SECTION J, ATTACHMENT J.4

FY 2015
PERFORMANCE EVALUATION AND MEASUREMENT PLAN (PEMP)

Fiscal Year 2015

Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan
For
Washington River Protection Solutions LLC

Performance Period:
October 1, 2014 through September 30, 2015

Signature Block

Kevin W. Smith, Fee Determination Official
U.A. Department of Energy, Office of River Protection

9/30/2014
Date

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

A. INTRODUCTION 4

B. REFERENCES 7

C. ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE FOR PERFORMANCE FEE ADMINISTRATION 7

D. METHOD FOR DETERMINING PERFORMANCE FEE 9

E. PEB INVOLVEMENT IN FINAL EVALUATIONS 12

F. FDO RESPONSIBILITIES IN FINAL EVALUATIONS 12

G. METHOD FOR CHANGING PLAN COVERAGE 13

ATTACHMENTS 14-60

1. PERFORMANCE BASED INCENTIVES AND AWARD FEE SPECIAL EMPHASIS AREAS 14

2. PERFORMANCE MONITOR EVALUATION REPORT FORM 57

3. FDO AND PERFORMANCE EVALUATION BOARD MEMBERS 58

4. PERFORMANCE EVALUATION AND MEASUREMENT PLAN CHANGE REQUEST 59

5. INTERIM RATING CHART – OBJECTIVE AND SUBJECTIVE ITEMS 60

ACRONYMS

DOE/HQ ..... DOE Headquarters
FDO ..... Fee Determination Official
FY ..... Fiscal Year
ORP ..... Office of River Protection
PBI ..... Performance Based Incentive
PEB ..... Performance Evaluation Board
PEMP ..... Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan
SEA ..... Special Emphasis Area
WRPS ..... Washington River Protection Solutions LLC

A. INTRODUCTION

Contract No. DE-AC27-08RV14800 uses multiple performance-based incentives (PBI) and special emphasis area (SEA) award fee components to drive Contractor excellence in performing the operations, construction, and maintenance of the Hanford Tank Farms. The Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan (PEMP) gives the Office of River Protection (ORP) a tool to identify and reward superior performance.

In the execution of the contract, Washington River Protection Solutions LLC (WRPS) is expected to provide comprehensive, effective management as conscientious stewards of all Tank Farm facilities and activities through:

- Demonstrating safety leadership and risk-informed, conservative decision-making
- Anticipating project challenges and providing timely resolution
- Open communication with the workforce fostering a questioning attitude and an environment free from retribution
- Aggressive self-discovery of project issues to ORP through critical self-analysis, performance monitoring, and comprehensive extent of condition reviews

This PEMP also defines the ORP approach in evaluating, documenting, and providing performance fee to WRPS, in the execution of requirements defined in Contract DE-AC27-08RV14800. This PEMP is for the first year of the contract option period of performance from October 1, 2014, through September 30, 2015.

1. PEMP Objectives

a. Provide ORP with a mechanism to achieve its highest priority objectives;

b. Provide incentive to WRPS to accomplish ORP's management and program objectives through the establishment of critical performance objectives and measures;

c. Reward WRPS with fee commensurate with the achievement of the specific ORP performance requirements;

d. Create an administratively efficient process to assess WRPS performance;

e. Provide a fair and reasonable basis for determining the amount of fee earned; and

f. Create a process that ensures WRPS work efforts are executed in a manner that provides high value and high quality deliverables to ORP.

2. Definitions

a. Award Fee. The subjective fee component of Performance Fee.

b. Expected Performance Level. Meets agreed upon requirements and performance objectives.

c. Fee Determination Official (FDO). The final authority in determination of fee awarded to WRPS.

d. Office of River Protection (ORP). ORP is a Department of Energy Environmental Management field office.

e. Performance Evaluation Board (PEB). For the purpose of this PEMP, designated ORP senior managers and Contracting Officer are chartered with recommending WRPS earned fee to the Fee Determination Official.

f. Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan (PEMP). A plan that defines an approach in evaluating, documenting, and providing performance fee against specified Performance Based Incentives and Award Fee Incentives.

g. Performance Evaluation Period. The period for which the Performance Evaluation Board evaluates contractor's overall performance: October 1 through September 30.

h. Performance Fee. That portion of the total available fee which is tied exclusively to the contractor's performance of the contract. The performance fee amount will consist of an incentive fee component for objective performance requirements and an award fee component for subjective performance requirements, or both.

i. Performance Based Incentive (PBI). A performance incentive represents a reward or consequences that may be employed to motivate a contractor to achieve baseline or higher levels of performance of a requirement. In most instances, the incentive represents an amount of fee tied to the accomplishment of a performance objective.

j. Performance Measure. The quantitative method for characterizing performance.

k. Performance Monitor (PM). Designated by the PEB as responsible individuals monitoring and evaluating the contractor's performance.

l. Performance Objective. A statement of desired results from an organization or activity.

m. Provisional Payment of Fee. Any payments paid on a provisional basis may be reclaimed.

n. Special Emphasis Area (SEA). An area that is extremely important to DOE and ORP and the fee associated with each area represents an incentive based on a graded approach and is a subjective determination by the PM for calculation of possible earned fee.

o. Straight-line Method: This method provides a 100% incremental fee for completion of the performance measure prior to the expiration of the performance evaluation period

p. Terminal Method: This method provides 100% incremental fee for completion of the performance measure prior to a specific date and/or milestone; however, the Contractor will forfeit 100% of the fee allocated to the performance measure for completion of the performance measure after the passing of the specific date and/or milestone as defined within the performance measure.

3. Fee Concept

Performance-based management contracting principles emphasize results-oriented work statements, and performance objectives and measures to incentivize contractors to achieve excellent performance. ORP implements performance-based management contracting principles through processes associated with *Strategic Planning, Budget Formulation, Budget Execution, and Performance Evaluation.*

WRPS is responsible for the furnishing of safe, compliant, cost-effective and energy-efficient services to further the DOE/ORP mission to store, retrieve and treat Hanford tank waste, store and dispose of treated waste, and to close the Tank Farm waste management areas to protect the Columbia River. Because of the nature of this work, ORP uses performance fee to incentivize and reward WRPS for performance. Performance fee consists of two components: an incentive fee component which provides management focus and emphasis on ORP's few critical program objectives and an award fee component which provides management focus on all other aspects of WRPS's performance of the overall Tank Farm operations, construction, and maintenance programs.

a. Performance Based Incentive (PBI)

The PBI performance measures and fee measures are delineated in Attachment 1 of

this PEMP. Emphasis will be placed on development of objective incentives based on definition of the desired outcome (the "what") and expect the contractor to compliantly and safely determine "how" the work is performed to achieve the desired outcome within the established funding constraints. These incentives are identified as PBIs and typically carry more performance risk and higher fee earning opportunities.

b. Award Fee Special Emphasis Area (SEA) Incentives

The SEA performance objectives and measures are delineated in Attachment 1 of the PEMP. In certain instances, the contractor must provide support and/or deliverables that are required to accomplish the project objectives but are not objectively measurable in all cases. These efforts are therefore measured subjectively under incentives identified as SEAs and typically carry reduced performance risk and moderate fee earning opportunities and the FDO may use discretionary factors in determining fee. Consideration will also be given to complete and accurate technical information/products delivered in mutually agreed time frames that meet all applicable codes, standards, rules, regulations and orders.

B. REFERENCES

U.S. Department of Energy Office of River Protection Contract with WRPS;
Contract DE-AC27-08RV14800.

C. ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE FOR PERFORMANCE FEE ADMINISTRATION

The PEMP is established unilaterally by DOE/ORP to provide for successful completion of ORP's significant management and program objectives. The effectiveness of this PEMP also requires the establishment of a close working relationship between DOE/ORP and WRPS because all entities are responsible for successful implementation of the plan and successful completion of ORP's significant management and program objectives. The roles and responsibilities of the key personnel are as follows:

1. **DOE/HQ**

Deputy Assistant Secretary for Acquisition and Project Management

- Serves as Head of Contracting Activity for the Office of Environmental Management
- Reviews and comments on the PEMP and Recommended Fee Determination
- Coordinates with the Deputy Secretary of Energy (S-2) and the Office of Procurement Assistance and Management as necessary

2. **ORP**

a. Manager, ORP

- Approves annual PEMP
- Approves changes to the PEMP during the execution period
- Serves as FDO

- Formally charters the PEB to ensure senior management involvement and accountability
- Issues annual Award Fee Determination
- Approves PBI Completion Determination

b. Assistant Manager, Tank Farms Project

- Serves as Chair of the PEB

c. Director, Contracts and Property Management

- Forwards draft PEMP to the EMHCA for review and comment
- Forwards draft Award Fee Determination for review and comment
- Works with PEB to address any HQ comments concerning PEMP or Award Fee Determination, adjudicated by the FDO
- Ensures a unilateral or bilateral plan is issued prior to the start of the performance period
- Reviews draft evaluation report
- Coordinates with FDO during PEMP evaluation and fee recommendation

d. ORP Performance Evaluation Board

- Accountable for final selection and recommendation of contract-specific performance-based and award fee incentives
- Assigns responsibilities to PMs to monitor and evaluate completion of performance against objectives and measures for PBIs and SEAs
- Provides input, reviews, and s on the PEMP
- Accountable for addressing any external stakeholder comments concerning PEMP or Award Fee Determination through the FDO
- Reviews WRPS performance at the end of the evaluation period and upon completion of key milestones
- Evaluates WRPS performance and recommends earned fee to the FDO

e. PEB Chair Person

- Issues call letters for input in the development of the PEMP
- Submits draft PEMP to PMs and WRPS for review and comment
- Consolidates, coordinates, and incorporates comments to the PEMP
- Obtains appropriate concurrence and approvals of the PEMP
- Issues call letter to PMs for input to WRPS performance evaluation report
- Coordinates evaluations of WRPS's performance with the PEB

- Consolidates input from ORP PMs
- Coordinates training for participants in the performance fee process
- Coordinates changes with PMs
- Provide fee recommendation to the FDO

f. Performance Evaluation Board Members/Performance Monitors

- Attend all meetings unless formally excused by the Chair
- Actively participate in meetings
- Assure all program activities are represented
- Accountable for finalizing performance objectives/measures
- Monitor and evaluate completion of performance objectives
- Provides input, review, and concur on performance objectives
- Provides independent assessment of WRPS performance and recommend earned fee to the FDO
- Validate and document completion of PBI and SEA performance objectives and measures
- Elevate recommendations, issues or concerns to the Chair
- Reviews and considers WRPS self-assessments in recommending fee

g. Contracting Officer

- Transmits the PEMP to the contractor and incorporates the PEMP into the contract either bilaterally or unilaterally
- Provides input, reviews, and concurs on the PEMP PBI and SEA objectives and measures to achieve ORP's management and program requirements
- Determines the completion and achievement of the performance objectives and measures for the FDO

3. **WRPS**

General Manager

- Collaborates with ORP management to establish a working relationship that enables production of high value deliverables
- Responsible for the achievement of performance objectives and measures
- Provides critical self-assessments of performance against PBI and SEA performance objectives and measures to the ORP Contracting Officer

D. METHOD FOR DETERMINING PERFORMANCE FEE

1. Communication with WRPS during the Evaluation Period

One important consideration for evaluation will be discussions between the Performance Monitor (PM) and their WRPS counterpart. It is a management expectation that PMs

meet with their WRPS counterpart at least monthly to review, discuss, and provide interface on WRPS's performance against the performance-based and award fee incentives and overall contract performance.

