



REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

Title	<i>Development of a Comprehensive Dispersant Monitoring Protocol</i>
RFP Number	962.12.01
Project Manager	Joe Banta
Submittal Deadline	January 10, 2012
Award Announcement	Mid-January 2012

Submit Proposals to:

Joe Banta PWSRCAC Project Manager
Prince William Sound Regional Citizens' Advisory Council
3709 Spenard Road Suite 100
Anchorage, AK 99503

or

via email at the following address:
banta@pwsrcac.org

To verify receipt of proposal, proposer must contact **Joe Banta** before the submittal deadline.

Proposal submission requirements:

- a. Proposals shall be submitted in electronic form in Adobe Portable Document form (PDF) (Acrobat 7.0 or later). The PDF file for the proposal itself shall be created directly from the authoring application. It is permissible but not preferred for appendices and other attachments to the proposal to be submitted in scanned PDF format.
- b. To assure consideration, proposals must be received by Prince William Sound Regional Citizens' Advisory Council (PWSRCAC) by the deadline. Proposals

Citizens promoting environmentally safe operation of the Alyeska terminal and associated tankers

received after the deadline may be considered but only if they can be accommodated by PWSRCAC's review process. Additional information provided after the deadline may also be considered but only if such information can be accommodated by the review process.

Inquiries regarding this request for proposals shall be directed to the project manager named above via email.

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

The Prince William Sound Regional Citizens' Advisory Council (PWSRCAC) is inviting proposals for a project to review current dispersant monitoring information and prepare a comprehensive monitoring protocol for evaluating dispersants effectiveness and potential impacts. The final work product of this effort is a report that will summarize identified gaps in the current dispersant monitoring programs and provide a protocol that PWSRCAC can use for sampling prior to dispersant application as well as during and after application. PWSRCAC has up to \$50,000 available for this project.

ABOUT PWSRCAC

MISSION STATEMENT: Citizens promoting environmentally safe operation of the Alyeska terminal and associated tankers.

PWSRCAC was formed following the Exxon Valdez oil spill to advise Alyeska Pipeline Service Company and the public on issues related to oil spill prevention and response and mitigating the environmental impacts of terminal and tanker operations. PWSRCAC also advises oil shippers, regulatory agencies and elected officials on these issues.

PWSRCAC's membership comprises communities affected by the Exxon Valdez oil spill and interest groups with a stake in safe oil transportation in the region. PWSRCAC's 19 member organizations are communities and boroughs impacted by the 1989 Exxon Valdez Oil Spill, as well as Native, commercial fishing, aquaculture, recreation, tourism and environmental representatives.

PWSRCAC was chartered as a non-profit corporation by the State of Alaska on December 26, 1989. PWSRCAC is funded under a contract with Alyeska, and is certified as the alternative voluntary advisory group for Prince William Sound under the Oil Pollution Act of 1990 (OPA90).

Citizens promoting environmentally safe operation of the Alyeska terminal and associated tankers

Please note: All of PWSRCAC's products and the products resulting from contracts are considered public information. Proposals and work plans may be distributed throughout the organization for review and comment. Proprietary information should not be submitted in any proposal. PWSRCAC will not knowingly reveal the contents of a proposal that is not subsequently accepted for contract; however, PWSRCAC accepts no liability should such contents inadvertently be revealed to third parties.

1. PROJECT

INTRODUCTION

It has been the general consensus of PWSRCAC that the current dispersant monitoring programs are missing some critical aspects; therefore the goal of this project will be to create a review of these monitoring programs and relative information, as well as an all-encompassing protocol to use for dispersant monitoring.

PWSRCAC is interested in consolidating and evaluating the reviews of the current Special Monitoring of Applied Response Technologies (SMART) monitoring process, as well as other dispersant testing protocols and available information. A goal of this part of this project is to summarize the beneficial and the disadvantageous parts of the current dispersant monitoring systems, and to identify gaps in the monitoring process. This review would also include recommendations of what the best technology is for determining dispersants effectiveness as well as adverse effects to the biota and ecosystems. This would serve as background knowledge for the next step, creating a protocol that PWSRCAC could use in the event of a spill.

GOALS and DELIVERABLES

This project has two phases that each require two separate methodologies: those used for testing an area of a spill before dispersants are applied as well as those methods for testing the effectiveness and potential impacts after they are applied. These two methodologies should be included and discussed in the following two phases of the project. The first phase is a literature review on current dispersant monitoring methods and knowledge, and the second phase is creating a monitoring protocol that can be used through the process of dispersant use in a potential oil spill in the Prince William Sound region.

Part one of this project will consist of a literature review that will consolidate information available on monitoring for dispersant use before they are applied as well as monitoring for their effectiveness and side effects after they are applied.

