

## **THE OAK RIDGE BROAD SPECTRUM CONTRACTS FOR TREATMENT OF MIXED LOW LEVEL WASTE**

Charles H. Estes and Kenneth D. Simpson, Bechtel Jacobs Company; Fred H. Miller, Jacobs Engineering Group, Inc.

### **ABSTRACT**

A major element of the strategy of the Department of Energy (DOE) Oak Ridge Operations Office (ORO) to meet the requirements of the State of Tennessee's Department of Environment and Conservation Commissioner's Order for treatment of mixed low level wastes is to implement contracts accessible by all DOE sites for treatment and disposal of a wide range of Mixed Low Level Waste matrices making up a "broad spectrum" of the mixed low level wastes on the Oak Ridge Reservation. These contracts will provide savings to DOE by: eliminating construction of new facilities, improving schedules, maximizing economies of scale, enhancing competition, and eliminating redundant individual procurement actions. For these contracts to meet these objectives maximum participation from DOE sites is required.

This paper will describe details of the contracts, waste category information, the schedule for implementation, costs, and progress to date. The contracts have been designed around five waste matrix groups with each group consisting of waste streams that have similar treatment requirements. The paper will discuss the contracts which have been awarded, the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) documentation process, modification or new construction at commercial facilities resulting from the contracts, and the schedule for treatment including the 2-year period to allow construction of facilities and acquisition of permits. Issues to be discussed include task order development, waste characterization and profiling, staging and delivery of waste to vendors, NEPA documentation, and treatment pricing.

### **BACKGROUND**

The Federal Facility Compliance Act requires that all DOE facilities identify treatment for Low Level Mixed Waste (LLMW). In most cases this requires construction of new facilities or establishing new contracts with private sector firms having the capability to treat LLMW. However, volumes of LLMW at many DOE facilities are small, making the economies of many small treatment efforts unfavorable.

To take advantage of economies of scale, Bechtel Jacobs Company, the Oak Ridge management and integrating contractor for waste management and environmental restoration, initiated a procurement for treatment of a wide variety of LLMW. This contracting action makes LLMW treatment available to all DOE facilities. There are roughly 80 separate waste streams or approximately 14 million pounds of LLMW stored on the Oak Ridge Reservation that are included in this action. Many other DOE sites have similar waste streams in storage and some sites continue to generate LLMW. This results in a potential to treat 40 million pounds of LLMW.

The procurement allowed competitive bids for five different categories of waste that reflect

the spectrum of legacy mixed wastes in DOE; and is available to all sites as a National Procurement. Five categories were chosen to maximize the competition between qualified firms and result in multiple contract awards. DOE treatment schedules are expected to be shortened as a result of greater DOE access to commercial mixed waste treatment capacity through the contracts. For those wastes where there is a lack of existing treatment capability at DOE sites, the contracts eliminate the need to construct new treatment facilities at DOE sites.

Qualified bidders must have had existing, or applications for: Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) Part-B permits; Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) licenses; and/or Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA) approvals, depending on which categories they bid. For all waste in each category, vendors will transport the raw waste to their treatment facility and treat to meet waste acceptance criteria of a disposal facility under DOE contract at the time of disposal or successfully recycle the waste. The vendor's on-site activities will be limited to picking up containerized waste from staging areas at each site. After treatment, the vendors will be required to package and transport all treated and ancillary waste for disposal.

The procurement was structured so that up to five awards could have been made, one award for each waste category. Awarding five contracts resulted in two key benefits to DOE: (1) competition was fostered because contractors that were not qualified to propose on all the wastes but that had, or wished to develop, limited mixed waste treatment capability were qualified for some waste groups; and (2) this single procurement action covered multiple awards and allowed all DOE sites to utilize the awarded contracts, thereby eliminating redundant individual procurements.

## **WASTE CATEGORIES**

The waste categories were developed based on waste type, treatment technologies, and regulatory requirements and are described below.

