

# Scoring Committee

## Meeting Minutes

---



December 1, 2022  
9:00am – 12:00pm  
WebEx Meeting

### Committee Members Present:

Bruce Reznik, LA Waterkeeper (Nature-Based Solutions/Water Quality), Chair  
Dave Sorem, Mike Bubalo Construction Co., Inc (Water Quality)  
TJ Moon, LA County Public Works (Water Quality), Vice-Chair  
David Diaz, Active SGV (Community Investments)  
Matt Stone, Santa Clarita Valley Water Agency (Water Supply)  
Esther Rojas, Water Replenishment District (Water Supply/Community Investments/Nature-Based Solutions)

### Committee Members Absent:

None

See attached sign-in sheet for full list of attendees.

---

## **1. Welcome and Introductions**

District staff conducted a brief tutorial on WebEx. Chair Reznik welcomed Committee Members and called the meeting to order. All Committee Members made self-introductions and a quorum was established.

## **2. Approval of Meeting Minutes from November 3, 2022 and November 9, 2022**

Motions to approve the meeting minutes from 11/03/22 and 11/09/22 were made by Vice-Chair Moon and were seconded by Member Rojas. The Committee voted to approve the meeting minutes, with six votes in favor for each set of meeting minutes (approved, see vote tracking sheet).

## **3. Committee Member and District Updates**

District staff provided an update:

- On November 15, 2022, the Board of Supervisors (Board) voted to continue meeting virtually, acting under the authority of Assembly Bill 361 which authorizes public committees to meet without complying with all the teleconferencing requirements of the Brown Act. The Board is reviewing its position every 30 days. If the Board does not approve AB 361, Committee Members will vote whether to continue teleconferencing. District staff will provide additional guidance as needed.
- The District has distributed the first batch of Transfer Agreements and Addendums for new and continuing projects approved in Round 3. Project Developers should look out for emails from the District and provide requested items in a timely manner to help the District execute the Transfer Agreements and disperse Safe, Clean Water Program (SCWP) funds.
- Annual Report functionality is now available on the SCWP Reporting Module. The District sent an email notice to project developers on the new annual report functionality.
- Projects and Studies funded in Round 1 and Round 2 Stormwater Investment Plans (SIPs) are required to submit their first Annual Progress Report by December 31, 2022.

## **4. Public Comment Period for Non-Agenda Items**

District Staff will compile all public comment cards received and include them in the meeting minutes that will be uploaded to the SCWP website.

# Scoring Committee Meeting Minutes



John Yi (Los Angeles Walks) voiced support for the Sylmar Channel Project as an advocate for pedestrian spaces in Los Angeles.

Anthony Espinoza, on behalf of City of Los Angeles’ Councilwoman Monica Rodriguez, District 7 office, voiced support for the Sylmar Channel Project and noted that their team will address any safety concerns and engage with the community.

Miguel Luna (Community advocate on behalf of City of Paramount) submitted a comment card and voiced support for Spane Park project and highlighted that extensive community engagement was conducted in addition to education.

Michael Centeno (Tia Chucha’s Centro Cultural) submitted a comment card expressing support for the Sylmar Channel Project.

## 5. Discussion Items:

### a) Ex Parte Communication Disclosure

Member Rojas met with staff from the City of Los Angeles regarding projects being developed.

Vice-Chair Moon met with Maria Mehranian from the Regional Oversight Committee and discussed water supply plans for the City of Los Angeles. Vice-Chair Moon also met with staff from the City of Los Angeles and consultants regarding project resubmittals.

### b) Scoring of Feasibility Studies (SCWP Portal)

The tables below for each project contain information recorded on the scoring rubric sheet during the Scoring Committee meeting. The scoring rubric sheet, as recorded during the meeting, captures a project’s evaluation by the Scoring Committee.

Project: Via Princessa Park and Regional Best Management Practice (BMP) Project		WASC(s): Santa Clara River (SCR)	
Category	Applicant Score	Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Part 1	20	20	
Water Quality Part 2	30	30	
Water Supply Part 1	13	6	
Water Supply Part 2	12	12	
Community Investment	5	5	
Nature-Based Solutions	10	10	
Leveraging Funds Part 1	3	3	
Leveraging Funds Part 2 (Community Support)	4	2	
<b>Conclusion:</b> The project received 88 points.			
<b>Discussion:</b> The applicant provided corrected calculations and the committee confirmed the scores. Full discussion on the first scoring is available for review in the Scoring Committee minutes from October 6, 2022, posted on the SCWP website.			

# Scoring Committee Meeting Minutes



<b>Project:</b> Cornell – Mulholland Highway Green Improvement Project			<b>WASC(s):</b> North Santa Monica Bay (NSMB)
Category	Applicant Score	Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Part 1	11	11	
Water Quality Part 2	25	30	See below
Water Supply Part 1	0	0	
Water Supply Part 2	0	0	
Community Investment	5	5	
Nature-Based Solutions	10	10	
Leveraging Funds Part 1	6	6	
Leveraging Funds Part 2 (Community Support)	4	1	
<b>Conclusion:</b> The project received 63 points.			
<b>Discussion:</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>Water Quality:</u> Vice-Chair Moon noted that trash could have been claimed as a secondary pollutant to gain an additional 5 points. Chair Reznik noted that there was not enough clarification to award more community support points. Chair Reznik recognized that the NSMB WASC historically struggles to receive projects given the lack of water supply potential and was not clear if the committee has the authority to override applicant scores. District staff noted that improving the module is a priority and mentioned that in the past, District staff has helped applicants change the inputs for the module if the instructions were not initially clear. The applicant explained that the primary pollutant was chosen because more accurate data was available for the Class I pollutant of toxins, but Vice-Chair noted that because there is a Trash Total Maximum Daily Load in the region, trash could also be considered a Class I pollutant. The applicant agreed to changing the primary pollutant to toxics and secondary pollutant to trash to receive an additional five points and District staff making the changes in the module on the their behalf.</li> </ul> <p>Vice-Chair Moon mentioned that the committee is more inclined to be flexible for this project because the project is only requesting design funds and the NSMB WASC's struggles to receive qualifying projects due to the lack of groundwater recharge available in the region.</p> <p>Full discussion on the first scoring is available for review in the Scoring Committee minutes from October 6, 2022, posted on the SCWP website.</p>			

