

Award Fee Determination Scorecard

Contractor: Advanced Technologies and Laboratories (ATL) International Inc.

Contract: Laboratory Analytical Services and Testing Contract

Contract Number: DE-AC27-10RV15051

Award Fee Period: January 1, 2015 to November 21, 2015

Basis of Evaluation: January 1, 2015 to November 21, 2015 Award Fee, Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan

Award Fee Available (PBI and SEA): \$789,765.60

Award Fee Earned (PBI and SEA): \$781,078.18 (98.9%)

Award Fee Area Adjectival Ratings for each Performance Based Incentives (PBI):

FUNCTIONAL ELEMENT	ADJECTIVAL RATING
PBI 1: On-Time Delivery	Excellent
PBI 2: Evaluation/Proficiency Tests	Excellent
PBI 3: Maintain Hold Times	Excellent
Overall	Excellent

* Adjectival Rating Scale: Unsatisfactory (0); Satisfactory (1-50); Good (51-75); Very Good (76-90)

Award Fee Area Adjectival Ratings for each Award Fee Special Emphasis Area (SEA):

FUNCTIONAL ELEMENT	ADJECTIVAL RATING
SEA 1: Cost and Schedule	Excellent
SEA 2: Analytical Performance and Data Quality	Excellent
SEA 3: Environmental Stewardship and Compliance	Excellent
Overall	Excellent

* Adjectival Rating Scale: Unsatisfactory (0); Satisfactory (1-50); Good (51-75); Very Good (76-90)

Key Positives:

- ATL maintained schedule integrity, they operated exceptionally well under the analytical services budget, and they implemented several time and cost savings processes. In addition, they skillfully managed a changing and dynamic workforce.
- ATL had no reports that required resampling and only one issue that required re-analysis. ATL meticulously maintained the sample archive inventory and did a very commendable job of maintaining analytical instrumentation while supporting instrument issue resolution efforts. ATL had quick turnaround times, holding times, and on time deliverables.
- ATL's management of chemical inventory was excellent. They demonstrated strong support for the 222-S facility manager's compliance with environmental permits. Management of Satellite Accumulation Areas, managing waste generation, and waste additions to the 219-S tanks was well supported by ATL. Neither ATL's internal assessment program, nor the 222-S facility manager's evaluation program, identified any significant issues with ATL's environmental compliance performance for the evaluation period.