

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2020-2021



<b>SCW.ID</b>	39
<b>Project Name</b>	Active Transportation Rail to River Corridor Project - Segment A
<b>Project Lead</b>	Los Angeles Metropolitan Transit Authority (Metro)
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$8,425,000
<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	20	0 20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerns: 8 AF Capacity used for modeling does not match 2 AF (p.55) noted within design plans.</li> <li>An update to this score would bring this score down from 20 to 0.</li> <li>SC noted for total construction costs, applicant is using grant funding to reduce cost. Applicant noted that full project is much larger than the LID portion of the project, and soil remediation costs are not associated with the LID enhancement. SC accepts this justification.</li> </ul>
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	30	Insufficient Evidence 30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Applicant used their own water quality modeling, noting that 100% of all pollutants were removed.</li> <li>Applicants should resubmit a detailed WQ analysis to confirm the pollutant removal.</li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	0	13	0	
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	0	12	0	
<b>Community Investment</b>	10	10	5	<p>Claimed community benefits are not clear or realized:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>School Benefit (located adjacent vs within a school)</li> <li>Adjacent to river corridor</li> <li>Flood benefit</li> <li>Benefits for trees, exactly how many trees, how to confirm carbon sequestration, etc.</li> <li>SC noted that the project is only adjacent to school. Applicant noted that the project provides access to school.</li> <li>River access as part of phase 2 should not be counted for this phase of the project.</li> </ul>
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	10	15	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Addition of trails has increased impervious cover. No change to score</li> </ul>
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	6	6	6	
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	4	4	
<b>TOTALS</b>	80	110	Does not Meet Threshold 75	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Condition: Need to report back on two categories with insufficient evidence.</li> </ul>

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2020-2021



<b>SCW.ID</b>	40
<b>Project Name</b>	City of San Fernando Regional Park Infiltration Project
<b>Project Lead</b>	City of San Fernando (Kenneth Jones)
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$8,900,000
<b>Project Type</b>	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	<b>20</b>	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	3	<b>13</b>	3	
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	9	<b>12</b>	9	
<b>Community Investment</b>	5	<b>10</b>	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide types of trees</li> <li>• (30 trees)</li> <li>• Unclear if new baseball field or replacing of an old field. Needs more clarity</li> </ul>
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	5	<b>15</b>	5	
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	3	<b>6</b>	3	
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	<b>4</b>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No Letters of support within the application</li> </ul>
<b>TOTALS</b>	79	<b>110</b>	75	

# Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2020-2021



<b>SCW.ID</b>	41
<b>Project Name</b>	Echo Park Lake Rehabilitation
<b>Project Lead</b>	City of Los Angeles, Bureau of Sanitation
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$400,000
<b>Project Type</b>	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	<b>20</b>	20	
<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>Recommendation to provide existing monitoring data. Provide to the WASC</li> </ul>
<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>	4	
<b>TOTALS</b>	69	<b>110</b>	69	

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2020-2021



<b>SCW.ID</b>	42
<b>Project Name</b>	Fernangeles Park Stormwater Capture Project
<b>Project Lead</b>	Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (LADWP)
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$8,360,748
<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>Engineering analysis is just one page factsheet currently. Would be beneficial to see additional details for this project.</li> <li>SC would recommend a more solidified design to better confirm cost estimates to the WASC.</li> </ul>
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	<b>30</b>	30	
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	6	<b>13</b>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Water supply cost effectiveness is based on the stormwater enhancement vs total project cost.</li> <li>SC recommends that for consistency the project total cost should be used for this metric vs just the cost of the stormwater enhancement.</li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	5	<b>12</b>	5	
<b>Community Investment</b>	10	<b>10</b>	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Improving access to waterways, may need more clarification/justification. Intent is for physical access and public use of waterways.</li> </ul>
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	15	<b>15</b>	15	
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	6	<b>6</b>	6	
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	<b>4</b>	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SC noted a very good collection of community support letters.</li> </ul>
<b>TOTALS</b>	96	<b>110</b>	85	

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2020-2021



<b>SCW.ID</b>	43
<b>Project Name</b>	Franklin D. Roosevelt Park Regional Stormwater Capture Project
<b>Project Lead</b>	Los Angeles County
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$4,000,000
<b>Project Type</b>	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	14	<b>20</b>	14	
<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	2	<b>12</b>	2	
<b>Community Investment</b>	5	<b>10</b>	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Replacement of natural turf for artificial turf is not desirable.</li> </ul>
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	10	<b>15</b>	10	
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	6	<b>6</b>	6	
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	0	<b>4</b>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Community supported natural turf, unclear why natural turf could not be achieved.</li> </ul>
<b>TOTALS</b>	67	<b>110</b>	67	

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2020-2021



<b>SCW.ID</b>	44
<b>Project Name</b>	Lankershim Boulevard Local Area Urban Flow Management Network Project
<b>Project Lead</b>	City of Los Angeles, Bureau of Sanitation
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$25,696,900
<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	44 20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Capacity of 110 AF for a tributary area of 200 acres seems very high.</li> <li>Applicant should provide clarity for the exact capacity of the Project. From documents 14-15 AF seems to be the actual capacity.</li> <li>P.321 of submittal has additional clarity on design.</li> <li>Applicant should confirm BMP capacity.</li> </ul>
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	30	To-Be Determined 30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Using the 110 AF capacity would max out automatically the pollutant removal.</li> <li>Adjusting for reduced capacity, score needs to be confirmed.</li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	0	13	0	
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	5	12	To-Be Determined 5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Depends on what applicant provides for capacity.</li> </ul>
<b>Community Investment</b>	5	10	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Applicant does not include benefits for the habitat they are providing. However, does not increase score.</li> </ul>
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	10	15	10	
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	0	6	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Scoring Committee recommends applicant leverage some of their own municipal funds to boost their score.</li> </ul>
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	4	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Applicant lays out a plan to demonstrate local support, but does not include existing support for</li> <li>Community support is only forward looking. Only a city council member letter is included. SC recommends applicant include actual local community support.</li> </ul>
<b>TOTALS</b>	74	110	Did not meet Threshold. 70	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence submitted was not sufficient to validate score.</li> </ul>

