

*****DRAFT*** Scoring Committee Recommendations**

The members of the Scoring Committee thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on the first round of projects reviewed under the Safe Clean Water Program (SCWP). As a small group that ultimately scored all 58 funding applications - while taking regular feedback from project applicants who attended many of our meetings (in an open-dialogue meeting format) - we believe the Scoring Committee is uniquely situated to provide input in how the SCWP can be improved in the future.

The first round of scoring allowed the Committee to get feedback on which criteria were unclear or regularly misinterpreted. The Committee observed that different entities misunderstood instructions in the online module, requiring resubmission and rescoring. In the next round, we must avoid similar problems to prevent unreasonable demands on Committee members' time.

Some of the recommendations below focus on improvements in the application *process*, while other suggestions are more substantive comments on the scoring criteria itself. Some can be implemented quickly (such as clarifying instructions on the application portal), while others will require additional research or time to vet to fully implement. Some of our recommendations are specific, while at other times we simply identify challenges that need to be resolved. We hope these are useful as the SCWP continues to evolve to meet the region's needs.

A small committee faced with a daunting task of scoring 58 projects in a short timeframe, we are proud of the work we have done, and believe the SCWP is off to an excellent start to be the transformational program we all believe it can be.

We hope you consider the recommendations we are putting forward to ensure the program achieves all SCWP goals as effectively and efficiently as possible. Please do not hesitate to reach out to me or any Committee member should you have any comments or questions.

General Comments

One of the greatest challenges faced by the Scoring Committee resulted from figuring out how to score projects that were at very different stages of development, as well as projects that were phased or where stormwater capture, treatment and reuse were just one part of much larger projects. Should projects be scored only on what is immediately before the committee? Should costs be applied across the entirety of projects, or just stormwater elements? A more detailed assessment and recommendations follow.

O&M and Feasibility Study Projects

In scoring projects, it quickly became clear that the Regional Project feasibility guidelines and scoring criteria were geared for the development of new capital projects. These criteria were extremely difficult (if not impossible) to adequately apply to operation & maintenance (O&M) projects or initial phase/feasibility studies. This resulted in understandable inconsistencies among applicants in how to explain and score O&M projects.

Recommended near-term fixes

At a minimum, applications requesting O&M funds should supply real-world monitoring data on how the BMPs (for which O&M funding is sought) are currently performing.

Recommended longer-term fixes

The County should seriously consider developing a separate scoring rubric for O&M projects and feasibility studies in recognition of the challenges associated with scoring these projects under the current scoring rubric geared towards new project development.

Whether under a separate scoring rubric, or simply developing guidance clarifying the existing criteria, some of the questions that should be addressed are:

- For O&M applications, should applicants be allowed to take credit (i.e., get points) from all water quality, water supply and community benefits of the overall project, or only for those benefits associated with the O&M activities that would be funded;
- Whether feasibility study projects should be scored based on benefits for the entire future project (which are often hard to project as such applications are by definition in the early stage), or is there some better criteria on which to evaluate such studies.

Phased Projects and Projects with Many Non-Storm Water Components

It was equally unclear how to score phased projects—in particular, whether to grade only the proposed phase of the project before the Committee or whether to grade based on what the final project will look like. If the latter, it is unclear how certain future phases must be in order to reward points. Relatedly, for larger projects (where stormwater is a small component), it was unclear whether to score applications based on the entirety of the project, or just the stormwater elements). Applicants often tried to get the best of both worlds by claiming benefits from the entire project, but only counting stormwater elements of the project for any cost-effectiveness criteria. The Scoring Committee generally only looked at the phase of the project being proposed in isolation and, where stormwater was just one component, tried to count the entire project for all benefits and costs (to be internally consistent).

Recommended near-term fixes

None

Recommended longer-term fixes

Clearer guidelines should be developed for applicants as to what part of the project they can get credit for, including direction as to whether:

- (1) Phased projects should only be scored on the phase where funding is being sought or for the entirety of the final project after all phases (and how certain must future phases be to be awarded points).
- (2) Projects where stormwater is only a component whether the portion of the project considered must be consistent across criteria or purposefully inconsistent (e.g., cost effectiveness might count only stormwater features, but community investment benefits and leveraging funding might count the whole project).

Online Form/Portal

Several applicants who attended Scoring Committee meetings mentioned that they were uncertain where to attach certain documents in the first round. As a result, supporting documentation was not included for many claimed project components and benefits. At the same time, long feasibility studies (often hundreds and in some cases more than a thousand pages) were often attached to multiple sections of the online form. Due to online submission challenges, the Scoring Committee provided a five-day resubmission process for applicants and did its best to go through all documents, even when it was not easy to find information in pertinent sections.

