

Appendix B - Minutes of the Task Force Meetings

11/20/98

Task Force to Review the Cooperative Water Program

**Minutes of the First Meeting
October 14-15, 1998
Reston, Virginia**

Attendees:

Task Force Members - - Craig Albertsen, Bureau of Reclamation; Thomas Baumgardner, National Weather Service; Tom Bruns, American Water Works Association; Ed Burkett, Corps of Engineers; Richard Burton, National Association of Counties; Randall Duncan; International Association of Emergency Managers; James Enote, Pueblo of Zuni; Frank Tsai, Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA); Fred Lissner, Oregon Department of Water Resources; Peter Mack (by phone), New York Department of Environmental Conservation; Fred Ogden, University of Connecticut; Don Phelps, American Society of Civil Engineers; David Pope, Kansas Department of Agriculture; Jonathan Price (by phone), Nevada Bureau of Mines and Geology; Robert Roberts (1st day), Environmental Council of States; Larry Rowe, Mojave Water Agency; Jim Shotwell, American Institute of Professional Geologists; Earl Smith, Interstate Council on Water Policy; Charles Spooner, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency; Alan Vicory, Ohio River Valley Water Sanitation Commission; Leslie Wedderburn, South Florida Water Management District; Don Woodward, USDA

U. S. Geological Survey - - Steve Blanchard, Task Force Executive Secretary; Bill Carswell, Regional Hydrologist – Northeastern Region; Betsy Daniel, Facilitator; Robert Hirsch, Chief Hydrologist; Nancy Lopez, Chief - Water Information Coordination Program; Jim Peters, Water Resources Division Program Officer

Location: U. S Geological Survey, National Center, Reston Virginia

The meeting closely followed the meeting agenda (attachment 1). The first day of the meeting (October 14, 1998) was primarily the USGS Water Resources Division (WRD) staff sharing information about the USGS, the WRD, and the Federal – State Cooperative Water Program with the Task Force members. Presentations included (1) introductory remarks and the charge to the Task Force by Bob Hirsch, (2) an overview of the USGS and the WRD by Bob Hirsch, (3) a general Division level presentation on the Coop Program from Jim Peters, (4) a more detailed presentation on how the Coop Program works at the Regional/District level by Bill Carswell, (5) a presentation on how other WRD programs relate to the Coop Program by Bob Hirsch, and (6) a time for the Task Force Members to share their thoughts and expectations about the work of the Task Force and the Coop Program.

Most of the Task Force members and some USGS staff participated in an informal social hour followed by a group dinner on the evening of October 14, 1998.

The second day (October 15) of the meeting was solely for Task Force deliberations. Betsy Daniel facilitated the process the Task Force used for its deliberations. The goals for the deliberations were (1) to brainstorm issues that the Task Force should address in addition to those listed in the Terms of Reference, (2) prioritize and develop preliminary action plans for the list of issues resulting from the deliberations combined with those in the Terms of Reference, (3) elect a chair and vice-chair, and (4) set the dates for the next three meetings. The Task Force ultimately divided into three groups to develop a list of issues and preliminary action plans for future meetings. The time available was limited so that most groups were able to develop a list of issues but only start on the preliminary action plans. The three groups focused on the four elements of scope from the Terms of Reference. The three groups and their topics were:

1. Federal-State Cooperative Water Program Mission (Terms Of Reference – Element 1 of the Scope)

Craig Albertsen
Thomas Baumgardner
Randall Duncan
Fred Lissner
Frank Tsai

2. Federal-State Cooperative Water Program Prioritization and Conduct of Work (Terms of Reference – Elements 2 and 3 of the Scope)

Ed Burkett
Dick Burton
Peter Mack
Fred Ogden
Don Phelps
Jonathan Price
Larry Rowe
Earl Smith
Jim Shotwell
Charles Spooner
Don Woodward

3. Federal-State Cooperative Water Program Products (Terms of Reference – Element 4 of the Scope)

Tom Bruns
Jim Enote
Dave Pope
Alan Vicory
Leslie Wedderburn

The issues and preliminary action plans developed by each group are summarized in attachments 2 for “Mission”, attachment 3 for “Prioritization and Conduct of Work”, and attachment 4 for “Products.”

The committee selected Mr. Larry Rowe, General Manager of the Mojave Water Agency, Apple Valley, California as the Chairperson for the Task Force. Mr. Fred Lissner, Manager, Ground Water and Hydrology Department, Oregon Department of Water Resources, Salem, Oregon was selected as Vice-Chairperson.

The Task Force set dates for the next three meetings. The locations will be USGS District offices in different USGS Regions and will be determined by the Chair and Vice-chair in consultation with the Executive Secretary. The dates for the next meetings are:

January 25-27, 1999

March 24-26, 1999

May 5-7, 1999

Action Items:

The Chair, Vice-Chair, and Executive Secretary meet by conference call to:

1. further develop and consolidate the preliminary plans of action,
2. determine the information needs for the January 25-27 meeting, including guest attendees and presenters,
3. determine the location for the January 25-27 meeting, and
4. set the preliminary agenda for the January 25-27 meeting.

TASK FORCE TO REVIEW THE COOPERATIVE WATER PROGRAM

AGENDA OCTOBER 14-15, 1998 Reston, Virginia Room 5A217

Wednesday, October 14

8:30 Opening Remarks – Hirsch (1 Hr)

- ACWI
- Overview Of Terms Of Reference
- Composition Of Task Force
- Self Introductions
- Goals For And Outline Of Meeting
- Brief Overview Of Coop Program

9:30 Break (0.5 Hr)

10:00 WRD Overview – Hirsch (1 Hr)

11:00 Coop Program – Division Level General Overview – Peters (1 Hr)

12:00 Lunch (USGS Cafeteria) (1 Hr)

1:00 Regional/District Overview – Carswell (1 Hr)

2:00 Break (0.5 Hr)

2:30 WRD Programs And Their Relation To The Coop Program – Hirsch (1 Hr)

3:30 Open Discussion Of Coop Program – Daniel (1 Hr)

4:30 Adjourn

6:30 Group Dinner

Thursday, October 15

8:30 Task Force Deliberations – All (1.5 Hr)

- Selection Of Chair And Co-Chair For Task Force – Daniel
- Discussion Of Terms Of Reference – Blanchard
- Discussion Of Approach/Plans For Task Force – Blanchard/Daniel
- Set Dates And Locations for Future Meetings

10:00 Break (0.5 Hr)

10:30 Continue Task Force Deliberations (1.5 Hr)

12:00 Lunch (1 Hr)

1:00? Question/Answer and Discussion of Anything Relating to USGS/WRD/Coop Program – Hirsch/Peters/Blanchard/Daniel/Others as needed (1 Hr)

Note: This can occur at any time during the day

2:00 Break (0.5 Hr)

2:30 Continue Task Force Deliberations (1 Hr)

3:30 Task Force Closeout Briefing To Chief Hydrologist (0.5 Hr)

4:00 Adjourn

Mission
Terms of Reference - Element 1 of Scope

Issues:

Mission – What, how, who, and why

Is the Coop Program adequately supporting user needs in the areas of surface- and ground-water quality, quantity, and use information and decision support systems?

1. What are the practical and “ideal” networks, and how close to ideal is the current?
2. What process can assure network preservation and stability?
3. Is there a proper balance among the disciplines?
4. Do data measurement, analysis, and reporting meet user needs?
5. Is the Cooperative Water Program generating new technology needed to address complex resource management problems?

Preliminary Action Plan:

Actions before the January 25-27 meeting

- Get list of cooperators
- Get lists of groups that are coop users to answer questions
- Plan agenda and identify speakers
- Prepare questions for field meetings.
- Telecom or email /brainstorm preservation process (#2)
- Review mission Statement - revise
- Conference calls, etc to flesh out details
- Have Chuck Spooner give an overview of National Water-Quality Monitoring Council
- History of network by States, Tribes, counties, etc.

