



FY26-27 Scoring Committee Memo

SAFE CLEAN WATER PROGRAM
07/13/26



Scoring Committee Memo

- Prepared annually by Regional Coordination team
- Captures key discussion points and recommendations during scoring process
- [FY26-27 Memo](#) captures comments and recommendations from Scoring Committee (SC) during scoring of FY26-27 Call for Projects (Round 7) Infrastructure Program Project applications



Scoring Committee Memo

To: Safe, Clean Water Program
Scoring Committee

From: Safe, Clean Water Program
Regional Coordination Team
Date: April 23, 2026

Reference: Scoring Committee Comments and Recommendations – Round 7 Projects

Purpose and Background

At the December 15, 2025 Scoring Committee (Committee) meeting, Committee Members requested that the Regional Coordination team summarize the observations and recommendations made by the Committee about the Safe, Clean Water (SCW) Program Scoring Criteria during the evaluation of Round 7 Regional Program Infrastructure Program Projects (Fiscal Year 2026-27 Call for Projects).

Scoring Committee Recommendation #1: Implement Separate Applications for Infrastructure Program Projects That Request Operations & Maintenance-Only Funding

In prior rounds of scoring, the Committee recommended phase-specific applications for the three types of Infrastructure Program Project submittals: Design, Construction, and Operations & Maintenance (O&M). This year, Round 7 Call for Projects Scoring was updated to include two application types: Design-Only and Design/Construction/O&M, with separate requirements outlined in the [Supplemental Guidance to Support Feasibility Study Guidelines](#), depending on project phase. The Committee expressed positive feedback for the separation of these two applications, and recommended the application be further refined to separate O&M-only funding requests as a distinct application type.

The Committee reflected that projects currently returning for O&M-only funding have previously been reviewed by the Scoring Committee for Design/Construction funding and thus received a score above the threshold to be considered by the Watershed Area Steering Committee and funded by the SCW Regional Program. The Committee recommended a more streamlined application for O&M-Only Applicants that have previously received funding through the SCW Program for prior project phases, and the ability to track and reference projects' previous scoring rubrics.

A recommendation was presented to, and well received, by the Committee to classify O&M Applications into two categories, with separate processes. O&M-Only application categories would be defined as either:

- 1) Projects that were previously awarded SCW Program construction funding and are returning with a SCW Regional Program O&M funding request, or
- 2) Projects whose construction was funded outside of the SCW Regional Program, but are requesting SCW Regional Program O&M funding.

Projects that have previously received SCW Program construction funding and are returning for O&M funding will apply through a streamlined process with previous Final Scores from the Scoring Committee carried over and verified by the Scoring Committee for up to five years of O&M funding. After the fifth year, a new O&M-Only application will need to be submitted through the same streamlined process.

Projects that have not previously received SCW Program construction funding, meaning that project construction was funded outside of the SCW Program, and are requesting SCW Program O&M funding will need to undergo scoring by the Committee. The scoring of these projects will be evaluated through the same Scoring Criteria as other Infrastructure Program Project applications. However, previous construction funding

SC Recommendation #1: Implement Separate Applications for Infrastructure Program Projects That Request Operations & Maintenance-Only Funding

- Classify O&M Applications into two categories, with separate processes:
 - 1) Projects that were **previously awarded SCW Program construction funding** and are returning with a SCW Regional Program O&M funding request
 - 2) Projects whose **construction was funded outside of the SCW Regional Program**, but are requesting SCW Regional Program O&M funding



SC Recommendation #2: Evaluate Water Quality Scoring Adaptation Pilot

- Understanding how the newly- introduced Water Quality Scoring Adaptation Pilot impacted the SCW Program

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).

Water Quality Benefit Scoring Adaptation Pilot Rubric

Section	Score Range	Scoring Standards				
Wet + Dry Weather Water Quality Benefits	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. <table><thead><tr><th>Primary Class of Pollutants</th><th>Second or More Classes of Pollutant</th></tr></thead><tbody><tr><td> • < 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) </td><td> • < 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) </td></tr></tbody></table>	Primary Class of Pollutants	Second or More Classes of Pollutant	• < 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)	• < 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)
Primary Class of Pollutants	Second or More Classes of Pollutant					
• < 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)	• < 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)					
- OR -						
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)				

SC Recommendation #3: Clarify Eligible Claims for Water Quality Benefits

- Revise Projects Module to More Accurately Represent Projects with Multiple BMPs and Treat-and-Release BMPs
- “Wet Weather” and “Dry Weather” Designations



SC Recommendation #4: Clarify Eligible Claims for Water Supply Benefits

- Expand definition of “Water Supply Benefit” in the SCW Program Ordinance to include activities that infiltrate water with the intent to replenish groundwater or adjust criteria to including specific thresholds for each Watershed Area, creating a “base plus bonus” system of scoring, or assigning less weight to water supply points
 - a) Net Countable Supply Ratios
 - b) Cost Effectiveness Ratios
 - c) Diversion to Sanitary Sewer



SC Recommendation #5: Revise Scoring Criteria for Community Investment Benefits

- Implement a **Community Investment Benefits Scoring Adaptation Pilot** to award points for Community Investments Benefits on a quantifiable, scaled metrics basis



Section	Score Range	Scoring Standards
C. Community Investment Benefits	10 points max	The Project provides Community Investment Benefits
	10 points max	C1. Project includes: • Zero Community Investment Benefits identified = 0 points • One or Two Community Investment Benefits identified = 2 points • Three Community Investment Benefits identified = 4 points • Four Community Investment Benefits identified = 6 points • Five Community Investment Benefits identified = 8 points • Six or Seven Community Investment Benefits identified = 10 points 3. Community Investment Benefits include: • Improved flood management, flood conveyance, or flood risk mitigation. • Creation, enhancement, or restoration of parks, habitat, or wetlands. • Improved public access to waterways. • Enhanced or new recreational opportunities. • Greening of schools. • Reducing local heat island effect and increasing shade. • Increasing the number of trees and/or other vegetation at the site location that will increase carbon reduction/sequestration and improve air quality.

Community Investment Benefit Scoring Adaptation Pilot Rubric

SC Recommendation #6: Revise Scoring Criteria for Nature-Based Solutions – Removal of Impervious Area from Project

1. Modify Projects Module to require that additional information documenting impermeable surface removed in relation to total project area
2. Revise Scoring Criteria to adjust to total impermeable areas removed in acres, rather than a percentage



SC Recommendation #7: Strengthen Requirements to Demonstrate Local Support

- Establish additional minimum requirements to further demonstrate local support
- Require itemized budgets with line items for community engagement
- Emphasize the importance of quantifiable metrics
- Add a minimum eligibility threshold for all project types to have conducted community engagement



Other Items

- Watershed Planning Alignment
- Leverage Funding

