

Appendix E – The 1999 Numerical Survey of Cooperators

1. Transmittal letter for the survey
2. Blank Numerical Survey
3. Summary of Numerical Survey results
4. Written comments provided with the Numerical Survey

Transmittal letter for the survey

In Reply Refer To:
Mail Stop 409

March 30, 1999

Dear U.S Geological Survey Water Resources Division Cooperator:

As a participant in the U.S. Geological Survey's (USGS) Federal-State Cooperative Water Program (Co-op Program), we are asking that you provide feedback about the program by completing the enclosed survey. The survey was developed by and will serve as input to an external Task Force that is reviewing the Co-op Program.

The Task Force to Review the Federal-State Cooperative Water Program (Task Force) was established in August 1998 by the USGS's Advisory Committee on Water Information (ACWI) to conduct an external review of the Co-op Program. The Task Force was commissioned to review four critical aspects of the Co-op Program and report their results and recommendations to ACWI by July 1999. The areas for review are:

- 1) the Co-op Program's mission,
- 2) the way in which priorities are established for the Co-op Program,
- 3) the way in which work is conducted under the Co-op Program, and
- 4) the products resulting from the Co-op Program.

Copies of the Task Force's Terms of Reference (the charter given to the Task Force by ACWI) and the Task Force membership are enclosed for your information.

The Task Force is in the process of meeting with different Co-op Program stakeholders and gathering input and opinions from a wide range of organizations, like yours, which participate in or use information generated by the Co-op Program. This survey is intended to help the Task Force understand the importance of the Cooperative Program to your organization, your level of satisfaction with the program as it currently exists, and your ideas for improving the program.

Please take a few minutes to help us by filling out the enclosed survey. Your responses will be compiled anonymously and used to help the Task Force reach conclusions and make recommendations to ACWI on the Co-op Program. Please respond by April 16, 1999, if possible. If you are unable to respond by the due date, survey responses will still be accepted up through June 1999. A return envelope also is enclosed for your use.

The input of organizations, such as yours, is critical to the Task Force's success. Thank you for participating.

If you have any questions, please don't hesitate to contact either of us. If you would like to offer additional comments about the Co-op Program feel free to call us or to contact any of the Task Force members. If you would like to speak with someone in the USGS about the Task Force and/or the survey, you can contact Steve Blanchard, Assistant to the Chief Hydrologist (Executive Secretary to the Task Force) at 703-648-5629.

Sincerely yours,

Larry Rowe, Task Force Chair

Western Water Company
109 East 49th Street.
San Bernardino, CA 92404

619-535-9282
lwrowe@discover.net

Mr. Frederick G. Lissner, Task Force Vice-Chair

Manager, Ground Water and Hydrology Section
Oregon Department of Water Resources
158 12th Street, N.E.

Salem, OR 97310
503-378-8455, ext. 204
frederick.g.lissner@ wrd.State.or.us

4 Enclosures

PAPERWORK REDUCTION ACT STATEMENT: A Federal agency may not conduct or sponsor and a person is not required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number. Public burden for collection of this information is estimated to average 15 minutes per response. Comments regarding this collection of information should be directed to: Desk Officer for the Interior Department, Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget, Washington, DC 20503; and the Bureau Clearance Officer, U.S. Geological Survey, 807 National Center, Reston, Virginia 20192

OMB NO. 1028-0071; Expiration Date 2-28-2002

Blank Numerical Survey

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.						
• Responds well to administrative needs (billing, agreements, etc).						
• Compared with other providers, the quality of products and services is worth the cost						
• 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	
• Adequacy of geographic coverage.																									
• Length of data-collection period																									
• Frequency of data collection																									
• Field sampling techniques																									
• Use of the appropriate instrumentation																									
• Reliability of instrumentation																									
• Precision of instrumentation																									
• Instrumentation keeps pace with available technology																									
• Innovative use and application of instrumentation																									
• Overall data collection performance																									

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	NA	E	A	A	P	B	NA	E	A	A	B	P	NA	E	A	A	B	P	NA
• Technical approach selected																								
• Quality of the execution of the analysis and interpretation																								
• Timeliness																								
• Consideration of alternative interpretations																								
• Overall data analysis and interpretation performance																								

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
• Adequately address the objectives of the investigation						
• Include the appropriate level of detail						
• Are understandable						
• Are timely						
• Overall quality is excellent						

I have sufficient access to...

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not Applicable
• Hydrologic data and reports in printed form						
• Hydrologic data and reports on the Internet						
• Hydrologic data and reports on-line by computer						
• Hydrologic data and reports on diskette, tape, or CD-ROM						
• USGS computers to access information						

Section 6: Summary

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

Section 7: 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)

<u>Duration of Participation</u>	<u>Annual Coop Budget (your agency contribution)</u>
Less than 5 years	under \$50,000
5-10 Years	\$50,000- \$150,000
10-20 Years	\$150,000 - \$250,000
More than 20 Years	More than \$250,000

(Optional Information): Your Name: _____
Your Organization: _____

Section 8: 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.)

