

**PERFORMANCE EVALUATION AND
MEASUREMENT PLAN**

Incentive B – Award Fee

**DESIGN, CONSTRUCTION, AND COMMISSIONING OF THE
HANFORD TANK WASTE TREATMENT AND
IMMOBILIZATION PLANT**

CONTRACT NO. DE-AC27-01RV14136

**Evaluation Period 2019
January 1, 2019, to December 31, 2019**

**Bechtel National, Inc.
Richland, Washington
Rev. 1 – Effective January 1, 2019**



Issued By:

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "B.T. Vance", is written over a horizontal line.

Brian T. Vance
Manager, DOE Office of River Protection
Fee-Determining Official

TABLE OF CONTENTS

A. AWARD FEE OBJECTIVES1
A.1 Evaluation Process.....1
A.2 Award Fee Determination2
A.3 Award Fee Objective 1: Project Performance2
A.4 Award Fee Objective 2: Environmental, Safety, Health, and Quality Assurance.....4
A.5 Award Fee Objective 3: One System – Direct-Feed Low-Activity Waste
Integration.....7
A.6 Award Fee Objective 4: Engineering, Procurement, and Construction8
A.7 Award Fee Objective 5: Startup and Commissioning10
A.8 Award Fee Objective 6: High-Level Waste and Pretreatment Facilities11
B. PERFORMANCE EVALUATION AND MEASUREMENT PLAN
GENERAL INFORMATION11
B.1 Contract Incentive Fee Structure11
B.2 Process11
B.3 Provisional Fee11
B.4 Contractor Self-Assessment12
B.5 Method for Changing the Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan
During the Evaluation Period12

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1 Award Fee – Incentive Ratings and Definition.....1
Table 2 Award Fee – Fee Earnings Calculation.....2

A. AWARD FEE OBJECTIVES

This Performance Evaluation Measurement Plan (PEMP) contains the following six award fee objectives:

1. Project performance
2. Environmental, safety, health, and quality assurance (QA)
3. One System, direct-feed low-activity waste (DFLAW) integration
4. Engineering, procurement, and construction
5. Startup and commissioning
6. High-Level Waste (HLW) and Pretreatment facilities.

A.1 EVALUATION PROCESS

The U.S. Department of Energy (DOE), Office of River Protection (ORP) will evaluate and measure performance for each of the six award fee objectives on a quarterly basis. The contractor will provide a summary of the effectiveness of its Contractor Assurance System to ORP to support the quarterly evaluations. DOE will identify Bechtel National, Inc.’s performance strengths and weakness at the end of each of the four quarters, year-to-date for each of the award fee objectives. DOE will assign adjectival ratings only at the end of the fourth quarter. The adjectival ratings for each of the award fee objectives will be based on the entire year’s performance (see Table 1, “Award Fee – Incentive Ratings and Definitions”).

Table 1. Award Fee – Incentive Ratings and Definition. (2 pages)

Adjectival Rating	Definition	Percentage of Award Fee Earned
Excellent	Contractor has exceeded almost all of the significant award-fee criteria and has met overall cost, schedule, and technical performance requirements of the contract in the aggregate as defined and measured against the criteria in the award-fee plan for the award fee evaluation period.	91% to 100%
Very Good	Contractor has exceeded many of the significant award-fee criteria and has met overall cost, schedule, and technical performance requirements of the contract in the aggregate as defined and measured against the criteria in the award-fee plan for the award fee evaluation period.	76% to 90%
Good	Contractor has exceeded some of the significant award-fee criteria and has met overall cost, schedule, and technical performance requirements of the contract in the aggregate as defined and measured against the criteria in the award-fee plan for the award fee evaluation period.	51% to 75%
Satisfactory	Contractor has met overall cost, schedule, and technical performance requirements of the contract in the aggregate as defined and measured against the criteria in the award-fee plan for the award fee evaluation period.	≤ 50%

Table 1. Award Fee – Incentive Ratings and Definition. (2 pages)

Adjectival Rating	Definition	Percentage of Award Fee Earned
Unsatisfactory	Contractor has failed to meet overall cost, schedule, and technical performance requirements of the contract in the aggregate as defined and measured against the criteria in the award-fee plan for the award fee evaluation period.	0%

A.2 AWARD FEE DETERMINATION

Award fee dollars earned are determined by the method presented in Table 2, “Award Fee – Fee Earnings Calculations.” The adjectival ratings are as determined in Section A.1 above. The Fee Determining Official (FDO) will determine the percent of fee earned according to the ranges in Table 1 above. The award fee dollars earned will be the product of the award fee available and the percent of award fee earned. The FDO may consider any other pertinent factors in making a final fee determination, especially if poor performance is in any one of the award fee objectives.

