



REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

Title	Facilitating the Dispersants Use Position Update
LRFP Number	955.21.02
Project Manager	Betsi Oliver
Submittal Deadline	July 19, 2021
Award Announcement	by August 30, 2021

Submit Proposals to:

Betsi Oliver, PWSRCAC Project Manager
Prince William Sound Regional Citizens' Advisory Council
3709 Spenard Rd. Ste 100
Anchorage, AK 99508

or

via email at the following address:

betsi.oliver@PWSRCAC.org

To verify receipt of proposal, proposer must contact **Betsi Oliver** 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 support its Board of Directors to make an informed decision regarding updating or possibly changing its 2006 position on the use of chemical dispersants, and to generate supporting documents. An experienced expert in facilitating the translation of science into organizational position is sought. The final work product of this effort is a report documenting the Council's position on the use of chemical dispersants and a document listing supporting talking points.

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 Council has thorough resources on the current state of dispersant science, compiled by comprehensively reviewing peer reviewed studies and participating in professional conferences such as Arctic Marine Oilspill Program technical seminar and the International Oil Spill Conference. The intention of this project is not to repeat those efforts, but to *manage the synthesis of available data into a useable format for staff and the Board and to assist the Board in reviewing and potentially updating its dispersant position.*

This request is to solicit a contractor to guide the Board through considering the numerous data and the impacts of possible positions the Council could adopt regarding the use of dispersants in our region. There are three basic categories of documents that will need to be considered in this effort: peer reviewed research about dispersants (and summaries thereof), already collated by the Council; the Council's official position and supplemental documents related to the use of dispersants in our region; and the regulatory framework and planning for the use of dispersants in our region.

The current Board position on the use of dispersants was adopted in 2006. The position and its supporting documents can be found here:

<https://www.pwsrcac.org/programs/environmental-monitoring/dispersants/>.

Specifically, the Contractor is asked to review the 2006 Board position and, at a minimum, the supplemental 2006 dispersant position paper approved by the Council's Scientific Advisory Committee, and a 2013 paper providing further background on why the Council does not support the use of chemical dispersants.

The contractor will then prepare a report that presents possible positions the Council could adopt regarding the use of dispersants in our region. The contractor will work with staff to educate the Board of Directors and relevant committees on the implications of various positions and facilitate the Board to adopt a formal position. Once a position has been adopted, the contractor will then create supporting materials that provide talking points related to the selected position. The position and supporting materials will be used to facilitate the Council's conversations with legislators and regulators on long-term policy decisions and with spill response teams, such as Unified Command, in the case of an incident.

GOALS and DELIVERABLES

The intention of this project is to integrate the myriad data on dispersants available since the last Council position was adopted in 2006. With fifteen additional years of research, in particular with the heavy focus on dispersants after Deepwater Horizon, it's timely to revisit the position and consider revising, changing, or reaffirming it in accordance with current best available science. *PWSRCAC already has a completed review of peer reviewed studies related to dispersants available for the contractor to work from*, as well as additional materials related to the application of dispersants as it would apply to the region of the Exxon Valdez oil spill. The contractor will comprehensively review provided materials, as well as current policy and plans for the state/region, and also integrate external resources as needed.

Goal: PWSRCAC promotes defensible spill prevention and response planning policies and procedures that are in the best interest of its stakeholders.

Objective 1: The Board of Directors approves and adopts a position on Dispersant Use in the Exxon Valdez oil spill region (Prince William Sound and

downstream waters) that incorporates best available current science and considers the potential efficacy and impacts of dispersant use in the region.

Objective 2: Board and staff are equipped with supporting materials based on best available research to defend and promote its position with legislators and regulators on long-term policy decisions and with spill response teams, such as Unified Command, in the case of an incident.

Deliverables:

- An initial report that incorporates science and policy review and presents possible positions the Council could adopt regarding the use of dispersants in our region. This will require discussion of the following:
 - The complex current science on dispersants, weighing the efficacy and impacts (such as toxicity) of dispersants, especially in the waters of our region, and in different locations and seasons;
 - Review of the current existing regulatory framework for applying dispersants in our region in plain language; and
 - Which dispersants are authorized/available for use in Alaska and what is known about them.
- Strategically facilitate conversations, presentations, learning opportunities, and discussions about the data and possible positions. Guide the Board of Directors to adopting a formal position on dispersant use in the Council's region. This could include, but is not limited to:
 - Organizing and hosting a workshop of approximately 3 hours with various key data and perspectives on dispersants presented by a panel, and facilitated Q&A.

