

Request for Proposals

**Development of an Integrated Fisheries Restoration and
Monitoring Plan for the Klamath Basin: Task 1.1**



Actual issue date:

July 15, 2016

DEADLINE FOR PROPOSALS:

August 15, 2016

Table of Contents

SECTION 1: PROPOSED REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS (RFP) SCHEDULE 3

SECTION 2: DESCRIPTION/SPECIFICATIONS/WORK STATEMENT 4

SECTION 3: INSTRUCTIONS, CONDITIONS, AND NOTICES TO PROPOSERS13

Citations.....17

SECTION 1: REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS (RFP) TIMELINE

Development of an Integrated Fisheries Restoration and Monitoring Plan for the Klamath Basin

July 15, 2016	Request for Proposal (RFP) issued and distributed.
July 29, 2016	Deadline for written questions regarding this RFP. <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Please email questions to contracting@psmfc.org
August 5, 2016	Responses to written questions available on PSMFC RFP page at http://www.psmfc.org/procurements/blog <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Responses to all questions will be provided to all participating parties. To be added to the response list, send an email to contracting@psmfc.org with a request to be added.
August 15, 2016	Proposal submission deadline. <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Only e-mailed proposals will be accepted. Submit proposals to: contracting@psmfc.org• Faxed and hard copy proposals will not be accepted.
August 16 - 19, 2016	Proposal Review.
August 19, 2016	Project Finalists Selected.
August 23-25, 2016	Interview Finalists.
August 31, 2016	Select Contractor for Task 1.1.

SECTION 2: Description/Specifications/Work Statement

Development of an Integrated Fisheries Restoration and Monitoring Plan for the Klamath Basin

Terms of Reference

Background

There is a widely recognized need for a transparent, basin-wide, science-driven approach to fish restoration in the Klamath Basin that integrates needs of listed suckers, Bull Trout, and Coho Salmon with those of tribal and public trust species, such as spring and fall Chinook Salmon, Steelhead, lamprey, and sturgeon. The National Research Council made the following conclusion and recommendation in their 2008 report titled Hydrology, Ecology, and Fishes of the Klamath River Basin:

Planning for management and restoration of hydrological and ecological research in the Klamath River basin is piece-meal” “There is no overall independent coordination of science as it interacts with decision making.”

“A formal science plan for the Klamath River basin should support policy and decision-making for the basin’s hydrologic and ecological resources. Such a plan should prioritize data needs, identify key uncertainties, specify limits to management capabilities, conduct independent scientific review of research and management plans using that research, construct and oversee monitoring of the systems, and create hydrologic and ecological models.”

There is a need to develop an integrated Fisheries Restoration and Monitoring Plan for the Klamath Basin. This Plan should also be consistent with NRC’s 2008 recommendation’s that Klamath Basin stakeholders work towards “*connecting science and decision making*” and employ “*conceptual and simulation models*” towards that end in an “*adaptive management*” approach on a “*Basin scale*.”

The intent of the integrated Fisheries Restoration and Monitoring Plan for the Klamath Basin is to help support the overarching basin goal to restore and sustain natural fish production and provide for full participation in ocean and river harvest opportunities of fish species throughout the Klamath Basin.

The Service and NMFS envision the Plan to help guide the design, prioritization, and effectiveness monitoring of restoration work throughout the Basin that integrates the principles of adaptive management/strategic habitat conservation (SHC) and uses the best available science.

The monitoring component of the Plan will also provide data necessary to inform fisheries, fish habitat, and water management decisions in the Klamath Basin.

It is also implied throughout this document that the Fisheries Restoration and Monitoring Plan will incorporate necessary monitoring and restoration actions that support the Anadromous Fish Reintroduction Plan, a separate effort being completed by the states of Oregon and California and the Klamath Tribes.

