Approved_____
Adam Ariki

September 9, 2025

TO: Scoring Committee
Safe, Clean Water Program

FROM: Los Angeles County Flood Control District

IMPLEMENTATION OF WATER SUPPLY AND WATER QUALITY SCORING PILOT ADAPTATIONS AND PHASE-SPECIFIC APPLICATIONS – FISCAL YEAR 2026-27 CALL FOR PROJECTS

OVERVIEW

As part of the ongoing adaptive management of the Safe, Clean Water (SCW) Program, Los Angeles County Public Works analyzed 183 Infrastructure Program Project applications (including projects that were accepted and funded, considered but not funded, referred to the Technical Resources Program, and withdrawn) to inform potential modifications to the SCW Program Scoring Criteria for Water Supply Benefits and Water Quality Benefits.

EVALUATION AND FINDINGS

Several alternative approaches to score Water Supply Benefits and Water Quality Benefits were evaluated, including calibrating scoring to historical projects (with construction cost indexing) and adding gradation to scoring rubrics for Water Supply and Water Quality, and adding gradation and refining calculation of cost-effectiveness by using an updated 24-hour Best Management Practice (BMP) definition (the maximum volume managed by a project during a 24-hour, 85th percentile design storm event) to scoring rubrics for Water Quality.

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

For Water Quality Benefits, it was determined that calibrating scoring to historical projects is unlikely to provide a viable alternative to test in the future years of implementation. This is mostly attributed to the distribution of project scores under the current scoring criteria, which awards relatively high point values to a broad array of historical projects. The act of calibrating scoring criteria inherently shifts this distribution, substantially reducing potential project scores. Adding gradation to the current scoring criteria, however, has been identified as a viable alternative to test in the future years of implementation.

Additionally, this effort determined that cost-effectiveness calculated with 85th percentile storm capture volumes is much more correlated with pollutant capture efficiency and may be more aligned with Water Quality Benefits.

IMPLEMENTATION

As a result, Public Works is continuing a pilot scoring rubric to aid project applicants in estimating Water Supply Benefits scores calibrated to historical projects, with gradation, as an alternative Scoring Criteria for Water Supply Benefits. Additionally, Public Works is providing a pilot scoring rubric to aid project applicants in estimating Water Quality Benefits scores, with gradation added to the current criteria with redefined project capacity. These criteria are to be applied to all nine Watershed Areas in Fiscal Year (FY) 2026-27 Call for Projects only.

The SCW Program Projects Module will continue to show estimated Water Supply Benefits and Water Quality Benefits scores based on the original criteria, per the Feasibility Study Guidelines, along with the pilot scores, per this memo. Project applicants may select from the original or pilot scoring options for Water Supply Benefits and Water Quality Benefits, ensuring the Scoring Committee will only need to utilize one methodology or the other.

To improve project evaluation and accelerate implementation, Public Works also implemented phase-specific applications for the Infrastructure Program in FY 2026-27 Call for Projects. Projects with less than 60 percent design completed may apply for design funding only, while projects with more than 60 percent design completed may apply for design, construction, and/or operation and maintenance funding. Both application types may select from the original or pilot scoring options, and then scoring would proceed based on the appropriate level of documentation needed for the respective phase(s) of the project. Supplemental guidance has been developed to clarify these requirements and support evaluation of phase-specific applications. Additional information is available in the Supplemental Guidance to Support Feasibility Study Guidelines.

CONCLUSION

For the scoring of FY 2026-27 Infrastructure Program Projects, the Scoring Committee shall review and score the submitted projects based on each applicant's selected Scoring Criteria for Water Supply Benefits and Water Quality Benefits, as was previewed at the Scoring Committee meeting held on April 29, 2025, and FY 2026-2027 Call for Projects information sessions held on May 21 and 22, 2025.

It is important to note that these scoring pilot adaptations have not yet been formally incorporated into the original criteria outlined in the Feasibility Study Guidelines, and their application will be evaluated for adoption following the conclusion of the FY 2026-27 Scoring Committee proceedings as part of ongoing adaptive management.

