

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Committee



Meeting Minutes:

Tuesday, February 18, 2020

8:00am - 12:00pm

Los Angeles County Public Works, LA County Public Works, Conference Room D
900 South Fremont Ave, Alhambra, CA 91803

Attendees

Committee Members Present:

Bruce Reznik

Dave Sorem

TJ Moon

JR De Shazo

Jill Sourial

Committee Members Not Present:

Dean Efstathiou

1) Welcome and Introductions

Bruce Reznik, the Chair of the Scoring Committee, called the meeting to order.

All committee members in attendance made self-introductions, and quorum was established.

2) Approval of Meeting Minutes from February 4, 2020

The District provided a copy of the meeting minutes from the previous meeting. Bruce Reznik asked the committee members for comments or revisions.

JR De Shazo made a motion to approve the meeting minutes. TJ Moon seconded the motion. The Committee voted to approve the meeting minutes (unanimous).

3) Committee Member and District Updates

Kirk Allen noted that in April the Watershed Coordinators' solicitation is expected to be available and the General Low Income Tax Reduction form is now available on the website.

4) Public Comment Period for Non-Agenized Items

A member of the public inquired how project points are handled that are docked during the scoring process. Bruce Reznik noted that the Scoring Committee is only tasked with scoring a project above or below the threshold score. JR De Shazo clarified that notes for reductions are for clarity to the project applicant as well as to the WASCs. Kirk Allen further clarified that project scores are only one initial consideration for a project, and that all projects that pass the threshold score are eligible for consideration, and the WASCs should not use project scores as a deciding factor.

5) Discussion Items:

a) Ex Parte Communications Disclosure

TJ Moon noted he has had discussions with City of Monrovia and Craftwater on the Arcadia Wash project. He has also had conversations with PACE on their project comments.

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Committee



Bruce Reznik noted he has had discussions with NRDC on Arcadia Wash.

Jill Sourial noted she has had conversations with Ronda Stone.

b) Scoring of Feasibility Studies

Scoring Committee members reviewed the following projects. Detailed notes were taken within the master Scoring Rubric document.

- #9 - Venice High School
- #12 - Furman Park Stormwater Capture and Infiltration Project
- #15 - Rancho Los Cerritos: Looking Back to Advance Forward
- #16 - Salt Lake Park Infiltration Cistern
- #18 - Stormwater Treatment and Reuse System (STAR System) Hacienda Park
- #19 - Bellflower Simms Park Stormwater Capture Project
- #21 - Caruthers Park
- #25 - Skylinks Golf Course at Wardlow Stormwater Capture Project
- #29 - Arcadia Wash Water Conservation Diversion
- #34 - Newhall Park Infiltration
- #36 - Harbor City Greenway O&M
- #37 - Torrance Airport Storm Water Basin Project, Phase 2
- #38 - Wilmington Q Street Local Urban Area Flow Management Project
- #39 - Active Transportation Rail to River Corridor Project - Segment A
- #44 - Lankershim Boulevard Local Area Urban Flow Management Network Project
- #48 - The Distributed Drywell System Project
- #53 - Encanto Park Stormwater Capture Project (Alexander Tachiki)
- #55 - Garvey Avenue Grade Separation Drainage Improvement Project
- #57 - Pedley Spreading Grounds

6) Public Comment Period for Agenized Items

A member of the public provided clarification the Bellflower Simms project resubmission, noting that what is shown online was not the latest submission. The SC evaluated the latest resubmission documents and adjusted the score accordingly.

A member of the public requested clarity on what benefits a project can claim if only a portion of the project is funded through the SCW Program. JR De Shazo noted that if the SCW funding does not cover enhancements for specific benefits, those benefits should not be claimed within the submission.

7) Voting items:

- a) Return passing scores of projects and feasibility studies to WASCs

JR De Shazo made a motion to approve. Dave Sorem seconded the motion. The Committee voted to approve. (unanimous).

