REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

Title: Dasic EcoSafe OSD toxicity relative to Corexit 9500A when applied to Alaska North Slope Oil in Prince William Sound marine conditions.

RFP Number: 9310.27.01

Project Manager: Naomi Tomco

Submittal Deadline: January 8, 2027

Award Announcement: February 26, 2027

Submit Proposals to:

Naomi Tomco, Project Manager
Prince William Sound Regional Citizens' Advisory Council
2525 Gambell Street Suite 305
Anchorage, AK 99503

or

via email at the following address:
naomi.tomco@pwsrcac.org

To verify receipt of proposal, proposer must contact Naomi Tomco before the submittal deadline.

Proposal submission requirements:

a. Proposals shall be submitted in electronic form in Adobe Portable Document format (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 ensure consideration, proposals must be received by the 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

PWSRCAC is inviting proposals for an investigation into the toxicity of the dispersant Dasic EcoSafe OSD in comparison to the formerly stockpiled dispersant Corexit 9500A when applied to Alaska North Slope (ANS) oil under environmentally realistic conditions. The proposal should consider toxic effects on one or more relevant species found within the Exxon Valdez oil spill (EVOS) region and the physical conditions (e.g., temperature and salinity) of the water in which they live. In addition to the toxicity of each dispersant, the effects of the dispersants mixed with ANS crude oil and ANS crude oil alone should be examined. Comparisons with Corexit 9500A and ANS crude oil may be based on direct laboratory comparisons or on historical studies, provided their relevance is well justified. The final report will compare the observable effective concentrations of these substances and their effects on one or more species living in the EVOS region. PWSRCAC has up to

$150,000 available for this project, with no more than $75,000 available to be invoiced before July 1, 2027.

ABOUT PWSRCAC

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

PWSRCAC was formed following the 1989 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 19 member organizations are communities impacted by the Exxon Valdez spill, as well as Alaska Native, commercial fishing, aquaculture, recreation, tourism, and environmental groups.

PWSRCAC was chartered as a nonprofit corporation by the State of Alaska on December 26, 1989. PWSRCAC is funded under a contract with Alyeska, and is federally mandated and certified as the alternative voluntary advisory group for Prince William Sound under the Oil Pollution Act of 1990 (OPA 90).

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

As of December 2025, Corexit 9500A is no longer an authorized dispersant in the United States. The manufacturer of Corexit 9500A discontinued its production, sale, and regulatory support of the product following amendments to the listing requirements under 40 CFR Part 300 Subpart J of the National Contingency Plan (NCP) by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). Therefore, existing stockpiles of Corexit 9500A in the United States, including the stockpile in Alaska available for use by Trans Alaska Pipeline System (TAPS) shippers, were replaced with new dispersants that meet the listing criteria of the EPA's NCP Product Schedule. In Alaska, this replacement is Dasic EcoSafe OSD, manufactured by Dasic USA, LLC. Scientific literature on Dasic EcoSafe OSD is currently limited compared to that on previously stockpiled dispersants. While Dasic EcoSafe OSD consists of four surfactants and two solvents, all of which are also found in Corexit 9500A, direct comparisons of ecotoxicity between Corexit 9500A and Dasic EcoSafe OSD cannot be made based on publicly available information due to changes in testing protocols for listing. Additionally, no data on the toxicity of Dasic EcoSafe OSD exists for mixtures with ANS oil, species that are present in Alaska marine environments, or water conditions (e.g., temperature, salinity) found in the EVOS region.

GOALS and DELIVERABLES

The goals of this project are to 1) assess the toxicity of Dasic EcoSafe OSD alone, mixed with ANS oil, and ANS oil alone to one or more marine species found in the EVOS region; and 2) compare the toxicity of the newly listed dispersant to Corexit 9500A, Corexit 9500A mixed with ANS oil, and ANS oil alone. The final scientific report will include exposure dose-response information for one or more regionally relevant species exposed to dispersants and dispersed oil, and it will contain an interpretation of those results in the context of understanding the potential impacts of oil spill countermeasures on the effects of spilled oil in the EVOS region.

DESCRIPTION of REQUESTED WORK

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

1. The contractor is responsible for procuring necessary quantities of Dasic EcoSafe OSD, Corexit 9500A, and ANS crude oil for this research.

2. The contractor will examine toxicity of Dasic EcoSafe OSD, Corexit 9500A, each dispersant mixed with ANS oil, and ANS oil alone to one or more relevant species within the EVOS region. Using historical studies for Corexit 9500A and ANS oil comparisons is acceptable provided that adequate justification and explanation of relevance are given.

   The contractor should identify one (or more) relevant species and life stage(s) based on their importance to ecosystems in the EVOS region; vulnerability to impacts from chemically dispersed spilled oil; sensitivity to oil, dispersants, and dispersed oil; availability for and amenability to laboratory toxicity testing; and availability of existing information. The contractor should have the capacity to house the target species and have all necessary approvals to collect, maintain, and conduct testing with organisms.

   Dispersant and dispersed oil exposure solutions should be generated using standard protocols (e.g., CROSERF). Other exposure regimens may be considered if they enhance environmental relevance without compromising comparability. Organism dosing levels should represent a range of environmentally realistic exposures, and exposures should be chemically characterized and quantified by measuring petroleum hydrocarbons and toxicologically relevant oil constituents (e.g., PAHs) in the water (nominal doses are not acceptable).