DC:lgu
P:\SWPPUB\SEC\2025\SIGNED DOCS\MEMOS\SC FY26-27 SCORING PILOTS.DOCX

Enc.

SCW Program
Alternate Water Supply Scoring Pilot (Optional)

Guidance for Alternate Water Supply Scoring Pilot (Optional) for FY2026-27 Call for Projects

Water Supply Benefits Alternative Scoring Analysis

An outcome of the Safe, Clean Water Program (SCW Program) Adaptive Management process is a recommendation to provide future 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 five 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 were withdrawn.

Alternate Water Supply Scoring Pilot

Considering the recommendations in the Metrics and Monitoring Study and subsequent adaptive management, 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 2026-2027 (FY 26-27) 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.

Applicants seeking IP funding in FY 26-27 will have the option of using the new alternative scoring criteria, in lieu of the original scoring criteria, to determine their Project's Water Supply Benefits score. Note: Use of the criteria is optional; the Scoring Committee will evaluate the Water Supply Benefits scores of either the alternate score 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:

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	B1. Water Supply Cost Effectiveness. The Total Life-Cycle Cost[2] per unit of acre foot of Stormwater and/or Urban Runoff volume captured for water supply is: • ≥ $77,910.00/ac-ft = 1 point • $77,909.99 – $37,950.00/ac-ft = 2 points • $37,949.99 – $24,280.00/ac-ft = 3 points • $24,279.99 – $16,300.00/ac-ft = 4 points • $16,299.99 – $11,950.00/ac-ft = 5 points • $11,949.99 – $8,850.00/ac-ft = 6 points • $8,849.99 – $6,930.00/ac-ft = 7 points • $6,929.99 – $5,280.00/ac-ft = 8 points • $5,279.99 – $3,590.00/ac-ft = 9 points • $3,589.99 – $2,390.00/ac-ft = 10 points • $2,389.99 – $1,830.00/ac-ft = 11 points • $1,829.99 – $963.00/ac-ft = 12 points • < $963.00/ac-ft = 13 points *[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.*

B2. Water Supply Benefit Magnitude

B. Significant Water Supply Benefits, continued	12 points max	B2. Water Supply Benefit Magnitude. The yearly additional water supply volume resulting from the Project is: • < 3.0 ac-ft/year = 1 point • 3.0 – 6.9 ac-ft/year = 2 points • 7.0 – 16.9 ac-ft/year = 3 points • 17.0 – 37.9 ac-ft/year = 4 points • 38.0 – 71.9 ac-ft/year = 5 points • 72.0 – 103.9 ac-ft/year = 6 points • 104.0 – 144.9 ac-ft/year = 7 points • 145.0 – 178.9 ac-ft/year = 8 points • 179.0 – 236.9 ac-ft/year = 9 points • 237.0 – 343.9 ac-ft/year = 10 points • 344.0 – 667.9 ac-ft/year = 11 points • ≥ 668.0 ac-ft/year = 12 points

Guidance for Alternate Water Quality Scoring Pilot (Optional) for FY2026-27 Call for Projects

Water Quality Benefits Alternative Scoring Analysis

An outcome of the Safe, Clean Water Program (SCW Program) Adaptive Management process is a recommendation to provide future Infrastructure Program (IP) applicants the opportunity for Projects to be scored using new alternative (optional) scoring criteria for the Water Quality Benefits Sections A1 and A2 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 five 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 were withdrawn.

Alternate Water Supply Scoring Pilot

Considering the recommendations in the Metrics and Monitoring Study and subsequent adaptive management, the District will implement the Alternate Water Quality 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 Quality Benefits score, and will be utilized in the Fiscal Year 2026-2027 (FY 26-27) 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). Unlike the Water Supply Scoring Pilot, this approach does not necessarily align the scoring with the true range of Program-worthy multi-benefit project efficiencies and performance, nor inherently account for District-wide opportunities, constraints, or economic changes over time; however, it does provide incremental specificity to scoring that improves outcomes in some cases. Cost effectiveness calculated with 85th percentile storm capture volumes are much more correlated with pollutant capture efficiency and may be more aligned with Water Quality Benefits.

