

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Committee



Meeting Minutes:

Tuesday, January 5, 2021
9:00am – 12:00pm
WebEx Meeting

Attendees

Committee Members Present:

Matt Stone	Bruce Reznik
J.R. De Shazo	TJ Moon
Jill Sourial	Dave Sorem

Committee Members Not Present:

None

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 a quorum was established.

2) Approval of Meeting Minutes from December 21, 2020

Meeting minutes from December 21, 2020 are pending approval.

3) Committee Member and District Updates

Kirk Allen provided the District update, noting: an updated schedule for the scoring committee. Informed the Committee of the engagement of a consultant to assist with meeting minute preparation. Kirk Allen reminded those Cities that have fund Transfer Agreements to send their executed Transfer Agreements with the required documents to the District; and noted additional program guidance items to be discussed on the next round of Stormwater Investment Plans. For those interested in additional program guidance items please consider attending the Regional Oversight Committee meeting to be hosted on January 28, 2021.

Bruce Reznik noted that WASCs will continue with the interviews for Watershed Coordinators throughout the month January 2021.

4) Public Comment Period for Non-Agenda 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 regarding the process for resubmitting projects; he was approached by SEITech, Corvias, Geosyntech and City of Los Angeles. Mr. Reznik let the parties know their questions can be brought up to District staff.

TJ Moon noted he had general discussions with Amigos de Los Rios and Paradigm Environmental.

J.R. De Shazo noted that he had a general discussion with Metro regarding their project.

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Committee



b) Scoring of Feasibility Studies

(See attached scoring rubric)

ULAR	12	Valley Plaza Park Stormwater Capture Project
	13	Victory ES - DROPS
	14	Westmont - Vermont Avenue Green Improvement
	15	Woodlake ES - LID Project
LLAR	1	Compton Blvd Et. Al. Project
	2	Furman Park Stormwater Capture and Infiltration Project
	3	Huntington Park High School Storm Water Management System
	4	Lynwood City Park Stormwater Capture Project
	5	Rancho Los Cerritos: Looking Back to Advance Forward
	6	Salt Lake Park Infiltration Cistern
	7	Spane Park
NSMB	8	Urban Orchard Project
	9	Stormwater Treatment, Diversion, Water Supply Augmentation, & Bioremediation Project
	10	Viewridge Road Stormwater Improvements Project

6) Meeting Schedule

Bruce Reznik announced that the next meeting is scheduled for January 6, 2021 and that the Committee will be reviewing Infrastructure Projects from the Rio Hondo Watershed Area and Upper San Gabriel River Watershed Area.

7) Public Comment Period for Agenda Items

No comments received.

8) Voting items:

- a) Send all passing scored projects from December 21, 2020 to the WASC

J.R. De Shazo made a motion to advance the 9 scored projects with scores of at least 60 points and TJ Moon seconded the motion. The Committee voted to approve (unanimous; see Vote Tracking Sheet).

- b) Allow all non-passing scored or unscored projects from December 21, 2020 one week to provide updates

Jill Sourial made a motion to allow the applicants of the 2 projects that did not achieve a score of at least 60 points one week to provide clarifying information and J.R. De Shazo seconded the motion. The Committee voted to approve (unanimous; see Vote Tracking Sheet).

9) Adjournment

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

SCORING COMMITTEE MEETING - January 5, 2021

Member Type	Quorum Present		Voting Items		
	Member	Voting?	Meeting Minutes (item held)	Voting Item 7a	Voting Item 7b
Water Supply	Matt Stone	X		Y	Y
Water Supply / Water Quality	J.R. De Shazo	X		Y	Y
Nature-Based Solutions / Community Investments Benefits	Jill Sourial	X		Y	Y
Nature-Based Solutions / Water Quality	Bruce Reznik	X		Y	Y
Water Quality	Dave Sorem	X		Y	Y
Water Quality	TJ Moon	X		Y	Y
Total Non-Vacant Seats	6	Yay (Y)	0	6	6
Total Voting Members Present	6	Nay (N)	0	0	0
		Abstain (A)	0	0	0
		Total	0	6	6
			Not Approved	Approved	Approved