Summary of Numerical Survey Results

SECTION 1: INTRODUCTION

1. Provides products and services that are necessary for my organization to accomplish its mission.
2. Responds to the changing needs of my organization.
3. Keeps me informed of the types of products it offers.
4. Keeps me informed of the types of service it offers
5. Coordinates with my organization on programs and activities that may affect us.
6. Keeps my organization informed of programmatic and fiscal changes that affect us.
7. Responds to my requests in a timely manner.
8. Responds well to administrative needs (billing, agreements, etc.).
9. Compared with other providers, the quality of products and services is worth the cost.
10. Providers of unbiased scientific and technical support and products.

Question		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
RAW:	Strongly Agree	76	25	17	16	28	23	52	39	42	77
	Agree	73	90	80	82	74	80	85	89	70	75
	Neutral	12	32	43	45	47	41	18	26	41	10
	Disagree	6	8	20	19	15	18	4	4	8	4
	Strongly Disagree	0	1	2	1	1	2	0	2	2	0
	Not Applicable	3	14	8	7	5	6	11	10	7	4
PCT:	Strongly Agree	44.7	14.7	10.0	9.4	16.5	13.5	30.6	22.9	24.7	45.3
	Agree	42.9	52.9	47.1	48.2	43.5	47.1	50.0	52.4	41.2	44.1
	Neutral	7.1	18.8	25.3	26.5	27.6	24.1	10.6	15.3	24.1	5.9
	Disagree	3.5	4.7	11.8	11.2	8.8	10.6	2.4	2.4	4.7	2.4
	Strongly Disagree	0.0	0.6	1.2	0.6	0.6	1.2	0.0	1.2	1.2	0.0
	Not Applicable	1.8	8.2	4.7	4.1	2.9	3.5	6.5	5.9	4.1	2.4

SECTION 2: PROPOSALS

1. Address the needs of my organization.
2. Reflect work that is realistic in scope.
3. Are of appropriate content and length.
4. Are clear and understandable.
5. Present realistic work schedules.
6. Reflect reasonable pricing.

Question		1	2	3	4	5	6
RAW:	Strongly Agree	37	30	25	29	22	23
	Agree	87	92	90	91	83	55
	Neutral	19	22	26	25	28	48
	Disagree	5	3	4	2	10	16
	Strongly Disagree	0	0	0	0	1	4
	Not Applicable	22	23	25	23	26	24
PCT:	Strongly Agree	21.8	17.6	14.7	17.1	12.9	13.5
	Agree	51.2	54.1	52.9	53.5	48.8	32.4
	Neutral	11.2	12.9	15.3	14.7	16.5	28.2
	Disagree	2.9	1.8	2.4	1.2	5.9	9.4
	Strongly Disagree	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.6	2.4
	Not Applicable	12.9	13.5	14.7	13.5	15.3	14.1

SECTION 3: DATA COLLECTION

1. Adequacy of geographic coverage
2. Length of data-collection period
3. Frequency of data collection
4. Field sampling techniques
5. Use of the appropriate instrumentation
6. Reliability of instrumentation
7. Precision of instrumentation
8. Instrumentation keeps pace with available technology
9. Innovative use and application of instrumentation
10. Overall data collection performance

Ground Water

Question		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
RAW:	Strongly Agree	11	11	10	26	27	20	22	22	14	18
	Agree	26	35	28	28	27	34	33	25	29	35
	Neutral	39	31	40	16	16	15	15	23	24	25
	Disagree	6	2	2	3	3	3	2	4	2	2
	Strongly Disagree	2	2	2	1	0	0	0	1	1	1
	Not Applicable	86	89	88	96	97	98	98	98	95	100
PCT:	Strongly Agree	6.5	6.5	5.9	15.3	15.9	11.8	12.9	12.9	8.2	10.6
	Agree	15.3	20.6	16.5	16.5	15.9	20.0	19.4	14.7	17.1	20.6
	Neutral	22.9	18.2	23.5	9.4	9.4	8.8	8.8	13.5	14.1	14.7
	Disagree	3.5	1.2	1.2	1.8	1.8	1.8	1.2	2.4	1.2	1.2
	Strongly Disagree	1.2	1.2	1.2	0.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.6	0.6	0.6
	Not Applicable	50.6	52.4	51.8	56.5	57.1	57.6	57.6	55.9	58.8	52.4

