

Tuesday, June 6, 2023 1:00pm – 3:00pm City Hall of Culver City, Patacchia Room 9770 Culver Blvd, Culver City, CA 90232

**Committee Members Present:** Marcela Benavides, LA County Flood Control District (Agency) \*Matthew Veeh, West Basin Metropolitan Water District (Agency) \*Art Castro, LA Department of Water and Power (Agency) \*Hubertus Cox, LA City Sanitation and Environment (Agency) \*Darryl Ford, LA City Recreation & Parks (Agency) Rita Kampalath, LA County Chief Sustainability Office (Community), Vice-Chair Alysen Weiland, PSOMAS (Community) \*Maggie Gardner, LA Waterkeeper (Community) \*Lorna Avila, T.R.U.S.T. South LA (Community) Josette Descalzo, Beverly Hills (Municipal) \*Yanni Demitri, Culver City (Municipal) Roberto Perez, Los Angeles (Municipal) Susie Santilena, Los Angeles (Municipal), Chair Bruce Hamamoto, Los Angeles County (Municipal) Curtis Castle, Santa Monica (Municipal)

<u>Committee Members Attending Online:</u> \*Gloria Medina, The Solutions Project/SCOPE (Community)

\*Committee Member Alternate

<u>Absent Committee Members</u> Rafael Prieto, Los Angeles (Municipal) Mikaela Randolph, Heal the Bay (Watershed Coordinator, non-voting member) Michelle Struthers, S. Groner Associates (Watershed Coordinator, non-voting member)

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

#### 1. Welcome and Introductions

District Staff conducted a brief tutorial on WebEx for participants joining online. Member Santilena, Chair of the Central Santa Monica Bay (CSMB) Watershed Area Steering Committee (WASC), welcomed Committee Members, shared a few housekeeping items, and called the meeting to order.

District Staff facilitated the roll call of Committee Members. District Staff and all Committee Members made self-introductions and a quorum was established.

To comply with the modified Brown Act per AB2449 hybrid teleconferencing requirements, Member Medina, attending online, confirmed that there was no one else in the room with the member during rollcall.

#### 2. Approval of Meeting Minutes from February 28, 2023

Meeting minutes were available at the in-person meeting location and online. Member Descalzo made a motion to approve, seconded by Member Hamamoto. The Committee voted to approve the February 28, 2023 minutes, with 13 votes in favor, 3 votes in abstention, and 0 votes opposed (approved, see vote



tracking sheet attached). Member Medina, who was participating online, confirmed that no people were present with the member during the vote.

#### 3. Committee Member and District Updates

District staff provided an update, noting:

- On April 20, 2023, the Regional Oversight Committee voted to advance all 9 Stormwater Investment Plans (SIP) to the Board of Supervisors for funding. The District is drafting the Board Letter for SIP approval later this summer.
- Fiscal Year 2022-2023 (FY22-23) Quarter 3 (Q3) (January through March 2023) Quarterly Reports were due on May 15, 2023 and are required for Rounds 1, 2, and 3 Infrastructure Projects and Scientific Studies. Quarterly Reports are still required even if there is no project activity or the Transfer Agreement has not been executed. Project developers may be asked to give an update at a future meeting.
- The first term for WASC Community Stakeholder seats will end on June 30, 2023. Individuals interested in serving as a Community Stakeholder on the WASC for the next 3-year term should submit the Interest to Serve Form, <u>available here</u>. Current Committee Members do not need to submit another form; members stepping down should let District staff know as soon as possible. Existing members are asked to continue to serve until new members are onboarded and should let District staff know if this will not be possible.
- District staff hosted FY24-25 Call for Projects Information Sessions on May 24 and May 25. The application deadline to apply to the Infrastructure Program (IP) is July 31, 2023. Project applicants may refer to the Call for Projects webpage on the SCWP website for application details.

#### 4. Watershed Coordinator Updates

Watershed Coordinators were not present at this meeting. Watershed Coordinators will provide an a presentation on their Strategic Outreach and Engagement Plan (SOEP) during the next meeting.

#### 5. Public Comment Period

No comment cards were received before the meeting. There were no public comments.

