


Mission Support Contract

Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan



FY17

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION2

2. ALLOCATION OF AVAILABLE FEE2

3. RATINGS2

4. FEE CALCULATION METHODOLOGY4

5. PERFORMANCE OUTCOMES.....4

PERFORMANCE OUTCOME 1.1.....4

 COMPLETION CRITERION 1.1.14

 COMPLETION CRITERION 1.1.26

 COMPLETION CRITERION 1.1.36

 COMPLETION CRITERION 1.1.46

PERFORMANCE OUTCOME 2.1.....6

 COMPLETION CRITERION 2.1.16

 COMPLETION CRITERION 2.1.27

 COMPLETION CRITERION 2.1.37

 COMPLETION CRITERION 2.1.47

 COMPLETION CRITERION 2.1.57

 COMPLETION CRITERION 2.1.67

PERFORMANCE OUTCOME 3.1.....7

TABLES

Table 3.1, Performance Outcome Ratings and Definitions3

Table 4.1, Fee Calculation Methodology4

Table 5.1, FY17 Performance Outcomes4

PEMP ORGANIZATION

Fee Determining Official Doug Shoop, RL Manager

Award Fee Review Board Chairperson Joe Franco, Assistant Manager for Mission Support (AMMS)

Award Fee Review Board Members:

 Deputy Program Director Jeff Bird, Deputy AMMS

 Contracting Officer Tim Corbett, MSC Contracting Officer

 Attorney Staff Member Paul Davis, Attorney

 Financial Management Staff Member Steve Einan, Project Controls Officer

Performance Monitors:

 AMMS Jeff Bird, Deputy AMMS

 Infrastructure and Services Sharee Dickinson, ISD Director

 Site Stewardship Boyd Hathaway, SSD Director

 Safeguards and Emergency Services/Information Management Corey Low, SEI Director

ATTACHMENT J-4-h

Mission Support Contract (MSC) FY 2017 Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan

1. INTRODUCTION

This Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan (PEMP) is an award fee plan containing both objective and subjective outcomes in order to maximize the efficiency and effectiveness of the Mission Support Contract. Please note that "PEMP" is synonymous with the term "Award Fee Plan" found in FAR 16.401(e)(3). The award fee plan is a strategic document under the control and direction of the Assistant Manager Mission Support and the Chief Operations Officer of the Mission Support Alliance (MSA). Senior officials may delegate certain actions in support of this plan. The completion criteria for objective outcomes consist of the successful completion of specified activities. The completion criteria for subjective outcomes are focused on the achievement of high-level strategies 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 2017 budget levels. Additionally, specific completion criteria for each respective outcome has been established and will be promulgated by contracting officer letter. This criteria provides 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 site-wide service functions, safety and security programs, and business functions.

The objective performance outcomes are allocated 65% of the available fee and the remaining 35% is allocated to the subjective performance outcome.

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 outcomes and satisfied 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 outcomes. Furthermore, the evaluation of objective outcomes will also include a subjective determination regarding quality, timeliness, cost, and effectiveness.

MSA, through the submission of monthly progress reports, shall identify issues potentially affecting the completion of individual outcomes 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 outcome 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 Outcome 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 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 OUTCOMES		FEE
1.0: Effective Site Cleanup	Deliver site-wide 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.	37%
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.	28%
Target Objective Performance Outcome Fee Allocation: (\$21,526,000 X 65% = \$13,991,900)				65%
3.0: Comprehensive Performance		3.1	Subjective outcome.	35%
Target Subjective Performance Outcome Fee Allocation: (\$21,526,000 X 35% = \$7,534,100)				35%

5. PERFORMANCE OUTCOMES

Table 5.1, FY17 Performance Outcomes

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

PERFORMANCE OUTCOME 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	37%
Strategic Area 1.0: Effective Site Cleanup		
Alignment to the Cleanup Mission: Deliver site-wide services and reliable infrastructure to support the Hanford cleanup mission.		

