

AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION/MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT		1. CONTRACT ID CODE	PAGE OF PAGES 1 34
2. AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION NO. 0710	3. EFFECTIVE DATE See Block 16C	4. REQUISITION/PURCHASE REQ. NO. Not Applicable	5. PROJECT NO. (If applicable)
6. ISSUED BY Richland Operations Office U.S. Department of Energy Richland Operations Office P.O. Box 550, MSIN A7-80 Richland WA 99352	CODE 00601	7. ADMINISTERED BY (If other than Item 6)	CODE
8. NAME AND ADDRESS OF CONTRACTOR (No., street, county, State and ZIP Code) MISSION SUPPORT ALLIANCE, LLC Attn: JENNIFER JAHNER POST OFFICE BOX 650 RICHLAND WA 99352		(x) 9A. AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION NO.	9B. DATED (SEE ITEM 11)
CODE 010605464	FACILITY CODE	X 10A. MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT/ORDER NO. DE-AC06-09RL14728	10B. DATED (SEE ITEM 13) 04/28/2009

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)
Not Applicable

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: Clause I.103 FAR 52.243-2 and by mutual agreement
	D. OTHER (Specify type of modification and authority)

E. IMPORTANT: Contractor is not. is required to sign this document and return 1 copies to the issuing office.

14. DESCRIPTION OF AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION (Organized by UCF section headings, including solicitation/contract subject matter where feasible.)
This modification revises Section J.4-i FY 2018 Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan (PEMP) to update Performance Outcome 1.0, Completion Criterion 1.4, Performance Outcome 2.0, Completion Criterion 2.2 and Performance Outcome 3.0 in the Mission Support Contract. The allocation of available fee for objective performance outcomes is revised from 62% to 60% and allocation of subjective performance outcomes is revised from 38% to 40%. The total available fee is revised incorporate available fee amounts authorized through prior modifications. The total available fee as of Modification 709 is \$22,165,111.00 as reflected in Clause B.4, Table B.4-3.

Attachments:
Attachment 1 - Changes Page
Continued ...

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

15A. NAME AND TITLE OF SIGNER (Type or print)  Jennifer Jahner, Contracts (Signature of person authorized to sign)	16A. NAME AND TITLE OF CONTRACTING OFFICER (Type or print) Timothy E. Corbett
15B. CONTRACTOR/OFFEROR	15C. DATE SIGNED 6/8/18
15D. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  (Signature of Contracting Officer)	16C. DATE SIGNED 6/8/2018

CONTINUATION SHEET

REFERENCE NO. OF DOCUMENT BEING CONTINUED
DE-AC06-09RL14728/0710

PAGE OF
2 34

NAME OF OFFEROR OR CONTRACTOR
MISSION SUPPORT ALLIANCE, LLC

ITEM NO. (A)	SUPPLIES/SERVICES (B)	QUANTITY (C)	UNIT (D)	UNIT PRICE (E)	AMOUNT (F)
	<p>Attachment 2 - Section J TOC Attachment 3 - Section J.4-i FY 18 PEMP</p> <p>There is no change in the total contract amount as a result of this modification. This modification does not add additional funds to the contract. Accordingly, work under the Contract, such as described herein, must be performed within the amount of funds which have been allotted to the contract in accordance with Clause I.82 FAR 52.232.22 - Limitation of Funds (Apr 1984).</p> <p>By signature on this modification, the Contractor agrees to the following Contractor's Statement of Release:</p> <p>In consideration of this Modification 710 agreed to herein as complete equitable adjustment, the Contractor hereby releases the Government from any and all liability under this contract for further equitable adjustments attributable to such facts or circumstances giving rise to this modification.</p> <p>There are no other changes to the terms and conditions of the contract.</p> <p>Payment: Period of Performance: 05/26/2009 to 05/25/2019</p>				

1. FEE CALCULATION METHODOLOGY

Table 4.1, Fee Calculation Methodology

STRATEGIC AREA	ALIGNMENT TO CLEANUP MISSION		PERFORMANCE OUTCOMES	FEE
1.0: Effective Site Cleanup	Deliver site-wide services and reliable infrastructure.	1.1	Achievement of cleanup contractors' key milestones and regulatory commitments.	5250%
2.0: Efficient Site Cleanup	Align resources and capabilities to support the site cleanup mission.	2.1	Reduced cost of site cleanup.	10%
Target Objective Performance Outcome Fee Allocation: $(22,444,94722,165,111 \times 6062\% = \$13,299,067709,407)$				6260%
3.0: Comprehensive Performance		3.1	Subjective outcome.	3840%
Target Subjective Performance Outcome Fee Allocation: $(22,165,111444,947 \times 4038\% = \$8,866,0448,402,540)$				3840%

Formatted: Tab stops: 0.75", Left + 2.42", Left
 Formatted: Not Different first page header

2. PERFORMANCE OUTCOMES

Table 5.1, FY18 Performance Outcomes

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

PERFORMANCE OUTCOME 1.0		
Achievement of cleanup contractors' key milestones and regulatory commitments.	Fee	5250%
Strategic Area 1.0: Effective Site Cleanup		
Alignment to the Cleanup Mission: Deliver site-wide services and reliable infrastructure.		

COMPLETION CRITERION 1.4		
Demonstrate effective development and management of reliability projects that assure mission milestones and regulatory commitments are met.	Fee	75%
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prepare and issue Projects L-781, L-826, L-851, L-852 Engineering Evaluation and Hydraulic Analysis Study by 04/31/18 Complete Planning Activities and Issue Design BCRs for Projects L-781, L-791, and L-826, and L-854 by 09/30/18 Complete Planning Activities and Issue Design BCR for Project L-898 by 03/31/18 L-894, Definitive Design Complete by 04/10/18 L-895, Definitive Design Complete by 08/40/4809/30/18 L-897, Definitive Design Complete by 09/30/18 L-357, Definitive Design Complete by 03/26/18 L-853, Phase 1-5 Construction Complete by 09/30/18 S-245, Construction Complete by 09/30/18 	Due Date	9/30/18

Formatted: Indent: Left: -0.25"

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Complete two Reliability Project team training events to improve knowledge, interaction and overall project execution by 3/31/18 <p>DOE will focus its review of completion of these project activities to ensure that they demonstrate the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mission need was identified through sound business case analysis. Project execution supported mission milestones and regulatory commitments. Credible, objective and transparent reviews of the performance bases. Performance bases integrated key mission and regulatory milestones. Effective execution and turnover to operations including the development of a systems maintenance plan as needed. The project resolved the identified mission need as appropriate. 					
Measure	Timeliness, quality, and completeness	Performance Level	Excellent Very Good Good	Fee Range	91-100% 76-90% 51-75%
DOE Lead	Jeff Frey				
MSA Lead	Robert Wilkinson				