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Committee



8) Items for next agenda

Bruce Reznik discussed a potential next meeting date, and noted potential meeting topics, including: updating the feasibility guidelines and scoring criteria, providing additional clarity to needed sections; creating a new process for scoring O&M only project submittals; discussing expectations on the Credit Program appeals process; selecting a new 6th member.

The SC set March 3 as the next meeting with 9AM as the start time of the meeting.

9) Adjournment

Bruce Reznik thanked the committee members and public for their time and participation and adjourned the meeting.

Scoring Committee Meeting

COMMITTEE MEMBER SIGN-IN



Member Name	Municipality/ Organization	Email Address	Signature
Dean Efstathiou	Consulting Engineer	defstath1@gmail.com	
Taejin Moon	LA County Public Works	TMOON@dpw.lacounty.gov	<i>Taejin Moon</i>
Bruce Reznik	LA Waterkeeper	bruce@lawaterkeeper.org	<i>Bruce Reznik</i>
Dave Sorem	Mike Bubalo Construction Co., Inc.	dave@bubalo.com	<i>Dave Sorem</i>
Jill Sourial	The Nature Conservancy	jill.sourial@tnc.org	<i>Jill Sourial</i>
J.R. De Shazo	UCLA Luskin Center for Innovation	deshazo@ucla.edu; cvance@luskin.ucla.edu	<i>J.R. De Shazo</i>

Scoring Committee Meeting

PUBLIC SIGN-IN



First Name	Last Name	Municipality/Organization	Email Address
Richard	Watson	RWA	rwatson@rwaplanning.com
Susie	Santilena	City of LA	susie.santilena@lacity.org
YALE	Williams	LA HASCO UTS	YALEWILLIAMS@LACOSWATER.COM
Conor	Mossari	LADWP	conor.mossari@ladwp.com
Heather	Merenda	Santa Clara	hmerenda@santa-clara.com
Bronwyn	Kelly	Carollo	bkelly@carollo.com
Oliver	Cramer	Santa Clara Co	ocramer@santa-clara.com
Deborah	Deets	LAUSD	deborah.deets@lacity.org
John	Hunter	JLHA	JHunter@JLHA.NET
Karen	Lee	LAUSD	karen.lee@lausd.net
Alex	Tachikawa	Monrovia	
Dylan	Ferk	Merced	dferk@merced.ca.us
Oliver	Galang	Craftwater Engg	oliver.galang@craftwaterinc.com
Vik	Bapna	CWE	vbapna@cwecorp.com
David	Pohl	Burns + McDermott	dhpohl@burnsmcd.com

*Signing or completing this form is voluntary for members of the public

Scoring Committee Meeting

PUBLIC SIGN-IN



First Name	Last Name	Municipality/Organization	Email Address
Jud	Warren	Weston Solutions	robert.warren@westonsolutions.com
Alfredo	Magallanes	City of LA-Sanitation	alfredo.magallanes@lacity.org
Danielle	Chupa	Cordova	dchupa@cordobacorp.com

*Signing or completing this form is voluntary for members of the public

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2020-2021



SCW.ID	9
Project Name	Venice High School
Project Lead	Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD/District)
Total Funding Requested	\$5,893,250
Project Type	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	20	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> User entered 9.2AF, however documents note 1AF as the capacity \$5.8M/1AF should bring this score to 0. Clarify that the project capital is for the construction of the storm water infrastructure only. Unclear what the footprint of the project is. Website may have caused confusion. Revised: applicant doubled the storage capacity, geotech noted a 1" per hour infiltration rate, but applicant is using 12.2" per hour infiltration rate. SC believes the capacity should be 1AF. Still unclear how applicant reached 9.2AF. No change to score
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	30	To be determined	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A reduction in capacity requires a recalculation of the water quality scores. If LID is being met, it's likely the project will still meet the 30 points.
Water Supply Part 1	0	13	0	
Water Supply Part 2	0	12	0	
Community Investment	10	10	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not a lot of detail on the native trees and plantings. Suggest these are brought to the WASC for consideration.
Nature-Based Solutions	10	15	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unclear what the footprint of the project is. Provide additional details. Are the trees included in the footprint of the area? Clarify.
Leveraging Funds Part 1	0	6	0	
Leveraging Funds Part 2	0	4	0	
TOTALS	70	110	Below Threshold	

