



Adaptive Management Update



SAFE, CLEAN WATER PROGRAM
4/29/2025

SCORING COMMITTEE



Alternative 2: Using 85th %-ile Storm Capture - FSG A.1.1


**Current Scoring:
Based on 24-Hour
BMP Capacity Volume**



Feasibility Study Guidelines: 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

Alternative 2: Using 85th %-ile Storm Capture - FSG A.1.1

Insight: 85th %-ile storm volume better correlates with pollutant capture (i.e., Water Quality Benefit)



Alternative 2: Using 85th %-ile Storm Capture - FSG A.1.1

Approach


- Estimated 85th %-ile runoff volume (not capture) for all historical projects
- Used Alternative 1 rubric with 1-pt increments to compute score using runoff volume
- **NOTE: Project Module will include HydroCalc-based estimates of 85th %-ile storm capture volumes, whereas runoff volume to each project was used as a proxy in this preliminary scoring analysis.**

Alternative 2: Using 85th %-ile Storm Capture - FSG A.1.1

Impact: Tends to moderately decrease scores but better align with Water Quality Benefit*


| Scoring Rubric | Change in Score of Historical Projects Under Alternative Criteria | | |
|--|---|-------------|-------------------|
| | Greatest Decrease | Mean Change | Greatest Increase |
| Using 85 th %-ile w/Gradation | -20 | -1.9 | 9 |
| More Favorable of 85 th %-ile or 24-hr Capacity w/Gradation | 0 | 1.3 | 9 |

* Using BMP capture volume (instead of runoff volume) will further decrease scores but better align with benefits



Alternative 3: Calibrating to Historical Projects with Added Gradation Approach


- Evenly distribute point scale based on range of proposed Infrastructure Program project performance
- Comparable to “grading on a curve”
- Also provide 1-pt increments



Alternative 3: Calibrating to Historical Projects with Added Gradation

Impact: Tends to severely decrease scores because majority of historical projects achieve upper range of points under current rubric

| | Change in Score of Historical Projects Under Alternative Criteria | | |
|-----------------------|---|-------------|-------------------|
| Scoring Category | Greatest Decrease | Mean Change | Greatest Increase |
| Cost Effectiveness | -11 | -3.6 | 2 |
| Water Quality Benefit | -19 | -8 | 2 |




Alternative 4: Using Pollutant Mass with Added Gradation

Approach


- Estimate total mass (not % capture) of pollutant capture by each project
- Evenly distribute point scale based on range of proposed Infrastructure Program project performance

Insight: current scoring based on % reduction of what enters the BMP is not correlated with total Water Quality Benefits




Alternative 4: Using Pollutant Mass with Added Gradation

FSG A.1.1/A.2.1




FSG A.1.2/A.2.2



Alternative 4: Using Pollutant Mass with Added Gradation

Impact: Best aligns with Water Quality Benefits, but tends to severely decrease scores because majority of historical projects achieve upper range of points with current rubric

| | Change in Score of Historical Projects Under Alternative Criteria | | |
|-----------------------|---|-------------|-------------------|
| Scoring Rubric | Greatest Decrease | Mean Change | Greatest Increase |
| Cost Effectiveness | -19 | -3 | 17 |
| Water Quality Benefit | -29 | -9.8 | 10 |





Considerations for Adaptation of Water Quality Scoring

Considerations for Adaptation of Water Quality Scoring

- **Near Term:** Encourage gradual adaptation by adding 1-pt scoring increments and allowing the option to use 85th %-ile design storm capture volume
- **Long Term:** Evaluate results of pilot scoring using design storm capture and consider adjusting point scale to enable range of project sizes/types while still encouraging projects with substantial Water Quality Benefits and cost effectiveness



Water Quality Scoring Pilot Adaptation:

- Fiscal Year 2026-2027 (Due July 2025)
- Regional Program Applicants have option to use pilot rubric w/gradation and design storm capture volumes



