AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION/MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT

1. CONTRACT ID CODE

PAGE 1 OF PAGES 35

2. AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION NO.
0737

3. EFFECTIVE DATE
See Block 16C

4. REQUISITION/PURCHASE REQ. NO.
Not Applicable

5. PROJECT NO. *(If applicable)*

6. ISSUED BY CODE 893039

Richlands Operations Office
U.S. Department of Energy
Richland Operations Office
P.O. Box 550, MSIN H5-20
Richland WA 99352

7. ADMINISTERED BY *(If other than Item 6)* CODE 00601

Richland Operations Office
U.S. Department of Energy
Richland Operations Office
P.O. Box 550, MSIN H5-20
Richland WA 99352

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

CODE 010605464 FACILITY CODE

(x) 9A. AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION NO.

9B. DATED *(SEE ITEM 11)*

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).
	C. THIS SUPPLEMENTAL AGREEMENT IS ENTERED INTO PURSUANT TO AUTHORITY OF:
X	D. OTHER *(Specify type of modification and authority)* B.7 Fee Structure

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

14. DESCRIPTION OF AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION *(Organized by UCF section headings, including solicitation/contract subject matter where feasible.)*

In accordance with Clause B.7(c) Fee Structure, this modification adds Attachment J-4-j Fiscal Year 2019 Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan to Section J.

Attachments:
Attachment 1 - Section J Table of Contents
Attachment 2 - Section J-4-j Fiscal Year 2019 Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan

This modification does not add additional obligated funds to the contract as the work is incrementally funded. 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).
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)*

16A. NAME AND TITLE OF CONTRACTING OFFICER *(Type or print)*
Timothy E. Corbett

15B. CONTRACTOR/OFFEROR
(Signature of person authorized to sign)

15C. DATE SIGNED

16B. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
(Signature of Contracting Officer)

16C. DATE SIGNED
9/20/2018

NAME OF OFFEROR OR CONTRACTOR
MISSION SUPPORT ALLIANCE, LLC

ITEM NO. (A)	SUPPLIES/SERVICES (B)	QUANTITY (C)	UNIT (D)	UNIT PRICE (E)	AMOUNT (F)
	There are no other changes to the terms and conditions of the contract. Payment: Period of Performance: 05/26/2009 to 05/25/2019				

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	728	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 EVAULATION & MEASUREMENT PLAN	466	11
g	FY 2016 PERFORMANCE EVAULATION & MEASUREMENT PLAN	482	9
h	FY 2017 PERFORMANCE EVAULATION & MEASUREMENT PLAN	672	9
i	FY 2018 PERFORMANCE EVAULATION & MEASUREMENT PLAN	710	30
j	FY 2019 PERFORMANCE EVALUATION & MEASUREMENT PLAN	737	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	716	10
J-10.	WAGE DETERMINATIONS – SERVICE CONTRACT ACT, DAVIS-BACON ACT, AND COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AGREEMENTS	735	35
J-11.	CONTRACT DELIVERABLES	671	22

J-12.	GOVERNMENT FURNISHED SERVICES AND INFORMATION	134	4
J-13.	HANFORD SITE STRUCTURES LIST	729	19
J-14.	HANFORD WASTE SITE ASSIGNMENT LIST	729	61
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



TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION **3**
2. ALLOCATION OF AVAILABLE FEE **3**
3. RATINGS **3**
4. FEE CALCULATION METHODOLOGY **5**
5. PERFORMANCE OUTCOMES **5**
PERFORMANCE OUTCOME 1.0 ..... **5**
COMPLETION CRITERION 1.1 5
COMPLETION CRITERION 1.2 8
COMPLETION CRITERION 1.3 9
PERFORMANCE OUTCOME 2.0 ..... **10**
COMPLETION CRITERION 2.1 10
COMPLETION CRITERION 2.2 10
PERFORMANCE OUTCOME 3.0 ..... **11**
APPENDIX A IN SUPPORT OF COMPLETION CRITERIA 1.1 ..... **12**
PM J34-1: Biological Controls – Pest Removal 13
PM J34-1: Biological Controls – Tumbleweed Removal 14
Contractor Assurance System – Assessments 16
Contractor Assurance System – Causal Analyses 17
Contractor Assurance System – Issue Resolution 18
PM J35-1: Crane and Crew Support 19
PM J36-1: Facilities Maintenance 20
PM J20-1: Fire Protection System Maintenance 21
PM J20-2: Fire Protection System Maintenance 22
PM J20-3: Fire Protection System Maintenance 23
PM J20-4: Fire Protection System Maintenance 24
PM J38: Fleet Services – Heavy Equipment (Cranes, Excavators, General Purpose) 25
PM J38: Fleet Services – Light Equipment (Hanford Patrol, Hanford Fire, Special Purpose Trucks) 26
PM J14-1: Cyber Security – System Patching 27
PM J32-3: Dosimetry – External Services 28
PM J32-1: Radiological Instrumentation Calibration 29

