April 28, 1995

RE: Interim Proposal Bid Review Meeting for the WIPP Part B Permit Application, Response to Questions

Dear RFP Participant:

NMED appreciates the thoroughness and scope of the questions from all the participants at the meeting on April 19, 1995. This response to questions document will be sent to all participants at the meeting and to anyone who requested a copy of the RFP Information Packet.

The deadline for submitting proposals for professional services to NMED has been extended fifteen (15) calendar days until Thursday, May 25, 1995, at 4:00 pm MDT. Likewise, the notice of proposed award(s) will be June 26, 1995.

This response document provides answers to all questions raised either at the April 19 meeting or to written questions submitted prior to 5:00 pm April 21. NMED will no longer respond to technical questions for the duration of the solicitation period, with the exception of clarifying potential conflicts of interest. Direct all other questions either to Steve Zappe or myself at (505) 827-4308.

Sincerely,

Barbara Hoditschek, RCRA Permits Program Manager
Hazardous and Radioactive Materials Bureau

Enclosures:

Attachment A - Responses to Questions at the Interim Proposal Bid Review Meeting
Attachment B - Responses to Written Questions
Attachment C - RFP Mailing List
Attachment D - Sign-in Sheet for Interim Proposal Bid Review Meeting
Attachment E - WIPP Reading Room List
Attachment F - Limits under the New Mexico Tort Claims Act
Attachment G - Current Contract Brief
Attachment H - Example Invoice
Responses to questions raised at the Interim Proposal Bid Review Meeting, Wednesday, April 19, 1995.

1. "Please provide a list of all potential bidders."

NMED Response: Attachment C is the mailing list (sorted by zip code) for every request for the RFP information packet received by NMED as of 4/26/95. Included on this list is an indication of whether a representative of the company attended the meeting on April 19, 1995, or if the company has informed NMED that it will not bid on this project. Attachment D is a copy of the sign-in sheet for the April 19 meeting.

2. "Please provide a list of locations where previous DOE WIPP RCRA applications may be reviewed."

NMED Response: Attachment E is the list of all WIPP Reading Rooms excerpted from a WIPP Fact Sheet provided by DOE.

3. "Will previous experience at WIPP be considered a plus?"

NMED Response: NMED will evaluate all previous technical RCRA experience, including WIPP-related RCRA experience, using the criteria in sections 2.a.1 and 2.a.2 of the Proposal Evaluation Criteria.

4. "The Conflict of Interest form on page 2c of the information package appears to have a typographical error in the first sentence."

NMED Response: The first sentence has been corrected to read "The Contractor warrants that it does not hold any other contract...," and a revised Conflict of Interest form has been included as a miscellaneous attachment.

5. "What sort of contract structure is NMED looking for?"

NMED Response: NMED expects a fee schedule proposal. The final contract will follow the contract structure included in the RFP information packet.

6. "Please provide an estimated budget, as alluded to on the Proposal Evaluation Criteria, 4.c., page 3e."

NMED Response: NMED's budget will be based upon the selected bidder's submittal of costs. Criteria 4.c., "Project within estimated budget (7 points)"", will be used to rank all bidders from low bid (7 points) to high bid (zero points). No estimated budget will be provided to bidders.

7. "Please clarify whether evaluation criteria 4.b. and 4.c. on page 3e will be applied. How are overhead and administrative costs to be described in the bid?

NMED Response: Criteria 4.b. and 4.c. on page 3e will be applied. Overhead and administrative costs will be described in the bid.
NMED Response: Criteria 4.c. will be applied as described above in the response to question #6. See also the response to question #9 from A.T. Kearney.

8. "Will there be any delay in the submittal deadline to compensate for the time required to answer questions raised at the interim proposal bid review meeting?"

NMED Response: NMED will delay the schedule by fifteen (15) calendar days as follows:

- May 25, 1995 - Proposals due no later than 4:00 pm MDT
- June 26, 1995 - Notice of proposed award(s), begin contract negotiations

9. "Please clarify the conflict of interest statement, 'The Contractor warrants that it does not hold ... any other contract with DOE for WIPP activities related to these applications.' What constitutes work for DOE on WIPP?"

NMED Response: Any work performed for DOE or its contractors in support of the RCRA Part A or B applications for WIPP constitutes a conflict of interest. This includes any work performed for a waste generator that would be in support of the RCRA Part A or B applications.

If any bidders believe they may have a potential conflict of interest, they should contact Barbara Hoditschek prior to submitting a proposal.

10. "What constitutes a local office? Must the staff level be determined by regular staff only, or can it be both prime and subcontract staff combined?"

NMED Response: The major reason NMED is requiring the contractor to have an office in New Mexico is to assure that the NMED has ready access to the contractor. The office therefore needs to be an office of the prime contractor. The proposal evaluation criteria on page 3e has been corrected as follows:

5. Local (New Mexico) office (15 points)
   a. Has office; 3 staff or more (15 points)
   b. Has office; 2 staff or fewer (10 points)

11. "There appear to be conflicting statements in III.A. on page 9a, 'Travel expenses that the contractor incurs in performance of this contract shall be at the cost of the contractor. The NMED may require that its designee approve in advance in writing any travel under this contract.' Please clarify."

NMED Response: Anticipated travel should be included in estimated costs for each task, and will be reflected in the total bid cost. Thus, anticipated travel by the contractor is at the cost of the
contractor, and those direct travel expenses are not reimbursable by NMED. Other travel under the contract which was not anticipated must be at the approval of NMED, since those costs would exceed the scope of the contract.

12. "Will there be any preferential consideration for minority- or women-owned small businesses?"

