

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Committee



Meeting Minutes:

Monday, January 29, 2020

8:00am - 12:00pm

Los Angeles County Public Works, LA County Public Works, Conference Room C
[900 South Fremont Ave, Alhambra, CA 91803](#)

Attendees

Committee Members Present:

Bruce Reznik

JR De Shazo

Jill Sourial

TJ Moon

Committee Members Not Present:

Dave Sorem

Dean Efstathiou

1) Welcome and Introductions

Mr. Bruce Reznik, the Chair of the Scoring Committee, called the meeting to order.

All committee members in attendance made self-introductions, and quorum was established.

2) Approval of Meeting Minutes from January 21, 2020

The Los Angeles County Flood Control District (District) provided a copy of the meeting minutes from the previous meeting. Mr. Bruce Reznik asked the committee members for comments or revisions.

Mr. JR De Shazo made a motion to approve the meeting minutes from January 21, 2020. Mr. TJ Moon seconded the motion. The Committee voted to approve the meeting minutes from January 21, 2020 (unanimous).

3) Committee Member and District Updates

Mr. Kirk Allen covered District updates and housekeeping items, updated Ex Parte Guidelines, and COI Q&A guidelines.

4) Public Comment Period for Non-Agenized Items

A member of the Public requested clarification if a feasibility study is required. Mr. Kirk Allen clarified that there should be some level of information available so that project applicants can enter information into the Project Module, including all 19 minimum requirements and be sufficient for scoring. Mr. TJ Moon and Mr. Bruce Reznik further clarified that the Scoring Committee (SC) is still looking for some type of documentation to verify the benefits claimed.

A member of the Public requested clarification if it's a requirement to use the website modeling tool. Mr. TJ Moon noted that is not a requirement, but that it is more challenging for the SC to score these. The website is not capable of modeling very complex systems, so that would require an analysis outside of the web tool.

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Committee



5) Discussion Items:

a) Ex Parte Communications Disclosure

- Mr. Bruce Reznik noted that he is taking part in the CSMB WASC meeting, had conversations with Ms. Liz Crosson after the meeting, and had breakfast conversation with District Consultant Stantec.

b) Scoring of Feasibility Studies

Scoring Committee members reviewed the following projects. Detailed notes were taken within the master Scoring Rubric document.

- #3 CSMB – Culver City Mesmer Low Flow Diversion
- #4 CSMB – Imperial Highway Sunken Median
- #5 CSMB – Ladera Park Stormwater Improvements Project
- #13 LLAR – John Anson Ford Park Infiltration Cistern
- #14 LLAR – Long Beach Municipal Urban Stormwater Treatment (LB MUST)
- #20 LSGR – Bolivar Park
- #21 LSGR – Caruthers Park
- #31 RH – East Los Angeles Sustainable Median Stormwater Capture Project
- #33 SCR – Hasley Canyon Park Stormwater Improvements Project
- #34 SCR – Newhall Park Infiltration
- #36 SSMB – Harbor City Greenway O&M
- #38 SSMB – Wilmington Q Street Local Urban Area Flow Management
- #42 ULAR – Fernageles Park Stormwater Capture Project
- #43 ULAR – Franklin D. Roosevelt Park Regional Stormwater Capture Project
- #45 ULAR – Oro Vista Local Area Urban Flow Management Project
- #51 USGR – Barnes Park
- #53 USGR – Encanto Park Stormwater Capture Project
- #54 USGR – Finkbliner Park Multi-Benefit Stormwater Capture Project
- #55 USGR – Garvey Avenue Grade Separation Drainage Improvement Project

c) Feasibility Study Review Lead Assignments and Order of Scoring

- Mr. Bruce Reznik suggested additional new feasibility studies to review.

