AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION/MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT

1. CONTRACT ID CODE	PAGE OF PAGES
	1 | 2

2. AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION NO.	3. EFFECTIVE DATE	4. REQUISITION/PURCHASE REQ. NO.	5. PROJECT NO. *(If applicable)*
0237	See Block 16C		

6. ISSUED BY CODE 00603

Office of River Protection
U.S. Department of Energy
Office of River Protection
P.O. Box 450
Richland WA 99352

7. ADMINISTERED BY *(If other than Item 6)* CODE 00603

Office of River Protection
U.S. Department of Energy
Office of River Protection
P.O. Box 450
MS: H6-60
Richland WA 99352

8. NAME AND ADDRESS OF CONTRACTOR *(No., street, county, State and ZIP Code)*

WASHINGTON RIVER PROTECTION SOLUTIONS LLC
Attn: BRIAN THOMAS
C/O URS ENERGY & CONSTRUCTION, INC.
PO BOX 73 / 720 PARK BLVD
BOISE ID 837290073

CODE 806500521 FACILITY CODE

(x) 9A. AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION NO.

9B. DATED *(SEE ITEM 11)*

x 10A. MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT/ORDER NO. DE-AC27-08RV14800

10B. DATED *(SEE ITEM 13)* 05/29/2008

11. THIS ITEM ONLY APPLIES TO AMENDMENTS OF SOLICITATIONS

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

12. ACCOUNTING AND APPROPRIATION DATA *(If required)*
See Schedule

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

CHECK ONE	
	A. THIS CHANGE ORDER IS ISSUED PURSUANT TO: *(Specify authority)* THE CHANGES SET FORTH IN ITEM 14 ARE MADE IN THE CONTRACT ORDER NO. IN ITEM 10A.
	B. THE ABOVE NUMBERED CONTRACT/ORDER IS MODIFIED TO REFLECT THE ADMINISTRATIVE CHANGES *(such as changes in paying office, appropriation date, etc.)* SET FORTH IN ITEM 14, PURSUANT TO THE AUTHORITY OF FAR 43.103(b).
X	C. THIS SUPPLEMENTAL AGREEMENT IS ENTERED INTO PURSUANT TO AUTHORITY OF: Contract Clauses B.4 Contract Cost and Contract Fee, and B.5 Changes to Contract Cost and Contract Fee
	D. OTHER *(Specify type of modification and authority)*

E. IMPORTANT: Contractor [ ] is not, [x] is required to sign this document and return 2 copies to the issuing office.

14. DESCRIPTION OF AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION *(Organized by UCF section headings, including solicitation/contract subject matter where feasible.)*
See continuation pages.
Period of Performance: 06/20/2008 to 09/30/2016

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

15A. NAME AND TITLE OF SIGNER *(Type or print)*	16A. NAME AND TITLE OF CONTRACTING OFFICER *(Type or print)*
Amy D. Basche Project Int. Mgr	Wade E. Hader

15B. CONTRACTOR/OFFEROR	15C. DATE SIGNED	16B. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	16C. DATE SIGNED
Amy D. Basche *(Signature of person authorized to sign)*	8/14/14	*(Signature of Contracting Officer)*	13 Aug 2014

NSN 7540-01-152-8070
Previous edition unusable

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

Purpose of Modification:

1. The purpose of this modification is to incorporate the Performance Evaluation Measurement Plan (PEMP) for the Fiscal Year (FY) 2014 project execution funding level of $409M. The FY14 fee pool will be incorporated into Section J-*List of Attachments*, Attachment J.4-*PEMP,* of the contract under the authority of contract clauses B-4-Contract Cost and Fee, and B.5-Changes to Contract Cost and Fee replacing the previous version of Section J, Attachment J.4 in its entirety.

2. WRPS and DOE ORP are currently preparing a revised FY14 PEMP based on an approved budget for FY14 of $520M, which will be incorporated into Section J, Attachment J.4 upon approval.

3. Attached to this modification is Section J, Attachment J.4, FY14 Performance Evaluation Measurement Plan, pages J.4-1 thru J.4-46.

4. **Contractor's Statement of Release**

This contract modification encompasses adjustments to the Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan (PEMP) as required to align to known funding and work authorization limitations under the annual budget level indicated in 13-TF-0116, Fiscal Year 2014 Project Execution Direction Under the Continuing Resolution Funding Level, dated November 11, 2013. The Contractor agrees to these adjustments bilaterally with the following assumption and exceptions:

- A future contract modification will align the PEMP to increases in funding guidance and work authorization issued via 14-CPM-0031, FY14 Project Execution Direction Under the $520M ORP-0014 Funding Level, dated February 18, 2014.
- Contractor acceptance of this contract modification excludes bilateral agreement on PBI 7.0.5, Complete retrieval of Tank 241-C-102, which is recognized as being issued unilaterally. WRPS has proposed adjustments to the criteria of this PBI in PEMP Change Request 2014-001 (dated 11/21/2013, via correspondence WRPS-1304656) and provided possible alternatives in subsequent discussion that could be a basis for bilateral agreement and would better align this milestone with the negotiated contract scope and schedule.
- Contractor acceptance of this contract modification excludes bilateral agreement on PBI 2.0.1, Volume Reduction, which is recognized as being issued unilaterally.
- Performance against contract cost as documented under SEA 3, Cost Performance, is understood to be measured on aggregate Fiscal Year to Date (FYTD) performance on all contract work.

