

**FY2015 Water Data Exchange (WaDE)
Project/EN Grant Conference Call**

Minutes – February 3, 2016, 3pm Mountain (2pm PT, 4pm CT)

Attendees:

WSWC - Sara Larsen

South Dakota BIT and DNR – Wade Douglas, Ron Duvall, Ryan Ogan

Nevada State Engineer's Office – Brian McMenemy

CDWR – Gary Darling, Nikki Hatcher, John Helly

Welcome and Roll Call: Sara took roll and welcomed everyone. The group approved the December meeting minutes, with Ron D. moving for approval and a second from Wade.

Status of Contracts: Sara pulled up the draft contract that CDWR had supplied. She went over the Scope of Work portion of the IT Services Agreement, highlighting who would be working on tasks that were listed in both the Administrative and Implementation Task tables. Sara asked about the Work Authorization page. Nikki said that they could edit it or remove it. She said if WSWC wanted it, it could be modified and kept, or not. Sara said they should discuss it. Wade asked about some of the timelines for the tasks and their target dates. Sara said that the dates were different based on the fact that WSWC's role would be to oversee the work through 2018. However, if the states wished to accomplish the implementation of their nodes earlier than that, that would be much better. WSWC would implement contracts with SD and NV that have an implementation deadline that is different from the larger project if desired. Sara talked about upcoming meetings and potential target dates. Sara asked Nikki about distribution of funds, as the contract specifies a reimbursement arrangement. Nikki answered that that would be the preferred arrangement, with submitted invoices. Sara confirmed that WSWC would be requesting reimbursement for themselves and for the partners, receiving reimbursement from CDWR, and passing that back to the other partners. The partners said that would be fine. Nikki said that Gary will be the contract manager on the project. Wade asked about certified small business status. Nikki clarified that that only applies if the partner was a certified small business. Sara said that they will modify the contract and budget tables for each state. Nikki said that CDWR would be fine with whatever contractual arrangement that WSWC had with the other states. She said that the contract draft is a boilerplate, except that some things had been added to the Scope of Work. She explained the hierarchy of the boilerplate language, that the SOW could take precedence for some items. If for whatever reason, WSWC needed the boilerplate needed to be changed, Nikki would have to go back and work with their legal team. Sara asked about procuring equipment by the partners. Nikki said that they would not be involved in that, so if something is going to be used to complete the WaDE project, it would belong to the state partner, but for WSWC, that was not the case. If WSWC purchases any equipment, CDWR would hold title for that. Sara said that WSWC would want to check with the partners as they implement it, but if it didn't and got extended, Sara would like to get a progress report from SD and NV. Sara asked CDWR whether or not they wanted to see progress reports from both WSWC and partners, or just WSWC. Gary said that they had a reporting requirement back to the EPA, and so additional information would be good. Nikki said that the document was flexible and could be

used to agree that progress reports would be a project deliverable. Gary and Sara would work to put something together for the Work Authorization. Sara asked about the first report due to the EPA. Gary listed some items and thought it would be a good report. Wade asked a question about the equipment. When he originally put in the pricing, he thought it would require a hardware purchase. Instead, now he thought that it would likely be a virtual machine. Nikki said that if WSWC bought the equipment, but the states would own it. Wade asked about reimbursement through the WSWC and if that would be okay. Nikki said that that would be fine and the states would be reimbursed. Sara mentioned purchasing server capacity from a central IT department and that other states were covered by that for the grant period (through 2018). John Helly clarified the distribution of funds and how the partners didn't need to worry about the contract with WSWC. Brian wanted to make sure that WSWC would be able to receive funds.

WaDE Status: Sara re-listed the rollout timeline for WaDE. She talked about what states were flowing data currently and that the partners could be a beta tester. She listed the states that they hoped to having flowing for the WGA Staff Advisory Council (SAC) meeting. She asked about adjustments to timelines. WaDE (SD) said that they are in the middle of a larger project and that the contract would dictate whether they would do some additional work, or get right to it. Brian (NV) said that they would be fine with their current timeline. Once the contract is in place, then they could get started.

Wrap-Up: Sara recapped the action items and said they would have a meeting in early March.

Action Items:

	Description	Assignee
1	WSWC will work with CDWR to develop a finalized contract	CDWR/WSWC
2	Draft a contract template for SD and NV	WSWC
3	NV and SD to review and amend the contract with WSWC as needed	SD, NV