Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022

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

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	**20**	0	• Algae is not a TMDL • Unclear justification for treatment volume • Applicant noted targeting algae will lead to the treatment of bacteria
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	20	**30**	0	•
Water Supply Part 1	0	**13**	0	• Unclear Justification for water supply volume
Water Supply Part 2	2	**12**	2	• Applicant provided their own adjustments for water supply • Complex infrastructure system for the size of the project. • Concern for how the project would get permitted and operated at a school
Community Investment	10	**10**	10	• Applicant claiming recreational benefit by improving water quality in the channel
Nature-Based Solutions	12	**15**	12	•
Leveraging Funds Part 1	0	**6**	0	•
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	**4**	4	• Applicant provided a neighborhood council letter of support
TOTALS	68	**110**	28	• A technical support grant may be a better fit at this point. • Or if the applicant can retrieve the permit and agreement from the property owners.

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022

Watershed Area	Central Santa Monica Bay
Project Name	Ballona Creek Low Flow Diversion Project
Project Lead	SEITec
Total Funding Requested	$14,951,000
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	• 19ft high rubber dam is concerning with potential dangers or safety concerns, does not affect score. • Applicant noted the application includes examples of similarly tall rubber dams • Unclear if Hyperion has capacity to treat this supply. JR Noted Hyperion is targeting to use 100% of the flow.
Water Supply Part 2	12	**12**	12	•
Community Investment	5	**10**	5	• Additional justification would be beneficial, does not affect score
Nature-Based Solutions	5	**15**	0	• Applicant claims gravity for NBS, which does not meet the intent of the NBS category in the context of SCW.
Leveraging Funds Part 1	0	**6**	0	•
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	**4**	0	• Applicant did not have a letter of support from any community entities (NGO, CBO, etc)
TOTALS	79	**110**	70	• Very similar to a second project proposed for Ballona Creek

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022

Watershed Area	Central Santa Monica Bay
Project Name	Ballona Creek TMDL Project
Project Lead	City of Los Angeles, LA Sanitation and Environment
Total Funding Requested	$15,000,000
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 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	20	**30**	20	•
Water Supply Part 1	13	**13**	13	•
Water Supply Part 2	12	**12**	12	•
Community Investment	5	**10**	5	•
Nature-Based Solutions	5	**15**	~~5~~ 0	• Project provides some greening, would be helpful to have additional detail on this portion of the project. • Does not impact score. • 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.
Leveraging Funds Part 1	6	**6**	6	•
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	**4**	4	•
TOTALS	85	**110**	~~85~~ 80	•

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022

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

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	7	**20**	0	• Project targets treating the 85th percentile • Applicant uses an aggregate number for the design elements, which is difficult to confirm. • 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 85th. • Cost per capacity would go up due to less treatment volume. Estimated 0.28 Capacity/$M • $5M for a 5ac treatment area seems high
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	10	**10**	10	•
Nature-Based Solutions	10	**15**	10	•
Leveraging Funds Part 1	0	**6**	0	•
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	**4**	4	•
TOTALS	61	**110**	54	•

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022

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

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	**20**	11	• $5M for a 14ac treatment area seems high • Applicant uses a high 2.5 in/hr infiltration rate. Assumes treating double the 85th percentile • 1 in/hr is more reasonable. This is still an 85th percentile project • Estimated 0.6 (capacity/$M)
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	10	**10**	10	• Additional justification would be beneficial. Does not affect score.
Nature-Based Solutions	10	**15**	10	•
Leveraging Funds Part 1	0	**6**	0	•
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	**4**	4	•
TOTALS	74	**110**	65	•

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022

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

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	**20**	?	• There's no plans, cost estimate, or hydrology. • 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 85th volume. • Estimated 0.2 AF/$5M will yield a score of 0 • Total inflow volume in application shows 0 ac-ft. Need to show hydrology • $5M for 3ac treatment area • Percolation test may not have allowed hours of pre-soak to validate infiltration rate
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	**30**	?	• Applicant to provide hydrology
Water Supply Part 1	0	**13**	0	•
Water Supply Part 2	0	**12**	0	•
Community Investment	10	**10**	10	• Additional details on the planting would have been helpful. Does not impact score.
Nature-Based Solutions	11	**15**	11	•
Leveraging Funds Part 1	0	**6**	0	•
Leveraging Funds Part 2	0	**4**	0	• SC noted there should be some level of community support for this project, which could potentially raise score.
TOTALS	71	**110**	Unable to Score	• Applicant to find additional justification, construction cost breakdown.

