

AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION/MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT		1. CONTRACT ID CODE	PAGE OF PAGES 1 15
2. AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION NO. 0423	3. EFFECTIVE DATE See Block 16C	4. REQUISITION/PURCHASE REQ. NO. Not applicable	5. PROJECT NO. (If applicable)
6. ISSUED BY Richland Operations Office U.S. Department of Energy Richland Operations Office P.O. Box 550, MSIN A7-80 Richland WA 99352	CODE 00601	7. ADMINISTERED BY (If other than Item 6)	CODE
8. NAME AND ADDRESS OF CONTRACTOR (No., street, county, State and ZIP Code) MISSION SUPPORT ALLIANCE, LLC Attn: JENNIFER JAHNER POST OFFICE BOX 650 RICHLAND WA 993523562		(x) 9A. AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION NO.	
CODE 01C605464 FACILITY CODE		9B. DATED (SEE ITEM 11)	
		x 10A. MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT/ORDER NO. DE-AC06-09RL14728	
		10B. DATED (SEE ITEM 13) 04/28/2009	

11. THIS ITEM ONLY APPLIES TO AMENDMENTS OF SOLICITATIONS

The above numbered solicitation is amended as set forth in Item 14. The hour and date specified for receipt of Offers is extended. is not extended. Offers must acknowledge receipt of this amendment prior to the hour and date specified in the solicitation or as amended, by one of the following methods: (a) By completing Items 8 and 15, and returning _____ copies of the amendment; (b) By acknowledging receipt of this amendment on each copy of the offer submitted; or (c) By separate letter or telegram which includes a reference to the solicitation and amendment numbers. FAILURE OF YOUR ACKNOWLEDGEMENT TO BE RECEIVED AT THE PLACE DESIGNATED FOR THE RECEIPT OF OFFERS PRIOR TO THE HOUR AND DATE SPECIFIED MAY RESULT IN REJECTION OF YOUR OFFER. If by virtue of this amendment you desire to change an offer already submitted, such change may be made by telegram or letter, provided each telegram or letter makes reference to the solicitation and this amendment, and is received prior to the opening hour and date specified.

12. ACCOUNTING AND APPROPRIATION DATA (If required)

Not applicable

13. THIS ITEM ONLY APPLIES TO MODIFICATION OF CONTRACTS/ORDERS. IT MODIFIES THE CONTRACT/ORDER NO. AS DESCRIBED IN ITEM 14.

CHECK ONE	A. THIS CHANGE ORDER IS ISSUED PURSUANT TO: (Specify authority) THE CHANGES SET FORTH IN ITEM 14 ARE MADE IN THE CONTRACT ORDER NO. IN ITEM 10A.
	B. THE ABOVE NUMBERED CONTRACT/ORDER IS MODIFIED TO REFLECT THE ADMINISTRATIVE CHANGES (such as changes in paying office, appropriation date, etc.) SET FORTH IN ITEM 14, PURSUANT TO THE AUTHORITY OF FAR 43.103(b).
X	C. THIS SUPPLEMENTAL AGREEMENT IS ENTERED INTO PURSUANT TO AUTHORITY OF Section B.7 (b) Fee Structure and by mutual agreement
	D. OTHER (Specify type of modification and authority)

E. IMPORTANT: Contractor is not. is required to sign this document and return 1 copies to the issuing office.

14. DESCRIPTION OF AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION (Organized by UCF section headings, including solicitation/contract subject matter where feasible.)



This modification provides minor changes to Attachment J-4.f, Performance Evaluation and Management Plan and updates the FY 2015 fee allocation amounts for the definitized modifications through November 5, 2014, as reflected in Table B.4-3, Available Award Fee Distribution.

Attachments:

- Attachment J Table of Contents
- Attachment J-4.f, Performance Evaluation and Management Plan

This modification does not add additional obligated funds to the contract as the work is incrementally funded. Accordingly, work under the Contract, such as described herein, must Continued ...

Except as provided herein, all terms and conditions of the document referenced in Item 9 A or 10A, as heretofore changed, remains unchanged and in full force and effect.

