Updated on 2/28/22

SAFE CLEAN WATER PROGRAM SCIENTIFIC STUDY PROPOSAL QUESTIONNAIRE

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

Title: **Microplastics in LA County Stormwater**

Proposing Organization: **University of California Riverside**

Your summary of the Project Goals and Objectives:

The reviewers agree that the project's overarching goal is to develop standardized methods for monitoring microplastics in urban streams and to collect baseline monitoring data for L.A. County rivers and streams. Specifically, the project will compare two different measurement methods – one cheaper and more rapid, and the other more costly but known to produce more accurate results. The project also will seek to estimate microplastic loadings – key numerical data that will be used to build regional understanding of the source, fate and transport of plastic pollution. The project is part of a series of ongoing microplastics monitoring, modeling and analysis projects by the study team.

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

All three reviewers agreed that the study's objectives are clear. Two of the reviewers offered suggestions for further improving clarity, including more details about the sampling plans, modeling, as well as about why there is unevenness in the number of samples to be collected at each site during different years.

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 reviewers emphasized that this study constitutes foundational research to understand microplastics contamination in rivers and streams, noting that managers cannot effectively intervene to reduce microplastics pollution until they understand how much is present and how it is entering and traveling through stormwater systems. The baseline data from this project will be critical for evaluating future management action success. Finally, two reviewers commented on the positive aspects of developing a standardized sampling method that could be used throughout L.A.

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 key technical elements of the study are: (1) Conduct field sampling using two different, previously developed methods to gather data on microplastic fluxes, (2) estimate microplastics fluxes via established modeling techniques, (3) compare results from the two methods and (4) integrate the data into regional watershed modeling.

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

All three reviewers agreed that, on the whole, sufficient information was provided describing the study's technical approaches. However, all three reviewers cited things they would have preferred to see more information on. Two reviewers expressed a preference for more details on how the flux modeling portions will be done. Although the third reviewer explicitly stated that the modeling work is "well-described". The third reviewer, asked for an explanation of how the proposal's authors decided to use a specific analytical technique for identifying tire wear particles.

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 three reviewers agreed that the technical approach for the sampling methods portion of the study is sound. The reviewers disagreed on whether the modeling portion of the study is sound: Two expressed confidence that the modeling portion is technically sound, while the third said it was difficult to make this determination because of a lack of detail.

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

   All three reviewers expressed general optimism that the study's objectives are achievable within the proposed timeframe and budget, although two of them caveated their assessments by saying they would have preferred to see a breakdown of costs by task to have more confidence that the budget will be appropriate.

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

   All three reviewers identified technical risks, but they said that none of these risks would be insurmountable or would be likely to derail the project. One reviewer said that an unavoidable risk is the prospect of insufficient rain events during the planned sampling period. A second reviewer noted the logistical difficulty of having a sampling team ready to deploy within minutes of a "first-flush" rain event. And the third reviewer said identification and analysis of microplastics in a laboratory can often take more time than is allocated, especially in stormwater where there are likely to be a lot of [microplastic and non-microplastic] particles.

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 agree that the study has direct and important links to stormwater management. One reviewer characterized the information that will be provided by the study as "extremely useful." Two reviewers stated that the monitoring will help to establish estimates of microplastic loads providing information about the magnitude of stormwater loads relative to other pathways, establish baseline loads against which future loads assessment may be compared, and help establish grounds for potential concern. All three reviewers also agreed that the vetting of the two candidate monitoring methods is likely to pave the way for establishment of routine microplastics monitoring initiatives for the region's rivers and streams.

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

Two of the reviewers provided additional comments. One reviewer commended the study design as being the most robust microplastics monitoring study of its kind that they've come across, and suggested that the study could be further strengthened by comparing the two monitoring methods to a third method (a single depth-integrated sample at the thalweg), provided additional funding could be secured. The other reviewer suggested that the study reconsider the method that the study is planning to use for monitoring tire wear particles, but characterized it as a "small" suggestion because the authors can adjust the method to optimize as the study progresses.

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 proposal's objectives as being "excellent" for addressing SCWP goals, while the third 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?

       Two reviewers rated the chances of the study's technical approach achieving its stated outcomes as "excellent." The third reviewer gave a "very good" rating and cited concerns about the method that will be used to identify tire wear particles as the reason for not giving the highest possible rating.

    c. Technical experience and qualifications of the study team?

