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**	• Low cost-effectiveness ratio
Water Quality – Part 2 Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Dry Weather (20 pts)	30	30	30	**30**	**30**	• Possible perched groundwater near surface
Water Supply – Part 1	3	0	3	**13**	~~**Unable to Score**~~ 3	• ~~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	•
Community Investment	5	5	5	**10**	**5**	•

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	Central Santa Monica Bay
Project Name	Syd Kronenthal Park Stormwater Capture Project
Project Lead	Culver City
Application Type	Design Only
Total Funding Requested	$730,000.00
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
Water Quality – Part 1 Wet + Dry Weather	7	7	8	**20**	**7**	• Diverting dry weather runoff from Ballona Creek and taking water intended for downstream use. Located upstream from LASAN's Ballona Creek TMDL O&M project. • Recommend focusing on 77-acre drainage area at the park • Concerned with benefits canceling out with the Ballona Creek Project
Water Quality – Part 2 Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Dry Weather (20 pts)	30	30	30	**30**	**30**	•
Water Supply – Part 1	10	10	12	**13**	**10**	• Partial water reuse for irrigation at the park and the rest diverts to the Hyperion Water Reclamation Plant (Hyperion set to be complete 2056)
Water Supply – Part 2	12	12	12	**12**	**12**	•
Community Investment	5	5	5	**10**	**5**	• Community garden
Nature-Based Solutions	5	5	5	**15**	**5**	

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2026-2027

Leveraging Funds	6	6	6	**6**	**6**	• 730k leveraged funds
Community Support	0	0	0	**4**	**0**	• Missing supporting documentation for engagement
TOTAL	75	75	78	**110**	**75**	• WASC to consider and discuss the potential of double counting WQ and WS benefits

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2026-2027

Watershed Area	Central Santa Monica Bay
Project Name	Campus-Community Connection: UCLA's Mobility, Stormwater Capture, and Greening Project
Project Lead	UCLA
Application Type	Design Only
Total Funding Requested	$1,126,000.00
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
Water Quality – Part 1 Wet + Dry Weather	7	7	7	**20**	**7**	• Different pollutant targets for different drainage areas (e.g., areas picking up trash only and other areas with drywells) • Recommend using devices that address pollutants and trash • May be difficult for drywells due to high groundwater
Water Quality – Part 2 Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Dry Weather (20 pts)	20	10	20	**30**	**20**	• Claiming 33% zinc reduction
Water Supply – Part 1	4	0	4	**13**	**4**	• Santa Monica GMA needs net countable supply ratios • Need a letter of confirmation from watermaster for SCW construction funding
Water Supply – Part 2	5	2	5	**12**	**5**	•
Community Investment	10	10	10	**10**	**10**	•
Nature-Based Solutions	10	10	10	**15**	**10**	•

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2026-2027

Leveraging Funds	6	6	6	**6**	**6**	• Secured $1.1M
Community Support	4	4	4	**4**	**4**	•
TOTAL	66	49	66	**110**	**66**	•

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2026-2027

Watershed Area	Central Santa Monica Bay
Project Name	Memorial Park Multi-Benefit Stormwater Capture
Project Lead	Santa Monica
Application Type	Construction and O&M Funding
Total Funding Requested	$11,750,000.00
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
Water Quality – Part 1 Wet + Dry Weather	9	7	9	**20**	**9**	• 60 in/hr considered high; reduced to a more reasonable
Water Quality – Part 2 Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Dry Weather (20 pts)	30	30	30	**30**	**30**	• 85th percentile with high infiltration rate • Not reality: 100% bacteria and zinc pollutant reduction
Water Supply – Part 1	7	0	7	**13**	**7**	• New groundwater management authority in CSMB WA, Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA) • Projects under SGMA are able to get points for Water Supply Benefits
Water Supply – Part 2	9	5	9	**12**	**9**	•
Community Investment	5	5	5	**10**	**5**	• Increase number of trees
Nature-Based Solutions	13	13	13	**15**	**13**	• Removing 3 acres of impervious area
Leveraging Funds	6	6	6	**6**	**6**	• City leveraged funding
Community Support	4	4	4	**4**	**4**	• Good engagement efforts