   Use of standard toxicity testing protocols, such as the acute and subchronic toxicity tests for NCP product schedule listing, is recommended to ensure comparability.

Other toxicity testing approaches may be considered if they enhance ecological relevance without compromising comparability.

Concentration-response curves or similar quantitative toxic effects data will be generated for each treatment and be statistically compared.

3. The contractor will provide brief progress reports to PWSRCAC at least monthly via telephone calls or emails. These updates should cover progress to date, challenges, work planned for the ensuing period, any schedule changes, budget status, and preliminary findings and recommendations when appropriate. See Progress Reports on page 9 of this document for specific details.

4. The contractor will write a draft report on the toxicity of Dasic EcoSafe OSD, Corexit 9500A, each dispersant mixed with ANS oil, and ANS oil alone. The goal of this report is to generate regionally relevant information about the effects of Dasic EcoSafe OSD and determine if the newly listed dispersant is comparable to, or significantly more or less toxic to, one or more EVOS region species than the previously stockpiled Corexit 9500A, for which a substantial amount of information is available. The report should provide insight into the potential effects of using Dasic EcoSafe OSD in response to a spill in Alaskan waters and the relevance of published literature on Corexit 9500A to the newly stockpiled dispersant. The contractor should provide recommendations for further ecotoxicological studies of dispersants that may be relevant to the region. The report must be suitable for public release and contain the following sections:

    - Title page - Include the name of the report, date, name of contractor, and the PWSRCAC contract number. The title page should also include the following language, “The opinions expressed in this PWSRCAC commissioned report are not necessarily those of PWSRCAC.”

- Executive summary - This one-page summary should be prepared with policymakers in mind, specifically the following audiences: the staff and volunteers of PWSRCAC, staff from Alyeska Pipeline Service Company, and state and federal regulators – none of whom are experts in the field of environmental chemistry or marine toxicology.
- Introduction
- Methods
- Results and Discussion
- Conclusions and Recommendations
- References and Bibliography- Any documents cited in the report should be listed under references, and any documents recommended for supplemental reading should be listed under the bibliography. A bibliography is not required.

The draft report would then undergo a round of review, questions, and comments, pertaining to its content and organization, by PWSRCAC staff and volunteers from its Scientific Advisory Committee. The contractor would be expected to meet with the PWSRCAC via videoconference to receive questions and comments on the draft report, and the PWSRCAC would provide the contractor with detailed comments in writing. The contractor would consider implementing received comments into the next version of the report.

5. The contractor will revise the draft report, based on comments received from PWSRCAC, and submit a final report to PWSRCAC. The contractor would meet, via videoconference, with PWSRCAC staff and volunteers from its Scientific Advisory Committee to address comments and questions regarding the final report. Following that videoconference, the final report will be subject to a copyedit review by PWSRCAC's Director of Communications. The copyedit suggestions would be

provided in writing to the contractor, and the contractor is expected to consider implementing received copyedit suggestions into an updated version of the final report. The final report would then be provided to PWSRCAC's Board of Directors for their final review and comments, and acceptance of the report as meeting the terms of the contract for this project.

6. The selected contractor would prepare and deliver a summary presentation (approximately 15 minutes long plus any questions and answers) to the PWSRCAC Board of Directors via videoconference. The purpose of this presentation is to provide an overview of the final summary report, highlight critical conclusions, and discuss recommendations identified by the contractor, such that the Board of Directors can understand and decide which recommendation(s) they might endorse and recommend action to be taken by Alyeska and state or federal regulators. This meeting will also be the venue wherein the Board of Directors will decide to accept the final report and any technical supplements from the contractor as meeting the terms of the contract and being suitable for public release.

Schedule and Completion Date.

Award Announcement: **February 26, 2027**

Draft report: April 1, 2028

Draft final report: May 16, 2028

Final report: June 15, 2028

Presentation to the Board: September 21-22, 2028

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.

Progress Reports. Progress reports shall be submitted to the Council project manager at least monthly via telephone call or email, as described in the scope of work. Progress reports should address the following, as applicable:

a. Progress to date;

b. Identification of any difficulties encountered in accomplishing the work;

c. Work planned for the ensuing period;

d. Any schedule changes;

e. Budget status; and

f. Preliminary findings and recommendations, when appropriate.

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 Microsoft Word format, and data in Excel or Access. In addition, the final report shall be submitted in a portable document format (PDF) version. 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 in Microsoft Access or Excel to PWSRCAC.

Oral Report. The contractor will be asked to deliver an oral presentation to the PWSRCAC Board of Directors via videoconference upon completion of the work, as described in the scope of 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 email address 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.

Page Limit. Proposals should be between 10 and 15 pages, excluding the cover sheet, resumes, and budget forms.

Introduction. This section shall include the RFP title and number, and a 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.

Conflict of Interest. Describe all financial, business, or personal ties the contractor has to Alyeska Pipeline Service Company or members of the Alyeska consortium, or any Prince William Sound oil tanker contingency plan holder, 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 ensure 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) **Conflicts of Interest.** 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's 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 the selected contractor(s) to refine the proposal to achieve a contract that fully satisfies PWSRCAC's needs.

C. Professional Services Contract. A copy of PWSRCAC's standard professional services contract form can be found at https://www.pwsrcac.org/document/sample-professional-services-agreement/ 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 Annual Report