NMED Response: This is not a proposal evaluation criteria. NMED does encourage minority- or women-owned small businesses to apply.
Responses to written questions submitted prior to 5:00 PM, Friday April 21, 1995:

A. T. Kearney Written Questions

1. "The technical review evaluation criteria specified in Section I.B.3 of the RFP Scope of Work indicates that the application shall be reviewed for compliance with (40 CFR 264) Subparts A-E, G, I, S, AA, and BB, part 268, and New Mexico regulations (20 NMAC 4.1) Subpart V, 40 CFR part 264(.601). The following questions pertaining to this reference are offered:

   a. "40 CFR Subpart X, which addresses miscellaneous units, was not included in Section I.B.3, although it would appear to apply to WIPP and is discussed as a technical issue to address in the Proposal Evaluation Criteria, Section 2.a.2. Please clarify this omission."

   **NMED Response:** This was inadvertently omitted by the typist during the many revisions of this document. 40 CFR Subpart X, which addresses miscellaneous units, will be included in Section I.B.3. See the attached change made to page 3b, I.B.3, as well as page 5a, II.C.1.

   b. "Section 2.a.2 of the Proposal Evaluation Criteria specify groundwater monitoring waivers as a criteria to be evaluated. However, 40 CFR Subpart F, which discusses groundwater exemptions, is not included in Section I.B.3 of the RFP Statement of Work. Since groundwater waivers are addressed in Subpart F it may be desirable to include this subpart in the technical review section."

   **NMED Response:** This also was inadvertently omitted by the typist during the many revisions of this document. See the attached change made to page 3b, I.B.3, as well as page 5a, II.C.1.

2. "Please clarify whether support materials, such as public meeting materials, fact sheets, public hearing notes, should be prepared in both English and Spanish."

   **NMED Response:** Support materials, such as public meeting materials, fact sheets, public hearing notes, will be required to be prepared in both English and Spanish.

3. "Will WIPP-related experience that poses no conflict of interest be included as part of the Technical Evaluation Criteria?"

   **NMED Response:** Yes. WIPP-related technical experience will be evaluated as RCRA experience in sections 2.a.1 and 2.a.2 of the Proposal Evaluation Criteria. See also the response to question #3 raised at the Interim Proposal Bid Review Meeting.
4. "Page 1a, Paragraph II. What are the applicable limits in the New Mexico Tort Claims Act, Section 41-4-1 et seq., NMSA 1978?"

**NMED Response:** Please see attachment F for limits under the New Mexico Tort Claims Act.

5. "Page 2a, Paragraph VII. Is a performance bond necessary under a service contract, or is Professional Liability Insurance acceptable?"

**NMED Response:** Professional Liability Insurance is acceptable under Paragraph VIII, page 2a.

6. "Page 8a, Paragraph III(A). Is travel to be computed as a factor that should be included in the hourly labor rates, or will travel be reimbursed at actual cost?"

**NMED Response:** Travel approved by NMED will be reimbursed at hourly labor rates. The cost of travel should be incorporated into hourly labor costs. See also the response to question #11 raised at the Interim Proposal Bid Review Meeting.

7. "Page 9a, Paragraph III (B). Does "percentage, if any is added to the billing" refer to G&A or any other burden?"

**NMED Response:** "Percentage" refers to administrative costs which is billed into the total cost.

8. "Page 8b, Paragraph VIII (B). Should the hourly rates be proposed by calendar year (1995, 1996, etc.), or by Contract performance period (Base period, 2 years, Option period 2 years)?"

**NMED Response:** The hourly rates applied to labor costs should be proposed for the length of the contract.

9. "Page 3e, 4 (b). Please provide further explanation as to the meaning of the terms "markup" and "general charge" as they relate to overhead and administrative costs. Does this mean that if, for example, as in government pricing, an overhead of 100% that would normally be applied to direct labor would receive "no points" under the Proposal Evaluation Criteria? Also does the term "fees" mean labor costs?"

**NMED Response:** The term "markup" refers to the percentage increase in cost over and above the hourly fee rate, and other task costs which the contractor may wish to charge for indirect costs. The term "general charge" refers to charges which take care of the business fees and is in addition to hourly rate fee. The term "fee" includes labor cost.

10. "The proposal includes evaluation criteria points for the presence of a local NM office. Please indicate if the number
of staff located in New Mexico can include the addition of both prime and subcontract personnel."

**NMED Response:** See the response to question #10 raised at the Interim Proposal Bid Review Meeting.

**Geraghty and Miller, Inc. Written Questions**

1. "Under the Proposal Evaluation Criteria, section 1.b., it states "Experience of staff in reviewing RCRA permit application..." does this experience have to be directly related to state or EPA oversight review? Or, can direct RCRA permit application preparation and review for commercial clients and responses to NODs suffice as experience?"

**NMED Response:** NMED will evaluate all experience on merit. The same experience, regardless of association to specific regulatory agencies or contractors, will be valued equally.

2. "Does working for DOE at sites other than WIPP create a conflict?"

**NMED Response:** Working for DOE by and of itself does not constitute a conflict. Working on DOE projects which directly or indirectly support the WIPP RCRA application may be considered to be conflicts. See also the response to question #3 raised at the Interim Proposal Bid Review Meeting.

3. "Is there a timeframe in which the State is required to submit the NOD to the WIPP site?"

**NMED Response:** NODs are the responsibility of the NMED. The contractor will not be responsible for any such action.

4. "Could there be a more task-specific timeframe presented by the State within which the bidders could work to produce accurate and comparable cost proposals (i.e., scope)?...or, is it the intent of the State that the respondent costs-out a full-time, two year schedule with as many FTEs as the respondent feels is necessary? The overall scope of work regarding the number and extent of documents to review, and the timeframe within which the review is to occur is not clear."