15A. NAME AND TITLE OF SIGNER (Type or print) Jennifer Jahner, Contracts	16A. NAME AND TITLE OF CONTRACTING OFFICER (Type or print) Gigi H Brannett
15B. CONTRACTOR/OFFEROR  (Signature of person authorized to sign)	15C. DATE SIGNED 11/10/14
	16B. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  (Signature of Contracting Officer)
	16C. DATE SIGNED 11/12/14

NSN 7540-01-154-8070
Previous edition unusable

STANDARD FORM 30 (REV. 10-83)
Prescribed by GSA
FAR (48 CFR) 53.243

CONTINUATION SHEET

REFERENCE NO. OF DOCUMENT BEING CONTINUED
DE-AC06-09RL14728/0423

PAGE 2 OF 15

NAME OF OFFEROR OR CONTRACTOR
MISSION SUPPORT ALLIANCE, LLC

ITEM NO. (A)	SUPPLIES/SERVICES (B)	QUANTITY (C)	UNIT (D)	UNIT PRICE (E)	AMOUNT (F)
	<p>be performed within the amount of funds which have been allotted to the contract in accordance with Clause I.82 FAR 52.232.22 - Limitation of Funds (Apr 1984).</p> <p>By signature on this modification, the Contractor agrees to the following Contractor's Statement of Release:</p> <p>In consideration of this Modification 423 agreed to herein as complete equitable adjustment, the Contractor hereby releases the Government from any and all liability under this contract for further equitable adjustments attributable to such facts or circumstances giving rise to this modification.</p> <p>There are no other changes to the terms and conditions of the contract.</p> <p>Period of Performance: 05/26/2009 to 05/25/2017</p>				


**PART III – LIST OF DOCUMENTS, EXHIBITS, AND OTHER ATTACHMENTS
 SECTION J -- LIST OF ATTACHMENTS
 TABLE OF CONTENTS**

Attachment Number	Title of Attachment	Revision Number	Pages
J-1.	ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYM LIST	000	4
J-2.	REQUIREMENT SOURCES AND IMPLEMENTING DOCUMENTS	369	10
J-3.	HANFORD SITE SERVICES AND INTERFACE REQUIREMENTS MATRIX	240	108
J-4.	PERFORMANCE EVALUATION AND MEASUREMENT PLAN		
a	FY 2010 PERFORMANCE EVALUATION & MEASUREMENT PLAN	052	19
b	FY 2011 PERFORMANCE EVALUATION & MEASUREMENT PLAN	145	10
c	FY 2012 PERFORMANCE EVALUATION & MEASUREMENT PLAN	215	13
d	FY 2013 PERFORMANCE EVALUATION & MEASUREMENT PLAN	298	10
e	FY 2014 PERFORMANCE EVALUATION & MEASUREMENT PLAN	394	20
f	FY 2015 PERFORMANCE EVALUATION & MEASUREMENT PLAN	423	11
J-5.	PERFORMANCE GUARANTEE AGREEMENT	000	7
J-6.	SMALL BUSINESS SUBCONTRACTING PLAN	369	11
J-7.	SMALL DISADVANTAGED BUSINESS PARTICIPATION PROGRAM TARGETS	000	2
J-8.	ADVANCE UNDERSTANDING OF COSTS	336	8
J-9.	SPECIAL FINANCIAL INSTITUTION ACCOUNT AGREEMENT	108	8
J-10.	WAGE DETERMINATIONS – SERVICE CONTRACT ACT, DAVIS-BACON ACT, AND COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AGREEMENTS	369	35
J-11.	CONTRACT DELIVERABLES	370	19
J-12.	GOVERNMENT FURNISHED SERVICES AND INFORMATION	134	4
J-13.	HANFORD SITE STRUCTURES LIST	393	25
J-14.	HANFORD WASTE SITE ASSIGNMENT LIST	393	59
J-15.	Be SAMPLING PROTOCOL FOR BUILDINGS	059	5

