



# Oregon State University

## Marine Operations Consultant: PacWave

**RFP #2026-021481**

### **ADDENDUM NO. 1**

ISSUE DATE: June 11, 2026

**CONTRACT ADMINISTRATOR:**

Ben Baggett, PacWave Contract Officer

**Construction Contracts Administration**

Email: [ConstructionContracts@oregonstate.edu](mailto:ConstructionContracts@oregonstate.edu)

This Addendum is hereby issued to inform you of the following revisions and or clarifications to the above-referenced RFP and/or the Contract Documents for the Project, to the extent they have been modified herein. Any conflict or inconsistency between this Addendum and the Solicitation Document or any previous addenda will be resolved in favor of this Addendum. Proposals shall conform to this Addendum. Unless specifically changed by this Addendum, all other requirements, terms and conditions of the Solicitation Document and or Contract Documents, and any previous addenda, remain unchanged and can be modified only in writing by OSU. The following changes are hereby made:

**MODIFICATIONS:**

Item 1 – Remove the 1<sup>st</sup> recital of the Sample Consultant’s Agreement referencing remotely operated vehicle.

Item 2 – Revise Section 7.12 ‘Negotiations’ subsection 7.12.2 to replace 7.12.2 reference with 7.12.1 reference.

Item 3 – Revise first page of RFP ‘RFP Due Date/Time’ to remove the ‘AM/PM’ and replace with ‘AM’

**QUESTIONS:**

Item 4 –

**Question:** Will all invoices be paid in \$ or is there scope to provide a quotation in another currency?

**Response:** All invoices and payments are in U.S. dollars (USD).

**Question:** If we have previously performed engineering work for a device developer testing at PacWave, would we be precluded from participating in Scope of Services Task E (Third-Party Verification Review)? Would this constitute a potential conflict of interest?

**Response:** In addition to following the existing conflicts of interest provisions stated in the Sample Consultant Agreement, OSU may consider additional measures to mitigate conflicts of interest between Consultant and device developers. It will be the responsibility of the Consultant to self-report to Owner any actual or potential conflicts of interests prior to performance of the work under this Agreement.

**Question:** The sample 'Consultant's Agreement – Marine Operations Consultant – PacWave South', RFP Number 2026-021481, reads: 'WHEREAS THE OWNER DESIRES to have the assistance of the Consultant to provide remotely operated vehicle survey services.' is not the subject of RFP 2026-021481. This sample agreement, however, was provided as an example of the agreement related to this RFP.

Given 'remotely operated vehicle survey services' is dramatically more involved in terms of personnel, equipment, onshore and offshore operations, associated hazards, and other industrial type activities, perhaps many of the requirements and conditions provided therein may not apply to this RFP 2026-021481.

**Response:** The recital referencing 'remotely operated vehicle survey services' is incorrect and is removed by this addendum. The remaining terms and conditions align with the Marine Operations Consultant scope of this RFP and will serve as the starting point for contract drafting and negotiations with an awarded consultant.

**Question:** If the sample 'Consultant's Agreement – Marine Operations Consultant – PacWave South', RFP Number 2026-021481 agreement differs in scope from Section 1.5 Scope of Services on page 3 of RFP 2026-021481, then do the Insurance Provisions detailed in Section VIII also differ? Specifically, the (A) Worker's Compensation, (B) Commercial General Liability, (C) Automobile Liability, (D) Professional Liability/Errors and Omissions, (E) "Tail Coverage", and (F) Certificate of Insurance. While I fully understand some level of insurance may be required, the scope of the Consultant as described in 'RFP 2026-021481 – Marine Operations Consultant: PacWave' does not involve industrial-type activities, time at sea, or other physical activities which may warrant such coverages, at least at the amounts provided in the example document.

**Response:** The insurance provisions in the Sample Consultant's Agreement are OSU's standard insurance provisions for consulting services and are aligned with the Marine Operations Consultant scope of this RFP.