**NMED Response:** No, it is not the intent of NMED to have the contractor cost-out a full-time two year schedule. Rather, NMED is looking for a proposal that indicates the hourly cost for costs in different technical areas which the bidder may be able to offer NMED. NMED expects task costs then to be based on these hourly costs and task demands. With regard to the reference to "review of other documents" the contractor would use the hourly cost per FTE to develop the cost per task to perform "other document" review.
requested by NMED. Total project costs would be based on task costs.

5. "Is this the first contract to be let by the State of New Mexico, NMED for RCRA permit application review at the WIPP site? If not, what was the preceding contract period, and what individual or firm provided the oversight?"

**NMED Response:** This is not the first contract to be let by the State for the review of a RCRA permit application for WIPP. A previous application had been submitted by DOE and the contractor who reviewed that application was A. T. Kearney who had a contract with NMED for a total of 3 years. See Attachment G for the contract brief. There is no "oversight" responsibility attached to the contract. The contract is for technical review and regulatory interpretation expertise only. NMED retains all authority and responsibility for oversight at WIPP. Please note on page 1a III that the proposed contract will be for a period of 2 years, with an option to extend the contract for an additional 2 years.

**NMSU Physical Science Laboratory Written Questions**

1. "The Proposal requests total costs for the contract and for each task. NMSU/PSL has no difficulty providing identification of staff and hourly rates. However, for cost estimation purposes some appraisal of the hours anticipated is needed.

"NMSU/PSL requests that an amendment to the RFP be prepared stating the number of hours expected per task. If possible, the amendment should include an estimate of the number of hours for technical document review broken down by technical area such as air, soil and water modeling, and so forth. Technical document review is part of Task C, entitled, **Perform Technical Review of the Permit Application.**"

**NMED Response:** The bidders are encouraged to examine the previous RCRA application for WIPP by DOE (DOE/WIPP 91-005, Revision 3), available at the locations listed in Attachment E, to estimate the number of hours required to complete a technical review of this document. NMED will not estimate the expected number of hours per task for the bidders.

2. "What type of contract does NMED anticipate issuing? There are several types of contracts, for example: Cost reimbursable, Cost plus fixed fee, Time and materials, Fixed price. The type of contract has a direct bearing on preparing a cost estimate for the proposal."

**NMED Response:** See the response to question #5 raised at the Interim Proposal Bid Review Meeting.
Consolidated Technical Services, Inc., Written Questions

1. "Provide the total dollar value and contract term for the 'incumbent' support contract for review of the WIPP Test Phase application."

NMED Response: See Attachment G for the existing contract.

2. "Provide the approximate level of effort (billable hours/year) for the incumbent support contract."

NMED Response: See Attachment H for a summary of charges over the contract period.

3. "Provide the estimated budget for the proposed work scope."

NMED Response: See the response to question #6 raised at the Interim Proposal Bid Review Meeting.

4. "Provide a 'template' which described all the required elements for submittal of invoices. In particular, provide details regarding the appropriate reporting of actual labor charges and other direct charges."

NMED Response: See Attachment H for an example of an invoice provided by the incumbent contractor.

5. "Provide a description of the proposed contract structure, as well as a description of the contract structure used for the incumbent contract. It appears that we are being asked to provide fixed rates and an estimated contract ceiling. Should we propose our fully burdened hourly rates for each employee classification, along with a detailed estimate of labor hours for each category? In order to provide the basis for directly comparable cost proposals, should we estimate all other direct charges by category (e.g., travel, phone, postage, computer charges, etc.)?"

NMED Response: See the response to question #5 raised at the Interim Proposal Bid Review Meeting. Rates should be fully burdened hourly rates for both straight time and overtime for each task. Other direct charges should be estimated apart from labor rates.

6. "Clarify the extent to which WIPP related experience will be considered as relevant experience under the evaluation criteria. If WIPP related experience will be scored, please describe relevant experience (e.g., experience with TRU waste characterization, generator site operations, WIPP facility operations, etc.)."

NMED Response: See the response to question #3 raised at the Interim Proposal Bid Review Meeting.
7. "Please clarify the reference (page v., item XV) that ‘...Women Minority business Enterprises’ are encouraged to apply. Are there point preferences or other considerations during the procurement process for women-owned small business bidders? If so, is self-certification acceptable, or is some other certification process required?"

**NMED Response:** See the response to question #12 raised at the Interim Proposal Bid Review Meeting.

8. "Clarify the extent to which ‘approved’ travel expenses will be billable under the proposed contract. If appropriate, please specify those cases in which travel will not be considered a billable expense, but must be addressed in burden rates. For example, if payment for travel to the Albuquerque/Santa Fe area will not be authorized under the contract, this should be stated in the RFP."

**NMED Response:** See the response to question #11 raised at the Interim Proposal Bid Review Meeting.

9. "Is it acceptable to propose payment terms and conditions which require payment of invoices in 30 days, with interest incurred for past due invoices?"

**NMED Response:** The current contract provides for 1% interest on past due invoices. "Past due" means 45 calendar days following receipt of a correct invoice.

10. "Please clarify the type and nature of conditions which would constitute a conflict of interest for the proposed scope of work. We believe that it is important for any successful offeror to commit to avoidance of conflicts of interest throughout the NMED contract term."