COMPLETION CRITERION 1.1.1					
Demonstrate that the following outcome-oriented performance measurement targets were met.				Fee	30%
				Due Date	9/30/17
Measure	See performance measures below	Performance Level	See below	Fee Range	See below
DOE Lead	Joe Franco				
MSA Lead	Robert Wilkinson				

Title	Measure	Target/ Performance Level	Fee Range
Biological Controls – Pest Removal	Days to close service catalog request	≥ 85%	91-100%
	Percent 3-business-day completion	80-84%	76-90%
		< 80%	0-75%
Biological Controls – Tumbleweed Removal	Days to close catalog service request	≥ 80%	91-100%
	Percent 15-business-day completion	75-79%	76-90%
		< 75%	0-75%

Title	Measure	Target/ Performance Level	Fee Range
Biological Controls – Vegetation	Acres treated Percent on-time campaign fulfillment	≥ 85% 80-84% < 80%	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%
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%
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 preventive maintenance packages completed Percent 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%
IT – Cyber Security/System Patching	Days to deploy patch Percent 14-business-day turnaround time (desktops) Percent 14-business-day turnaround time (databases/servers)	≥ 97% 94-96% < 94%	91-100% 76-90% 0-75%
PFP Support – Loaned Labor	Number of loaned labor requests fulfilled Percent fulfillment of loaned labor requests	≥ 95% 90 to 94% < 90%	91-100% 76-90% 0-75%
Public Works – Maintenance Backlog	Maintenance backlog in water, sewer, and electrical utilities	≥ 90% 85% to 89% < 85%	91-100% 76-90% 51-75%
RSS – 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%
RSS – Instrumentation Calibration	Number of on-time requests completed Percent 10-day turnaround time	≥ 90% 85-89% < 85%	91-100% 76-90% 0-75%
Spent Fuel Activity Support – Loaned Labor	Number of loaned labor requests fulfilled Percent fulfillment of loaned labor requests	≥ 85% 80-84% < 80%	91-100% 76-90% 0-75%

Title	Measure	Target/ Performance Level	Fee Range
Water – Potable	Average monthly pressure at the filter plant	≥ 80-110 psi 66-79 or 111-125 psi < 66 or > 125 psi	91-100% 76-90% 0-75%
Water – Raw	Average monthly pressure at 282E & 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						
Implement FY17 activities per the approved schedule of the MSC-PLN-ENG-56352 Maintenance Management Program Management Plan Rev 2 and HNF-56046, Rev. 5 MSA Maintenance Program Five-Year Plan.					Fee	2%
					Due Date	9/30/17
Measure	Timeliness, quality, and completeness	Performance Level	Excellent Very Good Good	Fee Range	91-100% 76-90% 51-75%	
DOE Lead	Joe Franco					
MSA Lead	Robert Wilkinson					

COMPLETION CRITERION 1.1.3						
Transition Public Works Maintenance Backlog process to required Deferred Maintenance Management process.					Fee	1%
					Due Date	9/30/17
Measure	Timeliness, quality, and effectiveness	Performance Level	Excellent Very Good Good	Fee Range	91-100% 76-90% 51-75%	
DOE Lead	Joe Franco					
MSA Lead	Robert Wilkinson					

COMPLETION CRITERION 1.1.4						
Complete approved project investment portfolio elements as measured by the cost/schedule performance index, which is calculated as (CPI + SPI)/2.					Fee	4%
					Due Date	9/30/17
Measure	Timeliness, quality, and effectiveness	Performance Level	≥ 98% Excellent 95-97% Very Good 92-94% Good	Fee Range	91-100% 76-90% 51-75%	
DOE Lead	Joe Franco					
MSA Lead	Robert Wilkinson					

