

# Scoring Committee Meeting Minutes



November 9, 2022  
2:00pm - 5:00pm  
WebEx Meeting

## Committee Members Present:

Bruce Reznik, LA Waterkeeper (Nature-Based Solutions/Water Quality), Chair  
TJ Moon, LA County Public Works (Water Quality), Vice-Chair  
David Diaz, Active SGV (Community Investments)  
Matt Stone, Santa Clarita Valley Water Agency (Water Supply)  
Esther Rojas, Water Replenishment District (Water Supply/Community Investments/Nature-Based Solutions)

## Committee Members Absent:

Dave Sorem, Mike Bubalo Construction Co., Inc (Water Quality)

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

---

## **1. Welcome and Introductions**

District staff conducted a brief tutorial on WebEx. Bruce Reznik, Chair of the Scoring Committee, welcomed Committee Members and called the meeting to order. All Committee Members made self-introductions and a quorum was established.

## **2. Approval of Meeting Minutes from October 17, 2022**

Motion to approve the meeting minutes by Member Matt Stone, seconded by Vice-Chair TJ Moon. The Committee voted to approve the October 17, 2022 meeting minutes, with three votes in favor, one in abstention, and one member absent at the time of the vote (approved, see vote tracking sheet).

## **3. Committee Member and District Updates**

District staff provided an update:

- On October 18, 2022, the Board of Supervisors (Board) voted to continue meeting virtually, acting under the authority of Assembly Bill 361 which authorizes public committees to meet without complying with all the teleconferencing requirements of the Brown Act. The Board is reviewing its position every 30 days. If the Board decides to no longer approve findings to continue teleconferencing meetings under AB 361, the Committee has the authority to make their own AB 361 findings. District staff will provide additional guidance as needed.
- Quarterly Reports for Infrastructure Program (IP) and Scientific Study (SS) Developers for Fiscal Year 2022-2023 (FY22-23) are due on November 15, 2022. Past-due reports must still be completed even if no project activities have occurred.
- The Safe Clean Water Program's (SCWP) Metrics and Monitoring Study is set to conclude in late 2023. Workshops are scheduled for November 16, 2022 from 5:30 pm to 7:00 pm and November 17, 2022 from 1:00pm to 2:30pm. More information on this can be found on the SCWP website.

## **4. Public Comment Period for Non-Agenda Items**

District Staff compiles public comment cards that are received by 5:00pm the day before scheduled CSMB WASC meetings. No comment cards were received before today's meeting.

# Scoring Committee Meeting Minutes



No public comments were shared during the meeting.

## 5. Discussion Items:

### a) Ex Parte Communication Disclosure

No ex parte communications were disclosed.

### b) Scoring of Feasibility Studies

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

Project: Burke Heritage Park & Marengo Yard Stormwater Capture Project			WASC(s): RH
Category	Applicant Score	Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Part 1	20	20	See below
Water Quality Part 2	30	30	See below
Water Supply Part 1	0	0	
Water Supply Part 2	0	0	
Community Investment	5	5	
Nature-Based Solutions	10	10	
Leveraging Funds Part 1	0	0	
Leveraging Funds Part 2 (Community Support)	4	2	See below
<b>Conclusion:</b> The project received 67 points.			
<b>Discussion:</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>Water Quality:</u> While all points were awarded, Vice-Chair Moon noted that the project has a combination of treatment options (infiltration and treat-and-release), which is difficult to capture in the SCW module. The drawdown rate in the application was different than the rate in the geotechnical report because the treatment BMP was included in the calculation. The system is oversized, treating above the 85<sup>th</sup> percentile. This will be flagged for the Biennial Review.</li> <li><u>Leveraging Funds Part 2 (Community Support):</u> Chair Reznik noted that the engagement is outward-facing in nature and does not adequately demonstrate robust community support.</li> </ul>			

Project: El Monte Norwood Elementary School Stormwater Capture Project			WASC(s): RH
Category	Applicant Score	Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Part 1	14	Unable to score	See below
Water Quality Part 2	30	Unable to score	See below
Water Supply Part 1	0	0	
Water Supply Part 2	2	0	See below
Community Investment	5	5	

# Scoring Committee Meeting Minutes



Nature-Based Solutions	12	12	
Leveraging Funds Part 1	N/A	0	
Leveraging Funds Part 2 (Community Support)	4	4	See below
<b>Conclusion:</b> The project is unable to be scored.			
<b>Discussion:</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Water Quality:</u> Vice-Chair Moon noted that the infiltration area in the application does not match the basin's bottom area shown in the schematic plan and asked the applicant to revise.</li> <li>• <u>Water Supply:</u> There was no letter from the Water Replenishment District.</li> <li>• <u>Leveraging Funds Part 2 (Community Support):</u> The project receives four points because it was developed by a non-governmental organization (NGO). The project also demonstrated strong letters of support and outreach metrics.</li> </ul>			

<b>Project:</b> Kinneloa Yard Stormwater Capture Project Preliminary Design and Feasibility Study		<b>WASC(s):</b> RH	
<b>Category</b>	<b>Applicant Score</b>	<b>Committee Score</b>	<b>Notes</b>
Water Quality Part 1	20	20	See below
Water Quality Part 2	30	30	See below
Water Supply Part 1	0	0	
Water Supply Part 2	0	0	
Community Investment	10	10	
Nature-Based Solutions	10	10	
Leveraging Funds Part 1	N/A	0	
Leveraging Funds Part 2 (Community Support)	4	0	See below
<b>Conclusion:</b> The project received 70 points.			
<b>Discussion:</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Water Quality:</u> Infiltration was assumed at 100% due to the nature of the treat and release methodology. Vice-Chair Moon looked up the proprietary treatment BMP and feels confident that adequate treatment will occur given the specifications. The project is also only asking for design funds, so all points are awarded. Vice-Chair Moon noted that the SCW module should be altered to consider non-infiltration BMPs. Vice-Chair Moon also mentioned that there should be a discussion about what constitutes a flood protection benefit considering that the project treats less than the 85<sup>th</sup> percentile.</li> <li>• <u>Leveraging Funds Part 2 (Community Support):</u> Not much outreach has been done to date, according to the application.</li> </ul>			

