

Phil Rockefeller
Chair
Washington

Tom Karier
Washington

Henry Lorenzen
Oregon

Bill Bradbury
Oregon



Northwest Power and Conservation Council

W. Bill Booth
Vice Chair
Idaho

James Yost
Idaho

Pat Smith
Montana

Jennifer Anders
Montana

August 25th, 2015

DECISION MEMORANDUM

TO: Fish and Wildlife Committee Members

FROM: Tony Grover and staff

SUBJECT: Implementation of 2014 Program Priorities

PROPOSED ACTION: Staff will present recommendations regarding immediate implementation of four actions regarding the Council's 2014 Fish and Wildlife Program's priorities.

SIGNIFICANCE Supports 2014 Fish and Wildlife Program priority work.

BUDGETARY/ECONOMIC IMPACTS

Estimated funds available from the Bonneville Fish and Wildlife FY 2016 budget include \$238,000 (potential available BOG funds) for the hatchery asset assessment and \$183,000 (potential cost savings) for the habitat assessment. Completion of this work may occur in FY 2017 with additional funds.

BACKGROUND

The Council's Fish and Wildlife Committee will meet in special session on August 27, 2015 for the purpose of considering staff recommendations regarding immediate implementation of the Council's 2014 Fish and Wildlife Program's emerging priorities.

The Council identified seven emerging Program priority areas in the [Investment Strategy](#) chapter of the Program to implement recommended measures that expand existing work or expands the program in new directions. These are:

1. Provide for funding *long-term maintenance* (Appendix P) of the assets that have been created by prior program investments
2. Implement *adaptive management* (including prioritized research on critical uncertainties) throughout the program by assessing the effectiveness of ongoing projects, developing program objectives when appropriate and taking into account the effects of *climate change*
3. Preserve program effectiveness by supporting: (1) expanded management of *predators*; (2) mapping and determining hotspots for *toxic contaminants*; and (3) aggressively addressing *non-native and invasive species*
4. Investigate *blocked area mitigation* options through reintroduction, passage and habitat improvement, and implement if warranted
5. Implement additional *sturgeon* and *lamprey* measures (passage and research)
6. Update the *subbasin plans* most in need of updates
7. Continue efforts to *improve floodplain habitats*

In the Program, the Council recognizes that the 2014 Program priorities are a subset of all of the measures in the Fish and Wildlife Program which has many priorities, most of which are being implemented and many have multi-year funding and implementation commitments. The Program emerging priorities represent important measures that were either not happening or not being implemented to a sufficient extent. In the 2014 Program the Council provided the following guidance to Bonneville, the other federal agencies, and the region in general as to which of these new measures are emerging priorities for implementation in the next five years: "During the course of the next five years, the Council anticipates that Bonneville will take the necessary steps to integrate these priorities into the Program and will report annually to the Council on its progress." The Program further notes that, "Bonneville should fund any new fish and wildlife obligations from identifying savings within the current Program and as necessary, from additional expenditures. ...To the extent that targeted savings are insufficient to meet Bonneville's financial obligations in this Program, Bonneville should consider increasing expenditures."

ANALYSIS

At the August Fish and Wildlife Committee meeting, the Committee and staff discussed the emerging program priorities, the [program measures and timeframes](#) for implementation as well as [options for solicitation](#) of new work to address the priorities. The staff also presented [recommendations](#) for three implementation timeframes: 1) immediate; 2) near-term; and 3) extended term.

For the Committee's consideration on August 27, the staff will present to the Committee:

1. Attachment A) draft language for an email to be sent to EPA's regional Toxics Reduction Work Group to seek their assistance in characterizing and mapping toxic contaminant "hot spots" in the Columbia River Basin; and
2. Attachment B) a draft letter requesting federal funding to assist the states in the protection of Columbia River waters and infrastructure from the introduction of dreissenid mussels.
3. Attachment C) a draft *request for proposals* for commencing immediate (FY 2016) implementation of two program priorities, a hatchery assessment and a

blocked area mitigation habitat assessment for areas between Columbia river miles 545.1 and 745.

The staff will develop additional initial implementation scenarios for continuing near term implementation of the Fish and Wildlife Program priorities for FY 2017 for discussion at the September Fish and Wildlife Committee meeting.