- Meeting with the Project Team, the Scientific Advisory Committee, and the Board, as layers of decision makers within the organization, to present the initial report and facilitate conversation moving towards consensus.
- Soliciting and incorporating perspectives from nineteen Board members and ensuring all members' opinions are adequately represented. Strategically managing differing opinions and guiding the group towards consensus, as possible.
- Working with the Board through working groups, executive sessions, and/or public meetings to bring the body to an adopted position.
- Please see the suggested timeline, below, for an estimated workflow. We encourage proposals to include a suggested workflow for meetings and facilitation to reach a position based on the proposer's expertise and experience with this kind of process.
- A final report that incorporates the initial report and expands on why the final position was adopted by the Council.
- Supporting materials for the adopted position that facilitate interactions with legislators and regulators in long-term policy decisions and with spill response teams, such as Unified Command, in the case of an incident. These should be brief, consisting a few pages of bulleted highlights, and refer to the more comprehensive materials for further investigation. Supporting materials should include, in addition to the science highlights, a brief introduction to the unique historical and environmental context of the region.

DESCRIPTION of REQUESTED WORK

Scope of Work. We are interested in proposals that include a recommended scope of work and timeline based on the expertise of the proposer in facilitating this kind of process. Our anticipated scope looks as follows:

1. **Review** research, reports, plans, policies, and other relevant materials to establishing a comprehensive understanding of the current state of dispersant science – efficacy and impacts – especially as it relates to the waters of the Exxon Valdez oil spill region. Much of the literature to review will be provided by PWSRCAC and includes, but not limited to, the dispersant literature reviews available at: <https://www.pwsrcac.org/programs/environmental-monitoring/dispersants/dispersant-literature-reviews/>. The following Council-generated work should also be included in this review:
 - [May 3, 2006 Council Dispersant Use Position Statement.](#)
 - [April 26, 2006 Scientific Advisory Committee Dispersant Position paper.](#)
 - [November 2013 Council paper Why PWSRCAC Does not Support the Use of Chemical Dispersants.](#)
 - [July 2016 Prince William Sound Dispersants Monitoring Protocol: Implementation and Enhancement of SMART \(Special Monitoring of Applied Response Technologies\).](#)
2. **Write initial report** that summarizes the literature and regulatory framework and presents possible positions the Council could adopt related to the use of dispersants in the region.

3. **Present initial report** to committee(s).
4. **Organize education efforts**, including:
 - a. Virtual workshop of approximately 3 hours with key data and perspectives on dispersants presented by a panel and facilitated Q&A.
 - b. Additional educational meetings or presentations, as necessary.

Note: please budget for all workshops and meetings to be virtual.

5. **Solicit input** from all Board members and ensure all perspectives are given adequate attention.
6. **Facilitate conversations and integrate differing opinions**, working towards consensus on a position.
7. **Refine** possible position statements as needed.
8. **Present to Board** via executive session(s) and/or public meeting(s) to facilitate adoption of position.
9. **Revise report** with additional information and explanation related to the position that has been adopted.
10. **Draft supporting materials**, consisting of a few pages of bulleted highlights that provide talking points justifying the adopted position. Supporting materials should include, in addition to the science highlights, a brief introduction to the unique historical and environmental context of the region.
11. **Present report and supporting materials** to committee(s) and staff for review.
12. **Finalize** report and supporting materials, incorporating any edits/suggestions.

Schedule* and Completion Date

Award Announcement: by August 30, 2021

November 2021: Initial report due

November 2021 – March 2022: Host workshop, present at meetings, and solicit Board input to educate and refine position option(s)

May 2022: Present position at Board meeting for vote

June 2022: Final report due; Draft of supporting materials due for comment

September 2022: Final draft of supporting materials due

January 2023: Present final report and supporting material at Board meeting for acceptance

*Note: We are interested in proposals that include a recommended scope of work and timeline based on the expertise of the proposer in facilitating this kind of process.

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. We are interested in proposals that include a recommended scope of work and timeline based on the expertise of the proposer in facilitating this kind of process. Describe in detail the methods to be used and how they will produce the deliverables.

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. Please note that Council staff will be available and heavily invested in the group facilitation aspect of this project to help guide successful citizen engagement, in accordance with the Council's mission.

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. Workshops and meetings can be attended virtually, without travel.

Statement of Qualifications. Describe, relevant to the proposed work, previous work experience, related 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. Areas of particular interest for this project include:

- Experience translating complex science into policy or organizational positions.
- Experience guiding a group through a policy-making process.
- Experience facilitating decision-making processes related to environmental management.
- Experience building group consensus around political or scientific topics.

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

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

RFP# 955.21.02

Form revised 4/5/2021

Page 17 of 17