Regular communication with WRPS at the PM level will contribute to the success of the fee process. PM should discuss performance which may not currently meet performance objectives and measures, and thereby keep WRPS informed as to achievements and deficiencies that may appear in the final evaluation for the period.

2. WRPS Self-Assessment

WRPS shall provide the ORP Contracting Officer with a critical self-assessment within ten (10) working days after the end of an award fee evaluation period. WRPS must also provide an electronic copy of its critical self-assessment of performance to ORP Contracting Officer for distribution to ORP PMs.

WRPS shall critically assess progress in meeting deliverables within cost, schedule and scope, including meeting the specified acceptance criteria. WRPS shall identify issues potentially affecting the completion of individual PBIs and SEAs and the overall success of the program, and actions taken or recommended to resolve those issues. WRPS's critical self-assessment shall propose and justify the amount of performance based incentive and award fee earned, and include a discussion of fee reductions warranted by any failure to meet performance expectation. In the event the contractor self-discloses a situation that falls within the support of a special emphasis area, and appropriately self-corrects the situation in a timely manner, fee reduction may be waived by the FDO.

3. ORP Assessment

ORP PMs shall prepare and submit to ORP PEB Chair Person, an independent assessment of WRPS's performance within 20 calendar days upon receipt of the WRPS end of the year self-assessment. The ORP PM shall consider WRPS's input with respect to completing the SEA performance criteria and with respect to the quality. Where significant disagreement exists between WRPS's self-assessment and ORP's assessment, the responsible ORP PM shall raise such disagreements to the PEB for resolution. WRPS may be requested to attend a Board meeting to assure their view is understood.

ORP PMs shall also consider the additional input received during monthly operating reviews. Such reviews will enable Program-wide understanding of progress, an integrated assessment of impacts, and the identification of corrective actions. Assessments shall also document the rationale for any reduction in the amount of award fee earned.

ORP PEB Chair Person will consolidate ORP PM Evaluation Reports and submit a written evaluation report to the PEB members with recommendations for final approval from the FDO.

4. Performance Evaluation Process

Performance Evaluation Process		
Activity	Duration	Evaluation Period
Award Fee Evaluation Period	365 days	October 1, 2013 to September 30, 2014
WRPS Monthly list of completed PBIs and supporting documentation are provided to the ORP CO	10 days	10 working days after each calendar month
WRPS Quarterly self-assessment of award fee performance objectives and measures are provided to the ORP CO	10 days	10 working days after each quarter
ORP PMs will prepare and submit Independent Assessment of WRPS performance to ORP PEB Chair	20 days	20 working days after each calendar month for PBIs and 20 days after each quarter for AF assessment
ORP consolidate performance monitor evaluation reports and submit to ORP PEB members for review	30 days	~ 30 days after receipt of monthly PBI completion letter and quarterly AF self-assessment.
PEB will review, validate and prepare evaluation report with recommendation to the FDO	60 days	~60 days after receipt of monthly PBI completion letter and quarterly AF self-assessment.
FDO determines amount of PBI fee earned (monthly) and AF Fee earned (annually)	70 days	70 days after receipt of monthly PBI completion letters and 70 days after receipt of 4th quarter AF self-assessment.

a. Within ten (10) working days after the end of a calendar month, WRPS shall provide the ORP Contracting Officer with a list of the PBIs completed in that month and supporting documentation demonstrating the performance based incentives have been earned. Within ten (10) days after the end of each quarter, WRPS shall provide the CO with a self-assessment of their performance towards achievement of the award fee performance objectives and measures during the quarter. The contractor will provide an electronic copy of its monthly PBI completion report and quarterly award fee self-assessment report to the ORP Contracting Officer for distribution to ORP PMs.

b. Within twenty (20) working days upon receipt of the monthly WRPS PBI completion letter, and twenty (20) working days upon receipt of the quarterly award fee self-assessment report ORP PMs will prepare and submit an independent assessment of WRPS's performance, with respect to quality and schedule, against the PBI completion criteria and/or award fee performance objectives and measures to the ORP PEB Chair Person for consolidation. The ORP PM shall consider WRPS's input with respect to payments of fee. Where significant disagreement exists between WRPS's self-assessment and ORP's assessment, the responsible Performance Monitor shall raise such disagreements to the ORP PEB for resolution.

c. The ORP assessment must be submitted on the Performance Monitor Evaluation Report form, Attachment 2 of the Plan, and will only be accepted by the ORP PEB Chair Person upon the approval of the ORP Performance Monitor.

d. Within approximately thirty (30) calendar days upon receipt of the monthly WRPS PBI completion letter, and quarterly award fee evaluation period, the ORP PEB Chair Person will consolidate Performance Monitor Evaluation Reports and submit to the PEB members for review.

e. Within approximately sixty (60) calendar days upon receipt of the monthly WRPS PBI completion letter, and quarterly award fee evaluation period, the PEB will review, validate, and prepare an evaluation report and submit a fee recommendation to the FDO.

f. Within seventy (70) calendar days upon receipt of the monthly WRPS PBI completion letter, and quarterly award fee self-assessment, the FDO will make a determination of the fee earned.

5. Evaluation and Discussion Documentation

Where meetings or discussions are held by the PM (with WRPS, HQ, or others) that significantly impact award fee evaluations, it is necessary that appropriate documentation be created. This documentation can be in the form of signed and dated notes, minutes, or correspondence. Copies of the PM documentation should be maintained by the PM in support of the Performance Evaluation Report.

Rationale for fee payments will be documented by the PEB for the fee determination official. The final PEB Fee Recommendation and FDO Fee Determination reports along with supporting rationale will be maintained by the ORP Contracts and Property Management organization in the official "contract file".

E. PEB INVOLVEMENT IN FINAL EVALUATIONS

The PEB is responsible for reviewing the Performance Evaluation Reports and developing a Fee Recommendation Report to the FDO. The PEB Chair will provide updates and feedback to the FDO prior to receiving the PEB's final signed fee recommendation report.

F. FDO RESPONSIBILITIES IN FINAL EVALUATIONS

Based on the FDO's personal knowledge, the information contained in WRPS's self-assessment, the PEB Fee Recommendation Report, and/or other information relating to WRPS's performance of the contract requirements, the FDO develops a determination on the evaluation and award fee. The FDO informs the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Acquisition and Project Management of their Fee Determination. Following the review with the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Acquisition and Project Management, the FDO issues a Fee

Determination letter of award fee earned to WRPS.

G. METHOD FOR CHANGING PLAN COVERAGE

Proposed changes to the PEMP may be initiated by ORP. Proposed changes to the PEMP may be initiated on the official PEMP Change Form (Attachment 4). The respective PM will review and concur on proposed changes prior to any changes being made to the PEMP. The FDO will either approve or disapprove any proposed changes to the PEMP.

PERFORMANCE BASED INCENTIVES

PERFORMANCE BASED INCENTIVES	VALUE	PERFORMANCE MONITOR
PBI 10.1 CLIN 1 222-S Laboratory	$750,000	Tank Farms
PBI 10.2 CLIN 1 Waste Volume Reduction	$1,250,000	Tank Farms
PBI 10.3 CLIN 1 Increase Rated Maximum Tank Levels in AP Farm	$250,000	Tank Farms
PBI 10.4 CLIN 1 Tank Farm Upgrades	$1,250,000	Tank Farms
PBI 10.5 CLIN 1 Comprehensive Double-Shell Tank Enhanced Annulus Visual Inspections	$500,000	Tank Farms
PBI 10.6 CLIN 1 SST Intrusion Mitigation	$500,000	Tank Farms
PBI 10.7 CLIN 1 Tank Farms Infrastructure and Core Sampling	$1,750,000	Tank Farms
PBI 10.8 CLIN ETF/LERF/TEDF Transition	$250,000	Tank Farm
PBI 11.0 CLIN 2 AX Farm Pre-Retrieval Activities	$2,000,000	Tank Farms
PBI 11.1 CLIN 2 AY-102 Recovery Phases 1 and 2	$1,500,000	Tank Farms
PBI 11.2 CLIN 2 C Farm Waste Retrieval Operations	$2,000,000	Tank Farms
PBI 11.3 CLIN 2 End of C Farm Retrieval Activities	$1,000,000	Tank Farms
PBI 12.0 CLIN 5.1 Department of Energy Headquarters Approval of the Low Activity Waste Pretreatment System Critical Decision 1 Package	$1,000,000	Tank Farms
PBI 13.0 CLIN _ Resolution of DNSFB 2012-2	$1,000,000	Tank Farms
Total PBI Fee Available	**$15,000,000**	

AWARD FEE SPECIAL EMPHASIS AREAS

SPECIAL EMPHASIS AREAS	VALUE	PERFORMANCE MONITOR
SEA 1: Management of Single Shell (SST) and Double Shell Tank (DST) System	$2,700,000	Tank Farms
SEA 2: Performance of Tank Farm Project Operations – Conduct of Operations	$1,500,000	Tank Operations
SEA 3: Cost Performance	$4,500,000	Tank Farms
SEA 4: Quality Assurance Program	$2,100,000	Quality Assurance
SEA 5: Nuclear Safety	$1,200,000	Nuclear Safety
SEA 6: Environmental Regulatory Management	$900,000	Environmental
SEA 7: Safety Program Implementation	$900,000	Safety and Health
SEA 8: Tank Farm Closure Activities	$1,200,000	Tank Farms
Total SEA Fee Available	**$15,000,000**	

The PBIs are for specific scopes of work to be performed during the annual evaluation period. Each PBI will be evaluated on a Pass-Fail basis. This Award Fee Plan may be updated to include new or revised PBIs as approved by the ORP Manager.

