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1.0 PURPOSE

This guidance document describes the technical planning processes implemented by Mission Support Alliance LLC (MSA) and its key stakeholders to support Hanford programs management and budget formulation. It describes the hierarchy and interface of key planning and program documents to show the flow of information leading to an annual budget request aligned with Hanford program objectives and end states. It specifically describes:

- Planning horizons and planning levels
- Planning document integration and how key planning documents correlate with each other
- How and when planning documents receive data

This guide also describes the relationships between MSA’s internal planning documents and the reports developed for external stakeholders, including the Hanford Site Cleanup Completion Framework, Life Cycle Scope, Schedule and Cost Report (LCR), successor to the Ten Year Site Plan (TYSP) Report, and Hanford Site Sustainability Plan (H-SSP) Report.

In 2016, DOE-RL and MSA developed a summary of reports called the Business Rhythms list to outline the purpose and timing of each report.

2.0 SCOPE

This Level 1 Guidance Document applies to the development of key MSA planning deliverables, including the Infrastructure and Services Alignment Plan (ISAP), System/Facility Master Plans, Reliability Project Investment Portfolio (RPIP), and Forecast of Services. It is to be used by MSA and MSA subcontractors in supporting their responsibilities in the development of the Integrated Investment Portfolio (IIP) per MSC-PRO-PC-48223, Integrated Investment Portfolio and Out-Year Planning Data Process.

Refer to the Mission Support Contract Table J-11.1 for Deliverables List from Section C Statement of Work (SOW) for the list of all deliverable reports and frequency of required submittals.

3.0 IMPLEMENTATION

This guidance document is effective upon publication.
4.0 REQUIREMENTS

NOTE: For the tables in this section under the requirement "type" column, “V” means verbatim and “I” means interpreted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Based on the DOE scope direction, develop an execution year IIP, conforming to execution year funding levels against which future adjustments in scope or funding may be evaluated for impacts and creating a basis for documenting elements of contract scope that have been differently time-phased or eliminated or otherwise adjusted in the PMB as a result of these impacts.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>MSC Section C.3.1.2.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.0 PROCESS

5.1 Planning Roles and Responsibilities

5.1.1 Executive Branch & Congressional Branch Planning
At the highest level of planning, the Executive Branch of the administration sets priorities. The Secretary of Energy managing the Department of Energy Headquarters (DOE-HQ) prepares a strategic plan periodically updated for managing 30 major properties nationwide, including the Hanford program site. Within the department, Environmental Management (DOE-EM) has oversight of 5 program sites, including the Hanford site. Congress reviews and approves budgets to implement the strategy of the administration subject to all applicable laws and regulations including roles by the Appropriations Committee and Office of Management and Budget.

5.1.2 Department of Energy Planning – Cleanup Mission
The Department of Energy-Richland Operations Office (DOE-RL) and Department of Energy-Office of River Protection (DOE-ORP) are two major counterpart work groups that share overall Hanford program responsibility. The two agencies prepare and update strategic cleanup strategy priorities found primarily in plan vision level documents. The primary vision level planning documents include the River Protection Project System Plan, Hanford Site Cleanup Completion Framework and the Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP), plus CERCLA cleanup requirements formally acknowledged with the latest amended version of the Tri-Party Agreement of 1989. The vision documents by DOE-RL and DOE-ORP plus CERCLA cleanup Record of Decision (ROD) documents are the primary drivers for the next tier of strategic planning and the ensuing tactical and budget planning described below.
Implementation of research and technology programs located at the Hanford site includes the DOE Office of Science programs, including ongoing research operations implemented by Pacific Northwest National Laboratory (PNNL) in association with Battelle. Site wide infrastructure systems and services operated by DOE-RL and planning implemented by MSA also support several of the PNNL research facilities, primarily in the 300 Area of the site.

5.1.3 Department of Energy and Department of Interior – Manhattan Project National Historic Park Mission (MPNHP)

In December 2014, the President signed into law the Manhattan Project National Historical Park Act, which directs the Department of Energy (DOE) and the National Park Service (NPS) to work together to establish a new co-managed National Park in the three original Manhattan Project locations – Oak Ridge, Tennessee; Los Alamos, New Mexico; and the Hanford Site in Washington State. The park was established December 19, 2014.

With the coming of the National Park, DOE will need to reevaluate its long term strategy for roads and other affected systems, including utilities, communications, and emergency services, to ensure the safety of public access to the historical facilities in the Park. As one example, decisions about which roads are needed, and the condition in which the roads should be kept for the National Park.