Recommended near-term fixes

The online form should be revised to clarify which attachments should be included where, with a goal of making it easy for reviewers to easily see relevant supporting information when reviewing specific scoring sections. Long studies should be included ONCE, while appropriate back up should be readily accessible in each section—community investment benefits, nature-based solutions, etc.—in a concise, clear, easy-to-read format that is responsive to the scoring criteria.

The online form should also generate a table of contents for attachments.

A standardized budget on the website, with O&M information, would also be beneficial, as the way the website currently characterizes project budgets is not well defined.

Finally, the form should require applicants to include a project summary that, where applicable, explains how the proposal fits within a larger project, includes useful project pictures, and clearly identifies which components of the larger project would be funded through the proposal.

Recommended longer-term fixes

Continue to get feedback from project applications and Scoring Committee members to ensure the online application portal is as clear as possible and allows for easy and consistent scoring.

Consider whether to make formulas/modeling used to calculate water quality and water supply benefits on the on-line portal publicly accessible (so applicants could easily review)

Project Flow / Role of the Committee

The flow of projects from the Scoring Committee to WASCs was inefficient for the first round of review. The Scoring Committee rushed to get scores to WASCs in time for WASCs to have them during project presentations. However, this information did not always make it to WASCs prior to applicant presentations, meaning many projects were presented to WASCs without a score or notes from the Scoring Committee. The notes, in particular, were meant to allow WASCs to ask applicants directly to address some of the concerns or uncertainties identified by the Scoring Committee. But this was not possible where WASC's didn't get our scores or notes in advance of their meetings.

Recommended near-term fixes

The Flood Control District should create a better timeline and meeting arc for all committees so that things are not as rushed and information is provided early enough to inform decisions.

Recommended longer-term fixes

Moving forward, the Board of Supervisors may want to revisit the roles & responsibilities of each Committee (e.g., should the WASC take a more active role in reviewing projects prior to sending them to the Scoring Committee?). In addition, as Fund Transfer Agreements are finalized it would be beneficial to have a level of consistency between Scoring Criteria and Performance Standards the project will use for ongoing reporting.

Enhancing Resources for Applicants

In the first round we found that entities provided dramatically different information with different levels of detail when asked to provide a “description.”

Recommended near-term fixes

We support the development of a tutorial, training, and FAQ page to help applicants navigate and input data into the website.

We also urge the Flood Control District to take the opportunity to improve the guidance included in the module so that different entities enter comparable information that can inform WASC and Regional Oversight Committee (ROC) decisions.

Pre-submittal workshops should be held for potential applicants, including both County personnel and non-County speakers (members of the Scoring Committee, WASC or even outside groups that worked on developing the Program) participating so applicants can understand what the intent is for certain sections and what decision-makers are looking for in submittals.

Additional Research Needs

The scoring criteria for this first round of applications was developed using a very small sample-size of projects developed. This resulted in some criteria not accurately reflecting the realities of how much projects cost, potential for water quality improvements or the like.

Recommended longer-term fixes

Armed with feedback from project applicants and a larger set of projects that can be evaluated, there should be additional data mining to further refine and enhance scoring criteria moving forward. A list of potential additional research needs can be found in Appendix A. Depending on how intensive this effort would be, funding could be sought from the Special Studies Fund of the SCWP.

Disadvantaged Community Benefits Information

While not in purview of Scoring Committee, there is no clear definition of what “DAC benefit” means, which allows many applications to claim this benefit with little support. The County should consider developing clearer guidance on DAC benefits.

A. Water Quality

A.1 Wet + Dry Weather Water Quality Benefits

Some parts of the online form related to water quality criteria were confusing, especially for projects with multiple best management practices (BMPs) or linear BMPs. In addition, the scoring criteria was developed based on results gleaned from a very small sample-size of built projects, meaning the criteria might not fully or accurately reflect benefits of projects. In addition, for projects with a large drainage area, it was difficult to build projects with enough capacity to score high as 'wet weather' projects (thus disadvantaging larger projects that might actually reduce pollutant loading more than smaller projects that achieve a higher percentage reduction). Where a project could not score as a wet weather project, the Committee applied the dry weather scoring to try to maximize points for the applicant, though this did not always reflect the intent of the project. Similarly, since scoring criteria is based on the percentage of pollutant reduction between influent with effluent, projects in areas with cleaner runoff (such as mountain runoff) will score higher for removing very small amounts of pollutants compared to more polluted areas where overall pollution reduction is greater but percentage reduction is less. The Committee also observed that it was sometimes hard for projects that were 'over-built' in order to address flooding or other community needs to score many cost-effectiveness points. Finally, some applicants used their own model, making it hard for the Committee to evaluate outputs.