J-16.	PORTFOLIO MANAGEMENT TASK ORDERS		
	Task 09-001 Hammer Budget Analysis	006	1
	Task 11-001 200W Pump & Treat Independent Review	077	1
	Task 11-002 Assessment of the 618-10 Burial Ground Characterization	080	2
	Task 11-003 Consulting Support to HQ EM-2.1	148	5
	Task 11-004 PIC Support for Project Controls System Description	144	3
	Task 12-001 Project Management and Project Controls Support for the River Corridor Closure Project	157 220	2
	Task 12-002 PMB review support to the Plutonium Finishing Plant Project	159	1
	Task 13-001 Project Management and Project Controls Support for the River Corridor Closure Project	223	2
	Task 13-002 DOE-HQ Security Systems Review and Assessment	280	2
	Task 13-003_R1 DOE-RL AMB HGET Training Approval Process SIA	310 347	2
	Task 13-004 DOE-RL Groundwater Sampling Structured Improvement Activity	306	2
	Task 14-001 - Project Management / Project Controls Support	323	2
	Task 14-002 – Cultural Resources Support	353	2
	Task 14-003 – AMSE Business Rhythms & Reporting Workshop	358	2
	Task 14-004 - DOE-HQ Human Resources Staffing Process Structured Improvement Activity	398	2
	Task 14-005 River Corridor Contract Change Process Structured Improvement Activity	410	2
	Task 15-001 River corridor Division PBS 41 Project Management/Project Controls Support	410	2

Mission Support Contract

Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan



FY15

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION2

2. ALLOCATION OF AVAILABLE FEE2

3. RATINGS2

4. FEE CALCULATION METHODOLOGY4

5. PERFORMANCE INCENTIVES5

 PERFORMANCE INCENTIVE 1.15

 COMPLETION CRITERION 1.1.15

 COMPLETION CRITERION 1.1.27

 COMPLETION CRITERION 1.1.37

 COMPLETION CRITERION 1.1.47

 COMPLETION CRITERION 1.1.57

 PERFORMANCE INCENTIVE 2.18

 COMPLETION CRITERION 2.1.18

 PERFORMANCE INCENTIVE 3.18

 COMPLETION CRITERION 3.1.18

 COMPLETION CRITERION 3.1.29

 COMPLETION CRITERION 3.1.39

 PERFORMANCE INCENTIVE 4.19

 COMPLETION CRITERION 4.1.19

 COMPLETION CRITERION 4.1.29

 COMPLETION CRITERION 4.1.39

 PERFORMANCE INCENTIVE 5.110

TABLES

Table 3.1, Performance Incentive Ratings and Definitions3

Table 4.1, Fee Calculation Methodology4

Table 5.1, FY15 Performance Incentives5

PEMP ORGANIZATION

Fee Determining Official Doug Shoop, Acting RL Manager

Award Fee Review Board Chairperson Karen Flynn, Assistant Manager for Mission Support (AMMS)

Award Fee Review Board Members:

 Deputy Program Director Jeff Bird, Deputy AMMS

 Contracting Officer Gigi Branch, MSC Contracting Officer

 Program Manager TBD, MSC Program Manager

 Contracting Staff Member Tim Corbett, Contract Specialist

 Attorney Staff Member Paul Davis, Attorney

 Financial Management Staff Member Margo Qualheim, Project Controls Officer

Performance Monitors:

 Infrastructure Services/Information Management Sharee Dickinson, ISI Division Director

 Site Stewardship Boyd Hathaway, SS Division Director

 Safeguards and Emergency Services Corey Low, SES Division Director

 Project Integration Controls Paul Pak, PIC Division Director

ATTACHMENT J-4-f

Mission Support Contract FY 2015 Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan

1. INTRODUCTION

This Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan (PEMP) contains both objective and subjective performance incentives in order to maximize the efficacy of the Mission Support Contract. The completion criteria for objective incentives consist of the successful completion of specified activities. The completion criteria for subjective incentives are focused on the achievement of high-level strategies, outcomes, and envisioned end states. The completion criteria are based on negotiated integrated priority lists (IPLs) and requisite budget levels commensurate with IPL execution and are subject to adjustment based on actual approved 2015 budget levels. Additionally, specific completion criteria for each respective PI have been established that provide the criteria for the successful completion in terms of measurable deliverables and associated constraints (measurable ranges/delivery dates).

