

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: **San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments**

Your summary of the Project Goals and Objectives:

The reviewers agree that the project's overarching goal is to develop standardized methods for quantifying the effectiveness of non-structural BMPs (a.k.a. minimum control measures, or MCMs) and then for optimally integrating these MCMs into watershed management strategies in the L.A. region. Specifically, the project will aggregate existing MCM monitoring data and collect additional data, decide how to model MCM performance, facilitate the integration of MCMs into models, and create publicly accessible tools to promote adoption of these approaches.

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

All three reviewers agree that the project's objectives are, on the whole, clearly stated. Two reviewers provided suggestions for further improving clarity, including providing more information on how the MCMs will be monitored and evaluated, and clarity on the specific roles and responsibilities of the project's stakeholder engagement group.

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 three reviewers agreed that the project effectively supports the SCWP's goals of increasing stormwater or urban runoff capture and/or reducing stormwater or urban runoff pollution. All three reviewers applauded the study's focus, noting that MCMs have historically been understudied and that there is a management need to improve understanding MCM performance and to facilitate their integration into routine watershed 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 agreed that the technical approach will consist of collecting data on MCM performance in the L.A. region, standardizing data collection and performance evaluation methods, developing a technical approach for integrating MCMs into watershed models, and leveraging these insights to improve understanding of how to enhance and optimize MCMs to deliver maximum benefits.

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

All three reviewers pointed out information that is missing from the proposal. Two of the reviewers identified relatively few missing details, while the third reviewer identified extensive amounts of missing information. The two reviewers who identified relatively few details said they were looking for more detailed information on how MCMs will be monitored and have their performance evaluated, as well as how the study will produce a final set of tools that are built on

a rigorous technical foundation. The third reviewer indicated they were looking for more specificity for almost every task, noting a lack of detail regarding specifically how many of the tasks will be carried out.

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 disagreed on the soundness of the study's technical approach. One reviewer characterized the approach as "very sound." A second reviewer said it is "hard to tell" because of a lack of detail. And the third reviewer said the approach is "generally sound," but identified multiple areas that are unclear in the proposal, including how the MCM performance modeling will be conducted and how cost-effectiveness will be determined.

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

All three of the reviewers expressed optimism that the study's goals could be achieved within the stated timeframe and budget, but all of the reviewers caveated their optimism by noting that they would have liked to see more details to feel confident about this assessment.

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

All three reviewers identified technical risks associated with implementing this project. One reviewer expressed concerns about the project's ability to monitor, evaluate and quantify MCM performance in a "robust, credible and consistent manner." A second reviewer expressed concerns that the online tools would lack a strong technical footing. The third reviewer expressed concerns about potentially unpredictable outcomes when engaging with stakeholders, and about collecting potentially uneven data on MCM performance, which could complicate efforts to optimally integrate MCMs into watershed planning.

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 three reviewers expressed confidence that the project has strong potential to influence management decision-making. One reviewer described the project as "high value," a second reviewer said the project could lead to increased MCM investments by local governments, and the third reviewer said the study will provide "critical tools" to inform best management practices.

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

All three reviewers suggested that the project should reach out to and learn from similar efforts by others. One reviewer suggested engaging with national groups, including the National Municipal Stormwater Alliance. A second reviewer suggested convening a national panel of technical experts to provide peer review, and possibly funding the project in a phased/adaptive manner to ensure the project's final tools are built on a strong technical foundation. The third reviewer suggested reaching out to municipalities with experience in this topic, such as Austin,

Texas, for support and guidance, particularly for areas like how to evaluate and quantify MCM performance.

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 of the reviewers rated the proposal's objectives as being "excellent" for addressing SCWP goals, while the other reviewer gave a "very good" rating and did not elaborate further.

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

The reviewers disagreed on the likelihood of the study achieving its objectives. One reviewer gave an "excellent" rating, one gave an "adequate" rating, and one gave an "adequate to inadequate" rating and did not elaborate further.

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

The reviewers disagreed in their assessment of the study team's capabilities. One reviewer gave an "excellent" rating, while the other two gave a "Not applicable because of insufficient information" rating. One of the latter two reviewers elaborated on their rating, noting that while the proposal makes clear that the study team is already involved with similar work, the proposal fails to describe successful completion of any of this work.