

# Scoring Committee

## Meeting Minutes

---



Tuesday October 19, 2021  
1:00 PM – 4:00 PM  
WebEx Meeting

### Committee Members Present:

Bruce Reznik (LA Waterkeeper), Chair  
TJ Moon (LA County Public Works), Vice-Chair  
Kirsten Schwarz (UCLA)  
Matt Stone (Santa Clarita Valley Water Agency)

### Committee Members Absent:

Dave Sorem (Mike Bubalo Construction Co., Inc)  
David Diaz (Active SGV)

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

---

## **1. Welcome and Introductions**

District staff conducted a brief tutorial of the WebEx platform.

Bruce Reznik, Chair of the Scoring Committee, welcomed Committee Members and called the meeting to order. All Committee Members made self-introductions and a quorum was established.

## **2. Approval of Meeting Minutes from October 5, 2021**

District staff provided a copy of the meeting minutes from the previous meeting. Motion to approve the meeting minutes by Vice Chair Moon, seconded by Member Schwarz. The committee voted to approve the October 5<sup>th</sup>, 2021 meeting minutes (approved, see vote tracking sheet).

Chair Reznik noted that the previous meeting minutes should be corrected to reflect that project letters of support are not transferable from previously submitted projects, specifically pointing to the SEITec project reviewed on October 5. The draft minutes erroneously reported that Chair Reznik said the letters of support could be transferred from the LADWP project to the SEITec project.

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

District Updates:

- The District is initiating the fund transfer agreement process for projects that were approved for funding in Fiscal Year 2021-2022 Stormwater Investment Plans (SIPs). Addendums to projects that were approved in Fiscal Year 2020-2021 SIPs were also sent out.
- The District gave an update at the October 7<sup>th</sup> Regional Oversight Committee Meeting, providing an implementation update and overview of accomplishments to-date.
- Regional Program project developers are required to submit quarterly reports. The next set of quarterly reports are due Nov. 15.
- The Governance Committees will continue to meet virtually, under AB 361 and direction of the Board of Supervisors.

Chair Reznik shared that the Accelerate Resilience LA (ARLA) effort to assess how multi-benefit projects are being developed in the SCWP is underway and will be presenting at an upcoming meeting for the California Stormwater Quality Association (CASQA).

## **4. Public Comment Period for Non-Agenda Items**

# Scoring Committee

## Meeting Minutes

---



Chair Reznik opened the floor for public comments. Chair Reznik noted that two comment letters were received and will be forwarded to the WASCs. No public comments were received.

### 5. Discussion Items:

#### a. Ex Parte Communication Disclosure

Chair Reznik disclosed regular meetings with Our Water LA and ARLA as well as email correspondence with SEITec and the Council for Watershed Health to resolve the misunderstanding related to the letters of support discussed in the previous meeting.

#### b. Scoring of Feasibility Studies

##### Upper Los Angeles River

#### 1. Echo Park Lake Rehabilitation Operation and Maintenance

Vice Chair Moon noted that this project was previously submitted to the SCWP.

Water Quality: Vice Chair Moon disagrees with the project's capacity benefit calculation and expressed doubt that the retention times would allow for storm flows to be treated by the onsite system. Vice Chair Moon recommends treating the project as a dry weather project without a wet weather benefit.

Water Supply: Member Stone raised the question of whether the project should be granted partial credit for the partial Water Supply Benefit it does provide. Vice Chair Moon replied that the Scoring Committee has typically only awarded water supply points for projects that deliver water for aquifer recharge or recycled water treatment plants so for the sake of consistency this project which feeds water to bioswales would not receive water supply points. Vice Chair Moon did speak to the possibility of expanding the Water Supply Criteria in the future. Chair Reznik highlighted the unresolved question of whether offsetting new demand should count toward Water Supply Benefit. Chair Reznik noted that the bottom line should drive toward net Water Supply Benefits—considering, for example, whether the project offsets an existing need or simply offsets needs generated by the project itself (i.e., through new plantings).

Chair Reznik noted that scoring operations and maintenance (O&M) projects is difficult under the current Scoring Criteria, since it is unclear whether the Scoring Committee is scoring the original project itself or the O&M work in isolation. Chair Reznik suggests revising the way those projects are scored in the future. Vice Chair Moon agreed with Chair Reznik, that the applications for O&M projects need to change. Vice Chair Moon also noted that rather than needing to model projected benefits, O&M projects could evaluate and report benefits that have already been achieved under the existing project. Member Schwarz agreed that a separate assessment for O&M projects should be developed.

Member Stone expressed willingness to award points if the applicant can demonstrate that the project offsets an existing demand for potable water from the lake. Specifically, how much potable water does refilling the lake use and of that amount how much will this project reduce that demand?

Chair Reznik suggested awarding the 2 points, pending additional information that backs up the assertion, citing concern that the Scoring Committee should focus on awarding points when possible, as opposed to deferring decisions.



Community Investment: Member Schwarz awarded the full 10 points based on the benefits granted by the original project. Chair Reznik scored this criteria more strictly, dropping the score down to 5 based on the questionable flood benefit. Vice Chair Moon agreed that based on the earlier evaluation of the dubious flood-benefit provided by the project, the score should be 5. Member Schwarz agreed to only award 5 points for Community Investment.