# Scoring Committee Meeting Minutes



Project: Merced Avenue Stormwater Capture Project			WASC(s): RH
Category	Applicant Score	Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Part 1	20	20	See below
Water Quality Part 2	20	20	See below
Water Supply Part 1	0	0	
Water Supply Part 2	0	0	
Community Investment	5	5	
Nature-Based Solutions	12	12	
Leveraging Funds Part 1	3	3	
Leveraging Funds Part 2 (Community Support)	4	3	See below
<b>Conclusion:</b> The project received 63 points.			
<b>Discussion:</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>Water Quality:</u> This project has multiple components and makes it difficult to fit into the SCW module. The initial geotechnical inspection demonstrated very low infiltration rates and the application notes that further investigation will be necessary. While there may be no infiltration, the bioswale will be able to treat runoff, so all points are awarded.</li> <li><u>Leveraging Funds Part 2 (Community Support):</u> Chair Reznik noted that while the project provided seven support letters, more direct engagement could be conducted.</li> </ul>			

Project: Beach Cities Green Streets Project			WASC(s): SSMB
Category	Applicant Score	Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Part 1	20	Unable to score	See below
Water Quality Part 2	30	Unable to score	See below
Water Supply Part 1	0	0	
Water Supply Part 2	2	0	See below
Community Investment	5	5	
Nature-Based Solutions	10	10	
Leveraging Funds Part 1	3	3	
Leveraging Funds Part 2 (Community Support)	4	4	
<b>Conclusion:</b> The project is unable to be scored.			
<b>Discussion:</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>Water Quality:</u> The project spans a large area, but because of the different BMPs being used, it is difficult to accurately reflect treatment in the SCW module. Vice-Chair Moon requested developing a table that shows each BMP, the infiltration rates, 85<sup>th</sup> percentile values, and drainage areas in disaggregated format, in order to fully explain the aggregate values provided in the application. The self-reported model referenced the region's Watershed Management</li> </ul>			

# Scoring Committee Meeting Minutes



Plan's Reasonable Assurance Analysis, which is a high-level analysis. Vice-Chair Moon requested the applicant perform a model analysis that is project specific.

- Water Supply: Member Stone commented that no letter from the Water Replenishment District was provided and questioned the feasibility of seawater barrier intrusion. Vice-Chair Moon noted that there has historically been no benefit granted for seawater barrier intrusion benefits because of the depth of the seawater barrier.

<b>Project:</b> Glen Anderson Park Regional Stormwater Capture Green Streets			<b>WASC(s):</b> SSMB
<b>Category</b>	<b>Applicant Score</b>	<b>Committee Score</b>	<b>Notes</b>
Water Quality Part 1	20	20	See below
Water Quality Part 2	30	30	See below
Water Supply Part 1	0	0	
Water Supply Part 2	0	0	
Community Investment	5	5	See below
Nature-Based Solutions	14	14	
Leveraging Funds Part 1	N/A	0	
Leveraging Funds Part 2 (Community Support)	4	2	See below
<b>Conclusion:</b> The project received 71 points.			
<b>Discussion:</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>Water Quality</u>: Vice-Chair Moon commented that the assumption of 1 cubic foot per second (cfs) based on the initial cone penetration tests seems high, but the project is for design funding and Vice-Chair Moon noted that if a lower rate was used, the score would remain the same. The design capacity is much higher than the 85<sup>th</sup> percentile. Vice-Chair Moon noted that a more thorough geotechnical analysis and calculation for the drywell will be needed when the project returns for construction funding.</li> <li><u>Community Investment</u>: Chair Reznik noted that some of the benefits were vague and could have used more documentation but were enough to garner full points.</li> <li><u>Leveraging Funds Part 2 (Community Support)</u>: Most of the outreach was outward, but the project is only at the design phase and has the opportunity to conduct better engagement moving forward.</li> </ul>			

<b>Project:</b> Machado Lake Ecosystem Rehabilitation (MLER) Operations and Maintenance			<b>WASC(s):</b> SSMB
<b>Category</b>	<b>Applicant Score</b>	<b>Committee Score</b>	<b>Notes</b>
Water Quality Part 1	20	20	See below
Water Quality Part 2	25	20	See below
Water Supply Part 1	0	0	
Water Supply Part 2	9	5	See below

# Scoring Committee Meeting Minutes



Community Investment	10	5	See below
Nature-Based Solutions	10	10	
Leveraging Funds Part 1	3	3	
Leveraging Funds Part 2 (Community Support)	4	4	See below
<b>Conclusion:</b> The project received 67 points.			
<b>Discussion:</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Water Quality:</u> Vice-Chair Moon recommended classifying the project as a dry weather project.</li> <li>• <u>Water Supply:</u> Vice-Chair Moon noted that the supply benefits are due to offsetting potable water which would otherwise be used to fill the lake. The applicants confirmed that potable water was occasionally being used to fill the lake for the preservation of ecological systems. Member Stone recommended the applicant clarify the evaporative rates when sharing their presentation to the WASC. Member Stone also noted that the application references relining the lake, but these types of efficient landscaping/non-stormwater strategies have not previously been awarded points. Vice-Chair Moon also noted that not all stormwater captured during storm events would stay in the lake and therefore full credit cannot be claimed.</li> <li>• <u>Community Investment:</u> Reclassifying the project as a dry weather project means that no flood protection benefits can be claimed. Chair Reznik noted that the community benefits were well explained in relation to the specific operations and maintenance benefits.</li> <li>• <u>Leveraging Funds Part 2 (Community Support):</u> Chair Reznik and Member Diaz applauded this project's continual community engagement.</li> </ul>			