<b>Project:</b> Arroyo Seco Projects			<b>WASC(s):</b> Upper Los Angeles River (ULAR)
Category	Applicant Score	Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Part 1	11	11	See below
Water Quality Part 2	30	30	See below
Water Supply Part 1	0	0	
Water Supply Part 2	5	5	

# Scoring Committee Meeting Minutes



Community Investment	10	5	
Nature-Based Solutions	10	10	
Leveraging Funds Part 1	N/A	0	
Leveraging Funds Part 2 (Community Support)	4	2	
<b>Conclusion:</b> The project received 63 points.			
<b>Discussion:</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>Water Quality:</u> The Feasibility Study completed through the Technical Resources Program (TRP) was not originally included in the application but was included in the resubmittal and clarified calculations.</li> </ul> <p>Full discussion on the first scoring is available for review in the Scoring Committee minutes from October 6, 2022, posted on the SCWP website.</p>			

<b>Project:</b> California Avenue and Adjacent Streets Stormwater Capture Project			<b>WASC(s):</b> ULAR
<b>Category</b>	<b>Applicant Score</b>	<b>Committee Score</b>	<b>Notes</b>
Water Quality Part 1	20	20	
Water Quality Part 2	25	25	
Water Supply Part 1	10	3	See below
Water Supply Part 2	5	2	See below
Community Investment	5	5	
Nature-Based Solutions	12	12	
Leveraging Funds Part 1	3	3	
Leveraging Funds Part 2 (Community Support)	4	1	
<b>Conclusion:</b> The project received 71 points.			
<b>Discussion:</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>Water Supply:</u> Vice-Chair Moon noted that 72 hours is the typical duration used after a wet weather event to mark when dry weather begins, not 24 hours as used in the application. A shorter storm duration used for the calculation may inflate the amount of dry weather flows being captured.</li> </ul> <p>The committee agreed that some form of standardization for dry weather should be created for future applications. Field measurements are ideal but using a standard authority's cubic feet per second (cfs) per acre could also be considered. The number of dry days in a year assumed in an application should also be standardized.</p> <p>Full discussion on the first scoring is available for review in the Scoring Committee minutes from October 6, 2022, posted on the SCWP website.</p>			

# Scoring Committee Meeting Minutes



Project: Earvin "Magic" Johnson Park Operation and Maintenance Project			WASC(s): ULAR
Category	Applicant Score	Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Part 1	11	20	See below
Water Quality Part 2	30	20	
Water Supply Part 1	0	0	
Water Supply Part 2	5	2	See below
Community Investment	5	5	
Nature-Based Solutions	10	10	
Leveraging Funds Part 1	6	6	
Leveraging Funds Part 2 (Community Support)	4	4	
<b>Conclusion:</b> The project received 67 points.			
<b>Discussion:</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>Water Quality:</u> The project was reclassified as a dry weather project.</li> <li><u>Water Supply:</u> The project being reclassified as a dry weather project affected the water supply values.</li> </ul> <p>Full discussion on the first scoring is available for review in the Scoring Committee minutes from October 6, 2022, posted on the SCWP website.</p>			

Project: Hollenbeck Park Lake Rehabilitation Project			WASC(s): ULAR
Category	Applicant Score	Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Part 1	14	20	See below
Water Quality Part 2	30	20	See below
Water Supply Part 1	0	0	
Water Supply Part 2	12	0	See below
Community Investment	10	5	
Nature-Based Solutions	12	12	
Leveraging Funds Part 1	3	3	
Leveraging Funds Part 2 (Community Support)	4	3	
<b>Conclusion:</b> The project received 63 points.			
<b>Discussion:</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>Water Quality:</u> Committee Members shared the Los Angeles County hydrology map with the project applicant, which affected the project's estimated drainage area calculation. The applicant provided an updated geotechnical report. Updated infiltration rates and drainage areas demonstrated that the project cannot treat the 85<sup>th</sup> percentile flow, so the project was reclassified as a dry weather project.</li> </ul>			

# Scoring Committee Meeting Minutes



- Water Supply:** There was no letter from the groundwater master, so no points were awarded. The committee had a discussion regarding the size of the project. All water is captured upstream, so no dry weather flows are being captured at the lake due to the number of dry wells. The committee mentioned there were too many drywells included in the project and applicant should consider a smaller number of larger sized dry wells. The project treats more water than required which increases the cost and use of SCWP funds. The committee recommended that the applicant reconsider the size and number of BMPs used in the project.

Full discussion on the first scoring is available for review in the Scoring Committee minutes from October 17, 2022, posted on the SCWP website.

Project: South Pasadena Huntington Drive Regional Green Street Project			WASC(s): ULAR
Category	Applicant Score	Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Part 1	20	Unable to score	See below
Water Quality Part 2	30	Unable to score	
Water Supply Part 1	3	Unable to score	
Water Supply Part 2	9	Unable to score	
Community Investment	5	5	
Nature-Based Solutions	10	10	
Leveraging Funds Part 1	6	3	
Leveraging Funds Part 2 (Community Support)	4	1	

**Conclusion:** Project is unable to be scored. The project does not advance to the WASC.

**Discussion:**

The project scope has changed from the original TRP project scope. According to the geotechnical report used in the TRP, the proposed dry well depth is not feasible. The depth of the drywell also brings up construction challenges past the 50 foot depth.

The applicant noted that the number of the dry wells is still variable and that this can change if the depth of the drywell needs to be changed. The applicant also noted that the tunnel has portals for the drywells so no additional drilling will be required. The tunneling alternative chosen has no corrugated metal and would use prefabricated concrete. The applicant also noted that the different alternatives were combined because the project had already applied for other funding sources committing to the tunnel alternative.

The committee decided that because the project is requesting construction funds, more clarification from a geotechnical report is required to prove project feasibility.

Full discussion on the first scoring is available for review in the Scoring Committee minutes from October 17, 2022, posted on the SCWP website.

Project: Sylmar Channel Project			WASC(s): ULAR
Category	Applicant Score	Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Part 1	20	20	See below

# Scoring Committee Meeting Minutes



Water Quality Part 2	30	30	
Water Supply Part 1	6	0	See below
Water Supply Part 2	9	5	See below
Community Investment	5	5	
Nature-Based Solutions	10	10	
Leveraging Funds Part 1	6	6	
Leveraging Funds Part 2 (Community Support)	4	3	

**Conclusion:** The project received 79 points.

**Discussion:**

- Water Quality: The infiltration data is not site specific, but data is available in the vicinity of the project (around 0.5 miles away). For future applications, site specific geotechnical data should be required and may be a step in the District’s preliminary verification process.
- Water Supply: Vice-Chair Moon recommends that the operation and maintenance cost be included in the life cycle cost to maintain standard comparisons across all projects. The dry weather flow rate was calculated based on local low flow diversion drainage area analysis, which Vice-Chair Moon flagged as a potential standardization method for future projects. However, the number of dry weather days used in calculations was rather high, which may inaccurately inflate the points received. Committee Members also noted that the project is designed for more than the 85<sup>th</sup> percentile storm and may be oversized, thus using more SCWP funds than necessary and recommends the applicant reconsider BMP sizing.