Actions during the January 25-27 meeting

- USGS and outside presentation on success in technical development
- Gather success stories regarding network preservation
- Public comment period
- What are streamgaging group, monitoring group, and ground water group doing and how does that relate to our task?
- Do post mortem evaluation after field presentations
- Document meeting results
- Select random samples?
- Outline mission section and assign writers
- Revisit mission Statement

March 24-26 meeting

- Finish report for Task Force review and approval
- Edit mission section
- Revisit mission Statement

May 5-7 meeting

- Review final version of report

Prioritization and Conduct of Work
Terms of Reference – Elements 2 and 3 of Scope

Issues:

General

- Has there been a formal (written) analysis of contracting procedures?
- Need a copy of the USGS Organic Act and USGS mission Statement

Project Selection

- Review WRD Memorandum No. 95.44 for relevance
- Consider establishing an outside review panel
- Resource availability
- Lead agency selection
- Expansion of scientific knowledge base
- Compliance with USGS mandate from Congress
- Compliance with strategic plan

Conduct of Work

- Outsource – public/private
 - “best and brightest”
- Quality control methods
- Multi-year project budgets
- Use of in-kind services
- Interim project reports with status of project and data
- Release of preliminary data
- USGS/cooperator relationship

Relationships

- Feedback – (customer satisfaction)
- Private users?
- Participants?
- Scheduled reviews – responsiveness summary
- Progress reporting
- Cooperator, public

- Collaboration – enabling environment
- Training
- Transfer of knowledge
- Involvement of non-cooperators
- New partners
- MOUs with Professional Societies.
- Joint project development
- Non duplication
- Cost/benefit discussion
- Alternate funding sources

Data Access

- Access to all data (consider proprietary data)
- Water-quantity database

Data Standards

- Define/set standards
- QA criteria
- USGS QA on non-USGS data
- “Certification” of local data

Preliminary Action Plan:

Actions before the January 25-27 meeting

- Review WRD Memoranda Nos. 95.44 and 92.14
- Look for evidence of encroachment into private consultant roles
- USGS provide a list of FY1997 projects in enough detail to determine the relative emphasis of coop projects
- Invite two District Chiefs to discuss their programs
 - * 1 doing well
 - * 1 not doing well
- Invite critics to talk to Task Force
- Ask USGS for copies of cooperative agreement to check for problem Districts
- Ask USGS for list of cooperators by State
- Ask USGS for trends up/down in the Cooperative Program funding by District
- Ask USGS for information on how streamgaging network is funded
- Choose sample group of cooperators
- Task Force contacts cooperators by mail include ACWI charge and TOR
- Task Force prepares questionnaire for interviews
- Conduct interviews (3-5 per person)
- USGS compiles results of interviews
- Ask USGS for quality plans for projects
- Ask USGS for policy on interim reports and release of data
- Appoint subcommittee to review QA/QC process and in-kind services policy
- Ask USGS for their quality control plans - internal and external
- Review issues and add/revise
- Ask USGS for a policy on in-kind services – what is it?

Actions during the January 25-27 meeting

- Interview results (re: WRD Memorandum No. 95.44)
- Assessment of QA/QC and in-kind services
- Policies on interim reports and release of data
- Discussion of initial perspectives on the coop program
- Review/revision of action plans

Actions before the March 24-26 meeting

- Draft Task Force recommendations
- Outside review panel
- Resource availability
- Lead agency
- Multi-year project plan
- Draft recommendations on relationships

Actions during the March 24-26 meeting

- Task Force recommendations on WRD Memorandum No. 95.44
- Task Force recommendations on outsourcing

Actions before the May 5-7 meeting

- Finalize Task Force recommendation

Actions for the May 5-7 meeting

- Adoption of Task Force recommendations on WRD Memorandum No. 95.44

PRODUCTS

Terms of Reference – Element 4 of Scope

Issues:

Funding, cost, and products of the Cooperative Water Program

- Multi-year project planning and funding (adequacy)
- Projects need cost-value analysis (efficiency)
- Alternative sources of funding (for example, in kind and private?)
- Overhead costs!
- Are current products understandable, useable, accessible, and meet cooperator needs?
- Delivery of timely, quality products (review process)

Preliminary Action Plan:

Actions for multi-year project planning and funding before/during January 25-27 meeting

- USGS provide national data on multi-year project planning and funding such as the number of active projects, the number of terminated projects, and the amount of rollover funding
- USGS provide a detail list of projects for some representative districts
- USGS provide information on Federal law vs. USGS policy on 1-year funding

Actions associated with cost before/during January 25-27 meeting

- USGS and Task Force examine how project costs are determined from project chief perspective through interviews with project chief(s) at the district; USGS provide district policies and worksheets.
- USGS provide detail description of overhead costs
- Task Force compare USGS overhead costs to the engineering community
- Try to obtain information about projects that were not done because of excessive cost/quality. USGS provide information, if possible, and Task Force interview cooperators
- Task Force members cost some projects/data collection to compare to USGS
- USGS provide gaging-station costs by District and explanation of why costs differ

Action associated with products before/during January 25-27 meeting

- USGS provide a flow chart of the product review and approval process
- USGS provide information on percent of projects that meet deadline
- Task Force examine if project deadlines are reasonable
- USGS make a presentation describing the various WRD products with samples of the products
- USGS make a presentation describing the WRD data bases and schedule of posting them to the web and for increasing access
- USGS make a presentation describing data-collection methods and quality standards and why they are important
- USGS provide a copy of the policy on direct services

Task Force to Review the Cooperative Water Program

Minutes of the Second Meeting
January 25-27, 1998

Denver, Colorado

Attendees:

Task Force Members - - Craig Albertsen, Bureau of Reclamation; Thomas Baumgardner, National Weather Service (2nd and 3rd days only); Tom Bruns, American Water Works Association; Ed Burkett, Corps of Engineers; Richard Burton, National Association of Counties; Randall Duncan; International Association of Emergency Managers; James Enote, Pueblo of Zuni; Fred Lissner, Oregon Water Resources Department; Fred Ogden, University of Connecticut; Don Phelps, American Society of Civil Engineers; David Pope, Kansas Department of Agriculture; Jonathan Price, Nevada Bureau of Mines and Geology; Tom Looby for Robert Roberts, Environmental Council of States; Larry Rowe, Western Water Inc; Jim Shotwell, American Institute of Professional Geologists; Earl Smith, Interstate Council on Water Policy; Charles Spooner (1st day only), USEPA; Alan Vicory, Ohio River Valley Water Sanitation Commission; Leslie Wedderburn, South Florida Water Management District; Don Woodward, USDA

U. S. Geological Survey - - Steve Blanchard, Task Force Executive Secretary; Dave Lystrom (1st day only), Regional Hydrologist – Central Region; Betsy Daniel, Facilitator; Bill Horak, District Chief – Colorado District (1st day only), Doug Cain, Associate District Chief -Colorado District (1st day only)

Absent: FEMA representative; Peter Mack, New York Department of Environmental Conservation;

Location: U. S Geological Survey, National Training Center, Denver, Colorado

The meeting closely followed the meeting agenda (attachment 1). The meeting started with overview presentations by Don Woodward on the ACWI Streamgaging Task Force activities and Chuck Spooner on the ACWI National Water-Quality Monitoring Council activities. The morning of the first day of the meeting (January 25, 1999) primarily focused on the Federal-State Cooperative Program of the Colorado District. Bill Horak (District Chief) and Doug Cain (Assistant District Chief) made the Colorado District presentations. The topics they covered included (1) an overview of the Colorado District program, (2) how cooperative projects are developed, and (3) how indirect costs are determined and applied. The Task Force had questions about how the District determined the appropriateness of projects to take on and how the USGS indirect costs compared to those of the private sector.

The afternoon sessions included a presentation by Lew Wade (Chief of the Office of Information) and Greg Allord (Chief Cartographer of the Publications Management Program) on USGS products and information. The Task Force spent the remainder of the afternoon in their subgroups discussing a survey of cooperators to be conducted by the Task Force. Most of the Task Force members and some USGS staff participated in an informal group dinner on the evening of January 25, 1999.

The second day (January 26) of the meeting started with a presentation by John Briggs (Chief of the National Water Information System Testing, Data Transfer, Support, and Maintenance Unit) on WRD databases. This presentation was followed by a panel discussion between the Task Force and a panel of individuals representing agencies that cooperate with the Colorado District. The panel was composed of the following individuals:

Cooperators Panel – Ms. Janet Bell, Jefferson County Board of Commissioners, Golden, Colorado; Mr. Russell Forrest, Town of Vail, Vail, Colorado; Mr. Alan Hamel, Board of Water Works, Pueblo, Colorado; Mr. David Holm, Colorado Dept of Public Health and Environment, Denver, Colorado; Mr. David Merritt, Colorado River Conservation District, Glenwood Springs, Colorado; Mr. John Porter, Dolores Water Conservancy District, Cortez, Colorado; Mr. Phil Saletta, Colorado Springs Utilities, Colorado Springs, Colorado

The discussion with the cooperator panel focused on answers to questions from the list of questions in attachment 2. The questions in bold text were the questions asked of the cooperator panel.

The afternoon included another panel discussion between the Task Force and a group of individuals that represented users of Cooperative Program data and products. The panel was composed of the following individuals:

Data Users Panel -- Mr. Neil Grigg, Head, Department of Engineering, Colorado State University, Fort Collins, Colorado; Mr. Reed Dills, Four Corners Expeditions, Buena Vista, Colorado; Mr. Ralph Clark, Gunnison Basin POWER, Gunnison, Colorado; Mr. Chuck Haines, Wright Water Engineers Inc, Denver, Colorado; Mr. Jim Sharkoff, State Agronomist, NRCS, Lakewood, Colorado; Mr. Allen Davey, Davis Engineering Inc, Del Norte, Colorado

The discussion with the data-users panel focused on answers to questions from the list of questions in attachment 3.

The third day (January 27) started with presentations about and a tour of the WRD National Water Quality Laboratory (NWQL) in Arvada, Colorado. Bob Williams (NWQL Chief) presented information of the mission, operation, and unique characteristics of the lab. Leroy Schroder (Chief, Branch of Quality Systems) provided an overview of the activities used by the Water Resources Division to monitor and ensure the quality of its data, especially water quality data and laboratory analyses.

A portion of the Task Force (Don Phelps, Larry Rowe, Fred Lissner, Randy Duncan, and Alan Vicory) did not attend the lab tour and remained at the training center to work on developing and completing two surveys (verbal and numerical) that could be used to survey USGS cooperators to get their opinions about the Coop Program.