       All three reviewers rated the study team's capabilities as "excellent."

Updated on 2/28/22

SAFE CLEAN WATER PROGRAM SCIENTIFIC STUDY PROPOSAL QUESTIONNAIRE

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

Title: **Rebuilding Soils for Effective Nature-based Solutions**

Proposing Organization: **TreePeople**

Your summary of the Project Goals and Objectives:

The reviewers agree that the study's overarching goal is to evaluate the effectiveness of a method developed in Virginia to rehabilitate compacted soils in L.A. to increase the soil's water infiltration capacity. Specifically, the study will conduct the rehabilitation work at three testing sites, quantify infiltration rates before and after, and use the improved infiltration estimates for evaluating the effectiveness of nature-based solutions.

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

   All three reviewers agreed that the study's objectives are, on the whole, clearly stated, although two of the reviewers identified areas that they would have liked to see clarified. One reviewer would have preferred more detail on the different types of soil conditions and remediation methods to be tested. The other reviewer said it is unclear how the project is defining what the soil infiltration rate would need to be for the method to be considered an effective nature-based solution.

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. Two of the reviewers offered only positive comments affirming the value of this work to managers, citing the positive impact similar work had in Virginia. The third reviewer caveated their generally positive assessment by noting that on-the-ground implementation of this work would be "somewhat limited" by the limited number of direct connections to end-user managers.

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 agree that the main study elements are: (1) Physically decompact soils at three urban sites, (2) implement multiple types of rehabilitation, including carbon amendments and woody plant species, (3) assess infiltration rates through monitoring and (4) model how the soil rehabilitation work influences soil moisture and runoff rates.

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

   All three reviewers noted that key information is missing about the study design, including how the soil rehabilitation work will be conducted, how effectiveness will be assessed, and how the modeling work will be conducted. While all three reviewers agreed that the proposal is significantly lacking in its description of the technical approach, the reviewers disagreed on how

big of a deal this is. Two reviewers expressed dismay at the lack of detail, while the third reviewer was not bothered, noting that missing details will "be determined if the project is funded."

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 did not agree about whether the project is technically sound. Two of the reviewers expressed optimism about the soundness of the technical approach and offered suggestions for how to ensure the study is conducted in a technically rigorous fashion. Examples include depth of topsoil, use of plants, use of soil amendments, and the use of untreated control sites, amongst others. The third reviewer, while never explicitly saying the proposal is not technically sound, heavily critiqued the technical approach, expressing concerns about how monitoring data will be analyzed, how key water-quality parameters will be selected, and whether sufficient data will be collected to enable researchers to conduct necessary model calibration work.

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

   All three reviewers expressed overall confidence that the study will achieve its goals within the proposed timeframe and budget, although each reviewer caveated their assessment by pointing to gaps in the proposal that could jeopardize the project's path to success. One reviewer said considerations such as types of pollutants to be monitored could have a significant impact on costs. Another reviewer noted that the budget to support salary seemed excessive to produce a single manuscript, which is what is planned to be written. Both of these reviewers noted that the scope of the monitoring design could affect the timeline. And the third reviewer said the exact scope of the soil rehabilitation work – which was not specified in the proposal – will affect the timeline.

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

   All three reviewers identified multiple significant technical risks that could affect the project's success. One reviewer highlighted a possible lack of appropriate control sites, as well as the unintended influence that nutrients introduced during soil rehabilitation could have on monitoring measurements. A second reviewer expressed concerns about the applicability of findings to other sites if the study sites are not representative, whether the study would appropriately capture site-specific hydrological dynamics, the potential high degree of uncertainty associated with the modeling outputs, and whether the planned scale at which measurement and modeling work will be conducted is appropriate. The third reviewer echoed concerns about selecting study sites that are representative, whether the timeline to complete soil rehabilitation work is sufficiently long, and how the study will adapt if none of the soil rehabilitation methods being tested are deemed to be successful in Southern California.

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 three reviewers expressed differing degrees of confidence about whether the study will produce results that are utilized by managers. Two of the reviewers expressed only optimism that the study could be managerially relevant. The third reviewer noted that the study lacks "explicit links" to management decision-making, although this reviewer simultaneously noted that the study team has had success getting recommendations codified into building codes – which is a holy-grail scenario and an ideal outcome.