Funds have been provided by the Service to PSMFC to support the planning effort in phases, including for expenses related to salaries, travel, supplies, and other costs to support work accomplished through August 30, 2018. After discussion with participants, it is apparent that an extension may be required for later phases of this effort. While both the Service and PSMFC agree that this will likely be needed, such an extension has not yet been formally granted.

The overall effort to develop this plan will be split into distinct tasks, however, this RFP is for Task 1.1 only.

Task 1.1 will involve the acquisition and synthesis of contemporary information and plans developed for the Klamath Basin with innovative concepts taken from similar planning efforts conducted for other basins. The primary deliverable for Task 1.1 will be a Synthesis

Report that summarizes and integrates the information developed under Task 1.1, as well as an outline of the approach and estimated costs the contractor estimates will be needed for completion of all subsequent phases of the plan. As part of this effort, the contractor will help develop a process and structure to engage Cooperating Partners throughout this process.

This Synthesis Report will recognize and summarize the ongoing work being done under existing and ongoing water quality and fish reintroduction efforts in the basin, and will outline how the proposed restoration and monitoring efforts will be integrated with these programs.

Subsequent phases will involve producing a peer-reviewed Final Plan based on the information, approach, and timeline developed in Task 1.1. The intent of PSMFC is to select a contractor that will complete Task 1.1 of the plan. This RFP will result in the award of a contract for Task 1.1. The proposed subsequent phases of the plan are outlined herein for informational purposes. Nothing in this RFP shall be construed as a contractual obligation beyond the successful completion of Task 1.1.

If, upon completion of Task 1.1, The Administrative Co-Leads and PSMFC jointly determine that the budget and resources available are adequate to undertake the next phase of the project, (in whole or in part), then the next task may be initiated. This methodology will be used at the end of each task. If, at the sole discretion of PSMFC, it is determined that the next task can be completed and if, at PSMFC's sole discretion, it is determined that the Contractor shall be contracted for the next task, then a modification to the contract may be completed and provided to the contractor for their consideration. Nothing in this RFP or any subsequent contract shall obligate PSMFC, the Service, or any other party for any work subsequent to Task 1.1. The primary deliverable for all tasks combined will be the Integrated Fisheries Restoration and Monitoring Plan (Plan) for the Klamath Basin.

More information about Klamath restoration is available at: <http://klamathrestoration.gov/>

Scope of the plan

The Integrated Fisheries Restoration and Monitoring Plan should be crafted to fully meet the restoration and monitoring needs for such a program, which at a minimum, may include the following elements, but may be revised or expanded based on input from Cooperating Partners:

- 1) scientifically-driven goals and objectives,
- 2) long-term status and trend monitoring of fish and their habitats,
- 3) effectiveness monitoring,
- 4) an adaptive management framework and process, such as strategic habitat conservation, or similar process
- 5) a defined process for prioritizing science-based restoration projects and monitoring studies

Approach. Development of the Plan will be driven by collaboration, incentives, and adaptive management as preferred approaches. In development of this plan, the assistance of Cooperating Partners, defined here, as the States and Tribes and federal agencies within the Klamath Basin, is essential. This is because Tribes, states and federal agencies have specific expertise in the Klamath Basin and they may have already developed plans – or may be in the process of developing plans – to guide restoration and monitoring in particular areas of the Klamath Basin. These plans must be incorporated into a broader basin-wide plan based on input from these partners. This ensures that repetition of effort and/or the implementation of conflicting restoration plans are avoided. The contractor selected must develop an effective strategy to obtain input from the Cooperating Partners as part of the development of the plan.

A kick-off workshop and additional conference calls and/or meetings will be scheduled as necessary with Cooperating Partners to develop an outline for the Integrated Fisheries Restoration and Monitoring Plan. This effort will include refining the scope and goals of the program and a description of sections, chapters, graphics, bibliography and related information to be included in a Final Integrated Fisheries Restoration and Monitoring Plan. A recommended starting point to inform this effort is the Proposed Outline and Approach, KBRA Fish Managers, 2011, which was developed based on significant stakeholder input. It is also recognized that this document is only a starting point and refinements are necessary.