Attachment A. [Draft e-mail to the Toxics Reduction Workgroup]

TO: Fish and Wildlife Committee members
FROM: Jim Ruff
SUBJECT: Draft email language re: toxics mapping for Toxics Reduction Work Group
Per your 8-12-15 request, below is draft language for your consideration to be sent in an email message to EPA's regional Toxics Reduction Work Group concerning the Program's high priority action to characterize and map toxic contaminant "hot spots" in the Columbia River Basin.

Proposed draft email language to the regional Toxics Reduction Work Group

At the August 11, 2015, Council meeting in Missoula, MT, the Council's Fish and Wildlife Committee met and requested staff to prepare a short list of possible actionable items and propose a process to implement identified work in the high priority areas of the 2014 Columbia River Basin Fish and Wildlife Program (the program). One of the program's emerging priorities addresses "preserving program effectiveness by supporting the mapping and determining hot spots for toxic contaminants." (see p. 116 of the Council's 2014 Fish and Wildlife Program.) This priority action was recommended by various parties during the 2013-14 Program amendment process and subsequently adopted by the Council in the program.

Accordingly, the Council requests EPA's regional Toxics Reduction Work Group to address this issue at its next meeting in October 2015 and develop a scope of work to characterize and map toxic contaminant "hot spots" in the Columbia River Basin. In the Water Quality sub-strategy on page 56 of the Council's Program, a measure calls for the federal action agencies to "partner with and support ongoing federal, state, tribal and regional agencies' efforts to ... assess and map high priority toxic contaminant hot spots in the Columbia River Basin and evaluate their relationship, if any, to the development and operation of the hydrosystem."

The scope of work for assessing and mapping high priority toxic contaminant hot spots in the Columbia Basin should include, but not be limited to: a) the various sources of existing contaminant data that could be used to help identify toxic hot spots in the basin; b) identification of any suspected high priority toxic hot spots where there may be key gaps in, or limited, toxics monitoring data; c) a proposed schedule for how long it may take to identify and map such hot spots in the basin; and d) a cost estimate to implement such a toxics characterization and mapping effort in the Columbia River Basin.

The Council has asked Jim Ruff of the Fish and Wildlife Division staff to work with and assist the Toxics Reduction Work Group in developing this scope of work. The Council requests the scope of work should be completed and submitted to us by [December xx, 2015? Or insert appropriate date]. The scope of work will then be considered by the Council and could be used in a future targeted Program solicitation process to implement this work.

The Council wishes to thank the Toxics Reduction Work Group in advance for its consideration of this task and looks forward to a favorable response to our request to help scope this high priority work.

Attachment B. [Draft letter to Action Agencies regarding quagga and zebra mussels]

Phil Rockefeller
Chair
Washington

Tom Karier
Washington

Henry Lorenzen
Oregon

Bill Bradbury
Oregon



**Northwest Power and
Conservation Council**

W. Bill Booth
Vice Chair
Idaho

James Yost
Idaho

Pat Smith
Montana

Jennifer Anders
Montana

DRAFT
August 25, 2015

Elliot Mainzer, Administrator
Bonneville Power Administration
[address]

Brigadier General Scott A. Spellmon, Commander
Northwestern Division, Corps of Engineers
[address]

Lorri Lee, Regional Director
Bureau of Reclamation-Pacific Northwest Region
[address]

Dear Action Agencies,

The Council adopted a revised Columbia River Basin Fish and Wildlife Program (the program) in October 2014. One of the program's highest priorities addresses "preserving program effectiveness by ... aggressively addressing non-native and invasive species."¹ This includes preventing the establishment of quagga and zebra (*Dreissenid* spp.) mussels into the waters of the Columbia River Basin.

The Pacific Northwest is the only region of the western United States and Canada that does not yet have established populations of invasive quagga or zebra mussels. The Pacific Northwest region includes the four U.S. states of Idaho, Montana, Oregon and Washington, as well as the western Canadian provinces of British Columbia, Alberta and Saskatchewan. The estimated costs associated with failing to prevent an invasion of dreissenids in the Northwest states and western provinces exceeds \$500 million

¹ See page 116 for a list of program priorities, as well as the sub-strategy on non-native and invasive species on pp. 46-48, of the Council's 2014 Fish and Wildlife Program.
<http://www.nwcouncil.org/fw/program/2014-12/Program>

annually.² Based on existing economic analyses, the following industries and programs are at greatest risk of dreissenid mussel establishment, all of which rely heavily on water as a key element of their function:

- Hydropower generation at dams
- Fish passage facilities at dams
- Drinking water systems
- Water management and irrigation structures
- Water diversion intakes
- Fish hatcheries and aquaculture
- Navigation lock operations at mainstem dams
- Boating facilities and boater maintenance
- Recreational fishing and golf courses

Collectively, the four Northwest states are currently spending over \$3.35 million annually of their own funds to prevent the introduction of dreissenid mussels and other aquatic invasive species into the waters of the Columbia River Basin. These conservative cost estimates are focused primarily on the states' watercraft inspection and decontamination efforts.³ Over the past three years, the Northwest states have inspected more than 300,000 boats, and successfully intercepted hundreds of those that were mussel-infested. This track record is all the more admirable considering these stations are underfunded, under staffed, and only operate during portions of the year. There is little doubt, however, that the states' network of regional inspection stations are an important reason why the Northwest is the only area in the western U.S. that continues to be free of zebra and quagga mussels.

A key measure included in the non-native and invasive species sub-strategy of the Council's 2014 Fish and Wildlife Program addresses preventing the establishment of non-native, invasive species such as dreissenids. The measure encourages federal [agencies] ... to prevent non-native and invasive species introductions by monitoring and managing the various pathways that could introduce additional aquatic nuisance species into the Columbia River Basin." The prevention measure also states that "BPA and other federal agencies should assist the Northwest states' efforts to prevent the establishment of quagga and zebra mussels."⁴

However, the federal action agencies, who are the federal project operators and the power marketing agency of the most valuable water resources assets in the Northwest, have not assisted the states' watercraft inspection efforts to protect the waters of the Columbia Basin and the federal hydroelectric power facilities. Accordingly, funding support is urgently needed from the federal action agencies to assist the four Northwest states enhance the existing regional network of watercraft inspection and decontamination stations.

² From *Advancing a Regional Defense Against Dreissenids in the Pacific Northwest*, a report prepared by the Pacific Northwest Economic Region and Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission, August 2015.

³ These costs do not include funds expended by federal agencies, utilities, academia, and others to implement various mussel monitoring, research, vulnerability assessments at hydropower dams, etc.

⁴ See p. 47 in the non-native and invasive species sub-strategy of the 2014 Columbia River Basin Fish and Wildlife Program. <http://www.nwcouncil.org/fw/program/2014-12/Program>

Specifically, an initial \$1-1.6 million is needed in FY 2017 as a federal cost-share to the four Northwest states to augment the existing states' annual commitment of \$3.35 million. These additional federal funds will better protect the waters and water-related infrastructure of the Columbia Basin, including FCRPS hydropower dams and federal irrigation projects, from an introduction of dreissenid mussels by helping to create a more robust regional watercraft inspection and decontamination program.⁵ It will also help protect recreational use at federal projects, which is a Congressionally-authorized project purpose. By cost-sharing with the Northwest states to prevent the spread of invasive mussels into the Pacific Northwest, the federal government will save several hundred million dollars in capital and annual operation and maintenance costs at its hydropower and irrigation facilities in the basin.⁶

The Council seeks this \$1-1.6 million in federal funding to assist the states in implementing an identified high program priority. Not only will this funding help protect the valuable federal infrastructure in the Columbia Basin, it will also help maximize the biological response resulting from past and current ratepayer and federal investments in the fish and wildlife program.

Thank you for your attention to this important matter. Please do not hesitate to contact me or Jim Ruff at the Council if you have any questions or concerns.

Sincerely,

Phil Rockefeller, Chair

cc: PSMFC
NOAA Fisheries
USFWS
CRITFC
ISDA
MFWP
ODFW
WDFW
PNWER

⁵ An enhanced inspection program would also protect the region and Columbia River Basin from many other types of aquatic invasive species.