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

    All three reviewers offered additional comments. One reviewer said the project's success could hinge on whether the County has legal mechanisms in place for codifying the study's recommendations into permitting for future development/redevelopment projects. This reviewer also said it would be valuable to contextualize soil rehabilitation in terms of the role it could play in advancing the County's overall water-quality improvement goals. A second reviewer said that the project's integration with management decision-making is "somewhat weak," and that they would have preferred much more information on the study design. The third reviewer suggested that the study team might want to rethink aspects of the study design, as well as consult with the Huntington Library and other L.A. County organizations that have previously explored investing in soil rehabilitation.

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?

       One reviewer rated the proposal's objectives as being "excellent" for addressing SCWP goals, while the other two reviewers gave a "very good" rating and did not explicitly state why they did not give a higher rating.

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

       The reviewers rated the likelihood of the study achieving its objectives either "adequate" or "very good." The reviewer who gave an "adequate" rating said the study design could be improved by separately validating the efficacy of the individual aspects of the soil rehabilitation work (i.e., soil decompaction, addition of organic matter to the soil, and addition of plants).

    c. Technical experience and qualifications of the study team?

Updated on 2/28/22

The three reviewers disagreed in their assessment of the technical capabilities of the study team. Two reviewers gave an "excellent" rating, while the third reviewer gave a "Not applicable due to insufficient information" rating and cited the lack of information in the proposal about whether the study team has prior experience doing this type of work.

Updated on 2/28/22

SAFE CLEAN WATER PROGRAM SCIENTIFIC STUDY PROPOSAL QUESTIONNAIRE

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

Title: **Community Garden Stormwater Capture Investigation**

Proposing Organization: **Los Angeles Community Garden Council**

Your summary of the Project Goals and Objectives:

The proposal reviewers agree that the goal of this project is to identify existing community gardens in L.A. County that are optimally suited to serve as implementation sites for BMPs, and to develop BMP design concepts for multiple sites across multiple watersheds where runoff capture/treatment could be optimized.

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

The reviewers disagree on whether the objectives are clearly stated. Two reviewers said the objectives are generally clear, while the third said the objectives are not entirely clear. One of the reviewers who indicated the objectives are generally clear said they would have liked to see more clarity on how candidate sites will be ranked and prioritized, while the other reviewer described the objectives as clear but too brief. The third, more critical reviewer said the number of watersheds to be studied is not clear – either 7 or 14, depending on where in the proposal you read — nor is there clarity around how the sites will be analyzed and what kinds of design criteria will be used.

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 disagree on how effectively the project supports the SCWP's goals of increasing stormwater or urban runoff capture and/or reducing stormwater or urban runoff pollution. Two of the reviewers expressed doubts, while the third reviewer expressed confidence. Of the two reviewers who expressed doubts, one questioned whether a lack of BMP concept designs for community gardens is the limiting factor and the cause of more BMPs not being built, and also questioned whether, as a result of having concept designs, more BMPs would actually be implemented in L.A. County. The other reviewer who expressed doubts pointed out that no BMPs will actually get built by the end of the project, although with additional future funding for implementation, the reviewer expressed optimism that the project could be impactful. The third reviewer expressed confidence in the proposal's potential management impact, commending the proposal for considering both site characteristics and the buy-in of community garden leaders in selecting BMP sites.

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 proposal reviewers agree that the proposal consists of the following steps: (1) compile basic information for about 750 community gardens in L.A. County, (2) narrow down these sites to a much smaller number of candidate sites using screening criteria, (3) visit the candidate sites to collect field information, (4) develop conceptual designs for implementing BMPs at a subset of the

candidate sites, and (5) develop materials to support future efforts to secure the necessary funding to implement the BMP concept designs.

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

   All three reviewers expressed concerns about the lack of detail in the technical approach. One reviewer noted the lack of information about what site selection criteria will be used – specifically, if volume of stormwater the site is capable of capturing would be considered. A second reviewer noted that the proposal writer had skipped or provided little information in multiple key subsections, including neglecting to specify site selection criteria and threshold cutoffs. The third reviewer expressed concerns about the feasibility of obtaining some types of data for various sites, and the lack of detail on the role of the [SCWP] Coordinator .

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 three reviewers expressed concerns about the technical soundness of the proposal. One reviewer deemed the technical gaps to be "significant," noting that the proposal should have offered much more specificity around what the final concept designs will look like, what types of BMPs will be considered, and what field data will be collected. A second reviewer said that the proposal's plan to rely on existing, publicly available soil survey data would be a mistake, as these data are "notoriously inaccurate." The third reviewer expressed concerns about the lack of detail on BMP sizing requirements and feasibility evaluations at the sites where concept designs will be created.

