



PACIFIC STATES MARINE FISHERIES COMMISSION

205 SE Spokane Street, SUITE 100, Portland, OREGON 97202
PHONE (503) 595-3100 FAX (503) 595-3232

Klamath Basin Restoration RFP Questions and Answers

08/09/16

1) Q: How much funding is available for this work?

A: PSMFC has a contract with the USFWS for a total of \$1,084,000 for the period Sep. 21, 2015 – August 31, 2018 to develop an Integrated Fisheries Restoration and Monitoring Plan (Plan) for the Klamath Basin. The current RFP is for Task 1.1 of this project. The actual amount available for Task 1.1 has not yet been determined, and will depend in part on the proposals received under the RFP.

2) Q: Has any company already completed some initial work on this project?

A: There has been a substantial amount of restoration work and restoration planning for the Klamath Basin from numerous state, federal and local agencies, Tribes and other conservation-oriented groups. In addition, some federal and state agencies and Tribes developed an outline for an Integrated Fisheries Restoration and Monitoring Plan (Plan) for the Klamath Basin. This RFP is for a synthesis report that summarizes existing information and to refine an outline, approach, and estimated costs needed to complete subsequent phases of the Plan. There has been no previous work on this specific project, and no company or companies has an “inside track” because they are already working on the project.

3) Q: Is the use of “water management” (RFP pg. 5, top paragraph) focused exclusively on water quantity or would it also include water quality and connections to ongoing efforts for TMDL implementation in the Klamath Basin?

A: Also on page 5 the RFP states: “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.” There is no intent to ask contractors to focus exclusively on water quantity in the RFP.

4) Q: The RFP defines the Cooperating Partners as “the States and Tribes and federal agencies within the Klamath Basin” (RFP pg. 6). What specific entities are included in the “Cooperating Partners”? Is this a pre-defined group, or are some Cooperating Partners yet to be determined? Would watershed groups, RCDs, or other local organizations that may have significant on-the-ground knowledge of the Klamath Basin as related to fisheries be included?

A: The intent of including some definition of “Cooperating Partners” in the RFP was to ensure that the sovereign entities essential to a successful plan -- the federal and state governments and federally recognized tribes with specific fisheries management jurisdiction in the Klamath River -- were recognized by potential contractors. This was not intended to be an exclusionary process defining others not listed as not being “Cooperating Partners”.

For the purposes of completing a submission under this RFP, potential contractors should assume that other groups may also be involved and defined as “Cooperating Partners”, though this has yet to be determined.

5) Q: The 2011 KBRA Fish Managers Plan outline explicitly includes the following species: “Chinook and coho salmon, steelhead trout, resident rainbow trout, lamprey, suckers, bull trout, sturgeon, and eulachon” (RFP pg. 8).

– **Will resident non-salmonids other than native suckers be included in the plan? Examples would be the endemic lamprey, chub (blue and tui), and sculpin (marbled, slender, and Upper Klamath Lake) species.**

– **Will non-native species (e.g., fathead minnow, yellow perch, centrarchids) be considered in the plan? Non-native species are prevalent and abundant in Upper Klamath Lake and the Cooperating Partners may be interested in addressing them as part of the restoration strategy for native species.**

A: The first paragraph of the RFP states: “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.” (emphasis added).

Task 1.1 emphasizes the development of a synthesis report using of existing information and some of this information does address impacts of non-native species on native Klamath Basin species. This information will help inform subsequent phases of the Plan. For the purposes of completing a submission under this RFP, potential contractors should assume that the full complement of native species, as well as non-native species that interact with and impact native fish, should be included in the Integrated Plan. Potential contractors should also assume that the amount of attention and detail attended to various species in the plan may vary significantly, dependent on such factors as listing status, cultural significance, or others not named here.

6) Q: The RFP (pg. 12–13) specifies an interim deliverable due date for the Draft Synthesis Report of March 15, 2017, and two different due dates for the Final Synthesis Report. May 15, 2017 is listed as the “deadline for completion of Task 1.1 Final Synthesis Report”; and July 15, 2017 is listed as the due date for the “Final Synthesis Report, including full bibliography and supporting data, as modified after comments and review from the Service, NMFS, and Cooperating Partners.” Is the deliverable due May 15 intended to be a second draft Synthesis Report, to be finalized by July 15 in response to the final round of comments by USFWS, NMFS, and Cooperating Partners?

A: The date “May 15, 2017” on page 12 of the RFP (5th line of text after “Timing and Schedule”) as the deadline for completion of Task 1.1 is an editing error from a previous version and is incorrect. The correct dates and timeline are as specified in the bulleted list starting on page 12 and continuing on page 13;

“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.”

7) Q: Please clarify what products are intended as Interim and Final deliverables for Task 1.1, due February 15, 2018 and May 15, 2018, respectively (RFP pg. 13).

A: As specified on page 13 of the RFP;

“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”

The interim and final deliverables for Task 1.1 are defined just above this section of the RFP and were further clarified in the answer provided to question 6 (above). There is no intent to obligate any contractor selected through the current RFP process to make additional changes to any product provided after

successfully completing a contract with the current final deliverable date of July 15, 2017. Any additional work done on the Deliverables for Task 1.1 after the final deliverable date specified in the current RFP (July 15, 2017) are not part of any contract under this RFP.

