

Award Fee Determination Scorecard

Contractor: Washington River Protection Solutions, LLC

Contract: Tank Operations Contract

Contract Number: DE-AC27-08RV14800

Award Fee Period: October 1, 2015 to September 30, 2016

Basis of Evaluation: FY 2016 Award Fee, Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan

Award Fee Available: \$12,471,000

Award Fee Earned: \$9,638,450 (77%)

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

Functional Element	Adjectival Rating*
SEA 1: Management of Single-Shell (SST) and Double-Shell Tank (DST) System	Good
SEA 2: Performance of Tank Farms Project Operations – Conduct of Operations	Very Good
SEA 3: Cost and Management Performance	Very Good
SEA 4: Quality Assurance Program	Very Good
SEA 5: Nuclear Safety	Excellent
SEA 6: Environmental Regulatory Management	Very Good
SEA 7: Safety Program Implementation	Very Good
SEA 8: Support for DFLAW and WTP Commissioning	Excellent
Overall	Very Good

*Adjectival Rating Scale: Unsatisfactory (0); Satisfactory (1-50); Good (51 to 75); Very Good (76 to 90); Excellent (91 to 100).

Key Positives: WRPS met or exceeded most of the award-fee performance criteria and, excluding the impact of litigation and vapors issues, has met the overall cost, schedule, and technical performance requirements of the contract given that caveat. WRPS delivered a significant level of work (an average \$49M per month) with a notable number of specific achievements including processing more than 4 million gallons of waste water at the Effluent Treatment Facility (ETF), retrieving tank AY-102 to the limits of standard sluicing technology, and installing four extended-reach sluicer systems in tank AY-102 to support the next phase of retrieval

Key Areas for Improvement: WRPS performed adequately through a turbulent year, but there were times when substantial ORP guidance and involvement were needed. In the area of vapors, communications were not adequate to proactively sustain trust throughout the workforce. In addition, WRPS' communication to the workforce did not adequately cover past evaluations and decisions related to vapors and potential engineering controls or other solutions. This resulted in undue tension and frustration within the workforce.