Citizens promoting environmentally safe operation of the Alyeska terminal and associated tankers

This review should build on the 2003 report "Review of Monitoring Protocols for Dispersant Effectiveness" that was prepared by Merv Fingas for PWSRCAC, as well as other reports or reviews of the SMART protocol, other protocols and other monitoring methods. Using current information and any other applicable sources, this review will help identify the most important aspects to focus on when monitoring, the gaps in the existing knowledge base, the current best technologies available for monitoring and other important material on dispersant monitoring.

Phase two of this project will be to create a monitoring protocol. This monitoring protocol would include monitoring that is done before dispersants are applied in a spill as well as monitoring for effectiveness and impact during and after a spill. A component of this monitoring protocol should be designed to aid in determining whether dispersant use is beneficial for the location, considering the biota and ecosystem and potential nondispersant and dispersant effects. A protocol that associated potential side effects with biota and ecosystem functions from non-dispersed, physically, and chemically dispersed oil, would be a beneficial tool to have available in the event of a spill. Any other pre monitoring aspects that could be advantageous in making a better educated decision on the best approach for dispersant application would also be beneficial to this project.

In regards to monitoring for effectiveness and side effects during a spill best technology and methods should be identified in the literature review to aid in this protocol. Current concerns include: the lack of monitoring for biota in the SMART monitoring system, the limited monitoring focus of SMART system ("are dispersants effective in dispersing the oil" rather than "are dispersants serving to protect human or natural resources?") and the questionable validity of data collected from fluorimeters that are the bases of data collection in the current monitoring system.

DESCRIPTION of REQUESTED WORK

Scope of Work. The scope of work shall include, but is not limited to the following:

1. The first phase will be a literature review of available information on dispersant monitoring including pre and post application aspects.

This report will include and identify:

- Current information about monitoring dispersants

- Gaps and strengths in the current monitoring protocols and procedures
 - Important aspects to monitor and the timing for these aspects in dispersant applications
 - Pre-application factors that can help decide whether to apply dispersants
 - How biota should be part of the monitoring process, and how best to monitor this aspect
 - Current information on the effectiveness of common dispersants in conditions found in the Prince William Sound
 - Other information relevant in the review and improvement of dispersant monitoring.
2. The second phase of this project is to create a monitoring protocol that PWSRCAC can use to provide useful information on when, if and how it is most beneficial to apply dispersants and then how to monitor their effectiveness after they have been applied. This field monitoring protocol should take into account both pre-dispersant application and post application monitoring criteria, to create a monitoring protocol for the whole dispersant application process.

Pre-Dispersant Application Monitoring Criteria to consider:

- Weather/wave action in the area (are conditions acceptable for dispersant application and effectiveness)
- Salinity and water temperatures (are they in a range where a dispersant maybe effective)
- Assessment of biota in area (testing for plankton as well as assessment for birds, mammals and fish)
- Aspects that are important to consider for the Prince William Sound

Post Application criteria to monitor effectiveness and side effects

- Best method for monitoring the effectiveness of dispersants that have been applied
- Assess the biota, and how they are being affected by the dispersant and dispersant oil mixtures
- Aspects that are important to consider for the Prince William Sound

Schedule and Completion Date

Award Announcement: Mid-January, 2012

The final report due date: May 1, 2012

Citizens promoting environmentally safe operation of the Alyeska terminal and associated tankers

2. GENERAL REQUIREMENTS

PWSRCAC Costs. PWSRCAC is not liable for any costs incurred by the proposer during the proposal preparation.

Single Point of Contact. The contractor will designate one person as the project manager and point of contact with PWSRCAC. In the case of multiple investigators, one shall be designated as the lead to serve as the project manager and point of contact.

Subcontracts. Proposers may subcontract minor portions of the contract. However, the proposer must have the major elements of expertise in house and demonstrate the ability to manage the subcontractor.

Schedule. Progress reports shall be submitted to the contract manager upon completion of each phase described in the scope of work. At a minimum, progress reports shall include:

- a. An introduction;
- b. An overview of progress to date;
- c. Identification of any difficulties encountered in accomplishing the work;
- d. A schedule for completion of the remaining tasks; and
- e. Specific recommendations concerning the matters addressed.

Final Report. The contractor shall submit a written final report. The final written report shall include an executive summary and be of a professional quality suitable for release.

The Final report must be submitted in an electronic file in PC format on a CD-ROM in MSWord, and data in Excel or Access. In addition, the final report shall be submitted on CD-ROM in a portable document format (pdf) version optimized for web viewing and created directly from the authoring application using Adobe Acrobat 7.0 or later. Project maps, photos or other graphics shall be included as part of the digital submittal in a common graphic format. Any data or collection of information resulting from work done under the contract is the property of PWSRCAC and shall be submitted either on diskette and CD-ROM in Microsoft Access or Excel to PWSRCAC.

