

Scoring Committee

Meeting Minutes



January 10, 2022
1:00 PM – 2:30 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
Matt Stone, Santa Clarita Valley Water Agency

There were no absent committee members.
See attached sign-in sheet for full list of attendees.

1. Welcome and Introductions

District Staff conducted a brief tutorial of the WebEx meeting features. 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 December 9, 2021

District staff provided the meeting minutes from the previous meeting. Motion to approve the meeting minutes by Vice-Chair TJ Moon, seconded by Member Dave Sorem. Committee voted to approve the December 9, 2021 meeting minutes (approved, see vote tracking sheet).

3. Committee Member and District Updates

District staff provided an update:

- Funds transfer process for Round 2 projects is underway
- The District has updated the spatial data library on the Safe Clean Water Program (SCWP) website, with layers reflecting old and new boundaries.
- The next Quarterly Reports are due February 15 for Infrastructure Program and Scientific Studies. A summary of Quarterly Reports will be presented to all Watershed Area Steering Committees (WASCs).
- The District has released online Municipal Annual Reports that were due December 31, 2021; and will follow up with Municipalities that did not submit an Annual Report.
- The District recently sent an email to the Watershed Area Steering Committees requesting vaccine information, with additional information from the Board of Supervisors on vaccine requirements.
- On December 21, the Board of Supervisors voted to continue meeting virtually, acting under the authority of Assembly Bill 361 which authorizes public committees to meet without complying with all the teleconferencing requirements of the Brown Act. The Board is reviewing their position every 30 days.

Member David Diaz asked if it would be possible to switch the meeting platform to something easier to use by community members. District Staff noted that it will still be WebEx for the foreseeable future with no intentions to change the platform. Member Diaz asked if the District could explore the feasibility of using a different platform. Chair Reznik offered to discuss the issue further offline.

Scoring Committee

Meeting Minutes



4. Public Comment Period for Non-Agenda Items

Chair Reznik opened the floor for public comments.

Cesar Roldan (City of Huntington Park) presented a public comment card (See attached public comment card).

Dr. Shahriar Eftekhazadeh (SEITec) commented on the North Hollywood Stormwater Capture Project. An email was sent to the Scoring Committee, requesting rescoring of the project. The Project received a letter of support from the Upper Los Angeles River watermaster that confirms the water supply benefits. An email was also sent regarding the existing information that was provided to the Committee that infiltration at the site does replenish the San Fernando Basin, and it was publicly announced at the LADWP Stormwater Capture Parks Program. Dr. Eftekhazadeh asked that the project be rescored so that the score reflects the true nature of the project. (See attached public comment card)

5. Discussion Items:

a. Ex Parte Communication Disclosure

Chair Reznik received an email (cc'd to Vice-Chair Moon and District Staff) from SEITec regarding the North Hollywood Stormwater Capture Project asking to rescore the project, with a letter of support from the Upper Los Angeles River Watermaster. Chair Reznik asked to add further discussion on rescoring the North Hollywood Project to a later agenda item.

Chair Reznik, Vice-Chair Moon, and Member Matt Stone disclosed that they would be interviewed by Los Angeles County Flood Control District consultant DRP as part of the SCWP Metrics and Monitoring Study (MMS). The MMS is a study analyzing the progress of the SCWP.

Member Stone received an email from Oliver Galang requesting clarification on the scoring of the Heartwell Park at Palo Verde Channel Stormwater Capture Project and participated in a follow-up video conference with Richard Watson, Oliver Galang, and Kristen Ruffell from the LA County Sanitation Districts to discuss the project.

b. Scoring of Resubmitted Feasibility Studies

Central Santa Monica Bay (CSMB)

1. Angeles Mesa Green Infrastructure Corridor Project

Vice-Chair Moon noted that the project applicant resubmitted the application to include 30 Dry Wells for BMPs and provided geotechnical information to show that the project site area is conducive to infiltration. Vice-Chair Moon pointed out that the capacity noted in the application is 38 acre-feet. The 85th percentile is 8.88 acre-feet, so the project scored the maximum number of points for Water Quality.

Member Sorem noted that the project is capturing more than the 85th percentile storm; this is unnecessary and project costs could be reduced by reducing the capture volume.

The project received 68 points.