5. All other Terms and Conditions remain unchanged.

SECTION J, ATTACHMENT J.4

PERFORMANCE EVALUATION AND MEASUREMENT PLAN (PEMP)

Fiscal Year 2014

Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan
For
Washington River Protection Solutions LLC

Performance Period:
October 1, 2013 through September 30, 2014

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 14-47

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

2. PERFORMANCE MONITOR EVALUATION REPORT FORM 43

3. FDO AND PERFORMANCE EVALUATION BOARD MEMBERS 44

4. PERFORMANCE EVALUATION AND MEASUREMENT PLAN CHANGE REQUEST 45

5. INTERIM RATING CHART – OBJECTIVE AND SUBJECTIVE ITEMS 46

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, 2013, through September 30, 2014.

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
- 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. Performance Evaluation Board

- Accountable for final selection and approval 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 concurs on the PEMP
- Responsible for addressing any HQ comments concerning PEMP or Award Fee Determination
- 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

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 for approval.

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 PMr 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 and 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 coordinates their Fee Determination with the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Acquisition and Project Management. Following the review of 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 1.0 CLIN 1 222-S Laboratory, 242-A Evaporator, Tank Farm Upgrades	$1,257,108	Tank Farms
PBI 2.0 CLIN 1 Volume Reduction	$2,084,238	Tank Farms
PBI 2.1 CLIN 1 Comprehensive Double-Shell Tank Enhanced Annulus Visual Inspections	$402,000	Tank Farms
PBI 2.2 CLIN 1 SST Intrusion Mitigation	$536,000	Tank Farms
PBI 3.0 CLIN 1 Core Sampling	$230,470	Tank Farms
PBI 3.1 CLIN 2 Preparation to Retrieval Waste From DST AY-102	$589,600	Tank Farms
PBI 4.0 CLIN 2 Deep Sludge Gas Release Resolution	$1,319,963	Tank Operations
PBI 5.0 CLIN 2 Vadose Zone/Interim Measures/ Tank Leak Assessment Process for Tank AX-102 and AX-104	$858,461	Tank Farms
PBI 6.0 CLIN 2 C Farm Waste Retrieval Operations	$4,142,770	Tank Farms
PBI 7.0 CLIN 2 Retrieval Data Reports for C-100 Tanks	$230,470	Tank Farms
PBI 8.0 CLIN 3 RPP Technical Baseline (System Planning)	$586,650	Tank Farms
PBI 09.0 CLIN 3 Feed Delivery Technical Issue Resolution Testing	$238,410	Tank Farms
Total PBI Fee Available	**$12,476,140**	

AWARD FEE SPECIAL EMPHASIS AREAS

SPECIAL EMPHASIS AREAS	VALUE	PERFORMANCE MONITOR
Management of Single Shell (SST) and Double Shell Tank (DST) System	$2,496,479	Tank Farms
Performance of Tank Farm Project Operations – Conduct of Operations	$793,244	Tank Operations
Cost Performance	$1,665,935	Tank Farms
Quality Assurance Program	$793,244	Quality Assurance
Nuclear Safety	$793,244	Nuclear Safety
Environmental Regulatory Management	$793,244	Environmental
Safety Program Implementation	$793,244	Safety and Health
Tank Farm Closure Activities	$230,470	Tank Farms
Tank Farm Retrieval Activities	$4,237,948	Tank Farms
Total SEA Fee Available	**$12,597,052**	

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 $25,073,192.

PBI 1.0 CLIN 1 222-S Laboratory, 242-A Evaporator, Tank Farm Upgrades

Performance Fee value is established at $1,257,108 of FY 2014 fee pool.

Fee Structure: Straight-Line Method

Milestone	Method	Fee Value	Due Date
1	Straight-Line	$230,470	September 30, 2014
2	DELETE (Mod 237)		
3	Straight-Line	$230,470	September 30, 2014
4	Straight-Line	$398,084	September 30, 2014
5	Straight-Line	$398,084	September 30, 2014
Total		**$,1,257,108**	

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.

Highly reliable waste evaporation and waste transfer systems are crucial to safe, efficient management of the Hanford Tank Farms prior to and during tank waste treatment. This planned scope will replace systems in support of 242-A Evaporator upgrades, complete evaporator upgrades as defined in the document titled "Engineering Study for the 242-A Life Cycle Extension Upgrades for FY 2010 through 2015."

Tank Farm and related facility upgrade projects are necessary to support safe reliable and compliant storage of tank waste. This planned scope ensures tank waste retrieval, staging, feed delivery, and treatment efforts can be safely executed to meet regulatory requirements.