The remainder of the day was spent by the Task Force finalizing the plans for the use of the surveys, planning the next meeting, and making assignments for the subgroups for the period in between meetings.

The Task Force adopted a verbal survey (attachment 4) that each Task Force member would use to interview at least two cooperators. The verbal survey was based on the questions used during the cooperator panel discussion. The Task Force also adopted a numerical survey (attachment 5) to be mailed to 400 cooperators pick at random in proportion to the number of cooperators in each State.

During the period between the Reston and Denver meetings and at the beginning of the Denver meeting, there was minor rearranging of the subgroup membership. The subgroup membership established at the Denver meeting is as follows:

1. Cooperative Water Program Mission (Terms of Reference – Element 1 of the Scope)

Craig Albertsen
Thomas Baumgardner
Dick Burton
Randall Duncan
Fred Lissner
Peter Mack

2. Cooperative Water Program Prioritization and Conduct of Work (Terms of Reference – Elements 2 and 3 of the Scope)

Ed Burkett
Fred Ogden
Don Phelps
Jonathan Price
Larry Rowe
Earl Smith
Jim Shotwell
Charles Spooner
Don Woodward

3. Cooperative Water Program Products (Terms of Reference – Element 4 of the Scope)

Tom Bruns
Jim Enote
Dave Pope
Alan Vicory
Leslie Wedderburn

The next meeting location was selected to be the Arizona District Office in Tucson, Arizona. The Task Force laid out the general format for the meeting as:

Day 1

- District overview presentations by two District Chiefs – Arizona District and an eastern District
 - District overview
 - what's unique about the program in that district
 - indirect costs – explain variation high, medium, low
 - difficulties in the program and what's right about the program
 - ideas for improving report timeliness
- Presentation on how new technologies and methods are being developed and incorporated into the coop program – Hydro21 and research

Day 2

Panel on competition – invite American Consulting engineers Council and American Institute of Professional Geologists

Panel of Cooperators – include Tribes

Day 3

Task Force deliberations

Action Items:

January 27, 1999

1. Table of overhead rates by District – Blanchard by next meeting. Cost of field personnel vs. total budget.
2. FACA rules for reports; example of reports done for ACWI – Blanchard by next meeting
3. Subgroups begin drafting responses to Terms of Reference. Task Force members get products to Blanchard by 1st week in March
4. Blanchard to distribute compiled products to Task Force members at least 10 days prior to March meeting.
5. Task Force co-chairs make presentation to next ACWI meeting on status of Task Force – May
6. Final copies of verbal survey to Task Force members (by email) so that they can be used to interview cooperators – Blanchard

Task Force Agreements regarding the Verbal Survey

1. Each Task Force member will survey a minimum of two cooperator organizations and members may do more.
2. In selecting organizations for interviewing, members will avoid organizations that have only one gaging station and will attempt to interview representatives of different categories of (i.e., not all the same) organizations.
3. Members will complete their interviews by 3rd week in February. Interview results will be summarized in bullet form and submitted to Blanchard by 3rd week in February.
4. Subgroups should begin the analysis of survey results before the next meeting.

Task Force Agreements regarding the Numeric Survey

1. Survey will go to 400 randomly selected cooperators. The number of cooperators selected in each State will be in proportion to the number of total cooperators in that State.
2. Survey results should be distributed by the 1st week in March.

Task Force to Review the Cooperative Water Program

Agenda January 25-27, 1998 Denver, Colorado

Monday, January 25, 1999

8-8:30 Opening remarks/discussion – meeting agenda and Task Force (Task Force) directions

Larry and Fred

8:30-9:30 Presentation/discussion of ACWI streamflow and water quality subcommittee work – tentative presenters would be Charlie Spooner for the National Water-Quality Monitoring Council and Don Woodward for the Streamgaging Task Force. The goal of these presentations is to help the Coop Task Force understand the scope of the work of the other two groups so that the Coop Task Force won't duplicate the other groups efforts.

9:30-9:45 Break

9:45-10:45 Presentations by the host District Chief (as much paper info as possible, on the topics below, will be handed out prior to the meeting)

- overview of Cooperative Water Program in district
- how a coop project is developed
- how overhead is determined

10:45-12:00 Questions and answers – Task Force with the District Chief

12-1 lunch

1-2 presentation on WRD products - - reports, fact sheets, etc

2-3:30 subgroup deliberations on survey question; subgroup plans. The goal of this session is for the subgroup to (1) review their plans and strategy and develop further as necessary and (2) review the consolidated list of survey questions.

3:30-4:30 Task Force deliberations to finalize survey questions, plans for use of the survey, survey data analysis, etc.

4:30- 5:30 Overview/tour of National Training Center and District Office

Evening – group outing/diner

Tuesday, January 26, 1999

8-9:00 Presentation on WRD databases

9:00 –11:30 Task Force meeting with cooperators from host district – want diversity of types of agencies, geographic locations, and types of programs on the panel

11:30-1 Task Force deliberations and working lunch

1-3 Task Force meeting with non-cooperators – private sector, academia, other product users, etc

3-4:30 Task Force deliberations

Evening – subgroup deliberations if necessary/desired?

Wednesday, January 27, 1999

7:30-11:00 Tour of National Water-Quality Lab – including presentations from Methods Development Group and Branch of Quality Assurance

11-2:30 Subgroup deliberation and working lunch

2:30- 4 Combined Task Force deliberations

4:00 Adjourn

Cooperator Panel Discussion Questions

A. General Introductory Questions

1. What is the primary role of your organization (for example, regulatory, water management, scientific, etc.)?
2. What is your position and how does it relate to the USGS Coop Program?
3. Has your organization participated in the Federal-State Coop Program for more than 5-years?
4. Has your organization's level of participation changed over time? If yes, how so?
5. What types of programs/projects are you involved in with the USGS under the Federal-State Coop Program (for example, stream gaging, water sampling and testing, interpretive studies)?
6. Does your organization foresee a change in the programs/projects requested of the Coop Program in the future? What are the reason(s) for the change(s)?

B. Mission - Historically, the Coop Program has been designed to develop hydrologic data and technical analysis needed to assist in meeting the USGS mission of continuously assessing the Nation's water resources, and to provide technical assistance to State, Tribal, and local water management agencies in seeking solutions to water-resources issues of national concern through a matched funding arrangement.

7. How important is your organization's participation in the Coop Program to accomplishing the activities, goals, and responsibilities assigned to your organization? Is the need increasing or decreasing?

8. Is cost sharing a necessary element in your organization's participation in a cooperative agreement with the USGS?
9. What is the minimum USGS cost share acceptable to your agency?

C. Prioritization - In Fiscal Year 1997, the Congress appropriated \$64.5 million for the Coop Program. State and local agencies provided an equal amount of matching funds plus an additional \$28.5 million of unmatched funding.

10. Is there adequate funding in the Coop Program to meet your short and long term needs? If no, please explain the needs that are not being met.

11. Do you have any suggestions for broadening support for the Coop Program?

12. How do changes in the USGS Coop Program, such as losing long-term data-collection stations, affect the mission of your organization?

13. What means, if any, does your organization use to involve other possible cooperators who may have an interest in your Coop Program activity as a way to improve study results and lower costs?

D. Conduct of Work - Nearly all of the work performed in the Coop Program is done by USGS scientists and technicians. This arrangement is designed to enhance quality control, provide national consistency in data collection and methods of analysis, and provide a stable core of experienced water scientists nationwide.

14. What would be the implications of altering current work arrangements on the Coop Program and water management nationwide (such as the cooperator performing a portion of the work, contracting out some of the work, etc)?

15. If appropriate USGS quality assurance was made available, would your organization (1) be able to, and (2) want to perform the data collection portion of a coop project so that the project costs would be reduced? If yes, what interest would your organization have? If no, please explain.

16. Why does your organization go to the USGS for assistance rather than to other sources (for example, consulting firms, academia, etc.)?

17. What services does the USGS offer that you cannot get elsewhere?

18. What is your opinion on the USGS outsourcing (contracting out) parts or all of the work you asked it to perform?

E. Products - The products developed in the Coop Program need to be useful to cooperators and other users. These users include representatives of governments, the scientific community, the private sector, and the general public. The products also fulfill national needs by building long-term national databases, augmenting activities in other USGS programs, and providing a national picture of water resources through synthesis of information from individual projects across the country. In addition, the Coop Program advances the development and application of new approaches and methodologies relevant to water resources issues.

19. Is the USGS using the appropriate, applicable, and most cost effective technology to satisfy your organization needs?

20. In what areas does the USGS need to develop and apply new approaches, methods, and technologies?

21. Is the USGS conscious of and sensitive to the needs of the cooperator in areas such as:

- a) **types of data collected,**
- b) **documentation of data,**
- c) **timeliness of products,**
- d) **cost/value of products, and**
- e) **other?**

22. Does your organization use real-time data? If yes, are you satisfied?

23. Do you routinely have access to data you need to make to make informed decisions?

24. Do you see changes in the products to be delivered to you in the future?

F. General Closing Question

25. Do you have any other ideas for improving or changing the Coop Program?

1/25/99

Discussion Questions for Data Users Panel

1. **Briefly** (3-5 min) provide:
 - your name
 - your position
 - a description of your organization (if appropriate)
2. What types of USGS information/products/data do you use?
3. How is the information used?
4. How often do you access and use USGS information?
5. How do you usually obtain this information?
6. Why is the information important?
7. What are the most important USGS products for you? The least important?
8. How would the value and/or the usefulness of the information change if contractors produced it for the USGS?
9. Do you have any suggestions about ways to improve the information or method of delivery?
10. Would you access USGS information and data if there were a cost to you for using it?
11. Have you ever been approached about participating in or supporting the USGS Cooperative Water Program?

