

**ATTACHMENT A**Technical Evaluation Criteria

Evaluation of the technical proposals will be made in accordance with the following criteria:

A. Personnel (25 Points)

The offeror must demonstrate the availability and degree of commitment of personnel with technical expertise in health physics, statistics, data management, records management, and auditing experience. In addition to demonstrating general knowledge of internal and external radiation dosimetry, the offeror will be evaluated on relevant experience in the following areas: 1) experience in the use of ICRP based internal dosimetry calculation software with specific emphasis on the evaluation of intakes of the actinide elements, 2) experience in the application of bioassay data modeling and fitting techniques applied to the assessment of chronic and acute internal exposure scenarios, 3) experience in the interpretation of external dose monitoring data at facilities with a range of radiation types, 4) experience in the interpretation of external dose monitoring data from a range of dosimeter types, 5) experience with uncertainty analysis and bounding techniques, and 6) experience in evaluating contradictory records.

Evidence of this must be specifically documented in the proposal. The offeror shall specify the name, title, educational background, relevant work experience and number of hours proposed for key professionals who will perform the work specified in the Statement of Work and provide a resume for each. The offeror must identify the individual who will serve as the principal. The offeror principal shall be a health physicist with experience in performing and reviewing dose reconstructions, both for individuals and classes.

Each dose reconstruction review, site profile review, worker profile review, or SEC petition review will be overseen by a health physicist who will be identified in the report of the review. The principal or at least one key personnel shall be a health physicist with a minimum of ten years relevant experience. All health physicists performing these tasks will have, at a minimum, five years of relevant professional experience. An advanced degree in health physics or a related field may substitute for two years of experience. The contractor will have at least one technical staff member who currently has, or is capable of reinstating in a short time period, a DOE Q clearance.

B. Management Approach and Understanding of the Requirement (5 Points)

This portion of the proposal will be rated according to how well the proposal demonstrates an understanding of the work to be undertaken and the offeror's

approach to the unique management issues posed by the contract and effectiveness of the offeror's use of staff and/or subcontractors, both in terms of cost and in terms of meeting unique technical needs and variable workload.

C. Technical Approach (10 Points)

Offeror will be evaluated on the adequacy and effectiveness of the described technical approach. The offeror should specify their approach for conducting the review of the individual dose reconstruction cases and the review of the NIOSH site profiles, provide evidence of effective understanding of relevant areas of internal and external radiation dosimetry and radiation dose reconstruction techniques, quality control plans, workload tracking techniques/tools and how the technical approach supports the Advisory Board's statutory requirements. Offeror should provide documentation to support professed examples of any such methods, tools, or plans.

D. Past Performance (-20 to +20 points)

- a. The offeror's past performance in dose reconstruction program support will be evaluated after completion of the technical evaluation. Only those offerors determined technically acceptable in the preliminary competitive range will be evaluated on past performance.
- b. Evaluation will be based on information obtained from references provided by the offeror, as well as other relevant past performance information obtained from other sources known to the Government. 
- c. The Government will assess the relative risks associated with each offeror. Performance risks are those associated with an offeror's likelihood of success in performing the acquisition requirements as indicated by that offeror's record of past performance.
- d. The assessment of performance risk is not intended to be the product of a mechanical or mathematical analysis of an offeror's performance on a list of contracts but rather the product of subjective judgment by the Government after it considers all available and relevant information.
- e. When assessing performance risks, the Government will focus on the past performance of the offeror as it relates to all acquisition requirements such as cost, schedule, and performance, including standards of good workmanship; the offeror's adherence to contract schedules, including the administrative aspects of performance; the offeror's ability to attract and maintain key personnel minimizing turn-over, the offeror's reputation for reasonable and cooperative behavior and commitment to customer satisfaction and generally the offeror's business-like concern for the interest of the customer.

