

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



Watershed Area	Central Santa Monica Bay
Project Name	Ballona Creek Dry Weather Flow Treatment Project
Project Lead	SEITec
Total Funding Requested	\$13,100,000
Project Type	Dry

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"> Algae is not a TMDL Unclear justification for treatment volume Applicant noted targeting algae will lead to the treatment of bacteria No diversion for this project Algae not a pollutant within a stream river, would also meet algae downstream after leaving site. Applicant confirmed General Permit for algae
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	20	30	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Water Supply Part 1	0	13	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unclear Justification for water supply volume
Water Supply Part 2	2	12	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Applicant provided their own adjustments for water supply Complex infrastructure system for the size of the project. Concern for how the project would get permitted and operated at a school
Community Investment	10	10	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Applicant claiming recreational benefit by improving water quality in the channel
Nature-Based Solutions	12	15	12	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Leveraging Funds Part 1	0	6	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	4	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Applicant provided a neighborhood council letter of support
TOTALS	68	110	28	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A technical support grant may be a better fit at this point. Or if the applicant can retrieve the permit and agreement from the property owners.

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



Watershed Area	Central Santa Monica Bay
Project Name	Ballona Creek Low Flow Diversion Project
Project Lead	SEITec
Total Funding Requested	\$14,951,000
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	13	13	13	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 19ft high rubber dam is concerning with potential dangers or safety concerns, does not affect score. • Applicant noted the application includes examples of similarly tall rubber dams • Unclear if Hyperion has capacity to treat this supply. JR Noted Hyperion is targeting to use 100% of the flow.
Water Supply Part 2	12	12	12	•
Community Investment	5	10	5	• Additional justification would be beneficial, does not affect score
Nature-Based Solutions	5	15	0	• Applicant claims gravity for NBS, which does not meet the intent of the NBS category in the context of SCW.
Leveraging Funds Part 1	0	6	0	•
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	4	0	• Applicant did not have a letter of support from any community entities (NGO, CBO, etc)
TOTALS	79	110	70	• Very similar to a second project proposed for Ballona Creek

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



Watershed Area	Central Santa Monica Bay
Project Name	Ballona Creek TMDL Project
Project Lead	City of Los Angeles, LA Sanitation and Environment
Total Funding Requested	\$15,000,000
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	20	30	20	•
Water Supply Part 1	13	13	13	•
Water Supply Part 2	12	12	12	•
Community Investment	5	10	5	•
Nature-Based Solutions	5	15	5 0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project provides some greening, would be helpful to have additional detail on this portion of the project. • Does not impact score. • Scoring Committee removed points as nature-based solutions is intended to be for the process for how water is treated vs providing greening around the site.
Leveraging Funds Part 1	6	6	6	•
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	4	4	•
TOTALS	85	110	85 80	•

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



Watershed Area	Central Santa Monica Bay
Project Name	Blackwelder Tract Lower Ballona Creek Green BMPs and Landscape Improvement Project
Project Lead	California Greenworks, Inc.
Total Funding Requested	\$5,848,774
Project Type	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	7	20	0 7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project targets treating the 85th percentile Applicant uses an aggregate number for the design elements, which is difficult to confirm. The applicant uses an assumed draw down rate, which is not based on any Geotech study. Drawdown rate should be closer to 1 in/hr to match the 85th. Cost per capacity would go up due to less treatment volume. Estimated 0.28 Capacity/\$M \$5M for a 5ac treatment area seems high Applicant provided updated numbers to justify drawdown rate. Would still be beneficial to see backup justification to the WASC.
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	30	30	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Water Supply Part 1	0	13	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Water Supply Part 2	0	12	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Community Investment	10	10	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Nature-Based Solutions	10	15	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Leveraging Funds Part 1	0	6	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	4	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
TOTALS	61	110	54 61	<ul style="list-style-type: none">

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



Watershed Area	Central Santa Monica Bay
Project Name	Hayden Tract Lower Ballona Creek Green BMPs and Landscape Improvement Project
Project Lead	California Greenworks, Inc.
Total Funding Requested	\$5,120,579
Project Type	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	20	11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> \$5M for a 14ac treatment area seems high Applicant uses a high 2.5 in/hr infiltration rate. Assumes treating double the 85th percentile 1 in/hr is more reasonable. This is still an 85th percentile project Estimated 0.6 (capacity/\$M)
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	30	30	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Water Supply Part 1	0	13	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Water Supply Part 2	0	12	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Community Investment	10	10	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Additional justification would be beneficial. Does not affect score.
Nature-Based Solutions	10	15	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Leveraging Funds Part 1	0	6	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	4	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
TOTALS	74	110	65	<ul style="list-style-type: none">

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



Watershed Area	Central Santa Monica Bay
Project Name	Normandie Ave ES - DROPS and Paving
Project Lead	Los Angeles Unified School District
Total Funding Requested	\$5,213,778
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"> There's no plans, cost estimate, or hydrology. Applicant uses a 15.1 in/hr infiltration rate, which brings 24-hr capacity to 25 ac-ft in one day, which seems high. Needs justification. Applicant should go back in to assume 85th volume. Estimated 0.2 AF/\$5M will yield a score of 0 Total inflow volume in application shows 0 ac-ft. Need to show hydrology \$5M for 3ac treatment area Percolation test may not have allowed hours of pre-soak to validate infiltration rate Applicant provided updated numbers to increase total capacity. Applicant adjusted construction cost, but appear inconsistent throughout. Project is potentially 50x oversized to treat the 85th percentile. SC to review a potential cap in the future to capacity over the 85th. Does not impact score
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	30	30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Applicant to provide hydrology
Water Supply Part 1	0	13	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Water Supply Part 2	0	12	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Community Investment	10	10	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Additional details on the planting would have been helpful. Does not impact score.
Nature-Based Solutions	11	15	11	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Leveraging Funds Part 1	0	6	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Updated numbers for cost were inconsistent. Not clear what the construction costs were. Will need to be addressed to the WASC.
Leveraging Funds Part 2	0	4	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SC noted there should be some level of community support for this project, which could potentially raise score.
TOTALS	71	110	Unable to Score 71	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Applicant to find additional justification, construction cost breakdown.

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



Watershed Area	Central Santa Monica Bay
Project Name	Slauson Connect Clean Water Project
Project Lead	Corvias Infrastructure Solutions, Geosyntec Consultants
Total Funding Requested	\$4,898,440
Project Type	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	11	20	11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1.7 in/hr drawdown rate seems high, need additional justification to verify this rate. Otherwise will not score higher than 60pts. 24-hr volume seems high as well, estimated 1.7 ac-ft Applicant to follow-up and provide additional justification. Applicant updated drawdown rate to 0
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	25	30	30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Applicant used their own modeling results.
Water Supply Part 1	0	13	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Water Supply Part 2	0	12	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Community Investment	10	10	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not enough backup justification provided. Unclear what "maximum extent feasible" means. Needs additional justification. Access to waterway seems questionable, additional justification would be beneficial. Intent to greening of Schools benefit does not include after schools program. Applicant justification provided indirect benefits to access to waterways, SC agreed this did not meet the intent of this benefit.
Nature-Based Solutions	12	15	12	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Leveraging Funds Part 1	0	6	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	4	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Letter of support from the Vermont Slauson Development company (business incubator). Intent is to be from a CBO, NGO, etc. Applicant noted the project has been developed in coordination with the community and neighborhood councils. Applicant has provided updated letters of support.
TOTALS	62	110	Unable to Score 62	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project seems closer to a concept, not fully fleshed out currently. Project may be geared more towards a design phase, or TRP Project applicant noted \$0 needed for the first year.