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

   All three reviewers agreed that the study's timeframe and budget seem reasonable, although one reviewer said they are "somewhat unsure" about taking this stance due to insufficient technical details in the proposal. The other two reviewers said the timeframe was reasonable and that the budget might be larger than necessary.

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

   All three reviewers agreed that the project could experience significant technical risks, although the reviewers had difficulty pinpointing these risks and providing solutions because of the lack of technical detail in the proposal. One reviewer questioned whether narrowing down the sites during the screening process will result in a viable list of candidate sites, and also whether the site selection data to be collected will identify all relevant site-specific factors that the project team will need to know when preparing its concept designs (and moreover, that managers will need to know to sign off on the design plans). A second reviewer expressed concerns about improper soils or groundwater elevation data sets resulting in multiple candidate sites identified through the evaluation process being ultimately disqualified during the concept design stage. The third reviewer expressed concerns that the proposal does not explicitly identify all of the data sets that

will be collected, noting that the quality of these data sets will determine the feasibility of the project itself.

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 disagreed on whether the study will produce results useful to stormwater managers. Two of the reviewers expressed doubts, with one noting that it remains unclear whether the BMP concept designs developed through this project will actually be implemented, and the other reviewer noting that with no plan for data collection presented, the proposal is unlikely to advance management practices. The third reviewer expressed confidence in the proposal's potential management impact, noting that the study will give managers a list of sites that are appropriate for implementing BMPs.

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

    All three reviewers provided additional perspectives expressing doubts about the technical underpinnings of the proposal. One reviewer said that the proposal should have discussed the positive impact of "green jobs" creation, and provided more detailed cost justification, especially given that some watersheds have many more community gardens to evaluate than others. A second reviewer expressed disappointment that the proposal did not highlight how much stormwater could be captured if the BMP concept designs to be developed via this study were to all be eventually implemented; the second reviewer also noted that many of the sites – being former housing plots – are likely to be above street level, which would require implementing BMPs requiring disruptive excavation work. The third reviewer simply expressed disappointment at the lack of technical detail in the proposal.

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 "adequate" for addressing SCWP goals, but simultaneously used their rating to criticize the proposal, with one reviewer noting that community gardens may not be optimal BMP locations in the first place and may not have sizeable-enough watersheds to justify placing BMPs in them, and the other characterizing the project's final products as "underwhelming for the total budget proposed." The third reviewer provided a "Not applicable because of insufficient information" rating.

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

All three reviewers rated the chances of the project achieving its stated outcomes as "adequate." One of the reviewers did not elaborate, while the other two reiterated their concerns about the lack of technical detail.

c. Technical experience and qualifications of the study team?

All three reviewers provided a "Not applicable because of insufficient information" rating, with one explicitly calling out the fact that no information was provided for any members of the project team, except for the proposal writer.

Updated on 2/28/22

SAFE CLEAN WATER PROGRAM SCIENTIFIC STUDY PROPOSAL QUESTIONNAIRE

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

Title: **Regenerate LA**

Proposing Organization: **Kiss The Ground**

Your summary of the Project Goals and Objectives:

The project's overarching goal is to expand use of compost to improve urban soil health. Specifically, the project will conduct a feasibility study to determine where compost should be locally made, apply compost to a site and then monitor its soil health, develop a network for producing and distributing compost regionally, and educate end users on the benefits of using compost instead of industrial fertilizers to improve soil health.

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

All three reviewers expressed confidence that the study's objectives are, on the whole, reasonably clear, although they all caveated this assessment by identifying multiple areas where the objectives aren't clear. One reviewer said the objectives should have been placed into the context of previously completed work in this area and planned future work. A second reviewer noted potential contradictions in the objectives – for example, whether it will be possible to study compost amendments if the study does not include constructing a viable site where this study can be conducted, and whether there will be time during the relatively short, one-year study for both a pre- and post-assessment of soil health. The third reviewer said the proposal could have been strengthened by putting into context how much compost in total the City has the potential to produce and how much of a positive overall benefit could be realized by making this investment.

