Scoring Committee
Meeting Minutes

Thursday, November 2, 2023
9:00am – 12:00pm
WebEx Hybrid Meeting
LA County Public Works Headquarters
1st Floor (Courtyard) Conference Room B 900 S. Fremont Ave, Alhambra, CA 91803

Committee Members Present:
Bruce Reznik, LA Waterkeeper (Nature-Based Solutions/Water Quality), Chair
TJ Moon, LA County Public Works (Water Quality), Vice-Chair
David Diaz, Active SGV (Community Investments)
Esther Rojas, Water Replenishment District (Water Supply/Community Investments/Nature-Based Solutions)

Committee Members Absent:
Matt Stone, Santa Clarita Valley Water Agency (Water Supply)
Dave Sorem, Mike Bubalo Construction Co., Inc. (Water Quality)

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

---

1) Welcome and Introductions

Los Angeles County Flood Control District (District) staff conducted a brief tutorial on WebEx.

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

2) Approval of Meeting Minutes from October 23, 2023 (if available)

District staff presented the meeting minutes from the October 23, 2023 meeting. Member David Diaz motioned to approve the meeting minutes. The motion was seconded by Member Esther Rojas. The Committee voted to approve the October 23, 2023 meeting minutes, with 4 votes in favor (approved, see vote tracking sheet).

3) Committee Member and District Updates

District staff provided an update, noting:

- The Regional Oversight Committee (ROC) shall biennially prepare a SCW Program Progress Report for the Board every two years, which includes a summary of the progress of the Regional Program, Municipal Program, and the District Program. The ROC will continue to meet to discuss the draft Biennial Report and initiate public comment period. The next meeting is scheduled for Thursday, December 7 at 1:00 pm, which is on the same day as the Scoring Committee meeting. The Committee is welcome to attend, either virtually or in-person, at the Public Works Headquarters. Meeting details can be found on the SCW Program website.

4) Public Comment Period for Non-Agenda Items

District staff compiled all public comment cards received by 5:00pm the day before the meeting, uploaded them to the SCW Program website, and displayed them on-screen.

One comment card was received before the meeting.

Debby Reece (WSP USA) acknowledged that the passing score received for the Washington Park Stormwater Capture Project was acceptable. However, the 0.21 inch storm depth treated by the project in the application is incorrect. The correct storm depth should be 0.42 inches of captured stormwater, and the

project should have been scored as a wet weather project. In addition, the project infiltrates stormwater via two infiltration facilities. Changes to the scoring are not necessary, however WSP would like to note for the record that this is a project with significant impact to the basin.

There were no other public comments.

5) Discussion Items:

a) Ex Parte Communication Disclosure

Chair Reznik disclosed involvement in recent meetings about the Biennial Report.

Vice-Chair TJ Moon disclosed an upcoming meeting with Jesse Williams (Jacobs) on the South El Monte High School Stormwater Improvement Project. Vice-Chair Moon additionally disclosed communications with Dawn Petschauer (City of Pasadena) regarding the Washington Park Stormwater Capture Project.

Vice-Chair Moon disclosed that Scoring Committee Members have been invited to the Southern California Water Coalition Annual Dinner scheduled for the evening of November 2.

Member Rojas disclosed communication with Larry Tortuya (CWE) regarding Water Supply Benefits comments on the Dominguez Channel Parkway BMPs Prioritization Project.

b) Scoring of FY24-25 Infrastructure Program Projects

The tables below for each project contain information recorded on the scoring rubric sheet during the Scoring Committee meeting. The scoring rubric sheet captures a project's evaluation by the Scoring Committee.

