a set of criteria to ensure all applicants are providing aligned costs. Chair Moon suggested that the SCW Program team should standardize allowable O&M expenses. Public Works staff commented that they will explore potential options.

Antos provided a brief overview of the Larkin Park Project. Full presentation slides are available on the SCW Program Website.

Project: Larkin Park	**WASC(s):** Upper San Gabriel River (USGR)
Application Type: IP – Design Only	**Captures:** Wet Weather
Water Quality Scoring Pilot: Yes	
Water Supply Scoring Pilot: Yes	
Community Investment Benefit Scoring Pilot: No	

Category	Applicant Score	Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Part 1	14	14	See below
Water Quality Part 2	30	30	See below
Water Supply Part 1	2	2	See below
Water Supply Part 2	3	3	See below
Community Investment	5	5	See below
Nature-Based Solutions	10	5	See below
Leveraging Funds	0	0	
Community Support	3	1	See below
TOTAL	67	60	See below

Conclusion: The Project received 60 points and will move to the WASC for consideration.

Discussion:

- Water Quality:

Chair Moon noted that the applicant provided a geotechnical report for the Project site. Site infiltration rate is 0.8 inches per hour. Chair Moon continued that the Project would divert flow at two points with a total drainage area of 455 acres, the 24-hour capacity is 10.67 acre-feet, and the construction cost is $13.9 million. Chair Moon noted that the ratio of the 24-hour capacity to the construction cost justifies a score of 14 for Water Quality Part 1 using the pilot scoring system.

Chair Moon noted that the applicant used the Water Quality Part 2 module on the SCW Program website and received 75% reduction of Zinc and Phosphorus; as such, a score of 30 is justified.

- Water Supply:

Member Rojas expressed agreement with the applicant scoring for the Water Supply criteria but noted that if the applicant returned for construction funding, they would need to provide a letter or technical report confirming augmentation of the local groundwater supply.

Chair Moon noted that the applicant included an O&M cost estimate of $40,000 annually in their application and expressed concern that the estimate is too low. Chair Moon commented that the SCW Program should implement a standardized O&M cost database to assist project applicants in more accurately estimating O&M costs. Chair Moon confirmed that the applicant would not need to submit revised costs at this time, but the Committee would like more realistic O&M numbers to ensure accurate Water Supply scoring.

- Community Investment:

Member Diaz noted that the applicant claimed three Community Investment Benefits, elected not to use the Community Investment scoring pilot, and therefore received a score of 5. Member Pierce commented that the information supplied by the applicant was minimal and expressed agreement with a score of 5.

- Nature-Based Solutions:

Member Diaz noted the Project applicants did not claim any removal of impermeable area, justifying a Nature-Based Solutions score of 5. Member Pierce noted that the application seemed to repeat information about how stormwater capture generally works rather than providing sufficient project-specific information to warrant a score of 10. Member Pierce expressed support for a Nature-Based Solutions score of 5.

- Leveraging Funds:

The project applicant did not claim any Leveraging Funds points.

- Community Support:

Member Diaz noted the applicant provided minimal information on previous and planned community outreach and suggested a score of 0 or 1 for Community Support. Member Pierce noted a lack of articulation and lack of demonstration of community support and expressed agreement with a score of 1.

Chair Moon commented that the Project applicant should fix the deficiencies discussed during scoring if the Project applicants intend to reapply to the SCW Program for construction funding.

Gurjot Kohli (Stantec) provided clarifications on behalf of the Project applicant. Kohli stated that the estimated O&M costs could be reassessed. Kohli shared that the addition of a bioswale was considered. Kohli stated that the City of Claremont is planning a separate improvement project at Larkin Park, and construction between the projects may overlap. Kohli expressed that the Project team is actively scheduling more community outreach and has received letters of support from Fastpitch and the Joslyn Senior Center.

Antos provided a brief overview of the Fern Dell Restoration and Stormwater Capture Project. Full presentation slides are available on the SCW Program Website.