2. ALLOCATION OF AVAILABLE FEE

Because the services to be determined under this contract directly support the mission contractors, and because such services are integral to the environmental cleanup mission at Hanford, DOE will heavily weight the assignment of fee toward the following strategic areas of the contract:

- a. Effective Site Cleanup - Enable mission contractors to achieve their cleanup mission by providing site utilities, infrastructure, and services at the levels required. The key outcomes include:
 - Enabling site contractors to achieve reduced cost of site cleanup
 - Delivering timely service that supports customer key milestones and regulatory commitments
- b. Efficient Site Cleanup - Realize efficiencies by consolidating, integrating, and centralizing sitewide service functions, safety and security programs, and business functions.
- c. Safe and Secure Operations - Maintain high standards for safe and secure operations.
- d. Site Stewardship - Provide sitewide, integrated stewardship for the Hanford Site.

The objective performance incentives are allocated 70% of the available fee and the remaining 30% is allocated to the subjective performance incentive.

3. RATINGS

Payment of fee is subject to the fee reduction terms of this contract and fee determining official (FDO) approval that the contractor has achieved the stated outcome for the performance incentives and satisfying the specific completion criteria. The criteria listed in Table 3.1, Performance Ratings and Definitions, will be used in the evaluation of both objective and subjective incentives. Furthermore, the evaluation of objective incentives will also include a subjective determination regarding quality, timeliness, cost, and effectiveness.

MSA, through the submission of monthly performance incentive reports, shall identify issues potentially affecting the completion of individual performance incentives and the overall success of the contract, with actions taken or recommended to resolve those issues. In the event MSA self-discloses an issue with regard to an incentive in the PEMP and appropriately self-corrects the situation in a timely manner, fee reduction may be waived or mitigated by the FDO.

Table 3.1, Performance Incentive Ratings and Definitions

Adjectival Rating	Definition	Percentage of Fee Earned
Excellent	Contractor has exceeded almost all of the significant award-fee criteria and has met overall cost, schedule, and technical performance requirements of the contract in the aggregate as defined and measured against the criteria in the award-fee plan for the award-fee evaluation period. Contractor's work is highly professional. Contractor solves problems with very little, if any, Government involvement. Contractor is proactive and takes an aggressive approach in identifying problems and their resolution, including those identified in the risk management process, with a substantial emphasis on performing quality work in a safe manner within cost/schedule requirements. No significant re-work.	91% to 100%
Very Good	Contractor has exceeded many of the significant award-fee criteria and has met overall cost, schedule, and technical performance requirements of the contract in the aggregate as defined and measured against the criteria in the award-fee plan for the award-fee evaluation period. Contractor solves problems with minimal Government involvement. Contractor is usually proactive and demonstrates an aggressive approach in identifying problems and their resolution, including those identified in the risk management process, with an emphasis on performing quality work in a safe manner within cost/schedule requirements. Problems are usually self-identified and resolution is self-initiated. Some limited, low-impact rework within normal expectations.	76% to 90%
Good	Contractor has exceeded some of the significant award-fee criteria and has met overall cost, schedule, and technical performance requirements of the contract in the aggregate as defined and measured against the criteria in the award-fee plan for the award-fee evaluation period. Contractor is able to solve basic problems with adequate emphasis on performing quality work in a safe manner within cost/schedule objectives. The rating within this range will be determined by level of necessary Government involvement in problem resolution, including those problems identified in the risk management process, and extent to which the performance problem is self-identified vs. Government-identified. Some re-work required that unfavorably impacted cost and/or schedule.	51% to 75%
Satisfactory	Contractor has met overall cost, schedule, and technical performance requirements of the contract in the aggregate as defined and measured against the criteria in the award-fee plan for the award-fee evaluation period. Contractor has some difficulty solving basic problems, and cost, schedule, safety, and technical performance needs improvement to avoid further performance risk. Government involvement in problem resolution, including those problems identified in the risk management process, is necessary. Some rework required that unfavorably impacted cost and/or schedule.	≤ 50%
Unsatisfactory	Contractor has failed to meet overall cost, schedule, and technical performance requirements of the contract in the aggregate as defined and measured against the criteria in the award-fee plan for the award-fee evaluation period. Contractor does not demonstrate an emphasis on performing quality work in a safe manner within cost/schedule objectives. Contractor is unable to solve problems and Government involvement in problem resolution, including those problems identified in the risk management process, is necessary. Excessive rework required that had significant unfavorable impact on cost and/or schedule.	0%