Nature-Based Solutions: Member Schwarz also awarded the full 10 points for Nature-Based Solutions. Chair Reznik agreed with awarding 10 points.

Leveraging Funds Part 1: The project had a 45% cost share with the City of LA for the past nine years, so Member Schwarz awarded 3 points for this criteria. Chair Reznik agrees with awarding 3 points.

Leveraging Funds Part 2 (Community Support): Member Schwarz found scoring community engagement for the O&M project difficult, noting that details were not available to demonstrate the level of community engagement efforts conducted for the original project. The applicant did provide letters of support and referenced CalEnviroScreen so Member Schwarz recommended awarding 2 points. Chair Reznik agrees with awarding 2 points to this criteria.

Member Schwarz suggested the Scoring Committee devote additional consideration to how community support points are awarded to O&M projects. Member Schwarz noted appreciation for the applicant's inclusion of the project's performance record.

Conclusion: The project earned 62 points.

## 2. La Crescenta Green Improvement Project

Water Quality: Vice Chair Moon noted that the effective drawdown rate appears to be incorrect (the drawdown rate was calculated to match the 24-hour capacity of 7.5 ac-ft but 24-hour capacity is listed as 12.1 ac-ft on the model). As such, Vice Chair Moon cannot score the project's Water Quality Benefit until the error has been corrected.

Water Supply: Vice Chair Moon and Member Stone agreed to award 2 points for the second Water Supply Criteria.

Community Investment: Chair Reznik agreed with the applicant's self-score of 5 points for Community Investment, noting that it would have been good to see justification for the claimed flood benefits, though it is clear that the project provides air quality, heat island, and habitat benefits. Member Schwarz agreed.

Nature-Based Solutions: Chair Reznik awarded 10 points to this criteria, noting appreciation for the backup materials provided with Attachment 6. Member Schwarz agreed.

Leveraging Funds Part 1: Chair Reznik awarded 6 points for leveraging funds. Member Schwarz agreed.

Leveraging Funds Part 2 (Community Support): Chair Reznik only awarded 2 points for this criteria because although the applicant provided two letters of support, the Scoring Committee has decided to hold applicants to a higher standard of community-driven project development.

# Scoring Committee

## Meeting Minutes

---



Member Schwarz had awarded 3 points, finding it noteworthy that the project incorporates transportation planning assessments that point to community need for ADA-compliant curb ramps. Member Schwarz did critique the project's one-directional approach to community development and would like to see projects work toward forming partnerships with communities to co-develop projects. Chair Reznik and Member Schwarz agreed to award 2 points.

Conclusion: The project will be rescored pending correction to the effective drawdown rate.

### **South Santa Monica Bay**

#### **3. Fulton Playfield Multi-Project**

Water Quality: Vice Chair Moon would like the applicant to clarify whether the project is for an overflow detention basin or if it will receive first flush flows. Noting the limited information on infiltration in the area, Vice Chair Moon critiqued the applicant's use of the high end of the range of infiltration data where instead it may have been more appropriate for them to have used the low-end infiltration rate to be more appropriately conservative. The applicant should update their modeling based on this critique (though it likely won't impact the score).

Water Supply: Vice Chair Moon recommended awarding 0 points for Water Supply since the claim of protecting against seawater intrusion seems like a stretch, and points were not awarded for seawater intrusion protection for other SSMB Watershed Area projects.

Community Investment: Member Schwarz awarded 5 points rather than 10 because although the project creates green spaces, those benefits are located nearby, but not on school property. The Member cited similar precedent set at previous meetings. Chair Reznik agreed with Member Schwarz.

Nature-Based Solutions: Member Schwarz noted that the applicant may have erroneously assigned 5 points for removing impermeable area, which does not appear to be in the scope of work. Member Schwarz, therefore, suggests awarding 10 points for Nature-Based Solutions Criteria, rather than 15. Chair Reznik thought the project did include a small amount of impervious surface removal, but it was not significant enough to receive points. Chair Reznik also critiqued the Scoring Criteria, noting that impermeable surface removal should be scored by the size of the area rather than the percentage reduction. Chair Reznik noted that the current Scoring Criteria incentives proponents to limit the project area to get maximum impermeable surface reduction points. Member Schwarz suggested awarding partial credit for the amount of surface that the project does remove, however, Chair Reznik decided to leave the point allocation at 10, unless the applicant can provide additional backup information.

Leveraging Funds Part 1: The project only had a nine percent cost share, so no points were awarded.

Leveraging Funds Part 2 (Community Support): Member Schwarz suggests awarding 3 points, noting that the project included community engagement efforts beyond the provision of letters of support. Chair Reznik agreed to award 3 points, agreeing with Member Schwarz that they provided more than other applicants did to demonstrate community support.

Conclusion: The applicant to revise the infiltration rate used on the website, provide clarification on how the detention basin works (whether it captures the first flush or if it's an overflow

# Scoring Committee

## Meeting Minutes

---



bypass), and include an explanation of how the detention basin benefit was calculated to confirm the score of 68 points

#### **4. Downtown Lomita Multi-Benefit Stormwater Project**

Vice Chair Moon described the project, stating that the technical information provided was well developed for a design-only ask.