Other Attendees	
Brenda Morales	Peter Tonthat
Brett Perry	Ryan A
Bryce Lee	Susie Santilena
Christine McLeod	Thom Epps
Clare Faulkner	Thuan Nguyen
Conor Mossavi	Van Woods
Gladis Deras	Wendy Dinh
Haris Harouny	Harry Drake
Jae Ko	Lorry Hempe
Jason Fussel	Zelda Wong
Joe Venzon	Laura Ochoa
Johanna Chang	Aric Torreyson
John Hunter	Curtis Fang
Karen Lee	Ilene Ramirez
Katie M	Jason Casanova
Lorena Matos	Allan Lumidao
Mark Lombos	Chris Jansen
Matilda Reyes	Mohammed Baig
Michael Gagan	Sheila Brice
Nick S	Alberto Grajeda
Noel L	Sergio Gonzalez
Oliver Galang	Carlos Moran

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



Watershed Area	Upper Los Angeles River
Project Name	Valley Plaza Park Stormwater Capture Project
Project Lead	Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (LADWP)
Total Funding Requested	\$26,447,000
Project Type	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	20	20	•
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	30	30	•
Water Supply Part 1	0	13	0	•
Water Supply Part 2	12	12	12	•
Community Investment	10	10	10	• Very good justification for each CI benefit claimed.
Nature-Based Solutions	15	15	15	•
Leveraging Funds Part 1	6	6	6	•
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	4	4	• Great sample of letters of support from community groups
TOTALS	97	110	97	•

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



Watershed Area	Upper Los Angeles River
Project Name	Victory ES - DROPS
Project Lead	Los Angeles Unified School District
Total Funding Requested	\$178,585
Project Type	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	20	Unable to score	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No hydrology or cost estimates provided. Challenging to calculate breakdown. Need additional information to confirm cost and capacity dimensions on p.8 of application. Applicant to provide plans and calculation for how aggregate number is calculated.
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	30	30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Oversized for flooding, captures more than the 85th percentile storm.
Water Supply Part 1	0	13	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Water Supply Part 2	0	12	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Community Investment	10	10	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would be beneficial to see the planting pallet and other plans as project is already constructed.
Nature-Based Solutions	15	15	15	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Leveraging Funds Part 1	0	6	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Leveraging Funds Part 2	0	4	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As applicant is a school, would be good to see letters of support from PTA, community groups, and others.
TOTALS	75	110	Unable to score	<ul style="list-style-type: none">

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



Watershed Area	Upper Los Angeles River
Project Name	Westmont - Vermont Avenue Green Improvement
Project Lead	Los Angeles County Public Works
Total Funding Requested	\$500,000
Project Type	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	20	20	•
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	25	30	25	•
Water Supply Part 1	0	13	0	•
Water Supply Part 2	5	12	5	•
Community Investment	5	10	5	•
Nature-Based Solutions	14	15	14	•
Leveraging Funds Part 1	6	6	6	•
Leveraging Funds Part 2	0	4	0	• Post-design, would be good to see community letters of support.
TOTALS	75	110	75	•

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



Watershed Area	Upper Los Angeles River
Project Name	Woodlake ES - LID Project
Project Lead	Los Angeles Unified School District
Total Funding Requested	\$1,006,629
Project Type	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	20	Unable to score	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No hydrology or cost estimates provided. Challenging to calculate breakdown. Need additional information to confirm cost and capacity dimensions on p.8 of application.
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	30	Unable to score	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Water Supply Part 1	0	13	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Water Supply Part 2	0	12	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Community Investment	10	10	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would be beneficial to see the plant pallet as the project has been constructed.
Nature-Based Solutions	10	15	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Leveraging Funds Part 1	0	6	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Leveraging Funds Part 2	0	4	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As applicant is a school, would be good to see letters of support from PTA, community groups, and others.
TOTALS	70	110		<ul style="list-style-type: none">

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



Watershed Area	Lower Los Angeles River
Project Name	Compton Blvd Et. Al. Project
Project Lead	Los Angeles County
Total Funding Requested	\$600,000
Project Type	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	14	20	14	•
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	30	30	•
Water Supply Part 1	0	13	0	•
Water Supply Part 2	2	12	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unclear if 40 wells or 66. • Applicant confirmed 66 is accurate.
Community Investment	5	10	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Was a challenge identifying where the bioswales, biofiltration, and trees are located. No backup provided to confirm this. • Unclear if bike access is existing or new. Does not impact score. • Applicant to provide schematic and map to the WASC and Scoring Committee for where plantings and bioswales and biofiltration are located. • Applicant confirmed bikeway is new.
Nature-Based Solutions	10	15	10	•
Leveraging Funds Part 1	6	6	6	•
Leveraging Funds Part 2	0	4	0	•
TOTALS	67	110	67	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Points conditionally awarded, SC requests additional evidence to verify score.

