

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Committee



Meeting Minutes:

Monday, January 25, 2021
1:00pm – 4:00pm
WebEx Meeting

Attendees

Committee Members Present:

Matt Stone	Bruce Reznik
J.R. De Shazo	TJ Moon
Jill Sourial	Dave Sorem

Committee Members Not Present:

None

1) Welcome and Introductions

Bruce Reznik, the Chair of the Scoring Committee, called the meeting to order. All committee members in attendance made self-introductions, and a quorum was established.

2) Approval of Meeting Minutes from January 12, 2021

The District provided copies of the meeting minutes from the previous meeting. Bruce Reznik asked the committee members for comments or revisions.

Matt Stone made a motion to approve the meeting minutes. TJ Moon seconded the motion. The Committee voted to approve the meeting minutes (5 'Yes' votes and 1 'not present', see attached Vote Tracker Sheet).

3) Committee Member and District Updates

Kirk Allen provided the following District updates: 8 of the 9 WASCs have chosen Watershed Coordinators (WC); 11 out of the 12 available WC positions have been selected, LA County Public Work's contracts division is working on issuing contracts to the selected WCs; District is in the process of executing Municipal Program Transfer Agreements, receiving municipal Annual Plans and the required authorization documents; and the District is in the process of reviewing and executing Regional Program Transfer Agreements and the accompanied detailed Scopes of Work; funding disbursements will begin after all requirements are satisfied; also, the District as a CEQA Responsible Agency will have to make CEQA determinations for CEQA defined projects; which may delay funds disbursement for those projects.

4) Public Comment Period for Non-Agenda Items

No public comments received.

5) Discussion Items:

a) Ex Parte Communications Disclosure

Matt Stone exchanged an email with Thom Epps to clarify the El Dorado Park recycled water issue.

Bruce Reznik was contacted by Blake Wittington of Tree People about a letter of support he was requested to provide. Bruce received emails from other applicants about additional requested information and advised them to submit any new information through the application.

b) Scoring of Feasibility Studies

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Committee



(See attached scoring rubric)

Resubmission of Projects for Scoring on January 25, 2021		
CSMB	1	Ballona Creek Dry Weather Flow Treatment Project
	2	Blackwelder Tract Lower Ballona Creek Green BMPs and Landscape Improvement Project
	3	Normandie Ave ES - DROPS and Paving
	4	Slauson Connect Clean Water Project
	5	Webster MS – DROPS
ULAR	6	Altadena Mariposa Green Street Demonstration Project
	7	Lincoln Park Neighborhood Green Street Network
	8	Victory ES – DROPS
	9	Woodlake ES - LID Project
LLAR	10	Furman Park Stormwater Capture and Infiltration Project
	11	Salt Lake Park Infiltration Cistern
NSMB	12	Stormwater Treatment, Diversion, Water Supply Augmentation, and Bioremediation Project
RH	13	Alhambra Wash Dry-Weather Diversion (HELD FOR JANUARY 27 TH MEETING)
	14	East Los Angeles College Northeast Drainage Area and City of Monterey Park Biofiltration Project (HELD FOR JANUARY 27 TH MEETING)
	15	Eaton Wash Dry-Weather Diversion (HELD FOR JANUARY 27 TH MEETING)
	16	Rubio Wash Dry-Weather Diversion (HELD FOR JANUARY 27 TH MEETING)
USGR	17	Fairplex (HELD FOR JANUARY 27 TH MEETING)
	18	Larkin Park (HELD FOR JANUARY 27 TH MEETING)
	19	Lone Hill Park (HELD FOR JANUARY 27 TH MEETING)
	20	Washington Park (HELD FOR JANUARY 27 TH MEETING)
	21	Zamora Park Renovation Project (HELD FOR JANUARY 27 TH MEETING)
LSGR	22	Stormwater Treatment and Reuse System (STAR System) Hacienda Park (HELD FOR JANUARY 27 TH MEETING)
	23	Heartwell Park at Palo Verde Channel (HELD FOR JANUARY 27 TH MEETING)
SSMB	24	Beach Cities Green Streets Project WITHDRAWN BY APPLICANT

6) Public Comment Period for Agenda Items

No public comments received.