Recommended near-term fixes

Revise the cost-effectiveness (per acre-foot or AF) criteria under A.1.1 to more of a linear or scaled ratio, to help ensure projects don't lose so many points for relatively small changes in cost effectiveness (which is both fairer and will reduce the incentive of manipulating scores to maximize points).

Recommended longer-term fixes

Amend section A.1.2 to include two options: a magnitude route such as pounds of pollutants removed, and a volume treatment route.

In addition to, *or instead of*, the recommendation above, scoring criteria could also be modified to have more of a sliding scale, which would allow for partial credit.

Undertake additional data mining (now that we have significantly more projects to assess than when the Program was first launched) to develop an appropriate threshold to support a "magnitude route for compliance (which would allow applicants to select from two options: a magnitude route such as pounds of pollutants removed, and a volume treatment route).

Guidance should clarify that website values must be supported in the application materials and must be consistent throughout the application. In addition, additional supporting information should be required when applicants use their own model to calculate water quality benefits.

A.2 Dry Weather Only Water Quality Benefits

Applicants of large projects that could not score well under the A.1 criteria opted for dry weather even when the project was clearly intended for wet weather. Even when applicants didn't do this

on their own, the Scoring Committee took it upon itself to recategorize projects that (based on our calculations) wouldn't have scored points under A.1 as dry weather projects.

Recommended near-term fixes

Dry weather points should be modified to 0.1-inch storms as a maximum to prevent wet weather projects from using the category. (Note, making the previous recommended edits to A.1.2 would also help address the underlying issue.)

Recommended longer-term fixes

Consider creating a cost-effectiveness category for the A.2 category (possibly employing a Gallons per Minute (GPM)/\$1M metric). Similar to A.1.1, such an update would require a data mining effort to develop this metric.

B. Water Supply Benefits

While we did not undertake a statistical analysis, it appeared that some watersheds and project types had a significant scoring advantage, which could then create inequities or challenges for other watersheds. Specifically, watersheds and projects that have significant advantages to achieve water supply points include: (1) larger projects (e.g., spreading grounds) in areas with good soils and aquifer recharge (like San Gabriel, Upper LA River, and Rio Hondo watersheds); or (2) larger low-flow diversion projects sending water to water recycling facilities. Having scoring criteria that makes it almost impossible to get 25 water supply related points in areas without easy access to groundwater or water recycling facilities could potentially make it hard for certain WASCs to have any projects get approved.

For the Upper San Gabriel and Rio Hondo watershed areas, there is the added uncertainty of whether projects should get credit for water supply benefits when the majority of stormwater is already captured. The Scoring Committee opted for now to give points in these areas, acknowledging that there could be longer term ecosystem benefits of such an approach.

The Scoring Committee also observed that applicants with a low-flow diversion project often asked for water supply points even when the water recycling projects are planned, but not yet built (e.g., Hyperion or JWPCP in Carson). While we appreciate that providing these low-flow diversions could help create the supply (and influence the market) to help ensure such water reclamation facilities get built, it is also true that these projects are not yet certain and therefore it is possible we might be approving projects that are not truly multi-benefit (as required by the SCWP). In the first round, the Scoring Committee allowed these projects to claim water supply points because we assume a goal of the SCWP would be to encourage projects that will facilitate the development of water recycling plants.

Recommended near-term fixes

The County should provide more definitive direction to the Committee and applicants: (1) whether it will award water supply points for projects diverting water to speculative water reuse projects, and (2) whether, for the Upper San Gabriel and Rio Hondo watershed areas, projects will get credit for water supply benefits when the majority of storm water is already captured.

Recommended longer-term fixes

The Board of Supervisors may decide to change the scoring criteria in the future so that it is curved for each watershed (or for watersheds with similar water supply constraints). It would work well to set an acre-feet capture value as a threshold for applicants to get a minimum level of points, and then to curve the points for each watershed area (or similar watershed areas) to the points of the application with the highest acre-feet captured value. This would help ensure that projects in the majority of watersheds are not unfairly disadvantaged.

In addition, maintenance costs have a major effect on cost effectiveness. It would be beneficial to convert this metric to a scaled value as well as to conduct a data mining effort to update the score ranges.