						• To continue robust engagement in future outreach and phases of the project
TOTAL	83	70	83	**110**	**83**	•

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2026-2027

Watershed Area	Central Santa Monica Bay
Project Name	View Park – Windsor Hills Green Alley Project
Project Lead	Los Angeles County
Application Type	Design Only
Total Funding Requested	$500,000.00
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
Water Quality – Part 1 Wet + Dry Weather	10	7	10	**20**	**10**	•
Water Quality – Part 2 Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Dry Weather (20 pts)	30	30	30	**30**	**30**	• Captured 85th percentile and trash pollutants
Water Supply – Part 1	3	0	3	**13**	**0**	•
Water Supply – Part 2	4	2	4	**12**	**0**	•
Community Investment	2	2	2	**10**	**0**	• No supporting documents for flood benefits
Nature-Based Solutions	10	10	10	**15**	**5**	•
Leveraging Funds	6	6	6	**6**	**6**	•
Community Support	1	1	1	**4**	**0**	•
TOTAL	66	58	66	**110**	**51**	• Does not meet the 60-point threshold

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2026-2027

Watershed Area	Central Santa Monica Bay
Project Name	Edward Vincent Jr. Park Stormwater Improvements Project
Project Lead	Inglewood
Application Type	Construction and O&M Funding
Total Funding Requested	$28,493,400.00
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
Water Quality – Part 1 Wet + Dry Weather	11	7	11	**20**	**11**	•
Water Quality – Part 2 Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Dry Weather (20 pts)	30	30	30	**30**	**30**	•
Water Supply – Part 1	0	0	5	**13**	**0**	• No letter from watermaster to support claimed benefits; not claiming WS Benefits
Water Supply – Part 2	9	9	9	**12**	**0**	•
Community Investment	10	10	10	**10**	**10**	•
Nature-Based Solutions	10	10	10	**15**	**10**	•
Leveraging Funds	3	3	3	**6**	**3**	• Amounts committed were not clear in leveraged funds supporting documents • Caltrans leverage funding of $10M
Community Support	4	4	4	**4**	**4**	• Good example of community engagement • Robust community engagement; 2-way engagement • Multiple partners in the engagement

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2026-2027

TOTAL	77	73	82	**110**	**68**	•

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2026-2027

Watershed Area	Central Santa Monica Bay
Project Name	San Vicente Streetscape Plaza
Project Lead	West Hollywood
Application Type	Design Only
Total Funding Requested	$897,000.00
Project Type Scoring Method	Dry
WQ Scoring Pilot	No
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	20	20	20	**20**	**20**	• Concerned with geotechnical report finding groundwater level at 5 feet • Typically need minimum of 10 feet from biofiltration to groundwater level • "Infiltration of stormwater is not feasible for the project" per application; WASC to obtain clarification from applicant • Applicant to conduct more geotechnical analysis for final design • Recommend typical low flow diversion and park elements separately
Water Quality – Part 2 Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Dry Weather (20 pts)	20	20	20	**30**	**20**	•
Water Supply – Part 1	1	0	1	**13**	**1**	• Diverting to bioretention cells • Treatment required before irrigation • Applicant to further investigate during completion of design

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2026-2027

Water Supply – Part 2	1	0	1	**12**	**1**	•
Community Investment	5	5	5	**10**	**5**	•
Nature-Based Solutions	11	11	11	**15**	**11**	• 22 new trees, removing pavement
Leveraging Funds	0	0	0	**6**	**0**	• Good prospect to leverage with Measure A and M
Community Support	2	2	2	**4**	**2**	• 3 community workshops, City Council presentations • Requesting more metrics
TOTAL	60	58	60	**110**	**60**	• WASC to obtain clarification from applicant on "Infiltration of stormwater is not feasible for the project" per application