Water Quality: The applicant shared that they had issues with the dry well component on the SCWP application module and therefore used their own modeling, which is acceptable. The project received full points for Water Quality.

Water Supply: The project does not claim a Water Supply Benefit.

Community Investment: Chair Reznik and Member Schwarz both agreed with the project's self-assessment of 5 points.

Nature-Based Solutions: Chair Reznik and Member Schwarz agreed with awarding 13 points for Nature-Based Solutions.

Leveraging Funds Part 1: Chair Reznik and Member Schwarz awarded 6 points for Leveraging Funding.

Leveraging Funds Part 2 (Community Support): Chair Reznik and Member Schwarz awarded 2 points for community support, citing the one-directional community engagement. Member Schwarz noted her appreciation for the applicant's inclusion of information about planned future engagement, which goes above the minimum level required.

Conclusion: The project received 76 points.

#### **5. Hermosa Beach Multi-Benefit Stormwater Project**

Water Quality: Vice Chair Moon noted that the project claims a very high capacity relative to the drainage area, but given the improvements suggested and the high infiltration rate of the area, it is appropriate. The project went far above the 85<sup>th</sup> percentile bar, set for awarding the maximum amount of points in the criteria.

Water Supply: This project does not claim a Water Supply Benefit.

Community Investment: Member Schwarz awarded the 5 points requested based on the benefits to localized flooding, addressing heat, increasing vegetation, and improving access to waterways. The Member noted the applicant also claimed recreational benefits which the Member disagreed with, but it didn't change the overall score.

Nature-Based Solutions: Member Schwarz awarded the 11 points to Nature-Based Solutions for the implementing natural processes, using natural materials, and using native plants.

Leveraging Funds Part 1: Member Schwarz awarded 6 points because the project has a 59% cost share from Coastal Conservancy and Safe, Clean Water Program Municipal Program funds.

# Scoring Committee Meeting Minutes



Leveraging Funds Part 2 (Community Support): Member Schwarz awarded full points for Community Support because of the high level of community engagement the applicant has incorporated.

Chair Reznik highlighted the question of what constitutes a regional project when the benefit area is so small.

Chair Reznik shared appreciation that the applicant did not claim a Disadvantaged Community Benefit, though disadvantaged community members will use the parking lot.

Conclusion: The project received 76 points.

## **6. LA Harbor College Central & West Campus Underground Infiltration and Biofiltration Project**

Water Quality: Vice Chair Vice Chair Moon recommends requesting additional information from the applicant about their water quality modeling basis, specifically the infiltration rate and effective drawdown rate. The criteria is unable to score.

Water Supply: Member Stone voiced that no water supply points are warranted because of the geologic conditions.

Community Investment: Member Schwarz shared that habitat and recreation opportunity enhancement would likely be minimal, and thus reduced the points awarded to 5.

Nature-Based Solutions: Member Schwarz voiced skepticism about the applicant's claim to removing 100% of impermeable surfaces, so reduced the points awarded to 10.

Leveraging Funds Part 1: Member Schwarz awarded 6 points because of funding from Bond Measure CC.

Leveraging Funds Part 2 (Community Support): Member Schwarz described that the applicant has done some outreach with LADWP, but have not engaged the benefiting disadvantaged communities, so reduced points awarded to 2. Chair Reznik suggested awarding only 1 point until the applicant comes back with the letter of support that appears missing.

Conclusion: The project was deemed unable to score until the applicant comes back with more information and the missing letter of support. Member Schwarz asked whether the project is truly unable to score, given the score can't reach 60 points. For this project, the group agreed that the applicant might be able to push their score up in a few criteria, based on the follow-up information they'll provide.

## **7. Machado Lake Ecosystem Rehabilitation (MLER) Operation and Maintenance**

Water Quality: Vice Chair Moon recommends scoring this as a dry weather project and therefore awarded only 20 points to the Water Quality Part 2 Criteria.

Water Supply: Vice Chair Moon voiced skepticism that the Water Supply Benefit will be as high as estimated by the applicant, given their assumptions about how much of the stormwater

# Scoring Committee

## Meeting Minutes

---



delivered stays in the lake. Vice Chair Moon would like the applicant to verify the amount of potable water offset by the project.

Community Investment: Member Schwarz voiced again that assessment on O&M projects is not well-defined, but based on the original project, agreed to award 10 points for Community Investment. Chair Reznik shared that the types of Community Investment Benefits provided don't align perfectly with Scoring Criteria, but agrees with awarding 10 points, given the project's exemplary benefits. Vice Chair Moon voiced that for the sake of consistency, the project should receive 5 points for Community Investment, as it is a dry weather project without a flood benefit. The group agreed to award 5 points.

Nature-Based Solutions: Member Schwarz awarded 10 points for Nature-Based Solutions.

Leveraging Funds Part 1: The project includes a cost-share with the City of LA, so Member Schwarz awarded 3 points. The Member reiterated the need to clarify whether this score is based on the original project or the O&M component specifically.

Leveraging Funds Part 2 (Community Support): The project received six letters of support and referenced the CalEnviroScreen score for the ten communities living near Machado Lake, so Member Schwarz awarded 3 points.