Treatment Category A: The waste offered for treatment is generally expected to consist of non-combustible, low-level, contact-handled soils, sludges, and other solids material meeting the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) definition of debris, all of which is contaminated with organic constituents alone, or organic constituents and RCRA metals, including mercury. The predominant waste codes in this category will be D004 through D011 and F001 through F007. Additional codes that are expected include D018 through D043 and those list codes that may need similar treatment technology. Polychlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs), at levels requiring regulation under TSCA are not present in this waste. The radionuclides in the raw waste will be below licensing levels at the disposal facility, such as Envirocare of Utah, Inc. which is currently under DOE contract, and consist of elements that are accepted for disposal at the disposal facility.

Treatment Category B: This category is generally expected to consist of non-combustible, low-level, contact-handled soils, sludges, and other solids material meeting the EPA definition of debris, all of which is contaminated with PCBs above levels requiring regulation under TSCA. The waste will also contain organic constituents alone, or organic constituents and RCRA metals, including mercury. The predominant waste codes in this category will be D004 through D011 and F001 through F007. Additional codes that are expected include D018 through D043 and those list codes that may need similar treatment technology. The radionuclides in the raw waste will be below licensing levels at the disposal facility, such as Envirocare of Utah, Inc. which is currently under DOE contract, and consist of elements that are accepted for disposal at the disposal facility.

Treatment Category C: This category is generally expected to consist of non-combustible, low-level, contact-handled, non-combustible soils, sludges, and other solids material meeting the EPA definition of debris, all of which is contaminated with RCRA metals. The predominant waste codes in this category will be D004 through D011, F006, and F007 and those list codes that may need similar treatment technology. Mercury levels will be below 260 ppm. The radionuclides in the raw waste will be below licensing levels at the disposal facility, such as Envirocare of Utah, Inc. which is currently under DOE contract, and consist of elements that are accepted for disposal at the disposal facility.

Treatment Category D: This category consists of low-level, contact-handled, combustible and non-combustible material including soils, sludges, and may contain some material meeting the EPA definition of debris. All of this waste is contaminated with PCBs above levels requiring regulation under TSCA. The waste will also contain RCRA constituents that require incineration and may contain other RCRA constituents that may be treated by incineration or stabilization. The radionuclides in the raw waste will be below licensing levels at the disposal facility, such as Envirocare of Utah, Inc. which is currently under DOE contract, and consist of elements that are accepted for disposal at the disposal facility.

Treatment Category E: This category consists of low-level, contact-handled, combustible and non-combustible soils, sludges, electrical equipment and debris contaminated with PCBs above levels requiring regulation under TSCA and needing thermal treatment or permitted alternative. RCRA regulated materials are not present. The radionuclides in the raw waste will be below licensing levels at the disposal facility, such as Envirocare of Utah, Inc. which is currently under DOE contract, and consist of elements that are accepted for disposal at the disposal facility.

## **CURRENT STATUS**

Five Broad Spectrum contracts were signed in June 1998 between Bechtel Jacobs Company and two vendors. East Tennessee Materials and Energy Corporation (M&EC) of Oak Ridge, Tennessee was awarded contracts for treatment of Categories A, B, and D. Waste Control Specialists (WCS) of Andrews, Texas was awarded contracts for Categories C and E. M&EC is in the process of removing equipment and cleaning up a former uranium processing building at the East Tennessee Technology Park to provide capacity for their

WM99 CONFERENCE, FEBRUARY 28 - MARCH 4, 1999

waste processing and treatment capabilities. M&EC is also in the process of obtaining their RCRA permits and PCB authorization. Waste acceptance is expected to begin in the summer of 1999. WCS has already obtained all RCRA permits and have installed stabilization equipment to treat Category C waste. PCB authorization for treatment and process equipment for Category E waste is being obtained by WCS. Waste acceptance for Category E is expected in January 2001.