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



Watershed Area	Central Santa Monica Bay
Project Name	Venice High School Comprehensive Modernization Project
Project Lead	Los Angeles Unified School District
Total Funding Requested	\$6,088,250
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"> 12 in/hr infiltration rate and 9ac-ft capacity seem high Cost breakdown is hard to follow, not possible to parse out the cost of the water quality components. Additional justification needed Applicant noted the 7 ac-ft is infiltrated with additional for storage which leads to 9ac-ft Project is designed as a flood project, with a much higher volume than the 85th percentile volume. Overdesigned for the 85th Applicant to follow-up with additional detail to the WASC
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	30	30	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Water Supply Part 1	0	13	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Water Supply Part 2	0	12	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Community Investment	10	10	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> More detail would be beneficial on the Flood Risk Mitigation benefit. Does not impact score.
Nature-Based Solutions	10	15	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Leveraging Funds Part 1	0	6	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Leveraging Funds Part 2	0	4	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A school based project should have been able to secure letters from the community, PTA, etc.
TOTALS	70	110	70	<ul style="list-style-type: none">

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



Watershed Area	Central Santa Monica Bay
Project Name	Webster MS - DROPS
Project Lead	Los Angeles Unified School District
Total Funding Requested	\$1,632,382
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"> No Plans, no cost, no hydrology. Not possible to score or validate. Project designed for much higher than the 85th. Overdesigned. Applicant to follow-up with needed information. Applicant provided updated construction cost numbers, however, unclear what the costs are as inconsistent throughout application. Updated WQ data, provides enough justification to score. SC to revisit the overdesigned project and the score over inflation.
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	30	30	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Water Supply Part 1	0	13	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Water Supply Part 2	0	12	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Community Investment	5	10	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minimal detail provided for the greenery. Would be beneficial to see more details and justification.
Nature-Based Solutions	10	15	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Application notes a reduction in impervious area, but there's no points shown in the Project Module
Leveraging Funds Part 1	0	6	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Leveraging Funds Part 2	0	4	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A school-based project should have been able to secure letters from the community, PTA, etc.
TOTALS	65	110	Unable to Score 65	<ul style="list-style-type: none">

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



Watershed Area	Lower Los Angeles River
Project Name	Compton Blvd Et. Al. Project
Project Lead	Los Angeles County
Total Funding Requested	\$600,000
Project Type	Wet

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	0	13	0	•
Water Supply Part 2	2	12	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unclear if 40 wells or 66. Applicant confirmed 66 is accurate.
Community Investment	5	10	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Was a challenge identifying where the bioswales, biofiltration, and trees are located. No backup provided to confirm this. Unclear if bike access is existing or new. Does not impact score. Applicant to provide schematic and map to the WASC and Scoring Committee for where plantings and bioswales and biofiltration are located. Applicant confirmed bikeway is new.
Nature-Based Solutions	10	15	10	•
Leveraging Funds Part 1	6	6	6	•
Leveraging Funds Part 2	0	4	0	•
TOTALS	67	110	67	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Points conditionally awarded, SC requests additional evidence to verify score.

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



Watershed Area	Lower Los Angeles River
Project Name	Furman Park Stormwater Capture and Infiltration Project
Project Lead	City of Downey
Total Funding Requested	\$12,325,670
Project Type	Dry

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"> Applicant is between a wet and dry weather project. Applicant chose to classify as dry weather, but the project does take in wet weather flow. 30-ft of gravel depth seems high. Applicant noted focus is to address dry weather bacteria TMDL and noted that infiltration rates at the site are very good.
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	20	30	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> With such a high infiltration rate, project may be close to the 85th percentile storm volume, to pick up additional points being classified as a wet weather project.
Water Supply Part 1	0	13	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Water Supply Part 2	5	12	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Deep media layer may be inflating supply benefit. Applicant noted that 30ft of gravel is an underestimate. Support letter from WRD appears to be a blanket letter. SC still to resolve what level of Watermaster approval is needed. Water is pre-treated before infiltration into groundwater.
Community Investment	5	10	Unable to score 5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clarification needed on the native vegetation and infiltration gallery. Applicant noted that current phase is design, with more details to come post-design. If classifying as dry weather, won't be able to claim Flood control benefit. Applicant provided additional detail for the CI Benefits
Nature-Based Solutions	12	15	Unable to score 12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Need clarification on the scale of the infiltration gallery to confirm score. Applicant provided additional detail on bioswale and natural processes
Leveraging Funds Part 1	0	6	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Leveraging Funds Part 2	0	4	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would be good to see letters of support from community groups.
TOTALS	62	110	Unable to score 62	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Application currently requesting funds for design and construction. Needs additional information as construction included.

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



Watershed Area	Lower Los Angeles River
Project Name	Huntington Park High School Storm Water Management System
Project Lead	Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD/District)
Total Funding Requested	\$1,401,707
Project Type	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	20	14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Irrigation included in capacity, SC reducing. 1 AF as capacity / \$1.2M = 0.83 = 14 points
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	30	30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Overdesigned, captures more than the 85th percentile.
Water Supply Part 1	0	13	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Water Supply Part 2	0	12	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Community Investment	10	10	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Nature-Based Solutions	10	15	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Leveraging Funds Part 1	0	6	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	4	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Applicant provides a pdf noting community meeting schedule but does not include letters of support. With applicant being a school, should provide a letter of support from PTA, community groups, or others.
TOTALS	74	110	64	<ul style="list-style-type: none">

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



Watershed Area	Lower Los Angeles River
Project Name	Lynwood City Park Stormwater Capture Project
Project Lead	City of Lynwood
Total Funding Requested	\$1,691,629
Project Type	Dry

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"> Applicant classified as a dry weather project, but it should be able to capture the 85th. Project is clearly not a dry weather project. As project is design only, leaving now for dry weather.
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	20	30	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Water Supply Part 1	0	13	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Water Supply Part 2	5	12	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Community Investment	10	10	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Application claimed flood control benefit. Unless reclassification to wet weather, this will remove flood benefit.
Nature-Based Solutions	12	15	12	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Leveraging Funds Part 1	0	6	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	4	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
TOTALS	71	110	66	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project is more than likely a wet weather project. Clarification should be provided to the WASC.

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



Watershed Area	Lower Los Angeles River
Project Name	Rancho Los Cerritos: Looking Back to Advance Forward
Project Lead	Rancho Los Cerritos
Total Funding Requested	\$1,715,000
Project Type	Dry

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"> Applicant classified as a dry weather, but should be classified as a wet weather. Score would not change as Part 1 would drop to zero.
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	10	30	30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Drywell alone can capture more than the 85th, which would provide full points in part 2.
Water Supply Part 1	0	13	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Water Supply Part 2	0	12	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Community Investment	10	10	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dry weather classification would not be able to claim flood control benefit. Would be able to claim if reclassification to wet weather. School benefit has to be located adjacent to the school.
Nature-Based Solutions	13	15	13	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide additional detail to the WASC on the nature-based benefits provided.
Leveraging Funds Part 1	3	6	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	4	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
TOTALS	60	110	60	<ul style="list-style-type: none">

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



Watershed Area	Lower Los Angeles River
Project Name	Salt Lake Park Infiltration Cistern
Project Lead	City of Huntington Park
Total Funding Requested	\$29,000,000
Project Type	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	20	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No plans or hydrology provided, and applicant used their own modeling with no justification. This project is between a wet and dry weather project. SC recommends reclassifying as a dry weather project, as it is not large enough to meet 85th
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	30	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This project only captures about half of the 85th percentile, but application claims full capture of pollutants. Needs justification.
Water Supply Part 1	3	13	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Applicant using their own cost estimate for supply cost. No justification provided.
Water Supply Part 2	0	12	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Community Investment	5	10	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Nature-Based Solutions	15	15	Unable to score 15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nature based justification needs more detail. Would be beneficial to see what these benefits are and what the plantings are. Applicant provided additional detail to justify NBS benefits.
Leveraging Funds Part 1	0	6	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	4	0 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Letters of support are from only cities and no community groups. SC recognizes that multi-city support is beneficial. Applicant notes support from Tree People, would be good to see a letter of support from this group. Applicant provided letters of support
TOTALS	77	110	Unable to score 64	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> WASC to confirm that benefits claimed would be constructed.