- f. The lack of a performance record must result in an unknown performance risk assessment that will neither be used to the advantage nor disadvantage of the offeror.
- g. The following past performance ratings are indicative of the point values that will be assigned to various levels of performance. The actual scores assigned may fall anywhere within the range of -25 to +25.
  - +20 Excellent - Based on the offeror's performance record, no doubt exists that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort. A significant majority of sources of information are consistently firm in stating that the offeror's performance was superior and that they would unhesitatingly do business with the offeror again.
  - +10 Good - Based on the offeror's performance record, little doubt exists that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort. Most sources of information state that the offeror's performance was good, better than average, etc., and that they would do business with the offeror again.
  - 0 None - No past performance history identifiable.
  - 10 Marginal - Based on the offeror's performance record, some doubt exists that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort. Many sources of information make unfavorable reports about the offeror's performance and express concern about doing business with the offeror again.
  - 20 Poor - Based on the offeror's performance record, serious doubt exists that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort. A significant majority of sources of information consistently state that the offeror's performance was entirely unsatisfactory and that they would not do business with the offeror again.

#### E. Conflict of Interest

(25 Points)

The offeror will be required to provide a Conflict of Interest plan which clearly indicates how the offeror will manage and control for potential and perceived conflicts. Offerors must provide a detailed past work history of key personnel and potential consultants or experts who will be employed in this contract, and such information shall be made public upon award of the contract for the successful offeror.

At a minimum, key personnel shall have no prior work history, while performing on behalf of DOE, a DOE contractor, AWE, or an AWE Contractor, in the past 2 years. Beyond this limitation, the offeror, teaming partners, and key personnel shall be evaluated for their entire work history with DOE, a DOE contractor, an AWE or AWE

contractor for any appearance or actual conflict of interest, or other factors which could otherwise prejudice the independence of the offeror, teaming partners, and key personnel. If the offeror, teaming partners or key personnel have current or past work history with DOE, a DOE contractor, AWE or an AWE contractor, the offeror should include a needs justification for the key personnel's participation in the project.

Additionally, the offeror, teaming partners, and key personnel shall have no prior work history, while performing under contract with NIOSH or ORAU or ORAU teaming partners in the past 5 years.

Additionally, no personnel may be employed under this contract who have served as an expert witness (including non testifying witness) at any time in the past in any litigation defending worker compensation or other radiation related claims on behalf of , DOE Contractor, AWE, or AWE Contractor.

Moreover, the offeror and teaming partners shall assure that key personnel and staff members who ever worked at a specific DOE or AWE site (under a contract to DOE, DOE contractor, AWE, AWE contractor or NIOSH or ORAU or ORAU teaming partners) will not be involved in any reviews related to that site.

The offeror, teaming partners, and key personnel will not be permitted to perform or bid for radiation dosimetry related projects for the DOE, a DOE contractor, AWE, AWE contractor or NIOSH or ORAU or any of ORAUs teaming partners while performing work under this contract. In addition, they may not be engaged (either directly or indirectly) in a decision making role in a radiation protection program for any of the entities listed above.

Finally, individuals currently working on NIOSH Dose Reconstruction Contract (Contract Number 200-2002-00593) will not be eligible for work, in any capacity, under this contract.

It should be noted that past employment or work as a subcontractor for DOE, DOE contractors, AWE, or AWE Contractor does not prohibit any individual's participation in the contract, subject to the limitations delineated above.

Key Personnel include those individuals who will oversee the technical, professional, managerial and support functions and/or assume responsibility for assuring the validity and quality of the contractor's work products. Prior to reassigning any of the specified individuals to other programs, the Contractor shall notify the Contracting Officer reasonably in advance and shall submit justification (including proposed substitutions) in sufficient detail to permit evaluation of the impact on the program. No diversion shall be made by the Contractor without the written consent of the Contracting Officer; provided, that the Contracting Officer may ratify in writing such diversion, and such ratification shall constitute the consent of the Contracting Officer required by this clause. The

contract may be amended from time to time during the course of the contract to either add or delete personnel, as appropriate.

F. Practical Assessment

(15 points)

How well responses to sample work assignments listed in Attachment D and E demonstrate depth and breadth of experience and satisfactory technical approach. Responses will be evaluated based on methodology, thoroughness, reasonableness, and practicality. Responses must address the specifics of the practical assessment questions. General introductory textbook treatments are not appropriate.

DRAFT