COMPLETION CRITERION 2.2					
<p>Demonstrate effective Hanford Site integration to include, but not limited to, identifying longstanding or emerging issues that affect efficient site operations and provide recommendations for improvement.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Through the CLC and CIB processes, provide DOE-RL with an unfiltered, forward looking view of emerging operational, budget, regulatory, or contractual issues. Conduct Operational Excellence Events: 40% of MSA's FY18 Operational Excellence events will be focused on cross-cutting inter-contractor Site Integration opportunities. Special Projects: Implement the FY18 selected asset management system recommended by the FY17 site integrator alternatives analysis of computerized maintenance management systems excluding fire systems & safeguards. Implement FY 18 improvements identified in the January 30, 2017, self-assessment of the relationships and functions of MSA's systems for effective planning, organizing, controlling, and reviewing all activities. <u>Implement the FY18 selected asset management system recommended by the FY17 site integrator alternatives analysis of computerized maintenance report excluding fire system maintenance and safeguards. Successful completion of FY18 activities to implement EAM as the MSA CMMS will be documented by providing the following to DOE-RL.</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> EAM Software Management Plan (on or about 04/30/1806/30/18) EAM Functional Requirement Document (on or about 05/14/1806/30/2018) EAM Software Design Description (on or about 09/17/18) EAM Requirements Traceability Matrix (maps each functional requirement to the test cases) (09/24/18) EAM Acceptance Test Report (records testing results and customer acceptance) (09/24/18) Roadmap of proposed implementation schedule for additional Infor EAM modules and Sitewide integration (09/27/18) Through an annual Site Integration Self-Assessment Report, evaluate how well MSA performed the above measures against the stated objectives. MSA's approach, objectives, tools and processes, and results will be considered as part of the Site Integration Self-Assessment Report, which will be submitted in the fourth quarter of FY18 <u>by 9/30/2018</u>. 				Fee	5%
				Due Date	9/30/18
Measure	Timeliness, quality, and effectiveness	Performance Level	Excellent Very Good Good	Fee Range	91-100% 76-90% 51-75%
DOE Lead	Jeff Frey				
MSA Lead	Robert Wilkinson				

PERFORMANCE OUTCOME 3.0

Strategic Area 3.0: Comprehensive Performance		Fee	3840%
DOE Lead	Jeff Frey		
MSA Lead	Robert Wilkinson		

Formatted Table

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

PART III – LIST OF DOCUMENTS, EXHIBITS, AND OTHER ATTACHMENTS
SECTION J -- LIST OF ATTACHMENTS
TABLE OF CONTENTS


Attachment Number	Title of Attachment	Revision Number	Pages
J-1.	ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYM LIST	000	4
J-2.	REQUIREMENT SOURCES AND IMPLEMENTING DOCUMENTS	694	9
J-3.	HANFORD SITE SERVICES AND INTERFACE REQUIREMENTS MATRIX	694	109
J-4.	PERFORMANCE EVALUATION AND MEASUREMENT PLAN		
a	FY 2010 PERFORMANCE EVALUATION & MEASUREMENT PLAN	052	19
b	FY 2011 PERFORMANCE EVALUATION & MEASUREMENT PLAN	145	10
c	FY 2012 PERFORMANCE EVALUATION & MEASUREMENT PLAN	215	13
d	FY 2013 PERFORMANCE EVALUATION & MEASUREMENT PLAN	298	10
e	FY 2014 PERFORMANCE EVALUATION & MEASUREMENT PLAN	394	20
f	FY 2015 PERFORMANCE EVALUATION & MEASUREMENT PLAN	466	11
g	FY 2016 PERFORMANCE EVALUATION & MEASUREMENT PLAN	482	9
h	FY 2017 PERFORMANCE EVALUATION & MEASUREMENT PLAN	672	9
i	FY 2018 PERFORMANCE EVALUATION & MEASUREMENT PLAN	710	30
J-5.	PERFORMANCE GUARANTEE AGREEMENT	667	9
J-6.	SMALL BUSINESS SUBCONTRACTING PLAN	667	11
J-7.	SMALL DISADVANTAGED BUSINESS PARTICIPATION PROGRAM TARGETS	000	2
J-8.	ADVANCE UNDERSTANDING OF COSTS	702	11
J-9.	SPECIAL FINANCIAL INSTITUTION ACCOUNT AGREEMENT	534	4
J-10.	WAGE DETERMINATIONS – SERVICE CONTRACT ACT, DAVIS-BACON ACT, AND COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AGREEMENTS	647	35
J-11.	CONTRACT DELIVERABLES	671	22
J-12.	GOVERNMENT FURNISHED SERVICES AND INFORMATION	134	4

J-13.	HANFORD SITE STRUCTURES LIST	603	25
J-14.	HANFORD WASTE SITE ASSIGNMENT LIST	603	55
J-15.	Be SAMPLING PROTOCOL FOR BUILDINGS	059	5
J-16.	PORTFOLIO MANAGEMENT TASK ORDERS		
	Task 09-001 Hammer Budget Analysis	006	1
	Task 11-001 200W Pump & Treat Independent Review	077	1
	Task 11-002 Assessment of the 618-10 Burial Ground Characterization	080	2
	Task 11-003 Consulting Support to HQ EM-2.1	148	5
	Task 11-004 PIC Support for Project Controls System Description	144	3
	Task 12-001 Project Management and Project Controls Support for the River Corridor Closure Project	157 220	2
	Task 12-002 PMB review support to the Plutonium Finishing Plant Project	159	1
	Task 13-001 Project Management and Project Controls Support for the River Corridor Closure Project	223	2
	Task 13-002 DOE-HQ Security Systems Review and Assessment	280	2
	Task 13-003_R1 DOE-RL AMB HGET Training Approval Process SIA	310 347	2
	Task 13-004 DOE-RL Groundwater Sampling Structured Improvement Activity	306	2
	Task 14-001 - Project Management / Project Controls Support	323	2
	Task 14-002 – Cultural Resources Support	353	2
	Task 14-003 – AMSE Business Rhythms & Reporting Workshop	358	2
	Task 14-004 - DOE-HQ Human Resources Staffing Process Structured Improvement Activity	398	2
	Task 14-004, Rev 2 – DOE HQ Human Resources Staffing Process Structured Improvement Activity	456	3
	Task 14-005 River Corridor Contract Change Process Structured Improvement Activity	410	2
	Task 15-001 River Corridor Division PBS 41 Project Management/Project Controls Support	410	2
	Task 15-002 Office of River Protection Project Dashboard Solutions	432	3
	Task 15-002 Rev 1 Office of River Protection Project Dashboard Solutions Phase 2a	457	2
	Task 15-002 Rev 2 Office of River Protection Project Dashboard Solutions Phase 3	471 478	2
	Task 15-004 Nuclear Safety Division Safety Basis Review and Approval Process Structured Improvement Activity	459	2
	Task 16-001 River Corridor Division PBS 41 Project Management/Project Controls support	483	2

	Task 16-002 Hanford Property Management Structured Improvement Activity	523	2
	Task 16-003 DOE CERCLA Structured Improvement Activity	528	2
	Task 17-001 Hanford Site-Wide Contractor Assurance System Implementation Support	597	5
	Task 17-001 Rev. 1 Hanford Site-Wide Contractor Assurance System Implementation Support	632	5
	Task 18-001 Hanford Site-Wide Contractor Assurance System Implementation Support Phase 2	648	4
	Task 18-002 Rev. 2 Plutonium Finishing Plant Expert Panel	707	3

