

MISSION SUPPORT CONTRACT

Contract No. DE-AC06-09RL14728

CONTRACT MANAGEMENT PLAN

Mission Support Alliance, LLC



U.S. Department of Energy
RICHLAND OPERATIONS OFFICE

Approved September 8, 2014


**RICHLAND OPERATIONS OFFICE
CONTRACT MANAGEMENT PLAN**

MISSION SUPPORT CONTRACT


Contract No. DE-AC06-09RL14728

July 2014


Concurrences:



Karen L. Flynn
Assistant Manager for Mission Support
Richland Operations Office, (509) 376-7323
Date 7/21/2014



Andrew H. Wirkkala
Procurement Director
Richland Operations Office, (509) 376-7271
Date 7/21/2014



Gigi H. Branch
Site Office Contracting Officer
Richland Operations Office, (509) 376-7942
Date 7/21/2014



Jack E. Surash (HCA)
EM 50 (202) 586-3867
Date Sep 8, 2014 *Approved*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0	Contract Summary and Background of the Scope of Work	1
2.0	Identification of Key Contract Management Team Members, Including Roles and Responsibilities.....	3
2.1	Contracting Officer	5
2.2	Contracting Officer Representative.....	5
2.3	Manager, Richland Operations Office	6
2.4	Assistant Managers	6
2.5	Federal Project Director.....	7
2.6	Subject Matter Experts.....	7
2.7	Legal Counsel/Litigation COR	8
2.8	Finance/Budget	8
2.9	Industrial Relations/Human Resources	8
2.10	Certified Realty Specialist	8
2.11	Organizational Property Management Officer and Property Administrator.....	8
3.0	Contract Management Processes.....	9
3.1	Contract Communication Protocol.....	9
3.2	Government-Furnished Services/Information Review Process.....	10
3.3	Inspection/Surveillance and Acceptance Processes	11
3.4	Stop Work Authorities	11
3.5	Contract Payment Method	14
3.6	Performance Evaluation Measurement Plan (PEMP) and Fee Administration	14
3.7	Conditional Payment of Fee Contract Clause	15
3.8	Program Management Activities and Contract Change Control	15
3.9	Contract Change Control Process	15
3.10	Review of Contractor’s Requests for Equitable Adjustment.....	16
3.11	Contractor Litigation Management	16
3.12	Contractor Human Resource Management	16
3.13	Contract Records	16
3.14	Contract Closeout	17
4.0	Contract Deliverables	17
5.0	Key Contract Vulnerabilities or Performance Risk Areas.....	17
6.0	Contractor Past Performance Reporting Requirements	18
7.0	Contractor Assurance System.....	18
8.0	Agreements with State, Community, or Other Entities.....	18
9.0	Unique Contract Terms and Conditions.....	19
10.0	Mission Support Contract Points-of-Contact	21

TABLES/FIGURES

Table 5-1.	Risk and Mitigation Strategies	18
Figure 1.	MSC Summary Work Breakdown Structure for the Key Functional Areas.....	2
Figure 2.	Contract Management Team for the MSC	4
Figure 3.	MSC Service Provider Model	19
Figure 4.	Contractor Integrated Performance Evaluation Diagram	20

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

AE	Acquisition Executive
AMB	Assistant Manager for Business and Financial Operations
AMMS	Assistant Manager for Mission Support
AMRP	Assistant Manager for River and Plateau
AMSE	Assistant Manager for Safety and the Environment
CA	Contracting Activity
CAO	Contract Administration Office
CMP	Contract Management Plan
CMT	Contract Management Team
CO	Contracting Officer
COR	Contracting Officer's Representative
CS	Contract Specialist
DEAR	Department of Energy Acquisition Regulation
DNFSB	Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board
DOE	Department of Energy
DOE-EM	DOE Environmental Management
DOE-HQ	DOE Headquarters
DOE-ORP	DOE Office of River Protection
DOE-RL	DOE Richland Operations Office
EM	Environmental Management
ESH&Q	Environment, Safety, Health, and Quality
ESPC	Energy Savings Performance Contract
EVMS	Earned Value Management System
FAR	Federal Acquisition Regulation
FDO	Fee Determining Official
FPD	Federal Project Director
FMD	Financial Management Division
FRAM	Functions, Responsibilities, and Authorities Manual
GFS/I	Government Furnished Service/Information
HASC	Hanford Analytical Services Contract
HCA	Head of Contracting Activity
HPMP	Hanford Integrated Programmatic Risk Management Program
ICMT	Integrated Contract Management Team
IEP	Integrated Evaluation Plan
IGE	Independent Government Estimate
IPT	Integrated Project Team
LIGO	Laser Interferometer Gravitational Wave Observatory
MSA	Mission Support Alliance (Contractor)
MSC	Mission Support Contract
NTE	Not to Exceed
PBI	Performance Based Incentive
PD	Program Director
PEMP	Performance Evaluation Management Plan

PFP	Plutonium Finishing Plant
PNNL	Pacific Northwest National Laboratory
PNSO	Pacific Northwest Site Office
PRC	Plateau Remediation Contract
RCCC	River Corridor Closure Contract
REA	Request for Equitable Adjustment
RIMS	RL Integrated Management System
RL	Richland Operations Office
SOW	Statement of Work
TFC	Tank Farm Contract
TOC	Tank Operations Contract
TPA	Tri-Party Agreement
WTP	Waste Treatment Plant

CONTRACT MANAGEMENT PLAN MISSION SUPPORT CONTRACT

Purpose of the Contract Management Plan

The purpose of this Contract Management Plan (CMP) is to provide guidance to Richland Operations Office (RL) employees involved with the management and administration of the contract number DE-AC06-09RL14728, Mission Support Contract (MSC). Such guidance should be a useful tool to help the Department of Energy (DOE) ensure that Mission Support Alliance, LLC, herein referred to as “Contractor,” and RL comply with all terms and conditions that govern the contract. This CMP was developed with the guiding principles that:

- It shall be a useful tool for administering the contract.
- It shall be an executive summary of the roles and responsibilities of the contracting parties.
- It shall identify who is responsible for various contract administration activities.
- It shall be flexible and adapt to changing circumstances.

This CMP does not include every action that RL must take to make the contract successful. Instead, it summarizes the higher-level requirements, deliverables, and tasks necessary, and describes the overall process with which the tasks are performed. It describes the various contract management processes and how they fit together, but does not contain all of the step-by-step details of those processes. For the most part, these details are contained in the RL Integrated Management System (RIMS) processes and procedures, and specific desk instructions and documents. Appropriate references to these details are included in the CMP. Familiarization with this CMP and its related references is vital to all RL employees involved in contract management, and each staff member involved in overseeing the MSC is required to read the [*MSC Conformed Contract*](#).