d) Meeting Schedule

- For Feb-4-2020 Meeting, the following projects will be reviewed by the SC:
 - #6 CSMB – MacArthur Lake Rehabilitation Project
 - #7 CSMB – Monteith Park and View Park Green Alley Stormwater Improvements
 - #10 CSMB – Washington Boulevard Stormwater and Urban Runoff Diversion
 - #15 LLAR – Rancho Los Cerritos: Looking Back to Advance Forward
 - #16 LLAR – Salt Lake Park Infiltration Cistern
 - #17 LLAR – Spane Park
 - #22 LSGR – Cerritos Sports Complex
 - #23 LSGR – Hermosillo Park
 - #24 LSGR – Mayfair Park
 - #25 LSGR – Skylinks Golf Course at Wardlow Stormwater Capture Project

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Committee



-
- #26 LSGR – El Dorado Regional Project
 - #27 LSGR – Adventure Park Multi Benefit Stormwater Capture Project
 - #28 NSMB – Viewridge Road Stormwater Improvements Project
 - #46 Rory M. Shaw Wetlands Park Project
 - #47 ULAR – Strathern Park North Stormwater Capture Project
 - #48 ULAR – The Distributed Drywell System Project
 - #49 ULAR – Valley Village Park Stormwater Capture Project
 - #50 ULAR – Walnut Park Pocket Park Project
 - #57 USGR – Pedley Spreading Grounds
 - #58 USGR – Wingate Park Regional EWMP Project
- Mr. Bruce Reznik suggested canceling the February 10 Meeting. Committee Members conquered.

6) Public Comment Period for Agenized Items

Public Comment – noted it was important to capture the stormwater and groundwater interaction for projects.

7) Voting items:

- a) Return passing scores of projects and feasibility studies to WASCs

Mr. JR De Shazo made a motion to approve. Ms. Jill Sourial seconded the motion. The Committee voted to approve. (unanimous).

- b) Inform project applicants and WASCs of the projects that do not reach the Threshold Score and/or those that lack sufficient information to be scored. Applicants will have one week to correct and resubmit their applications for final scoring.

Pending a 5-day resubmittal process for project applicants, Mr. Bruce Reznik removed this voting item.

8) Items for next agenda




Mr. Bruce Reznik requested agenda should include next weeks' list of projects.

9) Adjournment

Mr. Bruce Reznik thanked the committee members and public for their time and participation and adjourned the meeting.

Scoring Committee Meeting
 COMMITTEE MEMBER SIGN-IN



Member Name	Municipality/ Organization	Email Address	Signature
Dean Efstathiou	Consulting Engineer	defstath1@gmail.com	
Taejin Moon	LA County Public Works	TMOON@dpw.lacounty.gov	
Bruce Reznik	LA Waterkeeper	bruce@lawaterkeeper.org	
Dave Sorem	Mike Bubalo Construction Co., Inc.	dave@bubalo.com	
Jill Sourial	The Nature Conservancy	jill.sourial@tnc.org	
J.R. De Shazo	UCLA Luskin Center for Innovation	deshazo@ucla.edu; cvance@luskin.ucla.edu	

Scoring Committee Meeting
PUBLIC SIGN-IN



First Name	Last Name	Municipality/Organization	Email Address
Christine	McLeod	Cordoba Corp	Cmcleod@cordoba Corp.
CRISTIAN	HERNANDEZ	CORDOBA CORP.	CRISTIAN.HERNANDEZ@CORDOBA CORP.COM
HUGO	GARCIA	JLHA	HGARCIA@JLHA.NET
Alfredo	Magallanos	LASD	alfredo.magallanos@lacity.org
CARLOS	LOPEZ VILARDELL	CORVIAS	CARLOS.LOPEZVILARDELL@CORVIAS.COM
MICHAEL	GAGGAR	K4	michael.gaggar@k4.com
Heather Merenda		Santa Clarita	hmerenda@Santa-clarita.com
Oliver	Cramer	Santa Clarita	ocramer@Santa-clarita.com
Gordon	Haines	City of LA - LASD	gordon.haines@lacity.org
Shahram	Kharaghani	City of LA - LASD	shahram.kharaghani@lacity.org
Traci	Minamide	//	Traci.Minamide@lacity.org
Noel	Le	City of LA - DWP	noel.le@ladwp.com
Peter	Tonthat	LADWP	peter.tonthat@ladwp.com
Ryan	Aghalchani	LADWP	Ryan.aghalchani@ladwp.com
Danalle	Chupa	Cordoba	dchupa@cordoba Corp.com