Project: Arroyo Park Infiltration Gallery			**WASC(s):** Upper Los Angeles River (ULAR)
Water Supply Scoring Pilot: Yes			
Category	**Applicant Score**	**Committee Score**	**Notes**
Water Quality Part 1	11	11	See Below
Water Quality Part 2	30	30	See Below
Water Supply Part 1	6	6	See Below
Water Supply Part 2	5	5	
Community Investment	5	5	See Below
Nature-Based Solutions	10	10	
Leveraging Funds Part 1	3	3	See Below
Leveraging Funds Part 2 (Community Support)	4	2	See Below
Conclusion: The project received 72 points and will move to the WASC for consideration.			
Discussion: • Water Quality: Vice-Chair Moon noted that only preliminary plans were submitted for this project and recommended that the submission of developed plans becomes a standard for			

future applications, especially for construction projects. Vice-Chair Moon shared the observation that the geotechnical analysis provided noted an infiltration rate of 7.8 in/hr, but the project applicant opted for a more conservative value of 5.8 in/hr, lowering the 24-hour capacity claimed to 5.6 acre-feet (AF), which is less than the 85th percentile storm volume of 6.1 AF. Vice-Chair Moon noted that the geotechnical analysis suggests the project applicant could have claimed flood benefits. The project applicant acknowledged in the application that a more conservative approach was preferable, so Vice-Chair Moon confirmed the points granted for Water Quality. Regarding preliminary plans, District staff added that some plans were included in the application. Vice-Chair Moon noted that the attachments provided were calculations and not elevation and profile plan documents. Chair Reznik highlighted the importance of submitting all appropriate documentation with the application to improve the probability of receiving the requested funds.

- Water Supply: Member Rojas noted that, contrary to other projects that provided letters from the Water Master, this project's letter did not clearly convey whether a new water supply would be created. Mike Antos (Stantec, Regional Coordination) observed that the letter refers to the San Gabriel River, instead of the Los Angeles River, and noted that the letter might be inappropriate for this project. Jon Abelson (Stantec) shared that the letter provided by the Main San Gabriel Basin Water Master appears to be a generic letter that was not adapted to the project in question. Member Rojas approved the points claimed for Water Supply and encouraged the project applicant to get the correct letter from the Water Master if possible.
- Community Investment: Member Diaz noted that finding appropriate documentation on community investment efforts in the application was difficult and encouraged project applicants to organize the documentation appropriately to better facilitate the scoring process.
- Leveraging Funds Part 2: Chair Reznik noted that additional letters of support would have been helpful, particularly one from the Arroyo Seco Foundation.

Project: Bowtie Demonstration Project			**WASC(s):** Upper Los Angeles River (ULAR)
Water Supply Scoring Pilot: No			
Category	**Applicant Score**	**Committee Score**	**Notes**
Water Quality Part 1	20	20	See Below
Water Quality Part 2	20	20	See Below
Water Supply Part 1	0	0	
Water Supply Part 2	0	0	
Community Investment	5	5	See Below
Nature-Based Solutions	10	10	
Leveraging Funds Part 1	3	3	See Below
Leveraging Funds Part 2 (Community Support)	4	4	See Below
Conclusion: The project received 62 points and will move to the WASC for consideration.			

Discussion:

- The Committee suggested that the project may be requesting Operations and Maintenance (O&M) funds prematurely, given that construction has not yet begun.
    - Kelsey Jessup (The Nature Conservancy) shared that the project is anticipated to be fully funded for the construction phase. Jessup noted that a grant from the Wildlife

Conservation Board will likely be confirmed by November 15. As a result, the project is seeking an opportunity to leverage secured construction funding by applying for SCW Program O&M funds. Construction is scheduled to begin early next calendar year. If included in the Stormwater Investment Plan (SIP), O&M funding would be received toward the end of construction. Jessup stated that by requesting O&M funds now, the project hopes to create a new model that avoids any gap between the finalization of construction and the start of operations.

- Water Quality: Vice-Chair Moon noted that this is a dry-weather project that will divert 100% of dry weather flows and confirmed the points awarded for Water Quality.
- Community Investment: Member Diaz commended the significant community engagement conducted for this project.