<b>Project:</b> Wilmington-Anaheim Green Infrastructure Corridor Project		<b>WASC(s):</b> SSMB	
<b>Category</b>	<b>Applicant Score</b>	<b>Committee Score</b>	<b>Notes</b>
Water Quality Part 1	14	Unable to score	See below
Water Quality Part 2	30	Unable to score	See below
Water Supply Part 1	0	0	
Water Supply Part 2	5	Unable to score	See below
Community Investment	5	5	
Nature-Based Solutions	11	11	
Leveraging Funds Part 1	0	0	
Leveraging Funds Part 2 (Community Support)	4	3	See below
<b>Conclusion:</b> The project is unable to be scored.			
<b>Discussion:</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Water Quality:</u> Vice-Chair Moon explained that this project is applying for phase 2; phase 1 was previously approved by the Scoring Committee. Because no sewer analysis was provided and the sewer diversion calculations were unclear, this section is unable to be scored. Vice-Chair Moon requested confirmation on these two items.</li> </ul>			

# Scoring Committee Meeting Minutes



- Water Supply: The absence of a sewer capacity study makes it difficult to verify the water supply points. The Committee also requested more clarification on how the dry weather capacity was calculated.
- Leveraging Funds Part 2 (Community Support): Chair Reznik noted that there were examples of community engagement, but more meaningful engagement could have been demonstrated.

## 6. Public Comment Period for Agenda Items

A representative from City of Los Angeles Council District 15 Councilmember Joe Buscaino voiced support for the Machado Lake Ecosystem Rehabilitation (MLER) Operations and Maintenance Project and the Wilmington-Anaheim Green Infrastructure Corridor Project. The representative summarized the importance of the Wilmington-Anaheim Green Infrastructure Corridor Project to the community and shared that they will work with the project developer to provide clarifying information.

## 7. Voting Items

- a) **From Today**: Send scoreable projects receiving a passing score to WASCs:
- i. Burke Heritage Park & Marengo Yard Stormwater Capture Project
  - ii. Kinneloa Yard Stormwater Capture Project Preliminary Design and Feasibility Study
  - iii. Merced Avenue Stormwater Capture Project
  - iv. Glen Anderson Park Regional Stormwater Capture Green Streets
  - v. Machado Lake Ecosystem Rehabilitation (MLER) Operations and Maintenance

Member Stone motioned to send the above projects to the WASC, seconded by Member Esther Rojas. The motion is approved, with five votes in favor (approved, see vote tracking sheet).

- b) **From Today**: Allow project applicants with unscorable projects 1 week to provide clarifying information to the Scoring Committee:
- i. El Monte Norwood Elementary School Stormwater Capture Project
  - ii. Beach Cities Green Streets Project
  - iii. Wilmington-Anaheim Green Infrastructure Corridor Project

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

## 8. Items for Next Agenda

The next meeting is scheduled for December 1, 2022, 9:00am – 12:00pm. See the SCWP website for meeting details. Items on the Agenda include:

- a) Findings to Continue Teleconference Meetings Under Assembly Bill 361
- b) Rescoring of Feasibility Studies:

SCR	Via Princessa Park and Regional BMP Project
NSMB	Cornell – Mulholland Highway Green Improvement Project
ULAR	Arroyo Seco Projects
	California Avenue and Adjacent Streets Stormwater Capture Project
	Earvin “Magic” Johnson Park Operation and Maintenance Project

# Scoring Committee Meeting Minutes



	Hollenbeck Park Lake Rehabilitation Project
	South Pasadena Huntington Drive Regional Green Street Project
	Sylmar Channel Project
LLAR	Spane Park
LSGR	Heartwell Park at Palo Verde Channel Stormwater Capture Project
	La Mirada Creek Park Project
CSMB	Baldwin Vista Green Streets Project
RH	El Monte Norwood Elementary School Stormwater Capture Project
SSMB	Beach Cities Green Streets Project
	Wilmington-Anaheim Green Infrastructure Corridor Project

District staff commented that a survey will be sent out to solicit Committee Member availability for a back-up meeting if the 15 projects are not all addressed at the next meeting. Member Stone asked District staff to streamline the rescoring process by providing the 15 scoring rubrics and ensure applicants provide the pages of the clarifying information in an easily accessible format.

## 9. Adjournment

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



**SCORING COMMITTEE MEETING - November 9, 2022**

Member Type	Quorum Present		Voting Items		
	Member	Voting?	10/17 Meeting Minutes	From today, 11/9 SC Mtg.: Send projects w/ passing scores to WASCs	From today, 11/9 SC Mtg.: Allow Project Applicants w/ unscorable projects to provide clarifying information
Water Supply	Matt Stone	x	Y	Y	Y
Water Supply / Community Investments / Nature-Based Solutions	Esther Rojas	x	A	Y	Y
Community Investments	David Diaz	x	Not Present	Y	Y
Nature-Based Solutions / Water Quality	<b>Bruce Reznik</b>	x	Y	Y	Y
Water Quality	Dave Sorem				
Water Quality	<b>TJ Moon</b>	x	Y	Y	Y
Total Non-Vacant Seats	6	Yay (Y)	3	5	5
Total Voting Members Present	5	Nay (N)	0	0	0
		Abstain (A)	1	0	0
		Total	4	5	5
			Approved	Approved	Approved