This CMP is intended solely to provide guidance to Government employees and should not be construed to create any rights or obligations on the part of any person or entity, including the Contractor and its employees. It is not intended to be either prescriptive or inclusive of all actions necessary to support and/or administer the contract.

1.0 Contract Summary and Background of the Scope of Work

Contractor name:	Mission Support Alliance, LLC (MSA)
Contract number:	DE-AC06-09RL14728
Contract title:	Mission Support Contract (MSC)
Performance period:	August 24, 2009 through May 25, 2019 (Notice to Proceed issued May 12, 2009, with transition period from May 26, 2009, through August 23, 2009)
Total contract price:	\$3.4B
Contract type:	Cost-plus-award-fee with performance incentives
Contractor key personnel:	Contractor key personnel are listed in contract clauses H.15, Key Personnel, and H.16, Safety and Security Key Personnel

The Hanford Site is located along the Columbia River in southeastern Washington State. The site covers 586 square miles and consists of a plutonium production complex with nine nuclear reactors and

associated processing facilities. Hanford played a pivotal role in the nation's defense for more than 40 years, beginning in the 1940s with the Manhattan Project. Today, under the direction of the U.S. Department of Energy officials, Hanford is engaged in the world's largest environmental cleanup project, with a number of overlapping technical, political, regulatory, financial, and cultural issues.

There are two DOE Federal organizations at Hanford. The mission of both organizations is environmental cleanup. The first organization, RL, employs officials responsible for ensuring nuclear waste and facility cleanup, and overall management of the Hanford Site; RL's mission is to restore the Columbia River corridor and transition the Hanford Central Plateau to a remediated state. The DOE Office of River Protection (DOE-ORP) employs officials responsible for cleanup of Hanford Site tank waste; ORP's mission is to retrieve and treat Hanford's tank waste and close the tank farms to protect the environmental integrity of the Columbia River. Each Office oversees separate contracts held by private companies. For purposes of this Contract, the land, facilities, property, projects and work performed and overseen by RL and ORP constitute the "Hanford Site."

The purpose of this contract is to provide direct support to DOE and its contractors with cost-effective infrastructure and site services integral and necessary to accomplish the Hanford Site environmental cleanup mission. The scope includes five primary functions as listed in Figure 1. MSC Summary Work Breakdown Structure below. The General Performance Requirements function represents those activities internal to the operation of the MSC and is not considered one of the five primary functions. In addition to these functions, the MSC will play a key role in ensuring that interfaces with and between Hanford Site customers (DOE Offices, Hanford Site contractors, etc.) that affect their scope of work are managed in a manner that encourages open and proactive communication, collaboration, and cooperation. The Contractor has the responsibility for determining the specific methods and approaches for accomplishing the identified work. This contract applies performance-based contracting approaches and expects the Contractor to implement techniques that emphasize safe, efficient, and measurable results.

Figure 1. MSC Summary Work Breakdown Structure for the Key Functional Areas

Safety, Security, & Environment	Site Infrastructure & Utilities	Site Business Management	Information Resources & Content Management	Portfolio Management	General Performance Requirements
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Safeguards & Security Site Training Services & HAMMER Fire and Emergency Response Services Emergency Operations Site Safety Standards Radiological Assistance Program Environmental Regulatory Management Public Safety & Resource Protection Radiological Site Services 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Analytical Services Biological Control Crane & Rigging Motor Carrier Services Facility Services Fleet Services Railroad Services Roads and Grounds Utilities Sewer Systems Sanitary Waste Management & Disposal 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Real Property Asset Management Property Systems/ Acquisition & Materials Management Sponsorship, Management & Administration of Employee Pension and Other Benefit Plans EEOICPA/Workers Compensation External Affairs & Other Interactions Courier & Mail Services Reproduction, Correspondence Control, & Multi-Media 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strategic Planning and Program Management Telecommunications Information Systems Content (Records) Management 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hanford Portfolio Planning, Analysis & Performance Assessment Project Acquisition & Support Independent Analysis & Assessments 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project Management ISMS Radiation Protection Worker Safety & Health Management Quality Assurance Beryllium Event Reporting & Investigation Work-for-Others Interface Management Transition Business Administration Legal Support Internal Audit Employee Concerns Traffic Management

In addition to the MSC, RL manages the below-listed major contracts. The following contractors, DOE offices and DOE customers are part of the key customer base receiving various infrastructure and site services from the Contractor specified throughout the MSC:

- Energy Savings Performance Contract (ESPC) includes steam service to support heating and other operations at 200 Area facilities. The contract may include energy conservation measures, such as upgrading lighting systems, pumping systems, automation systems, heating, ventilation, and air conditioning system; and adding utility monitoring and control systems.
- Hanford Site Occupational Medical Services Contract provides occupational health services to personnel at Hanford including medical monitoring and qualification examinations, human reliability testing, and records management.
- Plateau Remediation Contract (PRC) includes completion of the Plutonium Finishing Plant (PFP) project; non-tank farm waste disposal activities: groundwater monitoring and remediation; facility and waste site characterization, surveillance and maintenance, regulatory document preparation, and remediation.
- River Corridor Closure Contract (RCCC) includes closing the Hanford Site River Corridor through deactivation, decontamination, decommissioning, and demolishing excess facilities; placing former production reactors in an interim safe and stable condition; remediating waste sites and burial grounds; and transitioning the River Corridor to long-term stewardship.

The following major contracts are managed by ORP:


- Hanford Analytical Services Contract (HASC) provides analysis of highly radioactive samples in support of Hanford Site projects. These services are performed in the 222-S Laboratory Complex located in the 200 Area of the Hanford Site.
- Tank Operations Contract (TOC) includes operations and construction activities necessary to store, retrieve and treat Hanford tank waste, store and dispose of treated waste, and begin to close the tank farm waste management areas to protect the Columbia River.
- Waste Treatment and Immobilization Plant (WTP) Contract includes design, construction and commissioning of a vitrification facility that will convert radioactive tank wastes into glass logs for long-term storage. The WTP is being constructed on the Hanford Site Central Plateau.

2.0 Identification of Key Contract Management Team Members, Including Roles and Responsibilities

The Richland Operations Office is a contracting activity (CA) and the Contract Administration Office (CAO) responsible for the MSC.¹ The MSC Contract Management Team (CMT), as shown in Figure 2 below, is the group within the CAO that has the primary responsibility for assuring that the Contractor delivers the products and services necessary to support successful program element completion.

¹ FAR Subpart 2.1 – Definitions

Figure 2. Contract Management Team for the MSC



The MSC CMT is an integral part of the overall Hanford environmental cleanup program. The CMT is responsible for assuring that the Contractor delivers the products and services necessary to achieve the applicable overall Hanford acquisition plan objectives and environmental program goals defined in the contract and applicable regulatory requirements.

