

Award Fee Determination Scorecard Format

Contractor: Portage Inc.

Contract: Department of Energy Moab Uranium Mill Tailings Remedial Action Contract

Contract Number: DE-EM0000842 / DE-DT0002936

Award Period: 11/04/2011 – 09/30/2016

Basis of Evaluation: Performance and Evaluation Plan (PEMP) for Period: 10-01-2014 – 09-30-2015

Award Fee Available: \$1,494,810 **Award Fee Earned:** \$1,255,640

Award Fee Adjectival Ratings:

Project Management – 17.8/25.0 – Good

Tailings Excavation, Haul, and Disposal – 23.2/25.0 – Excellent

Health and Safety – 18.5/25.0 – Very Good

Overall Weighted Result – Very Good 21.3/25.0 rounded to 21/25

The Contractor met the majority of performance goals and objectives for the period.

Significant Achievements: None

Significant Deficiencies: None

1. Project Management –

• **Earned value performance:**

- Cost performance index (CPI) = 1.00
- Schedule Performance index (SPI) = 1.00

• **Effective baseline control management:**

- A strength was Portage made substantial effort and progress to returning to full production following the rock slide in November 2014

• **Management of Emerging Issues:**

- A strength was Portage's prompt response to the rock slide
- A strength was Portage's integration with the Technical Assistance Contractor
- A weakness was that Portage had a delay in issuing the assessment on the condition of the intermodal rail containers

• **Initiatives Resulting in Tangible Costs Savings:**

- A strength was that Portage self-identified discrepancies on a previous REA, resulting in a DOE credit
- A strength was that Portage was responsive to DOE request for cost proposals

- **Quantity and Compliance**

- A strength was that Portage supported major assessments, surveillances, and walkthroughs
- A strength was that Portage generated eleven lessons learned reports which was 4 times more than what were generated in the previous period
- A strength was that Portage ensured DOE personnel and pertinent workers were involved in critiques and that steps were followed to analyze incidents
- A strength was that Portage closed 35 deficiencies
- A weakness was that Portage had difficulties with managing overtime in the first few months, but improved over the rating period
- A weakness was a delayed removal of the dump ramp to make room for more residual radioactive material to be placed
- A weakness was that Portage was slow to revise a container weighing procedure

- **Property Management System and Performance**

- A strength was Portage made efforts to comply with the appropriate use of GSA vehicles, including turning in vehicles from the Crescent Junction site and procuring materials for the proper care of vehicles
- A strength was that Portage developed a system to gain control of tool inventory at the Moab project

Overall Summary of Rating Category: DOE compared the number of strengths and weaknesses to the criteria of the rating plan, and determined a rating of **Good**, because while the contractor did have some weaknesses, they also exhibited many strengths, which outweighed the weaknesses.

The Award Fee Plan assigned a weight of 10% to this set of criteria. DOE assigned a numeric rating of **17.8** out of **25**.

2. Tailings Quantity Excavated, Transported, and Disposed -

- A strength was that Portage safely shipped and disposed as many tons of residual radioactive material (RRM) as reasonably possible while facing many challenges due to the rock slide. Portage made adjustments to the work activities to continue smooth operations.
- A strength was that Portage excavated, transported, and disposed of a total of 600,725 tons of RRM despite facing the many challenges and work adjustments due to the rock slide.

Overall Summary of Rating Category: The rating plan goal was 918,680 tons for **Excellent**. The contractor disposed of 600,725 tons at the Crescent Junction disposal cell. Although the goal for the rating period of “Excellent” is 918,680, the Performance Evaluation Management Plan (PEMP) and the Federal Acquisition Regulations (FAR) provide flexibility in this criterion depending on the circumstances. DOE took into consideration the rock slide, which was out of Portage’s control, and calculated the amount of tons for disposal that DOE anticipated that the contractor could dispose of at 550,868 tons. The contractor’s disposal of 600,725 tons exceeded DOE’s expectations for the excavation, transportation, and disposal of RRM despite the challenges arising from the rock slide.

The Award Fee Plan assigned a weight of 60% to this set of criteria. DOE assigned a numeric rating of **23.2** out of **25**.

3. Health and Safety –

- **Health and Safety Rates**

- A strength was that Portage had 0 OSHA recordable injuries during the rating period. They had a TRC rate = 0.0 and a DART rate = 0.0.

- **Prevention of fatalities, injuries, incidents of exposure or release and near misses –**

- A strength was that Portage had no Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) recordable injury/illnesses
- A strength was that Portage had no chemical or biological personnel exposures above the established action levels
- A strength was that Portage implemented new thermoluminescent dosimeter (TLD) for its radiation workers, enabling the ability to track radiation doses at lower values and with greater monitoring accuracy, lowering individual doses in multiple project work areas
- A strength is that Portage made diligent efforts to ensure abundant water application to tailings pile during the windy conditions
- An improvement was that Portage closed reports quicker than the previous period

- **Accurate and Timely Incident Reporting and Notifications:**

- A strength was that out of 36 incidents, 28 of them were reported within 2 hours
- A weakness that there was one reportable incident that was not submitted within 48 hours.

- **Effective Implementation of ISM program that promotes a Project Safety Culture, Team-work, and Safety Awareness.**

- A strength was that Portage encouraged employees to identify and report all safety incidents, near-miss conditions, safety concerns, and process improvement suggestions through various means, such as their supervisor or management chain, safety personnel, safety committee members, or employee comment cards.
- A strength was that Portage maintained a Safety Action Item List
- A strength was that Portage led a massive, multi-agency emergency response drill at the Moab site. All participants took away valuable emergency preparedness lessons learned.
- A strength was that the RAC had several safety culture related improvements and several work control related safety improvements.
- A strength was that Portage improved their industrial hygiene program

Overall Summary of Rating Category: DOE compared the number of strengths and weaknesses to the criteria of the rating plan, and determined a rating of **Very Good**, because while the contractor did have several weaknesses, they exhibited many strengths, which outweighed the weaknesses.

The Award Fee Plan assigned a weight of 30% to this set of criteria. DOE assigned a numerical rating of **18.5** out of **25**

4. SUMMARY OF AWARD FEE EVALUATION -

Performance Requirement	Numeric Rating	Adjective Rating	Weighted Result
1. Project Management	17.8	Good	$0.10 \times 17.8 = 1.8$
2. Tailings Quantity	23.2	Excellent	$0.60 \times 23.2 = 13.9$
3. Health & Safety	18.5	Very Good	$0.30 \times 18.5 = 5.6$
		Very Good	TOTAL = 21.3 rounded to 21/25

A 21/25 numeric score = 84% of fee earned. Calculation of Award Fee dollar amount:
 $\$1,494,810 \times 84\% = \$1,255,640$ for the period 10-01-2014 – 09-30-2015. The PEMP for this contract is available at: WWW.EMCBC.DOE.GOV