7) Voting items:

- a) Send all projects with passing scores from the January 12, 2021 Scoring Committee meeting to their respective WASCs

Jill Sourial made a motion to approve sending the 7 projects with passing scores to their respective WASCs. TJ Moon seconded the motion. The Committee voted to approve sending the projects to the WASCs (5 'Yes' votes and 1 'not present', see attached Vote Tracker Sheet).

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Committee



8) Adjournment

Bruce Reznik reminded Committee members that the next meeting will be held on January 27, 2021 from 1:00 pm – 4:00 pm and adjourned the meeting.

SCORING COMMITTEE MEETING - January 25, 2021

Member Type	Quorum Present		Voting Items	
	Member	Voting?	Meeting Minutes Jan-12	Voting Item 7a
Water Supply	Matt Stone	X	Y	Y
Water Supply / Water Quality	J.R. De Shazo	X	Y	not present
Nature-Based Solutions / Community Investments Benefits	Jill Sourial	X	Y	Y
Nature-Based Solutions / Water Quality	Bruce Reznik	X	Y	Y
Water Quality	Dave Sorem	X	not present	Y
Water Quality	TJ Moon	X	Y	Y
Total Non-Vacant Seats	6	Yay (Y)	5	5
Total Voting Members Present	6	Nay (N)	0	0
		Abstain (A)	0	0
		Total	5	5
			Approved	Approved

Other Attendees	
Alfredo Magallanes	Lena Nguyen
Brad Parks	Lorena Matos
Breckell Mary Ann	Mayra Cabrena
Brenda Ponton	Megan Turnlund
Brett Perry	Michael Gagan
Bryce Lee	Mike Rudd
Carmen Andrade	Nate Schreiner
Chris Carandang	Oliver Galang
Christine McLeod	Phuoc Le
Christopher Rochfort	Richard Watson
Conor Mossavi	Sean Agid
Custis Fang	Shahriar Eftekhazadeh
Daniel Apt	Sheila Brice
Danielle Chupa	Susie Santilena
Ilene Ramirez	Thom Epps
Jacqueline Mak	Vik Bapna
Jae Ko	Yvana Hrovat
James Cramsie	Jim Rasmus
Jessica Forte	Gustavo Orozco
Joe Venzon	Karen Lee
John Hunter	Katie Harrel
Jose Rodriguez	Joshua Nelson
Katie M	Scott Struck
Kelly Fisher	Shahram Kharaghani
Ken Susilo	

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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Algae is not a TMDL Unclear justification for treatment volume Applicant noted targeting algae will lead to the treatment of bacteria No diversion for this project Algae not a pollutant within a stream river, would also meet algae downstream after leaving site. Applicant confirmed General Permit for algae
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	20	30	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Water Supply Part 1	0	13	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unclear Justification for water supply volume
Water Supply Part 2	2	12	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Applicant claiming recreational benefit by improving water quality in the channel
Nature-Based Solutions	12	15	12	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Leveraging Funds Part 1	0	6	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	4	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Applicant provided a neighborhood council letter of support
TOTALS	68	110	28	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	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 7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 Applicant provided updated numbers to justify drawdown rate. Would still be beneficial to see backup justification 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	•
Nature-Based Solutions	10	15	10	•
Leveraging Funds Part 1	0	6	0	•
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	4	4	•
TOTALS	61	110	54 61	•

