

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



Watershed Area	Lower Los Angeles River
Project Name	Compton Blvd Et. Al. Project
Project Lead	Los Angeles County
Total Funding Requested	\$600,000
Project Type	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	14	20	14	•
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	2	12	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unclear if 40 wells or 66. • Applicant confirmed 66 is accurate.
Community Investment	5	10	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Was a challenge identifying where the bioswales, biofiltration, and trees are located. No backup provided to confirm this. • Unclear if bike access is existing or new. Does not impact score. • Applicant to provide schematic and map to the WASC and Scoring Committee for where plantings and bioswales and biofiltration are located. • Applicant confirmed bikeway is new.
Nature-Based Solutions	10	15	10	•
Leveraging Funds Part 1	6	6	6	•
Leveraging Funds Part 2	0	4	0	•
TOTALS	67	110	67	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Points conditionally awarded, SC requests additional evidence to verify score.

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



Watershed Area	Lower Los Angeles River
Project Name	Furman Park Stormwater Capture and Infiltration Project
Project Lead	City of Downey
Total Funding Requested	\$12,325,670
Project Type	Dry

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

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



Watershed Area	Lower Los Angeles River
Project Name	Huntington Park High School Storm Water Management System
Project Lead	Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD/District)
Total Funding Requested	\$1,401,707
Project Type	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	20	14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Irrigation included in capacity, SC reducing. 1 AF as capacity / \$1.2M = 0.83 = 14 points
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	30	30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Overdesigned, captures more than the 85th percentile.
Water Supply Part 1	0	13	0	•
Water Supply Part 2	0	12	0	•
Community Investment	10	10	10	•
Nature-Based Solutions	10	15	10	•
Leveraging Funds Part 1	0	6	0	•
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	4	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Applicant provides a pdf noting community meeting schedule but does not include letters of support. With applicant being a school, should provide a letter of support from PTA, community groups, or others.
TOTALS	74	110	64	•

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



Watershed Area	Lower Los Angeles River
Project Name	Lynwood City Park Stormwater Capture Project
Project Lead	City of Lynwood
Total Funding Requested	\$1,691,629
Project Type	Dry

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	20	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Applicant classified as a dry weather project, but it should be able to capture the 85th. Project is clearly not a dry weather project. As project is design only, leaving now for dry weather.
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	5	12	5	•
Community Investment	10	10	5	• Application claimed flood control benefit. Unless reclassification to wet weather, this will remove flood benefit.
Nature-Based Solutions	12	15	12	•
Leveraging Funds Part 1	0	6	0	•
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	4	4	•
TOTALS	71	110	66	• Project is more than likely a wet weather project. Clarification should be provided to the WASC.

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



Watershed Area	Lower Los Angeles River
Project Name	Rancho Los Cerritos: Looking Back to Advance Forward
Project Lead	Rancho Los Cerritos
Total Funding Requested	\$1,715,000
Project Type	Dry

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	20	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Applicant classified as a dry weather, but should be classified as a wet weather. Score would not change as Part 1 would drop to zero.
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	10	30	30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Drywell alone can capture more than the 85th, which would provide full points in part 2.
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"> Dry weather classification would not be able to claim flood control benefit. Would be able to claim if reclassification to wet weather. School benefit has to be located adjacent to the school.
Nature-Based Solutions	13	15	13	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide additional detail to the WASC on the nature-based benefits provided.
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	60	110	60	<ul style="list-style-type: none">

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



Watershed Area	Lower Los Angeles River
Project Name	Salt Lake Park Infiltration Cistern
Project Lead	City of Huntington Park
Total Funding Requested	\$29,000,000
Project Type	Wet

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

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



Watershed Area	Lower Los Angeles River
Project Name	Spane Park
Project Lead	City of Paramount
Total Funding Requested	\$891,984
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"> Depth and capacity of gallery seems inconsistent throughout application.
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	30	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Applicant used their own modeling, but justification shows inconsistent reduced pollutant capture. 90% range vs 60% range.
Water Supply Part 1	10	13	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As design only, current assumptions are permitted
Water Supply Part 2	12	12	12	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Community Investment	10	10	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project is not providing a direct benefit to schools, it is adjacent to the school. Would be beneficial to see more detail about the stream, butterfly garden, and other benefits claimed. Provide details to the WASC.
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	92	110	77	<ul style="list-style-type: none">

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



Watershed Area	Lower Los Angeles River
Project Name	Urban Orchard Project
Project Lead	City of South Gate
Total Funding Requested	\$5,438,000
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	2	12	2	•
Community Investment	10	10	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dry weather projects are unable to claim flood benefit. • Project is located adjacent to school vs providing direct benefit to school.
Nature-Based Solutions	13	15	13	•
Leveraging Funds Part 1	6	6	6	•
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	4	4	•
TOTALS	75	110	70	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SC recognizes that this project is exemplary and stands out as a very good safe clean water project.