Further, because the current scoring criteria likely provides an incentive for applicants to underestimate O&M costs, O&M should be looked at separately and judged according to separate scoring criteria.

C. Community Investment Benefits

Lack of measurable outcomes around community benefits made it very difficult for applicants to know what to take credit for when submitting feasibility studies, and equally challenging for the Committee to score projects. Most applicants took credit for at least half of the available community investment benefits points, likely undermining the intent of these criteria. (See Appendix B for breakdown of how many projects were awarded points for various community benefits.)

One somewhat absurd example was ‘improved flood management’, which was claimed by virtually all applicants with the mere rationale that any stormwater project helps with flood management to some extent, which does not seem aligned with the initial intent of the SCWP (which likely was to meaningfully address flood risk in heavily impacted communities). Without clear metrics or guidance, the Scoring Committee’s workaround for ‘improved flood management’ was to award points for all wet weather projects, and deny for dry weather projects (whether projects were submitted as dry weather or the Committee reclassified as dry weather to improve points when projects couldn’t meet wet weather criteria). As you can guess, this was not a satisfying approach, and highlights the challenges (to applicants, scorers and even WASCs) when metrics are not included.

The online application added further confusion by shortening some descriptions from the feasibility guidelines, making things even less clear to applicants. Further complicating matters was that the vast majority of applicants didn’t include ANY attachments for the community benefit section (which may have resulted in lack of clear direction with the online form). To the extent information was included, it was generally within a hundreds-of-pages-long feasibility study in another section, which Committee members then had to sort through.

Due to lack of clarity in definitions (and the fact that many community benefits derive from building nature-based projects), in many instances doing one thing (e.g., enhancing a park or adding a few trees) got applicants points in several categories, such as planting of trees, heat island reduction, and greenhouse gas reduction. Overall, many projects took credit for somewhat dubious benefits—for example, rebuilding (slightly) nicer ball fields after tearing up an old field for underground storage. Others took credit for new park benches or improving an arboretum as ‘enhancing parks’ even though those improvements don’t relate to storm water or nature-based projects. Others took credit for a few native plantings in a bioswale in a parking lot (as enhancing habitat).

Largely because we felt direction to applicants, as well as the scoring criteria itself, was vague, the Scoring Committee took a lenient approach in this first round and generally awarded points to applicants claiming benefits, even when they did not provide sufficient supporting documentation and added benefits were unclear. Where points were awarded for fairly uncertain benefits, the Scoring Committee provided notes to WASCs identifying questions and concerns. This ‘workaround’ was deemed necessary for this first round of funding, but it is unsatisfactory as it does not ensure true community benefits are being achieved.

Recommended near-term fixes

Update the online application portal to require relevant backup materials for the Community Investment Benefits section, and ensure such attachments are responsive to the section (and not just reattaching the entire feasibility study).

As part of the portal update, put the onus on applicants to justify how their projects will actually achieve the benefits they claim with some level of specificity. For example,

The Feasibility Guidelines ask for explanations and analyses beyond what was submitted by most project applicants. The Scoring Committee therefore proposes to add specific prompts to the online form that are in line with the current Guidelines but would elicit more relevant information from applicants:

Improve flood management, flood conveyance, or flood risk mitigation:

- The explanation and analysis should include: (1) details (if any) about any flooding issues in the area of the project that the project will address, and/or (2) if flood risk is reduced in downstream rather than immediately adjacent area, specific information about downstream flooding issues (if any) and the volume of water that will be retained or infiltrated relative to the capacity of the downstream problem area.

Create, enhance, or restore parks, habitat, or wetlands

- The explanation and analysis should include a graphic and/or description of the area of the site that is “created, enhanced, or restored” relative to the total project footprint. These more ecosystem-focused park improvements should be distinguished from the recreational points below by including planting plans with a preference for native habitats, such as:
 1. Native woodland
 2. Native shrubland
 3. Native savanna
 4. Native grassland
 5. Native riparian woodland

6. Native marsh/meadow/vernal pool
7. Open water

Improve public access to waterways

- Access and waterway should be better defined. Does access mean physical access, or is visual access sufficient? Does waterway include constructed wetlands?
- The explanation and analysis should include, where relevant, a picture and/or description of the location of the project relative to the waterway.

Enhance or create new recreational opportunities

- The explanation and analysis should include, where relevant, a graphic and/or description of the area of the site that is “created, enhanced, or restored” relative to the total project footprint. The explanation should also specifically describe enhancements or restorations relative to the original project site, with supporting graphics where possible.