#### 6. Discussion

#### a) Ex Parte Communication Disclosure

There were no ex parte communication disclosures.

#### b) <u>Regional Program Quarterly Reporting Summary</u>

#### FY 2022-23 Q1 (July - September) and Q2 (October - December)

A summary sheet of quarterly reports from FY22-23 Q1 and Q2 was shown onscreen that lists projects funded by approved Stormwater Investment Plans (SIPs) in the Central Santa Monica Bay Watershed Area, with activity concerns highlighted in red. Project developers were invited to the meeting to address the modifications.

Chair Santilena shared an overview of all the projects listed in the Regional Program Quarterly Report Summary and asked project developers present to comment on highlighted projects, as follows:

 Member Descalzo commented on the Beverly Hills Burton Way Green Street and Water Efficient Landscape Project noting that the delay highlighted was due to the storms during the winter



months. The storms did not allow for the digging process to be as expeditious as initially proposed. Member Descalzo noted that the team has increased the pace and the project is expected to be completed between summer and fall of this year.

- Member Yanni Demitri noted that the Culver City Mesmer Low Flow Diversion Infrastructure Project had been on hold due to the winter storms. Construction is expected to resume soon.
- Member Hamamoto noted that the activity concern highlighted for the Ladera Park Stormwater Improvements Project is out of date and that the project has been completed.
- Member Hamamoto provided a comment on the Monteith Park and View Park Green Alley Stormwater Improvements Project noting that there was a slight delay to the schedule because the bids they received were higher than the project estimates and additional funding has to be sought from the County of LA. Member Hamamoto noted that the additional funding is expected to be approved.
- Member Demitri commented on the Washington Boulevard Stormwater and Urban Runoff Diversion Infrastructure Project noting that there was some concern regarding funding and that project developers had been working on identifying additional funds. Member Demitri noted that \$4 million was secured from Congressman Ted Lieu.
- Wendy Dinh (Los Angeles Sanitation and Environment) commented on the Ballona Creek TMDL Project. Dinh noted that the construction scheduled was adjusted to be completed by August 2025. The budget was also modified, and the construction cost is now \$75 million. The increase is due to additional structural and regulatory requirements and the inflation in recent years. Project developers are currently leveraging five different funding sources as well as exploring a potential partnership with the California Department of Transportation. Additionally, project developer will ask for additional SCWP funds, pending instructions on how to submit such a request.

#### c) Chair/Vice-Chair or Co-Chair Selection

District reminded the WASC that Chair/Vice-Chair or Co-Chairs serve on one-year terms and will be selected during the voting item as scheduled in this agenda. District noted that this discussion item is intended to express interest in the potential re-selection of current Chair/Vice-Chair and/or to nominate other members for the roles. District shared that it is envisioned that the newly selected Chair/Vice-Chair or Co-Chairs would start in August.

Both Chair Santilena and Vice-Chair Kampalath shared that they have enjoyed their roles, but also welcome anyone else who may be interested in the positions.

Member Castle asked Chair Santilena and Vice-Chair Kampalath if they had thought about switching to a Co-Chair leadership organization, as a potential way to better distribute the work among themselves. District noted that there is at least one WASC that selects co-chairs rather than a chair and vice-chair.

District provided some background on the roles of Chair and Vice-Chair noting that members with those roles work closely with the District. One role of the Chair and Vice-Chair is to provide recommendations on items for the agenda.

Mike Antos (Regional Coordination, Stantec) added that the Chair and Vice-Chair play an important role in the Regional Oversight Committee meetings, as they often attend to speak on behalf of the WASC.

Committee Members shared their appreciation for Chair Santilena and Vice-Chair Kampalath and expressed support for re-selection.

#### d) Regional Oversight Committee (ROC) CSMB SIP Recommendations



Chair Santilena provided an overview of the last Regional Oversight Committee (ROC) meeting where the ROC reviewed all nine SIPs. The ROC raised concerns about including the Imperial Highway Green Infrastructure Project, which was recommended by the WASC to be included in the SIP, as a project that benefits disadvantaged communities (DAC). Chair Santilena informed the ROC that the decision to designate the project as benefitting disadvantaged communities had been a specific conversation within the WASC, and a specific and narrowly decided vote retained that benefit claim by the proponent.