In September 1998, Bechtel Jacobs Company established a website for the Broad Spectrum contracts. The address for the website is [www.bechteljacobs/broadspectrum/bstihome.htm](http://www.bechteljacobs/broadspectrum/bstihome.htm). The website includes descriptions of each Broad Spectrum contract waste category. These descriptions include waste matrix, EPA waste codes, and other significant parameters. The website contains descriptions of each vendor's capabilities. Waste acceptance criteria for M&EC and WCS are provided on the website. Contract responsibilities of the vendor and the originating site is also described. A task order form is attached to assist in completing an order for waste treatment. An interactive cost sheet is provided to let potential users develop estimates for treatment of specific waste streams. Table 1 is an example of the information required. By inputting information on the waste matrix, quantity, container type, and certain chemical parameters, an estimate is calculated that is used in completing the task order with the treatment vendor. The website will be updated periodically.

Bechtel Jacobs Company conducted an audit of WCS in September 1998. The audit reviewed the storage, treatment, and disposal facilities at WCS. No findings of significant concern were found during the audit. The audit will be available on the Broad Spectrum website. DOE Oak Ridge Operations Office will conduct an audit of WCS in late January 1999.

To date, two waste streams have been shipped to WCS for treatment. One from the Mound Site and one from Oak Ridge. Treatment of these wastes are significant in that compliance milestones exist for each waste stream. The Mound waste consisted of three drums of metals contaminated dirt from a facility clean up. Oak Ridge shipped 267 containers of crushed light bulbs that require stabilization. These will be used as the First Article Test under the contract for Category C. It is expected that the DOE audit will be conducted during the treatment of the crushed light bulbs under the First Article Test.

Meetings on utilizing the Broad Spectrum contracts have been held at the Oakland Operations Office, Idaho Operations Office, and DOE Ohio Area Office. Additionally, discussions with Pantex Site, Hanford Operations Office, Savannah River Site, and the Nuclear Navy are on-going regarding use of the contracts.

## **CONTRACT IMPLEMENTATION**

### **Responsibilities of the Vendor**

The vendor's on-site activities will be limited to picking up containerized wastes from staging areas at each site. Vendors will only drive transport vehicles on-site to be loaded and secured by DOE contractor employees, then drive the loaded vehicles off-site to their treatment facility.

The treated waste must meet the Land Disposal Restriction treatment standards and the Waste Acceptance Criteria (WAC) of a disposal site under DOE contract at the time of disposal. After treatment, vendors will be required to package and transport to the disposal site all treated and ancillary waste.

Once taken, if the seller cannot treat the waste to disposal criteria, the waste will be returned to compliant storage at the site of origin at no cost to DOE with all vendor-developed characterization data.

### **Responsibilities of the DOE Site:**

The following is a list of the services to be provided by the DOE site, as called for in the approved contracts:

- Selection of all containerized waste awarded for treatment, and delivery of this waste, in accordance with an agreed-to schedule, to a designated staging area at a DOE site.
- Development of staging areas on the DOE sites, where containerized waste will be staged for loading prior to transport to the treatment facility.
- Obtain a waiver to DOE Order 5820.2A to allow disposal of radioactive waste off the DOE site.
- Provide NEPA documentation as required.
- If seller's treatment facility WAC requires completed waste profile forms, the origin site will complete as required.
- At the staging areas, provide all equipment and labor, and load all containerized untreated waste on the Seller's transporting vehicles.
- After loading, review all marking, labeling, and placarding activities as required by Department of Transportation (DOT) regulations 49 CFR 172 Subparts D, E, and F, respectively.
- Perform Health Physics survey for radioactivity and release for transport off-site.
- Perform Quality Assurance (QA) inspection and release for transport off-site.
- Provide required characterization data to meet RCRA, TSCA, DOT and vendor waste profile requirements to ship the wastes off site and fill out shipping papers and manifests for each load of untreated waste leaving a staging area for transport to the seller's treatment facility.

WM99 CONFERENCE, FEBRUARY 28 - MARCH 4, 1999

DOE-ORO will be conducting annual audits of the facilities. If other sites wish, they will be free to participate as members of the audits. If additional audits are needed, they will also be conducted by DOE approved personnel.