**NMED Response:** See the response to question #9 raised at the Interim Proposal Bid Review Meeting.

11. "Please confirm that if an offeror holds WIPP-related subcontracts with a DOE prime or sub-contractor, NMED will consider their proposal if the offeror certifies that prior to contract award, they will divest themselves of all subcontracts which are determined to present a conflict for the proposed work."

**NMED Response:** Direct any concerns related to actual or potential conflict of interest to Barbara Hoditschek.

12. "Provide a copy of the Part B checklist that NMED will require the contractor to use for completeness reviews of the permit application."

**NMED Response:** The checklist is a 41-page list copied directly from EPA guidance. It is a generalized list, containing many pages..."
unrelated to WIPP (e.g., specific requirements for surface impoundments, waste piles, land treatment units and landfills; financial assurance requirements, etc.). NMED is providing the checklist only to those who request it.
Charles Wood 505/646-5696
NM State University, Eng Research Center
Box 30001, Department 3449
Las Cruces NM 88003

Scott Sawyer 505/646-7854
WERC
Box 30001, Dept WERC
Las Cruces NM 88003-8001

Roger Taul 505/622-2872
Compliance Services, Inc.
714 East College Blvd
Roswell NM 88201

Cindi Byrns 702/795-4776
Bell Environmental Consultants, Inc.
2206 East Patrick Lane, Suite 23
Las Vegas NV 89119

John Petterson 619/459-0142
Impact Assessment, Inc.
2160 Avenida de la Playa, Suite A
La Jolla CA 92037

Azita Yazdani 714/255-1650
Pollution Prevention International, Inc.
471 West Lambert Road, Suite 105
Brea CA 92621

Colin Smith 510/832-2233
Uribe & Associates
2930 Lakeshore Avenue, Suite 200
Oakland CA 94610-3614

Roberta Tassey 916/649-2424
Law Companies
2710 Gateway Oaks, Suite 150 N
Sacramento CA 95833

Margaret Lamb Merrens 206/525-3362
Environment International
10334 48th Avenue NE
Seattle WA 98125

Lana Leiding 206/438-0115
Coe-Truman Technologies, Inc.
669 Woodland Square Loop SE, Suite C
Lacey WA 98503-1045

A. Azim Khan 509/332-0666
Environmental & Ecological Engineers, Inc.
NE 2345 Hopkins Court
Pullman WA 99163

Scott Lawrence 509/783-5571
Columbia Environmental Sciences, Inc.
8300 W. Gage Boulevard, #114
Kennewick WA 99336

RFP Department 509/946-7111
Columbia Energy & Environmental Services, Inc
1204 George Washington Way, Suite 22
Richland WA 99352
# SIGN-IN SHEET

**INTERIM PROPOSAL BID REVIEW MEETING**

**MARQUEZ PLACE CONFERENCE ROOM**

525 CAMINO DE LOS MARQUEZ
SANTA FE, NEW MEXICO
WEDNESDAY, APRIL 19, 1995

for

**NMED HAZARDOUS & RADIOACTIVE MATERIALS BUREAU**

**WIPP RCRA PERMIT APPLICATION REVIEW**

**PLEASE PRINT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>City, Zip</th>
<th>Phone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Steve Irish</td>
<td>BELFORT ENGINEERING</td>
<td>1780 LOUISIANA RVD, NE 571400</td>
<td>Albuquerque, NM 87110</td>
<td>505/262-1800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David F. Smith</td>
<td>Beta Corp. Int'l</td>
<td>6719 Academy</td>
<td>ABQ, NM</td>
<td>(505) 822-1948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Remley</td>
<td>Brown &amp; Root Enviro.</td>
<td>2300 Bueno Vista NE Suite 110</td>
<td>Albuquerque, NM 87110</td>
<td>(505) 247-4933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathleen M. Allen</td>
<td>Brown &amp; Root Enviro.</td>
<td>2300 Bueno Vista S.E., Suite 110</td>
<td>Albuquerque, NM 87106</td>
<td>505 247 4973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John G. Darabaris</td>
<td>A.T. Kearney</td>
<td>1200 17TH St, Suite 950</td>
<td>Denver, CO 80203</td>
<td>303-572-6175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eugene E. Lucero</td>
<td>environment Dept.</td>
<td>Harold Berman Inc.</td>
<td>Santa Fe, NM</td>
<td>(505) 827-8544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Guither</td>
<td>Professional Analysis Inc.</td>
<td>2155 Louisiana NE #2100</td>
<td>Albuquerque, NM 87110</td>
<td>(505) 883-0942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cindy Burns</td>
<td>Bell Environmental</td>
<td>2200 East Puky #25</td>
<td>Las Vegas, NV 89105</td>
<td>(702) 795-4716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Company</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>City, Zip</td>
<td>Phone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roger E. Palmenterj</td>
<td>GPI</td>
<td>2922 W. Cleverdon</td>
<td>Phoenix, AZ</td>
<td>(602) 234-0596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria Arizzi</td>
<td>CONSOLIDATED TECHNICAL SERVICES</td>
<td>7309 Indian School Rd NE</td>
<td>Albuquerque</td>
<td>(505) 881-2338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maureen Blalock</td>
<td>WASTREN, Inc.</td>
<td>1801 San Pedro, NE, Bldg 210</td>
<td>Albuquerque</td>
<td>(505) 880-1134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed Juddo</td>
<td>Prindle, Hinds Environmental</td>
<td>7208 Jefferson NE</td>
<td>Albuquerque</td>
<td>(505) 845-8792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TREAT N. THOMAS</td>
<td>GEOFOUNCE CONSULTANTS</td>
<td>505 Marquette M.W., Suite 100</td>
<td>Albuquerque</td>
<td>(505) 892-0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Nicol</td>
<td>Malcolm Pirnie</td>
<td>2201 Railroad Plaza, 8737 Broadway</td>
<td>San Antonio, TX</td>
<td>(210) 828-6060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy Lewis</td>
<td>Daniel B. Steichen &amp; Assoc.</td>
<td>4020 Academy NE</td>
<td>Albuquerque</td>
<td>(505) 870-9760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Company</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>City, Zip</td>
<td>Phone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeffrey Miller</td>
<td>Radian Corp.</td>
<td>115 Longview</td>
<td>White Rock, NM 87544</td>
<td>505/672-0327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James F Bresson</td>
<td>NFT Inc.</td>
<td>6200 Uptown Blvd #310</td>
<td>Albuquerque, NM 87110</td>
<td>(505) 843-9176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry D. Blankenship</td>
<td>Parsons Engineering Science, Inc.</td>
<td>475 Central Avenue, Suite 220</td>
<td>Los Alamos, NM 87544</td>
<td>(505) 662-7246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louis Martinez</td>
<td>LRL Software, Inc.</td>
<td>616 Central SE, Suite 205</td>
<td>Albuquerque, NM 87102</td>
<td>(505) 843-7714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian A. Smith</td>
<td>Geraghty &amp; Miller, Inc.</td>
<td>6400 Uptown Blvd 330 W NE</td>
<td>Albuquerque, NM 87110</td>
<td>(505) 481-7666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The DOE provides documents pertaining to the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant for public review in these WIPP Reading rooms:

DOE/Forrestal Building
Public Library Reading Room
AD-234.1
FOI - USDOE
1000 Independence Avenue SW
Washington, DC 20585

Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board
625 Indiana Ave NW, Suite 700
Washington, DC 20004

Office of Scientific and Technical Information
Technical Information Center
P.O. Box 62
Oak Ridge, TN 37831

Thomas Brannigan Memorial Library
200 E. Picacho
Las Cruces, NM 88005

New Mexico State Library
325 Don Gaspar
Santa Fe, NM 87505

Pannell Library
New Mexico Junior College
5317 Lovington Highway
Hobbs, NM 88240

Carlsbad Public Library
101 South Halagueno Street
Carlsbad, NM 88220

Zimmermann Library
Government Publications Department
University of New Mexico
Albuquerque, NM 87138

WIPP Public Reading Room
National Atomic Museum
U.S. Department of Energy
Albuquerque Field Office
Albuquerque, NM 87115

Sandia National Laboratories
Technical Library
Organization 3144
P.O. Box 5800
Albuquerque, NM 87185

Sandia National Laboratories
Waste Management and Transportation Library
Organization 6332
P.O. Box 5800
Albuquerque, NM 87175

Martin Speare Memorial Library
New Mexico Institute of Mining and Technology
Campus Station
Socorro, NM 87801

Raton Public Library
244 Cook Avenue
Raton, NM 87740
NEW MEXICO STATUTES
1978
ANNOTATED
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41-4-16. Notice of claims.

Due process. Application of the notice provision of Subsection A to any minor, whatever the circumstances, would not, in every circumstance, violate due process. Erwin v. City of Santa Fe, 115 N.M. 596, 863 P.2d 1086 (Ct. App. 1993).

Contents of notice. The notice required is not simply actual notice of the occurrence of an accident or injury but rather actual notice that there exists a likelihood that litigation may ensue. Dutton v. McKinley County Bd. of Comm'rs, 113 N.M. 51, 822 P.2d 1134 (Ct. App. 1991).

41-4-18. Jurisdiction; appeals; venue.

Federal jurisdiction barred. — Inmate could not pursue his claim against the New Mexico Department of Corrections and its employees acting within the scope of their employment in the federal district court, but rather was relegated to the state district court to seek relief consistent with the limited waiver of immunity under this section. Bishop v. Doe 1, 902 F.2d 809 (10th Cir. 1990), cert. denied, 498 U.S. 873, 111 S. Ct. 198, 112 L. Ed. 2d 159 (1990).

41-4-19. Maximum liability.

A. In any action for damages against a governmental entity or a public employee while acting within the scope of his duties as provided in the Tort Claims Act [41-4-1 to 41-4-27 NMSA 1978], the liability shall not exceed:

1. the sum of one hundred thousand dollars ($100,000) for damage to or destruction of property arising out of a single occurrence; and
2. the sum of three hundred thousand dollars ($300,000) for all past and future medical and medically-related expenses arising out of a single occurrence; and
3. the sum of four hundred thousand dollars ($400,000) to any person for any number of claims arising out of a single occurrence for all damages other than property damage and medical and medically-related expenses as permitted under the Tort Claims Act; or
4. the sum of seven hundred fifty thousand dollars ($750,000) for all claims other than medical or medically-related expenses arising out of a single occurrence.

B. No judgment against a governmental entity or public employee for any tort for which immunity has been waived under the Tort Claims Act shall include an award for exemplary or punitive damages or for interest prior to judgment.


Bracketed material. — The bracketed material in this section was inserted by the compiler. It was not enacted by the legislature and is not a part of the law.

The 1991 amendment, effective July 1, 1992, in Subsection A, added Paragraph (2), redesignated former Paragraphs (2) and (3) as Paragraphs (3) and (4), substituted “four hundred thousand dollars ($400,000)” for “three hundred thousand dollars ($300,000)” and inserted “and medical and medically-related expenses” in Paragraph (3), and substituted “seven hundred fifty thousand dollars ($750,000)” for “five hundred thousand dollars ($500,000)” and inserted “other than medical or medically-related expenses” in Paragraph (4).

