

# Highlighting Watershed Area Priorities

Leverage Funding and Cost Effectiveness  
Considerations



SAFE CLEAN WATER L.A.



# IP Scoring Criteria

- 60-point threshold is the “floor” for consideration by the WASC
- Scoring results also can be useful for understanding project details, how projects align with WASC goals

<b>50</b> <i>points max</i> <b>A1</b> Wet+Dry Weather Water Quality Benefits	<b>- OR -</b>	<b>40</b> <i>points max</i> <b>A2</b> Dry Weather Only Water Quality Benefits	<b>25</b> <i>points max</i> <b>B</b> Significant Water Supply Benefits
<b>10</b> <i>points max</i> <b>C</b> Community Investment Benefits		<b>15</b> <i>points max</i> <b>D</b> Nature-Based Solutions	<b>10</b> <i>points max</i> <b>E</b> Leveraging Funds and Community Support



SAFE CLEAN WATER L.A.



# Leverage Funding Criterion

- >25% Funding Matched = 3 points
- >50% Funding Matched = 6 points

E. Leveraging Funds and Community Support	10 points max	The Project achieves one or more of the following:
	6 points max	E1. Cost-Share. Additional Funding has been awarded for the Project. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• &gt;25% Funding Matched = 3 points</li> <li>• &gt;50% Funding Matched = 6 points</li> </ul>
	4 points	E2. The Project demonstrates strong local, community-based support and/or has been developed as part of a partnership with local NGOs/CBOs.



SAFE CLEAN WATER L.A.



# Cost Effectiveness Criteria (WQ)

- Cost effectiveness criterion for water quality
- Only for wet + dry weather projects (not for just dry weather)

Section	Score Range	Scoring Standards
A.1 Wet + Dry Weather Water Quality Benefits	50 points max	The Project provides water quality benefits
	20 points max	<p>A.1.1: For Wet Weather BMPs Only: Water Quality Cost Effectiveness (Cost Effectiveness) = (24-hour BMP Capacity)<sup>1</sup> / (Capital Cost in \$Millions)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• &lt;0.4 (acre feet capacity / \$-Million) = 0 points</li> <li>• 0.4-0.6 (acre feet capacity / \$-Million) = 7 points</li> <li>• 0.6-0.8 (acre feet capacity / \$-Million) = 11 points</li> <li>• 0.8-1.0 (acre feet capacity / \$-Million) = 14 points</li> <li>• &gt;1.0 (acre feet capacity / \$-Million) = 20 points</li> </ul> <p><sup>1</sup>. Management of the 24-hour event is considered the maximum capacity of a Project for a 24-hour period. For water quality focused Projects, this would typically be the 85<sup>th</sup> percentile design storm capacity. Units are in acre-feet (AF).</p>



SAFE CLEAN WATER L.A.



# Cost Effectiveness Criteria (WS)

- Cost effectiveness criterion for water supply
- Alongside water supply benefit magnitude

<b>B. Significant Water Supply Benefits</b>	25 points max	The Project provides water re-use and/or water supply enhancement benefits
	13 points max	<p>B1. Water Supply Cost Effectiveness. The Total Life-Cycle Cost<sup>2</sup> per unit of acre foot of Stormwater and/or Urban Runoff volume captured for water supply is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• &gt;\$2500/ac-ft = 0 points</li> <li>• \$2,000–2,500/ac-ft = 3 points</li> <li>• \$1500–2,000/ac-ft = 6 points</li> <li>• \$1000–1500/ac-ft = 10 points</li> <li>• &lt;\$1000/ac-ft = 13 points</li> </ul> <p><sup>2</sup>. Total Life-Cycle Cost: The annualized value of all Capital, planning, design, land acquisition, construction, and total life O&amp;M costs for the Project for the entire life span of the Project (e.g. 50-year design life span should account for 50-years of O&amp;M). The annualized cost is used over the present value to provide a preference to Projects with longer life spans.</p>
	12 points max	<p>B2. Water Supply Benefit Magnitude. The yearly additional water supply volume resulting from the Project is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• &lt;25 ac-ft/year = 0 points</li> <li>• 25 - 100 ac-ft/year = 2 points</li> <li>• 100 - 200 ac-ft/year = 5 points</li> <li>• 200 - 300 ac-ft/year = 9 points</li> <li>• &gt;300 ac-ft/year = 12 points</li> </ul>



# What to Signal as Watershed Area-Specific Priorities

- Are there elements of the scoring criteria that should be highlighted as priorities in the LSGR Watershed Area

- OR -

- Are there other ways that the LSGR WASC wants to communicate its priorities?



SAFE CLEAN WATER L.A.



# How to Signal Watershed Area-Specific Priorities

- Need for Watershed Coordinator and rest of WASC members to play a key role in communicating new Watershed Area priorities to potential project proponents
- Project proponents for FY 23-24 should be connecting with Watershed Coordinator



SAFE CLEAN WATER L.A.