An initial boundary map indicating which eligible facilities will eventually be in the Park was established by December 2015, along with a Memorandum of Agreement outlining roles and responsibilities for DOE and NPS. The law directs DOE to expand public access to Park facilities and to undertake historic preservation and maintenance work to ensure the longevity of the historic facilities. DOE welcomes and embraces this new mission for the Hanford Site, and is already working closely with NPS to prioritize preservation work and evaluate options for public access to proposed Park facilities.

5.1.4 Department of Energy – Science, Research and Technology Mission

Implementation of research and technology programs located at the Hanford Site includes the DOE Office of Science programs, including ongoing research operations implemented by Pacific Northwest National Laboratory (PNNL) managed by Battelle. Site wide infrastructure systems and services operated by DOE-RL and planning implemented by MSA also support several PNNL research facilities, primarily in the 300 Area of the site.

5.1.5 Mission Support Planning

MSA has the primary responsibility in conjunction with DOE-RL, DOE-ORP and Other Hanford Contractors (OHCs) to conduct planning to support and implement the Hanford vision level documents. The planning process results in 1) plans that provide the basis for delivery of services for safe and reliable infrastructure; 2) the framework for projects
and operations execution; and 3) the basis for budget development. The key planning documents prepared and maintained by MSA include:

- Hanford Life Cycle Scope, Schedule and Cost Report (LCR)
- Infrastructure and Services Alignment Plan (ISAP)
- Reliability Project Investment Portfolio (RPIP)
- System Master plans
- Annual business plans (Example: HAMMER)
- Annual facility plans (Example: HAMMER until FY2013)
- Compliance reports including Hanford Site Sustainability Plan (H-SSP) annual report
- Annual Forecast of Services (AFS) report

### 5.1.6 Other Hanford Contractor Planning

Other Hanford Contractors (OHCs) conduct annual planning in support of the DOE vision documents and cleanup priorities. The OHC planning activity outputs are reflected in contracts, the AFS, service level agreements, and interface control documents. Key contractors that influence MSA’s planning are:

- Bechtel National, Inc. (BNI)
- CH2M Hill Plateau Remediation Company (CHPRC)
- Pacific Northwest National Laboratory (PNNL)
- Washington Closure Hanford (WCH), thru the end of FY 2016
- Washington River Protection Solutions (WRPS)
- One System Technical group

### 5.1.7 Other Agency Planning

In addition to planning the cleanup mission, MPNHP, and mission support, several other agencies or entities influence planning for portions of the Hanford site, including the following agencies with planning roles and/or facilities on the Hanford Site:

- Tri City Development Council, the redevelopment agency designated for land reuse
- United State Fish & Wildlife Service, with land management oversight role
- Washington Department of Natural Resources, with regulatory oversight roles of aggregates and ground water
- Washington Fish & Wildlife Department, with regulatory oversight of fish and wildlife habitat
- Washington Department of Ecology, with regulatory oversight of Dangerous Waste, Model Toxic Clean-Up Act, plus natural systems including surface and ground water
5.2 **MSA Planning Hierarchy**

The MSA planning process encompasses multi-tiered documents that are linked and related in scale, time, duration, and planning horizon. The various documents have primary roles that can be separated into two categories, 1) external communications and reporting; and 2) internally utilized planning documents. The documents are comprised of high level vision documents that define Hanford mission end states (e.g., CLUP, Cleanup Framework, Record of Decision, etc.); strategic level documents that integrate, aligns, and identifies gaps between the high level vision documents and the required end states and attributes of various systems, along with identifying the strategic steps to achieving those end states (e.g., ISAP); and tactical level documents that lay out implementation of the strategies (e.g., System Master Plans, Program Plans, and Annual Forecast of Services). The tactical documents, in conjunction with ISAP, become key input drivers for MSA’s annual execution year IIP and out year budget formulation.
As shown below, the planning level detail increases as you move from the largest scale of planning focus downward to mission support strategic plans, to area wide plans, to system master plans and finally to the limited focus at the project level where the granular planning detail is the greatest.
The hierarchy of the MSA planning documents and reports, and the information flow between them is graphically represented below. Vision and strategic level documents are coded BLUE while tactical level documents are coded GREEN. Budget documents are coded in PURPLE.

Mission Support Planning Hierarchy Summary
5.3 **Planning Chronology**

As the Strategic and tactical planning documents are critical to the development of the MSA annual budget formulation (Integrated Priority List), they are also linked in time. Alignment between planning and annual budget is cyclic and has three main phases throughout the year. This is represented graphically below and an overview description of the activities in each phase (Trimester) is presented below.

