

Scoring Committee

Meeting Minutes



November 22, 2021
9:30 AM – 1:30 PM
WebEx Meeting

Committee Members Present:

Bruce Reznik, LA Waterkeeper, Chair
Dave Sorem, Mike Bubalo Construction Co., Inc
TJ Moon, LA County Public Works, Vice-Chair
Kirsten Schwarz, UCLA
David Diaz, Active SGV

Committee Members Absent:

Matt Stone, Santa Clarita Valley Water Agency

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

1. Welcome and Introductions

District Staff conducted a brief tutorial on WebEx. 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 November 17, 2021 (if available)

Meeting minutes for November 17, 2021 have not been posted. They will be approved at the next meeting.

3. Committee Member and District Updates

District staff provided an update:

- Funds transfer process is initiated; currently setting up transfer agreements for the Round 2 projects and addendums for projects that will continue to receive funding.
- Staff reminded project proponents and Watershed Coordinators to submit quarterly reports, which will be summarized and presented to the WASC at upcoming meetings.
- Form 700 conflict of interest paperwork will be due in April.
- The Board of Supervisors are acting under the authority of AB 361 and have voted to continue holding virtual meetings.

4. Public Comment Period for Non-Agenda Items

Chair Reznik opened the floor for public comments. No public comments were received.

5. Discussion Items:

a. Ex Parte Communication Disclosure

Vice Chair TJ Moon was contacted by Fulton Playfield Project applicant. They will discuss the Vice Chair's comments on the project.

b. Scoring of Feasibility Studies

Lower Los Angeles River

1. Salt Lake Park Infiltration Cistern

Member Dave Sorem noted that this project was previously scored by the Committee.

Water Quality: The Committee expressed confusion about how many acre-feet of water are proposed for Phase 2. Vice Chair Moon is not sure what was previously scored and if they are re-counting water used in Phase 1 for their Phase 2 proposal. Vice Chair Moon recommends awarding 0 points and asking for clarification on the gallons of water for stormwater use. Vice Chair Moon noted that the Applicant's pollutant reduction was indicated to be 100%, but no justification was provided. Member Sorem assumed 605 acres instead of 1584 based on previous project documents but would like to have the applicant explain the numbers further. Chair Reznik shares their concerns and noted that it is helpful for applicants to provide as much input as possible. The Committee requested the applicant provide justification for the 100% pollutant reduction. Currently, the criteria is unable to be scored.

Water Supply: The applicant did not justify the amount of water captured annually or the water supply cost effectiveness. The Water Replenishment District does not suffice as a letter of project support, as it seems more like an invoicing document. The Committee requested the applicant provide justification for the 542 acre-foot Water Supply Benefit claimed. The criteria could not be scored.

Community Investment: Member Schwarz scored the project 5 out of 10 points. The applicant received points for flood management and risk mitigation, enhancement of park space, and installation of new bioswales. The project does not improve public access to waterways. Member Schwarz did not assign points for enhancement of recreational activities or for green spaces at the school, although the applicants claimed the project provides after-school opportunities. Member Schwarz did not award points for addressing the heat island or providing shade, though the applicant did claim those benefits. The application did not provide details about the number of trees. Member Schwarz awarded points for increasing vegetation. Member Diaz concurred with awarding 5 points. Chair Reznik was between 2 and 5, but is fine with awarding 5.

Nature-Based Solutions: Member Schwarz awarded points for natural processes, facilitating infiltration, and use of natural materials (drought-tolerant landscaping). Applicant assigned 4 points for impermeable area removal but did not include supporting documentation for the 98% removed claim. Members Schwarz and Diaz proposed awarding 10 points. Chair Reznik requested the applicant provide justification for the impermeable area removed.

Leveraging Funds Part 1: Cost share was provided but does not reach threshold for points. No points.

Leveraging Funds Part 2 (Community Support): Application included details about future outreach plans as well as three letters of support, though the Committee noted that outreach appeared to be one-way and not participatory. Members Schwarz and Diaz agreed to award 2 points.

Conclusion: The project was deemed unable to be scored.

2. Apollo Park Stormwater Capture Project

Water Quality: The claimed 41 points were assigned.

Scoring Committee

Meeting Minutes



Water Supply: 5 points awarded. Chair Reznik noted that the application includes a Water Supply letter from the Water Replenishment District that does not explicitly state the project benefits.

