

Scoring Committee

Meeting Minutes



June 1, 2023

9:00am – 12:00pm

WebEx Hybrid Meeting

In-Person Location: LA County Public Works Headquarters, 1st Floor (Courtyard) Conference Room B
900 S. Fremont Ave, Alhambra, CA 91803

Committee Members Present:

Bruce Reznik, LA Waterkeeper (Nature-Based Solutions/Water Quality), Chair

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

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)

Committee Members Absent:

Esther Rojas, Water Replenishment District (Water Supply/Community Investments/Nature-Based Solutions)

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

1. Welcome and Introductions

LA County Flood Control District (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 April 6, 2023

District staff presented the meeting minutes from the April 6, 2023 meeting. Motion to approve the meeting minutes by Member Dave Sorem, seconded by Vice-Chair TJ Moon. The Committee voted to approve the meeting minutes, with five votes in favor (approved, see vote tracking sheet).

3. Committee Member and District Updates

District staff provided an update:

- All nine Stormwater Investment Plan (SIP) Transmittals were recommended by the Regional Oversight Committee to the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors (Board) on April 20, 2023.
- The District hosted informational sessions for the Fiscal Year 2024-2025 (FY24-25) Call for Projects on May 24 and 25, 2023. The application deadline is July 31, 2023
- A summary of module changes was presented. See meeting minute attachments for details.
- All six Committee Member seats are up for re-selection for the upcoming fiscal year. Individuals interested in being reappointed as a Committee Member should submit the Interest to Serve Form or notify District staff via email. Nominations will be accepted, and the final decision made by the five Supervisorial Districts.
- Subject matter experts are also appointed by the Board of Supervisors. Individuals interested in serving as a subject matter expert for the next term should submit the online Interest to Serve Form.

District staff highlighted updates to the project module to allow project applicants the option of selecting multiple BMP types, though the module still only performs the calculation for the primary BMP type.

Scoring Committee

Meeting Minutes



District staff recommended project applicants use the module to calculate the largest BMP benefit and provide calculations for other BMP types via attachment.

Member Matt Stone plans to step down and is willing to serve until a replacement is found.

Answering a question from Member David Diaz, District Staff shared that Fund Transfer Agreements have historically been executed in January, and District staff is working to expedite the process this year. Projects that do not require CEQA approval are expected to receive funds around October.

a) Alternate Water Supply Scoring Pilot in FY24-25 Call for Projects

District staff shared the SCW Project Module on screen to demonstrate how applicants can choose whether to be scored using the pilot water supply scoring method. Member Dave Sorem mentioned that the incremental points are more practical for the higher point ranges; projects that receive one water supply point, for example, would have a cost of \$104,000 per acre-foot or greater, and that if the project were a single-purpose water supply project that cost would be infeasible.

The memo describing this pilot scoring method can be found on the Safe, Clean Water Program (SCWP) website.

4. Public Comment Period for Non-Agenda Items

District staff compile all public comment cards received and include them in the meeting minutes that are uploaded to the SCWP website as "Meeting Minutes Attachment". There were no public comment cards submitted prior to the meeting.

Michael Scaduto (City of Los Angeles) commented that it is good to see incremental point attribution for water quality and water supply being implemented in the SCWP. However, Scaduto highlighted that the SCWP is meant to promote multi-benefit projects, which may mean projects may have secondary or tertiary benefits that earn only a few points. Projects with low water supply points but whose primary benefit is water quality should not be discounted purely because of the lower water supply points. Scaduto also commented that the roll out of the updated module changes comes close to the application deadline and project applicants may have difficulty adjusting to the new module inputs given that many applicants have been working on project applications since the end of the last round. For future changes to the module, it would be beneficial for applicants to be made aware of these changes earlier.

Member Stone replied regarding the water supply cost effectiveness comment and is in favor of the graduated scoring method given that the project applicant acknowledges that water supply, for example, may not be the primary benefit.

5. Discussion Items:

a) Ex Parte Communication Disclosure

Chair Bruce Reznik disclosed weekly meetings with Our Water LA and the City of Los Angeles that discuss SCWP in general.

b) Revised FY23-24 Scoring Memo

District staff presented the Revised Scoring Memo. Slides can be found on the SCWP website.

Scoring Committee

Meeting Minutes



- **Variation in project submittal type**

Currently, the Project Module allows project applicants to fill out one application for design, construction, and operation and maintenance (O&M) funding. The Scoring Committee has recommended that the Project Module be changed to allow applicants to submit separate and different applications for different project types.

There was a discussion that SCWP is one of the only public programs that fund O&M (as opposed to only capital improvement projects) and that a discussion needs to occur about the future of the Program funding only O&M.

- **Water Quality**

The Committee clarified the recommendation includes project applicants still capturing higher than the 85th percentile storm; but does suggest capping point accrual at the 85th percentile storm volume treated to discourage oversizing projects for point inflation. This has been a recommendation for several years, and project developers should be aware of the Scoring Committee's perspective on this issue. Vice-Chair Moon added that treat and release BMPs are required to capture 1.5 times the 85th percentile storm to be consistent with the MS4 permit. District staff noted that applicants will be asked to include the 85th percentile storm capture volume in the application as a point of reference for the Scoring Committee to evaluate accordingly, however, the Project Module will not restrict calculations that go above the 85th percentile in this round of Call for Projects as it involves changing the operating guidelines of the SCWP.

Vice-Chair Moon expressed interest in reviewing modeling data from previous projects to inform development of the scoring scales that the District has indicated would eventually help delineate dry from wet weather projects.

Chair Reznik requested District staff analyze the Metrics and Monitoring Study's (MMS) water quality category recommendations. Most of the recommendations would require a 30-day public comment period to implement and are therefore not under consideration for this Stormwater Investment Plan year.

Vice-Chair Moon noted that dry weather projects should have a cost effectiveness metric and that gallons per minute per one million dollars (GPM/\$1M) is not necessarily the only option, as was described by the memo.

- **Water Supply**

Chair Reznik clarified that particularly for construction projects, the recommendation is to require more specificity in describing the water supply benefit being claimed. For design projects, it would be acceptable for the applicant to still be in the process of evaluating different options. Chair Reznik also said these issues could be resolved if the design and construction applications were made distinct.

