

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Committee



---

### **Meeting Minutes:**

Tuesday, December 1, 2020

9:00am - 12:00pm

WebEx Meeting

### **Attendees**

#### Committee Members Present:

Matt Stone

JR De Shazo

Jill Sourial

Bruce Reznik

TJ Moon

Dave Sorem

#### Committee Members Not Present:

### **1) Welcome and Introductions**

Bruce Reznik, the Chair of the Scoring Committee, called the meeting to order. All committee members in attendance made self-introductions, and quorum was established.

### **2) Approval of Meeting Minutes from November 4, 2020**

The District provided a copy of the meeting minutes from the previous meeting. Bruce Reznik asked the committee members for comments or revisions.

TJ moon requested his Ex Parte be corrected from contacting Long Beach to Torrance

JR De Shazo made a motion to approve the meeting minutes. TJ Moon seconded the motion. The Committee voted to approve the meeting minutes (unanimous).

### **3) Committee Member and District Updates**

Kirk Allen provided the District update, noting: the District is now receiving municipal transfer agreement documents from applicants; all regional applicants are now completing their scopes of work and submitting documents; for Watershed Coordinators, 15 applications were qualified, and the ranking process will start shortly for those applicants; Round 3 call for projects is now open for the regional program.

### **4) Public Comment Period for Non-Agenized Items**

No public comments received.

### **5) Discussion Items:**

#### a) Ex Parte Communications Disclosure

Bruce Reznik is part of the Our Water LA Coalition and has had general discussions outside regarding projects and the scoring of projects.

TJ Moon noted he has taken part and is aware in the Carson and Arboretum projects.

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Committee



---

### b) Guidance updates for Feasibility Study Guidelines and Scoring Criteria: Long-Term Recommendations

Bruce Reznik provided a summary of the draft letter of recommendation for the short and long-term recommendations. Many to most of the short-term recommendations have been addressed, but additional work will be necessary either within our outside of the Scoring Committee and potentially with the Regional Oversight Committee (ROC) to make substantial changes to address the long-term recommendations. (see attached recommendation letter)

JR De Shazo requested from the ROC to determine if and when those long-term recommendations may be picked up and addressed. Kirk Allen noted that he would report back from the ROC on this item after the next ROC meeting.

### c) Scoring of Feasibility Studies

*(See attached scoring rubric)*

#### i) RH Arboretum Natural Treatment Wetland & Groundwater Recharge Facility

- Project Type: Wet
- BMP Type: Treatment Facility
- Phase: Design
- Funding Requested: \$981,890.00

#### ii) SSMB Carson Stormwater and Runoff Capture Project at Carriage Crest Park

- Project Type: Wet
- BMP Type: Diversion to Sanitary Sewer
- Phase: O & M
- Funding Requested: \$1,037,500.00

#### iii) ULAR North Hollywood Park Stormwater Capture Project

- Project Type: Dry
- BMP Type: Infiltration Facility
- Phase: Design, Construction
- Funding Requested: \$92,394,000.00

### d) Feasibility Study Review Assignments and Order of Scoring

- Option 1 – Score in order top to bottom
- Option 2 – Score in groups by project applicant
- Option 3 – Score based on project type

The Scoring Committee discussed which scoring methodology would be preferable. The committee decided on Option 1 was preferable, to score them in order of the WASC.

### e) Meeting Schedule

The Scoring Committee reviewed the availability table, and decided on meeting on December 8, 21, and January 5, 6, 12.

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Committee



---

### 6) Public Comment Period for Agenda Items

A member of the public suggested that the WASCs with the most projects be scored first as they have a more difficult job ahead of them; and it would be beneficial if the Scoring Committee had a central location for how various criteria was being interpreted.

### 7) Voting items:

None

### 8) Items for next agenda

Next agenda will include the list of projects to score.

### 9) Adjournment

Bruce Reznik thanked the committee members and public for their time and participation and adjourned the meeting.

## SCORING COMMITTEE MEETING - December 1, 2020

Member Type	Quorum Present		Items
	Member	Voting?	Meeting Minutes
Water Supply	Matt Stone	X	Not Present
Water Supply / Water Quality	<b>J.R. De Shazo</b>	X	Y
Nature-Based Solutions / Community Investments Benefits	Jill Sourial	X	Y
Nature-Based Solutions / Water Quality	<b><u>Bruce Reznik</u></b>	X	Y
Water Quality	Dave Sorem	X	Not Present
Water Quality	TJ Moon	X	Y
Total Non-Vacant Seats	6	Yay (Y)	4
Total Voting Members Present	6	Nay (N)	0
		Abstain (A)	0
		Total	4
			Approved