Mission Support Contract

Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan



FY18

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION3

2. ALLOCATION OF AVAILABLE FEE3

3. RATINGS3

4. FEE CALCULATION METHODOLOGY5

5. PERFORMANCE OUTCOMES.....5

PERFORMANCE OUTCOME 1.0.....5

 COMPLETION CRITERION 1.15

 COMPLETION CRITERION 1.27

 COMPLETION CRITERION 1.37

 COMPLETION CRITERION 1.48

PERFORMANCE OUTCOME 2.0.....9

 COMPLETION CRITERION 2.19

 COMPLETION CRITERION 2.29

PERFORMANCE OUTCOME 3.0.....10

APPENDIX A IN SUPPORT OF COMPLETION CRITERIA 1.111

 PM J34-1: Biological Controls – Pest Removal12

 PM J34-1: Biological Controls – Tumbleweed Removal13

 Contractor Assurance System – Assessments15

 Contractor Assurance System – Causal Analyses16

 Contractor Assurance System – Issue Resolution17

 PM J35-1: Crane and Crew Support18

 PM J36-1: Facilities Maintenance19

 PM J20-1: Fire Protection System Maintenance20

 PM J20-2: Fire Protection System Maintenance21

 PM J20-3: Fire Protection System Maintenance22

 PM J20-4: Fire Protection System Maintenance23

 PM J38: Fleet Services – Heavy Equipment (Cranes, Excavators, General Purpose)24

 PM J38: Fleet Services – Light Equipment (Hanford Patrol, Hanford Fire, Special Purpose Trucks)25

 PM J14-1: Cyber Security – System Patching26

 PM J32-3: Dosimetry – External Services27

 PM J32-1: Radiological Instrumentation Calibration28

 K Basin Sludge Support – Loaned Labor29

TABLES

Table 3.1, Performance Outcome Ratings and Definitions4

Table 4.1, Fee Calculation Methodology5

Table 5.1, FY18 Performance Outcomes5

PEMP ORGANIZATION

Fee Determining Official Doug Shoop, RL Manager

Award Fee Review Board Chairperson Jeff Frey, Assistant Manager for Mission Support (AMMS)

Award Fee Review Board Members:

Deputy Program Director Jeff Bird, Deputy AMMS

Contracting Officer Tim Corbett, MSC Contracting Officer

Attorney Staff Member Paul Davis, Attorney

Financial Management Staff Member Steve Einan, Project Controls Officer

Performance Monitors:

AMMS Jeff Bird, Deputy AMMS

Infrastructure and Services Sharee Dickinson, ISD Director

Site Stewardship Karen Lutz, Acting SSD Director

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

ATTACHMENT J-4-i

**Mission Support Contract (MSC)
FY 2018 Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan****1. INTRODUCTION**

This Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan (PEMP) is an award fee plan containing both objective and subjective outcomes in order to maximize the efficiency and effectiveness of the Mission Support Contract. Please note that "PEMP" is synonymous with the term "Award Fee Plan" found in FAR 16.401(e)(3). The award fee plan is a strategic document under the control and direction of the Assistant Manager Mission Support and coordinated with the Chief Operations Officer of the Mission Support Alliance (MSA). Senior officials may delegate certain actions in support of this plan.

The completion criteria for objective outcomes are focused on specific activities. The completion criteria for subjective outcomes are focused on the achievement of high-level strategies and envisioned end states. The completion criteria are based on negotiated integrated priority lists (IPLs) and requisite budget levels commensurate with IPL execution and are subject to adjustment based on actual approved 2018 budget levels. These criteria define successful performance in terms of measurable deliverables and associated constraints (measurable ranges/delivery dates).

2. ALLOCATION OF AVAILABLE FEE

Because the services to be determined under this contract directly support the mission contractors, and because such services are integral to the environmental cleanup mission at Hanford, DOE will heavily weight the assignment of fee toward the following strategic areas of the contract:

- a. Effective Site Cleanup - Deliver site-wide services and reliable infrastructure to enable achievement of cleanup contractors' key milestones and regulatory commitments.
- b. Efficient Site Cleanup - Align resources and capabilities to support and reduce the cost of the site cleanup mission.

The objective performance outcomes are allocated 60% of the available fee and the remaining 40% is allocated to the subjective performance outcome.

3. RATINGS

Payment of fee is subject to the fee reduction terms of this contract and fee determining official (FDO) approval that the contractor has achieved the stated outcomes and satisfied the specific completion criteria. The evaluation of objective outcomes will include a subjective determination regarding quality, timeliness, cost, and effectiveness. Consistent with FAR 16.401(e), the criteria listed in Table 3.1, Performance Ratings and Definitions, will be used in the evaluation of only subjective outcomes (Performance Outcome 3.0).

MSA, through the submission of monthly progress reports, shall identify issues potentially affecting the completion of individual outcomes and the overall success of the contract, with actions taken or recommended to resolve those issues. In the event MSA self-discloses an issue with regard to an outcome in the PEMP and appropriately self-corrects the situation in a timely manner, fee reduction may be waived or mitigated by the FDO.

Table 3.1, Subjective Performance Outcome Ratings and Definitions
Applicable to Performance Outcome 3.0 only

ADJECTIVAL RATING	DEFINITION	PERCENTAGE OF FEE EARNED
Excellent	Contractor has exceeded almost all of the significant award-fee criteria and has met overall cost, schedule, and technical performance requirements of the contract in the aggregate as defined and measured against the criteria in the award-fee plan for the award-fee evaluation period. Contractor's work is highly professional. Contractor solves problems with very little, if any, Government involvement. Contractor is proactive and takes an aggressive approach in identifying problems and their resolution, including those identified in the risk management process, with a substantial emphasis on performing quality work in a safe manner within cost/schedule requirements. No significant re-work.	91% to 100%
Very Good	Contractor has exceeded many of the significant award-fee criteria and has met overall cost, schedule, and technical performance requirements of the contract in the aggregate as defined and measured against the criteria in the award-fee plan for the award-fee evaluation period. Contractor solves problems with minimal Government involvement. Contractor is usually proactive and demonstrates an aggressive approach in identifying problems and their resolution, including those identified in the risk management process, with an emphasis on performing quality work in a safe manner within cost/schedule requirements. Problems are usually self-identified and resolution is self-initiated. Some limited, low-impact rework within normal expectations.	76% to 90%
Good	Contractor has exceeded some of the significant award-fee criteria and has met overall cost, schedule, and technical performance requirements of the contract in the aggregate as defined and measured against the award-fee plan for the award-fee evaluation period. Contractor is able to solve basic problems with adequate emphasis on performing quality work in a safe manner within cost/schedule objectives. The rating within this range will be determined by level of necessary Government involvement in problem resolution, including those problems identified in the risk management process, and extent to which the performance problem is self-identified vs. Government-identified. Some re-work required that unfavorably impacted cost and/or schedule.	51% to 75%
Satisfactory	Contractor has met overall cost, schedule, and technical performance requirements of the contract in the aggregate as defined and measured against the criteria in the award-fee plan for the award-fee evaluation period. Contractor has some difficulty solving basic problems, and cost, schedule, safety, and technical performance needs improvement to avoid further performance risk. Government involvement in problem resolution, including those problems identified in the risk management process, is necessary. Some rework required that unfavorably impacted cost and/or schedule.	≤ 50%
Unsatisfactory	Contractor has failed to meet overall cost, schedule, and technical performance requirements of the contract in the aggregate as defined and measured against the criteria in the award-fee plan for the award-fee evaluation period. Contractor does not demonstrate an emphasis on performing quality work in a safe manner within cost/schedule objectives. Contractor is unable to solve problems and Government involvement in problem resolution, including those problems identified in the risk management process, is necessary. Excessive rework required that had significant unfavorable impact on cost and/or schedule.	0%