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2020-2021



SCW.ID	12
Project Name	Furman Park Stormwater Capture and Infiltration Project
Project Lead	City of Downev
Total Funding Requested	\$14,670,000
Project Type	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	20	14 To Be determined 20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Website capacity does not match the project capacity. P. 4 says 8.4AF capacity, p. 16 says 12.84AF capacity, Project Module shows 40AF capacity. Unclear what number should be used for calculation Project developer should provide clarification Low Estimate would be 11 points Revised: applicant confirmed 12 AF storage capacity and Design Capacity of 40AF 24-hour capacity, and infiltration is very high at this site. SC noted that 85th-percentile storm is 12AF. Applicant is designing for 40AF
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	30	To be determined 30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unclear capacity, would require a re-run of modeling within the project module. User used their own value but provided no modeling analysis. Recommendation is to use the website to run the water supply estimates.
Water Supply Part 1	0	13	0	
Water Supply Part 2	9	12	To be determined 5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Changes in capacity could change water supply estimates. Require a re-run of the model. Requires a 20 year average, the provided modeling was only for 10 years. Use the website years for modeling analysis. Revised: SC noted that applicant only used 10 years of data, where 20 years was recommended. Sets score to 5 points.
Community Investment	10	10	2 5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> School improvement, but not part of the school. School adjacent. Unclear if this would benefit the school. There may be a benefit to be school adjacent, but does not meet the intent of this scoring category. Application claimed enhanced or new recreational opportunities. Unclear if this is replacing existing recreational amenities. Revised: project now has 5 benefits
Nature-Based Solutions	12	15	12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide a verification that items are being added vs replacing what is already there.
Leveraging Funds Part 1	0	6	0	
Leveraging Funds Part 2	0	4	0	
TOTALS	81	110	To Be Determined 72	

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2020-2021



SCW.ID	15
Project Name	Rancho Los Cerritos: Looking Back to Advance Forward
Project Lead	Rancho Los Cerritos
Total Funding Requested	\$2,000,000
Project Type	Dry

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	20	20	
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	10	30	10	
Water Supply Part 1	0	13	0	
Water Supply Part 2	0	12	0	
Community Investment	10	10	5 To Be Determined 10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It's not on a school property. With Dry Weather project, there should be no flood benefit. Revised: Applicant claims flood benefit for dry weather project. SC noted that justification provided is not applicable to dry-weather projects. SC noted that flooding benefit should be clarified for future rounds of projects. Resubmitted including school partnership letter.
Nature-Based Solutions	13	15	13	
Leveraging Funds Part 1	3	6	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Potentially increase cost share to boost score.
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	4	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Potentially provide a letter of support from the school to potentially increase Community Investment score. Or Formal agreement from school.
TOTALS	60	110	Below Threshold To Be Determined 60	

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2020-2021



SCW.ID	16
Project Name	Salt Lake Park Infiltration Cistern
Project Lead	City of Huntington Park
Total Funding Requested	\$2,000,000
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"> SC is accepting the revised 600AC drainage area and using that for the following metrics. City is working on an upstream project that will come online in the future to help this drainage area.
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	30	To Be Determined 20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Applicant claiming 100% reduction. Should classify downstream bypass to note actual pollutant reductions. Project is between a Dry and Wet weather project. Revised: applicant revised drainage area, and is noting future project to tackle remaining drainage area. SC noted that only the current phase of project is what should be considered. SC using only the reduced drainage area.
Water Supply Part 1	3	13	3 0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A cistern was used for the BMP type, use infiltration basin to have the model calculate supply automatically. Revised: SC noted that a secondary project (John Hanson Park) was used as a proxy to develop a ratio of water supply for this project.
Water Supply Part 2	12	12	12 9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Revised: with reduced drainage area, overall supply score drops.
Community Investment	5	10	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unclear if "greening" is actual or conceptual greening
Nature-Based Solutions	15	15	15	
Leveraging Funds Part 1	6	6	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appears to be a 25% match. Would need a \$2M in match.
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	4	0 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No community letters of support. Only includes letters of support from cities. Revised: applicant provided community letter of support
TOTALS	95	110	58 To Be Determined 76	