Other Attendees	
Alex Tachiki	Mercedes Passanisi
Ana Tabuena-Ruddy	Noel Le
Belinda Faustinos	Oliver Galang
Blake Whittington	Paul Glenn
Brett Perry	Peter Tonthat
Conor Massavi	Sheila Brice
Danielle Chupa	Simon Fowell
Gustavo Orozco	Sophie Freeman
Johanna Chang	Susie Santilena
Karen Lee	Thom Epps
Katie M	Vanessa Hevener

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



<b>Watershed Area</b>	Rio Hondo
<b>Project Name</b>	Arboretum Natural Treatment Wetland & Groundwater Recharge Facility
<b>Project Lead</b>	City of Arcadia
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$981,890
<b>Project Type</b>	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Max Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather  Part 1	20	<b>20</b>	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reclassify as a Dry weather project. Does not capture 85<sup>th</sup>.</li> <li>Applicant assumed 100% capture of the pollutants diverted into the project, which is not the intent of this criteria (TJ to confirm language in guidelines, reduction of diversion or reduction of entire tributary)</li> <li>Assumed 6" per hour infiltration rate, which seems high (applicant clarified this is the amount of water flowing through the project)</li> <li>Wetlands projects cannot be modeled in the SCW Projects Module</li> </ul>
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	20	<b>30</b>	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assuming Dry, &gt;200ac</li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b>  Part 1	10	<b>13</b>	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Likely in unconfined aquifer</li> <li>User input their own values for modeling</li> <li>Modeling unclear what infiltration amount, is it 47 or 406 AFY (applicant clarified; TJ noted that water treated by wetlands had not been classified as supply in round 1 call for projects; JR and Bruce noted that it could be classified as supply or equal standing; no clear policy; JR noted that this type of project is now the norm, should be resolved)</li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	12	<b>12</b>	12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unclear how project will impact downstream projects, is it claiming supply that is already or will be captured downstream</li> </ul>
<b>Community Investment</b>	10	<b>10</b>	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Jill and Bruce noted dry weather reclassification removes flood control benefit</li> <li>Bruce noted that he would like additional justification from applicants to claim CI benefits</li> <li>JR noted his notes had 8/10 CI benefits (no mechanism to award 8 points; will be solved in Round 3 call for projects) Future rubrics should provide flexibility for additional investment types</li> </ul>
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	10	<b>15</b>	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Impervious surface increases.</li> </ul>
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	0	<b>6</b>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	<b>4</b>	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>TOTALS</b>	86	<b>110</b>	81	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Scoring Committee members noted that the project is a good representative project for SCW.</li> </ul>

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



<b>Watershed Area</b>	South Santa Monica Bay
<b>Project Name</b>	Carson Stormwater and Runoff Capture Project at Carriage Crest Park
<b>Project Lead</b>	City of Carson
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$1,037,500
<b>Project Type</b>	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather  Part 1	20	<b>20</b>	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Applicant assumes a full capacity on trunk line at the optimal time of day; is a challenge to model. This leads to 100% capture.</li> <li>Should be above 50% capture if not at optimal time, but difficult to model this.</li> </ul>
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	<b>30</b>	30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project is claiming construction funds for O&amp;M expenditures</li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	0	<b>13</b>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Infiltration not possible at this site due to soil contamination and other restrictions</li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	12	<b>12</b>	12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assumes Reclamation Plant upgrade plans will come online to convert the detained water to future supply.</li> </ul>
<b>Community Investment</b>	5	<b>10</b>	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Would be good to know the types and placements of trees</li> <li>Unclear if the park was enhanced or put back the same; modernization of above ground amenities</li> </ul>
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	5	<b>15</b>	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>With soil contamination replacement, is this a nature-based solution; possibly included as a community investment</li> </ul>
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	6	<b>6</b>	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	0	<b>4</b>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>TOTALS</b>	78	<b>110</b>	78	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



<b>Watershed Area</b>	Upper Los Angeles River
<b>Project Name</b>	North Hollywood Park Stormwater Capture Project
<b>Project Lead</b>	Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (LADWP)
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$92,394,000
<b>Project Type</b>	Dry

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	<b>20</b>	20	•
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	20	<b>30</b>	20	•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	0	<b>13</b>	0	•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	12	<b>12</b>	12	•
<b>Community Investment</b>	10	<b>10</b>	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bruce noted they provided sufficient justification for CI benefits</li> <li>• Dry weather would not likely receive flood benefit (does not change score)</li> </ul>
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	15	<b>15</b>	15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Unclear if all impervious surface is being replaced with pervious pavement (confirmed by applicant, replaced with pervious pavement)</li> </ul>
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	6	<b>6</b>	6	•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	<b>4</b>	4	•
<b>TOTALS</b>	87	<b>110</b>	87	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Applicant attached a monitoring plan for a separate project (Should be retrieved by SCW Team)</li> </ul>