The contractor should solicit participation on a Steering Committee from each of the Partners and develop protocols for handling decisions and disputes if consensus cannot be reached, such as through a charter or Memorandum of Agreement or similar document. It may also be necessary for the Steering Committee to establish subcommittees to provided additional expertise.

The contractor will also construct a web-based document sharing and calendar tool to facilitate

access to information and the collection of comments from the Steering Committee. The Steering Committee will be given opportunity for review and input throughout the planning process, with specific periods where comments are solicited and reviewed on the drafts of the document. This Committee will be co-chaired by the Service and NMFS.

Consensus on content will be the goal during review. If consensus cannot be reached, the Service and NMFS will make a joint determination but only after reasonable attempts to obtain consensus have been made.

A series of meetings and conference calls is specifically referenced in this RFP. In addition, additional workshops and calls may be scheduled as needed.

Geographic Scope. The focus of restoration and monitoring will be the Klamath River Basin. Input from the steering committee, will help determine how best to incorporate information from the Trinity River Program's Integrated Management Plan.

Methodology

This project is segregated into distinct tasks, with each subsequent task, in part, dependent upon the findings and deliverables completed for the prior task. The complete outline of the tasks is provided here for reference. This RFP should result in a contract award for Task 1.1 only. It is intended that all aspects of this effort will be completed in a collaborative manner that incorporates participation by Cooperating Partners, with the Service and NMFS making joint determinations for situations when consensus among partners cannot be reached. Initiate the planning process and provide a strong foundation for the development of the Final Integrated Fisheries Restoration and Monitoring Plan.

Task 1.1 Develop the Synthesis Report, which summarizes contemporary information and planning efforts that are underway to advance the restoration of Klamath Basin fisheries. The report should be a synthesis of contemporary information and plans developed for the Klamath Basin, and should incorporate innovative concepts taken from similar planning efforts conducted for other basins, in order to inform the planning process and avoid duplication of effort. This report should describe the process through which existing studies, reports, and ongoing restoration planning and monitoring efforts were incorporated into this planning effort, and should address restoration and monitoring topics by producing a synthesis report that generally follows the outline that the Klamath Fish Managers produced in 2011. This synthesis report is not intended to resolve issues, but to summarize the work already completed in the basin and to capture information and context on related ongoing efforts. The recommended components of the 2011 document;

Proposed Outline and Approach, KBRA Fish Managers, 2011

Section components:

- a. Fisheries Restoration Program goals*
- b. Conceptual model development*

- c. Timeframe*
- d. Context (Phase I and Phase II Restoration Plan, Monitoring Plan, Reintroduction Plan)*
- e. Spatial extent*
- f. Spatial scale (tributaries of tributaries, and similar-sized mainstem segments)*
- g. Temporal scale (short and longer-term goals)*
- h. Development of program metrics*
 - i. Metrics will be developed across spatial scales, where appropriate, to track restoration project success and guide effectiveness monitoring*
 - ii. Metrics will be defined for monitoring to track species-specific population and habitat changes*
 - iii. Metrics will consider and integrate the four parameters for evaluating population viability status including abundance, population growth rate, genetic diversity, and spatial structure.*
- i. Primary goals of the Restoration and Monitoring Plan*
 - i. Define the restoration component of the plan as described in Section 10.1.2 to prioritize restoration projects (instream, riparian, and upland) that:*
 - 1. Directly benefit existing fish resources*
 - 2. Significantly contribute to protecting and preparing habitats for use by anadromous fish after passage is restored (Phase I Restoration)*
 - 3. Significantly contribute to protecting and preparing habitats for utilization throughout the Basin as abundances of anadromous and nonanadromous fish increase (Phase II Restoration)*
 - ii. Define the monitoring component of the plan as described in Section 12.2:*
 - 1. Status and trends*
 - a. Methods for stock identification*
 - b. Collecting information to assess status and trends in sizes of fish populations and availability of their habitats and distribution, including riparian areas*
 - c. Providing information on restoration actions and for management of fisheries dependent on Klamath Basin populations*
 - d. Species will include Chinook and coho salmon, steelhead trout, resident rainbow trout, lamprey, suckers, bull trout, sturgeon, and eulachon.*
 - 2. Data related to environmental water*
 - a. Collect data on water quality and quantity*
 - b. Evaluate water outcomes from implementation of Water Resources Program*
 - i. Monitor Klamath River instream flows and Upper Klamath Lake water surface elevations*
 - c. Assist TAT in developing Annual Water Management Plan*
 - i. Provide in-season management recommendations*
 - 3. Restoration effectiveness*
 - a. Evaluated based on a priori selection of:*
 - i. Representative indicators of ecosystem status*
 - ii. Multi-scale indicators of progress towards achieving long-term goals of the monitored restoration actions*
 - b. Used to inform adaptive management actions*
 - 4. Limiting factors*
 - a. Assessments to evaluate factors limiting recovery and*