Fee-Bearing Milestones

1. Procure new hood and demolish/remove existing hood and ductwork in Room 1L in preparation for FY 2015 installation of a new ICP-OES instrument to restore redundancy in tank waste metals analysis. Procure and receive 4 replacement instruments for installation in FY 2015 (Gas Chromatograph/Mass Spectrometer, Polarized Light Microscope, X-Ray Diffraction Unit, and Automated Solvent Extractor). The Contractor shall earn $230,470 of FY2014 fee pool upon completion of these tasks critical to continued process in replacing obsolete and failed 222-S Laboratory Analytical Instruments.

   Work scope/completion criteria: New hood arrives on site, old hood and ductwork removed, 4 replacement instruments arrive on site.
   Completion document: Letter transmitting the Performance Expectation Completion Notice and copy of work order signature page approved through Operations Acceptance for the hood

and duct removal, and paperwork showing receipt of the 4 instruments at Hanford.

2. DELETED (Mod 237)

3. Complete two (2) 222-S Laboratory Support System Upgrades. The Contractor shall earn $230,470 of FY2014 fee pool upon completion of support system upgrades.

   Work scope/completion criteria: Perform support system upgrades including installation of restraining clamps on 2nd floor fire line hangers, and replacement of chiller system for vacuum pumps.

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

4. Complete one (1) system in support of 242-A Evaporator Upgrade. The Contractor shall earn a total of $398,084 of FY2014 fee pool upon completion of work on the system.

   Work scope/completion criteria: Replace one (1) system in support of the 242-A Evaporator upgrades 1) DELETED (Mod 237), 2) DELETED (Mod 237), and 3) 242-A safety significant steam isolation valve installation.

   Completion document: Letter transmitting the Performance Expectation Completion Notice and a copy of the as-built drawings with ECNs incorporated documenting completion of the installation and incorporation into the design baseline.

5. Complete one (1) DST upgrade to the tank farm. The Contractor shall earn a total of $398,084 of FY 2014 fee pool upon completion of tank farm upgrades as described in the work scope/completion criteria below.

   Work scope/completion criteria: Complete one (1) DST farm upgrade; AZ01A gear actuators.

   Completion Document: Letter transmitting performance expectation completion notice and copy of work package signature page documenting completion of installation.

PBI 2.0 CLIN 1 Volume Reduction

Performance Fee value is established at $2,084,238 of FY 2014 fee pool.

Fee Structure: Straight-Line Method

Milestone	Method	Fee Value	Due Date
1	Straight-Line	$694,746	September 30, 2014
2	Straight-Line	$694,746	September 30, 2014
3	Straight-Line	$694,746	November 17, 2014
Total		**$2,084,238**	

Desired Endpoint/Outcome

Upon completion of 750,000 gallons (after flush) of 242-A Evaporator waste volume reduction during FY2014, the Contractor shall earn $2,084,238 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 242-A 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 250,000 gallons (after flush) during FY 2014 of free DST volume achieved to earn milestone 1, and an additional 250,000 gallons (after flush) during FY 2014 of free DST volume achieved to earn milestone 2 (total volume 500,000 gallons), and an additional 250,000 gallons (after flush) during FY 2014 of free DST volume achieved to earn milestone 3 (total volume 750,000 gallons).

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 2.1 CLIN 1 Comprehensive Double-Shell Tank Enhanced Annulus Visual Inspections

Performance Fee value is established at $402,000 of FY 2014 fee pool.

Fee Structure: Straight-Line Method (September 30, 2014)

Milestone	Method	Fee Value	Due Date
1	Straight-Line	$402,000	September 30, 2014
Total		**$402,000**	

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 three (3) DST enhanced annulus visual inspections for three (3) distinct DSTs (excluding AY-102) and issue report for DST integrity. The Contractor shall earn $402,000 of FY 2014 fee pool upon completion of the report for the three (3) annulus visual inspections.

Work scope/completion criteria: Perform three (3) 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 2.2 CLIN 1 SST Intrusion Mitigation

Performance Fee value is established at $536,000 of FY 2014 fee pool.

Fee Structure: Straight-Line Method (September 30, 2014)

Milestone	Method	Fee Value	Due Date
1	Straight-Line	$536,000	September 30, 2014
Total		**$536,000**	

Desired Endpoint/Outcome

Support Single-Shell Tank (SST) Integrity Project. Perform required maintenance and upgrades to the existing portable exhauster skid POR06 or equivalent. These modifications and upgrades will support the use of a portable exhauster, to remove liquids from SSTs that have experienced water intrusion. A plan shall also be developed that identifies the proposed tanks at which the exhauster will be used and prioritizes the deployments to those SSTs. The plan will also identify any future permitting that will be required for use of the exhauster at the SSTs identified in the plan.

Fee Bearing Milestones

1. Complete all required maintenance and modifications needed for operation of the existing portable exhauster skid. Document a plan for the future use of the upgraded portable exhauster to mitigate existing intrusions and future leaks in SSTs. The Contractor shall earn $536,000 of the fiscal year 2014 fee pool.

Work scope/completion criteria: All physical work needed in order for the existing portable exhauster to be operated at a SST shall have been completed. This does not include the infrastructure or environmental permitting needed for operation at a SST. The plan for future use of the portable exhauster shall be documented and approved by ORP.

