LOUISIANA WATERSHED INITIATIVE
working together for sustainability and resilience

ROUND 1 PHASE 2 APPLICATION

PROJECTS EVALUATION AND RANKING CRITERIA

Projects submitted for Round 1 funding in the Louisiana Watershed Initiative can earn up to 100 points in scoring criteria. Projects must receive a minimum of X points to be funded. In the case that remaining funding will only partially fund the next highest scoring project, the applicant will be offered partial funding. The applicant may resubmit the same project in subsequent rounds if that project is eligible and adheres to minimum criteria for subsequent rounds.

In the case that multiple projects have the same score and not all can be funded, additional tie-breaker points will determine which projects will be funded (see below).
Each project will be scored and then ranked according to the following criteria:

Criteria	Maximum Score
Effectiveness	55
Affordability / Schedule	10
Social Benefits	10
Natural Functions	15
Community Investment	10
Total	100

DRAFT

SUMMARY DETAILED APPLICATION CRITERIA

Effectiveness	Affordability / Schedule	Social	Natural Functions	Community investment
• Maximum level of flood risk reduction • Future flood risk consideration • Upstream and downstream flood effects • Passivity and reliability • Multi-jurisdictional flood risk reduction benefits • Critical infrastructure assets protected • Design Life • Avoided direct physical damage to built assets and agriculture • Adaptability / Flexibility • Support • Permitting requirement / regulatory considerations • Replicability	• Implementation timeframe • Fund Match • Maintenance • Project stage of development • Governance	• Outdoor Recreational Resources • Cultural & Community Resources • Visual Resources / Viewsheds • Educational opportunities • Benefits to vulnerable populations • Including and innovative planning process • Economic opportunity	• Hydrology • Water quality • Habitat value	• CRS Participation • Community funding mechanisms • Freeboard • Elevation requirements within X Zones • On-site drainage / stormwater retention and / or treatment requirements • Fill Restrictions • Plan alignment

DRAFT

EFFECTIVENESS *(MAXIMUM OF 55 POINTS)*		
Criteria Description	**Criteria Value**	**Points**
Effectiveness Criteria 1	*See below*	0-20: _____
Consideration of future flood risk	Uses best-available science, incorporating scenarios or probabilities of climate change, future development/land use change, and other factors relevant to the type of flood risk (e.g., sea level rise) (see Appendix 0.1 on acceptable methodologies)	☐ 2
	Uses historical averages to project future conditions (see Appendix 0.1)	☐ 1
	Does not consider future changes to flood risk	☐ DQ
Upstream and downstream flood effects	Application provides documentation showing project reduces flood risk up and/or downstream of the project's primary benefitting area	☐ 2
	Application provides documentation showing no flood risk impact up or downstream of the project's primary benefitting area	☐ 1
	Project increases flooding on surrounding areas	☐ DQ
	Cannot provide documentation related to impact on surrounding areas (will need to be determined through Final Design process, at which point, the project could be disqualified or rescored)	☐ 0
Passivity and reliability	Completely passive project which will require no regular operations and/or maintenance	☐ 2
	Automated (mechanical) response during a flood event	☐ 1
	Non-passive project which may require operations and/or maintenance	☐ 0
	Project is the result of agreed collaboration between 2 or more parishes	☐ 5

EFFECTIVENESS *(MAXIMUM OF 55 POINTS)*		
Criteria Description	**Criteria Value**	**Points**
Multi-jurisdictional flood risk reduction benefits	Project is the result of agreed collaboration between 2 or more municipal districts	☐ 3
	Project benefits are realized by 2 or more parishes	☐ 2
	Project benefits are realized by only one parish or municipal jurisdiction	☐ 0
Critical infrastructure assets protected (e.g., hospitals, power, evacuation routes & critical roads, water, wastewater) *(maximum 3 points)*	Project will mitigate loss of service from one or more ASCE Category IV facilities (see Appendix 2.11)	☐3
	Project will mitigate loss of service from one or more ASCE Category III facilities (see Appendix 2.11)	☐2
	Mitigate loss of service of evacuation routes	☐ 1
	No mitigation of loss of service from critical infrastructure or evacuation routes	☐ 0
Design Life *(in accordance with FEMA standards, see Appendix, or supporting documentation)*	> 50 years	☐ 3
	30-49 years	☐ 2
	15-29 years	☐ 1
	< 15 years	☐0
Benefit-Cost Ratio: Avoided **direct physical damage to built assets and agriculture** (based on existing or approved permits for the built environment)	Expected losses avoided are greater than project capital and maintenance costs over the life of the project by a factor greater than 2 (Benefit cost ratio >2)	☐ 2
	Expected losses avoided are greater than project capital and maintenance costs over the life of the project by a factor greater than 1 (Benefit cost ratio >1)	☐ 1
	Expected losses avoided are equal to project capital and maintenance costs over the life of the project by a factor of 1 (Benefit cost ratio ≤ 1)	☐ 0
Adaptability / flexibility	Method/installation can be modified to adapt to higher flood levels	☐ 2
	Not adaptable, but does not impede future more protective solutions to higher flood levels	☐ 1
	Not adaptable to higher flood levels	☐ 0
Support *(maximum of 5 points) No more than 1 point per type of letter. All neighboring communities that could*	Written agreement (MOA/MOU) demonstrating collaboration between two or more parishes	☐ 2
	Letter(s) of no objection from public officials, local legislative delegation, or Regional Planning Commission	☐ 1