restoration of fish populations

b. Used to identify measures to eliminate, reduce, or mitigate threats

i. To inform restoration priorities and adaptive management actions

j. Criteria for project selection

i. Based on contribution to overall, Basin-scale goals and objectives

ii. Restoration action priorities set at Basin scale, then geographically prioritized by ecological benefit

The contractor will work with the Steering Committee to first adopt a final consensus outline of the components that will be included in the plan. This outline should reference other ongoing efforts in the basin rather than re-creating them. The contractor should then populate the outlined sections with existing information, review this information with the Cooperating Partners, and develop review drafts and ultimately a final synthesis report through this collaborative process. This product will then serve as the introduction and background sections of the final Integrated Fisheries Restoration and Monitoring Plan, Task 2, and will be used to populate a metadata library for use by Cooperating Partners.

In addition to the synthesis report, the contractor will provide an outline, timeline, and the estimated cost(s) the contractor anticipates will be needed for completion of all subsequent Tasks required to complete the final plan, based on the outline that is adopted by Cooperating Partners. The synthesis report will include a brief description of overarching and interim goals and objectives of a Klamath Basin Fisheries Restoration and Monitoring Program, referencing stakeholder input, and literature cited and supporting information, including materials presented in any past, current and future Klamath Basin settlement agreements.

Task 1.2 Develop draft restoration and monitoring goals, objectives, and interim benchmarks needed to assess progress using information from contemporary Klamath Basin planning efforts identified in Task 1.1, integrated with innovative concepts and approaches derived from similar planning efforts developed for other basins such as the Trinity, Elwha, etc. Interim benchmarks and goals should also be included to help guide the preparation of habitats for use by anadromous fish in the Upper Klamath Basin, upstream PacifiCorp Project Dams that dictate the current extent of anadromy in the basin.

Task 1.3 Use an adaptive management framework, such as Strategic Habitat Conservation, to identify and articulate a logical, step-wise, collaborative process for implementing the Plan. Components of this process will include: 1) scientifically-driven goals and objectives, 2) long-term status and trend monitoring, 3) effectiveness monitoring, 4) an adaptive management framework and process, 5) a defined methodology for prioritizing science-based restoration projects and monitoring studies.

Task 2 Completion of the final Integrated Fisheries Restoration and Monitoring Plan, including a process for peer review and public reviews as appropriate based on input from Steering Committee. The final plan should consider incorporating guidelines for specific restoration activities at a relatively fine spatial scale such as tributary sub-basins or finer.

Reporting outputs

Task 1.1 Required Services. Task 1.1 will require the services of a contractor to provide all manpower, equipment, and services to:

- execute internal and external queries for data and literature; develop brief narrative summaries of available data and literature, including a description of important data or literature gaps in information needed to fully develop the Plan; and produce a comprehensive bibliography of relevant references;

Task 1.1 Deliverables.

