

Central Valley Salinity Coalition with CV-SALTS Initiative

Request for Proposal (RFP) 2010-001 For Consulting Services to Conduct Beneficial Use and Objective Study Phase 1

Pre-proposal Teleconference Agenda Thursday, March 4, 2010 10:00 AM

No Written Comments were Submitted by the March 5th Deadline

UPDATED 3/10/10 see below

1. Welcome, Introductions, Attendees

11 prospective firms participated:

Sjo Liang (CSU Fresno), Lynn Baumgras (BFK Associates), Kijana Hartsorn, Logan Hanson (EKI), Lou Regenmorter (CBM), David Johnson (GEI), Ken Loy (West Yost Associates), Cameron Tanna (Hydrometrics Water Resources), Lana Cati (Kennedy Jenks Consultants), Brian Schmidt (New Fields), Jeff Boles (Brown and Caldwell), Bob Smith (Larry Walker), Joe Dickey (New Fields) also participating Daniel Cozad (CVSC), Dennis Westcot (San Joaquin River Group and CVSC), Joe McGahan (Drainage Authority)

2. Brief Review of RFP (Daniel)

The Technical Committee worked on several areas of the Beneficial Use and Objectives Study. Phases 2, 3, 4 and of that work has not yet been decided.

One issue that came up since development of the initial scope was the identification that a number of coverages of the information that might be needed for surface water that was available from the state board. We were concerned that we would have too many people contacting the state board. We found out where the coverages for the state board lived and one of the attachments is a GIS storage block.

The group will be contracting the work once the firm is selected through the Drainage Authority.

The committee thinks the Work schedule and budget should cost no more than \$50,000 and should take less than four months.

Task 1 lists the things that we know we want to see in the information that comes back.

Task 2 goes into existing water quality objectives and both the efforts to map those out, to follow those along and develop – with a little bit of help from the Regional board – those areas. Following and developing the tributary rule so that each point and each of the water bodies can be seen. The groundwater will be the most challenging because here is where there is the least development spatially, at least in the GIS layers.

Task 3 is a literature search looking at the water quality criteria.

3. Review of questions received to date, if any - None

4. Questions or clarifications from participants

Q: (Bob Smith) – There is mention of the indicator permits to guide the work on the objectives. I assume that those will not be identified prior to submittal of the proposal – that will be something that will be worked with with the regional board.

A: (Daniel) – We can't commit to them being done before the proposal. They're certainly not done at this point. The review is being done by board staff and so it has to fit with all the other things that are going. We hope that by the time the contract is awarded that will be nailed down (at least very shortly thereafter). I will be meeting with them next Wednesday to follow up on where they are in the process. The set of indicator permits is because it would be unrealistic to go through a large list of permits. If you're trying to price the effort based on a per-indicator, I think that would be reasonable. Assume some number that you think is going to be there and then break it up per-indicator permit. Or another approach if you have ideas.

UPDATED, Based on 3/10/10 meeting with Regional Board Staff Please include not more than 50 indicator permits to be reviewed. Please price per permit beyond 25.

Q: (Cameron Hanna) – Do you view the choice of interface for the end user as something that will be defined in the proposal and part of the selection process, or do you think the selection will be part of the project?

A: (Daniel) – Because this is a short project, I would say that you ought to propose what you want to use and we would just screen that for acceptability for the committee and I hope that we will not go back and reassess that once we've started work. That would probably put us off our four-month timeline.

Q: With regard to contracting, you mentioned the Clean Up and Abatement Fund would be going to the San Joaquin Valley Drainage Authority. Are those funds already allocated and transferred to the Drainage Authority.

A: (Joe McGann) – The funds are not with the Drainage Authority. We have to request the funds. Once we receive an invoice, then we send the invoice in and the state reimburses 90%. There is a 10% withhold, then once they received the monies then we pay. My experience is that's a 45- to 60-day delay by the time you send me the invoice to when you get paid.

A: (Daniel) – It is under the current Beneficial Uses and Objectives contract so the money is allocated from the Clean Up and Abatement Account and there is an existing contract for the total of those monies then this contract will develop a task order, which will be approved and we will do that at the same time that we're contracting with you.

Q: Is that structured differently than you had in the first one? The first project?

A: (Daniel) – It is different in that the first work we did we paid the majority out of Coalition Funds with a part of that money coming from the Clean Up and Abatement account. So we sent some of those payments ahead and the last part of those, as Bob Smith laments, are coming out the Clean Up and Abatement funding which has taken us a little longer than we expected to get going. So it's a hybrid and it is possible that other task orders will be a hybrid like that, however, we're looking for this one to come from the Clean Up and Abatement Fund in its entirety.

Q: (Bob Smith) The listing of beneficial uses, is the intent there to link nitrates to these uses some how and it's aimed at getting the nutrient criteria for the avoidance of Nitrification? Or do we know?

