

MIWMA Proposal Pre-Bid Meeting List of Questions

Budget/Scope

1. Given the extensive scope of the project, could you provide more details on how the budget was determined? Did you have external support to develop the budget?

The scope of the project started with all desired elements of the watershed planning process, with both modeling and data collection subsequently eliminated to remove two of the biggest costs. The scope and proposed budget were also paralleled against previous RFPs seeking watershed planning services by neighboring WMAs. Some consultation regarding public input event costs was sought from external sources. Additionally, IDNR provided general input on scope in relation to budget, based on extensive past experience with watershed planning proposals.

2. The current scope of work appears to be missing an important element, namely conducting a watershed assessment and analysis designed to connect cause and effect between issues in the watershed and their sources. Was this intended?
 - o Is the budget reflective of an expectation that baseline data and preliminary analyses will be provided, or does it include funds for conducting these from scratch?

The expectation is that existing data and literature will be compiled to establish cause and effect. This should not be done from scratch.

3. Is the budget fixed?

Yes, the budget is fixed at \$221,000. That represents the total grant and WMA member contributions at this time.

- a. If so, then is there any opportunity for negotiating the scope of work to align with the budget?
 - i. Is there a process for budget adjustments and conducting the work in a phased approach over the subsequent years?

While the consultant may make recommendations on addressing certain items in subsequent years as funding becomes available, a phased approach for this contract will not be considered for the planning services, because future funds are not guaranteed. The expectation is that the

consultant will provide a scope of work that they can realistically complete within the budget, recognizing that this will be a consideration within the budget evaluation of the proposal, and also weighed against other proposals.

If not, then are you open to proposers providing an appropriate budget for the full scope of work (in a prioritized, phased approach)?

Yes, the expectation is that the consultant will provide a scope of work that they can realistically complete within the budget. However, a phased approach outside of the scope of this planning project will not be considered.

- b. Would MIWMA be open to a transparent discussion about the budget if the proposed scope of work during the project reveals financial constraints?

The budget is fixed, and thus the proposal should clearly demonstrate how the scope of work will be done within the budget. If constraints are anticipated, the proposal should reflect an adjusted approach to show what the consultant can realistically achieve, so the review committee can weigh this in evaluation of the proposal. There would be no additional funds to address unforeseen financial constraints and would need to be addressed via elimination or modification of desired planning elements.

- 4. Are there specific aspects of the project that are more flexible and can be adjusted based on budget limitations?

The allocation of the budget is flexible, the consultant is welcome to reflect recommended reallocation within the detailed break-down of costs.

- 5. What deliverables are the agency's top priorities, and how are these ranked in terms of budget allocation?

Priorities can be set during the watershed planning process. The consultant should illustrate what they can accomplish within the budget, understanding that all tasks/deliverables are desired for inclusion in the plan.

- 6. How does MIWMA view the balance between the value of comprehensive stakeholder engagement and the associated costs within the proposed budget?

The stakeholder engagement is a necessary component of the planning process. The TAC and other potential partners will be key for an efficient and affordable approach to stakeholder engagement, with the TAC playing a key role in guiding stakeholder engagement. Additionally, some events will be led by partner agencies, such as the ag field days. The approach should be practical and should utilize the TAC to get the most efficient connection to stakeholders, and leverage their expertise and networks.

7. Is the RFP tailored with the assumption that proposers have prior experience and baseline analyses in the region?

The assumption is that the consultant will lead the effort and work with partner agencies to identify and compile sources of baseline analysis data. Some of the partner agencies will be good sources of data in and of themselves. This data or information might include snapshot sampling, project-specific data at various resolutions, and data contained within literature, such as USGS publications. This is essentially a brand new WMA. Part of the effort will be to identify sources or partners that can contribute relevant information to the baseline analysis, as many of these are yet unknown.

8. What are the intended outcomes of case studies, and are specific areas within the watershed already identified for detailed planning?

The intended outcome of the case studies is to provide a fully developed conceptual plan that can address an identified issue at the community level, that could then be used as the basis to apply for funding when it becomes available. Currently, there are no specific areas within the watershed identified for these community-based studies. There are WMA members for which their own community-based watershed issues provided the main incentive to become active members, and we anticipate as member organizations continue to join the WMA and stakeholder engagement commences, that additional opportunities for case studies will be elucidated, again emphasizing the importance of the community input/engagement and partner cooperation component of the project.