Community Investment: Member Diaz awarded 5 points for addressing flooding and providing increased shade. Member Schwarz agreed. Member Schwarz gave points for recreation benefits that will result from converting the existing parking lot area to turf.

Nature-Based Solutions: Members Diaz and Schwarz agreed to award the claimed 14 points.

Leveraging Funds Part 1: No cost share provided. No points claimed by the applicant or rewarded.

Leveraging Funds Part 2 (Community Support): Members Sorem and Schwarz awarded 2 points because the letters of support seem to indicate that communication with the community was one-way.

Conclusion: The project received 67 points.

3. Willow Springs Park Wetland Restoration and Expansion Project

Water Quality: Vice Chair Moon awarded the claimed 39 points for the 7.1 acre-feet, \$7.4 million project.

Water Supply: Applicant did not claim Water Supply Benefits, which Vice Chair Moon agreed with, as there is no draw-down rate. Member Sorem noted that they would like to see a larger water supply and thinks this project provides a good template

Community Investment: Member Schwarz awarded points for flood management, enhanced park space, providing public access to waterways and new recreational opportunities, addressing the heat island, and increasing vegetation. The applicant claimed points for enhancement of nearby schools, but Member Schwarz did not agree with that claim. Members Schwarz and Diaz both assigned 10 out of 10 points. Chair Reznik was leaning between 5 and 10 because the flood benefit was unclear, however, because this the project is at the design stage, the Chair agreed to award 10 points.

Nature-Based Solutions: Member Schwarz assigned 10 of 15 points. The wetland design mimics natural processes and native plants will be used in the landscape. Member Diaz and Chair Reznik agreed.

Leveraging Funds Part 1: 0 points assigned. Chair Reznik recommends pursuing cost share in the future.

Leveraging Funds Part 2 (Community Support): No letters of support were provided. Members Schwarz and Diaz suggest assigning 1 or 2 points. Member Diaz agreed with 1 or 2 points. Chair Reznik agrees with 2 points due to the feedback from the Master Plan. Chair Reznik recommends the applicant strengthen community support and provide letters.

Conclusion: The project received 61 points. Chair Reznik recommends the applicant try to leverage funds moving forward.



Rio Hondo

4. East LA College East Drainage Area Biofiltration and Stormwater Capture & Use Project

Water Quality: The Committee requested the applicant clarify the storage volume: 0.46 acre-feet of storage is claimed, but page 47 identifies the storage as 0.23 acre-feet. The draw-down rate also appears to be double counted. Vice Chair Moon and Member Sorem both agreed the criteria is unable to be scored.

Water Supply: The project applicant did not claim Water Supply Benefits. The Committee noted that points are not awarded for directing stormwater to bioswales. No points were assigned.

Community Investment: Member Diaz suggested 5 points for increased vegetation, improved flood management, and enhanced greenspace. Member Schwarz agreed. Chair Reznik noted that the project needed more Community Investment Benefits due to the high cost, but also agreed with 5 points.

Nature-Based Solutions: Member Diaz assigned 15 points while Member Schwarz suggested 10 points. The Members discussed the question of whether points should be awarded for removing impermeable area, since it looks like the area to be removed is grass creek and may not be impervious. The Committee requested the applicant clarify the impermeable area. The component could not be scored.

Leveraging Funds Part 1: The project provided 56.58% cost share, so the Committee awarded full (6) points.

Leveraging Funds Part 2 (Community Support): Member Diaz suggested awarding 1 point because the letter from the City of Monterey Park was not dated or signed and the application demonstrated limited outreach. Member Schwarz and Chair Reznik agreed to assign 1 point.

Conclusion: This project does not meet the 60-point threshold. The Committee noted that projects that are lower on water supply and quality need to maximize their community scores.

5. Vincent Lugo Park Stormwater Capture Project

Water Quality: The Committee assigned the full 40 points.

Water Supply: The Committee assigned the full 25 points.

Community Investment: Vice Chair Moon noted they should not claim flood benefits because it is a dry weather diversion project. Member Schwarz agreed and assigned 5 points, accordingly. Points were awarded for creating and enhancing park space habitat, providing new recreational activities, and increasing shade. The applicant claimed points for providing public access to waterways, but Member Schwarz disagreed. Member Diaz and Chair Reznik agreed to award 5 points.

Nature-Based Solutions: Member Schwarz suggested awarding 10 points. Member Diaz and Chair Reznik agreed.

Leveraging Funds Part 1: No cost share was provided – 0 points were awarded.