The MSC CMT interfaces with associated Integrated Project Teams (IPT), other Hanford CMTs, program managers, Hanford Acquisition Team, technical monitors, and support groups. The contract is the primary tool that the CMT and associated IPTs reference to identify that the Contractor's performance complies with the various program and project level objectives defined in the Acquisition Plan. The MSC CMT will coordinate with other CMTs in RL and Office of River Protection to include the River Corridor Closure Contract, Plateau Remediation Contract, and Tank Operations Contract. The CMT will also have a direct interface with the IPT for each project within the MSC scope. **Table 1** of this document provides a listing of points of contact responsible for different areas of the MSC administration.

Successful management and administration of the MSC by the CMT requires the coordinated efforts of a variety of RL personnel. Some of these key personnel on the CMT include the RL Manager and senior staff, Contracting Officer(s) (CO), Contracting Officer's Representative(s) (COR), contract specialist(s) (CS), program director(s) (PD), federal project director(s) (FPD), technical support staff, and subject matter experts on the mission contracts that are serviced by the MSC. This CMP delineates the roles and responsibilities of these team members and describes their key contract administration duties.

2.1 Contracting Officer

The RL MSC CO is appointed by the Environmental Management (EM) head of contracting activity (HCA) and is the functional leader of the MSC CMT. Additional EM-appointed COs may also be assigned administrative responsibilities on the MSC. Contracts may be entered into and signed on behalf of the Government only by an appointed CO. The CO has the responsibility and authority to administer the contract and make related determinations and findings. Pursuant to [Clause G.3](#), Modification Authority, only the CO is authorized to accept non-conforming work; waive any requirement of the contract; or modify any term or condition of the contract. A [CO List](#) is available on the Hanford intranet, which includes CO/COR authorities and limitations. CO responsibilities and authorities are described in the [Federal Acquisition Regulation Subpart 1.602](#).

2.2 Contracting Officer Representative

The primary role of a COR is to assist the CO in performing certain technical functions in administering the contract. A COR is officially designated in writing by the CO who provides a formal Letter of Designation that defines the COR's specific roles and responsibilities. A COR acts solely as a technical representative of the CO and is not authorized to perform any function that results in a change in the scope, price, or terms and conditions of the contract.² Technical direction provided by a COR is defined in Department of Energy Acquisition Regulation (DEAR) 952.242-70, Technical Direction. A COR has the following general responsibilities:

² **Supplement 942.270-1 -- Contracting Officer's Representatives.**

The contracting officer may designate other qualified personnel to be the Contracting Officer's Representative (COR) for the purpose of performing certain technical functions in administering a contract. These functions include, but are not limited to, technical monitoring, inspection, approval of shop drawings, testing, and approval of samples. The COR acts solely as a technical representative of the contracting officer and is not authorized to perform any function that results in a change in the scope, price, terms or conditions of the contract. COR designations must be made in writing by the contracting officer, and shall identify the responsibilities and limitations of the designation. A copy of the COR designation must be furnished to the contractor and the contract administration office.

- Provide assistance in areas such as technical monitoring, including:
 - Provide performance oversight to ensure the products and services for which the COR is responsible are delivered by the Contractor in accordance with the terms and conditions of the contract, including quality.
 - Review and where authorized, approve drawings, testing, samples, and technical information to be delivered under the contract.
 - Monitor expenditures.
 - Perform inspection and acceptance of work, as required.
 - Conduct periodic reviews, audits, and surveillances of the Contractor to ensure compliance with the contract, as required.
 - Perform periodic reviews of the Contractor to evaluate invoices, incremental and provisional payments, and recommend final fee.
 - Provide technical and/or administrative direction to the Contractor in accordance with clause I.134, Technical Direction, and the COR's Letter of Designation.
- Keep the CO informed of the Contractor's progress and provide prompt notification of any contractual problems or issues. A [COR List](#) is available on the Hanford Intranet, which includes CO/COR authorities and limitations.

2.3 Manager, Richland Operations Office

The RL Manager provides the EM onsite presence and is responsible for implementing DOE-HQ policy and direction. The RL Manager has line-management authority and responsibility to integrate administrative and operations requirements into program missions. These responsibilities include, but are not limited to: (1) Establish and communicate expectations, integrate DOE requirements, provide feedback to the Contractor; (2) serve as the Fee Determining Official; (3) monitor overall operations, review work and coordinate activities related to assigned programs and projects; (4) maintain and protect Federal assets; and (5) manage RL staff and administrative systems to assure effective operations.

2.4 Assistant Managers

The Assistant Manager for Mission Support (AMMS) is the primary COR who leads the oversight of assigned Hanford activities associated with the MSC; however, the MSC also contains program elements that fall under the responsibility of the Assistant Manager for River and Plateau (AMRP), Assistant Manager for Safety and Environment (AMSE), and Assistant Manager for Budget and Financial Operations (AMB). Additional AMRP, AMSE, and AMB responsibilities, accountabilities, and authorities are available on the [RL Roles, Responsibilities, Accountabilities, and Authorities page on the RIMS](#) web site. The AMMS responsibilities include:

- Participating as a key member of the MSC CMT.
- Coordinating with the CO and other CORs to assure that the Contractor is delivering the necessary programmatic deliverables.
- Delivering assigned government furnished service/information (GFS/I) consistent with the contract.

- Maintaining in-depth operational awareness of projects.
- Monitoring contractor performance in meeting performance incentives, Tri Party Agreement (TPA) milestones, and Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board (DNFSB) commitments, as applicable.
- Providing RL management with accurate and objective information regarding project performance.
- Monitoring cost and schedule variance of projects.
- Promptly notifying management of events that significantly affect project performance.

2.5 Federal Project Director

A Federal Project Director (FPD) is also a technical monitor who leads the oversight of an assigned Hanford Cleanup project. Additional FPD responsibilities, accountabilities, and authorities are available on the RL Roles, Responsibilities, Accountabilities, and Authorities page on the RIMS web site. FPDs are assigned the following responsibilities as they apply to each FPD's project:

- Participating as a member of the CMT.
- Performing contract technical monitor or COR role.
- Leading the assigned project team for their assigned project.
- Assuring delivery of assigned GFS/I consistent with the contract.
- Maintaining overall operational awareness of the assigned project.
- Coordinating the monitoring of Contractor performance in meeting performance incentives, TPA milestones, and DNFSB commitments.
- Providing timely recommendations to their manager and the CO and other affected CORs to correct performance consistent with the contract.
- Providing management and the CO and other affected CORs with accurate and objective information regarding project performance.
- Leading the development of the RL Integrated Evaluation Plan (IEP) for their assigned project.
- Monitoring cost and schedule variance of assigned project.
- Performing variance analysis (what and why) of significant favorable and unfavorable variances.
- Promptly notifying management of events that significantly affect project performance.