### **Qualification and Evaluation Criteria**

The following criteria was required to be submitted by each proposer:

- submit evidence on the ability to treat or to obtain a permit/license/authorization to treat or recycle RCRA, radioactive, or TSCA contaminated wastes;
- have experience directly associated with the handling of low-level radioactive, mixed or hazardous waste and the transportation of same;
- submit a process description sufficient to allow Bechtel Jacobs Company a thorough understanding of the process to be utilized in treating the waste;
- have a management plan which is sufficient for Bechtel Jacobs Company to thoroughly understand how the project will be managed and includes an estimated project schedule, a project management system description, and a plan for coordinating with Bechtel Jacobs Company;
- because of the likelihood that a bidder may not have in place all permits, recycling exemptions, and licenses, or have the facilities, systems, and equipment needed to treat and process all waste in a category, the bidder was required to complete and submit a Treatment Milestone Schedule and fully describe the actions required to meet this milestone schedule and start First Article Test (FAT) treatment of the awarded waste by the required date;
- submit a health and safety plan;
- have a satisfactory record in environmental, health and safety matters;
- supply requested NEPA documentation.

### **IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE**

The implementation schedule calls for the completion of an environmental critique process, M&O/M&I audits of each treatment vendor after award, the development of environmental impact statements (EIS) or environmental assessments (EA), the successful completion of a FAT, and adequate characterization of legacy waste to the treatment vendor's WAC.

The NEPA environmental critique process is described in 10 CFR 1021.216 and began prior to issuance of the request for proposal (RFP) with initial stakeholder meetings and the development of environmental checklists and templates. DOE will publish the environmental critique synopsis that will briefly describe the results of the NEPA screening and review of the proposed action. Stakeholders will be allowed to comment on the synopsis and a determination will be made on the level of NEPA review.

The contracts awarded as a result of this procurement are contingent upon completion of the NEPA process by DOE. A two year limit with respect to completion of NEPA requirements has been placed on the awards. If NEPA requirements have not been completed within this two year time period, the contract may be terminated at either Bechtel Jacobs Company's or the vendor's request.

In addition, a treatment milestone schedule was submitted for each category of waste on which a proposer makes an offer. The milestone dates must allow the bidder to start FAT treatment within two years (104 weeks) after award of the contract. Starting the FAT within 104 weeks after contract award and starting the full production treatment within 116 weeks after contract award is mandatory performance under the contract.

The treatment contracts extend for five years from the date of award and include the time necessary to modify facilities or obtain necessary permits or licenses.

### **PRICING APPROACH**

The pricing approach was developed to address the uncertain treatment needs and volumes of the currently stored wastes while obtaining the economic and administrative advantages of a fixed price contract. These uncertainties led to the need to develop five representative treatment categories that reflected the expected treatment needs, but did not define the waste in precise terms. For example, representative hazardous waste codes were supplied in each category description and were reported to reflect the *predominant* hazardous waste characteristics of the waste (and the most likely treatment requirements); however, all of the supplied waste codes were not present on all wastes within a particular waste category.

The pricing approach also addressed the desire to obtain a fixed price contract awarded based on price alone. This simplified the selection process and made it more price competitive but complicated the RFP. To obtain an award based on price alone, a second, more detailed description of each category was provided that was based on expected treatment needs. This second description was used in determining the lowest price bidder. Without this second description the final bids would have reflected each bidder's assumptions. These assumptions would have benefited that bidder's treatment process and comparisons based on price alone would have been impossible. The selection process would then have had to consider technical ability as well as price.

The pricing approach used was developed to take maximum advantage of efficiencies of scale. The procurement concept was to address the needs of DOE to treat numerous small-volume waste streams without developing a like number of individual procurements and obtain lower prices by taking advantage of volume discounts. It was also desirable to capitalize on efficiencies by allowing bidders to develop prices on two or more categories and submit them as a unified, dependent bid. In this case, if a bidder believed that they had a process that could treat more than one waste category, they were encouraged to develop bid prices for two or more categories that would be submitted together as one bid for both categories, resulting in a "multiple category dependent bid." The award process considered

the bids for both categories as linked together.