Project: Fern Dell Restoration and Stormwater Capture Project	**WASC(s):** Central Santa Monica Bay (CSMB)
Application Type: IP – Design Only	**Captures:** Dry Weather

Water Quality Scoring Pilot: Yes	
Water Supply Scoring Pilot: No	
Community Investment Benefit Scoring Pilot: Yes	

Category	Applicant Score	Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Part 1	20	20	See below
Water Quality Part 2	20	20	See below
Water Supply Part 1	0	0	
Water Supply Part 2	0	0	
Community Investment	10	10	See below
Nature-Based Solutions	10	10	See below
Leveraging Funds	0	0	
Community Support	4	4	See below
TOTAL	64	64	See below

Conclusion: The Project received 64 points and will move to the WASC for consideration.

Discussion:

- Water Quality:

Chair Moon noted the Project's proposed 336-acre drainage area and questioned whether the proposed 22,500 gallon cistern could capture the flow from the drainage area. Merrill Taylor (Craftwater) later clarified on behalf of the Project applicant that the cistern is not to be used for capture, and the water temporarily stored in the cistern would be recirculated from the lower Fern Dell to the upper Fern Dell. Upon inquiry, Taylor confirmed that some captured water from the cistern would be used for irrigation.

- Water Supply:

The applicant did not claim any Water Supply Benefits.

- Community Investment:

Member Diaz noted that the Project applicant is claiming public access to waterways as a Community Investment Benefit (CIB). Member Diaz highlighted that the upper Fern Dell is dry year-round and questioned whether the claim is appropriate. Taylor clarified that the lower half of the dell is always wet, and the upper half is always dry; the Project aims to put water in the top of the dell, recapture it at the bottom, and recirculate it to the top of the dell. Taylor clarified that conversation with LA City Parks has dissuaded the Project applicants from retrofitting stormwater to existing irrigation lines, but irrigation line repair would still be in the Project scope. Chair Moon expressed agreement that this Project would provide the CIB of public access to a waterway. Taylor clarified that the captured water would be recirculated to the top of the dell at 25 gallons per minute. Member Diaz confirmed the score of 10 for Community Investment.

- Nature-Based Solutions:

Member Diaz noted that three of six SCW Program-defined Nature-Based Solutions are applicable to the Project, and confirmed a score of 10.

- Leveraging Funds:

The applicant did not claim points for leveraging funds.

- Community Support:

Member Diaz noted that there is a strong coalition in support of this Project. Member Diaz stated that there was strong community engagement efforts by the Project applicant during the Technical Resources Program Project (TRP) phase to create a community-driven design. Member Pierce commented that this application makes a good case for the importance to the community.

Chair Moon noted variety in the community support between Project applicants. Chair Moon noted that the Fern Dell Restoration and Stormwater Capture Project received 12 letters of support, while some other projects received minimal community support. Chair Moon asked Public Works staff if the Program directs applicants to work with Watershed Coordinators (WC) and if WC are involved in obtaining letters of support. Public Works staff responded that WC are intended to help connect applicants with communities, but applicants are not required to work with WC. Chair Moon expressed belief that Project applicants should be required to work with the WCs. Antos reminded that applicants who take advantage of WC support are generally more successful in obtaining community support. Member Pierce commented that some Project applicants may not feel the need to work with the WCs to pass the Scoring threshold.

Antos provided a brief overview of Pacoima Wash Greenway Project. Full presentation slides are available on the SCW Program Website.

Project: Pacoima Wash Greenway	**WASC(s):** Upper Los Angeles River (ULAR)
Application Type: IP – Design Only	**Captures:** Wet Weather
Water Quality Scoring Pilot: Yes	
Water Supply Scoring Pilot: No	
Community Investment Benefit Scoring Pilot: Yes	

Category	Applicant Score	Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Part 1	5	5	See below
Water Quality Part 2	27	27	See below
Water Supply Part 1	0	0	
Water Supply Part 2	0	0	

Community Investment	10	10	See below
Nature-Based Solutions	15	15	See below
Leveraging Funds Part	3	3	See below
Community Support	4	4	See below
TOTAL	64	64	See below

Conclusion: The Project received 64 points and will move to the WASC for consideration.

