

Award Fee Determination Scorecard

Contractor: Bechtel National, Inc. (BNI)

Contract: Design, Construction, and Commissioning of the Hanford Tank Waste Treatment & Immobilization Plant

Contract Number: DE-AC27-01RV14136

Award Fee Period: January 1, 2013 to June 30, 2013

Basis of Evaluation: 2013-A Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan

Award Fee Available: \$6,300,000

Award Fee Earned: \$3,124,170 (49.6%)

Award Fee Area Adjectival Ratings:

Project Management: Satisfactory

\$1,869,210 earned (49.5% of \$3,780,000 available)

Cost: Satisfactory

\$1,254,960 earned (49.8% of \$2,520,000 available)

Key Positives for Project Management:

- Use of Reliability Validation Process (RVP) to tackle Quality Assurance (QA) issues
- Identified RLD 8 as not meeting QA requirements prior to delivery – refused acceptance
- Effectively managed contract and procurements during continuing resolution, control point reprogramming, and sequestration
- Initial RVP process/system reviews are self-critical, thorough, and transparent
- Demonstrated improved coordination and effectiveness between Bechtel National, Inc. (BNI) and ORP Engineering
- Project and construction site safety performance significantly exceeded goals

Key Negatives for Project Management:

- Quality Program still has programmatic deficiencies in a range of activities and areas
- Software QA has grading level issues of their applications
- Slow in establishing corrective action plans for Level 1 findings
- Slow to identify needed improvement for conducting hazard analysis
- Slow progress in resolving several safety basis issues
- Inadequate internal BNI integration of nuclear safety and facility design

Key Positives for Cost:

- BNI completed update of risk management plan, procedures, and guide
- 91% of risk mitigation actions were effective – all of the major ones were addressed
- Early identification of risks continues to be effective and helpful

Key Negatives for Cost:

- Only 7 of 20 planned milestones completed on time – but several were sequestration impacted
- More efficient method of forecasting effects of funding reductions is needed
- No opportunities for cost efficiency or risk reduction identified