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2026-2027

Watershed Area	Central Santa Monica Bay
Project Name	Reimagining La Brea Tar Pits: An Investment in Community, Green Space, and Water Quality Enhancement
Project Lead	The Natural History Museum
Application Type	Construction and O&M Funding
Total Funding Requested	$1,980,000.00
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
Water Quality – Part 1 Wet + Dry Weather	5	0	5	**20**	**5**	• Low cost-effectiveness ratio
Water Quality – Part 2 Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Dry Weather (20 pts)	30	30	30	**30**	**30**	•
Water Supply – Part 1	0	0	2	**13**	**0**	• Not in a rechargeable aquifer
Water Supply – Part 2	0	0	1	**12**	**0**	•
Community Investment	5	5	5	**10**	**5**	• 103 new trees
Nature-Based Solutions	10	10	10	**15**	**10**	•
Leveraging Funds	6	6	6	**6**	**6**	•
Community Support	4	4	4	**4**	**4**	• Extensive outreach conducted including with indigenous communities • Mailed over 30,000 households • Reached out to community to be partners

						• Input from community engagement was incorporated into the design. Commitment to coordinating more in later phases.
TOTAL	60	55	63	**110**	**60**	

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2026-2027

Watershed Area	Central Santa Monica Bay
Project Name	Ballona Creek TMDL Operations and Maintenance Project
Project Lead	LA Sanitation and Environment
Application Type	Construction and O&M Funding
Total Funding Requested	$9,736,678.00
Project Type Scoring Method	Dry
WQ Scoring Pilot	No
WS Scoring Pilot	No

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Original Score	Pilot Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality – Part 1 Wet + Dry Weather	20	20	20	**20**	**20**	• Very large dry-weather project
Water Quality – Part 2 Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Dry Weather (20 pts)	20	20	20	**30**	**20**	•
Water Supply – Part 1	13	13	13	**13**	**13**	•
Water Supply – Part 2	12	12	12	**12**	**12**	• Recycled water; concerned with schedule in meeting benefits • Expecting near-term benefits during dry weather, but fully built-out Hyperion Water Reclamation Plant won't occur until 2056
Community Investment	5	5	5	**10**	**5**	•
Nature-Based Solutions	0	0	0	**15**	**0**	•
Leveraging Funds	6	6	6	**6**	**6**	•
Community Support	4	4	4	**4**	**4**	• Obtained many letters of support

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2026-2027

TOTAL	80	80	80	**110**	**80**	•

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2026-2027

Watershed Area	North Santa Monica Bay
Project Name	Westlake Village MS4 Compliance Project
Project Lead	Westlake Village
Application Type	Design Only
Total Funding Requested	$1,315,356.00
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
Water Quality – Part 1 Wet + Dry Weather	20	20	20	**20**	**20**	• Combination of dry and wet weather project, mostly dry with four drainage locations • High design cost due to anticipated permitting costs • Concerned with low construction cost • Concerned with proposed gravity flow with valve at storm drain to the sewer • Applicant confirmed with Las Virgenes MWD on no pump; request a letter to confirm final design • 1 cfs of low flow diversion is too high; request actual data to confirm dry-weather runoff in final design • Groundwater is at 16 ft; to confirm 10-ft space separation in final design
Water Quality – Part 2 Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Dry Weather (20 pts)	30	30	30	**30**	**30**	•
Water Supply – Part 1	13	13	13	**13**	**13**	• Recycled into sewer

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2026-2027

Water Supply – Part 2	12	12	12	**12**	**12**	•
Community Investment	5	5	5	**10**	**5**	•
Nature-Based Solutions	10	10	10	**15**	**10**	•
Leveraging Funds	0	0	0	**6**	**0**	• No leveraging funds
Community Support	2	2	2	**4**	**0**	• Little effort on community engagement to date • Population of 8,000; most engagement through phone and email • Request a robust community engagement for final design
TOTAL	92	92	92	**110**	**90**	•

