

COON CREEK WATERSHED DISTRICT
Request for Board Action

MEETING DATE: October 26, 2026
AGENDA NUMBER: 7
ITEM: Request to Award Work for Economic Analysis

AGENDA: Policy
BUDGET: \$125,000

ACTION REQUESTED

Award Economic Analysis contract.

BACKGROUND

The District has budgeted funds for an Economic Analysis to support long-term planning, funding, implementation, and public cost communication. The project is intended to provide practical decision-support tools for evaluating long-term funding needs, implementation pacing, public cost, financing mechanisms, and the value of District programs and projects.

The work originated from the Comprehensive Watershed Management Plan process, which identified larger and more complex long-term implementation and funding needs than the District has historically managed. The analysis is intended to improve the information available to the Board and staff as funding, project costs, and implementation assumptions change over time.

At the May 26, 2026, Board meeting, the Board authorized staff to solicit proposals for the Economic Analysis and return to the Board with proposal results and a recommended consultant selection. Following Board authorization, staff distributed the Request for Proposals to 10 consultants. Proposals were due September 29, 2026.

At the October 12, 2026 Board meeting, the Board reviewed the proposals and tabled action until all Board members are in attendance.

ISSUES/CONCERNS

Project budget \$125,000

Request for Proposal The attached RFP was distributed to 10 consultants.

Base Scope of work includes project initiation and data review, long-term funding need model, implementation pacing and cost of delay, levy and taxpayer impact analysis, funding and financing mechanisms, and public value, funding gap, and Board decision support.

Optional Add Alternates includes a local willingness to pay survey, parcel level property value analysis, detailed flood risk reduction value analysis, precipitation and flood risk cost scenario, and post-2045 stewardship model.

Basis of Award proposals were evaluated based on qualifications, project understanding, proposed approach, deliverables, schedule, cost, and overall value to the District. The District is not required to select the lowest cost proposal.

Value of Analysis District staff will continue to manage routine budgeting, forecasting, and planning. The Economic Analysis is intended to complement existing staff tools by bringing in outside expertise for long-term decisions involving implementation pacing, public cost, taxpayer impacts, external funding needs, and financing options. Future implementation needs remain significant, and the Board will benefit from decision support tools that can be updated as assumptions and available information change.

PROPOSALS

Consultant	Base Scope Cost	Optional Add Alternates	Summary
Ehlers	\$65,100	Not priced	Complete proposal. Within budget. Uses a 20-year financial management plan and editable funding model as the central tool to address the full Base Scope.
Stantec Consulting Services	\$124,932	Provided planning level cost ranges	Complete proposal. Within budget. Includes an integrated interdisciplinary approach combining financial modeling, implementation pacing, taxpayer impacts, funding strategy, public value, and Board decision support.

EVALUATION

Proposals were reviewed using the evaluation criteria identified in the RFP.

Evaluation Criteria	Staff Evaluation Summary
Project understanding and approach	Both proposals are responsive. Ehlers centers the work on the financial management plan and funding model, then uses that tool to address the remaining Base Scope tasks. Stantec provides a more detailed task-by-task approach and stronger alignment with the decision-support purpose of the RFP.
Experience, qualifications, references, and samples	Both firms appear qualified. Ehlers demonstrates strong public finance and financial management planning experience. Stantec demonstrates broader economic, funding, and watershed-related experience.
Deliverables, model, scenarios, and Board materials	Both proposals appear capable of producing the required Base Scope deliverables. Stantec provides more detail, higher level of effort, more developed scenario testing, and stronger model

	adaptability. Ehlers provides a lower-cost approach centered on the financial management plan and funding model, with the remaining deliverables developed from that tool.
Schedule and project management	Both proposals provide acceptable schedule and project management approaches. Stantec proposes a larger team and higher level of effort, which may provide more flexibility during implementation. Staff will confirm key staff availability and roles before contract execution.
Cost and overall value	Ehlers proposed \$65,100. Stantec proposed \$124,932, including estimated travel expenses. Ehlers provides a substantially lower-cost proposal and would preserve more budget capacity. Stantec uses nearly the full project budget, but staff review found added value in scope depth, model adaptability, watershed alignment, and Board decision-support deliverables.

Evaluation consideration The primary tradeoff is cost and demonstrated scope depth. Ehlers provides a responsive, substantially lower-cost proposal centered on public finance, financial management planning, and the funding model. Stantec provides a higher-cost proposal, but staff review found that it demonstrates a stronger understanding of the District's intended use of the Economic Analysis, a more detailed approach to each Base Scope task, greater level of effort, and stronger alignment with watershed management, scenario analysis, public value, and Board decision-support needs. Based on the evaluation criteria and staff review, Stantec is recommended as the best overall value for the District.

