



REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

Title: Prince William Sound Vessel Traffic Service Best Available
Technology Review

LRFP Number: 8040.19.01

Project Manager: Alan Sorum

Submittal Deadline: September 20, 2019

Award Announcement: October 25, 2019

Submit Proposals to:

Alan Sorum - PWSRCAC Project Manager
Prince William Sound Regional Citizens' Advisory Council
Post Office Box 3089
130 South Meals, Suite 202
Valdez, Alaska 99686

or

via email at the following address:
alan.sorum@pwsrcac.org

To verify receipt of proposal, proposer must contact Alan Sorum 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 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 what constitutes best available technology in the field of vessel traffic control, conduct a survey of Prince William Sound (PWS) Vessel Traffic Service (VTS) stakeholders and develop recommendations for potential improvements to the PWS VTS. The final work product of this effort is a report detailing results of the study that reflect the project's stated goals and objectives.

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 18 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).

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

The U.S. Coast Guard (USCG) operates 12 Vessel Traffic Service (VTS) facilities across the country. Personnel at these facilities use surveillance and communications systems to reduce vessel collisions, allisions and groundings. Prince William Sound (PWS) has a VTS established

primarily to ensure the safe transportation of crude oil from the Valdez Marine Terminal to the Gulf of Alaska.

This project will review what constitutes best available technology in the field of vessel traffic control, conduct a survey of PWS VTS stakeholders and develop recommendations for potential improvements to the PWS VTS.

Interest in the USCG VTS system by the National Transportation Safety Board (NTSB) began in 1972, in response to an accident with the Arizona Standard and Oregon Standard that spilled 800,000 gallons of oil. These vessels belonging to the Standard Oil Company collided in San Francisco Bay, near the Golden Gate Bridge in heavy fog. The current VTS system was put into place in 1973 as a response to this accident. Over the years, the NTSB has made several recommendations supporting the use of the VTS system.

On September 13, 2016, the NTSB adopted their report titled “An Assessment of the Effectiveness of the US Coast Guard Vessel Traffic Service System.” The agency looked at accident, vessel movement and data from the USCG VTS Center. VTS watch standers were interviewed and site visits were conducted. The NTSB had several safety concerns with the operation of the national VTS system.

Most of the recommendations from the NTSB are focused on improvements that could be made to Coast Guard procedures and watch standers training. The only industry related recommendation asks that they work with the Coast Guard to determine the feasibility and benefits of having professional mariner representation on the watch floor of each VTS center.

GOALS and DELIVERABLES

The project will be finished upon completion of a final report and recommendation letter that will be provided to industry and regulatory agencies. Information developed through this

research will continue to build the body of work accomplished by the Council in the field of marine safety.

DESCRIPTION of REQUESTED WORK

Scope of Work. Effective and proactive operation of the Valdez VTS Center is vital to ensuring the safe transportation of crude oil through Prince William Sound. Reinforcing and building on the work conducted by the NTSB will help develop a better understanding by VTS users of the problems and issues that can affect their operational marine safety. Providing the Coast Guard with informed feedback on their operations will ultimately improve marine safety in the Sound.

At a minimum, the project scope of work will include these elements:

- Standards and Guidelines – International Association of Marine Aids to Navigation and Lighthouse Authorities, International Maritime Organization/Safety of Life at Sea Convention, and United States Coast Guard.
- Equipment Technology – Vessel location, Communications, Data Management, Operational Procedures and Personnel Training.
- Case Studies – Review of exemplary vessel traffic systems around the world including those with tanker traffic and prepare a comparison to the PWS VTS.
- Stakeholder Survey – Identify PWS VTS stakeholders and solicit feedback from them on the use of the system.

This project will provide, but is not limited to the following deliverables:

- A. Review the technology currently being used and available for operation of vessel traffic systems globally that would be considered Best Available Technology (BAT). The evaluation will consider relevant materials and references, current research and results from past related studies in its formation.
- B. Develop a set of criteria to evaluate what constitutes the best available technology for operation of vessel traffic systems.

- C. Identify key stakeholders in Prince William Sound (PWS) that use the PWS VTS Center.
- D. Develop a survey instrument for PWS VTS users that can provide feedback to the Coast Guard on ways to improve its PWS operations.
- E. Prepare a concise summary of recommendations coming from the BAT review and user feedback for improvements that could be made by the Coast Guard to the PWS VTS system.
- F. Solicit cooperation of the PWS VTS Center in outreach efforts with PWS VTS users.
- G. Ascertain potential future avenues of research and outreach.
- H. A final report of findings that the Council will share with its stakeholders in Prince William Sound.

Schedule and Completion Date

Submittal Deadline: September 20, 2019
Award Announcement: October 25, 2019
Final Report Completed: February 21, 2020

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 in MSWord, and data in Excel or Access. In addition, the final report shall be submitted 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 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

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

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/wp-content/uploads/filebase/newsroom/rfps/professional_services_agreement.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