⁶ IEAB 2010-1, *Economic Risk Associated with the Potential Establishment of Zebra and Quagga Mussels in the Columbia River Basin*, Council's Independent Economic Analysis Board, July 2010. http://www.nwcouncil.org/media/30565/ieab2010_1.pdf

Attachment C. [Draft RFP for hatchery assessment and habitat assessment]

Phil Rockefeller
Chair
Washington

Tom Karier
Washington

Henry Lorenzen
Oregon

Bill Bradbury
Oregon



**Northwest Power and
Conservation Council**

W. Bill Booth
Vice Chair
Idaho

James Yost
Idaho

Pat Smith
Montana

Jennifer Anders
Montana

Draft: August 25, 2015

**Request for Proposals
to implement two emerging priorities from the Northwest Power and Conservation
Council's 2014 Columbia River Basin Fish and Wildlife Program**

Dear Recipient:

The Northwest Power and Conservation Council (Council), in coordination with the Bonneville Power Administration (Bonneville) invite proposals to specifically address two emerging priorities in the Council's 2014 Columbia River Basin Fish and Wildlife Program:

- A. an assessment of assets at 14 Bonneville-funded fish hatcheries for the purposes of developing a long-term asset management plan for maintenance of those hatcheries; and
- B. a habitat reach assessment for blocked area mitigation in the Columbia River and its significant tributaries to characterize for potential salmon and steelhead habitat between river mile 545.1 and river mile 745 (Canadian Border).

This special solicitation for project proposals is part of the on-going effort by the Council and Bonneville to implement the Council's [Columbia River Basin Fish and Wildlife Program](#) under the [Northwest Power Act](#). Bonneville has agreed to make available \$2.9 million available to fund projects addressing Fish and Wildlife Program priorities during fiscal years 2016-2017.

If you are interested in submitting a project proposal for either of these emerging priorities, please refer to *the Guide to Submitting Proposals* beginning on page two. The *Guide* contains the information you will need to submit project proposal(s) for funding consideration. The packet includes guidance, tips, important dates and contact information. All information contained in this packet also can be found on the Council's website at: <http://www.nwcouncil.org/fw/XXX>. **Proposals are due by midnight [November 30, 2015].**

The Council will use information submitted in your proposal, and reviews by the Independent Scientific Review Panel (ISRP), and public comments to inform its project funding recommendations to Bonneville. The Council's funding recommendations will span fiscal years 2016 and 2017. Contracts for the work will be made between Bonneville Power Administration and the successful project proponents.



COLUMBIA RIVER BASIN FISH AND WILDLIFE PROGRAM

Emerging Program Priorities: Guide to submitting proposals

Fiscal Years 2016-2017

Northwest Power and Conservation Council
Bonneville Power Administration
Independent Scientific Review Panel

This guide was prepared for use by both project proponents and proposal reviewers for the 2014 Columbia River Basin Fish and Wildlife Program.

Draft August 25, 2015

1. Background

The Council and Bonneville are soliciting for proposals that address two Fish and Wildlife Program emerging priorities for funding by Bonneville in Fiscal Year 2016 and 2017. Proposals should reflect the following two target area(s) identified by the Council:

- A. Hatchery Asset Assessment: The Council is looking to develop a plan for funding long-term maintenance of the assets that have been created by prior program investments. The purpose of this Request For Proposals is to develop an assessment of assets at 14 Bonneville-funded fish hatcheries for the purpose of developing the long-term asset management plan for maintenance of those hatcheries; [see page 7 for details] and
- B. Habitat Reach Assessment: The Council is interested in investigating the habitat availability, suitability, and salmon survival potential in habitats above blocked areas of the Upper Columbia Basin within the United States. The purpose of the Request for Proposals is to develop an assessment of the Columbia River and its significant tributaries for potential salmon and steelhead habitat from river mile 545.1 to river mile 745 [see page 10 for details].

2. Description of Solicitation

2.1 Threshold Requirements

Submission for funding under the Council's Program is open to organizations that are able to meet the requirements and expectations below. [Insert additional procurement details from Bonneville as needed]

1. To be considered, proposals must be received no later than midnight Pacific Standard Time on November 30, 2015;
2. The applicant must address the above emerging program priorities;
3. The Council's expectation is that the projects be completed within nine months of contract initiation date;
4. Applicants must propose work that can be completed within the target budget;
5. Proposals for new projects that do not address these topics will not be considered for funding at this time;
6. Applicant must demonstrate its feasibility, readiness and qualifications for implementation;
7. Applicants must be able to meet BPA contractual requirements. Requirements can be viewed here: [insert website].

2.1.1 Who may apply

The Council {and Bonneville} will consider proposals from the following organizations for each emerging priority target area:

A: Hatchery Asset Assessment:

[Option 1] Any organization including non-governmental organizations and firms, states, tribe’s academic institutions, or government agencies
 [or Option 2] -- BPA may be required to do this solicitation if it is necessary to use commercial vendors.