Scoring Committee

Meeting Minutes



Leveraging Funds Part 2 (Community Support): The applicant referenced previous engagement and outreach conducted and provided 4 letters of support. Member Schwarz suggested assigning 2 points. Member Diaz and Chair Reznik agreed.

Conclusion: The project received 82 points and moves to the WASC for consideration.

Santa Clara River

6. Pico Canyon Park Stormwater Improvements Project

Water Quality: Vice Chair Moon suggested awarding the claimed 44 points. Member Sorem agreed.

Water Supply: The applicant did not claim Water Supply Benefits.

Community Investment: Member Diaz assigned 5 points for flood management, enhanced park space, and providing recreation benefits. Member Diaz noted they hope the applicant will perform more community engagement and outreach moving forward. Member Schwarz and Chair Reznik agreed.

Nature-Based Solutions: Member Diaz assigned 10 points for the use of bioswales. Member Schwarz and Chair Reznik agreed.

Leveraging Funds Part 1: The full 6 points for cost share were awarded.

Leveraging Funds Part 2 (Community Support): No points were claimed for this criteria.

Conclusion: The project received 65 points. Chair Reznik noted that moving forward, they would like more community outreach and specifics regarding greening.

Upper San Gabriel River

7. Glendora Avenue Green Streets

Member Diaz noted the potential conflict of interest for Active SGV. Out of an abundance of caution, the Member will refrain from providing comment on this project.

Water Quality: The Committee awarded 45 points.

Water Supply: Vice Chair Moon referenced the 0.172 cfs dry weather flow claimed in the application and noted that it is a huge dry weather benefit when multiplied by approximately 300 days a year. The Committee will accept the assumption because the project is at the design stage, but Vice Chair Moon would like to see flow meter data or documentation in the next round of scoring to justify the number. 8 points were assigned. Member Sorem agreed.

Community Investment: Member Schwarz assigned the claimed 5 points for flood management and flood risk mitigation as well as recreational opportunities, shade, and increased vegetation. Chair Reznik agreed.

Nature-Based Solutions: Member Schwarz awarded the claimed 11 points for mimicking infiltration and using natural materials in design. The applicant assigned 1 point for impermeable area removal and provided a calculation for that. Chair Reznik agreed.

Leveraging Funds Part 1: The project provided some cost share; Member Schwarz and Chair Reznik awarded 3 points.

Scoring Committee

Meeting Minutes



Leveraging Funds Part 2 (Community Support): The project includes an extensive outreach plan and multiple letters of support were provided. The Committee agreed to award 3 points.

Conclusion: The project received 76 points. For the next round of scoring, the applicant needs to provide documentation to support the high daily average assumption.

8. Marchant Park

Water Quality: Vice Chair Moon assigned of the claimed 44 points. Member Sorem agreed.

Water Supply: Vice Chair Moon assigned of the claimed 2 points. Member Sorem agreed.

Community Investment: Member Diaz assigned of the claimed 5 points for enhancing parking space, reducing heat island, and increased shade. Member Schwarz and Chair Reznik agreed.

Nature-Based Solutions: Member Diaz assigned of the full 10 points. Member Schwarz and Chair Reznik agreed.

Leveraging Funds Part 1: No points claimed or awarded.

Leveraging Funds Part 2 (Community Support): Applicant provided 5 letters of support and reached out to key stakeholders. Member Diaz recommended awarding 2 or 3 points. Member Schwarz assigned 2 points, and Chair Reznik agreed.

Conclusion: Project received 63 points.

9. Pelota Park

Water Quality: Vice Chair Moon recommended the project apply as a dry weather project for the construction phase. Member Sorem agreed. This would allow them an additional 20 points under water quality. 40 points were assigned as a dry weather project. Chair Reznik requested projects be consistent in how they calculate acreages. After receiving clarification from Stantec staff, the Committee concluded that the double counting of the acreages was justified.

Water Supply: 12 points were assigned.

Community Investment: Member Schwarz assigned no points for flood management since it will be scored as a dry weather project. The Member assigned points for creating park space and planting native trees. The project does not improve public access to waterways. The applicant claimed points for new recreational opportunities – the points were not assigned, as no fields seem to be added. Member Schwarz suggested awarding 5 points. Member Diaz agreed. Member Diaz liked that the applicant has a shared user agreement with the school district. Chair Reznik also expressed appreciation for the strong partnership with the school district.

Nature-Based Solutions: Members Schwarz and Diaz agreed to award 12 points.