Level of scrutiny of cap on damages. — A tort victim’s interest in full recovery of damages calls for a form of scrutiny somewhere between minimum rationality and strict scrutiny. Therefore, intermediate scrutiny should be applied to determine the constitutionality of the cap on damages in Subsection A(2) of this section. Trujillo v. City of Albuquerque, 110 N.M. 621, 798 P.2d 571 (1990).

“Single occurrence” construed. — In a negligence action against a city for injuries sustained in a collision with a city-owned crane, there was but a single occurrence when successive negligent acts or omissions of the governmental entity combined concurrently to create a singular risk of collision and to proximately cause injury triggered by a discrete event. Trujillo v. City of Albuquerque, 110 N.M. 621, 798 P.2d 571 (1990).

In a wrongful death and personal injury action brought against the state highway department and others for deaths and injuries from a runaway truck, all injuries proximately caused by a governmental agency’s successive negligent acts or omissions that combined concurrently to create a singular, separate, and unitary risk of harm fell within the meaning of a “single occurrence” when triggered by the discrete...
TECHNICAL AND PROFESSIONAL SERVICES CONTRACT BRIEF

State Contracts Review Office (SCRO)
DFA Budget Division
Bataan Memorial Bldg. - Room 194
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87503

CONTRACTOR: A.T. Kearney, Inc.

ADDRESS: 225 Reinekers Lane, P.O. Box 1405, Alexandria, VA 22313

PHONE: 703-572-6175  STATE TAX ID: 02-200809-008  FEDERAL: 6080235

SOCIAL SECURITY NO.: ____________________________ AGENCY CONTACT PERSON: Barbara Hoditschek

CONTRACT OR AMENDMENT AMOUNT:

GENERAL FUND: $650,000.00

OTHER STATE FUNDS: $650,000.00

FEDERAL: $0

TOTAL: $650,000.00

CONTRACT TERM - FROM: 2-16-93 TO: June 30, 1995

BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF SERVICES: To provide technical expertise in review of (1) a permit application for a Resource Conservation & Recovery Act (RCRA) permit and (2) technical documents on DOE's Waste Isolation Plan. Expertise not available in the FD Department.

PROCUREMENT PROCEDURE — PLEASE CHECK ONE OR MORE OF THE FOLLOWING:

- X Does not exceed $20,000 (Excluding gross receipt taxes)
- Amendment (Requires written justification, if applicable)
- Competitive Proposal (I certify that the competitive sealed proposal process required by the Procurement Code has been followed.)
- Sole Source (A written determination signed by the Cabinet Secretary, Agency Head, or Designee is attached.)
- Exempt procurement from a state agency

OTHER REQUIREMENTS — ENTER Y (YES), N (NO), OR N/A (NOT APPLICABLE) TO EACH OF THE FOLLOWING:

- No Is contract with a state employee, legislator or former state employee employed within the preceding year? If yes, please indicate which: State Employee __________; Legislator __________; or Former State Employee __________ (Conflict of Interest Act, Sections 10-16-7, 10-16-8 or 10-16-9 NMSA 1978).
- No Has contractor earned more than $5,000.00 from one or more state agency professional services contracts within the last 12 months? If yes, has conflict of interest form been filed with the Secretary of State? (Section 10-16-12 NMSA 1978).
- X Yes The agency hereby certifies to the DFA that the contractor will perform at all times as an independent contractor for purposes of IRS tax compliance and is not performing services as an employee of the agency.
- NA Information Systems Council approval has been obtained.
- Yes Attorney General review (If contract is greater than $200,000, or may violate the Conflict of Interest Act) has been obtained.
- Yes Agency is unable to perform services to be provided by contractor.
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CURRENT CONTRACT BRIEF

CATEGORY: _____ STAFF: _______ KW1: _____ KW2: _______  FY: _______

1ST RECPT: _______ RETURNED/HELD: _______ MO: _______

SUBS RECPT: _______ SENT TO F/C: _______ NO: _______

RET FR F/C: _______ RESUB TO F/C: _______ AM: _______

ENCUMBRANCE # 1: _______ MED #1: _______ Amount # 1: $ _______

ENCUMBRANCE # 2: _______ MED #2: _______ Amount # 2: $ _______

COMMENTS: __________________________________________________________________________

(Attachment Current Contract Brief Page 0)
STATE OF NEW MEXICO
ENVIRONMENT DEPARTMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 2 TO
PROFESSIONAL/TECHNICAL SERVICES CONTRACT NO. 30.667.50.023.

THIS AGREEMENT to amend the above identified contract is entered into by the State of New Mexico Environment Department (hereafter "Department") and A.T. Kearney, Inc. (hereafter "CONTRACTOR").

IT IS AGREED by the parties:

Article 2A. Compensation of said contract is hereby amended to read as follows: Compensation is increased by $350,000.00, from $300,000.00 to $650,000.00. The Department shall pay the Contractor a sum not to exceed $650,000.00; full payment for services rendered.

Article 2c. Compensation of said contract is amended to read as follows: The total amount of this contract shall not exceed $650,000.00.