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



Watershed Area	Lower Los Angeles River
Project Name	Spane Park
Project Lead	City of Paramount
Total Funding Requested	\$891,984
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"> Depth and capacity of gallery seems inconsistent throughout application.
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	30	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Applicant used their own modeling, but justification shows inconsistent reduced pollutant capture. 90% range vs 60% range.
Water Supply Part 1	10	13	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As design only, current assumptions are permitted
Water Supply Part 2	12	12	12	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Community Investment	10	10	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project is not providing a direct benefit to schools, it is adjacent to the school. Would be beneficial to see more detail about the stream, butterfly garden, and other benefits claimed. Provide details to the WASC.
Nature-Based Solutions	10	15	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Leveraging Funds Part 1	0	6	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Leveraging Funds Part 2	0	4	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
TOTALS	92	110	77	<ul style="list-style-type: none">

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



Watershed Area	Lower Los Angeles River
Project Name	Urban Orchard Project
Project Lead	City of South Gate
Total Funding Requested	\$5,438,000
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	0	13	0	•
Water Supply Part 2	2	12	2	•
Community Investment	10	10	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dry weather projects are unable to claim flood benefit. • Project is located adjacent to school vs providing direct benefit to school.
Nature-Based Solutions	13	15	13	•
Leveraging Funds Part 1	6	6	6	•
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	4	4	•
TOTALS	75	110	70	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SC recognizes that this project is exemplary and stands out as a very good safe clean water project.

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



Watershed Area	Lower San Gabriel River
Project Name	Stormwater Treatment and Reuse System (STAR System) Hacienda Park
Project Lead	City of La Habra Heights
Total Funding Requested	\$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 confirmed 20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Oversized for 85th percentile p.16: Unclear what drawdown rate of 11.8 in/hr is from. No Geotech provided. p.16 Unclear what the 24-hour capacity is from. Applicant to verify these two figures. And to confirm if these are from evapotranspiration. No way to verify vendor rates
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	25	30	To be confirmed 25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Applicant used their own modeling system, would be better for consistency to use WMMS.
Water Supply Part 1	0	13	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Water Supply Part 2	0	12	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Community Investment	10	10	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Access to waterway, is a viewing terrace considered access. Committee will need to provide additional clarity for future applications.
Nature-Based Solutions	10	15	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unclear if the STAR system is natural. Committee discussion noted it's similar to modular wetlands. Would be beneficial to know how much of the vegetation is new vegetation.
Leveraging Funds Part 1	0	6	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	4	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Single letter from a resident. Intent for strong community support is geared more towards community groups.
TOTALS	69	110	To Be Confirmed 69	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No budget shown for O&M? Applicant to confirm this and other info requests.

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



Watershed Area	Lower San Gabriel River
Project Name	Artesia Park Stormwater Capture Project
Project Lead	City of Artesia
Total Funding Requested	\$1,250,502
Project Type	Dry

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	20	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project not quite dry or wet. Classification as dry weather.
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	20	30	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Water Supply Part 1	0	13	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Water Supply Part 2	5	12	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Potential for irrigation listed in application, unclear if this will be built or not. Applicant also claims groundwater recharge. Applicant to provide calculation for irrigation demand and amount of stormwater benefit claimed p.100 of application does not indicate how the project dry weather would provide irrigation demand
Community Investment	10	10	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dry weather project claiming flood benefit. Applicant provides detailed justification for this benefit. Improved access to water ways claimed due to creation of ephemeral stream. Committee discussion noted this does not meet the intent of this CI benefit.
Nature-Based Solutions	12	15	12	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Leveraging Funds Part 1	0	6	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	4	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
TOTALS	71	110	61	<ul style="list-style-type: none">

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



Watershed Area	Lower San Gabriel River
Project Name	Bellflower Simms Park Stormwater Capture Project
Project Lead	City of Bellflower
Total Funding Requested	\$2,141,987
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	25	30	25	• Project slightly just below 85 th percentile score.
Water Supply Part 1	0	13	0	•
Water Supply Part 2	2	12	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supply is noted as potential irrigation. Unclear if this will be incorporated. • p.144 Modeled dry weather flow does not appear to meet irrigation demand. Application notes removal of turf. Is demand being removed? • Applicant provided clarification on supply benefit.
Community Investment	5	10	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More detail would be beneficial for the CI benefits claimed. • Artificial turf may cause issues with heat island and injuries. Community feedback requested year round play. Does not impact score.
Nature-Based Solutions	12	15	12	• Artificial turf used for project.
Leveraging Funds Part 1	3	6	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prop 68 funding is not yet approved. Committee discussion noted that additional scoring guidance should be provided on this topic by ROC, District, or SC. • Applicant noted that grant is not guaranteed, and is being reapplied for from a previous declined application.
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	4	4	•
TOTALS	71	110	68	•

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



Watershed Area	Lower San Gabriel River
Project Name	Cerritos Sports Complex
Project Lead	City of Cerritos
Total Funding Requested	\$2,408,000
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	10	13	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applicant notes only the potential for water supply. Unclear if this is going to be constructed and realized. P. 116, 117: Benefits claimed for sewer discharge, on-site irrigation, and recharge. • Groundwater recharge not applicable for this project. • Application is for design funding. • Applicant noted large amount of water used for irrigation.
Water Supply Part 2	12	12	12	• Would be beneficial to see additional detail for the CI benefits.
Community Investment	10	10	5	• Application claims flood benefit as a dry weather. Would not get flood benefit.
Nature-Based Solutions	12	15	12	•
Leveraging Funds Part 1	0	6	0	•
Leveraging Funds Part 2	0	4	0	•
TOTALS	84	110	69	•

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



Watershed Area	Lower San Gabriel River
Project Name	Heartwell Park at Palo Verde Channel
Project Lead	City of Long Beach
Total Funding Requested	\$1,539,676
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"> Applicant applied for wet weather, should be reclassified as Dry weather. Project is significantly smaller than the 85th percentile. Would preserve the same 40 points.
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	20	30	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Water Supply Part 1	0	13	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Water Supply Part 2	5	12	To Be Confirmed 5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Applicant used their own value for water supply. Unclear if supply to be used for irrigation? Golf course is currently served with recycled water. Unclear if conversion from recycled to stormwater yields new supply. Applicant noted that recycled supply does not meet the needs of the golf course. New stormwater provides irrigation water with the option for discharge to sewer. Applicant to provide additional clarification on supply benefit.
Community Investment	5	10	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> With dry weather reclassification would not be able to claim Flood Benefit. Does not impact score.
Nature-Based Solutions	10	15	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Leveraging Funds Part 1	0	6	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	4	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
TOTALS	64	110	To Be Confirmed 64	<ul style="list-style-type: none">

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



Watershed Area	North Santa Monica Bay
Project Name	Stormwater Treatment, Diversion, Water Supply Augmentation, and Bioremediation Project
Project Lead	City of Agoura Hills (Jessica Forte and Kelly Fisher)
Total Funding Requested	\$4,674,650
Project Type	Dry