4. FEE CALCULATION METHODOLOGY

Table 4.1, Fee Calculation Methodology

STRATEGIC AREA	ALIGNMENT TO CLEANUP MISSION	PERFORMANCE INCENTIVES		FEE
1.0: Effective Site Cleanup	Deliver sitewide services and reliable infrastructure to support the cleanup mission.	1.1	Enable mission contractors to achieve their cleanup mission by delivering timely service and reliable infrastructure that support customer key milestones and regulatory commitments.	38%
2.0: Efficient Site Cleanup	Align resources to efficiently meet site mission needs, strategically align capabilities to the cleanup mission, and implement technologies that reduce cost and improve support for site customers.	2.1	Demonstrate MSA's responsiveness and alignment of resources and equipment to meet the cleanup contractors' project requirements in support of key milestones.	9%
3.0: Safe and Secure Operations	Maintain high standards for safe and secure operations.	3.1	Maintain operational readiness and realize efficiencies through integration, standardization, and consolidation of security systems.	13%
4.0: Site Stewardship	Provide sitewide, integrated stewardship for the Hanford Site	4.1	Achieve effective and efficient utilization of Hanford Site through comprehensive and compliant land management.	10%
Target Objective PI Fee Allocation: $(\$20,774,642 \times 70\% = \$14,542,249)$				70%
5.0: Comprehensive Performance		5.1	Subjective incentive.	30%
Target Subjective PI Fee Allocation: $(\$20,774,642 \times 30\% = \$6,232,393)$				30%

5. PERFORMANCE INCENTIVES

Table 5.1, FY15 Performance Incentives

Fee determination and payment will be made in accordance with the Section B clause entitled Fee Determination and Payment. The completion criteria for objective incentives consist of the successful completion of specified activities. The completion criteria for subjective incentives are focused on the achievement of high-level strategies, outcomes, and envisioned end states. The evaluation of all incentives will include a subjective determination regarding quality, timeliness, cost, and effectiveness.

PERFORMANCE INCENTIVE 1.1		
Enable mission contractors to achieve their cleanup mission by delivering timely service and reliable infrastructure that support customer key milestones and regulatory commitments.	Fee	38%
Strategic Area 1.0: Effective Site Cleanup		
Alignment to the Cleanup Mission: Deliver sitewide services and reliable infrastructure to support the cleanup mission.		

COMPLETION CRITERION 1.1.1					
Demonstrate that the following performance measure targets were met.				Fee	25%
				Due Date	9/30/15
Measure	See performance measures below	Performance Level	See below	Fee Range	See below
DOE Lead	Jeff Bird				
MSA Lead	PK Brockman				

Title	Measure	Target/ Performance Level	Fee Range
Biological Controls – Pest Removal	Days to close service catalog request Percent 3-business-day completion	≥ 85% 80-84% < 80%	91-100% 76-90% 0-75%
Biological Controls – Vegetation	Acres treated Percent on-time campaign fulfillment	≥ 85% 80-84% < 80%	91-100% 76-90% 0-75%
Biological Controls – Tumbleweed Removal	Days to close catalog service request Percent 15-business-day completion	≥ 80% 75-79% < 75%	91-100% 76-90% 0-75%
Crane and Crew Support	Days to fulfill request Percent 2-business-day turnaround time (standard requests) Percent 1-business-day turnaround time (emergency requests)	≥ 85% 80-84% < 80%	91-100% 76-90% 0-75%
Cyber Security - System Patching	Days to deploy patch Percent 7-business-day turnaround time (desktops) Percent 14-business-day turnaround time (databases/servers)	≥ 97% 94-96% < 94%	91-100% 76-90% 0-75%
Dosimetry - External Services	Days to completion Percent 10-business-day turnaround time (routine exchanges) Percent 30-business-day turnaround time (annual exchanges)	≥ 95% 90-94% < 90%	91-100% 76-90% 0-75%
Dosimetry - Records Request Fulfillment	Days to completion Percent 7-business-day turnaround time (FOIA and PA) Percent 45-business-day turnaround time (EEOICPA)	≥ 90% 85-89% < 85%	91-100% 76-90% 0-75%
Electrical – Power Availability	Number of outages to 119 identified important distribution service transformers per year (1 outage=1 transformer out of service)	≤ 50 N/A N/A	91-100% 76-90% 0-75%
Emergency Radio / SONET Transport Availability	Channel hours available per month Percent availability per month	≥ 99% 95-98% < 95%	91-100% 76-90% 0-75%