All other articles of the contract remain unchanged.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personnel Category</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>OT Rate</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>OT Hours</th>
<th>TT Hours</th>
<th>Labor Cost</th>
<th>Pocket Expenses</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MID TECHNICAL ASSISTANT</td>
<td>67.00</td>
<td>67.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLERICAL SUPPORT</td>
<td>58.00</td>
<td>56.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MID ENGINEER</td>
<td>32.00</td>
<td>49.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROGRAM DIRECTOR</td>
<td>67.00</td>
<td>46.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUNIOR ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENTIST</td>
<td>52.00</td>
<td>49.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAZARDOUS WASTE MANAGEMENT SPECIALIST</td>
<td>99.00</td>
<td>78.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUNIOR ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENTIST</td>
<td>52.00</td>
<td>49.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SENIOR ENGINEER</td>
<td>75.00</td>
<td>48.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SENIOR ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENTIST</td>
<td>115.00</td>
<td>78.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUNIOR ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENTIST</td>
<td>52.00</td>
<td>49.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SENIOR ENGINEER</td>
<td>75.00</td>
<td>48.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAZARDOUS WASTE MANAGEMENT SPECIALIST</td>
<td>99.00</td>
<td>78.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUNIOR ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENTIST</td>
<td>52.00</td>
<td>49.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SENIOR ENGINEER</td>
<td>75.00</td>
<td>48.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAZARDOUS WASTE MANAGEMENT SPECIALIST</td>
<td>99.00</td>
<td>78.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUNIOR ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENTIST</td>
<td>52.00</td>
<td>49.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MID ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENTIST</td>
<td>52.00</td>
<td>49.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUNIOR ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENTIST</td>
<td>52.00</td>
<td>49.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>67.00</td>
<td>67.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Corporate Expenses (CDE) by Type:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supplies</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photocopying</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage/Overnight Mail</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment Rental</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract/Financial Admin</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchased Services</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBTOTAL - CORPORATE EXPENSES</td>
<td>250.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL LABOR AND EXPENSES</td>
<td>250.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GROSS RECEIPTS TAX PAID BY ATE</td>
<td>945.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAND TOTAL</td>
<td>1195.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Additional Data:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Accrued GROSS Receipts Tax</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Total Task Cost</td>
<td>1195.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated TOTAL Task Cost</td>
<td>1195.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Budget</td>
<td>60,716.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Task Budget</td>
<td>60,716.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Budget Balance Available</td>
<td>64,734.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

I. The New Mexico Environment Department is soliciting proposals from qualified firms to provide the following services:

Expertise in the review of the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act permit application and other technical documents submitted to the State of New Mexico for the Department of Energy's Waste Isolation Pilot Plant. The review process will entail a completeness determination, technical evaluation, evaluation of responses from the applicant, decision analysis and administrative support of general permitting activities and technical evaluation of WIPP-related documents.

II. This request is to provide professional services to two (2) years from the date of the contract award with an option to extend the contract for up to a total of four (4) years. Proposals should include the qualifications of all personnel to be used in permit review activities and define what the role of each person will be in satisfying the scope of work of the proposed contract.

III. Tentative Schedule

March 29, 1995 - RFP released
April 19, 1995 - Interim proposal bid review conference
May 25, 1995 - Proposals due no later than 4:00 pm MDT
June 26, 1995 - Notice of proposed award(s) begin contract negotiations

IV. To obtain the Request for Proposals application packet, contact:

Barbara Hoditschek
Hazardous & Radioactive Materials Bureau
New Mexico Environment Department
525 Camino de Los Marquez
P.O. Box 26110
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87502-6110
(505) 827-4308

V. An original and five (5) typed copies of the proposal must be received by registered mail or hand delivered to:

Cliff Hawley, Chief
Personnel Services Bureau
New Mexico Environment Department
P.O. Box 26110
1190 St. Francis Drive
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87502-6110

by 4:00 pm, MDT, May 25, 1995.
VI. The following weighted evaluation factors will be used in rating the proposals:

20  -  Personnel qualifications and experience
20  -  RCRA experience
20  -  Review Capabilities: in-house equipment, materials, staff expertise and services offered
25  -  Costs
15  -  Local (New Mexico) office

VII. Any proposal may be rejected in whole or in part when it is in the best interest of the New Mexico Environment Department.

VIII. The Procurement Code: Sections 13-1-28 to 13-1-199 NMSA 1978, imposes civil and criminal penalties for its violation. In addition, the New Mexico criminal statutes impose felony penalties for illegal gratuities and kickbacks.

IX. Offerors submitting proposals may be afforded an opportunity for discussion and revision of proposals. Revision may be permitted after submission of proposals and prior to award, for the purpose of obtaining the best and final offers.

X. The contents of any proposal shall not be disclosed so as to be available to competing offerors during the negotiation process.

XI. All costs incurred by the offeror in the preparation transmittal or presentation of any proposal or material submitted in response to this RFP will be borne solely by the offeror.

XII. The New Mexico Environment Department may negotiate provisions in addition to those stipulated in this RFP with a successful offeror.

XIII. Offerors must prepare a certification of independent price determination which certifies that no collusion, as defined by the Federal and State anti-trust laws, occurred during proposal preparation.

XIV. Award of contracts may not necessarily go to the lowest bidders.

XV. Minority Business Enterprises and Women Minority Business Enterprises are encouraged to apply.
REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS FOR PROFESSIONAL SERVICES

I. Background Information

The New Mexico Environment Department seeks proposals from firms with expertise in the technical review of (1) a permit application for a Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) permit and (2) other technical documents on the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP). The review must compare the applicant’s Part B submittals to the permitting requirements and technical standards in the New Mexico Hazardous Waste Management Regulations (20 NMAC 4.1), Subpart IX, 40 CFR Section 270 and Subpart V Section 264. The other WIPP technical documents for review would include, but not be limited to: hydrogeological reports; waste packaging and placement criteria; waste treatment; explosiveness, gas production and emergency response reports; sampling and statistical programs; radiation standards and protection; long-term impact on public health, safety and the environment. This Request for Proposals (RFP) must be responded to as a unit; no part can be responded to individually.