TABLES

Table 3.1, Performance Outcome Ratings and Definitions 4
Table 4.1, Fee Calculation Methodology 5
Table 5.1, FY19 Performance Outcomes 5

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 2019 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 2019 budget levels. These criteria define successful performance in terms of measurable deliverables and associated constraints (measurable ranges/delivery dates). Please note that for FY19 Completion Criterion 1.1 and 2.1, MSA will report performance information through April 20, 2019.

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: ($14,404,401.00 X 60% = $8,642,640.60)				**60%**
3.0: Comprehensive Performance		3.1	Subjective outcome.	40%
Target Subjective Performance Outcome Fee Allocation: ($14,404,401.00 X 40% = $5,761,760.40)				**40%**

5. PERFORMANCE OUTCOMES

Table 5.1, FY19 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**	35%
				Due Date	5/25/19
Measure	See performance measures below (See Appendix A for details)	**Performance Level**	See below	**Fee Range**	See below
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 contract 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	≤ 18 >18	91-100% 0-90%
Fire Systems – Priority 3 System Restrictions	Number of System Restrictions or at month end	≤ 40 >40	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%

Title	Measure	Target/ Performance Level	Fee Range
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%

COMPLETION CRITERION 1.2					
Demonstrate effective management of electric, water and sewer utilities to maximize reliability and redundancy. • The success criteria for water utilities is: o Maintain Raw Water Pressure at 110 – 130 PSI o Maintain Potable Water pressure at approved ICD level o Perform Preventative maintenance at 90% or better each month o Maintain backlog corrective maintenance average age of open work packages to 300 days or less. o Ensure all water quality samples are completed on time o Quarterly System Health report by Engineering submitted one calendar month after each quarter • The success criteria for Sewer utilities is: o Perform Preventative maintenance at 90% or better each month o Maintain backlog corrective maintenance average age of open work packages to 300 days or less. o Quarterly System Health report by Engineering submitted one calendar month after each quarter • The success criteria for Electrical: o Electrical power availability- minimize the number of unplanned power outages of important transformers to no more than 50 o Perform Preventative maintenance at 90% or better each month o Reduce corrective maintenance backlog as of October 1, 2018 by 20% no later than May 1, 2019. o Quarterly System Health report by Engineering submitted one calendar month after each quarter				**Fee** **Due Date**	10% 5/25/19
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					
Demonstrate effective development and management of reliability projects that assure mission milestones and regulatory commitments are met. • L-894, Raw Water Cross Connections - Complete construction of the cross tie line. • L-897, Central Plateau Water Treatment Facility (DFLAW Essential) - Complete 90% of design. • L-850, Replace 200W 1.1M-gal PW tank (DFLAW Essential) - Complete 100% of design. • L-791, RFL Transfer Trip - Complete design and installation of fiber optic cable from fox box 6FX2 on Pole E2476 to the A6 substation. DOE will focus its review of completion of these project activities to ensure that they demonstrate the following: • 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 Dates	4/8/19 4/30/19 3/01/19 4/30/19
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	5/25/19
Measure	Cumulative year-to-date percent composite over/under liquidation rates of usage-based services pools (calculated in the following manner: ∑ (Direct Labor Adders' and Usage Based Services' Year-to-Date over/under Liquidations) / ∑ (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. • 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 FY19 Operational Excellence events will be focused on cross-cutting inter-contractor Site Integration opportunities. • Full implementation of the MSA Assurance system to cover Operations, Financial, Maintenance, Work Management, Emergency Management, Safety and Environmental. • Conduct monthly performance reviews using the Mission Assurance System demonstrating achievement of MSA's service levels, key milestones and regulatory commitments using a fully Implemented system. • Prepare Transition Plan for contract turnover, due 2/28/19. • Prepare Closeout Plan for MSC closeout, due 4/1/19. Support activities associated with Contract Closeout (subcontracts, incurred cost submissions/audits, accounting reconciliations, etc.).				**Fee**	5%
				Due Date	5/25/19 5/25/19 5/25/19 5/25/19 2/2819 4/1/19
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		

- 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.