*Signing or completing this form is voluntary for members of the public

Scoring Committee Meeting
PUBLIC SIGN-IN



First Name	Last Name	Municipality/Organization	Email Address
Armando	D'Angelo	LA County PW	adangelo@pw.lacounty.gov
Oliver	Galang	Craftwater Energy	oliver.galang@craftwaterinc.com
Phuoc	le	LASAN	Phuoc.le@lacity.org
Delon	Kwan	LADWP	Delon.Kwan@LADWP.com
Seth	Carr	LA SAN	seth.carr@lacity.org
Kate	Mike	LASAN	kathryn.mike@lacity.org
Bruce	Hamamoto	LACDPW	B.H. bhomam@plw.kerncounty.gov
Vik	Bapna	CWE	vbapna@cwecorp.com
Susie	Santilena	City of LA	susie.santilena@lacity.org
ART	CASTRO	LADWP	

*Signing or completing this form is voluntary for members of the public

Safe, Clean Water Program

Fiscal Year 2020-2021

Scoring Rubric



SCW.ID	3
Project Name	Culver City Mesmer Low Flow Diversion
Project Lead	City of Culver City
Total Funding Requested	\$950,000
Project Type	Dry

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	20	20	
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	20	30	20	
Water Supply Part 1	13	13	13	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Relying on future project for future supply benefit
Water Supply Part 2	12	12	12	
Community Investment	0	10	0	
Nature-Based Solutions	0	15	0	
Leveraging Funds Part 1	6	6	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is applying for prop 1 funding enough to be considered leveraged funds. SC noted it's unclear if the project applicant will receive this funding. SC has decided that future potential funding should not include potential future funding options.
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	4	4	
TOTALS	75	110	69	

Safe, Clean Water Program

Fiscal Year 2020-2021

Scoring Rubric



SCW.ID	4
Project Name	Imperial Highway Sunken Median
Project Lead	City of Los Angeles, Bureau of Sanitation
Total Funding Requested	\$50,000
Project Type	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	20	20	
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	30	25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Applicant claims 100% reduction of all water captured. There would be some level of bypass in the drain. There should be some level of pollutants that bypass the site. Modeling results show that there are 79% reductions (not quite 80%)
Water Supply Part 1	0	13	0	
Water Supply Part 2	0	12	0	
Community Investment	5	10	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would be beneficial to have more information for how the vegetative soils and bioswales are performing.
Nature-Based Solutions	10	15	10	
Leveraging Funds Part 1	0	6	0	
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	4	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No letter of support provided
TOTALS	69	110	60	

Safe, Clean Water Program

Fiscal Year 2020-2021

Scoring Rubric



SCW.ID	5
Project Name	Ladera Park Stormwater Improvements Project
Project Lead	Los Angeles County Public Works
Total Funding Requested	\$2,000,000
Project Type	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality				
Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	14	20	14	
Water Quality				
Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2	30	30	30	
Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2				
Water Supply				
Part 1	0	13	0	
Water Supply				
Part 2	0	12	0	
Community Investment	5	10	5	
Nature-Based Solutions	10	15	10	
Leveraging Funds				
Part 1	6	6	6	
Leveraging Funds				
Part 2	4	4	4	
TOTALS	69	110	69	