Title	Measure	Target/ Performance Level	Fee Range
Facilities Maintenance	Number of managed task work completed as scheduled Percent on-time completion	≥ 85% 80-84% < 80%	91-100% 76-90% 0-75%
Fire Protection System Maintenance	Number of scheduled preventive maintenance packages completed Percent on-time completion	≥ 90% 85-89% < 85%	91-100% 76-90% 0-75%
Fire Protection System Maintenance for PFP	Number of scheduled preventive maintenance packages completed Percent on-time completion	≥ 90% 85-89% < 85%	91-100% 76-90% 0-75%
Fleet Services – Heavy Equipment (Cranes)	In-service times Percent in-service	≥ 70% 65-69% < 65%	91-100% 76-90% 0-75%
Fleet Services – Heavy Equipment (Excavators)	In-service times Percent in-service	≥ 90% 85-89% < 85%	91-100% 76-90% 0-75%
Fleet Services – Heavy Equipment (General Purpose)	In-service times Percent in-service	≥ 90% 85-89% < 85%	91-100% 76-90% 0-75%
Fleet Services – Light Equipment (Hanford Patrol)	In-service times Percent in-service	≥ 90% 85-89% < 85%	91-100% 76-90% 0-75%
Fleet Services – Light Equipment (Hanford Fire)	In-service times Percent in-service	≥ 85% 80-84% < 80%	91-100% 76-90% 0-75%
Fleet Services – Light Equipment (Special Purpose Trucks)	In-service times Percent in-service	≥ 90% 85-89% < 85%	91-100% 76-90% 0-75%
HAMMER – Worker Training Completion Input	Number of on-time record entries completed Percent 24-hour turnaround time	≥ 95% 90-94% < 90%	91-100% 76-90% 0-75%
HLAN Availability	HLAN availability Percent availability per year	≥ 99% 95-98% < 95%	91-100% 76-90% 0-75%
PFP Support	Number of loaned labor requests fulfilled Percent fulfillment of loaned labor requests	≥ 95% 90-94% < 90%	91-100% 76-90% 0-75%
Radiological Instrumentation Calibration	Number of on-time requests completed Percent 10-day turnaround time	≥ 90% 85-89% < 85%	91-100% 76-90% 0-75%
SAS Access Denial Request Processing	Number of on-time requests completed Percent one-business day turnaround time	≥ 95% 90-94% < 90%	91-100% 76-90% 0-75%
SAS Remote Sensor Continuity	Sensor system uptime Percent sensor system uptime	≥ 90% 85-89% < 85%	91-100% 76-90% 0-75%
Spent Fuel Activity Support	Number of loaned labor requests fulfilled Percent fulfillment of loaned labor requests	≥ 85% 80-84% < 80%	91-100% 76-90% 0-75%
Water - Potable	Pressure at filter plant	≥ 80-110 psi 66-79 or 111-125 psi < 66 or > 125 psi	91-100% 76-90% 0-75%

Title	Measure	Target/ Performance Level	Fee Range
Water - Raw	Pressure at 282E and 282W	≥ 110-125 psi 90-109 or 126-150 psi < 90 or > 150 psi	91-100% 76-90% 0-75%

COMPLETION CRITERION 1.1.2						
Ensure customer satisfaction for all service catalog requests.					Fee	5%
					Due Date	9/30/15
Measure	Composite average customer satisfaction rating	Performance Level	≥ 4.4 4.3-4.2 < 4.2	Fee Range	91-100% 76- 90% 0- 75%	
DOE Lead	Jeff Bird					
MSA Lead	PK Brockman					