2.6 Subject Matter Experts

Federal staff members provide specific technical assistance to project staff and management involved in the oversight of an assigned Hanford Cleanup project as part of the overall program. General federal staff responsibilities, accountabilities, and authorities are available on the [RL Roles, Responsibilities, Accountabilities, and Authorities page on the RIMS](#) website. Federal staff responsibilities include:

- Supporting the project teams.

- Delivering assigned GFS/I consistent with the contract.
- Maintaining in-depth operational awareness in the assigned subject areas.
- Assisting the FPD in developing timely recommendations to their manager to correct performance consistent with the contract.
- Providing the FPD with accurate and objective information regarding project performance.
- Assisting in the development of the RL IEP for their assigned roles.
- Promptly notifying management of events that significantly affect project performance.

2.7 Legal Counsel/Litigation COR

The legal counsel/litigation COR has primary responsibility for providing technical direction related to the area of litigation management and legal policy.

2.8 Finance/Budget

The Finance Division (FIN) and the Budget Division (BUD), Assistant Manager for Business and Financial Operations, is responsible for ensuring that the Contractor's accounting and billing systems are adequate and reflect accurate reporting of costs along with all aspects of financial management including executing procedures, policies, and programs related to budgeting, accounting, financial review, audit, and financial analysis activities. The Budget Division coordinates with Contractors and RL line organizations for budget preparation and tracking, and provides funds control for all RL funds.

2.9 Industrial Relations/Human Resources

The Contractor Industrial Relations Team provides support to RL/ORP in accordance with the RIMS procedure entitled *RL Oversight of Contractor Human Resource Programs*: (1) Administers the RL/ORP workforce restructuring program; (2) monitors Hanford labor relations programs and reviews/coordinates economic bargaining parameters; (3) serves as a member of the Labor Standard Board for review and approval of plant force work reviews; (4) oversees and approves the RL/ORP prime contractors' personnel appendices; (5) oversees the third-party administration of Hanford contractors' workers' compensation claims; (6) provides lead oversight of the Rocky Flats Closure workers' compensation claims and settlements; (7) provides lead oversight of the pension and benefits plans for Hanford Site contractors; and (8) provides lead oversight of identified DOE Closure Site legacy pension and benefits plans.

2.10 Certified Realty Specialist

The Certified Realty Specialist provides the review and approvals required to acquire, manage, and dispose of real property. The Certified Realty Specialist provides all approvals and recommendations to the MSC CO. In accordance with regulations and DOE guidance, only the MSC CO can provide approval of real estate actions to the Contractor.

2.11 Organizational Property Management Officer and Property Administrator

In RL, one individual serves as the Organizational Property Management Officer (OPMO) and the Property Administrator (PA). This individual establishes and administers personal property

management scope within RL consistent with DOE Order 580.1A, Change 1, and applicable laws, regulations, practices, and standards.

3.0 Contract Management Processes

3.1 Contract Communication Protocol

3.1.1 Formal Communications with the Contractor

All formal direction to the Contractor is issued by the CO, or the COR within designated authority. Such direction should be in writing, but may be provided orally in meetings, briefings, phone, or video conferencing. A written record of direction should be created for such oral directions. All formal written correspondence to the Contractor should include the contract number within the subject line. Correspondence will include the following statement, where applicable—

The Government considers this action to be within the scope of the existing contract and therefore, the action does not involve or authorize any delay in delivery or additional cost to the Government, either direct or indirect.

The following caveat should be included within the body of correspondence issued by CORs:

If, in my capacity as a Contracting Officer's Representative (COR), I provide any direction which your company believes exceeds my authority you are to immediately notify the Contracting Officer and request clarification prior to complying with the direction.

The CO must be on concurrence for all correspondence to the Contractor (e.g., technical direction by the COR) and receive a copy when issued. Only the CO has the authority to interpret the contract terms and conditions or make changes to the contract.

To ensure correspondence control, all formal correspondence will be addressed to the Contractor's local principal executive, and cite the contract number and applicable contract provision and/or GFI/S item number in the letter's subject line. Formal communication from the Contractor should follow a formal contract correspondence tracking system with commitments appropriately assigned and tracked for timely completion.

3.1.2 Informal Communications with the Contractor

Informal communications can occur between an RL employee and any Contractor employee. This type of communication is non-binding for both the Government and the Contractor and does not constitute contract direction (i.e., formal communication). Informal communication can take the form of electronic mail, retrievable databases, telephone, facsimile, presentations, meetings, and other means.

Informal communications between RL and Contractor staff are needed for proper oversight coordination. This communication should be constructive in nature. Avoid requesting information obtainable by other means. In their informal communications, RL employees need to avoid the impression the communications are formal. Particularly, when COs or CORs are engaging in informal communications, they must be careful to identify those communications as non-binding. CORs should inform the Contractor as to whether or not the

communications or portions thereof are formal or informal. More specific expectations for RL interfaces with Contractors are described in the RIMS Contract Management and Oversight Performance crosscutting processes.

3.1.3 Non-RL Communications

The Contractor will be required to communicate with other than RL staff in conjunction with its responsibilities and work scope. The parties most likely to be involved are DOE-Headquarters; other federal agencies and offices including the Environmental Protection Agency and Government Accountability Office, the DNFSB; other Hanford Contractors; Hanford Advisory Board; State agencies and officials including the Washington State Departments of Ecology & Health; Tribal Nations; and the general public. Because these entities are outside of the contractual relationship between the Contractor and RL, their communications to the Contractor may not be construed as contractual direction to change the scope or terms and conditions of the contract. It is expected, however, that these “stakeholder” communications are coordinated or monitored by the CO, COR, or responsible IPT participant as described in RIMS Intergovernmental Affairs and Public Affairs crosscutting processes.

3.2 Government-Furnished Services/Information Review Process

The Government has a responsibility to enable contract performance by ensuring that Government Furnished Services and Information (GFS/I) are available, timely and of the required quality. Section C, Section C.1, of the MSC entitled “Mission Support Contract Overview and General Requirements” describes the Statement of Work (SOW) structure including GFI/S requirements. This Section explains that the contract work scope is divided into 3 key Sections, with Section C.1 containing the background, contract purpose and overview, scope summary and organization of the Statement of Work; Section C.2, Description of Mission Support Performance Requirements, containing specific scope for the projects within the MSC; and Section C.3, Description of Mission Support General Performance Requirements containing the functional areas such as, Project Management, Integrated Safety Management System, Worker Safety and Health Management, Interface Management, Business Administration, etc. Each project area contains specific scope descriptions and requirements that are necessary to accomplish the work scope. Typical GFS/I include RL approval of Contractor submittals such as decision documents and reports; and approval of management products and controls deliverables. If GFS/I are not furnished as specified in the contract, the Contractor may be due an equitable adjustment. Contract deliverables and GFS/I are consolidated in Attachments J-11 and J-12, respectively.

