|  |
| --- |
| **WASHINGTON DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND WILDLIFE****SOLE SOURCE CONTRACT APPROVAL PROCESS FORM** |
| **Part 1 – Basic Information (Completed by Contracts/Purchasing Officer)** |
| 1.1 | Name of Contractor | Interfluve |
| 1.2 | WDFW Contract Number | 25-26642  |
| 1.3 | Maximum Amount | $200,000 |
| 1.4 | Date of Filing with DES | 03/13/2025 |
| 1.5 | Date when contract can be signed\* | 04/04/2025 |
| *\*DES requires 10 business days from filing date for review* |
| **Part 2 – WEBS Announcement (Completed by Contracts/Purchasing Officer)** |
| 2.1 | Date posted on WEBS | 03/13/2025 |
| 2.2 | WEBS Solicitation Number | 55153 |
| 2.3 | Responses? | TBD |
| **Part 3 – Agency Website Announcement (Completed by Contracts/Purchasing Officer)** |
| 3.1 | Date information provided to Kirsten | 03/07/2025 |
| 3.2 | Date of announcement  | 03/13/2025 |
| 3.3 | Responses? | TBD |
| **Part 4 – DES Sole Source Contract Justification (Completed by Project Manager)** |
| 4.1 | Specific Problem or Need – What is the business need or problem that requires this contract? |
| In 1999, LCR chum salmon populations were listed as threatened under the auspices of the Endangered Species Act. Of the 17 historic LCR chum salmon populations, 90% are considered extirpated or nearly so.The Lewis, Cowlitz and Sandy chum salmon populations are identified as the primary recovery populations within the Cascade strata of the LCR chum salmon ESU (NMFS 2013). De-listing requires at least two primary populations within each of the ESUs strata be “recovered”. Due to the low smolt-to-adult survival rates that LCR chum salmon experience, significant increases in freshwater productivity in this population will be necessary to achieve recovery plan goals. Lower Columbia River chum salmon’s current distribution is very limited, mostly in Washington, with 99% of the annual adult return concentrated in only three populations/areas: the Grays River, the Washougal (although these adults spawn in the mainstem Columbia River), and the lower Gorge (combination of spawning in the mainstem and tributaries of the Columbia River near Bonneville Dam). The combined recent 10 year average adult return for these three populations is less than 14,500 adults. Outside of these remaining three viable populations, average annual returns are estimated to range from zero to less than 100 adults annually. This includes the Cowlitz population, which historically would have had a huge component of the return, likely numbering in the tens of thousands of adults annually. Section 3.2.4 (page 3-31) of the LCR salmon recovery plan states "Chum habitats have been reduced by 75% or more for the majority of the populations by changes or loss of low elevation reaches and off-channel areas due to channel stabilization, loss of floodplain connectivity and function, and sedimentation due to land use activities throughout the entire watershed." This statement is especially true in the areas of the Cowlitz River basin that chum salmon would utilize. Additionally, there is a hydropower/flow regulation component on the river further reducing the creation of the productive side- and off-channel spawning habitat types that chum salmon prefer/need. This work will assess chum salmon spawning ground habitat in the Cowlitz River, by gathering existing population information, identify population specific limiting factors, and habitat evaluations. The contract with Interfluve is necessary to implement this need. |
| 4.2 | Sole Source Criteria: |
| 4.2.1 | Describe the unique features, qualifications, abilities or expertise of the contractor proposed for this sole source contract. |
| Interfluve is a unique contractor and specializes in watershed scale assessment, feasibility studies, site analysis and design for the potential creation of chum spawning channels. Interfluve is the only contractor that responded to our advertisement for statement for qualifications. Interfluve completed a recent (2011-2016) project with similar goals in the Lewis River in Washington that was highly successful. During the project Interfluve demonstrated their unique qualifications, abilities, and expertise. |
| 4.2.2 | What kind of market research did the agency conduct to conclude that alternative sources were inappropriate or unavailable? |
| WDFW advertised work need with an advertisement on the Seattle Journal of Commerce. Interfluve was the only contractor to respond with a statement of qualifications. Three other firms inquired but did not ultimately submit qualifications. |
| 4.2.3 | Provide a detailed and compelling description of the costs and risks mitigated by contracting with this contractor (i.e. learning curve, follow-up nature). |
| Contracting with Interfluve will result in significant cost savings and risk reductions for the State of Washington. The costs and risks associated with developing a Cowlitz chum assessment program (hiring/training/oversight of new State employees capable of effectively implementing this work would be very high. Use of a qualified contractor like Interfluve for this work is currently the most efficient way to implement this work while minimizing both cost and risk. Interfluve’s performance during a project on Lewis River in Washington was highly professional and there is very little risk associated with working with this contractor. |
| 4.2.4 | Is the agency proposing this sole source contract because of special circumstances such as confidential investigations, copyright restrictions, etc.? If so, please describe. |
| There are no special circumstances such as confidential investigations or copyright restrictions associated with this sole source contract.  |
| 4.2.5 | Is the agency proposing this sole source contract because of unavoidable, critical time delays or issues that prevented the agency from completing this acquisition using a competitive process? If so, please describe. For example, if time constraints are applicable, identify when the agency was on notice of the need for the goods and/or service, the entity that imposed the constraints, explain the authority of that entity to impose them, and provide the timelines which work must be accomplished. |
| WDFW is proposing this sole source contract because of the high-quality work and proven track record of Interfluve. Interfluve was also the only firm to completely respond to our request for qualifications. |
| 4.2.6 | Is the agency proposing this sole source contract because of a geographic limitation? If the proposed contractor is the only source available in the geographical area, state the basis for this conclusion and the rationale for limiting the size of the geographical area selected. |
| There is no geographic limitation associated with this sole source contract. The proposed contractor is the only qualified contractor currently offering this service in the Pacific Northwest that responded to our advertisement of request for qualifications. |
| 4.2.7 | What are the consequences of not having this sole source filing approved? Describe in detail the impact to the agency and to services it provides if this sole source filing is not approved. |
| Failure to approve this sole source filing will result in inability of the Washington Department of Fish to continue our recovery actions for ESA listed chum in the Cowlitz River. |
| 4.2.8 | What considerations were given to providing opportunities in this contract for small business, including but not limited to unbundling the goods and/or services acquired. |
| Other small businesses providing the required level of expertise are not available. The proposed project/contract is not able to be unbundled. |
| 4.2.9 | Response(s) to Posting on WEBS and/or Agency Website (Completed by Contracts/Purchasing Officer) |
|  |
| 4.3 | Reasonableness of Cost – Since competition was not used as the means for procurement, how did the agency conclude that the costs, fees, or rates negotiated are fair and reasonable. Please make a comparison with comparable contracts, use the results of a market survey, or employ some other appropriate means calculated to make such a determination. |
| This contract will result in significant cost savings for our agency. The contractor (Interfluve) has specialized equipment and highly trained staff that are able to complete this work need for a much lower cost than WDFW agency staff are capable of. Hiring, training, oversight of new State employees capable of effectively implementing this work would be very high. |
| 4.4 | Is this a Late Filing (i.e. services began, or goods were received prior to the expiration of the 10-business day filing period)? |
| No. |
| 4.4.1 | If yes, what was the reason for the late filing? |
|  |
| 4.4.2 | Explain how a similar late filing situation could be prevented in the future. |
|  |
| **Part 5 – DES Approval (Completed by Contracts/Purchasing Officer)** |
| 5.1 | Date of DES Response |  |
| 5.2 | Approved, Reviewed or Denied? |  |