The limits in the Sample Agreement are standard for all OSU contracts. OSU may consider Proposer requests to reduce limits, but the Proposer should not assume that such a request will be granted.

**Question:** Item 5.0 of 'RFP 2026-021481' states that the sample contract may contain notes or alternative provisions. Could the notes or provisions in the sample contract be clarified for the present RFP?

**Response:** Notes, if any, refer to internal notes for OSU internal use to assist in completing the contract drafting phase. Alternative provisions, if there are any, would refer to any provisions that may appear optional or pending on the results of the negotiations between Consultant and OSU.

**Question:** Item 7.8.4 of 'RFP 2026-021481' Workplan and Staff Availability. Does this apply to single-person firms, and how would the points be assigned in the Evaluation process? Could the confirmed availability of the single person suffice for this Criterion?

**Response:** Yes, this criterion equally applies to single person firms. Single-person firms will provide the information requested (i.e. availability of the single person) in this provision adjusted for a single person to perform the scope of services.

**Question:** Item 7.8.5 of 'RFP 2026-021481' involves a Workforce Diversity Plan and is worth 15 points in the Evaluation process. If the applicant is the sole employee of the applying business entity, is this condition applicable? Likewise, for other requirements which apply to firms larger than one person, are there exceptions for those programs for single-employee firms? If so, is there an adjustment towards the total points as stated in 7.8 'Evaluation Criteria' and 7.9 'Point Summary Table'?

**Response:** Yes, this criterion equally applies to single person firms. Points will not be deducted for limitations to Workforce Diversity Planning as a result of being a single person firm.

**Question:** Item 8.2 of 'RFP 2026-021481' regards Project Termination. While OSU reserves the right to terminate the Project or contract during any phase in the Project, there is no provision for the Consultant to terminate the relationship without implied repercussions. I believe this right to terminate should be reciprocal.

**Response:** See RFP Section 7.12.1 Any/all exceptions to the Term and Conditions included in the Sample Contract/Agreement shall be clearly identified and appended to the Proposal in order to be considered by OSU during the negotiation period.

**Question:** A note in 'RFP 2026-021481', 7.12.2, the last sentence should read '... Response pursuant to Section 7.12.1 above' instead of 7.12.2.

**Response:** Correct, reference to 7.12.2 is removed and replaced with 7.12.1 by this addendum.

**Question:** The RFP document appears to indicate that proposals are due on "24 June 2026 at 10:00 AM/PM Pacific Time (PT)," while the bid posting on [bid.oregonstate.edu](http://bid.oregonstate.edu) appears to show a different closing time. Please confirm the official proposal submission deadline, including the date, time, and applicable time zone.

**Response:** Official due date and time is as stated in the RFP document.

**Question:** How will OSU communicate addenda, clarifications, or revisions to the RFP to prospective offerors? Will addenda be posted through [bid.oregonstate.edu](http://bid.oregonstate.edu), and will each addendum include an identifying number, revision date, or other method for confirming that proposers are working from the current solicitation documents?

**Answer:** Yes, all official communications are by posted addenda at the OSU Business and Bid Opportunities website. It is the Offeror's responsibility to continue to monitor the [OSU Business and Bid Opportunities](http://OSU Business and Bid Opportunities) ([bid.oregonstate.edu](http://bid.oregonstate.edu)) website for Addenda. Failure to acknowledge any Addenda in the Transmittal Letter may cause your Proposal to be considered non-responsive.

**Question:** The sample consultant agreement includes insurance limits and provisions that appear consistent with broader construction, engineering, or design-professional engagements, including professional liability/E&O coverage and subconsultant coverage requirements. Because the Marine Operations Consultant role appears to be advisory in nature, will OSU consider adjusting or negotiating insurance requirements based on the final negotiated scope of services, risk profile, and whether the consultant is providing advisory review services rather than stamped engineering, construction, vessel operations, or field labor?