Required government responses and approvals: In the course of performing the contract, the Contractor is required to obtain the Government’s review and/or approval on numerous documents and management systems. It is imperative the Government provides appropriate responses within the timeframes specified by the contract. The DOE action and response times for specific Contractor deliverables are specified in Attachments J-11 as “DOE Action” and “Response time.” The response time is given in calendar days, and in some cases the response time is very short. The response time is specified as the number of calendar days for DOE to execute its GFS/I responsibilities to provide review, approval and/or certification action on the deliverable following Contractor submission of an acceptable product; or DOE comments on a deliverable following Contractor submission of an unacceptable product that will require revision and re-submission for DOE review, approval, and/or certification action. It is expected at reviews of key Contractor management system documentation, such as an Integrated Safety Management System description and the Project Management Plan, be conducted with the Contractor prior to formal submittal by the Contractor for review and approval. Communication with the Contractor and within the

organization will be essential to managing the requirement to deliver GFS/I to avoid a basis for equitable adjustment claims.

As a reminder, the only way in which GFS/I can be modified is through the CO, via a contract modification. As with other contracting changes, only those changes agreed to by the CO are binding.

3.3 Inspection/Surveillance and Acceptance Processes

Various RL organizational elements have contract management responsibilities and ownership for actions associated with this contract. RL's [FRAM](#) establishes these key responsibilities. Each project organization is responsible for monitoring performance measures within its control. AMMS is responsible for overall monitoring of performance measures. The primary method used for monitoring contractor performance is based on:

- An understanding of the performance-based nature of the contract
- Knowledge of the Contractor's performance in accordance with the contract requirements
- Awareness of the type and level of associated risks and hazards
- Insight on the technical and management approaches to mitigating programmatic risks and controlling hazards
- Familiarity with the Contractor's approved management systems

Increased evaluation efforts are placed on those areas where there are indications of poor or suspect contractor performance, indicated by contractor self-assessment or by IPT surveillance and analysis. The level of review is reduced when there are indications that the contractor's performance is strong and the contractor's self-assessment and corrective action programs are effective. In general, DOE's intent is to minimize the level of DOE involvement and allow the Contractor to perform to, or exceed, the contract requirements. DOE's goal is to reduce evaluations when the Contractor demonstrates an effective self-assessment program that includes self-identification, taking appropriate corrective actions, and successful follow-on action to prevent recurrence and improve performance. If the Contractor's performance is deficient, and it appears that the contractor's management processes have not produced the desired result(s), DOE can increase evaluations in order to protect the Government's interests. Additional DOE inspection and acceptance rights can be found in Section E of the contract.

Contractor progress and fee are determined by Contractor success in meeting end states established in [Section C](#), Statement of Work and the Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan in [Section J, Attachment J.4](#), as well as compliance with minimum contract requirements. All work must be performed in accordance with applicable Law, Regulation, and DOE Directives. Failures in contract performance as defined in contract [Clause B.9](#); Fee Reductions may be the basis for reduction of fee. The contract [Section E](#), Inspection and Acceptance is also the basis for Contractor rework for performance that does not meet contract requirements.

3.4 Stop Work Authorities

Clause H. 18, Stop Work and Shutdown Authorization, provides the following:

(a) Definitions:

Imminent Danger: Any condition or practice such that a hazard exists that could reasonably be expected to cause death, serious physical harm, or other serious hazard to employees, unless immediate actions are taken to mitigate the effects of the hazard and/or remove employees from the hazard.

Adversely Affects Safe Operation of Facility or Serious Facility Damage: A condition, situation, or activity that if not terminated or mitigated could reasonably be expected to result in: nuclear criticality; facility fire/explosion; major facility or equipment damage or loss; or, a facility evacuation response.

Stop Work Criteria:

- 1. Conditions exist that pose an imminent danger to the health and safety of workers or the public; or*
- 2. Conditions exist, that if allowed to continue, could adversely affect the safe operation of, or could cause serious damage to, the facility; or*
- 3. Conditions exist, that if allowed to continue, could result in the release from the facility to the environment of radiological or chemical effluents that exceed applicable regulatory requirements or approvals*

(b) DOE Stop Work Order.

In accordance with Section I, Contract Clause, I.143, DEAR 970.5223-1 Integration of Environment, Safety, and Health into Work Planning and Execution, the DOE Contracting Officer has the ability to issue a DOE Stop Work Order stopping work in whole or in part if:

- 1. The contractor fails to provide resolution of any noncompliance with applicable requirements and Safety Management System or if,*
- 2. At any time the contractor's acts or failure to act causes substantial harm or an imminent danger to the environment or health and safety of employees or the public.*

In addition, a DOE Stop Work Order can be initiated if the Stop Work Criteria as defined in Section H.17 (a) is met dependent on the severity and extent of the condition.

The DOE Stop Work Order shall be executed in accordance with Section F, Deliverables or Performance, F.3 FAR 52.242-15, STOP-WORK ORDER.

(c) DOE Stop Work Action.

DOE personnel provide safety oversight of contractor operations and have the authority to initiate a DOE Stop Work Action if the Stop Work Criteria as defined in Section H.17 (a) is met. DOE personnel have the authority to shutdown an entire facility, activity, or job. Following a DOE Stop Work Action the contractor shall:

- 1. Immediately stop the identified activity or activities (up to and including entire plant shutdown);*
- 2. Place the area, activity, facility, etc. into a safe condition;*
- 3. Determine actions necessary to address the unsafe condition;*
- 4. Provide proposed corrective actions to the DOE initiator of the DOE Stop Work Action;*
- 5. Prior to restarting work, inform the DOE initiator that the corrective actions allowing for restart have been completed;*
- 6. Restart work only after the unsafe condition is mitigated and the DOE has given verbal direction to allow restart; and*
- 7. If requested, provide DOE a Corrective Action Plan subsequent to the resumption of work in accordance with contractual requirements.*

(d) Contractor Stop Work Action

- 1. The contractor shall establish a stop work process/procedure that:*

- a. *meets the requirement of 10 CFR 851.20, Management responsibilities and worker rights and responsibilities*
 - b. *at a minimum uses the Stop Work Criteria defined in Section H.17 (a) for when a Contractor Stop Work Action is required; and*
 - c. *meets the tenets of the "Stop Work Policy."*
2. *Upon initiating a Contractor Stop Work Action the contractor shall:*
- a. *immediately stop the identified activity or activities (up to and including entire plant shutdown);*
 - b. *place the area, activity, facility, etc. into a safe condition;*
 - c. *notify the DOE Facility Representative if the Contractor's Stop Work Action meets the Stop Work Criteria defined in Section H.17 (a), or notification of facility management is required for the issue;*
 - d. *determine actions necessary to address the unsafe condition;*
 - e. *restart work only after the unsafe condition is mitigated.*

(e) Stop Work Policy.