EFFECTIVENESS *(MAXIMUM OF 55 POINTS)*		
Criteria Description	**Criteria Value**	**Points**
be affected by the project must be consulted for any points in this category)	Letter(s) of no objection from neighboring authorities that could be affected by the project	☐ 1
	Letter(s) of no objection from citizen groups	☐ 1
	No letter(s) or documentation received from neighboring authorities that could be affected by the project (*project cannot be further reviewed or progress to Final Design until received*)	☐ 0
Replicability	Design that can be replicated / may facilitate initiation of other projects	☐ 2
	Specialized for the site but provides lessons learned for other areas	☐ 1
	Design or approach is extremely complex and highly specialized for the site only	☐ 0
Permitting Requirement / Regulatory Considerations	Application documents that the project will have a positive impact on special historical, archeological, geological, or environmental sensitive areas	☐ 5
	Application documents that the project will have no impact on special historical, archeological, geological, or environmental sensitive areas	☐ 1
	Application documents that the project will have minimal, acceptable impact on special historical, archeological, geological, or environmental sensitive areas	☐ 0
	Application documents that the project will have moderate to severe impact on special historical, archeological, geological, or environmental sensitive areas, and regulatory and commenting agencies indicate significant redesign would be required	☐ DQ

AFFORDABILITY/SCHEDULE *(10 POINTS MAXIMUM)*		
Criteria Description	**Criteria Value**	**Points**
Implementation timeframe	Scheduled completion within 2 years of funding	☐ 5
	Scheduled completion within 3 years of funding	☐ 3
	Scheduled completion 3+ years of funding	☐ 0

Fund Match	Documented commitment of 10% additional match funds for project	☐ 2
	Documented commitment of *less than* 10% additional match funds for project	☐ 0
Maintenance	Project annual maintenance cost is less than 0.5 percent of capital cost	☐ 2
	Project annual maintenance cost is 0.5 to 1.5 percent of capital costs	☐ 1
	Project annual maintenance cost exceeds 1.5 percent of capital cost	☐ 0
Project Stage of Development (*maximum of 5 points based on the completeness of design*)	Project is fully designed and permitted (Note: some redesign could be necessary in Final Design to meet required metrics)	☐ 3
	Project is designed, but not yet permitted (Note: some redesign could be necessary in Final Design to meet required metrics)	☐ 2
	Project is designed to a sufficient level of detail for regulatory review, with initial consultations complete, and provides clear direction for detailed project engineering and specifications	☐ 1
	Project is at conceptual level of design (scope, drawings, cost estimates, but no environmental consultations complete)	☐ 0
	Minimal or no design complete (project ineligible for Round 1 funds)	☐ DQ
Governance	Project has a defined governance structure in place for project implementation and long-term project maintenance that does not require adjustment before moving to Final Design *(if applicable)*	☐ 1
	Project does not have a defined governance structure in place for project implementation and long-term project maintenance *(if applicable)*	☐ 0

SOCIAL BENEFITS *(10 POINTS MAXIMUM. ANY ADDITIONAL POINTS MAY BE USED AS TIE BREAKER)*		
Criteria Description	**Criteria Value**	**Points**
Outdoor Recreational Resources	Adds new and equitable recreational assets, greenways or trails, or recreational fields or programmed open space and nature preserves	☐ 2
	Enhances existing recreational space	☐ 1
	No change / any resulting losses mitigated	☐ 0
	Results in loss of existing public recreational space, without mitigation	☐ DQ
Cultural & Community Resources	Provide flood risk reduction for significant cultural and community resource such as public gathering space or cultural institution open to the public	☐ 2