Leveraging Funds Part 1: No cost share provided. No points claimed, 0 assigned.

Leveraging Funds Part 2 (Community Support): Member Schwarz noted that the applicant has not determined whether they will coordinate with organizations that manage and use the park. The applicant has, however, met with the school district. Members Schwarz and Diaz both assigned 2 points.

Scoring Committee Meeting Minutes



Conclusion: The project received 71 points.

6. Public Comment Period for Agenda Items

Chair Reznik opened the floor for public comments. No public comments were received.

7. Voting Items:

- a. Send all projects with passing scores from the November 17, 2021 Scoring Committee meeting to their respective WASCs
 - i. Edward Vincent Jr. Park Stormwater Improvements Project
 - ii. Bellflower Simms Park Stormwater Capture Project
 - iii. Heartwell Park at Clark Channel Stormwater Capture Project
 - iv. Lakewood Equestrian Center
 - v. York Field Stormwater Capture Project

- b. Contact and allow all unscorable project applicants 1 week to provide clarifying information to Scoring Committee
 - i. Angeles Mesa Green Infrastructure Corridor Project
 - ii. West Los Angeles College Soccer Field Basin Dry Well Project
 - iii. Stormwater Treatment and Reuse (STAR) System Hacienda Park
 - iv. Artesia Park Stormwater Capture Project
 - v. Heartwell Park at Palo Verde Channel Stormwater Capture Project

Member Diaz made a motion to send all projects to their WASCs for consideration. Vice Chair Moon seconded. The motion passed (approved, see tracking sheet).

8. Items for Next Agenda

- a. Rescoring of Feasibility Studies

9. Adjournment

Chair Reznik thanked committee members and district staff and adjourned the meeting.

SCORING COMMITTEE MEETING - November 22, 2021

Member Type	Quorum Present		Items
	Member	Voting?	Voting Items 7a & 7b
Water Supply	Matt Stone		
Water Quality / Community Investments Benefits / Nature-Based Solutions	Kirsten Schwarz	X	Y
Community Investments Benefits	David Diaz	X	Y
Nature-Based Solutions / Water Quality	Bruce Reznik	X	Y
Water Quality	Dave Sorem	X	Y
Water Quality	TJ Moon	X	Y
Total Non-Vacant Seats	6	Yay (Y)	5
Total Voting Members Present	5	Nay (N)	0
		Abstain (A)	0
		Total	5
			Approved

Other Attendees	
Amanda Begley	Marisa Perez-Reyes
Brad Parks	Mary Breckell
Bryce Lee	Michele Farmer
Cameron Castillo	Michelle Kim
Cecilia Salazar	Mikaela Randolph
Cesar Roldan	Nancy Villasenor
Conor Mossavi	Nate Schreiner
Daniel Apt	Phillip West
Emily Ramos	Phyllis Ho
Greg de Vinck	Tara Dales
Gurjot Kohli	Taylor McCauley
Heather Merenda	Thom Epps
Humphrey Egekeze	Trevor Davis
Jake Comer	Wataru Kumagai
James Cramsie	Laureen Abustan
John Hunter	Jeff Atijera
Jon Abelson	Lauren Marshall
Josafat Flores	C Hernandez
Larry Rich	Raymond Tan
Lorena Matos	

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2022-2023



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	Unable to score	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Confirm 9M gal for Stormwater use
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"> Provide justification for 100% pollutant reduction Consider Dry weather project
Water Supply Part 1	6	13	Unable to score	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide justification for WS cost effectiveness. Use Portal generated values. WRD letter seems unrelated to Project
Water Supply Part 2	12	12	Unable to score	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide justification for 542 ac-ft Water Supply
Community Investment	10	10	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Nature-Based Solutions	14	15	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Justify impermeable area removed
Leveraging Funds Part 1	0	6	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	4	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> One way outreach
TOTALS	96	110	Unable to score	<ul style="list-style-type: none">

- TO BE VOTED BY SCORING COMMITTEE -

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2022-2023



Watershed Area	Lower Los Angeles River
Project Name	Apollo Park Stormwater Capture Project
Project Lead	City of Downey
Total Funding Requested	\$2,832,639
Project Type	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	11	20	11	•
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	5	12	5	•
Community Investment	5	10	5	•
Nature-Based Solutions	14	15	14	•
Leveraging Funds Part 1	N/A	6	0	•
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	4	2	• One way outreach
TOTALS	69	110	67	•