Other Attendees	
Alfredo Magallanes	Jack Mikesell
Ana Rivera	Jacob Haik
Andrea Prado Iriarte	Joe Venzon - LA County
Andrew Kim	john hunter
Annelisa Moe (she/he)	Joyce Amaro
Brenda Ponton	Kevin H
Brett Perry	Kimberly Goins
Carmen Andrade	Latoya Waters
Christine McLeod	Maggie Gardner
cristian	Mark Nguyen
Curtis Fang	Merrill Taylor
Daniel Rydberg	Michael Scaduto
Debby Reece	Nancy Shrodes
Donna Tran	Nathan Schreiner
Doug Krauss	Oliver Galang
Dustin Bambic	Paige Bistromowitz
Edna Robidas -TPL	Richard Watson
gabriela gonzalez	Ryanna Fossum
gabriela medina	Serena Zhu
geraldine trivedi	seth carr
Giselle Ramirez	Susie Santilena
Gordon Haines	Yen Pham
Gus Orozco	

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2023-2024



<b>Watershed Area</b>	Central Santa Monica Bay
<b>Project Name</b>	Baldwin Vista Green Streets Project
<b>Project Lead</b>	City of Los Angeles, Department of Public Works, LA Sanitation and Environment
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$6,097,900
<b>Project Type</b>	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	<b>20</b>	Unable to score	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Groundwater depth at 19 feet but drywell invert at 40 feet.</li> </ul>
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	<b>30</b>	Unable to score	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Requested clarification on calculations</li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	0	<b>13</b>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	2	<b>12</b>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Cannot infiltrate due to depth to groundwater aquifer</li> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Community Investment</b>	5	<b>10</b>	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	10	<b>15</b>	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	0	<b>6</b>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	<b>4</b>	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Low participation from outreach conducted</li> </ul>
<b>TOTALS</b>	71	<b>110</b>	Unable to score	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2023-2024



<b>Watershed Area</b>	Central Santa Monica Bay
<b>Project Name</b>	Imperial Highway Green Infrastructure Project
<b>Project Lead</b>	City of Los Angeles, Department of Public Works, LA Sanitation and Environment
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$5,232,000
<b>Project Type</b>	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	0	20	0	•
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	30	30	•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	0	13	0	•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	0	12	0	•
<b>Community Investment</b>	10	10	10	• Bike lane – community enhancement
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	14	15	14	•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	6	6	6	• Demonstrate great funding partnerships
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	4	3	•
<b>TOTALS</b>	64	110	63	• Meets minimum points threshold

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2023-2024



<b>Watershed Area</b>	Lower Los Angeles River
<b>Project Name</b>	Spane Park
<b>Project Lead</b>	City of Paramount
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$18,913,128
<b>Project Type</b>	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	<b>20</b>	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 27 ac-ft capacity</li> <li>• Recommendation to score project as a dry weather project and to reclassify as dry</li> </ul>
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	<b>30</b>	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	3	<b>13</b>	Unable to score	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• WRD letter - not clear project would recharge aquifer</li> <li>• Pg 41 applicant should revise O&amp;M cost (incorrect Annual Maintenance \$20.00)</li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	12	<b>12</b>	Unable to score	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>
<b>Community Investment</b>	10	<b>10</b>	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	10	<b>15</b>	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	N/A	<b>6</b>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	<b>4</b>	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Two outreach meetings</li> </ul>
<b>TOTALS</b>	89	<b>110</b>	Unable to score	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2023-2024



<b>Watershed Area</b>	Lower Los Angeles River
<b>Project Name</b>	Long Beach Municipal Urban Stormwater Treatment (LB MUST) - Phase 2
<b>Project Lead</b>	City of Long Beach
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$10,387,527
<b>Project Type</b>	Dry

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	<b>20</b>	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Meets Title 22 standards for water treatment</li> </ul>
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	20	<b>30</b>	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Dry weather; captures &gt;200 Acres</li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	0	<b>13</b>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	2	<b>12</b>	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>81.6 AF/year</li> </ul>
<b>Community Investment</b>	10	<b>10</b>	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Dry weather project, no flood benefit</li> </ul>
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	14	<b>15</b>	14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	3	<b>6</b>	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	<b>4</b>	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Only 1 non-elected letter of support</li> </ul>
<b>TOTALS</b>	73	<b>110</b>	65	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Projects meets minimum points threshold</li> </ul>

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2023-2024



<b>Watershed Area</b>	Lower San Gabriel River
<b>Project Name</b>	Heartwell Park at Palo Verde Channel Stormwater Capture Project
<b>Project Lead</b>	City of Long Beach
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$3,313,865
<b>Project Type</b>	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather  Part 1	20	<b>20</b>	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Request to reclassify as dry weather project</li> <li>Project ask is for full design and only for construction of dry weather diversion; should only claim dry weather components</li> </ul>
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	20	<b>30</b>	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	0	<b>13</b>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	5	<b>12</b>	Unable to score	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Request to resubmit water supply calculations</li> </ul>
<b>Community Investment</b>	10	<b>10</b>	Scoring on hold	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project will not qualify for flood benefit, reducing score</li> </ul>
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	10	<b>15</b>	Scoring on hold	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	0	<b>6</b>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	<b>4</b>	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No significant community engagement. Only 2 letters of support</li> </ul>
<b>TOTALS</b>	69	<b>110</b>	Unable to score	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2023-2024



<b>Watershed Area</b>	Lower San Gabriel River
<b>Project Name</b>	Artesia Park Urban Runoff Capture Project
<b>Project Lead</b>	City of Artesia
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$1,568,876
<b>Project Type</b>	Dry

