

## SAFE CLEAN WATER PROGRAM SCIENTIFIC STUDY PROPOSAL QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Proposal identification information and summary of the project goals.

Title: **Depave LA: Prioritizing Parking Lots for Green Retrofitting**

Proposing Organization: **Council for Watershed Health**

Your summary of the Project Goals and Objectives:

**All three reviewers agreed that the study aims to develop a web-based GIS Tool and Toolkit to identify, rank, and prioritize parking lots for green retrofitting. The project's objectives include:**

- **Creating a GIS Tool to screen and rank parking lots for green infrastructure (GI) retrofits.**
- **Piloting the Tool in selected areas, refining it based on lessons learned, and expanding to multiple watersheds.**
- **Developing a Toolkit with resources to support project implementation, including community outreach and design guidance.**
- **Training users to maximize adoption and application of the Tool and Toolkit.**

**Two reviewers emphasized the study's potential to provide data-driven decision-making tools, while another raised concerns about long-term management and usability of the Tool beyond the study's scope.**

2. Are the objectives clearly stated? What portion of the objectives need more clarification?

**All reviewers found the objectives clearly stated. However, additional clarification was recommended on:**

- **Long-Term Maintenance: How will the GIS Tool remain updated, and who will be responsible for its upkeep?**
- **Scoring Criteria: Further details on the metrics used to evaluate parking lots, including weighting of multi-benefit outcomes.**
- **User Accessibility: Will the Tool include integrated training, or will users need separate training resources?**

3. How do the project goals directly support a nexus to increasing stormwater or urban runoff capture and/or reducing stormwater or urban runoff pollution?

**The reviewers agreed that the study supports stormwater management by:**

- **Identifying impervious surfaces that can be converted to permeable solutions.**
- **Reducing pollutant loads through green infrastructure retrofits.**
- **Providing municipalities with planning tools to optimize stormwater capture projects.**

**One reviewer noted that the project aligns well with broader goals of urban greening and community benefits beyond stormwater management.**

4. What is (are) the overarching technical approach element(s) of the proposed project as you understand them (not necessarily the same as the elements described in the proposal)?

**The reviewers identified the following technical approach elements:**

- **Developing the GIS Tool: Creating a data-driven platform to assess and rank parking lots for green retrofits.**
- **Piloting the Tool: Testing in selected locations, gathering feedback, and refining the approach.**
- **Toolkit Development: Providing resources for stakeholders to implement identified projects.**
- **User Engagement: Training users, ensuring accessibility, and promoting the Tool's adoption across different watersheds.**

5. Has the proposal provided sufficient information to describe the technical approach for each element? If not, what information is missing?

**Two reviewers found the proposal sufficiently detailed, while one suggested additional information in the following areas:**

- **Data Sources: Clarify the datasets that will be integrated into the GIS Tool.**
- **Security and Access Control: How will unauthorized access to the Tool be prevented?**
- **Scalability: Address challenges in expanding the Tool to additional watersheds and jurisdictions.**

6. Is the technical approach sound? If not, what do you recommend should be done to improve the technical approach of the proposed project?

**The reviewers agreed that the technical approach is sound, with recommendations for improvement:**

- **Long-Term Funding Plan: Identify financial mechanisms for sustaining the GIS Tool post-study.**
- **Comprehensive Data Layers: Incorporate additional layers such as hydrology, soil data, and existing BMPs.**
- **Training Integration: Verify that training materials are embedded within the Tool for user-friendly navigation.**

7. How achievable are the study's stated technical objectives, especially within the proposed timeframe and budget?

**Two reviewers found the objectives achievable within the 23-month timeframe and \$1,088,720 budget, while one expressed concerns about:**

- **Potential Scheduling Delays: Coordination among multiple stakeholders could impact the project timeline.**

- **Community Engagement Challenges: Adoption by municipalities may require additional outreach efforts.**

8. What are the greatest technical risks that you foresee the proposing agency facing when implementing the project?

**The reviewers identified several technical risks:**

- **Data Gaps: Incomplete or low-resolution spatial data may impact prioritization accuracy.**
- **Stakeholder Coordination: Aligning multiple agencies and municipalities may cause delays.**
- **Tool Usability and Maintenance: The long-term viability of the Tool depends on securing funding and technical support.**

9. Please describe the linkages between the project's technical objectives and the types of decisions that stormwater managers will make based on the project's outcome(s)? Will the technical achievements provide stormwater managers useful linkages that extend beyond this study?

**The reviewers agreed that the study will provide stormwater managers with:**

- **Data-driven insights for identifying high-priority green retrofit opportunities.**
- **Tools for project bundling and funding optimization.**
- **Guidelines for integrating community needs into stormwater management planning.**

**One reviewer noted that the study could inform updates to municipal stormwater planning frameworks, making its impact extend beyond the immediate project area.**

10. Please provide any additional technical perspectives you would like to share.

**The reviewers offered the following perspectives:**

- **The study should include a strategy for ongoing Tool maintenance and updates.**
- **Expanding the Toolkit's accessibility for both public and private stakeholders could enhance its usability.**
- **Consideration of economic incentives for property owners could drive higher adoption rates.**

11. Please answer each of the following questions by selecting one of the following five answer choices: *Excellent, Very good, Adequate, Inadequate or Not applicable because of insufficient information*. Please add an explanation to accompany your answer choice (or refer to the question number above for appropriate context and rationale):

- a. How well do the proposal objectives address the County's goals of increasing stormwater or urban runoff capture and/or reducing stormwater or urban runoff pollution?

**Two reviewers rated the objectives as "excellent," emphasizing their potential to optimize stormwater capture. The third reviewer rated them as "very good," noting that additional considerations for long-term Tool maintenance would strengthen the study's impact.**

- b. How well do you think the technical approaches will achieve the study objectives and stated outcomes?

**Two reviewers rated the technical approaches as "very good," highlighting the well-structured methodology. The third found them "adequate," citing concerns about maintaining the GIS Tool beyond the study period.**

- c. Technical experience and qualifications of the study team?

**Two reviewers rated the study team as "excellent," citing their expertise in GIS analysis, stormwater planning, and green infrastructure implementation. The third reviewer marked this section as "not applicable," due to limited details on individual team members' qualifications.**