Full discussion on the first scoring is available for review in the Scoring Committee minutes from October 17, 2022, posted on the SCWP website.

<b>Project:</b> Spane Park		<b>WASC(s):</b> Lower Los Angeles River (LLAR)	
<b>Category</b>	<b>Applicant Score</b>	<b>Committee Score</b>	<b>Notes</b>
Water Quality Part 1	20	20	See below
Water Quality Part 2	30	20	
Water Supply Part 1	3	0	
Water Supply Part 2	12	0	See below
Community Investment	10	5	
Nature-Based Solutions	10	12	See below
Leveraging Funds Part 1	N/A	0	
Leveraging Funds Part 2 (Community Support)	4	4	See below
<b>Conclusion:</b> Project received 61 points.			
<b>Discussion:</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Water Quality:</u> The project was reclassified as a dry weather project.</li> </ul>			

# Scoring Committee Meeting Minutes



- Water Supply: Committee Members confirmed that the project would not recharge a drinking water aquifer and therefore received no points for water supply.
  - Nature-Based Solutions: The project applicant noted in the resubmittal that impervious area would be converted to permeable pavement resulting in a 59% reduction in permeable area. Committee Members agreed to award 2 additional points for nature-based solutions. District staff noted that there may be a gradient point scale developed for points awarded for percent reduction in impervious area.
  - Leveraging Funds Part 2 (Community Support): Door-to-door outreach may have been missed in original scoring and an additional point was awarded.
- Full discussion on the first scoring is available for review in the Scoring Committee minutes from October 17, 2022, posted on the SCWP website.

<b>Project:</b> Heartwell Park at Palo Verde Channel Stormwater Capture Project			<b>WASC(s):</b> Lower San Gabriel River (LSGR)
Category	Applicant Score	Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Part 1	20	20	
Water Quality Part 2	20	20	
Water Supply Part 1	0	0	
Water Supply Part 2	5	5	See below
Community Investment	10	5	See below
Nature-Based Solutions	10	10	
Leveraging Funds Part 1	0	0	
Leveraging Funds Part 2 (Community Support)	4	1	
<b>Conclusion:</b> The project received 61 points.			
<b>Discussion:</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Water Supply</u>: Vice-Chair Moon noted that 72 hours is the typical duration used after a wet weather event to mark when dry weather begins, not 24 hours as used in the application. A shorter storm duration used for the calculation may inflate the amount of dry weather flows being captured. However, the project applicant noted that the project is discharging to the sanitary sewer and follows direction from LA County Sanitation, which allows for discharge after the 24-hour mark. The water flows to the Long Beach Treatment Plant, where it is used to protect against seawater intrusion. Committee Members noted that justification for the 24-hour discharge should be included in future applications.</li> <li>• <u>Community Investment</u>: The project will not qualify for flood protection benefits.</li> </ul> <p>Full discussion on the first scoring is available for review in the Scoring Committee minutes from November 3, 2022, posted on the SCWP website.</p>			

<b>Project:</b> La Mirada Creek Park Project			<b>WASC(s):</b> LSGR
Category	Applicant Score	Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Part 1	20	20	



# Scoring Committee Meeting Minutes



Water Quality Part 2	20	20	
Water Supply Part 1	6	0	
Water Supply Part 2	5	0	
Community Investment	10	5	
Nature-Based Solutions	14	14	
Leveraging Funds Part 1	0	0	
Leveraging Funds Part 2 (Community Support)	N/A	2	See below

**Conclusion:** The project received 61 points.

**Discussion:**

- Leveraging Funds Part 2 (Community Support): Chair Reznik noted that the best way of demonstrating community support is highlighting where community suggestions are implemented directly into project design. Although more recent engagement would have been ideal, this project was awarded points for meaningful community engagement demonstrated in the Master Plan.

Full discussion on the first scoring is available for review in the Scoring Committee minutes from November 3, 2022, posted on the SCWP website.

Project: Baldwin Vista Green Streets Project			WASC(s): CSMB
Category	Applicant Score	Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Part 1	20	Unable to score	See below
Water Quality Part 2	30	Unable to score	See below
Water Supply Part 1	0	0	
Water Supply Part 2	2	0	
Community Investment	5	5	
Nature-Based Solutions	10	10	
Leveraging Funds Part 1	0	0	
Leveraging Funds Part 2 (Community Support)	4	3	

**Conclusion:** Project is unable to be scored. The project not advance to the WASC.

**Discussion:**

- Water Quality: The applicant assumed a gradient in the groundwater table because the project area is located on a hill with liquefaction zones nearby; therefore, two borings were conducted. The project has drywells clustered on the east side where high groundwater was not encountered; however, the geotechnical report mentions that the groundwater is highly variable in the region and one boring demonstrates high groundwater nearby. The project applicant noted that the design team is confident with the geotechnical findings, but that additional borings could be conducted. The location of the drywells could then be altered based on those findings. Because the project is applying for construction funds, the Committee

# Scoring Committee Meeting Minutes



Members recommend that further development be done to confirm the groundwater in the area.

The committee had a conversation regarding the difference in scoring for projects requesting a small amount for design versus a large amount for construction should be intentionally considered during the scoring process. This difference is not strictly written in the SCWP guidelines and could be a decision for the WASC to decide the appropriate list of requests for budget. District staff shared that the Scoring Committee does have an obligation to confirm the cost benefit ratio of a project, which may involve stricter scoring for construction projects.

Full discussion on the first scoring is available for review in the Scoring Committee minutes from November 3, 2022, posted on the SCWP website.