B. Habitat Reach Assessment: This project solicitation is targeted to the following six entities since they are uniquely qualified to quickly obtain site access on their and others authorities’ lands [see more detail on page x].

1. Spokane Tribe of Indians
2. The Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation
3. Coeur d’Alene Tribe of Indians
4. Upper Columbia United Tribes
5. Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife
6. Upper Columbia Salmon Recovery Board

2.2 Schedule and Deadline for Submission

Proposals due	Nov 30, 2015
ISRP Review	Dec 1, 2015
Additional information due for ISRP (fix-it loop)	Jan 15, 2016
ISRP Final Report	Jan 29, 2016
Public Review of ISRP report	Jan 31, 2016
Committee Recommendations	Feb 9, 2016
Council Recommendation to Bonneville	March 8, 2016
BPA Final Contracts in place	May-June 2016

2.3 Where to send [or] How to submit Proposals

[Fill in details for submittal mechanism – cbfish, narrative proposal form, other?]

2.4. Communications

Council staff leads	Review Process: Lynn Palensky Hatchery assessment: Mark Fritsch Habitat assessment: Laura Robinson
Bonneville Contracting Officer	<i>Insert</i>
Technical contact (form-specific help) ???	Eric Schrepel or CBfish help
Science review	Erik Merrill, 503-222-5161, emerrill@nwcouncil.org or Lynn Palensky lpalensky@nwcouncil.org

2.5 How Proposals are Evaluated and Selected

Proposals are evaluated and recommended by a combination of administrative evaluation and professional and scientific peer review. The evaluation occurs over several months in discrete steps, which are described below.

1. Administrative Review

All proposals are reviewed first to see that they contain the requested information and meet threshold criteria. Incomplete proposals will not be considered for funding. Project proposals will be posted on the Council's website [need to insert link] for the ISRP and public review and comment as soon as possible following the close of the solicitation.

2. Peer Review of the Proposals

Proposals for the emerging priorities will be distributed to the ISRP on December 1, 2015. The ISRP will review proposals using criteria from the 1996 Amendment to the Northwest Power Act that projects 1) be based on science principles; 2) benefit fish and wildlife; 3) have clearly defined objectives and outcomes; and 4) have provisions for monitoring and evaluation of results. The ISRP reviews proposals in the context of the Council's Fish and Wildlife Program. See the Council's website for [more information](#) about the ISRP and review criteria.

The ISRP is scheduled to provide the Council with a final report on XXX. This report will include:

- a) an overview of the evaluation, general observations of the match between proposed projects and the emerging priorities, and overall recommendations on the projects reviewed;
- b) recommendations and comments on proposals that are consistent with the emerging priorities target areas;
- c) an evaluation of the consistency of the proposed work with the Northwest Power Act criteria cited above.

4. Public Comment

The Council will make the project proposals and the ISRP report available for public review and comment for 30 days.

5. Northwest Power and Conservation Council Recommendations to Bonneville.

Finally, based on the advice provided the ISRP, administrative review, and public comment, the Council will select the projects to be recommended for funding and make those recommendations to Bonneville at the March 2016 Council meeting. If Council's recommendations differ notably from those of the ISRP, the Council will explain its reasoning in writing as part of its recommendations. BPA funding will be compliant with applicable procurement and contracting requirements and guidelines. Bonneville may request additional information during the course of the contracting

process, which may include more specificity of the work to be performed and the associated costs. The amount of funding ultimately approved by Bonneville for a project may differ from the amount initially proposed by the applicant or recommended by the Council in its recommendations.

2.6 Getting Started on your proposal

[If this is in fact the appropriate vehicle to support the proposals; adjust as necessary]

1. Go to www.cbfish.org. OR complete the narrative proposal form
2. Log in (upper right corner) using your Pisces username and password. If you don't have a username and password, click on the "Request Support" link (upper right corner) to request one.
3. Click on "Proposals" from the top navigation bar.
[Add new cbfish info if necessary]

2.7 Important Guidance Documents (links)

Useful reference documents for proposal development are listed below.