Finally, because the amount of waste to be sent to the vendors in each shipment was unknown, a tiered pricing structure was requested from the bidders that would factor in price reductions as the amount of waste in a task order increased. As a result, each bidder developed a series of prices based on the efficiencies of their treatment process that decreased as quantity of waste increased. Table 1 is an example of the form provided to vendors to develop the unit pricing for a range of waste under a specific waste category. The award process extracted bid prices for several predetermined shipment amounts to determine the best price over a wide range of waste expected to need treatment.

### **AWARD PROCESS**

Based on submittal of qualification criteria, nine vendors were qualified to participate in the technical oral presentations. The vendors included: Applied Technologies Group, Diversified Environmental Services; Diversified Scientific Services, Inc.; GTS Durateck; East Tennessee Materials and Energy; Molten Metal Technology; Perma Fix; Theta; Waste Control Specialists. Each vendor was allocated one day in which their technical capabilities were presented to a panel of technical experts assembled by Bechtel Jacobs Company.

Following the oral presentations, eight vendors were invited to submit business proposals. Each bidder submitted "independent category bids" on each of the categories that they were interested in. In addition, each bidder had an option to combine two or more waste categories into a "multiple category dependent bid." This option was offered in the hope that bidders would submit lower unit price bids on groupings of multiple categories since it would be an assurance of increased treatment volumes if the combination was included in the final award. In order to be considered responsive to the RFP, all bidders were required to provide an independent bid for each category included in the "multiple category dependent bid." This was done to facilitate selection based on a comparison at all combinations of category prices.

Awards were based on comparisons of all possible combinations of bids, including multiple category dependent bids. Contracts were awarded for the combination of bids that resulted in the lowest evaluated proposed price for transportation and treatment of the mixed waste plus the Government's estimated cost for the disposal of final treatment residuals and secondary waste under the proposed agreements.

The evaluated cost for each waste category was developed based on a "representative," detailed description of each waste category. This description took the uncertain chemical and physical properties of the waste and developed a representative description of each category that addressed the expected waste characteristics affecting bidder pricing. The bidders were given a list of the key characteristics of the waste and the percentage of the waste that would contain these characteristics. Prices were requested for the treatment of each characteristic and presented as price elements. These elements included the expected hazardous constituents in the waste, the type of container the waste was stored in, and the matrix (soil, sludge, debris) of the waste material.



Bid comparisons were based on the calculated price to treat the “representative” waste category using the bidder-supplied price for each element. However, payment to the vendors will be based on the amount of waste requiring a particular treatment process or handling characteristic and the applicable price to treat that characteristic.

M&EC of Oak Ridge, Tennessee was awarded contracts for treatment of Categories A, B, and D. WCS of Andrews, Texas was awarded contracts for Categories C and E. Now that contracts have been placed, work by a vendor will be directed through the issuance of task order contracts. Payment for these task orders will be based on the price agreement submitted by the vendor. This price agreement has multiple price elements to account for the variability of waste characteristics within each category.

## **INNOVATIVE APPROACHES**

### **Incentive to Minimize Disposal Volume**

In order to provide an incentive to minimize disposal volumes and, therefore, cost to the government, Bechtel Jacobs Company included a method to benefit the vendor if disposal volumes are less than anticipated at the time of award or penalize the vendor if disposal volumes exceed the anticipated amount. To accomplish this, the proposer included a formula in their proposal that calculated the anticipated disposal volume of treated waste based on the initial waste characteristics and the proposer’s treatment process.

The formula, along with a specified disposal price, was used in determining the total price to the government for each proposer and addressed the factors that were considered important to the proposer to establish the disposal volume for mixed waste. After award, this formula will be used in determining the final payment to the vendor by comparing the actual disposal volume with the calculated disposal volume. If the disposal volume of treated waste is less than that calculated, Bechtel Jacobs Company will provide compensation to the proposer at 50 percent of the volume difference times a specified disposal price per cubic foot. If the disposal volume is greater than that calculated, Bechtel Jacobs Company will withhold compensation from the vendor at 100 percent of the volume difference times the same disposal price per cubic foot.