Surface Water

Question		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
RAW:	Strongly Agree	24	33	30	45	42	32	39	34	29	36
	Agree	48	64	47	43	49	51	48	46	39	64
	Neutral	43	29	49	28	34	37	31	42	47	33
	Disagree	14	5	6	2	1	2	3	5	5	1
	Strongly Disagree	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
	Not Applicable	41	39	38	52	44	48	49	43	49	36
PCT:	Strongly Agree	14.1	19.4	17.6	26.5	24.7	18.8	22.9	20.0	17.1	21.2
	Agree	28.2	37.6	27.6	25.3	28.8	30.0	28.2	27.1	22.9	37.6
	Neutral	25.3	17.1	28.8	16.5	20.0	21.8	18.2	24.7	27.6	19.4
	Disagree	8.2	2.9	3.5	1.2	0.6	1.2	1.8	2.9	2.9	0.6
	Strongly Disagree	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.6	0.0
	Not Applicable	24.1	22.9	22.4	30.6	25.9	28.2	28.8	25.3	28.8	21.2

SECTION 3: DATA COLLECTION (Cont.)

1. Adequacy of geographic coverage
2. Length of data-collection period
3. Frequency of data collection
4. Field sampling techniques
5. Use of the appropriate instrumentation
6. Reliability of instrumentation
7. Precision of instrumentation
8. Instrumentation keeps pace with available technology
9. Innovative use and application of instrumentation
10. Overall data collection performance

Water Quality

Question		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
RAW:	Strongly Agree	12	14	12	27	20	16	19	18	14	17
	Agree	21	27	21	31	32	33	32	27	27	37
	Neutral	30	28	35	15	16	16	15	24	23	18
	Disagree	17	9	12	4	3	4	3	4	5	6
	Strongly Disagree	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Not Applicable	87	91	90	93	99	101	101	97	101	92
PCT:	Strongly Agree	7.1	8.2	7.1	15.9	11.8	9.4	11.2	10.6	8.2	10.0
	Agree	12.4	15.9	12.4	18.2	18.8	19.4	18.8	15.9	15.9	21.8
	Neutral	17.6	16.5	20.6	8.8	9.4	9.4	8.8	14.1	13.5	10.6
	Disagree	10.0	5.3	7.1	2.4	1.8	2.4	1.8	2.4	2.9	3.5
	Strongly Disagree	1.8	0.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	Not Applicable	51.2	53.5	52.9	54.7	58.2	59.4	59.4	57.1	59.4	54.1

Water Use

Question		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
RAW:	Strongly Agree	6	4	6	10	8	7	6	5	6	6
	Agree	5	13	8	6	6	7	7	7	7	9
	Neutral	23	19	19	13	11	10	11	14	12	17
	Disagree	8	5	8	3	2	3	2	4	4	6
	Strongly Disagree	2	2	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	1
	Not Applicable	126	127	127	136	142	142	143	139	140	131
PCT:	Strongly Agree	3.5	2.4	3.5	5.9	4.7	4.1	3.5	2.9	3.5	3.5
	Agree	2.9	7.6	4.7	3.5	3.5	4.1	4.1	4.1	4.1	5.3
	Neutral	13.5	11.2	11.2	7.6	6.5	5.9	6.5	8.2	7.1	10.0
	Disagree	4.7	2.9	4.7	1.8	1.2	1.8	1.2	2.4	2.4	3.5
	Strongly Disagree	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2	0.6	0.6	0.6	0.6	0.6	0.6
	Not Applicable	74.1	74.7	74.7	80.0	83.5	83.5	84.1	81.8	82.4	77.1

SECTION 4: DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

1. Technical approach selected
2. Quality of the execution of the analysis and interpretation
3. Timeliness
4. Consideration of alternative interpretations
5. Overall data analysis and interpretation performance

Question		Ground Water					Surface Water				
		1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
RAW:	Strongly Agree	16	17	7	7	14	25	30	16	17	26
	Agree	35	37	17	29	37	60	57	39	39	58
	Neutral	19	19	35	28	21	33	28	51	47	37
	Disagree	3	1	15	4	2	0	3	8	3	2
	Strongly Disagree	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	8	3	1
	Not Applicable	97	95	95	101	95	51	51	48	61	45
PCT:	Strongly Agree	9.4	10.0	4.1	4.1	8.2	14.7	17.6	9.4	10.0	15.4
	Agree	20.6	21.8	10.0	17.1	21.8	35.3	33.5	22.9	22.9	34.3
	Neutral	11.2	11.2	20.6	16.5	12.4	19.4	16.5	30.0	27.6	21.9
	Disagree	1.8	0.6	8.8	2.4	1.2	0.0	1.8	4.7	1.8	1.2
	Strongly Disagree	0.0	0.6	0.6	0.6	0.6	0.6	0.6	4.7	1.8	0.6
	Not Applicable	57.1	55.9	55.9	59.4	55.9	30.0	30.0	28.2	35.9	26.6