Safe, Clean Water Program

Fiscal Year 2020-2021

Scoring Rubric



SCW.ID	13
Project Name	John Anson Ford Park Infiltration Cistern
Project Lead	City of Bell Gardens
Total Funding Requested	\$10,000,000
Project Type	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	20	20	
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	20	30	To Be Determined	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Applicant provided their own modeling results. Applicant claims the water quality benefit of the full build out of all phases of the project. If run through the model, it would likely not be a high water quality score. Would likely score 0 points if run through the model. Possible suggestion to SC would provide a partial credit for different phases of the project. Recommend the applicant redo the modeling for combining Phase 1 & 2.
Water Supply Part 1	10	13	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unclear if the water is reaching a usable aquifer.
Water Supply Part 2	12	12	12	
Community Investment	10	10	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Difficult to tell what phase these CI benefits are claimed.
Nature-Based Solutions	10	15	10	

Safe, Clean Water Program

Fiscal Year 2020-2021

Scoring Rubric



Leveraging Funds Part 1	3	6	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Applicant is claiming some portion of Phase 1 funding as part of this projects leveraged funding.
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	4	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Letters of support from community organizations or the public. Only letters of support from municipalities.
TOTALS	89	110	Above Threshold	

Safe, Clean Water Program

Fiscal Year 2020-2021

Scoring Rubric



SCW.ID	14
Project Name	Long Beach Municipal Urban Stormwater Treatment (LB MUST) - Phase 1
Project Lead	City of Long Beach
Total Funding Requested	\$10,800,000
Project Type	Dry

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality				
Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	20	20	
Water Quality				
Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	20	30	20	
Water Supply				
Part 1	0	13	0	
Water Supply				
Part 2	0	12	0	
Community Investment	10	10	10	
Nature-Based Solutions	10	15	10	
Leveraging Funds				
Part 1	6	6	6	
Leveraging Funds				
Part 2	4	4	4	
TOTALS	70	110	70	

Safe, Clean Water Program

Fiscal Year 2020-2021

Scoring Rubric



SCW.ID	20
Project Name	Bolivar Park
Project Lead	City of Lakewood
Total Funding Requested	\$1,265,900
Project Type	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	20	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SC has reclassified as a Dry Weather Project If applicant wants to keep as a wet project, applicant should rerun model to note downstream bypass
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	25	30	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Applicant is claiming 100% of pollutant removal of all flows incoming to the project Recommend the project as a dry weather project. Would provide 20 points.
Water Supply Part 1	10	13	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Claims recharge in Lakewood. Unclear if this area has usable groundwater aquifer. Would also need to provide a letter of confirmation by the local groundwater master.
Water Supply Part 2	12	12	12	
Community Investment	5	10	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Only school adjacent, not greening of school Unclear what natural turf is. What does marginally increased trees mean.
Nature-Based Solutions	5	15	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Only utilizing existing natural features. Did not reduce impervious cover.
Leveraging Funds Part 1	6	6	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project is claiming Caltrans match that was for construction but not O&M.
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	4	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Within video, there does not appear to be a strong local support. Recommend providing a letter of support.
TOTALS	87	110	65	

Safe, Clean Water Program

Fiscal Year 2020-2021

Scoring Rubric



SCW.ID	21
Project Name	Caruthers Park
Project Lead	City of Bellflower
Total Funding Requested	\$855,000
Project Type	Dry

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	20	20	
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	20	30	20	
Water Supply Part 1	6	13	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unclear if Bellflower has access to usable groundwater aquifer. WRD provided a general letter of acknowledgement of projects that provide groundwater recharge benefit.
Water Supply Part 2	9	12	9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SC to provide additional clarity on Feasibility Guidelines on what level (short & long term) of supply is applicable.
Community Investment	5	10	To Be Determined	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unclear how the pre and post enhancements are different. Is this new turf and trees? No backup provided to clarify this. Is the O&M including maintenance of the Community Investment enhancements? Applicant should provide clarity on what O&M activities are covering.
Nature-Based Solutions	10	15	To Be Determined	