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2026-2027

Watershed Area	Rio Hondo
Project Name	East Los Angeles Sustainable Median Stormwater Capture Project
Project Lead	Los Angeles County
Application Type	Construction and O&M Funding
Total Funding Requested	$1,500,000.00
Project Type Scoring Method	Dry
WQ Scoring Pilot	No
WS Scoring Pilot	~~No~~ Yes

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Original Score	Pilot Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality – Part 1 Wet + Dry Weather	20	20	20	**20**	**20**	• Infiltration project, large drainage area • Based on captured volume of 22 acre-ft, project is classified as dry weather project
Water Quality – Part 2 Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Dry Weather (20 pts)	20	20	20	**30**	**20**	•
Water Supply – Part 1	6	6	11	**13**	**11**	•
Water Supply – Part 2	12	12	12	**12**	**12**	•
Community Investment	5	5	5	**10**	**5**	•
Nature-Based Solutions	10	10	10	**15**	**10**	•
Leveraging Funds	6	6	6	**6**	**6**	•
Community Support	3	3	3	**4**	**3**	• Various tours and engagement events
TOTAL	82	82	87	**110**	**87**	•

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2026-2027

Watershed Area	Rio Hondo
Project Name	Rio Hondo Ecosystem Restoration Project
Project Lead	Monrovia
Application Type	Construction and O&M Funding
Total Funding Requested	$19,397,616.00
Project Type Scoring Method	~~Wet~~ Dry
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	16	14	16	**20**	**20**	• Claiming 0.22 inches, which would be a dry weather project. Reclassified as dry weather • Concerned with clearance requested
Water Quality – Part 2 Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Dry Weather (20 pts)	27	20	27	**30**	**20**	•
Water Supply – Part 1	2	0	2	**13**	**2**	• Concerned whether project is recharging water
Water Supply – Part 2	5	2	5	**12**	**5**	•
Community Investment	10	10	10	**10**	**5**	• No flood benefit • Good job articulating why DAC benefits are claimed even though outside the region
Nature-Based Solutions	10	10	10	**15**	**10**	• Good job at describing NBS
Leveraging Funds	3	3	3	**6**	**3**	•
Community Support	4	4	4	**4**	**4**	•
TOTAL	77	63	77	**110**	**69**	•

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2026-2027

Watershed Area	Rio Hondo
Project Name	Sierra Madre Boulevard Median Enhancement Project
Project Lead	Pasadena
Application Type	Construction and O&M Funding
Total Funding Requested	$12,481,400.00
Project Type Scoring Method	Dry
WQ Scoring Pilot	No
WS Scoring Pilot	No

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Original Score	Pilot Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
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	0	0	13	**13**	**0**	•
Water Supply – Part 2	0	0	1	**12**	**0**	•
Community Investment	5	5	5	**10**	**5**	•
Nature-Based Solutions	10	10	10	**15**	**10**	• 292,000 sqft shrub coverage, 275,000 sqft of tree canopy • Great job quantifying benefits
Leveraging Funds	3	3	3	**6**	**3**	• Caltrans leverage funding
Community Support	4	4	4	**4**	**4**	• Multiple workshops, 2-way engagement • Community letter of support
TOTAL	62	62	76	**110**	**62**	•

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2026-2027

Watershed Area	Rio Hondo
Project Name	Story Park Stormwater Capture Project
Project Lead	Alhambra
Application Type	Design Only
Total Funding Requested	$1,648,000.00
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
Water Quality – Part 1 Wet + Dry Weather	12	11	12	**20**	**12**	• Treat and release project; 0.3 inches/hour • Two diversion points, one on east & other on south
Water Quality – Part 2 Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Dry Weather (20 pts)	30	30	30	**30**	**30**	• Has wet weather and dry weather components. Only evaluated the wet weather portion • Claiming 90% effectiveness
Water Supply – Part 1	2	0	2	**13**	**2**	•
Water Supply – Part 2	3	0	3	**12**	**3**	•
Community Investment	5	5	5	**10**	**5**	• No points on greening school and access to waterways • No documentation on localized flooding
Nature-Based Solutions	11	11	11	**15**	**11**	•
Leveraging Funds	0	0	0	**6**	**0**	•
Community Support	2	2	2	**4**	**2**	• Good list of local community-based supporters
TOTAL	65	59	65	**110**	**65**	•