5.3.1 **October to January (1st Phase)**

The first phase is characterized by data collection for several key planning documents. Meetings are conducted among the ISAP Program Team, DOE-RL Infrastructure and Services Division (ISD) staff, and MSA infrastructure system managers to support the update of system attributes and end states. These data collection meetings serve the dual purpose of supporting ISDs Fall Planning Workshops and initiating the first phase of the annual ISAP process. Additional meetings are conducted between MSA and the OHCs to gather updated infrastructure requirements for the various cleanup projects. Data collection in the first trimester also supports the update of the tactical system and facility master plans.

External planning documents are also in various stages of completion. The current calendar year LCR is prepared in November and December while draft of the H-SSP has begun. The data collection for the H-SSP has potential synergy with the ISAP data collection, master plans, and ISD workshops.
Utilizing the approved execution year IIP, in conjunction with the ISAP and tactical planning documents, MSA also supports DOE-RL in the out year budget formulation. Similar to the development of the execution year IIP, this is an iterative process where out year priorities are adjusted to meet budget planning targets.

5.3.2 February to April (2nd Phase)
The second phase is focused on data synthesis, gap analyses, and project identification. Data is integrated from multiple sources including the system Subject Matter Experts (SMEs), system managers, OHCs, and the H-SSP. Data integration leads to updated system attributes and end states at different planning horizons. These efforts, support gap analyses as compared against current system conditions and configuration. The results of the gap analyses are compared against the previous planning documents (i.e., ISAP, master plans) to determine what revisions may be required and what new projects may need to be defined to achieve the revised attributes and end states. Spring ISD workshops provide a forum for reviewing the gap analyses and prioritizing the system needs for updates to the master plans and the ISAP. As new projects are prioritized, the RPIP is drafted to integrate them with the capital projects and procurements across all the infrastructure systems.

DOE-RL issues preliminary budget guidance in April that provides budget targets, planning assumptions and priorities that will work in concert with the drafting of the ISAP, master plans, and RPIP. The early guidance also allows MSA to collaborate with the OHCs on data collection for the AFS and development of preliminary labor rates. DOE-RL also completes the Fiscal Year plus out year budget formulation and submits to DOE Headquarters.

In addition, the H-SSP is finalized and submitted by the end of April.

5.3.3 May to September (3rd Phase)
The third phase focuses on planning completion and documentation of the ISAP annual update, RPIP, and master plans. During this phase DOE-RL issues their final Contract and Budget Alignment Guidance (CBAG) for the upcoming fiscal year in support of development of the IIP. MSA, in collaboration with DOE, finalizes infrastructure system priorities and completes the applicable master plans and the RPIP. The tactical documents, in conjunction with the strategies outlined in the revised ISAP annual update, are critical in supporting the development, negotiation, and approval of MSA’s IIP during the months of July and August.

With planning occurring in parallel at the OHCs, MSA collects final service level needs from the OHCs for the upcoming fiscal year and publishes the AFS. This supports the final MSA labor rates for usage based services that can be used by the OHCs in completing their IIPs.
In addition, the H-SSP is usually published in May or June and the next calendar year LCR is prepared between June and August.

A more detailed calendar of annual planning activities is shown in Attachment 1.

5.4 Setting The Vision

Both DOE-RL and DOE-ORP conduct routine planning to define Hanford program end states and priorities. This planning results in high level vision documents such as the RL Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP) and the River Protection Project System Plan that are used by MSA and other stakeholders. The vision documents provide planning horizons from rolling 5 years to 50 years ahead. Vision documents are the foundation of MSA’s strategic planning to support Hanford mission objectives.

DOE-RL currently uses Vision 2028 plus annual Key Performance Goals (KPG) to track progress toward mission vision goals.

5.5 Strategic Planning – ISAP

The ISAP program is a collaborative, interactive and structured planning process and resulting document that the strategic blueprint for infrastructure systems and services needs of the OHCs based on the high level vision documents and the required end states and attributes of various systems at specific planning horizons.

In 2014, WRPS and ORL developed a similar process called Infrastructure Stewardship Plan (ISP) modeled in part on ISAP and RPIP.

The ISAP process is a four phase planning process executed in conjunction with an interactive (commonly referred to as “living”) component where emerging issues and previously identified concepts or ideas are continuously brought forward with the DOE-RL, DOE-ORP and OHC stakeholders and decision makers for discussion, closure or inclusion in the future plans. These four phases are discussed below with a graphical representation on the following page.