1. [Council's website](#) for general information
2. [Fish and Wildlife Program Investment Strategy](#)
3. [ISRP](#) and [ISAB](#) Reports
4. [Council's 2014 Fish and Wildlife Program](#), [Subbasin plans](#)

3. Emerging Priority Targeted Solicitations

3.1. Emerging Priority: Hatchery Asset Assessment

Background: The 2014 Columbia River Basin Fish and Wildlife Program adopted in October 2014, calls for providing funding for the long-term maintenance of the assets that have been created by prior program investments. The Council has been working with the Operation and Maintenance (O&M) Sub-committee, Independent Economic Analysis Board, Bonneville staff, and Fish Screening Oversight Committee to develop a long-term O&M strategic plan to ensure the longevity and integrity of the Programs past investments.

The O&M strategic plan will utilize an asset management framework that will provide a long-term maintenance, rehabilitation, and replacement plan for Program investments. The phased approach is based on similar assessment processes Bonneville uses for the maintenance of transmission and hydro facility assets. The framework has four phases: Phase 1 is the asset inventory; Phase 2 is the condition assessment; Phase 3 addresses prioritization, and Phase 4 is the strategic plan for implementing priorities over time.

Currently, Council and Bonneville staffs have completed the direct Program hatchery list (Phase 1 – Inventory) and are now transitioning to implementation of the condition/asset assessment (Phase 2) needed for the asset management strategy, as part of the O&M Strategic Plan. This RFP seeks to complete Phase 2 of this process.

Phase 1 – Inventory (complete)

The developed [hatchery list](#) reflects Fish and Wildlife Program (Program) hatcheries and the projects explicitly linked or associated with them. In order to capture all the sites and facilities associated with certain hatcheries the table reflects the hatcheries as “facility/program”. In addition, the table shows other Program hatchery projects that are dependent on facilities that are not funded by, nor the responsibility of, the Program. The proposed inventory and assessment review focuses on projects that reflect major physical assets and infrastructure.

The facilities/programs warranting an assessment are bricks and mortar structures, not the associated facilities that provide non-Program support for the hatcheries. Of the 39 projects listed, staff recommend 14 facility/programs (involving 23 projects) for an assessment (please see shaded boxes in the table).

Phase 2 – Hatchery Asset Assessment

With the assistance of an independent contractor, the technical work group will define the assessment to meet the Program goals of creating an asset management strategy.

Relying on existing information, the assessment will collect enough detail to inform the asset management strategy and provide possible approaches to replacement or repair of capital investments. Burden on hatchery managers should be minimized to complete this work. Therefore the assessment should be based on existing reviewed and recommended project narratives (cbfish.org) and other documents such as Hatchery Genetic Management Plans (HGMP's). In addition, energy efficiency opportunities should be considered.

Following is a *general* outline of the assessment and major physical assets to be reviewed:

Introduction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Project Description (include goals and objectives of the review and recommended facility/program)</i>
Water Supply System	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Surface</i> • <i>Ground</i> • <i>Infrastructure</i>
Trap and Weirs	
Transport	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Ladders</i> • <i>Other</i>
Adult Holding	
Incubation	
Rearing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Rearing/Grow-out</i> • <i>Raceways</i>
Release	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Volitional</i> • <i>Other</i>
Effluent	
Buildings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Hatchery Buildings</i> • <i>Housing</i>
Grounds	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Access</i> • <i>Utilities</i>
Capital (Support) Equipment	

Expectations for the Hatchery Condition Assessment

1. The assessment is based on existing hatchery goals and objectives as reviewed and recommended through the Fish and Wildlife Program.
2. The assessment is based on existing information available through HGMP's and other planning documents.
3. A technical work group (TWG) chaired by a Council member will oversee this work.

Tasks

1. Develop and create an assessment template for review by the TWG
2. Describe the collection of existing information needed for assessment prior to site visits
3. Describe site visits for each of the hatchery programs
4. Provide an outline of the deliverable; an individual facility assessment.

Deliverable:

Provide a facility assessment for each of the 14 facilities/programs in a final assessment report to the Council by XX 2016.

Budget:

The budget associated with this request for proposals should not exceed \$238,000 in expense funds for Fiscal Year 2016. In addition, in kind contributions of Council staff time will approach .20 FTE to assist the technical workgroup, O&M Subcommittee, and Council (e.g., coordinate meetings and presentations) and collaboration with the independent contractor (including site visits). Bonneville will provide 1.5 FTE to assist with the condition assessments.