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022

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

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	11	**20**	?	• 1.7 in/hr drawdown rate seems high, need additional justification to verify this rate. Otherwise will not score higher than 60pts. • 24-hr volume seems high as well, estimated 1.7 ac-ft • Applicant to follow-up and provide additional justification.
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	25	**30**	25	• Applicant used their own modeling results.
Water Supply Part 1	0	**13**	0	•
Water Supply Part 2	0	**12**	0	•
Community Investment	10	**10**	5	• Not enough backup justification provided. Unclear what “maximum extent feasible” means. Needs additional justification. • Access to waterway seems questionable, additional justification would be beneficial. • Intent to greening of Schools benefit does would not include after schools program.
Nature-Based Solutions	12	**15**	12	•
Leveraging Funds Part 1	0	**6**	0	•
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	**4**	0	• Letter of support from the Vermont Slauson Development company (business incubator). Intent is to be from a CBO, NGO, etc. • Applicant noted the project has been developed in coordination with the community and neighborhood councils.
TOTALS	62	**110**	Unable to Score	• Project seems closer to a concept, not fully fleshed out currently. • Project may be geared more towards a design phase, or TRP • Project applicant noted $0 needed for the first year.

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022

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

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	**20**	20	• 12 in/hr infiltration rate and 9ac-ft capacity seem high • Cost breakdown is hard to follow, not possible to parse out the cost of the water quality components. • Additional justification needed • Applicant noted the 7 ac-ft is infiltrated with additional for storage which leads to 9ac-ft • Project is designed as a flood project, with a much higher volume than the 85th percentile volume. Overdesigned for the 85th • Applicant to follow-up with additional detail 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	0	**13**	0	•
Water Supply Part 2	0	**12**	0	•
Community Investment	10	**10**	10	• More detail would be beneficial on the Flood Risk Mitigation benefit. Does not impact score.
Nature-Based Solutions	10	**15**	10	•
Leveraging Funds Part 1	0	**6**	0	•
Leveraging Funds Part 2	0	**4**	0	• A school based project should have been able to secure letters from the community, PTA, etc.
TOTALS	70	**110**	70	•

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022

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

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	**20**	?	• No Plans, no cost, no hydrology. Not possible to score or validate. • Project designed for much higher than the 85th. Overdesigned. • Applicant to follow-up with needed information.
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	**30**	?	•
Water Supply Part 1	0	**13**	0	•
Water Supply Part 2	0	**12**	0	•
Community Investment	5	**10**	5	• Minimal detail provided for the greenery. Would be beneficial to see more details and justification.
Nature-Based Solutions	10	**15**	10	•
Leveraging Funds Part 1	0	**6**	0	•
Leveraging Funds Part 2	0	**4**	0	• A school-based project should have been able to secure letters from the community, PTA, etc.
TOTALS	65	**110**	Unable to Score	•

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022

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

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

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022

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

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

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022

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

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

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022

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

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

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022

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

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

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022

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

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

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022

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

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

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022

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

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

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022

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

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

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022

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

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

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022

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

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

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022

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

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

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022

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

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

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022

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

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

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022

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

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

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022

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

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

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022

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

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Max Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	**20**	20	• Reclassify as a Dry weather project. Does not capture 85th. • 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) • Assumed 6" per hour infiltration rate, which seems high (applicant clarified this is the amount of water flowing through the project) • Wetlands projects cannot be modeled in the SCW Projects Module
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	20	**30**	20	• Assuming Dry, >200ac
Water Supply Part 1	10	**13**	10	• Likely in unconfined aquifer • User input their own values for modeling • 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)
Water Supply Part 2	12	**12**	12	• Unclear how project will impact downstream projects, is it claiming supply that is already or will be captured downstream
Community Investment	10	**10**	5	• Jill and Bruce noted dry weather reclassification removes flood control benefit • Bruce noted that he would like additional justification from applicants to claim CI benefits • 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
Nature-Based Solutions	10	**15**	10	• Impervious surface increases.
Leveraging Funds Part 1	0	**6**	0	•
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	**4**	4	•
TOTALS	86	**110**	81	• Scoring Committee members noted that the project is a good representative project for SCW.

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022

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

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

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022

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

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

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022

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

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

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022

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

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

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022

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

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

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022

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

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

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022

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

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

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022

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

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

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022

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

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	**20**	20	• Applicant assumes a full capacity on trunk line at the optimal time of day; is a challenge to model. This leads to 100% capture. • Should be above 50% capture if not at optimal time, but difficult to model this.
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	**30**	30	• Project is claiming construction funds for O&M expenditures
Water Supply Part 1	0	**13**	0	• Infiltration not possible at this site due to soil contamination and other restrictions
Water Supply Part 2	12	**12**	12	• Assumes Reclamation Plant upgrade plans will come online to convert the detained water to future supply.
Community Investment	5	**10**	5	• Would be good to know the types and placements of trees • Unclear if the park was enhanced or put back the same; modernization of above ground amenities
Nature-Based Solutions	5	**15**	5	• With soil contamination replacement, is this a nature-based solution; possibly included as a community investment
Leveraging Funds Part 1	6	**6**	6	•
Leveraging Funds Part 2	0	**4**	0	•
TOTALS	78	**110**	78	•