2. West Los Angeles College Soccer Field Basin Dry Well Project

The project changed the total capacity to 1.5-acre feet. Vice-Chair Moon noted that the project re-ran the pollution reduction model, which achieved 80% removal, and agreed with the applicant's scores for Water Quality.

The project received 62 points.

Lower San Gabriel River (LSGR)

1. Stormwater Treatment and Reuse (STAR) System Hacienda Park

Project proponents provided documentation for the drawdown rate, as requested by Vice-Chair Moon. The project proponents continued to include the irrigation component as stormwater use, despite Vice-Chair Moon's comment that the irrigation is not part of the project and thus, the stormwater use should be 0, instead of 100,000 gallons. Vice-Chair Moon asked that the project proponents clarify why stormwater use remained the same and determined that the project is unable to be scored.

Vice-Chair Moon noted project used a metric unfamiliar to the SCWP and recommended the project proponents review the application with the Scoring Committee prior to resubmittal.

The project received 51 points and does not meet the 60-point threshold.

2. Artesia Park Stormwater Capture Project

Member Stone asked whether the project has quantified and documented the amount of water that will be used. Vice-Chair Moon responded that the project is proposing irrigation next to a bioswale, off hours discharge to the sanitary sewer, and irrigation along a nearby trail, but they have not provided specific calculations. The project is requesting funds for design. Member Stone awarded points for Water Supply, noting that during the design phase, the project team should calculate and document sewer diversion capacity. Chair Reznik agreed that the project should use the design phase to make details more concrete.

Member Stone referenced ex parte communication with the project proponents, noting that the Scoring Criteria for design applications need reflection and more clarification is needed on how much detail is required for design applications.

The project received 64 points.

3. Heartwell Park at Palo Verde Channel Stormwater Capture Project

Member Stone commented that the project explored the possibility of diverting dry weather flow to two sewers but needs a capacity study to check the capacity of the two sewers. Member Stone had recommended that the project proponents find previous analyses in master plans. Member Stone spoke with the Sanitation District, who could not make any commitments to capacity without a study, despite how dry weather flows look low; Member Stone had also heard from project proponents that there should be capacity available.

Member Stone suggested scoring other sections of the rubric, since a clear support of Water Supply Benefits are not available.

Scoring Committee

Meeting Minutes



Chair Reznik and Vice-Chair Moon agreed that a capacity analysis should be conducted to provide construction funding for the project.

Project Proponent, Oliver Galang (Craftwater), agreed with the perspective of the Scoring Committee members. Mr. Galang noted that a capacity analysis was not performed during the application phase, as the time it takes to do the capacity analysis does require agreement between the City of Long Beach and the Sanitation District, which takes a significant amount of time. The City of Long Beach hopes to get partial funding from the SCWP. Member Kirsten Schwarz mentioned the project can use a purchase order to expedite the process.

Vice-Chair Moon noted that a purchase order can be done within a month, whereas an agreement will take 3 to 4 months. The Vice-Chair believes it would be of interest for the City of Long Beach to pursue an agreement now, for the purpose of the application.

The project received 59 points and does not meet the 60-point threshold.

Lower Los Angeles River (LLAR)

1. Salt Lake Park Infiltration Cistern

In response to Vice-Chair Moon's question about the stormwater use indicated in the application (9 million gallons), the applicant deleted the stormwater use in the Portal.

The pollution reduction model was redone and continues to confirm the applicant's score for Water Quality Benefits.

The project claims to recharge the aquifer, but the attached WRD letter did not provide justification for this claim. Member Stone noted that the WRD letter is an invoice for water master services and seems unrelated to the project, without supplemental information provided by the project applicant.

Vice-Chair Moon highlighted that the applicant did not update the life span value for Water Supply Part 1, despite previous requests from the Scoring Committee. The Scoring Committee proceeded to award 0 points for Water Supply.

Member Sorem noted that the project is providing more capacity than necessary.

Member Stone requested the project obtain a more definitive letter from WRD and clarify the calculations for arriving at the cost effectiveness figure provided in the Water Supply section of the application.

The project received 67 points.

6. Public Comment Period for Agenda Items

Chair Reznik initiated a discussion on the North Hollywood Park Stormwater Capture Project. Chair Reznik shared that the project applicant has requested more points be awarded in the Water Supply category. The applicant has provided a letter of support. Chair Reznik asked the Committee how they'd like to proceed with the scoring of the project.