DRAFT

SOCIAL BENEFITS *(10 POINTS MAXIMUM. ANY ADDITIONAL POINTS MAY BE USED AS TIE BREAKER)*		
Criteria Description	**Criteria Value**	**Points**
	No change/any resulting losses mitigated	☐ 0
Visual Resources / Viewsheds	Would create new views of a key community landmark or culturally significant open space	☐ 1
	No change/ loss of views	☐ 0
Educational opportunities	Educational component in project	☐ 2
Benefits to vulnerable population	Placeholder for a criterion that exceeds threshold requirements from federal register, including housing supply and affordability, such as: Project would reduce risk to housing that is affordable to households at or below Area Median Income (In general, housing for which the occupant(s) is/are paying no more than 30 percent of his or her income for gross housing costs, including utilities[1]) – 1 point	☐ 3
Inclusive and innovative planning process (*max 5 pts*)	Application provides documentation that indicates how public and stakeholder input affected project selection / design	☐ 2
	Application documents that the public planning process took concrete steps to engage with traditionally marginalized groups	☐ 2
	Application documents that the public planning process included innovative engagement techniques including but not limited hands-on activities, digital feedback	☐ 1
	No record of public engagement	☐ 0
Economic opportunity	Project can document expected job creation and / or increased economic activity as a result of project benefits (not just through construction and maintenance)	☐ 3
	Reduced risk of job loss expected as a result of the project	☐ 2

[1] Glossary of HUD terms: https://www.huduser.gov/portal/glossary/glossary_a.html

NATURAL FUNCTIONS (15 *POINTS MAXIMUM.* SCORING GUIDANCE PROVIDED IN APPENDIX)		
Criteria Description	**Criteria Value**	**Points**
Natural Hydrology *A project may provide flood storage and conveyance, reduce flood velocities, reduced peak flows, promote infiltration and aquifer recharge or reduce frequency and duration of low surface flows*	Significantly improves/ restores natural hydrology	☐ 5
	Improves/restores natural hydrology	☐ 3
	No Change/alters natural hydrology	☐ 0
Water quality *A project may reduce sedimentation, reduced nutrients and impurities from runoff, process organic wastes, or moderate temperature fluctuations*	Significantly improves *(i.e., decreases pollutant and nutrient loading / enhances nutrient and pollution filtration and sequestration)*	☐ 5
	Improves	☐ 3
	No Change/detracts	☐ 0
Aquatic/floodplain habitat value *A project may add rich alluvial soils to promote vegetative growth, maintain biodiversity, maintain integrity of ecosystems, provide breeding and feeding grounds, create enhanced waterfowl habitat or protect habitats for rare and endangered species*	Adds new high-quality aquatic/floodplain habitat	☐ 5
	Somewhat enhances aquatic/floodplain habitat	☐ 3
	No Change/detracts	☐ 0

DRAFT

COMMUNITY INVESTMENT (10 POINTS MAXIMUM. ADDITIONAL POINTS MAY APPLY AS TIE BREAKER)		
Criteria Description	**Criteria Value**	**Points**
CRS Participation	Class 7 and below	☐ 5
	Class 8	☐ 3
	Class 9	☐ 1
Community funding mechanisms	Community has created a replenishable fund for flood risk reduction actions through a mechanism such as a local fee, tax revenue, or regular allocation from the general fund. To obtain points, eligible use of funds may include outreach and education, planning, policy and program evaluation and development, staff training and credentialing, and project implementation	☐ 5
Freeboard adopted above BFE throughout AE and VE Zones, as applicable within a community	New and substantial improvement construction >+2 foot adopted	☐ 5
	New and substantial improvement construction +2 foot adopted	☐ 4
	New and substantial improvement construction +1 foot adopted	☐ 3
	Freeboard incentivized	☐ 1
Elevation requirements within X Zones in a community	New and substantial improvement construction >2 ft above highest of nearest AE or VE Zone BFE or crown of the road, or highest adjacent (finished) grade	☐ 5
	New and substantial improvement construction 2 ft above highest of nearest AE or VE Zone BFE or crown of the road, or highest adjacent (finished) grade	☐ 4
	New and substantial improvement construction 1 ft above highest of nearest AE or VE Zone BFE, crown of the road, or highest adjacent (finished) grade	☐ 3
	Elevation in X zones incentivized	☐ 1
On-site drainage / stormwater retention and / or treatment requirements for new construction and redevelopment[2]	Community has requirements to prepare Stormwater Management Plans for new construction and redevelopment sites	☐ 5
	On-site treatment requirements to reduce pollutants of concern (e.g., suspended solids/sediment, nutrients, metals, etc.), in addition to reduced volume and flow requirements	☐ 4
	On-site retention/detention requirements to reduce volume and flow	☐ 3

[2] Criteria based on based on the Orleans and Jefferson parishes BMP Guidance tool document and the EBPR Master plan development Program.

