

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



<b>Watershed Area</b>	Central Santa Monica Bay
<b>Project Name</b>	Ballona Creek Dry Weather Flow Treatment Project
<b>Project Lead</b>	SEITec
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$13,100,000
<b>Project Type</b>	Dry

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	<b>20</b>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Algae is not a TMDL</li> <li>Unclear justification for treatment volume</li> <li>Applicant noted targeting algae will lead to the treatment of bacteria</li> </ul>
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	20	<b>30</b>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	0	<b>13</b>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unclear Justification for water supply volume</li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	2	<b>12</b>	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Applicant provided their own adjustments for water supply</li> <li>Complex infrastructure system for the size of the project.</li> <li>Concern for how the project would get permitted and operated at a school</li> </ul>
<b>Community Investment</b>	10	<b>10</b>	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Applicant claiming recreational benefit by improving water quality in the channel</li> </ul>
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	12	<b>15</b>	12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	0	<b>6</b>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	<b>4</b>	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Applicant provided a neighborhood council letter of support</li> </ul>
<b>TOTALS</b>	68	<b>110</b>	28	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A technical support grant may be a better fit at this point.</li> <li>Or if the applicant can retrieve the permit and agreement from the property owners.</li> </ul>

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



<b>Watershed Area</b>	Central Santa Monica Bay
<b>Project Name</b>	Ballona Creek Low Flow Diversion Project
<b>Project Lead</b>	SEITec
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$14,951,000
<b>Project Type</b>	Dry

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	<b>20</b>	20	•
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	20	<b>30</b>	20	•
<b>Water Supply</b>  Part 1	13	<b>13</b>	13	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 19ft high rubber dam is concerning with potential dangers or safety concerns, does not affect score.</li> <li>• Applicant noted the application includes examples of similarly tall rubber dams</li> <li>• Unclear if Hyperion has capacity to treat this supply. JR Noted Hyperion is targeting to use 100% of the flow.</li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	12	<b>12</b>	12	•
<b>Community Investment</b>	5	<b>10</b>	5	• Additional justification would be beneficial, does not affect score
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	5	<b>15</b>	0	• Applicant claims gravity for NBS, which does not meet the intent of the NBS category in the context of SCW.
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	0	<b>6</b>	0	•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	<b>4</b>	0	• Applicant did not have a letter of support from any community entities (NGO, CBO, etc)
<b>TOTALS</b>	79	<b>110</b>	70	• Very similar to a second project proposed for Ballona Creek

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



<b>Watershed Area</b>	Central Santa Monica Bay
<b>Project Name</b>	Ballona Creek TMDL Project
<b>Project Lead</b>	City of Los Angeles, LA Sanitation and Environment
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$15,000,000
<b>Project Type</b>	Dry

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	<b>20</b>	20	•
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	20	<b>30</b>	20	•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	13	<b>13</b>	13	•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	12	<b>12</b>	12	•
<b>Community Investment</b>	5	<b>10</b>	5	•
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	5	<b>15</b>	<del>5</del> 0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project provides some greening, would be helpful to have additional detail on this portion of the project.</li> <li>• Does not impact score.</li> <li>• <b>Scoring Committee removed points as nature-based solutions is intended to be for the process for how water is treated vs providing greening around the site.</b></li> </ul>
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	6	<b>6</b>	6	•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	<b>4</b>	4	•
<b>TOTALS</b>	85	<b>110</b>	<del>85</del> 80	•

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



<b>Watershed Area</b>	Central Santa Monica Bay
<b>Project Name</b>	Blackwelder Tract Lower Ballona Creek Green BMPs and Landscape Improvement Project
<b>Project Lead</b>	California Greenworks, Inc.
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$5,848,774
<b>Project Type</b>	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather  Part 1	7	20	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project targets treating the 85<sup>th</sup> percentile</li> <li>Applicant uses an aggregate number for the design elements, which is difficult to confirm.</li> <li>The applicant uses an assumed draw down rate, which is not based on any Geotech study. Drawdown rate should be closer to 1 in/hr to match the 85<sup>th</sup>.</li> <li>Cost per capacity would go up due to less treatment volume. Estimated 0.28 Capacity/\$M</li> <li>\$5M for a 5ac treatment area seems high</li> </ul>
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	30	30	•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	0	13	0	•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	0	12	0	•
<b>Community Investment</b>	10	10	10	•
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	10	15	10	•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	0	6	0	•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	4	4	•
<b>TOTALS</b>	61	110	54	•

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



<b>Watershed Area</b>	Central Santa Monica Bay
<b>Project Name</b>	Hayden Tract Lower Ballona Creek Green BMPs and Landscape Improvement Project
<b>Project Lead</b>	California Greenworks, Inc.
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$5,120,579
<b>Project Type</b>	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather  Part 1	20	<b>20</b>	11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• \$5M for a 14ac treatment area seems high</li> <li>• Applicant uses a high 2.5 in/hr infiltration rate. Assumes treating double the 85<sup>th</sup> percentile</li> <li>• 1 in/hr is more reasonable. This is still an 85<sup>th</sup> percentile project</li> <li>• Estimated 0.6 (capacity/\$M)</li> </ul>
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	<b>30</b>	30	•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	0	<b>13</b>	0	•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	0	<b>12</b>	0	•
<b>Community Investment</b>	10	<b>10</b>	10	• Additional justification would be beneficial. Does not affect score.
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	10	<b>15</b>	10	•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	0	<b>6</b>	0	•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	<b>4</b>	4	•
<b>TOTALS</b>	74	<b>110</b>	65	•