After discussion, the ROC decided to move forward with advancing the CSMB SIP but recommended that the Board of Supervisors remove the DAC Benefit designation from the Imperial Highway Infrastructure Project. District shared that the transmittal package from the ROC to the Board of Supervisors will carry the ROC's request, and it is unknown how the Board of Supervisors will respond. Chair Santilena noted that the reason why the ROC decided not to send the SIP back to the WASC was to avoid any delays to the program. District staff also noted that the ROC's role is not to provide judgment on individual projects, but rather to ensure that the SIP and the projects align with the overall SCW Program goals.

Chair Santilena recommended that moving forward, the WASC should exercise caution in assessing the degree to which future projects may or may not provide DAC benefits. Member Descalzo asked the District to amend the guidelines so that they are more specific, noting that some projects get approved while others do not when it seems like they are attributing the same kinds of benefits to members of DACs.

Regional Coordinator Antos shared that a set of interim guidelines published in 2022 describes the nature of the policies on DAC benefits and helps answer questions about projects that fall outside the boundaries of a DAC, but that provide direct benefits to the DAC. The set of interim guidelines includes suggested questions for WASC members to ask project developers and offers ways to consider benefits to DACs.

Member Hamamoto noted that they appreciate the flexibility of District guidelines, as it allows the WASC to make its own decisions about how projects impact the watershed area. Member Hamamoto asked to provide some clarity in the guidelines to help ensure that all projects are treated fairly without sacrificing flexible decision-making.

#### e) Alternate Water Supply Scoring Pilot

District shared that the District is evaluating the different components of the SCWP to identify opportunities to modify and adapt processes and frameworks. The objective is to ensure that the processes are better aligned with the overall SCWP goals. This resulted in a pilot Water Supply Scoring Rubric applicable only to Round 5 project submissions. Round 5 applicants in all nine watershed areas will be given the option to use the proposed pilot criteria to score in the Water Supply Benefit category or use the original scoring rubric. District shared that the Metrics and Monitoring Study (MMS) evaluated over 130 projects to calibrate the Water Supply Scoring Rubric to those projects. The pilot responds to stakeholder concerns around changes in the economy and the variable magnitude of water supply opportunities across watersheds. This pilot will allow projects with smaller drainage areas to gain more points in the Water Supply Benefit category. The pilot rubric allows projects to score anywhere from 1 to 13 points in cost-effectiveness and 1 to 12 points in Water Supply Benefits. The pilot materials are posted on the SCWP website and were revealed during the required information sessions.

District staff noted that project applicants will have access to both rubrics and that the Scoring Committee will evaluate projects based on the selected rubric. If project applicants do not select the pilot rubric, the Scoring Committee will rely on the module-generated scores. District added that the District will manually



input the values from the pilot rubric into the application as the module has not yet been programmed to automatically use the pilot rubric.

#### 7. Public Comment Period

There were no public comments.

#### 8. Voting Items

#### a) FY 23-24 Chair/Vice-Chair or Co-Chair Selection

Chair Santilena and Vice-Chair Kampalath agreed to serve as Co-Chairs per the Committee's suggestion.

Member Castle made a motion to approve the selection of Chair Santilena and Vice-Chair Kampalath as Co-Chairs for the new term. Member Demitri seconded the motion. The Committee voted to approve the motion, with 16 votes in favor, 0 votes in abstention, and 0 votes opposed (approved, see vote tracking sheet attached).

#### 9. Items for Next Agenda

Chair Santilena invited Committee Members to voice any items that they would like to add to the agenda.

Member Descalzo asked the District for an update regarding School Districts working towards joint partnerships for municipal projects.

Chair Santilena noted that project proponents have voiced a desire to partner with schools and that Watershed Coordinators are working to support school applicants. Vice-Chair Kampalath suggested discussing how these conversations should be approached.

Items on the agenda include:

a) FY 23-24 Strategic Outreach and Engagement Plan (SOEP) Presentation

The next meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, August 1, 2023, 1:00pm – 3:00pm and will be hybrid, held in person at the City Hall of Culver City and online via WebEx. See SCWP website for meeting details.