Discussion:

- Water Quality:

Chair Moon noted that the Project would use bioswales and biofiltration, capture the 85th percentile storm drainage from a 53-acre drainage area, and reduce pollutants by 73%. Chair Moon and Member Sorem noted high estimated design costs compared to estimated construction costs, which lowered the Water Quality Part 1 score.

- Water Supply:

The applicant did not claim any points for Water Supply.

- Community Investment:

Member Diaz commented that this application is a good example of what the Scoring Committee is looking for in intentionality and effort, and highlighted the planting of 56 new trees. Member Diaz noted the constraints of the Scoring criteria occasionally prevent the Committee from awarding more points to Projects with this level of intentionality than to lower-effort applications.

- Nature-Based Solutions:

Member Diaz highlighted the Project's proposed bioswales and biofiltration, planned addition of native vegetation, and 56 new shade trees.

Member Pierce highlighted the high level of detail included in this section of the application.

- Leveraging Funds:

The Project team secured $2.3M in leveraged funding for design.

- Community Support:

Member Diaz highlighted that the proposed scope is the product of over 15 years of community-involved planning. The applicant developed a diverse coalition, received 14 letters of support for the Project, and conducted many focus groups. Member Pierce highlighted the strong community investment and support for this project application.

Chair Moon suggested that the SCW Program should highlight the Fern Dell Restoration and Stormwater Capture Project and Pacoima Wash Greenway Project as examples for project applicants on how to score highly on community support.

Nola Eaglin Talmage (Trust for Public Land) clarified that coordination with Caltrans and other agencies, as well as Community Investment Benefit-driven aspects of the Project such as the proposed bike path, drove the estimated design costs up. Veronica Padilla (Pacoima Beautiful) expressed gratitude to the Scoring Committee for their recognition and support.

7) Public Comment Period

There were no public comments.

8) Voting Items

a. Send scorable projects receiving a passing score to Watershed Area Steering Committees

Vice-Chair Sorem motioned to send scoreable projects (Los Cerritos Channel Reactive Filter Media Pilot Filtration Project, Washington Park Stormwater Capture Project, Larkin Park, Fern Dell Restoration and Stormwater Capture Project, and Pacoima Wash Greenway) to the WASCs, seconded by Member Diaz. The motion passed with five votes in favor (approved, see vote tracking sheet).

b. Allow Project Applicants with unscorable projects one week to provide clarifying information to Scoring Committee

Member Diaz motioned to allow unscoreable projects (Long Beach Island – Harco Street, et al. Green Streets) one week to provide clarifying information to the Scoring Committee, seconded by Vice-Chair Sorem. The motion passed with five votes in favor (approved, see vote tracking sheet).

9) Items for Next Agenda

The next meeting is tentatively set for Monday, November 16th, 2026. The next meeting will include the following agenda items:

a. Scoring of FY27-28 Infrastructure Program Projects

10) Adjournment

Chair Moon thanked Committee Members, staff, and the public and adjourned the meeting.

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2027-2028

Project Name	Los Cerritos Channel Reactive Filter Media Pilot Filtration Project				
Project Lead	Los Cerritos Channel Watershed Management Group		**Watershed Area**	Lower San Gabriel River	
Total Funding Requested	$2,311,000		**Phase Requested**	Design Only	
Previously Funded IP Project	No		**Project Type Scoring Method**	Dry	
WQ Scoring Pilot	Yes	**WS Scoring Pilot**	No	**CIB Scoring Pilot**	Yes