### **Assurance that the Vendor Can Do the Work**

In order to obtain reasonable assurance the vendor is capable of performing the required treatment, Bechtel Jacobs Company will require one FAT be conducted for each treatment category awarded under the contract. FAT quantities will be offered from what is available for treatment at the time of request by the contractor and within the awarded treatment category.

The Contractor shall perform the FAT using the same facilities, systems, equipment, method of treatment, technology, and personnel that are planned for full production processing. These planned facilities must meet the throughput requirements to accomplish treatment of

minimum specified amounts within the contractual period. The same method for container handling, delidding, emptying, debris separation, blending, transfer, packaging, and residual waste management, described in the Project Plan for full production treatment, shall be used for the FAT. Also, all FAT activities shall adhere to all aspects of sampling, testing, inspection, safety, and quality plans that were submitted to Bechtel Jacobs Company.

The Contractor shall sample, characterize, and inspect each container or package of residual waste produced during the FAT. All FAT residual material must be accepted for disposal or recycle, as evidenced by acceptance of approved profile sheets by the disposal site or accepted for resale, prior to Bechtel Jacobs Company approval of the FAT. The contractor will be compensated for waste treated during the FAT on the same per unit basis as full production processing.

If, by his actions, the Contractor is unable to start or complete the FAT in accordance with the treatment schedule milestone, or if the final product does not meet the disposal contractor's WAC or is not accepted for resale and the FAT is determined unsuccessful, the Contractor will not be allowed to start production treatment of the awarded grouping of waste and must return the waste to compliant storage at the generating DOE site. The Contractor will not be paid for an unsuccessful FAT.

#### **Protection From Numerous Change Orders**

Although all the waste anticipated to be treated through the Broad Spectrum contracts has not been fully characterized, a price agreement list has been developed that will reduce the number of change orders. This price agreement list requests unit prices for those waste characteristics that are expected to result in significant differences in treatment prices within a given waste category. For example, within one waste category separate costs are requested for waste contaminated with organics and wastes contaminated with organics and metals, or for wastes contaminated with mercury above 260 parts per million (ppm) and for those contaminated with mercury below 260 ppm. In addition, different handling prices have been requested for wastes contained in 55-gallon drums or B-25 boxes.

#### **Proposer Supplied with Maximum Information in Readily Accessible Format**

In order to supply the proposer with the maximum available information in a readily accessible format, Bechtel Jacobs Company developed a CD ROM presentation of all significant Broad Spectrum data. Although there was an enormous amount of information contained in the RFP package, the structure of the CD ROM allowed the proposer to quickly determine the information it needed to review for proposal development and, because of the electronic format, allowed the proposer to quickly access that information. In addition, use of the CD ROM supported the Bechtel Jacobs Company belief that supplying the proposer with all available information would allow development of an informed proposal and lead to the best price for the government and minimize complications during the conduct of the work.

The information on the CD ROM addressed the text of the request for proposal and statement of work; detailed analytical characterization data for waste streams, where available; over 800 photographs of open containers showing the condition and variety of the waste; a listing of all potential waste streams from all DOE sites; and, a unit price calculation spreadsheet which developed the unit price for each category based on the baseline definition of each waste category and proposer-supplied prices.

### **Environmental Critique Process**

DOE carries the burden of conducting the NEPA review, however, the vendor (post-awards) shall be prepared to provide additional information to support this review to DOE upon request.

DOE deferred determination as to the level of NEPA review until after awards were made. Any contracts awarded as a result of the Broad Spectrum procurement was contingent upon completion of the NEPA process. A two-year limit on the completion of NEPA requirements was placed on each selected vendor. If NEPA requirements have not been completed within this two-year time period, the contract may be terminated at either Bechtel Jacobs Company or the vendor's request.

The three major steps in the NEPA process were developed from the "Integrated DOE NEPA Implementing Procedures" (10CFR 1021.216). These steps consisted of: requesting environmental data and analyses from proposers with their proposals; preparing an environmental critique prior to award, based on the bidder information; and award contracts contingent on completion of NEPA review.