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2020-2021



SCW.ID	18
Project Name	Stormwater Treatment and Reuse System (STAR System) Hacienda Park
Project Lead	City of La Habra Heights
Total Funding Requested	\$991,954
Project Type	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	20	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3.8 AF, \$900k 1 AF capacity used, 0.1 AF is what is shown in documentation Capacity could go up to 0.25AF Website and engineering documents do not match. Revised: applicant reduced drainage area to 1.4AC, increased capacity to 1.2AF, and increased infiltration rate. SC approximates capacity should be 0.1AF. Applicant noted that tank is only for onsite irrigation storage. Project is primarily treat and release through cartridges. Infiltration rate should be revised to 0" per hour as it is a tank
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	25	30	To-Be Determined 25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> User used their own water quality model (MUSIC model). How is the MUSIC model similar to the County WMMS? Provide confirmation that this model is similar. Revised: SC now using applicants MUSIC model results.
Water Supply Part 1	0	13	0	
Water Supply Part 2	0	12	0	
Community Investment	10	10	5 10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not clear how this project increases access to waterway. Is view of a stream/river considered access to a waterway. Provide clarification on access Not clear how this project provides recreation benefit. Is this adding new benefit, or adding back what existed previously A layout or planting diagram would be beneficial. Revised: SC noted access to waterways can be claimed
Nature-Based Solutions	10	15	10	
Leveraging Funds Part 1	0	6	0	
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	4	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Single individual. Not clear if this is strong community support. Not the intent of this scoring criteria.
TOTALS	69	110	Below Threshold 49	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SC recommends the project for consideration by the WASC for Technical Resource Program

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2020-2021



SCW.ID	19
Project Name	Bellflower Simms Park Stormwater Capture Project
Project Lead	City of Bellflower
Total Funding Requested	\$17,200,000
Project Type	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	20	To-Be Determined 20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> \$13.9M 26.35AF P. 14, infiltration rate seems generous. No geotech to prove this high infiltration rate. Provide geotech or soils report. Revised: applicant notes project is now treat and release and costs have increased. Overall the project has changed, unclear what the project is now considered. Applicant noted that project is diverting storm water to Mayfair park for infiltration. SC discussed how much the project can change during resubmissions. District noted that resubmissions should only be used for clarifying questions and to limit major scope changes. Applicant noted that they worked with District for clarification on scope changes.
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	30	To-be determined 20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> User used their own modeling analysis. If infiltration rate lowers, would require a re-run of the model. Recommend to use the existing web tool.
Water Supply Part 1	0	13	0	
Water Supply Part 2	0	12	0	
Community Investment	5	10	2 5 40	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The replacement of natural surface, and converting to artificial turf SC using revised email attachment
Nature-Based Solutions	12	15	12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> magnitude of the impermeable area removed unclear.
Leveraging Funds Part 1	0	6	0	
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	4	0 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No letters of support provided for this project. Letter of support included from email attachment memo
TOTALS	71	110	To-be determined 61	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unable to score due to major changes to the scope.

