

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Committee



Meeting Minutes:

Wednesday, January 27, 2021

1:00pm – 4:00pm

WebEx Meeting

Attendees

Committee Members Present:

Matt Stone

J.R. De Shazo

Jill Sourial

Bruce Reznik

TJ Moon

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) Committee Member and District Updates

The District will provide copies of the meeting minutes from the January 25th and 27th meetings for approval at the February 2, 2021 Scoring Committee meeting.

Kirk Allen provided the following District updates: 8 of the 9 WASCs have chosen Watershed Coordinators (WC); 11 out of the 12 available WC positions have been selected; future WASC meetings will begin soon and applicants with Infrastructure Program (IP) Projects that meet the minimum Threshold Scores will be invited to give presentations to the WASCs, as well as Technical Resource concept applicants and Scientific Study applicants; Cities are still executing Municipal Program Transfer Agreements and providing documents to the District; approximately half of the municipal local returns have been issued, and District has received approximately 18 executed Regional Program Transfer Agreements and is in the process of reviewing the scopes of work and other associated ordinance requirements. Kirk Allen discussed the tax relief program associated with the Safe, Clean Water Program; there are opportunities for tax exemptions, reductions, and credits for the Safe, Clean Water Tax for qualifying individuals and businesses.

3) Public Comment Period for Non-Agenda Items

No public comments received.

4) Discussion Items:

a) Ex Parte Communications Disclosure

TJ Moon received documents from and had a phone conversation with Jessica Forte from Agoura Hills regarding the Stormwater Treatment, Diversion, Water Supply Augmentation, and Bioremediation Project and advised her to provide public comment at today's Scoring Committee meeting.

Bruce Reznik received an email from Shariar Eftekhazadeh of SEITec regarding the Ballona Creek Dry Weather Flow Treatment Project; also, they had a phone conversation and Bruce advised Shariar to provide a public comment at the 1/27 Scoring Committee meeting.

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Committee



b) Scoring of Feasibility Studies

(See attached scoring rubric)

Resubmission of Projects for Scoring on January 27, 2021		
CSMB	1	Ballona Creek Dry Weather Flow Treatment Project (SCORED ON JANUARY 25 TH MEETING)
	2	Blackwelder Tract Lower Ballona Creek Green BMPs and Landscape Improvement Project (SCORED ON JANUARY 25 TH MEETING)
	3	Normandie Ave ES - DROPS and Paving (SCORED ON JANUARY 25 TH MEETING)
	4	Slauson Connect Clean Water Project (SCORED ON JANUARY 25 TH MEETING)
	5	Webster MS – DROPS (SCORED ON JANUARY 25 TH MEETING)
ULAR	6	Altadena Mariposa Green Street Demonstration Project (SCORED ON JANUARY 25 TH MEETING)
	7	Lincoln Park Neighborhood Green Street Network (SCORED ON JANUARY 25 TH MEETING)
	8	Victory ES – DROPS (SCORED ON JANUARY 25 TH MEETING)
	9	Woodlake ES - LID Project (SCORED ON JANUARY 25 TH MEETING)
LLAR	10	Furman Park Stormwater Capture and Infiltration Project (SCORED ON JANUARY 25 TH MEETING)
	11	Salt Lake Park Infiltration Cistern (SCORED ON JANUARY 25 TH MEETING)
NSMB	12	Stormwater Treatment, Diversion, Water Supply Augmentation, and Bioremediation Project (SCORED ON JANUARY 25 TH MEETING)
RH	13	Alhambra Wash Dry-Weather Diversion
	14	East Los Angeles College Northeast Drainage Area and City of Monterey Park Biofiltration Project
	15	Eaton Wash Dry-Weather Diversion
	16	Rubio Wash Dry-Weather Diversion
USGR	17	Fairplex
	18	Larkin Park
	19	Lone Hill Park
	20	Washington Park
	21	Zamora Park Renovation Project
LSGR	22	Stormwater Treatment and Reuse System (STAR System) Hacienda Park
	23	Heartwell Park at Palo Verde Channel
SSMB	24	Beach Cities Green Streets Project WITHDRAWN BY APPLICANT

5) Public Comment Period for Agenda Items

Two comment cards were received from the public (see attached comment cards).