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

PBI 3.0 CLIN 1 Core Sampling

Performance Fee value is established at $230,470 of FY 2014 fee pool.

Fee Structure: Straight-Line Method

Milestone	Method	Fee Value	Due Date
1	Straight-Line	$230,470	September 30, 2014
Total		**$230,470**	

Desired Endpoint/Outcome

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.

Recent efforts to define the WTP waste acceptance criteria as well as validating the WTP feed design baseline have revealed a critical need for additional tank waste sample data, particularly rheological data. Obtaining core sample data from tank waste to allow better understanding of plutonium species form and properties is of particular importance. The valuable data obtained from the tank waste core samples will support a number of ongoing tank farms program needs, including safety, waste storage, waste retrieval and waste feed delivery.

Fee-Bearing Milestones

Deploy the core sample platform and complete 1 core sample in support of the Tank Operations Contract (TOC) mission. The Contractor shall earn a total of $230,470 of FY2014 fee pool upon completion of work on the core sample.

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 3.1 CLIN 2 Preparation to Retrieve Waste from DST AY-102

Performance Fee value is established at $589,600 of FY 2014 fee pool.

Fee Structure: Straight-Line Method and Terminal

Milestone	Method	Fee Value	Due Date
1	Straight-Line	$294,800	September 30, 2014
2	Terminal	$294,800	September 1, 2014
Total		**$589,600**	

Desired Endpoint/Outcome

Preparation to retrieve waste from the leaking double-shell tank (DST) AY-102 is a high priority to the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) and the Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology). In order to provide the highest confidence in our design and procurement activities, inspection and verification of system configuration in critical valve and pump pits along with access risers on both AY-102 and the DST receiver for the AY-102 sludge, is critical.

Fee Bearing Milestones

1. Complete the high/medium radiological risk work packages needed to perform video examinations of pits and risers on AY-102 and the DST receiver for the AY-102 sludge. The Contractor shall earn $294,800 of FY 2014 fee pool upon completion of the high/medium radiological risk work packages.

   Work scope/completion criteria: Plan and execute the high/medium radiological risk work packages needed to complete the video examinations of (2) pits and (2) tank risers.

   Completion Document: Letter transmitting to the ORP the performance expectation completion notice and copy of the Ops Acceptance work packages signature page.

2. Initiate procurements of the supernatant and slurry transfer pumps, and necessary isolation valves to support the retrieval of AY-102 by September 1, 2014. The Contractor shall earn $294,800 of incremental fee.

   Work scope/completion criteria: Award contract(s) to the selected vendor(s).

Completion document: Letter transmitting to the ORP the performance expectation completion notice and copy of the purchasing orders.

PBI 4.0 CLIN 2 Deep Sludge Gas Release Resolution

Performance Fee value is established at $1,319,963 of FY 2014 fee pool.

Fee Structure: Terminal Method

Milestone	Method	Fee Value	Due Date
1	Terminal	$649,506	July 15, 2014
2	Terminal	$670,457	July 15, 2014
Total		**$1,319,963**	

Desired Endpoint/Outcome

Resolution of the Deep Sludge Gas Release issue in the Tank Farms Documented Safety Analysis (DSA) is critical to both ongoing retrieval/closure operations and management of the tank farms per the system plan.

Fee-Bearing Milestones

1. Complete model refinement and submit resulting Justification for Continued Operation (JCO) to ORP to support refined definition of tank sludge accumulation in Double-Shell Tanks AN-106 and AN-101. If there is no operational need for a revised JCO, WRPS is directed to bypass this milestone and can earn fee for both milestones by completing milestone 2.

2. Submit DSA amendment to ORP that addresses Deep Sludge Gas Release Events based upon results of column experiments, in-situ strength samples, and model refinement. WRPS can earn the total fee for PBI 4.0 by completing this milestone once Milestone 1 is determined not to be needed.

Work scope/completion criteria: Complete Deep Sludge Gas Release Event project to resolve the outstanding positive USQ declared on January 17, 2013 and currently addressed in JCO TF-13-01. The Contractor shall earn a total of $1,319,963 of FY2014 fee pool upon completion of resolution of the deep sludge gas release issue. This milestone assumes all testing results are completed such that it provides the technical justification to complete the revision to the JCO and / or ultimately the DSA amendment.

Completion Document:

1. Updated JCO shall be submitted to ORP for approval (if required for operational needs) no later than July 15, 2014 based upon model refinements. If there is no operational need for a revised JCO, WRPS is directed to bypass this milestone and can earn fee for both milestones by completing milestone 2.

2. Submit the DSA amendment to ORP for incorporation of Deep Sludge Gas Release model and associated controls to support long term management of Tank Farm deep sludge no later than July 15, 2014.

PBI 5.0 CLIN 2 Vadose Zone/Interim Measures/Tank Leak Assessment Process for tank AX-102 and AX-104

Performance Fee value is established at $858,461 of FY 2014 fee pool.