Water Supply Scoring Adaptations

Water Supply Scoring Adaptations

Review of Current Water Supply Scoring Criteria

Drivers for Water Supply Scoring Adaptation

Alternative Water Supply Scoring Rubric

Considerations for Adaptation of Water Supply Scoring






Review of Current Water Supply Scoring Criteria

Review of Current Water Supply Scoring Criteria

FSG B.1


Cost Effectiveness



Review of Current Water Supply Scoring Criteria

FSG B.2

Magnitude




Insight: magnitude scores more evenly distributed than cost effectiveness scores



Drivers for Water Supply Scoring Adaptation

Review of Current Water Supply Scoring Criteria



MMS Recommendation 2.A

Drivers

- In first few rounds of SCW Program, most Regional Project applications earned no Water Supply Cost-Effectiveness points
- Cost-based scoring criteria were developed in 2018, and do not currently consider inflation and economic changes
- Interested parties suggested that Water Supply Benefits and scoring are challenging in some Watershed Areas

WATER SUPPLY BENEFIT SCORE BENCH- MARKING





Figure 6. Current and Alternative Pilot Rubric for Water Supply Magnitude






Alternative Water Supply Scoring Rubric

Alternative: Add Gradation and Calibrate to Historical Projects

Approach


- Evenly distribute point scale based on range of proposed Infrastructure Program project performance
- Provide 1-pt scoring increments
- Comparable to “grading on a curve”



Alternative: Add Gradation and Calibrate to Historical Projects

Impact: Tends to increase scores, particularly for cost effectiveness

| | Change in Score of Historical Projects Under Alternative Criteria | | |
|--------------------|---|-------------|-------------------|
| Scoring Category | Greatest Decrease | Mean Change | Greatest Increase |
| Cost Effectiveness | 0 | 5 | 10 |
| Magnitude | -2 | 1.8 | 4 |





Considerations for Adaptation of Water Supply Scoring

Considerations for Adaptation of Water Supply Scoring

- **Calibrating rubric to historical projects and adding gradation:**
 - Better aligns scoring rubric with multi-benefit project performance and cost
 - Accounts for economic changes
 - Enables scoring at 1-pt increments
- **Consider updating calibration every 1-2 years**
- **Many Watershed Areas constrained by “what counts” as a new, locally available water supply (see Interim Guidance and Supplemental Guidance)**



Water Supply Scoring Pilot Adaptation:

- Fiscal Year 2026-2027 (Due July 2025)
- Regional Program Applicants have option to use pilot rubric w/gradation calibrated to historical projects



Interim Guidance Update

Interim Guidance Update

Drivers

- The Program has undergone drastic evolution since the *2022 Interim Guidance*
- Numerous concurrent efforts to clarify definitions and inform implementation
- *Feasibility Study Guidelines* must also be supplemented with new performance measures and pilot scoring criteria

SCW Program 2022 Interim Guidance
Strengthening Community Engagement and Support



Safe, Clean Water Program 2022 Interim Guidance


Contents

| | |
|---|----|
| Strengthening Community Engagement and Support..... | 3 |
| Water Supply Guidance | 16 |
| Programming of Nature-Based Solutions | 24 |
| Implementing Disadvantaged Community Policies in the Regional Program | 46 |

Interim Guidance Update

Approach


- Update, amend, append *2022 Interim Guidance* with advancements from preceding strategies and...
 - MMS and Equity White Paper
 - Initial Watershed Plans
 - NBS Blue Ribbon Committee
 - Watershed Planning
 - Others



Interim Guidance Updates

What to Expect

- New format and organization
- Detailed glossary
- Additional guidance and clarity on:
 - Required activities
 - Recommended activities



Interim Guidance Updates

What's New: Community Engagement & Support

- Incorporation of select recommendations from the *Equity in Stormwater Investments* white paper
- Refined best practices for engagement
- Alignment of outreach/engagement expectations with project phases
- Considerations for applying the ongoing Community Strengths and Needs Assessment (CSNA)



Interim Guidance Updates

What's New: Water Supply

- Discussion of new performance measures to better quantify and evaluate Water Supply Benefits
- Clarification of definitions related to Water Supply Benefits and “locally available water supply”

What Counts?