OPTIONS

1. Award the Economic Analysis contract to Ehlers
2. Award the Economic Analysis contract to Stantec Consulting Services
3. Table action until a future meeting with statement of reason and need
4. Reject all proposals

RECOMMENDATION

Award Economic Analysis contract to Stantec Consulting Services.

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

FROM: Jon Janke
Coon Creek Watershed District
13632 Van Buren St NE
Ham Lake MN 55304

SUBJECT: Coon Creek Watershed District Economic Analysis

The Coon Creek Watershed District (District) is seeking proposals from qualified firms or consultant teams to provide economic analysis services for the District. Proposals must be received by **12:00 pm (Noon) on September 29, 2026**. Email is preferred. Delivered or mailed proposals are also acceptable.

Please email technical questions, inquiries, and proposals to Jon Janke, District Administrator, at jjanke@cooncreekwd.org or deliver or mail to:

Coon Creek Watershed District
Attn: Jon Janke
13632 Van Buren Street NE
Ham Lake, MN 55304

RFP Timeline:

9/22/26

9/24/26

9/29/26 12:00 pm CST

10/12/26

October 2026

Spring 2027

Technical questions and inquiries due
District response to questions

Proposals and materials due

Estimated Board consideration of consultant selection

Estimated project kickoff

Target substantial completion

Organizational Background:

The Coon Creek Watershed District is a special purpose unit of government with taxing authority established in 1959 by public petition to address flood and water resource related issues. The District is managed by a five member Board of Managers and operates from the District office in Ham Lake, Minnesota.

The District is responsible for watershed management across approximately 107 square miles in central Anoka County. District responsibilities include water quality, flood risk reduction, public drainage, wetlands, groundwater, regulation, public service, capital project implementation, and related long term watershed management activities.

The District has historically funded many capital projects primarily through its own levy. That operating model is changing. Current and future implementation needs are larger, more complex, and increasingly dependent on multiple funding sources, including District levy, grants, intergovernmental cost sharing, partner participation, potential financing mechanisms, and coordinated project delivery.

The District has an existing budgeted project titled Economic Analysis. The budgeted description identifies valuation, willingness to pay, and financing mechanisms as intended study elements. The budget justification is to achieve and maintain the District mission long term. On May 26, 2026, the Board authorized staff to solicit proposals for the Economic Analysis and return to the Board with proposal results and a recommended consultant selection.

Project Purpose:

The purpose of the Economic Analysis is to develop a practical, defensible, and usable analysis of the District's long term funding and financing needs. The study should provide economic information and decision support tools that can be used during budget development, capital planning, District and partner funding discussions, grant strategy, legislative funding discussions, and public communication.

The analysis is intended to help the District compare long term funding and implementation scenarios and understand how those scenarios may affect future costs, taxpayer impacts, funding needs, and Board decision making.

Summary of Requested Services:

The District is requesting proposals for a Base Scope and separately priced Optional Add Alternates. The Base Scope is intended to produce a usable economic and financial decision support tool. The Optional Add Alternates may be considered if they are useful, cost effective, and do not weaken the core work.

Detailed descriptions of the Base Scope, Optional Add Alternates, and expected deliverables are included in Attachment A.

The Base Scope includes:

1. Project initiation and data review.
2. Long term funding need model.
3. Implementation pacing and cost of delay.
4. Levy impact and taxpayer impact analysis.
5. Funding and financing mechanisms.
6. Public value, funding gap, and Board decision support.

The Optional Add Alternates include:

1. Local willingness to pay survey.
2. Parcel level property value analysis.
3. Detailed flood risk reduction value analysis.
4. Precipitation and flood risk cost scenario.
5. Post 2045 stewardship model.

Proposal Requirements

Proposals should be concise. Firms may use their standard proposal format, provided the proposal includes enough information for the District to evaluate the following:

1. Firm or consultant team qualifications and relevant experience.
2. Project understanding and proposed approach for completing the Base Scope.
3. Recommended refinements to the Base Scope or sequencing of Optional Add Alternates, if any, with explanation.
4. Key personnel, roles, and subconsultants, including who will lead the funding model, financing analysis, taxpayer impact analysis, economic value assessment, and project management.
5. Examples of similar work and references, preferably including public sector clients.
6. Sample work products or representative excerpts, if available. If confidential client work cannot be shared, provide a description of similar deliverables.
7. Proposed schedule, meetings, deliverables, staff review periods, and anticipated completion date.
8. Project management approach, communication expectations, meeting needs, data request process, review periods, and District staff involvement assumptions.
9. Cost proposal using Attachment B or an equivalent format that provides the same information.
10. Assumptions, exclusions, reimbursable expenses, and work that would require additional authorization.