Fee Structure: Terminal and Straight-Line Method

Milestone	Method	Fee Value	Due Date
1	Terminal	$230,469	June 30, 2014
2	Terminal	$230,470	August 31, 2014
3	Straight-Line	$397,522	September 30, 2014
Total		**$858,461**	

Desired Endpoint/Outcome

Upon completion of these PBI activities, the following interim measure/barriers outcomes will be achieved:

- Performance of proof-of-principle soil desiccation/contaminant removal test at SX tank farm will be completed, per a work plan provided as a TPA primary document.
- Characterization of TX farm for possible future interim measures will be performed to support definition and design of future interim measures or surface barriers, per the work plan and a Sample Analysis Plan for TX farm.
- Recommendations on future interim measures and/or barrier construction will be provided.
- Completion of the necessary field investigations and characterizations and ultimately the leak assessment process will allow for selection of the appropriate retrieval technology for AX-102 and AX-104.

Fee Bearing Milestones

1. In completion of TPA target M-045-22-T03, perform desiccation/contaminant removal proof-of-principal testing at 241-SX Farm and document results. The Contractor shall earn a total of $230,469 of FY2014 fee pool upon completion of work.

   Work scope/completion criteria: Perform field testing as described in the field test plan delivered in TPA milestone M-045-20. Document the results and provide recommendations regarding the potential for larger scale testing or implementation of the technology for tank farm vadose zone remediation. Due date: June 30, 2014.

   Completion documents: Provide to the ORP a report of the results of field testing, performed per the test plan. Include, in the report or as a separate document, recommendations regarding the potential for larger scale testing or implementation of the technology for tank farm vadose zone remediation.

2. In completion of TPA target M-045-22-T01, complete vadose zone direct push characterization in 241-TX farm, as described in the work plan submitted under TPA Milestone M-045-20. The Contractor shall earn a total of $230,470 of FY2014 fee pool upon completion of work.

   Work scope/completion criteria: Use the hydraulic hammer/direct push technology to perform logging and sampling for remaining 6 locations (of the approximately 12 included in the work plan submitted under TPA Milestone M-045-20). Field work shall include: placement of 6 direct push probes (probes pushed to refusal), geophysical logging of direct push probe holes, obtaining up to 3 soil samples per location for analysis, and placement of 2 or more deep electrodes per location. Samples will be analyzed as described in the sampling and analysis plan submitted under TPA Milestone M-045-21. Due date: August 31, 2014.

   Completion documents: Provide to the ORP a formally released report documenting completion of direct push probe-holes at all locations in TX Farm, logging results, placement of deep electrodes, sample depths, and summary of analytical results. Include, in the report or in a separate document, recommendations regarding consideration of TX farm as a location for future interim barriers or other interim measures.

3. In support of planning for waste retrieval, leak detection, and soil corrective actions in 241-A and 241-AX tank farms, completes the necessary field investigation and characterization needed to support an updated leak assessment process per Section 4.2 of TFC-ENG-CHEM-D-42, *Tank Leak Assessment Process*, for Tanks AX-102 and AX-104. The Contractor shall earn a total of $397,522 of FY 2014 fee pool upon completion of the following work:

   - Complete ground penetrating radar surveys of both farms;
   - Install 8 sets of deep electrodes to support a 3-dimensional electrical resistivity baseline measurements to support retrieval leak detection and soil characterization in 241-A and 241-AX tank farms;
   - Perform spectral gamma logging and moisture logging in a minimum of 25 drywells in 241-AX tank farm, in support of planning for waste retrieval, leak detection, and soil corrective actions;
   - Complete the necessary field investigations and characterizations and ultimately the leak assessment process will allow for selection of the appropriate retrieval technology for AX-102 and AX-104.

   Work scope/completion criteria: Due date: September 30, 2014.

   - Perform ground penetrating radar data acquisition in 241-A and 241-AX tank farms. Acquire data in both farms at a resolution of 3 meters or better. Analyze the data and provide a summary report showing maps of the results.
   - Use the hydraulic hammer/direct push technology to perform logging and deep electrode placement at a minimum of 8 locations in 241-A and 241-AX tank farms. Field work shall include: placement of 8 direct push probes (probes pushed to refusal), geophysical logging of direct push probe holes, and placement of 2 or more deep electrodes per location.
   - Perform spectral gamma logging and moisture logging in a minimum of 25 drywells in

241-AX farm. Each drywell will be logged to the total accessible depth; conditions that prevent logging to the total drywell depth will be noted in the report. Analyze the data and develop plots of the logs for comparison to past log data for the same drywells.

- Complete the leak assessment process for Tanks AX 102 and AX-104.

Completion Document:

- Provide to the ORP a letter report of the results of ground penetrating data acquisition and analysis in 241-A and 241-AX tank farms.
- Provide to the ORP a letter report documenting completion of direct push probe-holes at 8 locations in 241-A and 241-AX tank farms, logging results, and placement of deep electrodes.
- Provide to the ORP a letter report of the results of spectral gamma and moisture logging. Include a map of the drywells logged, a copy of the logs, comparison to past log data collected from the same drywells, and preliminary interpretation of the data.

3. Letter transmitting to the ORP the performance expectation completion notice and copy of the released Final Assessment Report(s) for Tanks AX 102 and AX 104.