The Committee noted that letters of support from watermasters or water purveyors have not been as indicative of water supply benefits as the SCWP originally intended. Watermasters are constrained by adjudications and policies and the Committee should consider whether the SCWP should be constrained by those same limitations. Mike Antos (Stantec, Regional Coordination) noted that there have been instances of projects funded through SCWP that provide infiltration as a treatment opportunity but were not evaluated as eligible for water supply points because of those policy limitations. In response to a question about evaluation of different metrics, it was shared that MMS is investigating elements of water supply as previously discussed, and that the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works is in a partnership with the United States Department of the Interior Bureau of Reclamation that is evaluating aspects of distributed infiltration for water supply.

Scoring Committee

Meeting Minutes



Chair Reznik highlighted the need to clarify water supply points for wastewater recycling projects. The Committee needs guidance on evaluating projects that divert to future, planned recycling facilities or facilities that do not perform 100% recycling. This topic should be flagged for the Regional Oversight Committee's Biennial Review. Antos noted that one SCWP project was not able to claim benefits for diverting wet weather flow to another nature-based treat and release project that was not yet built. Current guidance is that a project, which diverts flow to a wastewater treatment plant that does or will soon recycle water, received water supply benefit credit.

- **Community Investment Benefits**

Applicants need to clearly demonstrate the need for the community investment benefits proposed. This could look like quantitative metrics or direct community support for the claimed benefits. The heat island effect is an example of a benefit claimed by many project applicants who didn't provide clear reasoning, which could look like a map demonstrating the community is a heat island and then describing in detail how the project would contribute to addressing the heat island.

The Committee discussed the earlier Scoring Committee recommendation to only allow wet weather projects to receive the flood protection community investment benefit. The Committee has been skeptical of the many projects that have claimed this benefit because relatively small-scaled stormwater management projects are rarely a significant contribution to broad watershed or city scale flood protection. On the other hand, this recommendation may prevent dry weather projects that do present clear solutions to localized flooding (such as addressing recurring flooding at the intersection across from a school, for example) from receiving the flood protection community investment benefit. The Regional Coordination team will make note of the distinction and supplement the memo.

- **Nature Based Solutions**

The Committee did not discuss the proposed recommendations in this category.

- **Leveraged Funds and Community Support**

Chair Reznik recognized that the SCWP is often the first place for projects to receive funding to use as leverage for other funding programs. Antos also mentioned that there are additional resources available outside this Committee related to leveraged funds, such as the Watershed Coordinators.

Member Diaz suggested that along with a community engagement plan, applications should require a budget for community engagement. Member Diaz also mentioned on a separate topic, that the Technical Resources Program (TRP) should also require community engagement dollars as part of the \$300,000 scope (as opposed to engagement promised after the TRP process). The Regional Coordination team will ensure that the Scoring Committee's recommendation for mandatory community engagement is reflected in the memo.

The memo will be sent to the Regional Oversight Committee for their Biennial Review of the SCWP, and will be used as one of the sources of adaptive management planning within the District staff.

c) Meeting Schedule

The tentative timeline for FY24-25 projects is as follows:

- August 2023: District to conduct completeness checks
- September 2023: WASCs to vote to send selected Infrastructure Program (IP) projects to the Scoring Committee
- October 2023: Scoring Committee to start scoring IP projects

Scoring Committee

Meeting Minutes



Member Diaz requested the District provide a summary of the current funding allocations for all the Watershed Areas prior to scoring. The updated summary with the most recent SIP transmittals can also be found on the SIP transmittal letter for each WASC on the SCWP website under the Regional Program tab, Stormwater Infrastructure Program. Chair Reznik added that it may also be useful to see a distribution of types of projects for each Watershed Area prior to scoring but will discuss with District Staff/Regional Coordination prior to the September meeting.

No appeals have been submitted to this Committee from previous rounds.

6. Public Comment Period for Agenda Items

There were no public comments.

7. Voting Items

There were no voting items.

8. Items for Next Agenda

The next meeting is scheduled for the first Thursday in September. See the SCWP website for meeting details. District staff will be prioritizing appointing new Scoring Committee members by the September meeting.

9. Adjournment

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

SCORING COMMITTEE MEETING - June 1, 2023

Member Type	Quorum Present		Voting Items
	Member	Voting?	4/6/2023 Meeting Minutes
Water Supply	Matt Stone	x	Y
Water Supply / Community Investments / Nature-Based Solutions	Esther Rojas		Not Present
Community Investments	David Diaz	x	Y
Nature-Based Solutions / Water Quality	Bruce Reznik	x	Y
Water Quality	Dave Sorem	x	Y
Water Quality	TJ Moon	x	Y
Total Non-Vacant Seats	6	Yay (Y)	5
Total Voting Members Present	5	Nay (N)	0
		Abstain (A)	0
		Total	5
			Approved

Other Attendees	
Alonso	Ida Meisami LASAN
Andrew Kim	Janet Rodriguez Livesey
Annelisa Moe she/her	Johanna Chang
Billy Berler	John Bodenchak
Carlos Moran	Julie Allen
Cas, CWH	M. Scaduto
Charlotte Derby	Maggie Gardner
Christine McLeod	Marisol Ibarra
Christopher Vong	Mark Nguyen
Cristian Hernandez	Melania Gaboyan
Daniel Rydberg	Mossavi, Conor
Devon Provo	Paige Bistromowitz
Donna T	Raina
Gina L	Shirley Fontanie
Heather Merenda	Susie Santilena
Joe Venzon - LA County	leslie friedman

SUMMARY OF SCW PROJECTS MODULE CHANGES FOR FY24-25 CALL FOR PROJECTS (SCORING COMMITTEE VERSION)

