

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



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

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	20	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SCW Projects module is not suited to design dry wells. Applicant using their own methodology.
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	25	30	25	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Water Supply Part 1	3	13	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No letter from water master to confirm usable aquifer water benefit (Unclear if Letter Required at early design phase) Raymond basin does augment GW
Water Supply Part 2	5	12	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Community Investment	5	10	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would be beneficial to see more of the details for CI benefits in a later phase of design.
Nature-Based Solutions	12	15	12	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Leveraging Funds Part 1	6	6	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Leveraging Funds Part 2	0	4	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
TOTALS	76	110	76	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would be beneficial to see the letter confirmation from Raymond Basin Watermaster

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



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

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	20	Unable to Score 20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Water is captured from the storm drain system but only under large flood event. Project is not designed to capture first flush of the storm drain. Application currently assumes capture of the full tributary area, but flow is bypassing the site. Applicant noted that storm drain will fill to capacity by the time upstream flows reach the project site, and most will end up as surface flow. Additional information needed to confirm water quality benefits. Applicant noted a revised drainage area more accurate for the project.
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	30	Unable to Score 30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project is now 7x greater than the 85th. SC to review oversized points for WQ in future. Does not impact score.
Water Supply Part 1	0	13	0	•
Water Supply Part 2	0	12	0	•
Community Investment	5	10	5	•
Nature-Based Solutions	11	15	11	•
Leveraging Funds Part 1	0	6	0	•
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	4	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Significant number of letters of support. Exemplary community outreach and engagement.
TOTALS	70	110	Unable to Score 70	•

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



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

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	20	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SCW Projects Module is not well suited to modeling wetland projects. • Applicant has combined both projects together into the module with a high infiltration, assumes rate 6cfs treatment and 5.18 in/hr draw down rate (proxy for evapotranspiration) • Project should be reclassified a dry weather project. • Applicant noted treatment is through a filter unit, so rates are high as a result • San Rafael site treats 85th, but 2nd site does not.
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	20	30	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
Water Supply Part 1	0	13	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
Water Supply Part 2	5	12	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No letter from groundwater master to confirm supply benefit.
Community Investment	10	10	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
Nature-Based Solutions	12	15	12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
Leveraging Funds Part 1	3	6	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	4	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very good diversity for letters of support.
TOTALS	74	110	74	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For WASC consideration, provide letter from groundwater master to confirm supply benefit

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



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

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	11	20	11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No justification for 1.15 in/hr draw down rate. Storage alone however could capture 85th percentile volume.
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	30	30	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Water Supply Part 1	0	13	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Water Supply Part 2	5	12	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Applicant used their own 100AFY vs 43AFY from the module. Needs better justification than existing spreadsheet. Recommend using the website generated number. Applicant noted that supply includes irrigation as well, which the website is unable to model. The site has a smart system in place to tackle potable vs storm supply. Applicant notes that (25 acres 6 are new) additional acres of landscaping are being constructed to pull from this system. Committee notes that offsetting potable supply for stormwater provides SCW supply benefit.
Community Investment	10	10	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Application noted greening of schools, but is located in a median adjacent to a school. Would be beneficial to get confirmation from the School that they are aware of the project and is involved with the design. Applicant has a letter from the principal of the school. Plant pallet was chosen by the community, strong community engagement.
Nature-Based Solutions	10	15	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Leveraging Funds Part 1	3	6	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	4	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Very good example of a community project.
TOTALS	73	110	73	<ul style="list-style-type: none">

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



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

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	20	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project captures slightly more than the 85th percentile storm
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	30	30	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Water Supply Part 1	0	13	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Water Supply Part 2	12	12	12	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Community Investment	10	10	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would be beneficial to see a letter of support from the school that benefit is provided for greening of schools.
Nature-Based Solutions	15	15	15	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Leveraging Funds Part 1	6	6	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	4	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
TOTALS	97	110	97	<ul style="list-style-type: none">

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



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

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	20	Unable to Score 20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SCW Website not well suited for dry well projects. Project is overdesigned, ~5x larger than the 85th percentile storm. Appears to be an error No Geotech provided to justify the infiltration rate. It is likely designed for the 85th percentile storm. $8.5/16 = \sim 0.5$ Applicant notes that the high capacity takes into consideration the infiltration rate. Storage volume in application leads to ~1ac-ft per drywell, which seems overdesigned Application to provide additional clarity Project Module Developer noted capacity is currently accurate but will be updated for future years. Does not impact score.
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	30	Unable to Score 30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is a discrepancy of the drainage area in the application and the report.
Water Supply Part 1	0	13	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Water Supply Part 2	2	12	Unable to Score 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Applicant provided additional justification for the supply benefit.
Community Investment	10	10	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would be beneficial to see a letter of support from the school that benefit is provided for greening of schools. May have been able to claim access
Nature-Based Solutions	10	15	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Leveraging Funds Part 1	0	6	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Leveraging Funds Part 2	0	4	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
TOTALS	72	110	Unable to Score 72	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Applicant to provide additional clarity

