

Memorandum

To: Maija Madec, Richard Moss

From: Michael Taylor

Subject: DAC Involvement Request for Proposals

Date: 9-20-16

Comments:

Some comments, recommendations for consideration:

TLB DAC Water Database

It is suggested that the scope is clarified to state that data available from the State will be linked and may be incorporated into this new database as appropriate. Data acquired through the project will be used to supplement the data available from other sources. It is recommended that a frequency is established (i.e. Every 6 months) where the other publicly available data is again linked or used to update this new database. Duplication of effort to enter information should be avoided to the extent possible.

It is suggested that a draft database and web portal site be prepared upon definition of several (limited in number) parameters and report functions. Upon development and use of the initial web portal site, the need to evolve the information to other formats or functions could be better determined.

It is suggested that legal counsel be included in the project team to assist with making sure that any information gathered, used, reported, conveyed, etc. is with the written authorization of the source of the information. Similarly, legal counsel may be beneficial for other aspects of the project (at this point unknown). Legal counsel will be necessary prior to obtaining and using information from private sources.

TLB DAC Water DB Proposal from TCiCT, Item 1.5: I am not able to understand the intent of this statement.

Item 1.6: I do not understand the intent or implications of this statement.

It is noted that there are no "partnerships" between any agencies. The issue of sharing the information needs to be further defined. In my understanding, the information is to be obtained through funding assistance from the State and is intended to be publically available.

It is recommended that the scope include the ability to report or show trends. Examples could be: a) the number or location of sites that exceed an MCL for a particular constituent on an

annual basis or b) the change of groundwater levels each year (information available from other sources).

Item 2.5: It appears in the statement that this is included in the scope.

Item 3.0: The issue of hardware and software should be clarified. It may be suggested that all hardware and software for this project are purchased from the funding program and therefore are not subject to other uses. This is subject to whether the costs are eligible for reimbursement.

Item 6.0: The issue of hiring ESRI and a Water Quality expert are not understood. These arrangements, if made, would need to be very early in the project.

Item 9.0: The issue of testing of the database and model is not clearly understood. This testing would also be necessary early in the process.

Item 11.0: The costs for Items 11.2 and 11.3 seem to be excessive and are showing a schedule that seems inconsistent with the intent of the project.

Item 11.4: This item is not understood. It seems to rely upon an arrangement with other parties for an unknown benefit to said parties.

Needs Assessment Template

“Describe involvement with local IRWM Governance” – vague statement. Suggest choices such as involved, aware, not involved.

Part 2) Drinking Water

Recommend adding:

Maximum day water demand

Add capacity of the wells

Add capacity of surface water sources

Add depth to water

Add water quality exceedances or MCL violations (various constituents)

The terms “Accessible for Community (Y/N)” and “Affordable for Community (Y/N)” are subjective and undefined.

Accessible for Community – It is not understood what this means.

Affordable for Community – Suggest using 1.5% of MHI as affordability criteria.

Part 3) Waste Water

Describe in the type of system whether it is a community system or individual on-site systems.

Include capacity of the system

Part 4) Storm Water

Include what entity owns the storm water system

Part 6) Water System Financing

Rate structure should include as choices “flat rate”, “metered rate”

It is unknown what is intended by the term “Describe system **financing** needs”

DAC Engagement Program

It is recommended that the DAC Engagement Program begin with identifying the costs associated with searching and hiring a lead person for the subject. The costs for this activity are absent.

It is suggested that one of the first objectives of the lead person for this program would be to define the present circumstances relative to level of communication between DACs and the various IRWMs, past activities relative to preparation, submittal, and support of funding applications that would benefit DACs, and anticipated future activities. Essentially, a baseline of the present circumstances should be defined as based on specific evidence and documented results of outreach. This work would also utilize the Needs Assessment portion of the project as a basis for describing present circumstances.

Subsequent to the initial baseline, the lead person would be responsible to describe alternative courses of action and recommended courses of action. The present outline has predetermined a large number of specific meetings and other actions without specific objectives.

The present proposal has many specific line items and costs of predetermined items, yet the supporting basis for those items has not yet been gathered, vetted, or authorized by the Steering Committee.

The term non-DAC members and the relative relationship to the purpose of this study is not understood.

The objectives seem to stretch beyond the understood objectives of 1) involvement in IRWM planning efforts to ensure balanced access and opportunity for participation in the IRWM process, 2) increase the understanding of water management needs of DACs, and 3) develop strategies and long-term solutions that address identified DAC water management needs.

Building increased communications between DACs and the IRWMs is a viable objective that compliments the above objectives.

There seems to be a perspective of emphasizing regional water management in the process. It is suggested, that while an understanding of regional issues is beneficial, it appears that the goal of the project is to focus on the specific water management needs of the individual DACs. Until the specific needs are understood and documented, the alternatives to consider to attempt to address the needs cannot be defined.

It is recommended that an initial deliverable of the lead person would be a report documenting the present circumstances, defining the needs, and presenting alternative courses of actions (and associated budgets) based on the present circumstances and needs. Included in the initial work tasks would be to attend a meeting at each IRWM group. Upon authorization by the Steering Committee, subsequent actions, which may include hiring of additional staff, would be pursued.

The initial costs for the DAC Engagement Program need to take into account costs to search and hire a lead person. The rent, hardware, software, communications, insurance, benefits, expenses of the lead person, and at least a year of employment of the lead person is recommended to be included.

Additional tasks would be added to the work as authorized by the Steering Committee for a specific time frame (i.e. Subsequent 6 months). It is recommended that a Contingency budget is reserved for potential use with the tasks to be authorized.

The present task descriptions have pre-determined activities. It is recommended that the ideas of meetings, tours, trainings and similar are to be considered for incorporation into the project. However, all meetings, workshops, trainings, tours, and similar activities would need to identify the need for the task, purpose, required and optional participants, documentation of the results of the tasks, and accounting for all expenses associated with the tasks. It is anticipated that the expenses and time for all participants in the activities who are not a part of the project team will not be eligible for reimbursement and are not included in any budget for the project. It is anticipated that each task will be evaluated for effectiveness and may offer recommendations for follow up activities.

The process of submitting recommended actions and budgets to the Steering Committee for consideration would be repeated at an appropriate interval for the duration of the project.

Education

It appears that there is a predetermined need for a series of three informational videos.

It is suggested that there is no predetermined product until the needs of the area, subsequent recommended actions, and approved courses of action are defined. Products such as a video would seem to have a specific message, a specific audience, an intended schedule, and result.

It is recommended that the Education portion of the scope eliminate the predetermined production of a video series and have a Contingency line item of \$33,000 for use when a specific product is approved during the course of the project.