COMPLETION CRITERION 1.1.3						
Implement HNF-54670 (MSA Maintenance Management Program) per the approved implementation schedule.					Fee	4%
					Due Date	9/30/15
Measure	Timeliness, quality, and completeness	Performance Level	Excellent Very Good Good	Fee Range	91-100% 76-90% 51-75%	
DOE Lead	Sharee Dickinson					
MSA Lead	Lori Fritz					

COMPLETION CRITERION 1.1.4						
Complete planning for execution of Hanford FY16 infrastructure projects to include electrical upgrades necessary for the Office of River Protection (ORP).					Fee	3%
					Due Date	9/30/15
Measure	Timeliness, quality, and completeness	Performance Level	Excellent Very Good Good	Fee Range	91-100% 76-90% 51-75%	
DOE Lead	Sharee Dickinson					
MSA Lead	Lori Fritz					

COMPLETION CRITERION 1.1.5						
For the areas of computer support, facility occupancy, training, roads and grounds, and warehouse services, develop new performance measures and begin measuring and recording performance data by 2/1/15. Evaluate the effectiveness of the measure and the calculation methodology for all developmental performance measures by 6/30/15 to determine if the measures achieved their intended purpose, and propose FY16 performance targets by 9/30/15.					Fee	1%
					Due Date	9/30/15
Measure	Timeliness, quality, and effectiveness	Performance Level	Excellent Very Good Good	Fee Range	91-100% 76-90% 51-75%	
DOE Lead	Jeff Bird					
MSA Lead	PK Brockman					

PERFORMANCE INCENTIVE 2.1		
Demonstrate MSA's responsiveness and alignment of resources and equipment to meet the cleanup contractors' project requirements in support of key milestones.	Fee	9%
Strategic Area 2.0: Efficient Site Cleanup		
Alignment to the Cleanup Mission: Align resources to efficiently meet site mission needs, strategically align capabilities to the cleanup mission, and implement technologies that reduce cost and improve support for site customers.		

COMPLETION CRITERION 2.1.1					
Demonstrate that the following business performance measure targets were met.				Fee	7%
				Due Date	9/30/15
Measure	See business performance measures below	Performance Level	See below	Fee Range	See below
DOE Lead	Jeff Bird				
MSA Lead	PK Brockman				

Description	Measure	Perform. Level	Fee Range
Rapid Re-alignment of Resources (usage-based services)	Cumulative year-to-date percent composite over/under liquidation rates of usage-based services pools	±0-5% ±6-7% >±7%	91-100% 76-90% 0-75%
General and Administrative (G&A)	Percent variance from the FY15-established G&A rate	+0-5% +6-7% >+7%	91-100% 76-90% 0-75%

COMPLETION CRITERION 2.1.2					
Reduce the Information Technology (IT) infrastructure footprint considering options such as data centers, IT facilities, towers, etc. and submit an execution schedule for approval by 12/31/14. Implement the FY15 actions per the approved schedule.				Fee	2%
				Due Date	9/30/15
Measure	Timeliness, quality, and completeness	Performance Level	Excellent Very Good Good	Fee Range	91-100% 76-90% 51-75%
DOE Lead	Sharee Dickinson				
MSA Lead	Todd Eckman				

PERFORMANCE INCENTIVE 3.1		
Maintain operational readiness and realize efficiencies through integration, standardization, and consolidation of security systems.	Fee	13%
Strategic Area 3.0: Safe and Secure Operations		
Alignment to the Cleanup Mission: Maintain high standards for safe and secure operations		

COMPLETION CRITERION 3.1.1					
Implement FY15 actions per the HSPD-12 implementation plan.				Fee	7%
				Due Date	9/30/15
Measure	Timeliness, quality, cost, and effectiveness	Performance Level	Excellent Very Good Good	Fee Range	91-100% 76-90% 51-75%
DOE Lead	Corey Low				
MSA Lead	Craig Walton				

COMPLETION CRITERION 3.1.2						
Complete a review of the Hanford Patrol training program to include the application of the Elite Force training to the protection of special nuclear material from a cost versus benefit perspective and compliance. Ensure the program is aligned with the current site protection strategy and any forthcoming emerging requirements. Identify potential cost-savings initiatives and submit an implementation schedule for DOE approval by 3/31/15. Implement FY15 actions of the approved schedule.					Fee	3%
					Due Date	9/30/15
Measure	Timeliness, quality, cost, and effectiveness	Performance Level	Excellent Very Good Good	Fee Range	91-100% 76-90% 51-75%	
DOE Lead	Corey Low					
MSA Lead	Craig Walton					