Member Schwarz appreciated the inclusion of the performance reports on the original project and suggested those reports be included with other O&M projects in the future. Chair Reznik appreciated that the slide deck included information about the importance of O&M.

Gordon Haines (LA Sanitation) provided additional details about the cost share amount and total budget as well as some additional information about their claim of wet weather benefits. Vice Chair Moon responded voicing that the wet weather benefits won't be achieved, so scoring the project as a dry weather project is more appropriate.

Conclusion: The project received 61 points.

Chair Reznik reminded project proponents that reaching or exceeding the 60-point minimum allows projects to advance to the WASC, and higher scores aren't necessary. Chair Reznik encouraged applicants to focus on presentations to the WASC instead of raising their scores beyond 60 points.

### **8. West Rancho Dominguez – San Pedro Street Green Improvement**

Water Quality: The project received the points requested.

Water Supply: The project does not include a Water Supply Benefit.

Community Investment: Member Schwarz agreed with the 5 points claimed by the project applicant for addressing heat and localized flooding as well as increasing vegetation. Chair Reznik agreed to award 5 points because of the heat island, shade, and air quality benefits provided.

# Scoring Committee

## Meeting Minutes

---



Nature-Based Solutions: Member Schwarz expressed some skepticism about the impermeable area removal. Chair Reznik suggests awarding 10 points for Nature-Based Solutions, given the uncertainty around the impermeable area removal calculation.

Leveraging Funds Part 1: Member Schwarz awarded 6 points based on the 50% cost-share with the City of L.A.

Leveraging Funds Part 2 (Community Support): Member Schwarz noted that the applicant has a letter from Tree People, the project addresses community needs, and the project is a result of the Green Street Master Plan. They have not engaged disadvantaged communities, but they did have a meeting scheduled for late August. If applicant did host that meeting, the Member recommends awarding 3 points rather than 2.

Conclusion: The project received 64 points.

### **9. Wilmington-Anaheim Green Infrastructure Corridor Project**

Water Quality: Vice Chair Moon voiced that the applicant claimed an infiltration rate 0.5 inches/hr but the data indicates 0.1-0.3 inches/hr. Vice Chair Moon also voiced concern about groundwater being as shallow as 10 feet below ground surface, which would rule out a stormwater detention chamber. He did not see a geotechnical report included with the application. The applicant also used their own modeling, but Vice Chair Moon would like to see the infiltration rate clarified before accepting the results. Vice Chair Moon cannot score this criteria at this time.

Water Supply: The project claims Water Supply Benefits, but Vice Chair Moon expressed doubts, given that no other project proponents in the SSMB Watershed Area have been awarded Water Supply Benefits. Member Stone agreed with Vice Chair Moon's assessment, noting that he experienced difficulty following the applicant's calculations. The project scores 0 for Water Supply at this time, unless the applicant can provide clarification.

Community Investment: Chair Reznik knocked the points down to 5, noting the project addressed flooding, but because the project is not located on-site at a school (but is instead a green street in front of a school), the Committee should score lower for consistency. Member Schwarz agrees with awarding 5 points, given that providing a recreational benefit is a stretch. Member Schwarz did highlight that the idea of increasing connectivity or use is important and isn't captured well under the current scoring criteria, as it isn't the same as recreational use. Member Schwarz and Chair Reznik would like the Scoring Committee to consider amending the Scoring Criteria in the future.

Nature-Based Solutions: Chair Reznik agreed with the applicant's self-score of 11 points.

Leveraging Funds Part 1: Chair Reznik agreed with the N/A determined by the applicant.

Leveraging Funds Part 2 (Community Support): Chair Reznik awarded 3 points and Member Schwarz concurred.

Conclusion: The Scoring Committee was unable to score the project.

### **North Santa Monica Bay**





## 10. Liberty Canyon Road Green Improvement

Vice Chair Moon described the project, noting that the infiltration in this area is very limited, in part due to geological constraints, which contributed to lower scores.

Water Quality: Vice Chair Moon noted that the project met the capacity percentile, but given the expense of the project, they did not get full points for Part 1. Member Stone pointed out that one could round up on the volume per dollar metric to allow for full points. The group deferred making a judgement call.

Water Supply: The project did not claim a Water Supply Benefit.

Community Investment: Member Schwarz agrees with the applicant's self-score and recommends awarding 5 points. The project claimed points for enhancing recreational activities, which Member Schwarz expressed doubt about, but again noted the previous point related to increasing mobility and connectivity.

Nature-Based Solutions: Member Schwarz noted that the proponent did not include points for removing impermeable area, though they do include some removal of impermeable surface. Chair Reznik agreed to award the requested 10 points.

Leveraging Funds Part 1: Based on the 33% cost-share with the City of LA, Member Schwarz recommends awarding 3 points.

Leveraging Funds Part 2 (Community Support): The project received several letters of community support and had good turnout at a community meeting. The project was also part of the Green Street Master Plan. Member Schwarz and Chair Reznik agreed to award 3 points.

Conclusion: The project received 60 points.

## c. Meeting Schedule

The Scoring Committee agreed to move the November 2<sup>nd</sup> meeting to November 17<sup>th</sup> from 10:00 AM to 1:00 PM. The Scoring Committee agreed to move the November 16<sup>th</sup> meeting to November 22<sup>nd</sup> from 9:30 AM to 1:30 PM. Chair Reznik suggested the Committee hold November 23<sup>rd</sup> from 2:00 to 5:00 PM as a backup option, if other times fall through.