**Response:** See RFP Section 7.12.1 Any/all exceptions to the Term and Conditions included in the Sample Contract/Agreement shall be clearly identified and appended to the Proposal in order to be considered by OSU during the negotiation period. The limits in the Sample Agreement are standard for all OSU contracts. OSU may consider Proposer requests to reduce limits, but the Proposer should not assume that such a request will be granted.

**Question:** If the selected prime consultant uses named individual technical advisors or small specialist subconsultants who work under the prime consultant's project management, quality control, invoicing, and

professional liability structure, may the prime consultant's professional liability policy satisfy coverage requirements for their advisory work? Or must each individual advisor/subconsultant independently carry the insurance limits listed in the sample agreement?

**Response:** Subconsultant insurance requirements are stated in the Sample Consultant's Agreement. Each subconsultant is responsible for meeting those requirements.

**Question:** Please confirm whether OSU anticipates any deliverables under this Marine Operations Consultant scope to require stamped engineering by an Oregon-licensed Professional Engineer. If stamped engineering is not anticipated, should proposers structure their response as advisory review and operational assessment services rather than engineer-of-record or design-professional services?

**Response:** Consultant provided stamped engineering is not expected to occur during performance of work under this Agreement. Advisory review and operational assessment is appropriate.

**Question:** May proposers take exceptions to the sample agreement in their proposal, or must all requested changes be submitted as pre-proposal questions and addressed only through addenda or post-selection negotiation?

**Response:** See RFP Section 7.12.1. Any/all exceptions to the Term and Conditions included in the Sample Contract/Agreement shall be clearly identified and appended to the Proposal to be considered by OSU during the negotiation period.

**Question:** Does OSU anticipate negotiating contract terms with the selected proposer, including insurance limits, subconsultant coverage requirements, advisory-scope limitations, indemnity provisions, and other terms tied to the final scope of services?

**Response:** See RFP Section 7.12.1 Any/all exceptions to the Term and Conditions included in the Sample Contract/Agreement shall be clearly identified and appended to the Proposal in order to be considered by OSU during the negotiation period.

**Question:** Bonds / Proposal Security / Retainage Does OSU require proposal security, a performance bond, payment bond, retainage, or any other construction-style financial security for this Marine Operations Consultant agreement?

**Response:** No.

**Question:** Are there any DOE or other federal funding requirements not already reflected in the RFP or sample consultant agreement that the selected Marine Operations Consultant should plan for?

**Response:** The DOE flow-down requirements are listed in the Sample Agreement. Consultant is responsible to comply with all applicable federal, state, county, and local laws, ordinances, regulations, and all applicable OSU Standards and Policies applicable to the Services to be provided under this Agreement.

**Question:** Proposer specializes in supporting planning and execution of Installation, Operations, Maintenance, and Decommissioning activities for marine technology and test equipment. If awarded the PacWave Marine Operations Consultant contract, would there be limitations on the selected consultant being separately engaged by PacWave clients to support marine operations planning or execution outside of work performed directly for OSU/PacWave?

If direct engagement with PacWave clients is not automatically prohibited, what disclosure, consent, recusal, confidentiality, or information-firewall procedures would OSU expect the consultant to follow to avoid actual or apparent conflicts of interest?

**Response:** In addition to the existing conflicts of interest provisions stated in the Sample Consultant Agreement, OSU may consider additional measures to mitigate conflicts of interest between Consultant and device developers (i.e. Nondisclosure Agreements). It will be the responsibility of the Consultant to self-report to Owner any actual or potential conflicts of interest prior to performance of the work under this Agreement. Also refer to the Conflict of Interest provision in the Sample Consultant's Agreement.

**Question:** Are there any travel cost guidelines that need to be considered?

**Answer:** Yes, please review all travel related terms and conditions as provided in the Sample Consultant's Agreement.

**Question:** Will work be issued via task orders under a master agreement, or as continuous services? Are labor rates expected to remain fixed for the full contract term (including extensions)?