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	20	20 To be Confirmed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No plans or data provided on the 17 LFD's. Unclear if project is only claiming for just the one Medea Creek Diversion site or 17 LFD's. Applicant notes that construction funds to include the 17 LFD's. Applicant to provide additional details on the LFDs. Application provided insufficient additional documentation to the application. Applicant provided clarifying statements SC noted additional documentation still needed to justify WQ benefits. The cost appears much lower that would be needed to construct 17 LFDs at ~\$1M each. Applicant noted it is up to 17 LFD's, with dry streams most days of the year.
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	20	30	20 To be Confirmed	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Water Supply Part 1	3	13	3 To be Confirmed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Applicant used their own figures for the supply. These seem reasonable. Applicant to provide additional clarity to justify water supply benefits.
Water Supply Part 2	12	12	12 To be Confirmed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Applicant to retrieve letter of support for water supply benefit.
Community Investment	0	10	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Nature-Based Solutions	0	15	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Leveraging Funds Part 1	3	6	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> O&M seems high on this project. Unclear if this funding accounted for. Applicant noted that O&M is currently an estimate.
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	4	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
TOTALS	62	110	62 To be confirmed Could not Confirm. Insufficient Information	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Applicant to provide clarity on the IRWM grant for only 10 LFD's Applicant to provide schematics showing the locations and design details for the 17 LFDs.

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



Watershed Area	North Santa Monica Bay
Project Name	Viewridge Road Stormwater Improvements Project
Project Lead	Los Angeles County Public Works
Total Funding Requested	\$800,000
Project Type	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	7	20	7	•
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	30	30	•
Water Supply Part 1	0	13	0	•
Water Supply Part 2	0	12	0	•
Community Investment	5	10	5	• Very detailed planting plan provided by applicant.
Nature-Based Solutions	12	15	12	•
Leveraging Funds Part 1	6	6	6	•
Leveraging Funds Part 2	0	4	0	• Would have been beneficial to see letters of support.
TOTALS	60	110	60	•

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



Watershed Area	Rio Hondo
Project Name	Alhambra Wash Dry-Weather Diversion
Project Lead	San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments (SGVCOG), Mark Christoffels
Total Funding Requested	\$2,737,180
Project Type	Dry

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	20	20	•
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	20	30	20	•
Water Supply Part 1	0	13	0	•
Water Supply Part 2	0	12	0	•
Community Investment	5	10	Unable to score 5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would be beneficial to see additional details and justification as project is asking for construction funding. • Applicant using enhanced walking under shade as a recreational benefit, may be more geared towards habitat benefit. • Unclear if this area is high in pedestrian traffic. • Applicant to provide additional documents to show planting plan, and clarify number of trees. •
Nature-Based Solutions	10	15	Unable to score 10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very little detail provided to justify nature-based solution benefits claimed. • Unclear if benefits will be provided, listed as potential within application • Applicant confirmed bioswale area and number of trees; this needs to be verified. • Question if pedestrians in area; applicant stated likely high pedestrian traffic
Leveraging Funds Part 1	6	6	Unable to score 6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Match percentage appears inconsistent. Unclear if \$200k is missing. • Applicant confirmed 50% match • Applicant noted cost share is associated only with capital cost and not O&M.
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	4	4	
TOTALS	65	110	Unable to score 65	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Points awarded with the understanding that bioswales and trees documented will be implemented

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



Watershed Area	Rio Hondo
Project Name	Arboretum Natural Treatment Wetland & Groundwater Recharge Facility
Project Lead	City of Arcadia
Total Funding Requested	\$981,890
Project Type	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Max Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	20	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reclassify as a Dry weather project. Does not capture 85th. Applicant assumed 100% capture of the pollutants diverted into the project, which is not the intent of this criteria (TJ to confirm language in guidelines, reduction of diversion or reduction of entire tributary) Assumed 6" per hour infiltration rate, which seems high (applicant clarified this is the amount of water flowing through the project) Wetlands projects cannot be modeled in the SCW Projects Module
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	20	30	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assuming Dry, >200ac
Water Supply Part 1	10	13	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Likely in unconfined aquifer User input their own values for modeling Modeling unclear what infiltration amount, is it 47 or 406 AFY (applicant clarified; TJ noted that water treated by wetlands had not been classified as supply in round 1 call for projects; JR and Bruce noted that it could be classified as supply or equal standing; no clear policy; JR noted that this type of project is now the norm, should be resolved)
Water Supply Part 2	12	12	12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unclear how project will impact downstream projects, is it claiming supply that is already or will be captured downstream
Community Investment	10	10	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Jill and Bruce noted dry weather reclassification removes flood control benefit Bruce noted that he would like additional justification from applicants to claim CI benefits JR noted his notes had 8/10 CI benefits (no mechanism to award 8 points; will be solved in Round 3 call for projects) Future rubrics should provide flexibility for additional investment types
Nature-Based Solutions	10	15	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Impervious surface increases.
Leveraging Funds Part 1	0	6	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	4	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
TOTALS	86	110	81	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Scoring Committee members noted that the project is a good representative project for SCW.

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



Watershed Area	Rio Hondo
Project Name	East Los Angeles College Northeast Drainage Area and City of Monterey Park Biofiltration Project
Project Lead	East Los Angeles College/Build LACCD
Total Funding Requested	\$532,618
Project Type	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	11	20	To be Confirmed 11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Website not able to model wetlands. Applicant provides a draw down rate, but there is no diversion or infiltration. Should be zero. Reduces ratio Applicant noted drawdown rate is associated with filtration Applicant to provide justification for filtration drawdown rate comparison. Draw down rate confirmed – 0.375 with documentation provided
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	25	30	25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project is larger than the 85th percentile. Should have maximized pollutant capture.
Water Supply Part 1	0	13	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Water Supply Part 2	0	12	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Community Investment	5	10	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unclear how the project is enhancing the school and improve local head island effect. Are these new plantings to provide school improvement and heat island? Applicant noted site has some existing vegetation, and project will include new native plantings. Applicant notes improvements will be to both the school and the transit center. Applicant to provide additional detail and plans to the WASC.
Nature-Based Solutions	10	15	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Application notes reduction of impermeable area, would be beneficial to see detail on this.
Leveraging Funds Part 1	6	6	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	4	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
TOTALS	61	110	Held 61	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SC holding pending additional detail

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



Watershed Area	Rio Hondo
Project Name	Eaton Wash Dry-Weather Diversion
Project Lead	San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments (SGVCOG), Mark Christoffels
Total Funding Requested	\$1,894,220
Project Type	Dry

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	20	20	•
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	20	30	20	•
Water Supply Part 1	0	13	0	•
Water Supply Part 2	0	12	0	•
Community Investment	5	10	2 5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would be beneficial to see additional details and justification as project is asking for construction funding. • Application notes benefits are potential. With construction funds, more detail should be available. • Applicant to provide graphic and counts for detailed plantings and improvements
Nature-Based Solutions	10	15	5 10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Application notes reduction of impermeable area, would be beneficial to see detail on this. • Unclear if swale is included in the project, as it is called out as a potential improvement. • Applicant to provide clarity if these natural features will be included in the project.
Leveraging Funds Part 1	6	6	6	•
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	4	4	•
TOTALS	65	110	57 65	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Points awarded with the understanding that bioswales and trees documented will be implemented

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



Watershed Area	Rio Hondo
Project Name	Merced Ave Greenway (Phase I - South Residential Corridor)
Project Lead	City of South El Monte
Total Funding Requested	\$3,234,694
Project Type	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	11	20	11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Capacity is an aggregate of all BMPs in project. Confirmed.
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	20	30	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Water Supply Part 1	0	13	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Water Supply Part 2	0	12	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Community Investment	10	10	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Applicant did a very good job at justifying the various benefits provided.
Nature-Based Solutions	10	15	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Leveraging Funds Part 1	6	6	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SC recognized a good collection of cost match and leveraging other funding sources
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	4	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
TOTALS	61	110	61	<ul style="list-style-type: none">