TASK FORCE TO REVIEW THE COOPERATIVE WATER PROGRAM

Cooperator Survey

A. General Introductory Questions

1. What is the primary role of your organization (i.e., regulatory, water management, scientific, etc.)?
2. What is your position in the organization and how does it relate to the USGS Federal-State Cooperative Water Program (Coop Program)?
3. Has your organization participated in the Coop Program for more than 5-years?
4. What is your organizations current level of financial participation? How has it changed over time?
5. What types of programs/projects are you involved in with the USGS under the Coop Program?
6. Does your organization foresee a change in the programs/projects it requests of the Coop Program in the future? Do you see the need increasing or decreasing?

A. **Mission - Historically, the Coop Program has been designed to develop hydrologic data and technical analysis needed to assist in meeting the USGS mission of continuously assessing the Nation's water resources, and to provide technical assistance to State, tribal, and local water management agencies in seeking solutions to water-resource issues of national concern through a matched funding arrangement.**

7. Explain how the Coop Program assists your organization in accomplishing its activities, goals, and responsibilities?
8. Is cost sharing a necessary element in your organization's participation in a cooperative agreement with the USGS? Please explain.
9. What is the minimum USGS cost share acceptable to your organization?
10. Explain whether your coop program is meeting your needs in the areas of groundwater and surface-water quality, quantity, and use data, and analytical tools, etc.?

C. Prioritization - In Fiscal Year 1997, the Congress appropriated \$64.5 million for the Coop Program. State and local agencies provided an equal amount of matching funds plus an additional \$28.5 million of unmatched funding.

11. Is there adequate funding in the Coop Program to meet your short and long term needs? If no, please explain the needs that are not being met.
12. Do you have any suggestions for the appropriate level of funding for the Coop Program?
13. What is the proper balance between routine long-term data collection and interpretive studies?
14. How do changes in the Coop Program, such as losing long-term data-collection stations, affect the mission of your organization?
15. How does your organization involve other parties in your Coop Program activity to improve study results and lower costs?

D. Conduct of Work - Nearly all of the work performed in the Coop Program is done by USGS scientists and technicians. This arrangement is designed to enhance quality control, provide national consistency in data collection and methods of analysis, and provide a stable core of experienced water scientists nationwide.

16. If appropriate USGS quality assurance were made available, would your organization be able to and/or want to perform the data collection portion of a coop project? Please explain.
17. How do you believe the quality and credibility of the Coop Program would be impacted if data collection and analysis were not performed entirely by the USGS staff?
18. Why does your organization use the USGS for assistance rather than other sources (for example, consulting firms, academia, etc.)?
19. What does the USGS offer through the Coop Program that you cannot obtain elsewhere?
20. What is your opinion of the Coop Program contracting out parts or all of the work you have asked them to perform?

E. Products - The products developed in the Coop Program need to be useful to cooperators and other users. These users include representatives of governments, the scientific community, the private sector, and the general public. The products also fulfill national needs by building long term national data bases, augmenting activities in other USGS programs, and providing a national picture of water resources through synthesis of information from individual projects across the country. In addition, the Coop Program advances the development and application of new approaches and methodologies relevant to water-resources issues.

21. Is the Coop Program using the appropriate, applicable, and most cost effective level of technology to satisfy your needs?
22. What suggestions do you have for the Coop Program to improve approaches, methods, and technologies to enhance the usability and effectiveness of products?

23. Is the Coop Program conscious of and sensitive to the needs of the cooperator in areas such as:
- a. types of data collected,
 - b. documentation of data,
 - c. timeliness of products,
 - d. value of products, and
 - e. other?

24. Do you have timely access to the data you need?

25. In what form will you want Coop Project output delivered in the future?

F. General Closing Question

26. Do you have any recommendations for improving or changing the Coop Program?

2/2/99

Section 1: Introduction

This questionnaire relates to your **overall** experience with the United States Geological Survey (USGS) Water Resources Division (WRD) **Federal-State Cooperative Water Program (Coop Program)**. For each Statement, please mark the appropriate box. If a Statement does not apply to your experience, please check the not applicable (NA) box.

The United States Geological Survey, through the Cooperative Water Program...

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	NA
• Provides products and services that are necessary for my organization to accomplish its mission.						
• Responds to the changing needs of my organization.						
• Keeps me informed of the types of products it offers.						
• Keeps me informed of the types of service it offers.						
• Coordinates with my organization on programs and activities that may be of interest to us.						
• Keeps my organization informed of programmatic and fiscal changes that affect us.						
• Responds to my requests in a timely manner.						

Please rate the overall expertise offered by the USGS through the Cooperative Water Program in the following areas:

	Excellent	Above Average	Average	Below Average	Poor	NA
• Water-resources data and information.						
• Water-resources investigations and research.						
• Geologic information and investigations.						
• Mapping information and products.						
• Biological-resources information and investigations.						
• Provider of unbiased scientific and technical support and products.						

Section 2: Proposals

Proposals from the Cooperative Water Program...

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	NA
• Address the needs of my organization.						
• Reflect work that is realistic in scope.						
• Are of appropriate content and length.						
• Are clear and understandable.						
• Present realistic work schedules.						
• Reflect reasonable pricing.						

Section 3: Data Collection

E=Excellent; AA=Above Average; A= Average; BA= Below Average; P=Poor; NA= Not Applicable

	Ground Water						Surface Water					Water Quality					Water Use							
	E	A	A	B	P	N	E	A	A	B	P	N	E	A	A	B	P	N	E	A	A	B	P	N
• Performance in meeting the needs of my organization.																								
• Adequacy of geographic coverage.																								
• Length of data-collection period																								
• Frequency of data collection																								
• Reliability																								
• Value relative to cost																								

Hydrologic Equipment and Instrumentation...

	Excellent	Above Average	Average	Below Average	Poor	NA
• Performance in meeting the needs of my organization.						
• Reliability						
• Use of advanced technology						
• Accuracy						
• Innovation						
• Value relative to cost						

Section 4: Data Analysis and Interpretation

E=Excellent; AA=Above Average; A= Average; BA= Below Average; P=Poor; NA= Not Applicable

	Ground Water						Surface Water					Water Quality					Water Use							
	E	A	A	B	P	N	E	A	A	B	P	N	E	A	A	B	P	N	E	A	A	B	P	N
• Performance in meeting the needs of my organization.																								
• Adequacy of technical approach																								
• Technical quality																								
• Ability to be understood																								
• Timeliness																								
• Consideration of alternative interpretations																								
• Value relative to cost																								

Section 5: Products

Requests for data, reports, and information...

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not Applicable
• Are handled courteously						
• Are addressed promptly						
• Are answered accurately						

Reports (e.g., Water-Resources Investigations Reports, Open-File Reports, Data Reports)...

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not Applicable
• Meet the needs of my organization						
• Adequately address the objectives of the investigation						
• Include the appropriate level of detail						
• Are understandable						
• Are technically sound						
• Are timely						

I have sufficient access to hydrologic data and reports...

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not Applicable
• In printed form						
• On the Internet						
• On-line by computer						
• On diskette, tape, or CD-ROM						

Section 6: Support

I receive sufficient support in...

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	NA
• Administrative Processes (Contracts, Billings, Etc.)						
• Computer Systems (Performance, Compatibility, Ease of Use, Etc.)						
• Technical capability (Performance, Professionalism, Expertise, Etc.)						

Section 7: Summary

	Excellent	Above Average	Average	Below Average	Poor	N A
• Overall, I think the Cooperative Water Program is						

Section 8: Cooperator Information

The following questions will be used only to identify similarities and differences among groups of customers. Thank you for your cooperation in providing the following data.

Please indicate your affiliation: (please circle)

- | | |
|----------------------------|--|
| State Government | Tribal Government |
| County Government | Municipal Government |
| Other Local Government | Basin Commission |
| Water Management Districts | Interstate Commission / Compact / Agency |
| Other (specify) _____ | |

Please indicate your area(s) of specific interest: (please circle any that apply)

- | | | |
|---------------|--------------|-----------------------|
| Surface Water | Ground Water | Other (specify) _____ |
| Water Quality | Water Use | |

Please indicate your organization's involvement with the USGS: (please circle one for each column)

Duration of Participation

Annual Coop Budget (your agency contribution)

Less than 5 years

under \$50,000

5-10 Years

\$50,000- \$150,000

10-20 Years

More than 20 Years

\$150,000 - \$250,000

More than \$250,000

(Optional Information): Your Name: _____

Your Organization: _____

Section 9: Comments

Are there any other comments that you would like to make regarding the Federal-State Cooperative Water Program, or any clarifications of your responses? (Attach additional sheets as needed.)