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2020-2021



SCW.ID	21
Project Name	Caruthers Park
Project Lead	City of Bellflower
Total Funding Requested	\$855,000
Project Type	Dry

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	20	20	
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	20	30	20	
Water Supply Part 1	6	13	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unclear if Bellflower has access to usable groundwater aquifer. WRD provided a general letter of acknowledgement of projects that provide groundwater recharge benefit.
Water Supply Part 2	9	12	9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SC to provide additional clarity on Feasibility Guidelines on what level (short & long term) of supply is applicable.
Community Investment	5	10	To Be Determined 5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unclear how the pre and post enhancements are different. Is this new turf and trees? No backup provided to clarify this. Is the O&M including maintenance of the Community Investment enhancements? Applicant should provide clarity on what O&M activities are covering. Applicant claiming flood control benefit for dry weather project.
Nature-Based Solutions	10	15	To Be Determined 10	
Leveraging Funds Part 1	6	6	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Applicant is using original construction cost share from Caltrans. Recommend project applicant provide some level of municipal cost share.
Leveraging Funds Part 2	0	4	0	
TOTALS	76	110	To Be Determined 70	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Major changes to scope, Unable to be scored.

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2020-2021



SCW.ID	25
Project Name	Skylinks Golf Course at Wardlow Stormwater Capture Project
Project Lead	City of Long Beach
Total Funding Requested	\$10,500,000
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	30	30	20 (if Dry) To Be Determined 20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project between a wet and dry weather project Applicant claims 100% pollution reduction. Should include downstream bypass, or classify as a dry weather project. Revised: applicant kept as wet weather project. Applicant used a higher infiltration rate, confirmed by Geotech report.
Water Supply Part 1	0	13	0 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Water Supply Part 2	0	12	0 9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If available, project should try to claim supply benefit. 22-inches per hour from geotech report.
Community Investment	5	10	5 10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would be beneficial to see landscaping plan What is the net number of trees and types. If dry weather, should not consider flood benefit. Could potentially claim heat island effect with additional trees.
Nature-Based Solutions	10	15	10	
Leveraging Funds Part 1	0	6	0	
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	4	0 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No letter of support from community group Revised: received a letter of support from the Golf Course and LCWA. Would be helpful to have a letter from a CBO
TOTALS	69	110	Below Threshold To Be Determined 76	

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2020-2021



SCW.ID	29
Project Name	Arcadia Wash Water Conservation Diversion
Project Lead	City of Monrovia
Total Funding Requested	\$12,664,496
Project Type	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	20	0 20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Phase 1 is only a storm drain. Phase 2 is the project at Arcadia Wash. There's no guarantee that Phase 2 will happen. Are benefits being considered for phase 2. It is not possible to score a storm drain. Recommend that phase 2 be combined with this drain diversion project. (noted on p.47 of application) User may be able to classify this as a dry weather project if they added a low-flow sewer connection. Applicant reclassified project as dry-weather and notes a 77AF capacity based on drain flow capacity. SC noted that this is a flow capacity vs a treatment capacity. Applicant noted that this is intended for pre-treatment of first flush which LACFCD would not take at the downstream spreading ground. SC noted that pretreatment can help some with water quality treatment. Score for dry weather accepted as treat and release.
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	30	0 20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Uses unknown designs for phase 2
Water Supply Part 1	10	13	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Claiming supply benefits for Phase 2. Committee only able to score phase 1. Applicant notes that storm water is being infiltrated downstream. SC noted this is water already recharged downstream. No change to supply score.
Water Supply Part 2	12	12	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Claiming supply benefits for Phase 2. Committee only able to score phase 1.
Community Investment	5	10	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Claiming supply benefits for Phase 2. Committee only able to score phase 1. Reclassification to dry-weather, cannot claim Flood Benefit.
Nature-Based Solutions	10	15	5 13	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There's no loss of impermeable cover. Appears to claim benefits from phase 2. Applicant noted impervious cover for side of street. SC noted that this is acceptable but disconnected from the drain project.
Leveraging Funds Part 1	3	6	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Leveraged funds are primarily only for staff time, which are not expressed as a monetary value Future pursuit of additional funds is unclear if for phase 1 or phase 2. How is this allocated. SC unable to find justification for cost share. Applicant noted that an exact dollar figure can't be committed to at this stage of the project.
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	4	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No existing letters, but there is ongoing outreach for this project. Community support is not shown. Applicant provided letters of support from a city. SC noted letters should be from NGOs or CBOs.
TOTALS	94	110	Below Threshold 55	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Committee unclear how phase 2 would be accomplished. Combine Phase 1 and Phase 2.

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2020-2021



SCW.ID	34
Project Name	Newhall Park Infiltration
Project Lead	Dan Duncan, Oliver Cramer
Total Funding Requested	\$3,000,000
Project Type	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	20	To-Be Determined 20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No documentation to confirm these numbers. No Engineering Analysis provided (dimensions and engineering drawings)
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	30	To-Be Determined 30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Applicant claiming 100% pollutant reduction. Should include downstream bypass.
Water Supply Part 1	0	13	0	
Water Supply Part 2	5	12	To-Be Determined 9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> May change based on WQ analysis.
Community Investment	5	10	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Applicant to provide clarification for DAC benefit. Applicant should use definition of DAC benefit within the SCW Ordinance and Feasibility Guidelines Unclear if natural or artificial turf. Provide the types of trees School adjacent, may not be technically greening of schools, but provides access to the green space and benefits the school. Applicant provides an agreement with the school to note these benefits.
Nature-Based Solutions	10	15	10	
Leveraging Funds Part 1	6	6	0 6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project is utilizing local return. Applicants is utilizing future speculative leveraged funds. Project is asking for \$3M, utilizing \$3M of municipal, unclear if the match is based on total cost. (\$3M/\$19M)
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	4	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No letter of support from community. Project should provide the letter noted in the application.
TOTALS	80	110	To-Be Determined 80	

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2020-2021



SCW.ID	36
Project Name	Harbor City Greenway O&M
Project Lead	City of Los Angeles
Total Funding Requested	\$75,000
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"> This is a difficult project to score.
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	10	30	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Only trash benefit claimed May want to classify this as a dry weather project, this project would receive more points. SC treated this project as a Dry Weather Project to boost the score. Score may raise if wet weather pollutants is modeled.
Water Supply Part 1	0	13	0	
Water Supply Part 2	0	12	0	
Community Investment	10	10	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Credit for 3 benefits, but not six. How does the O&M support these community investment benefits. If there is monitoring information, that would help confirm these benefits are reached. With dry weather project, cannot claim Flood Benefit
Nature-Based Solutions	10	15	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would be beneficial to know what other upgrades are being made.
Leveraging Funds Part 1	6	6	To Be Determined 6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cost share for the construction phase of the project should not be counted. Provide additional clarity how cost share will be provided for this project. A matching fund of 25% could raise this score.
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	4	4	
TOTALS	60	110	To Be Determined 65	

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2020-2021



SCW.ID	37
Project Name	Torrance Airport Storm Water Basin Project, Phase 2
Project Lead	City of Torrance
Total Funding Requested	\$906,000
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"> Website Capacity used is 127AF capacity, but documentation shows 14.5AF Applicant fixed error for capacity.
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	30	To-Be Determined 30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduction of capacity would require a re-run of the website model.
Water Supply Part 1	13	13	To-Be Determined 6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will need to be recalculated with a corrected capacity.
Water Supply Part 2	12	12	To-Be Determined 5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will need to be recalculated with a corrected capacity.
Community Investment	2	10	2	
Nature-Based Solutions	0	15	0	
Leveraging Funds Part 1	3	6	3 0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SC noted leveraging funds is less than 25%
Leveraging Funds Part 2	0	4	0	
TOTALS	80	110	To-Be Determined 63	