#### 10. Adjournment

Chair Santilena thanked WASC members and the public for their attendance and participation and adjourned the meeting.

				Quorum Presen	t		Voting	Items
Member Type	Organization	Primary Member	Attendance: In-person ("x" for present)	Alternate Member	Attendance: In-person ("x" for present)	Attendance: Virtual (Brown Act Tel Rqts, "Just Cause" - audio & video, room disclosure) ("x" for present)	2/28/2023 Meeting Minutes	Susie & Rita as co-chairs
Agency	Los Angeles County Flood Control District	Marcela Benavides	х	Mark Beltran			A	Y
Agency	West Basin Metropolitan Water District	E.J. Caldwell		Matthew Veeh	х		A	Y
Agency	Los Angeles City Water & Power	Delon Kwan		Art Castro	х		Y	Y
Agency	Los Angeles City Sanitation and Environment	Sheila Brice		Hubertus Cox	х		Y	Y
Agency	Los Angeles City Recreation & Parks	Cathie Santo Domingo		Darryl Ford	х		Y	Y
Community Stakeholder	Los Angeles County Chief Sustainability Office	Rita Kampalath	Х	Kristen Pawling			Y	Y
Community Stakeholder	PSOMAS / Business Sector	Alysen Weiland	х	Cecilia Mokler			Y	Y
Community Stakeholder	The Solutions Project / SCOPE	Gloria Walton		Gloria Medina		х	Y	Y
Community Stakeholder	Los Angeles Waterkeeper	Bruce Reznik		Maggie Gardner	х		A	Y
Community Stakeholder	T.R.U.S.T. South LA	Edgar Campos		Lorna Avila	х		Y	Y
Municipal Members	Beverly Hills / West Hollywood	Josette Descalzo	х	Matthew Magener			Y	Y
Municipal Members	Culver City	Sean Singletary		Yanni Demitri	х		Y	Y
Municipal Members	Los Angeles	Roberto Perez	х				Y	Y
Municipal Members	Los Angeles	Rafael Prieto					Not Present	Not Present
Municipal Members	Los Angeles	Susie Santilena	х	Ryan Jackson			Y	Y
Municipal Members	Los Angeles County	Bruce Hamamoto	х	Geremew Amenu			Y	Y
Municipal Members	Santa Monica	Curtis Castle	х	Selim Eren			Y	Y
Watershed Coordinator	Heal the Bay	Mikaela Randolph					N/A	N/A
Watershed Coordinator	SGA Marketing	Michelle Struthers					N/A	N/A
	Total Non-Vacant Seats	17			Yay (Y)		13	16
	Total Voting Members Present	15			Nay (N)		0	0
	Agency	5			Abstain (A)		3	0
	Community Stakeholder	4			Total		16	16
	Municipal Members	6					Approved	Approved

#### MEETING ATTENDEES

Andrea Prado Iriarte	Marisol Serrano
Anh Ta	Mark Nguyen
Ava Farriday	Mike Antos
Ben O'Neal	Paige Bistromowitz
Billy Berler	Sean Singletary
Brenda Ponton	Shirley Fontanie
Carmen Andrade	Thomas Lee
Charlotte Bloemsma	Wendy Dinh
Charlotte Derby	Gabriela Gonzalez
Christine McLeod	
Christopher Vong	
Conor Mossavi	
Erin Bergren	
Giselle	
Gloria Meinda	
Hannah Fausnaught	
Ingrid Camacho	
Jason Casanova	
Jenny Chau	
Johanna Chang	
Josafat Flores	
Katie Harrel	
Lorena Matos	
M. Scaduto	

## Central Santa Monica Bay Watershed Area Steering Committee Meeting COMMITTEE MEMBER AND ALTERNATE SIGN-IN: JUNE 6, 2023



