

Three-Step Review Process

I. Types of Projects Requiring the Review Process

In order to determine if a proposal requires a review process, the following triggers have been developed. When the Council recommends a proposal as part of a funding recommendation, it will also identify which of the following triggers applies to direct the project into the step review. This will occur as a comment as part of the funding recommendations to Bonneville in association to a particular solicitation. The goal in making that finding and statement at the time of a Council recommendation is to clearly articulate whether or not the proposal will be subject to the three-step review process and what the expectations (e.g., time certain deliverables) will be as a condition of future funding.

A. Artificial Production Initiatives

Production initiatives will trigger a review when a project proposes any one of the following: (a) construct significant new production facilities; (b) begin planting fish in waters they have not been planted in before; (c) increase significantly the number of fish being introduced; (d) change stocks or the number of stocks, and/or (e) change the location of production facilities. It also includes initiation of funding existing facilities that were formerly funded otherwise.

B. Other Project Initiatives

For other projects the Council may request a review based on the following triggers: (a) construct a facility that costs more than \$1,000,000 during the fiscal year; (b) phased engineering designs are required for contractual purposes; (c) proposed actions address the entire watershed; (d) action is a multi-agency and multi-contractual effort, (e) new proposal that is outside the current solicitation and review cycle, (f) additional review or fix-it-loop is requested, and/or (g) the action is a substantial deviation from the adopted subbasin plan.

II. Design Development Definition for Construction

As a capital construction project develops from a conceptual to final design, more detail and understanding is generated that can be analyzed. Several stages in this process can be identified and used by decision makers to ensure scope, intent and accuracy of cost. In adopting the major review process, the Council identified three convenient stopping points (i.e., steps). These steps in the developmental phase are far enough apart in the design/planning process to allow a meaningful amount of progress to take place, so that efforts are not restrictive, and still close enough to provide choices to be made before effort is expended on unrealistic or unrealized goals. These phases are in the following table.

Development Phase	Design Phase	Variance Expected¹
Step 1	Conceptual	+/- 35 to 50 %
Step 2	Progress Review/ Preliminary	+/- 25 to 35 %
Step 3	Detailed/Final	+/- 10 to 15 %

The conceptual phase (Step 1) can be considered largely the feasibility stage that is important in identifying all major components and elements and includes the initial attempts at laying out the components on the chosen site or proposal. Approximate structure size and layouts are presented, with rough plans and elevations, general electrical and piping layouts are identified, but with little detail. Cost estimates are general and often are based on costs from previous projects and comparable construction costs.

The progress review/preliminary phase (Step 2) should identify any major difficulties in the design and proposal. At this point the proposal should provide the detail and the specifics to assure that all details will meet the intent and scope of the previous decision and ensure financial responsibility. In addition environmental review has been completed and any changes after this point should be minor.

At the detailed/final phase (Step 3) the design is ready to go out to bid. A detail and exhaustive review has been carried out, to assure that all details will meet operational requirements. The 100 percent cost estimate represents the best available estimate of construction costs for the project. A general contingency of 10 percent to 15 percent is specified as a line item in the cost estimate as a general contingency to cover unforeseen problems that may be encountered during construction.

III. Review Process and Schedule

The review process will include an independent scientific review of the project sponsor's answers to the review elements listed below. Depending on the nature and status of the proposed project a combination review may occur and address all relevant review elements in one submittal. For less complex and costly proposals a multiple phase review (i.e., Step 1, 2 and 3) would be more appropriate. This would entail a review of a submitted document (e.g., master plan) and the associated supporting information, and additional reviews that would include preliminary and detailed/final designs, remaining review elements, environmental review and answers to technical questions requested during the previous reviews.

Review periods for project submittals can vary depending on the circumstances and nature surrounding any specific project. Generally the review schedule for the Step 1 process is 18 weeks (attachment I), and Step 2 and 3 reviews, and combination reviews (i.e., all elements reviewed) is

¹ Degree of variance at each phase will be dependent on the size and complexity of the project.

² The reviews for a specific project will be established during fiscal and provincial reviews. Generally, the steps for these projects will be based on the phase of the step process as follows: Step 1 -- conceptual planning, represented under the program primarily by master plan development and approval; Step 2 -- preliminary design and cost estimation, and environmental (NEPA and ESA) review; and Step 3 -- final design review prior to construction and operation.

nine weeks (attachment II). Due to the needed alignment to the Council's Fish and Wildlife Committee and Council meetings, this schedule is based on the minimum amount of time required. Council staff will review the results of the peer review with the project proponents and make recommendations to the Council.

IV. Review Elements

An important part of the major project review process will include an independent scientific review of the responses to the technical elements listed below. The Council is looking for a full explanation of how the project is consistent with these elements. These elements reflect and refer to specific elements delineated under relevant sections in the fish and wildlife program. In addition, these elements may be supplemented with issues raised in previous reviews.