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



Watershed Area	Rio Hondo
Project Name	Mt. Lowe Median Stormwater Capture Project
Project Lead	Los Angeles County
Total Funding Requested	\$800,000
Project Type	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	11	20	11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is a challenge to model drywells in the SCW website. Applicant using creative inputs to match the capacity of the drywell.
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	30	30	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Water Supply Part 1	0	13	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Water Supply Part 2	0	12	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Community Investment	5	10	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Nature-Based Solutions	10	15	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Leveraging Funds Part 1	6	6	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	4	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Only letter of support is from a town council. Applicant noted the Altadena town council functions primarily as a neighborhood council. SC recognizes that more clarity is required by the ROC and District to specify intent for what constitutes Strong Community Support.
TOTALS	66	110	66	<ul style="list-style-type: none">

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



Watershed Area	Rio Hondo
Project Name	Plymouth School Neighborhood Stormwater Capture Demonstration Project
Project Lead	Amigos de los Rios (AdIR), Claire Robinson
Total Funding Requested	\$559,162
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"> 3 in/hr seems high. Would be beneficial to see justification. No Geotech report provided in this report to justify infiltration rate. Even with zero rate, still scores 20 pts.
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	30	30	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Water Supply Part 1	0	13	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Water Supply Part 2	0	12	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Community Investment	5	10	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unclear if flooding benefit is justified. Does not impact score. Applicant noted that flooding does occur at the site, and the project will remove the surface water during flooding.
Nature-Based Solutions	11	15	11	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Leveraging Funds Part 1	3	6	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	4	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SC recognizes the strong community support for this project.
TOTALS	73	110	73	<ul style="list-style-type: none">

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



Watershed Area	Rio Hondo
Project Name	Rio Hondo Ecosystem Restoration Project
Project Lead	City of Monrovia
Total Funding Requested	\$2,329,375
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"> Project is undersized for the 85th percentile storm, should be classified as dry-weather project. Would not impact score.
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	20	30	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Applicant used their own modeling. As project is asking for design funds, assumptions are reasonable.
Water Supply Part 1	10	13	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Applicant used their own modeling. There's no letter from the groundwater master endorsing the project
Water Supply Part 2	12	12	12	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Community Investment	5	10	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project appears to provide more benefits than were claimed, such as reducing heat island effect, shade, and providing trees. Unclear if project provides flood benefit.
Nature-Based Solutions	10	15	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Leveraging Funds Part 1	0	6	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	4	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
TOTALS	81	110	81	<ul style="list-style-type: none">

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



Watershed Area	Rio Hondo
Project Name	Rubio Wash Dry-Weather Diversion
Project Lead	San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments (SGVCOG), Mark Christoffels
Total Funding Requested	\$2,977,080
Project Type	Dry

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	20	20	•
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	20	30	20	•
Water Supply Part 1	0	13	0	•
Water Supply Part 2	0	12	0	•
Community Investment	5	10	2 5	• Walking claimed for recreation without more details on how much of a benefit is provided.
Nature-Based Solutions	10	15	10	• Unclear if swale will be provided or not. There is only a potential of the trees and swale. • Applicant to provide schematic to show what benefits will be provided.
Leveraging Funds Part 1	6	6	6	• Unclear where the remaining \$200k are to make a full 50/50 match. • Applicant to provide clarity on cost match.
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	4	4	•
TOTALS	65	110	Held 65	• Held pending additional information to SC.

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



Watershed Area	South Santa Monica Bay
Project Name	Beach Cities Green Streets Project
Project Lead	City of Torrance
Total Funding Requested	\$2,595,000
Project Type	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	20	Unable to Score	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Applicant aggregating all numbers of the 7 locations. Would be beneficial to see details on how the project parameters were aggregated. Infiltration rate is an aggregate number, but no detail to justify Applicant to provide additional detail and justification to claim WQ benefit.
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	30	Unable to Score	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Application claims 85th percentile capture, but there's no documentation on what the 85th percentile is.
Water Supply Part 1	3	13	Unable to Score	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Application claims supply benefit but there is not groundwater recharge in the beach cities. There's no information on any discharge to sewer or other supply options. Insufficient information to justify. Application notes site is located at a seawater barrier, and would contribute to the barrier. Applicant to provide additional detail and justification to claim supply benefit.
Water Supply Part 2	2	12	Unable to Score	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Community Investment	5	10	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would be beneficial to see more detail and justification, such as the type of trees planted.
Nature-Based Solutions	10	15	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Application notes replacement of pavement with pervious pavement, but there's no points claimed.
Leveraging Funds Part 1	6	6	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cost share appears to be just less than 50%, unclear how full points awarded. Missing \$45k somewhere.
Leveraging Funds Part 2	0	4	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
TOTALS	76	110	Unable to Score Withdrawn by Applicant	<ul style="list-style-type: none">

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



Watershed Area	South Santa Monica Bay
Project Name	Carson Stormwater and Runoff Capture Project at Carriage Crest Park
Project Lead	City of Carson
Total Funding Requested	\$1,037,500
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"> Applicant assumes a full capacity on trunk line at the optimal time of day; is a challenge to model. This leads to 100% capture. Should be above 50% capture if not at optimal time, but difficult to model this.
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	30	30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project is claiming construction funds for O&M expenditures
Water Supply Part 1	0	13	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Infiltration not possible at this site due to soil contamination and other restrictions
Water Supply Part 2	12	12	12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assumes Reclamation Plant upgrade plans will come online to convert the detained water to future supply.
Community Investment	5	10	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would be good to know the types and placements of trees Unclear if the park was enhanced or put back the same; modernization of above ground amenities
Nature-Based Solutions	5	15	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> With soil contamination replacement, is this a nature-based solution; possibly included as a community investment
Leveraging Funds Part 1	6	6	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Leveraging Funds Part 2	0	4	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
TOTALS	78	110	78	<ul style="list-style-type: none">

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



Watershed Area	South Santa Monica Bay
Project Name	Portuguese Bend Landslide Complex Mitigation Project
Project Lead	City of Rancho Palos Verdes
Total Funding Requested	\$1,875,000
Project Type	Dry

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"> Project is more a landslide mitigation project. Applicant classifies as a dry weather project. A portion of the project aims to seal fissures in hillside. Is this a SCW eligible expenditure.
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	20	30	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Water Supply Part 1	0	13	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Water Supply Part 2	2	12	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project to capture flows and divert to sewer. Is this diversion recycled downstream? Application is only asking for design currently.
Community Investment	10	10	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project classified as a dry weather project, not clear if Flood benefit can be claimed. Project discusses groundwater dewatering, unclear if this is a CI benefit. Unclear if trails are new or existing that go to the coast.
Nature-Based Solutions	10	15	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Leveraging Funds Part 1	0	6	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	4	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
TOTALS	66	110	61	<ul style="list-style-type: none">

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



Watershed Area	South Santa Monica Bay
Project Name	South Santa Monica Bay Water Quality Enhancement: 28th Street Storm Drain Infiltration Project
Project Lead	City of Manhattan Beach (Mamerto Estepa Jr., Prem Kumar, and Shawn Igoe)
Total Funding Requested	\$17,620,030
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	25	30	25	•
Water Supply Part 1	6	13	0	• Providing supply directly into a tidal zone does not qualify for supply.
Water Supply Part 2	12	12	0	•
Community Investment	2	10	2	• Reduction of Heat island from 3 trees does not seem justifiable.
Nature-Based Solutions	13	15	13	•
Leveraging Funds Part 1	3	6	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 23% match appears to be lower than the bar to reach 3 points. • Applicant noted that there's a module discrepancy of present value vs life cycle cost values. • Committee noted application claims monitoring and O&M. • Does not impact score.
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	4	4	•
TOTALS	85	110	67	•