4. FEE CALCULATION METHODOLOGY

Table 4.1, Fee Calculation Methodology

STRATEGIC AREA	ALIGNMENT TO CLEANUP MISSION	PERFORMANCE OUTCOMES		FEE
1.0: Effective Site Cleanup	Deliver site-wide services and reliable infrastructure.	1.1	Achievement of cleanup contractors' key milestones and regulatory commitments.	50%
2.0: Efficient Site Cleanup	Align resources and capabilities to support the site cleanup mission.	2.1	Reduced cost of site cleanup.	10%
Target Objective Performance Outcome Fee Allocation: (22,165,111 X 60% = \$13,299,067)				60%
3.0: Comprehensive Performance		3.1	Subjective outcome.	40%
Target Subjective Performance Outcome Fee Allocation: (22,165,111 X 40% = \$8,866,044)				40%

5. PERFORMANCE OUTCOMES

Table 5.1, FY18 Performance Outcomes

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

PERFORMANCE OUTCOME 1.0		
Achievement of cleanup contractors' key milestones and regulatory commitments.	Fee	50%
Strategic Area 1.0: Effective Site Cleanup		
Alignment to the Cleanup Mission: Deliver site-wide services and reliable infrastructure.		

COMPLETION CRITERION 1.1					
Demonstrate that the following performance measurement targets were met.				Fee	30%
				Due Date	9/30/18
Measure	See performance measures below (See Appendix A for details)		Performance Level	See below	Fee Range
DOE Lead	Jeff Frey				
MSA Lead	Robert Wilkinson				

Title	Measure	Target/ Performance Level	Fee Range
Biological Controls – Pest Removal	Days to close service catalog request Percent 3-business-day completion	≥ 85% <85%	91-100% 0-90%
Biological Controls – Tumbleweed Removal	Days to close catalog service request Percent 15-business-day completion	≥ 80% <80%	91-100% 0-90%
Biological Controls – Vegetation	Acres treated Percent on-time campaign fulfillment	≥ 85% <85%	91-100% 0-90%

Title	Measure	Target/ Performance Level	Fee Range
Contractor Assurance System - Assessments	Percent on-time completion of scheduled assessments by year end	≥ 85% <85%	91-100% 0-90%
Contractor Assurance System – Causal Analyses	Percent on-time completion of causal analyses	≥ 80% <80%	91-100% 0-90%
Contractor Assurance System – Issue Resolution	Percent on-time screening of newly identified issue identification forms	≥ 90% <90%	91-100% 0-90%
Crane and Crew Support	Days to fulfill request Percent 2-business-day turnaround time (standard requests) Percent 1-business-day turnaround time (emergency requests)	≥ 85% <85%	91-100% 0-90%
Facilities Maintenance	Number of managed task work completed as scheduled Percent on-time completion	≥ 85% <85%	91-100% 0-90%
Fire Systems - Inspection, Testing and Maintenance	Percent on-time completion	≥ 90% <90%	91-100% 0-90%
Fire Systems – Priority 1 Emergency Impairments	Number of open emergency impairments at month end	≤ 3 >3	91-100% 0-90%
Fire Systems – Priority 2 System Restrictions	Number of System Restrictions at month end	≤ 20 >20	91-100% 0-90%
Fire Systems – Priority 3 System Restrictions or Deficiencies	Number of System Restrictions or Deficiencies at month end	≤ 45 >45	91-100% 0-90%
Fleet Services – Heavy Equipment (Cranes)	Percent in-service	≥ 70% <70%	91-100% 0-90%
Fleet Services – Heavy Equipment (Excavators)	Percent in-service	≥ 90% <90%	91-100% 0-90%
Fleet Services – Heavy Equipment (General Purpose)	Percent in-service	≥ 90% <90%	91-100% 0-90%
Fleet Services – Light Equipment (Hanford Patrol)	Percent in-service	≥ 90% <90%	91-100% 0-90%
Fleet Services – Light Equipment (Hanford Fire)	Percent in-service	≥ 85% <85%	91-100% 0-90%
Fleet Services – Light Equipment (Special Purpose Trucks)	Percent in-service	≥ 90% <90%	91-100% 0-90% 0

Title	Measure	Target/ Performance Level	Fee Range
IT – Cyber Security/System Patching	Days to deploy patch Percent 14-business-day turnaround time (desktops/databases/servers)	≥ 97% <97%	91-100% 0-90%
Radiological Site Services – Dosimetry External Services	Days to completion Percent 10-business-day turnaround time (routine exchanges) Percent 30-business-day turnaround time (annual exchanges)	≥ 95% <95%	91-100% 0-90%
Radiological Site Services – Instrumentation Calibration	Number of on-time requests completed Percent 10-day turnaround time	≥ 90% <90%	91-100% 0-90%
K Basin Sludge Support – Loaned Labor	Number of loaned labor requests fulfilled Percent fulfillment of loaned labor requests	≥ 85% <85%	91-100% 0-90%

COMPLETION CRITERION 1.2						
<p>Enhance the integration of MSA's performance and business reporting systems in order to comprehensively demonstrate in a credible, objective and transparent manner, the achievement of MSA's key milestones and regulatory commitments and that MSA is enabling the achievement of Other Hanford Contractor's key milestones and regulatory commitments.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Partnering with DOE, develop and provide a meaningful joint briefing to DOE-RL and MSA leadership that achieves alignment on the concepts and principles of assurance system by 11/15/17 that includes at a minimum Operations, Financial, Maintenance, Work Management, Emergency Management, Safety and Environmental. Develop an effective transition/implementation plan to drive change and present it to DOE by 1/30/18. Implement a workable MSA Assurance System that can serve as a prototype and conduct a joint review with DOE by 9/30/18. Complete applicable improvement actions identified by the MSA Contractor Assurance System independent assessment and update supporting system description documentation along with other transition/implementation actions by 9/30/18. 					Fee	5%
					Due Date	9/30/18
Measure	Timeliness, quality, and completeness		Performance Level	Excellent Very Good Good	Fee Range	91-100% 76-90% 51-75%
DOE Lead	Jeff Frey					
MSA Lead	Robert Wilkinson					