Vice-Chair Moon confirmed that the project will recharge the basin, but no letter was available in the first two submissions. The City of Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (LADWP) did not provide a letter, but the project procured a letter from a nearby water agency. Vice-Chair Moon noted that the letter was provided late in the scoring process and other projects haven't received points for letters received

Scoring Committee

Meeting Minutes



later in the scoring process. Vice-Chair Moon commented that the letter should be packaged in the application, rather than requesting scoring changes through public comments.

Chair Reznik agreed that the letter was received late in the scoring process and proceeded to send the project to the WASC.

Chair Reznik opened the floor for public comments.

Melanie Tory, an attorney for the City of Los Angeles representing LADWP, shared context related to the North Hollywood Park Stormwater Capture Project. Ms. Tory clarified that LADWP opposes the project. LADWP submitted the project under Round 2 but did not receive funding. LADWP has since been seeking other potential funding options. Ms. Tory emphasized that LADWP has not abandoned the project. Ms. Tory noted that it appears SEITec used the application materials LADWP developed to resubmit the project under this round without LADWP's authorization. The project applicant does not have the water right for the project site. Although SEITec have a Watermaster letter, the Watermaster does not have the authorization to grant the right to use LADWP water.

Ms. Tory provided additional background on the legal history of this project. LADWP and the City of LA have fought over this issue for more than 30 years. In 1975 case City of Los Angeles vs City of San Fernando, the California Supreme Court recognized the City of LA's prior and paramount right to all surface waters of the LA River and the native groundwater in the San Fernando Basin. In 1979, the Los Angeles Superior Court confirmed the City's water rights. Any diversion of stormwater in the Upper LA River area would diminish the native flows to the LA River or the recharge of the San Fernando Basin, therefore the project would infringe on LADWP's water rights. LADWP respectfully asks that the Committee deny the project.

Dr. Eftekhazadeh commented that the North Hollywood Park Stormwater Capture Project application materials previously submitted by LADWP are publicly available documents and the project application submitted by SEITec uses technical materials that provide technical support for a scheme. Dr. Eftekhazadeh clarified that there is no water right issue, as the project does not use a water right; it is proposing a scheme that would replenish the San Fernando Basin in the same manner proposed by LADWP (i.e., infiltration). Dr. Eftekhazadeh also noted that the project proponents had asked the Department of Recreation and Parks to provide a revokable permit to utilize the site. The project provides many Water Supply benefits at low costs. Dr. Eftekhazadeh welcomed further discussion with LADWP.

Chair Reznik noted that they are not inclined to rescore the project and the Committee will vote to send it to the WASC. Member Stone agreed that the Scoring Committee is not able to rescore the project.

7. Voting Items:

- a. Send all projects with passing scores from the December 9, 2021 Scoring Committee meeting to their respective WASCs
 - i. Ladera Heights - W Centinela Ave Green Improvement
 - ii. Jackson Elementary School Campus Greening and Stormwater Quality Improvement Project
 - iii. North Hollywood Park Stormwater Capture Project
 - iv. Watts Civic Center Serenity Greenway
 - v. Winery Canyon Channel and Descanso Gardens Stormwater Capture and Reuse Project
 - vi. La Crescenta Green Improvement Project
 - vii. Fulton Playfield Multi-Benefit Infiltration Project

Scoring Committee

Meeting Minutes



A motion to approve Agenda Item 7a was made by Member Dave Sorem, seconded by Member Kirsten Schwarz. Committee voted to approve the motion (approved, see vote tracking sheet).

8. Items for Next Agenda

The next meeting is scheduled for February 1, 2022, 9 AM – 12 PM. See SCWP website for meeting details.

Member Schwarz noted that they have a recurring meeting conflict on Tuesdays and Thursdays from 9:30-10:45 AM and therefore cannot make the February 1. Member Stone noted a conflict on February 1. Chair Reznik confirmed that the other members of the Scoring Committee are available on the date. The Scoring Committee will vote on February 1 to send the resubmitted projects from today's meeting to their respective WASCs.

Chair Reznik noted that the District has been documenting areas of challenges identified by the Scoring Committee, and asked if that documentation is available for review before the upcoming MMS interviews. Mike Antos (Stantec) shared that work is underway to compile a staff memo of the observations the Scoring Committee has made about the SCWP scoring and project submittal system by reviewing notes from prior meetings. The work will not be complete in the short-term, but likely sometime in February. Chair Reznik requested the District possibly schedule a Doodle Poll for a March meeting where this information could be discussed.