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	<b>20</b>	20	•
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	20	<b>30</b>	20	•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	0	<b>13</b>	0	•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	5	<b>12</b>	2	• Recharge not feasible due to groundwater aquifer depth
<b>Community Investment</b>	5	<b>10</b>	5	• Dry weather, no flood benefits
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	12	<b>15</b>	12	•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	N/A	<b>6</b>	0	•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	<b>4</b>	2	• 2 letters of support • Early design phase, funds planned for future outreach
<b>TOTALS</b>	66	<b>110</b>	61	• Meets minimum points threshold

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2023-2024



<b>Watershed Area</b>	Lower San Gabriel River
<b>Project Name</b>	La Habra Heights Stormwater Treatment and Reuse System The Park Hacienda Road
<b>Project Lead</b>	City of La Habra Heights
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$705,348
<b>Project Type</b>	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	<b>20</b>	20	•
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	25	<b>30</b>	25	•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	0	<b>13</b>	0	•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	0	<b>12</b>	0	•
<b>Community Investment</b>	10	<b>10</b>	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not clear how project will enhance recreational opportunities</li> <li>• Not clear on flood protection benefit</li> </ul>
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	10	<b>15</b>	10	•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	3	<b>6</b>	3	•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	<b>4</b>	2	• One way engagement; no participatory feedback
<b>TOTALS</b>	72	<b>110</b>	65	• Meets minimum points threshold



# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2023-2024



<b>Watershed Area</b>	Lower San Gabriel River
<b>Project Name</b>	La Mirada Creek Park Project
<b>Project Lead</b>	City of La Mirada
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$6,616,197
<b>Project Type</b>	Dry

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	<b>20</b>	20	•
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	20	<b>30</b>	20	•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	6	<b>13</b>	0	• \$2000 per year for maintenance is low
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	5	<b>12</b>	0	• Cannot infiltrate due to depth to groundwater
<b>Community Investment</b>	10	<b>10</b>	5	• No improvements to flood management.
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	14	<b>15</b>	14	•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	0	<b>6</b>	0	•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	N/A	<b>4</b>	Unable to score	• Request clarification on community engagement during park master plan process and how it informed the project. during Master Plan process and how it informed this project
<b>TOTALS</b>	75	<b>110</b>	Unable to score	•

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2023-2024



<b>Watershed Area</b>	Lower San Gabriel River
<b>Project Name</b>	Progress Park Stormwater Capture Project
<b>Project Lead</b>	City of Paramount
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$2,161,744
<b>Project Type</b>	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	<b>20</b>	20	•
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	<b>30</b>	30	•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	0	<b>13</b>	0	•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	5	<b>12</b>	0	• No water supply benefit due to depth to groundwater aquifer
<b>Community Investment</b>	10	<b>10</b>	10	• Joint use of park with adjacent school
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	10	<b>15</b>	10	•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	N/A	<b>6</b>	0	•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	<b>4</b>	3	• Demonstrated engagement that informed project • 3 letters of support
<b>TOTALS</b>	79	<b>110</b>	73	• Meets minimum points threshold

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2023-2024



<b>Watershed Area</b>	North Santa Monica Bay
<b>Project Name</b>	Cornell – Mulholland Highway Green Improvement Project
<b>Project Lead</b>	Los Angeles County Public Works
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$350,000
<b>Project Type</b>	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	11	<b>20</b>	11 to verify	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4.89 ac impervious area very low</li> <li>Clarify capital cost, overestimated O&amp;M</li> </ul>
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	25	<b>30</b>	25	•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	0	<b>13</b>	0	•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	0	<b>12</b>	0	•
<b>Community Investment</b>	5	<b>10</b>	5	•
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	10	<b>15</b>	10	•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	6	<b>6</b>	Unable to Score	• Secured funding not clear
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	<b>4</b>	1	• Few letters of support, but lacking participatory engagement
<b>TOTALS</b>	61	<b>110</b>	Unable to Score	

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2023-2024



<b>Watershed Area</b>	Rio Hondo
<b>Project Name</b>	Burke Heritage Park & Marengo Yard Stormwater Capture Project
<b>Project Lead</b>	City of Alhambra
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$4,424,118
<b>Project Type</b>	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	<b>20</b>	20	•
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	<b>30</b>	30	•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	0	<b>13</b>	0	•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	0	<b>12</b>	0	•
<b>Community Investment</b>	5	<b>10</b>	5	•
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	10	<b>15</b>	10	•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	0	<b>6</b>	0	•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	<b>4</b>	2	• Does not demonstrate robust two-way engagement
<b>TOTALS</b>	69	<b>110</b>	67	• Meets minimum points threshold

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2023-2024



<b>Watershed Area</b>	Rio Hondo
<b>Project Name</b>	El Monte Norwood Elementary School Stormwater Capture Project
<b>Project Lead</b>	Edna Robidas (Trust for Public Land)
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$9,828,559
<b>Project Type</b>	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	14	<b>20</b>	Unable to score	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Infiltration area does not match schematic provided – 0.7 ac, not 1.1 ac</li> </ul>
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	<b>30</b>	Unable to score	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Infiltration area does not match schematic provided</li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	0	<b>13</b>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	2	<b>12</b>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No letter from a groundwater management agency</li> </ul>
<b>Community Investment</b>	5	<b>10</b>	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	12	<b>15</b>	12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	N/A	<b>6</b>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	<b>4</b>	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Strong letters of support and metrics around outreach</li> </ul>
<b>TOTALS</b>	67	<b>110</b>	Unable to score	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2023-2024



<b>Watershed Area</b>	Rio Hondo
<b>Project Name</b>	Kinneloa Yard Stormwater Capture Project Preliminary Design and Feasibility Study
<b>Project Lead</b>	City of Pasadena
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$2,292,762
<b>Project Type</b>	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	<b>20</b>	20	•
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	<b>30</b>	30	•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	0	<b>13</b>	0	•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	0	<b>12</b>	0	•
<b>Community Investment</b>	10	<b>10</b>	10	• 6 benefits
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	10	<b>15</b>	10	•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	N/A	<b>6</b>	0	•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	<b>4</b>	0	• Application states no outreach done to date. One letter of support provided.
<b>TOTALS</b>	74	<b>110</b>	70	• Meets minimum points threshold