New locally available water supply and a Water Supply Benefit include (claims to be confirmed through modeling, geotechnical analysis, and/or engagement):

- **Net water used onsite for potable offset** (not including offset of project-created water supply demand).
- **Water that is diverted to existing treatment/reuse plants.**
- **Water that is diverted to future planned treatment/reuse plants operational within 10 years** with concurrence from treatment/reuse plant on timeline and capacity.
- **Water infiltrated to managed useable groundwater aquifers.**
- **Water infiltrated to unmanaged aquifer** with geotechnical analysis and/or community acknowledgement to confirm infiltration and use.
- **Water that is treated and discharged to storm drain or receiving water** when tributary to a downstream water recharge facility in the project facilitates the recharge of water that would otherwise not be used to augment water supply.

Interim Guidance Updates

What's New: Water Supply

- Discussion of new performance measures to better quantify and evaluate Water Supply Benefits
- Clarification of definitions related to Water Supply Benefits and “locally available water supply”

What Doesn't Count?

The following **do NOT count towards new locally available water supply** but do provide Water Quality Benefits:

- **Water that would have already captured downstream of a project by an existing water recharge facility** (see adjustment factors in Watershed Planning Framework and Supplemental Guidance to Support Feasibility Study Guidelines that can be used to prorate the net new local water supply when captured upstream from existing facilities)
- **Maintenance of existing infrastructure** (i.e. sediment removal behind dams).

Environmental Water: Water that is allocated and managed specifically for improvements to the ecological health of receiving waters.

- Environmental water does not count as locally available water supply nor a Water Quality Benefit unless analysis proves that discharging clean water to channels to support ecological functions will offset potable supplies. Environmental water may provide a Water Quality Benefit if site-specific studies demonstrate improvement in flow ecology.

Interim Guidance Updates

Programming of Nature-Based Solutions


- At this time, a Nature-Based Solutions (NBS) Blue Ribbon Panel is being convened by Public Works to establish Countywide NBS standards
- Outcomes of the panel are expected to be incorporated into subsequent interim guidance in late 2025 or early 2026; as such
- Accordingly, no new updates in current version



Interim Guidance Updates

What's New: Implementing Disadvantaged Community Policies in the SCW Program

- Incorporation of place-based measures (i.e., “walksheds”) to help quantify potential benefits to surrounding communities
- Discussion of select recommendations and best practices from the *Equity in Stormwater Investments* white paper
- Discussion of the CSNA as a tool to support evaluating benefits to Disadvantaged Community






Supplemental Guidance to Support Feasibility Study Guidelines

Feasibility Study Guideline Adaptation Process

“The Chief Engineer shall develop and adopt guidelines for the preparation of Feasibility Studies (Feasibility Study Guidelines), including required contents, and shall update those guidelines from time to time, consistent with the purposes and goals of the SCW Program. Prior to adopting or updating the guidelines, the Chief Engineer shall provide not less than thirty (30) days' advance public notice of the proposed guidelines or revisions.”

**– SCWP Implementation Ordinance
Section 18.07.6.3**



Feasibility Study Guideline Adaptation Process

Drivers & Approach

- *Feasibility Study Guidelines* must be supplemented with:
 - Phase-specific guidance
 - Technical guidance for new performance measures
 - Scoring pilot adaptations
- Supplemental Guidance created as precursor to formal adaptation of *Feasibility Study Guidelines*

“Revised Regional Program application processes, feasibility study guidelines, and Scoring Criteria to account for additional performance indicators and distinct Project phases.”