- metadata for all information used and/or referenced in the Synthesis Report, provided to Service as a separate deliverable product in an electronic format;
- comprehensive draft Synthesis Report for the Service, NMFS, and Cooperating Partners' review;
- develop an effective strategy to seek out and obtain input from the Cooperating Partners as part of the planning effort. The contractor should solicit participation on a Steering Committee from each of the Partners and develop protocols for handling decisions and disputes if consensus cannot be reached, such as through a charter or Memorandum of Agreement or similar document;
- construct a web-based document sharing and calendar tool to facilitate access to information and the collection of comments from the Steering Committee. The Steering Committee will be given opportunity for review and input throughout the planning process, with specific periods where comments are solicited and reviewed on the drafts of the document
- conduct and prepare technical analyses, edited documents, various graphics, electronic and printed copies of all documents produced for public distribution and review, and summary presentations to Cooperating Partners, stakeholder groups, and public;
- review of all work to ensure that is technically and legally consistent with policies and directives of both the Service and NMFS and uses a Strategic Habitat Conservation framework;
- review of all work for consistency with the language and intent of the Klamath Settlement Agreements and ongoing settlement discussions, including the amended Klamath Hydroelectric Settlement Agreement (KHSA), the Upper Klamath Basin Comprehensive Settlement Agreement, and the Klamath Power and Facilities Agreement, and any subsequent agreement, and/or new agreements as determined by agency review;
- response to reviewer comments included as an appendix in the final Synthesis Report;

Upon approval of deliverables in Task 1.1 by the Co-leads and Cooperating Partners, PSMFC and the Co-Leads will assess the budget and resources available and determine if they are adequate to undertake the next phase(s) of the project. This process will be completed for each subsequent task thereafter. Task 2 will ultimately lead to the production of a final Integrated

Fisheries Restoration and Monitoring Plan for the Klamath Basin based on the information and approach developed in previous tasks.

Task 1.1 - Synthesis Report Outline

The following provides an overview of the required content for each of the major sections comprising the Synthesis Report. The information presented below serves as the minimum content for an acceptable submittal.

Introduction. The contractor will begin by briefly summarizing the need for the Plan, citing sources such as the NAS 2004 and NAS 2008 reports, various Klamath Agreements, and related documents. Source material for this element is readily available and can be provided by the Service and NMFS as lead federal agencies for this planning effort. The fisheries restoration goals of the many stakeholders that have been involved in Klamath settlement discussions are, in part, to: 1) restore and maintain ecological functionality and connectivity of historic fish habitats; 2) re-establish and maintain naturally sustainable and viable populations of fish to the full capacity of restored habitats; and 3) provide for full participation in harvest opportunities for fish species.

The Introduction section will also include appropriate information necessary for the reader to understand the context of this planning effort. Such information may include the scope of the information being provided within this document and extent of the effort to populate the Synthesis Report. The document should also specify the following overarching concepts, which should be used as the basis for compiling information.

Methods. The Synthesis Report should provide a brief description of the methods and approach used for collecting and assembling information. Provide an explanation of how partner/stakeholder inputs were used in the development of this document. Include information on contacts made and their responses. Include contact information for subsequent follow-up if a method or approach from an outside organization is of interest.

Literature and Data Review and Synthesis. The Synthesis Report will be based on all available information associated with fisheries restoration and monitoring in the Klamath Basin and/or similar restoration/ monitoring efforts in other areas and/or regions. If information specific to the Klamath is not available or is considered inadequate, the effort will rely on literature and findings from similar systems, such as the Trinity, Elwha, Kissimmee, etc., with a brief summary describing the basis for why it was considered. It will be important to ensure the synthesis identifies ongoing and historic efforts so as to avoid duplication of effort in subsequent actions, which may include implementation of the amended KHSA and other potential agreements. This activity will also serve as the basis for the introduction and background sections of the Plan and will be used to populate a metadata library for use by program partners.