COMPLETION CRITERION 1.3						
<p>Demonstrate effective management of electric, water and sewer utilities to maximize reliability and redundancy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The success criteria for water utilities is: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maintain Raw Water Pressure at ICD level Maintain Potable Water pressure at ICD Perform Preventative maintenance at 90% or better each month Reduce corrective maintenance (including backlog) to an average completion of 365 days or less. Ensure all water quality samples are completed on time Complete Water master plans on or before the contract deliverable due date. Quarterly System Health report by Engineering submitted one calendar month after each quarter The success criteria for Sewer utilities is: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Perform Preventative maintenance at 90% or better each month Reduce corrective maintenance (including backlog) to an average completion of 365 days or less. Complete Sewer master plans on or before the contract deliverable due date. Quarterly System Health report by Engineering submitted one calendar month after each quarter The success criteria for Electrical: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Electrical power availability- minimize the number of unplanned power outages of important transformers to no more than 50 					Fee	10%
					Due Date	9/30/18

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Perform Preventative maintenance at 90% or better each month o Reduce corrective maintenance backlog identified prior to October 2017 by 65%. o Quarterly System Health report by Engineering submitted one calendar month after each quarter 					
Measure	Timeliness, quality, and completeness	Performance Level	Excellent Very Good Good	Fee Range	91-100% 76-90% 51-75%
DOE Lead	Jeff Frey				
MSA Lead	Robert Wilkinson				

COMPLETION CRITERION 1.4					
<p>Demonstrate effective development and management of reliability projects that assure mission milestones and regulatory commitments are met.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prepare and issue Projects L-781, L-826, L-851, L-852 Engineering Evaluation and Hydraulic Analysis Study by 04/31/18 • Complete Planning Activities and Issue Design BCRs for Projects L-781, L-791, and L-826 by 09/30/18 • Complete Planning Activities and Issue Design BCR for Project L-898 by 03/31/18 • L-894, Definitive Design Complete by 04/10/18 • L-895, Definitive Design Complete by 09/30/18 • L-357, Definitive Design Complete by 03/26/18 • L-853, Phase 1-5 Construction Complete by 09/30/18 • S-245, Construction Complete by 09/30/18 • Complete two Reliability Project team training events to improve knowledge, interaction and overall project execution by 3/31/18 <p>DOE will focus its review of completion of these project activities to ensure that they demonstrate the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mission need was identified through sound business case analysis. • Project execution supported mission milestones and regulatory commitments. • Credible, objective and transparent reviews of the performance bases. • Performance bases integrated key mission and regulatory milestones. • Effective execution and turnover to operations including the development of a systems maintenance plan as needed. • The project resolved the identified mission need as appropriate. 				Fee	5%
				Due Date	9/30/18
Measure	Timeliness, quality, and completeness	Performance Level	Excellent Very Good Good	Fee Range	91-100% 76-90% 51-75%
DOE Lead	Jeff Frey				
MSA Lead	Robert Wilkinson				

PERFORMANCE OUTCOME 2.0		
Reduced cost of site cleanup.	Fee	10%
Strategic Area 2.0: Efficient Site Cleanup		
Alignment to the Cleanup Mission: Align resources and capabilities to support the site cleanup mission.		


COMPLETION CRITERION 2.1					
Maximize efficient MSA use of resources to meet the other Hanford contractors' changing project needs.				Fee	5%
				Due Date	9/30/18
Measure	Cumulative year-to-date percent composite over/under liquidation rates of usage-based services pools (calculated in the following manner: $\frac{\sum (\text{Direct Labor Adders' and Usage Based Services' Year-to-Date over/under Liquidations})}{\sum (\text{Direct Labor Adders' and Usage Based Services' Year-to-Date Liquidations})}$	Performance Level	±0-5% ±6-7% >±7%	Fee Range	91-100% 76-90% 0-75%
DOE Lead	Jeff Frey				
MSA Lead	Robert Wilkinson				

COMPLETION CRITERION 2.2					
Demonstrate effective Hanford Site integration to include, but not limited to, identifying longstanding or emerging issues that affect efficient site operations and provide recommendations for improvement.				Fee	5%
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Through the CLC and CIB processes, provide DOE-RL with an unfiltered, forward looking view of emerging operational, budget, regulatory, or contractual issues. Conduct Operational Excellence Events: 40% of MSA's FY18 Operational Excellence events will be focused on cross-cutting inter-contractor Site Integration opportunities. Implement the FY18 selected asset management system recommended by the FY17 site integrator alternatives analysis of computerized maintenance report excluding fire system maintenance and safeguards. Successful completion of FY18 activities to implement EAM as the MSA CMMS will be documented by providing the following to DOE-RL. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> EAM Software Management Plan (on or about 06/30/18) EAM Functional Requirement Document (on or about 06/30/2018) EAM Software Design Description (on or about 09/17/18) EAM Requirements Traceability Matrix (maps each functional requirement to the test cases) (09/24/18) EAM Acceptance Test Report (records testing results and customer acceptance) (09/24/18) Roadmap of proposed implementation schedule for additional Infor EAM modules and Sitewide integration (09/27/18) Through an annual Site Integration Self-Assessment Report, evaluate how well MSA performed the above measures against the stated objectives. MSA's approach, objectives, tools and processes, and results will be considered as part of the Site Integration Self-Assessment Report, which will be submitted by 9/30/2018. 				Due Date	9/30/18
Measure	Timeliness, quality, and effectiveness	Performance Level	Excellent Very Good Good	Fee Range	91-100% 76-90% 51-75%
DOE Lead	Jeff Frey				
MSA Lead	Robert Wilkinson				

PERFORMANCE OUTCOME 3.0				
Strategic Area 3.0: Comprehensive Performance			Fee	40%
DOE Lead	Jeff Frey			
MSA Lead	Robert Wilkinson			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Execute the balance of contract work scope within the contract requirements, terms, and conditions, demonstrating excellence in quality, schedule, management, cost control, small business utilization, and regulatory compliance. • Provide leadership to improve management effectiveness and collaborate and participate proactively with customers. • Work with DOE and the other Hanford contractors in a spirit of cooperation to demonstrate operational excellence to include, but not limited to, the following areas: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Business and financial management using approved purchasing, estimating, property, budget, planning, billing, labor, accounting, and performance measurement systems, providing visibility and transparency to DOE with respect to each of the foregoing ○ Contract change management and subcontract administration and consent activities, e.g., proposal review and negotiation process, including timely and adequate submission of proposals and requests for additional data, timely counteroffers, and attaining small business goals ○ Safeguards and security, fire department operations, emergency response, and emergency operations/emergency management ○ Land management ○ Infrastructure and services program management, operations, and maintenance ○ Effective contractor human resources management ○ Problem identification and corrective action implementation and effectiveness • Perform work safely and in a compliant manner that assures the workers, public, environment, and national security assets are adequately protected while meeting the performance expectations of the contract. 				