6) Voting items:

- a) Send all projects with passing scores from the January 25, 2021 Scoring Committee meeting to their respective WASCs

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Committee



J.R. De Shazo made a motion to approve sending the 10 projects with passing scores to their respective WASCs. Jill Sourial seconded the motion. The Committee voted to approve sending the projects to the WASCs (unanimous, see attached Vote Tracker Sheet).

7) Adjournment

Bruce Reznik reminded Committee members that the next meeting will be held on February 2, 2021 from 9:00 am – 12:00 pm and adjourned the meeting.

SCORING COMMITTEE MEETING - January 27, 2021

Member Type	Quorum Present		Voting Items
	Member	Voting?	Voting Item 7a
Water Supply	Matt Stone	X	Y
Water Supply / Water Quality	J.R. De Shazo	X	Y
Nature-Based Solutions / Community Investments Benefits	Jill Sourial	X	Y
Nature-Based Solutions / Water Quality	<u>Bruce Reznik</u>	X	Y
Water Quality	Dave Sorem	X	Y
Water Quality	TJ Moon	X	Y
Total Non-Vacant Seats	6	Yay (Y)	6
Total Voting Members Present	6	Nay (N)	0
		Abstain (A)	0
		Total	6
			Approved

Other Attendees	
Alexis Holmdal	Nate Schreiner
Alysha Chan	Paul Glenn
Brad Parks	Richard Watson
Brenda Ponton	Shahriar Eftekhazadeh
Christine McLeod	Sheila Brice
Christopher Rochfort	Susie Santilena
Conor Mossavi	Thom Epps
Daniel Apt	Vik Bapna
James Cramsie	Wendy Dinh
Joe Venzon	Yvana Hrovat
Joshua Nelsom	Rod Wiese
Julie Carver	Tekil Fujin
Katie M	Scott Struck
Kuldeep Gill	Oliver Galang
Lena Nguyen	Armando D'Angelo
Lorena Matos	
Mary Breckell	
Michael Drennan	

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



Watershed Area	Lower San Gabriel River
Project Name	Stormwater Treatment and Reuse System (STAR System) Hacienda Park
Project Lead	City of La Habra Heights
Total Funding Requested	\$859,000
Project Type	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	20	To-be confirmed 20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Oversized for 85th percentile p.16: Unclear what drawdown rate of 11.8 in/hr is from. No Geotech provided. p.16 Unclear what the 24-hour capacity is from. Applicant to verify these two figures. And to confirm if these are from evapotranspiration. No way to verify vendor rates
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	25	30	To-be confirmed 25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Applicant used their own modeling system, would be better for consistency to use WMMS.
Water Supply Part 1	0	13	0	•
Water Supply Part 2	0	12	0	•
Community Investment	10	10	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Access to waterway, is a viewing terrace considered access. Committee will need to provide additional clarity for future applications.
Nature-Based Solutions	10	15	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unclear if the STAR system is natural. Committee discussion noted it's similar to modular wetlands. Would be beneficial to know how much of the vegetation is new vegetation.
Leveraging Funds Part 1	0	6	0	•
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	4	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Single letter from a resident. Intent for strong community support is geared more towards community groups.
TOTALS	69	110	To-Be Confirmed 69	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No budget shown for O&M? Applicant to confirm this and other info requests.