**Answer:** This is not a master contract. Work is to be performed as a continuous service for performance of all deliverables described in the statement (scope) of work at the contracted for labor rates for the full contract term. Owner will consider requests for changes to the Agreement – no changes are binding on the Owner or Consultant unless in writing and signed by the Parties as per the terms of the Agreement.

**Question:** What is the anticipated duration of future engagements, once the initial term has expired. Whilst not in any way contractual, it would be good to understand the intent of OSU.

**Answer:** We expect PacWave will be in operation for at least the next couple of decades. It is likely that some level of MOC support would continue to be required throughout this time.

**Question:** What is the anticipated amount of engagement or support required, either in terms of hours or a budget. Whilst we appreciate this may be undefined, an order of magnitude / non-binding guide would help us resource the project adequately with the right personnel. Is there a budget planned for contract extensions beyond the initial term?

**Answer:** The current provisional budget includes up to \$100,000 per year to cover services such as those included in the MOC scope.

**Question:** Will there be an intent to provide reasonable notice for when services are required. As a marine operator, key personnel may be offshore conducting operations and might not be available immediately. Understanding the requirements would be useful to help mitigate the effect of this.

**Answer:** We anticipate that most operations at PacWave will be planned well in advance. So, immediate availability of the MOC is not required. However, it would obviously be helpful to be able to call on the MOC's expertise in the event of an emergency.

**Question:** Is there an estimate of the potential annual contract value?

**Answer:** The current provisional budget includes up to \$100,000 per year to cover services such as those included in the MOC scope.

**Question:** Section 7.8.4 requires offerors to submit a work plan and schedule for the proposed work. Because the Marine Operations Consultant scope appears to be task-order/advisory in nature and dependent on future PacWave client activity, can OSU provide guidance on how offerors should structure the proposed work plan and schedule?

Does OSU have an anticipated annual level of effort, estimated number of hours, not-to-exceed budget range, or expected volume of support during the initial contract term?

Because proposed labor rates must account for overhead, profit, insurance, administrative burden, and anticipated utilization, any guidance regarding expected annual billable hours or budget range would assist proposers in developing realistic rates and staffing assumptions.

**Response:** The current provisional budget includes up to \$100,000 per year to cover services such as those included in the MOC scope. The work plan and schedule should be based on this budget and should assume two, one-week visits during the year to Newport, Oregon to observe and advise on operations.

**Question:** Does OSU anticipate the Marine Operations Consultant workload to be relatively steady throughout the year, or concentrated around specific events such as developer submittals, IOM&D reviews, deployment windows, maintenance periods, decommissioning planning, post-storm assessment, or incident-response activities?

**Response:** The weather window for offshore activity in Oregon is generally May through September. So peak activity would be expected between these months. However, planning activities will be occurring throughout the year, and we would be encouraging clients to provide documents for review outside of peak deployment periods. So, assume the workload is relatively steady throughout the year, but with an uptick over the deployment season.

**Question:** Are there expected response times for routine reviews, urgent operational questions, onsite observation requests, post-incident/post-storm support, or other time-sensitive advisory needs?

For example, should proposers assume routine response within several business days and urgent response within 24 hours, or will expectations be established task-by-task?

**Response:** Planning for deployments with testing clients is expected to occur over an extended period (18 months or more), so routine reviews by the MOC would likely be expected within a couple of weeks and the MOC should be aware that they are coming. Occasional urgent reviews may require responses within 24 hours, depending on availability.

**Question:** Does OSU anticipate that the Marine Operations Consultant may be asked to provide urgent, after-hours, weekend, or emergency advisory support related to active marine operations, post-storm events, equipment degradation, or incident response?

**Response:** This is not required but could obviously be of great value to PacWave.

**Question:** If so, may proposers include separate urgent-response or after-hours labor rates, and what authorization process should apply before such rates are used?

**Response:** While not required, please feel free to provide urgent response/after-hours rates and associated authorization processes.