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2026-2027

Watershed Area	Rio Hondo
Project Name	Arcadia City Hall Stormwater Capture Project
Project Lead	Arcadia
Application Type	Design Only
Total Funding Requested	$1,272,000.00
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
Water Quality – Part 1 Wet + Dry Weather	20	20	20	**20**	**20**	• Only treats around 40%, 0.49 infiltration rate • Verification of 85th percentile when applying for SCW funds for construction • 60-70 % effective rate, theoretical
Water Quality – Part 2 Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Dry Weather (20 pts)	25	20	25	**30**	**25**	•
Water Supply – Part 1	0	0	9	**13**	**0**	• Treat and release; no Water Supply Benefits
Water Supply – Part 2	0	0	1	**12**	**0**	•
Community Investment	5	5	5	**10**	**5**	•
Nature-Based Solutions	10	10	10	**15**	**10**	• 10 trees for shade
Leveraging Funds	0	0	0	**6**	**0**	• No leveraging funds
Community Support	1	1	1	**4**	**1**	•
TOTAL	61	56	71	**110**	**61**	•

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2026-2027

Watershed Area	Rio Hondo
Project Name	Eaton Wash Stormwater Capture Project
Project Lead	Pasadena
Application Type	Construction and O&M Funding
Total Funding Requested	$19,435,556.00
Project Type Scoring Method	~~Wet~~ Dry
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	12	11	12	**20**	**20**	• 90% treat and release, only 10% infiltration; not treating 85th percentile • Questioning the effectiveness of BMPs
Water Quality – Part 2 Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Dry Weather (20 pts)	30	30	30	**30**	**20**	• Categorized as dry weather project • Claiming over 80% treatment
Water Supply – Part 1	2	0	2	**13**	**2**	• No new water per Raymond Basin letter
Water Supply – Part 2	5	2	5	**12**	**5**	• 60% from cartridge filter
Community Investment	10	10	10	**10**	**5**	• No benefit for flood management because not treating 85th percentile
Nature-Based Solutions	10	10	10	**15**	**10**	• Inconsistent number of trees
Leveraging Funds	3	3	3	**6**	**3**	• Leveraging funds from Caltrans
Community Support	4	4	4	**4**	**3**	• Workshops, press release survey • Would like to see more community engagement
TOTAL	76	70	76	**110**	**68**	• DAC benefits due to the nearby Boys and Girls Club; WASC to confirm

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2026-2027

Watershed Area	Santa Clara River
Project Name	Jake Kuredjian Park Stormwater Improvments Project
Project Lead	Los Angeles County
Application Type	Design Only
Total Funding Requested	$1,250,000.00
Project Type Scoring Method	Wet
WQ Scoring Pilot	~~No~~ Yes
WS Scoring Pilot	No

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Original Score	Pilot Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality – Part 1 Wet + Dry Weather	14	14	16	**20**	**16**	•
Water Quality – Part 2 Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Dry Weather (20 pts)	30	30	30	**30**	**30**	•
Water Supply – Part 1	0	0	10	**13**	**0**	• No letter from watermaster (design-only)
Water Supply – Part 2	9	9	9	**12**	**9**	•
Community Investment	5	5	5	**10**	~~**Unable to Score**~~ **5**	• Wrong recreational waterway identified • ~~Request to clean up recreational benefits~~ Applicant provided clarifying information
Nature-Based Solutions	10	10	10	**15**	**10**	•
Leveraging Funds	6	6	6	**6**	**6**	•
Community Support	0	0	0	**4**	**0**	•
TOTAL	74	74	86	**110**	~~**Unable to Score**~~	•