Create or enhance green spaces at schools

- The explanation and analysis should include, where relevant, a picture and/or description of the location of the project relative to the school.
- This Community Investment Benefit can be awarded only if the project is “at” a school, given that several applicants took credit for school adjacent projects or projects likely to attract students from local schools.

Improve public health by reducing local heat island effect and increasing shade

- The explanation and analysis should include a description of the relative increase in shade at the project site. It should also include the number of trees that will be added and the square feet of canopy added (once fully grown in) compared to the pre-project site and compared to the full site footprint.

Improve public health by increasing the number of trees and/or other vegetation at the site location that will increase carbon reduction/sequestration and improve air quality

- The explanation and analysis should include the number and types of trees and plants to be added compared to the number and types at the site before construction begins, as well as an analysis of the amount of CO₂ that will be sequestered annually from that new vegetation (once it is mature).

Recommended longer-term fixes

Establish specific (clear) definitions and metrics for each benefit (e.g., how much carbon needs to be sequestered to receive points?; identifying what type of measurable can be applied to improved flood management).

Revisit whether Community Benefits should be merged with (more measurable) Nature-Based Solutions section (as there is so much overlap between these two). To the extent this is not deemed feasible or desirable, try to eliminate areas of redundancy, where one project design element yields multiple points (such as adding a few trees in an existing public park yields points for: (1) carbon sequestration; (2) heat island effect; (3) park enhancement; and (4) enhanced recreational opportunity, while also getting points under the Nature-Based Solution section).

D. Nature-Based Solutions

Again, due to lack of metrics and clear guidance, it was very hard for applicants to self-score or the Committee to issue a final score on nature-based solutions. Most projects claimed 10 (of 15)

nature-based solutions points, and the Scoring Committee largely awarded these points with notes to WASCs that the claims were not well supported in the application. It is currently unclear how much actual greening will occur in association with proposed projects given the inadequate guidance. Another issue the committee faced is that impermeable area points (similar to previous sections related to water quality) are percentage based, so some of the projects that scored highest actually had very little actual removal of impervious cover, but had a high percentage (for example, one project got maximum points by decreasing impermeable area from .1 to 0 acres). And some projects (which included parking lot enhancements as part of a larger park stormwater project) actually increased impervious cover, but were still awarded points if there were other nature-based (e.g., bioswale) elements to the project.

Recommended near-term fixes

Moving forward, the feasibility guidelines should be more clearly incorporated into the online application so that both applicants and Scoring Committee members can better assess whether projects are eligible for these points. Those guidelines state that “[i]f Nature-Based Solutions are not utilized, an explanation, with supporting analysis and information, of why it is not feasible to do so.” In addition, the Feasibility Study must include “[a]n explanation, with supporting analysis and information, of how the Project” meets the following criteria:

Implements natural processes to slow, detain, capture, and absorb/infiltrate water in a manner that protects, enhances or restores habitat, green space or usable open space.

- Nature mimicking projects include “green streets, spreading grounds and planted areas with water storage capacity.” Ordinance at p. 3. It must be clarified that nature-mimicking projects do not include bioreactors or low flow diversions unless there are associated planted materials.

Utilizes natural materials such as soils and vegetation with a preference for native vegetation.

- The explanation should include the relative increase in soils and vegetation at the project site and/or the relative increase in native vegetation. If a plant palate has been developed, it should be attached (and if no plant palate has been developed, then at least a description of what would go into determining a plant palate).

Recommended longer-term fixes

Consider awarding points for removal of impermeable surface based on overall acreage removed, or at least should impose a minimum acreage removed threshold to score points if percent reduction continues to be the metric. Consider whether projects that actually increase impermeable surface should face some penalty.

Undertake additional research to develop a more metrics-based approach to awarding points for nature-based projects.

E. Leveraging Funds & Community Support

Cost Share

Although the cost share criteria seems clear, applicants interpreted it in different ways: some claimed cost-share points for staff time, some claimed points for speculative funding (e.g., grant applications, or for using unspecified amounts of local return funds), and some left funding gaps (e.g., asked for \$2 million and showed \$2 million in match, but listed the overall project cost as \$5

million). The Scoring Committee gave points where there was a committed funding match (not just staff time), and funding was secure for the entire storm water portion of the project.