## 6. Public Comment Period for Agenda Items

Peter Tonthat commented on the Whitsett Fields Park North Stormwater Capture Project, noting that the Scoring Committee identified an incorrect project support letter from Pacoima Beautiful previously provided, sharing that a corrected project support letter was provided with their comment card. The score will be corrected to reflect this.

Lorena Matos (LA Sanitation) mentioned that the LA River Green Infrastructure Project soft costs would be only 27% of total cost. They request that the comment in the previous meeting minutes and the scoring rubric regarding the project costs be amended to reflect this.

## 7. Voting Items:

# Scoring Committee

## Meeting Minutes



- a. Send all projects with passing scores from the October 5, 2021 Scoring Committee meeting to their respective WASC
  - i. LA River Green Infrastructure Project
    - Vice Chair Moon is comfortable with the change provided by the applicant. The edits requested by Lorena Matos will be incorporated in the previous meeting minutes.
  - ii. Whitsett Fields Park North Stormwater Capture Project
    - The applicant has provided the corrected letter of support. The Committee will revise the scoring accordingly and remove the note.
- b. Contact and allow all unscorable project applicants 1 week to provide clarifying information to Scoring Committee.

Committee Members provided specific notes on deficiencies. **Applicants should refer back to the October 5<sup>th</sup> Meeting Minutes for full details on the additional information requested.**

- i. Ladera Heights – W Centinela Ave Green Improvement per revisions
  - i. Vice Chair Moon noted that a member of the public found a small error in the application. The applicant will make the appropriate adjustment. Chair Reznik clarified that the project was not unable to score—rather, the applicant was asked to come back with additional information.
- ii. Acacia Avenue Storm Drain Infiltration Project
  - i. The applicant needs to provide additional details. See previous meeting minutes.
- iii. Alexandria Park Stormwater Capture Project
  - i. The applicant needs to provide additional details. See previous meeting minutes.
- iv. California Avenue and Adjacent Streets Stormwater Capture Project
  - i. The applicant needs to provide more information on water quality and water supply points claimed.
- v. Jackson Elementary School Campus Greening and Stormwater Quality Improvement Project
  - i. The applicant needs backup and justification for water quality points claimed.
- vi. North Hollywood Park Stormwater Capture Project
  - i. The applicant needs to provide additional information supporting water quality calculations.
  - ii. The applicant needs to provide their own specific letters of support, not those for a previously submitted related project, if they want to claim leveraging funds points related to community support.
- vii. Watts Civic Center Serenity Greenway
  - i. The applicant needs to provide additional information to justify inconsistencies in values throughout the application. They also need to provide the geotechnical report. The community categories could not be scored. Chair Reznik advised the applicant that the Scoring Committee does not typically rescore projects twice, so they should do all they can to provide everything requested.
- viii. Winery Canyon Channel and Descanso Gardens Stormwater Capture and Reuse Project
  - i. The applicant needs to add a drawdown rate and revisit water quality calculations as requested.
  - ii. Member Schwarz also mentioned previous discussion about whether the gardens are accessible to the public, asking the applicant for clarification and referring them to the October 5<sup>th</sup> meeting minutes for clarification.

# Scoring Committee

## Meeting Minutes

---



Member Stone made a motion to send the LA River Green Infrastructure and Whitsett projects to their WASCs for consideration and return other projects to project proponents to provide additional information. Vice Chair Moon seconded. The motion passed (approved, see vote tracking sheet).

### **8. Items for Next Agenda (November 17<sup>th</sup>)**

- a. Scoring of Feasibility Studies for CSMB and LSGR WASCs
- b. Discussion of potential December meeting

### **9. Adjournment**

Vice Chair Moon motioned to adjourn the meeting; Member Schwarz seconded. The Chair thanked members of the Committee and the public for attending and adjourned the meeting at 3:28 PM.

#### **Next Meeting:**

November 17, 2021

10:00 AM – 1:00 PM

See SCW website for meeting details

## SCORING COMMITTEE MEETING - October 19, 2021

Member Type	Quorum Present		Voting Items	
	Member	Voting?	Meeting Minutes	Voting Item 7a & 7b of 10/19 agenda
Water Supply	Matt Stone	x	Y	Y
Water Quality / Community Investments Benefits / Nature-Based Solutions	Kirsten Schwarz	x	Y	Y
Community Investments Benefits	David Diaz			
Nature-Based Solutions / Water Quality	<b>Bruce Reznik</b>	x	Y	Y
Water Quality	Dave Sorem			
Water Quality	<b>TJ Moon</b>	x	Y	Y
Total Non-Vacant Seats	6	Yay (Y)	4	4
Total Voting Members Present	4	Nay (N)	0	0
		Abstain (A)	0	0
		Total	4	4
			Approved	Approved