Table 2. Award Fee – Fee Earnings Calculation.

	Award Fee Objective	Award Fee Available	Adjectival Rating	Percentage of Award Fee Earned	Award Fee Dollars Earned
1	Project Performance	\$2M			
2	Environmental, Safety, Health, and Quality Assurance	\$2.4M			
3	One System – Direct-Feed Low-Activity Waste Integration	\$272,603			
4	Engineering, Procurement, and Construction	\$1M			
5	Startup and Commissioning	\$2M			
6	High-Level Waste and Pretreatment	\$200K			

A.3 AWARD FEE OBJECTIVE 1: PROJECT PERFORMANCE

ORP will evaluate the contractor’s cost and schedule performance based upon actual incurred costs compared to the total estimated costs of that work and actual schedule performance as compared to the planned schedule.

The analysis of project performance will give consideration to changed programmatic requirements, changed statutory requirements, and/or changes beyond the contractor’s control, which impact cost and/or schedule. ORP will rely on other objective and/or subjective cost and

schedule performance elements, such as critical path and float analysis, to evaluate the contractor's performance, which includes, but is not limited to the following:

- Contractor Assurance System – Contractor is self-critical in assessment of performance, actions are implemented in a timely manner and tracked to completion, and progress towards performance objectives are measured and new actions are taken as needed to achieve target performance objectives.
- Cost Control – The contractor maintains cost control (i.e., actual costs incurred for work performed are equal to or less than the planned costs for that work) and actively pursues cost containment and reduction through innovative approaches and management of resources. Cost control will be monitored against the Performance Measurement Baseline for the Low Activity Waste (LAW) Facility, Balance of Facilities, and Analytical Laboratory (collectively LBL) / DFLAW.
- Schedule Control – The contractor maintains a contract compliant, resource loaded, logic-tied schedule with discrete tasks through contract completion, including credible and accurate critical path network(s) that accurately portray critical work activities toward meeting the contract milestone date for demonstration of DFLAW hot commissioning and implements innovative actions to accelerate the overall project schedule with due consideration to the overall risk profile.
- Communication – The contractor is expected to be transparent and communicate clearly and effectively for the reporting of data and metrics. In addition, it is expected that the Contractor works proactively with the ORP communications division to support enhanced communications with all key stakeholders.
- Risk Management – The contractor identifies new threats, opportunities, and risk closures to demonstrate an effective risk program. Risks shall be identified early to maximize risk mitigation and risks shall be tracked, managed, and monitored using the Waste Treatment and Immobilization Plant (WTP) Risk Register Database until mitigated to the maximum extent practical, avoided, or accepted in accordance with formal program requirements. Risk effectiveness shall be reported on for closed threats, open threats, and opportunities realized.
- Available Funding Utilization – The contractor optimizes 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.
- Baseline and Contract Alignment – The contractor shall maintain alignment between the baseline and the contract. The contractor shall submit quality documents as required to support the alignment between the baseline and the contract and to support independent reviews.
- Subcontractor Incurred Cost Audits – The contractor will complete a minimum of 12 subcontractor incurred cost audits to standard.

A.4 AWARD FEE OBJECTIVE 2: ENVIRONMENTAL, SAFETY, HEALTH, AND QUALITY ASSURANCE

ORP will assess this award fee objective in the areas of environmental permitting and compliance; nuclear safety; quality assurance (QA); safety, health, and quality programs; and Contractor Assurance System.