Safe, Clean Water Program

Fiscal Year 2020-2021

Scoring Rubric



Leveraging Funds Part 1	6	6	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Applicant is using original construction cost share from Caltrans.• Recommend project applicant provide some level of municipal cost share.
Leveraging Funds Part 2	0	4	0	
TOTALS	76	110	To Be Determined	

Safe, Clean Water Program

Fiscal Year 2020-2021

Scoring Rubric



SCW.ID	31
Project Name	East Los Angeles Sustainable Median Stormwater Capture Project
Project Lead	Los Angeles County
Total Funding Requested	\$7,000,000
Project Type	Dry

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality				
Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	20	20	
Water Quality				
Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2	20	30	20	
Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2				
Water Supply				
Part 1	10	13	10	
Water Supply				
Part 2	12	12	12	
Community Investment	5	10	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clarify the type of trees provided Dry weather project claiming flood benefit, would not be awarded that benefit. Does not change score.
Nature-Based Solutions	10	15	10	
Leveraging Funds				
Part 1	6	6	6	
Leveraging Funds				
Part 2	0	4	0	
TOTALS	83	110	83	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dave Sorem noted that this project is already out for bidding and fully funded.

Safe, Clean Water Program

Fiscal Year 2020-2021

Scoring Rubric



SCW.ID	33
Project Name	Hasley Canyon Park Stormwater Improvements Project
Project Lead	Los Angeles County Public Works
Total Funding Requested	\$2,887,500
Project Type	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	20	20	
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	20	30	20	
Water Supply Part 1	0	13	0	
Water Supply Part 2	2	12	2	
Community Investment	5	10	5	
Nature-Based Solutions	14	15	10 To Be determined	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For impervious area reduction, not clear how this was determined. No explanation for the reduction of imperviousness. Not clear if bioswales were new or replaced.
Leveraging Funds Part 1	6	6	6	
Leveraging Funds Part 2	0	4	0	
TOTALS	67	110	63	

Safe, Clean Water Program

Fiscal Year 2020-2021

Scoring Rubric



SCW.ID	34
Project Name	Newhall Park Infiltration
Project Lead	Dan Duncan, Oliver Cramer
Total Funding Requested	\$3,000,000
Project Type	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	20	To Be Determined	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No documentation to confirm these numbers. No Engineering Analysis provided (dimensions and engineering drawings)
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	30	To Be Determined	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Applicant claiming 100% pollutant reduction. Should include downstream bypass.
Water Supply Part 1	0	13	0	
Water Supply Part 2	5	12	To Be Determined	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> May change based on WQ analysis.
Community Investment	5	10	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Applicant to provide clarification for DAC benefit. Applicant should use definition of DAC benefit within the SCW Ordinance and Feasibility Guidelines Unclear if natural or artificial turf. Provide the types of trees School adjacent, may not be technically greening of schools, but provides access to the green space and benefits the school. Applicant provides an agreement with the school to note these benefits.

Safe, Clean Water Program

Fiscal Year 2020-2021

Scoring Rubric



Nature-Based Solutions	10	15	10	
Leveraging Funds				<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Project is utilizing local return.• Applicants is utilizing future speculative leveraged funds.• Project is asking for \$3M, utilizing \$3M of municipal, unclear if the match is based on total cost. (\$3M/\$19M)
Part 1	6	6	0	
Leveraging Funds				<ul style="list-style-type: none">• No letter of support from community. Project should provide the letter noted in the application.
Part 2	4	4	0	
TOTALS	80	110	To Be Determined	

Safe, Clean Water Program

Fiscal Year 2020-2021

Scoring Rubric



SCW.ID	36
Project Name	Harbor City Greenway O&M
Project Lead	City of Los Angeles
Total Funding Requested	\$75,000
Project Type	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	20	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This is a difficult project to score.
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	10	30	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Only trash benefit claimed May want to classify this as a dry weather project, this project would receive more points. SC treated this project as a Dry Weather Project to boost the score. Score may raise if wet weather pollutants is modeled.
Water Supply Part 1	0	13	0	
Water Supply Part 2	0	12	0	
Community Investment	10	10	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Credit for 3 benefits, but not six. How does the O&M support these community investment benefits. If there is monitoring information, that would help confirm these benefits are reached.
Nature-Based Solutions	10	15	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would be beneficial to know what other upgrades are being made.
Leveraging Funds Part 1	6	6	To Be Determined	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cost share for the construction phase of the project should not be counted. Provide additional clarity how cost share will be provided for