The environmental information requested as part of the proposals was only what was readily available to bidders. To meet qualification requirements for the procurement, bidders were required to provide proof of permit applications or existing permits. A brief description of potential environmental impact from the proposed action was not considered a heavy burden on the bidders as they are in the waste treatment business and have begun the permitting process for treatment of mixed waste. The requirement for environmental data/analysis was considered on a pass/fail basis.

DOE developed specific guidance on what was adequate information and specified the threshold levels for impacts to the environment as a result of stakeholder meetings early in the development of the RFP. From this data DOE developed an environmental critique based on the information supplied in each proposal. The critique was a decision document and required an independent review of the information provided by the proposers. If a selected bidder's information satisfied NEPA requirements, e.g. an EIS had been done, no further NEPA review was conducted and a contract was awarded without a contingency on developing approved NEPA documentation. If a selected bidder's information satisfied the threshold levels to qualify for award but did not provide sufficient information to complete the NEPA review, a contract was awarded with implementation contingent on completion of NEPA review. The environmental critique was considered proprietary information and

was not shared with the public. An environmental synopsis derived from the critique will be provided to the public after review by DOE Headquarters. This will document the consideration given to environmental factors in the award process and provide the rationale for any additional NEPA review required.

It is anticipated that, to complete the NEPA review on a selected vendor's proposal, it may be necessary for DOE to do an Environmental Assessment (EA). An example of when this will be necessary is when the vendor's proposal provides an environmental analysis that meets the thresholds for qualification but does not satisfy NEPA requirements or stakeholder concerns. In this case DOE will complete the NEPA review upon receipt of the contractor's more detailed environmental analysis compared with the no action alternative. DOE must prepare the EA because the vendor will not be able to perform analysis on the no action alternative.

Additional information needed from the contractor to complete the NEPA review after award was specified in the statement of work and included:

- an overview of the facilities and processes being offered;
- the location(s) of all facilities and processes and information on the local population centers;
- a brief description of the site(s) including whether or not any surveys for sensitive resources (e.g., wetlands, floodplains, cultural resources, threatened and endangered species) have been conducted and if any such resources have been identified;
- any by-products or secondary waste streams that would be associated with implementation of the proposal and how they would be disposed of based on the representative waste definitions provided in the RFP;
- any infrastructure requirements (e.g., utilities, roadways) not already developed and available; and
- the anticipated workforce to be used during implementation of the proposal (e.g., local or other);
- records of regulatory history, including all correspondence from or to any regulatory agencies for the past 3 years. If any correspondence has left an action or determination pending, it was required to be included regardless of date;
- copies of minutes or queries resulting from public meetings or permit reviews if available;
- copies of any existing NEPA documentation for the facility or process and any existing environmental analyses such as transportation/accident, if available.

The vendors were cautioned to take no action with potential adverse environmental impact until the NEPA review was complete. In addition, the cost recovery for NEPA support was limited to an amount pre-agreed upon at the time the support is provided.

**TABLE 1**

**PRICE AGREEMENT**

<u>Pricing Options</u>	<u>Independent Category Bids</u>			<u>Multiple Category Dependent Bids</u>		
	<u>Unit Price</u>	<u>Unit Price</u>	<u>Unit Price</u>	<u>Unit Price</u>	<u>Unit Price</u>	<u>Unit Price</u>
Treatment Category A Task Order Prices	Tier 1	Tier 2	Tier i	Tier 1	Tier 2	Tier i
Solids:						
Treatment for organics (\$/kg)	\$ _____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Treatment for organics and metals						
Mercury above 260 ppm (\$/kg)	\$ _____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Mercury below 260 ppm (\$/kg)	\$ _____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Handling costs:						
55 Gal. Drums (\$/container)	\$ _____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
B-25 Boxes (\$/container)	\$ _____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Sludges:						
Treatment for organics (\$/kg)	\$ _____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Treatment for organics and metals						
Mercury above 260 ppm (\$/kg)	\$ _____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Mercury below 260 ppm (\$/kg)	\$ _____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Handling costs:						
55 Gal. Drums (\$/container)	\$ _____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Overpacks (\$/container)	\$ _____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____