- LA County Board of Supervisors Motion: Progress and Adaptive Management of the Safe Clean Water Program

Supplemental Guidance to Support Feasibility Study Guidelines

Phase-Specific Guidance


- Design-Only & Construction/O&M application requirements

Technical Guidance for Metrics & Measures

- Resources to estimate new Performance Measures
- How to accurately account for upstream/downstream projects

Scoring Pilot Adaptations

- Summary of scoring analysis
- Pilot rubrics



Supplemental Guidance to Support Feasibility Study Guidelines

Example Subset of Performance Measures Summarized in Supplemental Guidance

188

Performance Measures
(many calculated
by Module)

| CATEGORY | METRIC | METRIC or SUBMETRIC TEXT | UNITS | REQUIRED FOR | |
|-------------------------------|---|---|----------------|--------------|------------------|
| | | | | DESIGN ONLY | CONSTRUCTION/O&M |
| Increase Drought Preparedness | Stormwater Used On-Site for Potable Offset | Stormwater Capture Used On Site for Potable Offset | acre-feet/year | Y | Y |
| | Other Stormwater Capture | Stormwater Capture Other | acre-feet/year | Y | Y |
| Improve Public Health | Net Area of Park Created, Enhanced, or Restored | Created Park Space | acres | Y | Y |
| | | Enhanced Park Space | acres | Y | Y |
| | | Restored Park Space | acres | Y | Y |
| | Net New Green Space Created | | acres | | Y |
| | Net Change in Canopy at Maturity | Quantity of Trees Planted | acres | | Y |
| | | Quantity of Trees Removed | acres | | Y |
| | | Net Change in Canopy at Maturity | acres | Y | Y |
| | Net New Green Space and Tree Canopy on School Grounds | Project on School Grounds? | Y/N | Y | Y |
| | | Net Area of New Tree Canopy at Maturity on School Grounds | acres | Y | Y |
| | | Net New Green Space on School Grounds | acres | Y | Y |
| | Area of Accessible Park or Green Space | Is the Project Publicly Accessible | Y/N | Y | Y |
| | | Is the Entire Project Site Publicly Accessible | Y/N | Y | Y |
| | | Area of Publicly Accessible Park or Green Space | acres | | Y |
| | Type and Number of Enhanced or New Recreational Opportunities | Select Opportunity Type (Drop-down) | count | Y | Y |
| | Public Access to Waterway Provided | Select Access Type (Drop-down) | count | Y | Y |
| | Net New Area of Cooling/Shading Surfaces | Net New Area of Manmade Shade Structures | acres | | Y |



Adaptation Progress & Next Steps

| 2025 Adaptive Management Strategies | Summary | Status/ Deadlines |
|---|--|---|
| WASC SIP Programming Guidelines | Enhanced Financial Oversight, Prioritization Considerations | Completed March 2025 |
| Reporting & Projects Module Updates | New Mid-Year Reports, Metrics & Measures section, New Performance Measure Guidance | Reporting Complete: Jan 2025 Projects Module: May 2025 |
| Scoring Criteria Pilot Adaptations | Water Quality Water Supply Project Phases Future Considerations | Pilot Adaptations: May 2025 Future Consideration: Dec 2025 |
| Interim Guidance Update(s) | Next pilot scoring release Phased revisions to 2022 Interim Guidance, as needed and in line with Watershed Planning | Phase 1: May 2025 Phase 2: Dec 2025 |
| Supplemental Guidance to Support Feasibility Study Guidelines | Scoring Criteria pilot adaptations, Feasibility Study requirements | May 2025 |

| 2025 Adaptive Management Strategies | Summary | Status/ Deadlines |
|---------------------------------------|---------|----------------------|
| Post-Construction Monitoring Guidance | TBD | Dec 2025 (TBD) |



Questions & Discussion

Thank you

QUESTIONS?

Safe, Clean Water Program
SafeCleanWaterLA@pw.lacounty.gov
1-833-ASK-SCWP or 1-833-275-7297