Task Force to Review the Cooperative Water Program

Minutes of the Third Meeting
March 24-26, 1999

Tucson, Arizona

Attendees:

Task Force Members - - Craig Albertsen, Bureau of Reclamation; Thomas Baumgardner, National Weather Service; Tom Bruns, American Water Works Association; Ed Burkett, Corps of Engineers; Richard Burton, National Association of Counties; James Enote, Pueblo of Zuni; Fred Lissner, Oregon Department of Water Resources; Wendell McCurry, Association of State and Interstate Water Pollution Control Administrators; Fred Ogden, University of Connecticut; Don Phelps, American Society of Civil Engineers; Jonathan Price, Nevada Bureau of Mines and Geology; Larry Rowe, Western Water Inc; Jim Shotwell, American Institute of Professional Geologists; Alan Vicory, Ohio River Valley Water Sanitation Commission; Leslie Wedderburn, South Florida Water Management District; Don Woodward, USDA

U. S. Geological Survey - - Bill Alley, Chief Office of Ground Water; Steve Blanchard, Task Force Executive Secretary; Bob Hirsch, Chief Hydrologist; Nick Melcher, Arizona District Chief; John Vecchioli, Florida District Chief; Tim Hale, Southeastern Region Program Officer; Betsy Daniel, Facilitator.

Absent: A FEMA representative; Randall Duncan, International Association of Emergency Managers; Peter Mack, New York Department of Environmental Conservation; Dave Pope, Kansas Department of Agriculture; Earl Smith, Interstate Council on Water Policy; Chuck Spooner, USEPA.

Location: U. S Geological Survey, Arizona District Office, Tucson, Arizona

The meeting closely followed the meeting agenda (attachment 1). The meeting started with presentations by Nick Melcher (Arizona District Chief) and John Vecchioli (Florida District Chief) on the Arizona and Florida District's Cooperative Water Programs, respectively. Nick Melcher highlighted the Arizona District Cooperative Water Program areas of emphasis in work for Indian Tribes, collecting ground-water information, developing new methods, participation in public consortiums, and development of a ground-water database. John Vecchioli presented information on the Florida District's Cooperative Water Program areas of emphasis in studying ground water and surface water interactions, conducting lake studies, studying and modeling the factors that influence salt water intrusion and its impacts, and studying the susceptibility of ground water to contamination through various techniques including ground-water age dating.

Following the presentations on each district's Cooperative Water Program, John Vecchioli discussed the costs that are included in a district's indirect costs and explained why there is variation from district to district. Nick Melcher then described what the Arizona District and the Water Resources Division are doing to improve report timeliness. Both Nick and John discussed their thoughts about what is working well in the Cooperative Water Program and what difficulties they have with the program.

The afternoon sessions was a panel discussion between the Task Force and a panel of individuals representing agencies that cooperate with the Arizona District. The panel was composed of the following individuals:

Cooperators Panel – Michael Block, District Hydrologist, Metropolitan Domestic Water Improvement District, Tucson, AZ; Dave Gardner, Flood Control District of Maricopa County, Phoenix, AZ; Katharine L. Jacobs, Director, Arizona Department of Water Resources, Tucson, AZ; Bruce Johnson, Chief Hydrologist, Tucson Water, Tucson, AZ; Allon C. Owen, Director - Floodplain Administrator, Cochise County Flood Control District, Bisbee, AZ; Greg Wallace, Chief Hydrologist, Arizona Department of Water Resources, Phoenix, AZ.

The discussion with the cooperator panel focused on answers to questions from the list of questions in attachment 2. The questions in bold text were the questions asked of the cooperator panel. The Task Force summarized the information they heard from the panel discussion and the initial Task Force response to the information in bullet Statements as listed in attachment 3.

The second day (March 25) started with a presentation by Bob Hirsch (WRD Chief Hydrologist) on the proposed FY2000 budget and its impacts on the Cooperative Water Program.

During the next session, the Task Force deliberated and developed the major points to be presented in a status report to the ACWI Alternate Chair at the end of the day. The Task Force also discussed different options that might be used for developing their findings and recommendations. Options such as reaching consensus and majority voting were discussed. No decision was made but the Task Force members were asked to consider which options they would prefer and to be prepared to discuss it at a later time.

The afternoon session began with a panel discussion between the Task Force and a group of individuals from the private sector to discuss the issue of competition with the private sector and the appropriate role of the USGS. The panel was composed of the following individuals:

Panel on competition and the appropriate role of the USGS -- Ed McGavock, Montgomery and Associates, Sedona, Arizona (Representing AIPG local); Tyler Gass, Geologist, Blasland Bouck and Lee Inc, Golden, CO (Representing AIPG National); Jeff Bradley, West Consultants, Bellevue, WA; Bob Weaver, Hydrosphere Resource Consultants, Boulder, Colorado; Martin Nicholson, Vice President of Water Resources, CH2MHill, Reading, California

The discussion with the panel on competition focused on answers to questions from the list of questions in attachment 4. The Task Force summarized the information they heard from the panel discussion and the initial Task Force response to the information in bullet Statements as listed in attachment 5. In addition, the Task Force summarized criteria proposed by the panels to be used by the USGS for project selection to avoid competition. The proposed criteria are also presented in attachment 5.

The Task Force discussions with a panel of private sector individuals on the issue of competition was followed by Task Force discussions with a panel of USGS staff to provide the Task Force an opportunity to ask the USGS question related to competition. The USGS staff on the panel were Bill Alley, Chief of the Office of Ground Water; Tim Hale, Southeastern Region Program Officer, Nick Melcher, Arizona District Chief; and John Vecchioli, Florida District Chief. The Task Force asked the USGS panel various questions related to how projects are selected for inclusion in the Cooperative Water Program and why the USGS was involved in a few specific projects.

The Day ended with a presentation by Larry Rowe, Chair of the Task Force, to Bob Hirsch, the Alternate Chair of ACWI on the status of the Cooperative Water Program Review. Larry described the activities the Task Force has conducted and the information the Task Force has gathered to date. The Task Force believes it will complete its work by the June 30, 1999 deadline.

The third day (March 26, 1999) began with a presentation by Nick Melcher on the WRD project titled "Hydro21" which is investigating new technologies that could be applied to the streamgaging program to determine river stage, water velocity, and river channel configuration through non-contact methods. Bob Hirsch then presented information on new water resources related technologies and methods that have been developed through the National Research Program. The remainder of the day was spent in subgroup meetings with the subgroups working to develop preliminary findings and recommendations.

The next meeting location was selected to be the Massachusetts District Office in Marlboro, Massachusetts or the New York District Office in Troy, New York. The Task Force laid out the general format for the May 5-7, 1999 meeting as:

Day 1

District Overview Presentation

- No description of the organization, funding allocations, etc. Presentations should be focused on issues
 - Write-ups of district information sent to Task Force members before the meeting would be helpful.

Panel 1 – Cooperators Panel for Eastern Districts with Tribal Representative – it is assumed that water quantity will not be an issue.

Panel 2 – Competition Panel

- Try for a more "balanced panel. Include some non-critics – seek private sector individuals who are representative of "typical" private consultants - those who have not lodged specific complaints (?). Also include ACEC and a university perspective on competition.
- The intent is to get a realistic sense of what the magnitude of the problem is.
- Would like more stories of successful collaboration between USGS and private sector.

Day 2

Subgroups meet to develop consensus within Subgroup

Day 3

Subgroups report to the combined Task Force to reach consensus

Action Items:

- Description of Massachusetts Coop projects
- Background info on the Coop allocation
- Summary sheet of district issues
- Verbal and numerical survey results
- Denver and Tucson meeting minutes
- Description of the process USGS uses to advertise for contract work
- Participants on the Massachusetts competition panel should provide a written Statement to Task Force members ahead of time with both opinions and facts of examples illustrating inappropriate competition.

Task Force to Review the Cooperative Water Program
March 24-27, 1999
Tucson, Arizona

Final Agenda

Wednesday March 24, 1999

8:00-8:10 Welcome and housekeeping – Steve Blanchard

8:10-8:30 Opening remarks/discussion – meeting agenda and Task Force (Task Force) directions -- Larry and Fred

8:30-11:00 Presentation by Nick Melcher – AZ District Chief and John Vecchioli, FL District Chief, (as much paper info as possible, on the topics below, will be handed out prior to the meeting) (includes a break)

- overview of coop program in district – emphasize what is unique
- difficulties in program and positives (what's right) with the program
- compare your indirect costs to all districts and explain why it is higher or lower
- ideas on improving timeliness of products

Questions and answers from the Task Force after each segment of the presentation

11:00-12:45 Subgroup deliberations and working lunch -- The goal of this session is for the subgroups to (1) review the status of their work to date and progress on assignments (2) discuss and report on results of verbal survey, (3) continue working on consensus Statements and findings related to the questions in the Terms of Reference, and (4) draft summary bullets that can be shared with the rest of the Task Force.