COMMUNITY INVESTMENT (10 POINTS MAXIMUM. ADDITIONAL POINTS MAY APPLY AS TIE BREAKER)		
Criteria Description	**Criteria Value**	**Points**
	On-site drainage or stormwater retention incentivized through ordinance or specific criteria	☐ 1
Fill Restrictions	No Fill for new and substantial improvement construction	☐ 5
	Limited fill for new and substantial improvement construction	☐ 3
Plan alignment (*up to 5 points)*	Community can document alignment of local programs and plans with flood risk reduction objectives (+1 for each of the following plans or programs, up to 3 points) • Comprehensive or master plan • Land use or zoning code • Capital improvements program	☐ 1
	Additional point for each where future flood risk is considered (*up to 2 points*)	☐ 1

DRAFT

EFFECTIVENESS METHODOLOGY

Effectiveness will be calculated base on a future with project compared to the current condition for non-coastal projects, and a future with project compared to "future without action" for coastal projects.

Step 1

Applicant should fill out the Benefit Cost Analysis worksheet to the best of their ability. Up to six design storm intervals will be considered (5-year, 10-year, 25-year, 50-year, 100-year, 500-year) when calculating the annual probability. All projects except non-structural projects are expected to have basic H&H modeling completed. For non-structural projects, the applicant may rely on historical storms. A historical storm would replace the closest design storm (for example, a 28-year storm would replace the 25-year design storm, with a corresponding probability of 0.0357). Projects with lower level of service than 500 years should provide their highest level of service.

A	B (1/A)	C	D	E (C-D)	F B*E
Recurrence interval	Likeliness	# of Structures flooded by prescribed recurrence interval event - **Current Condition / Future without Action**	# of Structures flooded by prescribed recurrence interval event - **With Project**	# of structures protected by project in prescribed recurrence interval event	Weighted # of Structures protected by prescribed recurrence interval event
5	.2	5	0	5	1
10	.1	10	0	10	1
25	0.04	20	5	15	0.6
50	.02	25	10	15	0.3
100	.01	125	115	10	0.1
500	.002	475	470	5	0.01
			Annual Probability:		**3.01**

Step 2

$$\frac{Annual\ benefits\ (\#\ structurers)}{Total\ project\ cost\ (\$)} * Design\ Life\ (years) = Expected\ Benefits\ per\ Cost$$

The annualized benefits will be multiplied by the expected design life, and then divided by the total project costs to determine a total benefit per dollar amount.

After all Round 1 applications have been submitted, LWI will normalize the effectiveness between projects submitted, and allocate 0-20 points per project accordingly.

DRAFT

TIE BREAKER FOR EQUALLY SCORING PROJECTS

Points available (in addition to, not including, the maximum of 10 points that will be used to rank projects):

Social Benefits	5
Community Investment	25
Total	**30**

PROCESS

1. Projects are scored against the project evaluation criteria and ranked based on score
2. Projects will be allocated funding according to score-based rank (after any allocations are satisfied)
    a. If the entire $100 million can be spent using the project evaluation criteria ranking and there is a clear scoring break between funded and unfunded projects, then the tie-breaker will not apply
    b. If there is an ambiguous scoring break between funded and unfunded projects because there are multiple similarly scoring projects[3] on either side of the line, then the tie-breaker must be used
3. Projects with the same score will be scored separately based on tie-breaker criteria. Tie-breaker points available are in addition to, not including the maximum of 10 points used to rank projects.
4. The highest scoring projects of those evaluated against tie-breaker criteria will receive funding, depending on funding availability and rank. In the case that remaining funding will only partially fund the next highest scoring project, the applicant will be offered partial funding. The applicant may resubmit the same project in subsequent funding rounds.

EXAMPLE APPLICATION

Example using fictitious projects and fictitious dollar amounts based on $100M in available funding:

Project	Rank based on scoring	Funding Requested	Status	Tie-breaker rank	Updated Status
A	1	$30M	Funded	NA	Funded
B	2	$30M	Funded	NA	Funded
C	3	$20M	Funded	NA	Funded
D	4	$20M	Tie-breaker	2	-
E	4	$20M	Tie-breaker	1	Funded
F	4	$20M	Tie-breaker	3	-

DRAFT