SAFE CLEAN WATER PROGRAM SCIENTIFIC STUDY PROPOSAL QUESTIONNAIRE

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

   Title: Quantifying Community Flood Management Benefits of Watershed-Scale Stormwater Capture

   Proposing Organization: San Garbriel Valley Council of Governments

   Your summary of the Project Goals and Objectives:

   Across the four reviews, reviewers were in strong agreement that the primary goal of the study is to quantify flood management and nuisance flooding reduction benefits associated with watershed-scale stormwater capture projects in the Upper Los Angeles River and Rio Hondo watersheds. Reviewers consistently noted that the study builds upon prior SCWP-funded hydrologic and hydraulic modeling efforts to compare pre- and post-SCWP conditions and to evaluate peak flow reduction, flood risk mitigation, and channel capacity. Several reviewers emphasized that a key anticipated outcome is the use of study results to inform future stormwater capture, restoration, and flood management projects, including projects intended to maximize Community Investment Benefits as defined in the Flood Control District Code.

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

   All reviewers agreed that the study objectives are clearly stated and logically organized. Reviewers found the phased structure of watershed-scale and reach-scale modeling to be appropriate and easy to follow. One reviewer noted that additional clarity regarding how outputs from multiple modeling efforts would be synthesized into final decision-making guidance could further strengthen the objectives, but no reviewer identified significant deficiencies in objective clarity.

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 effectively supports the SCWP nexus by evaluating how upstream stormwater capture and distributed storage reduce peak flows and flood risk. While reviewers consistently noted that flood management is the primary focus of the study, most agreed that stormwater capture benefits are directly addressed and that pollutant reduction may occur as a secondary benefit through reduced runoff volumes and improved system performance. Several reviewers characterized the project as strongly aligned with stormwater capture goals, even though direct pollutant removal is not a central emphasis.

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 developing and refining watershed-scale hydrologic models and reach-scale hydraulic models for representative portions of the Upper Los Angeles River and Rio Hondo. Reviewers noted that the study builds on previous SCWP modeling work, includes calibration to observed storm events where possible, and evaluates future conditions, including climate change and post-wildfire scenarios. Reviewers agreed that model outputs are intended to quantify flood management benefits and support stormwater capture and restoration planning.

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

improve confidence in the results. These included clarification of model calibration procedures, criteria for selecting calibration storm events, and how future rainfall events will be incorporated. Several reviewers also noted that further explanation of climate change datasets, alternative projections, and post-wildfire hydrologic considerations would improve transparency.

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 and relies on established hydrologic and hydraulic modeling methodologies. Reviewers consistently noted that the study appropriately builds on prior SCWP investments. Some reviewers suggested that documenting assumptions, calibration criteria, limitations, and the use of multiple data sources could further strengthen the analysis, particularly for future-condition and post-wildfire scenarios.

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

   Reviewers generally agreed that the study's technical objectives are achievable within the proposed timeframe and budget. The reliance on existing models and datasets was viewed as reducing implementation risk. Several reviewers noted that final model calibration is dependent on the availability of suitable rainfall events during the study period, which introduces some timing uncertainty but does not fundamentally undermine feasibility.

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

   Reviewers identified relatively low technical risk overall. The most commonly cited risk was reliance on future storm events for model calibration, as well as potential data limitations and variability in stormwater behavior. Reviewers generally agreed that, because the study is primarily a modeling effort rather than a field-based implementation project, technical risks are manageable.

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 would provide useful decision-support information for stormwater managers. Reviewers noted that the results could inform project prioritization, planning, and design, support coordination between stormwater and flood management efforts, and assist with applications for future SCWP or other funding programs. Several reviewers indicated that the modeling framework and findings are likely to be transferable to other watersheds and applicable beyond this specific study.

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

    This study represents a logical extension of prior SCWP-funded modeling efforts and has the potential to strengthen the program's ability to quantify flood management and community resilience benefits associated with stormwater capture projects.

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?

Reviewers rated this criterion between Very Good and Excellent, noting strong alignment with stormwater capture and flood risk reduction goals, with pollutant reduction addressed primarily as a secondary benefit.

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

Reviewers rated this criterion as Very Good to Excellent, citing the use of established modeling methods and the study's foundation in prior SCWP work.

c. Technical experience and qualifications of the study team?

Where provided, reviewers generally rated this criterion as Very Good, noting strong institutional experience among the proposing organization and collaborators. Some reviewers indicated that limited detail on individual qualifications constrained more detailed assessments.