<b>Project:</b> El Monte Norwood Elementary School Stormwater Capture Project			<b>WASC(s):</b> Rio Hondo (RH)
Category	Applicant Score	Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Part 1	14	11	See below
Water Quality Part 2	30	30	
Water Supply Part 1	0	0	
Water Supply Part 2	2	0	
Community Investment	5	5	
Nature-Based Solutions	12	12	
Leveraging Funds Part 1	N/A	0	
Leveraging Funds Part 2 (Community Support)	4	4	
<b>Conclusion:</b> The project received 62 points.			
<b>Discussion:</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>Water Quality:</u> The project updated the infiltration area which reduced the water quality points awarded.</li> </ul>			
Full discussion on the first scoring is available for review in the Scoring Committee minutes from November 9, 2022, posted on the SCWP website.			

<b>Project:</b> Beach Cities Green Streets Project			<b>WASC(s):</b> South Santa Monica Bay (SSMB)
Category	Applicant Score	Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Part 1	20	20	
Water Quality Part 2	30	25	See below
Water Supply Part 1	0	0	
Water Supply Part 2	2	0	
Community Investment	5	5	

# Scoring Committee Meeting Minutes



Nature-Based Solutions	10	10	
Leveraging Funds Part 1	3	3	
Leveraging Funds Part 2 (Community Support)	4	4	
<b>Conclusion:</b> The project received 67 points.			
<b>Discussion:</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>Water Quality:</u> The project provided clarifying summary tables and corrected some values, which affected the water quality score.</li> </ul> <p>Full discussion on the first scoring is available for review in the Scoring Committee minutes from November 9, 2022, posted on the SCWP website.</p>			

<b>Project:</b> Wilmington-Anaheim Green Infrastructure Corridor Project			<b>WASC(s):</b> SSMB
<b>Category</b>	<b>Applicant Score</b>	<b>Committee Score</b>	<b>Notes</b>
Water Quality Part 1	14	14	See below
Water Quality Part 2	30	30	See below
Water Supply Part 1	0	0	
Water Supply Part 2	5	5	See below
Community Investment	5	5	
Nature-Based Solutions	11	11	
Leveraging Funds Part 1	0	0	
Leveraging Funds Part 2 (Community Support)	4	3	
<b>Conclusion:</b> The project received 68 points.			
<b>Discussion:</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>Water Quality:</u> The applicant provided the City of Los Angeles' sewer drain analysis, which demonstrated that the pipe has sufficient capacity. The scores were confirmed.</li> <li><u>Water Supply:</u> The applicant provided clarifying dry weather calculations.</li> </ul> <p>Full discussion on the first scoring is available for review in the Scoring Committee minutes from November 9, 2022, posted on the SCWP website.</p>			

**c) Continuation of Rescoring (if needed)**

- i. Thursday, December 8<sup>th</sup> from 1-3PM
- ii. Tuesday, December 20<sup>th</sup> from 9-11AM

The committee determined that these meetings will not be needed.

**6. Public Comment Period for Agenda Items**

Merrill Taylor noted that only projects with an infiltrative aspect should have the requirement of onsite geotechnical reports as it is not relevant for projects diverting to storm or sewer drains.

# Scoring Committee Meeting Minutes



Fernando Navarete expressed support for the Wilmington-Anaheim Green Infrastructure Corridor Project as a lifelong resident of Wilmington and mentioned that the project would complement existing infrastructure projects in the area.

## 7. Voting Items

- a) **From Today:** Send scoreable projects receiving a passing score to WASCs:

SCR	Via Princessa Park and Regional BMP Project
NSMB	Cornell – Mulholland Highway Green Improvement Project
ULAR	Arroyo Seco Projects
	California Avenue and Adjacent Streets Stormwater Capture Project
	Earvin “Magic” Johnson Park Operation and Maintenance Project
	Hollenbeck Park Lake Rehabilitation Project
	Sylmar Channel Project
LLAR	Spane Park
LSGR	Heartwell Park at Palo Verde Channel Stormwater Capture Project
	La Mirada Creek Park Project
RH	El Monte Norwood Elementary School Stormwater Capture Project
SSMB	Beach Cities Green Streets Project
	Wilmington-Anaheim Green Infrastructure Corridor Project

Member Rojas motioned to send the above projects to the WASC, seconded by Member Sorem. The motion is approved, with six votes in favor (approved, see vote tracking sheet).

## 8. Items for Next Agenda

The next meeting is tentatively scheduled for January 5, 2023, 9:00am – 12:00pm. See the SCWP website for meeting details. Items on the Agenda include:

- a) Findings to Continue Teleconference Meetings Under Assembly Bill 361
- b) Assessment of previous submissions
- c) SCWP/Scoring Improvements (Scoring Criteria, Application Process/Project Module)

## 9. Adjournment

Chair Reznik thanked Committee Members and District staff and adjourned the meeting.

**SCORING COMMITTEE MEETING - December 1, 2022**

Member Type	Quorum Present		Voting Items		
	Member	Voting?	11/3/2022 Meeting Minutes	11/9/2022 Meeting Minutes	From today, 12/1 SC Mtg.: Send projects w/ passing scores to WASCs
Water Supply	Matt Stone	x	Y	Y	Y
Water Supply / Community Investments / Nature-Based Solutions	Esther Rojas	x	Y	Y	Y
Community Investments	David Diaz	x	Y	Y	Y
Nature-Based Solutions / Water Quality	<b>Bruce Reznik</b>	x	Y	Y	Y
Water Quality	Dave Sorem	x	Y	Y	Y
Water Quality	<b>TJ Moon</b>	x	Y	Y	Y
Total Non-Vacant Seats	6	Yay (Y)	6	6	6
Total Voting Members Present	6	Nay (N)	0	0	0
		Abstain (A)	0	0	0
		Total	6	6	6
			Approved	Approved	Approved

Other Attendees		
Alberto Grajeda	Edna Robidas	Maggie Gardner
Alexandro Garcia	Eugene Serrano	Mark Nguyen
Allen Ma	Fernando Navarrete	Mark Stowell
Alonso Garcia	Francisco Romero	Merrill Taylor
Amanda Begley	gabriela gonzalez	Michael Scaduto
Ana Rivera	Gil Crozes	Michelle Kim
Andrew Kim	hakeem	Miguel Luna
Annelisa Moe	Heather Merenda	Mike Scaduto
Anthony Espinoza	Ida Meisami	Nathan Schreiner
Aric Martinez	Jack Mikesell - Paradig	Oliver Galang
Brad Milner	Jackie Lillio	Paige Bistromowitz
brett perry	Jenny Chau	Paola Machan
Brian Spindor	Joe Venzon - LA Count	Peter Massey
Carmen Andrade	John Dettle	Phuoc Le
Cas, CWH	john hunter	Rafael Piamonte
Cherise Thompson	John Yi	Richard Watson
Chris Mote	Jonathan Abelson	Sarkis Oganesyanyan
Christine McLeod	Josafat Flores	Serena Zhu
Conor Mossavi	Joyce Amaro	seth carr
CWE - Larry Tortuya	Julie Allen	Shahriar Eftekhazadeh
Dan Duncan	Kevin Ho	Stacy Luell
Daniel Rydberg	Leneysde Chavez	Susie Santilena
Darin Seegmiller	Leslie Frazier	Tammy Takigawa
Duong Do	Lorena Matos	Ted Gerber
		Thom Epps