Oral Report. The contractor may be asked to deliver an oral presentation at a council meeting upon completion of the work.

Final Payment. A portion of the total payment to the contractor will be withheld until all requirements are met. No interest will be paid on any withheld payments.

3. REQUIRED PROPOSAL CONTENTS

Any submitted proposal shall include the following as appropriate to the requirements of the scope of work:

Cover Sheet

- Name, address, telephone number and facsimile number of proposer.
- RFP Title and Number
- Name of Principal Consultant(s)
- Cost of Proposal

Table of Contents. May include a list of Tables and Figures if appropriate.

Introduction. This section shall include the RFP title and number, brief general discussion of the problem and the proposed project. Scientific and technical terms shall be clearly defined and a list of pertinent enclosures included.

Goals and Deliverables. Describe how the proposer intends to address the specific goals and provide the deliverables of the work requested, as listed above.

Materials and Methods. Describe in detail the methods to be used and how they will produce the deliverables. Cite references and provide background information where applicable and as needed.

Project Duration and Work Schedule. Describe the schedule in which the proposed work will be completed. Include specific milestones, work phase completion dates and the timing of progress reports. Indicate what will be achieved by the completion of each milestone or phase of work.

Management Scheme. Clearly describe how the work will be managed including the role of each key individual expected to be involved in the work. Provide names and resumes of each. This section should also include information on how the scope, time and costs of the project will be controlled.

Budget. Include information about the total costs (cited in U.S. Dollars), professional fees, expenses and contingencies. In case of overhead rates or administrative fees, give percent of direct personnel cost. Provide a breakdown of hours per individual and rates per individual. If subcontractors are used, indicate the percentage of work to be performed by each subcontractor with respect to the entire proposed scope of work.

Consultant/Contractual Services. Indicate if, how, and why a subcontractor will be used for any portion of the work.

Logistics and On-Site Visits. Describe logistics and schedules for all travel in conjunction with the proposed work.

Statement of Qualifications. Describe, relevant to the proposed work, previous work experience, related technical accomplishments and educational background of each of the principal investigators and subcontractors if used. If multiple investigators are involved, describe the role of each individual.

References. The names, contact persons, and telephone numbers of firms for which the respondent recently performed services shall be included. A minimum of three such references is suggested.

Conflict of Interest. Describe all financial, business or personal ties contractor has to Alyeska Pipeline Service Company or members of the Alyeska consortium, excluding normal commercial purchases of petroleum products.

4. SUBMITTAL AND EVALUATION PROCESS

A. Evaluation Criteria. Proposals will be evaluated based on, but not limited to, the following:

- 1) **Proposal Format.** Does the proposal follow the requested format?
- 2) **Proposed Scope of Work.** Does the proposal clearly address the requested scope of work?
- 3) **Technical Approach.** Is the proposed approach to the scope of work technically feasible?

- 4) **Qualifications.** Does the principal investigator possess expertise and experience to assure successful completion of the scope of work?
- 5) **Management Scheme.** Will the proposed management scheme reasonably lead to successful development of the deliverables?
- 6) **Schedule.** Is the proposed schedule for completion of the scope of work in accordance with the requested project duration and schedule?
- 7) **Deliverables.** Are the proposed deliverables in accordance with the deliverables requested in the scope of work?
- 8) **References and Conflicts of Interest.** Does a reference check indicate proposer has the potential to successfully complete the proposed scope of work? If conflicts of interest are stated, are they sufficiently relevant to preclude an offer to perform the work for PWSRCAC?
- 9) **Budget and Cost Justification.** Is the budget reasonable and adequate for the work proposed? Does the budget provide good value for the funds requested?

B. Contract Award. The successful proposal will be the one that, in PWSRCAC sole opinion, best meets the needs as outlined in this RFP. In the event that PWSRCAC determines that no proposal completely meets all of the needs as outlined in the RFP, PWSRCAC shall have the option not to accept any proposal or enter into any contract whatsoever. In the alternative, PWSRCAC may select the proposal or proposals that, in its sole view, most nearly conform to its needs as outlined in this RFP; and then negotiate directly with that contractor to refine the proposal to achieve a contract that fully satisfies PWSRCAC needs.

C. Professional Services Contract. A copy of PWSRCAC's standard professional services contract form can be found at <http://www.pwsrcac.org/docs/d0022500.pdf> or can be made available upon request.

D. PWSRCAC Information. The following information about PWSRCAC is available upon request to the project manager:

- PWSRCAC/Alyeska Contract
- PWSRCAC Bylaws
- PWSRCAC Observer Newsletter
- PWSRCAC Brochure
- PWSRCAC Annual Report

Citizens promoting environmentally safe operation of the Alyeska terminal and associated tankers