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2020-2021



SCW.ID	38
Project Name	Wilmington Q Street Local Urban Area Flow Management Project
Project Lead	City of Los Angeles, Bureau of Sanitation
Total Funding Requested	\$4,923,700
Project Type	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	20	To-Be Determined 20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lankershim technical report provided instead of the Wilmington Q street technical reports. Correct report can be provided in the resubmittal. Applicant attached correct attachment
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	30	To-Be Determined 30	
Water Supply Part 1	0	13	0	
Water Supply Part 2	0	12	0	
Community Investment	5	10	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> School adjacent and not direct greening of school. Does not affect score.
Nature-Based Solutions	12	15	12	
Leveraging Funds Part 1	0	6	0	
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	4	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Only letter of support from Council office, vs community group.
TOTALS	71	110	To-Be Determined 67	

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2020-2021



SCW.ID	39
Project Name	Active Transportation Rail to River Corridor Project - Segment A
Project Lead	Los Angeles Metropolitan Transit Authority (Metro)
Total Funding Requested	\$8,425,000
Project Type	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	20	0 20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerns: 8 AF Capacity used for modeling does not match 2 AF (p.55) noted within design plans. An update to this score would bring this score down from 20 to 0. SC noted for total construction costs, applicant is using grant funding to reduce cost. Applicant noted that full project is much larger than the LID portion of the project, and soil remediation costs are not associated with the LID enhancement. SC accepts this justification.
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	30	Insufficient Evidence 30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Applicant used their own water quality modeling, noting that 100% of all pollutants were removed. Applicants should resubmit a detailed WQ analysis to confirm the pollutant removal.
Water Supply Part 1	0	13	0	
Water Supply Part 2	0	12	0	
Community Investment	10	10	5	<p>Claimed community benefits are not clear or realized:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> School Benefit (located adjacent vs within a school) Adjacent to river corridor Flood benefit Benefits for trees, exactly how many trees, how to confirm carbon sequestration, etc. SC noted that the project is only adjacent to school. Applicant noted that the project provides access to school. River access as part of phase 2 should not be counted for this phase of the project.
Nature-Based Solutions	10	15	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Addition of trails has increased impervious cover. No change to score
Leveraging Funds Part 1	6	6	6	
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	4	4	
TOTALS	80	110	Does not Meet Threshold 75	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Condition: Need to report back on two categories with insufficient evidence.

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2020-2021



SCW.ID	44
Project Name	Lankershim Boulevard Local Area Urban Flow Management Network Project
Project Lead	City of Los Angeles, Bureau of Sanitation
Total Funding Requested	\$25,696,900
Project Type	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	20	44 20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Capacity of 110 AF for a tributary area of 200 acres seems very high. Applicant should provide clarity for the exact capacity of the Project. From documents 14-15 AF seems to be the actual capacity. P.321 of submittal has additional clarity on design. Applicant should confirm BMP capacity.
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	30	To-Be Determined 30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Using the 110 AF capacity would max out automatically the pollutant removal. Adjusting for reduced capacity, score needs to be confirmed.
Water Supply Part 1	0	13	0	
Water Supply Part 2	5	12	To-Be Determined 5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Depends on what applicant provides for capacity.
Community Investment	5	10	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Applicant does not include benefits for the habitat they are providing. However, does not increase score.
Nature-Based Solutions	10	15	10	
Leveraging Funds Part 1	0	6	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Scoring Committee recommends applicant leverage some of their own municipal funds to boost their score.
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	4	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Applicant lays out a plan to demonstrate local support, but does not include existing support for Community support is only forward looking. Only a city council member letter is included. SC recommends applicant include actual local community support.
TOTALS	74	110	Did not meet Threshold. 70	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence submitted was not sufficient to validate score.