The contractor will consult with the Service and other agencies to obtain resource information necessary to prepare the review and synthesis. Information and data included in this or other chapters should include appropriate reference citations (author and date) in the text, with data sources summarized in the bibliography.

Bibliography and Meta Data. This section of the Synthesis Report should include a cohesive and integrated collection of monitoring data and restoration information consistent with federal metadata standards (FGDC-STD-001-1998). The integrated data system will identify existing monitoring efforts and monitoring gaps to expand data collection efforts where necessary to promote comprehensive, integrated, and efficient Restoration and Fisheries Management programs. It should be noted several metadata gathering efforts are available and would serve as an appropriate starting place for initiating elements of this task.

Timing and Schedule

This effort recognizes that many Klamath Basin Tribes as well as states and federal agencies are at capacity to address the many natural resource needs of the Klamath Basin. This schedule may be revised and amended based on recommendations of the Steering Committee.

These initial milestones have been identified:

May 15, 2017 is the deadline for completion of Task 1.1 Final Synthesis Report and outline proposal delineating the approach and estimated costs needed to complete subsequent phases of the plan.

The projected goal to complete Tasks 1.1 – 1.3, including the data/information Synthesis Report, is March 15, 2018. The projected goal to complete a draft Plan required under Task 2 is March 15, 2019, with the final Plan being on a tentative schedule for completion and delivery no later than August 31, 2019.

The start date of the contract is the award date, August 31, 2016. The contractor will develop the following products or interim deliverables in a step-wise manner in the production of the final deliverables as specified in the contract. The contractor will produce printed and electronic copies of all documents, including graphics and editing, of all products (in Microsoft Word 2010), as follows:

- **Interim Deliverable:** Schedule coordination meetings/calls with the Service, NMFS, and identified partners to solicit sources and responses to the data and information call. Hold meetings/calls with key partners/stakeholders to solicit their input into goal and objective setting and partner/stakeholder needs for participation in the collaborative plan development process. In addition, hold coordination meetings/calls to solicit input on draft products as stipulated in the timeline table below. Generate minutes of those meetings and share with program partners through a web-based service. Kickoff meeting(s) will start no later than October 15, 2016, subsequent follow-up meetings/calls quarterly thereafter and one meeting/call after delivery of the initial draft Synthesis Report. Meeting/call minutes will be due no later than two weeks from the date of the meeting/call.
- **Interim Deliverable:** Draft Synthesis Report and outline proposal delineating the approach and estimated costs needed to complete subsequent phases of the plan. Synthesis report to consist of all available information associated with fisheries

restoration and monitoring planning and associated efforts in the Klamath Basin and/or similar restoration/monitoring programs. This product will be due March 15, 2017.

- Final Deliverable for Task 1.1: Final Synthesis Report, including full bibliography and supporting data, as modified after comments and review from the Service, NMFS, and Cooperating Partners, due no later than July 15, 2017.

The following timeline outlines subsequent tasks of the project through completion. These are provided for information only.

- Interim Deliverable for Tasks 1.1, 1.2, and 1.3: February 15, 2018
- Final Deliverable for Tasks 1.1, 1.2, and 1.3: May 15, 2018
- Interim Deliverable for Task 2: May 15, 2019
- Final Deliverable for Task 2: October 1, 2019

SECTION 3: INSTRUCTIONS, CONDITIONS, AND NOTICES TO PROPOSERS

SUBMISSION, MODIFICATION REVISION, AND WITHDRAWAL OF PROPOSALS

Deadline for proposals is **August 15, 2016**

Proposals by electronic copy must be submitted by email to: contracting@psmfc.org

Proposals and modifications to proposals may be submitted via electronic copy in PDF or MS Word format.

PSMFC reserves the right to consult with and to consider information from its own sources, including information from state and federal agencies regarding the proposer's prior performance or the status of outstanding investigations or warrants involving the proposer.

