

CACASA Pesticide Permitting and Use Reporting, RFP #10

This document contains official answers to questions received from interested vendors between September 17th and 23rd, 2009. Questions asked more than once have been consolidated.

Note: Questions 1-57 were answered in the previous Q&A document with filename: *PPUR RFP Q&A 9-16-09.pdf*

Answers to Individual Questions (in the order received):

58) Question: One key area that remains a bit fuzzy is the level of commitment from each of the 58 counties to the SRS. As a foundational document for the system, changes in the SRS can impact all other system development and deployment aspects. How well does the CACASA management team understand the potential cascading impacts of SRS changes on the system architecture, application, project management process, schedule and costs? Do you anticipate further vetting or a formalized county level acceptance of the SRS prior to the January project start date?

Answer: The guidance for the SRS was to describe three things: A) Baseline regulatory and technical requirements, B) The combined functionality of both existing systems, and C) A limited amount of additional functionality not present in either system but considered essential upon inception of a new or improved system. The objective is to ensure that every user has the capabilities they already have and depend upon (i.e. nothing is taken away) and also gets some additional capabilities that users of another system already have or that nobody has but that represent universal (or near universal) needs.

This first draft of the SRS is a starting point and the vetting of it will be an ongoing process that extends beyond even initial system implementation. Vendors will need to propose effective mechanisms for engaging users in making the requirements more precise and in reaching mutual understanding about any tradeoffs that significant changes to the SRS might entail. Vendors should identify any such tradeoffs they consider to be immediately apparent and describe these in their proposals. In the meantime, the suggestion for further vetting prior to the January launch is a good one and will be pursued.

59) Question: **SRS Page 36: 11.7.c – Add GIS Features to Sites:** This section requires that systems “automatically calculate GIS feature attribute (values upon feature creation and after linking to the site record.” Please provide further detail regarding this requirement. If the system is able to display corresponding GIS attribute data stored in the PURS system within the graphical GIS interface, is this requirement needed?

Answer: When accessing GIS data from within the PPUR system (e.g. when editing or browsing permit records), then linking GIS features with permit site records and displaying the corresponding site attributes is all that is required. However, some counties will also want to access the GIS field sites layer using mapping interfaces other than that supplied with the PPUR system – or will want to export this layer to share with other county departments or with other counties. To make this layer useful in these other contexts when it is not directly linked to PPUR system tables requires the ability to add and populate so-called “GIS Other Site Attributes” fields that are attached to the GIS layer.

This is explained further in SRS Section 9.3.1 (bullet #10) on page 23 and Table 9-3 on page 22, where applying duplicate site attributes on both the permit site records and GIS features is described as a potential supplement to the exclusive use of defined relationships for all query/display of spatial feature attributes within the PPUR application. So attribute transfer and duplication is an option for working in the PPUR application, but it is a requirement for making the GIS field sites layer portable for use in other applications.

60) **Question:** **SRS Page 51, Section 14.2 – System Login Feature:** Will each county have its own existing database of public users or are they willing to convert and maintain this data in the new PURS system.

Answer: Clarification obtained from the source of this question indicated that they wanted to know two things: 1) Does every county need to maintain its own database of public user logins, and 2) Is this database expected to be part of the PPUR system. The answer to both questions is “yes”, and regarding part 1 vendors should refer to the answer for frequently asked Question A in the 9-16-09 Q&A to review the overall data access conditions that must apply to all data, including public user logins. These conditions hold that the data specific to each county must be under the exclusive control of each county regardless of whether separate database instances are parceled out to individual counties or a combined database instance is used with each county granted access to only its portion.

61) **Question:** **SRS Page 60, Section 14.6.3 – Creating New or Editing Existing Condition Records:** “Page 60 of the SRS implies an interface is required for the upload and management of GWPA tables. Please clarify where these conditions are stored (in the PURs system or in external database) and if the CACASA prefers these conditions be stored in the PURS system, once deployed.”