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. But each reviewer simultaneously offered critiques of the project's anticipated effectiveness. One reviewer said that the project could be strengthened if it also were to investigate how compost enhances runoff capture opportunities, as well as how construction of the composting facility could simultaneously become an opportunity to reduce impervious surface, which is a major impediment to effectively managing runoff. A second reviewer lamented that the study does not go far enough in describing a long-term vision for building a local network of composting facilities, as this network could result in compost being utilized at a massive scale across the entire city. The third reviewer said the study's planned monitoring of soil health would not be adequate, as the study also needs to monitor for nutrient-laden runoff leaving the site – a potential outcome that could run counter to County water-quality improvement goals.

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)?

Only one of the reviewers felt confident articulating the technical elements of the proposal. (The other two reviewers expressed confusion about what the technical elements will actually consist of; see Question 5). The reviewer who articulated the technical elements of the proposal said it will consist of designing a composting facility, determining the facility's capacity to generate compost, applying compost to nearby areas, and monitoring soil health for a year.

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

   Two of the reviewers expressed doubts that they could even articulate what the technical elements of the proposal will consist of, noting that the proposal is not framed and presented the same way that scientific study proposals typically are. These two reviewers noted that the proposal largely glosses over the nuts and bolts of how the composting facility will be designed, how the soil monitoring program will be designed, and precisely how the demonstration plots that are referenced in the proposal's appendix will be used. The third reviewer came to the opposite conclusion, indicating a comfort level with the fact that the proposal was not framed as a traditional scientific study, and offering minor suggestions for improving the clarity of the technical approach, including citing scientific literature that offers a technical rationale for why the study was designed as it was.

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 did not reach the same conclusions about the soundness of the technical approach. Two reviewers said they struggled to even evaluate the technical approach because of a lack of detail; these two reviewers emphasized that they were looking for much more technical meat about the scope and size of the composting efforts, where the composting will take place, and how the soil monitoring program will be designed and conducted. The third reviewer expressed confidence in the proposal's technical soundness (see Question 5, above).

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

   The reviewers offered a mixed assessment regarding whether the study's objectives will be achievable within its stated timeframe and budget. Regarding timeframe, one reviewer did not weigh in at all, and the other two reviewers expressed concern that the timeframe will be too short, due to pandemic-related delays and other factors. Regarding budget, one reviewer expressed concerns about not being able to account for how the requested budget will be spent, a second reviewer deemed the budget "reasonable," and the third reviewer said the budget felt "underestimated."

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 the project. One reviewer cited the lack of clarity around how the study will be conducted. A second reviewer said convincing end users to adopt composting will involve more than just education and outreach; end users also may need to acquire different equipment for tillage, as well as to provide ongoing

staff training to prevent rapid soil re-compaction. The third reviewer identified potential COVID-19 pandemic-related delays, such as not being able to generate the necessary amounts of compost within the study's timeframe.

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 tepid optimism that the study will produce results that are relevant and directly applicable to stormwater managers. One reviewer said the proposal would have been stronger if the link between this project and stormwater management needs had been "brought out as a focal point" in the proposal. The other two reviewers said the project's management influence will depend largely on whether the project is able to take a technically rigorous approach to showing that compost can substantially reduce runoff volumes – because the main reason stormwater managers will be interested in this project is for its potential to improve runoff management.

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

    Only one of the reviewers provided additional comments. This reviewer said they appreciated the project's statement on anticipated benefits for local disadvantaged communities, as well as the strong letter of support from the City of L.A.'s Sanitation and Environment division affirming the project's potential to be scaled up into a city-wide initiative.

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?

       All three reviewers rated the proposal as "adequate" for achieving SCWP goals. Two of the reviewers said the proposal does not lay out a strong enough case about the relationship between composting and the potential benefits to stormwater management. The third reviewer said the proposal did not include enough information about how soil monitoring will be conducted.

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

       The reviewers disagreed about the likelihood of the study achieving its goals. One reviewer gave an "excellent" rating and expressed confidence the project can be achieved. A second reviewer gave a "very good" rating and said that while they would have liked more clarity around some of the goals, the project overall represents a

"potentially good value" if it can serve as a catalyst for a citywide composting effort. The third reviewer gave an "inadequate" rating and said that while the project has a "strong potential for success," the clarity of the proposal is significantly lacking.

c. Technical experience and qualifications of the study team?

All three reviewers rated the capabilities of the study team as either "excellent" or "very good" and had only complimentary things to say about the study team, including pointing out that the study team has had prior successes with similar initiatives.