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



Watershed Area	Lower San Gabriel River
Project Name	Heartwell Park at Palo Verde Channel
Project Lead	City of Long Beach
Total Funding Requested	\$1,539,676
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"> Applicant applied for wet weather, should be reclassified as Dry weather. Project is significantly smaller than the 85th percentile. Would preserve the same 40 points.
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	20	30	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Water Supply Part 1	0	13	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Water Supply Part 2	5	12	To Be Confirmed 5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Applicant used their own value for water supply. Unclear if supply to be used for irrigation? Golf course is currently served with recycled water. Unclear if conversion from recycled to stormwater yields new supply. Applicant noted that recycled supply does not meet the needs of the golf course. New stormwater provides irrigation water with the option for discharge to sewer. Applicant to provide additional clarification on supply benefit.
Community Investment	5	10	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> With dry weather reclassification would not be able to claim Flood Benefit. Does not impact score.
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	4	4	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
TOTALS	64	110	To Be Confirmed 64	<ul style="list-style-type: none">

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



Watershed Area	Rio Hondo
Project Name	Alhambra Wash Dry-Weather Diversion
Project Lead	San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments (SGVCOG), Mark Christoffels
Total Funding Requested	\$2,737,180
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	0	12	0	•
Community Investment	5	10	Unable to score 5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would be beneficial to see additional details and justification as project is asking for construction funding. • Applicant using enhanced walking under shade as a recreational benefit, may be more geared towards habitat benefit. • Unclear if this area is high in pedestrian traffic. • Applicant to provide additional documents to show planting plan, and clarify number of trees. •
Nature-Based Solutions	10	15	Unable to score 10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very little detail provided to justify nature-based solution benefits claimed. • Unclear if benefits will be provided, listed as potential within application • Applicant confirmed bioswale area and number of trees; this needs to be verified. • Question if pedestrians in area; applicant stated likely high pedestrian traffic
Leveraging Funds Part 1	6	6	Unable to score 6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Match percentage appears inconsistent. Unclear if \$200k is missing. • Applicant confirmed 50% match • Applicant noted cost share is associated only with capital cost and not O&M.
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	4	4	
TOTALS	65	110	Unable to score 65	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Points awarded with the understanding that bioswales and trees documented will be implemented

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



Watershed Area	Rio Hondo
Project Name	East Los Angeles College Northeast Drainage Area and City of Monterey Park Biofiltration Project
Project Lead	East Los Angeles College/Build LACCD
Total Funding Requested	\$532,618
Project Type	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	11	20	To be Confirmed 11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Website not able to model wetlands. Applicant provides a draw down rate, but there is no diversion or infiltration. Should be zero. Reduces ratio Applicant noted drawdown rate is associated with filtration Applicant to provide justification for filtration drawdown rate comparison. Draw down rate confirmed – 0.375 with documentation provided
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	25	30	25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project is larger than the 85th percentile. Should have maximized pollutant capture.
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	5	10	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unclear how the project is enhancing the school and improve local head island effect. Are these new plantings to provide school improvement and heat island? Applicant noted site has some existing vegetation, and project will include new native plantings. Applicant notes improvements will be to both the school and the transit center. Applicant to provide additional detail and plans to the WASC.
Nature-Based Solutions	10	15	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Application notes reduction of impermeable area, would be beneficial to see detail on this.
Leveraging Funds Part 1	6	6	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	4	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
TOTALS	61	110	Hold 61	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SC holding pending additional detail

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



Watershed Area	Rio Hondo
Project Name	Eaton Wash Dry-Weather Diversion
Project Lead	San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments (SGVCOG), Mark Christoffels
Total Funding Requested	\$1,894,220
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	0	12	0	•
Community Investment	5	10	2 5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would be beneficial to see additional details and justification as project is asking for construction funding. • Application notes benefits are potential. With construction funds, more detail should be available. • Applicant to provide graphic and counts for detailed plantings and improvements
Nature-Based Solutions	10	15	5 10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Application notes reduction of impermeable area, would be beneficial to see detail on this. • Unclear if swale is included in the project, as it is called out as a potential improvement. • Applicant to provide clarity if these natural features will be included in the project.
Leveraging Funds Part 1	6	6	6	•
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	4	4	•
TOTALS	65	110	57 65	• Points awarded with the understanding that bioswales and trees documented will be implemented