Other Attendees	
Alberto Grajeda	Marisa Perez-Reyes
Alfredo Magallanes	Mary Ann Breckell
Brett Perry	Melanie Rivera
Carla Dillon	Michelle Staffield
Carlos Moran	Paul Glenn
Chris Carandang	Peter Tonthat
Christine McLeod	Phuoc Le
Clarasophia Gust	Rafael Piamonte
Conor Mossavi	Scott Struck
Curts Fang	Seth Carr
Daniel Apt	Shahram Kharaghani
Dawn Petschauer	Susie Santilena
Doug Krauss	Trevor Davis
Geraldine Trivedi	Vik Bapna
Gordon Haines	Wendy Dinh
Gus Orozco	Brianne Logasa
Haris Harouny	Sheila Brice
Heather Meranda	Wing Tam
Jacqueline Mak	Joe Smith
Jeff Atijera	Chris Wessel
Jennifer Coryell	Katie M
Johanna Chang	Brad Parks
Josafat Flores	Danielle Chupa
Jose Rodriguez	Dustin Bambic
Kara Plourde	Jason Casanova
Kevin Chang	Lynda Bybee
Lorena Matos	

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2022-2023



<b>Watershed Area</b>	Upper Los Angeles River
<b>Project Name</b>	Echo Park Lake Rehabilitation Operation and Maintenance
<b>Project Lead</b>	City of Los Angeles, LA Sanitation and Environment
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$2,400,000
<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	•
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	<b>30</b>	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recommend submitting project as dry weather project</li> <li>• Disagree with 90 ac-ft capacity</li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	0	<b>13</b>	0	•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	2	<b>12</b>	2	• Request for additional info. What is the potable water consumption of the lake?
<b>Community Investment</b>	10	<b>10</b>	5	•
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	10	<b>15</b>	10	•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	3	<b>6</b>	3	•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	<b>4</b>	2	•
<b>TOTALS</b>	79	<b>110</b>	62	•

- TO BE VOTED BY SCORING COMMITTEE -

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2022-2023



<b>Watershed Area</b>	Upper Los Angeles River
<b>Project Name</b>	La Crescenta Green Improvement Project
<b>Project Lead</b>	County of Los Angeles
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$1,500,000
<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	•
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	20	<b>30</b>	Unable to score	• Need to adjust drawdown rate
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	0	<b>13</b>	0	•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	2	<b>12</b>	2	•
<b>Community Investment</b>	5	<b>10</b>	5	•
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	10	<b>15</b>	10	•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	6	<b>6</b>	6	•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	<b>4</b>	2	•
<b>TOTALS</b>	67	<b>110</b>	Unable to score	•

- TO BE VOTED BY SCORING COMMITTEE -

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2022-2023



<b>Watershed Area</b>	South Santa Monica Bay
<b>Project Name</b>	Fulton Playfield Multi-Benefit Infiltration Project
<b>Project Lead</b>	City of Redondo Beach
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$4,292,138
<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>Recommend using a lower more conservative infiltration rate (0.25 cfs). Update application.</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></li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	6	<b>13</b>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	5	<b>12</b>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Community Investment</b>	10	<b>10</b>	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not part of a school</li> </ul>
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	15	<b>15</b>	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></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>	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Outlined community identified needs</li> </ul>
<b>TOTALS</b>	90	<b>110</b>	68 To be confirmed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Add explanation of how detention basin works</li> </ul>

- TO BE VOTED BY SCORING COMMITTEE -

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2022-2023



<b>Watershed Area</b>	South Santa Monica Bay
<b>Project Name</b>	Downtown Lomita Multi-Benefit Stormwater Project
<b>Project Lead</b>	City of Lomita
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$449,300
<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	•
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	<b>30</b>	30	•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	0	<b>13</b>	0	•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	0	<b>12</b>	0	•
<b>Community Investment</b>	5	<b>10</b>	5	•
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	13	<b>15</b>	13	•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	6	<b>6</b>	6	•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	<b>4</b>	2	•
<b>TOTALS</b>	78	<b>110</b>	76	•

- TO BE VOTED BY SCORING COMMITTEE -



# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2022-2023



<b>Watershed Area</b>	South Santa Monica Bay
<b>Project Name</b>	Hermosa Beach Multi-Benefit Parking Lot Greening Project (Lot D)
<b>Project Lead</b>	Hermosa Beach
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$423,950
<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	•
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	<b>30</b>	30	•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	0	<b>13</b>	0	•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	0	<b>12</b>	0	•
<b>Community Investment</b>	5	<b>10</b>	5	• Credit for localized flooding
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	11	<b>15</b>	11	•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	6	<b>6</b>	6	•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	<b>4</b>	4	• 4 letters of support and extensive community engagement
<b>TOTALS</b>	76	<b>110</b>	76	•

- TO BE VOTED BY SCORING COMMITTEE -

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2022-2023



<b>Watershed Area</b>	South Santa Monica Bay
<b>Project Name</b>	Los Angeles Harbor College Central and West Campus Underground Infiltration and Biofiltration Project
<b>Project Lead</b>	Los Angeles Community College District & BuildLACCD
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$3,152,758
<b>Project Type</b>	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	7	<b>20</b>	Unable to score	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need justification of how effective drawdown rate and stormwater use was determined</li> </ul>
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	20	<b>30</b>	Unable to score	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	0	<b>13</b>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	0	<b>12</b>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Community Investment</b>	10	<b>10</b>	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Minimal park space and recreation enhancement</li> </ul>
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	15	<b>15</b>	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></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	4	<b>4</b>	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Have not engaged benefitting DACs</li> <li>Need to provide referenced letter of support</li> </ul>
<b>TOTALS</b>	62	<b>110</b>	Unable to score	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>

