
To:	Safe, Clean Water Program	From:	Mike Antos, Ryanna Fossum Stantec Consulting Inc
	900 South Freemont Ave Alhambra, CA 91803		300 North Lake Avenue, #400 Pasadena, CA 91101
		Date:	January 30, 2023

**Reference: Scoring Committee Comments and Recommendations during Safe Clean Water Program
Call for Projects Fiscal Year 2023-2024**

PURPOSE AND BACKGROUND

At the November 3, 2022 Scoring Committee Meeting, Chair Bruce Reznik requested that note-takers keep a list of the items discussed regarding the Safe Clean Water Program (SCWP) scoring system. The following memorandum includes a list of systemic updates discussed or mentioned during Scoring Committee meetings for Round 4 Projects (Fiscal Year 2023-2024).

Previous comments and feedback about the scoring system discussed during the prior round of project scoring are included in this [memo](#), dated April 18, 2022.

VARIATION IN INFRASTRUCTURE SUBMITTAL TYPES

The following comments reflect the Scoring Committee's thinking about how projects submitted for design funding only or a previously or concurrently implemented project seeking only Operations and Maintenance (O&M) funding are difficult to evaluate alongside projects seeking design, construction, and O&M funding.

- September 1, 2022 – There is not yet guidance to help evaluate design-only projects that propose a variety of alternatives. An audit to compare benefits promised and benefits realized for projects that received SCWP funding may be needed (Member Matt Stone).
- October 6, 2022 – As noted in previous rounds of scoring, it is difficult to score O&M projects using the current Scoring Criteria (comment by Member Diaz and concurrence by Chair Reznik).
- November 3, 2022 – As noted in previous rounds of scoring, projects that apply for both design and construction funding should submit separate applications, especially if there are multiple phases of the project (Committee Members).
- November 3, 2022 – As noted in previous rounds of scoring, evaluation of projects seeking design-only funding is typically more lenient than projects seeking both design and construction funding (Chair Reznik).
- December 1, 2022 – Projects requesting a small amount for design only projects and then later requesting a large amount for construction should be considered together (design + construction) during the scoring process as it relates to the cost benefit ratio of a project (Committee Members).

WATER QUALITY BENEFITS

Reference: **Scoring Committee Comments and Recommendations during Safe Clean Water Program Call for Projects Fiscal Year 2023-2024**

The following comments reflect the Scoring Committee considering the issues around assessing a project as providing wet weather Water Quality Benefits as opposed to dry weather Water Quality Benefits and practices to standardize project applications for assessment.

- September 1, 2022 – More guidance is needed to assess whether projects are dry weather or wet weather (Vice Chair TJ Moon).
- October 17, 2022 – The maximum calculated 24-hour storm capacity should be capped at the 85th percentile storm capacity. This cap will reduce the points historically awarded to applicants that use a larger capacity in calculations (Vice Chair Moon).
 - Concerns about inaccurate system capacity calculations that go above the 85th percentile storm capacity were raised again at the November 3rd and November 9th Scoring Committee Meetings.
- November 3, 2022 – Projects with treat-and-release or propriety BMPs should be evaluated with the results of the Metrics and Monitoring Study instead of being treated as an infiltration basin in the SCW module (Vice Chair Moon).
- November 9, 2022 -- The Project Module and Scoring Criteria are not equipped to allow applicants to input multiple structural Best Management Practice (BMP) types (e.g. dry wells and treat-and-release) (Vice Chair Moon).
- December 1, 2022 – Some form of standardization for dry weather should be created for future applications. Field measurements are ideal but using a standard authority's cubic feet per second (cfs) per acre could also be considered. The number of dry days in a year assumed in an application should also be standardized. If an applicant uses a 24-hour duration instead of the standard 72-hour duration used after a wet weather event to mark when dry weather begins, they should provide justification. (Vice Chair Moon).
- December 1, 2022 – Projects should not be designed to treat more water than required, as it increases the cost and use of SCWP funds (Vice Chair Moon).
- December 1, 2022 – For future applications, site-specific geotechnical data should be required and may be a step in the District's preliminary verification process (Vice Chair Moon).

WATER SUPPLY BENEFITS

The following comments reflect the Scoring Committee considering how Water Supply Benefits can be assessed and considered for other-than infiltration to groundwater.

- November 3, 2022 – Water supply cost effectiveness points are difficult to earn (Chair Reznik)
- November 3, 2022 – The Scoring Committee should consider whether projects located in Watershed Areas with very deep aquifers should be awarded Water Supply Benefit points for interventions that intend to recharge the aquifer (such as concrete removal), even if no direct path to the aquifer is specified (comment by Member Stone and concurrence by Member Esther Rojas).

Reference: Scoring Committee Comments and Recommendations during Safe Clean Water Program Call for Projects Fiscal Year 2023-2024

- In the past, no points have been awarded to projects in Watershed Areas with very deep aquifers, but the Scoring Committee has given partial points to projects that demonstrate the intent for recharge in regions where aquifers are present (Vice Chair Moon).

COMMUNITY INVESTMENT BENEFITS

The following comments reflect the Scoring Committee considering how school greening and flood protection benefits can be considered for Community Investment Benefits.

- October 17, 2022 – As noted in previous rounds of scoring, school greening points should only be awarded to projects that directly green school campuses (Chair Reznik).
- November 3, 2022 – The Scoring Committee should consider whether school greening points may be awarded to projects that are not located on school property but located on property which the school uses or intends to use (Chair Reznik).
- November 3, 2022 – Flood protection benefits cannot be awarded to dry weather projects for Community Investment points (comment by Member David Diaz and concurrence by Chair Reznik).
- November 9, 2022 – More discussion is needed to decide whether all wet weather projects confer flood protection benefits, or just those which treat the 85th percentile storm (comment by Vice Chair Moon).

NATURE-BASED SOLUTIONS

The following comments reflect the Scoring Committee considering the elements of Nature-Based Solutions Benefits.

- November 3, 2022 – The Committee's stance on artificial turf as a nature-based solution should be discussed (Chair Reznik).
- November 3, 2022 – Because removal of impermeable surfaces is expressed as a percentage, applicants can game the Scoring Criteria by reducing the overall project area and inaccurately represent claimed benefits (Chair Reznik).
- December 1, 2022 – There may be a gradient point scale developed for points awarded for percent reduction in impervious area (District Staff).

LEVERAGING FUNDS AND COMMUNITY SUPPORT

The following comments reflect the Scoring Committee considering the elements of Leveraged Funds and Community Support Criteria.

- October 17, 2022 – The Scoring Committee is only responsible for evaluating leveraged funds that have been secured. The Watershed Area Steering Committees would be responsible for evaluating the likelihood of securing funds not yet committed (District Staff).
- October 17, 2022 – It is acceptable to evaluate letters of support for projects that are addressed to other funding sources, so long as the project has not drastically changed and the length of time since

Reference: **Scoring Committee Comments and Recommendations during Safe Clean Water Program Call for Projects Fiscal Year 2023-2024**

the letter was dated is not too great (comment by member Diaz and concurrence by Chair Reznik and Vice Chair Moon).

OTHER ITEMS

The following comments reflect other issues raised by members of the Scoring Committee that were not similar to the categories identified above.

Considerations for North Santa Monica Bay Watershed Area

- October 6, 2022 – It has been difficult to generate qualifying projects in the North Santa Monica Bay Watershed Area, and a separate scoring system should be considered (comment made by Chair Reznik).

Estimates of O&M costs vary

- October 17, 2022 - Inconsistent estimates of O&M costs across applications make it difficult to assess projects (Vice Chair Moon).