Mission Support Contract

APPENDIX A IN SUPPORT OF COMPLETION CRITERIA 1.1



FY18

FY18 Performance Measure					
PM J34-1: Biological Controls – Pest Removal					
Service area	Biological Controls (Pest Removal)				
Corresponding J-3	34	Corresponding SDD	SDD J3-34	Corresponding PI	(FY18) 1.1

Performance Measure Details	
Objective	Reduce biological hazards to employees and operations

Measure	Days to close service catalog request
----------------	---------------------------------------

Calculation methodology	Number of on-time requests completed ÷ total number of requests
--------------------------------	---

Target	≥85% three business-day completion
---------------	------------------------------------

MSA stoplight levels	Green: ≥85%, Yellow: 84-80%, Red: <80%
-----------------------------	--

Bounding conditions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Customers must use the Service Catalog for requests (clock starts when request is entered into the Service Catalog). • Customers/OHCs cannot impede immediate access to building or area due to their resource constraints (i.e., escorts, locks, cancelations). • Weather delays preventing reaching or accessing building or area will not be counted towards PI/performance measure.
----------------------------	---

Reporting		
Frequency	Period	Internal MSA date of submission
Monthly	Calendar month	Within 10 business days of the end of the previous calendar month

FY18 Performance Measure					
PM J34-1: Biological Controls – Tumbleweed Removal					
Service area	Biological Controls (Tumbleweed Removal)				
Corresponding J-3	34	Corresponding SDD	SDD J3-34	Corresponding PI	(FY18) 1.1

Performance Measure Details	
Objective	Minimize the impact to customer operations through responsive tumbleweed removal

Measure	Days to close catalog service request
----------------	---------------------------------------

Calculation methodology	Number of on-time requests completed ÷ total number of requests
--------------------------------	---

Target	≥80% 15-business day completion
---------------	---------------------------------

MSA stoplight levels	Green: ≥80%, Yellow: 79-75%, Red: <75%
-----------------------------	--

Bounding conditions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Customers must use the service catalog for requests. • Excludes reporting from December - February due to resources allocated to weather and road conditions. • Campaign schedule adherence is dependent on OHC access and support (e.g., minimal number of OHC cancelations). Where access cannot be attained, the service request will be closed and not counted and a new service request will have to be generated. • Equipment downtime and time in ERDF/tank farms is excluded from calculation.
----------------------------	---

Reporting		
Frequency	Period	Internal MSA date of submission
Monthly	Calendar month	Within 10 business days of the end of the previous calendar month

FY18 Performance Measure					
PM J34-1: Biological Controls – Vegetation					
Service area	Biological Controls (Vegetation)				
Corresponding J-3	34	Corresponding SDD	SDD J3-34	Corresponding PI	(FY18) 1.1

Performance Measure Details	
Objective	Reduce evasive plants and noxious weeds to minimize biological uptake and transport of contaminants.
Measure	Acres treated
Calculation methodology	Numbers of acres treated ÷ monthly planned treatment
Target	≥85% of on-time campaign fulfillment
MSA stoplight levels	Green: ≥85%, Yellow: 84-80%, Red: <80%
Bounding conditions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Campaign refers to both the number of acreage and the schedule • Campaigns are limited to a seasonal schedule that is developed by Biological Controls project (e.g., some months will have no activity) • Campaign schedule adherence is dependent on OHC access and support (e.g., minimal number of OHC cancelations)

Reporting		
Frequency	Period	Internal MSA date of submission
Monthly	Calendar month	Within 10 business days of the end of the previous calendar month

FY18 Performance Measure					
Contractor Assurance System – Assessments					
Service area	Contractor Assurance System – Assessments				
Corresponding J-3	N/A	Corresponding SDD	N/A	Corresponding PI	(FY18) 1.1

Performance Measure Details	
Objective	Complete assessments as scheduled
Measure	Percent on-time completion of scheduled assessment
Calculation methodology	Number of assessments completed divided by total assessments scheduled at the beginning of the Fiscal Year.
Target	≥85% completed by September 30, 2018
MSA stoplight levels	Green: ≥85%; Yellow: 84%-80%; Red: <80%
Bounding conditions	

Reporting		
Frequency	Period	Internal MSA date of submission
Monthly	Calendar month	Within 10 business days of the end of the previous calendar month

FY18 Performance Measure					
Contractor Assurance System – Causal Analyses					
Service area	Contractor Assurance System – Causal Analyses				
Corresponding J-3	N/A	Corresponding SDD	N/A	Corresponding PI	(FY18) 1.1

Performance Measure Details	
Objective	Complete causal analyses within procedurally mandated timeframe
Measure	Percent on-time completion of causal analyses
Calculation methodology	Number of casual analyses completed divided by total casual analyses due
Target	≥80% completed within 45 days
MSA stoplight levels	Green: ≥80%; Yellow: 79%-70%; Red: <70%
Bounding conditions	

Reporting		
Frequency	Period	Internal MSA date of submission
Monthly	Calendar month	Within 10 business days of the end of the previous calendar month

FY18 Performance Measure					
Contractor Assurance System – Issue Resolution					
Service area	Contractor Assurance System – Issue Resolution				
Corresponding J-3	N/A	Corresponding SDD	N/A	Corresponding PI	(FY18) 1.1

Performance Measure Details	
Objective	Issues will be screened for significance and assigned to responsible management.
Measure	Percent on-time screening of newly identified issue identification forms
Calculation methodology	Number of issues initiated divided by total issues screened
Target	≥90% of issues screened within 5 days of initiation
MSA stoplight levels	Green: ≥90%; Yellow: 89%-80%; Red: <80%
Bounding conditions	

Reporting		
Frequency	Period	Internal MSA date of submission
Monthly	Calendar month	Within 10 business days of the end of the previous calendar month

FY18 Performance Measure					
PM J35-1: Crane and Crew Support					
Service area	Crane and Crew Support				
Corresponding J-3	35	Corresponding SDD	SDD J3-35	Corresponding PI	(FY18) 1.1

Performance Measure Details	
Objective	Align MSA crane and crew resources to meet Site customer needs

Measure	Days to fulfill request
----------------	-------------------------

Calculation methodology	Total on-time requests ÷ total number of requests
--------------------------------	---

Target	≥85% 2-business-day turnaround time (standard requests)/1-business-day turnaround time (emergency requests)
---------------	---

MSA stoplight levels	Green: ≥85%, Yellow: 84-80%, Red: <80%
-----------------------------	--

Bounding conditions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Response time calculated using normal business hours
----------------------------	--

Reporting		
Frequency	Period	Internal MSA date of submission
Monthly	Calendar month	Within 10 business days of the end of the previous calendar month

FY18 Performance Measure					
PM J36-1: Facilities Maintenance					
Service area	Facility Maintenance				
Corresponding J-3	36	Corresponding SDD	SDD J3-36	Corresponding PI	(FY18) 1.1

Performance Measure Details

Objective	Timely completion of facility maintenance scheduled work to support customer operations
------------------	---

Measure	Number of managed task work completed as scheduled
----------------	--

Calculation methodology	Percent of managed task work completed per the weekly schedule - number of managed task requests completed ÷ total number of managed task scheduled
--------------------------------	---

Target	≥85% on-time completion
---------------	-------------------------

MSA stoplight levels	Green: ≥85%, Yellow: 84-80%, Red: <80%
-----------------------------	--

Bounding conditions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work Control establishes weekly schedule based on customer needs and priorities • Work cancelled by the customer after the schedule is published will not be counted • Delays due to customer access restrictions, or facility conditions, or facility personnel are unable to support will not be counted • Lockout/tagout by Other Hanford Contractors will not be counted • Delays due to weather conditions will not be counted
----------------------------	---