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2020-2021



<b>SCW.ID</b>	45
<b>Project Name</b>	Oro Vista Local Area Urban Flow Management Project
<b>Project Lead</b>	City of Los Angeles, Bureau of Sanitation
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$10,590,600
<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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would be helpful to know the types of trees.</li> </ul>
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	13	<b>15</b>	13	
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	0	<b>6</b>	0	
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	<b>4</b>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No community letters of support provided.</li> </ul>
<b>TOTALS</b>	72	<b>110</b>	68	

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2020-2021



<b>SCW.ID</b>	46
<b>Project Name</b>	Rory M. Shaw Wetlands Park Project
<b>Project Lead</b>	Los Angeles Flood Control District
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$10,000,000
<b>Project Type</b>	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	<b>20</b>	20	
<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>Flood Control Project, much greater than 85<sup>th</sup> percentile</li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	13	<b>13</b>	13	
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	12	<b>12</b>	12	
<b>Community Investment</b>	10	<b>10</b>	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Wetlands are not considered access to existing waterway.</li> <li>Would be beneficial to see native plantings</li> </ul>
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	10	<b>15</b>	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project is increasing impervious surface. Unclear how impervious area being modified.</li> <li>Provide clarification on how the impervious acreage increased from 5ac to 21ac.</li> </ul>
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	6	<b>6</b>	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unclear is agreement for Prop O approved? For WASC, ensure that the agreement is approved.</li> </ul>
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	<b>4</b>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No letter provided. Upload the backup document to prove this.</li> </ul>
<b>TOTALS</b>	105	<b>110</b>	96	



# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2020-2021



<b>SCW.ID</b>	47
<b>Project Name</b>	Strathern Park North Stormwater Capture Project
<b>Project Lead</b>	Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (LADWP)
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$9,278,606
<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	10	<b>13</b>	0 To Be Determined	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Using an alternate methodology for calculating supply. Update with standardized calculation methodology (including full cost of project in cost analysis)</li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	9	<b>12</b>	9	
<b>Community Investment</b>	10	<b>10</b>	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Access to waterway should not be claimed. No access noted</li> <li>Would be beneficial to see native plantings</li> </ul>
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	15	<b>15</b>	15	
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	6	<b>6</b>	6	
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	<b>4</b>	4	
<b>TOTALS</b>	104	<b>110</b>	89 Above Threshold	

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2020-2021



<b>SCW.ID</b>	48
<b>Project Name</b>	The Distributed Drywell System Project
<b>Project Lead</b>	City of Glendale
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$1,859,000
<b>Project Type</b>	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	20	<del>To-Be Determined</del>  20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Challenging to confirm engineering analysis with inputs to the model.</li> <li>Applicant using peak flow multiplied by 24-hours, capacity seems too high (1AF per dry well)</li> <li>Hydrology p19 (claiming 1.97 AF for 85<sup>th</sup> volume, but building a drywall system that has a 16AF capacity; only need 2AF) Calculation may be off.</li> <li>Provide clarification on the drywell capacity.</li> <li>Applicant has updated capacity</li> </ul>
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	20	30	<del>To-Be Determined</del>  30	
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	13	13	<del>To-be determined</del>  10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>p.19 of pdf, project claims 5cfs of dry weather flow per day, seems high. Should be 0cfs for 57 acres for dry weather flow.</li> <li>Project does recharge an aquifer</li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	12	12	<del>To-be determined</del>  2	
<b>Community Investment</b>	5	10	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Would be beneficial to know the types of trees</li> </ul>
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	10	15	10	
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	0	6	0	
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	0	4	0	
<b>TOTALS</b>	80	110	<del>To-Be Determined</del>  77	

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2020-2021



<b>SCW.ID</b>	49
<b>Project Name</b>	Valley Village Park Stormwater Capture Project
<b>Project Lead</b>	Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (LADWP)
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$3,177,344
<b>Project Type</b>	Dry

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	<b>20</b>	20	
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	20	<b>30</b>	20	
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	13	<b>13</b>	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Recalculate supply score based on standard methodology (use full cost of project not just stormwater enhancement portion)</li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	5	<b>12</b>	5	
<b>Community Investment</b>	10	<b>10</b>	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is no access to waterway</li> <li>Would be helpful to know how much new park space vs replaced</li> </ul>
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	15	<b>15</b>	15	
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	6	<b>6</b>	6	
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	<b>4</b>	4	
<b>TOTALS</b>	93	<b>110</b>	78	

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2020-2021



<b>SCW.ID</b>	50
<b>Project Name</b>	Walnut Park Pocket Park Project
<b>Project Lead</b>	County of Los Angeles
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$1,000,000
<b>Project Type</b>	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	11	<b>20</b>	11	
<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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Please provide native plantings plan</li> </ul>
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	10	<b>15</b>	10	
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	6	<b>6</b>	6	
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	0	<b>4</b>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Would be good to see partner community groups on this project. Does not impact score.</li> </ul>
<b>TOTALS</b>	62	<b>110</b>	62	