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	? 20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 Applicant provided updated numbers to increase total capacity. Applicant adjusted construction cost, but appear inconsistent throughout. Project is potentially 50x oversized to treat the 85th percentile. SC to review a potential cap in the future to capacity over the 85th. Does not impact score
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	30	? 30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Applicant to provide hydrology
Water Supply Part 1	0	13	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Water Supply Part 2	0	12	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Community Investment	10	10	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Additional details on the planting would have been helpful. Does not impact score.
Nature-Based Solutions	11	15	11	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Leveraging Funds Part 1	0	6	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Updated numbers for cost were inconsistent. Not clear what the construction costs were. Will need to be addressed to the WASC.
Leveraging Funds Part 2	0	4	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SC noted there should be some level of community support for this project, which could potentially raise score.
TOTALS	71	110	Unable to Score 71	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	7 11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. Applicant updated drawdown rate to 0
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	25	30	25 30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Applicant used their own modeling results.
Water Supply Part 1	0	13	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Water Supply Part 2	0	12	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Community Investment	10	10	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 not include after schools program. Applicant justification provided indirect benefits to access to waterways, SC agreed this did not meet the intent of this benefit.
Nature-Based Solutions	12	15	12	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Leveraging Funds Part 1	0	6	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	4	0 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. Applicant has provided updated letters of support.
TOTALS	62	110	Unable to Score 62	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	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	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. Applicant provided updated construction cost numbers, however, unclear what the costs are as inconsistent throughout application. Updated WQ data, provides enough justification to score. SC to revisit the overdesigned project and the score over inflation.
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	30	30	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Water Supply Part 1	0	13	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Water Supply Part 2	0	12	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Community Investment	5	10	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minimal detail provided for the greenery. Would be beneficial to see more details and justification.
Nature-Based Solutions	10	15	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Application notes a reduction in impervious area, but there's no points shown in the Project Module
Leveraging Funds Part 1	0	6	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Leveraging Funds Part 2	0	4	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A school-based project should have been able to secure letters from the community, PTA, etc.
TOTALS	65	110	Unable to Score 65	<ul style="list-style-type: none">

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	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Applicant is between a wet and dry weather project. Applicant chose to classify as dry weather, but the project does take in wet weather flow. 30-ft of gravel depth seems high. Applicant noted focus is to address dry weather bacteria TMDL and noted that infiltration rates at the site are very good.
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	20	30	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> With such a high infiltration rate, project may be close to the 85th percentile storm volume, to pick up additional points being classified as a wet weather project.
Water Supply Part 1	0	13	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Water Supply Part 2	5	12	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Deep media layer may be inflating supply benefit. Applicant noted that 30ft of gravel is an underestimate. Support letter from WRD appears to be a blanket letter. SC still to resolve what level of Watermaster approval is needed. Water is pre-treated before infiltration into groundwater.
Community Investment	5	10	Unable to score 5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clarification needed on the native vegetation and infiltration gallery. Applicant noted that current phase is design, with more details to come post-design. If classifying as dry weather, won't be able to claim Flood control benefit. Applicant provided additional detail for the CI Benefits
Nature-Based Solutions	12	15	Unable to score 12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Need clarification on the scale of the infiltration gallery to confirm score. Applicant provided additional detail on bioswale and natural processes
Leveraging Funds Part 1	0	6	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Leveraging Funds Part 2	0	4	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would be good to see letters of support from community groups.
TOTALS	62	110	Unable to score 62	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Application currently requesting funds for design and construction. Needs additional information as construction included.

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	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No plans or hydrology provided, and applicant used their own modeling with no justification. This project is between a wet and dry weather project. SC recommends reclassifying as a dry weather project, as it is not large enough to meet 85th
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	30	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This project only captures about half of the 85th percentile, but application claims full capture of pollutants. Needs justification.
Water Supply Part 1	3	13	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Applicant using their own cost estimate for supply cost. No justification provided.
Water Supply Part 2	0	12	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Community Investment	5	10	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Nature-Based Solutions	15	15	Unable to score 15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nature based justification needs more detail. Would be beneficial to see what these benefits are and what the plantings are. Applicant provided additional detail to justify NBS benefits.
Leveraging Funds Part 1	0	6	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	4	0 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Letters of support are from only cities and no community groups. SC recognizes that multi-city support is beneficial. Applicant notes support from Tree People, would be good to see a letter of support from this group. Applicant provided letters of support
TOTALS	77	110	Unable to score 64	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> WASC to confirm that benefits claimed would be constructed.