12:45-1:00 Break and prep for panel

1:00-3:30 Task Force meeting with cooperators from host district – want diversity of types of agencies, geographic locations, and types of programs on the panel (include a break) – Larry Rowe

3:30-4:00 Task Force discussion and summary of panel

4:00-4:15 Break

4:15- 5:30 Combined Task Force deliberations –

- Status of verbal survey
- Status of numerical survey
- Each subgroup will report on the status of their work and preliminary findings (10 min per group)
- Begin drafting summary bullets for report to ACWI Alternate Chair

5:30 Adjourn

Evening – group outing/dinner

Thursday March 25, 1999

8:00-8:45 Tribal perspective/issues – Jim Enote

8:45-9:30 FY2000 WRD budget – Bob Hirsch, Chief Hydrologist

9:30-9:45 Break

9:45-10:45 Task Force deliberations – prep questions for competition panel (note: I suggest that subgroup 2 use the questions from the non-cooperators panel from Denver and, prior to the AZ mtg, modify them accordingly for use with the competition panel. This list would be a starting point for the combined Task Force to review and modify.)

10:45-11:45 Task Force deliberations –

- summarize progress and status – prepare summary bullets for report to ACWI Alternate-Chair
- decide on Task Force decision making rules – how will “consensus” Statements be decided on and adopted (Betsy draft proposal prior to meeting)?

11:45-12:45 Lunch

12:45-1:00 Prep for panel

1:00-3:30 Task Force meeting with those concerned about competition with the private sector (include a break) – Fred Lissner

3:30-4:00 Task Force discussion and summary of panel

4:00-4:15 Break

4:15-5:00 Task Force Questions about competition to USGS (AZ + FL District Chiefs, Bill Alley – Chief Office of GW, Tim Hale- SE Region Program Officer)

5:00-5:45 Task Force status report to Alternate-Chair of ACWI (Bob Hirsch) -- Larry and Fred

5:45 Adjourn

Friday March 26, 1999

8:00 - 9:00 Presentation on Hydro21 and new technologies from the National Research Program – Melcher for Hydro21 and Bob Hirsch for NRP

9:00-9:15 Break

9:15-11:00 Subgroup deliberations – subgroups continue working on consensus Statements and findings related to the questions in the Terms of Reference (include a break)

11:00-11:45 Subgroup 1 report on preliminary findings – rest of Task Force comment and discuss

11:45-12:45 Lunch

12:45-1:45 Subgroup 2 reports on preliminary findings – rest of Task Force comment and discuss

1:45-2:00 Break

2:00-2:45 Subgroup 3 report on preliminary findings – rest of Task Force comment and discuss

2:45-4:00 Task Force deliberations – review status, pick next mtg locations, plan next meeting, make assignments

4:00 Adjourn

TASK FORCE TO REVIEW THE COOPERATIVE WATER PROGRAM

Cooperator Survey

A. General Introductory Questions

1. What is the primary role of your organization (i.e., regulatory, water management, scientific, etc.)?
2. What is your position in the organization and how does it relate to the USGS Federal-State Cooperative Water Program (Coop Program)?
3. Has your organization participated in the Coop Program for more than 5-years?
4. What is your organization's current level of financial participation? How has it changed over time?
5. What types of programs/projects are you involved in with the USGS under the Coop Program?
6. Does your organization foresee a change in the programs/projects it requests of the Coop Program in the future? Do you see the need increasing or decreasing?

- A. **Mission** - Historically, the Coop Program has been designed to develop hydrologic data and technical analysis needed to assist in meeting the USGS mission of continuously assessing the Nation's water resources, and to provide technical assistance to State, tribal, and local water management agencies in seeking solutions to water-resource issues of national concern through a matched funding arrangement.

7. Explain how the Coop Program assists your organization in accomplishing its activities, goals, and responsibilities?

8. Is cost sharing a necessary element in your organization's participation in a cooperative agreement with the USGS? Please explain
9. What is the minimum USGS cost share acceptable to your organization?
10. Explain whether your coop program is meeting your needs in the areas of ground water and surface-water quality, quantity, and use data, and analytical tools, etc.?

- C. **Prioritization** - In Fiscal Year 1997, the Congress appropriated \$64.5 million for the Coop Program. State and local agencies provided an equal amount of matching funds plus an additional \$28.5 million of unmatched funding.

11. Is there adequate funding in the Coop Program to meet your short and long term needs? If no, please explain the needs that are not being met.

12. Do you have any suggestions for the appropriate level of funding for the Coop Program?

13. What is the proper balance between routine long-term data collection and interpretive studies?
 14. **How do changes in the Coop Program, such as losing long-term data-collection stations, affect the mission of your organization?**
 15. How does your organization involve other parties in your Coop Program activity to improve study results and lower costs?
- D. Conduct of Work** - Nearly all of the work performed in the Coop Program is done by USGS scientists and technicians. This arrangement is designed to enhance quality control, provide national consistency in data collection and methods of analysis, and provide a stable core of experienced water scientists nationwide.
16. **If appropriate USGS quality assurance were made available, would your organization be able to and/or want to perform the data collection portion of a coop project? Please explain.**
 2. How do you believe the quality and credibility of the Coop Program would be impacted if data collection and analysis were not performed entirely by the USGS staff?
 18. **Why does your organization use the USGS for assistance rather than other sources (for example, consulting firms, academia, etc.)?**
 19. What does the USGS offer through the Coop Program that you cannot obtain elsewhere?
 20. **What is your opinion of the Coop Program contracting out parts or all of the work you have asked them to perform?**
- E. Products** - The products developed in the Coop Program need to be useful to cooperators and other users. These users include representatives of governments, the scientific community, the private sector, and the general public. The products also fulfill national needs by building long term national data bases, augmenting activities in other USGS programs, and providing a national picture of water resources through synthesis of information from individual projects across the country. In addition, the Coop Program advances the development and application of new approaches and methodologies relevant to water resources issues.
21. Is the Coop Program using the appropriate, applicable, and most cost effective level of technology to satisfy your needs?
 22. What suggestions do you have for the Coop Program to improve approaches, methods, and technologies to enhance the usability and effectiveness of products?
 23. **Is the Coop Program conscious of and sensitive to the needs of the cooperator in areas such as:**
 - a) **types of data collected,**
 - b) **documentation of data,**
 - c) **timeliness of products,**
 - d) **value of products, and**
 - e) **other?**

24. Do you have timely access to the data you need?

25. **In what form will you want Coop Project output delivered in the future?**

F. General Closing Question

26. **Do you have any recommendations for improving or changing the Coop Program?**

2/2/99

Summary Following Cooperator's Panel - March 24, 1999

1. Cooperators view USGS as relatively unbiased. Cooperators are willing to pay a premium for USGS credibility.
2. The same may not be true on the East Coast.
3. There's a real issue with communication and the process of converting hard science to information the public can understand.
4. If USGS moves too far into homogenizing information, they may be perceived as biased.
5. Cost sharing is an important part of the credibility of the Coop Program.
6. The importance of cost sharing argues against the concept of unmatched funding.
7. There is a need for an increase in funding for the Coop Program.
8. USGS may need a line item appropriation for increased national streamgaging data network.
9. It would be very difficult to contract out long term projects (those lasting three years or longer) because of the potential loss of institutional memory in the private sector.
10. USGS could outsource maintenance and administrative work.
11. Data collection and interpretation and report writing cannot be outsourced.
12. USGS needs to have a better understanding of the need for timely data by local communities and be more sensitive to their needs and how their results are communicated.
13. Technology is important ("overkill" is good).
14. Applying new technology is important.
15. The effect of using the merit-funding program was problematic. USGS needs to inform cooperators that the merit-funding program is no longer operating.
16. There should be a way for the USGS to release provisional reports.
17. Each USGS District needs a Public Information Officer (PIO).
18. There is pressure for the USGS to be more involved in local issues and not just to do science.
19. If USGS is more involved in local issues, they run the risk of becoming advocates and losing their credibility.
20. USGS is a facilitator to bringing communities and Tribes together.
21. The cooperators had a strong positive response to the topic of peer reviews.
22. Funding to Districts should be on the basis of need not past history.
23. Cooperators were confident they could get preliminary data from USGS if they asked for it.
24. USGS needs to be more visible.
25. USGS has developed and uses cutting edge technology.

TASK FORCE TO REVIEW THE COOPERATIVE WATER PROGRAM

Discussion Points for the Panel Dealing With Issues Related to Competition and the Appropriate Role of the USGS

1. Discuss where you see the USGS competing with the private sector? Can you provide specific examples?
2. Describe criteria the USGS should use to decide whether a project is appropriate for them to undertake?
3. Discuss the advantage you perceive USGS personnel to have over individuals in private practice with regard to such items as liability insurance, registration issues, etc.?
4. Discuss the appropriate role for private sector individuals in long term data collection efforts?
5. Discuss what role the USGS should be taking relative to national, regional, and local issues?
6. Discuss how the private sector could assure that the same consistent standard of excellence was applied to work conducted by them – over a period of 20 – 40 years?
7. Given the Federal procurement process, discuss how the private sector could maintain the level of expertise required to perform the services offered by the USGS?
8. Describe how the USGS could better involve the private sector in its operations?
9. How can USGS communicate with the private sector to avoid even the appearance of competition with the private sector?
10. What services and products can you provide that USGS cannot?
11. Discuss how you've collaborated with the USGS on projects. Are there ways for the USGS to transfer technology through using consultants that may not have the expertise already?