II. Liability Insurance

A. The contractor warrants that it shall, at all times during the term of this contract, have and keep in force liability insurance in at least the amount of the applicable limits in the New Mexico Tort Claims Act, Section 41-4-1 et seq., NMSA 1978, and any amendments thereto. Such insurance shall be written by an insurance company licensed to do business in New Mexico and shall cover all liability which might arise from the provision of services under this contract.

B. The contractor shall immediately notify the New Mexico Environment Department upon the cancellation of any insurance policy required by this article.

C. The contractor shall provide Workers’ Compensation insurance for its employees as required by New Mexico law.

III. Contract Term

This request is for proposals to provide completeness and technical application review for two (2) years from the date of the contract award, with an option to extend the contract for an additional two (2) years for a total of four (4) years.
III. Evaluation of NOD responses from the applicant.

A. The contractor shall review any application revisions made in response to the contractor's or NMED's technical review letters.

B. Support the state in preparing for and conducting meetings or conference calls with applicants regarding comments provided by the contractor to the state as a result of completeness and/or technical reviews.

C. This support shall include but not be limited to developing agendas for meetings, providing summaries of the major issues to be discussed and review of relevant regulations and guidance that may be discussed at the meeting.

D. The state will conduct all such meetings, but the contractor shall be ready to respond to the applicant's comments/questions when directed by the RPPM.

IV. Decision analysis after completion of completeness technical reviews.

A. The contractor as a part of the completeness and technical reviews shall prepare a report which provides a basis for permit denial decisions at that step in the review.

B. The contractor shall detail in the report whether or not enough information exists to support continuation of the permitting process following a completeness review and whether or not adequate technical information has been provided to support continuation of the permitting process following a technical review.

C. The contractor shall furnish the report for or against continuation of the permit process at the time of the submission of the completeness review and/or technical report.

D. The state will make all decisions regarding the permitting process and policies.
d. The Contractor shall be available to conduct task C. (Evaluation of NOD Responses from Applicant) upon notification by the RPPM.

3. Perform technical review of the permit application
   b. The Contractor shall provide technical expertise in air, soil and water modeling, meteorology, and risk assessment to determine if the standards required under 20 NMAC 4.1, Subpart V, Section 264.601 are met.
   c. The Contractor must review the waste analysis plan with particular attention being focused on quality assurance/quality control portions associated with the sampling and analysis functions being performed at a generating site. The review must also determine whether the waste characterization is adequate for all waste packaged for transport to WIPP. A report on the proposed waste analysis plan and the quality assurance/quality control procedures shall be submitted to the Department and a meeting scheduled with the RPPM to discuss the findings in the report.
   d. The Contractor shall review the data and the discussion to evaluate the logical progression of the information and the assumptions involved in the permit application.
   e. The Contractor shall review the data contained in the tables, figures, technical drawings and elsewhere and verify the calculations presented in support of the application.
   f. The Contractor shall review the applicant's conclusions to ensure compatibility with the data presented and the validity of the proposed conclusions.
g. Upon completion of the technical evaluation, the Contractor shall schedule a meeting with the RPPM to discuss the findings. The RPPM will make the final determination as to whether or not the permit application meets the technical standards.

h. The Contractor shall be available to conduct task C. (Evaluation of NOD Responses from Applicant) upon notification by the RPPM.

C. Evaluation of NOD or Other Responses From the Applicant

1. The Contractor shall review any application revisions made in response to the Contractor's or the Department's technical review letters.

2. Support the Department in preparing for and conducting meetings or conference calls with the applicant regarding comments provided by the Contractor to the Department as a result of completeness and/or technical reviews.

3. This support shall include but not be limited to developing agendas for meetings, providing summaries of the major issues to be discussed and review of relevant regulations and guidance that may be discussed at the meeting.

4. The Department will conduct all such meetings, but the Contractor shall be ready to respond to the applicant's comments/questions when directed by the RPPM.

D. Decision Analysis After Completion of Completeness Technical Reviews

1. The Contractor as a portion of the completeness and technical reviews shall prepare a report which provides a basis for permit denial decisions at that step in the review.

2. The Contractor shall detail in the report whether or not enough information exists to support continuation of the permitting process following a completeness review and whether or not adequate technical information has been provided to support continuation of the permitting process following a technical review.
CONFLICT OF INTEREST
PERSONS OR RETAINER OR ON CONTRACT

The Contractor warrants that it does not hold any other contract with the Department of Energy for the writing and/or review of the Part A and B applications for the permit required by the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act or any other contract with DOE for WIPP activities related to these applications. The Contractor also assures the same for its subcontractors working on this contract.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Middle Initial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Title

Corporation Name

Corporation Address  Number  Street  City  Zip Code

Signature

Date

Revised April 28, 195
g. Are the company's internal structure and review procedures clear (3 points)?

4. Costs (25 points)
   a. Reliance on and costs of subcontractors?
      1. Two or more services in house (9 points)
      2. Only one service in house (5 points)
      3. Rely on four subcontractors (1 point)
   b. How do overhead and administrative costs compare with other respondents?
      1. No markup (9 points)
      2. No general charge (7 points)
      3. 1-14% markup (1 point)
      4. 15% or more markup (no points)
      5. General administrative charge on all fees (no points)
   c. Project within estimated budget (7 points)

5. Local (New Mexico) office (15 points)
   a. Has office; 3 staff or more (15 points)
   b. Has office; 2 staff or less (10 points)
   c. No office in NM (no points)
   d. Left off address ( -1 point)
   e. Staff not named ( -1 point)