The following represent the site's Stop Work Policy:

Stop Work Responsibility: Every Hanford site employee, regardless of employer, has the responsibility and authority to stop work IMMEDIATELY, without fear of reprisal, when the employee is convinced:

1. *Conditions exist that pose a danger to the health and safety of workers or the public; or*
2. *Conditions exist, that if allowed to continue, could adversely affect the safe operation of, or could cause serious damage to, a facility; or*
3. *Conditions exist, that if allowed to continue, could result in the release from the facility to the environment of radiological or chemical effluents that exceed applicable regulatory requirements or approvals.*

Reporting Unsafe Conditions: Employees are expected to report any activity or condition which he/she believes is unsafe. Notification should be made to the affected worker(s) and then to the supervisor or designee at the location where the activity or condition exists. Following notification, resolution of the issue resides with the responsible supervisor.

Right to a Safe Workplace: Any employee who reasonably believes that an activity or condition is unsafe is expected to stop or refuse work without fear of reprisal by management or coworkers and is entitled to have the safety concern addressed prior to participating in the work.

Stop Work Resolution: If you have a "stop work" issue that has not been resolved through established channels, immediately contact your employer's Safety Representative or your Union Safety Representative. Alternatively, you may contact the employer's Employee Concerns Program or the DOE Employee Concerns Program

3.5 Contract Payment Method

Contract payment under this contract is executed via a Special Financial Institution Account Agreement (letter of credit). There are no invoices submitted to DOE under the contract, except for award fee or performance based incentive (PBI). DOE, the Contractor, and its financial institution (US Bank) entered into a tripartite agreement for providing for the transfer of funds on a payments-cleared basis. DOE requires that amounts transferred to the Contractor be deposited in a special bank account at a financial institution covered by a U.S. Department of the Treasury-approved Government deposit insurance organization. The special bank account must be kept separate from the Contractor's general or other funds, and the parties have agreed to deposit amounts with the financial institution to cover incurred costs under the contract. The Government has the title to the credit balance in the special bank account to secure the repayment of all funds transferred to the Contractor, and under the agreement this title shall be superior to any lien, title, or claim of the financial institution or others, with respect to the special bank account.

DOE, or its authorized representatives, has access to financial records maintained by the financial institution, with respect to such special bank account, at all reasonable times and for all reasonable purposes, including, but without limitation to, the inspection or copying of such financial records and any or all memoranda, checks, payment requests, correspondence, or documents pertaining thereto. Such financial records shall be preserved by the financial institution for a period of six years and three months after the final payment under the special bank account agreement. Under the agreement the financial institution is required to maintain an average daily balance as close to zero as possible. The responsible DOE organization for maintaining the Financial Institution Account Agreement is the RL Finance Division.

3.6 Performance Evaluation Measurement Plan (PEMP) and Fee Administration

The fee on the MSC is administered primarily in accordance with contract Clause B.7, Fee Structure and the RIMS procedure for Performance Incentives Development and Evaluation Process under the cross cutting procedure entitled Contract Management. The Contractor will have the opportunity to earn 100% of the available fee through objective fee components and subjective fee components contained in the PEMP, Attachment J.4 of the MSC. The PEMP contains annual and multi-year performance measures. Final fee determinations for performance measures are made and fees are paid per contract Clauses B.8, Fee Determination and Payment, and B.9, Fee Reductions. The RL Manager has been delegated the responsibilities as the Fee Determining Official for this contract.

Contract clauses relevant to the fee determination include:

- B.4, Contract Cost and Contract Fee
- B.5, Changes to Contract Cost and Contract Fee
- B.6, Basis for Total Available Fee
- B.7, Fee Structure
- B.8, Fee Determination and Payment
- B.9, Fee Reductions
- B.10, Small Business Subcontracting Fee Reduction
- B.11, Allowability of Subcontractor Fee
- B.12, Conditional Payment of Fee, Profit, and Other Incentives—Facility Management Contracts
- B.13, Conditional Payment of Fee, DOE Richland Operations Office Site-Specific Performance Criteria/Requirements

- G.1, Contract Administration
- H.15, Key Personnel
- H.16, Safety and Security Key Personnel
- H.23, Financial Management System Requirements
- H.24, Payments and Advances
- I.78, Limitation on Withholding of Payments
- I.79, Advance Payments
- I.84, Prompt Payments
- I.85, Payment of Electronic Funds Transfer—Central Contract Registration
- I.128, Allowable Cost and Payment

3.7 Conditional Payment of Fee Contract Clause

Under clause B.12, Conditional Payment of Fee, and clause B.13, RL Site-Specific Conditional Payment of Fee, DOE may unilaterally reduce earned fees for failure to meet minimum requirements of the environmental, safety, and health (ES&H) management systems or for failures in safeguards and security systems. This unilateral right also extends to a catastrophic event, failures to comply with the SOW, or cost performance failures.

3.8 Program Management Activities and Contract Change Control

AMMS has the primary responsibility for the programmatic and technical oversight of the MSC. Within AMMS, division directors and program staff have been assigned the responsibility for managing and overseeing the diverse nature of the work scope covered under the MSC and report to AMMS, see item 2.0 above. The work scope covered under the MSC is organized into many functional areas as depicted in item 1.0, Contract Summary and Background of Scope of Work, above and will be managed and overseen as an AMMS portfolio.

The division directors are supported by integrated project teams (IPTs). The AMMS IPTs consist of a core group of individuals with direct responsibility for the primary functional areas. The core IPTs coordinate and maintain cognizance of activities and issues related to the following areas: project status, conduct of field oversights and operational efficiency, safety documentation and engineering design, readiness assessments, operational readiness, environmental, regulatory, and legal permits and documents. AMMS core team members are also responsible for the overall integration of all oversight activities related to the AMMS portfolio. Integration includes direct interface with other RL elements providing oversight support such as the facility representatives in the Operations Oversight Division, Safety and Engineering Division, Environmental Services Division, Office of Chief Counsel, and Procurement Division. The AMMS oversight model and approach is to focus its efforts against identified vulnerabilities and to utilize scheduled/planned oversight activities planned by both internal and external organizations.