Proposers are responsible for submitting proposals, and any modification of revisions, so as to reach PSMFC by 4:00 p.m., local time, on **August 15, 2016**.

Late proposals: Any proposal, modification, or revision at the PSMFC office designated in the solicitation after the exact time specified for receipt to offers is "late" and will not be considered unless it is received before award is made, the PSMFC Fiscal Manager determines that accepting the late offer would not unduly delay the acquisition; and there is acceptable evidence to establish that it was received at the PSMFC installation designation for receipt of offers and was under the PSMFC's control prior to the time set for receipt to offers; or It is the only proposal received.

However, a late modification of an otherwise successful proposal that makes its terms more favorable to the PSMFC, will be considered at any time it is received and may be accepted. Acceptable evidence to establish time of receipt by PSMFC includes the time/date stamp of that installation on the proposal wrapper, time/date record on PSMFC's email server and other

documentary evidence of receipt maintained by PSMFC, or oral testimony or statements of PSMFC personnel.

Proposers shall submit proposals in response to this solicitation in English and in U.S. dollars.

Proposers may submit modifications to their proposals at any time before the solicitation closing date and time, and may submit modifications in response to an amendment, or to correct a mistake at any time before award.

Proposers may submit revised proposals only if requested or allowed by PSMFC. Proposals may be withdrawn at any time before award. Withdrawals are effective upon receipt of notice by the Fiscal Manager.

Each Proposal must state that it is a firm offer which may be accepted within a period of ninety (90) days. Although the contract is expected to be awarded prior to that time, the ninety-day period is requested in order to allow for unforeseeable delays.

Proposer shall submit the name, address, and telephone number of the person(s) with the authority to bind the firm, as well as to answer questions or provide clarification concerning the firm's proposal.

PSMFC is not liable for any costs incurred by vendors/contractors in developing or submitting their response to this RFP.

PROPOSAL FORMAT AND CONTENT

Proposals should be prepared simply and economically, providing a straightforward, concise description of the vendor's ability to meet the requirements of the work outlined in this RFP.

Proposals may be submitted as an electronic file attached to an email message and sent to contracting@psmfc.org with the following inserted in the "subject" line of the email: "PSMFC Klamath Restoration". Emailed proposals must be received by the specified deadline according to the internal clock of PSMFC's server.

Proposers should use the following outline in organizing the content of their proposals:

Cover Letter

The letter of transmittal shall, at a minimum, contain the following:

Identification of the Proposer, including business name, address, and telephone number;

Name, title, address, telephone number, fax number, and email address of a contact person during the period of proposal evaluation;

A statement that the proposal shall remain valid for a period not fewer than ninety (90) days from the due date of proposals;

Identification of any information contained in the proposal that the Proposer deems to be, and establishes as, confidential or proprietary and wishes to be withheld from disclosure to others

under the US Freedom of Information Act. A blanket statement that all contents of the proposal are confidential or proprietary will not be honored by PSMFC); and

The signature and typed name of the person authorized to bind the offering firm to the terms of the proposal

Evaluation Factors

The proposed award will be a fixed price contract. The initial award will be made solely for those items identified as Task 1.1. Additional task awards may be made subsequently, as funding becomes available and subject to the sole discretion of PSMFC. Those responding to this RFP should include a detailed proposal and budget for Task 1.1, as well as an outline proposal and budget for Tasks 1.2, 1.3, and 2 as part of their submissions.

The detailed proposal should include all elements specified below. The outline proposal may have less detail, but should include estimates and timeline for each subsequent task. It is understood that should PSMFC proceed with subsequent tasks after Task 1.1 is completed, the contractor will be asked to provide a more detailed proposal and timeline for each subsequent task prior to any decision by PSMFC as to whether to proceed forward

The proposal must be prepared in two parts: A technical proposal and a price proposal. Contractors shall submit one electronic copy of the technical and price proposal that specifically addresses the requirements of this RFP to contracting@psmfc.org by 4:00 p.m. Pacific Standard Time on **August 15**, 2016.