No.	Description of Changes
1	<p>Design Elements: Multiple BMP types</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - On the Overview tab, added a multi-select drop down where users can select several BMP types for description purposes. The list is output in the compiled PDF. - On Configuration page, Revised BMP Type dropdown prompt to indicate the selected type is for modeling and scoring purposes.
2	<p>Total SCW Funding Requested</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Locked down funding requested field after submittal, only accounts with admin permissions can update after that. - For partial funding, use submit table to see if the project has been submitted before
3	<p>Assumed Constructions by FY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Added a subsection in the Cost & Schedule page, Funding Request tab with a toggle for users to indicate whether they anticipate they will request SCW funding in the future for construction costs. If toggled yes, user enters anticipated future construction funding requests by FY.
4	<p>Cost & Schedule</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Revise description: <p>Please enter cost breakdown information in fields below to generate a table with cost breakdown and estimate life-cycle costs. Also, please attach cost justification including detailed line-item breakdown of estimated expenditures (including all project costs and Cost Share funding) and a detailed schedule of estimated expenditures and phases. Please ensure the attachments are consistent with the Total Funding in the Phase Costs table within this section of the application.</p>
5	<p>Scores in Public Facing Summary</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Updated to show module scores, last updated date. - Added comment boxes for each score section, above which is the module score and notes on their project tiles. - Final scores and comments included in excel export as well.
6	<p>Project Status</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Added project status "Withdrawn".
7	<p>Cost & Schedule</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Revised description and tooltip: <p>A major consideration for project funding is cost. Below please provide information on all costs by phase (planning, design, and construction, and Bid/Award) and annual costs...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Revised tooltip <p>..., land acquisition, permitting, construction, Bid/Award, full lifetime...</p>
8	<p>Funding Request</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Revised description: <p>Please enter the requested schedule of funding (by Year and Phase) to create a summary table for the first 5 years. The requested schedule of funding must match the Total Funding Requested Funding. Funding requested beyond the first 5 years should only be used for extended planning, design, and/or construction. O&M requests should be submitted as a separate funding request in 5-year increments.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Revised tooltip: <p>Eligible expenses may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Project Management, including required reporting •... •Non-eligible expenses include investigation, litigation, fines or settlements <p>Eligible expenditures being only those incurred on or after November 6, 2018.</p> <p>Refer to sections 16.05.A.2 and 16.05.A.3 of the SCWP Ordinance.</p>
9	<p>SCW Program 2022 Interim Guidance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Updated links throughout site.
10	<p>LACFCD Conceptual Approval</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Updated map and contacts.
11	<p>Cost & Schedule:Capital Costs of \$25M or more</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Added new toggle and alert to make them toggle when it applies. - Acknowledgement statement added to compiled PDF.
12	<p>Pilot Scoring Method with point increments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Added new toggle and upload section.

Approved 
Keith A. Lilley

May 22, 2023

TO: Scoring Committee
Safe, Clean Water Program

FROM: Los Angeles County Flood Control District

IMPLEMENTATION OF THE ALTERNATE WATER SUPPLY SCORING PILOT IN FISCAL YEAR 2024-25 CALL FOR PROJECTS

As part of the adaptive management of the Safe, Clean Water (SCW) Program, the Metrics and Monitoring Study produced an early deliverable to analyze 183 Infrastructure Program project applications (including projects that were accepted and funded, considered but not funded, referred to the Technical Resources Program, or currently under consideration) to inform potential modifications to the Safe, Clean Water Program Water Supply Benefits Scoring Criteria.

Several alternative approaches to scoring Water Supply Benefits were evaluated, including calibrating scoring to historical projects, adding gradation to scoring rubrics, construction cost indexing, additional accounting for leveraged funding, and a strawman rubric proposal recommended by the North Santa Monica Bay Watershed Area Steering Committee to accommodate local characteristics.

It was determined that calibrating Water Supply Benefits scoring to historical projects would provide a viable alternative to test in the next year of implementation. Not only does it create a refined framework for projects to potentially increase their water supply score, but it also addresses stakeholder concerns about inflation and potential diminishing opportunities resulting from water captured by nearby projects.

As a result, the District is providing a pilot rubric/worksheet to aid project developers in estimating Water Supply Benefit scores calibrated to historical projects as an alternative Scoring Criteria for Water Supply Benefits in all 9 Watershed Areas in Fiscal Year 2024-25 Call for Projects only. It is intentionally separated from the Safe, Clean Water Program project module application since this effort is only a pilot, and the module will still show estimated Water Supply Benefit scores based on the original criteria. Applicants will be able to select whether their proposal should be scored per the original or pilot scoring options for Water Supply Benefits, ensuring the Scoring Committee will only need to utilize one methodology or the other.

Scoring Committee
May 22, 2023
Page 2

For the scoring of Fiscal Year 2024-25 Infrastructure Program Projects, the Scoring Committee shall review and score the submitted projects per each applicant's selected Scoring Criteria for Water Supply Benefits, as was previewed at the April 20th Regional Oversight Committee meeting. The District will provide support throughout the process, and will be providing further background and details in the upcoming Call For Projects Information Sessions scheduled for May 24th and May 25th.

It is important to note that Water Supply Benefits Scoring Criteria will continue to be evaluated within the context of the Metrics and Monitoring Study and the Regional Oversight Committee's upcoming Biennial Progress Report process. If the pilot Scoring Criteria were to be applied to future years, it would require annual updates to the historical calibration going forward. It is also possible that a different direction may be pursued altogether.

DC:le

p:\swppub\secretarial\2023\memos\scw sc memo-20230517.docx

Attach.

Guidance for Alternate Water Supply Scoring Pilot (Optional) for FY2024-25 Call for Projects

Water Supply Benefits Alternative Scoring Analysis

An early outcome of the Metrics and Monitoring Study (MMS) is a recommendation to provide future Safe, Clean Water Program (SCW Program) Infrastructure Program (IP) applicants the opportunity for Projects to be scored using new alternative (optional) scoring criteria for the Water Supply Benefits Sections B1 and B2 of the scoring rubric. The alternative scoring criteria was established by evaluating historical trends and other data based on the analysis of 183 IP Projects that were submitted in the first four years of the SCW Program. Analysis included review of Project applications that were accepted and subsequently funded, considered but not funded, referred to the Technical Resources Program (TRP) for further refinement, or are currently under consideration.

Alternate Water Supply Scoring Pilot

Considering the recommendations in the MMS, the District will implement the Alternate Water Supply Scoring Pilot (Pilot) in all 9 SCWP Watershed Areas. The Pilot will incorporate the new alternative scoring criteria, to potentially determine a project's Water Supply Benefits score, and will be utilized in the Fiscal Year 2024-2025 (FY 24-25) Call for Projects cycle only.

The new alternative scoring criteria will provide additional point scale flexibility so that Project scores can be tallied at one-point increments (as compared to the current stepwise criteria) and would enable projects managing smaller drainage areas to earn points. This approach better aligns the cost-effectiveness and magnitude scoring with the true range of Program-worthy multi-benefit project efficiencies and performance, and inherently accounts for District-wide opportunities, constraints, and economic changes over time.