Member Type	Member Name	Municipality/ Organization	Role	Signature
Agency	Marcela Benavides	Los Angeles County Flood Control District	Р	Manula Berad
Agency	Mark Beltran	Los Angeles County Flood Control District	A	marazzi v;
Agency	E.J. Caldwell	West Basin Metropolitan Water District	Р	
Agency	Matthew Veeh	West Basin Metropolitan Water District	A	22021
Agency	Delon Kwan	Los Angeles City Water & Power	Р	V
Agency	Art Castro	Los Angeles City Water & Power	A	ACA
Agency	Sheila Brice	Los Angeles City Sanitation and Environment	Р	HAT.C.
Agency	Hubertus Cox	Los Angeles City Sanitation and Environment	A	
Agency	Cathie Santo Domingo	Los Angeles City Recreation & Parks	Р	
Agency	Darryl Ford	Los Angeles City Recreation & Parks	A	12/4
Community Stakeholder	Rita Kampalath	Los Angeles County Chief Sustainability Office	Р	
Community Stakeholder	Kristen Pawling	Los Angeles County Chief Sustainability Office	A	
Community Stakeholder	Alysen Weiland	PSOMAS / Business Sector	Р	angila
Community Stakeholder	Cecilia Mokler	PSOMAS / Business Sector	A	
Community Stakeholder	Gloria Walton	The Solutions Project / SCOPE	Р	
Community Stakeholder	Gloria Medina	The Solutions Project / SCOPE	A	
Community Stakeholder	Bruce Reznik	Los Angeles Waterkeeper	Р	
Community Stakeholder	Maggie Gardner	Los Angeles Waterkeeper	A	Maszie Gard
Community Stakeholder	Edgar Campos	T.R.U.S.T. South LA	Р	. A
Community Stakeholder	Lorna Avila	T.R.U.S.T. South LA	А	H 1
Municipal Members	Josette Descalzo	Beverly Hills / West Hollywood	Р	March
Municipal Members	Matthew Magener	Beverly Hills / West Hollywood	A	YAR
Municipal Members	Sean Singletary	Culver City	Р	



Member Type	Member Name	Municipality/ Organization	Role	Signature
Municipal Members	Yanni Demitri	Culver City	A	10
Municipal Members	Roberto Perez	Los Angeles	Р	
Municipal Members	Rafael Prieto	Los Angeles	Р	~
Municipal Members	Susie Santilena	Los Angeles	Р	gambler
Municipal Members	Ryan Jackson	Los Angeles	А	
Municipal Members	Bruce Hamamoto	Los Angeles County	Р	p-/
Municipal Members	Geremew Amenu	Los Angeles County	A	
Municipal Members	Curtis Castle	Santa Monica	Р	Male
Municipal Members	Selim Eren	Santa Monica	А	
Watershed Coordinator	Mikaela Randolph	He ai the Bay		
Watershed Coordinator	Michelle Struthers	SGA Marketing		

# Central Santa Monica Bay Watershed Area Steering Committee Meeting PUBLIC SIGN-IN : June 6, 2023



First Name	Last Name	Municipality/Organization	Email Address
Enin	Bereznen	GHD	evin bergren Eghd. cos