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022

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

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

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022

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

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

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022

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

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

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022

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

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

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022

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

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	**20**	20	• Overdesigned for the 85th, project captures for a full rainy season for irrigation purposes.
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	• Applicant provided very good justification for CI benefits.
Nature-Based Solutions	11	**15**	11	•
Leveraging Funds Part 1	0	**6**	0	•
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	**4**	4	•
TOTALS	72	**110**	72	•

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022

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

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	**20**	20	• SCW Projects module is not suited to design dry wells. Applicant using their own methodology.
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	25	**30**	25	•
Water Supply Part 1	3	**13**	3	• No letter from water master to confirm usable aquifer water benefit (Unclear if Letter Required at early design phase) • Raymond basin does augment GW
Water Supply Part 2	5	**12**	5	•
Community Investment	5	**10**	5	• Would be beneficial to see more of the details for CI benefits in a later phase of design.
Nature-Based Solutions	12	**15**	12	•
Leveraging Funds Part 1	6	**6**	6	•
Leveraging Funds Part 2	0	**4**	0	•
TOTALS	76	**110**	76	• Would be beneficial to see the letter confirmation from Raymond Basin Watermaster

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022

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

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	**20**	Unable to Score	• 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. • 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. • Additional information needed to confirm water quality benefits.
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	**30**	Unable to Score	•
Water Supply Part 1	0	**13**	0	•
Water Supply Part 2	0	**12**	0	•
Community Investment	5	**10**	5	•
Nature-Based Solutions	11	**15**	11	•
Leveraging Funds Part 1	0	**6**	0	•
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	**4**	4	• Significant number of letters of support. Exemplary community outreach and engagement.
TOTALS	70	**110**	Unable to Score	•

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022

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

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	**20**	20	• SCW Projects Module is not well suited to modeling wetland projects. • 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) • Project should be reclassified a dry weather project. • Applicant noted treatment is through a filter unit, so rates are high as a result • San Rafael site treats 85th, but 2nd site does not.
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	5	**12**	5	• No letter from groundwater master to confirm supply benefit.
Community Investment	10	**10**	10	•
Nature-Based Solutions	12	**15**	12	•
Leveraging Funds Part 1	3	**6**	3	•
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	**4**	4	• Very good diversity for letters of support.
TOTALS	74	**110**	74	• For WASC consideration, provide letter from groundwater master to confirm supply benefit

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022

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

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	11	**20**	11	• No justification for 1.15 in/hr draw down rate. Storage alone however could capture 85th percentile volume.
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	• Applicant used their own 100AFY vs 43AFY from the module. Needs better justification than existing spreadsheet. Recommend using the website generated number. • 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. • Applicant notes that (25 acres 6 are new) additional acres of landscaping are being constructed to pull from this system. • Committee notes that offsetting potable supply for stormwater provides SCW supply benefit.
Community Investment	10	**10**	10	• 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. • Applicant has a letter from the principal of the school. • Plant pallet was chosen by the community, strong community engagement.
Nature-Based Solutions	10	**15**	10	•
Leveraging Funds Part 1	3	**6**	3	•
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	**4**	4	• Very good example of a community project.
TOTALS	73	**110**	73	•

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022

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

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	**20**	20	• Project captures slightly more than the 85th percentile storm
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	12	**12**	12	•
Community Investment	10	**10**	10	• Would be beneficial to see a letter of support from the school that benefit is provided for greening of schools.
Nature-Based Solutions	15	**15**	15	•
Leveraging Funds Part 1	6	**6**	6	•
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	**4**	4	•
TOTALS	97	**110**	97	•

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022

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

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	**20**	Unable to Score	• SCW Website not well suited for dry well projects. • Project is overdesigned, ~5x larger than the 85th percentile storm. Appears to be an error • No Geotech provided to justify the infiltration rate. • It is likely designed for the 85th percentile storm. 8.5/16 = ~0.5 • Applicant notes that the high capacity takes into consideration the infiltration rate. • Storage volume in application leads to ~1ac-ft per drywell, which seems overdesigned • Application to provide additional clarity
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	**30**	Unable to Score	• There is a discrepancy of the drainage area in the application and the report.
Water Supply Part 1	0	**13**	0	•
Water Supply Part 2	2	**12**	Unable to Score	•
Community Investment	10	**10**	10	• Would be beneficial to see a letter of support from the school that benefit is provided for greening of schools. • May have been able to claim access
Nature-Based Solutions	10	**15**	10	•
Leveraging Funds Part 1	0	**6**	0	•
Leveraging Funds Part 2	0	**4**	0	•
TOTALS	72	**110**	Unable to Score	• Applicant to provide additional clarity

