

Request for Proposals

Developing Borough and Census Area (BCA)-level Regional Economic Models for Southwest Alaska Fisheries



Issue date: August 24, 2016

Schedule/Instructions/ Provision/Clauses

DEADLINE FOR PROPOSALS: September 28, 2016

Developing Borough and Census Area (BCA)-level Regional Economic Models for Southwest Alaska Fisheries Request for Proposals

Table of Contents

SECTION 1: PROPOSED REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS (RFP) SCHEDULE	3
SECTION 2: DESCRIPTION/SPECIFICATIONS/WORK STATEMENT	4
2.1 PROBLEM STATEMENT	4
2.2 PROJECT OBJECTIVES	4
2.3 RESEARCH METHODS	4
2.4 TASKS, TIMELINES, DELIVERABLES	5
2.5 BUDGET AVAILABLE.....	6
SECTION 3: INSTRUCTIONS, CONDITIONS, AND NOTICES TO PROPOSERS.....	7
3.1 QUESTIONS.....	7
3.2 NOTICE OF INTENT	7
3.3 AMENDMENTS TO SOLICITATIONS	7
3.4 SUBMISSION, MODIFICATION REVISION, AND WITHDRAWAL OF PROPOSALS.....	7
3.5 PROPOSAL EVALUATION	9
3.6 CONTRACT AWARD	10
3.7 SPECIAL CONTRACT AWARD REQUIREMENTS	11

SECTION 1: PROPOSED REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS (RFP) SCHEDULE

Developing Borough and Census Area (BCA)-level Regional Economic Models for Southwest Alaska Fisheries

- 24 August 2016 Requests for Proposals (RFP) distributed and posted at:
<http://www.psmfc.org/procurements/blog>
- 9 September 2016 Deadline for Notice of Intent and written questions on RFP
Notice of Intent and written questions should be directed to:
- Please notify PSMFC if your firm intends to respond to this RFP. Your notification should be sent via email to marredondo@psmfc.org.
 - After this date, proposals will not be accepted from vendors who did not express intent.
- 14 September 2016 Answers to written questions posted on PSMFC website:
<http://www.psmfc.org/procurements/blog>
- 28 September 2016 Deadline for proposals
One (1) electronic copy to:
Michael Arredondo
205 SE Spokane Street, Suite 100
Portland, OR 97202
Email: marredondo@psmfc.org
- Tentative Schedule:
- 29 Sept. – 3 Oct. 2016 Proposal Review
- 3 Oct. 2016 Select Contractor

SECTION 2: DESCRIPTION/SPECIFICATIONS/WORK STATEMENT

2.1 PROBLEM STATEMENT

Most regional economic models developed for North Pacific fisheries are designed to depict either the whole state (i.e., Alaska) or an administrative region (e.g., the Southeast region). While these models are well suited to calculate the impacts of fishery management actions on relatively large regions, they may not as accurately represent impacts on smaller, fishing-dependent areas such as boroughs, census areas or “fishing communities”. Therefore, results from these large models may be less useful for fishery managers, policy makers and other parties interested in illustrating impacts on specific communities, especially ones with very unique economic structures. No existing study has yet developed models designed to estimate impacts on individual fishing-dependent communities in Alaska. Recently, Alaska Fisheries Science Center (AFSC) collected regional economic information (such as employment and expenditures) for six boroughs and census areas (BCAs) in Southwest (SW) Alaska region from fish harvesting vessels and key informants including seafood processors and local businesses. The six BCAs include Aleutians East Borough; Aleutians West Census Area; Bristol Bay Borough; Dillingham Census Area; Lake and Peninsula Borough; and Kodiak Borough. The goal of this project is to (i) construct datasets [i.e., social accounting matrices (SAMs)] which are needed to develop regional economic models for SW fisheries and (ii) develop regional economic models that can be used to calculate BCA-level economic impacts of fishery management actions.

2.2 PROJECT OBJECTIVES

The first objective of the proposed project is to (i) develop a SAM for each of the six BCAs and (ii) develop a multi-regional SAM (MRSAM) for each of the six BCAs. Five regions will be specified in each of the six MRSAMs: a BCA in SW, rest of SW (RSW), rest of Alaska (RAK), West Coast (WC), and rest of US (RUS). The second objective is to develop single-region and multi-regional economic models including SAM models and computable general equilibrium (CGE) models using the SAMs and MRSAMs. In developing the SAMs/ MRSAMs, the contractor will need to combine non-seafood data from IMPLAN with seafood industries’ data from the surveys and interviews recently completed. Results from these models will be useful for fishery managers and others who are interested in understanding the economic impacts of fishery management actions or exogenous shocks (such as climate change) on fishing dependent communities in SW region and other regions.