PBI 6.0 CLIN 2 C Farm Waste Retrieval Operations

Performance Fee value is established at $3,142,770 of FY 2014 fee pool.

Fee Structure: Straight-Line Method

Milestone	Method	Fee Value	Due Date
2	Straight-Line	$1,047,590	September 30, 2014
3	Straight-Line	$1,047,590	September 30, 2014
4	Straight-Line	$1,047,590	September 30, 2014
6	Straight-Line	$1,000,000	September 30, 2014
Total		**$4,142,770**	

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. Deleted (Mod ___)

2. Complete retrieval of Tank 241-C-107 thru the deployment of two technologies. The Contractor shall earn a total of $1,047,590 of FY2014 fee pool upon completion.

   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-107 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.

3. Complete retrieval of Tank 241-C-111. The Contractor shall earn a total of $1,047,590 of FY2014 fee pool upon completion of retrieval of Tank C-111 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 B).

Completion document: Submittal of material balance data and engineering calculations summary information documenting the results of retrieval Tank C-111 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.

4. Complete retrieval of Tank 241-C-112. The Contractor shall earn a total of $1,047,590 of FY2014 fee pool upon completion of retrieval of Tank C-112 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 two technologies identified in the TWRWP to the "limits of technology" (as defined in Appendix B) to a waste residual volume of not more than 360 ft^3 or deploy two technologies identified in the TWRWP to the limits of technology and demonstrate that it is not practicable to deploy a third technology or provide ORP with 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-112 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 ft3 or that it is not practicable to deploy a third technology.PBI 7.0 CLIN 2 Retrieval Data Reports for C-100 Tanks

5. Deleted (Mod ___)

6. Complete retrieval of Tank 241-C-107 thru the deployment of a third technology as recommended in item 2 above. The Contractor shall earn a total of $1,000,000 of FY2014 fee pool upon completion.

   Work scope/completion criteria: Complete waste retrieval to meet or exceed performance requirements in the Consent Decree – Appendix B and C, specifically the third technology deployed to the limits of technology as defined by the TWRWP.

   Completion document: Submittal of material balance data and engineering calculations summary information documenting the results of retrieval of Tank C-107 to the limits of technology for the third technology.

Performance Fee value is established at $230,470 of FY 2014 fee pool.

Fee Structure: Straight-Line Method

Milestone	Method	Fee Value	Due Date
1	Straight-Line	$230,470	September 30, 2014
Total		**$230,470**	

Desired Endpoint/Outcome

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

Fee Bearing Milestones

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 $230,470 of FY2014 fee pool 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.

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

PBI 8.0 CLIN 3 RPP Technical Baseline (System Planning)

Performance Fee value is established at $586,650 of FY 2014 fee pool.

Fee Structure: Straight-Line Method (September 30, 2014)

Milestone	Method	Fee Value	Due Date
1	Straight-Line	$586,650	September 30, 2014
Total		**$586,650**	

Desired Endpoint/Outcome

Complete and submit to the U.S. Department of Energy, Office of River Protection (ORP) the RPP System Plan, Revision 7, which reflects directions provided by the ORP and documented modeling results from the Hanford Tank Waste Operations Simulator (HTWOS). The scenario selection and update will support decision making by the ORP through evaluation of scenarios. The results and evaluations provided in the RPP System Plan play a vital role in the successful management of the RPP in that they assist the ORP with evaluating potential programmatic and operational planning considerations. The RPP System Plan also assists the ORP planning by defining the issues, and proposing mitigating actions, that must be resolved to ensure the success of the cleanup mission. Completion and submission of the RPP System Plan for FY 2014 satisfies TPA Milestone M-62-040D. The RPP System Plan will provide the technical basis for the budget and schedule updates to the Tank Operations Contract (TOC) Performance Measurement Baseline (PMB), and will present results for scenarios selected by ORP and the Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology)."

Fee Bearing Milestones

Complete and submit Revision 7 to the RPP System Plan. The Contractor shall earn a total of $586,650 of FY2014 fee pool upon completion of the update.

Work scope/completion criteria: Complete and submit Revision 7 to the RPP System Plan to reflect direction provided by the ORP and documented modeling results from the HTWOS to meet TPA Milestone M-62-040D. Transmit Contractor-approved RPP System Plan to the ORP by September 30, 2014.

Completion documents: Letter transmitting the performance expectation completion notice and Contractor-approved RPP System Plan Revision 7.

PBI 9.0 CLIN 3 Feed Delivery Technical Issue Resolution Testing

Performance Fee value is established at $238,410 of FY 2014 fee pool.

Fee Structure: Straight-Line Method

Milestone	Method	Fee Value	Due Date
1	Straight-Line	$238,410	September 30, 2014
Total		**$238,410**	

Desired Endpoint/Outcome

Complete Isolok sampler testing using the Remote Sampler Demonstration (RSD) test platform to demonstrate Isolok sampler accuracy against a reference sampler that is representative of RSD flow loop contents. The testing will inform future project decisions regarding sampling equipment capability necessary to support compliant WTP feed delivery.