Scoring Section	Maximum Points	Original Score (No Pilots)	Applicant Score	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality – Part 1 Wet + Dry Weather	**20**	**20**	**20**	**20**	• 5,600 acre drainage area • Low-flow using RFM (reactive filter media) • Questions about efficacy • East LA Sustainable median project uses similar biochar filter
Water Quality – Part 2 Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Dry Weather (20 pts)	**30**	**20**	**20**	**20**	• > 200 acres
Water Supply – Part 1	**13**	**0**	**0**	**0**	•
Water Supply – Part 2	**12**	**0**	**0**	**0**	•
Community Investment	**10**	**5**	**8**	**8**	•
Nature-Based Solutions	**15**	**10**	**10**	**10**	• 50 new trees and 50,200 sqft of new native plants
Leveraging Funds	**6**	**0**	**0**	**0**	•
Community Support	**4**	**3**	**3**	**2**	• 2 events happened just before submission • 48 residents engaged
TOTAL	**110**	**58**	**61**	**60**	•

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2027-2028

Project Name	Long Beach Island – Harco Street, et al. Green Streets				
Project Lead	Los Angeles County Public Works		**Watershed Area**	Lower San Gabriel River	
Total Funding Requested	$50,000		**Phase Requested**	Design Only	
Previously Funded IP Project	No		**Project Type Scoring Method**	Wet	
WQ Scoring Pilot	No	**WS Scoring Pilot**	No	**CIB Scoring Pilot**	No

Scoring Section	Maximum Points	Original Score (No Pilots)	Applicant Score	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality – Part 1 Wet + Dry Weather	**20**	**20**	**20**	**20**	• 134 acres of drainage area • Treat and release BMP, green street features • Expected to treat 90th percentile storm since treat and release systems have inefficiencies and do not treat 100% of the inflow
Water Quality – Part 2 Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Dry Weather (20 pts)	**30**	**30**	**30**	**30**	•
Water Supply – Part 1	**13**	**0**	**0**	**0**	•
Water Supply – Part 2	**12**	**2**	**2**	**0**	• Applicant is not claiming Water Supply
Community Investment	**10**	**5**	**5**	**5**	• 3 benefits claimed • Limited community investment information provided
Nature-Based Solutions	**15**	**5**	**5**	**5**	•
Leveraging Funds	**6**	**6**	**6**	**Unable to Score**	• No supporting documents for >$8M claimed leveraged funding
Community Support	**4**	**3**	**3**	**0**	• Insufficient demonstration of community support
TOTAL	**110**	**71**	**71**	**Unable to Score**	•

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2027-2028

Project Name	Washington Park Stormwater Capture Project				
Project Lead	City of Pomona		**Watershed Area**	Upper San Gabriel River	
Total Funding Requested	$2,165,000		**Phase Requested**	Design Only	
Previously Funded IP Project	No		**Project Type Scoring Method**	Dry	
WQ Scoring Pilot	Yes	**WS Scoring Pilot**	Yes	**CIB Scoring Pilot**	Yes

Scoring Section	Maximum Points	Original Score (No Pilots)	Applicant Score	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality – Part 1 Wet + Dry Weather	**20**	**20**	**20**	**20**	• 7.4 ac-ft infiltration gallery • 375 acre drainage area •
Water Quality – Part 2 Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Dry Weather (20 pts)	**30**	**20**	**20**	**20**	• >200 acre capture area
Water Supply – Part 1	**13**	**0**	**5**	**5**	• 78.42 ac-ft of capture • Will need either a geotechnical report confirming infiltration rates or a letter from Chino Basin Watermaster concurring with WS claims if the applicant comes back for construction funds
Water Supply – Part 2	**12**	**2**	**6**	**6**	•
Community Investment	**10**	**5**	**6**	**6**	• Incorporated CSNA feedback from the community
Nature-Based Solutions	**15**	**10**	**10**	**10**	•
Leveraging Funds	**6**	**0**	**0**	**0**	•
Community Support	**4**	**3**	**3**	**3**	• Multiple Letters of support and outreach events • Bilingual outreach conducted
TOTAL	**110**	**60**	**70**	**70**	•