The District is open to proposals from individual firms or consultant teams. Proposers should clearly identify the role of each firm and key staff member.

Cost Proposal Requirements

Proposers should provide a cost proposal that allows the District to compare Base Scope cost, optional task pricing, staffing assumptions, and exclusions across proposals. Proposers should use the cost proposal table in Attachment B or provide substantially equivalent information.

The cost proposal should include:

1. Total not to exceed cost for the Base Scope.
2. Cost by Base Scope task.
3. Separately priced Optional Add Alternates.
4. Hourly rates for proposed staff.
5. Estimated hours by staff role and task.
6. Brief cost assumptions or notes necessary to understand the proposal.
7. Assumptions, exclusions, and reimbursable expenses.
8. Identify any assumptions about District staff completing work, preparing analysis, compiling data, or otherwise reducing consultant effort or cost.

Evaluation Criteria

The District will evaluate proposals based on qualifications, project understanding, proposed approach, deliverables, schedule, cost, and overall value to the District. The District is not required to select the lowest cost proposal.

The District will consider the following criteria when evaluating proposals:

1. Project understanding and approach.
2. Relevant experience and qualifications.
3. Quality and usefulness of proposed deliverables.
4. Ability to produce an editable funding model, clear scenario outputs, assumptions documentation, and Board usable materials.
5. Schedule and project management approach.
6. Cost, budget clarity, hourly rates, staffing plan, assumptions, and exclusions.
7. References and sample work products.
8. Overall value to the District.

The evaluation criteria are intended to support staff review and recommendation to the Board. The Board retains discretion to accept, reject, or modify a recommendation, negotiate scope and cost, or decline to award a contract.

The District may conduct interviews with one or more proposers. The District may request clarification, revised scopes, or revised fee proposals before making a recommendation to the Board.

Contract Award

This RFP does not authorize a consultant contract or commit the District to proceed with the work. Staff will return to the Board with proposal results, scope considerations, and a recommended consultant selection before contract award.

The selected consultant will be required to enter into a written professional services agreement acceptable to the District. The final contract scope, schedule, compensation, insurance requirements, ownership of work product, and other terms will be negotiated before execution.

Additional Terms:

Public Data and Confidentiality. Proposals submitted to the District may be subject to the Minnesota Government Data Practices Act. Proposers should clearly identify any data they believe to be trade secret or otherwise protected from disclosure and provide the legal basis for that designation. The District cannot guarantee that all information marked confidential will be withheld from public disclosure.

Conflict of Interest. Applicants should identify any conflicts of interest or potential conflicts of interest in servicing the District and explain how those conflicts would be managed and mitigated to support the best interests of the District.

Reservation of Rights. This RFP does not commit the District to award a contract, pay any costs incurred in preparing a proposal, or contract for services. The District reserves the right to accept or reject any or all proposals, waive minor irregularities, informalities, or discrepancies, negotiate with any qualified consultant or firm, request clarifications or revised proposals, or cancel the RFP.

Technical Questions and Inquiries. Technical questions and inquiries must be submitted in writing by the deadline listed in the RFP Timeline. Responses to questions may be compiled and distributed to known proposers and posted with the RFP materials, as needed.

Work Product. All final work products, models, data summaries, tables, graphics, presentations, and reports prepared under the contract will become the property of the District, subject to final contract terms.

Subconsultants. Subconsultants may be used if identified in the proposal and approved by the District. The prime consultant will remain responsible for all work performed by the consultant team.

Submission

Submit proposals electronically as a PDF by 12:00 pm (Noon) on September 29, 2026. A separate Excel file may be submitted for the detailed budget if useful. Proposals may also be delivered or mailed to the District address listed above.

Questions and proposals should be directed to Jon Janke, District Administrator, at jjanke@cooncreekwd.org or 763-755-0975.

Regards,

Jon Janke
District Administrator
jjanke@cooncreekwd.org
763-755-0975

Attachment A: Scope of Work and Expected Deliverables

The following scope describes the District's anticipated Base Scope and Optional Add Alternates. Proposers may recommend refinements if they believe a different approach would better meet the District's purpose and desired outcomes.