The Pilot includes the development of the enclosed Alternate Water Supply Scoring Form (Form). Applicants seeking IP funding in FY 24-25 will have the option of using the imbedded Form to determine their Project's Water Supply Benefits score, using the new alternative scoring criteria, in lieu of the original scoring criteria. Note: Use of the Form is optional; the Scoring Committee will evaluate the Water Supply Benefits scores of either the Form (if selected and filled in by the applicant) or the original SCW Program Project Module score that uses the original criteria. Below is the new alternative Water Supply Benefits scoring criteria for reference:

SCW Program

Alternate Water Supply Scoring Pilot (Optional)



B1. Water Supply Cost Effectiveness

Section	Score Range	Scoring Standards
B. Significant Water Supply Benefits	25 points max	The Project provides water re-use and/or water supply enhancement benefits
	13 points max	<p>B1. Water Supply Cost Effectiveness. The Total Life-Cycle Cost² per unit of acre foot of Stormwater and/or Urban Runoff volume captured for water supply is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • $\geq \\$104,000/\text{ac-ft} = 1 \text{ point}$ • $\geq \\$39,700 \text{ and } < 104,000/\text{ac-ft} = 2 \text{ points}$ • $\geq \\$29,400 \text{ and } < 39,700/\text{ac-ft} = 3 \text{ points}$ • $\geq \\$19,400 \text{ and } < 29,400/\text{ac-ft} = 4 \text{ points}$ • $\geq \\$13,600 \text{ and } < 19,400/\text{ac-ft} = 5 \text{ points}$ • $\geq \\$8,880 \text{ and } < 13,600/\text{ac-ft} = 6 \text{ points}$ • $\geq \\$7,020 \text{ and } < 8,880/\text{ac-ft} = 7 \text{ points}$ • $\geq \\$5,360 \text{ and } < 7,020/\text{ac-ft} = 8 \text{ points}$ • $\geq \\$2,930 \text{ and } < 5,360/\text{ac-ft} = 9 \text{ points}$ • $\geq \\$2,290 \text{ and } < 2,930/\text{ac-ft} = 10 \text{ points}$ • $\geq \\$1,786 \text{ and } < 2,290/\text{ac-ft} = 11 \text{ points}$ • $\geq \\$976 \text{ and } < 1,786/\text{ac-ft} = 12 \text{ points}$ • $< \\$976/\text{ac-ft} = 13 \text{ points}$ <p>². Total Life-Cycle Cost: The annualized value of all Capital, planning, design, land acquisition, construction, and total life O&M costs for the Project for the entire life span of the Project (e.g. 50-year design life span should account for 50-years of O&M). The annualized cost is used over the present value to provide a preference to Projects with longer life spans.</p>

B2. Water Supply Benefit Magnitude

Section	Score Range	Scoring Standards
B. Significant Water Supply Benefits, continued	12 points max	<p>B2. Water Supply Benefit Magnitude. The yearly additional water supply volume resulting from the Project is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • $> 0 \text{ and } \leq 2 \text{ ac-ft/year} = 1 \text{ point}$ • $> 2 \text{ and } \leq 6 \text{ ac-ft/year} = 2 \text{ points}$ • $> 6 \text{ and } \leq 11 \text{ ac-ft/year} = 3 \text{ points}$ • $> 11 \text{ and } \leq 34 \text{ ac-ft/year} = 4 \text{ points}$ • $> 34 \text{ and } \leq 61 \text{ ac-ft/year} = 5 \text{ points}$ • $> 61 \text{ and } \leq 100 \text{ ac-ft/year} = 6 \text{ points}$ • $> 100 \text{ and } \leq 137 \text{ ac-ft/year} = 7 \text{ points}$ • $> 137 \text{ and } \leq 189 \text{ ac-ft/year} = 8 \text{ points}$ • $> 189 \text{ and } \leq 263 \text{ ac-ft/year} = 9 \text{ points}$ • $> 263 \text{ and } \leq 420 \text{ ac-ft/year} = 10 \text{ points}$ • $> 420 \text{ and } \leq 692 \text{ ac-ft/year} = 11 \text{ points}$ • $> 692 \text{ ac-ft/year} = 12 \text{ points}$

Alternate Water Supply Scoring Pilot

Project Name	Enter Project Name
Call for Projects Year	FY24-25
SCW Program Watershed Area	Enter Watershed Area

Annualized Life-Cycle Cost (\$)		(Cost & Schedule > Cost & Schedule)
Annual Average Capture (AF)		(Water Supply > Benefit Magnitude)
B1. Water Supply Cost Effectiveness (\$/AF)		

B1. Water Supply Score (Pilot)	
B2. Water Supply Benefit Magnitude (Pilot)	

Project Scoring Criteria Section B1 incorporates life-cycle costs. Water Supply efficiency is driven by the ratio of the project’s life-cycle cost to the magnitude of annual capture of stormwater for augmenting water supply.

Project Scoring Criteria Section B2 is based upon estimates of annual average Water Supply Benefits. Water Supply Benefit Magnitude is the yearly additional water supply volume.

Revised Scoring Committee Memo

Comments and recommendations shared during Round 4 project scoring

6/1/23



SAFE CLEAN WATER L.A.



Summary - Recommendation Themes

- Variation in infrastructure project submittal types
- Calculations and scoring of water quality benefits
- Criteria to earn water supply points
- Scoring of nature-based solutions
- Eligible community investment benefits
- Scoring considerations for leveraged funding and community support letters



SAFE CLEAN WATER L.A.



Scoring Committee recommendations to address variation in project submittal type

1. Modify feasibility study guidelines with different submittals for different project types:
 - a) Design-only requests
 - b) Construction projects
 - c) O&M-only requests
2. Encourage separate applications for design and construction funding, especially if there are multiple phases of a project
3. Provide guidance on how the Committee should evaluate design-only projects that propose a variety of implementation scenarios



SAFE CLEAN WATER L.A.