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2023-2024



<b>Watershed Area</b>	Rio Hondo
<b>Project Name</b>	Merced Avenue Stormwater Capture Project
<b>Project Lead</b>	City of El Monte
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$9,799,210
<b>Project Type</b>	Dry

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	20	20	•
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	20	30	20	• Project site may not infiltrate well
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	0	13	0	•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	0	12	0	•
<b>Community Investment</b>	5	10	5	•
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	12	15	12	•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	3	6	3	• Caltrans provided matching funds
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	4	3	• 7 support letters
<b>TOTALS</b>	64	110	63	• Meets minimum points threshold

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2023-2024



<b>Watershed Area</b>	Santa Clara River
<b>Project Name</b>	Via Princessa Park and Regional BMP Project
<b>Project Lead</b>	Heather Merenda, City of Santa Clarita Environmental Services Division
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$20,079,768
<b>Project Type</b>	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	<b>20</b>	Unable to score	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Volume of storage assumes open space. Volume should be a lot less (pipe), effecting total capacity. 9 ac-ft vs 17 ac-ft</li> </ul>
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	<b>30</b>	Unable to score	
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	13	<b>13</b>	Unable to score	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.5 inches, not 118 (stormwater treat in 24 hours)</li> <li>Maintenance cost low, effecting cost-effectiveness</li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	12	<b>12</b>	Unable to score	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2 cfs inflating water supply values (based on standing water)</li> </ul>
<b>Community Investment</b>	5	<b>10</b>	5	•
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	10	<b>15</b>	10	•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	3	<b>6</b>	3	•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	<b>4</b>	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No clear indication of commitment in letters of support. Unclear if engaged with mobile home residents. Good indication showing needs of community.</li> </ul>
<b>TOTALS</b>	97	<b>110</b>	Unable to score	•



# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2023-2024



<b>Watershed Area</b>	South Santa Monica Bay
<b>Project Name</b>	Wilmington-Anaheim Green Infrastructure Corridor Project
<b>Project Lead</b>	City of Los Angeles, Department of Public Works, LA Sanitation and Environment
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$10,274,500
<b>Project Type</b>	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	14	<b>20</b>	Unable to score	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Request confirmation of sewer diversion rate with a sewer analysis</li> </ul>
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	<b>30</b>	Unable to score	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	0	<b>13</b>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	5	<b>12</b>	Unable to score	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No sewer modeling capacity analysis documented</li> <li>Unclear how dry weather supply was calculated</li> </ul>
<b>Community Investment</b>	5	<b>10</b>	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	11	<b>15</b>	11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	0	<b>6</b>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	<b>4</b>	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Did not demonstrate strong community support</li> </ul>
<b>TOTALS</b>	69	<b>110</b>	Unable to score	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2023-2024



<b>Watershed Area</b>	South Santa Monica Bay
<b>Project Name</b>	Beach Cities Green Streets Project
<b>Project Lead</b>	City of Torrance
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$5,366,953
<b>Project Type</b>	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather  Part 1	20	<b>20</b>	Unable to score	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Request for summary table of the individual bmps explaining how aggregate bmp value was determined; clarifying info requested to explain dimensions</li> <li>Aggregate drainage area, dimensions, 85<sup>th</sup> %, and infiltration rate</li> </ul>
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	<b>30</b>	Unable to score	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RAA was used instead of module and RAA is for watershed scale modeling; requesting to do a project specific modeling exercise</li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	0	<b>13</b>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b>  Part 2	2	<b>12</b>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No letter from a groundwater management agency</li> <li>Seawater barrier too deep to achieve benefit</li> <li>Sea water barriers are too deep to achieve benefit</li> </ul>
<b>Community Investment</b>	5	<b>10</b>	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	10	<b>15</b>	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planting 200 trees</li> </ul>
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	3	<b>6</b>	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	<b>4</b>	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Over 20 meetings, meaningful engagement</li> </ul>
<b>TOTALS</b>	74	<b>110</b>	Unable to score	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2023-2024



<b>Watershed Area</b>	South Santa Monica Bay
<b>Project Name</b>	Glen Anderson Park Regional Stormwater Capture Green Streets
<b>Project Lead</b>	City of Redondo Beach
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$782,000
<b>Project Type</b>	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	<b>20</b>	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assumption of 1 cfs infiltration is high; impacts capacity – 21 ac-ft</li> <li>Request more thorough geotech analysis when returning for construction funds</li> </ul>
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	<b>30</b>	30	•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	0	<b>13</b>	0	•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	0	<b>12</b>	0	•
<b>Community Investment</b>	5	<b>10</b>	5	•
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	14	<b>15</b>	14	•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	N/A	<b>6</b>	0	•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	<b>4</b>	2	• Mostly one way engagement
<b>TOTALS</b>	73	<b>110</b>	71	• Meets minimum points threshold

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2023-2024



<b>Watershed Area</b>	South Santa Monica Bay
<b>Project Name</b>	Machado Lake Ecosystem Rehabilitation (MLER) Operations and Maintenance
<b>Project Lead</b>	City of Los Angeles, Department of Public Works, LA Sanitation and Environment
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$3,200,000
<b>Project Type</b>	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	<b>20</b>	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Recommend classifying project as dry weather project</li> </ul>
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	25	<b>30</b>	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	0	<b>13</b>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	9	<b>12</b>	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pending confirmation of evaporation rate to WASC</li> <li>Not all stormwater will stay in lake during storm events, cannot claim full credit for all stormwater</li> <li>Not all stormwater will stay in lake during storm events and can't claim full credit</li> </ul>
<b>Community Investment</b>	10	<b>10</b>	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not a wet weather project, no flood benefit</li> </ul>
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	10	<b>15</b>	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	3	<b>6</b>	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	<b>4</b>	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>TOTALS</b>	81	<b>110</b>	67	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Meets minimum points threshold</li> </ul>