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



Watershed Area	South Santa Monica Bay
Project Name	Stormwater Basin Expansion Project
Project Lead	City of Torrance
Total Funding Requested	\$4,505,000
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"> Project already exists with some capacity, unclear if only delta capacity should be considered.
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	30	30	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Water Supply Part 1	13	13	Unable to Score	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unclear if all benefit is from recharge, located in Torrance near the coast. Would not reach usable groundwater. Suggest using only irrigation supply. Is recharge of the barrier eligible. More detail needed to justify if barrier benefit provided. Unclear again if only delta benefit is included. Applicant noted that this area contains a well, so project is providing benefit vs to barrier protection. More detail on the exact benefit is needed in application
Water Supply Part 2	12	12	Unable to Score	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Community Investment	5	10	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Nature-Based Solutions	10	15	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Leveraging Funds Part 1	0	6	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Leveraging Funds Part 2	0	4	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
TOTALS	90	110	65	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Applicant to provide justification on supply benefit to the WASC.

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



Watershed Area	South Santa Monica Bay
Project Name	Torrance Airport Storm Water Basin Project, Phase 2 Construction
Project Lead	City of Torrance
Total Funding Requested	\$12,000,000
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"> Applicant provided their own WQ modeling. Construction costs seem low.
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	30	30	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Water Supply Part 1	6	13	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sewer diversion for downstream recycling.
Water Supply Part 2	12	12	12	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Community Investment	2	10	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Nature-Based Solutions	0	15	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Leveraging Funds Part 1	0	6	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	4	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Letters are from Cities and the County, and are for a 2016 proposition application, not for SCW project. Does not meet the intent of the strong community support.
TOTALS	74	110	70	<ul style="list-style-type: none">

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



Watershed Area	South Santa Monica Bay
Project Name	Wilmington Neighborhood Greening Project
Project Lead	City of Los Angeles, Bureau of Sanitation and Environment
Total Funding Requested	\$12,183,000
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"> Overdesigned for the 85th, project captures for a full rainy season for irrigation purposes.
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	30	30	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Water Supply Part 1	0	13	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Water Supply Part 2	2	12	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Community Investment	5	10	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Applicant provided very good justification for CI benefits.
Nature-Based Solutions	11	15	11	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Leveraging Funds Part 1	0	6	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	4	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
TOTALS	72	110	72	<ul style="list-style-type: none">

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



Watershed Area	Upper Los Angeles River
Project Name	Altadena - Lake Avenue Green Improvement
Project Lead	Los Angeles County Public Works
Total Funding Requested	\$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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SCW Projects module is not suited to design dry wells. Applicant using their own methodology.
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	25	30	25	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Water Supply Part 1	3	13	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No letter from water master to confirm usable aquifer water benefit (Unclear if Letter Required at early design phase) Raymond basin does augment GW
Water Supply Part 2	5	12	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Community Investment	5	10	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would be beneficial to see more of the details for CI benefits in a later phase of design.
Nature-Based Solutions	12	15	12	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Leveraging Funds Part 1	6	6	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Leveraging Funds Part 2	0	4	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
TOTALS	76	110	76	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would be beneficial to see the letter confirmation from Raymond Basin Watermaster

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



Watershed Area	Upper Los Angeles River
Project Name	Altadena Mariposa Green Street Demonstration Project
Project Lead	Amigos de los Rios, Claire Robinson
Total Funding Requested	\$739,772
Project Type	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	20	Unable to Score 20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Water is captured from the storm drain system but only under large flood event. Project is not designed to capture first flush of the storm drain. Application currently assumes capture of the full tributary area, but flow is bypassing the site. Applicant noted that storm drain will fill to capacity by the time upstream flows reach the project site, and most will end up as surface flow. Additional information needed to confirm water quality benefits. Applicant noted a revised drainage area more accurate for the project.
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	30	Unable to Score 30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project is now 7x greater than the 85th. SC to review oversized points for WQ in future. Does not impact score.
Water Supply Part 1	0	13	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Water Supply Part 2	0	12	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Community Investment	5	10	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Nature-Based Solutions	11	15	11	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Leveraging Funds Part 1	0	6	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	4	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Significant number of letters of support. Exemplary community outreach and engagement.
TOTALS	70	110	Unable to Score 70	<ul style="list-style-type: none">

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



Watershed Area	Upper Los Angeles River
Project Name	Arroyo Seco-San Rafael Treatment Wetlands
Project Lead	City of Pasadena
Total Funding Requested	\$4,771,357
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"> SCW Projects Module is not well suited to modeling wetland projects. Applicant has combined both projects together into the module with a high infiltration, assumes rate 6cfs treatment and 5.18 in/hr draw down rate (proxy for evapotranspiration) Project should be reclassified a dry weather project. Applicant noted treatment is through a filter unit, so rates are high as a result San Rafael site treats 85th, but 2nd site does not.
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	20	30	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Water Supply Part 1	0	13	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Water Supply Part 2	5	12	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No letter from groundwater master to confirm supply benefit.
Community Investment	10	10	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Nature-Based Solutions	12	15	12	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Leveraging Funds Part 1	3	6	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	4	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Very good diversity for letters of support.
TOTALS	74	110	74	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For WASC consideration, provide letter from groundwater master to confirm supply benefit

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



Watershed Area	Upper Los Angeles River
Project Name	Broadway-Manchester Multi-Modal Green Streets Project
Project Lead	City of Los Angeles Bureau of Street Services (StreetsLA)
Total Funding Requested	\$11,719,000
Project Type	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	11	20	11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No justification for 1.15 in/hr draw down rate. Storage alone however could capture 85th percentile volume.
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	30	30	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Water Supply Part 1	0	13	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Water Supply Part 2	5	12	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Applicant used their own 100AFY vs 43AFY from the module. Needs better justification than existing spreadsheet. Recommend using the website generated number. Applicant noted that supply includes irrigation as well, which the website is unable to model. The site has a smart system in place to tackle potable vs storm supply. Applicant notes that (25 acres 6 are new) additional acres of landscaping are being constructed to pull from this system. Committee notes that offsetting potable supply for stormwater provides SCW supply benefit.
Community Investment	10	10	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Application noted greening of schools, but is located in a median adjacent to a school. Would be beneficial to get confirmation from the School that they are aware of the project and is involved with the design. Applicant has a letter from the principal of the school. Plant pallet was chosen by the community, strong community engagement.
Nature-Based Solutions	10	15	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Leveraging Funds Part 1	3	6	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	4	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Very good example of a community project.
TOTALS	73	110	73	<ul style="list-style-type: none">

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



Watershed Area	Upper Los Angeles River
Project Name	David M. Gonzales Recreation Center Stormwater Capture Project
Project Lead	Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (LADWP)
Total Funding Requested	\$19,363,000
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"> Project captures slightly more than the 85th percentile storm
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	30	30	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Water Supply Part 1	0	13	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Water Supply Part 2	12	12	12	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Community Investment	10	10	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would be beneficial to see a letter of support from the school that benefit is provided for greening of schools.
Nature-Based Solutions	15	15	15	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Leveraging Funds Part 1	6	6	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	4	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
TOTALS	97	110	97	<ul style="list-style-type: none">