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



Watershed Area	Rio Hondo
Project Name	Rubio Wash Dry-Weather Diversion
Project Lead	San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments (SGVCOG), Mark Christoffels
Total Funding Requested	\$2,977,080
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	0	12	0	•
Community Investment	5	10	2 5	• Walking claimed for recreation without more details on how much of a benefit is provided.
Nature-Based Solutions	10	15	10	• Unclear if swale will be provided or not. There is only a potential of the trees and swale. • Applicant to provide schematic to show what benefits will be provided.
Leveraging Funds Part 1	6	6	6	• Unclear where the remaining \$200k are to make a full 50/50 match. • Applicant to provide clarity on cost match.
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	4	4	•
TOTALS	65	110	Held 65	• Held pending additional information to SC.

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



Watershed Area	South Santa Monica Bay
Project Name	Beach Cities Green Streets Project
Project Lead	City of Torrance
Total Funding Requested	\$2,595,000
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"> Applicant aggregating all numbers of the 7 locations. Would be beneficial to see details on how the project parameters were aggregated. Infiltration rate is an aggregate number, but no detail to justify Applicant to provide additional detail and justification to claim WQ benefit.
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"> Application claims 85th percentile capture, but there's no documentation on what the 85th percentile is.
Water Supply Part 1	3	13	Unable to Score	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Application claims supply benefit but there is not groundwater recharge in the beach cities. There's no information on any discharge to sewer or other supply options. Insufficient information to justify. Application notes site is located at a seawater barrier, and would contribute to the barrier. Applicant to provide additional detail and justification to claim supply benefit.
Water Supply Part 2	2	12	Unable to Score	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Community Investment	5	10	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would be beneficial to see more detail and justification, such as the type of trees planted.
Nature-Based Solutions	10	15	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Application notes replacement of pavement with pervious pavement, but there's no points claimed.
Leveraging Funds Part 1	6	6	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cost share appears to be just less than 50%, unclear how full points awarded. Missing \$45k somewhere.
Leveraging Funds Part 2	0	4	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
TOTALS	76	110	Unable to Score Withdrawn by Applicant	<ul style="list-style-type: none">

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



Watershed Area	Upper San Gabriel River
Project Name	Fairplex
Project Lead	East San Gabriel Valley Watershed Management Group
Total Funding Requested	\$31,900,000
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 Geotech report provided to justify draw down rate. Plans provided in application show boring logs exist for the site. May be able to use these logs to estimate draw down rate. Applicant used custom value for capacity that is less than modeled 24-hour capacity. As application is requesting construction funds, justification for draw down rate needed. Applicant provided geotech evaluation from Metro. Geotech confirmed.
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	30	20 30	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Water Supply Part 1	0	13	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Water Supply Part 2	12	12	Unable to score 9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unclear if sections of the application are missing, or if justification is not provided.
Community Investment	2	10	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Nature-Based Solutions	5	15	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
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"> Applicant included no letters of support, only a pending letter from the LA County Fair Association. Landowner or business letters of support do not meet the intent of strong community support.
TOTALS	73	110	Unable to score 66	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SC holding project pending additional justification from applicant

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



Watershed Area	Upper San Gabriel River
Project Name	Larkin Park
Project Lead	East San Gabriel Valley Watershed Management Group
Total Funding Requested	\$23,100,000
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 11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No Geotech report provided to justify drawdown rate. Applicant used a custom value for their capacity which is higher than the website generated value. Applicant to provide justification for draw down rate and 24-hour capacity. Applicant provided geotech report from nearby garden. 1.8 in/hr rate. Capacity 13.9 ac-ft
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	30	Unable to score 30	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Water Supply Part 1	0	13	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Water Supply Part 2	9	12	Unable to score 9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Score will change if modifications are made to draw down rate and 24-hour capacity. The watermaster has provided a conditional letter of support, with concerns about high groundwater table. Applicant provided additional information on groundwater; pulled information from nearby well showing 40' clearance
Community Investment	2	10	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
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	4	4	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Letter provided by the Mayor of Claremont, which focuses only on MS4 compliance vs providing community benefits.
TOTALS	75	110	Unable to score 62	<ul style="list-style-type: none">