Water Quality Benefits

A.1 Wet + Dry Weather Water Quality Benefits	50 points max	The Project provides water quality benefits				
	20 points max	<p>A.1.1: For Wet Weather BMPs Only: Water Quality Cost Effectiveness (Cost Effectiveness) = (24-hour BMP Capacity)¹ / (Capital Cost in \$Millions)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <0.4 (acre feet capacity / \$-Million) = 0 points • 0.4-0.6 (acre feet capacity / \$-Million) = 7 points • 0.6-0.8 (acre feet capacity / \$-Million) = 11 points • 0.8-1.0 (acre feet capacity / \$-Million) = 14 points • >1.0 (acre feet capacity / \$-Million) = 20 points <p>¹. Management of the 24-hour event is considered the maximum capacity of a Project for a 24-hour period. For water quality focused Projects, this would typically be the 85th percentile design storm capacity. Units are in acre-feet (AF).</p>				
- OR -	30 points max	<p>A.1.2: For Wet Weather BMPs Only: Water Quality Benefit - Quantify the pollutant reduction (i.e. concentration, load, exceedance day, etc.) for a class of pollutants using a similar analysis as the E/WMP which uses the Districts Watershed Management Modeling System (WMMS). The analysis should be an average percent reduction comparing influent and effluent for the class of pollutant over a ten-year period showing the impact of the Project. Modeling should include the latest performance data to reflect the efficiency of the BMP type.</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;"><u>Primary Class of Pollutants</u></td> <td style="text-align: center;"><u>Second or More Classes of Pollutant</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • >50% = 15 points • >80% = 20 points <p>(20 Points Max)</p> </td> <td> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • >50% = 5 points • >80% = 10 points <p>(10 Points Max)</p> </td> </tr> </table>	<u>Primary Class of Pollutants</u>	<u>Second or More Classes of Pollutant</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • >50% = 15 points • >80% = 20 points <p>(20 Points Max)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • >50% = 5 points • >80% = 10 points <p>(10 Points Max)</p>
	<u>Primary Class of Pollutants</u>	<u>Second or More Classes of Pollutant</u>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • >50% = 15 points • >80% = 20 points <p>(20 Points Max)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • >50% = 5 points • >80% = 10 points <p>(10 Points Max)</p>					
A.2 Dry Weather Only Water Quality Benefits	20 points	A.2.1: For dry weather BMPs only, Projects must be designed to capture, infiltrate, treat and release, or divert 100% (unless infeasible or prohibited for habitat, etc) of all tributary dry weather flows.				
	20 points max	<p>A.2.2: For Dry Weather BMPs Only. Tributary Size of the Dry Weather BMP</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <200 Acres = 10 points • >200 Acres = 20 points 				



SAFE CLEAN WATER L.A.



Scoring Committee recommendations: Water Quality Benefits

Changes to project module:

- a) Disallow 24-hour BMP capacity above the 85th percentile design storm volume and require applicants to submit calculations
- b) Allow dry weather calculations to be superseded by monitoring data, if available
- c) Investigate standardizing the process for the flow calculation inputted by the applicant
- d) Allow applicants to select multiple BMP types to be evaluated



SAFE CLEAN WATER L.A.



Scoring Committee recommendations: Water Quality Benefits

Changes to Feasibility Study Requirements:

- a) Require site specific geotechnical reports for projects applying for construction funding



SAFE CLEAN WATER L.A.



Scoring Committee recommendations: Water Quality Benefits

Changes to Scoring Criteria:

- a) Allow applicants to categorize the project using a load-based criteria (i.e. pounds of pollutants removed), in addition to dry weather or wet weather criteria, or....
- b) Create sliding scale for projects that capture quantities between dry weather and wet weather capacities.
- c) Revise the cost-effectiveness (per acre-foot) criteria under A.1.1 to be linear or scaled
- d) Consider creating a cost-effectiveness category for the A.2 category (possibly employing a gallons per minute (GPM)/\$1M metric).



SAFE CLEAN WATER L.A.



Water Supply Benefits

B. Significant Water Supply Benefits	25 points max	The Project provides water re-use and/or water supply enhancement benefits
	13 points max	<p>B1. Water Supply Cost Effectiveness. The Total Life-Cycle Cost² per unit of acre foot of Stormwater and/or Urban Runoff volume captured for water supply is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • >\$2500/ac-ft = 0 points • \$2,000–2,500/ac-ft = 3 points • \$1500–2,000/ac-ft = 6 points • \$1000–1500/ac-ft = 10 points • <\$1000/ac-ft = 13 points <p>². Total Life-Cycle Cost: The annualized value of all Capital, planning, design, land acquisition, construction, and total life O&M costs for the Project for the entire life span of the Project (e.g. 50-year design life span should account for 50-years of O&M). The annualized cost is used over the present value to provide a preference to Projects with longer life spans.</p>
	12 points max	<p>B2. Water Supply Benefit Magnitude. The yearly additional water supply volume resulting from the Project is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <25 ac-ft/year = 0 points • 25 - 100 ac-ft/year = 2 points • 100 - 200 ac-ft/year = 5 points • 200 - 300 ac-ft/year = 9 points • >300 ac-ft/year = 12 points



Scoring Committee recommendations: Water Supply Benefits

- To address difficulty in claiming water supply points from infiltration:
 - Change the SCWP ordinance definition of “water supply benefit” to include activities that infiltrate water with the intent to replenish groundwater, or
 - Adjust the scoring criteria to include different thresholds for different WASCs, create a “base plus bonus” system of scoring, and/or assign weights to different scoring categories.



SAFE CLEAN WATER L.A.



Scoring Committee recommendations: Water Supply Benefits

- Adjust Scoring Criteria with recommendations from the Metrics and Monitoring Study (MMS) investigation on how to lower or recalibrate the B.1 cost effectiveness for water supply points.



Scoring Committee recommendations: Water Supply Benefits

- Modify the feasibility study guidelines to require that projects which claim water supply benefits via offsetting potable water demand provide an analysis of supply and demand impacts of the project.



SAFE CLEAN WATER L.A.



Community Investment Benefits

<p>C. Community Investments Benefits</p>	<p>10 points max</p>	<p>The Project provides Community Investment Benefits</p>
	<p>10 points</p>	<p>C1. Project Includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One of the Community Investment Benefits identified below = 2 points • Three distinct Community Investment Benefits identified below = 5 points • Six distinct Community Investment Benefits identified below = 10 points <p>Community Investment Benefits include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improved flood management, flood conveyance, or flood risk mitigation • Creation, enhancement, or restoration of parks, habitat, or wetlands • Improved public access to waterways • Enhanced or new recreational opportunities • Greening of schools • Reducing local heat island effect and increasing shade • Increasing the number of trees increase and/or other vegetation at the site location that will increase carbon reduction/sequestration and improve air quality.



SAFE CLEAN WATER L.A.