8) Q: Should the two parts of the proposal (technical and price) (RFP pg. 15) be submitted as two separate documents or as one complete document?

A: PSMFC has no preference as to submission of the technical and price proposals as one document or two. If submitted as one document, the two separate portions must be clearly identifiable and separable for analysis and assessment.

9) Q: Given the relatively open ended nature of some elements of the RFP, can PSMFC comment on the budgetary resources set aside to (a) complete Task 1.1 and (b) subsequent phases? We understand that provision of an exact figure may not be possible, but it would be extremely beneficial when preparing a response to know if budgetary resources were on the order of \$50K, \$100K, \$500K or other value (certainly for Task 1.1, and ideally, a similar cost range ballpark for subsequent phases)?

A: See answer to question 1). At the present time, PSMFC has not “set aside” resources for different Tasks. The amount available for subsequent tasks will be dependent upon proposals received and the contract ultimately granted under the RFP. If it appears that all proposed tasks will not be fundable under our current contract with PSMFC, discussions will be held with USFWS. However, there is no existing commitment for additional funding beyond the current amount.

10) Q: On pg. 10 of the RFT, Task 1.1 deliverables, please provide the PSMFC’s relative priority on each deliverable (low, medium, high, critical; or other similar qualitative scale of choosing)?

A: PSMFC does not have a relative priority ranking for these deliverables. Our intent is to select a contractor that can complete all of the bulleted items on page 10.

11) Q: Please *precisely* define the Klamath River Basin, spatially. Should respondents interpret this to include the Trinity River Basin? These systems/basins are of course, intricately linked.

A: The main deliverable for Task 1.1 is a "synthesis report" of existing plans and efforts that are underway for the Klamath Basin, not the Trinity River because the Trinity has an existing plan (see reference below).

Nevertheless, where functions, populations, processes, or other aspects of the Klamath are linked to the Trinity, they should be specified in the deliverables and existing documentation should be referenced. For example, Task 1.1 should reference and consider, as appropriate, such things as the Trinity River Restoration Program, lower Klamath River flow augmentation and associated disease mitigation issues utilizing Trinity water, lower Trinity River inclusive of the Hoopa Valley Indian Reservation and South Fork Trinity River, and the Trinity River Hatchery.

Furthermore, it is the intent of PSMFC that the contractor selected should reference the Trinity's Integrated Assessment Plan (referenced below) and, where information specific to the Klamath is unavailable: “rely on literature and findings from similar systems, such as the Trinity....”

The Steering Committee will also provide additional guidance on the issue.

Reference: *Trinity River Restoration Program, ESSA Technologies Ltd. 2009. Integrated Assessment Plan, Version 1.0 – September 2009.*

<http://odp.trrp.net/Data/Documents/Details.aspx?document=400> and cited on page 17 of the RFP.

Q: What is the budget for Task 1.1?

A: See answers to questions 1) and 9).

12) Q: Does the scope of work include upslope impacts/restoration, such as impacts to geology/channels/habitat associated with hydraulic mining or landslides associated with forest roads on unstable geology?

A: To the extent that the processes or impacts listed in this question impact fisheries restoration and monitoring, then they should be included in the deliverables. The priority and amount of time spent in the planning effort on each process or impact will be determined via discussion and collaboration with the Steering Committee as part of plan development.

Page 4 of the RFP quotes the National Research Council (2008): “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.” The RFP further states: “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.”

13) Q: On page 10, the 5th bullet under Task 1.1 Deliverables says "conduct and prepare technical analyses, ...". Does this indicate that the project team should conduct original analyses within Task 1.1, or just that they should be including existing analyses within the report?

A: The synthesis report, as it is defined on page 7: “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.”

14) Q: Does the PSMFC have any preferred models or approaches to be used as part of the greater project?

A: As defined on page 7; “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.” PSMFC does not have a selected model or approach to be used other than what is stated in the RFP.

15) Q: Does the PSMFC anticipate wanting a physical process model (or something similar) developed to describe sediment dynamics in the basin and their influence on anadromous fish habitat?

A: See answer to questions 13). To the extent that the processes or impacts listed in this question impact fisheries restoration and monitoring, then they should be included in the deliverables. The priority and amount of time spent in the planning effort on each process or impact will be determined via discussion and collaboration with the Steering Committee as part of plan development.

16) Q: Will any original field data collection be conducted as part of the overall project (Tasks 1 and 2)?

A: This RFP is for Task 1.1 only, so the question cannot be answered categorically for the overall project. The deliverables under the RFP for Task 1.1 are based on: “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” (page 7). The deliverables are further clarified in the bulleted list on page 10.

Potential contractors should be aware that there is a full suite of local, state, tribal, and federal organizations involved in field data collection in the basin. It is highly likely that “original field data collection efforts” (if any) associated with the overall project would be conducted by an existing organization.

: