

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2026-2027



Watershed Area	Central Santa Monica Bay
Project Name	West Los Angeles College Stormwater Improvements Project
Project Lead	Build LACCD
Application Type	Construction and O&M Funding
Total Funding Requested	\$3,166,768.00
Project Type Scoring Method	Wet
WQ Scoring Pilot	Yes
WS Scoring Pilot	Yes

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Original Score	Pilot Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality – Part 1 Wet + Dry Weather	6	0	6	20	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Low cost-effectiveness ratio
Water Quality – Part 2 Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Dry Weather (20 pts)	30	30	30	30	30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Possible perched groundwater near surface
Water Supply – Part 1	3	0	3	13	Unable to Score 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Applicant received email concurrence from City of Santa Monica, but Scoring Committee requests a letter and details on how project recharges aquifer 1 week: Applicant to provide details on how water being infiltrated is recharging aquifer Rescoring meeting: Applicant to provide letter from City of Santa Monica Applicant provided requested information and documentation
Water Supply – Part 2	3	0	3	12	Unable to Score 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Community Investment	5	5	5	10	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none">

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2026-2027



Nature-Based Solutions	10	10	10	15	10	•
Leveraging Funds	6	6	6	6	6	•
Community Support	2	2	2	4	Unable to Score 2	• Request clarification on specifics of engagement Confirmed the points
TOTAL	65	53	65	110	Unable to Score 65	•

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2026-2027



Watershed Area	South Santa Monica Bay
Project Name	Darby Park Multi-Benefit Project
Project Lead	Inglewood
Application Type	Design Only
Total Funding Requested	\$1,185,700.00
Project Type Scoring Method	Wet
WQ Scoring Pilot	Yes
WS Scoring Pilot	No

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Original Score	Pilot Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes Darby Park Multi-Benefit Project
Water Quality – Part 1 Wet + Dry Weather	9	7	9	20	9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Groundwater could be at 10 feet; to consider high groundwater in final design
Water Quality – Part 2 Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Dry Weather (20 pts)	30	30	30	30	30	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Water Supply – Part 1	0	0	4	13	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Infiltrated water has clay layer. The water is not recharging the aquifer
Water Supply – Part 2	2	2	4	12	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Community Investment	5	5	5	10	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Trees, fencing, 5,000 sqft of shading area
Nature-Based Solutions	10	10	10	15	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Leveraging Funds	3	3	3	6	Unable to Score 6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Request clarification on additional funding Applicant provided a match of more than 50%
Community Support	4	4	4	4	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Difficult to determine engagement outcome (number of participants; how input from community contributed design) Robust community engagement budget

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2026-2027



TOTAL	63	61	69	110	Unable to Score 62	
-------	----	----	----	-----	----------------------------------	--

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2026-2027



Watershed Area	South Santa Monica Bay
Project Name	Los Angeles Harbor College Stormwater Projects
Project Lead	Build LACCD
Application Type	Construction and O&M Funding
Total Funding Requested	\$3,974,463.00
Project Type Scoring Method	Wet
WQ Scoring Pilot	Yes
WS Scoring Pilot	Yes

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Original Score	Pilot Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes Los Angeles Harbor College Stormwater Projects
Water Quality – Part 1 Wet + Dry Weather	6	0	6	20	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Low capture-to-cost ratio
Water Quality – Part 2 Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Dry Weather (20 pts)	29	25	29	30	29	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Water Supply – Part 1	3	0	3	13	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Infiltrating to confined aquifer
Water Supply – Part 2	4	0	4	12	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Community Investment	10	10	10	10	Unable to Score 10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not sufficient supporting info; request clarification on claimed benefits. Additional information was provided, and points confirmed Committee had robust debate of each CIB category to obtain 10 points due to limited metrics within CIB scoring criteria; WASC to decide whether to program in SIP or not
Nature-Based Solutions	15	15	15	15	Unable to Score 10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Small footprint of impervious area removed; request clarification on footprint. Confirmed the points

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2026-2027



Leveraging Funds	6	6	6	6	6	•
Community Support	2	2	2	4	Unable to Score 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• No description of future engagement• Did not quantify outreach conducted; request clarification on outcome Confirmed the points
TOTAL	75	58	75	110	Unable to Score 63	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• WASC to consider the robust debate of CIB when deciding whether to program in SIP or not

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2026-2027



Watershed Area	Upper Los Angeles River
Project Name	Arroyo Park Infiltration Gallery
Project Lead	South Pasadena
Application Type	Design Only
Total Funding Requested	\$1,014,666.00
Project Type Scoring Method	Wet
WQ Scoring Pilot	Yes
WS Scoring Pilot	Yes

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Original Score	Pilot Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes Arroyo Park Infiltration Gallery
Water Quality – Part 1 Wet + Dry Weather	8	7	8	20	8	•
Water Quality – Part 2 Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Dry Weather (20 pts)	30	30	30	30	30	• 85th percentile capture project, 80% copper and zinc
Water Supply – Part 1	6	0	6	13	Unable to Score 6	• To update WS benefits with appropriate Net countable supply ratios % (reduction) for ULAR WA. Net countable supply ratio is very high and doesn't change score
Water Supply – Part 2	5	2	5	12	5	•
Community Investment	5	5	5	10	Unable to Score 5	• Missing supporting documents; minimal to no quantitative information • Requesting clarifying information on claimed benefits Applicant provided clarifying information
Nature-Based Solutions	10	10	10	15	Unable to Score 10	• Requesting clarifying information on claimed benefits Applicant provided clarifying information
Leveraging Funds	0	0	0	6	0	•

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2026-2027



Community Support	4	4	4	4	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Strong letters of support from local community groups provided, but no details on outreach and engagementFeedback in letters raise some concerns—Scoring Committee appreciative of honesty
TOTAL	68	58	68	110	<div>Unable to Score</div> <div>68</div>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2026-2027



Watershed Area	Upper Los Angeles River
Project Name	Calles Verdes at Workman St
Project Lead	San Fernando
Application Type	Design Only
Total Funding Requested	\$907,200.00
Project Type Scoring Method	Wet
WQ Scoring Pilot	No
WS Scoring Pilot	No

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Original Score	Pilot Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes Calles Verdes at Workman St
Water Quality – Part 1 Wet + Dry Weather	20	20	20	20	14 To verify 20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Executive summary contradicts application To provide consistent information on application and executive summary Executive Summary was updated, and values were confirmed 5.23 acre-ft / \$6M = 0.86, which is 14 points
Water Quality – Part 2 Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Dry Weather (20 pts)	30	30	30	30	Unable to Score 30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To provide consistent information on application and executive summary Applicant provided updated information
Water Supply – Part 1	0	0	7	13	Unable to Score 0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Presented monitoring data To update WS benefits with appropriate Net countable supply ratios % (reduction) for ULAR WA No Water Supply Benefit with net countable supply ratio applied
Water Supply – Part 2	2	2	5	12	Unable to Score 0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Community Investment	5	5	5	10	Unable to Score 5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requesting clarifying information on claimed benefits Applicant provided clarifying information

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2026-2027



Nature-Based Solutions	12	12	12	15	Unable to Score 12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Confused with claimed shade and trees Requesting clarifying information on claimed benefits Applicant provided clarifying information
Leveraging Funds	0	0	0	6	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Community Support	4	4	4	4	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Partnering with an NGO is a good way to engage the community
TOTAL	73	73	83	110	Unable to Score 71	<ul style="list-style-type: none">

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2026-2027



Watershed Area	Upper San Gabriel River
Project Name	Garvey Avenue Grade Separation Drainage Improvement Operations and Maintenance
Project Lead	El Monte
Application Type	Construction and O&M Funding
Total Funding Requested	\$510,000.00
Project Type Scoring Method	Wet
WQ Scoring Pilot	Yes
WS Scoring Pilot	Yes

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Original Score	Pilot Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes Garvey Avenue Grade Separation Drainage Improvement Operations and Maintenance
Water Quality – Part 1 Wet + Dry Weather	4	0	4	20	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project is a continuing SCW Infrastructure Program Project returning to the SCW for O&M funding
Water Quality – Part 2 Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Dry Weather (20 pts)	30	30	30	30	30	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Water Supply – Part 1	4	0	4	13	Unable to Score 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To apply the net countable supply ratio from the Supplemental Guidance to Support Feasibility Study Guidelines and provide calculations Net countable supply ratio was applied
Water Supply – Part 2	4	0	4	12	Unable to Score 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Community Investment	5	5	5	10	Unable to Score 5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To provide specific details on claimed benefits Applicant provided clarifying information
Nature-Based Solutions	10	10	10	15	Unable to Score 10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> “ornamental landscaping” is unclear “potential area for native landscaping” is unclear

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2026-2027



						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To provide specific details on the type of vegetations and how that yields to claimed benefits Applicant provided clarifying information
Leveraging Funds	0	0	0	6	Unable to Score 6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To provide description of leveraged funds and breakdown of how project funding was distributed (e.g., how was \$90k obtained?) Applicant provided requested information
Community Support	4	4	4	4	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
TOTAL	61	49	61	110	Unable to Score 64	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is a lack of clarity on leveraging funds for O&M Projects; recommend WASC to consider whether the Applicant should provide cost share for O&M specific or not