Scoring Committee recommendations: Community Investment Benefits

- School greening benefits will be evaluated on a per project basis for projects not located on a school campus
 - In general: projects with a joint use agreement with a school can receive school greening credit
- Only projects that capture the 85th percentile storm can receive flood protection benefits
 - *Staff note: this restriction may prevent community investment points from being awarded to projects that seek to address localized flooding concerns that occur in storms less than the 85th percentile.*



SAFE CLEAN WATER L.A.



Nature-based Solutions

D. Nature-Based Solutions	15 points max	<p>The Project implements Nature-Based Solutions</p> <p>D1. Project:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implements natural processes or mimics natural processes to slow, detain, capture, and absorb/infiltrate water in a manner that protects, enhances and/or restores habitat, green space and/or usable open space = 5 points • Utilizes natural materials such as soils and vegetation with a preference for native vegetation = 5 points • Removes Impermeable Area from Project (1 point per 20% paved area removed) = 5 points
---------------------------------	---------------	---



SAFE CLEAN WATER L.A.



Scoring Committee recommendations: Nature-based Solutions

- Document that artificial turf will not be considered a nature-based solution by the SCWP
- Improve the impervious surface removal calculation by:
 - Requiring applicants to submit additional information to document the impermeable surface removed in relation to the total project area
 - Adjusting scoring criteria from a percentage to the total impermeable area removed
- Assign points for projects that connect habitats or community hubs, or otherwise provide net benefits via nature-based solutions



SAFE CLEAN WATER L.A.



Leveraging Funds and Community Support

E. Leveraging Funds and Community Support	10 points max	The Project achieves one or more of the following:
	6 points max	<p>E1. Cost-Share. Additional Funding has been awarded for the Project.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • >25% Funding Matched = 3 points • >50% Funding Matched = 6 points
	4 points	E2. The Project demonstrates strong local, community-based support and/or has been developed as part of a partnership with local NGOs/CBOs.



SAFE CLEAN WATER L.A.



Scoring Committee recommendations: Leveraging Funds and Community Support

- Remind applicants that only secured leveraged funds can be evaluated by the Scoring Committee
 - Funds that are merely “likely” to be secured will not be sufficient to earn leverage funding points.



SAFE CLEAN WATER L.A.



Scoring Committee recommendations: Leveraging Funds and Community Support

- Remind proponents that letters of support for a project should be recent (1-2 years) and addressed to the SCWP instead of reusing letters of support addressed to other organizations



SAFE CLEAN WATER L.A.



Scoring Committee recommendations: Leveraging Funds and Community Support

- Provide clearer definition of “strong community support” and the minimum requirements for demonstrating that support (e.g., number of community members contacted, representation from the neighborhood, etc.)



SAFE CLEAN WATER L.A.



Other Recommendations

1. Adjust the scoring system to establish that certain categories are not optional
 - a) For example, the category for Leveraging Funds and Community Support (Part 2) is only worth five points, so project applicants can neglect community engagement and still pass the scoring threshold
2. Consider awarding points for job creation in the scoring criteria
3. Consider including positive impact on climate response in the scoring criteria

To: Safe, Clean Water Program
900 South Freemont Ave
Alhambra, CA 91803

From: Mike Antos, Ryanna Fossum
SCWP Regional Coordination Team
Stantec Consulting Inc
300 North Lake Avenue, #400
Pasadena, CA 91101

Date: May 30, 2023

Reference: Scoring Committee Comments and Recommendations – Round 4 Projects

PURPOSE AND BACKGROUND

At the November 3, 2022 Scoring Committee meeting, Chair Bruce Reznik requested that note-takers keep a list of the items discussed regarding the Safe Clean Water Program (SCWP) scoring system. The following memorandum includes a list of systemic updates discussed or mentioned during Scoring Committee meetings for Round 4 projects (Fiscal Year 2023-2034).

At the April 6, 2023 meeting, the Scoring Committee reviewed the summary materials here, and shared specific recommendations that align with their previously recorded comments, requesting that the recommendations be provided in this final memo. The Committee also requested that this memo incorporate comments made by the committee during the prior three years of SCWP implementation. Both additions were made to this final memo.

The recommendations made by the Scoring Committee will be reviewed by District Staff and incorporated into the production of the SCWP biennial report, and as appropriate to other adaptive management efforts.

VARIATION IN INFRASTRUCTURE SUBMITTAL TYPES

The following comments reflect the Scoring Committee's thinking about how projects submitted to the infrastructure program for design only funding, or for a previously or concurrently implemented project seeking only O&M funding are difficult to evaluate alongside projects seeking design, implementation, and O&M funding.

- September 1, 2022 – There is not yet guidance to help evaluate design-only projects that propose a variety of alternatives. An audit to compare benefits promised and benefits realized for projects that received SCWP funding may be needed (Member Matt Stone).
- October 6, 2022 – As noted in previous rounds of scoring, it is difficult to score Operations and Maintenance (O&M) projects using the current scoring criteria (comment by Member Diaz and concurrence by Chair Reznik).
- November 3, 2022 – As noted in previous rounds of scoring, projects that apply for both design and construction funding should submit separate applications, especially if there are multiple phases of the project (Committee Members).
- November 3, 2022 – As noted in previous rounds of scoring, evaluation of projects seeking design-only funding is typically more lenient than projects seeking both design and construction funding (Chair Reznik).

Reference: Scoring Committee Comments and Recommendations – Round 4 Projects

- December 1, 2022 –Projects requesting a small amount for design versus a large amount for construction should be intentionally considered during the scoring process as it relates to the cost benefit ratio of a project (Committee Members).

Notes from Scoring Committee Review, April 6, 2023

The Scoring Committee shared that the Infrastructure Program application process does not sufficiently manage the three types of infrastructure program project submittals: design, construction, and O&M. The Committee believes the different project types warrant slightly different scoring approaches or a weighted scoring system. The Scoring Committee also recommends that the SCWP encourage projects that apply for both design and construction funding to submit separate applications, especially if there are multiple phases of the project. The Scoring Committee also requested guidance on how to evaluate design-only projects that propose a variety of alternatives.

Similarly, the Scoring Committee sought more guidance on whether to award points for project benefits based on the entire cost and merits of a project or just components of the project funded by the SCWP.