9. Adjournment

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

SCORING COMMITTEE MEETING - January 10, 2022

Member Type	Quorum Present		Voting Items	
	Member	Voting?	12/09/21 Meeting Minutes	Voting Item 7a
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	x		Y
Nature-Based Solutions / Water Quality	Bruce Reznik	x	Y	Y
Water Quality	Dave Sorem	x	Y	Y
Water Quality	TJ Moon	x	Y	Y
Total Non-Vacant Seats	6	Yay (Y)	5	6
Total Voting Members Present	6	Nay (N)	0	0
		Abstain (A)	0	0
		Total	5	6
			Approved	Approved

Other Attendees	
Annelisa Moe	Maggie Gardner
Brad Parks	Mary Breckell
Brett Perry	Michelle Kim
Bryce Lee	Michelle Struthers
Cameron Castillo	Pablo Glenn
Cesar Roldan	Richard Watson
Chris Carandang	Ryan Edgley
Christine McLeod	Ryan Jackson
Conor Mossavi	Shahriar Eftekharzadeh
Daniel Apt	Sheila Brice
Daniel Rydberg	Sunshine Saucedo
Danielle Chupa	Susie Santilena
Dustin Bambic	Thom Epps
Erin Pang	Wendy Dinh
Ghina Yamout	Melanie Tory
Gus Orozco	Oliver Galang
Jim Rasmus	Shahram Kharaghani
John Hunter	
Jonathan Lee	
Lisa Skutecki	
Lorena Matos	

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2022-2023



Watershed Area	Central Santa Monica Bay
Project Name	Angeles Mesa Green Infrastructure Corridor Project
Project Lead	City of Los Angeles, LA Sanitation and Environment
Total Funding Requested	\$8,401,432
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"> Need storage volume justification Recommend using 'Dry Well' BMP type Applicant resubmitted as Dry Well BMP – 30 dry wells
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	30	30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Need justification for 0.5 cfs, since dry well manufacturer spec has max rate of 0.25 cfs Recommend a new monitoring plan specific to project
Water Supply Part 1	0	13	0	•
Water Supply Part 2	5	12	0	•
Community Investment	10	10	5	• No points for greening schools
Nature-Based Solutions	10	15	10	•
Leveraging Funds Part 1	N/A	6	0	•
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	4	3	• Robust future plan
TOTALS	79	110	68	•

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2022-2023



Watershed Area	Central Santa Monica Bay
Project Name	West Los Angeles College Soccer Field Basin Dry Well Project
Project Lead	Los Angeles Community College District & BuildLACCD
Total Funding Requested	\$399,967
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"> Confirm total capacity is 1.5 cfs Revised capacity to 1.5 ac-ft
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	25	30	25	<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">
Nature-Based Solutions	5	15	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Leveraging Funds Part 1	6	6	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	4	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would be great to get support from students, soccer team, etc Missing letter of support
TOTALS	65	110	62	<ul style="list-style-type: none">

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2022-2023



Watershed Area	Lower San Gabriel River
Project Name	Stormwater Treatment and Reuse System (STAR System) Hacienda Park (re-submittal with leveraged funds)
Project Lead	City of La Habra Heights
Total Funding Requested	\$644,000
Project Type	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	20	7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 0 out stormwater use Did not revise stormwater use Provide documentation for drawdown rate Provided documentation for drawdown rate Drainage area incorrect Recommendation for applicant to review application with SC before future submittal
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	25	30	25	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Water Supply Part 1	0	13	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Water Supply Part 2	0	12	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Community Investment	10	10	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No irrigation use
Nature-Based Solutions	10	15	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Leveraging Funds Part 1	3	6	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	4	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Vague details on community meetings/outreach Only 1 letter of support from resident
TOTALS	72	110	51	<ul style="list-style-type: none">

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2022-2023



Watershed Area	Lower San Gabriel River
Project Name	Artesia Park Stormwater Capture Project
Project Lead	City of Artesia
Total Funding Requested	\$1,250,502
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	5	12	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not clear how water will be used. • Provide more detail regarding sewer diversion • Okay since Design funds requested
Community Investment	10	10	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Passive recreation • Need to detail net gain for heat island reduction due to trees
Nature-Based Solutions	12	15	12	•
Leveraging Funds Part 1	N/A	6	0	•
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	4	2	• No robust community outreach
TOTALS	71	110	64	•