**Question:** Should proposers identify committed availability for each key person, such as hours per week/month or percentage availability?

Or is it acceptable to describe availability by role and task area, given that the work appears to be task-order/advisory in nature?

**Response:** A description of availability by role and task area is acceptable.

**Question:** How often does OSU anticipate onsite support at PacWave facilities or related locations in Newport, Corvallis, or elsewhere?

Should proposers assume occasional onsite meetings/observations only, or should they plan for more frequent field engagement during active operations?

**Response:** Proposers should assume occasional onsite visits – for the purpose of the proposals, assume two, one-week visits during the year to Newport, Oregon to observe and advise on operations.

**Question:** Can OSU provide an estimated level of effort (hours/week or annual hours) for this contract? If unknown at this time, would hourly or lump sum day rates be acceptable for the proposed personnel?

**Response:** The estimated level of effort should be based on our current provisional budget of up to \$100,000 per year to cover the types of services included in the MOC scope.

**Question:** "What is the expected volume and frequency of key activities (e.g., IOM&D reviews, TPV reviews, decommissioning assessments)? Will work be steady, seasonal, or ad hoc/task-order based?"

**Response:** The weather window for offshore activity in Oregon is generally May through September. So peak activity would be expected between these months. However, planning activities will be occurring throughout the year, and we would be encouraging clients to provide documents for review outside of peak deployment periods. So, assume the workload is relatively steady throughout the year, but with an uptick over the deployment season.

**Question:** Will the Marine Offshore Consultant be expected to support real-time operations (on-call / rapid response) or scheduled advisory reviews?

**Response:** Generally, proposers should assume they will be involved in scheduled advisory reviews. While on-call support could be very valuable, it is not required under the current scope.

**Question:** Any offshore participation expected during this phase (e.g., site visits, trips to vessel)?

**Response:** Proposers should assume occasional onsite visits – for the purpose of the proposals, assume two, one-week visits – and these could involve observation of offshore activities.

**Question:** Which scope elements are highest priority in the first year (e.g., business model advisory, client plan reviews, SOP development vs. offshore costing review)?

**Response:** All of these will be important, but client plan and offshore costing reviews will likely be the highest priorities.

**Question:** Are there standard templates, formats, or required levels of detail for deliverables (e.g., risk assessments, TPV reviews, comment responses, etc.)? Are there preferred technical standards (e.g., DNV, IEC, ISO) for reviews?"

**Response:** All of these are TBD, but we would be looking to the MOC to advise on what is most appropriate based on industry best practices.

**Question:** Will the MOC provide formal recommendations or strictly advisory input? How will differences in opinion between MOC, clients, and TPV providers be resolved?

**Response:** The MOC will provide formal technical recommendations to OSU, which will be documented and considered as part of OSU's review and approval process. While PacWave clients remain responsible for the design, engineering, and execution of their marine operations, OSU is ultimately responsible for ensuring that all activities conducted at PacWave are performed safely and in compliance with applicable permits, regulatory requirements, and industry best practices, and therefore retains final authority regarding whether proposed operations may proceed. If differences of opinion arise between the MOC, a client, and/or a TPV provider, OSU will evaluate the technical basis for each position and may request additional information, analyses, risk assessments, or independent expert input as needed to reach a technically sound resolution that appropriately manages operational risk while supporting project objectives. Where consensus cannot be reached, OSU will make the final determination based on safety considerations, regulatory compliance obligations, permit requirements, and accepted industry standards.

**Question:** What data and documentation will be available (e.g., metocean data, prior reports, SOPs, asset designs)?

**Response:** If required, OSU can provide data and documentation such as metocean, geophysical & geotechnical data, reports, copies of SOPs etc. Non-Disclosure Agreements may need to be established in order to share client asset designs.

**Question:** Are there any known upcoming client projects or activities that will require support immediately after Notice to Proceed?

