



UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20555

JUL 8 1980

MEMORANDUM FOR: Harold Denton, Director
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Robert J. Budnitz, Director
Office of Nuclear Regulatory Research

FROM: Harris E. Coleman, Chief
Contract Policy Staff
Division of Contracts

SUBJECT: UNSOLICITED PROPOSAL FROM SCIENCE APPLICATIONS, INC.
ENTITLED "A PROPOSAL TO PROVIDE THE NRC WITH A REACTOR RADIATION
STREAMING ANALYSIS CAPABILITY," DOC NUMBER 80-559

The subject proposal is forwarded for your review and consideration. Please note that we have placed a cover sheet on the proposal so that the manner of handling unsolicited proposals is compatible with the provisions of FPR Section 1-4.913.

The Federal Procurement Regulations and Manual Chapter 5102 require that rejection letters to offerors in connection with their proposal submissions be informative to the maximum practical extent. Accordingly, to the degree possible, technical reasons are to be given in a program office's rejection of an unsolicited proposal. Such reasons could include for example, technical flaws in approach or assumptions made, inadequately experienced personnel to conduct the proposed effort, the technical approach could lead to biased results, or the proposed work does not meet the NRC's needs or is nonapplicable as regards its mission.

Further, where applicable, evaluation of unsolicited proposals should include statements that: the proposed work duplicates current efforts or the proposed or similar work is intended to be procured under competitive solicitation in the future.

In the future, rejection letters to offerors will be coordinated by our Policy Staff and the appropriate office performing the evaluation. Concurrence will be reflected by signature on the yellow file copy.

The evaluator of this proposal should keep in mind that the proposal should meet the following criteria (FPR 1-4.909):

1. Does the proposal contain unique, innovative, or meritorious methods, approaches, or ideas which have originated with or are assembled by the offeror?
2. Does the proposal have overall scientific, technical, or socioeconomic merits?

8010030 532

3. Will the proposed effort make a potential contribution to the agency's mission at this time?
4. Does the proposer have capabilities, related experience, facilities, or techniques, or unique combinations thereof, which are considered to be integral factors for the achieving of the proposed objectives?
5. Are the qualifications, capabilities, and the experience of the principal investigator, team leader, or key personnel considered to be critical in achieving the objectives of the proposal?

Should the proposal receive a favorable technical evaluation and you recommend that a contract be awarded for this work, your justification for noncompetitive procurement should clearly state why your requirement for their services cannot be procured on a competitive basis.

Should you recommend that this work not be funded, please return all copies of the proposal to me with your decision. They will then be destroyed or returned to the proposer.

We have advised Science Applications, Inc. that we will let them know of our decision within 60 working days. Accordingly, I would appreciate your prompt review consistent with that schedule. In response, please refer to the above DOC Number. Should you have any questions, please contact Voneree DeLoatch at 42-74383.

Harris E. Coleman, Chief
Contract Policy Staff
Division of Contracts

Attachments: As stated