- TO BE VOTED BY SCORING COMMITTEE -

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2022-2023



<b>Watershed Area</b>	South Santa Monica Bay
<b>Project Name</b>	Machado Lake Ecosystem Rehabilitation (MLER) Operations and Maintenance
<b>Project Lead</b>	City of Los Angeles, LA Sanitation and Environment
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$5,700,000
<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	• Recommend scoring as dry weather project
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	<b>30</b>	20	•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	0	<b>13</b>	0	•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	9	<b>12</b>	0	• Need verification of amount of potable water offset by project
<b>Community Investment</b>	10	<b>10</b>	5	•
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	10	<b>15</b>	10	•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	3	<b>6</b>	3	•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	<b>4</b>	3	• Discussion of ongoing engagement
<b>TOTALS</b>	86	<b>110</b>	61	•

- TO BE VOTED BY SCORING COMMITTEE -

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2022-2023



<b>Watershed Area</b>	South Santa Monica Bay
<b>Project Name</b>	West Rancho Dominguez - San Pedro Street Green Improvement
<b>Project Lead</b>	Los Angeles County Public Works
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$800,000
<b>Project Type</b>	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	11	<b>20</b>	11	•
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	<b>30</b>	30	•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	0	<b>13</b>	0	•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	0	<b>12</b>	0	•
<b>Community Investment</b>	5	<b>10</b>	5	• Addresses localized flooding, improving vegetation
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	13	<b>15</b>	10	• Natural materials • Over claim of removal of impermeable area
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	6	<b>6</b>	6	•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	<b>4</b>	2	• Provide info on August community engagement
<b>TOTALS</b>	69	<b>110</b>	64	•

- TO BE VOTED BY SCORING COMMITTEE -

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2022-2023



<b>Watershed Area</b>	South Santa Monica Bay
<b>Project Name</b>	Wilmington-Anaheim Green Infrastructure Corridor Project
<b>Project Lead</b>	City of Los Angeles, Bureau of Sanitation and Environment
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$12,808,258
<b>Project Type</b>	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	7	<b>20</b>	Unable to score	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need verification of how infiltration rate was determined</li> <li>No geotech report or plans provided</li> </ul>
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	<b>30</b>	Unable to score	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	0	<b>13</b>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	5	<b>12</b>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need to provide proof of water supply benefit</li> </ul>
<b>Community Investment</b>	10	<b>10</b>	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project not in a school</li> </ul>
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	11	<b>15</b>	11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	N/A	<b>6</b>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	<b>4</b>	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>TOTALS</b>	67	<b>110</b>	Unable to score	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>

- TO BE VOTED BY SCORING COMMITTEE -

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2022-2023



<b>Watershed Area</b>	North Santa Monica Bay
<b>Project Name</b>	Liberty Canyon Road Green Improvement
<b>Project Lead</b>	Los Angeles County Public Works
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$100,000
<b>Project Type</b>	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	14	<b>20</b>	14	•
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	25	<b>30</b>	25	•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	0	<b>13</b>	0	•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	0	<b>12</b>	0	•
<b>Community Investment</b>	5	<b>10</b>	5	•
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	10	<b>15</b>	10	•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	3	<b>6</b>	3	•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	<b>4</b>	3	• 5 letters of support and community meeting
<b>TOTALS</b>	61	<b>110</b>	60	•

- TO BE VOTED BY SCORING COMMITTEE -









# Pacoima Beautiful

ENVIRONMENTAL EDUCATION. LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT & ADVOCACY

August 24, 2020

Mr. David R. Pettijohn, Director of Water Resources  
Los Angeles Department of Water and Power  
111 North Hope Street, Room 1460  
Los Angeles, CA 90012

**Subject: Stormwater Capture Parks Program**

Dear Mr. Pettijohn,

On behalf of Pacoima Beautiful, we are pleased to support the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power's (LADWP) implementation of the Stormwater Capture Parks Program (Program).

The Program will provide improvements that will benefit both the community and the urban watershed. This includes replenishing the San Fernando Groundwater Basin with up to 2,912 acre-feet of stormwater per year from a 5,686-acre drainage area, improving the water quality in the Los Angeles River, alleviating localized flooding, and enhancing recreational amenities across nice parks.

Pacoima Beautiful is a grassroots organization that has long supported policies, programs and projects that will create a safer and cleaner community. The Program is aligned with Pacoima Beautiful's mission to promote a healthy and sustainable San Fernando Valley.

As a result, I fully support the Program and LADWP's application for funding through the Los Angeles County's Safe Clean Water Program.

If you have any questions about this letter of support, please contact me at (818) 899-2454 or via email at [vpadilla@pacoimabeautiful.org](mailto:vpadilla@pacoimabeautiful.org).