### Central Santa Monica Bay Regional Program Quarterly Report Summary

Watershed Area	(Multiple Items)	Full reports are available at:         https://portal.safecleanwaterla.org/scw-reporting/n					ng/map				
Report Year	FY22-23										
						Exhibit	Activity	Activity			Expenditures to
Row Labels	Project Developer	Report Period	Report Status	Active Phase List	Scope Modification	Modification	Concern	Delay	Funding Projected	to Date	Date
FY20-21											
Infrastructure Project											
Beverly Hills Burton Way Green											
Street and Water Efficient	City of Beverly Hills										
Landscape Project	(Derek Nguyen)	Q1 (July - September)	Complete	Construction	No	No	N/A	No	\$5,000,000.00	\$5,000,000.00	\$1,727,697.45
		Q2 (October -							4	+	to -0.000 00
		December)	Complete	Construction	No	No	Yes	No	\$5,000,000.00	\$5,000,000.00	\$2,534,822.33
Culver City Mesmer Low Flow Diversion	City of Culver City	Q1 (July - September)	Complete	Other, Construction, Design	Νο	A-10 Work Schedule and Completion Date Modifications	N/A	No	\$950,000.00	\$950,000.00	\$37,715.50
Diversion	City of Culver City	Q2 (October -	Complete	Other, Construction,	NU	Woullications	N/A	No	\$950,000.00	\$950,000.00	\$57,715.50
		December)	Complete	Design	No	No	N/A	No	\$950,000.00	\$950,000.00	\$349,173.51
Ladera Park Stormwater	Los Angeles County	December	complete	Design	140	NO	N/A	NU	\$950,000.00	\$350,000.00	\$349,173.J1
Improvements Project	Public Works	Q1 (July - September)	Complete	Construction	No	No	Yes	No	\$2,000,000.00	\$2,000,000.00	\$2,000,000.00
		Q2 (October -									
		December)	Complete	Construction	No	No	Yes	No	\$2,000,000.00	\$2,000.00	\$2,000,000.00
MacArthur Lake Rehabilitation Project	City of Los Angeles, Bureau of Sanitation	Q1 (July - September)	Complete	Design, Environmental Documentation	No	No	N/A	No	\$20,043,718.00	\$13,397,900.00	\$2,102,948.11
		Q2 (October - December)	Complete	Design, Environmental Documentation	No	No	N/A	No	\$20,043,718.00	\$13,397,900.00	\$2,139,781.39
Monteith Park and View Park Green Alley Stormwater Improvements Project	Los Angeles County Public Works	Q1 (July - September)	Complete	Design, Environmental Documentation, Other	No	No	Yes	No	\$4,550,000.00	\$4,550,000.00	\$1,386,574.55
		Q2 (October - December)	Complete	Design, Environmental Documentation, Other, Bid/Award	No	No	N/A	No	\$4,550,000.00	\$4,550,000.00	\$1,386,574.55
Sustainable Water Infrastructure											
Project	City of Santa Monica	Q1 (July - September)	Complete	Construction	No	No	N/A	No	\$7,500,000.00	\$7,500,000.00	\$7,500,000.00
		Q2 (October -									
		December)	Complete	Construction	No	No	N/A	No	\$7,500,000.00	\$7,500,000.00	\$7,500,000.00
Washington Boulevard Stormwater and Urban Runoff				Other, Construction, Design, Post Construction							
Diversion	City of Culver City	Q1 (July - September)	Complete	Monitoring	No	No	Yes	No	\$3,600,000.00	\$2,400,000.00	\$271,857.03

### Central Santa Monica Bay Regional Program Quarterly Report Summary

Washington Boulevard Stormwater and Urban Runoff Diversion FY21-22	City of Culver City	Q2 (October - December)	Complete	Other, Construction, Post Construction Monitoring, Design	No	A-10 Work Schedule and Completion Date Modifications	N/A	No	\$3,600,000.00	\$2,400,000.00	\$271,857.03
Infrastructure Project											
Dellara Gradi TADI Desirat	City of Los Angeles, LA Sanitation and	O1 (lube Contoucher)		Did (Assert		A-1 Budget Plan Modifications, A- 10 Work Schedule and Completion Date Modifications, A- 3 Total Activity Cost	Vec		615 000 000 00	¢c 000 000 00	¢0.00
Ballona Creek TMDL Project	Environment	Q1 (July - September)	Complete	Bid/Award	No	Modifications	Yes	No	\$15,000,000.00	\$6,000,000.00	\$0.00
		Q2 (October -		Bid/Award,							
		December)	Complete	Construction	No	No	N/A	No	\$15,000,000.00	\$6,000,000.00	\$0.00

Approved Keith Lilley

May 22, 2023

TO: Scoring Committee Safe, Clean Water Program

#### FROM: Los Angeles County Flood Control District

# IMPLEMENTATION OF THE ALTERNATE WATER SUPPLY SCORING PILOT IN FISCAL YEAR 2024-25 CALL FOR PROJECTS

As part of the adaptive management of the Safe, Clean Water (SCW) Program, the Metrics and Monitoring Study produced an early deliverable to analyze 183 Infrastructure Program project applications (including projects that were accepted and funded, considered but not funded, referred to the Technical Resources Program, or currently under consideration) to inform potential modifications to the Safe, Clean Water Program Water Supply Benefits Scoring Criteria.