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	20 To be Confirmed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No plans or data provided on the 17 LFD's. Unclear if project is only claiming for just the one Medea Creek Diversion site or 17 LFD's. Applicant notes that construction funds to include the 17 LFD's. Applicant to provide additional details on the LFDs. Application provided insufficient additional documentation to the application. Applicant provided clarifying statements SC noted additional documentation still needed to justify WQ benefits. The cost appears much lower that would be needed to construct 17 LFDs at ~\$1M each. Applicant noted it is up to 17 LFD's, with dry streams most days of the year.
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	20	30	20 To be Confirmed	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Water Supply Part 1	3	13	3 To be Confirmed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Applicant used their own figures for the supply. These seem reasonable. Applicant to provide additional clarity to justify water supply benefits.
Water Supply Part 2	12	12	12 To be Confirmed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Applicant to retrieve letter of support for water supply benefit.
Community Investment	0	10	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Nature-Based Solutions	0	15	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Leveraging Funds Part 1	3	6	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> O&M seems high on this project. Unclear if this funding accounted for. Applicant noted that O&M is currently an estimate.
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	4	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
TOTALS	62	110	62 To be confirmed Could not Confirm. Insufficient Information	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Applicant to provide clarity on the IRWM grant for only 10 LFD's Applicant to provide schematics showing the locations and design details for the 17 LFDs.

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 20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. Applicant noted a revised drainage area more accurate for the project.
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	30	Unable to Score 30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project is now 7x greater than the 85th. SC to review oversized points for WQ in future. Does not impact 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Significant number of letters of support. Exemplary community outreach and engagement.
TOTALS	70	110	Unable to Score 70	•

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 20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. $8.5/16 = \sim 0.5$ 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 Project Module Developer noted capacity is currently accurate but will be updated for future years. Does not impact score.
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	30	Unable to Score 30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is a discrepancy of the drainage area in the application and the report.
Water Supply Part 1	0	13	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Water Supply Part 2	2	12	Unable to Score 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Applicant provided additional justification for the supply benefit.
Community Investment	10	10	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Leveraging Funds Part 1	0	6	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Leveraging Funds Part 2	0	4	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
TOTALS	72	110	Unable to Score 72	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Applicant to provide additional clarity

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	Unable to score 20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No hydrology or cost estimates provided. Challenging to calculate breakdown. Need additional information to confirm cost and capacity dimensions on p.8 of application. Applicant to provide plans and calculation for how aggregate number is calculated. Applicant provided design plans to provide justification. 10x oversized. Construction cost seems inconsistent throughout the application but does not impact score.
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	30	30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Oversized for flooding, captures more than the 85th percentile storm.
Water Supply Part 1	0	13	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Water Supply Part 2	0	12	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Community Investment	10	10	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would be beneficial to see the planting pallet and other plans as project is already constructed.
Nature-Based Solutions	15	15	15	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Leveraging Funds Part 1	0	6	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Leveraging Funds Part 2	0	4	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As applicant is a school, would be good to see letters of support from PTA, community groups, and others.
TOTALS	75	110	Unable to score 75	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Applicant to provide final construction cost to WASC Constructed in Feb-2019, would only recoup funds for approximately 2 months of construction. Can request O&M moving forward.

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	Unable to score 20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No hydrology or cost estimates provided. Challenging to calculate breakdown. Need additional information to confirm cost and capacity dimensions on p.8 of application. Applicant provided additional documentation to justify benefits. Drainage area increased, unclear why. Construction cost very inconsistent throughout the application. Does not impact score even using the highest cost.
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	30	Unable to score 30	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Water Supply Part 1	0	13	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Water Supply Part 2	0	12	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Community Investment	10	10	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would be beneficial to see the plant pallet as the project has been constructed.
Nature-Based Solutions	10	15	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Leveraging Funds Part 1	0	6	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Leveraging Funds Part 2	0	4	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As applicant is a school, would be good to see letters of support from PTA, community groups, and others.
TOTALS	70	110	Unable to Score 70	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Applicant to provide WASC with accurate construction cost figure.