A. All Projects

All projects are expected to:

- address the relationship and consistencies of the proposed project to the eight scientific principles (see 2000 Columbia River Basin Fish and Wildlife Program, Basinwide Provisions, Section B.2) (Step 1)
- describe the link of the proposal to other projects and activities in the adopted subbasin and the desired end-state condition for the target subbasin (Step 1)
- define the biological objectives (see 2000 Columbia River Basin Fish and Wildlife Program, Basinwide Provisions, Section C.2 (1) and (2), and Technical Appendix) with measurable attributes that define progress, provide accountability and track changes through time associated with this project (Step 1)
- define expected project benefits (e.g., preservation of biological diversity, fishery enhancement, water optimization, and habitat protection) (Step 1)
- describe the implementation strategies (see 2000 Columbia River Basin Fish and Wildlife Program, Basinwide Provisions, Section D.2) as they relate to the current conditions and restoration potential of the habitat for the target species and the life stage of interest (Step 1)
- address the relationship to the habitat strategies (see 2000 Columbia River Basin Fish and Wildlife Program, Basinwide Provisions, Section D.3) (Step 1)
- ensure that cost-effective alternate measures are not overlooked and include descriptions of alternatives for resolving the resource problem, including a description of other management activities in the subbasin, province and basin (Step 1)
- provide the historical and current status of anadromous and resident fish and wildlife in the subbasin most relevant to the proposed project (Step 1)

- describe current and planned management of anadromous and resident fish and wildlife in the subbasin (Step 1)
- demonstrate consistency of the proposed project with National Marine Fisheries Service recovery plans and other fishery management and watershed plans (Step 1)
- describe the status of the comprehensive environmental assessment (Step 1 and 2)
- describe the monitoring and evaluation plan (see 2000 Columbia River Basin Fish and Wildlife Program, Basinwide Provisions, Section D.9) (Step 1, 2 and 3)
- describe and provide specific items and cost estimates for 10 Fiscal Years for planning and design (i.e. conceptual, preliminary and final), construction, operation and maintenance and monitoring and evaluation (Step 1, 2 and 3)

B. Artificial Production Initiatives

Artificial production initiatives are expected to:

- address the relation and link to the artificial production policies and strategies (see 2000 Columbia River Basin Fish and Wildlife Program, Basinwide Provisions, Section D.4 and Technical Appendix) (Step 1)
- provide a completed Hatchery and Genetic Management Plan (HGMP) for the target population (s) (Step 1)
- describe the harvest plan (see 2000 Columbia River Basin Fish and Wildlife Program, Basinwide Provisions, Section D.5) (Step 1)
- provide a conceptual design of the proposed facilities, including an assessment of the availability and utility of existing facilities (Step 1)
- provide a preliminary design, including appropriate value engineering review, of the proposed facilities (Step 2)
- provide a final design of the proposed facilities consistent with previous submittal documents and preliminary design (Step 3)

C. Other Project Initiatives

Other major project initiatives are expected to:

- provide a conceptual design of the proposed strategies and/or facilities (Step 1)

- provide a preliminary design, including appropriate value engineering review, of the proposed facilities (Step 2)
- provide a final design of the proposed facilities consistent with previous submittal documents and preliminary design (Step 3)

Attachment I: Schedule for the Step 1 Review Process

Week³	Description
1 (Monday)	Proponents submits Master Plan to NPPC and Bonneville
1 – 2	NPPC staff review
2 (Monday)	Bonneville/NPPC initiates peer review with the ISRP
2 (Thursday)	NPPC staff comments regarding master plan and draft issue paper to Fish and Wildlife Committee (packet)
3 - 8	Additional materials provided to the ISRP, if necessary
4 (Tuesday)	NPPC Fish and Wildlife Committee reviews the master plan and draft issue paper
6 (Thursday)	Fish and Wildlife Committee recommendation to Council (packet)
8 (Wednesday)	NPPC considers releasing master plan and issue paper for review and comment
8 (Friday)	ISRP findings submitted to NPPC
11 (Wednesday)	NPPC takes comments on master plan and issue paper at Council Meeting
15 (Wednesday)	NPPC takes comments on Master plan and Issue Paper at Council meeting
15 (Friday)	Due date for all written comments on master plan and issue paper
16-17	NPPC staff prepares a summary of comments and potential alternatives for decision
18 (Thursday)	NPPC staff provides summary of comments and potential alternatives to Fish and Wildlife Committee to consider recommendation (packet)
20 (Tuesday)	Fish and Wildlife Committee considers potential alternatives for recommendation
22 (Thursday)	NPPC staff provides decision memo with Fish and Wildlife Committee recommendation to Council (packet)
24 (Wednesday)	Council considers approval of master plan

³ Due to the needed alignment to the Fish and Wildlife Committee and Council meetings, this schedule is based on the minimum amount of time required

**Attachment II: Schedule for the Step 2, 3 and Combined
Review Processes**

Week⁴	Description
1 (Monday)	Proponents submit to NPPC and Bonneville information and responses for technical questions as they relate to the appropriate step
1	NPPC staff review
2 (Monday)	Bonneville/NPPC initiates peer review with the ISRP
3 (Monday)	Additional materials provided to the ISRP, if necessary
4 (Friday)	ISRP review findings submitted to NPPC staff
5 (Thursday)	NPPC staff provides draft version of potential alternatives for recommendations (packet)
7 (Tuesday)	Fish and Wildlife Committee considers potential alternatives for recommendation to Council
9 (Thursday)	NPPC staff provides decision memo with Fish and Wildlife Committee recommendation to Council (packet)
11 (Wednesday)	Council considers approval of project step

w:\mf\ww\hatchery\3step\revised step 2007-2009\102406fy2007-2009stepprocess.doc

⁴ Due to the needed alignment to Fish and Wildlife Committee and Council meetings, this schedule is based on the minimum amount of time required.