Project: Green Street Demonstration Project on Main Street			**WASC(s):** Upper Los Angeles River (ULAR)
Water Supply Scoring Pilot: Yes			
Category	**Applicant Score**	**Committee Score**	**Notes**
Water Quality Part 1	20	Unable to Score	See Below
Water Quality Part 2	30	Unable to Score	See Below
Water Supply Part 1	6	Unable to Score	See Below
Water Supply Part 2	4	Unable to Score	See Below
Community Investment	5	5	
Nature-Based Solutions	10	10	
Leveraging Funds Part 1	6	6	
Leveraging Funds Part 2 (Community Support)	4	3	See Below

Conclusion: The project could not be scored and is awaiting additional information from the applicant.

Discussion:

- Water Quality: Vice-Chair Moon noted that the percolation rate included in the application of 0.2 in/hour is a low estimate and may not allow for infiltration. In addition, the infiltration assumed per drywell is difficult to confirm without geotechnical reports. The maximum capacity assumed for each drywell is larger than the 85th percentile storm, which may artificially inflate the water quality points.
    - Chris Carandang (Paradigm Environmental) noted that the project initially relied on bioretention. However, geotechnical analysis performed for the Feasibility Study confirmed low infiltration rates, leading the proponent to pivot to drywells. In addition, the known groundwater depth is high (200 ft), and the project plans to conduct additional geotechnical analysis during the design to find ideal locations to achieve infiltration. Vice-Chair Moon noted that the project is requesting funding for construction, making it difficult to confirm the score without additional geotechnical data. The project applicant was asked to provide additional data from borings or nearby drywells to justify that the drywell design is effective.
- Water Supply: Member Rojas noted that the proponent provided minimal Water Supply Benefit magnitude justification and suggested that it would be helpful to receive a letter from the Water Master agreeing with the results.

- Leveraging Funds Part 2: Chair Reznik noted that, while the project conducted community outreach, many of the strategies focused on sharing project information rather than incorporating community feedback into the project.

Project: La Crescenta Avenue Green Improvement Project			**WASC(s):** Upper Los Angeles River (ULAR)
Water Supply Scoring Pilot: No			
Category	**Applicant Score**	**Committee Score**	**Notes**
Water Quality Part 1	14	14	See Below
Water Quality Part 2	25	25	
Water Supply Part 1	0	0	
Water Supply Part 2	2	0	See Below
Community Investment	5	5	
Nature-Based Solutions	14	14	
Leveraging Funds Part 1	6	6	
Leveraging Funds Part 2 (Community Support)	4	2	See Below
Conclusion: The project received 66 points and will move to the WASC for consideration.			

Discussion:

- Water Quality: Vice-Chair Moon noted that an application for this project was submitted last year, and that this application is very similar to the previous submittal. Preliminary plans were included in the application, as well as a geotechnical analysis report. Vice-Chair Moon noted that the analysis provided shows high infiltration rates, greater than 100 in/hr. Vice-Chair Moon thanked the project applicants for self-adjusting the project capacity to match the 85th percentile storm volume. Vice-Chair Moon confirmed the points for Water Quality.
- Water Supply: Member Rojas noted that although a letter from the Water Master was included, the letter was very generic and explicitly states that more information is required to confirm Water Supply Benefits.
- Leveraging Funds Part 2: Member Diaz noted that the application was missing information about how outreach efforts have informed the design.

Project: LA River Green Infrastructure Project			**WASC(s):** Upper Los Angeles River (ULAR)
Water Supply Scoring Pilot: No			
Category	**Applicant Score**	**Committee Score**	**Notes**
Water Quality Part 1	20	20	
Water Quality Part 2	20	20	
Water Supply Part 1	0	0	
Water Supply Part 2	9	9	See Below
Community Investment	5	5	

Nature-Based Solutions	12	12	
Leveraging Funds Part 1	0	0	
Leveraging Funds Part 2 (Community Support)	4	4	See Below
Conclusion: The project received 70 points and will move to the WASC for consideration.			
Discussion: • Water Supply: Member Rojas approved the points for Water Supply Benefits noting that the letter from Water Master included in the application was very specific and detailed. • Leveraging Funds Part 2: Chair Reznik noted that the application demonstrated very strong community outreach and engagement.			

Project: Osborne Street Stormwater Capture Green Street Project			**WASC(s):** Upper Los Angeles River (ULAR)
Water Supply Scoring Pilot: Yes			
Category	**Applicant Score**	**Committee Score**	**Notes**
Water Quality Part 1	20	Unable to Score	See Below
Water Quality Part 2	30	Unable to Score	See Below
Water Supply Part 1	6	Unable to Score	See Below
Water Supply Part 2	6	Unable to Score	See Below
Community Investment	10	10	
Nature-Based Solutions	11	11	
Leveraging Funds Part 1	3	3	
Leveraging Funds Part 2 (Community Support)	4	4	See Below
Conclusion: The project could not be scored and is awaiting additional information from the applicant.			

Discussion:

- Water Quality: Vice-Chair Moon noted that the geotechnical information provided was based on cone penetration testing, in which soil resistance is measured to develop a soil profile. Vice-Chair Moon commented that cone penetration testing is not intended for construction analysis and design efforts. Vice-Chair Moon shared that the application assumes a high infiltration rate of 0.75 cfs per well, which leads to a project capacity that is six times greater than the 85th percentile storm volume. Vice-Chair Moon shared that, since this is an application for construction funds, either a smaller assumption or a more thorough analysis is expected.
    - Curtis Fang (Geosyntec) appreciated the comments and noted that there are multiple ways to justify the assumption of a 0.75 cfs infiltration rate. Fang shared that extensive research was done for existing drywells in the area and a table noting the infiltration rates of nearby wells is included in the application. The infiltration rates of nearby wells range from 0.41 to 1.24 cfs. Fang noted that this data was used to correlate and calculate the infiltration rate for the project, based on location. Vice-Chair Moon shared that it would be better to adjust the project infiltration rate to 0.59 cfs based on the project's vicinity to project ID #10 on the table referenced. Fang accepted the suggestion and will revise accordingly. Fang commented that the way the modeling system is set up maximizes the capacity to a point that is greater than the 85th

percentile storm volume. Vice-Chair Moon acknowledged that some models skew the results and suggested that District staff cap the project capacity claimed in the applications based on the 85th percentile storm value.
    - Vice-Chair Moon summarized action items, including adjusting the map to clearly show that the project is next to drywell ID #10, adjust the infiltration rate based on drywell ID #10, and adjust the project capacity so that it is not six times the 85th percentile storm volume.
- Water Supply: Member Rojas noted that the recharge claimed will be influenced by the infiltration rate and recommended evaluating this item during the rescoring process.
- District staff flagged a unit error in model input between cfs and in/hr, but noted that in this instance, using the correct units does not change the model output significantly because of the project's area. Vice-Chair Moon suggested continuing this conversation further after the meeting.
- Leveraging Funds Part 2: Member Diaz noted robust community outreach and engagement efforts, highlighting a support letter from the Fernandeño Tataviam Band of Mission Indians.

Project: Sun Valley Green Neighborhood Infrastructure Project			**WASC(s):** Upper Los Angeles River (ULAR)
Water Supply Scoring Pilot: Yes			
Category	**Applicant Score**	**Committee Score**	**Notes**
Water Quality Part 1	14	14	See Below
Water Quality Part 2	30	30	
Water Supply Part 1	9	9	
Water Supply Part 2	9	9	See Below
Community Investment	10	5	See Below
Nature-Based Solutions	10	10	
Leveraging Funds Part 1	0	0	
Leveraging Funds Part 2 (Community Support)	4	3	
Conclusion: The project received 80 points and will move to the WASC for consideration.			

Discussion:

- Water Quality: Vice-Chair Moon noted that the application provided information about nearby drywells to exhibit different infiltration rates in the area. Vice-Chair Moon was not able to locate the project relative to the existing drywells but noted that the infiltration rates of the wells shown look promising. Vice-Chair Moon clarified that the map and information of nearby drywells was provided as supplemental information to the geotechnical analysis. Vice-Chair Moon added that the project modeling efforts result in a project capacity that is two times greater than the 85th percentile storm volume, but the project applicant self-corrected it to 8.9 AF, a value closer to the 85th percentile. Vice-Chair Moon applauded the project applicant for self-correcting the project capacity and approved the score of 14 points.
- Water Supply: Member Rojas noted that an appropriate letter was provided by the Water Master.
- Community Investment: Chair Reznik noted that the project applicant included a letter that implies the possibility of working with the nearby school, but no specific efforts are part of the design yet. Green spaces for the project are outside school boundaries.

6) Public Comment Period for Agenda Items

There were no public comments in this section of the meeting.

7) Voting Items

a) **From Today:** Send scoreable projects receiving a passing score to Watershed Area Steering Committees (WASCs).
   i. Arroyo Park Infiltration Gallery
   ii. Bowtie Demonstration Project
   iii. La Crescenta Avenue Green Improvement Project
   iv. LA River Green Infrastructure Project
   v. Sun Valley Green Neighborhood Infrastructure Project

Member Diaz motioned to send the above projects to the WASC, seconded by Vice-Chair Moon. The motion was approved, with 4 votes in favor (approved, see vote tracking sheet).

b) **From Today:** Allow Project Applicants with unscorable projects one week to provide clarifying information to Scoring Committee
   i. Green Street Demonstration Project on Main Street
   ii. Osborne Street Stormwater Capture Green Street Project

Member Rojas motioned to send the above projects back to the project applicants for more clarifying information, seconded by Vice-Chair Moon. The motion was approved, with 4 votes in favor (approved, see vote tracking sheet).

Member Diaz asked whether the Committee is required to allow applicants with unscorable projects the chance to provide further information for a rescore. Chair Reznik replied that, in the past, the Committee has been lenient in allowing projects to return to be rescored, however, it is not a requirement. Chair Reznik suggested this could be discussed at a future meeting. Antos suggested that along with that conversation, it might be worth discussing how to better document the requirements that the Scoring Committee applies during the review process to improve project applicants' expectations.

The Committee discussed the timeline and dates for rescoring projects in December. There are currently five projects that will be rescored. The Committee and District staff will determine whether a second meeting in December is needed to rescore projects.

Vice-Chair Moon initiated a discussion on the Alternate Water Supply Scoring Pilot, noting that projects that were already receiving Water Supply points are now getting more points, and projects that were not getting any Water Supply points are not affected by this Alternate Water Supply Scoring Pilot. Vice-Chair Moon questioned whether the Scoring Pilot is achieving its intended role. Chair Reznik advised that this point is something that can be further evaluated during future meetings. Antos shared that the North Santa Monica Bay WASC was excited to hear that one of the submitted projects received a passing score due to the Scoring Pilot.

Member Diaz thanked District staff for embedding application hyperlinks in the meeting materials sent to Committee Members.

8) Items for Next Agenda

The next meeting is scheduled for November 27, 2023, 9:00am – 12:00pm. See the SCWP website for meeting details. Items on the Agenda include:

a) Scoring of FY24-25 Infrastructure Projects (Project Scoring Schedule)

9) Adjournment

Chair Reznik thanked Committee Members and District staff and adjourned the meeting.