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



<b>Watershed Area</b>	Central Santa Monica Bay
<b>Project Name</b>	Normandie Ave ES - DROPS and Paving
<b>Project Lead</b>	Los Angeles Unified School District
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$5,213,778
<b>Project Type</b>	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	<b>20</b>	?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There's no plans, cost estimate, or hydrology.</li> <li>Applicant uses a 15.1 in/hr infiltration rate, which brings 24-hr capacity to 25 ac-ft in one day, which seems high. Needs justification. Applicant should go back in to assume 85<sup>th</sup> volume.</li> <li>Estimated 0.2 AF/\$5M will yield a score of 0</li> <li>Total inflow volume in application shows 0 ac-ft. Need to show hydrology</li> <li>\$5M for 3ac treatment area</li> <li>Percolation test may not have allowed hours of pre-soak to validate infiltration rate</li> </ul>
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	<b>30</b>	?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Applicant to provide hydrology</li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	0	<b>13</b>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	0	<b>12</b>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Community Investment</b>	10	<b>10</b>	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Additional details on the planting would have been helpful. Does not impact score.</li> </ul>
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	11	<b>15</b>	11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	0	<b>6</b>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	0	<b>4</b>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SC noted there should be some level of community support for this project, which could potentially raise score.</li> </ul>
<b>TOTALS</b>	71	<b>110</b>	Unable to Score	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Applicant to find additional justification, construction cost breakdown.</li> </ul>

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



<b>Watershed Area</b>	Central Santa Monica Bay
<b>Project Name</b>	Slauson Connect Clean Water Project
<b>Project Lead</b>	Corvias Infrastructure Solutions, Geosyntec Consultants
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$4,898,440
<b>Project Type</b>	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	11	20	?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.7 in/hr drawdown rate seems high, need additional justification to verify this rate. Otherwise will not score higher than 60pts.</li> <li>24-hr volume seems high as well, estimated 1.7 ac-ft</li> <li>Applicant to follow-up and provide additional justification.</li> </ul>
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	25	30	25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Applicant used their own modeling results.</li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	0	13	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	0	12	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Community Investment</b>	10	10	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not enough backup justification provided. Unclear what "maximum extent feasible" means. Needs additional justification.</li> <li>Access to waterway seems questionable, additional justification would be beneficial.</li> <li>Intent to greening of Schools benefit does would not include after schools program.</li> </ul>
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	12	15	12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	0	6	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	4	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Letter of support from the Vermont Slauson Development company (business incubator). Intent is to be from a CBO, NGO, etc.</li> <li>Applicant noted the project has been developed in coordination with the community and neighborhood councils.</li> </ul>
<b>TOTALS</b>	62	110	Unable to Score	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project seems closer to a concept, not fully fleshed out currently.</li> <li>Project may be geared more towards a design phase, or TRP</li> <li>Project applicant noted \$0 needed for the first year.</li> </ul>

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



<b>Watershed Area</b>	Central Santa Monica Bay
<b>Project Name</b>	Venice High School Comprehensive Modernization Project
<b>Project Lead</b>	Los Angeles Unified School District
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$6,088,250
<b>Project Type</b>	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather  Part 1	20	<b>20</b>	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>12 in/hr infiltration rate and 9ac-ft capacity seem high</li> <li>Cost breakdown is hard to follow, not possible to parse out the cost of the water quality components.</li> <li>Additional justification needed</li> <li>Applicant noted the 7 ac-ft is infiltrated with additional for storage which leads to 9ac-ft</li> <li>Project is designed as a flood project, with a much higher volume than the 85<sup>th</sup> percentile volume. Overdesigned for the 85<sup>th</sup></li> <li>Applicant to follow-up with additional detail to the WASC</li> </ul>
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	<b>30</b>	30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	0	<b>13</b>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	0	<b>12</b>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Community Investment</b>	10	<b>10</b>	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>More detail would be beneficial on the Flood Risk Mitigation benefit. Does not impact score.</li> </ul>
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	10	<b>15</b>	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	0	<b>6</b>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	0	<b>4</b>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A school based project should have been able to secure letters from the community, PTA, etc.</li> </ul>
<b>TOTALS</b>	70	<b>110</b>	70	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>



# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



<b>Watershed Area</b>	Central Santa Monica Bay
<b>Project Name</b>	Webster MS - DROPS
<b>Project Lead</b>	Los Angeles Unified School District
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$1,632,382
<b>Project Type</b>	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather  Part 1	20	<b>20</b>	?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No Plans, no cost, no hydrology. Not possible to score or validate.</li> <li>Project designed for much higher than the 85<sup>th</sup>. Overdesigned.</li> <li>Applicant to follow-up with needed information.</li> </ul>
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	<b>30</b>	?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	0	<b>13</b>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	0	<b>12</b>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Community Investment</b>	5	<b>10</b>	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Minimal detail provided for the greenery. Would be beneficial to see more details and justification.</li> </ul>
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	10	<b>15</b>	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	0	<b>6</b>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	0	<b>4</b>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A school-based project should have been able to secure letters from the community, PTA, etc.</li> </ul>
<b>TOTALS</b>	65	<b>110</b>	Unable to Score	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



<b>Watershed Area</b>	Lower Los Angeles River
<b>Project Name</b>	Compton Blvd Et. Al. Project
<b>Project Lead</b>	Los Angeles County
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$600,000
<b>Project Type</b>	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	14	20		•
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	30		•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	0	13		•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	2	12		•
<b>Community Investment</b>	5	10		•
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	10	15		•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	6	6		•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	0	4		•
<b>TOTALS</b>	67	110		•

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



<b>Watershed Area</b>	Lower Los Angeles River
<b>Project Name</b>	Furman Park Stormwater Capture and Infiltration Project
<b>Project Lead</b>	City of Downey
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$12,325,670
<b>Project Type</b>	Dry

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	<b>20</b>		•
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	20	<b>30</b>		•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	0	<b>13</b>		•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	5	<b>12</b>		•
<b>Community Investment</b>	5	<b>10</b>		•
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	12	<b>15</b>		•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	0	<b>6</b>		•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	0	<b>4</b>		•
<b>TOTALS</b>	62	<b>110</b>		•

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



<b>Watershed Area</b>	Lower Los Angeles River
<b>Project Name</b>	Huntington Park High School Storm Water Management System
<b>Project Lead</b>	Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD/District)
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$1,401,707
<b>Project Type</b>	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	<b>20</b>		•
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	<b>30</b>		•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	0	<b>13</b>		•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	0	<b>12</b>		•
<b>Community Investment</b>	10	<b>10</b>		•
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	10	<b>15</b>		•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	0	<b>6</b>		•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	<b>4</b>		•
<b>TOTALS</b>	74	<b>110</b>		•