Safe, Clean Water Program

Fiscal Year 2020-2021

Scoring Rubric



				this project. A matching fund of 25% could raise this score.
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	4	4	
TOTALS	60	110	To Be Determined	

Safe, Clean Water Program

Fiscal Year 2020-2021

Scoring Rubric



SCW.ID	38
Project Name	Wilmington Q Street Local Urban Area Flow Management Project
Project Lead	City of Los Angeles, Bureau of Sanitation
Total Funding Requested	\$4,923,700
Project Type	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	20	To Be Determined	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lankershim technical report provided instead of the Wilmington Q street technical reports. Correct report can be provided in the resubmittal.
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	30	To Be Determined	
Water Supply Part 1	0	13	0	
Water Supply Part 2	0	12	0	
Community Investment	5	10	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> School adjacent and not direct greening of school. Does not affect score.
Nature-Based Solutions	12	15	12	
Leveraging Funds Part 1	0	6	0	
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	4	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Only letter of support from Council office, vs community group.
TOTALS	71	110	To Be Determined	

Safe, Clean Water Program

Fiscal Year 2020-2021

Scoring Rubric



SCW.ID	42
Project Name	Fernangeles Park Stormwater Capture Project
Project Lead	Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (LADWP)
Total Funding Requested	\$8,360,748
Project Type	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	20	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Engineering analysis is just one page factsheet currently. Would be beneficial to see additional details for this project. SC would recommend a more solidified design to better confirm cost estimates to the WASC.
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	30	30	
Water Supply Part 1	6	13	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Water supply cost effectiveness is based on the stormwater enhancement vs total project cost. SC recommends that for consistency the project total cost should be used for this metric vs just the cost of the stormwater enhancement.
Water Supply Part 2	5	12	5	
Community Investment	10	10	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improving access to waterways, may need more clarification/justification. Intent is for physical access and public use of waterways.
Nature-Based Solutions	15	15	15	
Leveraging Funds Part 1	6	6	6	

Safe, Clean Water Program

Fiscal Year 2020-2021

Scoring Rubric



Leveraging Funds				
Part 2	4	4	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• SC noted a very good collection of community support letters.
TOTALS	96	110	85	

Safe, Clean Water Program

Fiscal Year 2020-2021

Scoring Rubric



SCW.ID	43
Project Name	Franklin D. Roosevelt Park Regional Stormwater Capture Project
Project Lead	Los Angeles County
Total Funding Requested	\$4,000,000
Project Type	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	14	20	14	
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	30	30	
Water Supply Part 1	0	13	0	
Water Supply Part 2	2	12	2	
Community Investment	5	10	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Replacement of natural turf for artificial turf is not desirable.
Nature-Based Solutions	10	15	10	
Leveraging Funds Part 1	6	6	6	
Leveraging Funds Part 2	0	4	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Community supported natural turf, unclear why natural turf could not be achieved.
TOTALS	67	110	67	

Safe, Clean Water Program

Fiscal Year 2020-2021

Scoring Rubric



SCW.ID	45
Project Name	Oro Vista Local Area Urban Flow Management Project
Project Lead	City of Los Angeles, Bureau of Sanitation
Total Funding Requested	\$10,590,600
Project Type	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	20	20	
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	30	30	
Water Supply Part 1	0	13	0	
Water Supply Part 2	0	12	0	
Community Investment	5	10	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would be helpful to know the types of trees.
Nature-Based Solutions	13	15	13	
Leveraging Funds Part 1	0	6	0	
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	4	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No community letters of support provided.
TOTALS	72	110	68	