Answer: Each county has a list of the sections (Meridian/Township/Range/Section) designated as Ground Water Protection Areas. These lists are supplied by DPR but do not reside in a central database to which the PPUR system could dynamically link. Since these section lists are static a dynamic link is unnecessary anyway, so the requirement is to simply load the list into the PPUR database and be able to either reload a new list or add/delete records in the rare circumstance where GWPA sections are modified.

62) Question: **SRS Page 66, Section 15.4 – PUR Validation:** Please provide detail on what the County Batch Validation process consists of.

Answer: An itemized list of all possible PUR validation tests was not included in the SRS. Testing categories are given in bullets a-d on page 67, validation notes for individual data elements are given in Tables 15-2a and 15-2b, and validation objectives are discussed at the bottom of page 68. The selected contractor will be responsible for using these inputs and further consultation with counties and DPR to develop a comprehensive PUR validation scheme that determines how tests should be performed during and subsequent to data entry.

63) Question: **SRS Page 66, Section 15.4 – PUR Validation:** Please provide detail on what the DPR Validation process consists of. How is this data sent to DPR, and how is data returned to the County? If proposing systems can handle this validation internally in the system, is this approach preferable?

Answer: At this time vendors need not be concerned with DPR's validation process. Although this process has some redundancies with county PUR validation, it also includes many tests that counties do not perform. More sophisticated coordination between DPR and county validation processes is a potential future enhancement topic, but is not currently on the table. PUR data are sent to DPR in a standardized text file format detailed in SRS Appendix C. Suspect PUR record information is sent back to counties in hardcopy form as described at the bottom of page 73 in Section 15.7.

64) Question: **SRS Page 70, Section 15.5.2. – Common Features in all Interfaces:** Section 15.5.2 (f) of the SRS states: *“If there are multiple sites or commodities on the permit, then a notification appears asking if the new line is for the same site and commodity (Yes or No).”*

Please provide further information on this requirement. Specifically, the section stating “the new line is for the same site and commodity” – is the same as what?”

Answer: This passage in the second sub-bullet under bullet (f) refers to a Monthly Use Production Ag report in which all pesticide uses during the month are listed. These reports may include uses on multiple sites and types of commodities, unlike a Single Use Production Ag report, where all pesticide records (“lines”) correspond to a single site and commodity. In a Monthly report the user supplies site/commodity information for the first pesticide record that is entered. For each subsequent pesticide record entry the interface must prompt the user to specify whether the new record is for the same site/commodity as the previous record (or line) in the report. This is done in order to avoid having to enter the same site/commodity data repeatedly for every pesticide applied to a particular site during the month.

65) Question: **SRS Page 70, Section 15.5.2. – Common Features in all Interfaces:** Section 15.5.2 (g) of the SRS states: *“A control to add a line (record) to enter another site. This control is disabled for Single Use or MSPUR reports. A notification appears*

asking if the new line is for the same pesticide product (Yes or No). If not, then values pertaining to the product, site, and commodity are all reset to null in the new line.”

This requirement suggests that the site data is a subset to the pesticide data; however, item (f) above implies that pesticide data is a subset of site data. Please clarify this data structure.

Answer: This simply describes another data entry shortcut similar to the one addressed in the previous question (64). In question 64, the shortcut was to avoid repeated entry of the same site/commodity data for each pesticide applied to a single site. Here, the shortcut is to avoid repeated entry of pesticide information when the same pesticide is applied to more than one site.

It is probably best not to try and think of pesticide and site data as subsets of one another in the context of a Monthly Use Production Ag report. Instead, just realize that the interface requirements described in bullets (f) and (g) are designed so that users enter site/commodity information only once for each site. Then, because many of the operators that submit monthly reports grow the same things (and use the same pesticides) on several different sites, there needs to be an option when entering information for a new site to avoid having to re-enter pesticide information if it is the same pesticide used on the previously entered site.

66) Question: **RFP Page 37 Section 4.1.8 Company Financial Information:** Bullet (b) asks for: *“Audited statements of financial condition, prepared by an independent certified public accountant, for the past three (3) years.”*

Does the review of financial statements need to be performed by a third party auditor?

Answer: No. This is only asking for statements prepared by the CPA or certified accounting agency with which the company normally does business. It is not necessary to have these statements audited by a third party accountant.