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



<b>Watershed Area</b>	Lower Los Angeles River
<b>Project Name</b>	Lynwood City Park Stormwater Capture Project
<b>Project Lead</b>	City of Lynwood
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$1,691,629
<b>Project Type</b>	Dry

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	<b>20</b>		•
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	20	<b>30</b>		•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	0	<b>13</b>		•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	5	<b>12</b>		•
<b>Community Investment</b>	10	<b>10</b>		•
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	12	<b>15</b>		•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	0	<b>6</b>		•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	<b>4</b>		•
<b>TOTALS</b>	71	<b>110</b>		•

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



<b>Watershed Area</b>	Lower Los Angeles River
<b>Project Name</b>	Rancho Los Cerritos: Looking Back to Advance Forward
<b>Project Lead</b>	Rancho Los Cerritos
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$1,715,000
<b>Project Type</b>	Dry

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	<b>20</b>		•
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	10	<b>30</b>		•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	0	<b>13</b>		•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	0	<b>12</b>		•
<b>Community Investment</b>	10	<b>10</b>		•
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	13	<b>15</b>		•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	3	<b>6</b>		•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	<b>4</b>		•
<b>TOTALS</b>	60	<b>110</b>		•

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



<b>Watershed Area</b>	Lower Los Angeles River
<b>Project Name</b>	Salt Lake Park Infiltration Cistern
<b>Project Lead</b>	City of Huntington Park
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$29,000,000
<b>Project Type</b>	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	<b>20</b>		•
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	<b>30</b>		•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	3	<b>13</b>		•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	0	<b>12</b>		•
<b>Community Investment</b>	5	<b>10</b>		•
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	15	<b>15</b>		•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	0	<b>6</b>		•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	<b>4</b>		•
<b>TOTALS</b>	77	<b>110</b>		•

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



<b>Watershed Area</b>	Lower Los Angeles River
<b>Project Name</b>	Spane Park
<b>Project Lead</b>	City of Paramount
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$891,984
<b>Project Type</b>	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	<b>20</b>		•
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	<b>30</b>		•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	10	<b>13</b>		•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	12	<b>12</b>		•
<b>Community Investment</b>	10	<b>10</b>		•
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	10	<b>15</b>		•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	0	<b>6</b>		•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	0	<b>4</b>		•
<b>TOTALS</b>	92	<b>110</b>		•



# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



<b>Watershed Area</b>	Lower Los Angeles River
<b>Project Name</b>	Urban Orchard Project
<b>Project Lead</b>	City of South Gate
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$5,438,000
<b>Project Type</b>	Dry

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	<b>20</b>		•
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	20	<b>30</b>		•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	0	<b>13</b>		•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	2	<b>12</b>		•
<b>Community Investment</b>	10	<b>10</b>		•
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	13	<b>15</b>		•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	6	<b>6</b>		•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	<b>4</b>		•
<b>TOTALS</b>	75	<b>110</b>		•

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



<b>Watershed Area</b>	Lower San Gabriel River
<b>Project Name</b>	Stormwater Treatment and Reuse System (STAR System) Hacienda Park
<b>Project Lead</b>	City of La Habra Heights
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$859,000
<b>Project Type</b>	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	<b>20</b>		•
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	25	<b>30</b>		•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	0	<b>13</b>		•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	0	<b>12</b>		•
<b>Community Investment</b>	10	<b>10</b>		•
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	10	<b>15</b>		•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	0	<b>6</b>		•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	<b>4</b>		•
<b>TOTALS</b>	69	<b>110</b>		•

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



<b>Watershed Area</b>	Lower San Gabriel River
<b>Project Name</b>	Artesia Park Stormwater Capture Project
<b>Project Lead</b>	City of Artesia
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$1,250,502
<b>Project Type</b>	Dry

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	20		•
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	20	30		•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	0	13		•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	5	12		•
<b>Community Investment</b>	10	10		•
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	12	15		•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	0	6		•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	4		•
<b>TOTALS</b>	71	110		•

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



<b>Watershed Area</b>	Lower San Gabriel River
<b>Project Name</b>	Bellflower Simms Park Stormwater Capture Project
<b>Project Lead</b>	City of Bellflower
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$2,141,987
<b>Project Type</b>	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	<b>20</b>		•
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	25	<b>30</b>		•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	0	<b>13</b>		•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	2	<b>12</b>		•
<b>Community Investment</b>	5	<b>10</b>		•
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	12	<b>15</b>		•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	3	<b>6</b>		•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	<b>4</b>		•
<b>TOTALS</b>	71	<b>110</b>		•

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



<b>Watershed Area</b>	Lower San Gabriel River
<b>Project Name</b>	Cerritos Sports Complex
<b>Project Lead</b>	City of Cerritos
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$2,408,000
<b>Project Type</b>	Dry

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	<b>20</b>		•
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	20	<b>30</b>		•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	10	<b>13</b>		•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	12	<b>12</b>		•
<b>Community Investment</b>	10	<b>10</b>		•
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	12	<b>15</b>		•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	0	<b>6</b>		•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	0	<b>4</b>		•
<b>TOTALS</b>	84	<b>110</b>		•

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



<b>Watershed Area</b>	Lower San Gabriel River
<b>Project Name</b>	Heartwell Park at Palo Verde Channel
<b>Project Lead</b>	City of Long Beach
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$1,539,676
<b>Project Type</b>	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	<b>20</b>		•
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	20	<b>30</b>		•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	0	<b>13</b>		•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	5	<b>12</b>		•
<b>Community Investment</b>	5	<b>10</b>		•
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	10	<b>15</b>		•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	0	<b>6</b>		•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	<b>4</b>		•
<b>TOTALS</b>	64	<b>110</b>		•

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



<b>Watershed Area</b>	North Santa Monica Bay
<b>Project Name</b>	Stormwater Treatment, Diversion, Water Supply Augmentation, and Bioremediation Project
<b>Project Lead</b>	City of Agoura Hills (Jessica Forte and Kelly Fisher)
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$4,674,650
<b>Project Type</b>	Dry