PERFORMANCE OUTCOME 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	28%
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						
Maximize efficient MSA use of resources to meet the other Hanford contractors' changing project needs.					Fee	4%
					Due Date	9/30/17
Measure	Cumulative year-to-date percent composite over/under liquidation rates of usage-based services pools	Performance Level	±0-5% ±6-7% >±7%	Fee Range	91-100% 76-90% 0-75%	
DOE Lead	Joe Franco					
MSA Lead	Robert Wilkinson					

COMPLETION CRITERION 2.1.2						
Demonstrate consolidation of the Hanford Site infrastructure footprint to the 75-square miles of the Central Plateau. Submit a plan and schedule for approval by 10/15/16 and implement FY17 actions per the approved schedule.					Fee	4%
					Due Date	9/30/17
Measure	Timeliness, quality, and completeness	Performance Level	Excellent Very Good Good	Fee Range	91-100% 76-90% 51-75%	
DOE Lead	Joe Franco					
MSA Lead	Robert Wilkinson					

COMPLETION CRITERION 2.1.3						
Demonstrate effective safety and quality management to include, but not be limited to, a robust Contractor Assurance System.					Fee	4%
					Due Date	9/30/17
Measure	Timeliness, quality, and effectiveness	Performance Level	Excellent Very Good Good	Fee Range	91-100% 76-90% 51-75%	
DOE Lead	Joe Franco/Jeff Frey					
MSA Lead	Robert Wilkinson					

COMPLETION CRITERION 2.1.4						
Demonstrate effective Hanford Site integration to include, but not limited to, identifying longstanding or emerging issues that affect efficient site operations and provide recommendations for improvement.					Fee	10%
					Due Date	9/30/17
Measure	Timeliness, quality, and effectiveness	Performance Level	Excellent Very Good Good	Fee Range	91-100% 76-90% 51-75%	
DOE Lead	Joe Franco					
MSA Lead	Robert Wilkinson					

COMPLETION CRITERION 2.1.5						
Apply disciplined work controls to Fire Systems Maintenance to maximize safety, compliance, and integration with OHCs for site fire systems.					Fee	4%
					Due Date	9/30/17
Measure	Timeliness, quality, and completeness	Performance Level	Excellent Very Good Good	Fee Range	91-100% 76-90% 51-75%	
DOE Lead	Joe Franco					
MSA Lead	Robert Wilkinson					

COMPLETION CRITERION 2.1.6						
Provide Hanford contractors with integrated tools to maximize "wrench time".					Fee	2%
					Due Date	9/30/17
Measure	Timeliness, quality, and effectiveness	Performance Level	Excellent Very Good Good	Fee Range	91-100% 76-90% 51-75%	
DOE Lead	Joe Franco					
MSA Lead	Robert Wilkinson					

PERFORMANCE OUTCOME 3.1						
Strategic Area 3.0: Comprehensive Performance					Fee	35%
DOE Lead	Joe Franco					
MSA Lead	Robert Wilkinson					

- Execute the balance of contract work scope within the contract requirements, terms, and conditions, demonstrating excellence in quality, schedule, management, cost control, small business utilization, and regulatory compliance.
- Provide leadership to improve management effectiveness and collaborate and participate proactively with customers.
- Work with DOE and the other Hanford contractors in a spirit of cooperation to demonstrate operational excellence to include, but not limited to, the following areas:
 - Business and financial management using approved purchasing, estimating, property, budget, planning, billing, labor, accounting, and performance measurement systems, providing visibility and transparency to DOE with respect to each of the foregoing
 - Contract change management and subcontract administration and consent activities, e.g., proposal review and negotiation process, including timely and adequate submission of proposals and requests for additional data, timely counteroffers, and attaining small business goals
 - Safeguards and security, fire department operations, emergency response, and emergency operations/emergency management
 - Land management
 - Infrastructure and services program management, operations, and maintenance
 - Effective contractor human resources management
 - Problem identification and corrective action implementation
- Perform work safely and in a compliant manner that assures the workers, public, and environment are protected from adverse consequences.