Question		Water Quality					Water Use				
		1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
RAW:	Strongly Agree	14	18	10	7	14	6	7	3	6	6
	Agree	37	33	20	24	35	10	8	7	7	9
	Neutral	18	18	31	28	22	11	15	17	10	15
	Disagree	1	2	10	4	1	4	2	5	6	4
	Strongly Disagree	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
	Not Applicable	100	98	98	107	98	139	138	137	141	136
PCT:	Strongly Agree	8.2	10.7	5.9	4.1	8.2	3.5	4.1	1.8	3.5	3.5
	Agree	21.8	19.5	11.8	14.1	20.6	5.9	4.7	4.1	4.1	5.3
	Neutral	10.6	10.7	18.2	16.5	12.9	6.5	8.8	10.0	5.9	8.8
	Disagree	0.6	1.2	5.9	2.4	0.6	2.4	1.2	2.9	3.5	2.4
	Strongly Disagree	0.0	0.0	0.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.6	0.0	0.0
	Not Applicable	58.8	58.0	57.6	62.9	57.6	81.8	81.2	80.6	82.9	80.0

SECTION 5: PRODUCTS

Requests for data, reports, and information:

1. Are handled courteously
2. Are addressed promptly
3. Are answered accurately

Question		1	2	3
RAW:	Strongly Agree	85	63	73
	Agree	66	72	77
	Neutral	6	17	7
	Disagree	0	2	0
	Strongly Disagree	0	3	0
	Not Applicable	13	13	13
PCT:	Strongly Agree	50.0	37.1	42.9
	Agree	38.8	42.4	45.3
	Neutral	3.5	10.0	4.1
	Disagree	0.0	1.2	0.0
	Strongly Disagree	0.0	1.8	0.0
	Not Applicable	7.6	7.6	7.6

Reports:

1. Adequately address the objectives of the investigation
2. Include the appropriate level of detail
3. Are understandable
4. Are timely
5. Overall quality is excellent

Question		1	2	3	4	5
RAW:	Strongly Agree	44	36	34	15	36
	Agree	90	92	100	75	93
	Neutral	10	15	11	36	14
	Disagree	2	4	3	13	4
	Strongly Disagree	0	0	0	7	0
	Not Applicable	24	23	22	24	23
PCT:	Strongly Agree	25.9	21.2	20.0	8.8	21.2
	Agree	52.9	54.1	58.8	44.1	54.7
	Neutral	5.9	8.8	6.5	21.2	8.2
	Disagree	1.2	2.4	1.8	7.6	2.4
	Strongly Disagree	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.1	0.0
	Not Applicable	14.1	13.5	12.9	14.1	13.5

I have sufficient access to:

1. Hydrologic data and reports in printed form
2. Hydrologic data and reports on the Internet
3. Hydrologic data and reports on-line by computer
4. Hydrologic data and reports on diskette, tape, or CD-ROM
5. USGS computers to access information

Question		1	2	3	4	5
RAW:	Strongly Agree	48	34	24	13	14
	Agree	81	62	45	54	35
	Neutral	19	36	50	45	44
	Disagree	5	8	10	8	15
	Strongly Disagree	1	1	2	1	1
	Not Applicable	16	28	39	48	60
PCT:	Strongly Agree	28.2	20.1	14.1	7.7	8.3
	Agree	47.6	36.7	26.5	32.0	20.7
	Neutral	11.2	21.3	29.4	26.6	26.0
	Disagree	2.9	4.7	5.9	4.7	8.9
	Strongly Disagree	0.6	0.6	1.2	0.6	0.6
	Not Applicable	9.4	16.6	22.9	28.4	35.5

SECTION 6: SUMMARY

- Overall, I think the Cooperative Water Program is

	<u>RAW</u>	<u>PCT</u>
Excellent	48	28.2
Above Average	84	49.4
Average	31	18.2
Below Average	4	2.4
Poor	1	0.6
Not Applicable	2	1.2

SECTION 7: COOPERATOR INFORMATION

Total number of respondents:	170
Affiliation:	
State	52
County	18
Other Local	7
Water Management District	17
Tribal	5
Municipal	32
Basin Commission	1
Interstate	2
Other	33
Interest:	
SW	140
WQ	106
GW	80
WU	50
Duration:	
Less than 5 years	23
5-10 years	31
10-20 years	40
More than 20 years	61
Unknown	14
Annual Cooperative Water Program Budget:	
under \$50,000	81
\$50,000-\$150,000	32
\$150,000-\$250,000	11
More than \$250,000	23
Unknown	20

Written Comments Provided With The Numerical Survey

Comment 1 – Too few gage sites in Alaska. Fairbanks office is understaffed. Growing mineral industry will require more gaging and water quality. Fairbanks office will not be able to meet this need without additional support.