Several alternative approaches to scoring Water Supply Benefits were evaluated, including calibrating scoring to historical projects, adding gradation to scoring rubrics, construction cost indexing, additional accounting for leveraged funding, and a strawman rubric proposal recommended by the North Santa Monica Bay Watershed Area Steering Committee to accommodate local characteristics.

It was determined that calibrating Water Supply Benefits scoring to historical projects would provide a viable alternative to test in the next year of implementation. Not only does it create a refined framework for projects to potentially increase their water supply score, but it also addresses stakeholder concerns about inflation and potential diminishing opportunities resulting from water captured by nearby projects.

As a result, the District is providing a pilot rubric/worksheet to aid project developers in estimating Water Supply Benefit scores calibrated to historical projects as an alternative Scoring Criteria for Water Supply Benefits in all 9 Watershed Areas in Fiscal Year 2024-25 Call for Projects only. It is intentionally separated from the Safe, Clean Water Program project module application since this effort is only a pilot, and the module will still show estimated Water Supply Benefit scores based on the original criteria. Applicants will be able to select whether their proposal should be scored per the original or pilot scoring options for Water Supply Benefits, ensuring the Scoring Committee will only need to utilize one methodology or the other.

Scoring Committee May 22, 2023 Page 2

For the scoring of Fiscal Year 2024-25 Infrastructure Program Projects, the Scoring Committee shall review and score the submitted projects per each applicant's selected Scoring Criteria for Water Supply Benefits, as was previewed at the April 20th Regional Oversight Committee meeting. The District will provide support throughout the process, and will be providing further background and details in the upcoming Call For Projects Information Sessions scheduled for May 24th and May 25th.

It is important to note that Water Supply Benefits Scoring Criteria will continue to be evaluated within the context of the Metrics and Monitoring Study and the Regional Oversight Committee's upcoming Biennial Progress Report process. If the pilot Scoring Criteria were to be applied to future years, it would require annual updates to the historical calibration going forward. It is also possible that a different direction may be pursued altogether.

DC:le p:\swppub\secretarial\2023\memos\scw sc memo-20230517.docx

Attach.



# Guidance for Alternate Water Supply Scoring Pilot (Optional) for FY2024-25 Call for Projects

#### Water Supply Benefits Alternative Scoring Analysis

An early outcome of the Metrics and Monitoring Study (MMS) is a recommendation to provide future Safe, Clean Water Program (SCW Program) Infrastructure Program (IP) applicants the opportunity for Projects to be scored using new alternative (optional) scoring criteria for the Water Supply Benefits Sections B1 and B2 of the scoring rubric. The alternative scoring criteria was established by evaluating historical trends and other data based on the analysis of 183 IP Projects that were submitted in the first four years of the SCW Program. Analysis included review of Project applications that were accepted and subsequently funded, considered but not funded, referred to the Technical Resources Program (TRP) for further refinement, or are currently under consideration.

#### Alternate Water Supply Scoring Pilot

Considering the recommendations in the MMS, the District will implement the Alternate Water Supply Scoring Pilot (Pilot) in all 9 SCWP Watershed Areas. The Pilot will incorporate the new alternative scoring criteria, to potentially determine a project's Water Supply Benefits score, and will be utilized in the Fiscal Year 2024-2025 (FY 24-25) Call for Projects cycle only.

The new alternative scoring criteria will provide additional point scale flexibility so that Project scores can be tallied at one-point increments (as compared to the current stepwise criteria) and would enable projects managing smaller drainage areas to earn points. This approach better aligns the cost-effectiveness and magnitude scoring with the true range of Program-worthy multi-benefit project efficiencies and performance, and inherently accounts for District-wide opportunities, constraints, and economic changes over time.

