

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

Title: Depave Rio Hondo: Prioritizing Parking Lots for Green Retrofitting and Exploring Broader Hardscape Transformation Considerations.

Proposing Organization: Council for Watershed Health

Your summary of the Project Goals and Objectives:

Across the four reviews, reviewers generally agreed that the primary goal of the study is to expand an existing GIS-based screening and prioritization tool to the Rio Hondo watershed in order to identify parking lots that are suitable candidates for green retrofits. Reviewers noted that the study seeks to support future stormwater capture and runoff pollution reduction projects by reducing impervious surfaces and promoting the implementation of green infrastructure within parking lots. Several reviewers emphasized that an additional objective of the study is to provide guidance, outreach, and toolkit materials that help translate planning-level prioritization into implementable projects under the Safe Clean Water Program. Some reviewers also noted that the study explores broader impervious surface conversion scenarios and related programmatic considerations beyond parking lots.

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

Reviewers generally agreed that the objectives are clearly stated. However, several reviewers identified opportunities to improve clarity and organization. In particular, reviewers noted some confusion regarding the relationship between stated outcomes, objectives, and tasks, and suggested clearer articulation of how these elements relate to one another. **A few reviewers also questioned whether certain objectives, such as basin-wide impervious surface quantification and broader hardscape transformation analyses, may extend beyond the core focus on parking lot retrofits.** Clarification regarding intended tool users and how different audiences would engage with the Tool and Toolkit was also suggested.

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?

Reviewers generally agreed that the study supports the SCWP nexus by targeting impervious parking lots for green retrofits that increase stormwater capture, infiltration, and treatment. Most reviewers characterized the project as a planning- and prioritization-focused effort rather than a direct implementation project. While some reviewers rated the nexus as strong due to the focus on impervious surface reduction, others noted that benefits to stormwater capture and pollutant reduction are indirect and dependent on future project implementation informed by the study's outputs.

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)?

Reviewers agreed that the study's technical approach centers on expanding an existing web-based GIS tool to the Rio Hondo watershed, developing feasibility screening and multi-benefit prioritization criteria, and producing associated toolkit materials such as guidance documents, conceptual designs, and outreach resources. Several reviewers noted that the study also includes modeling to estimate basin-scale stormwater storage and pollutant reduction potential, as well as stakeholder engagement activities intended to inform toolkit development and usability.

5. Has the proposal provided sufficient information to describe the technical approach for each element?

If not, what information is missing?

Most reviewers agreed that the proposal provides sufficient information to understand the overall technical approach. However, multiple reviewers identified areas where additional detail would strengthen the study. These included clearer definition of screening and prioritization criteria, explanation of how scoring and weighting will be applied, identification of key GIS datasets and potential data gaps, and clarification of assumptions and limitations associated with planning-level runoff and pollutant reduction estimates. Some reviewers also noted inconsistencies or ambiguities in task descriptions, deliverables, and terminology that would benefit from clarification.

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

Reviewers generally agreed that the technical approach is sound and appropriate for a GIS-based screening and prioritization study. Several reviewers emphasized that the effectiveness of the approach depends on transparency regarding model assumptions, data limitations, and how user-adjustable weighting within the Tool and Toolkit will influence rankings. Some reviewers suggested that the approach could be strengthened by clarifying long-term tool maintenance and update responsibilities and by incorporating lessons learned from prior or parallel implementations of similar tools in other watersheds.

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

Reviewers generally agreed that the study's objectives are achievable within the proposed timeframe and budget, particularly because the work builds on prior SCWP-funded efforts. However, several reviewers noted that the schedule and critical path are dependent on the progress and data readiness of parallel Depave LA projects and on the availability and quality of GIS datasets for the Rio Hondo watershed. One reviewer expressed uncertainty regarding whether all proposed modeling components could be completed within the allotted timeframe.

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

Reviewers identified several technical risks, most of which relate to data quality and tool applicability. Commonly cited risks included uneven or incompatible GIS datasets, data gaps that may affect scoring accuracy, and the potential for tool rankings to overestimate feasibility if site-specific constraints—such as utilities, contamination, drainage connectivity, or ownership—are not adequately captured. Some reviewers also noted that the long-term value of the tool depends on clearly defined governance, hosting, and update mechanisms.

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 has the potential to provide useful decision-support information for stormwater managers. Reviewers noted that the tool and associated toolkit could help agencies identify, prioritize, and bundle parking lot retrofit opportunities, strengthen future SCWP applications, and support planning for impervious surface conversion projects. Several reviewers indicated that, if successfully implemented and maintained, the tool could have applicability beyond the Rio Hondo watershed and inform broader stormwater planning efforts.

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

No additional technical perspectives noted.

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?

Ratings ranged from Adequate to Excellent. Reviewers who rated the study lower **emphasized its planning-focused nature and indirect benefits, while higher ratings reflected the study's focus on impervious surface reduction and its support of future implementation.**

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

Most reviewers rated this criterion as Very Good to Excellent, noting that the GIS-based approach is appropriate and feasible, provided that data limitations and scoring assumptions are clearly documented.

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

Ratings ranged from Very Good to Not Applicable due to insufficient information. Where assessable, reviewers generally viewed the proposing organization and collaborators as well qualified, though some noted only limited detail on individual team roles and qualifications were provided.