District Involvement

The District expects this project to be completed through close coordination between District staff and the consultant. District staff will make available existing plans, budgets, levy history, capital improvement information, project cost information, grant and partner funding information, tax base information, historical context, and other readily available data needed to support the analysis. District staff will also participate in project meetings, assist in identifying key resource management and implementation assumptions, including TMDL/WRAPS assumptions, capital planning assumptions, and project pacing assumptions, and provide feedback on draft deliverables. The consultant is expected to use that information to develop the funding model, economic analysis, implementation scenarios, findings, considerations, and final work products.

Base Scope of Work

Task 1: Project Initiation and Data Review

1. Meet with District staff to confirm the project purpose, intended use, schedule, scope, deliverables, available data, District and consultant roles, staff involvement assumptions, and known constraints.
2. Develop an initial data request and assumptions framework that identifies information to be provided by the District, information to be developed by the consultant, key decisions or assumptions requiring District confirmation, and any data limitations that may affect the analysis.
3. Review relevant District materials, including comprehensive plans, capital improvement plans, budgets, levy history, tax capacity and parcel data, TMDL and WRAPS assumptions, project cost estimates, grant and partner funding assumptions, fund balance, and cash flow requirements.
4. Identify the key assumptions that will drive the analysis, including where data are strong, where assumptions are weak, and where scenarios or ranges will be needed rather than precise forecasts.

Task 2: Long Term Funding Need Model

1. Develop a transparent, editable, planning level funding model for the next 20 years.
2. Separate capital implementation costs from program support, operations and maintenance, staffing or consultant support, and reasonable future uncertainty allowances.
3. Include annual funding need, inflation and construction escalation, District levy assumptions, grant and partner funding assumptions, debt or financing assumptions where appropriate, use of available fund balance while maintaining required cash flow thresholds, and post implementation operations and maintenance assumptions.
4. Provide the District with an editable funding model, such as an Excel workbook, with assumptions, calculations, scenario inputs, and summary tables or dashboard style outputs suitable for staff and Board review.
5. Where practical, organize the model and summary outputs to align with the District's existing PlanIT capital planning software.

Task 3: Implementation Pacing and Cost of Delay

1. Evaluate implementation pacing scenarios such as current trajectory, steady implementation, phased growth, delayed implementation, constrained funding, and debt supported implementation where appropriate.
2. Quantify how project costs change if implementation is delayed by 5, 10, or 15 years under reasonable inflation and construction escalation assumptions.
3. Help answer the practical question: If the District does not fund or implement the work now, what does that cost later?

Task 4: Levy Impact and Taxpayer Impact Analysis

1. Develop a practical method for estimating and communicating District levy impacts under the funding and implementation scenarios developed in Tasks 2 and 3.
2. Identify useful ways to explain levy impacts to the Board and public, such as total levy change, estimated impact on representative residential properties, impacts by major property class, and funding allocation by major cost category.
3. Evaluate how changes in property value, tax capacity, property class, tax base growth, and levy amount affect year-to-year taxpayer impact estimates.
4. Prepare example tables, graphics, or other communication tools that accurately explain District levy impacts without overstating precision or implying that representative examples reflect all taxpayers.
5. Identify the strengths, limitations, and appropriate uses of different taxpayer impact communication methods, including representative property examples, cost allocation graphics, property class summaries, geographic summaries, or other approaches the consultant recommends.

Task 5: Funding and Financing Mechanisms

1. Evaluate potential funding and financing mechanisms, including District levy, grants, intergovernmental cost sharing, partner contributions, state bonding or legislative appropriations, loans, bonds, special assessments, charges, special taxing districts, phased funding, pay as you go capital funding, project specific funding agreements, and use of available fund balance while maintaining required cash flow thresholds.
2. For each mechanism, identify typical use, advantages, disadvantages, administrative burden, statutory, programmatic, or policy considerations requiring further review, political risk, implementation complexity, and suitability for different project types.
3. Define which tools fit which circumstances rather than selecting a single funding mechanism or making final policy decisions.

