

## SAFE CLEAN WATER PROGRAM SCIENTIFIC STUDY PROPOSAL QUESTIONNAIRE

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

Title: **Maximizing Impact of Minimum Control Measures**

Proposing Organization: **Craftwater Engineering**

Your summary of the Project Goals and Objectives:

**All three reviewers agreed that the goal of the study is to refine methodologies and develop tools to quantify the effectiveness of Minimum Control Measures (MCMs) for stormwater management in the Lower Los Angeles River (LLAR) and Lower San Gabriel River (LSGR) watersheds. The study aims to improve tracking and optimization of MCMs to align them more efficiently with watershed goals, increasing their impact and cost-effectiveness.**

**Specific objectives include:**

- **Identifying critical data and refining methodologies to quantify MCM effectiveness.**
- **Demonstrating MCM effectiveness within the broader context of watershed-scale strategies.**
- **Developing recommendations to enhance MCM implementation for improved water quality, water supply, and community benefits.**
- **Creating an optimization tool to streamline MCM program management and decision-making.**

**Two reviewers emphasized that the study aligns with regulatory requirements, including Reasonable Assurance Analysis (RAA) methodologies, making it relevant to MS4 permit compliance.**

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

**All reviewers found the objectives clearly stated. However, one reviewer suggested that additional details on sampling scope and weather variability considerations could improve clarity. Another reviewer noted that further explanation of how the study will address implementation gaps in current MCM programs would be beneficial.**

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?

**All reviewers agreed that the study directly supports stormwater management objectives by optimizing the implementation of MCMs, which play a critical role in reducing pollutant loads. By improving MCM tracking and effectiveness, the study aims to enhance pollutant reduction while optimizing resource allocation.**

**One reviewer pointed out that while most MCMs focus on pollution reduction, only two of the nine identified MCMs specifically target increasing stormwater capture.**

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:

1. **Baseline Data Compilation:** Reviewing existing MCM programs and compiling data to establish a starting point.
2. **Methodology Refinement:** Developing refined methodologies to assess MCM effectiveness.
3. **Quantification of Benefits:** Employing scientific methods, including RAA-compliant approaches, to evaluate pollutant reduction benefits.
4. **Optimization Tool Development:** Creating a management tool for tracking MCM implementation, flagging areas for improvement, and optimizing resource allocation.
5. **Stakeholder Engagement:** Engaging with MS4 permittees and stormwater managers to align study outcomes with practical applications.

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 the third recommended additional information in the following areas:

- **Sampling Methodology:** Clearer definitions of sample frequency, locations, and parameters.
- **Model Calibration:** How models will be calibrated and validated using observed data.
- **Long-Term Integration:** How the findings will be incorporated into MS4 programs beyond the study timeframe.

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

All reviewers agreed that the technical approach is sound, though one suggested minor improvements:

- **Incorporate Adaptive Strategies:** Address weather variability by including dynamic modeling approaches.
- **Provide Cost-Benefit Analysis:** Evaluate the financial feasibility of MCM enhancements to provide practical implementation.
- **Improve Data Collection Transparency:** Clearly define how data gaps will be addressed to improve model accuracy.

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

Two reviewers found the study objectives achievable within the \$630,000 budget and 13.6-month timeline, provided proactive coordination among stakeholders. The third reviewer noted that the budget appears sufficient, given Craftwater Engineering's experience in similar studies, but emphasized the importance of clear communication to prevent schedule delays.

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

**The reviewers identified several key risks:**

- 1. Data Availability: Challenges in obtaining high-quality, site-specific data to accurately quantify MCM effectiveness.**
- 2. Model Validation: Verify model assumptions align with real-world conditions, particularly for pollutant reduction quantification.**
- 3. Stakeholder Engagement: Verifying cooperation and timely feedback from MS4 permittees and regulatory agencies.**

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?

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

- **A data-driven framework for optimizing MCM implementation.**
- **Improved methodologies for assessing pollutant reductions.**
- **Tools for better aligning MCMs with MS4 compliance requirements.**

**One reviewer highlighted that the findings will be applicable beyond the Lower Los Angeles River and Lower San Gabriel River Watersheds, benefiting stormwater management in other regions as well.**

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

**The reviewers offered the following additional insights:**

- **The study should explore potential regulatory changes that may affect MCM implementation in the near future.**
- **Incorporating adaptive management principles will enhance the long-term applicability of findings.**
- **Expanding the study's scope to consider co-benefits such as heat island reduction and community engagement could strengthen its impact.**

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 the study's focus on optimizing MCMs to enhance pollution reduction. The third reviewer rated them as "adequate" for stormwater capture, as only two MCMs directly address infiltration.**

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

**All reviewers rated the technical approaches as "very good" to "excellent," citing the study's strong foundation in established methodologies and alignment with regulatory requirements.**

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

**Two reviewers rated the study team as "excellent," noting Craftwater Engineering's extensive experience in stormwater modeling and MS4 compliance. However, one reviewer pointed out that the study lead has not been officially designated, which could present an organizational challenge.**