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2022-2023



Watershed Area	Lower San Gabriel River
Project Name	Heartwell Park at Palo Verde Channel Stormwater Capture Project
Project Lead	City of Long Beach
Total Funding Requested	\$10,695,000
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	20	30	20	• Recommend classifying as dry weather project
Water Supply Part 1	0	13	0	•
Water Supply Part 2	5	12	0	• Not clear on how flows will be utilized • No capacity analysis from Sanitation District • Need clear support of water supply benefit
Community Investment	10	10	5	• No points for recreational opportunities
Nature-Based Solutions	10	15	10	•
Leveraging Funds Part 1	N/A	6	0	•
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	4	1	• No specific outreach to nearby DAC • One way exchange of info
TOTALS	69	110	59	•

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	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Confirm 9M gal for Stormwater use Deleted stormwater use in portal
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	30	30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide justification for 100% pollutant reduction Consider Dry weather project
Water Supply Part 1	6	13	0	<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	0	<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	67	<ul style="list-style-type: none">



Public Comment Form

Name:* _____ Organization*: _____

Email*: _____ Phone*: _____

Meeting: _____ Date: _____

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



Public Comment Form

Name:* Shahriar Eftekhazadeh Organization*: SEITec
Email*: Shahriar.Eftekhazadeh@seitecinc.com Phone*: 310 879 9376
Meeting: Scoring Committee Date: 01/10/2022

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

This is to request the restoring of the Water Supply Benefits score for the N. Hollywood Park Stormwater Capture Project, which was deducted at the Scoring Committee Meeting of 12/9/2021.

This is because the application already contains adequate technical material to meet the requirements and the intent of Section 3.2 of Feasibility Study Guidelines. The project site is one and the same as the LADWP previously proposed project and the [LADWP Stormwater Capture Parks Program Web Page](#) clearly shows that infiltration at the proposed site will replenish the San Fernando basin.

Furthermore, applicant received a letter from the ULAR Area Watermaster confirming that infiltration by the proposed project does replenish the San Fernando Basin.

Therefore, kindly restore the proposed project Water Supply Benefits score before forwarding the project for funding consideration by the ULAR WASC.

Thank you,



UPPER LOS ANGELES RIVER AREA WATERMASTER
Richard C. Slade - Watermaster

ularawatermaster.com

14051 Burbank Blvd, Suite 300
Sherman Oaks, CA 91401

818-506-0418 PHONE
818-506-1343 FAX

January 10, 2022

To: Applicants for Regional Projects under the Safe Clean Water Program

Regarding: Support for Infiltration Project at North Hollywood Park

The Upper Los Angeles River Area (ULARA) Watermaster is aware that many local agencies will be applying for Regional Project funds under the Los Angeles County Flood Control District's Safe Clean Water Fund program. One of the provisions of that application process requires applicants to contact the groundwater management agency (in this case, the ULARA Watermaster) for concurrence in support of the proposed project.

The purpose of this letter is to advise those agencies within or overlapping the ULARA's jurisdiction that the ULARA Watermaster is in general support of regional projects that provide infiltration of pre-treated captured runoff in order to help recharge and benefit the overall health of the local groundwater basin, in this specific case, the San Fernando Groundwater Basin.

Based on the information provided by one such applicant (SEITec), the proposed North Hollywood Park Stormwater Capture Project appears to be such a project that could benefit the San Fernando Groundwater Basin. The project proposes to direct stormwater to a series of tunnels and dry wells beneath North Hollywood Park (located south of Magnolia Blvd, between Tujunga Ave and the CA-170 Hollywood Freeway) so that the redirected stormwater has the potential to deep percolate into the aquifers within the San Fernando Groundwater Basin. The ULARA Watermaster concurs that the project has the potential to increase groundwater recharge in the San Fernando Basin.

It should be noted that this letter from the Watermaster's office is intended to assess the concept of the proposed infiltration (and recharge) project, but is not intended to serve as a review of the technical issues related to groundwater infiltration (including, but not limited to percolation rates, the potential for mounding, potential for liquefaction, etc.).

We look forward to working with our many agency partners on projects that promote groundwater recharge via infiltration for management of stormwater runoff in the Court-adjudicated ULARA region.

Respectfully Submitted,

Richard C. Slade
ULARA Watermaster