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2023-2024



<b>Watershed Area</b>	Upper Los Angeles River
<b>Project Name</b>	Arroyo Seco Projects
<b>Project Lead</b>	City of South Pasadena
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$33,995,086
<b>Project Type</b>	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	11	20	11 to verify	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Discrepancy pg 83 and application--Hydrology 437 vs 444</li> <li>Drawdown rate clarification</li> <li>Clarification on 16.36 ac-ft capacity</li> </ul>
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	30	30 to verify	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>More detail to verify numbers</li> <li>Reirrigation use vs infiltrated</li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	0	13	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pg 266 letter from watermaster</li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	5	12	5 to verify	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Community Investment</b>	10	10	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Flood prevention benefits not demonstrated</li> </ul>
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	10	15	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	N/A	6	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Potential future Caltrans cost share</li> </ul>
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	4	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Additional support at this point of project.</li> </ul>
<b>TOTALS</b>	70	110	To Verify	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2023-2024



<b>Watershed Area</b>	Upper Los Angeles River
<b>Project Name</b>	Bowtie Demonstration Project (Updated)
<b>Project Lead</b>	The Nature Conservancy
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$7,164,575
<b>Project Type</b>	Dry

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	<b>20</b>	20	•
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	20	<b>30</b>	20	•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	0	<b>13</b>	0	•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	0	<b>12</b>	0	•
<b>Community Investment</b>	10	<b>10</b>	5	• No flood benefits
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	10	<b>15</b>	10	•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	3	<b>6</b>	3	• Continuing to pursue grant funding
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	<b>4</b>	4	• Strong demonstrations of engagement
<b>TOTALS</b>	67	<b>110</b>	62	•

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2023-2024



<b>Watershed Area</b>	Upper Los Angeles River
<b>Project Name</b>	Brookside Park Stormwater Capture Project
<b>Project Lead</b>	City of Pasadena
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$2,198,612
<b>Project Type</b>	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	<b>20</b>	20	•
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	<b>30</b>	30	•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	0	<b>13</b>	0	•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	5	<b>12</b>	5	•
<b>Community Investment</b>	5	<b>10</b>	5	•
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	10	<b>15</b>	10	•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	N/A	<b>6</b>	0	•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	N/A	<b>4</b>	0	•
<b>TOTALS</b>	70	<b>110</b>	70	•

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2023-2024



<b>Watershed Area</b>	Upper Los Angeles River
<b>Project Name</b>	California Avenue and Adjacent Streets Stormwater Capture Project
<b>Project Lead</b>	City of Glendale
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$2,970,899
<b>Project Type</b>	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	<b>20</b>	20	•
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	25	<b>30</b>	25	•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	10	<b>13</b>	Unable to score	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pg29 160 ac assuming 0.15 cfs of constant dry-weather flow inflating WS number. Dry-weather assumption to be 0.1 in/day.</li> <li>• Will change cost-effectiveness</li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	5	<b>12</b>	Unable to score	•
<b>Community Investment</b>	5	<b>10</b>	5	•
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	12	<b>15</b>	12	•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	3	<b>6</b>	3	•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	<b>4</b>	1	•
<b>TOTALS</b>	84	<b>110</b>	Unable to score	•



# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2023-2024



<b>Watershed Area</b>	Upper Los Angeles River
<b>Project Name</b>	Eagle Rock Boulevard: A Multi-Modal Stormwater Capture Project
<b>Project Lead</b>	City of Los Angeles, Department of Public Works, StreetsLA
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$7,632,723
<b>Project Type</b>	Dry

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	<b>20</b>	20	•
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	20	<b>30</b>	20	•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	0	<b>13</b>	0	•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	0	<b>12</b>	0	•
<b>Community Investment</b>	5	<b>10</b>	5	•
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	10	<b>15</b>	10	•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	6	<b>6</b>	6	• \$16M of matching funds
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	<b>4</b>	4	• Multiple community partners
<b>TOTALS</b>	65	<b>110</b>	65	•

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2023-2024



<b>Watershed Area</b>	Upper Los Angeles River
<b>Project Name</b>	Earvin "Magic" Johnson Park Operation and Maintenance Project
<b>Project Lead</b>	Los Angeles County Public Works
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$1,625,000
<b>Project Type</b>	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather  Part 1	11	<b>20</b>	Unable to score	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>O&amp;M funding request. Close look at O&amp;M report (pg 85) for how project is performing (pollutant reduction numbers, how much flow captured)</li> <li>Discrepancy 22 ac-ft and 7 ac-ft capacity</li> </ul>
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	<b>30</b>	Unable to score	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reclassify as dry weather</li> <li>Use user input value</li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	0	<b>13</b>	0	•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	5	<b>12</b>	Unable to score	•
<b>Community Investment</b>	5	<b>10</b>	5	•
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	10	<b>15</b>	10	•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	6	<b>6</b>	6	•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	<b>4</b>	4	•
<b>TOTALS</b>	71	<b>110</b>	Unable to score	• If Dry Weather: 40 points for WQ & 2 points for WS Part 2