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



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

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	20	11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discrepancy in drainage area in application and the appendicies Application uses a 1 in/hr draw down rate for irrigation. Recommend using 0 in/hr. 7.5/9.8 = 11 pts Insufficient information, recommend providing additional clarity
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	30	30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project does capture the 85th
Water Supply Part 1	0	13	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Water Supply Part 2	5	12	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Insufficient information, recommend providing additional clarity re-running model
Community Investment	10	10	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enhancement of schools not really provided by converting field irrigation to stormwater. Would be covered under supply. Would be beneficial to see additional justification for heat island, plant palette, and others.
Nature-Based Solutions	10	15	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Leveraging Funds Part 1	3	6	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	4	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
TOTALS	82	110	63	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Additional information to be provided to WASC

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



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

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	20	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Applicant uses ~2.5x the 85th percentile volume, looks to be using peak flow, vs the shape of the hydrograph to estimate what drywells can take in. Does not impact score Applicant to provide additional clarity.
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	20	30	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Water Supply Part 1	3	13	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Water Supply Part 2	12	12	12	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Community Investment	5	10	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Applicant claims improving access to waterway but did not provide adequate justification. Unclear how much planting is present in the project. Would be beneficial to see planting palette.
Nature-Based Solutions	10	15	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide the WASC additional details on the nature based elements of this project.
Leveraging Funds Part 1	3	6	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	4	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
TOTALS	77	110	74	<ul style="list-style-type: none">

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



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

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	20	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Overdesigned for 50-year flood event. ~3x greater the 85th percentile storm.
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	30	30	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Water Supply Part 1	0	13	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Water Supply Part 2	0	12	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Community Investment	10	10	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Nature-Based Solutions	10	15	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Leveraging Funds Part 1	0	6	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	4	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Letter provided by the North Hollywood Community Gardens is part of the same school. Would be beneficial to see additional letters of support
TOTALS	74	110	74	<ul style="list-style-type: none">

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



Watershed Area	Upper Los Angeles River
Project Name	North Hollywood Park Stormwater Capture Project
Project Lead	Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (LADWP)
Total Funding Requested	\$92,394,000
Project Type	Dry

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	20	20	•
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	20	30	20	•
Water Supply Part 1	0	13	0	•
Water Supply Part 2	12	12	12	•
Community Investment	10	10	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bruce noted they provided sufficient justification for CI benefits • Dry weather would not likely receive flood benefit (does not change score)
Nature-Based Solutions	15	15	15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unclear if all impervious surface is being replaced with pervious pavement (confirmed by applicant, replaced with pervious pavement)
Leveraging Funds Part 1	6	6	6	•
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	4	4	•
TOTALS	87	110	87	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applicant attached a monitoring plan for a separate project (Should be retrieved by SCW Team)

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



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

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	20	7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inconsistent drainage area from the application and the appendices. 2.5 in/hr is the highest range vs an average of the two borings done. Would be beneficial to use the average infiltration rate between borings. $1.9AF/\\$3.3M = 0.57 = 7pts$
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	30	30	•
Water Supply Part 1	0	13	0	•
Water Supply Part 2	0	12	0	•
Community Investment	10	10	10	• Would have been beneficial to see the plantings given the project is already constructed.
Nature-Based Solutions	10	15	10	•
Leveraging Funds Part 1	3	6	3	•
Leveraging Funds Part 2	0	4	0	•
TOTALS	73	110	60	•

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



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

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	20	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project is overdesigned for flooding, 5x greater than the 85th percentile storm.
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	30	30	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Water Supply Part 1	0	13	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Water Supply Part 2	0	12	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Community Investment	10	10	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> More detail and justification would have been beneficial. Unclear what recreational benefits are being provided as part of the project. Does not impact score. Unclear what "natural turf" meant within the application Applicant noted plantings plan is available. To be provided to WASC
Nature-Based Solutions	11	15	11	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Leveraging Funds Part 1	0	6	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	4	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
TOTALS	75	110	75	<ul style="list-style-type: none">

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



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

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	20	20	•
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	30	30	•
Water Supply Part 1	0	13	0	•
Water Supply Part 2	12	12	12	•
Community Investment	10	10	10	• Very good justification for each CI benefit claimed.
Nature-Based Solutions	15	15	15	•
Leveraging Funds Part 1	6	6	6	•
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	4	4	• Great sample of letters of support from community groups
TOTALS	97	110	97	•

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



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

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

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



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

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	20	20	•
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	25	30	25	•
Water Supply Part 1	0	13	0	•
Water Supply Part 2	5	12	5	•
Community Investment	5	10	5	•
Nature-Based Solutions	14	15	14	•
Leveraging Funds Part 1	6	6	6	•
Leveraging Funds Part 2	0	4	0	• Post-design, would be good to see community letters of support.
TOTALS	75	110	75	•

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



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

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