5.5.1 Phase A, Inventory

This phase integrates DOE-RL and DOE-ORP vision statements and planning parameters, along with other Hanford contractors’ performance goals. Other requirements that influence the ISAP include Federal, State, and Tribal regulations and DOE directives. During the ISAP process, more than 130 planning feeder documents are reviewed and considered for inclusion as well as approximately 70 agreements among OHCs for services.
5.5.2 Phase B, Synthesis
During synthesis, MSA evaluates the data collected during the inventory phase. The outcomes include identification of gaps in infrastructure and services (i.e., J-3 Matrix categories) in meeting the needs of the River Protection Project and deactivation and demolition (D&D) cleanup programs for the vision document planning horizons.

5.5.3 Phase C, Conceptual
During the conceptual phase MSA conducts technical review meetings with system managers to, confirm and if necessary support the refinement of the attributes (e.g., configuration, capacity, reliability, efficiency, etc.) for 13 major systems. Activities are identified or validated to achieve the attributes and system end states and close the gaps identified during data synthesis. The activities of this phase are then tied to the defined planning horizons in the form of action steps, specific projects, and schedule milestones.

5.5.4 Phase D, Documentation and Review
This final phase completes the packaging of the ISAP strategies. Content is developed and published for key messages in hard copy and webhosted format. Reviews are completed by stakeholders before final approval.
5.6 Tactical Planning

The tactical planning documents (e.g., System Master Plans, Facility Plans, Program Plans, and Annual Forecast of Services) work in conjunction with ISAP development to provide more detail on activities and resources needed to meet goals for infrastructure and services. The tactical documents provide critical information to the annual budget formulation, showing linkage of resource needs back to attributes and end states that are required to meet the Hanford visions.

5.6.1 System and Facility Master Plans

The system and facility master plans are used to manage Hanford Site systems and facilities administered under the Mission Support Contract. The master plans contain technical details of the systems and facilities, including condition of structures and equipment that provide the bases for managing repairs, life extensions, equipment replacements, and deactivation of facilities and equipment. Outcomes include a
prioritized list of projects for each system and facilities that support defined attributes and end states. System master plans have been developed for electrical, transportation, fleet services, general purposes facilities, water, and sewer systems. Facility master plans have been developed for general purpose facilities and specialized facilities including fire stations and HAMMER training facilities.

5.6.2 Reliability Project Investment Portfolio (RPIP)
In 2015, the RPIP (formerly the IRPPL) according to MSC-PRO-PM-48665, Reliability Project Investment Portfolio Process has changed in nature from a static submittal to a dynamic data set. The RPIP comprises all of the work scope related to updating, upgrading or replacing elements of the fixed infrastructure. These DOE investments may be capital asset projects, either line item or general plant projects, or they may be maintenance activities. They may be designed and implemented by either MSA staff or subcontractors. The list is maintained continuously and reported within the ISAP and applicable master plan updates. The list forms the basis for requesting budget category RL-40 funding within the IIP. At the time of this report, the new process description document was under development.

5.6.3 Annual Forecast of Services (AFS)
In accordance with the Mission Support Contract, Section C.1.3, “Scope Summary,” MSA prepares the Annual Forecast of Services and Infrastructure for the upcoming fiscal year. The AFS is a key planning tool that MSA uses in rightsizing staffing and service levels. The AFS provides the basis for formulating MSA usage-based service fee rates. The following major usage-based services are forecast in the AFS report:

- Radiological Site Services (Calibration and Dosimetry)
- Public Safety and Resource Protection
- Crane and Rigging
- Facility, including Property and Grounds Maintenance Services
- Training
- Fleet Services
- Motor Carriers Services
- Information Technology (IT) Services
- Miscellaneous (Mail, Courier, etc.)

Throughout development of the AFS, MSA works closely with all the Hanford Site contractors to obtain their best estimate of their site wide infrastructure and support service needs for the upcoming year.

5.6.4 Program Plans
In addition to the system and facility master plans and the AFS, various program plans are developed and maintained to ensure compliance with regulatory requirements during the conduct of the various Hanford missions. These program plans, updated periodically,
define implementation activities and resources to ensure program compliance in support of the mission. Program plans are in place for the following areas:

- Long Term Stewardship
- Emergency Services including Fire, Patrol, and Emergency Management
- Biological Resources Management
- Land Use Management
- Cultural Resources Management
- Security Management and Institutional Controls
- Content (Records) Management

These plans provide, in part, the technical bases for annual budget formulation in the associated service areas.