Environmental Permitting and Compliance

The Contractor performance will be based on:

- Maintain a constructive and effective working relationship with all regulatory agencies to maximize the probability of successful delivery of the DFLAW program.
- Development and implementation of an integrated environmental protection program that applies best commercial practices and assures compliance with environmental requirements.
- Development of required applications for permits; licenses; and other regulatory approvals required for design, construction, and commissioning of WTP. Contractor will integrate with other Hanford contractors to provide data for site wide regulatory monitoring and reporting. Contractor will assess and track environmental performance. Contractor's work shall be accomplished in a manner that achieves high levels of quality, and protects the environment, workers, and the public.
- ORP will rely on evaluations of the contractor's performance in areas that include but are not limited to quality and timeliness of permit applications and other deliverables required to support project execution, proactive assessment of the environmental protection program, efforts to continuously improve, and regulatory compliance - including the number and seriousness of any findings or concerns.
- Submittal of permitting products with a high degree of quality and which enable schedule efficiencies. Specific deliverables that will be evaluated are:
 - Dangerous waste permit Class 3 modification to ORP for operation of WTP in the DFLAW configuration.
 - Preliminary risk assessment dangerous waste permit agency initiated modification to ORP for WTP in the DFLAW configuration.
 - Final issuance of Effluent Management Facility/ LAW Facility/Analytical Laboratory (LAB) radioactive air operating permit by the Washington State Department of Health.
 - Steam plant boiler performance test results to ORP for transmittal to the Washington State Department of Ecology.
 - Standby diesel generator performance test results to ORP for transmittal to Washington State Department of Ecology.
 - Preoperational ambient air monitoring data to ORP for transmittal to Washington State Department of Health.

- LAB construction certification to ORP for transmittal to Washington State Department of Ecology.

Nuclear Safety

The WTP Contract, Section C, “Statement of Work,” Standard 9, “Nuclear Safety (Table C.5-1.1, Deliverable 9.1),” describes contractor requirements to ensure radiological, nuclear, and process safety. This work scope includes implementation of a standards-based safety management program in compliance with the rules provided in 10 CFR 830, “Nuclear Safety Management,” on nuclear safety to ensure WTP safety requirements are defined, implemented, and maintained.

Evaluation criteria to measure performance will include ORP’s evaluation of the contractor’s progress toward and compliance with contract requirements for nuclear safety performance. Progress will be evaluated against interim project schedules for nuclear safety submittals and supporting documentation (e.g., hazards analyses) with consideration of any emerging issues. Compliance will be evaluated against guidance found in DOE-STD-3009-1994, *Preparation of Nonreactor Nuclear Facility Documented Safety Analysis*, Chg. 3 as well as all other contract requirements and formal clarifying direction from ORP.

ORP-WTP will consider any available information bearing on nuclear safety performance in making this evaluation. Documents to be considered include:

- Draft nuclear safety deliverables submitted for informal review possess a high degree of quality, and meet the requirements defined in the implementation plan for Contract Standard 9. Acceptable quality to be determined through use of existing quality engineering metrics for in-process documents.
- Nuclear safety calculations and engineering studies developed to support resolution of technical issues will possess a high degree of quality and will meet the requirements defined in the implementation plan for Contract Section C, Standard 9 for submittal of draft documents for informal review.
- Effectiveness in self-identifying nuclear safety concerns early and responding to concerns raised both internally and by external stakeholders and review teams.
- Progress toward interim project schedules and milestones while completing the conditions of approval documented in the Safety Evaluation Report for the LAW DSA (18-NSD-0009, “Contract No. DE-AC27-01RV14136 – Approval of 24590-LAW-DSA-NS-18-0001, “Documented Safety Analysis for the Low-Activity Waste Facility,” and 24590-LAW-TSR-NS-18-0001, “Low-Activity Waste Facility Technical Safety Requirements,””).
- Progress toward interim project schedules and milestones while producing a high quality hazard analysis report to support WTP LAB operations.
- Timeliness and effectiveness of corrective actions taken in response to findings from the fiscal year (FY) 2018 safety evaluation assessment (this includes effectiveness of metrics used to track the progress of corrective actions).

- Revise and issue 24590-WTP-3DP-G04B-00022, *Licensing Information*; 24590-WTP-3DG-W10T-00001, *WTP Nuclear Safety Analysis Design Guide*; and applicable desktop instructions to address corrective actions resulting from quality issues identified in 16-NSD-0026, “Contract No. DE-AC27-01RV14136 – Low-Activity Waste Process Hazards Analysis Report Quality Issues,” and to provide clear guidance on the mutually agreed upon level of detail required for hazard analysis to support an approvable preliminary documented safety analysis/document safety analysis.