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	<b>20</b>		•
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	20	<b>30</b>		•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	3	<b>13</b>		•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	12	<b>12</b>		•
<b>Community Investment</b>	0	<b>10</b>		•
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	0	<b>15</b>		•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	3	<b>6</b>		•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	<b>4</b>		•
<b>TOTALS</b>	62	<b>110</b>		•

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



<b>Watershed Area</b>	North Santa Monica Bay
<b>Project Name</b>	Viewridge Road Stormwater Improvements Project
<b>Project Lead</b>	Los Angeles County Public Works
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$800,000
<b>Project Type</b>	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	7	20		•
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	30		•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	0	13		•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	0	12		•
<b>Community Investment</b>	5	10		•
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	12	15		•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	6	6		•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	0	4		•
<b>TOTALS</b>	60	110		•



# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



<b>Watershed Area</b>	Rio Hondo
<b>Project Name</b>	Alhambra Wash Dry-Weather Diversion
<b>Project Lead</b>	San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments (SGVCOG), Mark Christoffels
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$2,737,180
<b>Project Type</b>	Dry

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	<b>20</b>		•
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	20	<b>30</b>		•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	0	<b>13</b>		•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	0	<b>12</b>		•
<b>Community Investment</b>	5	<b>10</b>		•
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	10	<b>15</b>		•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	6	<b>6</b>		•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	<b>4</b>		•
<b>TOTALS</b>	65	<b>110</b>		•

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



<b>Watershed Area</b>	Rio Hondo
<b>Project Name</b>	Arboretum Natural Treatment Wetland & Groundwater Recharge Facility
<b>Project Lead</b>	City of Arcadia
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$981,890
<b>Project Type</b>	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Max Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather  Part 1	20	<b>20</b>	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reclassify as a Dry weather project. Does not capture 85<sup>th</sup>.</li> <li>Applicant assumed 100% capture of the pollutants diverted into the project, which is not the intent of this criteria (TJ to confirm language in guidelines, reduction of diversion or reduction of entire tributary)</li> <li>Assumed 6" per hour infiltration rate, which seems high (applicant clarified this is the amount of water flowing through the project)</li> <li>Wetlands projects cannot be modeled in the SCW Projects Module</li> </ul>
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	20	<b>30</b>	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assuming Dry, &gt;200ac</li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b>  Part 1	10	<b>13</b>	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Likely in unconfined aquifer</li> <li>User input their own values for modeling</li> <li>Modeling unclear what infiltration amount, is it 47 or 406 AFY (applicant clarified; TJ noted that water treated by wetlands had not been classified as supply in round 1 call for projects; JR and Bruce noted that it could be classified as supply or equal standing; no clear policy; JR noted that this type of project is now the norm, should be resolved)</li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	12	<b>12</b>	12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unclear how project will impact downstream projects, is it claiming supply that is already or will be captured downstream</li> </ul>
<b>Community Investment</b>	10	<b>10</b>	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Jill and Bruce noted dry weather reclassification removes flood control benefit</li> <li>Bruce noted that he would like additional justification from applicants to claim CI benefits</li> <li>JR noted his notes had 8/10 CI benefits (no mechanism to award 8 points; will be solved in Round 3 call for projects) Future rubrics should provide flexibility for additional investment types</li> </ul>
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	10	<b>15</b>	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Impervious surface increases.</li> </ul>
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	0	<b>6</b>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	<b>4</b>	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>TOTALS</b>	86	<b>110</b>	81	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Scoring Committee members noted that the project is a good representative project for SCW.</li> </ul>

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



<b>Watershed Area</b>	Rio Hondo
<b>Project Name</b>	East Los Angeles College Northeast Drainage Area and City of Monterey Park Biofiltration Project
<b>Project Lead</b>	East Los Angeles College/Build LACCD
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$532,618
<b>Project Type</b>	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	11	20		•
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	25	30		•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	0	13		•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	0	12		•
<b>Community Investment</b>	5	10		•
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	10	15		•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	6	6		•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	4		•
<b>TOTALS</b>	61	110		•

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



<b>Watershed Area</b>	Rio Hondo
<b>Project Name</b>	Eaton Wash Dry-Weather Diversion
<b>Project Lead</b>	San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments (SGVCOG), Mark Christoffels
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$1,894,220
<b>Project Type</b>	Dry

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	<b>20</b>		•
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	20	<b>30</b>		•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	0	<b>13</b>		•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	0	<b>12</b>		•
<b>Community Investment</b>	5	<b>10</b>		•
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	10	<b>15</b>		•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	6	<b>6</b>		•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	<b>4</b>		•
<b>TOTALS</b>	65	<b>110</b>		•

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



<b>Watershed Area</b>	Rio Hondo
<b>Project Name</b>	Merced Ave Greenway (Phase I - South Residential Corridor)
<b>Project Lead</b>	City of South El Monte
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$3,234,694
<b>Project Type</b>	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	11	20		•
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	20	30		•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	0	13		•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	0	12		•
<b>Community Investment</b>	10	10		•
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	10	15		•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	6	6		•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	4		•
<b>TOTALS</b>	61	110		•

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



<b>Watershed Area</b>	Rio Hondo
<b>Project Name</b>	Mt. Lowe Median Stormwater Capture Project
<b>Project Lead</b>	Los Angeles County
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$800,000
<b>Project Type</b>	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	11	20		•
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	30		•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	0	13		•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	0	12		•
<b>Community Investment</b>	5	10		•
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	10	15		•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	6	6		•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	4		•
<b>TOTALS</b>	66	110		•

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



<b>Watershed Area</b>	Rio Hondo
<b>Project Name</b>	Plymouth School Neighborhood Stormwater Capture Demonstration Project
<b>Project Lead</b>	Amigos de los Rios (AdIR), Claire Robinson
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$559,162
<b>Project Type</b>	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	<b>20</b>		•
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	<b>30</b>		•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	0	<b>13</b>		•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	0	<b>12</b>		•
<b>Community Investment</b>	5	<b>10</b>		•
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	11	<b>15</b>		•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	3	<b>6</b>		•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	<b>4</b>		•
<b>TOTALS</b>	73	<b>110</b>		•