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2023-2024



<b>Watershed Area</b>	Central Santa Monica Bay
<b>Project Name</b>	Baldwin Vista Green Streets Project
<b>Project Lead</b>	City of Los Angeles, Department of Public Works, LA Sanitation and Environment
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$6,097,900
<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	20	Unable to score	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Groundwater depth at 19 feet but drywell invert at 40 feet.</li> <li>Dry wells located on east side of park with lower groundwater elevation</li> <li>Request for more elaborate geotech analysis</li> </ul>
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	30	Unable to score	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Requested clarification on calculations</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	2	12	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Cannot infiltrate due to depth to groundwater aquifer</li> </ul>
<b>Community Investment</b>	5	10	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	10	15	10	<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	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Low participation from outreach conducted</li> </ul>
<b>TOTALS</b>	71	110	Unable to score	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unable to be scored</li> <li>Project does not advance</li> </ul>

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2023-2024



<b>Watershed Area</b>	Central Santa Monica Bay
<b>Project Name</b>	Imperial Highway Green Infrastructure Project
<b>Project Lead</b>	City of Los Angeles, Department of Public Works, LA Sanitation and Environment
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$5,232,000
<b>Project Type</b>	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	0	20	0	•
<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	• Bike lane – community enhancement
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	14	15	14	•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	6	6	6	• Demonstrate great funding partnerships
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	4	3	•
<b>TOTALS</b>	64	110	63	• Meets minimum points threshold

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2023-2024



<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>	\$18,913,128
<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>27 ac-ft capacity</li> <li>Recommendation to score project as a dry weather project and to reclassify as dry</li> </ul>
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	<b>30</b>	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	3	<b>13</b>	Unable to score 0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>WRD letter - not clear project would recharge aquifer</li> <li>Pg 41 applicant should revise O&amp;M cost (incorrect Annual Maintenance \$20.00)</li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	12	<b>12</b>	Unable to score 0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Project will not recharge a drinking water aquifer</b></li> </ul>
<b>Community Investment</b>	10	<b>10</b>	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	10	<b>15</b>	4 12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Info provided on permeable parking lot</b></li> </ul>
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	N/A	<b>6</b>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	<b>4</b>	3 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Two outreach meetings</li> <li><b>Door to door outreach confirmed</b></li> </ul>
<b>TOTALS</b>	89	<b>110</b>	Unable to score 61	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Meets minimum points threshold</b></li> </ul>



# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2023-2024



<b>Watershed Area</b>	Lower Los Angeles River
<b>Project Name</b>	Long Beach Municipal Urban Stormwater Treatment (LB MUST) - Phase 2
<b>Project Lead</b>	City of Long Beach
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$10,387,527
<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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Meets Title 22 standards for water treatment</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>Dry weather; captures &gt;200 Acres</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>81.6 AF/year</li> </ul>
<b>Community Investment</b>	10	<b>10</b>	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Dry weather project, no flood benefit</li> </ul>
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	14	<b>15</b>	14	<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>	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Only 1 non-elected letter of support</li> </ul>
<b>TOTALS</b>	73	<b>110</b>	65	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Projects meets minimum points threshold</li> </ul>

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2023-2024



<b>Watershed Area</b>	Lower San Gabriel River
<b>Project Name</b>	Heartwell Park at Palo Verde Channel Stormwater Capture Project
<b>Project Lead</b>	City of Long Beach
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$3,313,865
<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	20	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Request to reclassify as dry weather project</li> <li>Project ask is for full design and only for construction of dry weather diversion; should only claim dry weather components</li> </ul>
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	20	30	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></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	5	12	Unable to score 5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Request to resubmit water supply calculations</li> <li>Justification provided for diversion to sewer within 24hrs vs 72hrs</li> </ul>
<b>Community Investment</b>	10	10	Scoring on hold 5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project will not qualify for flood benefit, reducing score</li> </ul>
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	10	15	Scoring on hold 10	<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	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No significant community engagement. Only 2 letters of support</li> </ul>
<b>TOTALS</b>	69	110	Unable to score 61	Meets minimum points threshold

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2023-2024



<b>Watershed Area</b>	Lower San Gabriel River
<b>Project Name</b>	Artesia Park Urban Runoff Capture Project
<b>Project Lead</b>	City of Artesia
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$1,568,876
<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	5	<b>12</b>	2	• Recharge not feasible due to groundwater aquifer depth
<b>Community Investment</b>	5	<b>10</b>	5	• Dry weather, no flood benefits
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	12	<b>15</b>	12	•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	N/A	<b>6</b>	0	•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	<b>4</b>	2	• 2 letters of support • Early design phase, funds planned for future outreach
<b>TOTALS</b>	66	<b>110</b>	61	• Meets minimum points threshold

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2023-2024



<b>Watershed Area</b>	Lower San Gabriel River
<b>Project Name</b>	La Habra Heights Stormwater Treatment and Reuse System The Park Hacienda Road
<b>Project Lead</b>	City of La Habra Heights
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$705,348
<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	•
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	25	<b>30</b>	25	•
<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>	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not clear how project will enhance recreational opportunities</li> <li>• Not clear on flood protection benefit</li> </ul>
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	10	<b>15</b>	10	•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	3	<b>6</b>	3	•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	<b>4</b>	2	• One way engagement; no participatory feedback
<b>TOTALS</b>	72	<b>110</b>	65	• Meets minimum points threshold

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2023-2024



<b>Watershed Area</b>	Lower San Gabriel River
<b>Project Name</b>	La Mirada Creek Park Project
<b>Project Lead</b>	City of La Mirada
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$6,616,197
<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	20	•
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	20	30	20	•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	6	13	0	• \$2000 per year for maintenance is low
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	5	12	0	• Cannot infiltrate due to depth to groundwater
<b>Community Investment</b>	10	10	5	• No improvements to flood management.
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	14	15	14	•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	0	6	0	•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	N/A	4	Unable to score 2	• Request clarification on community engagement during park master plan process and how it informed the project. during Master Plan process and how it informed this project • Meaningful community input during master plan process; not as recent engagement as desired
<b>TOTALS</b>	75	110	Unable to score 61	• Meets minimum points threshold