The available fee for both the PBI's and the SEAs combined is $30,000,000.

PBI-10.1 CLIN 1 222-S Laboratory

Performance Fee value is established at $750,000 of FY 2015 fee pool.

Fee Structure: Straight-Line Method

Milestone	Method	Fee Value	Due Date
1	Straight-Line	$250,000	September 30, 2015
2	Straight-Line	$250,000	September 30, 2015
3	Straight-Line	$250,000	September 30, 2015
Total		**$750,000**	

Desired Endpoint/Outcome

The 222-S Laboratory with its unique capabilities to analyze and store highly radioactive tank waste samples must operate reliably in support of the tank waste cleanup mission. The Contractor must replace and design/install new systems in support of 222-S Laboratory upgrades described in the Life Cycle plan completed in 2009 and updated in 2012.

Fee Bearing Milestones

1. Complete one (1) 222-S Laboratory analytical room renovation. This is part of a multi-year plan of room upgrades to provide reliability and capacity for handling projected workloads. The Contractor shall earn fee of $250,000.

   Work scope/completion criteria: Complete (1) Design, (2) Demolish, (3) Decontaminate, and (4) Renovate. (Renovate 1GB -Pending ORP approval of revised scope.)

   Completion document: Letter transmitting the Performance Expectation Completion Notices and copy of work order signature pages for the completed work scope approved through Operations Acceptance.

2. Complete two (2) 222-S Laboratory Support System Upgrades. The Contractor shall earn fee of $250,000.

   Work scope/completion criteria: Complete two (2) 222-S Laboratory support system upgrades to include: (1) Chiller Replacement, a very large chiller system and support equipment used for cooling the main laboratory (over 70,000 ft^2), and (2) Sample Receipt/Standards Laboratory, demolish and remove a severely degraded and vacated multipurpose facility that provided analytical standards preparation, cold testing of waste removal and treatment processes, and supported the Industrial Hygiene vapor program. Functions in the vacated facility were temporarily moved inside the laboratory until the replacement is installed. The replacement (2016) is critical to restore flexibility and space to accommodate future 10X increase in sample load through the main laboratory.

Completion document: Letter transmitting the Performance Expectation Completion Notices and copy of work order signature pages approved through Operations Acceptance.

3. Procure and install three (3) 222-S Laboratory Analytical Instruments. The Contractor shall earn fee of $250,000.

   Work scope/completion criteria: Procure and install three (3) of four (4) analytical instruments in support of the 222-S Laboratory: (1) Gas Chromatograph/Mass Spectrometer (GC/MS), (2) Gamma Energy Analyzer (GEA),(3) Ion Chromatograph (IC) and (4) Thermal Desorption Unit (TDU).

   Completion document: Letter transmitting the Performance Expectation Completion Notices and copy of work order signature pages approved through Operations Acceptance.

PBI-10.2 CLIN 1 Waste Volume Reduction

Performance Fee value is established at $1,000,000 of FY 2015 fee pool.

Fee Structure: Straight-Line Method

Milestone	Method	Fee Value	Due Date
1	Straight-Line	$330,000	September 30, 2015
2	Straight-Line	$330,000	September 30, 2015
3	Straight-Line	$340,000	September 30, 2015
4	Straight-Line	$250,000	September 30, 2015
Total		**$1,250,000**	

Desired Endpoint/Outcome

Prior to operations of the Waste Treatment and Immobilization Plant (WTP), conservation of Double-Shell Tank (DST) space is critical to allow continued Single-Shell Tank (SST) retrievals in accordance with negotiated regulatory milestones. The 242-A Evaporator is the primary tool to reduce waste volumes stored in the DST system. This succession of PBIs will make space for nearly one million gallons of waste retrieved from the SSTs.

Fee Bearing Milestones

1. Upon completion of 300,000 gallons (after flush) of 242-A Evaporator waste volume reduction during FY2015, the Contractor shall earn $330,000 of fee.

   Work scope/completion criteria: Operate the 242-A evaporator as a key component of the transfer and treatment system for tank farms. The evaporator will process the waste to the parameters determined by Process Engineering. The after-flush Waste Volume Reduction will be determined by the Process Control Plan (e.g. specific gravity goal and limits on the amount of waste removed from AW-102) with a minimum of 300,000 gallons (after flush) during FY 2015 of free DST volume achieved.

   Completion document: Letter transmitting the Performance Expectation Completion Notice and Letter Report and Evidence of Completion documenting that the waste volume reduction volume has been achieved and summarizing the volume reduction results.

2. Upon completion of 300,000 gallons (after flush total cumulative gallons 600,000) of 242-A Evaporator waste volume reduction during FY2015, the Contractor shall earn $330,000 of fee.

   Work scope/completion criteria: Operate the 242-A evaporator as a key component of the transfer and treatment system for tank farms. The evaporator will process the waste to the parameters determined by Process Engineering. The after-flush Waste Volume Reduction will be determined by the Process Control Plan (e.g. specific gravity goal and limits on the amount of waste removed from AW-102) with a minimum of 300,000 gallons (after flush) during

FY 2015 of free DST volume achieved. Assumes the evaporator campaign volumes can be combined to achieve milestones, e.g., Item 1's campaign has volume reduction of 400,000 gallons and Item 2's campaign has a volume reduction of 250,000 gallons with a total volume of 650,000 gallons, both Milestones 1 and 2 are complete.

Completion document: Letter transmitting the Performance Expectation Completion Notice and Letter Report and Evidence of Completion documenting that the waste volume reduction volume has been achieved and summarizing the volume reduction results.

3. Upon completion of 300,000 gallons (after flush total cumulative gallons 900,000) of 242-A Evaporator waste volume reduction during FY2015, the Contractor shall earn $340,000 of fee.

   Work scope/completion criteria: Operate the 242-A evaporator as a key component of the transfer and treatment system for tank farms. The evaporator will process the waste to the parameters determined by Process Engineering. The after-flush Waste Volume Reduction will be determined by the Process Control Plan (e.g. specific gravity goal and limits on the amount of waste removed from AW-102) with a minimum of 300,000 gallons (after flush) during FY 2015 of free DST volume achieved. Assumes the evaporator campaign volumes can be combined to achieve milestones, e.g., Item 1's campaign has volume reduction of 400,000 gallons, Item 2's campaign has a volume reduction of 250,000 gallons, and Item 3's campaign has a volume of 250,000 gallons with a total volume reduction of 900,000 gallons, Milestones 1 , 2, and 3 are complete.

   Completion document: Letter transmitting the Performance Expectation Completion Notice and Letter Report and Evidence of Completion documenting that the waste volume reduction volume has been achieved and summarizing the volume reduction results.

4. Upon completion of 300,000 gallons (after flush total cumulative gallons 1,200,000) of 242-A Evaporator waste volume reduction during FY2015, the Contractor shall earn $250,000 of fee.

   Work scope/completion criteria: Operate the 242-A evaporator as a key component of the transfer and treatment system for tank farms. The evaporator will process the waste to the parameters determined by Process Engineering. The after-flush Waste Volume Reduction will be determined by the Process Control Plan (e.g. specific gravity goal and limits on the amount of waste removed from AW-102) with a minimum of 300,000 gallons (after flush) during FY 2015 of free DST volume achieved. Assumes the evaporator campaign volumes can be combined to achieve milestones, e.g., Item 1's campaign has volume reduction of 400,000 gallons, Item 2's campaign has a volume reduction of 250,000 gallons, Item 3's campaign has a volume of 300,000 gallons and Item 4's campaign has a volume of 1,200,000 with a total volume reduction of 1,200,000 gallons, Milestones 1 , 2, 3 and 4 are complete.

   Completion document: Letter transmitting the Performance Expectation Completion Notice and Letter Report and Evidence of Completion documenting that the waste volume reduction volume has been achieved and summarizing the volume reduction results.

PBI-10.3 CLIN 1 Increase Rated Maximum Tank Levels in AP Farm

Performance Fee value is established at $250,000 of FY 2015 fee pool.

Fee Structure: Straight-Line Method

Milestone	Method	Fee Value	Due Date
1	Straight-Line	$125,000	September 30, 2015
2	Straight-Line	$125,000	September 30, 2015
Total		**$250,000**	

Desired Endpoint/Outcome

Increase the fill height in two (2) AP Farm tanks to provide the double-shell tank (DST) space needed to support future single-shell tank (SST) retrievals.

Fee Bearing Milestones

1. Upon completion to increase the rated maximum tank level of DST AP-107. The Contractor shall earn $125,000 of fee.

   Work scope/completion criteria: Complete work to increase the rated maximum tank level in AP-107 in accordance with applicable requirements in RPP-19438 Rev 0A, "Report of Expert Panel Workshop for Hanford Site Double-Shell Tank Waste Increase." The following identifies the work necessary to complete this evolution:

   a. Issue a Process Control Plan which provides direction to Operations during level rise activity in DST AP-107.
   b. Revise the Operating Specification Document to allow increase in operating limit for DST AP-107
   c. Issue a technical operating procedure to perform level rise of DST AP-107
   d. Perform the necessary transfer into and out of DST AP-107.

   Completion document: Letter transmitting the Performance Expectation Completion Notice and Letter Report and Evidence of Completion documenting that the increase in operating limit for DST AP-107 has been achieved.

2. Upon completion to increase the rated maximum tank level of DST AP-102. The Contractor shall earn $125,000 of fee.

   Work scope/completion criteria: Complete work to increase the rated maximum tank level in AP-102 in accordance with applicable requirements in RPP-19438 Rev 0A, "Report of Expert Panel Workshop for Hanford Site Double-Shell Tank Waste Increase." The following identifies the work necessary to complete this evolution:

a. Issue a Process Control Plan which provides direction to Operations during level rise activity in DST AP-102.
b. Revise the Operating Specification Document to allow increase in operating limit for DST AP-102.
c. Issue a technical operating procedure to perform level rise of DST AP-102.
d. Perform the necessary transfer into and out of DST AP-102.

Completion document: Letter transmitting the Performance Expectation Completion Notice and Letter Report and Evidence of Completion documenting that the increase in operating limit for DST AP-102 has been achieved.

PBI-10.4 CLIN 1 Tank Farm Upgrades

Performance Fee value is established at $1,500,000 of FY 2015 fee pool.

