



REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

Title	Escort Tug Best Available Technology Review
LRFP Number	8010.12.1
Project Manager	Alan Sorum
Submittal Deadline	September 25, 2012
Award Announcement	October 25, 2012

Submit Proposals to:

**Alan Sorum Maritime Operations Project Manager
Prince William Sound Regional Citizens' Advisory Council
Post Office Box 3089
Valdez, Alaska 99686**

or

via email at the following address:
alan.sorum@pwsrca.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.

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

RFP# 8010.12.01

Form revised 3/2010

Page 1 of 10

- 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 conduct a Prince William Sound Escort Tug Analysis. The final work product of this effort is a report detailing the consultant's professional opinion regarding what would be the best available tugboat in the primary and secondary escort roles.

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).

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 Prince William Sound Regional Citizens' Advisory Council (PWSRCAC) is charged with advising the TAPS tanker trade to employ the best available technology possible in order to minimize, to the greatest extent possible, the risk of oil spills in Prince William Sound. According to the 2007 Prince William Sound Tanker Owners/Operators Vessel Escort and Response Plan (VERP) "At least two escort vessels are required for each laden tanker transiting Prince William Sound. The Primary Escort vessel will be a Prince William Sound Class (ETT) or a Prevention and Response Class (PRT) tug...The second escort may be any other vessel listed in Table 4-1.¹ PWSRCAC is seeking consultants knowledgeable with tug capabilities and tanker/ship escorting operations in conditions similar to those encountered within Prince William Sound, Alaska.

The VERP requires a tugboat capable of ocean escort and rescue service be stationed at the Hinchinbrook Entrance to Prince William Sound. This tugboat serves as a sentinel escort for tankers transiting in or out of the Gulf of Alaska to 17 miles off of Cape Hinchinbrook. Tugboats in the PWS fleet identified for this role are the ETT, PRT and Theriot class vessels. The Gulf of Alaska is known for its extreme weather. Laden tankers are allowed to enter Hinchinbrook Entrance in any weather, while outbound laden tankers are not allowed to transit when winds exceed 45 knots or seas are higher than 15 feet.

Currently, the Prince William Sound Tanker Escort System, managed by Alyeska's Ship Escort Response Vessels System (SERVS), utilizes 10 tugs which are normally comprised of a mix of two Voith Schneider propulsion tractor tugs (Enhanced Tractor Tug, ETT's), three Azimuth drive (Z-drive) tractor tugs (Prevention and Response Tugs, PRT's), and five conventional tugs. Currently there is a Voith Schneider propelled tug temporarily filling in for a conventional tug in the fleet that is out of service. These tugs serve as both prevention escort tugs for the Trans-Alaska pipeline system (TAPS) trade tankers and also

¹ Table 4-1 lists Invader, Theriot or Utility Class tugs as potential secondary escort vessels.

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

as response tugs in the event of an oil spill. The approved escort configuration for each laden TAPS tanker consists of a primary tug, which is tethered to the tanker for part of the escort, and an additional secondary tug, usually a PRT. The State of Alaska approved contingency plan allows for either the PRT or ETT to serve in the primary tug role and the PRT, ETT or conventional tug (twin screw or Kort Nozzle) to serve in the secondary tug role. Please see the attached report titled "Tanker Escort System Report to the Board of the PWSRCAC" for more information on the prevention and response duties of the SERVS tug fleet.

If a tanker becomes disabled and calls the primary and secondary tugs for assistance, the primary tug is expected to arrest or make the "save" of a disabled tanker, while the secondary tug is used to tow the tanker once the save is achieved. This escort configuration is considered Best Available Technology by the State of Alaska.

Best Available Technology

Alaska Statute 46.04.030(e) directs oil discharge and contingency plans to use the best technology that was available at the time the contingency plan was submitted or renewed. The Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation (ADEC) is required to review and appraise technologies used to meet response planning standards every five years at an agency sponsored technology conference (BAT Conference) to be held every five years (18 AAC 75.447). The last BAT Conference was held in 2004 and escort tugboat capability was not a technology selected for further review at the event.

Evaluations of existing and alternative technology are typically conducted using the following criteria:

1. Availability – Is the technology the best in use in other similar situations?
2. Transferability – Can the technology be used in this situation?
3. Effectiveness – Is it reasonable to expect the technology to provide a benefit?
4. Cost – What is the cost of achieving BAT and how many years of service remain with the technology currently being used?
5. Age and Condition – What is the condition of currently used technology relative to use of similar equipment in current or past practice?
6. Compatibility – Is the technology compatible with current operations?
7. Feasibility – Is it feasible to use this technology from an engineering and operational perspective?
8. Environmental Impacts – Does use of the technology offset environmental impacts posed by its use?

Prince William Sound Escort Tugboat Capability

The capabilities of the vessels used within the Prince William Sound Tanker Escort System have long been of interest to the PWSRCAC. Past research projects have included the Council's participation in SAFETUG II and a study by DNV evaluating the effective escort notations of the ETT and PRT vessels. One goal of the Council has been to use data developed through these efforts to establish a baseline that could be used in comparisons made to other available escort tugboats to help determine what would constitute best available technology.

GOALS and DELIVERABLES

PWSRCAC is seeking expert advice from a consultant knowledgeable with tug capabilities and tanker/ship towing operations to provide an analysis of the capabilities of the PRT, ETT and conventional tugs with evaluation criteria similar to that utilized by the ADEC to determine what constitutes best available technology and then using a similar approach, compare currently used escort tugboat technology with alternatives identified by the consultant.

DESCRIPTION of REQUESTED WORK

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

1. Consultant shall conduct a survey of technology and vessel builds now available for escort tugboats and shall take into consideration relevant materials and references, current research, results from past Council studies and their best professional judgment to provide an analysis of this technology with the eight criteria used by the ADEC to evaluate what constitutes best available technology.
2. Consultant shall take into consideration relevant materials and references, current research, results from past Council studies and their best professional judgment to provide an analysis of the technology used in the Invader, Theriot, Utility, Protector, PWS and PRT Class escort vessels as listed in Table 4.1 of the VERP with the eight criteria used by the ADEC to evaluate what constitutes best available technology.
3. Consultant will construct a matrix detailing each of the eight criteria used by the ADEC to evaluate what constitutes best available technology for current escort tugboats and alternatives identified by the consultant.

4. Using the information developed from items shown above, the consultant shall provide a written professional opinion regarding what would constitute:
 - a. The best available tug (state-of-the-art) for the primary escort role;
 - b. The best available tug (state-of-the-art) for the secondary escort role;
 - c. Determine if there should be a different standard for what constitutes the best available tug (state-of-the-art) for the primary escort role in service of 9,000 DWT class tankers.
5. Consultant will provide a written professional opinion regarding what would constitute the best available tug (state-of-the-art) for the Hinchinbrook sentinel role as an additive alternate to their proposal submission.

Schedule and Completion Date

Award Announcement: October 25, 2012

Final Report Due: March 5, 2013

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;

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

- 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?

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

- 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