Response to RFP Questions Received

3/17/17

QUESTION:
We see that this RFP is for both writing of the watershed plan and facilitation of input. Do you have a level of facilitation in mind for the consultant to provide? For example, involvement may vary from having a facilitating consultant prepare meeting materials to facilitating all meeting discussions and decisions. Within this range, do you have a feel for which is best suited for your request? This will help guide what we include in our response.

RESPONSE:
The selected consultant’s facilitation role will involve the Advisory Committee to obtain stakeholder input during plan development. This will include developing a strategy for engaging a large and diverse number of stakeholders within the watershed. The selected consultant will be asked to generate the agendas, develop a process, and carry out the method chosen to best gather stakeholder input. Three or four Advisory Committee meetings to gather stakeholder input are expected.

Facilitation of the Planning Workgroup (LGU staff) and the Policy Committee (LGU officials) including development of meeting agendas and process will be led by staff and the Dakota SWCD who serves as the day to day contact. However, we anticipate the selected consultant being a participant in all of the Policy Committee meetings including providing necessary support materials, presenting materials at these meetings and being available for questions. Participating in monthly Planning Workgroup meetings may be needed but a facilitation role will not be necessary.

Once the consultant is selected, there will also be an informal kickoff meeting or “open house” scheduled. The Planning Workgroup will facilitate the kickoff meeting but we would like to introduced the selected consultant at this time and be a participant at this event.

QUESTION:
We noticed that the “Generalized Description of Scope of Services” (Section II) in the RFP does not match up with the BWSR 1W1P Work Plan included as Attachment C. Should the “Approach/Methodology” and “Cost” sections of the proposal be based on/organized by the Task breakdown identified in Section II: Generalized Description of Scope of Services or the task breakdown included in Attachment C (1W1P: Cannon River Watershed Plan Development: Work Plan)? If the proposal should follow the task breakdown in Section II, should the tasks of attachment C be cross-referenced to section II?

RESPONSE:
Please follow the task breakdown found in Section II of the RFP.
QUESTION:
The RFP includes the following task:

Task 2C: Use the outputs from modeling tools and/or programs that have been completed for the watershed, such as those listed below, to map and target areas identified through prioritization process

- Hydro-tools (SWAT, ACPF, etc.)
- HSPF
- Zonation

a. Besides the GIS mapping used to complete the SWAT/HSPF modeling and TMDL/WRAPS/Stressor ID reports, have any other GIS or Hydro-tool mapping efforts been made in the watershed, including hydrologic conditioning of LiDAR DEMs or terrain analysis?

b. Has the MnDNR completed, or are they expected to complete, a Zonation analysis of the watershed as a part of this planning effort?

RESPONSE:
A variety of modeling and mapping efforts have been completed within the Planning area. It should be noted that the Cannon River One Watershed, One Plan also includes approximately 23,500 acres of the Mississippi River Watershed – Lake Pepin Basin located in Goodhue County. No known modeling has been completed within this geographical area.

One task identified for the selected consultant will be to aggregate all the various modeling efforts completed and work with the planning grant participants to develop a strategy for incorporating existing or new information into the comprehensive watershed plan. Models and tools will be needed to project outcomes for specific actions, locations, and management practices in order to forecast measurable results. As part of this strategy, the appropriate scale of the various models will also need to be identified.

Modeling efforts used in the WRAPS/TMDL documents can be found at https://www.pca.state.mn.us/water/watersheds/cannon-river

Other known modeling efforts that were not part of the Cannon River WRAPS/TMDL documents include:

- Hydro Conditioned DEM and PTMApp in the upper, lower and middle lobes (underway)
- Terrain Analysis in upper, middle and lower lobes (underway)
- GSSHA Model in Straight River Watershed (completed through MDNR)
- SWAT Model in Little Cannon River Watershed – (completed through MPCA)

This is not intended to be an all-inclusive list of modeling efforts completed or underway.

Yes, the MDNR Zonation analysis has been built for the Cannon River Watershed and is ready for further use.
**QUESTION:**
Who are the firms that received the RFP?

**RESPONSE:**
Thirteen consultant firms within the region were directly sent the RFP. The RFP has also been posted on the Cannon River 1W1P web site for review and consideration by others. The 13 consultant firms included those who specifically requested the RFP be sent to them and firms considered to be leaders in developing comprehensive water plans.

**QUESTION:**
May we be copied on responses to questions from others?

**RESPONSE:**
Responses to all questions will be sent via email to those firms that submitted questions. The responses will also be posted to the Cannon River 1W1P web site.