2.3 RESEARCH METHODS

Developing a SAM is a very important first step to develop a regional economic model. The contractor will develop (i) a SAM for each of the six BCAs and (ii) an MRSAM for each of the six BCAs. In addition, the contractor will develop single-region and multi-regional economic models including SAM models and computable general equilibrium (CGE) models using these SAMs / MRSAMs.

The information needed to develop BCA-level models includes (i) IMPLAN data, (ii) landings data by port or

community in the BCAs, (iii) data on expenditures by harvesters and fish processors for the BCAs, and (iv) indicators of linkages among harvesters, processors and local input suppliers. IMPLAN provides the local-level regional economic data needed as the foundation for BCA-level models. However data for the seafood sector in IMPLAN is generally not considered reliable.

Recently, Alaska Fisheries Science Center (AFSC) collected regional economic information (such as employment and expenditures) for the six BCAs from fish harvesting vessels and key informants including seafood processors and local businesses. The regional economic data collected also include information on the geographical distribution of expenditures and employment for (i) fishing vessels making landings in SW Alaska ports, (ii) shoreside processors in SW Alaska, and (iii) local suppliers selling inputs to the fishing vessels and processors in SW Alaska.

Therefore, the contractor will derive the production functions for the six different vessel sectors (Trawlers, Hook and Line vessels, Groundfish Pot vessels, Crabbers, Salmon, and Other Vessels) using the survey data collected from the seafood industries, and replace the production functions in IMPLAN with the survey-based production functions. IMPLAN data on sales by input suppliers to the seafood sectors needs to be calibrated using the collected data [data element (iii) above]. Total revenues will be estimated using data on ex-vessel and first wholesale values available from existing sources (CFEC, AKFIN). These data combined with the basic regional economic structure for each BCA from IMPLAN will be used to develop the datasets (i.e., SAMs) and regional economic models mentioned above. Once the single region SAMs and the MRSAMs are developed, the contractor will develop regional economic models including single-region and multi-regional SAM models and CGE models. Chang Seung at AFSC will assist in developing CGE models. The regional models will specify six different fish harvesting sectors (industries) using the vessel survey data and other data. The six different fish harvesting sectors include Trawlers, Hook and Line vessels, Groundfish Pot vessels, Crabbers, Salmon, and Other Vessels.

In developing the multi-regional models, the contractor will use the information on the geographical distribution of vessel / processor expenditures obtained from the surveys and interviews in order to estimate the flows of goods and services among these areas / regions for seafood industries, as well as the interregional trade information for non-seafood industries available from IMPLAN.

The models will be used to calculate impacts of relevant fisheries management actions or exogenous shocks (such as climate change) on particular BCAs. The resulting models will provide more accurate and targeted measures of impacts for fishery managers, policy makers and other parties interested in understanding the effects of fishery policies and environmental shocks on fishing dependent communities in Alaska and in other regions.

2.4 TASKS, TIMELINES, DELIVERABLES

The tasks to be completed in this project include developing (i) six SAMs for the six BCAs and (ii) six MRSAMs for six BCAs where regions for each of the six MRSAMs include a BCA in SW, rest of SW (RSW),

rest of Alaska (RAK), West Coast (WC), and rest of US (RUS). For each single-region SAM, the contractor will develop a single-region SAM model and a CGE model. For each MRSAM, the contractor will develop a MRSAM model and a MRCGE model. Thus, the total number of models that the contractor will develop will be 24 models (6 SAM models, 6 MRSAM models, 6 single-region CGE models, and 6 MRCGE models).

In addition, the contractor will conduct simulation experiments with the models, document the results, and write journal papers with the PI. When performing all these tasks, the contractor will work closely with the NMFS PI. In particular, the PI will assist in developing the CGE models.

Project output will include (i) twelve SAMs (six single region SAMs and six MRSAMs), (ii) 24 regional economic models, (iii) results from simulation experiments, (iv) a project report, and (v) several journal papers. Results from these models will be useful for fishery managers and others who are interested in understanding the economic impacts of fishery management actions or exogenous shocks (such as climate change) on fishing dependent communities in SW region and other regions in US.

The contractor will have two years to complete all tasks and deliverables.

Table 1 Tasks

Task Number	Description
Development of SAMs	
1	Derive production functions for vessel sectors
2	Develop six BCA-level SAMs
3	Develop an MRSAM for each of six BCAs. An MRSAM will have five regions: a BCA, RSW, RAK, WC, and RUS.
Development of SAM Models	
4	Develop six BCA-level SAM models
5	Develop a five-region MRSAM model for each BCA
Development of CGE Models	
6	Develop six BCA-level CGE models
7	Develop a five-region MRCGE model for each BCA
Other	
8	Conduct simulation experiments
9	Prepare project report and journal papers

2.5 BUDGET AVAILABLE

PSMFC has budgeted \$158,564 for this work.

