SAFE CLEAN WATER PROGRAM SCIENTIFIC STUDY PROPOSAL QUESTIONNAIRE

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

Title: Optimizing Safe, Clean Water Capture Opportunities in NSMB

Proposing Organization: Craftwater Engineering

Your summary of the Project Goals and Objectives:

All three reviewers agreed that the study aims to evaluate non-traditional stormwater capture opportunities in the North Santa Monica Bay (NSMB) watershed. The study seeks to:

- Identify high-benefit stormwater projects for runoff capture, storage, and reuse.
- Explore large-scale and parcel-scale stormwater capture opportunities.
- Assess feasibility for bundling projects to qualify for Safe, Clean Water Program (SCWP) infrastructure funding.
- Investigate potential treatment and coordinated runoff release strategies.

One reviewer emphasized the importance of modifying feasibility study guidelines to improve project viability, while another highlighted the study's role in addressing NSMB's unique hydrologic conditions.

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 Project Viability: How will selected projects move from feasibility assessment to implementation?
- Stakeholder Involvement: Clarify the roles and responsibilities of partnering agencies (e.g., LVMWD, ARLA) in supporting project execution.
- Historical Data Analysis: Specify the time frame for evaluating rainfall patterns and storm events.
- 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 project supports stormwater management by:

- Evaluating large-scale distributed capture and parcel-scale stormwater projects.
- Addressing runoff treatment options to enhance water supply and water quality.
- Aligning stormwater capture strategies with SCWP funding criteria.

One reviewer highlighted that optimizing project bundling could make NSMB projects more competitive for funding.

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. Engagement and Coordination: Working with LVMWD, ARLA, and other stakeholders to assess project feasibility.
- 2. Data Compilation and Analysis: Conducting a planning-level assessment using historical rainfall data and storm event patterns.
- **3.** Screening for Feasibility: Evaluating regulatory and technical requirements for stormwater capture projects.
- 4. Development of Implementation Pathways: Identifying project funding opportunities and bundling strategies for infrastructure development.
- 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 Collection Scope: Define how far back historical rainfall data will be analyzed.
- Infiltration Assessments: Provide details on how infiltration rates will be determined across different land uses.
- Regulatory Coordination: Address potential hurdles in modifying feasibility study requirements for funding eligibility.
- 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 found the technical approach sound but recommended improvements:

- Clarify Feasibility Study Adaptation: Specify how the study will address SCWP feasibility study modifications to better accommodate project bundling.
- Define Stakeholder Roles: Establish clearer expectations for partner agencies in supporting project implementation.
- Address Uncertainties in Runoff Estimates: Consider how climate variability may impact stormwater capture projections.
- 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 \$293,000 budget and phased timeline, while one raised concerns about:

- Stakeholder Coordination Challenges: Delays may arise if agency collaboration is not wellstructured.
- Regulatory Flexibility: The study's success depends on agencies' willingness to adjust feasibility study guidelines.
- 8. What are the greatest technical risks that you foresee the proposing agency facing when implementing the project?

The reviewers identified several technical risks:

- 1. Regulatory Challenges: Modifying feasibility study requirements may take longer than anticipated.
- 2. Data Reliability Issues: Inconsistent historical stormwater data could affect project viability assessments.
- **3.** Scalability of Proposed Solutions: Ensuring that project bundling strategies align with regional funding criteria.
- 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 assist stormwater managers by:

- Providing a framework for identifying and prioritizing stormwater capture projects.
- Offering insights into regulatory adjustments needed for project bundling.
- Informing decision-making on water reuse potential and treatment strategies.

One reviewer noted that the study's methodologies could be replicated in other watersheds facing similar funding challenges.

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

The reviewers offered the following perspectives:

- The study should evaluate potential stormwater BMPs that complement large-scale capture projects.
- Cost-benefit analyses of project bundling strategies would improve funding applications.
- Establishing a pathway for long-term implementation would increase project impact beyond the initial feasibility phase.

- 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 "very good," emphasizing the study's alignment with SCWP goals. The third reviewer rated them as "excellent," noting that the study's results could inform funding pathways for stormwater projects.

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," citing a wellstructured methodology. The third found them "adequate," expressing concerns about whether feasibility study modifications would be successfully implemented.

c. Technical experience and qualifications of the study team?

Two reviewers rated the study team as "excellent," highlighting Craftwater's expertise in stormwater management and feasibility studies. The third reviewer marked this section as "not applicable" due to limited details on individual team members' qualifications.