Reporting

Frequency	Period	Internal MSA date of submission
Monthly	Calendar month	Within 10 business days of the end of the previous calendar month

FY18 Performance Measure					
PM J20-1: Fire Protection System Maintenance					
Service area	Fire Systems Inspection, Testing and Maintenance				
Corresponding J-3	20	Corresponding SDD	SDD J3-20	Corresponding PI	(FY18) 1.1

Performance Measure Details	
Objective	Maintain high standard of fire protection system operability
Measure	Number of preventive maintenance packages completed
Calculation methodology	Number of packages completed divided by the total number of packages
Target	≥ 90% packages completed
MSA stoplight levels	Green ≥:90% - Yellow 85-89% - Red <85%
Bounding conditions	Includes backlog (cannot cause facility impairment to safety systems)

Reporting		
Frequency	Period	Internal MSA date of submission
Monthly	Calendar month	Within 10 business days of the end of the previous calendar month

FY18 Performance Measure					
PM J20-2: Fire Protection System Maintenance					
Service area	Fire Systems – Priority 1 Emergency Impairments				
Corresponding J-3	20	Corresponding SDD	SDD J3-20	Corresponding PI	(FY18) 1.1

Performance Measure Details

Objective	Correct Emergency Impairments in a timely manner; ensuring fire system operability and compliance with facility DSA’s and life safety codes
------------------	---

Measure	Emergency Impairments
----------------	-----------------------

Calculation methodology	Number of Emergency Impairments open at month end
--------------------------------	---

Target	≤ 3 open Emergency Impairments open at the end of the month
---------------	---

MSA stoplight levels	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Green: ≤3, Yellow: 4 to 8, Red: >8
-----------------------------	---

Bounding conditions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Delays due to customer access restrictions, facility conditions, prerequisite work outside of FSM control, or facility personnel are unable to support will not be counted Lockout/tagout by Other Hanford Contractors will not be counted Delays due to weather conditions will not be counted EIs that occur on the last business day of the month will not be counted. <p>Does not include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maintenance of fire sprinkler and fire alarm systems in PNNL and other non-Hanford contractor's facilities. Maintenance of fire sprinkler and fire alarm systems at PFP facilities. Maintenance of fire protection equipment and building features such as fire barriers, fire dampers, emergency lights, fire extinguishers, etc. ITM or corrective maintenance activities added based on implementation of the new ITM Site Standard
----------------------------	--

Reporting

Frequency	Period	Internal MSA date of submission
Monthly	Calendar month	Within 10 business days of the end of the previous calendar month

FY18 Performance Measure					
PM J20-3: Fire Protection System Maintenance					
Service area	Fire Systems – Priority 2 System Restrictions				
Corresponding J-3	20	Corresponding SDD	SDD J3-20	Corresponding PI	(FY18) 1.1

Performance Measure Details	
Objective	Correct System Priority 2 Restrictions in a timely manner; ensuring fire system operability and compliance with facility DSA’s and life safety codes

Measure	Priority 2 System Restrictions
----------------	--------------------------------

Calculation methodology	Number of Priority 2 System Restrictions at month end
--------------------------------	---

Target	≤20 total System Restrictions Priority 2 (SR-2) at the end of each month
---------------	--

MSA stoplight levels	Green: ≤20, Yellow: 21 to 35, Red: >35
-----------------------------	--

Bounding conditions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Delays due to customer access restrictions, facility conditions, prerequisite work outside of FSM control, or facility personnel are unable to support will not be counted Lockout/tagout by Other Hanford Contractors will not be counted Delays due to weather conditions will not be counted <p>Does not include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maintenance of fire sprinkler and fire alarm systems in PNNL and other non-Hanford contractor's facilities. Maintenance of fire sprinkler and fire alarm systems at PFP facilities. Maintenance of fire protection equipment and building features such as fire barriers, fire dampers, emergency lights, fire extinguishers, etc. ITM or corrective maintenance activities added based on implementation of the new ITM Site Standard
----------------------------	---

Reporting		
Frequency	Period	Internal MSA date of submission
Monthly	Calendar month	Within 10 business days of the end of the previous calendar month

FY18 Performance Measure					
PM J20-4: Fire Protection System Maintenance					
Service area	Fire Systems – Priority 3 System Restrictions or Deficiencies				
Corresponding J-3	20	Corresponding SDD	SDD J3-20	Corresponding PI	(FY18) 1.1

Performance Measure Details

Objective	Correct System Priority 3 Restrictions or deficiencies in a timely manner; ensuring fire system operability and compliance with facility fire and life safety codes
------------------	---

Measure	Priority 3 System Restrictions or deficiencies
----------------	--

Calculation methodology	Number of Priority 3 System Restrictions or deficiencies at month end
--------------------------------	---

Target	≤45 total System Restrictions Priority 3 (SR-3) at the end of each month
---------------	--

MSA stoplight levels	Green: ≤45, Yellow: 46-65, Red: >65
-----------------------------	-------------------------------------

Bounding conditions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delays due to customer access restrictions, facility conditions, prerequisite work outside of FSM control, or facility personnel are unable to support will not be counted • Lockout/tagout by Other Hanford Contractors will not be counted • Delays due to weather conditions will not be counted <p>Does not include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintenance of fire sprinkler and fire alarm systems in PNNL and other non-Hanford contractor's facilities. • Maintenance of fire sprinkler and fire alarm systems at PFP facilities. • Maintenance of fire protection equipment and building features such as fire barriers, fire dampers, emergency lights, fire extinguishers, etc. • ITM or corrective maintenance activities added based on implementation of the new ITM Site Standard
----------------------------	---

Reporting

Frequency	Period	Internal MSA date of submission
Monthly	Calendar month	Within 10 business days of the end of the previous calendar month

FY18 Performance Measure					
PM J38: Fleet Services – Heavy Equipment (Cranes, Excavators, General Purpose)					
Service area	Fleet Services				
Corresponding J-3	38	Corresponding SDD	SDD J3-38	Corresponding PI	(FY18) 1.1

Performance Measure Details

Objective	Maximize equipment availability
------------------	---------------------------------

Measure	<p>In-service times for three categories:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cranes • Excavators • General purpose (e.g., road maintenance equipment, augers/drills, graders, plows, bucket lifts, portable pumps, smoke ejectors, sanders, rubber tired tractors, crawler tractors, vibrating compactors, welders, farm machinery, boats and boat engines, etc.). <p>The clock is started and stopped by a computer-generated time stamp on the work document which is triggered by a “start” and “complete” radial button.</p>
----------------	---

Calculation methodology	Percentage of (total hours - hours down time) ÷ total hours collected by month and averaged over the year for each category
--------------------------------	---

Target	<p>Percent in-service:</p> <p>Cranes – ≥70%</p> <p>Excavators – ≥90%</p> <p>General purpose – ≥90%</p>
---------------	--

MSA stoplight levels	<p>Cranes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ≥70% – Green • 69-65% – Yellow • <65% – Red <p>Excavators</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ≥90% – Green • 89-85% – Yellow • <85% – Red <p>General Purpose</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ≥90% – Green • 89-85% – Yellow • <85% – Red
-----------------------------	---