Task 6: Public Value, Scenario Comparison, and Board Decision Support

1. Provide a practical summary of economic value concepts that are relevant to District services, including willingness to pay literature, property value relevance, floodplain and drainage preventative value, grant leverage, partner coordination, and public benefit.
2. Compare how different combinations of District levy, grants, partner funding, financing, and implementation pacing affect taxpayer impacts, remaining external funding needs, and Board decision points.
3. Identify practical external funding needs or targets that can support grant, legislative, District, and partner conversations.
4. Prepare Board usable materials that summarize funding scenarios, taxpayer impacts, implementation pacing, financing mechanisms, external funding needs, and key decision points.

Optional Add Alternates

The Optional Add Alternates are not assumed to be required to complete the Base Scope. The Base Scope should be completed using available District information, available literature, planning-level assumptions, and professional judgment. However, proposers should identify if they believe any Optional Add Alternate is necessary to complete or materially improve the Base Scope, explain why, and describe whether it should be completed before, during, or after the Base Scope.

Optional Task A: Local Willingness to Pay Survey. Resident, stakeholder, or statistically valid contingent valuation survey. The consultant should explain the proposed method, sample size, confidence level, limitations, cost, schedule, and usefulness for levy, funding, or communication decisions.

Optional Task B: Parcel Level Property Value Analysis. Analysis of whether water quality, proximity to water, flood risk, or drainage conditions have measurable effects on local property values. This may require parcel data, sales data, water proximity data, water quality data, floodplain or inundation data, and regression or hedonic modeling.

Optional Task C: Detailed Flood Risk Reduction Value Analysis. Estimate the dollar value of flood risk reduction associated with District floodplain, drainage, modeling, infrastructure, and maintenance work. This may include comparing current or proposed District actions against delayed, reduced, or reactive management scenarios using flood depth grids, structure inventories, depth damage relationships, infrastructure vulnerability data, emergency response cost assumptions, and scenario modeling.

Optional Task D: Precipitation and Flood Risk Cost Scenario. Evaluate, at a planning level, how changing precipitation patterns, updated rainfall frequency data, future design storm assumptions, pending Atlas 15 information, and increased flood risk could affect future District costs, infrastructure needs, maintenance demands, and long term funding scenarios. This task may rely on literature review, available regional information, and clearly stated assumptions rather than new modeling.

Optional Task E: Post 2045 Stewardship Model. Evaluate in more detail how the District's role may shift from project delivery toward inspection, monitoring, maintenance, asset management, enforcement, adaptive management, and protection of prior investments.

Expected Deliverables

1. Project kickoff meeting and refined work plan.
2. Data request and assumptions memorandum or equivalent summary.
3. Editable 20-year funding model with documented assumptions and scenario inputs.
4. Funding, financing, and implementation pacing scenario summary.
5. Taxpayer impact and levy impact summary.
6. Funding and financing mechanisms matrix.
7. Scenario comparison and external funding needs summary.
8. Public value and economic context summary.
9. Draft report or technical memorandum for staff review.
10. Final report or technical memorandum appropriate for public review.
11. Board presentation materials.
12. Electronic copies of all final source files, including Word, Excel, PowerPoint, PDF, and any GIS or data files created for the project, as applicable.

Attachment B: Cost Proposal Table

Proposers should complete the following table or provide substantially equivalent information. Additional narrative may be included to explain assumptions, exclusions, staffing, schedule, or optional tasks.

Scope Task	Estimated Hours	Estimated Cost	Notes / Assumptions
Task 1: Project Initiation and Data Review			
Task 2: Long Term Funding Need Model			
Task 3: Implementation Pacing and Cost of Delay			
Task 4: Levy Impact and Taxpayer Impact Analysis			
Task 5: Funding and Financing Mechanisms			
Task 6: Public Value, Scenario Comparison, and Board Decision Support			
Base Scope Total Not to Exceed Cost			

Optional Add Alternate Costs

Optional Task	Estimated Hours	Estimated Cost	Notes / Assumptions
Optional Task A: Local Willingness to Pay Survey			
Optional Task B: Parcel Level Property Value Analysis			
Optional Task C: Detailed Flood Risk Reduction Value Analysis			
Optional Task D: Precipitation and Flood Risk Cost Scenario			
Optional Task E: Post 2045 Stewardship Model			

Hourly Rates and Staffing

Name / Role	Firm	Hourly Rate	Estimated Hours

Reimbursable Expenses, Assumptions, and Exclusions

Item	Description / Amount
Reimbursable expenses	
Major assumptions	
Exclusions	

RESPONSES TO TECHNICAL QUESTIONS

FROM: Jon Janke
Coon Creek Watershed District
13632 Van Buren St NE
Ham Lake MN 55304

SUBJECT: Coon Creek Watershed District Economic Analysis
Responses to Technical Questions

The Coon Creek Watershed District received technical questions regarding the Economic Analysis RFP. Responses are provided below for the benefit of firms receiving the RFP. These responses are intended to clarify the RFP and do not change the proposal deadline or the submittal instructions.