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2023-2024



<b>Watershed Area</b>	Upper Los Angeles River
<b>Project Name</b>	Emerald Necklace John Muir High School Campus Natural Infrastructure Improvement Project
<b>Project Lead</b>	Claire Robinson, Amigos de los Rios
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$1,891,500
<b>Project Type</b>	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	14	20	14	• $1.4 \text{ AF}/\$1.7 = 0.82$
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	30	30	•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	0	13	0	•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	0	12	0	•
<b>Community Investment</b>	5	10	5	• 4 benefits
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	10	15	10	•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	3	6	3	•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	4	4	•
<b>TOTALS</b>	66	110	66	• Project meets minimum points threshold

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2023-2024



<b>Watershed Area</b>	Upper Los Angeles River
<b>Project Name</b>	Green Street Demonstration Project on Main Street
<b>Project Lead</b>	City of Alhambra
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$3,773,000
<b>Project Type</b>	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	<b>20</b>	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5.1 AF</li> </ul>
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	<b>30</b>	30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Primary Pollutant: 96% reduction of Zinc</li> <li>Secondary Pollutant: trash</li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	0	<b>13</b>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	0	<b>12</b>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Community Investment</b>	5	<b>10</b>	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	10	<b>15</b>	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	3	<b>6</b>	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	<b>4</b>	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Strong community engagement</li> </ul>
<b>TOTALS</b>	72	<b>110</b>	72	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project meets minimum points threshold</li> </ul>

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2023-2024



<b>Watershed Area</b>	Upper Los Angeles River
<b>Project Name</b>	Hollenbeck Park Lake Rehabilitation Project
<b>Project Lead</b>	City of Los Angeles, Department of Public Works, LA Sanitation and Environment
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$25,161,316
<b>Project Type</b>	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	14	<b>20</b>	Unable to Score	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Drainage area does not appear complete – pockets of missing drainage area</li> </ul>
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	<b>30</b>	Unable to Score	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	0	<b>13</b>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No letter from groundwater master</li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	12	<b>12</b>	Unable to Score	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No project specific geotechnical information (infiltration rate)</li> </ul>
<b>Community Investment</b>	10	<b>10</b>	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Near schools, but not greening of a school</li> </ul>
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	12	<b>15</b>	12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Addition of 50 trees</li> <li>Constructed wetlands</li> </ul>
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	3	<b>6</b>	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	<b>4</b>	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>TOTALS</b>	85	<b>110</b>	Unable to score	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2023-2024



<b>Watershed Area</b>	Upper Los Angeles River
<b>Project Name</b>	McCambridge Park Stormwater Capture Multi-Benefit Project
<b>Project Lead</b>	City of Burbank Public Works Department
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$2,930,000
<b>Project Type</b>	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	7	20	7	• 18.3 ac-ft capacity
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	30	30	•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	0	13	0	•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	5	12	5	• 146 AF/year
<b>Community Investment</b>	5	10	5	•
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	10	15	10	
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	3	6	3	•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	4	2	• Design only • TRP project - had opportunity for more community engagement
<b>TOTALS</b>	64	110	62	• Project meets minimum points threshold

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2023-2024



<b>Watershed Area</b>	Upper Los Angeles River
<b>Project Name</b>	Mission Mile Sepulveda: A Climate Resilient Urban Greenway to Cultural Connections Project
<b>Project Lead</b>	City of Los Angeles, Department of Public Works, StreetsLA
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$22,914,301
<b>Project Type</b>	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	7	20	7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>18.7 AF capacity/\$46M = 0.41</li> </ul>
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	30	30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Primary Pollutant: Zinc &gt;80% reduction</li> <li>Secondary Pollutant: Cu &gt; 80% reduction</li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	0	13	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	5	12	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>124 ac-ft / year</li> </ul>
<b>Community Investment</b>	5	10	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	11	15	11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	6	6	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	4	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>TOTALS</b>	68	110	68	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project meets minimum points threshold</li> </ul>

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2023-2024



<b>Watershed Area</b>	Upper Los Angeles River
<b>Project Name</b>	South Pasadena Huntington Drive Regional Green Street Project
<b>Project Lead</b>	City of South Pasadena
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$2,986,000
<b>Project Type</b>	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	<b>20</b>	Unable to score	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clarification needed for the project drainage area</li> <li>Pg 173; pg 566 discrepancy</li> </ul>
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	<b>30</b>	Unable to score	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unclear how dry well infiltration rates determined</li> <li>Pg 174; how was 0.6 cfs calculated</li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	3	<b>13</b>	Unable to score	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>\$2,100/AF</li> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	9	<b>12</b>	Unable to score	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>261 AF/year</li> </ul>
<b>Community Investment</b>	5	<b>10</b>	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	10	<b>15</b>	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	6	<b>6</b>	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>\$1M committed</li> </ul>
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	<b>4</b>	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Former TRP – opportunity for more community engagement</li> </ul>
<b>TOTALS</b>	87	<b>110</b>	Unable to score	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>



# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2023-2024



<b>Watershed Area</b>	Upper Los Angeles River
<b>Project Name</b>	Sylmar Channel Project
<b>Project Lead</b>	City of Los Angeles, Department of Public Works, LA Sanitation and Environment
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$5,005,515
<b>Project Type</b>	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	<b>20</b>	Unable to score	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>0.5 cfs infiltration rate without any onsite geotechnical tests</li> </ul>
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	<b>30</b>	Unable to score	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Onsite geotechnical report requested for dry wells and channel</li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	6	<b>13</b>	Unable to Score	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Life cycle cost discrepancy pg 49</li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	9	<b>12</b>	Unable to Score	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Community Investment</b>	5	<b>10</b>	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>45 trees, pedestrian paths</li> </ul>
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	10	<b>15</b>	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	6	<b>6</b>	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>One virtual workshop</li> <li>Letter of support from CBO</li> </ul>
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	<b>4</b>	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>TOTALS</b>	90	<b>110</b>	Unable to score	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>