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022

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

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	**20**	11	• Discrepency in drainage area in application and the appencidies • Application uses a 1 in/hr draw down rate for irrigation. Recommend using 0 in/hr. • 7.5/9.8 = 11 pts • Insufficient information, recommend providing additional clarity
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	**30**	30	• Project does capture the 85th
Water Supply Part 1	0	**13**	0	•
Water Supply Part 2	5	**12**	0	• Insufficient information, recommend providing additional clarity re-running model
Community Investment	10	**10**	5	• Enhancement of schools not really provided by converting field irrigation to stormwater. Would be covered under supply. • Would be beneficial to see additional justification for heat island, plant palette, and others.
Nature-Based Solutions	10	**15**	10	•
Leveraging Funds Part 1	3	**6**	3	•
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	**4**	4	•
TOTALS	82	**110**	63	• Additional information to be provided to WASC

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022

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

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	**20**	20	• Applicant uses ~2.5x the 85th 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 • Applicant to provide additional clarity.
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	20	**30**	20	•
Water Supply Part 1	3	**13**	3	•
Water Supply Part 2	12	**12**	12	•
Community Investment	5	**10**	2	• Applicant claims improving access to waterway but did not provide adequate justification. • Unclear how much planting is present in the project. Would be beneficial to see planting palette.
Nature-Based Solutions	10	**15**	10	• Provide the WASC additional details on the nature based elements of this project.
Leveraging Funds Part 1	3	**6**	3	•
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	**4**	4	•
TOTALS	77	**110**	74	•

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022

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

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	**20**	20	• Overdesigned for 50-year flood event. ~3x greater the 85th percentile storm.
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	10	**10**	10	•
Nature-Based Solutions	10	**15**	10	•
Leveraging Funds Part 1	0	**6**	0	•
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	**4**	4	• Letter provided by the North Hollywood Community Gardens is part of the same school. Would be beneficial to see additional letters of support
TOTALS	74	**110**	74	•

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022

Watershed Area	Upper Los Angeles River
Project Name	North Hollywood Park Stormwater Capture Project
Project Lead	Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (LADWP)
Total Funding Requested	$92,394,000
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	12	**12**	12	•
Community Investment	10	**10**	10	• Bruce noted they provided sufficient justification for CI benefits • Dry weather would not likely receive flood benefit (does not change score)
Nature-Based Solutions	15	**15**	15	• Unclear if all impervious surface is being replaced with pervious pavement (confirmed by applicant, replaced with pervious pavement)
Leveraging Funds Part 1	6	**6**	6	•
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	**4**	4	•
TOTALS	87	**110**	87	• Applicant attached a monitoring plan for a separate project (Should be retrieved by SCW Team)

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022

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

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	**20**	7	• Inconsistent drainage area from the application and the appendices. • 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. • 1.9AF/$3.3M = 0.57 = 7pts
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	10	**10**	10	• Would have been beneficial to see the plantings given the project is already constructed.
Nature-Based Solutions	10	**15**	10	•
Leveraging Funds Part 1	3	**6**	3	•
Leveraging Funds Part 2	0	**4**	0	•
TOTALS	73	**110**	60	•

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022

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

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	**20**	20	• Project is overdesigned for flooding, 5x greater than the 85th percentile storm.
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	10	**10**	10	• More detail and justification would have been beneficial. • Unclear what recreational benefits are being provided as part of the project. Does not impact score. • Unclear what "natural turf" meant within the application • Applicant noted plantings plan is available. To be provided to WASC
Nature-Based Solutions	11	**15**	11	•
Leveraging Funds Part 1	0	**6**	0	•
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	**4**	4	•
TOTALS	75	**110**	75	•

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022

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

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

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022

Watershed Area	Upper Los Angeles River
Project Name	Victory ES - DROPS
Project Lead	Los Angeles Unified School DIstrict
Total Funding Requested	$178,585
Project Type	Wet

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

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022

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

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

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022

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

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

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022

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

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

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022

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

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

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022

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

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

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022

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

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

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022

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

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

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022

Watershed Area	Upper San Gabriel River
Project Name	Zamora Park Renovation Project
Project Lead	City of El Monte
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	20	**20**		•
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	**30**		•
Water Supply Part 1	0	**13**		•
Water Supply Part 2	0	**12**		•
Community Investment	5	**10**		•
Nature-Based Solutions	13	**15**		•
Leveraging Funds Part 1	6	**6**		•
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	**4**		•
TOTALS	78	**110**		•