**Response:** PacWave currently has three clients expected to begin testing activities in 2027 or 2028. We also anticipate receiving a number of smaller project proposals that may require MOC review. As a result, we do not expect a significant immediate workload for the MOC following contract execution. Instead, the initial phase of engagement will likely focus on familiarizing the MOC with the PacWave facility, applicable permits, operational policies, procedures, and standard operating practices, allowing them to effectively support future project reviews and marine operations planning.

**Question:** Is there an anticipated number of simultaneous client projects the MOC will support at any given time?

**Response:** PacWave has five test berths in total: four at the PacWave South site and one at the PacWave North site. We currently have three clients expected to begin testing activities in 2027 or 2028 and anticipate receiving a number of smaller project proposals that may also require MOC review. In addition, we expect a steady pipeline of prospective clients progressing through the PacWave onboarding and project development process, which will likely involve periodic MOC input. However, the path from initial engagement to offshore testing at PacWave typically takes 18 months or longer, allowing project reviews and operational planning activities to be distributed over time. As a result, we anticipate a relatively steady demand for MOC services rather than multiple large-scale reviews occurring simultaneously.

**Question:** Can OSU provide an estimated frequency of:

- IOM&D plan reviews
- TPV reviews
- Decommissioning reviews
- Policy/SOP updates

**Response:**

IOM&D plan reviews:	4-5 per year
TPV reviews:	2-3 per year
Decommissioning reviews:	1-2 per year
Policy/SOP updates:	on going, but likely consolidated into a bi-annual review process

**Question:** Any plans to hold project team HAZIDs or HIRAs in advance of the offshore operations? Would this be held remotely or in person?

**Response:** Yes, we would expect there to be project team HAZIDs or HIRAs in advance of offshore operations. These would be hybrid meetings to encourage the highest level of participation.

**Question:** What does success look like after year one for this role?

**Response:** Success after the first year would include the development of a more robust and mature marine operations framework for PacWave, including enhanced policies, procedures, and operational guidance. We would also expect to have identified and established relationships with qualified marine service providers capable of

supporting critical activities such as device deployment, recovery, and connection to PacWave's subsea connectors. In addition, success would be demonstrated through the development of comprehensive IOM&D plans for the first clients' deployments, supported by thorough risk assessments, safety reviews, and operational planning that positions those projects for safe, efficient, and successful execution. Ultimately, we would expect the MOC to have become a trusted technical advisor who is fully integrated into PacWave's project review and marine operations planning processes.

**Question:** What are the biggest current operational risks or gaps PacWave is trying to address?

**Response:** Oregon State University has decades of experience planning and conducting complex marine operations in coastal and offshore environments through its internationally recognized oceanographic, marine engineering, and marine energy research programs. However, PacWave presents a unique set of challenges that extend beyond OSU's traditional experience, particularly with respect to the deployment, recovery, and offshore handling of large-scale wave energy converters and their associated mooring and electrical systems. As a result, OSU intends to rely on the Marine Operations Consultant (MOC), together with other subject matter experts, to help identify industry best practices, evaluate operational risks, and support the planning and execution of safe and effective testing activities.

One of PacWave's most complex and potentially highest-risk operations will be the offshore mating of a client's connector and umbilical system to PacWave's subsea cable and dry-mate connector. This activity will require coordination among multiple organizations and contractors, recovery of PacWave-owned subsea connectors and cable ends from the seafloor, medium-voltage electrical operations, specialized lifting and handling procedures, and the successful completion of the subsea connection before returning the equipment to the seabed. The operation involves both OSU-owned infrastructure and client-owned equipment, may require several days to complete, and will be highly dependent on weather, vessel capabilities, and offshore operational conditions. Given the technical complexity, number of stakeholders involved, and potential consequences of an error, this type of activity illustrates the value of engaging an experienced MOC to help ensure that planning, risk management, and execution are conducted in accordance with industry best practices.

**Question:** Are there opportunities for the MOC to support continuous improvement metrics or KPIs?

**Response:** Yes.

END OF ADDENDUM NO. 1