Comment 2 - Work is contract – budget deficit driven. Not in the interest of national priorities. This change for the worst began some 10-15 years ago. Concurrent with declining State revenues.

Comment 3 - I would like for USGS personnel to come onto the Reservation for training purposes. Out tribe was involved in a similar program a few years ago; however, the personnel have changed for the Tribe. I think it would be helpful for our Tribe to participate in the co-op program again.

Comment 4 - Missing data and the timeliness of data return are the two major issues our agency encounters. Both issues are being worked on by both agencies for an agreeable resolution.

Comment 5 - The USGS is a great technical resource, capable of providing data and analysis that is very relevant to our mission. However, it is becoming increasingly difficult for the Water Resources Division to publish reports specified in the Cooperative Agreement in a timely manner. Special studies seem to require more time and Cooperator dollars than anticipated at program outset. Federal fiscal restraints also seem to result in steady increases to the “overhead” costs and reductions in cost-share funds available and decreased eligibility of items for cost-share. The net effect has been a steady increase in cost to the Cooperator and decreased ability of USGS personnel, stretched thin, to complete assignments in a timely manner.

Comment 6 - We have just begun a series of coop studies with the USGS on our groundwater basin and how we model it using USGS. I have been impressed by the technical support provided and the depth of knowledge of the USGS.

Comment 7 - I am distressed by the USGS position not to provide joint funding for new streamgage installations. Most local agencies cannot afford the full cost of a USGS-operated streamgage. Considering that your agency is charged with determining the quantity and quality of the US water supply, not operating any more stations or charging full price for new installations would be a conflict with your mission Statement.

Comment 8 - The District has benefited from the flow and stage data collected in the _____ River by the Ultrasonic Velocity Meter Data Collection Program. This program offers critical flow data that become available for the first time for myriad of technical analyses for the management and study of the river system.

Comment 9 - This is an important program for us that we hope has long-term stability.

Comment 10 - Yes, USGS does good work but they need to keep costs down. This can be accomplished by having more co-op funds available. Once programs are initiated the co-op % should not decrease.

Comment 11 - The survey's a splendid organization and very helpful. My dozens of specific recommendations were made a year ago in the five-year goal program out of Reston.

Comment 12 - Rainfall/Runoff Program: Some problems with rain gages and flow gages not followed through in a timely manner. Stormwater Quality: BOD test problems with contract lab in the past that District staff discovered and had to rectify with its own resources. Organics – adhered to high quality protocol; Fecal Coliform Test – done well in-house. Problem – missed some storms that our agency program didn't. NAWQA: Asked for input re/local needs in addition to national needs, but published only National.

Comment 13 - Our USGS collaborators have always been professional, reliable, and prompt. They are a great asset to our program.

Comment 14 – Our agency does not believe there is anything cooperative in its dealing with USGS on the “Cooperative Water Program”, for the following reasons:

When our agency proposed to purchase a reservoir to augment its water supply, it was pressured by the State Department of Environmental Protection to use the services of USGS to operate and maintain a flow gaging station on the inflow river.

Our agency purchased and installed the station. It paid USGS personnel for installation supervision and start up.

Our agency pays USGS approximately \$8,000 per year to operate and maintain the station. Our agency believes this fee is excessive. As the instrumentation associated with the station is no more complex than many others our agency has in its system, our agency believes it can perform USGS's tasks at significantly less cost by using its own staff. The State Department of Environmental Protection does not find this acceptable.

Other than insuring the minimum flow requirement is met, the station and all other information it gathers are of little relevance to our agency.

In summary, our agency believes it was forced into this “Cooperative Program” by the State, that it is bearing the full financial burden for USGS's effort and that it could perform the same task at a significantly lower cost than USGS.

Comment 15 - Our municipality, as a cooperator, is not of great consequence to the overall program and the system is apparently not set up to interact with a municipality on a watershed basis without special handling. The need for special handling is probably the source of our frustration since there is no “out-reach” effort to help the Town utilize the data acquired at our expense. We need to address land use development issues related to flooding, water quality, and consumptive use (diversions for water supply purposes). And these issues are apparently not of “critical mass” to justify program development at our level. It would be helpful if it did.

Comment 16 - Too involved in keeping themselves viable. Too little flexibility, too much competition for \$, not enough discretionary funding to support good ideas at the office level, they very much need a clear Statement of the minimal Federal role in stream flow monitoring!