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



Watershed Area	Lower Los Angeles River
Project Name	Furman Park Stormwater Capture and Infiltration Project
Project Lead	City of Downey
Total Funding Requested	\$12,325,670
Project Type	Dry

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	20	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Applicant is between a wet and dry weather project. Applicant chose to classify as dry weather, but the project does take in wet weather flow. 30-ft of gravel depth seems high. Applicant noted focus is to address dry weather bacteria TMDL and noted that infiltration rates at the site are very good.
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	20	30	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> With such a high infiltration rate, project may be close to the 85th percentile storm volume, to pick up additional points being classified as a wet weather project.
Water Supply Part 1	0	13	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Water Supply Part 2	5	12	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Deep media layer may be inflating supply benefit. Applicant noted that 30ft of gravel is an underestimate. Support letter from WRD appears to be a blanket letter. SC still to resolve what level of Watermaster approval is needed. Water is pre-treated before infiltration into groundwater.
Community Investment	5	10	Unable to score	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clarification needed on the native vegetation and infiltration gallery. Applicant noted that current phase is design, with more details to come post-design. If classifying as dry weather, won't be able to claim Flood control benefit.
Nature-Based Solutions	12	15	Unable to score	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Need clarification on the scale of the infiltration gallery to confirm score.
Leveraging Funds Part 1	0	6	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Leveraging Funds Part 2	0	4	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would be good to see letters of support from community groups.
TOTALS	62	110	Unable to score	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Application currently requesting funds for design and construction. Needs additional information as construction included.

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



Watershed Area	Lower Los Angeles River
Project Name	Huntington Park High School Storm Water Management System
Project Lead	Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD/District)
Total Funding Requested	\$1,401,707
Project Type	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	20	14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Irrigation included in capacity, SC reducing. 1 AF as capacity / \$1.2M = 0.83 = 14 points
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	30	30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Overdesigned, captures more than the 85th percentile.
Water Supply Part 1	0	13	0	•
Water Supply Part 2	0	12	0	•
Community Investment	10	10	10	•
Nature-Based Solutions	10	15	10	•
Leveraging Funds Part 1	0	6	0	•
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	4	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Applicant provides a pdf noting community meeting schedule but does not include letters of support. With applicant being a school, should provide a letter of support from PTA, community groups, or others.
TOTALS	74	110	64	•

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



Watershed Area	Lower Los Angeles River
Project Name	Lynwood City Park Stormwater Capture Project
Project Lead	City of Lynwood
Total Funding Requested	\$1,691,629
Project Type	Dry

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	20	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Applicant classified as a dry weather project, but it should be able to capture the 85th. Project is clearly not a dry weather project. As project is design only, leaving now for dry weather.
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	20	30	20	•
Water Supply Part 1	0	13	0	•
Water Supply Part 2	5	12	5	•
Community Investment	10	10	5	• Application claimed flood control benefit. Unless reclassification to wet weather, this will remove flood benefit.
Nature-Based Solutions	12	15	12	•
Leveraging Funds Part 1	0	6	0	•
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	4	4	•
TOTALS	71	110	66	• Project is more than likely a wet weather project. Clarification should be provided to the WASC.

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



Watershed Area	Lower Los Angeles River
Project Name	Rancho Los Cerritos: Looking Back to Advance Forward
Project Lead	Rancho Los Cerritos
Total Funding Requested	\$1,715,000
Project Type	Dry

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	20	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Applicant classified as a dry weather, but should be classified as a wet weather. Score would not change as Part 1 would drop to zero.
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	10	30	30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Drywell alone can capture more than the 85th, which would provide full points in part 2.
Water Supply Part 1	0	13	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Water Supply Part 2	0	12	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Community Investment	10	10	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dry weather classification would not be able to claim flood control benefit. Would be able to claim if reclassification to wet weather. School benefit has to be located adjacent to the school.
Nature-Based Solutions	13	15	13	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide additional detail to the WASC on the nature-based benefits provided.
Leveraging Funds Part 1	3	6	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	4	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
TOTALS	60	110	60	<ul style="list-style-type: none">