Complete Small-Scale Solids Delivery Testing (SSDT) test definition, platform modification, and exploratory simple simulant testing such that conditions for complex simulant testing are confidently defined to minimize the number of complex simulant tests. Testing in the 1/22nd and 1/8th scale tanks with complex simulants is significantly more costly and time consuming than simple simulant tests. Successful completion of this work will ensure test platform functionality and efficiency during the complex simulant testing phase.

Fee Bearing Milestones

1. Complete the following feed delivery field test activities. The Contractor shall earn $238,410 of FY 2014 fee pool upon completion of the following activities:

   - Complete field activities associated with Isolok reference sampler testing.
   - Complete test platform modifications and simple simulant testing necessary to demonstrate SSDT platform performance functionality and to define the appropriate complex testing test conditions.

   Work scope/completion criteria:

   - Work scope involves modification of the RSD flow loop to install a reference sampler that meets the recommendations identified from the FY 2013 RSD test report (RPP-RPT-53930) and subsequent testing of the Isolok sampling accuracy in accordance with the test plan. Field testing will be considered complete upon completion of all test sequences identified in the Isolok Reference Sampler Test Plan.
   - Work scope involves modification of the 1/22nd and 1/8th scaled tank test platform and multiple solids transfer performance tests. This work will demonstrate SSDT platform functionality and determine system operating parameters that provide the most effective method for transferring the maximum amount of solids out of the scaled double-shell tanks.

Test platform functionality and parameter variation and objectives are described in the Small-Scale Solids Delivery Test Plan, RPP-PLAN-56441, Rev 1. This testing will be performed with simple simulant (selected particulates and water) in order to effectively probe the multiple operating parameter variations while minimizing cost and schedule impacts. Successful completion of simple simulant testing will define specific system operating conditions to be performed during the more expensive and time consuming complex simulant testing phase.

Completion document:

Letter transmitting the performance expectation completion notice and the approved test plan and the completed run sheets from the test platform shall document the completion of the field testing (if off-site analytical analysis is required, the transfer of custody of the test samples to the off-site analytical laboratory will also be included in the documentation to demonstrate completion of field activities); and the completed test run sheets documenting completion of the planned simple simulant tests.

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, 2013, through September 30, 2014. 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 $2,496,479 of FY 2014 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, Support for WTP Commissioning, Conduct of Engineering, and Conduct of Maintenance.

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) Obtain a core sample of the concrete tank wall in Single-Shell Tank (SST)

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

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

5) 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) Technical support to WTP - data and analysis as part of the One System Integrated Project Team is timely, relevant, and supports an integrated licensing strategy;

2) Interface management - collaboration with other site contractors to update interface control documents including the Infrastructure and Services Alignment Plan, and resolution of interface issues is proactive; program documents are improved and matured;

3) Risk Management - the risk program and risk register show continued improvement and effective collaboration to manage crosscutting risks;

4) Program and Project Management - Effective management of integration activities between WRPS and BNI;

5) System Planning - reflects the system planning process that provides the most current available information on tank waste management and treatment capabilities and demonstrates continued improvement to optimize the sequence of tank waste treatment for reduction of total mission risk;

6) Closure of WRPS actions associated with external WTP reviews is timely and effective.

f) **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. The new ECN process will begin in April 2014; therefore only five (5) months of run time will be available to measure increased rigor in planning and execution.

3) Deployment of periodic engineering improvement training sessions (at least 4) and associated evidence (i.e., metrics) to evaluate effectiveness;

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

5) Implementation of engineering mentor program to increase the depth of the engineering organization and associated evidence of increased depth and technical/rigor;

6) Improve Ventilation System performance while maintaining a 90 percent availability. Areas for improvement are reduced unplanned outages, and minimize retrieval impacts due to portable ventilation skid performance.

g) **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.

h) **Work Processes:**

1) Develop a schedule performance metric for project work
2) Percent of accomplished scheduled work is greater than 75% for FY14
3) Number of preventable changes to work packages is less than 120 (30/month) for FY14
4) Delinquent preventative maintenance backlog is less than 150 (1.5% of total preventative maintenance packages)
5) 900 (75/month) Management oversight observations of work execution

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

Performance Fee value is established at $793,244 of FY 2014 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 no DOE Level 1 finding;

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 coaching co-workers or correcting conditions in the field through established WRPS processes (PER, MOP/WSV, etc.);

c) Additional trending data such as Occurrence Reporting & 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;

d) 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;

e) 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;

f) 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;

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

h) 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.

SEA 3: Cost Performance

Performance Fee value is established at $1,665,935 of FY 2014 fee pool.

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

Areas of Focus includes Contractor's Cost Performance.

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

Cost Performance - DOE will evaluate the Contractor's cost 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. Half of fee available to be earned under this SEA will be earned based on criteria (a) through (e); the other half will be earned based on criteria (f):

a) Cost Control – Contractor maintains cost control (i.e., actual costs incurred are equal to or less than the estimated costs negotiated in the contract) and actively pursues cost containment and reduction through innovative approaches and management of resources.

b) Cost 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.