Quality Assurance

The QA program and quality of performance objective will evaluate the contractor’s actions to strengthen the existing QA program, resolve QA issues, support the implementation of the commissioning and operations QA program, and improve the overall quality culture on the WTP Project. Performance will be evaluated based on the quality and timeliness of products and services produced during the reporting period and the overall effectiveness of the contractor’s assurance system to self-identify (e.g., nonconforming conditions, emerging negative performance trends), track, correct, and communicate issues. In addition, the analysis of quality performance will give consideration to the adequacy of quality records and the contractor’s demonstrated attributes of a strong quality culture (e.g., behavioral commitments to quality and QA issue resolution tools). ORP will rely on objective and subjective evaluations of the contractor’s performance.

ORP will perform both objective and subjective evaluations of the contractor’s efforts to:

- Resolve and complete actions to address all remaining QA War Room issues
- Demonstrate QA culture improvements (e.g., behavioral commitments to quality and effective use of QA issue resolution tools).
- Improve management of QA program requirements including the ability to demonstrate compliance with contractually imposed standards throughout all supporting program plans and specific implementing procedure elements or steps.
- Plan, schedule, and perform effective QA surveillances consistent with the contractor’s graded approach, including bias-based coverage for higher consequence processes and activities.
- Support the implementation of a commissioning and operations QA program.
- Continue to develop objective metrics and targets to assess the effectiveness of the QA program (not just the QA organization), including benchmarking of key functional areas. Measures reflecting significant rework should be included where available or otherwise developed.

Safety, Health, and Quality Programs

ORP will perform both objective and subjective evaluations of the contractor’s efforts to:

- Maintain an effective nuclear safety quality culture recognized by employees and stakeholders as sustaining a safety conscious work environment where safety, quality, or other concerns can be raised without fear of retaliation.
- Develop safety and health documents (e.g., plans, procedures, etc.) to support successful commissioning of DFLAW needed facilities.
- Demonstrate proactive monitoring of safety performance to systematically improve culture and processes.
- Implement an effective work hazard analysis and controls to reduce injury/illnesses and work place hazards.
- Implement actions to improve WTP Project safety based on analysis of work site conditions.

Contractor Assurance System

Measuring performance will include ORP's subjective and objective evaluation of the contractor's performance based on the following:

- Methods of monitoring and measuring performance, including metrics, assessments, surveillances, and other operational activities, are effectively used to provide an accurate representation of the current performance of mission objectives and goals, to include performance of a safety, health, environment, and quality program, relative to defined standards.
- Demonstrate that management system owners and levels of management are aware of applicable requirements and the status of compliance to those requirements.
- Demonstrate that risks to mission and operations are being effectively identified, monitored, communicated, and managed (i.e., accepted, avoided, or mitigated).
- Demonstrate a healthy self-critical approach to ensuring actions taken to manage risks or issues are appropriately effective.
- External independent evaluation of the Contractor Assurance System by entities such as corporate parent companies or other DOE sites.
- Timely, open, and continuous communication on mission and operations risks and issues with ORP.
- Lessons learned experiences and good practices are used to inform applicable organizations of adverse work practices or experiences and are incorporated into the overall work process to improve mission and operations performance.

A.5 AWARD FEE OBJECTIVE 3: ONE SYSTEM – DIRECT-FEED LOW-ACTIVITY WASTE INTEGRATION

ORP will assess this award fee objective in the following areas:

- Establish and maintain a constructive working relationship with all key interfacing organizations to maximize the probability of successful delivery of the DFLAW program.
- Establish and maintain One System Governance Council tools identifying, tracking, and communicating mitigation of DFLAW project threats, risks, opportunities, and barriers necessary to meet the contractual dates for startup and commissioning of the LBL facilities in the DFLAW configuration.
- Provide quality DFLAW integrated schedule data, including operational readiness planning and implementation, to the DFLAW program allowing the integration team to accurately track schedule performance and any schedule slippage by acting with urgency to raise issues to expedite issue resolution.
- Accurately identify and optimize interface services, usages, and timing. Effectively and efficiently implement interface requirements.
- Identify and utilize technical capabilities and resources, as appropriate, which support and respond to potential events that prevent demonstration of waste treatment capacity performance and steady state operations (e.g., national laboratory capabilities).

A.6 AWARD FEE OBJECTIVE 4: DFLAW DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION

ORP will assess this award fee objective in the areas of Design and Construction performance.