Fee Structure: Straight-Line Method

Milestone	Method	Fee Value	Due Date
1	Straight-Line	$500,000	September 30, 2015
3	Straight-Line	$125,000	September 30, 2015
4	Straight-Line	$125,000	September 30, 2015
5	Straight-Line	$250,000	September 30, 2015
6	Straight-Line	$250,000	September 30, 2015
Total		**$1,500,000**	

Desired Endpoint/Outcome

The Cathodic Protection Life Extension Project provides for the necessary evaluation, testing, maintenance, and system enhancements necessary to obtain/ensure compliance with Washington Administrative Code (WAC) 173-303-640 Tank Systems that are identified in the Cathodic Protection System Health Reports Recommendations and Independent Qualified Registered Professional Engineer (IQRPE) Double Shell Tank (DST) System Integrity Assessment Reports.

Ensure Reusable Contaminated Equipment (RCE) is compliantly packaged or dispositioned. Two structures will be erected to protect and preserve equipment packaging from environmental degradation and allow for the consolidation and positive control of RCE.

Fee Bearing Milestones

1. Perform and Analyze the Tank Farms Cathodic Protection System. The Contractor shall earn $500,000 of fee.

   Work scope/completion criteria: Perform and analyze the Tank Farms Cathodic Protection System to include: National Association of Corrosion Engineers (NACE) compliant testing of pipe to soil potentials (PSP) for the Tank Farms and 222-S Laboratory Cathodic Protection System. This testing will utilize a new process that includes recently procured current interrupters, revised Testing procedures, and trained personnel.

   Completion document: Letter transmitting the issuance of the Engineering document which demonstrates completion/analysis of PSP utilizing this new testing methodology.

2. Replace one (1) system in support of 242-A evaporator upgrade. The Contractor shall earn a total of $125,000 of fee upon completion of work on system.

Work scope/completion criteria: Replace one (1) system in support of the 242-A Evaporator

upgrades; installation of the 242-A safety significant steam isolation valve interlocks and control system.

Completion Document: Letter transmitting performance expectation completion notice and Operations acceptance of the installation Work Package.

3. Complete exhauster installation design in support of 241-AP primary ventilation system replacement. The Contractor shall earn a total of $125,000 of fee upon completion of exhauster installation design.

Work scope/completion criteria: All required design to allow for exhauster installation; tie into existing farm infrastructure (e.g., tank riser for drains, electrical utilities, etc.) in preparation for testing and turnover to operations.

Completion Document: Letter transmitting performance expectation completion notice with design documents referenced (e.g., drawings, engineering change notices, etc.).

4. Complete installation of new foundation, set exhauster skids, set work platforms (both for exhauster and for stack access), and set new stacks onto foundation in support of 241-AP primary ventilation system replacement. The Contractor shall earn a total of $250,000 of fee upon completion of installation of new foundation work in support of 241-AP primary ventilation system replacement.

Work scope/completion criteria: Foundation installed; exhauster skids, work platforms, and stacks installed on foundation.

Completion Document: Letter transmitting performance expectation completion notice and Operations acceptance of the installation Work Package.

5. Complete fabrication and installation of new air inlet stations on eight (8) AP farm DSTs in support of 241-AP primary ventilation replacement. The Contractor shall earn a total of $250,000 of fee upon completion of installation.

Work scope/completion criteria: Fabricate and install new air inlet stations on each of eight (8) AP farm DSTs.

Completion Document: Letter transmitting performance expectation completion notice and Operations acceptance of the installation Work Package.

PBI 10.5 CLIN 1 Comprehensive Double-Shell Tank Enhanced Annulus Visual Inspections

Performance Fee value is established at $500,000 of FY 2015 fee pool.

Fee Structure: Straight-Line Method (September 30, 2015)

Milestone	Method	Fee Value	Due Date
1	Straight-Line	$500,000	September 30, 2015
Total		**$500,000**	

Desired Endpoint/Outcome

Support Double-Shell Tank (DST) Integrity Project. The visual inspection results will be documented in a WRPS report and submitted to the U.S. Department of Energy, Office of River Protection (ORP). The results will inform future project decisions regarding tank integrity.

Fee Bearing Milestones

1. Complete ten (10) DST enhanced annulus visual inspections for ten (10) distinct DSTs (excluding AY-102) and issue report for DST integrity. The Contractor shall earn $500,000 of fee upon completion of the report for the ten (10) annulus visual inspections.

Work scope/completion criteria: Perform ten (10) DST enhanced annulus visual inspections. An enhanced annulus visual inspection consists of ≥ 95% inspection of the annulus floor. In addition, the visual inspection will included the primary tank dome, upper and lower haunches, sidewall, and insulating refractory visible from the annulus inspection risers.

Completion document: Letter transmitting performance expectation completion notice and applicable DST annulus visual inspection report to the ORP.

PBI 10.6 CLIN 1 SST Intrusion Mitigation

Performance Fee value is established at $500,000 of FY 2015 fee pool.

Fee Structure: Straight-Line Method (September 30, 2015)

Milestone	Method	Fee Value	Due Date
1	Straight-Line	$500,000	September 30, 2015
Total		**$500,000**	

Desired Endpoint/Outcome

Support Single-Shell Tank (SST) Integrity Project. Operate the portable exhauster POR06 at tank 241-T-111 to evaporate free liquid.

Fee Bearing Milestones

1. Complete all required design, construction and modifications needed for operation of the existing portable exhauster skid POR06 at Tank 241-T-111. Document the performance of the exhauster in evaporating the remaining free surface liquid and perform a video camera inspection after a minimum 30 days of operation. The Contractor shall earn $500,000 of fee upon completion.

Work scope/completion criteria: Documented performance of the portable exhauster including evaporation rates and operability after a minimum 30 days of operation and performance of an in-tank video inspection.

Completion document: Letter transmitting performance expectation completion notice and applicable documentation to the ORP.

PBI 10.7 CLIN 1 Tank Farms Infrastructure and Core Sampling

Performance Fee value is established at $1,750,000 of FY 2015 fee pool.

Fee Structure: Straight-Line Method (September 30, 2015)

Milestone	Method	Fee Value	Due Date
1	Straight-Line	$500,000	September 30, 2015
2	Straight-Line	$500.000	September 30, 2015
3	Straight-Line	$750,000	September 30, 2015
Total		**$1,750,000**	

Desired Endpoint/Outcome

Complete significant work scope towards tank farms infrastructure upgrades.

Tank waste sampling is essential to maintaining required tank waste chemistry, for maintaining tank integrity, for facilitating high level waste sludge management planning, to support waste blending strategy development in order to improve Waste Treatment Plan HLW melter operating efficiency, and to assess the degree of blending—Tank core sampling is high-risk work that must be completed safely to not impede project schedules.

Fee Bearing Milestones

1. Complete installation and testing of wireless infrastructure upgrades in SY, AY/AZ, and AN Farms. The Contractor shall earn $500,000 of fee upon installation of the wireless infrastructure upgrades.

Work scope/completion criteria: The Contractor shall complete installation and testing of wireless infrastructure upgrades in SY, AY/AZ, and AN Farms.

Completion Document: Letter transmitting the work package coversheet documenting completion and acceptance by Operations.

2. Install the AZ-101or the AW-106 pump replacement by September 30, 2015. The Contractor shall earn $500,000 of fee upon completion of the installation.

Work Scope/Completion Criteria: Complete installation of the AZ-101 pump replacement. Field work packages will be approved through Operations Acceptance.

Completion Document: Letter transmitting completed field work packages through Operations Acceptance.

3. Complete three (3) core samples in support of the Tank Operations Contract (TOC) mission. The Contractor shall earn a total of $750,000 of fee upon completion of the core samples.

Work scope/completion criteria: Completion of core sample as described in the applicable Tank Sampling and Analysis Plan (TSAP). The plan shall identify; the type of sample, the technical need for the sampling activity, the location of the sample, and the sampling requirements.

Completion Document: Letter transmitting performance expectation completion notice and copy of the chain of custody (COC) documenting completion of core sample and delivery of the sample to the 222-S laboratory.

PBI 10.8 CLIN 1 ETF/LERF/TEDF Transition

Performance Fee value is established at $250,000 of FY 2015 fee pool.

Fee Structure: Straight-Line Method (September 30, 2015)

Milestone	Method	Fee Value	Due Date
1	Straight-Line	$250,000	September 30, 2015
Total		**$250,000**	

Desired Endpoint/Outcome

Effluent Treatment Facility (ETF)/Liquid Effluent Retention Facility (LERF)/Treated Effluent Disposal Facility (TEDF) receives, treats, and disposes of liquid effluents and will play a major role in treating 242-A evaporator condensate and future WTP secondary liquid waste. Transition of the facilities from CH2M HILL Plateau Remediation Company (CHPRC) to the Tank Operations Contractor (TOC) is essential for providing waste treatment capabilities to meet future needs.

Fee Bearing Milestones

1. Complete transition of the ETF/LERF/TEDF from the CHPRC to TOC. The Contractor shall earn $250,000 of fee upon completion of transition.

Work scope/completion criteria: Complete the ETF/LERF/TEDF transition completion document which includes TOC functional area manager approval signatures designating receipt of the ETF/LERF/TEDF. The ETF/LERF/TEDF transition completion document will include completed functional area checklists and identify any post turnover punchlist items.

Completion Document: Letter transmitting the performance expectation completion notice and the ETF/LERF/TEDF transition completion document.

PBI-11.0 CLIN 2 AX Farm Pre-Retrieval Activities

Performance Fee value is established at $2,000,000 of FY 2015 fee pool.

Fee Structure: Straight-Line Method

Milestone	Method	Fee Value	Due Date
1	Straight-Line	$500,000	September 30, 2015
2	Straight-Line	$500,000	September 30, 2015
3	Straight-Line	$500,000	September 30, 2015
4	Straight-Line	$500,000	September 30, 2015
Total		**$2,000,000**	

Desired Endpoint/Outcome

The work outlined in this performance metric is required to prepare AX Farms for waste retrieval following the C Farm retrievals. Completion of tank waste retrieval activities to meet or exceed performance requirements in the Consent Decree – Appendix B and C.

Fee Bearing Milestones

1. Complete POR-126 installation, testing, and declaration of readiness to operate. The Contractor shall earn $500,000 of fee for declaration of readiness to operate.

   Work scope/completion criteria: Declare exhauster skid POR-126 ready to operate. All prestart outstanding issues shall be resolved prior to letter transmittal.

   Completion document: Letter transmitting the Performance Expectation Completion Notice and copy of the completed Operational Readiness Checklist (ORC). All pre-start outstanding issues shall be resolved prior to letter transmittal.

2. Complete equipment removal from two (2) AX farm tanks in preparation for installation of retrieval technologies. The Contractor shall earn $500,000 of fee upon completion.