RL has a defined baseline scope description, cost estimate, and schedule for the MSC work scope. Execution of baseline is conducted through the contract (i.e. no changes to the baseline until a change has been definitized in the contract). The baseline scope descriptions are linked to the SOW; baseline cost estimates are linked to the estimated contract costs; and the baseline schedule is linked to contract performance incentives, SOW deliverables, and contractual GFS/I.

3.9 Contract Change Control Process

There is a direct correlation between the contract price (contract estimated cost plus fee) and the contract performance baseline. Changes to baseline or the receipt of a revised baseline from the

Contractor does not constitute a contract change or a change proposal. Changes to the baseline that impact the MSC cost, fee, schedule, and/or SOW require identification as such on the change control form and require resolution through the MSC CO and appropriate contract change order processes. The structure for managing change control relating to scope, cost, and schedule, as well as mitigating variances to approved scope, cost, or schedule is explained in the RIMS RL Integrated Baseline Management crosscutting process.

3.10 Review of Contractor's Requests for Equitable Adjustment

Changes to the contract performance baseline that impact the MSC cost, fee, schedule and/or SOW as a result of a contractor-submitted REA, require resolution through the MSC CO and appropriate contract change order processes ([Policy Flash 2013-72](#)). Fee may be paid on contract change orders and REAs with entitlement in accordance with Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) Subpart 43.2, Change Orders, and Acquisition Guide 15.4.1, Pricing Contract Modifications. Contract change orders and REAs, including the associated contract fee, will be negotiated to the extent possible prior to the incurrence of significant costs. Incentive or performance fees may not be established or paid on incurred costs, past delivery dates, or other actions that have been accomplished by the Contractor prior to the negotiation of the fee. To the extent that changes and REAs involve significant costs incurred prior to agreement on contract price, the fee objective will be reduced to reflect decreased cost risk.

3.11 Contractor Litigation Management

The Department of Energy established regulations covering contractor legal management requirements. The RIMS Litigation Management - Contractor crosscutting process was written to assist personnel in controlling and overseeing litigation costs for which contractors seek reimbursement under the terms of their contracts, including general legal services. It also provides information for instances when the contractor is required to provide Richland Operations Office Chief Counsel with a Staffing and Resource Plan for litigation where legal costs over the life of the matter are expected to exceed \$100,000.

3.12 Contractor Human Resource Management

The DOE-RL Procurement Division is responsible to ensure that the Contractor conducts expedient reporting and processing of employee compensation claims. The RIMS procedure, [RL Oversight of Contractor Human Resource Programs](#), describes this area of RL oversight activities. Contract requirements related to Contractor Human Resource Programs are included in the first 13 clauses of Section H of the MSC.

Post-contract liabilities include site Pension and Retiree Medical expenses. The Contractor is tasked with prudently managing these benefits in accordance with DOE Order 350.1, Chg 4 as part of [Acquisition Letter 2013-09](#). The contract generally states that new employees will be offered, "Market Based," employee benefits. By utilizing Market Based employee benefits the long term liabilities should be reduced during the period of the contract. Since completion of all site work will extend beyond the performance period of the MSC, management of these programs may be transferred to MSC successor contractor(s).

3.13 Contract Records

All records acquired or generated by the Contractor in performing this contract are the property of the Government except for those defined as "contractor-owned" in contract Clause I.140 "Access to and Ownership of Records" (DEAR Clause 970.5204-3). These records must be delivered to the

Government or otherwise disposed of at contract completion or termination, as directed by the CO. Additional Contractor requirements concerning records management are found in clauses H.29, "Privacy Act Systems of Records" and H.38, "Information". The "Access to and Ownership of Records" contract clause addresses records management with respect to occupational health records and radiation exposure records. All occupational health records generated during the performance of Hanford-related activities will be maintained by the Occupational/Medical Services Contractor and are the property of DOE. All radiation exposure records generated during the performance of Hanford-related activities are the property of DOE and are maintained by Battelle staff at PNNL.

3.14 Contract Closeout

When the Contractor has completed the work scope, the process of verification of contract completion and initiation of contract closeout can commence. RIMS covers the major elements of contract closeout in the Contract Management crosscutting process, [Contract Management - Closeout procedure](#). Contract closeout will conform to the requirements of FAR 4.804, Closeout of Contract Files.

4.0 Contract Deliverables

MSC deliverables are identified in Section J, Attachment J.11. Specific PBI deliverables will be shown in the PEMP, Section J, Attachment J.4. These deliverables are monitored by the responsible support organizations or subject matter experts assigned responsibility in RL's FRAM. In addition, the Contractor is required to provide input to support Hanford Site-wide reporting performed (e.g., environmental permits, use of recovered materials, and pollution prevention activities), as defined in Section J, Attachment J.3, Hanford Site Services and Interface Requirements Matrix. The contract defines requirements for the interfaces between the Contractor and other Hanford Site contractors in the Section H Clause H.44, Hanford Site Services and Interface Requirements Matrix.

5.0 Key Contract Vulnerabilities or Performance Risk Areas

The [Project Risk Management](#) procedure in RIMS documents RL's approach to identify, analyze, prioritize, mitigate, and monitor the programmatic risks associated with the RL cleanup initiatives. Specific risk management documents for this contract and associated projects are maintained by the Project Integration and Control Division and are available to authorized individuals. Additionally, in accordance with Section C of the contract, the Contractor is required to implement a risk management process. Table 5-1 below delineates the risks and mitigation strategies that are critical to the overall success of the CMT:

Table 5-1. Risk and Mitigation Strategies

Risk Description	Basis	Mitigation Strategy
Ensuring the successful integration of three (3) new site contractors TOC, PRC, and the Contractor	Medium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Integrated meetings between TOC/PRC/the Contractor • Open communication as a result of proximity of the IPTs and CMTs. • Joint ORP/RL configuration control of attachments J.3, J.13, and J.14 ensuring consistency among the three contracts
Continuously changing directive system impacting cost and schedule	Medium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Precise specification of directive applicability • Be just as vigilant in regards to removing expired orders as we are in adding new ones • Have a questioning attitude. Why does this apply, how does it apply, what is the specific cost • Request waivers for those that don't provide a direct benefit • There is an established process of review, accountability, coordination, and tracking through a single individual

6.0 Contractor Past Performance Reporting Requirements

In accordance with RIMS Procedure, Contractor Performance Reporting, under the [Contract Management](#) cross cutting procedure, the CO, together with AMMS, will report through the Contractor Performance Reporting System, at intervals required by FAR Part 42.15 and DOE procedure ([Policy Flash 2013-77](#)).

