

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 Campus-Community Connection: UCLA's Mobility, Stormwater Capture, and Greening Project
Water Quality – Part 1 Wet + Dry Weather	7	7	7	20	7	<ul> <li>Different pollutant targets for different drainage areas (e.g., areas picking up trash only and other areas with drywells)</li> <li>Recommend using devices that address pollutants and trash</li> <li>May be difficult for drywells due to high groundwater</li> </ul>
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	<ul> <li>Santa Monica GMA needs net countable supply ratios</li> <li>Need a letter of confirmation from groundwater master for SCW construction funding</li> </ul>
Water Supply - Part 2	5	2	5	12	5	•
Community Investment	10	10	10	10	10	•
Nature-Based Solutions	10	10	10	15	10	•



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



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
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	To apply the net countable supply ratio from the Supplemental Guidance to Support Feasibility Study Guidelines and provide calculations
Water Supply – Part 2	4	0	4	12	Unable to Score	•
Community Investment	5	5	5	10	Unable to Score	To provide specific details on claimed benefits
Nature-Based Solutions	10	10	10	15	Unable to Score	<ul> <li>"ornamental landscaping" is unclear</li> <li>"potential area for native landscaping" is unclear</li> <li>To provide specific details on the type of vegetations and how that yields to claimed benefits</li> </ul>



Leveraging Funds	0	0	0	6	Unable to Score	To provide description of leveraged funds and breakdown of how project funding was distributed (e.g., how was \$90k obtained?)
Community Support	4	4	4	4	4	•
TOTAL	61	49	61	110	Unable to Score	•



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	<ul> <li>To recalculate dry weather (0.0003 cfs/developed acres * 363 acres impervious = 0.1 cfs)</li> <li>Missing the letter from groundwater master</li> </ul>
Water Supply – Part 2	9	9	9	12	Unable to Score	To apply the net countable supply ratio from the Supplemental Guidance to Support Feasibility Study Guidelines and provide calculations
Community Investment	2	2	2	10	2	•
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	•
-------	----	----	----	-----	--------------------	---



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	<del>Dry</del> 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	<ul> <li>To recalculate; incorrect dry weather calculation of 0.00003 cfs/developed acres * 26 acres impervious = 0.0008 cfs</li> <li>Missing the letter from groundwater master</li> </ul>
Water Supply – Part 2	4	2	4	12	Unable to Score	To apply the net countable supply ratio from the Supplemental Guidance to Support Feasibility Study Guidelines and provide calculations
Community Investment	2	2	2	10	2	•
Nature-Based Solutions	10	10	10	15	5	<ul><li>4 trees</li><li>1,000 sqf of canopy</li></ul>
Leveraging Funds	3	3	3	6	3	•
Community Support	2	2	2	4	0	Not much community engagement



TOTAL	67	49	67	110	Unable to Score	•
-------	----	----	----	-----	--------------------	---



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	<ul> <li>Diverting to sanitary sewer</li> <li>Need a letter of confirmation from Sanitation District for SCW construction funding</li> </ul>
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



TOTAL	69	64	69	110	69	•
-------	----	----	----	-----	----	---



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 Arrow Highway Beautification and Stormwater Capture Project
Water Quality – Part 1 Wet + Dry Weather	14	11	14	20	14	<ul> <li>Applicant mentions infiltration is not feasible due to contaminated aquifer</li> <li>Per MS4 Permits, treat and release need to be sized 1.5x 85<sup>th</sup> percentile</li> </ul>
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	•



TOTAL	61	58	68	110	61	•
-------	----	----	----	-----	----	---



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	<ul> <li>Combination of 3 stormwater inlets, infiltration, and treat and release BMPs</li> <li>To provide clarification on percolation rates</li> </ul>
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	<ul> <li>Per WS Pilot, \$24,279.99 - \$16,300.00/ac-ft = 4 points</li> <li>To apply the net countable supply ratio from the Supplemental Guidance to Support Feasibility Study Guidelines and p1rovide calculations (e.g., 47% if San Jose Creek flows to Rio Hondo Spreading Grounds)</li> </ul>
Water Supply – Part 2	7	5	7	12	Unable to Score	•
Community Investment	10	10	10	10	10	•
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	•