Questions and answers affiliated with WWBWC’s Blue Mountain Station Road, Couse Creek Project;

1. **What are the footprint limitations?** Understanding the attention to detail exhibited by the landowner in regard to the property management, a heightened awareness to minimizing property disturbance is warranted.

2. **Is the grazed horse pasture at the upper end of the project site owned by the landowner?** It is part of the family ownership. Permission is granted to include the most upstream fence line of the pasture for inclusion within the scope of the property boundary.

3. **What is the water right allotted at the project site and for how many users?** The water right is registered as .139 CFS, dated late 1800s and designated for a single user.

4. **Will irrigation use need to continue during the construction period?** In effort to keep optimal landowner relations, it would be most courteous to have the ability to enable usage of the irrigation system at or near the current mode of operation as to not provide disruption and jeopardize the values of the water usage right for associated purposes to prevent any potential detrimental effects that could arise from disablement and inability to use during crisis etc.

5. **Are proposals expected to address passage only or passage and habitat complexity?** The WWBWC is seeking two-tiered proposals from each design team; one covering passage only and the other including both passage and habitat complexity concepts.

6. **What is the target budget amount for this project?** Budget information is not to be disclosed at this time in effort to not bias proposals. Amounts sought may depend upon the chosen design alternative and advancement of the process and will be disclosed to the design team selected at the appropriate time. Final budget amount available will depend on securing and allocating the amount targeted, as established by the design development process affiliated with the chosen and approved alternative as it pertains to passage (and complexity if approved by landowner and funding entity).

7. **What is the history of the dam?** According to the landowner, a barn was located adjacent to the dam near water’s edge in the past. The part of the dam that is perpendicular to the thalweg was in existence prior to the 1964/1965 floods. Additional maintenance and improvements to the structure appear to have occurred at later dates on secondary features such as the wing walls. The current owner thinks there may have been some additional concrete added in the 1950s or 1960s.

8. **Are there any designs or photos of the dam that can be provided?** No designs to our knowledge are available as the structure appears to have been privately implemented. The photo provided by the WWBWC as part of the RFP tour invitation process is all that is available.

9. **What is the purpose of the existing dam?** It is our understanding that the dam was primarily installed for irrigation related purposes, although there was a State of Oregon flow monitoring gauge at this site in the 1960s.

10. **Is there any information from well logs that may describe the depth of bedrock near the dam?** Acquiring this and related information would be at the discretion of the contractor as it is not readily available to the WWBWC, but may be available on the OWRD website.

11. **Is a 50% level of design required?** 50% level of design is no longer part of the BPA HIP process. The most recent HIP 4, version 5.2 states that designs at the following levels of development need to be submitted to the project sponsor for review by BPA oversight representation; 15%, 30%, 80% & Final design levels are required.

12. **Are there adjacent landowners that need to be considered?** Standard consultation review process requires review and approval from adjacent landowners bordering the project parcel.
13. Did any damage occur during recent flood events? Minimal detrimental effects in the reach as Couse Creek did not experience the magnitude of peaks flows experienced in adjacent waterways due to different watershed elevations and climatic conditions. Woody debris flows in the reach were not observed as it is suspected that a substantial log jam located upstream at an unspecified location may have captured mobile debris before it reached the project parcel. The wooden, low-profile walk bridge located approximately 200 feet upstream of the concrete barrier remained fully intact during the February 2020 floods, but some shifting of boulder bank protection can be observed near the bridge. The landowner expressed that water approached the base of the house more so during the 1996 flood, but no significant damages were incurred.

14. Is there any LiDAR available for the reach? The WWBWC is not aware of any existing LiDAR data for the project site.

15. What is the design team’s role in the consultation process? The design team is expected to coordinate with the WWBWC to solicit input in the process of developing and submitting permits, of which is ultimately the responsibility of the contractor. The contractor will be responsible for successfully providing all information directly to the entities responsible for reviewing and ultimately approving project development. This includes all standard and unexpected aspects required to successfully navigate through the consultation process to assure the project will be implemented during the in stream work period of 2021.

16. Section 2 of the RFP appears to be language that would apply to the construction contractor rather than the design firm, is that correct? Section 2 does apply to the design team. Section 2.12 expresses somewhat of an indirect condition that informs the design team of wage requirements that directly affect a construction cost estimate expected at the 30% design level. Other text is just standard construction BMP language.

17. Does the scope of work include fish screening compliance for an intake/diversion structure? Yes, final designs must include adherence to fish screening criteria designated for the location of the project site.

18. Can a list of firms that participated in the Couse Creek project site field tour conducted by WWBWC on March 30 be provided? The following firms participated in the field tour; WH Pacific Inc. (Mike Homza), Rio Applied Science and Engineering (Tim Hanrahan), and Resource Specialists, Inc. (Gabe Williams).