Safe, Clean Water Program

Fiscal Year 2020-2021

Scoring Rubric



SCW.ID	51
Project Name	Barnes Park
Project Lead	City of Baldwin Park
Total Funding Requested	\$14,735,690
Project Type	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	20	20	
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	30	30	
Water Supply Part 1	0	13	0	
Water Supply Part 2	5	12	5	
Community Investment	5	10	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would be helpful to see a planting plan. • 17 trees, but what types
Nature-Based Solutions	10	15	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why does impermeable area not change if there is a large area of concrete/pavement is removed. Should benefit this project's score.
Leveraging Funds Part 1	0	6	0	
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	4	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No Letters of support from the community.
TOTALS	74	110	70	

Safe, Clean Water Program

Fiscal Year 2020-2021

Scoring Rubric



SCW.ID	53
Project Name	Encanto Park Stormwater Capture Project
Project Lead	City of Monrovia
Total Funding Requested	\$2,482,248
Project Type	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	20	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not treating the 85th percentile flow.
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	30	To Be Determined	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Applicant claiming 100% pollutant reduction. Should include downstream bypass in modeling. Applicant may be able to reclassify this as a dry weather project. SC notes the project is between a .25 & .75 inch storm, so it's a challenge to max out on this scoring category.
Water Supply Part 1	0	13	0	
Water Supply Part 2	0	12	0	
Community Investment	5	10	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Helpful to see details of plantings Are the recreational enhancements new or replaced. Unclear in the documentation.
Nature-Based Solutions	12	15	12	
Leveraging Funds	3	6	To Be Determined	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SC agrees that matched staff

Safe, Clean Water Program

Fiscal Year 2020-2021

Scoring Rubric



Part 1				<p>time can be considered as leveraged funding.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does not specifically state there is a cost share, just that the city will explore opportunities for cost share. Applicant should provide additional detail on this cost share.
Leveraging Funds				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is a community engagement strategy, but no existing letters of support. Only letters are from a group of cities.
Part 2	4	4	0	
TOTALS	74	110	To Be Determined	

Safe, Clean Water Program

Fiscal Year 2020-2021

Scoring Rubric



SCW.ID	54
Project Name	Finkbiner Park Multi-Benefit Stormwater Capture Project
Project Lead	City of Glendora
Total Funding Requested	\$25,000,000
Project Type	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	20	20	
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	30	30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project applicant is claiming 100% pollutant remove. Modeling should include downstream bypass. Does not affect score.
Water Supply Part 1	0	13	0	
Water Supply Part 2	12	12	12	
Community Investment	5	10	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would be beneficial to see green alley and design plans.
Nature-Based Solutions	12	15	12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Applicant claims impervious surface removal. Unclear what part of the project this reduction comes from.
Leveraging Funds Part 1	0	6	0	
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	4	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No letters from community groups, only from municipalities.
TOTALS	83	110	79	

Safe, Clean Water Program

Fiscal Year 2020-2021

Scoring Rubric



SCW.ID	55
Project Name	Garvey Avenue Grade Separation Drainage Improvement Project
Project Lead	City of El Monte
Total Funding Requested	\$4,000,000
Project Type	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	20	20	
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	30	30	
Water Supply Part 1	13	13	To Be Determined	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unrealistic dry weather flow assumption. SC recommends 0 cfs dry weather flow based on the size of the project. Applicant should recalculate based on these edits.
Water Supply Part 2	12	12	To Be Determined	
Community Investment	2	10	2	
Nature-Based Solutions	10	15	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> NBS solutions don't appear to meet the intent of this scoring section.
Leveraging Funds Part 1	0	6	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Applicant could use the grade separation project as part of the matching funds. Could provide a boost to score.
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	4	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No letters of support from community groups.
TOTALS	91	110	To Be Determined	