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2020-2021



SCW.ID	48
Project Name	The Distributed Drywell System Project
Project Lead	City of Glendale
Total Funding Requested	\$1,859,000
Project Type	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	20	To-Be Determined 20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Challenging to confirm engineering analysis with inputs to the model. Applicant using peak flow multiplied by 24-hours, capacity seems too high (1AF per dry well) Hydrology p19 (claiming 1.97 AF for 85th volume, but building a drywall system that has a 16AF capacity; only need 2AF) Calculation may be off. Provide clarification on the drywell capacity. Applicant has updated capacity
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	20	30	To-Be Determined 30	
Water Supply Part 1	13	13	To-be determined 10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> p.19 of pdf, project claims 5cfs of dry weather flow per day, seems high. Should be 0cfs for 57 acres for dry weather flow. Project does recharge an aquifer
Water Supply Part 2	12	12	To-be determined 2	
Community Investment	5	10	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would be beneficial to know the types of trees
Nature-Based Solutions	10	15	10	
Leveraging Funds Part 1	0	6	0	
Leveraging Funds Part 2	0	4	0	
TOTALS	80	110	To-Be Determined 77	

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2020-2021



SCW.ID	53
Project Name	Encanto Park Stormwater Capture Project
Project Lead	City of Monrovia
Total Funding Requested	\$2,482,248
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"> Not treating the 85th percentile flow.
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	30	To-Be Determined 30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Applicant claiming 100% pollutant reduction. Should include downstream bypass in modeling. Applicant may be able to reclassify this as a dry weather project. SC notes the project is between a .25 & .75 inch storm, so it's a challenge to max out on this scoring category. Applicant has changed the scope of the project. Infiltration rate has been increased, including addition of treatment. Applicant swapped a harvesting system with a filtration system. Applicant noted that cost did not change for this project. District and SC noted that cost and footprint have not been modified.
Water Supply Part 1	0	13	0	
Water Supply Part 2	0	12	0 2	
Community Investment	5	10	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Helpful to see details of plantings Are the recreational enhancements new or replaced. Unclear in the documentation.
Nature-Based Solutions	12	15	12	
Leveraging Funds Part 1	3	6	To-Be Determined 0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SC agrees that matched staff time can be considered as leveraged funding. Does not specifically state there is a cost share, just that the city will explore opportunities for cost share. Applicant should provide additional detail on this cost share. SC noted that justification does not count for cost share.
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	4	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is a community engagement strategy, but no existing letters of support. Only letters are from a group of cities.
TOTALS	74	110	To-Be Determined 69	

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2020-2021



SCW.ID	55
Project Name	Garvey Avenue Grade Separation Drainage Improvement Project
Project Lead	City of El Monte
Total Funding Requested	\$4,000,000
Project Type	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	20	20	
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	30	30	
Water Supply Part 1	13	13	To-Be Determined 0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unrealistic dry weather flow assumption. SC recommends 0 cfs dry weather flow based on the size of the project. Applicant should recalculate based on these edits. Applicant revised application
Water Supply Part 2	12	12	To-Be Determined 0	
Community Investment	2	10	2	
Nature-Based Solutions	10	15	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> NBS solutions don't appear to meet the intent of this scoring section.
Leveraging Funds Part 1	0	6	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Applicant could use the grade separation project as part of the matching funds. Could provide a boost to score.
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	4	0 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No letters of support from community groups.
TOTALS	91	110	To-Be Determined 61	

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2020-2021



SCW.ID	57
Project Name	Pedley Spreading Grounds
Project Lead	East San Gabriel Valley Watershed Management Group (City of San Dimas, City of Claremont, City of Pomona, City of La Verne)
Total Funding Requested	\$2,825,900
Project Type	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	20	20 To-Be Determined	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A challenge to score. Applicant is claiming the entire spreading ground vs just the increase. Should only claim the delta benefit. Applicant clarified they are only looking for the delta in volume.
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	30	30 To-Be Determined	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rerun mode with only the delta capacity benefit and not the entire Spreading ground capacity.
Water Supply Part 1	0	13	0	
Water Supply Part 2	0	12	0	
Community Investment	2	10	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not increasing habitat (does not impact score)
Nature-Based Solutions	5	15	5	
Leveraging Funds Part 1	0	6	0	
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	4	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would be good to include additional community groups beyond a trade organization. A nonprofit trade association doesn't really meet the intent of this scoring category, but does not impact score for now.
TOTALS	61	110	To-Be Determined 61	