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



Watershed Area	Upper Los Angeles River
Project Name	Lincoln Park Neighborhood Green Street Network
Project Lead	City of Los Angeles Sanitation and Environment
Total Funding Requested	\$18,634,578
Project Type	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	20	Unable to Score 20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SCW Website not well suited for dry well projects. Project is oversized, ~5x larger than the 85th percentile storm. Appears to be an error No Geotech provided to justify the infiltration rate. It is likely designed for the 85th percentile storm. $8.5/16 = \sim 0.5$ Applicant notes that the high capacity takes into consideration the infiltration rate. Storage volume in application leads to ~1ac-ft per drywell, which seems oversized Application to provide additional clarity Project Module Developer noted capacity is currently accurate but will be updated for future years. Does not impact score.
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	30	Unable to Score 30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is a discrepancy of the drainage area in the application and the report.
Water Supply Part 1	0	13	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Water Supply Part 2	2	12	Unable to Score 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Applicant provided additional justification for the supply benefit.
Community Investment	10	10	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would be beneficial to see a letter of support from the school that benefit is provided for greening of schools. May have been able to claim access
Nature-Based Solutions	10	15	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Leveraging Funds Part 1	0	6	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Leveraging Funds Part 2	0	4	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
TOTALS	72	110	Unable to Score 72	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Applicant to provide additional clarity

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



Watershed Area	Upper Los Angeles River
Project Name	Los Angeles Pierce College Northeast Campus Stormwater Capture & Use and Biofiltration Project
Project Lead	Los Angeles Community College District & BuildLACCD
Total Funding Requested	\$5,243,675
Project Type	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	20	11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discrepancy in drainage area in application and the appendices Application uses a 1 in/hr draw down rate for irrigation. Recommend using 0 in/hr. $7.5/9.8 = 11$ pts Insufficient information, recommend providing additional clarity
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	30	30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project does capture the 85th
Water Supply Part 1	0	13	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Water Supply Part 2	5	12	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Insufficient information, recommend providing additional clarity re-running model
Community Investment	10	10	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enhancement of schools not really provided by converting field irrigation to stormwater. Would be covered under supply. Would be beneficial to see additional justification for heat island, plant palette, and others.
Nature-Based Solutions	10	15	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Leveraging Funds Part 1	3	6	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	4	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
TOTALS	82	110	63	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Additional information to be provided to WASC

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



Watershed Area	Upper Los Angeles River
Project Name	Metro Orange Line a Water Infiltration and Quality Project
Project Lead	Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
Total Funding Requested	\$34,515,458
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"> Applicant uses ~2.5x the 85th percentile volume, looks to be using peak flow, vs the shape of the hydrograph to estimate what drywells can take in. Does not impact score Applicant to provide additional clarity.
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	20	30	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Water Supply Part 1	3	13	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Water Supply Part 2	12	12	12	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Community Investment	5	10	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Applicant claims improving access to waterway but did not provide adequate justification. Unclear how much planting is present in the project. Would be beneficial to see planting palette.
Nature-Based Solutions	10	15	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide the WASC additional details on the nature based elements of this project.
Leveraging Funds Part 1	3	6	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	4	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
TOTALS	77	110	74	<ul style="list-style-type: none">

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



Watershed Area	Upper Los Angeles River
Project Name	North Hollywood High School
Project Lead	Los Angeles Unified School District
Total Funding Requested	\$3,154,945
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"> Overdesigned for 50-year flood event. ~3x greater the 85th percentile storm.
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	30	30	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Water Supply Part 1	0	13	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Water Supply Part 2	0	12	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Community Investment	10	10	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Nature-Based Solutions	10	15	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Leveraging Funds Part 1	0	6	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	4	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Letter provided by the North Hollywood Community Gardens is part of the same school. Would be beneficial to see additional letters of support
TOTALS	74	110	74	<ul style="list-style-type: none">

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



Watershed Area	Upper Los Angeles River
Project Name	North Hollywood Park Stormwater Capture Project
Project Lead	Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (LADWP)
Total Funding Requested	\$92,394,000
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	0	13	0	•
Water Supply Part 2	12	12	12	•
Community Investment	10	10	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bruce noted they provided sufficient justification for CI benefits • Dry weather would not likely receive flood benefit (does not change score)
Nature-Based Solutions	15	15	15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unclear if all impervious surface is being replaced with pervious pavement (confirmed by applicant, replaced with pervious pavement)
Leveraging Funds Part 1	6	6	6	•
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	4	4	•
TOTALS	87	110	87	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applicant attached a monitoring plan for a separate project (Should be retrieved by SCW Team)

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



Watershed Area	Upper Los Angeles River
Project Name	Northridge Middle School
Project Lead	Los Angeles Unified School District
Total Funding Requested	\$1,920,084
Project Type	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	20	7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inconsistent drainage area from the application and the appendices. 2.5 in/hr is the highest range vs an average of the two borings done. Would be beneficial to use the average infiltration rate between borings. $1.9AF/\\$3.3M = 0.57 = 7pts$
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	30	30	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Water Supply Part 1	0	13	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Water Supply Part 2	0	12	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Community Investment	10	10	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would have been beneficial to see the plantings given the project is already constructed.
Nature-Based Solutions	10	15	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Leveraging Funds Part 1	3	6	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Leveraging Funds Part 2	0	4	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
TOTALS	73	110	60	<ul style="list-style-type: none">

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



Watershed Area	Upper Los Angeles River
Project Name	Thomas Jefferson High School Comprehensive Modernization Project
Project Lead	Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD)
Total Funding Requested	\$1,980,560
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"> Project is oversized for flooding, 5x greater than the 85th percentile storm.
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	30	30	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Water Supply Part 1	0	13	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Water Supply Part 2	0	12	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Community Investment	10	10	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> More detail and justification would have been beneficial. Unclear what recreational benefits are being provided as part of the project. Does not impact score. Unclear what "natural turf" meant within the application Applicant noted plantings plan is available. To be provided to WASC
Nature-Based Solutions	11	15	11	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Leveraging Funds Part 1	0	6	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	4	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
TOTALS	75	110	75	<ul style="list-style-type: none">

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



Watershed Area	Upper Los Angeles River
Project Name	Valley Plaza Park Stormwater Capture Project
Project Lead	Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (LADWP)
Total Funding Requested	\$26,447,000
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	0	13	0	•
Water Supply Part 2	12	12	12	•
Community Investment	10	10	10	• Very good justification for each CI benefit claimed.
Nature-Based Solutions	15	15	15	•
Leveraging Funds Part 1	6	6	6	•
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	4	4	• Great sample of letters of support from community groups
TOTALS	97	110	97	•

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



Watershed Area	Upper Los Angeles River
Project Name	Victory ES - DROPS
Project Lead	Los Angeles Unified School District
Total Funding Requested	\$178,585
Project Type	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	20	Unable to score 20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No hydrology or cost estimates provided. Challenging to calculate breakdown. Need additional information to confirm cost and capacity dimensions on p.8 of application. Applicant to provide plans and calculation for how aggregate number is calculated. Applicant provided design plans to provide justification. 10x oversized. Construction cost seems inconsistent throughout the application but does not impact score.
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	30	30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Oversized for flooding, captures more than the 85th percentile storm.
Water Supply Part 1	0	13	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Water Supply Part 2	0	12	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Community Investment	10	10	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would be beneficial to see the planting pallet and other plans as project is already constructed.
Nature-Based Solutions	15	15	15	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Leveraging Funds Part 1	0	6	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Leveraging Funds Part 2	0	4	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As applicant is a school, would be good to see letters of support from PTA, community groups, and others.
TOTALS	75	110	Unable to score 75	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Applicant to provide final construction cost to WASC Constructed in Feb-2019, would only recoup funds for approximately 2 months of construction. Can request O&M moving forward.