SCORING COMMITTEE MEETING - November 2, 2023

	Quorum Present		Voting Items		
Member Type	Member	Voting?	10/23 Meeting Minutes	From today, 11/2 SC mtg: Send projects receiving a passing score to WASCs	From today, 11/2 SC mtg: Allow Project Applicants with unscorable projects 1 week to provide clarifying information
Water Supply	Matt Stone				
Water Supply / Community Investments / Nature-Based Solutions	Esther Rojas	x	y	y	y
Community Investments	David Diaz	x	y	y	y
Nature-Based Solutions / Water Quality	**Bruce Reznik**	x	y	y	y
Water Quality	Dave Sorem				
Water Quality	**TJ Moon**	x	y	y	y
Total Non-Vacant Seats	6	Yay (Y)	4	4	4
Total Voting Members Present	4	Nay (N)	0	0	0
		Abstain (A)	0	0	0
		Total	4	4	4
			Approved	Approved	Approved

Other Attendees	
Alyssa	Kevin Ho
Andrew Kim	Kristina Kreter
Annelisa Moe she/her	Latoya Waters
Ava Farriday	M. Scaduto
Carlos Moran- ULAR WC	Maggie Gardner
Chris Carandang	Marisela Velasquez
Christine McLeod	Mark
Christopher Vong	Mark Nguyen
Curtis F	Michael Scaduto
Curtis Fang	Mikaela Randolph
David Dolphin	Mossavi, Conor
Debby Reece	Nancy Shrodes she/her
Donna T	Paige Bistromowitz
Emily Ng	Pearl
Felicia Yin	Rafael Piamonte
Gina L	Sara
Gurjot Kohli	Sienna Saucedo
Gus Orozco	Sofia Cardenas
H. Ted Gerber	Sunshine Saucedo
Ida Meisami	Susie Santilena
Joe Venzon - LA County	Thom Epps Craftwater
John Bodenchak	Tony Garcia
Jon Abelson	Valeria Arteaga
Joyce Amaro	janet L
Kelsey Jessup	

Public Comment Form

Name:* Debby Reece Organization*: WSP USA

Email*: debby.reece@wsp.com Phone*: 619-321-4176

Meeting: Scoring Committee Date: 11/2/2023

☑ 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

The Washington Park Stormwater Capture Project was given a score of 62 at the last Scoring Committee Meeting on October 23, 2023, as it was scored based on the dry weather flow project scoring rubric. WSP would like to acknowledge the passing score as acceptable in the essence of time, however, WSP would like to note that the 0.21 inch storm depth (in Section 3.4 of the application) treated by the project is incorrect and contrary to what was responded and noted in the previous meeting minutes. The actual storm depth should be 0.42 inches of captured stormwater. Further, the project infiltrates 5.13 acre feet of stormwater via two infiltration facilities (underground infiltration and a surface ephemeral basin). This information is documented in the feasibility study that was uploaded as part of the project application. Please make note of this in these meeting minutes in order to document this item so it can be later referenced in the upcoming WASC meeting. Thank you.

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2024-2025

Watershed Area	Upper Los Angeles River
Project Name	Arroyo Park Infiltration Gallery
Project Lead	City of South Pasadena
Total Funding Requested	$7,160,127
Project Type	Wet
WS Scoring Pilot	YES

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	11	**20**	11	• Used conservative infiltration rate of 5.8 in/hr
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	**30**	30	• >90% pollutant reduction for both primary and secondary pollutants
Water Supply Part 1	6	**13**	6	• Water Master letter shall be updated
Water Supply Part 2	5	**12**	5	•
Community Investment	5	**10**	5	•
Nature-Based Solutions	10	**15**	10	•
Leveraging Funds Part 1	3	**6**	3	•
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	**4**	2	• 3 stakeholder meetings. Limited community feedback.
TOTALS	74	**110**	72	• Meets minimum points threshold

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2024-2025

Watershed Area	Upper Los Angeles River
Project Name	Bowtie Demonstration Project
Project Lead	The Nature Conservancy
Total Funding Requested	$1,833,790
Project Type	Dry
WS Scoring Pilot	NO

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	**20**	20	• Diverting 100% of dry weather flows
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	20	**30**	20	•
Water Supply Part 1	0	**13**	0	•
Water Supply Part 2	0	**12**	0	•
Community Investment	5	**10**	5	•
Nature-Based Solutions	10	**15**	10	•
Leveraging Funds Part 1	3	**6**	3	• Only seeking O&M funding since construction is fully funded; construction will begin in early 2024.
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	**4**	4	• Significant community engagement
TOTALS	62	**110**	62	• Meets minimum points threshold