A: (Daniel) – I don't know that we know completely. We try to focus on salinity links. Some of the links are not clear.

A: (Dennis Westcott) – As far as the nitrate in the fishery resources, unless there is a direct connection, I don't see how we could get into it.

A: (Daniel) – We're certainly not looking to make it more difficult, but we have this process where we're both looking at salinity and nitrates and those beneficial uses and from this perspective, nitrates may be somewhat significantly different in the way it's approach.

Q (con'd): So an indirect effect like eutrification would not be our focus.

A: (Daniel) – Not at this stage unless we've got things already existing documents. We're not going to do new analyses or propose anything new. We're collecting things that are already there.

A: (Dennis) – That's the way I see it also.

Q: (Ken Loy) – Could you say a few more words about the phasing? How will the rest of the phases be conducted and how do they all fit together?

A: (Daniel) – This is phase 1 and it really is an existing information gathering. What's easily available? How do we help people understand what needs to be done? What data is there? Phase 2 looks at flushing that out. From this work and some of the salt and nitrate pilot source work we'll finish scoping the rest of the work, which will be at least Phase 2 and probably Phase 3. I'm hoping Phase 2 in May. And then Phase 3 in fall. Those are probably stretched over another 12-16 months to look at the individual beneficial uses where there is the greatest need to. In a lot of cases there may not be a need to look at the beneficial uses in the area. Some cases may need to break up beneficial uses into more detailed types, or look at the basis of them based on the Hoffman report and some of the other efforts that are going on in the basin. Figure out which ones of those are needed? Which data is needed? That will be in Phase 2 and then Phase 3 will likely take those and the water quality evaluation each generated here and in other places and propose some areas where there might be changes to objectives, or based on the information where those objectives would come out. That develops some sort of draft objectives changes.

In the next major section of work, which will come a year out from the next funds request, we will look at greater data background. We'll begin to look at anti-degradation and what the historic and current water quality is. Sort of building on the pilot that's recently been completed. With that then you can finish the analysis of whether those potential preliminary objectives are still correct based on anti-degradation and other requirements and then hopefully identifying then implementation plan efforts and then a basin plan amendment. And that's the regulatory document that goes forward.

Q: (Bob Smith) There's a statement in Task 1 that says the regional board may be able to provide clarification on the necessity for assessment of aquatic habitat and official uses. Is that going to happen before we submit the proposal or after?

A: (Daniel) – There is a report that's being worked on. I don't think you can count on it for happening before the proposal is submitted. That was regional board staff report. They were basically looking at aquatic issues

and whether aquatic life issues had any salinity impacts, but I've not even seen a draft of the report so I can't promise you it will be there.

UPDATED The [Davis 2000 report](#) has been posted on the procurement page.

Q: (Bob Smith) - It says on Task 2 the contractor can identify additional constituents for which numeric water quality objectives exist and may propose to map those, as well. Is there any rationale or prioritization to indicate the coalition or CV-SALTS' desire or need to map those? Is it all or nothing, or should we prioritize?

A: (Daniel) – Let me explain how this part of the RFP came about. We were discussing which of those should be mapped and I said that CV-SALTS is a salt and nitrate and possibly salt and nutrient oriented process and that we ought to stick with that and there was considerable discussion about, if it's not much more expensive it would be a higher valued product for the region and for the regional board if we could get them all. If the Delta to add those was relatively small we might try to find money to do that. From my perspective, it goes beyond the direct scope, but if it is a high-value product at a relatively low cost. It certainly seems we wouldn't want to go through the same things for other constituents and pay a lot more money some other time. We don't have any real prioritization. If it can be done especially effectively and inexpensively that would be an add-on. We would try to find folks to help cover the cost of that. The same people who are arguing that this is going to be a lot of value to us should come up with the value to help us pay for it.

A: (Dennis) – Let me give an example of what the thinking was there. Related to salinity in most instances is the compound Boron. If there are water quality objectives we should identify those because they are an integral part of what we do in controlling salinity.

Q: On delivering the proposal, do you want to receive it electronically and paper copy by that deadline.

A: (Daniel) – That's the idea. I may send an update on the number of hard copies. Some of our reviewers have committed to view from the electronic copies. And if we have a fewer number I may have them sent directly to the reviewers on that same timeline.

5. Summary of Deadlines and Closing

Proposals are due March 19, 2010

Short list week of March 26 – interviews may not be conducted depending on selection committee

Recommendation and agreement for approval on April 2

Execution of Agreement with Contractor April 9 – this is optimistic. This is the first time of working through the Drainage Authority mechanism, but we are working quickly.

Reviewers of the proposals are going to be from all areas – regional board, state board, as well as members of the bureau and Aggravated Agriculture.

No Written Comments were Submitted by the March 5th Deadline