Other Scoring Committee recommendations:

1. To Modify Feasibility Study Guidelines to outline specific requirements for each project submittal type:
 - a. Design-only projects:
 - i. A more flexible application process
 - ii. Require conceptual plan/feasibility study (already required)
 - iii. Preference for on-site geotechnical analysis, but would be satisfactory to use existing or nearby geotechnical information
 - b. Construction projects:
 - i. Require a minimum of 60% design plans
 - ii. Require on-site geotechnical analysis
 - iii. Require a letter from water purveyor for water supply points
 - iv. Require sanitary sewer capacity analysis
 - c. Operations & Maintenance only projects:
 - i. Require monitoring data to supersede modeling data
2. To Develop clearer guidelines for the Scoring Committee and applicants about which parts of a project can be given credit, including direction for the following:
 - a. Existing policy says that a project seeking funding for the first phase scope of a multi-phase project cannot claim benefits beyond what the first phase will achieve. In situations where an applicant is seeking funding for a design phase where multiple potential implementation scenarios exist, how should the Scoring Committee evaluate projects that propose a variety of alternatives?
 - b. Affirm that total project cost is used in the cost/benefit calculations in all project benefit categories where that metric is used to evaluate proposals. Some proposers have elected to include only partial project costs in the cost/benefit calculations.

Reference: Scoring Committee Comments and Recommendations – Round 4 Projects

WATER QUALITY BENEFITS

The following comments reflect the Scoring Committee considering the issues around assessing a project as providing wet weather Water Quality Benefits as opposed to dry weather Water Quality Benefits and practices to standardize project applications for assessment.

- September 1, 2022 – More guidance is needed to assess whether projects are dry weather or wet weather (Vice Chair Moon).
- October 17, 2022 – The maximum calculated 24-hour storm capacity should be capped at the 85th percentile storm capacity. This cap will reduce the points historically awarded to applicants that use a larger capacity in calculations (Vice Chair Moon).
 - Concerns about inaccurate system capacity calculations that go above the 85th percentile storm capacity were raised again at the November 3rd and November 9th Scoring Committee meetings.
- November 3, 2022 – Projects with treat-and-release or proprietary BMPs should be evaluated based on the results of the Metrics and Monitoring Study instead of being treated as an infiltration basin in the SCW module (Vice Chair Moon).
- November 9, 2022 -- The Project Module and Scoring Criteria are not equipped to allow applicants to input multiple treatment techniques (e.g. dry wells and treat-and-release) (Vice Chair Moon).
- December 1, 2022 – Some form of standardization for dry weather should be created for future applications. Field measurements are ideal but using a standard authority's cubic feet per second (cfs) per acre could also be considered. The number of dry days in a year assumed in an application should also be standardized. If an applicant uses a 24-hour duration instead of the standard 72-hour duration used after a wet weather event to mark when dry weather begins, they should provide justification. (Vice Chair Moon).
- December 1, 2022 – Projects should not be designed to treat more water than required, as it increases the cost and use of SCWP funds (Vice Chair Moon).
- December 1, 2022 – For future applications, site-specific geotechnical data should be required for projects requesting construction funding and may be a step in the District's preliminary verification process (Vice Chair Moon).

Notes from Scoring Committee Review, April 6, 2023

The Scoring Committee identified several challenges when it comes to awarding water quality benefit points to projects, including non-standardized calculations used across applications and a lack of flexibility in distinguishing between wet weather and dry weather projects. Scoring Committee recommendations from previous rounds of scoring also included revising the cost-effectiveness (per acre-foot) criteria under A.1.1 and potentially creating a cost-effectiveness category under A.2. Recommended next steps are below.

Other Scoring Committee recommendations:

1. Changes to project module:

Reference: Scoring Committee Comments and Recommendations – Round 4 Projects

- a. Disallow 24-hour BMP capacity above the 85th percentile design storm volume and require applicants to submit calculations.
 - b. Allow dry weather calculations to be superseded by monitoring data, if available
 - c. Investigate standardizing the process for the flow calculation inputted by the applicant
 - d. Allow applicants to select multiple BMP types to be evaluated
2. Changes to Feasibility Study Guidelines:
 - a. Require site specific geotechnical reports for projects applying for construction funding
 3. Changes to Scoring Criteria:
 - a. Allow applicants to categorize the project using a load-based criteria (i.e. pounds of pollutants removed), in addition to dry weather or wet weather criteria.
 - b. Create sliding scale for projects that capture quantities between dry weather and wet weather capacities
 - c. Revise the cost-effectiveness (per acre-foot) criteria under A.1.1 to be linear or scaled
 - d. Consider creating a cost-effectiveness category for the A.2 category (possibly employing a gallons per minute (GPM)/\$1M metric).

WATER SUPPLY BENEFITS

The following comments reflect the Scoring Committee considering how Water Supply Benefits can be assessed and considered for other-than infiltration to groundwater.

- November 3, 2022 – Water supply cost effectiveness points are difficult to earn (Chair Reznik)
- November 3, 2022 – The Scoring Committee should consider whether projects located in watershed areas with very deep aquifers should be awarded water supply benefit points for interventions that intend to recharge the aquifer (such as concrete removal), even if no direct path to the aquifer is specified (comment by Member Stone and concurrence by Member Esther Rojas).
 - In the past, no points have been awarded to projects in watershed areas without aquifers, but the Scoring Committee has given partial points to projects that demonstrate the intent for recharge in regions where aquifers are present (Vice Chair Moon).

Notes from Scoring Committee Review, April 6, 2023

The Scoring Committee concluded that the current water supply scoring criteria prevents them from awarding water supply benefit points for projects that demonstrate the intent for groundwater recharge without definitive proof of generating usable recharged water. Committee Members understand that this would limit the ability for many projects to receive points for water supply and recommended either adjusting the scoring criteria or changing the ordinance definition of water supply benefit.

The Scoring Committee also clarified its position on a Round 3 Scoring Memo comment, concerning whether a project's newly created water demand can count towards creating water supply, such as a project creating additional demand for onsite irrigation and meeting that demand with captured runoff. If a project is claiming a water supply benefit by offsetting a new potable demand, the applicant should provide an analysis of supply and demand impacts of the project.

Reference: Scoring Committee Comments and Recommendations – Round 4 Projects

Other Scoring Committee recommendations:

1. To address difficulty in claiming water supply points from infiltration:
 - a. Change the SCWP ordinance definition of “water supply benefit” to include activities that infiltrate water with the intent to replenish groundwater, or
 - b. Adjust the scoring criteria to include different thresholds for different WASCs, create a “base plus bonus” system of scoring, and/or assigning weights to different scoring categories.
2. Adjust scoring criteria with recommendations from the Metrics and Monitoring Study (MMS) investigation on how to lower or recalibrate the B.1 cost effectiveness for water supply points.
3. Modify the Feasibility Study Guidelines to require that projects which claim water supply benefits via offsetting potable water demand provide an analysis of supply and demand impacts of the project.