COMPLETION CRITERION 3.1.3						
Develop a long-term strategy to further consolidate fire operations, emergency preparedness, and safeguards and security activities consistent with shrinking the Hanford footprint to the Central Plateau; for example, port of entry, access control, emergency planning zones, etc. Submit for DOE approval a plan to include key milestones and DOE decision points that facilitate out-year budget planning.					Fee	3%
					Due Date	7/31/15
Measure	Timeliness, quality, cost, and effectiveness	Performance Level	Excellent Very Good Good	Fee Range	91-100% 76-90% 51-75%	
DOE Lead	Corey Low					
MSA Lead	Craig Walton					

PERFORMANCE INCENTIVE 4.1			
Achieve effective and efficient utilization of Hanford Site through comprehensive and compliant land management.		Fee	10%
Strategic Area 4.0: Site Stewardship			
Alignment to the Cleanup Mission: Provide sitewide, integrated stewardship for the Hanford Site.			

COMPLETION CRITERION 4.1.1						
Perform necessary actions for developing an Area Management Plan such as assemble baseline information, perform gap analyses, develop time-phased maps, determine land use decision considerations, develop communications plan, etc., and complete a preliminary draft plan.					Fee	7%
					Due Date	9/30/15
Measure	Timeliness, quality, cost, and effectiveness	Performance Level	Excellent Very Good Good	Fee Range	91-100% 76-90% 51-75%	
DOE Lead	Boyd Hathaway					
MSA Lead	Lori Fritz					

COMPLETION CRITERION 4.1.2						
Complete all FY15 reactor ISS five-year re-entries.					Fee	1%
					Due Date	6/30/15
Measure	Timeliness, quality, cost, and effectiveness	Performance Level	Excellent Very Good Good	Fee Range	91-100% 76-90% 51-75%	
DOE Lead	Boyd Hathaway					
MSA Lead	Lori Fritz					

COMPLETION CRITERION 4.1.3						
Lead the integrated contractor team to complete the CERCLA five-year review draft.					Fee	2%
					Due Date	9/30/15
Measure	Timeliness, quality, cost, and effectiveness	Performance Level	Excellent Very Good Good	Fee Range	91-100% 76-90% 51-75%	
DOE Lead	Joe Voice					
MSA Lead	Lori Fritz					

PERFORMANCE INCENTIVE 5.1					
Strategic Area 5.0: Comprehensive Performance			Fee	30%	
DOE Lead	Gigi Branch				
MSA Lead	Rich Olsen				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support the accomplishment of RL key performance goals. • Maintain alignment of cost performance with the negotiated estimated costs contained in the contract. • Work with DOE in a spirit of cooperation during the proposal review and negotiation process, including timely and adequate submission of proposals and requests for additional data, timely counteroffers, and conveying a positive and professional attitude to achieve fair and timely settlement of change order proposals or requests for equitable adjustment, and attaining small business goals. • Demonstrate operational excellence in business and financial management by fulfilling contractual obligations in a fiscally responsible manner to include, but not limited to, the use of approved purchasing, estimating, property, budget, planning, billing, labor, and accounting systems; and the contractor's management of government property. • Provide leadership to improve management effectiveness and collaborate and participate proactively with customers. • Measure overall performance under the contract via the use of a comprehensive performance measurement system. • Integrate and coordinate all activities required to execute the contract with other Hanford contractors, specifically the timeliness, completeness, and quality of problem identification and corrective action plans. • Initiate and provide effective participation in business case analyses and other cross-contractor activities leading to optimal utilization of RL resources (facilities, equipment, material and services) across all Hanford contractors. Continue evaluation and improvement of the Contractor Interface Board and other similar or proposed replacement functions. • Demonstrate operational excellence in Safeguards and Security, fire and emergency response, and emergency operations/emergency management by fulfilling contractual obligations in a fiscally responsible manner. • Perform work safely and in a compliant manner that assures the workers, public, and environment are protected from adverse consequences. 					