Comment 17 –

1. Our agency is, by statute, the only agency in the State authorized to conduct business with the USGS. I am the person who manages the Coop Program with the USGS and I have had this responsibility for many years. I think that we have a very good working relationship with the USGS. During the past several years the management (District Chief) as well as others who I deal with in the USGS District have been very cooperative. We work well together. As you may be aware, the relationship between organizations often reflects the abilities and willingness of those involved in management to work together and to keep each other informed. We have been fortunate to have had the opportunity to work with several District Chiefs who have been very cooperative and open. We appreciate that.
2. As is evident by my responses on the survey, I think the State has had an excellent overall relationship with the WRD of the USGS for many years. One primary reason for this is that we cooperate in all aspects of the program.
3. Section 2: Proposals. The USGS does a very good job in developing proposals. This is due in part to the strong involvement of the State in the USGS proposal development process. We work hand-in-hand when developing proposals. This enables us to minimize the potential for conflicts and misunderstandings, and ensures that we get what we pay for.
4. The actual amount of funds that the State provides to support our cooperative program with the USGS has been about \$65,000 for the past several years. However, the amount of State funds that flow to the USGS as part of the State's cooperative program that our agency manages generally ranges between \$150,000 and \$250,000. The other entities who participate in the program through our agency are very satisfied with the program because our agency ensures that they are satisfied with the products that the USGS produces before we pay the USGS.
5. The amount of funds available for matching appears to be decreasing. I believe this is due in part to decreased funding to the USGS at the Federal level. However, it also appears that the USGS is tightening their guidelines on the type of programs that they are willing to cost share on. I know in the State that there is substantially more State money going to the USGS than is being used by the USGS for cost matching.
6. I would like to suggest one area for improvement. It is quite evident in many of the reports that the USGS prepares pertaining to our State's geology and hydrology, that the reports contain primarily USGS references. Usually only a few reports prepared by others (our agency, other State agencies, professional peer reviewed publications, etc.) are included in the References. This practice hints of arrogance and an unwillingness to consider other's points of view or interpretations.

Comment 18 - Just wanted to add that the USGS staff I have worked with over the past 15 years have consistently been technically knowledgeable as well as resourceful and focused on meeting our needs.

Comment 19 - My main comment is that they don't communicate with their co-funders enough during their projects. I have seen mistakes and misinformation occur in reports due to this. The time that is required to publish a report also seems excessive. I believe their extensive review process is a major factor in this.

Comment 20 - The reduction in the cooperative funds available has really hurt this organization. The availability of groundwater is increasing in importance and cost and the USGS budget is going the other way. USGS has several programs that offer great long-term benefits, almost pure R and D. It is difficult for utilities to get the financial support from ratepayers and taxpayers to participate with USGS in these efforts. It would be a great benefit if USGS could fund these efforts at ~90%.

Comment 21 – (1) COLA's are not defensible with this organization's management. (2) Overhead charges are not seen as legitimate expenses.

Comment 22 - The USGS District Office we deal with is highly professional and easy to work with.

Comment 23 - I do not know enough about what your group is doing to be able to give specific input. We have been involved in a cooperative monitoring agreement but I don't know what results have been generated. Please inform me.

Comment 24 - We have a long-standing cooperative agreement (JFA) with USGS. In addition we have worked with them on many other projects. The USGS has been more interested in providing the information we need in the last couple of years. They have provided all of the information that we have recently requested (hard copy and disk).

Comment 25 - We are not currently involved in the co-op program. Answering Sections 3, 4, and 6 was not easy due to the lack of comparable services by others.

Comment 26 - A lot of questions on survey are for long-time users of Dept. Interior. They basically did a stream flow ($Q > 10$) survey for our wastewater treatment need. Costs were impressive and final results were helpful. It saved our small community several dollars. Thank you.

Comment 27 - Increasing cost of CMP is making the program unavailable to cooperators.

Comment 28 – (1) We wait 3-4 months to get back a chloride analysis from national lab. When there was a District lab, the analysis could be made very soon after collection. Bigger may be better, but as far as I'm concerned, national gets a D on turnaround time. Many routine analyses could still be done locally, chloride for example. (2) Please stop using lofty government language that sounds erudite but is vague to the reader. That is EPA's specialty. Vague Terms: Task Force was commissioned (quasi-military?); Co-op Program stakeholders (is someone holding the money in a wager?)

Comment 29 - We are in the initial stages of our cooperative project.

Comment 30 – (1) Additional efforts must be made to speed up report-approval process. (2) Publication of Annual Data Reports may no longer be justifiable. The data should be put on the Internet.

Comment 31 - USGS provides us with high-quality, unbiased work, often on the cutting edge. Basic surface water and ground water data is also excellent and putting it on the Internet solved a problem of timeliness. Reports and completion of projects still have a major problem of timeliness.