   Work scope/completion criteria: The Contractor shall remove equipment from two AX farm tanks to prepare the two tanks for installation of the waste retrieval systems. The equipment to be removed from each AX Farm tank is identified in RPP-RPT-57187, *241-AX Farm Riser Utilization Evaluation.* This work scope will be completed when equipment has been removed from two of the four tanks in accordance with RPP-RPT-57187.

   Completion document: Letter transmitting the Performance Expectation Completion Notices and work completed engineering change notice(s).

3. Complete AX farm retrieval system design media for the AX Farm to AZ-102 retrieval system. The Contractor shall earn $500,000 of fee upon completion.

Work scope/completion criteria: The Contractor shall complete and issue all design media for the AX Farm to AX-102 retrieval system. Design will include in-tank equipment (e.g. sluicers and pumps), hose in hose transfer line routing, electrical distribution from the farm infrastructure to the in-tank equipment, above ground valve boxes and Tank Farm Lighting upgrades.

Completion document: Letter transmitting the Performance Expectation Completion Notice and a listing of all design media issued for the AX Farm to AZ-102 retrieval system.

4. Complete the Tank Waste Retrieval Work Plan (TWRWP) or plans for all AX farm tanks. The Contractor shall earn $500,000 of fee upon completion.

   Work scope/completion criteria: The Contractor shall develop one or more tank waste retrieval work plans to address retrieval of the four tanks in AX tank farm. Each tank waste retrieval work plan shall include the required information as described in Appendix B, part 2 of the Consent Decree. In preparation of the tank waste retrieval work plan(s), the Contractor shall discuss the proposed content and format with ORP and Ecology. However, the Contractor is NOT required to obtain Ecology concurrence prior to formal submittal of the tank waste retrieval work plan. One or more tanks may be included in a TWRWP as appropriate.

   Completion document: Letter transmitting the Performance Expectation Completion Notice and the released tank waste retrieval work plan(s) for ORP transmittal to Ecology.

PBI-11.1 CLIN 2 AY-102 Recovery Phases 1 and 2

Performance Fee value is established at $1,500,000 of FY 2015 fee pool.

Fee Structure: Terminal Method

Milestone	Method	Fee Value	Due Date
1	Straight-Line	$500,000	May 30, 2015
2	Straight-Line	$500,000	September 30, 2015
3	Straight-Line	$500,000	July 31, 2015
Total		**$1,500,000**	

Desired Endpoint/Outcome

The following proposed project milestones are part of a project execution scenario supported by a funding level for AY-102 Recovery Phases 1 and 2 of at least $50M.
That level of funding enables the following accomplishments:

- AY-102 Waste retrieval and transfer system design completed
- Major procurements initiated and completed
- In-Tank legacy equipment removal completed in AY-102

Fee Bearing Milestones

1. Complete the AY-102 Waste Retrieval and Transfer System (WRS) final design by May 30, 2015. The Contractor shall earn $500,000 of fee for completion of the design.

   Work scope/completion criteria: Release the AY-102 Waste Retrieval and transfer System Design Description document (SDD).

   Completion Document: Letter transmitting to the ORP the performance expectation completion notice and copy the released AY-102 WRS SDD.

2. Complete procurements of the supernatant and slurry transfer pumps assemblies and Extended Reach Sluicers by September 30, 2015. The Contractor shall earn $500,000 of fee upon completion.

   Work scope/completion criteria: Equipment is delivered, accepted, and staged on-site.

   Completion document: Letter transmitting to the ORP the performance expectation completion notice and copy of the equipment receipt reports.

3. Complete pump removal and pit rehabilitation for NACE (National Association of Corrosion Engineers) compliance in pits AY-02B, AY-02D, and AY-02E. Complete one pit by February

28, 2015, one pit by April 30, 2015, and one pit by July 31, 2015. The Contractor shall earn $500,000 for the pump removals and pit rehabilitations.

Work scope/completion criteria: Plan and execute the high radiological risk work packages needed to complete each pump removal and pit rehabilitation.

Completion document: For each pit, letter transmitting to the ORP the performance expectation completion notice and copy of the Ops Acceptance work packages signature page.

PBI 11.2 CLIN 2 C Farm Waste Retrieval Operations

Performance Fee value is established at $2,000,000 of FY 2015 fee pool.

Fee Structure: Straight-Line Method

Milestone	Method	Fee Value	Due Date
1	Straight-Line	$500,000	September 30, 2015
2	Straight-Line	$1,500,000	September 30, 2015
Total		**$2,000,000**	

Desired Endpoint/Outcome

Completion of tank waste retrieval activities to meet or exceed performance requirements in the Consent Decree – Appendix B and C.

Fee Bearing Milestones

1. Complete retrieval of Tank 241-C-102. The Contractor shall earn a total of $500,000 of fee upon completion of retrieval of Tank C-102 to the requirements of the Consent Decree – Appendix B and C.

   Work scope/completion criteria: Complete waste retrieval to meet or exceed performance requirements in the Consent Decree – Appendix B and C, specifically deploy three technologies identified in the TWRWP to the "limits of technology" (as defined in Appendix C).

   Completion document: Submittal of material balance data and engineering calculations summary information documenting the results of retrieval Tank C-102 and demonstrating completion of tank waste retrieval in accordance with the Consent Decree – Appendix B and C, specifically that three technologies identified in the TWRWP were deployed to the limits of technology.

2. Complete retrieval of Tank 241-C-105. The Contractor shall earn $1,500,000 of fee upon completion of retrieval of Tank 241-C-105 to the requirements of the Consent Decree – Appendix B and C.

   Work scope/completion criteria: Complete waste retrieval to meet or exceed performance requirements in the Consent Decree – Appendix B and C, specifically those two technologies identified in the TWRWP were deployed to the limits of technology, and that the waste residual volume is not more than 360 ft^3. If the waste residual volume is greater than 360 ft^3, demonstrate that it is not practicable to deploy a third technology or provide to ORP a recommendation for a third technology.

Completion document: Submittal of material balance data and engineering calculations summary information documenting the results of retrieval of Tank C-105 and demonstrating completion of tank waste retrieval in accordance with the Consent Decree – Appendix B and C, specifically that two technologies identified in the TWRWP were deployed to the limits of technology, and either that the waste residual volume is not more than 360 ft^3 or that it is not practicable to deploy a third technology, or that the waste residual volume is greater than 360 ft^3 and a recommendation of a third technology to ORP.

PBI 11.3 CLIN 2 End of C Farm Retrieval Activities

Performance Fee value is established at $1,200,000 of FY 2015 fee pool.

Fee Structure: Straight-Line Method

Milestone	Method	Fee Value	Due Date
1	Straight-Line	$250,000	September 30, 2015
2	Straight-Line	$750,000	September 30, 2015
Total		$1,000,000	

Desired Endpoint/Outcome

The performance objectives in these fee bearing milestones must be completed upon the end of tank waste retrieval activities as required in the HFFACO. .

Hose-In-Hose Transfer Lines (HIHTL) that are used in the tank farms for the temporary movement of waste for retrieval are required to be removed from the Hanford Tank Farms once retrieval activities in a Farm are complete in accordance with the schedule in the Temporary HIHTL Management Plan.

Fee Bearing Milestones

1. In partial completion of TPA Milestone M-45-86, provide Retrieval Data Report for three (3) 241-C-100 tanks in C Farm that have completed retrieval under the Consent Decree. The Contractor shall earn a total of $250,000 of fee upon completion of work on all three reports.

Work scope/completion criteria: Each Retrieval Data Report shall include the following elements:

- Residual tank waste volume measurement, including associated calculations;
- The results of residual tank waste characterization;
- Retrieval technology performance documentation;
- The updated post-retrieval risk assessment;
- Opportunities and actions being taken to refine or develop tank waste retrieval technologies based on lessons learned and,
- Leak detection monitoring and performance results.

The tank residual characterization and residual volume estimate shall be based on the version of RPP-23403 (*Single-Shell Tank Component Closure Data Quality Objectives*) in effect at the time of retrieval completion certification for the tank in question, modified by any specific changes agreed to in the applicable Tank Sample Analysis Plan. The post-retrieval risk assessment shall be based on the risk model used in DOE/ORP-2005-01 (*Initial Single-Shell Tank System Performance Assessment for the Hanford Site*). A draft of the Retrieval Data Report shall be provided to ORP

for review, and all written comments submitted to the contractor on the draft, within 15 calendar days of providing the draft to ORP, will be addressed in the final Retrieval Data Report. Note: Development of a retrieval data report does not require Ecology approval of completion of retrieval.

Completion documents: For each tank, provide to the ORP a formally released Retrieval Data Report addressing the elements described above.

2. Complete removal and shipping of eight (8) interim stabilization Hose-in-Hose Transfer Lines (HIHTL). The Contractor shall earn$750,000 in fee when all 8 hoses are removed and shipped.

Work scope/completion criteria for HIHTL removal: The line has been removed from the field, and packaged for shipment to the treatment vendor. The line removal and packaging will be documented by Operations acceptance of the work package. At the completion of the HIHTL removal, the Field Work Supervisor will verify all housekeeping activities related to the work having been completed. Completion of housekeeping will be signed off in the work record of the work package. The HIHTL waste package has been shipped to the waste TSD facility.

Completion Document for HIHTL removal: Letter transmitting the work package coversheet documenting completion and acceptance by Operations and the waste disposal facility verification of receipt of shipment for the waste package(s).

PBI 12.0 CLIN 5.1 Department of Energy Headquarters Approval of the Low Activity Waste Pretreatment System Critical Decision 1 Package

Performance Fee value is established at $1,000,000 of the FY 2015 fee pool

Fee Structure: Straight-Line Method

Milestone	Method	Fee Value	Due Date
1	Straight-Line	$1,000,000	September 30, 2015
Total		**$1,000,000**	

Desired Endpoint/Outcome

Obtain the U.S. Department of Energy-Headquarters (DOE-HQ) approval of the Low Activity Waste Pretreatment System (LAWPS) CD-1, *Approve Alternative Selection and Cost Range.* Several components of the CD-1 Package are the responsibility of WRPS and some are the responsibility of the Office of River Protection (ORP), as delineated in DOE O 413.3B.

Substantial WRPS effort is necessary to produce final CD-1 documents that include the incorporation of Federal and DNFSB comments, ultimately leading to DOE-HQ approval.

Fee Bearing Milestones

1. Obtain DOE-HQ approval of the LAWPS CD-1, *Approve Alternative Selection and Cost Range.* Upon DOE-HQ approval the Contractor shall earn $1,000,000 of fee.