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



<b>Watershed Area</b>	Rio Hondo
<b>Project Name</b>	Rio Hondo Ecosystem Restoration Project
<b>Project Lead</b>	City of Monrovia
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$2,329,375
<b>Project Type</b>	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	<b>20</b>		•
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	20	<b>30</b>		•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	10	<b>13</b>		•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	12	<b>12</b>		•
<b>Community Investment</b>	5	<b>10</b>		•
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	10	<b>15</b>		•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	0	<b>6</b>		•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	<b>4</b>		•
<b>TOTALS</b>	81	<b>110</b>		•



# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



<b>Watershed Area</b>	Rio Hondo
<b>Project Name</b>	Rubio Wash Dry-Weather Diversion
<b>Project Lead</b>	San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments (SGVCOG), Mark Christoffels
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$2,977,080
<b>Project Type</b>	Dry

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	<b>20</b>		•
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	20	<b>30</b>		•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	0	<b>13</b>		•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	0	<b>12</b>		•
<b>Community Investment</b>	5	<b>10</b>		•
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	10	<b>15</b>		•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	6	<b>6</b>		•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	<b>4</b>		•
<b>TOTALS</b>	65	<b>110</b>		•

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



<b>Watershed Area</b>	South Santa Monica Bay
<b>Project Name</b>	Beach Cities Green Streets Project
<b>Project Lead</b>	City of Torrance
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$2,595,000
<b>Project Type</b>	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	<b>20</b>		•
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	<b>30</b>		•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	3	<b>13</b>		•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	2	<b>12</b>		•
<b>Community Investment</b>	5	<b>10</b>		•
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	10	<b>15</b>		•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	6	<b>6</b>		•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	0	<b>4</b>		•
<b>TOTALS</b>	76	<b>110</b>		•

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



<b>Watershed Area</b>	South Santa Monica Bay
<b>Project Name</b>	Carson Stormwater and Runoff Capture Project at Carriage Crest Park
<b>Project Lead</b>	City of Carson
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$1,037,500
<b>Project Type</b>	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather  Part 1	20	<b>20</b>	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Applicant assumes a full capacity on trunk line at the optimal time of day; is a challenge to model. This leads to 100% capture.</li> <li>Should be above 50% capture if not at optimal time, but difficult to model this.</li> </ul>
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	<b>30</b>	30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project is claiming construction funds for O&amp;M expenditures</li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	0	<b>13</b>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Infiltration not possible at this site due to soil contamination and other restrictions</li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	12	<b>12</b>	12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assumes Reclamation Plant upgrade plans will come online to convert the detained water to future supply.</li> </ul>
<b>Community Investment</b>	5	<b>10</b>	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Would be good to know the types and placements of trees</li> <li>Unclear if the park was enhanced or put back the same; modernization of above ground amenities</li> </ul>
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	5	<b>15</b>	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>With soil contamination replacement, is this a nature-based solution; possibly included as a community investment</li> </ul>
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	6	<b>6</b>	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	0	<b>4</b>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>TOTALS</b>	78	<b>110</b>	78	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



<b>Watershed Area</b>	South Santa Monica Bay
<b>Project Name</b>	Portuguese Bend Landslide Complex Mitigation Project
<b>Project Lead</b>	City of Rancho Palos Verdes
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$1,875,000
<b>Project Type</b>	Dry

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	20		•
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	20	30		•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	0	13		•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	2	12		•
<b>Community Investment</b>	10	10		•
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	10	15		•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	0	6		•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	4		•
<b>TOTALS</b>	66	110		•

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



<b>Watershed Area</b>	South Santa Monica Bay
<b>Project Name</b>	South Santa Monica Bay Water Quality Enhancement: 28th Street Storm Drain Infiltration Project
<b>Project Lead</b>	City of Manhattan Beach (Mamerto Estepa Jr., Prem Kumar, and Shawn Igoe)
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$17,620,030
<b>Project Type</b>	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	<b>20</b>		•
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	25	<b>30</b>		•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	6	<b>13</b>		•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	12	<b>12</b>		•
<b>Community Investment</b>	2	<b>10</b>		•
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	13	<b>15</b>		•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	3	<b>6</b>		•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	<b>4</b>		•
<b>TOTALS</b>	85	<b>110</b>		•

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



<b>Watershed Area</b>	South Santa Monica Bay
<b>Project Name</b>	Stormwater Basin Expansion Project
<b>Project Lead</b>	City of Torrance
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$4,505,000
<b>Project Type</b>	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	<b>20</b>		•
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	<b>30</b>		•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	13	<b>13</b>		•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	12	<b>12</b>		•
<b>Community Investment</b>	5	<b>10</b>		•
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	10	<b>15</b>		•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	0	<b>6</b>		•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	0	<b>4</b>		•
<b>TOTALS</b>	90	<b>110</b>		•

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



<b>Watershed Area</b>	South Santa Monica Bay
<b>Project Name</b>	Torrance Airport Storm Water Basin Project, Phase 2 Construction
<b>Project Lead</b>	City of Torrance
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$12,000,000
<b>Project Type</b>	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	<b>20</b>		•
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	<b>30</b>		•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	6	<b>13</b>		•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	12	<b>12</b>		•
<b>Community Investment</b>	2	<b>10</b>		•
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	0	<b>15</b>		•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	0	<b>6</b>		•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	<b>4</b>		•
<b>TOTALS</b>	74	<b>110</b>		•

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



<b>Watershed Area</b>	South Santa Monica Bay
<b>Project Name</b>	Wilmington Neighborhood Greening Project
<b>Project Lead</b>	City of Los Angeles, Bureau of Sanitation and Environment
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$12,183,000
<b>Project Type</b>	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	<b>20</b>	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Overdesigned for the 85<sup>th</sup>, project captures for a full rainy season for irrigation purposes.</li> </ul>
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	<b>30</b>	30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	0	<b>13</b>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	2	<b>12</b>	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Community Investment</b>	5	<b>10</b>	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Applicant provided very good justification for CI benefits.</li> </ul>
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	11	<b>15</b>	11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	0	<b>6</b>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	<b>4</b>	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>TOTALS</b>	72	<b>110</b>	72	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>



# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



<b>Watershed Area</b>	Upper Los Angeles River
<b>Project Name</b>	Altadena - Lake Avenue Green Improvement
<b>Project Lead</b>	Los Angeles County Public Works
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$500,000
<b>Project Type</b>	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	<b>20</b>	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SCW Projects module is not suited to design dry wells. Applicant using their own methodology.</li> </ul>
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	25	<b>30</b>	25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	3	<b>13</b>	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No letter from water master to confirm usable aquifer water benefit (Unclear if Letter Required at early design phase)</li> <li>Raymond basin does augment GW</li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	5	<b>12</b>	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Community Investment</b>	5	<b>10</b>	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Would be beneficial to see more of the details for CI benefits in a later phase of design.</li> </ul>
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	12	<b>15</b>	12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	6	<b>6</b>	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	0	<b>4</b>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>TOTALS</b>	76	<b>110</b>	76	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Would be beneficial to see the letter confirmation from Raymond Basin Watermaster</li> </ul>

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



<b>Watershed Area</b>	Upper Los Angeles River
<b>Project Name</b>	Altadena Mariposa Green Street Demonstration Project
<b>Project Lead</b>	Amigos de los Rios, Claire Robinson
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$739,772
<b>Project Type</b>	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather  Part 1	20	<b>20</b>	Unable to Score	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Water is captured from the storm drain system but only under large flood event. Project is not designed to capture first flush of the storm drain. Application currently assumes capture of the full tributary area, but flow is bypassing the site.</li> <li>Applicant noted that storm drain will fill to capacity by the time upstream flows reach the project site, and most will end up as surface flow.</li> <li>Additional information needed to confirm water quality benefits.</li> </ul>
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	<b>30</b>	Unable to Score	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	0	<b>13</b>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	0	<b>12</b>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Community Investment</b>	5	<b>10</b>	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	11	<b>15</b>	11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	0	<b>6</b>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	<b>4</b>	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Significant number of letters of support. Exemplary community outreach and engagement.</li> </ul>
<b>TOTALS</b>	70	<b>110</b>	Unable to Score	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



<b>Watershed Area</b>	Upper Los Angeles River
<b>Project Name</b>	Arroyo Seco-San Rafael Treatment Wetlands
<b>Project Lead</b>	City of Pasadena
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$4,771,357
<b>Project Type</b>	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather  Part 1	20	<b>20</b>	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SCW Projects Module is not well suited to modeling wetland projects.</li> <li>• Applicant has combined both projects together into the module with a high infiltration, assumes rate 6cfs treatment and 5.18 in/hr draw down rate (proxy for evapotranspiration)</li> <li>• Project should be reclassified a dry weather project.</li> <li>• Applicant noted treatment is through a filter unit, so rates are high as a result</li> <li>• San Rafael site treats 85<sup>th</sup>, but 2<sup>nd</sup> site does not.</li> </ul>
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	20	<b>30</b>	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	0	<b>13</b>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	5	<b>12</b>	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No letter from groundwater master to confirm supply benefit.</li> </ul>
<b>Community Investment</b>	10	<b>10</b>	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	12	<b>15</b>	12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	3	<b>6</b>	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	<b>4</b>	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Very good diversity for letters of support.</li> </ul>
<b>TOTALS</b>	74	<b>110</b>	74	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For WASC consideration, provide letter from groundwater master to confirm supply benefit</li> </ul>

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



<b>Watershed Area</b>	Upper Los Angeles River
<b>Project Name</b>	Broadway-Manchester Multi-Modal Green Streets Project
<b>Project Lead</b>	City of Los Angeles Bureau of Street Services (StreetsLA)
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$11,719,000
<b>Project Type</b>	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	11	<b>20</b>	11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No justification for 1.15 in/hr draw down rate. Storage alone however could capture 85<sup>th</sup> percentile volume.</li> </ul>
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	<b>30</b>	30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	0	<b>13</b>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	5	<b>12</b>	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Applicant used their own 100AFY vs 43AFY from the module. Needs better justification than existing spreadsheet. Recommend using the website generated number.</li> <li>Applicant noted that supply includes irrigation as well, which the website is unable to model. The site has a smart system in place to tackle potable vs storm supply.</li> <li>Applicant notes that (25 acres 6 are new) additional acres of landscaping are being constructed to pull from this system.</li> <li>Committee notes that offsetting potable supply for stormwater provides SCW supply benefit.</li> </ul>
<b>Community Investment</b>	10	<b>10</b>	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Application noted greening of schools, but is located in a median adjacent to a school. Would be beneficial to get confirmation from the School that they are aware of the project and is involved with the design.</li> <li>Applicant has a letter from the principal of the school.</li> <li>Plant pallet was chosen by the community, strong community engagement.</li> </ul>
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	10	<b>15</b>	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	3	<b>6</b>	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	<b>4</b>	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Very good example of a community project.</li> </ul>
<b>TOTALS</b>	73	<b>110</b>	73	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



<b>Watershed Area</b>	Upper Los Angeles River
<b>Project Name</b>	David M. Gonzales Recreation Center Stormwater Capture Project
<b>Project Lead</b>	Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (LADWP)
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$19,363,000
<b>Project Type</b>	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	<b>20</b>	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project captures slightly more than the 85<sup>th</sup> percentile storm</li> </ul>
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	<b>30</b>	30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	0	<b>13</b>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	12	<b>12</b>	12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Community Investment</b>	10	<b>10</b>	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Would be beneficial to see a letter of support from the school that benefit is provided for greening of schools.</li> </ul>
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	15	<b>15</b>	15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	6	<b>6</b>	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	<b>4</b>	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>TOTALS</b>	97	<b>110</b>	97	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