During the evaluation period, PSMFC may request additional information in order to fairly evaluate a Proposer's offer. If such information is required, the Proposer will be notified in writing (or by email) and will be permitted a reasonable period of time to respond.

By use of numerical and narrative scoring techniques, proposals will be evaluated by PSMFC against the factors specified below. The relative weights of the criteria –based on a 100-point percentage scale – are shown in parentheses.

This is a best value requirement with combined non-price factors being significantly more important than price. PSMFC reserves the right to make an award without discussions based solely upon initial proposals. Therefore, contractors should ensure that their initial proposal constitutes their best offer in terms of both price and the technical solution being proposed. Award will be made to the contractor that offers the best value to the PSMFC. The criteria stated below will be used in the evaluation of non-price factors (technical approach, experience and past performance). Factors are listed in descending order of importance.

1. Technical Approach (20%)
2. Experience (30%)
3. Past Performance (30%)
4. Cost (20%)

Provide the following information in the technical proposal:

Technical Approach: Describe the technical approach towards fulfilling the requirements and the appropriate personnel levels and skill mixes to be used to complete the deliverables as required under this RFP.

Experience: Provide a list of names, resumes, education, background, work experience and proposed duties of the proposed key personnel.

Past Performance: PSMFC may use past performance information obtained from any available reliable source. However, the contractor shall provide at least 3 examples of documents, reports, or like products completed during the past three years that were similar in nature to the proposed work herein. Examples will be provided in commonly accessible and readable electronic formats. Include the following information for each product:

- a. Name of contracting entity
- b. Title of Project
- c. Dates of work (inception, key interim dates, completion)
- d. Total contract value
- e. Brief description of work
- f. Contracting officer, telephone and fax number
- g. Key federal or other program manager(s) on each project, telephone and fax number

--Provide information on problems encountered during each contract performance and describe corrective actions taken to resolve those problems.

--Describe any quality awards or certifications that indicate the offeror possesses a high quality process for work performed.

Provide the following information in the Price Proposal: This section should disclose all charges that will be assessed to PSMFC as a result of the services provided by Proposer. Pricing details shall be itemized by task. Key individuals shall be identified by role. Detail shall be provided showing key individual rates and number of days anticipated for the task. Estimated task and subtask costs should be summarized, including totals for key individuals expected to participate in the task, anticipated support services, and other expenses. Also provide a separate line item for reimbursable travel. State your preference for how payments should be made (e.g. upon completion of each interim deliverable, as a final billing, or other request)

Contact

For any clarification on the assignment, please contact PSMFC or Michael Arredondo at (contracting@psmfc.org, 503-595-3100).

Attachments

Citations

National Research Council (NRC). 2007. Hydrology, ecology, and fishes of the Klamath River Basin, Committee on Hydrology, Ecology, and Fishes of the Klamath River Basin, National Research Council of the National Academies. ISBN:0-309-11507-8.

http://dels.nas.edu/resources/static-assets/materials-based-on-reports/reports-in-brief/klamath_river_basin_final.pdf

Trinity River Restoration Program, ESSA Technologies Ltd. (TRRP). 2009. Integrated Assessment Plan, Version 1.0 – September 2009. Draft report prepared for the Trinity River Restoration Program, Weaverville, CA. 285 pp.

(http://www.iims.trrp.net/DocumentLibraryFiles/IAP_1.01.pdf)

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Strategic Habitat Conservation

- <https://www.fws.gov/landscape-conservation/>
- <https://www.fws.gov/landscape-conservation/pdf/SHCReport.pdf>

KBRA Phase I Fisheries Restoration and Monitoring Plan: Proposed Outline and Approach

February 9, 2011 http://www.streamnet.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/07/KBRA_Fisheries_Restoration_Plan_Outline_Final.pdf