7.0 Contractor Assurance System

The overall quality assurance surveillance plan for the MSC is described by *RL's Contractor Integrated Performance Evaluation Management System* in RIMS, which includes DOE Orders 226.1B and 414.1D. The Contractor Integrated Performance Evaluation Management System identifies the crosscutting processes, procedures, and programs used by RL staff to plan and perform oversight of contractor work as well as to evaluate and report contractor performance against applicable contractual requirements (e.g., ESH&Q, security and emergency services, and business management). The framework and hierarchy for the Contractor Integrated Performance Evaluation Management System are illustrated in Figure 4 of this document. Requirements upon which the Contractor Integrated Performance Evaluation Management System are identified in the *Functions, Responsibilities, and Authorities Manual for the U.S. Department of Energy, Richland Operations Office, Appendix A..*

8.0 Agreements with State, Community, or Other Entities

The Contractor and/or RL are parties to agreements and understandings with Federal, state, and local government agencies as mentioned in the SOW, *Section C.1*, Mission Support Contract Overview and General Requirements. Specifically, the Hanford Federal Facility Agreement and Consent Order, commonly called the Tri Party Agreement, is maintained collectively by the U.S. Department of Energy, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, and the State of Washington Department of Ecology.

9.0 Unique Contract Terms and Conditions

The MSC is the first contract at the Richland Operations Office where the contract is devoted exclusively to providing infrastructure and support services to the Hanford mission contractors. Figure 3 below illustrates the MSC customers and services.

Contract clauses and requirements unique to the MSC include:


- H. 16, Safety and Security Key Personnel
- H. 43, Organizational Conflict of Interest Between Hanford Site Contracts
- H.46, Contractor Investment Commitment
- Section J, Attachment 2, CRD O 473.3 (Supp Rev O) Protection Program Operations
- Section J, Attachment 2, CRD M 484.1, Reimbursable Work for the Department of Homeland Security.

The Hanford Site Services and Interface Management Requirement Matrix (H Clause and section J, Attachment J-3) are in all three Central Plateau Remediation Contracts (MSC, PRC, TOC) to maintain consistency of interface and service matrix.

Figure 3. MSC Service Provider Model



Figure 4. Contractor Integrated Performance Evaluation Diagram



10.0 Mission Support Contract Points-of-Contact

Points-of-Contact for the MSC

MSC Administration	PRO Lead	PRO Backup	MSA POC	RL Lead
AMMS/AMRP/AMSE/AMB – General	G. Branch	T. Corbett	J. Jahner	K. Flynn, R. Corey, S. Charboneau, G. Jones
Contracting Officer	G. Branch	T. Corbett	J. Jahner	S. Sieracki
Contracting Officer Rep-AMMS				K. Flynn
Contracting Officer Rep-Legal				R. Carosino
AMMS MSC FUNCTIONAL AREAS:				
Safe, Security, & Environment	G. Branch	T. Corbett	C. Walton, M. Wilson	C. Low, E. MacAlister
Site Infrastructure & Services	G. Branch	T. Corbett	L. Fritz, P.K Brockman	S. Dickinson
Site Business Management	G. Branch	T. Corbett	R. Olson	G. Jones
Information Resources & Content Management	G. Branch	T. Corbett	T. Eckman	S. Dickinson
Portfolio Management	G. Branch	T. Corbett	S. Young	P. Pak
Administrative Services	G. Branch	T. Corbett	J. Jahner	P. Pak and various SMEs
GENERAL TOPICS:				
Key Personnel	G. Branch	T. Corbett	J. Jahner	K. Flynn
Contract Changes/REAs	G. Branch	T. Corbett, L. Beitz	J. Jahner/M. Skelton	P. Pak, various SMEs
Approval of Special Equipment Requests	G. Branch	T. Corbett	M. Skelton, D. Baie	C. Smith
Real Property Management	L. Beitz	G. Branch	M. Skelton	B. Hathaway
Personal Property	L. Beitz	G. Branch	M. Skelton	R. Mercado
Project Integration and Controls	G. Branch	T. Corbett	R. Miller	M. Qualheim, P. Pak
EVMS	G. Branch	T. Corbett	R. Miller	J. Rodriguez
Laws, Regs, & Directives	L. Beitz	G. Branch, T. Corbett	M. Skelton	Various SMEs
Development of Performance Incentives	G. Branch	T. Corbett	E. Lugo	J. Bird
Fee Determination & Payment	G. Branch	T. Corbett	E. Lugo	J. Bird
Performance Incentives Validation	G. Branch	T. Corbett	E. Lugo	J. Bird
Correspondence, Contract Deliverables, & GFS/I Tracking	L. Beitz	G. Branch T. Corbett	M. Skelton	Various SMEs

MSC Administration	PRO Lead	PRO Backup	MSA POC	RL Lead
Financial Management	G. Branch	T. Corbett, L. Beitz	Churchman	T. Toon
Budget	L. Beitz	G. Branch	R. Churchman	M. Coronado
Audit Liaison	M. Partida	T. Corbett	R. Churchman	T. Toon
Funding Modifications	L. Beitz	G. Branch, T. Corbett	J. Jahner M. Skelton	K. Andrew-Smith
WFOs/RFSs	L. Beitz	G. Branch	J. Ogren	D. Dove
Contractor Industrial Relations	G. Branch	T. Corbett	T. Beyers	J. Gilbert
EEO / Diversity	G. Branch	T. Corbett	T. Beyers	S. Ortega
Employee Concerns	G. Branch	T. Corbett	C. Jensen	R. Gordon
Plant Force Work Reviews	G. Branch	T. Corbett	T. Beyers	J. Gilbert
Acquisition Management	G. Branch	T. Corbett, L. Beitz	R. Meyer	N/A
Purchasing System Approval	G. Branch	T. Corbett	R. Meyer	N/A
Subcontract Consent	T. Corbett	G. Branch	R. Meyer	N/A
Balanced Score Card	L. Beitz	G. Branch	R. Meyer	N/A
Purchasing Cards	G. Branch	L. Beitz	R. Meyer	N/A
Various Reviews (PERT, IG, GAO, HQ)	G. Branch	T. Corbett, L. Beitz	R. Meyer	M. Partida
Small Business	G. Branch	T. Corbett, L. Beitz	R. Meyer	S. Sieracki
Legal/Counsel	G. Branch	T. Corbett	S. Fowler	P. Davis
Intellectual Property	G. Branch	T. Corbett	S. Fowler	G. Drew
Communications	G. Branch	T. Corbett	R. Weil	K. Lutz
Conformed contract updates on website	L. Beitz	G. Branch, T. Corbett	MSA webmaster	N/A
MSA/PRC/TOC interface (contract modifications)	L. Beitz	G. Branch, T. Corbett	J. Jahner	G. Branch, Jeff Short, W. Hader