Bounding conditions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Critical equipment only as defined above. • Delays due to customer not meeting appointments will not be counted. • Delays waiting for manufacturer, customer or vendor instructions will not be counted. • 24-hour clock seven days a week.
----------------------------	--

Reporting

Frequency	Period	Internal MSA date of submission
Monthly	Calendar month	Within 10 business days of the end of the previous calendar month

FY18 Performance Measure					
PM J38: Fleet Services – Light Equipment (Hanford Patrol, Hanford Fire, Special Purpose Trucks)					
Service area	Fleet Services				
Corresponding J-3	38	Corresponding SDD	SDD J3-38	Corresponding PI	(FY18) 1.1

Performance Measure Details

Objective	Maximize equipment availability
------------------	---------------------------------

Measure	<p>In-service times for three categories of light vehicles:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hanford Patrol (e.g., security sedans, vans, SUVs and 4WD trucks/vehicles). • Hanford Fire (e.g., ladder and aerial trucks, brush trucks, water tenders, ambulances). • Special purpose trucks (e.g., sedans, buses, 2&4WD pickups, vans, scooters, SUVs). <p>The clock is started and stopped by a computer-generated time stamp on the work document which is triggered by a “start” and “complete” radial button.</p>
----------------	--

Calculation methodology	Percentage of (total hours - hours down time) ÷ total hours collected by month and averaged over the year for each category.
--------------------------------	--

Target	<p>Percent in-service:</p> <p>Hanford Patrol – 90%</p> <p>Hanford Fire – 85%</p> <p>Special purpose trucks – 90%</p>
---------------	--

MSA stoplight levels	<p>Hanford Patrol</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ≥90% – Green • 89-85% – Yellow • <85% – Red <p>Hanford Fire</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ≥85% – Green • 84-80% – Yellow • <80% – Red <p>Special purpose trucks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ≥90% – Green • 89-85% – Yellow • <85% – Red
-----------------------------	--

Bounding conditions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Critical equipment only as defined above. • Delays due to customer not meeting appointments will not be counted. • Delays due to manufacturer, customer, or vendor instructions will not be counted. • 24-hour clock seven-days a week.
----------------------------	--

Reporting

Frequency	Period	Internal MSA date of submission
Monthly	Calendar month	Within 10 business days of the end of the previous calendar month

FY18 Performance Measure					
PM J14-1: Cyber Security – System Patching					
Service area	Cyber Security				
Corresponding J-3	14	Corresponding SDD	SDD J3-14	Corresponding PI	(FY18) 1.1

Performance Measure Details

Objective	Ensure system stability, integrity, and security by deploying software patches in a timely manner to support system users.
------------------	--

Measure	Days to deploy patch
----------------	----------------------

Calculation methodology	Number of on-time patches deployed ÷ total number of patches received
--------------------------------	---

Target	% 14-business-day turnaround time (desktops)/14-business-day turnaround time (databases/servers)
---------------	--

MSA stoplight levels	Green: ≥97%, Yellow: 96-94%, Red: <94%
-----------------------------	--

Bounding conditions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Turnaround time clock begins as soon as patch is received from software vendor. • Includes the standard Microsoft operating system on desktops, thin clients and servers as maintained by the desktop/server image, Linux servers, and all managed Oracle and Microsoft SQL databases running the site-supported standard and enterprise versions of Oracle and SQL and maintained within the two Hanford data centers. • Only includes security-related patches as identified by software vendor and rated high or critical. • Excludes enclaves and HPMC along with Androids, Apple iOS, Blackberry and other non-Windows devices as well as SQL Express, CE, etc. • The desktop patch is considered complete once available for deployment via SysPatch or included as part of the recompose of the production thin client pool. • Approved customer-requested delays, systems with a risk assessment in place, and/or patches that do not pass test plans and have email concurrence of the MSA ISSM or delegate are exempt from this PM.
----------------------------	--

Reporting

Frequency	Period	Internal MSA date of submission
Monthly	Calendar month	Within 10 business days of the end of the previous calendar month

FY18 Performance Measure					
PM J32-3: Dosimetry – External Services					
Service area	Dosimetry Services				
Corresponding J-3	32	Corresponding SDD	SDD J3-32	Corresponding PI	(FY18) 1.1

Performance Measure Details	
Objective	Provide timely dosimetry response to external customers
Measure	Days to completion
Calculation methodology	Total on-time requests ÷ total number of requests
Target	≥95% 10-business-day turnaround time (routine exchanges)/30-business-day turnaround time (annual exchanges)
MSA stoplight levels	Green: ≥95%, Yellow: 94-90%, Red: <90%
Bounding conditions	None

Reporting		
Frequency	Period	Internal MSA date of submission
Monthly	Calendar month	Within 10 business days of the end of the previous calendar month

FY18 Performance Measure					
PM J32-1: Radiological Instrumentation Calibration					
Service area	Radiological Instrumentation				
Corresponding J-3	32	Corresponding SDD	SDD J3-32	Corresponding PI	(FY18) 1.1

Performance Measure Details

Objective	Provide radiological instrumentation calibration in support of the cleanup mission.
------------------	---

Measure	Number of on-time requests completed
----------------	--------------------------------------

Calculation methodology	Number of on-time requests completed ÷ total number of requests
--------------------------------	---

Target	≥90% 10-day turnaround time
---------------	-----------------------------

MSA stoplight levels	Green: ≥90%, Yellow: 89-85%, Red: <85%
-----------------------------	--

Bounding conditions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Turnaround time requirements are for routine calibrations and will not include special requests, modifications to instrumentations, and validations of new instrument requests. • Radiological Site Services has certain capacity for calibrations according to current labor resources. A significant increase of demand by the client (e.g., a large influx of equipment in a limited amount of time) will not be considered to be normal workload conditions and will not be included in the on time delivery calculation.
----------------------------	--

Reporting

Frequency	Period	Internal MSA date of submission
Monthly	Calendar month	Within 10 business days of the end of the previous calendar month

FY18 Performance Measure					
K Basin Sludge Support – Loaned Labor					
Service area	Loaned Labor				
Corresponding J-3	J3-36	Corresponding SDD	SDD J3-36	Corresponding PI	(FY18) 1.1

Performance Measure Details

Objective	Demonstrate that target levels were met for dedicated loaned labor requests in support of K basin sludge milestones
------------------	---

Measure	Number of loaned labor requests fulfilled
----------------	---

Calculation methodology	Total requests filled ÷ total requests
--------------------------------	--

Target	≥85% fulfillment of loaned labor requests
---------------	---

MSA stoplight levels	Green: ≥85%, Yellow: 84-80%, Red: <80%
-----------------------------	--

Bounding conditions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work Control establishes weekly schedule based on customer needs and priorities. • Work cancelled by the customer after the schedule is published. • Delays due to customer access restrictions, or facility conditions, or facility personnel are unable to support. • Lockout/Tagout by Other Hanford Contractors will not be counted. • Delays due to weather conditions will not be counted.
----------------------------	--

Reporting

Frequency	Period	Internal MSA date of submission
Monthly	Calendar month	Within 10 business days of the end of the previous calendar month