

Questions and Responses to WinLaC RFQ posted April 29, 2021

Question1: Who are the other consulting firms that received the RFQ?

Answer: The RFQ was sent to consulting firms that were awarded past or current 1W1P projects, or were known to have submitted proposals for other 1W1P watersheds.

The RFQ for the WinLaC Planning Area was sent to the following consulting firms as well as being posted on the Winona County website [Clean Water Management - Natural Resource Management - Winona County](#):

- Barr Engineering Co
- Burns & McDonnell
- Emmons & Olivier Resources, Inc.
- HDR
- Houston Engineering, Inc.
- HRGreen
- ISG
- Limno Tech
- RESPEC
- Tetra Tech
- Wenck Associates, Inc.
- WSB & Associates, Inc.

Question 2: Has the partnership already sent out the notification letter? If so, when will responses be received?

Answer: Yes, the WinLaC Partnership has sent out notification letters to all Local Government Units within the Mississippi River Winona La Crescent (WinLaC) Planning Area as well as required State Partners. The notification was sent out on March 9, 2021 with a deadline of May 10, 2021 to provide responses.

Question 3: Regarding page 6 (of RFQ): **Consultant will utilize existing modeling data and complete modeling in areas of the watershed that have no past modeling work** - Have the Partners confirmed with BWSR and state partners regarding the scope of additional modeling referenced in this item? It is our understanding that new modeling (i.e., model development, vs running “BMP scenarios”) is not funded by 1W1P grants.

Answer: BWSR’s Guidance Document entitled “Allowable Costs for Planning Grants” <http://www.bwsr.state.mn.us/one-watershed-one-plan> (under “Planning Grants” dropdown) states that modeling work can be an allowable expense if that modeling is needed to “prioritize, target, and measure in a planning context.” This same guidance document does state that “developing new studies, models, or other research, including increasing the level of detail in models beyond what’s needed for planning is not an allowable cost.”

As part of Cycle II in the watershed approach, Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA) and local staff did not identify a need to “refresh” the SWAT model that was completed in Cycle I. If it is discovered through the 1W1P planning process that additional water quality modeling resources would become available through extension or recalibration of SWAT, MPCA could very likely support that work (either through their modeling staff or through a contract with the consultant).

Question 4: It appears that there is some inconsistency between the bulleted items below (see highlighting) pertaining to the SWAT and ACPF requirements, as follows:

- At the bottom of page 3 and the top of page 4 of the RFQ, it states that “The Consultant must have the capacity to support identification of priority areas and subwatersheds using GIS and GIS-based water quality models. Most agricultural subwatersheds of the Planning Area have SWAT and ACPF models completed; the consultant needs to be able to propose “next steps” in developing pollution reduction measures that meet watershed goals using these datasets.”
- At the bottom of page 4 and the top of page 5 of the RFQ, it states that “the Consultant will need to be familiar with these modeling tools and be able to enhance them to develop pollution reduction measurements that meet watershed goals.”
- At the top of page 6 of the RFQ, it states that “Consultant will utilize existing modeling data and complete modeling in areas of the watershed that have no past modeling work (under direction of Advisory Committee)...This modeling work can be completed in coordination with State Partners, but Consultant needs to be experienced in running SWAT and ACPF, understand karst landscape implications, interpreting their respective outputs, and have knowledge of overlaying SWAT into ACPF.”

What should we propose for our work — review existing tool and model results and then propose ways to incorporate the necessary reduction measures, or actually make changes to the existing tools/models to ensure that apples-to-apples comparisons are made and the necessary pollution reduction measures are incorporated?

Answer: Rather than creating a new model data set, the Partnership prefers to utilize watershed scale modeling already completed within the Planning Area along with completed targeting tools (ex. ACPF). Existing targeting tools, however, do not cover the entire Planning Area. Consultant proposals should address potential data gaps by expanding the use of the GIS-based tools and interfaces in these areas. A consultant proposal should identify the best course of action to develop measurable goals, identify targeted project locations, create a detailed implementation schedule with estimated costs, and pollutant reduction values to indicate a pace of progress towards meeting watershed goals in order to meet the Plan Content Requirements for the One Watershed One Plan Program.

A consultant needs to be proficient at working with SWAT, ACPF and potentially other GIS-based tools and interfaces in order to identify appropriate “next steps”. A consultant proposal should include specific examples of which watershed scale models (e.g. HSPF, SWAT, HSPF-SAM, etc.) and GIS-based tools and interfaces (PTMapp, ACPF, HSPF-SAM, etc.) they’ve previously worked with. Descriptions of past experiences should include examples of how the consultant utilized various models and/or tools to provide reduction estimates or assist in identifying priority areas.