Summary Following the Competition Panel - March 25, 1999

1. There needs to be more opportunities for teaming (USGS/private sector).
2. Scopes of work tended to expand when USGS became involved to be consistent with mission (effect: to eliminate the consultant's opportunity).
3. Quality/QA of USGS work slipping.
4. You can't pay the USGS to slant conclusions.
5. There is a need for a Cooperative Water Program clearinghouse for private sector to lodge complaints.
6. Too much competition could lead to a backlash against USGS core programs.
7. Competition conflicts are almost always over work that has a local scope.
8. Competition is a big issue involving multimillions of dollars.
9. USGS has criticized consultant's proposals.
10. Consultants are afraid to complain because of the potential for it to impact their relationship with the cooperator (ramifications from the cooperator).
11. USGS is becoming more aggressive (the competition problem is increasing).
12. A level playing field (for example, issues around certification of USGS employees and insurance) is not a big issue.
13. USGS should not submit proposals if consultants have already been negotiating with the client.
14. USGS should open up a dialogue on the non-competition policy.
15. Private sector consultants have no interest in competing for work involving high levels of policy or procedures.
16. USGS should make an effort to identify key sites for their core programs.

Questions and/or Suggestions to Determine Criteria for Non-Competition

1. Is USGS conduct of work
 - A benefit to the private sector?
 - An advance to the profession?
2. Can the work be accomplished by the private sector?
3. Is there an opportunity to collaborate with the private sector?
4. The transition between interpretation and implementation is a cut-off for USGS involvement.
5. How work products will be used by community?
6. What are expectations of the cooperator?
7. If recommendations are expected, should be private sector.
8. Is the perception of being unbiased needed in a contentious situation?
9. Are the issues being addressed regional in scope?
10. Private consultants should do projects of short-term duration to answer immediate questions.
Short term - less than 3 years.
11. Water-supply development, bridge scour, and application of models without modification are examples of work that should be outside the purview of the USGS.

Task Force to Review the Cooperative Water Program

Minutes of the Fourth Meeting
May 5-7, 1999
Troy, New York

Attendees:

Task Force Members - - Craig Albertsen, Bureau of Reclamation; Thomas Baumgardner, National Weather Service; Ed Burkett, Corps of Engineers; Richard Burton, National Association of Counties; James Enote, Pueblo of Zuni; Fred Lissner, Oregon Department of Water Resources; Wendell McCurry, Association of State and Interstate Water Pollution Control Administrators; Fred Ogden, University of Connecticut; Don Phelps, American Society of Civil Engineers; Dave Pope, Kansas Department of Agriculture; Jonathan Price, Nevada Bureau of Mines and Geology; Larry Rowe, Western Water Inc; Jim Shotwell, American Institute of Professional Geologists; Earl Smith, Interstate Council on Water Policy; Alan Vicory, Ohio River Valley Water Sanitation Commission; Leslie Wedderburn, South Florida Water Management District

U. S. Geological Survey - - Steve Blanchard, Task Force Executive Secretary; Grady Moore, District Chief, New York; Ward Freeman, Associate District Chief, New York; Besty Daniel, Facilitator.

Absent: A FEMA representative; Tom Bruns, American Water Works Association; Randall Duncan, International Association of Emergency Managers; Peter Mack, NY Department of Environmental Conservation; Chuck Spooner, USEPA; Don Woodward, USDA

Location: U.S. Geological Survey, New York District Office, Troy, New York

The meeting closely followed the meeting agenda (attachment 1). The meeting started with a brief presentation by Grady Moore (New York District Chief) on the New York District's Cooperative Water Program. Grady Moore highlighted the New York District Coop Program areas of emphasis in doing low-ionic strength waters research, pesticide monitoring, sediment chemistry and transport, nitrogen cycling in small watersheds, and ground water age-dating and modeling.

The remainder of the morning session was a panel discussion between the Task Force and a group of individuals from the private sector to discuss the issue of competition with the private sector and the appropriate role of the USGS. The panel was composed of the following individuals:

Panel on competition and the appropriate role of the USGS - Paul Grosser, P.W. Grosser Consulting Engineer and Hydrologist, Bohemia, NY (Representing ACEC); Robert K Lamonica, CPG – President, Leggette, Brashears, and Graham, Inc, Trumbull, CT; Ken McGraw, Paul B Krebs and Associates, Montgomery, AL; Gary Lovett, Institute of Ecosystem Studies, Millbrook, NY; Don Cohen, Senior Associate, Malcolm Pirnie Inc, Mahwah, NJ.

The discussion with the panel on competition focused on answers to questions from the list of questions in attachment 2. The Task Force summarized the information they heard from the panel discussion and the initial Task Force response to the information in bullet Statements as listed in attachment 3.

The afternoon session was a panel discussion between the Task Force and a panel of individuals representing agencies that participate in the Coop Program. There were cooperators representing the Coop Program in New York, Connecticut, New Jersey, and Washington. The panel was composed of the following individuals:

Cooperators Panel – Fred Van Alstyne, New York State Department of Environmental Conservation, Division of Water, Albany, NY; Patti Stone, Water Quality Coordinator Colville Confederated Tribes, Nespelem, WA; Tom Baxter, Executive Director, New Jersey Water Supply Authority, Clinton, NJ; Jim Mayfield, Chief of Watershed Management, New York City Department of Environmental Protection, Bureau of Water Supply, Shokan, NY; Tom Morrissey, Director of Planing and Standards, Connecticut Department of Environmental Protection, Hartford, CT; Robert K. Lamonica, Leggette, Brashears, and Graham, Inc , representing Suffolk County Water Authority, Oakdale, NY.

The discussion with the cooperator panel focused on answers to questions from the list of questions in attachment 4. The questions in bold text were the questions asked of the cooperator panel. The Task Force summarized the information they heard from the panel discussion and the initial Task Force response to the information in bullet Statements as listed in attachment 5.

The second (May 6, 1999) and third days (May 7, 1999) were spent by the Task Force in deliberations, both in subgroups and together as one group, to develop preliminary findings and recommendations to present to ACWI.

The next meeting location was selected to be Chicago, Illinois. The meeting will not be held in the Illinois District Office but at a hotel in the Chicago area. The entire meeting will focus on editing and revising the preliminary findings and recommendations and writing the final report.

Action Items:

- Each Subgroup is to incorporate the comments and edits suggested by the entire Task Force and transmit the document electronically to Steve Blanchard
- Steve Blanchard is to compile the findings and recommendations from the Subgroups into one document
- The Task Force will work on editing and consolidating the compiled findings and recommendations
- Steve Blanchard will draft the supporting text of the final report for all sections but the findings and recommendations

Task Force to Review the Cooperative Water Program
May 5-7, 1999 in Troy, New York
New York District Office

Final Agenda

Wednesday May 5, 1999

8:00 – 8:15 Introductory Remarks and housekeeping – Steve Blanchard, Larry Rowe, Fred Lissner

8:15 – 8:45 New York District Coop Program – highlight of issues and selected projects - Grady Moore, NY District Chief

8:45 – 9:00 Break and Prep for Panel

9:00 – 11:30 Competition Issues Panel - Task Force meeting with panel to discuss issues relating to competition with the private sector and the appropriate role of the USGS (include a break) – Fred Lissner

11:30 -12:15 Task Force discussion and summary of panel – Betsy Daniel

12:15 - 1:15 Lunch – box lunch in building

1:15 - 1:30 Prep for Panel

1:30 – 4:00 Cooperators Panel – Task Force meeting with Cooperators from NY and other Districts (include a break) – Larry Rowe

4:00 – 4:45 Task Force discussion and summary of panel – Betsy Daniel

4:45 Adjourn

Thursday May 6, 1999

8:00 – 4:30 Task Force Deliberations

- presentation and discussion of the draft final report outline
- a recommendation for and discussion of decision making rules
- presentations and discussions of each subgroups conclusions/recommendations

Friday May 7, 1999

8:00 – 1:30 A mix of subgroup deliberations to continue to draft conclusions / recommendations and combined Task Force deliberations to reach “consensus” decisions / recommendations

1:30 – 2:15 Draft bullets for status report to ACWI at their May 18 -19 meeting

2:15- 3:00 Next meeting – pick location and plan agenda

3:00 Adjourn

TASK FORCE TO REVIEW THE COOPERATIVE WATER PROGRAMDiscussion Points for the Panel Dealing With Issues Related to Competition
and the Appropriate Role of the USGS

1. Discuss where you see the USGS competing with the private sector? Can you provide specific examples?
2. Describe criteria the USGS should use to decide whether a project is appropriate for them to undertake?
3. Discuss the advantage you perceive USGS personnel to have over individuals in private practice with regard to such items as liability insurance, registration issues, etc.?
4. Discuss the appropriate role for private sector individuals in long term data-collection efforts?
5. Discuss what role the USGS should be taking relative to national, regional, and local issues?
6. Discuss how the private sector could assure that the same consistent standard of excellence was applied to work conducted by them – over a period of 20 – 40 years?
7. Given the Federal procurement process, discuss how the private sector could maintain the level of expertise required to perform the services offered by the USGS?
8. Describe how the USGS could better involve the private sector in its operations?
9. How can USGS communicate with the private sector to avoid even the appearance of competition with the private sector?
10. What services and products can you provide that USGS can not?
11. Discuss how you've collaborated with the USGS on projects. Are there ways for the USGS to transfer technology through using consultants that may not have the expertise already?