The Pilot includes the development of the enclosed Alternate Water Quality Scoring Form (Form). Applicants seeking IP funding in FY 26-27 will have the option of using the new alternative scoring criteria, in lieu of the original scoring criteria, to determine their Project's Water Quality Benefits score. Note: Use of the alternate criteria is optional; the Scoring Committee will evaluate the Water Quality Benefits scores of either the alternate score or the original SCW Program Project Module score that uses the original criteria. Below is the new alternative Water Quality Benefits scoring criteria for reference:

A1. Water Quality Cost Effectiveness

Section	Score Range	Scoring Standards
A.1 Wet + Dry Weather Water Quality Benefits	50 points max	The Project provides water quality benefits
	20 points max	A.1.1 : For Wet Weather BMPs Only: Water Quality Cost Effectiveness (Cost Effectiveness) = (24-hour BMP Capacity)[1] / (Capital Cost in $Millions) • < 0.12 = 0 points • 0.12–0.169 = 1 point • 0.17–0.219 = 2 points • 0.22–0.259 = 3 points • 0.26–0.309 = 4 points • 0.31–0.349 = 5 points • 0.35–0.399 = 6 points • 0.40–0.449 = 7 points • 0.45–0.489 = 8 points • 0.49–0.539 = 9 points • 0.54–0.579 = 10 points • 0.58–0.629 = 11 points • 0.63–0.679 = 12 points • 0.68–0.719 = 13 points • 0.72–0.769 = 14 points • 0.77–0.819 = 15 points • 0.82–0.859 = 16 points • 0.86–0.909 = 17 points • 0.91–0.949 = 18 points • 0.95–0.999 = 19 points • ≥ 1.000 = 20 points *(20 Points Max)* *[1]. Management of the 24-hour event is considered the maximum volume managed by a Project during a 24-hour, 85th percentile design storm event. Units are in acre-feet (AF).*
Wet + Dry Weather Water Quality Benefits **- OR -**	30 points max	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. Primary Class of Pollutants • < 3.0% = 0 points • 3.1–6.9% = 1 point • 7.0–9.9% = 2 points • 10.0–12.9% = 3 points • 13.0–16.9% = 4 point • 17.0–19.9% = 5 points • 20.0–22.9% = 6 points • 23.0–26.9% = 7 points • 27.0–29.9% = 8 points • 30.0–32.9% = 9 points • 33.0–36.9% = 10 points • 37.0–39.9% = 11 points • 40.0–42.9% = 12 points • 43.0–46.9% = 13 points • 47.0–49.9% = 14 points • 50.0–55.9% = 15 points • 56.0–61.9% = 16 points • 62.0–67.9% = 17 points • 68.0–73.9% = 18 points • 74.0–79.9% = 19 points • ≥ 80.0% = 20 points *(20 Points Max)* Second or More Classes of Pollutant • < 10.0% = 0 points • 10.0–19.9% = 1 point • 20.0–29.9% = 2 points • 30.0–39.9% = 3 points • 40.0–49.9% = 4 points • 50.0–55.9% = 5 points • 56.0–61.9% = 6 points • 62.0–67.9% = 7 points • 68.0–73.9% = 8 points • 74.0–79.9% = 9 points • ≥ 80.0% = 10 points (10 Points Max)

A2. Water Quality Benefits

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	A.2.2: For Dry Weather BMPs Only. Tributary Size of the Dry Weather BMP • < 20.0 Acres = 10 points • 20.0–39.9 Acres = 11 points • 40.0–59.9 Acres = 12 points • 60.0–79.9 Acres = 13 points • 80.0–99.9 Acres = 14 points • 100.0–119.9 Acres = 15 points • 120.0–139.9 Acres = 16 points • 140.0–159.9 Acres = 17 points • 160.0–179.9 Acres = 18 points • 180.0–199.9 Acres = 19 points • ≥ 200.0 Acres = 20 points *(20 Points Max)*