Timeline for completing work:

The tasks and deliverables are to be complete within nine months of contract start date.

3. 2 Emerging Priority: Habitat Reach Assessment for blocked area mitigation

Background: In the [Anadromous Fish Mitigation in Blocked Areas Strategy](#) in the Council's 2014 Fish and Wildlife Program, the Council calls for a science-based, phased approach to investigate reintroduction of anadromous fish in the blocked waters of the Upper Columbia River. Phase 1 is to be completed by the end of 2016 and includes:

- *“Evaluate information from passage studies at other blockages and from previous assessments of passage at Grand Coulee and Chief Joseph dams*
- *Investigate habitat availability, suitability and salmon survival potential in habitats above Grand Coulee. This might include selective releases of salmon and steelhead. Investigate the scientific feasibility and possible cost of upstream and downstream passage options for salmon and steelhead. Before funding new investigations, provide the Council with a report for consideration of subsequent work to advance the fish passage planning process.*
- *As part of Phase 1, the Council will engage in discussions with tribal, state, and federal agencies and others regarding the purpose, scope and progress of reintroduction efforts above Chief Joseph and Grand Coulee dams.”*

Additionally, the Council identified investigation of blocked area mitigation as one of the program's emerging priorities:

“Investigate blocked area mitigation options through reintroduction, passage and habitat improvement, and implement if warranted”

Since the adoption of the Council's 2014 program, the Council and regional entities have begun important discussions and preliminary planning for how to implement this program priority while engaging all interested parties. In particular, the Upper Columbia United Tribes have begun an effort in collaborating with the region on a draft work and coordination plan.

For reference, past work and proposals that could be used to inform this project proposal:

- [UCUT Draft Project Work and Coordination Plan](#)
- [Spokane Tribe Anadromous and Resident Fish Habitat Assessment Project](#) (2014)
- [JSAP: Joint Stock Assessment Project](#); [Project 1997-004-00](#) (JSAP)
- Colville Tribe project proposal (2007): [Assess Habitat and Passage for Anadromous Fish Upriver of Chief Joseph Dam](#)
- 15 tribes joint paper: [Fish Passage and Reintroduction into the US & Canadian Upper Columbia Basin](#)
- The [Intermountain Province Plan](#), specifically the [Spokane Subbasin Plan](#) and the [Upper Columbia Subbasin Plan](#)
- [The 2014 Columbia River Basin Fish and Wildlife Program](#)

Request for Proposals

This solicitation focuses on compiling, integrating, synthesizing, and assessing existing data related to habitat for the species of interest within the area of interest to inform opportunities to investigate blocked area mitigation. This work also includes identifying and filling gaps in habitat information (e.g. modeling, physical habitat assessment, etc.). If field work is required to fill critical gaps in habitat information, the methods used to gather data should be consistent with *monitoringmethods.org* to the extent possible.

Who may Apply

This project solicitation is targeted to the following six entities since they are uniquely qualified to quickly obtain site access on their and others authorities' lands where work will likely need to occur. Coordination amongst these entities is encouraged.

1. Spokane Tribe of Indians
2. The Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation
3. Coeur d'Alene Tribe of Indians
4. Upper Columbia United Tribes
5. Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife
6. Upper Columbia Salmon Recovery Board

Species of Interest: Chinook salmon, sockeye, and steelhead

Area of Interest: This project will be conducted for the reach of U.S. waters of the Columbia River between river mile 545.1 and river mile 745, and any potentially anadromous fish-bearing streams and tributaries along this stretch. This nearly 200 mile segment of the Columbia River has been impounded since the 1940's, blocking anadromous fish from reaching the U.S. Upper Columbia waters.

Tasks

Using existing information, conduct studies to determine which streams and tributaries may have available and suitable habitat for the species of interest. Conduct field/modeling work as necessary to fill critical gaps in habitat information.

Deliverables

A results report to the Council on habitat availability and suitability to inform subsequent work to advance the fish passage planning process.

Budget

The budget for this work will be based on the applicant's initial cost estimate. The final budget will be negotiated between Bonneville, the Council and the successful applicant

prior to contracting. The final contract budget will support the scientific integrity of the proposal as it was reviewed by the ISRP.

Timeline for completing work:

Tasks and deliverables are expected to be complete by the end of calendar year 2017.