Work scope/completion criteria: DOE-HQ approval of the LAWPS CD-1.

Completion document: DOE-HQ letter to ORP transmitting approval of the LAWPS CD-1, *Approve Alternative Selection and Cost Range.*

PBI 13.0 CLIN__ Resolution of DNFSB 2012-2

Performance Fee value is established at $1,000,000 of the FY 2015 fee pool

Fee Structure: Straight-Line Method

Milestone	Method	Fee Value	Due Date
1	Straight-Line	$330,000	September 30, 2015
2	Straight-Line	$330,000	September 30, 2015
3	Straight-Line	$340,000	September 30, 2015
Total		**$1,000,000**	

Desired Endpoint/Outcome

Make significant progress towards installing safety significant flow instruments in the ventilation system for the 28 double shell tanks (DSTs).

The Department of Energy (DOE) provided the Implementation Plan for Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board Recommendation 2012-2, Hanford Tank Farms Flammable Gas Safety Strategy which established a plan for reducing the potential risk posed by flammable gas events at the Hanford Tanks Farms. As part of this implementation plan, Action 2-2 installs safety significant instrumentation for real time monitoring of the ventilation exhaust flow from each DST. Additionally, Action 5-1 evaluates potential means to reduce the inventory of retained flammable gases in DSTs in a controlled manner. Both project scopes outlined below assist with the resolution of these milestones within the implementation plan.

1. Complete DNFSB 2012-2 Recommendation, Action 2-2 airflow instrumentation installation design. The Contractor shall earn a total of $330,000 of fee upon completion of installation.

Work scope/completion criteria: Complete final design for the safety significant flow instruments and associated infrastructure modifications.

Completion Document: Letter transmitting performance expectation completion notice with design documents referenced (e.g. drawings, engineering change notices, etc.).

2. Complete DNFSB 2012-2 Recommendation, Action 2-2 initial ISA-84 documentation and CGD plan for installation materials. The Contractor shall earn a total of $330,000 of fee upon completion of action.

Work scope/completion criteria: Approve/release safety integrity level (SIL) calculations and the installation materials CGD plan for DNFSB 2012-2 Recommendation, Action 2-2.

Completion Document: Letter transmitting performance expectation completion notice and the completed SIL calculations and CGD plan for installation materials with referenced release engineering calculation number.

3. Complete DNFSB 2012-2 Recommendation, Action 5-1, evaluate potential means to reduce the inventory of retained flammable gases in DSTs in a controlled manner. The Contractor shall earn a total of $340,000 of fee upon completion of installation.

Work scope/completion criteria: Approve/release the report for DNFSB 2012-2 Recommendation, Action 5-1.

Completion Document: Letter transmitting performance expectation completion notice and the approved/released report for DNFSB 2012-2 Recommendation, Action 5-1, with referenced release documentation.

SPECIAL EMPHASIS AREA
OVERALL GRADES & ASSOCIATED PERCENTAGES OF EARNED FEE

Award-Fee Adjectival Rating	Award-Fee Pool Available To Be Earned	Description
Excellent	91%-100%	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.
Very Good	76%-90%	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.
Good	51%-75%	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.
Satisfactory	No Greater Than 50%	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.
Unsatisfactory	0%	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.

Award Fee: The period of performance is October 1, 2014, through September 30, 2015. The total available fee is split between the PBIs and SEAs. At the conclusion of the 12-month evaluation period DOE will determine the award fee associated with the SEAs. ORP's evaluation of the contractor's performance in the SEAs will be combined to an overall rating. **Failure in any of the SEAs could result in a change to the overall rating as determined by the Fee Determination Official.**

To be minimally acceptable, all contractor formal products by contract, DOE Order, regulation, procedure, plan, or DOE written direction shall be complete, accurate, and on schedule. Requirements shall clearly flow down and be transparent within the product and ensure compliance with ES&H and QA requirements. Evidence of unsatisfactory performance on the part of the contractor is: (1) technical errors or omissions in contractor developed products, (2) performance not completed by COB on the agreed upon date scheduled, and (3) non-compliance with designated Completion Criteria.

SEA 1: Management of Single Shell (SST) and Double Shell Tank (DST) System

Performance Fee value is established at $2,700,000 of FY 2015 fee pool

Desired Outcome:

In the execution of the contract, Washington River Protection Solutions LLC (WRPS) is expected to provide holistic, comprehensive, and effective management as conscientious stewards of all Tank Farm facilities and activities through:

- Demonstrating safety leadership and risk-informed, conservative decision-making
- Anticipating project challenges and providing timely resolution
- Open communication with the workforce – fostering a questioning attitude and an environment free from retribution
- Aggressive self-discovery of project issues to ORP through critical self-analysis, performance monitoring, and comprehensive extent of condition reviews

Additionally, WRPS will provide management focus on maintenance, compliance, surveillance and integrity of the tank farms facility.

Areas of focus include overall WRPS management of the Hanford Tank Farm facilities and systems including SST and DST infrastructure, DST Chemistry, SST and DST Integrity, and Support for WTP Commissioning.

Evaluation criteria to measure performance will include ORP's subjective evaluation of the contractor's performance based on the following:

a) **Overall Tank Farm Management** Demonstrate effective long-term stewardship of the entire Hanford Tank Farm project facilities and processes through:

1) Demonstrating safety leadership and risk-informed, conservative decision-making

2) Anticipating project challenges and providing timely resolution

3) Open communication with the workforce – fostering a questioning attitude and an environment free from retribution

4) Aggressive self-discovery of project issues to ORP through critical self-analysis, meaningful performance monitoring, comprehensive extent of condition reviews, and effective risk identification and management

b) **SST and DST Infrastructure**

General maintenance of all SST and DST Infrastructure, to include but not limited to:

1) Maintain and remove or replace jumpers/funnel as needed.

2) Maintain DST ventilation.

c) **DST Chemistry and Integrity**

The maintenance of Double-Shell Tank (DST) and waste transfer system piping and associated containment system (waste transfer fitness for service) integrity is crucial to cost-effective completion of the tank waste cleanup mission. The Contractor shall:

1) Maintain tank chemistry per Operations Specifications Documents to ensure long term integrity of tanks

2) Confirm data obtained from active portions of the corrosion probe and gain better understanding of actual corrosion and corrosion mechanisms within the double-shell tanks (DSTs)

3) Obtain better understanding of the corrosion potential of the waste.

4) Perform analyses of dynamic mixing, benchmark analysis, and ventilation flow modeling.

5) Complete fitness for service simulant valve testing to determine the safety and integrity of equipment and maintain safe and reliable operation.

d) **Single-Shell Tank Integrity**

Maintain the SST Integrity program.

1) Perform video assessments and prepare summary conclusion reports for SST structural analysis and SST leak assessments.

2) Meet Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) Milestones and support TPA negotiations.

3) Continue update of the Tank Waste Summary Report, HNF-EP-0182.

4) Comply with and negotiate changes with Ecology on SST Functions and Requirements, 9937 Document.

e) **Support for WTP Commissioning:** Development of improved Management systems and technical support for Waste Treatment Plant (WTP) Commissioning.

1) Integration- Establish a prioritized set of activities and timing to fully integrate Tank Farms and WTP necessary to meet the contractual dates for startup and commissioning of WTP. Be responsible for coordinating, tracking, measuring and reporting on those activities;

2) Interface Control Documents- Manage the WTP Interface Control Documents (ICDs).;

3) Transition:- Recommend to ORP, WRPS, and BNI actions needed to more effectively and efficiently conduct the transition to startup, commissioning, and operation;

4) Flowsheet Management- Establish a long-term Tank Waste Disposition Integrated Flow-Sheet (TWDIF) stewardship and technical management process that involves the national laboratories;

5) System Planning - Provide for the integration of TOC and WTP system planning and modeling, with a focus on the WTP feed vector and waste feed qualification requirements;

6) Contract Management- Identify those DOE directives and contract changes needed to align the WRPS and BNI contracts, and establish an optimum or necessary time to have each item aligned.

7) Chief Technology Office- Establish an integrated national laboratory support program for WRPS including procurement, communication, reporting protocols, and a mission directed research and development program. Develop an integrated WRPS technology development roadmap including integration with WRPS mission planning documents (System Plan, Risk Management Plan, etc.) and DOE-HQ technology development program.

8) Project Management- Management of the Project Management Program is effective and supports the LAWPS project.

SEA 2: Performance of Tank Farm Project Operations – Conduct of Operations

Performance Fee value is established at $1,500,000 of FY 2015 fee pool.

Desired Outcome: Ensure focus is maintained on overall safety and efficiency of Tank Farm project operations through improvements in Conduct of Operations and Work Control.

Areas of focus include Work Control/Procedure Development process continuous improvement, the field implementation of work instructions, and general Conduct of Operations improvements.

Evaluation criteria to measure performance will include ORP's subjective evaluation of the contractor's performance based on the following:

a) DOE oversight indicate WRPS self-identification of event precursors and resolution of causal factors prior to significant issues or consequential (>/=SC-2) events;

b) Personnel are cognitive of and avoid at-risk behaviors and conditions. Senior Managers (Level 0, 1, and 2) are proactive in identifying these behaviors and correcting conditions in the field through established WRPS processes (PER, MOP/WSV, etc.);

c) WRPS assessment processes proactively identify noncompliances and opportunities for improvement that result in improved WRPS performance in accordance with the contract.

d) Additional trending data such as Occurrence Reporting and Processing System Reports, Problem Evaluation Requests, and Performance Indicators are established and monitored for Conduct of Operations and Work Control that monitor the health and status of the programs similar to those created as part of the FEOT process to both normalize and evaluate the safety significance of trending data and WRPS management takes actions to mitigate performance deficiencies;

e) Tank Farm general area housekeeping and maintenance is improved. Examples may include overall radiological zone reduction, farm signage and equipment labeling, and demonstrated reduction of radioactive contaminated material and equipment;

f) Responsiveness to and management of performance and assessment areas needing attention as identified by contractor self-assessments, ORP assessments, and external reviews as evidenced by a high ratio of WRPS self-identified issues that eliminate the need for ORP issues to be identified and minimal ORP rejection of corrective action plans;

g) The restructured Conduct of Operations Council and Training and Management Focus demonstrate continuous improvement as evidenced by WRPS performance indicators, effective improvement initiatives, and/or WRPS/ORP oversight results. Examples may include items such as implementing continued work control enhancements (Work Efficiency Design Lab),

increased senior management field presence, Field Excellence Captains ownership of Conduct of Operations initiatives and issues, additional Human Performance Improvement Lab response to abnormal events or lessons learned, or drill program improvement;

h) Base Operations Transfer and Single-Shell Retrieval and Closure Transfer processes, where applicable, demonstrate continuous improvement and consistency between the two line organizations for increased safety or more efficient transfer process.

i) Improvements in the Corrosion Control Program that result (or will result) in improved response (including a reduction in overall response time) to out of specification tank chemistry.

j) **Conduct of Engineering:** Improvement in effectiveness, consistency of Engineering systems and programs.

1) Reduction in Engineering Change Notices backlog;

2) Deployment of improved ECN process and evidence of increased rigor in planning and field execution..

3) Establish mechanisms and/or metrics to improve subcontractor performance.

4) Reduction in design errors resulting in Engineering or field rework;

5) Develop a weighted average metric to track and improve technical rigor issues.

6) Improve Ventilation System performance while maintaining a 90 percent availability, with a focus on deployment of additional portable ventilation skid capability and availability of portable systems.

7) Establish a metric and goals for consistent use of latest edition of ASME codes and standards when performing design/modification work.

8) Provide innovative engineering solutions that result in improved schedule adherence. Examples may be to eliminate use of all buried transfer lines and go to above ground HIHTL, incorporate a water based hydraulic system into the ERSS design, elimination of unique engineering processes that create error traps (e.g. Retrieval/Closure) and develop an alternate technology for retrieving tanks classified as leakers.

9) Effective transition of existing document control and configuration management systems, with implementation of the SmartPlant® Foundation (SPF) application;

10) Improved Design Control implementation;

k) **Conduct of Maintenance:**

1) Corrective maintenance backlog and 10% reduction in prioritized repairs;

2) Reduction in preventative maintenance backlog;

3) Identification and implementation of at least two improved stewardship opportunities (e.g., Smart Plant), including metrics to demonstrate improvement.

l) **Work Processes:**

1) Develop a schedule performance metric for project work
2) Delinquent preventative maintenance backlog is less than 150 (1.5% of total preventative maintenance packages)
3) 900 (75/month) Management oversight observations of work execution
4) Evaluate work packages for appropriate use of "skill of the craft" and integration of controls into work instructions. (at least 5% of completed MOPs, 4/month)

SEA 3: Cost/Schedule Performance

Performance Fee value is established at $4,500,000 of FY 2015 fee pool.

Desired Outcome: Contractor's cost and schedule performance is in alignment with the negotiated estimated costs and schedule contained in the contract.

Areas of Focus include: Contractor's Cost Performance Report, Monthly Performance Report, TOC Monthly Risk Status Report.

Evaluation criteria to measure performance will include ORP's subjective evaluation of the contractor's performance based on the following:

Cost and Schedule Performance - DOE will evaluate the Contractor's cost and schedule performance based upon Contractor's actual incurred costs compared to the total estimated costs of active CLINs and Sub-CLINs within the award fee evaluation period. The analysis of cost control performance will give consideration to changed programmatic requirements, changed statutory requirements, and/or changes beyond the Contractor's control which impact costs. ORP will rely on other objective and or subjective cost performance elements to evaluate the Contractor's performance, which includes, but is not limited to the following.

a) Cost Control – Contractor maintains cost control including but not limited to actual costs incurred are equal to or less than the estimated costs negotiated in the contract, the current FY 2015, Contract Performance Baseline is $522M and actively pursues cost containment and reduction through innovative approaches and management of resources.

b) Schedule Control Contractor maintains a schedule that is reflective of actual schedule performance, problem identification and corrective action plans. These action plans are tracked for actual schedule performance against the plan.

c) Cost and Schedule Reporting – Contractor is proactive in assisting ORP with problem identification. Potential problems are identified, and corrective action is implemented to minimize cost/schedule impacts. The Government is notified immediately of significant problems and the contractor interacts with the Government to develop viable resolutions and overcome delays.

d) Variances - Contractor is expected to promptly take corrective action on negative cost and schedule variances. Negative variances are not expected to build but instead be mitigated effectively and with sound business practices.

e) Available Funding Utilization – Contractor is expected to optimize utilization of funds while planning for an appropriate amount of carryover to cover outstanding year-end commitments and to provide for the first few weeks of continuing operations into the next fiscal year.

f) Earned Value Management System (EVMS) indices, including cost performance index (CPI)

and schedule performance index (SPI) - Contractor is expected to effectively use the EVMS in managing and reporting their project performance to ensure that actual progress is reported compared to the approved plans and that sound management actions are taken when negative cost and schedule variances and/or cost overruns are projected.

SEA 4: Quality Assurance Program

Performance Fee value is established at $2,100,000 of FY 2015 fee pool.

Desired Outcome: Continued improvement of the Quality Assurance (QA) program.

Areas of Focus for Quality Assurance Program Improvement:

Effectiveness of the contractor's QA program in providing products and services that are satisfactory for their intended function. Effectiveness will be measured by the ability of the products and services to be used as originally produced or provided, versus the need for rework to reach an acceptable status. Self-identification of quality-related problems, as well as prompt, effective corrective actions, is required rather than having those problems identified by ORP or by external organizations.

Evaluation criteria to measure performance will include ORP's subjective evaluation of the contractor's performance based on the following:

a) Adequate flow-down and effective application of TOC QA program management criteria (TFC-PLN-02, *Quality Assurance Program Description*);

b) Responsiveness to quality-related problems, as identified by internal and external assessments and reviews;

c) Completion of planned actions to fully implement ASME NQA-1-2008/09; EM-QA-001, revision 1; and DOE Order 414.D;

d) Improved Software Quality Assurance (SQA) implementation;

e) Improved Corrective Action management; and,

f) Effective implementation of Commercial Grade Dedication as a procurement strategy.

SEA 5: Nuclear Safety

Performance Fee value is established at $1,200,000 of FY 2015 fee pool.

Desired Outcome: Improvements in the Management of the Tank Farms safety basis, and required amendments

Areas of Focus include Contract requirements and responsiveness to emerging issues, high visibility items, and any areas needing attention as identified by contractor self-assessments, ORP assessments, and external reviews.

Evaluation criteria to measure performance will include ORP's subjective evaluation of the contractor's performance based on the following:

a) Completion of Planned Improvements identified in the Tank Farms Documented Safety Analysis (DSA);

b) Timely declaration and management of Potential Inadequacies in the Safety Basis (PISAs);

c) Un-reviewed Safety Question process compliance with 10 CFR 830.203 and DOE G 424.1-113, Implementation Guide for Use in Addressing Un-reviewed Safety Question Requirements;

d) Responsiveness to and management of performance and assessment areas needing attention as identified by contractor self-assessments, ORP assessments, and external reviews.

e) Proactive development of DSA amendments and JCOs to identify and resolve implementation challenges prior to transmittal to ORP for approval.

SEA 6: Environmental Regulatory Management

Performance Fee value is established at $900,000 of FY 2015 fee pool.

Desired Outcome: Demonstrated improvement in environmental stewardship

Areas of Focus for environmental- stewardship and compliance:

a) Environmental Management System and performance metrics;

b) Permitting documents and compliance to permits and licenses and environmental reporting;

c) Proactive assessment/evaluation program;

d) Number and seriousness of any findings of noncompliance, infractions or violations, and timeframes and quality of related reporting and responses.

Evaluation criteria to measure performance will include ORP's subjective evaluation of the contractor's performance based on the following:

a) Quality and implementation of the documented environmental protection program and the contractor's establishment and implementation of environmental performance metrics;

b) Early identification of issues and concerns through a proactive assessment/evaluation program;

c) Data and regulatory approaches are prepared in a timely manner and integration with Hanford Site regulatory compliance to support annual reports and compliance activities;

d) Quality, timeliness, completeness, and technical accuracy of environmental reports, permits, and licenses;

e) Permit documents are of high quality, have been integrated into project schedules which reflect adequate and appropriate timeframes for DOE and regulatory review permitting documents are technically accurate, with minimal revisions needed and fast track approval of submittals is not needed;

f) Number and seriousness of any non-compliances, infractions, or violations and the timeliness and quality of related reporting and responses; and

g) Implementation of waste minimization and pollution prevention practices.

SEA 7: Safety Program Implementation

Performance Fee value is established at $900,000 of FY 2015 fee pool.

Desired Outcome: Ensure focus is maintained on overall safety and efficiency of Tank Farm Project through improvements in Radiological Controls (RadCon), Industrial Health and Safety, and Emergency Preparedness.

Areas of Focus include RadCon, Industrial Health and Safety, Emergency Preparedness.

Evaluation criteria to measure performance will include ORP's subjective evaluation of the contractor's performance based on the following:

a) Radiological Controls:

1) Improve continuity and alignment of single/double shell tank waste transfer rad monitoring plans and processes. The deliverable should include a plan, schedule and metric tracking progress to completion.
2) Improve rad work control processes to achieve simplification and continuity between projects. The deliverable should include a plan, schedule and metric tracking progress to completion.

3) Reduction in the overall radiological areas (area and/or number of Contamination and High Contamination Areas, and High Radiation Areas).

4) Effectively control vegetation within TOC radiological posted areas, which have potential to spread contamination through root take-up and transport mechanisms.

b) Industrial Health and Safety:

1) Health and Safety Department leadership and programmatic control demonstrated through sound, consistent decision logic and associated policies and effective workforce intercommunications and interactions. Success is defined as a clear demonstrated improvement in the ability of WRPS to plan and implement industrial hygiene program improvements on schedule in the absence of excessive reactionary disruption.

2) Past IH related AOP and off normal events are analyzed, procedures reviewed and an integrated team formulated to generate improvements including development of training aids for IH response decision logic, worker awareness training, defensible thresholds for triggering an AOP, near real time characterization of acute exposure, and rapid submittal of pertinent information to the occupational medicine provider, as available.

3) Industrial hygiene personal exposure monitoring data analysis processes and metrics are developed and administered as a basis for targeting exposure monitoring, improving the characterization of personnel exposure histories, and documenting the selection of

controls.

4) Tank farm emissions data is reevaluated to assess historical trends in COPC emissions, the effectiveness of stack height, and dispersion of COPCs from point sources relative to work sites as a technical basis for assessing needs for added control measures, viability of new air monitoring technologies, the selection/ placement of area and personnel monitoring; and dose reconstruction considerations.

5) The parameters and tools to facilitate Industrial hygiene staff professional judgment are more clearly defined, training is provided and a process of accountability is implemented.

6) Complete a quarterly communication campaign centered on objectives identified in Safety and Health performance metrics and indicators.