- TO BE VOTED BY SCORING COMMITTEE -

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2022-2023



Watershed Area	Lower Los Angeles River
Project Name	Willow Springs Park Wetland Restoration and Expansion Project
Project Lead	City of Long Beach
Total Funding Requested	\$1,200,200
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	25	30	25	•
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	N/A	6	0	• Recommend pursuing cost share in the future
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	4	2	• Recommend strengthening community support
TOTALS	63	110	61	•

- TO BE VOTED BY SCORING COMMITTEE -

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2022-2023



Watershed Area	Rio Hondo
Project Name	East Los Angeles College East Drainage Area Biofiltration and Stormwater Capture & Use Project
Project Lead	Los Angeles Community College District & BuildLACCD
Total Funding Requested	\$2,411,477
Project Type	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	0	20	0	•
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"> • Clarify storage volume • Double counting storm capacity
Water Supply Part 1	0	13	0	•
Water Supply Part 2	0	12	0	•
Community Investment	5	10	5	•
Nature-Based Solutions	15	15	Unable to score	• Clarify Impermeable Area
Leveraging Funds Part 1	6	6	6	•
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	4	1	•
TOTALS	60	110	Below Threshold	•

- TO BE VOTED BY SCORING COMMITTEE -

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2022-2023



Watershed Area	Rio Hondo
Project Name	Vincent Lugo Park Stormwater Capture Project
Project Lead	City of San Gabriel
Total Funding Requested	\$4,078,000
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	13	13	13	•
Water Supply Part 2	12	12	12	•
Community Investment	10	10	5	• Does not provide Flood benefit (Dry)
Nature-Based Solutions	10	15	10	•
Leveraging Funds Part 1	N/A	6	0	•
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	4	2	•
TOTALS	89	110	82	•

- TO BE VOTED BY SCORING COMMITTEE -

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2022-2023



Watershed Area	Santa Clara River
Project Name	Pico Canyon Park Stormwater Improvements Project
Project Lead	Los Angeles County
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	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	0	12	0	•
Community Investment	5	10	5	•
Nature-Based Solutions	10	15	10	•
Leveraging Funds Part 1	6	6	6	•
Leveraging Funds Part 2	0	4	0	•
TOTALS	65	110	65	•

- TO BE VOTED BY SCORING COMMITTEE -

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2022-2023



Watershed Area	Upper San Gabriel River
Project Name	Glendora Avenue Green Streets
Project Lead	City of Glendora
Total Funding Requested	\$555,000
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	3	13	3	• High daily average assumption; to provide clarification in next round
Water Supply Part 2	5	12	5	•
Community Investment	5	10	5	•
Nature-Based Solutions	11	15	11	•
Leveraging Funds Part 1	3	6	3	•
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	4	3	• Not in DAC, but conducted many engagements
TOTALS	76	110	76	•

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2022-2023



Watershed Area	Upper San Gabriel River
Project Name	MacLaren Hall BMP & Park Project
Project Lead	City of El Monte
Total Funding Requested	\$11,500,000
Project Type	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	20		•
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	30		•
Water Supply Part 1	13	13		•
Water Supply Part 2	12	12		•
Community Investment	10	10		•
Nature-Based Solutions	13	15		•
Leveraging Funds Part 1	0	6		•
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	4		•
TOTALS	102	110	N/A	• Withdrawn by Applicant

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2022-2023



Watershed Area	Upper San Gabriel River
Project Name	Marchant Park
Project Lead	East San Gabriel Valley Watershed Management Group
Total Funding Requested	\$675,000
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	•
Community Investment	5	10	5	•
Nature-Based Solutions	10	15	10	•
Leveraging Funds Part 1	N/A	6	0	•
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	4	2	• No prior outreach • 5 letters of support
TOTALS	65	110	63	•

- TO BE VOTED BY SCORING COMMITTEE -

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2022-2023



Watershed Area	Upper San Gabriel River
Project Name	Pelota Park
Project Lead	East San Gabriel Valley Watershed Management Group
Total Funding Requested	\$1,325,000
Project Type	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	0	20	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SC considered project as dry weather for scoring
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	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	12	12	12	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Community Investment	10	10	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No point for flood management for dry weather No point for access/recreation benefit
Nature-Based Solutions	12	15	12	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Leveraging Funds Part 1	N/A	6	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	4	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strong coordination with school
TOTALS	68	110	71	<ul style="list-style-type: none">

- TO BE VOTED BY SCORING COMMITTEE -