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

d) 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.

e) 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 their projects to ensure that sound management actions are taken when negative variances and/or cost overruns are projected.

f) Aggregate Fiscal Year to Date (FYTD) cost management against the CPB. Contractor is expected to employ practices as described above that ensure strong project performance and

balances superior technical performance or delivery results at a cost that provides value to the Government. Half of fee available under this SEA is earned based on the following metric. The following table will be utilized to assess performance against contract cost performance measured by cost performance index (CPI).

Performance Against Contract Cost (Performance < 1 = overrun)	**Earned Percentage of SEA 3 Fee Allocated to Criteria f) and each PBI**
< 0.79	No fee under SEA 3 criteria f) and each PBI reduced by 75%.

SEA 4: Quality Assurance Program

Performance Fee value is established at $ $793,244 of FY 2014 fee pool.

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

Areas of Focus for Quality Assurance Program Improvement:

Compliance with all Management Criteria of the QAP-including: Program Requirements, Training and Qualifications; Quality Improvement, Documents and Records; work processes; design; procurement; Inspection and Acceptance testing; Independent and Management Assessment; Software QA; Implementation of ASME NQA- 1-2004 as the implementing standard to meet DOE requirements.

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

a) Compliance with management criteria of the QAP (TFC-PLN-02,"Quality Assurance Program Description") Contractor Performance Responsiveness to corrective action plans and issues;

b) Improvement in the following areas:

1. **Corrective Action Management**
    a) 300 (>25/month) Level 1/Level 2 Management oversight observations (MOPs/WSVs) observing field activities involving work instructions or procedures (>30/month exceeds expectations).
    b) 360 (30/month) Lessons Learned applications (>40/month exceeds expectations).
    c) >65% self-identification issue rate (12-month rolling average) (≥75% exceeds expectations)

2. **Software Quality Assurance**
    a) Software Quality Assurance implementing procedures are revised and aligned with Software Quality Assurance requirements
    b) Safety software lifecycle documentation is complete and accurate
    c) Software systems required to perform work are available and on-line and have compliant life-cycle documentation

3. **Supply Chain Quality**
    a) Perform 40 vendor oversight surveillances (10/quarter) during FY14
    b) Perform 4 surveillances of the vendor processes activities (1/quarter) during FY14
    c) Perform 4 surveillances of the supply chain process (1/quarter) during FY14
    d) Perform 2 surveillances of material storage during FY14

SEA 5: Nuclear Safety

Performance Fee value is established at $ $793,244 of FY 2014 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 $ $793,244 of FY 2014 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 $ $793,244 of FY 2014 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) Reduction in the overall radiological areas (area and/or number of Contamination and High Contamination Areas, and High Radiation Areas).

2) Reduction of litter/debris in and around the tank farm areas managed by the TOC. The intent is to remove/minimize the perception that the Tank Farms has spread contamination to the areas adjacent, and to enhance the ability to be able to detect any actual spread of contaminated/potentially contaminated material from a Tank Farm.

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

4) Create an environment where radiological workers actively monitor each other and, when necessary, coach each other to improve their radiological work performance.

b) Industrial Health and Safety:

1) Improve the consistency of final ESH&Q work control requirements and documentation submitted for approval to the Joint Review Group, as evidenced by a significant reduction in revisions to work control documents designed to correct deficiencies in ESH&Q-related work control documentation identified after the documents are "signature ready".

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 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.

2) Conduct a minimum of one evaluated field drill a quarter.

3) Conduct two no-notice ICP limited drills in FY14 that evaluate all Contractor specific RL Emergency Preparedness (RLEP) 1.1check-listed Facility Emergency Response Organization (FERO) positions.

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

SEA 8: Tank Farm Closure Activities.

Performance Fee value is established at $230,470 of FY14 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).

Areas of Focus for completing and documenting the modeling of the first version of the WMA C PA.

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.

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.

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 2014 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) This initial PA will not address the contribution of current soil.

SEA 9: Tank Farm Retrieval Activities.

Performance Fee total value established for Tanks 241-C-102 and 241-C-105 at $4,237,948 of FY14 fee pool.

Desired Outcome: Complete retrieval of Tanks 241-C-102 and 241-C-105 to the requirements of the Consent Decree – Appendix B and C.

Areas of Focus: Complete retrievals of Tanks 241-C-102 and 241-C-105 and documenting meeting or exceeding performance requirements in the Consent Decree – Appendix B and C.
Evaluation criteria: Complete retrieval of Tank 241-C-102 and 241-C-105. The Contractor shall earn fee directly calculated to a percentage of removed waste which is reported in the Tank Farm Retrieval Activities.

1) For Tank 241-C-102:
   a) Submit material balance data and engineering calculations documenting the results of retrieval of Tank 241-C-102.
   b) Demonstrate completion of tank waste retrieval in accordance with the Consent Decree Appendix B and C.

2) For Tank 241-C-105:
   a) Submit material balance data and engineering calculations documenting the results of retrieval of Tank 241-C-105.
   b) Demonstrate completion of tank waste retrieval in accordance with the Consent Decree Appendix B and C
   c) Demonstrate specifically that two technologies identify in the TWRWP were deployed to the limits of technology, and noting that no third technology is currently available to deploy into the suspected leaking Tank 241-C-105.

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