7) Employ mobile technologies and/or similar approaches to facilitate in the effectiveness of Safety and Health programs, procedures, and responsibilities.

8) Strategically benchmark Hanford Prime Contractors and Industry leaders (e.g., "best practice" companies) to further develop and expand the Behavior Based Safety program.

9) Develop and implement community outreach activities involving parent companies, Hanford prime contractors, and government agencies (e.g., OSHA, DOE) that include public education/awareness regarding Safety and Health.

c) Emergency Preparedness:

1) Implement an on-call Emergency Response Organization (DOE-0223 RLEP 1.1 check-listed positions) that is clearly identified on the WRPS Daily Report or similar shift turnover checklist.

2) Implement an Emergency Preparedness drill program that rigorously develops the ability to respond to and mitigate emergency and abnormal events safely and in compliance with all applicable requirements.

3) Demonstrate the ability to be self-critical and drive continuous improvements in the Emergency Management program.

4) Demonstrate effective corrective actions and a reduction in recurrence of identified weaknesses and opportunities for improvement.

5) Conduct a minimum of one evaluated field drill a quarter. This field drill shall:
   a. Minimize simulations and control cell actors in order to maximize field responses by FERO and skilled support personnel (i.e., HPT, IHT, NCO).
   b. Integrate HFD and/or Hanford Patrol such that FERO members interact directly with their counterparts (e.g., FOS and OSC) in the field (twice a year).

c. Demonstrate personnel decontamination using the decontamination trailers (twice a year).
d. Consist of a scenario that is plausible, realistic, and includes conditions that drive responders to demonstrate appropriate and timely emergency response actions.

6) Conduct two no-notice ICP limited drills in FY 2015 that evaluate all Contractor specific RL Emergency Preparedness (RLEP) 1.1 check-listed Facility Emergency Response Organization (FERO) positions. One of these drills shall be conducted on a weekend or off-shift.

SEA 8: Tank Farm Closure Activities.

Performance Fee value is established at $1,200,000 of FY 2015 fee pool.

Desired Outcome: Perform and document initial model runs for the initial human health and environmental risk assessment/performance assessment for Waste Management Area (WMA) C Performance Assessment (PA). Perform and complete the public working sessions for the development of the PA for WMA A/AX and for the development of the PA for the Integrated Disposal Facility (IDF).

Areas of Focus for completing and documenting the modeling of the first version of the WMA C PA and the completion of the public working sessions needed to begin the process for environmental risk assessment/performance assessment activities at WMA A/AX and IDF.

Upon completion of these activities, the following outcomes will be achieved: Initial modeling will be complete and draft documentation provided for the first version of the WMA C PA, supporting the closure decisions for WMA C in accordance with HFFACO Appendix I and DOE O 435.1. All public working sessions for the scoping of the WMA A/AX and IDF PA will be documented as being complete.

Evaluation criteria to measure performance will include ORP's subjective evaluation of this activity to include the review of the following product and objective:

a) Initial modeling will be complete and draft documentation provided for the first version of the WMA C PA;

   1) Employ available data regarding tank waste residuals following retrieval.

   2) Supplement with conservative assumptions for data not yet available.

   3) Initial runs of the numeric model developed through this process will be documented.

   4) Prepare all necessary documentation for a State Ecology and a Federal Low-Level Review Group review of the WMA-C PA necessary for follow on year submittals of both a Hanford Federal Facility Agreement and Consent Order, Action Plan, Appendix I Closure Plan and a DOE Order 435.1 Closure Plan.

b) The documentation will support the development of closure decisions for WMA C in accordance with HFFACO Appendix I and DOE O 435.1.

   1) The modeling output is required in fiscal year 2015 to allow time to develop the Tier 2 and Tier 3 Closure Plans required by HFFACO Milestone M-045-82 (due September 30, 2015).

2) The WMA C PA will be developed to meet the requirements of HFFACO Appendix I and DOE O 435.1.
3) The human health and environmental risk assessment/ performance assessment for WMA C is required to provide the risk basis to select the closure actions in C farm.

c) Complete an abbreviated series of public working sessions for A/AX Tank Farm with ECY, EPA, NRC, stakeholders in a similar fashion as was done for WMA-C PA working sessions by September 30, 2015, in preparation to start numerical modeling in fiscal year 2016.

d) Complete an abbreviated series of public working sessions for the Integrated Disposal Facility with ECY, EPA, NRC, and stakeholders by September 2015, in preparation to start numerical modeling in fiscal year 2016.

PERFORMANCE MONITOR EVALUATION REPORT FORM

I. EVALUATION PERIOD: _____

II. DOE PERFORMANCE MONITOR:

Signature: _____ Date: _____

III. PERFORMANCE BASED INCENTIVIES (PBI) EVALUATIONS:

PBI # ____ **Recommended Fee Earned** _____

Discussion:

IV. EVALUATION OF AWARD FEE SPECIAL EMPHASIS AREAS:

SEA #_____ **Adjective Rating** _____

Discussion:

Discussion summaries should describe the method used to evaluate timeliness, quality and completion of performance objectives/measures; clarifying remarks regarding the timeliness and sufficiency of the products/activities against defined performance objectives/measures; identification of significant deviations; rationale for recommended fee payment/rating (if necessary, provide computations); and mitigating factors, if any, that were considered in determining the amount of fee.

Areas to consider:

1. Contractor monthly performance indicator results including positive or negative trends.
2. Management reviews and reports including the new monthly reviews.
3. Contractor's self-assessment report.
4. DOE independent and program assessments.
5. Issues and corrective action of issue

FDO AND PERFORMANCE EVALUATION BOARD MEMBERS

FEE DETERMINATION OFFICIAL

Manager, ORP

PERFORMANCE EVALUATION BOARD MEMBERSHIP

Assistant Manager, Tank Farms Project, ORP (Chair Person)

Deputy Assistant Manager, Tank Farms Project, ORP

Assistant Manager, Technical and Regulatory Support Services, ORP

Manager, WTP Start-up and Commissioning Integration, ORP

Contracting Officer, Contracts and Property Management, ORP

PERFORMANCE EVALUATION AND MEASUREMENT PLAN CHANGE REQUEST

Page of

1. Initiator of Change Request:		2. Office Symbol:	3. Phone No:
4. Current Version of PEMP:	a. Revision No:	b. Change No:	5. Date of Request:
6. Reason for Request:			
7. Authority for Change: a. Technical Direction Letter ☐ b. Contracting Officer Letter ☐ c. Baseline Change Proposal ☐ d. Other ☐	e. Explain reason for change here, if necessary: (required for Other)		
8. Section No. in PEMP of Change:			
9. Exact Wording: (rewrite the section with changes identified)			
10. Request Disposition: a. Accepted, Change Implemented ☐ b. Accepted with Changes ☐ c. Rejected ☐ d. Other ☐	11. Comments: (including changes made, rejection reason, or other)		
12. Approved By:	13. Effective Date:	14. New PEMP Rev No/Change No.:	
		a. Rev No:	b. Change No.:

INTERIM RATING CHART – OBJECTIVE AND SUBJECTIVE ITEMS

ORP will use this separate color-coded table for informal monthly performance evaluations. The final evaluation will reflect the adjectival rating scale in Attachment 1.

		OBJECTIVE ITEMS	SUBJECTIVE ITEMS
Dark Blue "Excellent" Performance		- Objective measures are achieved on or ahead of time - Very high probability of achieving the outcome - Meeting all Cost, Scope, and Schedule objectives - Very high degree of transparency	- 100% of key areas meeting requirements - 100% of key deliverables will be met on time - 90% of sub or supporting areas are performing very well - No safety, security, or quality issues of note - Very high degree of self-identification and reporting deficiencies - Very high degree of transparency - Strong ISMS practices, timely reporting, critiqued/EOC whenever needed
Light Blue "Very Good" Performance		- Objective measures expected to be achieved on time - Very good probability of achieving the outcome - Expect to meet Cost, Scope, and Schedule objectives - High degree of transparency	- 100% of key areas meeting or close to meeting requirements - 100% of key deliverables are meeting or expected to meet requirements - Majority of sub or supporting areas are performing very well - At most minor safety, security, or quality issues of note - High degree of self-identification and reporting deficiencies - High degree of transparency - Strong ISMS practices, timely reporting, critiqued/EOC whenever needed
Green "Good" Performance		- Objective measures reasonably expected to be achieved on time - Reasonable probability of achieving the outcome - Expect to meet or be very close to Cost, Scope, and Schedule - Good degree of transparency	- Almost all key areas meeting or close to meeting requirements - Majority of key deliverables are satisfactory or better - Majority of sub or supporting areas are performing satisfactorily - Mostly minor safety, security, or quality issues of note - Good degree of self-identification and reporting deficiencies - Good degree of transparency - Infrequent deviation in ISMS practices, timely reporting, critiqued/EOC reviews

Yellow "Underperforming" "Needs improvement" "Elevated risk"		- Elevated risk of objectives not being achieved on time - Reasonable probability of not achieving the outcome - Expect to not meet Cost, Scope, or Schedule - Partial degree of transparency	- Majority key areas meeting or close to meeting requirements - Notable percentage of key deliverables are satisfactory or better - Notable percentage of sub or supporting areas are performing satisfactorily - Occasional mid-level safety, security, or quality issues of note - ~75% of issues are self-identified with most reporting in a timely manner - Partial degree of transparency - Clear deviations of ISMS practices, reporting, critiques, Extent of Condition reviews, safety basis/CONOPS/Engineering deviations that are generally infrequent or have minor consequences - Nominal NOV, PAAA, Fine, Injury, security infraction(s)
Red "Does not meet rqmts" "Failing or will fail"		- A clear (or high) risk of objectives not being achieved on time - High probability of not achieving the outcome - Expect to not meet or significantly miss Cost, Scope, or Schedule - Inadequate degree of transparency	- Overall most key areas meeting or close to meeting requirements - Inadequate percentage of key deliverables are satisfactory or better - Inadequate percentage of sub or supporting areas are performing satisfactorily - Too high a frequency of mid-level safety, security, or quality issues of note - Major safety, security, or quality issue - Less than ~75% of issues are self-identified and reported in a timely manner - Inadequate degree of transparency - Significant deviations of ISMS practices, reporting, critiques, Extent of Condition reviews, multiple safety basis/CONOPS/Engineering deviations or a significant deviation with nuclear safety or operational implications - Significant NOV, PAAA, Fine, Injury, security deviation(s)
Grey "Insufficient data" "Not able to assess"		- Insufficient data to assess at this time	- Insufficient data to assess at this time - Parties misaligned on the objective