- Open action management – Enhance line management efforts in the disposition of open actions to drive certainty in the delivery of DFLAW facilities. Demonstrate enhanced tracking, prioritization, management, and work-off of open actions, including but not limited to nonconformance reports, action tracking system items, design completion actions, and requirements verification steps. Proactively define, capture, and manage open actions to closure and implement metrics to measure the effectiveness of action closure and resolution.
- Configuration management – Maintain the technical requirements management system including system design descriptions, and develop and maintain an adequate SmartPlant® system to support LBL system turnover.
- Design and engineering output – Issue adequate design and engineering products reflecting acceptable quality; manage margin; control unverified assumptions; and adequately flow down requirements to calculations, drawings, specifications, datasheets, and procurement documents. Acceptable quality to be demonstrated through use of existing quality engineering metrics for in-process document reviews.
- Safety systems design – Demonstrates significant progress in the implementation of DOE-STD-1195-2011, *Design of Safety Significant Safety Instrumented Systems Used at DOE Nonreactor Nuclear Facilities*, towards completion of safety instrumented systems design for the LAW Facility. Progress is measured by fidelity to DOE-STD-1195-2011 requirements; against planned activities scheduled and the progress for those activities. Activities will include issuance of:
 - 24590-WTP-3DI-G04T-00005, *Engineering Instruction Functional Safety Assessments*, Rev. 0

- 24590-WTP-PL-MGT-15-0008, *Functional Safety Management Plan for Safety Instrumented Systems and Functions*, Rev. 1
- Safety performance monitoring procedure(s)
- Safety systems requirements specifications as identified in the LAW Facility engineering schedule
- Safety set-point calculations as identified in the LAW Facility engineering schedule
- Probability of failure on demand calculations as identified in the LAW Facility engineering schedule.

In addition, we will be evaluating performance for continuous improvement in these areas, which includes, but is not limited to:

- Contractor self-reports events and their causes and implements effective corrective actions prior to recurrence of significant or consequential events.
- Responsiveness to and management of performance and assessment areas needing attention as identified by contractor self-assessments, ORP assessments, and minimal ORP rejection of corrective action plans.
- Deliver effective solutions within contractual, procedural, and/or DOE orders-specified timing to emerging WTP field and resident engineering issues as and when the need arises. Provide efficient and effective field and resident engineering support to WTP construction and turnover to startup. Monitor and continue to reduce design errors resulting in engineering or field rework. Key areas will include mechanical, civil, and electrical inspections.
- Facility status and event notifications are provided to the facility representatives in accordance with contractual, procedural, and/or DOE orders in an accurate manner. Major work in progress and in planning are communicated.
- Contractor processes for safe operations are implemented and effectively applied in operational, maintenance, and construction activities incorporating practices resulting in an effective hierarchy of controls being implemented to mitigate WTP hazards.
- Corrective actions are within contractual, procedural, and/or DOE orders specified timing, prioritized by importance and appropriately targeted to correct negative performance and prevent the development of significant issues. In the case of significant conditions adverse to quality, effective compensatory measures are implemented, causes of the condition are determined within contractual, procedural, and/or DOE orders specified timing, and corrective actions are taken to preclude recurrence.
- Ensure effective interfacing and interactions between construction, engineering, startup and commissioning, and plant management organizations to provide safe and efficient transition to operations.

A.7 AWARD FEE OBJECTIVE 5: STARTUP AND COMMISSIONING

ORP will assess this award fee objective in the areas of startup, commissioning and plant management, and readiness based on the following criteria.

Startup:

- Execution of turnover processes that are efficient and ensure systems are successfully turned over.
- Turnover from construction to startup completed with effective management of impacts from equipment aging or other adverse conditions impacting startup work performance.
- Successful performance of component and initial system testing, to include review and approval of component test result packages for scoped systems consistent with the BCP-18-0103 (October 2018) baseline schedule.
- Completion of the following specific activities and all predecessors:
 - Accept turnover of PVA-A-01 March 2019 (5HTDPVA2331)
 - LAW – Startup – LMH-L-01 system available for use May 2019 (5HLC2LMH100)
 - LAW – Startup – LSH-L-01 system available for use June 2019 (5HLC2LSH100)
 - Accept turnover of PPJ-L-01 August 2019 (5HLC21TOT690)
 - LAW – Startup – C2V-L-01 system available for use October 2019 (5HLC2C2V100)
 - Balance of Facilities – Startup component and system testing complete November 2019 (5HBC108240).