Proposals remain due by **12:00 pm (Noon) Central Time on September 29, 2026.**

Question 1. The RFP states Subconsultants can be used. Does the District prefer a proposal that utilizes a subconsultant to address the optional add alternates or a proposal from one consultant that addresses the base scope but not the optional add alternates?

Response: The District does not have a preference for a single-firm proposal or a consultant team. The RFP allows subconsultants because the requested work includes several related areas of expertise, and the District recognizes that some firms may choose to team with others to address the Base Scope or Optional Add Alternates. The District also does not have a preference between a consultant team that addresses the Optional Add Alternates and a single consultant that addresses the Base Scope but not the Optional Add Alternates. Proposers should clearly identify what is included in their proposal, what is excluded, and any assumptions regarding consultant team roles.

Question 2. One of the expected deliverables is a 20-year funding model. Can you please expand on how the timeframe of 20 years was determined? Does the District have a 20-year capital improvement plan? If not, how does the District envision determining years 11-20 capital needs/estimates?

Response: The 20-year timeframe is intended to provide a long-term funding model that generally extends to the District's 2045 water quality planning goal. The District currently has a 10-year capital improvement planning period extending to 2033. The District also has other planning information that identifies remaining water quality needs, general implementation strategies, expected types of future work, and prior project cost information that may help inform later-year estimates. For years 11 through 20, the District is not prescribing a specific method. The District expects the consultant to review available District information, use professional judgment, and recommend an appropriate approach for developing reasonable planning-level funding scenarios. The model is expected to be a decision-support tool, not a final 20-year project-by-project capital improvement plan.

Question 3. The RFP states to provide “Brief cost assumptions or notes to understand the proposal” can you elaborate more fully what you are looking for? Are you looking for examples? Explanation of our pricing methodology?

Response: The District is looking for enough cost detail to understand and compare proposals. A single lump sum cost is not preferred. A cost proposal that identifies itemized costs by major task, associated staff roles, hourly rates, estimated hours, and any assumptions, exclusions, reimbursable expenses, or other costs necessary to understand the proposed price would be sufficient. The District understands that proposers may structure costs differently depending on their proposed approach. Any cost format should clearly explain what is included, what is excluded, and how the proposed cost was developed. The District is not requesting examples of prior pricing.

Question 4. For the Optional Add Alternates, may proposers provide estimated cost and hour ranges where the level of effort is dependent on data availability, selected methodology, stakeholder preferences, or other factors that would be refined during project initiation?

Response: Yes. Proposers may provide estimated cost and hour ranges for Optional Add Alternates where the level of effort depends on data availability, selected methodology, stakeholder preferences, or other factors that would be refined before authorization. The cost format should clearly explain what is included, what is excluded, the assumptions behind the range, and how the proposed cost was developed.

Question 5. The willingness to pay survey in Optional Task A will likely get a better response if it comes from CCWD than from a company that potential respondents are not familiar with. Will CCWD make the outreach to the potential respondents (residents, stakeholders, or a statistically representative sample) for the willingness to pay survey in Optional Task A?

Response: For proposal purposes, proposers should assume that any willingness to pay survey authorized under Optional Task A would be associated with the District, but primarily managed by the consultant. The District may review and approve survey materials, allow use of District name or letterhead where appropriate, and support distribution through appropriate District communication channels. The consultant should assume responsibility for recommending the survey approach, preparing materials, coordinating administration, compiling responses, analyzing results, and preparing findings. Proposers should identify any assumptions regarding District involvement.

Question 6. For Optional Task A, the cost will vary by the type of survey, the format in which it is administered, and the method used to estimate willingness to pay. Does CCWD have a preferred format for how the survey will be administered to respondents? Can we present a range of potential costs with the final costs to be determined with WWCD at the beginning of the task?

Response: The District does not have a preferred survey format at this time. Proposers should recommend the format or formats they believe would best meet the purpose of Optional Task A and should identify the cost, schedule, anticipated response rate, statistical validity, limitations, and District involvement associated with each recommended approach. Proposers may present a range of potential costs for Optional Task A, with final scope and cost to be refined if the District elects to authorize that optional task.

All other RFP terms, deadlines, and submittal instructions remain unchanged.