Comment 32 - Equipment and methods behind available science (FTS Inc.). Maintenance of gages and automated stations was not as good as suggested would be. QA/QC lacking ... daily/15 minute data missing for weeks before corrected. Poor accessibility to pre-published data. Data correction lag of more than 6 months. Reports not delivered in a timely manner. Contracts needing to be changed to do work and cover expenses that should have been foreseen.

Comment 33 - I feel that it is a good program and USGS staff are good people to work with. There is little question about their technical expertise. I have noticed great interest within the USGS to provide work products in a more timely fashion. I feel there is a need for basic data collection that USGS can provide us but the policy that a formal report must accompany this increases costs and has limited our contracting experience.

Comment 34 - Reports take a long time to complete. I am still waiting for a final report from Phase I of the project (1.5 years ago).

Comment 35 - We cooperatively fund river gage maintenance and flow data production.

1. During the times of year when aquatic vegetation is heavy, we would like the USGS to improve its efforts at producing modified gage readings – flow data.
2. In addition to real-time and verified flow data being available on the Internet, we would like provisional data posted until it can be verified. At present data is not available between real-time and verified (months ago).
3. In principle, we object to the national objective of maintaining streamgages by focusing on the easy targets of water suppliers for cooperative funding.

Comment 36 - We appreciate all USGS efforts in this program. We hope we can receive a larger share in grants from USGS. It's been a pleasure working with the District Chief at USGS.

Comment 37 - Long-term, continuous data from surface water gaging stations are critical for management and conservation of water supplies and stream ecosystems. Unfortunately, the geographic coverage of the current streamflow-monitoring network is inadequate, particularly for small and moderate size streams. Consequently, the USGS is not meeting its mission of continuously assessing the Nation's water resources.

Comment 38 – (1) USGS's co-op program is vital to job of managing our Reservoir! (2) Would like USGS to take over operation and maintenance of all rain gages in our area for US Weather Service. Therefore we could look to one agency, USGS, to insure reliable rainfall and streamflow data.

Comment 39 - The Tribes have used the services of the USGS cooperative program since 1982 for surface water, ground water, water quality, channel maintenance... We are totally satisfied with the program.

Comment 40 - Data analysis and interpretation: Reports are usually too technical and/or difficult to understand—especially if you don't have a basic understanding of hydrology, stream dynamics, etc.

Comment 41 - This is a very good coop program which merits continued or increased support from Congress.

Comment 42 - Some clarifications: My organization has never (to my knowledge) solicited or received any proposals from the USGS office that we cooperate with and therefore I checked the “NA” box. There is only one negative comment I need to make regarding my experience with the USGS cooperative program. We have not always been informed of changes in the water quality analyses, such as changes in parameters that are analyzed, reporting limits, etc. We only find out after the fact, upon reviewing data received from the USGS office. Despite this one comment, I have always been very pleased and impressed with the professionalism and courteousness of the USGS employees that I have dealt with.

Comment 43 - USGS is responsive when I point out problems, but it seems that I have to point them out more often than I expect. I also have to make all decisions and design the approach to data collection. Would be better if the individual managing the project had some inspiration and ideas, but the world isn't perfect. Otherwise, I can't complain.

Comment 44 - Need to use GPs for site locations.

Comment 45 - I have been with the Tribe for only 9 months, very little interaction with USGS to this point ... so, just to qualify my survey responses and lack thereof!

Comment 46 – (1) Many publications pertinent to my area are out of print – only available by loan from you. (2) How can you monitor ground water levels throughout the State with only 17 monitoring stations!?! (3) The city should fund expanding the network of monitoring stations using Bond Act \$. (4) I would like to see USGS take over _____ duties and provide climate data on Internet for free. (5) Timely drought forecasting is also needed – to be released in July/August of current year.

Comment 47 - Responses are averages of 2 raters. It is often difficult to adequately characterize the finances of the cooperative agreement to municipal officials who see our expenditure and in-kind, but don't see the Federal dollars as expended in the locality, because the municipality “writes a check” to USGS, but doesn't see a “check” written by USGS.

Comment 48 - Would like to see USGS instrumentation at all 5 rivers flowing into the Bay. Only 2 rivers are instrumented now.

Comment 49 - The best buy by far and outstanding staff support by the office chief and support staff. However, they need more Federal funds for cooperative projects.

Comment 50 - Thus far, our relationship with USGS has been very good.

Comment 51 - Your agency and your services are very important to our mission, and the coop program makes you affordable.

Comment 52 - Data collection is a very if not the most important function. It appears to us that data collection is being held “hostage” in order to obtain funding for other projects. Stream gaging and ground water data collection needs to be fully funded and not at the State's expense.

Comment 53 - Do not have a lot of dealings with USGS but everything has always been handled satisfactorily.