<b>Watershed Area</b>	Upper Los Angeles River
<b>Project Name</b>	Lincoln Park Neighborhood Green Street Network
<b>Project Lead</b>	City of Los Angeles Sanitation and Environment
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$18,634,578
<b>Project Type</b>	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather  Part 1	20	<b>20</b>	Unable to Score	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SCW Website not well suited for dry well projects.</li> <li>• Project is oversized, ~5x larger than the 85<sup>th</sup> percentile storm. Appears to be an error</li> <li>• No Geotech provided to justify the infiltration rate.</li> <li>• It is likely designed for the 85<sup>th</sup> percentile storm. <math>8.5/16 = \sim 0.5</math></li> <li>• Applicant notes that the high capacity takes into consideration the infiltration rate.</li> <li>• Storage volume in application leads to ~1ac-ft per drywell, which seems oversized</li> <li>• Application to provide additional clarity</li> </ul>
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	<b>30</b>	Unable to Score	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is a discrepancy of the drainage area in the application and the report.</li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	0	<b>13</b>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	2	<b>12</b>	Unable to Score	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>
<b>Community Investment</b>	10	<b>10</b>	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would be beneficial to see a letter of support from the school that benefit is provided for greening of schools.</li> <li>• May have been able to claim access</li> </ul>
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	10	<b>15</b>	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	0	<b>6</b>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	0	<b>4</b>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>
<b>TOTALS</b>	72	<b>110</b>	Unable to Score	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Applicant to provide additional clarity</li> </ul>

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



<b>Watershed Area</b>	Upper Los Angeles River
<b>Project Name</b>	Los Angeles Pierce College Northeast Campus Stormwater Capture & Use and Biofiltration Project
<b>Project Lead</b>	Los Angeles Community College District & BuildLACCD
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$5,243,675
<b>Project Type</b>	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather  Part 1	20	<b>20</b>	11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Discrepancy in drainage area in application and the appendicies</li> <li>Application uses a 1 in/hr draw down rate for irrigation. Recommend using 0 in/hr.</li> <li>7.5/9.8 = 11 pts</li> <li>Insufficient information, recommend providing additional clarity</li> </ul>
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	<b>30</b>	30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project does capture the 85th</li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	0	<b>13</b>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	5	<b>12</b>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Insufficient information, recommend providing additional clarity re-running model</li> </ul>
<b>Community Investment</b>	10	<b>10</b>	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Enhancement of schools not really provided by converting field irrigation to stormwater. Would be covered under supply.</li> <li>Would be beneficial to see additional justification for heat island, plant palette, and others.</li> </ul>
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	10	<b>15</b>	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	3	<b>6</b>	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	<b>4</b>	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>TOTALS</b>	82	<b>110</b>	63	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Additional information to be provided to WASC</li> </ul>

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



<b>Watershed Area</b>	Upper Los Angeles River
<b>Project Name</b>	Metro Orange Line a Water Infiltration and Quality Project
<b>Project Lead</b>	Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$34,515,458
<b>Project Type</b>	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather  Part 1	20	<b>20</b>	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Applicant uses ~2.5x the 85<sup>th</sup> percentile volume, looks to be using peak flow, vs the shape of the hydrograph to estimate what drywells can take in. Does not impact score</li> <li>Applicant to provide additional clarity.</li> </ul>
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	20	<b>30</b>	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	3	<b>13</b>	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	12	<b>12</b>	12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Community Investment</b>	5	<b>10</b>	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Applicant claims improving access to waterway but did not provide adequate justification.</li> <li>Unclear how much planting is present in the project. Would be beneficial to see planting palette.</li> </ul>
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	10	<b>15</b>	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provide the WASC additional details on the nature based elements of this project.</li> </ul>
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	3	<b>6</b>	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	<b>4</b>	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>TOTALS</b>	77	<b>110</b>	74	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>



# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



<b>Watershed Area</b>	Upper Los Angeles River
<b>Project Name</b>	North Hollywood High School
<b>Project Lead</b>	Los Angeles Unified School District
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$3,154,945
<b>Project Type</b>	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	<b>20</b>	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Overdesigned for 50-year flood event. ~3x greater the 85<sup>th</sup> percentile storm.</li> </ul>
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	<b>30</b>	30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	0	<b>13</b>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	0	<b>12</b>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Community Investment</b>	10	<b>10</b>	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	10	<b>15</b>	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	0	<b>6</b>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	<b>4</b>	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Letter provided by the North Hollywood Community Gardens is part of the same school. Would be beneficial to see additional letters of support</li> </ul>
<b>TOTALS</b>	74	<b>110</b>	74	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



<b>Watershed Area</b>	Upper Los Angeles River
<b>Project Name</b>	North Hollywood Park Stormwater Capture Project
<b>Project Lead</b>	Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (LADWP)
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$92,394,000
<b>Project Type</b>	Dry

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	<b>20</b>	20	•
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	20	<b>30</b>	20	•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	0	<b>13</b>	0	•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	12	<b>12</b>	12	•
<b>Community Investment</b>	10	<b>10</b>	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bruce noted they provided sufficient justification for CI benefits</li> <li>• Dry weather would not likely receive flood benefit (does not change score)</li> </ul>
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	15	<b>15</b>	15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Unclear if all impervious surface is being replaced with pervious pavement (confirmed by applicant, replaced with pervious pavement)</li> </ul>
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	6	<b>6</b>	6	•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	<b>4</b>	4	•
<b>TOTALS</b>	87	<b>110</b>	87	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Applicant attached a monitoring plan for a separate project (Should be retrieved by SCW Team)</li> </ul>

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



<b>Watershed Area</b>	Upper Los Angeles River
<b>Project Name</b>	Northridge Middle School
<b>Project Lead</b>	Los Angeles Unified School District
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$1,920,084
<b>Project Type</b>	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather  Part 1	20	<b>20</b>	7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Inconsistent drainage area from the application and the appendices.</li> <li>2.5 in/hr is the highest range vs an average of the two borings done. Would be beneficial to use the average infiltration rate between borings.</li> <li><math>1.9AF/\\$3.3M = 0.57 = 7pts</math></li> </ul>
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	<b>30</b>	30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	0	<b>13</b>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	0	<b>12</b>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Community Investment</b>	10	<b>10</b>	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Would have been beneficial to see the plantings given the project is already constructed.</li> </ul>
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	10	<b>15</b>	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	3	<b>6</b>	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	0	<b>4</b>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>TOTALS</b>	73	<b>110</b>	60	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