The Pilot includes the development of the enclosed Alternate Water Supply Scoring Form (Form). Applicants seeking IP funding in FY 24-25 will have the option of using the imbedded Form to determine their Project's Water Supply Benefits score, using the new alternative scoring criteria, in lieu of the original scoring criteria. Note: Use of the Form is optional; the Scoring Committee will evaluate the Water Supply Benefits scores of either the Form (if selected and filled in by the applicant) or the original SCW Program Project Module score that uses the original criteria. Below is the new alternative Water Supply Benefits scoring criteria for reference:



## B1. Water Supply Cost Effectiveness

Section	Score Range	Scoring Standards
Section B. Significant Water Supply Benefits	Score Range 25 points max 13 points max	Scoring StandardsThe Project provides water re-use and/or water supply enhancement benefitsB1. Water Supply Cost Effectiveness. The Total Life-Cycle Cost <sup>2</sup> per unit of acre foot of Stormwater and/or Urban Runoff volume captured for water supply is:• $\geq$ \$104,000/ac-ft = 1 point• $\geq$ \$5,360 and <7,020/ac-ft = 8 points• $\geq$ \$104,000/ac-ft = 1 point• $\geq$ \$5,360 and <7,020/ac-ft = 8 points• $\geq$ \$104,000/ac-ft = 1 point• $\geq$ \$5,360 and <7,020/ac-ft = 9 points• $\geq$ \$29,400 and <104,000/ac-ft = 2 points• $\geq$ \$2,930 and <5,360/ac-ft = 9 points• $\geq$ \$29,400 and <39,700/ac-ft = 3 points• $\geq$ \$2,290 and <2,930/ac-ft = 10 points• $\geq$ \$19,400 and <29,400/ac-ft = 4 points• $\geq$ \$1,786 and <2,290/ac-ft = 11 points• $\geq$ \$1,860 and <19,400/ac-ft = 5 points• $\geq$ \$976 and <1,786/ac-ft = 12 points• $\geq$ \$8,880 and <13,600/ac-ft = 6 points• $<$ \$976/ac-ft = 13 points
	const. design	<ul> <li>≥\$7,020 and &lt; 8,880/ac-ft = 7 points</li> <li><sup>2</sup>. Total Life-Cycle Cost: The annualized value of all Capital, planning, design, land acquisition, construction, and total life O&amp;M costs for the Project for the entire life span of the Project (e.g. 50-year design life span should account for 50-years of O&amp;M). The annualized cost is used over the present value to provide a preference to Projects with longer life spans.</li> </ul>

### B2. Water Supply Benefit Magnitude

Section	Score Range	Scoring Standards	
B. Significant Water Supply Benefits, continued	12 points max	<ul> <li>B2. Water Supply Benefit Magnitude. The yearly at Project is:</li> <li>&gt;0 and ≤2 ac-ft/year = 1 point</li> <li>&gt;2 and ≤6 ac-ft/year = 2 points</li> <li>&gt;6 and ≤11 ac-ft/year = 3 points</li> <li>&gt;11 and ≤34 ac-ft/year = 4 points</li> <li>&gt;34 and ≤61 ac-ft/year = 5 points</li> <li>&gt;61 and ≤100 ac-ft/year = 6 points</li> </ul>	dditional water supply volume resulting from the >100 and ≤137 ac-ft/year = 7 points >137 and ≤189 ac-ft/year = 8 points >189 and ≤263 ac-ft/year = 9 points >263 and ≤420 ac-ft/year = 10 points >420 and ≤692 ac-ft/year = 11 points >692 ac-ft/year = 12 points

# Alternate Water Supply Scoring Pilot

Project Name Call for Projects Year SCW Program Watershed Area	Enter Project Name FY24-25 Enter Watershed Area
Annualized Life-Cycle Cost (\$) Annual Average Capture (AF) B1. Water Supply Cost Effectiveness (\$/AF)	(Cost & Schedule > Cost & Schedule) (Water Supply > Benefit Magnitude)
B1. Water Supply Score <mark>(Pilot)</mark> B2. Water Supply Benefit Magnitude <mark>(Pilot)</mark>	

Project Scoring Criteria Section B1 incorporates life-cycle costs. Water Supply efficiency is driven by the ratio of the project's life-cycle cost to the magnitude of annual capture of stormwater for augmenting water supply.

Project Scoring Criteria Section B2 is based upon estimates of annual average Water Supply Benefits. Water Supply Benefit Magnitude is the yearly additional water supply volume.