SECTION 3: INSTRUCTIONS, CONDITIONS, AND NOTICES TO PROPOSERS

3.1 QUESTIONS

Questions regarding this RFP shall be submitted in writing no later than 9 September 2016 to:

Michael Arredondo
205 SE Spokane Street, Suite 100
Portland, OR 97202
Email: marredondo@psmfc.org

3.2 NOTICE OF INTENT

If your organization is interested in submitting a proposal, please send an email by 9 September 2016 to marredondo@psmfc.org, notifying PSMFC of your intent to submit a proposal. Your “reply to” address will be added to an email list of interested vendors. This list will be used to notify interested vendors of any modifications to this RFP.

3.3 AMENDMENTS TO SOLICITATIONS

If this solicitation is amended, all terms and conditions that are not amended remain unchanged. Proposers shall acknowledge receipt of any amendment to this solicitation in Proposer’s cover letter.

3.4 SUBMISSION, MODIFICATION REVISION, AND WITHDRAWAL OF PROPOSALS

3.4.1 Deadline for proposals is 28 September 2016

3.4.2 Proposals by electronic copy must be submitted to:

Attn: Michael Arredondo
205 SE Spokane Street, Suite 100
Portland, OR 97202
Email: marredondo@psmfc.org

3.4.3 Proposals and modifications to proposals may be submitted via electronic copy in PDF or MS Word format.

3.4.4 PSMFC reserves the right to consult with and to consider information from its own sources, including information from state and federal agencies regarding the proposer’s prior performance or the status of outstanding investigations or warrants involving the proposer.

3.4.5 Proposers are responsible for submitting proposals, and any modification of revisions, so as to reach PSMFC by 4:00 p.m. Pacific time on 28 September 2016.

3.4.6 Late proposals

3.4.6.1 Any proposal, modification, or revision at the PSMFC office designated in the solicitation after the exact time specified for receipt to offers is “late” and will not be considered unless it is received before award is made, the PSMFC Fiscal Manager determines that accepting the late offer would not unduly delay the acquisition; and

3.4.6.2 There is acceptable evidence to establish that it was received at the PSMFC installation designation for receipt of offers and was under the PSMFC’s control prior to the time set for receipt to offers; or

3.4.6.3 It is the only proposal received.

3.4.6.4 However, a late modification of an otherwise successful proposal that makes its terms more favorable to the PSMFC will be considered at any time it is received and may be accepted.

3.4.6.5 Acceptable evidence to establish time of receipt at the PSMFC installation includes the time/date stamp of that installation on the proposal wrapper, other documentary evidence of receipt maintained by the installation, or oral testimony or statements of PSMFC personnel.

3.4.6.6 If an emergency or unanticipated event interrupts normal PSMFC processes so that proposals cannot be received at the office designated for receipt of proposals by the exact time specified in the solicitation, and urgent PSMFC requirements preclude amendment of the solicitation, the time specified for receipt of proposals will be deemed to be extended to the same time of day specified in the solicitation on the first work day on which normal PSMFC processes resume.

3.4.6.7 Proposals may be withdrawn by written notice received at any time before award. Proposals may be withdrawn in person by an offer or an authorized representative, if the identity of the person requesting withdrawal is established and the person signs a receipt for the proposal before award.

3.4.7 Proposers shall submit proposals in response to this solicitation in English and in U.S. dollars.

3.4.8 Proposers may submit modifications to their proposals at any time before the solicitation closing date and time, and may submit modifications in response to an amendment, or to correct a mistake at any time before award.

3.4.9 Proposers may submit revised proposals only if requested or allowed by PSMFC.

3.4.10 Proposals may be withdrawn at any time before award. Withdrawals are effective upon receipt of notice by the Fiscal Manager.

3.4.11 Each Proposal must state that it is a firm offer which may be accepted within a period of ninety (90) days. Although the contract is expected to be awarded prior to that time, the ninety day period is requested in order to allow for unforeseeable delays.

3.4.12 Proposer shall submit the name, address, and telephone number of the person(s) with the authority to bind the firm, as well as to answer questions or provide clarification concerning the firm's proposal.

3.4.13 PSMFC is not liable for any costs incurred by vendors/contractors in developing or submitting their response to this RFP.

3.5 PROPOSAL EVALUATION

3.5.1 General. All proposals received in accordance with these RFP instructions will be evaluated to determine if they are complete and meet the requirements specified in this RFP. An award will be made to the Proposer whose offer is judged to be the most advantageous to PSMFC. PSMFC expressly reserves the right to reject any and all proposals and make no award under this RFP, or to negotiate separately with competing vendors.