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2023-2024



<b>Watershed Area</b>	Lower San Gabriel River
<b>Project Name</b>	Progress Park Stormwater Capture Project
<b>Project Lead</b>	City of Paramount
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$2,161,744
<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	•
<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	5	<b>12</b>	0	• No water supply benefit due to depth to groundwater aquifer
<b>Community Investment</b>	10	<b>10</b>	10	• Joint use of park with adjacent school
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	10	<b>15</b>	10	•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	N/A	<b>6</b>	0	•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	<b>4</b>	3	• Demonstrated engagement that informed project • 3 letters of support
<b>TOTALS</b>	79	<b>110</b>	73	• Meets minimum points threshold

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2023-2024



<b>Watershed Area</b>	North Santa Monica Bay
<b>Project Name</b>	Cornell – Mulholland Highway Green Improvement Project
<b>Project Lead</b>	Los Angeles County Public Works
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$350,000
<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	11 <del>44</del> to verify	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4.89 ac impervious area very low</li> <li>Clarify capital cost, overestimated O&amp;M</li> <li>Impervious area confirmed</li> </ul>
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	25	30	25 30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Request for water quality modeling info</li> <li>Design Only: Changing pollutants primary – toxic, secondary to trash</li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	0	13	0	•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	0	12	0	•
<b>Community Investment</b>	5	10	5	•
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	10	15	10	•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	6	6	6 <del>Unable to Score</del>	• Secured funding not clear
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	4	1	• Few letters of support, but lacking participatory engagement
<b>TOTALS</b>	61	110	63 <del>Unable to Score</del>	Meets minimum points threshold

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2023-2024



<b>Watershed Area</b>	Rio Hondo
<b>Project Name</b>	Burke Heritage Park & Marengo Yard Stormwater Capture Project
<b>Project Lead</b>	City of Alhambra
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$4,424,118
<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	•
<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>	5	<b>10</b>	5	•
<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>	2	• Does not demonstrate robust two-way engagement
<b>TOTALS</b>	69	<b>110</b>	67	• Meets minimum points threshold



# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2023-2024



<b>Watershed Area</b>	Rio Hondo
<b>Project Name</b>	El Monte Norwood Elementary School Stormwater Capture Project
<b>Project Lead</b>	Edna Robidas (Trust for Public Land)
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$9,828,559
<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	Unable to score 11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Infiltration area does not match schematic provided – 0.7 ac, not 1.1 ac</li> <li>Updated infiltration area</li> </ul>
<b>Water Quality</b> 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"> <li>Infiltration area does not match schematic provided</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	2	12	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No letter from a groundwater management agency</li> </ul>
<b>Community Investment</b>	5	10	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></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	N/A	6	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	4	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Strong letters of support and metrics around outreach</li> </ul>
<b>TOTALS</b>	67	110	Unable to score 62	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Meets minimum points threshold</li> </ul>

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2023-2024



<b>Watershed Area</b>	Rio Hondo
<b>Project Name</b>	Kinneloa Yard Stormwater Capture Project Preliminary Design and Feasibility Study
<b>Project Lead</b>	City of Pasadena
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$2,292,762
<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	•
<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	• 6 benefits
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	10	<b>15</b>	10	•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	N/A	<b>6</b>	0	•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	<b>4</b>	0	• Application states no outreach done to date. One letter of support provided.
<b>TOTALS</b>	74	<b>110</b>	70	• Meets minimum points threshold

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2023-2024



<b>Watershed Area</b>	Rio Hondo
<b>Project Name</b>	Merced Avenue Stormwater Capture Project
<b>Project Lead</b>	City of El Monte
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$9,799,210
<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	• Project site may not infiltrate well
<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>	5	<b>10</b>	5	•
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	12	<b>15</b>	12	•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	3	<b>6</b>	3	• Caltrans provided matching funds
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	<b>4</b>	3	• 7 support letters
<b>TOTALS</b>	64	<b>110</b>	63	• Meets minimum points threshold

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2023-2024



<b>Watershed Area</b>	Santa Clara River
<b>Project Name</b>	Via Princessa Park and Regional BMP Project
<b>Project Lead</b>	Heather Merenda, City of Santa Clarita Environmental Services Division
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$20,079,768
<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	20	Unable to score 20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Volume of storage assumes open space. Volume should be a lot less (pipe), effecting total capacity. 9 ac-ft vs 17 ac-ft</li> </ul>
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	30	Unable to score 30	
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	13	13	Unable to score 6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.5 inches, not 118 (stormwater treat in 24 hours)</li> <li>Maintenance cost low, effecting cost-effectiveness</li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	12	12	Unable to score 12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2 cfs inflating water supply values (based on standing water)</li> </ul>
<b>Community Investment</b>	5	10	5	•
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	10	15	10	•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	3	6	3	•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	4	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No clear indication of commitment in letters of support. Unclear if engaged with mobile home residents. Good indication showing needs of community.</li> </ul>
<b>TOTALS</b>	97	110	Unable to score 88	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Meets minimum points threshold</li> </ul>

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2023-2024



<b>Watershed Area</b>	South Santa Monica Bay
<b>Project Name</b>	Wilmington-Anaheim Green Infrastructure Corridor Project
<b>Project Lead</b>	City of Los Angeles, Department of Public Works, LA Sanitation and Environment
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$10,274,500
<b>Project Type</b>	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	14	20	Unable to score 14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Request confirmation of sewer diversion rate with a sewer analysis</li> <li>Sewer analysis provided</li> </ul>
<b>Water Quality</b> 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"> <li></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	5	12	Unable to score 5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No sewer modeling capacity analysis documented</li> <li>Unclear how dry weather supply was calculated</li> <li>Dry weather calc provided</li> </ul>
<b>Community Investment</b>	5	10	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	11	15	11	<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	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Did not demonstrate strong community support</li> </ul>
<b>TOTALS</b>	69	110	Unable to score 68	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Meets minimum points threshold</li> </ul>