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2026-2027

					76	

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**	• 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**	•
Water Supply – Part 1	0	0	4	**13**	**0**	• Infiltrated water has clay layer. The water is not recharging the aquifer
Water Supply – Part 2	2	2	4	**12**	**0**	•
Community Investment	5	5	5	**10**	**5**	• Trees, fencing, 5,000 sqft of shading area
Nature-Based Solutions	10	10	10	**15**	**10**	•
Leveraging Funds	3	3	3	**6**	~~**Unable to Score**~~ **6**	• ~~Request clarification on additional funding~~ Applicant provided a match of more than 50%
Community Support	4	4	4	**4**	**2**	• 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	Downtown Lomita Multi-Benefit Stormwater Project
Project Lead	Lomita
Application Type	Construction and O&M Funding
Total Funding Requested	$21,406,429.00
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	4	0	4	**20**	**4**	• Low capture-to-cost ratio
Water Quality – Part 2 Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Dry Weather (20 pts)	30	30	30	**30**	**30**	•
Water Supply – Part 1	8	0	8	**13**	**0**	• No letter from Water Replenishment District (WRD) of claimed Water Supply Benefits
Water Supply – Part 2	9	5	9	**12**	**0**	•
Community Investment	5	5	5	**10**	**5**	• To consider protected bike lanes • New benches
Nature-Based Solutions	11	11	11	**15**	**11**	• 46 trees with 12 new trees, plus several plants • Removal of impervious area
Leveraging Funds	0	0	0	**6**	**0**	•
Community Support	4	4	4	**4**	**1**	• Want to see robust engagement • Only one community outreach & engagement provided outcomes.

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2026-2027

						• No upcoming scheduled community & engagement
TOTAL	71	55	71	**110**	**51**	• Does not meet the 60-point threshold

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**	• Low capture-to-cost ratio
Water Quality – Part 2 Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Dry Weather (20 pts)	29	25	29	**30**	**29**	•
Water Supply – Part 1	3	0	3	**13**	**0**	• Infiltrating to confined aquifer
Water Supply – Part 2	4	0	4	**12**	**0**	•
Community Investment	10	10	10	**10**	~~**Unable to Score**~~ **10**	• ~~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**	• ~~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**	• 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**	• 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	Franklin D. Roosevelt Park Regional Stormwater Capture Operation and Maintenance Project
Project Lead	Los Angeles County
Application Type	Construction and O&M Funding
Total Funding Requested	$1,160,000.00
Project Type Scoring Method	Wet
WQ Scoring Pilot	~~No~~ Yes
WS Scoring Pilot	No

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Original Score	Pilot Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality – Part 1 Wet + Dry Weather	14	14	18	**20**	**18**	•
Water Quality – Part 2 Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Dry Weather (20 pts)	0	0	12	**30**	**12**	•
Water Supply – Part 1	13	13	13	**13**	**13**	• Requesting monitoring data for O&M and construction photos in future O&M applications
Water Supply – Part 2	12	12	12	**12**	**12**	•
Community Investment	5	5	5	**10**	**5**	•
Nature-Based Solutions	11	11	11	**15**	**11**	•
Leveraging Funds	6	6	6	**6**	**6**	•
Community Support	3	3	3	**4**	**3**	•
TOTAL	64	64	80	**110**	**80**	•

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**	• Strong letters of support from local community groups provided, but no details on outreach and engagement • Feedback in letters raise some concerns—Scoring Committee appreciative of honesty
TOTAL	68	58	68	**110**	~~**Unable to Score**~~ **68**	•

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**	• 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**	• ~~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**	• 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**	•
Community Investment	5	5	5	**10**	~~**Unable to Score**~~ **5**	• ~~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**	• ~~Confused with claimed shade and trees~~ • ~~Requesting clarifying information on claimed benefits~~ Applicant provided clarifying information
Leveraging Funds	0	0	0	**6**	**0**	•
Community Support	4	4	4	**4**	**4**	• Partnering with an NGO is a good way to engage the community
TOTAL	73	73	83	**110**	~~**Unable to Score**~~ **71**	•