3.5.2 Process. All Proposals received in accordance with these RFP instructions will be reviewed, analyzed, evaluated and scored in accordance with the criteria described below. If needed, additional information may be requested from one or more Proposers. Interviews will be conducted with the top scoring Proposers. Following the initial interview, review will be conducted by PSMFC staff. Selections will then be made for a second round of interviews, if necessary.

3.5.3 Request for additional information. During the evaluation period, PSMFC may request additional information in order to fairly evaluate a Proposer's offer. If such information is required, the Proposer will be notified in writing (or by email) and will be permitted a reasonable period of time to respond.

3.5.4 Evaluation Criteria. The proposal will be weighted based on the following items (100 percent total):

1. Familiarity with Alaska fisheries (20 percent)
2. Familiarity and experience with developing and balancing SAMs with seafood industry data from surveys (single region SAMs and MRSAMs). (30 percent)

3. Familiarity and experience with developing SAM models for fisheries including Alaska fisheries (single region and multi-region models) (10 percent).
4. Familiarity and experience with developing CGE models for fisheries including Alaska fisheries (single region and multi-region models) (30 percent).
5. Itemized Budget/Cost: This includes detailed costs for performing the tasks above (10 percent).

In your proposal, please address each of these items. Non-response of any item will lead to that element receiving 0 of the total percentage points. The length of the proposal with the descriptions of these items should not exceed three pages. If necessary, you can attach an abbreviated CV that provides information supporting your descriptions of the above items. The content within the CV will not count against the three pages allowed for the proposal.

3.6 CONTRACT AWARD

3.6.1 All qualified proposals will be evaluated and an award will be made to the firm whose combination of qualifications, cost and technical offers is deemed to be in the best interest of PSMFC.

3.6.2 The PSMFC may reject any or all of the proposals if such action is in the PSMFC's interest.

3.6.3 The PSMFC may waive informalities and minor irregularities in proposals received.

3.6.4 The PSMFC reserves the right to make an award on any item for a quantity less than a quantity offered, at the unit cost or price offered, unless the offer specifies otherwise in the proposal.

3.6.5 The PSMFC reserves the right to make multiple awards if, after considering the additional administrative cost, it is in the PSMFC's best interest to do so.

3.6.6 Exchanges with proposers after receipt of a proposal do not constitute a rejection or counteroffer by the PSMFC.

3.6.7 The PSMFC may determine that a proposal is unacceptable if the prices proposed are materially unbalanced between line items or subline items. Unbalanced prices exist when, despite an acceptable total evaluated price, the price of one or more contract line items is significantly overstated or understated as indicated by the application of cost or price analysis techniques. A proposal may be rejected if the PSMFC Fiscal Manager determines that the lack of balances poses an unacceptable risk to the PSMFC.

3.6.8 If a cost realism analysis is performed, cost realism may be considered by the source selection authority in evaluating performance or schedule risk.

3.6.9 The PSMFC may disclose the following information in post award debriefings to other

proposers:

3.6.9.1 The overall evaluated cost of price and technical rating of the successful proposer;

3.6.9.2 The overall ranking of all proposers, when any ranking was developed by the agency during source selection; and

3.6.9.3 A summary of the rationale for award.

3.7 SPECIAL CONTRACT AWARD REQUIREMENTS

3.7.1 Conflict of Interest

The Proposer warrants that, to the best of the Proposer's knowledge and belief, there are no relevant facts or circumstances which could give rise to an organizational conflict of interest, as defined in the Federal Acquisition Regulations (FAR) Subpart 9.5, or that the Proposer has disclosed all such relevant information.

The Proposer agrees that if an actual or potential organizational conflict of interest is discovered after award, the Proposer will make full disclosure in writing to the PSMFC Fiscal Manager. This disclosure shall include a description of actions that the Proposer has taken or proposes to take, after consultation with the PSMFC Fiscal Manager, to avoid, mitigate, or neutralize the actual or potential conflict.

Remedies – The PSMFC Fiscal Manager may terminate the contract for convenience, in whole or in part, if it deems such termination necessary to avoid an organizational conflict of interest. If the Proposer was aware of a potential organizational conflict of interest prior to award or discovered an actual or potential conflict after award and did not disclose or misrepresented relevant information to the PSMFC Fiscal Manager, PSMFC may terminate the contract for default, debar the Proposer from PSMFC contracting, or pursue such other remedies as may be permitted by law.

The Proposer further agrees to insert provisions that shall conform substantially to the language of this clause, including this paragraph, in any subcontract, personnel agreement, or consultant agreement hereunder.

3.7.2 Indemnification

Contractor shall indemnify and hold harmless PSMFC and its officers, agents, employees, boards and commissions, against any and all loss, damages, liability, claims, suits, costs and expense whatsoever, including reasonable attorney's fees, regardless of the merits or outcome of any such claim or suit arising from or in any manner connected to Proposer's negligent performance

of services provided or work conducted as a result of this RFP.