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



Watershed Area	Upper San Gabriel River
Project Name	Lone Hill Park
Project Lead	East San Gabriel Valley Watershed Management Group
Total Funding Requested	\$9,900,000
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 11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No Geotech report provided to justify drawdown rate. Applicant used their own custom value for their 24-hour capacity. Applicant to provide justification for these values. Applicant provided boring logs from the project site. 3.22 in/hr, expected to be higher.
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	30	Unable to score 30	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Water Supply Part 1	0	13	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Water Supply Part 2	5	12	Unable to score 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will change if modifications are made to draw down rate and 24-hour capacity. Applicant is in the process of retrieving a letter of support from Groundwater Master.
Community Investment	5	10	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Additional graphics and planting palette would be good to see. Parking lot may have the potential for pervious pavement.
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	4	4	0 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Letter of support from Mayor, with a focus on community benefits. Intent is for a community group to provide this letter of support. Recommendation to seek additional community support
TOTALS	74	110	Unable to score 62	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Request for Groundwater Master letter before WASC meeting

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



Watershed Area	Upper San Gabriel River
Project Name	Washington Park
Project Lead	East San Gabriel Valley Watershed Management Group
Total Funding Requested	\$48,400,000
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 20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No Geotech report provided to justify drawdown rate and custom higher 24-hour capacity. Applicant to provide Geotech information to justify these values. Applicant provided boring logs of nearby project, showing silty sand Infiltration rate seems too low, increasing infiltration rate could save construction cost
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	30	Unable to score 30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 85th percentile calculation seems low. Most of the tributary area is urban. Applicant to provide additional clarity for why 85th seems low.
Water Supply Part 1	0	13	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Water Supply Part 2	12	12	Unable to score 12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will change if modifications are made to the drawdown rate and 24-hour capacity Letter of support was not provided from Raymond Basin
Community Investment	5	10	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Additional graphics and planting palette would be good to see. Parking lot may have the potential for pervious pavement.
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	4	4	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Letter provided from council, with a focus on community benefits. Did council provide community input? Letters from elected officials are beneficial, but intent is to come from a community group.
TOTALS	81	110	Unable to score 77	<ul style="list-style-type: none">

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



Watershed Area	Upper San Gabriel River
Project Name	Zamora Park Renovation Project
Project Lead	City of El Monte
Total Funding Requested	\$2,000,000
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 20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No dimensions provided for the basins, unclear how capacity was calculated. 24-hour capacity seems excessively high Applicant to provide details and justification for the capacity. Applicant revised footprint area to 2.4 ac.....capacity reduced to 23 ac-ft.
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	30	Unable to score 30	<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	5	10	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bus stop enhancements are not on the school property. Does not change score. Applicant noted that students use the city bus at this site.
Nature-Based Solutions	13	15	13 11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduced due to resize of project
Leveraging Funds Part 1	6	6	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	4	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
TOTALS	78	110	Unable to score 76	<ul style="list-style-type: none">



Public Comment Form

Name:* Shahriar Eftekhazadeh Organization*: SEITec
Email*: Shahriar.Eftekhazadeh@seitecinc.com Phone*: 310 879 9376
Meeting: Scoring Committee Date: 01/27/2021

LA County Public Works may contact me for clarification about my comments

*Per Brown Act, completing this information is optional. At a minimum, please include an identifier so that you may be called upon to speak.

Phone participants and the public are encouraged to submit public comments (or a request to make a public comment) to SafeCleanWaterLA@dpw.lacounty.gov. All public comments will become part of the official record.

Please complete this form and email to SafeCleanWaterLA@dpw.lacounty.gov by at least 5:00pm the day prior to the meeting with the following subject line: "Public Comment: [Watershed Area] [Meeting Date]" (ex. "Public Comment: USGR 4/8/20").