Summary Following the Competition Panel - May 5, 1999

1. Calling a study “regional” says nothing about its geographic size.
2. There was a clear Statement of a role for the USGS in research, long-term data collection, and interpretative studies on a regional scale or initial application of a new process.
3. There is strong support for USGS data-collection programs.
4. The private sector’s role is to apply regional models.
5. There is a need to protect the integrity of USGS at all costs (for example, data, studies, etc.). That may involve keeping the USGS away from work that is a simple application of existing models.
6. On Long Island, contentiousness of issues should not be a criterion for involving USGS.
7. There are a number of examples of unfair competition with the private sector by USGS.
 - USGS is sensitive to the issue
 - It is perceived as counter productive for consultants to complain
 - The occurrence of instances of competition is perceived to be increasing
 - The amount of competition between the USGS and private sector is small but measurable.
8. USGS needs to be sensitive to the point at which technology development changes to implementation.
9. The private sector wants to open up a dialogue with USGS on the competition issue and technology transfer.
10. Discussion on the difficulty of acquiring private sector data.
 - to fill in the gaps in USGS data
 - volatility of streamgaging data
11. There is a reluctance to consider having USGS outsource its work.
12. Competition with universities exists and is a good thing.
13. There is no role for the private sector in long-term data collection. Long term data collection is a core competency of the USGS that is not receiving enough emphasis.
14. The private sector has much of the same expertise as the USGS – and that contributes to the competition issue. The USGS should attempt to hire staff interested in doing field work for data collection.
15. The private sector likes the idea of an ad hoc committee to address the roles of the players in specific activities.
16. There is a need for an annual review for “Lessons Learned”.

17. The private sector likes the idea of posting of proposed projects for comments.
18. Guidelines to avoid competition need to be more specific and continually improved.
19. Location of USGS offices (and need to keep employees working) is causing some competition (USGS needs a stronger funding base).

TASK FORCE TO REVIEW THE COOPERATIVE WATER PROGRAM

Cooperator Survey

A. General Introductory Questions

1. What is the primary role of your organization (for example, regulatory, water management, scientific, etc.)?
2. What is your position in the organization and how does it relate to the USGS Federal-State Cooperative Water Program (Coop Program)?
3. Has your organization participated in the Coop Program for more than 5-years?
4. What is your organization's current level of financial participation? How has it changed over time?
5. What types of programs/projects are you involved in with the USGS under the Coop Program?
6. Does your organization foresee a change in the programs/projects it requests of the Coop Program in the future? Do you see the need increasing or decreasing?

B. Mission - Historically, the Coop Program has been designed to develop hydrologic data and technical analysis needed to assist in meeting the USGS mission of continuously assessing the Nation's water resources, and to provide technical assistance to State, Tribal, and local water management agencies in seeking solutions to water-resource issues of national concern through a matched funding arrangement.

7. Explain how the Coop Program assists your organization in accomplishing its activities, goals, and responsibilities?

8. Is cost sharing a necessary element in your organization's participation in a cooperative agreement with the USGS? Please explain
9. What is the minimum USGS cost share acceptable to your organization?
10. Explain whether your coop program is meeting your needs in the areas of ground-water and surface-water quality, quantity, and use data, and analytical tools, etc.?

C. Prioritization - In Fiscal Year 1997, the Congress appropriated \$64.5 million for the Coop Program. State and local agencies provided an equal amount of matching funds plus an additional \$28.5 million of unmatched funding.

11. Is there adequate funding in the Coop Program to meet your short and long term needs? If no, please explain the needs that are not being met.

12. Do you have any suggestions for the appropriate level of funding for the Coop Program?

13. What is the proper balance between routine long-term data collection and interpretive studies?
 14. **How do changes in the Coop Program, such as losing long-term data-collection stations, affect the mission of your organization?**
 15. How does your organization involve other parties in your Coop Program activity to improve study results and lower costs?
- D. Conduct of Work** - Nearly all of the work performed in the Coop Program is done by USGS scientists and technicians. This arrangement is designed to enhance quality control, provide national consistency in data collection and methods of analysis, and provide a stable core of experienced water scientists nationwide.
16. **If appropriate USGS quality assurance were made available, would your organization be able to and/or want to perform the data collection portion of a coop project? Please explain.**
 17. How do you believe the quality and credibility of the Coop Program would be impacted if data collection and analysis were not performed entirely by the USGS staff?
 18. **Why does your organization use the USGS for assistance rather than other sources (e.g., consulting firms, academia, etc.)?**
 19. What does the USGS offer through the Coop Program that you cannot obtain elsewhere?
 20. **What is your opinion of the Coop Program contracting out parts or all of the work you have asked them to perform?**
- E. Products** - The products developed in the Coop Program need to be useful to cooperators and other users. These users include representatives of governments, the scientific community, the private sector, and the general public. The products also fulfill national needs by building long term national data bases, augmenting activities in other USGS programs, and providing a national picture of water resources through synthesis of information from individual projects across the country. In addition, the Coop Program advances the development and application of new approaches and methodologies relevant to water resources issues.
21. Is the Coop Program using the appropriate, applicable, and most cost effective level of technology to satisfy your needs?
 22. What suggestions do you have for the Coop Program to improve approaches, methods, and technologies to enhance the usability and effectiveness of products?
 23. **Is the Coop Program conscious of and sensitive to the needs of the cooperator in areas such as:**
 - a) **types of data collected,**
 - b) **documentation of data,**
 - c) **timeliness of products,**
 - d) **value of products, and**
 - e) **other?**

24. Do you have timely access to the data you need?

25. **In what form will you want Coop Project output delivered in the future?**

F. General Closing Question

26. **Do you have any recommendations for improving or changing the Coop Program?**

2/2/99

Summary Following Cooperator's Panel - May 5, 1999

1. Base data is valuable for TMDL studies.
2. Some studies wouldn't get done without cost share.
3. Six months for peer review (between submission of manuscript and approval to publish).
4. Timeliness is an issue with interpretive studies.
5. In several areas, USGS is vital in supporting cooperator programs.
6. Easier to raise dollars than manpower.
7. Better accounting for gage costs.
8. Better forecasting.
9. Multi-year funding.
10. More than 60-40% split makes cooperators uncomfortable.
11. State and Federal budget cycles present a problem (they're out of whack – some States are on a 2 year cycle).
12. Easier to contract govt.-to-govt. than with the private sector – administration of agreement easier than contract administration.
13. Public wants to know what's going on in their backyard.
14. Not enough USGS dollars.
15. Program has diminished from lack of dollars.
16. Like to see more Federal dollars.
17. Unmet Needs:
 - sampling and gaging in small drainage basins.
 - marrying water quality monitoring with flow monitoring.
 - predicting runoff and runoff changes with land-use changes.
 - trend analysis.
18. Improve remote sensing applications.
19. Oversight tracking of projects.
20. Independent audit of methods and means used.
21. Need for national consistency of work.
22. Reservations regarding outsourcing.
23. Trust responsibilities for Tribes.
24. Fact sheets are useful.
25. Timeliness is a REAL problem.
26. Government involvement in trans-boundary waters.
27. Partial billings tied to progress Statements may be possible with some cooperators (not all).
28. Designing projects to meet both national and cooperator needs is not seen as a problem.
29. Review of proposed projects is okay with these cooperators.
30. Great deal of interest in real-time data.
31. Examples of work USGS had refused as inappropriate.
32. Support for establishing a core network of streamgaging stations financed by Federal government (not at expense of cooperative program).
33. TMDLs, nonpoint source pollution from industrial sources.
34. Not all cooperators have seen USGS guidelines for avoiding competition.
35. Value, credibility, trust for USGS program.

Task Force to Review the Cooperative Water Program

**Minutes of the Fifth Meeting
June 28-30, 1999**

Rolling Meadows, Illinois

Attendees:

Task Force Members - - Craig Albertsen, Bureau of Reclamation; Thomas Baumgardner, National Weather Service; Ed Burkett, Corps of Engineers; Randall Duncan, International Association of Emergency Managers; Fred Lissner, Oregon Water Resources Department; Fred Ogden, University of Connecticut; Don Phelps, American Society of Civil Engineers; Dave Pope, Kansas Department of Agriculture; Jonathan Price, Nevada Bureau of Mines and Geology; Larry Rowe, Western Water, Inc; Jim Shotwell, American Institute of Professional Geologists;; Chuck Spooner, USEPA; Alan Vicory, Ohio River Valley Water Sanitation Commission; Leslie Wedderburn, South Florida Water Management District; Don Woodward, USDA.

U. S. Geological Survey - - Steve Blanchard, Task Force Executive Secretary; Besty Daniel, Facilitator.

Absent: A FEMA representative; Tom Bruns, American Water Works Association; Richard Burton, National Association of Counties; James Enote, Pueblo of Zuni; Peter Mack, New York Department of Environmental Conservation; Wendell McCurry, Association of State and Interstate Water Pollution Control Administrators; Earl Smith, Interstate Council on Water Policy.

Location: Holiday Inn Rolling Meadows, Illinois (near O'Hare Airport)

The entire meeting was spent in deliberations to finalize the "Findings and Recommendations" of the Task Force and the report resulting from the review of the Cooperative Water Program.