<b>Watershed Area</b>	Upper Los Angeles River
<b>Project Name</b>	Thomas Jefferson High School Comprehensive Modernization Project
<b>Project Lead</b>	Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD)
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$1,980,560
<b>Project Type</b>	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	<b>20</b>	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project is overdesigned for flooding, 5x greater than the 85<sup>th</sup> percentile storm.</li> </ul>
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	<b>30</b>	30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	0	<b>13</b>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	0	<b>12</b>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Community Investment</b>	10	<b>10</b>	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>More detail and justification would have been beneficial.</li> <li>Unclear what recreational benefits are being provided as part of the project. Does not impact score.</li> <li>Unclear what "natural turf" meant within the application</li> <li>Applicant noted plantings plan is available. To be provided to WASC</li> </ul>
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	11	<b>15</b>	11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	0	<b>6</b>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	<b>4</b>	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>TOTALS</b>	75	<b>110</b>	75	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



<b>Watershed Area</b>	Upper Los Angeles River
<b>Project Name</b>	Valley Plaza Park Stormwater Capture Project
<b>Project Lead</b>	Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (LADWP)
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$26,447,000
<b>Project Type</b>	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	<b>20</b>		•
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	<b>30</b>		•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	0	<b>13</b>		•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	12	<b>12</b>		•
<b>Community Investment</b>	10	<b>10</b>		•
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	15	<b>15</b>		•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	6	<b>6</b>		•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	<b>4</b>		•
<b>TOTALS</b>	97	<b>110</b>		•

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



<b>Watershed Area</b>	Upper Los Angeles River
<b>Project Name</b>	Victory ES - DROPS
<b>Project Lead</b>	Los Angeles Unified School District
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$178,585
<b>Project Type</b>	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	<b>20</b>		•
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	<b>30</b>		•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	0	<b>13</b>		•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	0	<b>12</b>		•
<b>Community Investment</b>	10	<b>10</b>		•
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	15	<b>15</b>		•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	0	<b>6</b>		•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	0	<b>4</b>		•
<b>TOTALS</b>	75	<b>110</b>		•

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



<b>Watershed Area</b>	Upper Los Angeles River
<b>Project Name</b>	Westmont - Vermont Avenue Green Improvement
<b>Project Lead</b>	Los Angeles County Public Works
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$500,000
<b>Project Type</b>	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	<b>20</b>		•
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	25	<b>30</b>		•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	0	<b>13</b>		•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	5	<b>12</b>		•
<b>Community Investment</b>	5	<b>10</b>		•
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	14	<b>15</b>		•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	6	<b>6</b>		•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	0	<b>4</b>		•
<b>TOTALS</b>	75	<b>110</b>		•

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



<b>Watershed Area</b>	Upper Los Angeles River
<b>Project Name</b>	Woodlake ES - LID Project
<b>Project Lead</b>	Los Angeles Unified School District
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$1,006,629
<b>Project Type</b>	Wet

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



# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



<b>Watershed Area</b>	Upper San Gabriel River
<b>Project Name</b>	Fairplex
<b>Project Lead</b>	East San Gabriel Valley Watershed Management Group
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$31,900,000
<b>Project Type</b>	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	<b>20</b>		•
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	<b>30</b>		•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	0	<b>13</b>		•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	12	<b>12</b>		•
<b>Community Investment</b>	2	<b>10</b>		•
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	5	<b>15</b>		•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	0	<b>6</b>		•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	<b>4</b>		•
<b>TOTALS</b>	73	<b>110</b>		•

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



<b>Watershed Area</b>	Upper San Gabriel River
<b>Project Name</b>	FINKBINER PARK STORMWATER CAPTURE PROJECT
<b>Project Lead</b>	City of Glendora
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$2,581,286
<b>Project Type</b>	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	<b>20</b>		•
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	<b>30</b>		•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	0	<b>13</b>		•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	9	<b>12</b>		•
<b>Community Investment</b>	5	<b>10</b>		•
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	12	<b>15</b>		•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	0	<b>6</b>		•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	<b>4</b>		•
<b>TOTALS</b>	80	<b>110</b>		•

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



<b>Watershed Area</b>	Upper San Gabriel River
<b>Project Name</b>	Larkin Park
<b>Project Lead</b>	East San Gabriel Valley Watershed Management Group
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$23,100,000
<b>Project Type</b>	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	<b>20</b>		•
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	<b>30</b>		•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	0	<b>13</b>		•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	9	<b>12</b>		•
<b>Community Investment</b>	2	<b>10</b>		•
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	10	<b>15</b>		•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	0	<b>6</b>		•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	<b>4</b>		•
<b>TOTALS</b>	75	<b>110</b>		•

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



<b>Watershed Area</b>	Upper San Gabriel River
<b>Project Name</b>	Lone Hill Park
<b>Project Lead</b>	East San Gabriel Valley Watershed Management Group
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$9,900,000
<b>Project Type</b>	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	<b>20</b>		•
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	<b>30</b>		•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	0	<b>13</b>		•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	5	<b>12</b>		•
<b>Community Investment</b>	5	<b>10</b>		•
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	10	<b>15</b>		•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	0	<b>6</b>		•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	<b>4</b>		•
<b>TOTALS</b>	74	<b>110</b>		•

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



<b>Watershed Area</b>	Upper San Gabriel River
<b>Project Name</b>	Washington Park
<b>Project Lead</b>	East San Gabriel Valley Watershed Management Group
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$48,400,000
<b>Project Type</b>	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	<b>20</b>		•
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	<b>30</b>		•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	0	<b>13</b>		•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	12	<b>12</b>		•
<b>Community Investment</b>	5	<b>10</b>		•
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	10	<b>15</b>		•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	0	<b>6</b>		•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	<b>4</b>		•
<b>TOTALS</b>	81	<b>110</b>		•

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



<b>Watershed Area</b>	Upper San Gabriel River
<b>Project Name</b>	Zamora Park Renovation Project
<b>Project Lead</b>	City of El Monte
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$2,000,000
<b>Project Type</b>	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	<b>20</b>		•
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	<b>30</b>		•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	0	<b>13</b>		•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	0	<b>12</b>		•
<b>Community Investment</b>	5	<b>10</b>		•
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	13	<b>15</b>		•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	6	<b>6</b>		•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	<b>4</b>		•
<b>TOTALS</b>	78	<b>110</b>		•