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2023-2024



<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>	\$5,366,953
<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	20	Unable to score 20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Request for summary table of the individual bmps explaining how aggregate bmp value was determined; clarifying info requested to explain dimensions</li> <li>Clarifying summary table provided</li> <li>Aggregate drainage area, dimensions, 85<sup>th</sup> %, and infiltration rate</li> </ul>
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	30	Unable to score 25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RAA was used instead of module and RAA is for watershed scale modeling; requesting to do a project specific modeling exercise</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	2	12	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No letter from a groundwater management agency</li> <li>Seawater barrier too deep to achieve benefit</li> <li>Sea water barriers are too deep to achieve benefit</li> </ul>
<b>Community Investment</b>	5	10	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	10	15	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planting 200 trees</li> </ul>
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	3	6	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	4	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Over 20 meetings, meaningful engagement</li> </ul>
<b>TOTALS</b>	74	110	Unable to score 67	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Meets minimum points threshold</li> </ul>

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2023-2024



<b>Watershed Area</b>	South Santa Monica Bay
<b>Project Name</b>	Glen Anderson Park Regional Stormwater Capture Green Streets
<b>Project Lead</b>	City of Redondo Beach
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$782,000
<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>Assumption of 1 cfs infiltration is high; impacts capacity – 21 ac-ft</li> <li>Request more thorough geotech analysis when returning for construction funds</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>	5	<b>10</b>	5	•
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	14	<b>15</b>	14	•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	N/A	<b>6</b>	0	•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	<b>4</b>	2	• Mostly one way engagement
<b>TOTALS</b>	73	<b>110</b>	71	• Meets minimum points threshold

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2023-2024



<b>Watershed Area</b>	South Santa Monica Bay
<b>Project Name</b>	Machado Lake Ecosystem Rehabilitation (MLER) Operations and Maintenance
<b>Project Lead</b>	City of Los Angeles, Department of Public Works, LA Sanitation and Environment
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$3,200,000
<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>Recommend classifying project as dry weather project</li> </ul>
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	25	<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	9	<b>12</b>	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pending confirmation of evaporation rate to WASC</li> <li>Not all stormwater will stay in lake during storm events, cannot claim full credit for all stormwater</li> <li>Not all stormwater will stay in lake during storm events and can't claim full credit</li> </ul>
<b>Community Investment</b>	10	<b>10</b>	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not a wet weather project, no flood benefit</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>	81	<b>110</b>	67	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Meets minimum points threshold</li> </ul>



# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2023-2024



<b>Watershed Area</b>	Upper Los Angeles River
<b>Project Name</b>	Arroyo Seco Projects
<b>Project Lead</b>	City of South Pasadena
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$33,995,086
<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	<del>44</del> to verify 11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Discrepancy pg 83 and application--Hydrology 437 vs 444</li> <li>Drawdown rate clarification</li> <li>Clarification on 16.36 ac-ft capacity</li> <li>Clarified discrepancies in hydrology</li> </ul>
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	30	<del>30</del> to verify 30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>More detail to verify numbers</li> <li>Reirrigation use vs infiltrated</li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	0	13	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pg 266 letter from watermaster</li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	5	12	<del>5</del> to verify 5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Community Investment</b>	10	10	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Flood prevention benefits not demonstrated</li> </ul>
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	10	15	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	N/A	6	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Potential future Caltrans cost share</li> </ul>
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	4	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Additional support at this point of project.</li> </ul>
<b>TOTALS</b>	70	110	<del>To Verify</del> 63	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Meets minimum points threshold</li> </ul>

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2023-2024



<b>Watershed Area</b>	Upper Los Angeles River
<b>Project Name</b>	Bowtie Demonstration Project (Updated)
<b>Project Lead</b>	The Nature Conservancy
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$7,164,575
<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	0	<b>12</b>	0	•
<b>Community Investment</b>	10	<b>10</b>	5	• No flood benefits
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	10	<b>15</b>	10	•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	3	<b>6</b>	3	• Continuing to pursue grant funding
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	<b>4</b>	4	• Strong demonstrations of engagement
<b>TOTALS</b>	67	<b>110</b>	62	•

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2023-2024



<b>Watershed Area</b>	Upper Los Angeles River
<b>Project Name</b>	Brookside Park Stormwater Capture Project
<b>Project Lead</b>	City of Pasadena
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$2,198,612
<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	•
<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	5	<b>12</b>	5	•
<b>Community Investment</b>	5	<b>10</b>	5	•
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	10	<b>15</b>	10	•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	N/A	<b>6</b>	0	•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	N/A	<b>4</b>	0	•
<b>TOTALS</b>	70	<b>110</b>	70	•

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2023-2024



<b>Watershed Area</b>	Upper Los Angeles River
<b>Project Name</b>	California Avenue and Adjacent Streets Stormwater Capture Project
<b>Project Lead</b>	City of Glendale
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$2,970,899
<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	20	20	•
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	25	30	25	•
<b>Water Supply</b>  Part 1	10	13	<del>Unable to score</del> 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pg29 160 ac assuming 0.15 cfs of constant dry-weather flow inflating WS number. Dry-weather assumption to be 0.1 in/day.</li> <li>• Will change cost-effectiveness</li> <li>• Applicant revised project's dry weather runoff using dry weather model, 0.09 cfs result</li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b>  Part 2	5	12	<del>Unable to score</del> 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• WS points lowered due to liberal assumption for days after storm event. Applicant used assumption of 24 hours rather and 72 hours for dry weather</li> </ul>
<b>Community Investment</b>	5	10	5	•
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	12	15	12	•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	3	6	3	•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	4	1	•
<b>TOTALS</b>	84	110	<del>Unable to score</del> 71	• Meets minimum points threshold

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2023-2024



<b>Watershed Area</b>	Upper Los Angeles River
<b>Project Name</b>	Eagle Rock Boulevard: A Multi-Modal Stormwater Capture Project
<b>Project Lead</b>	City of Los Angeles, Department of Public Works, StreetsLA
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$7,632,723
<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	0	<b>12</b>	0	•
<b>Community Investment</b>	5	<b>10</b>	5	•
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	10	<b>15</b>	10	•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	6	<b>6</b>	6	• \$16M of matching funds
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	<b>4</b>	4	• Multiple community partners
<b>TOTALS</b>	65	<b>110</b>	65	•