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**	• 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**	•
Water Supply – Part 1	4	0	4	**13**	~~**Unable to Score**~~ **2**	• ~~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**	•
Community Investment	5	5	5	**10**	~~**Unable to Score**~~ **5**	• ~~To provide specific details on claimed benefits~~ Applicant provided clarifying information
Nature-Based Solutions	10	10	10	**15**	~~**Unable to Score**~~ **10**	• “ornamental landscaping” is unclear • “potential area for native landscaping” is unclear

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2026-2027

						• ~~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**	• ~~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**	•
TOTAL	61	49	61	**110**	**~~Unable to Score~~ 64**	• 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	ESGVWMG 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 ESGVWMG 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**	• ~~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**	• ~~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	ESGVWMG 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 ESGVWMG Drywells Project
Water Quality – Part 1 Wet + Dry Weather	20	20	20	**20**	**20**	• 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**	•
Water Supply – Part 1	10	0	10	**13**	~~**Unable to Score**~~ **6**	• ~~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**	• ~~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**	•
Nature-Based Solutions	10	10	10	**15**	**5**	• 4 trees • 1,000 sqf of canopy
Leveraging Funds	3	3	3	**6**	**3**	•

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2026-2027

Community Support	2	2	2	**4**	**0**	• Not much community engagement
TOTAL	67	49	67	**110**	~~**Unable to Score**~~ **55**	• 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	San Jose Creek Greenway Project
Project Lead	Industry
Application Type	Design Only
Total Funding Requested	$5,532,000.00
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
Water Quality – Part 1 Wet + Dry Weather	20	20	20	**20**	**20**	• 1,000 acres split into multiple diversions
Water Quality – Part 2 Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Dry Weather (20 pts)	20	20	20	**30**	**20**	•
Water Supply – Part 1	3	0	3	**13**	**3**	• Diverting to sanitary sewer • Need a letter of confirmation from Sanitation District for SCW construction funding
Water Supply – Part 2	7	5	7	**12**	**7**	•
Community Investment	5	5	5	**10**	**5**	• Bike path
Nature-Based Solutions	10	10	10	**15**	**10**	•
Leveraging Funds	0	0	0	**6**	**0**	•
Community Support	4	4	4	**4**	**4**	• Strong letters of support • Appreciate the partnership between different agencies and community organizations

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2026-2027

TOTAL	69	64	69	**110**	**69**	•

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2026-2027

Watershed Area	Upper San Gabriel River
Project Name	Arrow Highway Beautification and Stormwater Capture Project
Project Lead	Irwindale
Application Type	Design Only
Total Funding Requested	$1,724,000.00
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
Water Quality – Part 1 Wet + Dry Weather	14	11	14	**20**	**14**	• Applicant mentions infiltration is not feasible due to contaminated aquifer • Per MS4 Permits, treat and release need to be sized 1.5x 85th percentile
Water Quality – Part 2 Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Dry Weather (20 pts)	30	30	30	**30**	**30**	• Recommend study on treat & release BMPs because Applicant is claiming a lot of WQ points
Water Supply – Part 1	0	0	6	**13**	**0**	•
Water Supply – Part 2	0	0	1	**12**	**0**	•
Community Investment	5	5	5	**10**	**5**	• Good job specifying the community benefits at design level
Nature-Based Solutions	10	10	10	**15**	**10**	•
Leveraging Funds	0	0	0	**6**	**0**	•
Community Support	2	2	2	**4**	**2**	•

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2026-2027

TOTAL	61	58	68	**110**	**61**	•

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**	• 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**	• 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**	• ~~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**	• 40 acre-ft
Community Investment	10	10	10	**10**	**10**	•

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**	•