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2027-2028

Project Name	Larkin Park				
Project Lead	City of Claremont		**Watershed Area**	Upper San Gabriel River	
Total Funding Requested	$1,400,000		**Phase Requested**	Design Only	
Previously Funded IP Project	No		**Project Type Scoring Method**	Wet	
WQ Scoring Pilot	Yes	**WS Scoring Pilot**	Yes	**CIB Scoring Pilot**	No

Scoring Section	Maximum Points	Original Score (No Pilots)	Applicant Score	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality – Part 1 Wet + Dry Weather	**20**	**11**	**14**	**14**	• Infiltration basin • 0.8 in/hr infiltration rate • 2 diversions w/ 455 acre drainage area
Water Quality – Part 2 Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Dry Weather (20 pts)	**30**	**30**	**30**	**30**	• >75% reduction in zinc & phosphorus
Water Supply – Part 1	**13**	**0**	**2**	**2**	• Applicant will need either geotechnical report confirming infiltration rates or letter from watermaster concurring with WS claims if applying for construction
Water Supply – Part 2	**12**	**0**	**3**	**3**	• $40,000 for O&M seems low of an estimate, if the applicant comes back for Construction, a more realistic number is needed.
Community Investment	**10**	**5**	**5**	**5**	• 3 claimed benefits
Nature-Based Solutions	**15**	**10**	**10**	**5**	• Lack of details and effort shown
Leveraging Funds	**6**	**0**	**0**	**0**	•
Community Support	**4**	**3**	**3**	**1**	• Insufficient outreach conducted
TOTAL	**110**	**59**	**67**	**60**	•

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2027-2028

Project Name	Fern Dell Restoration and Stormwater Capture Project				
Project Lead	Friends of Griffith Park		**Watershed Area**	Central Santa Monica Bay	
Total Funding Requested	$1,451,000		**Phase Requested**	Design Only	
Previously Funded IP Project	No		**Project Type Scoring Method**	Dry	
WQ Scoring Pilot	Yes	**WS Scoring Pilot**	No	**CIB Scoring Pilot**	Yes

Scoring Section	Maximum Points	Original Score (No Pilots)	Applicant Score	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality – Part 1 Wet + Dry Weather	**20**	**20**	**20**	**20**	• Primarily water circulation project, moving water from lower Fern Dell to upper Fern Dell • 336 acre drainage area •
Water Quality – Part 2 Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Dry Weather (20 pts)	**30**	**20**	**20**	**20**	• >200 acres
Water Supply – Part 1	**13**	**0**	**0**	**0**	•
Water Supply – Part 2	**12**	**0**	**0**	**0**	•
Community Investment	**10**	**10**	**10**	**10**	• Claiming increased public access to waterways by returning water upstream (25 gpm)
Nature-Based Solutions	**15**	**10**	**10**	**10**	•
Leveraging Funds	**6**	**0**	**0**	**0**	•
Community Support	**4**	**4**	**4**	**4**	• 12+ letters of support, 10 outreach events conducted
TOTAL	**110**	**64**	**64**	**64**	•

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2027-2028

Project Name	Pacoima Wash Greenway				
Project Lead	Pacoima Beautiful		**Watershed Area**	Upper Los Angeles River	
Total Funding Requested	$4,100,000		**Phase Requested**	Design Only	
Previously Funded IP Project	No		**Project Type Scoring Method**	Wet	
WQ Scoring Pilot	Yes	**WS Scoring Pilot**	No	**CIB Scoring Pilot**	Yes