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2023-2024



<b>Watershed Area</b>	Upper Los Angeles River
<b>Project Name</b>	Earvin "Magic" Johnson Park Operation and Maintenance Project
<b>Project Lead</b>	Los Angeles County Public Works
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$1,625,000
<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	Unable to score 20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>O&amp;M funding request. Close look at O&amp;M report (pg 85) for how project is performing (pollutant reduction numbers, how much flow captured)</li> <li>Discrepancy 22 ac-ft and 7 ac-ft capacity</li> </ul>
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	30	Unable to score 20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reclassify as dry weather</li> <li>Use user input value</li> <li><b>Project reclassified as dry weather</b></li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	0	13	0	•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	5	12	Unable to score 2	•
<b>Community Investment</b>	5	10	5	•
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	10	15	10	•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	6	6	6	•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	4	4	•
<b>TOTALS</b>	71	110	Unable to score 67	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If Dry Weather: 40 points for WQ &amp; 2 points for WS Part 2</li> <li><b>Meets minimum points threshold</b></li> </ul>

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2023-2024



<b>Watershed Area</b>	Upper Los Angeles River
<b>Project Name</b>	Emerald Necklace John Muir High School Campus Natural Infrastructure Improvement Project
<b>Project Lead</b>	Claire Robinson, Amigos de los Rios
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$1,891,500
<b>Project Type</b>	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	14	20	14	• $1.4 \text{ AF}/\$1.7 = 0.82$
<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>	5	10	5	• 4 benefits
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	10	15	10	•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	3	6	3	•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	4	4	•
<b>TOTALS</b>	66	110	66	• Project meets minimum points threshold

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2023-2024



<b>Watershed Area</b>	Upper Los Angeles River
<b>Project Name</b>	Green Street Demonstration Project on Main Street
<b>Project Lead</b>	City of Alhambra
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$3,773,000
<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>5.1 AF</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>Primary Pollutant: 96% reduction of Zinc</li> <li>Secondary Pollutant: trash</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>	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>Strong community engagement</li> </ul>
<b>TOTALS</b>	72	<b>110</b>	72	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project meets minimum points threshold</li> </ul>



# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2023-2024



<b>Watershed Area</b>	Upper Los Angeles River
<b>Project Name</b>	Hollenbeck Park Lake Rehabilitation Project
<b>Project Lead</b>	City of Los Angeles, Department of Public Works, LA Sanitation and Environment
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$25,161,316
<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	Unable to Score 20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Drainage area does not appear complete – pockets of missing drainage area</li> <li>• Applicant updated drainage area and provided geotech values</li> <li>• Project reclassified as dry weather</li> </ul>
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	30	Unable to Score 20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	0	13	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No letter from groundwater master</li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	12	12	Unable to Score 0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No project specific geotechnical information (infiltration rate)</li> <li>• Infiltration value cannot be confirmed</li> </ul>
<b>Community Investment</b>	10	10	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Near schools, but not greening of a school</li> </ul>
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	12	15	12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Addition of 50 trees</li> <li>• Constructed wetlands</li> </ul>
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	3	6	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	4	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>
<b>TOTALS</b>	85	110	Unable to score 63	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Meets minimum points threshold</li> </ul>

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2023-2024



<b>Watershed Area</b>	Upper Los Angeles River
<b>Project Name</b>	McCambridge Park Stormwater Capture Multi-Benefit Project
<b>Project Lead</b>	City of Burbank Public Works Department
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$2,930,000
<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	7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>18.3 ac-ft capacity</li> </ul>
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	30	30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></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	5	12	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>146 AF/year</li> </ul>
<b>Community Investment</b>	5	10	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	10	15	10	
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	3	6	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	4	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Design only</li> <li>TRP project - had opportunity for more community engagement</li> </ul>
<b>TOTALS</b>	64	110	62	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project meets minimum points threshold</li> </ul>

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2023-2024



<b>Watershed Area</b>	Upper Los Angeles River
<b>Project Name</b>	Mission Mile Sepulveda: A Climate Resilient Urban Greenway to Cultural Connections Project
<b>Project Lead</b>	City of Los Angeles, Department of Public Works, StreetsLA
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$22,914,301
<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	7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>18.7 AF capacity/\$46M = 0.41</li> </ul>
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	30	30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Primary Pollutant: Zinc &gt;80% reduction</li> <li>Secondary Pollutant: Cu &gt; 80% reduction</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	5	12	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>124 ac-ft / year</li> </ul>
<b>Community Investment</b>	5	10	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	11	15	11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	6	6	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	4	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>TOTALS</b>	68	110	68	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project meets minimum points threshold</li> </ul>

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2023-2024



<b>Watershed Area</b>	Upper Los Angeles River
<b>Project Name</b>	South Pasadena Huntington Drive Regional Green Street Project
<b>Project Lead</b>	City of South Pasadena
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$2,986,000
<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>	Unable to score	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clarification needed for the project drainage area</li> <li>Pg 173; pg 566 discrepancy</li> <li><b>Project not feasible with info provided</b></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>Unclear how dry well infiltration rates determined</li> <li>Pg 174; how was 0.6 cfs calculated</li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	3	<b>13</b>	Unable to score	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>\$2,100/AF</li> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	9	<b>12</b>	Unable to score	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>261 AF/year</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>	10	<b>15</b>	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	6	<b>6</b>	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>\$1M committed</li> </ul>
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	<b>4</b>	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Former TRP – opportunity for more community engagement</li> </ul>
<b>TOTALS</b>	87	<b>110</b>	Unable to score	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Unable to confirm project score</b></li> <li><b>Project does not advance</b></li> </ul>

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2023-2024



<b>Watershed Area</b>	Upper Los Angeles River
<b>Project Name</b>	Sylmar Channel Project
<b>Project Lead</b>	City of Los Angeles, Department of Public Works, LA Sanitation and Environment
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$5,005,515
<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	20	Unable to score 20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>0.5 cfs infiltration rate without any onsite geotechnical tests</li> <li>Applicant provided local infiltration data but not site specific data</li> </ul>
<b>Water Quality</b> 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"> <li>Onsite geotechnical report requested for dry wells and channel</li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	6	13	Unable to Score 0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Life cycle cost discrepancy pg 49</li> <li>Should use module life cycle cost</li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	9	12	Unable to Score 5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>High assumption of dry weather days</li> </ul>
<b>Community Investment</b>	5	10	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>45 trees, pedestrian paths</li> </ul>
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	10	15	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	6	6	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>One virtual workshop</li> <li>Letter of support from CBO</li> </ul>
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	4	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>TOTALS</b>	90	110	Unable to score 79	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Meets minimum points threshold</li> </ul>