COMMUNITY INVESTMENT BENEFITS

The following comments reflect the Scoring Committee considering how school greening and flood protection benefits can be considered for Community Investment Benefits.

- October 17, 2022 – As noted in previous rounds of scoring, school greening points should only be awarded to projects that directly implement green features in school campuses (Chair Reznik).
- November 3, 2022 – The Scoring Committee should consider whether school greening points may be awarded to projects that are not located on school property but located on property which the school uses or intends to use (Chair Reznik).
- November 3, 2022 – Flood protection benefits cannot be awarded to dry weather projects for Community Investment points (comment by Member Diaz and concurrence by Chair Reznik).
- November 9, 2022 – More discussion is needed to decide whether all wet weather projects confer flood protection benefits, or just those which treat the 85th percentile storm (comment by Vice Chair Moon).

Notes from Scoring Committee Review, April 6, 2023

The Scoring Committee concluded that school greening benefits will be evaluated on a per project basis for projects not located on a school campus. The Committee agreed that generally, if a project has a joint use agreement with a school, the project can receive school greening credit.

The committee agreed that only projects that capture the 85th percentile storm can receive flood protection benefits. *[Staff note: this restriction may prevent community investment points from being awarded to projects that seek to address localized flooding concerns that occur in storms less than the 85th percentile.]*

NATURE-BASED SOLUTIONS

Reference: Scoring Committee Comments and Recommendations – Round 4 Projects

The following comments reflect the Scoring Committee considering the elements of Nature-Based Solutions.

- November 3, 2022 – The Committee’s stance on artificial turf as a nature-based solution should be discussed (Chair Reznik).
- November 3, 2022 – Because removal of impermeable surfaces is expressed as a percentage, applicants can game the criteria by reducing the overall project area and inaccurately represent claimed benefits (Chair Reznik).
- December 1, 2022 – There may be a gradient point scale developed for points awarded for percent reduction in impervious area (District Staff).

Notes from Scoring Committee Review, April 6, 2023

The Scoring Committee determined that artificial turf will not be considered a nature-based solution. In previous rounds of scoring, the Committee shared they would like to be able to assign points for projects that connect habitats and community hubs. The Committee also want to pay more attention to the net benefits of projects. Committee Members also concluded that the best way to improve the impervious surface removal calculation is to require that applicants submit a description of impermeable surface removed relative to the total project area.

Other Scoring Committee recommendations:

1. For Round 5 Call for Projects:
 - a. Modify project module to require that applicants submit additional information documenting the impermeable surface removed in relation to the total project area.
2. For future Calls for Projects:
 - a. Consider adjusting the scoring criteria to assign points for projects that connect habitats or community hubs, or otherwise provide net benefits via nature-based solutions.
 - b. Consider adjusting the scoring criteria for impermeable area removed from a percentage to the total impermeable area removed

LEVERAGING FUNDS AND COMMUNITY SUPPORT

The following comments reflect the Scoring Committee considering the elements of leveraged funds and community support.

- October 17, 2022 – The Scoring Committee is only responsible for evaluating leveraged funds that have been secured. The WASC would be responsible for evaluating the likelihood of securing funds not yet committed (District Staff).
- October 17, 2022 – It is acceptable to evaluate letters of support for projects that are addressed to other funding sources, so long as the project has not drastically changed and the length of time since the letter was dated is not too great (comment by Member Diaz and concurrence by Chair Reznik and Vice Chair Moon).

Reference: Scoring Committee Comments and Recommendations – Round 4 Projects

Notes from Scoring Committee Review, April 6, 2023

The Scoring Committee confirmed that only secured leveraged funds can be evaluated and that funds that are merely “likely” to be secured will not be counted by the Scoring Committee. The Scoring Committee clarified that letters of support for a project should be recent (e.g., less than 1-2 years) and addressed to the SCWP instead of reusing letters of support addressed to other organizations.

Scoring Committee recommendations from previous rounds of scoring also included providing a clearer definition of “strong support” and the minimum requirements for demonstrating that support, which should at a minimum clarify that “strong support” does not mean a plan for future outreach, but rather entails concrete evidence of meaningful support. The Scoring Committee hopes that more information can be requested of the applicants, such as number of community members contacted, community demographics, demonstration of representation from the neighborhood, and demonstration by applicants of strong local support.

OTHER ITEMS

The following comments reflect other issues raised by members of the Scoring Committee.

Considerations for North Santa Monica Bay Watershed Area

- October 6, 2022 – It has been difficult to generate qualifying projects in the North Santa Monica Bay Watershed Area and a separate scoring system should be considered (comment made by Chair Reznik).

Estimates of O&M costs vary

- October 17, 2022 - Inconsistent estimates of O&M costs across applications make it difficult to assess projects (Vice Chair TJ Moon).

Notes from Scoring Committee Review, April 6, 2023

The Scoring Committee noted that the Metrics and Monitoring Study (MMS) will evaluate scoring criteria for the North Santa Monica Bay Watershed Area, which has historically struggled to generate projects that pass the scoring threshold due to lack of recharge potential in the Watershed Area.

In addition, the Scoring Committee agreed to recommend adjustments to the scoring system that would establish that certain categories are not optional. For example, the category for Leveraging Funds and Community Support (Part 2) is only worth five points, so project applicants can neglect community engagement and still pass the scoring threshold. The Committee felt that this should not be the case, as intentional community outreach and engagement should be required for projects seeking SCWP funds.

Scoring Committee recommendations from previous rounds of scoring also included considering how job creation might contribute to application score and developing guidance on how to weigh the climate-related

May 30, 2023

Safe, Clean Water Program

Page 8 of 8

Reference: Scoring Committee Comments and Recommendations – Round 4 Projects

impacts of projects. For example, some projects require a significant amount of pumping which uses energy, potentially producing GHG emissions.

Other Scoring Committee recommendations:

1. For Round 5 Call for Projects:

- a. Consider changes to scoring criteria for the North Santa Monica Bay Watershed Area based on MMS recommendations.

2. For future Calls for Projects:

- a. Consider altering the scoring criteria to require a minimum point threshold for Leveraging Funds and Community Support
- b. Consider awarding points for job creation in the scoring criteria
- c. Consider including positive impact on climate response in the scoring criteria