Recommended near-term fixes

For the next funding round, the feasibility guidelines should be elevated as part of the online application portal. Those state that, to be awarded cost share points, the Feasibility Study must include: “a discussion of how other funding sources are being leveraged to finance the Project, including documentation of such other funding sources (e.g., existing agreements, MOUs, grant awards). Other funding sources could include funds from the SCW Municipal Program.”

Recommended longer-term fixes

Consider providing more guidance on how cost-share should be calculated to ensure clarity and consistency, including:

- Requiring applicants that are committing to use their SCWP municipal funds as cost share to account for where all such local return funds are being utilized to ensure they are not being double-counted for multiple projects
- Making a determination about whether or not staff time can be counted as match
- Making a determination as to how certain funding must be to be awarded points (because of the timing of funding applications, does an applicant need to show 100% of funding is committed in order to get points, or is some lesser percentage sufficient as long as the applicant has a realistic plan to get the rest?).

Community Support

Many applicants claimed points for community support while either mistaking outreach for community support or providing a letter from an individual or group that is not representative of the broader community. Almost no applicants engaged with non-governmental organizations in a significant way to inform project design or implementation. The Scoring Committee awarded points to projects that had ANY letters of support, even if from a single resident or organization, so long as the letter was not from a municipality or elected official. However, it was unclear whether most projects have true “strong community support” as was intended when the Safe Clean Water Program was developed.

Recommended near-term fixes

For the next round of funding, a clearer definition of “strong support” must be provided and the minimum requirements for demonstrating that support must be defined, and should at a minimum clarify that “strong support” does not mean a plan for *future* outreach, and entails concrete evidence of meaningful support.

Recommended longer-term fixes

In the long run, the Board of Supervisors should consider enhancing the points available for true collaborations between NGOs and project applicants. They might also consider implementing community engagement metrics similar to those used in Prop O and Parks Measure A.

Appendix A: Possible Special Studies

1. Data mining to update scoring criteria given that the criteria was developed with five projects and there are now dozens of projects to improve thresholds.
2. For pollutant removal calculations at A.1.2 – data mining to come up with an appropriate threshold to support a “magnitude route for compliance. This would allow applicants to select from two options: a magnitude route such as pounds of pollutants removed, and a volume treatment route.
3. For the A.2 category - creating a cost effectiveness category to capture the high cost for some dry weather projects. Updates would require a data mining effort to develop this metric.
4. For the A2.2 tributary area limits - re-evaluate through a data mining effort as these came from a limited set of projects.
5. For water supply - maintenance costs have a major effect on cost effectiveness. Converting this metric to a scaled value as well as conducting a data mining effort to update the score ranges would be beneficial.
6. Water supply – Upper LA River, Upper San Gabriel River and Rio Hondo appear to have large advantage. The Scoring Committee could use a further detailed analysis to determine if what was perceived at the Committee was, in fact, what was happening.
7. Additional water supply categories could be developed for various ecological benefits provided to maximize the water supply benefits for the Region.
8. A member of the public noted that a study was done in 2007 that monitored dry weather capture for specific watersheds, and that the website should provide an estimate of dry weather flow for specific projects. TJ Moon noted that data may not be available to consistently provide a dry weather flow estimate for all areas of the County, and that new studies would likely be required. Currently, project applicants can overestimate water supply benefit by entering in their own dry weather flow value.
9. Undertake additional research to develop a more metrics-based approach to awarding points for nature-based projects

Appendix B: Breakdown of Community Investment Benefits

Of the 51 projects that cleared the scoring threshold, the following number of projects were awarded points (or claimed points for DAC benefits)

DAC	
DAC benefit claimed	34
Community Investment Benefit Awarded	
Improved flood management, flood conveyance, or flood risk mitigation	43
Creation, enhancement, or restoration of parks, habitat, or wetlands	39
Improved public access to waterways	7
Enhanced or new recreational opportunities	36
Greening of schools (assuming only at schools counts)	2
Reducing local heat island effect and increasing shade	41
Increasing the number of trees increase and/or other vegetation at the site location that will increase carbon reduction/sequestration and improve air quality	43
Nature-Based Solutions Full Points Awarded	
Implements natural processes or mimics natural processes to slow, detain, capture, and absorb/infiltrate water in a manner that protects, enhances and/or restores habitat, green space and/or usable open space	47
Utilizes natural materials such as soils and vegetation with a preference for native vegetation	43
100% impervious cover removed	7
60% impervious cover removed	2
40% impervious cover removed	6
Leveraging Funds Full Points Awarded	
>25% funding matched	5
>50% funding matched	23
Community Support Full Points Awarded	
Demonstrates strong local, community support	21