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



Watershed Area	Upper Los Angeles River
Project Name	Westmont - Vermont Avenue Green Improvement
Project Lead	Los Angeles County Public Works
Total Funding Requested	\$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	25	30	25	•
Water Supply Part 1	0	13	0	•
Water Supply Part 2	5	12	5	•
Community Investment	5	10	5	•
Nature-Based Solutions	14	15	14	•
Leveraging Funds Part 1	6	6	6	•
Leveraging Funds Part 2	0	4	0	• Post-design, would be good to see community letters of support.
TOTALS	75	110	75	•

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



Watershed Area	Upper Los Angeles River
Project Name	Woodlake ES - LID Project
Project Lead	Los Angeles Unified School District
Total Funding Requested	\$1,006,629
Project Type	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	20	Unable to score 20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No hydrology or cost estimates provided. Challenging to calculate breakdown. Need additional information to confirm cost and capacity dimensions on p.8 of application. Applicant provided additional documentation to justify benefits. Drainage area increased, unclear why. Construction cost very inconsistent throughout the application. Does not impact score even using the highest cost.
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	30	Unable to score 30	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Water Supply Part 1	0	13	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Water Supply Part 2	0	12	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Community Investment	10	10	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would be beneficial to see the plant pallet as the project has been constructed.
Nature-Based Solutions	10	15	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Leveraging Funds Part 1	0	6	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Leveraging Funds Part 2	0	4	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As applicant is a school, would be good to see letters of support from PTA, community groups, and others.
TOTALS	70	110	Unable to Score 70	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Applicant to provide WASC with accurate construction cost figure.

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



Watershed Area	Upper San Gabriel River
Project Name	Fairplex
Project Lead	East San Gabriel Valley Watershed Management Group
Total Funding Requested	\$31,900,000
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"> No Geotech report provided to justify draw down rate. Plans provided in application show boring logs exist for the site. May be able to use these logs to estimate draw down rate. Applicant used custom value for capacity that is less than modeled 24-hour capacity. As application is requesting construction funds, justification for draw down rate needed. Applicant provided geotech evaluation from Metro. Geotech confirmed.
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	30	20 30	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Water Supply Part 1	0	13	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Water Supply Part 2	12	12	Unable to score 9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unclear if sections of the application are missing, or if justification is not provided.
Community Investment	2	10	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Nature-Based Solutions	5	15	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Leveraging Funds Part 1	0	6	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	4	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Applicant included no letters of support, only a pending letter from the LA County Fair Association. Landowner or business letters of support do not meet the intent of strong community support.
TOTALS	73	110	Unable to score 66	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SC holding project pending additional justification from applicant

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



Watershed Area	Upper San Gabriel River
Project Name	FINKBINER PARK STORMWATER CAPTURE PROJECT
Project Lead	City of Glendora
Total Funding Requested	\$2,581,286
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	• Project is slightly larger than the 85 th percentile
Water Supply Part 1	0	13	0	•
Water Supply Part 2	9	12	9	• Applicant only includes a request letter to the Groundwater Master, but project is currently in design phase so full details not yet available.
Community Investment	5	10	5	• Project could have taken credit for enhancing recreation.
Nature-Based Solutions	12	15	12	•
Leveraging Funds Part 1	0	6	0	• Applicant did not take credit for match funds.
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	4	0	• Project includes a letter of support only from a city community service office. As a city department, this does not meet the intent of a strong community support such as a CBO, NGO, or other community group.
TOTALS	80	110	76	•

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



Watershed Area	Upper San Gabriel River
Project Name	Larkin Park
Project Lead	East San Gabriel Valley Watershed Management Group
Total Funding Requested	\$23,100,000
Project Type	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	20	Unable to score 11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No Geotech report provided to justify drawdown rate. Applicant used a custom value for their capacity which is higher than the website generated value. Applicant to provide justification for draw down rate and 24-hour capacity. Applicant provided geotech report from nearby garden. 1.8 in/hr rate. Capacity 13.9 ac-ft
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	30	Unable to score 30	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Water Supply Part 1	0	13	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Water Supply Part 2	9	12	Unable to score 9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Score will change if modifications are made to draw down rate and 24-hour capacity. The watermaster has provided a conditional letter of support, with concerns about high groundwater table. Applicant provided additional information on groundwater; pulled information from nearby well showing 40' clearance
Community Investment	2	10	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Nature-Based Solutions	10	15	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Leveraging Funds Part 1	0	6	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	4	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Letter provided by the Mayor of Claremont, which focuses only on MS4 compliance vs providing community benefits.
TOTALS	75	110	Unable to score 62	<ul style="list-style-type: none">

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



Watershed Area	Upper San Gabriel River
Project Name	Lone Hill Park
Project Lead	East San Gabriel Valley Watershed Management Group
Total Funding Requested	\$9,900,000
Project Type	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	20	Unable to score 11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No Geotech report provided to justify drawdown rate. Applicant used their own custom value for their 24-hour capacity. Applicant to provide justification for these values. Applicant provided boring logs from the project site. 3.22 in/hr, expected to be higher.
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	30	Unable to score 30	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Water Supply Part 1	0	13	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Water Supply Part 2	5	12	Unable to score 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will change if modifications are made to draw down rate and 24-hour capacity. Applicant is in the process of retrieving a letter of support from Groundwater Master.
Community Investment	5	10	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Additional graphics and planting palette would be good to see. Parking lot may have the potential for pervious pavement.
Nature-Based Solutions	10	15	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Leveraging Funds Part 1	0	6	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	4	0 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Letter of support from Mayor, with a focus on community benefits. Intent is for a community group to provide this letter of support. Recommendation to seek additional community support
TOTALS	74	110	Unable to score 62	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Request for Groundwater Master letter before WASC meeting

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



Watershed Area	Upper San Gabriel River
Project Name	Washington Park
Project Lead	East San Gabriel Valley Watershed Management Group
Total Funding Requested	\$48,400,000
Project Type	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	20	Unable to score 20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No Geotech report provided to justify drawdown rate and custom higher 24-hour capacity. Applicant to provide Geotech information to justify these values. Applicant provided boring logs of nearby project, showing silty sand Infiltration rate seems too low, increasing infiltration rate could save construction cost
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	30	Unable to score 30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 85th percentile calculation seems low. Most of the tributary area is urban. Applicant to provide additional clarity for why 85th seems low.
Water Supply Part 1	0	13	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Water Supply Part 2	12	12	Unable to score 12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will change if modifications are made to the drawdown rate and 24-hour capacity Letter of support was not provided from Raymond Basin
Community Investment	5	10	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Additional graphics and planting palette would be good to see. Parking lot may have the potential for pervious pavement.
Nature-Based Solutions	10	15	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Leveraging Funds Part 1	0	6	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	4	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Letter provided from council, with a focus on community benefits. Did council provide community input? Letters from elected officials are beneficial, but intent is to come from a community group.
TOTALS	81	110	Unable to score 77	<ul style="list-style-type: none">

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



Watershed Area	Upper San Gabriel River
Project Name	Zamora Park Renovation Project
Project Lead	City of El Monte
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	Unable to score 20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No dimensions provided for the basins, unclear how capacity was calculated. 24-hour capacity seems excessively high Applicant to provide details and justification for the capacity. Applicant revised footprint area to 2.4 ac.....capacity reduced to 23 ac-ft.
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	30	Unable to score 30	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Water Supply Part 1	0	13	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Water Supply Part 2	0	12	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Community Investment	5	10	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bus stop enhancements are not on the school property. Does not change score. Applicant noted that students use the city bus at this site.
Nature-Based Solutions	13	15	13 11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduced due to resize of project
Leveraging Funds Part 1	6	6	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	4	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
TOTALS	78	110	Unable to score 76	<ul style="list-style-type: none">