Commissioning and Plant Management:

- Development of programs and procedures to successfully operate and maintain the WTP LBL facilities.
- Hire and train staff to safely and efficiently operate the WTP LBL facilities.
- Handover of scoped systems to plant management:
 - Accept handover of HPS-B-01 June 2019 (2HBC3DFL1290)
 - Accept handover of Building 87S February 2019 (5HBC3SDG1290)
 - Accept handover of DOW-L-01 May 2019 (5HLC3UE0280)
 - Achieve beneficial occupancy of the LAW Facility annex – June 2019
 - Complete onsite LAB set equipment November 2019 (5HTD4AL96602).
- Corrective maintenance backlog less than 15 weeks on average over the PEMP period.
- Continue to mature commissioning plan to ensure readiness at 12 months prior to start of cold commissioning by resolution of commissioning plan open issues and proactive management of new emerging issues and content.

Readiness:

- Submit the startup and notification report in the first quarter of calendar year 2019.

A.8 AWARD FEE OBJECTIVE 6: HIGH-LEVEL WASTE AND PRETREATMENT FACILITIES

ORP will assess this award fee objective in the following areas:

- Continue efforts associated with ongoing asset maintenance of the HLW and Pretreatment facilities to protect equipment and structures.
- Ramp-up engineering design activities on key mechanical and process systems for the HLW Facility. Specific milestones to be completed:
 - Perform a formal engineering study addressing hydrogen mitigation strategy for HLW Facility with DOE acceptance.
 - Conduct 60 percent design review and issue reports for the radioactive liquid waste disposal system and HLW feed process system, and demonstrate that the design meets requirements.
- Continue initiatives resulting in a reduction of the labor resources needed for the Material Handling Facility in 2019 due to reduced HLW and Pretreatment facility activities.

B. PERFORMANCE EVALUATION AND MEASUREMENT PLAN GENERAL INFORMATION

B.1 CONTRACT INCENTIVE FEE STRUCTURE

Contract No. DE-AC27-01RV14136 utilizes multiple, performance-based incentive fee components to drive contractor performance excellence in completing the design, construction, and commissioning of the WTP contract.

The award fee provides a performance incentive for the contractor and gives the Government a tool to identify and reward superior performance.

B.2 PROCESS

The total available award fee for the 2019 evaluation period is \$7,872,603.

In accordance with FAR 16.401(e)(3)(v), “Incentive Contracts,” “General,” the contractor is prohibited from earning any award fee when the contractor’s overall cost, schedule, and technical performance is below satisfactory.

B.3 PROVISIONAL FEE

Provisional fee requirements in Contract No. DE-AC27-01RV14136 Section B, Clause B.8(g), “Provisional Payment of Fee,” apply to this PEMP.

B.4 CONTRACTOR SELF-ASSESSMENT

Contract No. DE-AC27-01RV14136 Section B, Clause B.8(f) states:

Following each evaluation period, the Contractor may submit a self-assessment, provided such assessment is submitted within ten (10) calendar days after the end of the period. This self-assessment shall address both the strengths and weaknesses of the Contractor's performance during the evaluation period. Where deficiencies in performance are noted, the Contractor shall describe the actions planned or taken to correct such deficiencies and avoid their recurrence. The Contracting Officer will review the Contractor's self-assessment, if submitted, as part of its independent evaluation of the Contractor's management during the period.

B.5 METHOD FOR CHANGING THE PERFORMANCE EVALUATION AND MEASUREMENT PLAN DURING THE EVALUATION PERIOD

Proposed changes to the current period PEMP may be initiated by either ORP or the contractor. Proposed changes shall be in writing. Both ORP and the contractor must agree to any changes. Once agreement is reached, the FDO and contractor representative will sign the revised PEMP. The revision number (e.g., Rev. 1) will be noted on the PEMP. Subsequently, the revised PEMP will be incorporated into the contract by reference via contract modification.

ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

DFLAW	direct-feed low-activity waste
DOE	U.S. Department of Energy
FDO	fee-determining official
HLW	high-level waste
LAB	Analytical Laboratory
LAW	low-activity waste
LBL	Low-Activity Waste Facility, Balance of Facilities, and Analytical Laboratory
ORP	U.S. Department of Energy, Office of River Protection
PEMP	performance evaluation measurement plan
QA	quality assurance
WTP	Waste Treatment and Immobilization Plant

REFERENCES

Contract No. DE-AC27-01RV14136, *Design, Construction, and Commissioning of the Hanford Tank Waste Treatment and Immobilization Plant*, U.S. Department of Energy, Washington, D.C., as amended.