

Watershed Area	Upper Los Angeles River
Project Name	Arroyo Seco Projects
Project Lead	City of South Pasadena
Total Funding Requested	\$33,995,086
Project Type	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	11	20	11 to verify 11	 Discrepancy pg 83 and applicationHydrology 437 vs 444 Drawdown rate clarification Clarification on 16.36 ac-ft capacity Clarified discrepancies in hydrology
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	30	30 to verify 30	More detail to verify numbersReirrigation use vs infiltrated
Water Supply Part 1	0	13	0	Pg 266 letter from watermaster
Water Supply Part 2	5	12	5 to verify 5	•
Community Investment	10	10	5	 Flood prevention benefits not demonstrated
Nature-Based Solutions	10	15	10	•
Leveraging Funds Part 1	N/A	6	0	Potential future Caltrans cost share
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	4	2	 Additional support at this point of project.
TOTALS	70	110	To Verify <mark>63</mark>	Meets minimum points threshold



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



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



-	
Watershed Area	Upper Los Angeles River
Project Name	California Avenue and Adjacent Streets Stormwater Capture Project
Project Lead	City of Glendale
Total Funding Requested	\$2,970,899
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	10	13	Unable to score 3	 Pg29 160 ac assuming 0.15 cfs of constant dry-weather flow inflating WS number. Dry-weather assumption to be 0.1 in/day. Will change cost-effectiveness Applicant revised project's dry weather runoff using dry weather model, 0.09 cfs result
Water Supply Part 2	5	12	Unable to score 2	 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
Community Investment	5	10	5	•
Nature-Based Solutions	12	15	12	•
Leveraging Funds Part 1	3	6	3	•
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	4	1	•
TOTALS	84	110	Unable to score 71	Meets minimum points threshold



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



Watershed Area	Upper Los Angeles River
Project Name	Earvin "Magic" Johnson Park Operation and Maintenance Project
Project Lead	Los Angeles County Public Works
Total Funding Requested	\$1,625,000
Project Type	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	11	20	Unable to score 20	 O&M funding request. Close look at O&M report (pg 85) for how project is performing (pollutant reduction numbers, how much flow captured) Discrepancy 22 ac-ft and 7 ac-ft capacity
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	30	Unable to score 20	 Reclassify as dry weather Use user input value Project reclassified as dry weather
Water Supply Part 1	0	13	0	•
Water Supply Part 2	5	12	Unable to score 2	•
Community Investment	5	10	5	•
Nature-Based Solutions	10	15	10	•
Leveraging Funds Part 1	6	6	6	•
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	4	4	•
TOTALS	71	110	Unable to score 67	 If Dry Weather: 40 points for WQ & 2 points for WS Part 2 Meets minimum points threshold



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

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



Watershed Area	Upper Los Angeles River
Project Name	Green Street Demonstration Project on Main Street
Project Lead	City of Alhambra
Total Funding Requested	\$3,773,000
Project Type	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	20	20	• 5.1 AF
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	30	30	 Primary Pollutant: 96% reduction of Zinc Secondary Pollutant: trash
Water Supply Part 1	0	13	0	•
Water Supply Part 2	0	12	0	•
Community Investment	5	10	5	•
Nature-Based Solutions	10	15	10	•
Leveraging Funds Part 1	3	6	3	•
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	4	4	Strong community engagement
TOTALS	72	110	72	Project meets minimum points threshol



Watershed Area	Upper Los Angeles River
Project Name	Hollenbeck Park Lake Rehabilitation Project
Project Lead	City of Los Angeles, Department of Public Works, LA Sanitation and Environment
Total Funding Requested	\$25,161,316
Project Type	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	14	20	Unable to Score 20	 Drainage area does not appear complete – pockets of missing drainage area Applicant updated drainage area and provided geotech values Project reclassified as dry weather
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	30	Unable to Score 20	•
Water Supply Part 1	0	13	0	No letter from groundwater master
Water Supply Part 2	12	12	Unable to Score 0	 No project specific geotechnical information (infiltration rate) Infiltration value cannot be confirmed
Community Investment	10	10	5	 Near schools, but not greening of a school
Nature-Based Solutions	12	15	12	Addition of 50 treesConstructed wetlands
Leveraging Funds Part 1	3	6	3	•
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	4	3	•
TOTALS	85	110	Unable to score 63	Meets minimum points threshold



Watershed Area	Upper Los Angeles River
Project Name	McCambridge Park Stormwater Capture Multi-Benefit Project
Project Lead	City of Burbank Public Works Department
Total Funding Requested	\$2,930,000
Project Type	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	7	20	7	• 18.3 ac-ft capacity
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	5	12	5	• 146 AF/year
Community Investment	5	10	5	•
Nature-Based Solutions	10	15	10	
Leveraging Funds Part 1	3	6	3	•
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	4	2	 Design only TRP project - had opportunity for more community engagement
TOTALS	64	110	62	Project meets minimum points threshold



Watershed Area	Upper Los Angeles River
Project Name	Mission Mile Sepulveda: A Climate Resilient Urban Greenway to Cultural Connections Project
Project Lead	City of Los Angeles, Department of Public Works, StreetsLA
Total Funding Requested	\$22,914,301
Project Type	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	7	20	7	• 18.7 AF capacity/\$46M = 0.41
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	30	30	 Primary Pollutant: Zinc >80% reduction Secondary Pollutant: Cu > 80% reduction
Water Supply Part 1	0	13	0	•
Water Supply Part 2	5	12	5	• 124 ac-ft / year
Community Investment	5	10	5	•
Nature-Based Solutions	11	15	11	•
Leveraging Funds Part 1	6	6	6	•
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	4	4	•
TOTALS	68	110	68	Project meets minimum points threshold



Watershed Area	Upper Los Angeles River
Project Name	South Pasadena Huntington Drive Regional Green Street Project
Project Lead	City of South Pasadena
Total Funding Requested	\$2,986,000
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	 Clarification needed for the project drainage area Pg 173; pg 566 discrepancy Project not feasible with info provided
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	30	Unable to score	 Unclear how dry well infiltration rates determined Pg 174; how was 0.6 cfs calculated
Water Supply Part 1	3	13	Unable to score	• \$2,100/AF
Water Supply Part 2	9	12	Unable to score	• 261 AF/year
Community Investment	5	10	5	•
Nature-Based Solutions	10	15	10	•
Leveraging Funds Part 1	6	6	3	\$1M committed
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	4	1	Former TRP – opportunity for more community engagement
TOTALS	87	110	Unable to score	Unable to confirm project scoreProject does not advance



Watershed Area	Upper Los Angeles River
Project Name	Sylmar Channel Project
Project Lead	City of Los Angeles, Department of Public Works, LA Sanitation and Environment
Total Funding Requested	\$5,005,515
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	 0.5 cfs infiltration rate without any onsite geotechnical tests Applicant provided local infiltration data but not site specific data
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	30	Unable to score 30	 Onsite geotechnical report requested for dry wells and channel
Water Supply Part 1	6	13	Unable to Score 0	 Life cycle cost discrepancy pg 49 Should use module life cycle cost
Water Supply Part 2	9	12	Unable to Score 5	 High assumption of dry weather days
Community Investment	5	10	5	• 45 trees, pedestrian paths
Nature-Based Solutions	10	15	10	•
Leveraging Funds Part 1	6	6	6	One virtual workshopLetter of support from CBO
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	4	3	•
TOTALS	90	110	Unable to score 79	Meets minimum points threshold