Comment 54 - A program worthy of continuing!

Comment 55 - Presently we receive surface water data via satellite every 4 hours. We need data every 30 minutes or every 1.0 hours. We need this badly.

Comment 56 - The State Water Board and the USGS have cooperated in joint water research investigations and data collection since early this century. Surface and ground water data collected through this effort are essential to the operations of the Board, whose role is to support planning, conservation, and responsible development of water for the State. To this end, the Water Development Board/USGS Coop program now supports over 110 stream gages, 40 water well gages, and 60 reservoir stage recorders.

The USGS is recognized throughout the Nation as the authority in flow and water level monitoring. Data collected through the Coop Program is recognized as being of high quality, and is therefore readily accepted by both the technical and legal communities. Loss or continued decline in funding through the Coop program would force the Water Development Board to seek other sources of data collection that would thereby jeopardize the acceptance of ready availability of the data.

The Water Development Board and the State have benefited tremendously over the years through the Coop program, and we strongly support its continuation.

Comment 56 - The USGS serves a vital role. They are professional in every way. We appreciate the opportunity to work with the USGS.

Comment 57 - Without this program there would be a lot of streams not monitored and data would not be available to the public.

Comment 58 - This evaluation covers two projects. One of the projects was managed by several principal investigators. The transition between investigators was not well managed, which in turn affects the overall quality of the project.

Comment 59 – The County Office of Emergency Management has contract with USGS, but Federal attorneys required provisions that violated State law. You need to find ways to be more cooperative if you want agencies like ours to use the USGS services that we think are a great asset to the County.

The USGS-WRD budget for gaging stations should be increased to maintain and expand the network of long-term, continuous gaging stations. To meet its mission, USGS (or other Federal agencies, i.e. COE and BOR, where appropriate) should provide 100% of the funding for a core network of gaging stations. This core network would provide much of the necessary data for water-resources issues of national and regional concern. Also, such a core network would not be affected by fluctuating budgets and priorities of cooperating agencies, and the long-term flow records necessary for water and stream management will be less likely to be interrupted or discontinued. Establishment of such a core network would allow Coop Program funds to be used for assessing water resources primarily of intrastate concern.

To better meet intrastate needs, I believe most States need a better process to more effectively allocate Coop Program and Cooperator funding of gaging stations. In each State, USGS should pursue establishment of an interagency committee to coordinate the collection of water resources and climatological data (See attached “By-laws for Interagency Hydrology Committee for _____”). By coordinating data needs, priorities, and collection, such committees will more effectively use available funding, and possibly encourage additional funding by cooperators.

Comment 60 - The USGS Cooperative Program has been an important source of data in providing the State Engineer with good reliable data upon which to base his decisions. The costs associated with the program have increased significantly over the last 10-12 years. The costs are now at a point where we are looking for alternatives. Whether it is right or not, we feel that the 50% cost share by the State/Local cooperators is covering the actual cost of the projects. The other 50% contributed on paper by the USGS goes to cover overhead, which provides funding for other agency programs.

Comment 61 - Greetings. I would like to see research and development of the radar gaging technologies. I find that tracking floods and real time data on the Internet is very helpful.

Comment 62 - The staff from _____ has been very cooperative, willing to attend educational meetings for property owners.

Comment 63 - We have a limited exposure to USGS, but have always had the best of relationships.

Comment 64 - This program works best for us when we work together as equal partners sharing the planning, proposal preparation, leadership, and workload, with credits given for in-kind contributions, and only a minimal transfer of actual money from us to the WRD. For joint projects that require additional money a separate third party is invited to participate as a traditional WRD defined cooperator. Just providing money on our part is not satisfactory because then we are not a true or equal partner in that project. Thirty years ago WRD personnel were the only water experts around but that is no longer true. Our State can now match most of the expertise that the WRD has and can do some things better and usually for less money, even when considering the Federal match. (We suspect the combined overhead is high.)

Comment 65 – (1) The program could be strengthened by placing more focus on partnering on data collection and special studies with State and local cooperators who have developed their own staff expertise (USGS no longer sole-source provider). (2) Program overhead is large and the cost effectiveness of so-called “matching” efforts is coming into greater question. Full and open disclosure of the true overhead is needed.

Comment 66 - What began as a 50-50 coop has begun to deteriorate into a standard “This is all the legislature gives us” line. There will come a time that our local government will balk at paying a disproportionate share of the costs of this program. Already, the question has arisen “Can we do this for the same or less money?”

Comment 67 – (1) Prefer internal procedure for accessing data vs. USGS computer dial up. (2) Make current water year data available in historic group. Typically don’t include until after data has been verified, but for those of us who need current data for planning purposes it would be very valuable to have. (Just make it as provisional.)