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2024-2025

Watershed Area	Upper Los Angeles River
Project Name	Green Street Demonstration Project on Main Street
Project Lead	City of Alhambra
Total Funding Requested	$2,027,000
Project Type	Wet
WS Scoring Pilot	YES

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	**20**	Unable to Score	• Concern over infiltration rate being too low (0.25 in/hr) to feasibly infiltrate. • Request for additional geotech data to justify dry wells
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	**30**	Unable to Score	•
Water Supply Part 1	6	**13**	Unable to Score	• No letter from Watermaster provided.
Water Supply Part 2	4	**12**	Unable to Score	•
Community Investment	5	**10**	5	•
Nature-Based Solutions	10	**15**	10	•
Leveraging Funds Part 1	6	**6**	6	•
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	**4**	3	• One way engagement
TOTALS	85	**110**	Unable to Score	•

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2024-2025

Watershed Area	Upper Los Angeles River
Project Name	La Crescenta Avenue Green Improvement Project
Project Lead	County of Los Angeles
Total Funding Requested	$2,000,000
Project Type	Wet
WS Scoring Pilot	NO

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	14	**20**	14	• High infiltration rates (>100 in/hr)
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	2	**12**	0	• Letter from Watermaster indicated a request for additional information.
Community Investment	5	**10**	5	•
Nature-Based Solutions	14	**15**	14	•
Leveraging Funds Part 1	6	**6**	6	•
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	**4**	2	•
TOTALS	70	**110**	66	• Meets minimum points threshold

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2024-2025

Watershed Area	Upper Los Angeles River
Project Name	LA River Green Infrastructure Project
Project Lead	City of Los Angeles, Department of Public Works, LA Sanitation and Environment (LASAN)
Total Funding Requested	$17,053,812
Project Type	Dry
WS Scoring Pilot	NO

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	9	**12**	9	• Letter from Watermaster with specific details provided
Community Investment	5	**10**	5	•
Nature-Based Solutions	12	**15**	12	•
Leveraging Funds Part 1	0	**6**	0	•
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	**4**	4	• Strong community outreach and engagement
TOTALS	70	**110**	70	• Meets minimum points threshold

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2024-2025

Watershed Area	Upper Los Angeles River
Project Name	Osborne Street Stormwater Capture Green Street Project
Project Lead	City of Los Angeles Bureau of Street Services (StreetsLA)
Total Funding Requested	$9,500,000
Project Type	Wet
WS Scoring Pilot	YES

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	**20**	Unable to Score	• Recommendation to adjust project infiltration rate to 0.59 cfs and capacity based on design storm. • Adjust submitted map to show location of the project in relation to the existing dry wells
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	**30**	Unable to Score	•
Water Supply Part 1	6	**13**	Unable to Score	•
Water Supply Part 2	6	**12**	Unable to Score	•
Community Investment	10	**10**	10	•
Nature-Based Solutions	11	**15**	11	•
Leveraging Funds Part 1	3	**6**	3	•
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	**4**	4	• Robust community outreach and engagement
TOTALS	90	**110**	Unable to Score	•

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2024-2025

Watershed Area	Upper Los Angeles River
Project Name	Sun Valley Green Neighborhood Infrastructure Project
Project Lead	City of Los Angeles, Department of Public Works LA Sanitation and Environment (LASAN)
Total Funding Requested	$13,771,475
Project Type	Wet
WS Scoring Pilot	YES

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	9	**13**	9	•
Water Supply Part 2	9	**12**	9	• Letter provided from Water Master
Community Investment	10	**10**	5	• No access to waterway • Greening should be at the school
Nature-Based Solutions	10	**15**	10	•
Leveraging Funds Part 1	0	**6**	0	•
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	**4**	3	•
TOTALS	86	**110**	80	• Meets minimum points threshold