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



Watershed Area	Lower Los Angeles River
Project Name	Salt Lake Park Infiltration Cistern
Project Lead	City of Huntington Park
Total Funding Requested	\$29,000,000
Project Type	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	20	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No plans or hydrology provided, and applicant used their own modeling with no justification. This project is between a wet and dry weather project. SC recommends reclassifying as a dry weather project, as it is not large enough to meet 85th
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	30	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This project only captures about half of the 85th percentile, but application claims full capture of pollutants. Needs justification.
Water Supply Part 1	3	13	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Applicant using their own cost estimate for supply cost. No justification provided.
Water Supply Part 2	0	12	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Community Investment	5	10	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Nature-Based Solutions	15	15	Unable to score	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nature based justification needs more detail. Would be beneficial to see what these benefits are and what the plantings are.
Leveraging Funds Part 1	0	6	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	4	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Letters of support are from only cities and no community groups. SC recognizes that multi-city support is beneficial. Applicant notes support from Tree People, would be good to see a letter of support from this group.
TOTALS	77	110	Unable to score	<ul style="list-style-type: none">

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



Watershed Area	Lower Los Angeles River
Project Name	Spane Park
Project Lead	City of Paramount
Total Funding Requested	\$891,984
Project Type	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	20	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Depth and capacity of gallery seems inconsistent throughout application.
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	30	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Applicant used their own modeling, but justification shows inconsistent reduced pollutant capture. 90% range vs 60% range.
Water Supply Part 1	10	13	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As design only, current assumptions are permitted
Water Supply Part 2	12	12	12	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Community Investment	10	10	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project is not providing a direct benefit to schools, it is adjacent to the school. Would be beneficial to see more detail about the stream, butterfly garden, and other benefits claimed. Provide details to the WASC.
Nature-Based Solutions	10	15	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Leveraging Funds Part 1	0	6	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Leveraging Funds Part 2	0	4	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
TOTALS	92	110	77	<ul style="list-style-type: none">

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



Watershed Area	Lower Los Angeles River
Project Name	Urban Orchard Project
Project Lead	City of South Gate
Total Funding Requested	\$5,438,000
Project Type	Dry

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	20	20	•
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	20	30	20	•
Water Supply Part 1	0	13	0	•
Water Supply Part 2	2	12	2	•
Community Investment	10	10	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dry weather projects are unable to claim flood benefit. • Project is located adjacent to school vs providing direct benefit to school.
Nature-Based Solutions	13	15	13	•
Leveraging Funds Part 1	6	6	6	•
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	4	4	•
TOTALS	75	110	70	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SC recognizes that this project is exemplary and stands out as a very good safe clean water project.

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



Watershed Area	North Santa Monica Bay
Project Name	Stormwater Treatment, Diversion, Water Supply Augmentation, and Bioremediation Project
Project Lead	City of Agoura Hills (Jessica Forte and Kelly Fisher)
Total Funding Requested	\$4,674,650
Project Type	Dry

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	20	20 To be Confirmed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No plans or data provided on the 17 LFD's. Unclear if project is only claiming for just the one Medea Creek Diversion site or 17 LFD's. Applicant notes that construction funds to include the 17 LFD's. Applicant to provide additional details on the LFDs.
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	20	30	20 To be Confirmed	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Water Supply Part 1	3	13	3 To be Confirmed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Applicant used their own figures for the supply. These seem reasonable. Applicant to provide additional clarity to justify water supply benefits.
Water Supply Part 2	12	12	12 To be Confirmed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Applicant to retrieve letter of support for water supply benefit.
Community Investment	0	10	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Nature-Based Solutions	0	15	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Leveraging Funds Part 1	3	6	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> O&M seems high on this project. Unclear if this funding accounted for. Applicant noted that O&M is currently an estimate.
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	4	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
TOTALS	62	110	62 To be confirmed	<ul style="list-style-type: none">

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



Watershed Area	North Santa Monica Bay
Project Name	Viewridge Road Stormwater Improvements Project
Project Lead	Los Angeles County Public Works
Total Funding Requested	\$800,000
Project Type	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	7	20	7	•
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	30	30	•
Water Supply Part 1	0	13	0	•
Water Supply Part 2	0	12	0	•
Community Investment	5	10	5	• Very detailed planting plan provided by applicant.
Nature-Based Solutions	12	15	12	•
Leveraging Funds Part 1	6	6	6	•
Leveraging Funds Part 2	0	4	0	• Would have been beneficial to see letters of support.
TOTALS	60	110	60	•