Comments

During the Scoring Committee Meeting of 1/25/2021, the committee's water quality expert, Mr. TJ Moon, objected to awarding the Water Quality scores to the "Ballona Creek Dry Weather Flow Treatment Project" on the basis that "...the project does not divert the dry weather flow for treatment..... instead injects chemicals". I have the following questions:

1. Is diversion a requirement for Dry Weather Flow/Stormwater treatment?
2. If so, where is this stated and what is the technical and scientific basis for it?
3. What about in-channel BMPs such as impoundments, Ponds, Rain Gardens, Sedimentation Basins, Cisterns, High Rate Treatment technologies, and Bioswales? Are these BMPs disqualified for lack of diversion?

Furthermore, Mr. TJ Moon stated that he would be willing to award the water quality score to the project if the applicant were to "...obtain the permit from the water board in advance". I have the following questions:

1. Why is this a requirement for this project (and only this project)? The feasibility study guidelines requirement is "An assessment of potential CEQA-related and permitting challenges and associated time requirements and costs", which has been provided in the project feasibility study report. Obtaining a permit typically requires project details that are developed during design.
2. How would getting the permit in advance address Mr. Moon's concern about the absence of a diversion facility in this project?

Thank you,



Public Comment Form

Name:* Shahriar Eftekhazadeh Organization*: SEITec
Email*: Shahriar.Eftekhazadeh@seitecinc.com Phone*: 310 879 9376
Meeting: Scoring Committee Date: 01/27/2021

LA County Public Works may contact me for clarification about my comments

*Per Brown Act, completing this information is optional. At a minimum, please include an identifier so that you may be called upon to speak.

Phone participants and the public are encouraged to submit public comments (or a request to make a public comment) to SafeCleanWaterLA@dpw.lacounty.gov. All public comments will become part of the official record.

Please complete this form and email to SafeCleanWaterLA@dpw.lacounty.gov by at least 5:00pm the day prior to the meeting with the following subject line: "Public Comment: [Watershed Area] [Meeting Date]" (ex. "Public Comment: USGR 4/8/20").

Comments

Subsequent to the Scoring Committee's scoring the **Portuguese Bend Landslide Complex Mitigation Project**, SEITec is providing the following technical review comments as a public service and for Scoring Committee's reconsideration of the project.

The Project is essentially a landslide stabilization project, submitted as a stormwater project for funding purposes. It does NOT provide any significant water quality benefits and should not be funded by SCW Program funds in its current form. Below are specific reasons:

1. Project description claims primarily wet weather water quality benefits (with no supporting calculations), yet the project is submitted as a Dry Weather project.
2. The proposed BMPs are hugely oversized for the very small calculated dry weather flow of 0.119 cfs, and therefore result in highly inefficient design for the stated purpose.
3. Project is NOT included in any water management plan (neither the RVP EWMP, the Greater Los Angeles IRWMP OPTI).
4. The project proposed discharge of intercepted groundwater directly to the ocean requires a separate MS4 permit and likely treatment. There is no design provision for this requirement in the study.
5. RVP EWMP identifies intercepted groundwater by existing wells as nuisance groundwater. Therefore, unless the intercepted groundwater is treated, the proposed project exacerbates the water quality problem identified in RVP EWMP.
6. There are no calculations to support the claimed benefits as per the feasibility study guidelines.
7. There is no retention facility for holding the captured water to enable diversion to the County sewer line.
8. The County sewer line for diversion of captured water is a force main. Project requires detention and pump station facility for diversion, which is not included in the proposed project.
9. There is no design element or supporting calculations for the claimed 50-100 ac-ft/yr "treated flow to the sanitary sewer" as water supply benefits.
10. The requested funds for Design will primarily be spent on designing project elements that are for landslide stabilization and have nothing to do with MS4.

Therefore, the Scoring Committee should reevaluate and re-score the project in the light of the above.