Mission Support Contract

APPENDIX A IN SUPPORT OF COMPLETION CRITERIA 1.1



FY19 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**	(FY19) 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	• 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

FY19 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**	(FY19) 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	• 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

FY19 Performance Measure					
PM J34-1: Biological Controls – Vegetation					
Service area	Biological Controls (Vegetation)				
Corresponding J-3	34	**Corresponding SDD**	SDD J3-34	**Corresponding PI**	(FY19) 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	• 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

FY19 Performance Measure					
Contractor Assurance System – Assessments					
Service area	Contractor Assurance System – Assessments				
Corresponding J-3	N/A	**Corresponding SDD**	N/A	**Corresponding PI**	(FY19) 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 5/25/19

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

FY19 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**	(FY19) 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

FY19 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**	(FY19) 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

FY19 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**	(FY19) 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	• 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

FY19 Performance Measure					
PM J36-1: Facilities Maintenance					
Service area	Facility Maintenance				
Corresponding J-3	36	**Corresponding SDD**	SDD J3-36	**Corresponding PI**	(FY19) 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	• 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

FY19 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**	(FY19) 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

FY19 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**	(FY19) 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	• Green: <3, Yellow: 4 to 8, Red: >8

Bounding conditions	• 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. **Does not include:** • 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.

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

FY19 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**	(FY19) 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	< 18 total System Restrictions Priority 2 (P-2) at the end of each month

MSA stoplight levels	Green: <18 , Yellow: 19 to 25, Red: >25

Bounding conditions	• 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 **Does not include:** • 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.

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

FY19 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**	(FY19) 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	≤40 total System Restrictions Priority 3 (P-3) at the end of each month

MSA stoplight levels	Green: ≤40 , Yellow: 41-55 Red: >55

Bounding conditions	• 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 **Does not include:** • 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.

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

FY19 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**	(FY19) 1.1

Performance Measure Details	
Objective	Maximize equipment availability
Measure	In-service times for three categories: • 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.). 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.
Calculation methodology	Percentage of (total hours - hours down time) ÷ total hours collected by month and averaged over the contract period for each category
Target	Percent in-service: Cranes – ≥70% Excavators – ≥90% General purpose – ≥90%
MSA stoplight levels	Cranes • ≥70% – Green • 69-65% – Yellow • <65% – Red Excavators • ≥90% – Green • 89-85% – Yellow • <85% – Red General Purpose • ≥90% – Green • 89-85% – Yellow • <85% – Red
Bounding conditions	• 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

FY19 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**	(FY19) 1.1

Performance Measure Details	
Objective	Maximize equipment availability

Measure	In-service times for three categories of light vehicles: • 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). 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.

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

Target	Percent in-service: Hanford Patrol – 90% Hanford Fire – 85% Special purpose trucks – 90%
MSA stoplight levels	Hanford Patrol • ≥90% – Green • 89-85% – Yellow • <85% – Red Hanford Fire • ≥85% – Green • 84-80% – Yellow • <80% – Red Special purpose trucks • ≥90% – Green • 89-85% – Yellow • <85% – Red
Bounding conditions	• 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

FY19 Performance Measure					
PM J14-1: Cyber Security – System Patching					
Service area	Cyber Security				
Corresponding J-3	14	**Corresponding SDD**	SDD J3-14	**Corresponding PI**	(FY19) 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	• 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

FY19 Performance Measure					
PM J32-3: Dosimetry – External Services					
Service area	Dosimetry Services				
Corresponding J-3	32	**Corresponding SDD**	SDD J3-32	**Corresponding PI**	(FY19) 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

FY19 Performance Measure					
PM J32-1: Radiological Instrumentation Calibration					
Service area	Radiological Instrumentation				
Corresponding J-3	32	**Corresponding SDD**	SDD J3-32	**Corresponding PI**	(FY19) 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	• 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