Sincerely,

Veronica Padilla  
Executive Director

Cc: Mr. Art Castro  
Manager of Watershed Management  
Los Angeles Department of Water and Power  
111 North Hope Street, Room 308  
Los Angeles, CA 90012

**From:** TJ Moon  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 19, 2021 3:18 PM  
**To:** DPW-SafeCleanWaterLA; Kevin Kim; Dusadee Corhiran; Luis Perez (SWPD)  
**Cc:** Bruce Reznik  
**Subject:** FW: Question about Ladera Heights - W Centinela Ave Green Improvement SCW Application

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

Email from Tom Epps

TJ Moon, PE  
Senior Civil Engineer  
Los Angeles County Public Works  
Office: (626) 458-4380  
Cell: (626) 476-7164

---

**From:** Thom Epps <Thom.epps@craftwaterinc.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, September 21, 2021 9:00 AM  
**To:** TJ Moon <TMOON@dpw.lacounty.gov>  
**Subject:** Question about Ladera Heights - W Centinela Ave Green Improvement SCW Application

**CAUTION:** External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

TJ,

I was reviewing the Ladera Heights - W Centinela Ave Green Improvement SCW application during the Scoring Committee meeting and a few things jumped out to me as potentially problematic related to the WQ scoring for this project. I am not sure if this warrants an official public comment, but I wanted to bring them to your attention in case you feel they would require amendment to the application.

1. The associated project entails two separate diversions from distinct though collocated drainage areas. The application utilized the SCWP module to carry out estimates of water quality benefit for the overall project with a lumped drainage area and single diversion. From previous recommendations, the SCWP module is not suited for this type of application or calculation due to the use of multiple diversions. I have run some sensitivity analysis of the module results related to diversion rates on previous applications that we have submitted, and the results are very sensitive to these parameters. Water quality benefits for this project may not be accurately quantified through lumping this projects drainage areas and diversion rates to single values.
2. The quantification of drywell infiltration rates were carried out using the field measured value of 37.5 in/hr as opposed to the design infiltration rate of 9.4 in/hr which incorporates factors of safety (see Figure 1&2 below). I agree with the method used to modify this infiltration rate for use in dry well throughput (though I think there was an error in the calculation in Figure 2 below; I am calculating 0.29 cfs based on the provided formula as opposed to 0.39 cfs). However, I have always been under the assumption that the Geotech-prescribed design infiltration rate should be used to ensure that factors of safety are accounted for. This can have a large impact on the quantified project performance since the factors of safety reduce the field measured value to a design rate by a factor of 4 in this case. Also, it appears that the overall number of dry wells recommended was based on this value, so the project sizing (# of dry wells) is highly dependent upon it.

While I know that this project is only asking for design funding, I do question these items as they relate to comparison to other projects and estimated water quality benefits that are highly influential on overall scoring. Feel free to reach out if you want to discuss or have any clarifications.

Thanks,

Based on subsurface investigation and testing, infiltration is feasible at the project site. Design infiltration rates for test Drywells BA-1 and BA-2 are shown below:

Table 1: Field Infiltration Rates.

Test Drywell	Diameter (in.)	Invert Depth (ft.)	Head Maintained (ft.)	Field Infiltration Rate (in./hour)
BA-1	24	50	30	56.5
			10	37.5
BA-2	18	50	30	45.6
			10	47.6

The GS 200 guidelines require a minimum design infiltration rate of 0.3 in./hour for LID infiltration. Based on the boring log data and infiltration testing, soils at 23 feet bgs and below are feasible for infiltration from a geotechnical standpoint. Correction factors have been applied to the field measured values to account for percolation test procedures, site variability, and long-term siltation. Refer to Appendix C for a full summary of these calculations.

**8.0 GEOTECHNICAL RECOMMENDATIONS**

Stormwater quality features are feasible at the project site, as indicated by assessment of subsurface material and test results of Drywells BA-1 and BA-2. The following recommendations should be followed:

Table 2: Drywell Design Infiltration Rates.

Proposed Stormwater Quality Feature	Design Infiltration Rate (in./hour)
Near BA-1	9.4
Near BA-2	11.4

Figure 1 - Screen capture of geotech results with highlighted values of interest.

As shown on page 4 of the 2019 Geotechnical Investigation, the in-situ infiltration rate at W. Centinela Avenue in the vicinity of the Project was 37.5 in/hr. To calculate the design infiltration rate (DIR) per drywell, the in-situ infiltration rate was multiplied by the surface area of the infiltration zone of the drywell, which includes the bottom of the drywell and the side of the drywell. For example, for the Radlock Ave site:

$$DIR = \text{In situ Infiltration Rate} \times (\text{Area at Bottom of Dry Well} + \text{Side Area of Drywell})$$

$$\text{Area at Bottom of Dry Well} = \left( \frac{\pi \times \text{Diameter}^2}{4} \right)$$

$$\text{Side Area of Dry Well} = \pi \times \text{Diameter} \times \text{Depth of Dry Well Infiltration Zone}$$

$$DIR = \frac{37.5 \text{ in}}{\text{hr}} \times \frac{1 \text{ ft}}{12 \text{ in}} \times \frac{1 \text{ hr}}{3600 \text{ sec}} \left[ \left( \frac{\pi \times (3 \text{ ft})^2}{4} \right) + \pi \times 3 \text{ ft} \times 35 \text{ ft} \right] = 0.39 \text{ cfs per drywell}$$

Figure 2 - Screen capture of supplied dry well throughput calculations with highlighted points of interest.