Scoring Section	Maximum Points	Original Score (No Pilots)	Applicant Score	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality – Part 1 Wet + Dry Weather	**20**	**0**	**5**	**5**	• 53 acre drainage area • Natural bioswales & biofiltration to manage 85th percentile storm • 2.2 ac-ft capacity • High design cost considering the construction cost
Water Quality – Part 2 Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Dry Weather (20 pts)	**30**	**20**	**27**	**27**	• 73% pollution reduction
Water Supply – Part 1	**13**	**0**	**0**	**0**	•
Water Supply – Part 2	**12**	**0**	**0**	**0**	•
Community Investment	**10**	**10**	**10**	**10**	• 56 shade trees • Really high level of details
Nature-Based Solutions	**15**	**15**	**15**	**15**	• Really high level of details
Leveraging Funds	**6**	**3**	**3**	**3**	• $2.3M secured for design
Community Support	**4**	**4**	**4**	**4**	• Project scope is product of >15 years of community-involved planning • 14 letters of support • >30 focus groups
TOTAL	**110**	**52**	**64**	**64**	•

SCORING COMMITTEE MEETING - October 19, 2026					
	Quorum Present		Voting Items		
Member Type	Member	Present?	Vote to approve 9/28/2026 Meeting Minutes	From today, 10/19/26, send scorable projects receiving a passing score to WASCs	From today, 10/19/2026, allow Project Applicant of Long Beach Island 1 week to provide clarifying information to Scoring Committee
Community Investments	Gregory Scott Pierce	x	y	y	y
Water Supply / Community Investments / Nature-Based Solutions	Esther Rojas	x	y	y	y
Nature-Based Solutions / Community Investments	David Diaz	x	y	y	y
Nature-Based Solutions / Community Investments / Water Quality					
Water Quality	**Dave Sorem**	x	y	y	y
Water Quality	**TJ Moon**	x	y	y	y
Total Non-Vacant Seats	5	Yay (Y)	5	5	5
Total Voting Members Present	5	Nay (N)	0	0	0
		Abstain (A)	0	0	0
		Recused (R)	0	0	0
		Total	5	5	5
			Approved	Approved	Approved

Attendees
Scoring Committee Meeting October 19, 2026

Alonso Garcia
Amanda Begley
Andrew Kim
Anthony Barreras
Becca Ayala
Brett Perry
Call-in User_1
Call-in User_2
Celine Gallon
Chloe Ebright (JLHA)
Conor Mossavi
Cristian Hernandez
David Coghiel
David Tan
Drew Ready (CWH)
Eloysa Sarabia
Emma Nguyen
Eric Bonilla - LACPW
Fred Gonzalez - LACPW
Gerry Hans
Grey Crisanto - LACPW
James- SCWP USGR WC
Jason Casanova
Jenna Cobb
Joshua Montion
Kevin Te
Kristina Kreter
Larry Tran
Linet Khechatoorian
Lisa Kim
Maggie Gardner
Marisela Velasquez
Marisol Ibarra
Mayra Cabrera
Mike Antos (Regional Coord)
Mike Scaduto
Nola Eaglin Talmage
Pablo Forni - LACPW
Rafael Piamonte
Ryanna Fossum
Scoring Committee AV
Sia Arguello, Heal The Bay
Stephanie Gebhardt Rath
Susie Santilena
Tara Dales
Thom Epps
Timothy Lim
Uriel Cobian
Valeria Mena
Veronica Padilla
Villegas Eddie
Wendy Chau

Scoring Committee Meeting

COMMITTEE MEMBER SIGN-IN

SAFE CLEAN WATER

Member Name	Municipality/ Organization	Email Address	Signature
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	

Scoring Committee Meeting

PUBLIC SIGN-IN

SAFE CLEAN WATER

First Name	Last Name	Municipality/Organization	Email Address
Gurjot	Kohli	Stantec	[redacted]
Lee	David	LA County	
Merrill	Tryon	Craftwater	
Anthony	Ortega	City of Pomona	
Pauline	Nguyen	Craftwater	
Allen	Lew	Stantec	
Richard	WATSON	RWR	

*Signing or completing this form is voluntary for members of the public

October 19, 2026