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2026-2027



Watershed Area	Upper San Gabriel River
Project Name	ESGVWVG Drywells Project
Project Lead	Pomona
Application Type	Design Only
Total Funding Requested	\$350,000.00
Project Type Scoring Method	Dry
WQ Scoring Pilot	Yes
WS Scoring Pilot	Yes

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Original Score	Pilot Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes ESGVWVG Drywells Project (Design Only)
Water Quality – Part 1 Wet + Dry Weather	20	20	20	20	20	•
Water Quality – Part 2 Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Dry Weather (20 pts)	20	20	20	30	20	•
Water Supply – Part 1	12	13	12	13	Unable to Score 10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To recalculate dry weather (0.0003 cfs/developed acres * 363 acres impervious = 0.1 cfs) Confirmed the points • Missing the letter from watermaster Letter was provided but is not needed for design-only application
Water Supply – Part 2	9	9	9	12	Unable to Score 6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To apply the net countable supply ratio from the Supplemental Guidance to Support Feasibility Study Guidelines and provide calculations Net countable supply ratio was applied • 74 acre-ft / year • Correct spreading ground: Whittier Narrows
Community Investment	2	2	2	10	2	•

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2026-2027



Nature-Based Solutions	10	10	10	15	5	•
Leveraging Funds	0	0	0	6	0	•
Community Support	2	2	2	4	0	•
TOTAL	75	76	75	110	Unable to Score 63	•

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2026-2027



Watershed Area	Upper San Gabriel River
Project Name	ESGVWVG Drywells Project
Project Lead	Pomona
Application Type	Construction and O&M Funding
Total Funding Requested	\$725,979.00
Project Type Scoring Method	Dry Wet
WQ Scoring Pilot	Yes
WS Scoring Pilot	Yes

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Original Score	Pilot Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes ESGVWVG Drywells Project
Water Quality – Part 1 Wet + Dry Weather	20	20	20	20	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Executive summary indicates dry weather but submitted as a wet weather Project
Water Quality – Part 2 Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Dry Weather (20 pts)	16	10	16	30	16	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Water Supply – Part 1	10	0	10	13	Unable to Score 6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To recalculate; incorrect dry weather calculation of 0.0003 cfs/developed acres * 26 acres impervious = 0.0008 cfs Confirmed the points Missing the letter from watermaster Letter was provided
Water Supply – Part 2	4	2	4	12	Unable to Score 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To apply the net countable supply ratio from the Supplemental Guidance to Support Feasibility Study Guidelines and provide calculations Net countable supply ratio was applied
Community Investment	2	2	2	10	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Nature-Based Solutions	10	10	10	15	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 4 trees 1,000 sqf of canopy
Leveraging Funds	3	3	3	6	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none">

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2026-2027



Community Support	2	2	2	4	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Not much community engagement
TOTAL	67	49	67	110	Unable to Score 55	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Does not meet the 60-point threshold

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2026-2027



Watershed Area	Upper San Gabriel River
Project Name	Ganesha Park Stormwater Capture Project
Project Lead	Pomona
Application Type	Construction and O&M Funding
Total Funding Requested	\$18,557,573.00
Project Type Scoring Method	Wet
WQ Scoring Pilot	Yes
WS Scoring Pilot	Yes

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Original Score	Pilot Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes Ganesha Park Stormwater Capture Project
Water Quality – Part 1 Wet + Dry Weather	15	14	15	20	15 To Verify 15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Combination of 3 stormwater inlets, infiltration, and treat and release BMPs To provide clarification on percolation rates Confirmed the points
Water Quality – Part 2 Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Dry Weather (20 pts)	28	20	28	30	28	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Treat and release needs to be calculated separately, which could be difficult to calculate; no adjustment factor was used
Water Supply – Part 1	4	0	4	13	Unable to Score 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Per WS Pilot, \$24,279.99 – \$16,300.00/ac-ft = 4 points Confirmed the points To apply the net countable supply ratio from the Supplemental Guidance to Support Feasibility Study Guidelines and provide calculations (e.g., 47% if San Jose Creek flows to Rio Hondo Spreading Grounds) Net countable supply ratio was applied
Water Supply – Part 2	7	5	7	12	Unable to Score 5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 40 acre-ft
Community Investment	10	10	10	10	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none">

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2026-2027



Nature-Based Solutions	10	10	10	15	10	•
Leveraging Funds	3	3	3	6	3	•
Community Support	4	4	4	4	4	•
TOTAL	81	66	81	110	Unable to Score 77	•