9. Could you provide more details on the requirements for the website? Is there an existing platform, or will this be built from scratch?

The website should present a mechanism for anyone engaging with the watershed to view the resulting material from the planning process in a way that is educational, streamlined, and informative. There is not an existing platform, and this will need to be built from scratch.

10. For the data review, the RFP says:

“...and analysis of existing data. The committee will assist in compiling, analyzing, and reviewing water quality data and information for the watershed.”

Does this mean the committee will be analyzing the data and the consultant just facilitates this?

The consultant will lead the compilation, analysis, and review of the water quality data effort, and should organize discussions and cooperation on input and feedback from the committee.

11. What does HCPF stand for? Is it the HSPF watershed model?

There is reference to both HCPF and ACPF within the RFP. Listing of HCPF is in error; all instances should be ACPF (Agricultural Conservation Planning Framework).

12. When is the next scheduled MIWMA quarterly meeting?

Thursday, April 4th, 1:00-2:30 PM. City of Tama City Hall meeting room.

13. Are there any compliance requirements with the ARPA Local Fiscal Recovery Funds?

No. The selected contractor will need to provide a Unique Entity Identifier (UEI) from SAM.gov and cannot be suspended or debarred on SAM.gov.

14. Do subconsultants have to attend the pre-bid meeting?

No. We did not expect subcontractors to be identified prior to the pre-bid meeting.

15. Does the consultant perform the source water plan or does DNR?

IDNR will lead the development of the source water plan.

16. The term “community level” is mentioned several times in the RFP. What is the definition of “community level”? (i.e. county-level, city/incorporated area level, HUC-8 level?)

The term community level really refers to efforts by an organized group, so the scale is yet unknown - though we do expect this to be drilled-down at a much smaller scale than the HUC 8 level. For example, it may be a city that has drought or flood issues, it may be a non-government group that has efforts focused on a stream reach or wetland restoration, it may be a county looking at focused riparian improvements.

17. Who will be hosting the website after it is complete?

This will be determined by and the responsibility of the WMA.

18. There are many Tasks and Actions (Appendix B) with shared responsibilities between the PC and other partners or committees. Having a clear understanding of roles and responsibilities is critical for adequately scoping and budgeting tasks. Can the MIWMA provide any additional clarity on the specific requirements or responsibilities of the PC (vs. TAC or partner) for the following tasks:

- a. (5d) Compilation of GIS-based riparian and stream buffer data (no responsible party listed in Appendix B)

The consultant is expected to lead this but can work with the TAC to have them assist in compiling data and technical expertise.

- b. (6b) Will the PC be responsible for performing land cover assessment or simply receive all land use data, in addition to the RUSLE analysis results, from the DNR and incorporate into the plan?

The IDNR and IDALS will be responsible for the land cover assessment and RUSLE results for those HUC12's identified for ACPF modelling. Land use/land cover data should be included as part of the data compilation effort for the full watershed, of which the PC is expected to lead, while utilizing the various partners and technical resources.

19. In RFP Section II. – Proposed Methodology and Scope of Work:

- a. Item 1-Establishment of Committees: Does the MIWMA desire the PC to schedule all meetings, manage attendees, be responsible for venues, develop agendas, and develop and distribute meeting notes, or will a member of the TAC perform any of those tasks?

The PC will be expected to fully manage the meetings, though this will be in direct cooperation with the TAC, who may also assist in various capacities. For example, a TAC member may be identified to take meeting notes. There is an existing listserv for quarterly meetings that will be made available to the consultant. These meetings are always held at the same location, first Thursday of the quarter, but confirmed as an agenda item at each meeting.

- b. Please clarify the PC's role and responsibility (relative to DNR's) with respect to Item 6-Source Water Plan. Is it limited to hosting the Source Water Protection workshop (Item 13 on next page) or are additional tasks required of the PC related to Source Water Protection Plan development?

The IDNR will lead the development and drafting of the plan. The PC will be expected to attend the workshop and incorporate this material into the overall watershed plan.