5.7 **Integrated Investment Portfolio – “Where the Rubber Meets the Road”**

The IIP (formally IPL) underwent a change in nature from a static submittal to a dynamic data set. MSA’s planning process ultimately leads to execution of work and application of resources to achieve planning goals. The execution phase starts with MSA’s annual funding request for those resources through the execution year IIP. The IIP, organized by MSA’s contract work breakdown structure (WBS), documents and justifies planning priorities for the next fiscal year. The IIP is developed in accordance with MSC-PRO-PC-48223, *Integrated Investment Portfolio and Out-Year Planning Data Process*, and the annual Contract and Budget Alignment Guidance (CBAG) issued by DOE-RL. The IIP is the process for budget formulation going forward in FY2016 and beyond. The CBAG provides both funding targets and planning assumptions that work in concert with MSA’s planning outcomes.

5.8 **External Planning Reports**

In conjunction with the internal planning process at MSA, several compliance reports are generated annually or periodically to inform external stakeholders of Hanford’s long range activities. The external planning reports include the Hanford Site Cleanup Completion Framework, the LCR, and the H-SSP. Data is shared between the LCR, H-SSP and the ISAP for synergy across the planning documents. More detailed descriptions of these reports and the other MSA planning documents can be found in Appendix A.
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APPENDIX A
Planning Document Descriptions
### Planning Document Descriptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report Title</th>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>Revision Cycle / Driver</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Information</th>
<th>Contributor</th>
<th>Funding Classification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hanford Site Cleanup Completion Framework</td>
<td>DOE/RL-2009-10, Revision 1</td>
<td>Periodically, when funding or program changes.</td>
<td>Comprehensive overview for completing Hanford's cleanup including transition to post-cleanup/future activities, with 8 major goals developed over the past 20 years for 3 major components – River Corridor, Central Plateau, and Tank Waste. This is a summary document with highlights of how long term Tri-Party Agreement provisions, plus CERCLA, RCRA, NEPA and other pertinent regulations will be implemented on a &quot;go-forward&quot; basis from the point of report update.</td>
<td>DOE-RL in collaboration with DOE-ORP.</td>
<td>DOE-RL &amp; DOE-ORP programs.</td>
<td>DOE-EM, all OHCs, the public.</td>
<td>Unconstrained – not a budget document.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanford Site Cleanup Vision 2015</td>
<td>DOE/RL-2015</td>
<td>Periodically, when funding or program changes.</td>
<td>Vision 2015 was Hanford's road map for finishing the cleanup activities on the 220-square-mile River Corridor portion of the Site by the year 2015, for cleanup projects that extend along the shore of the Columbia River from north of Richland to the far boundary of the Site near Highway 240 and the Vernita Bridge. The work includes cleanup of the 300 Area (the manufacturing and laboratory parts of the Site) and the 100 Area (the reactors along the river). The 2015 Vision is by Department of Energy, the Environmental Protection Agency, and the Washington Department of Ecology reflecting the shared vision to protect the Columbia River from Hanford contamination. As part of the plan, more than 335 facilities will be decommissioned, decontaminated, and demolished. More than 300 waste sites will be remediated. More than 4.6 million tons of waste and debris will be sent to Hanford's landfill, the Environmental Restoration Disposal Facility. As River Corridor projects are completed, the plan assets the work sequence will free up money that can be used toward cleaning up other places at Hanford that are not associated with the River Corridor project. When the River Corridor projects are closed out, the plan calls for workers to shift attention to the Central Plateau (200 East, West, and North Areas) for the majority of Hanford's solid waste burial grounds and underground liquid waste storage tanks.</td>
<td>DOE-ORP, DOE-RL along with EPA, WSDOE.</td>
<td>DOE-RL &amp; DOE-ORP programs.</td>
<td>DOE-EM, plus all OHCs.</td>
<td>Unconstrained – not a budget document.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Hanford Comprehensive Land Use Plan EIS (1999 with 2008 Supplement)</td>
<td>64 FR 61615, DOE/EIS-0222-F, 1997 (DOE/EIS-0222-SA-01, 2008)</td>
<td>Periodically supplemented, when program conditions change.</td>
<td>The DOE prepared in association with nine cooperating and consulting agencies the Final Hanford Comprehensive Land-Use Plan Environmental Impact Statement (HCP EIS, also referenced as CLUP in this guide) to evaluate the potential environmental impacts associated with implementing a comprehensive land-use plan for the Hanford site for at least the next 50 years. The report includes the required No-Action Alternative plus two Tribal, DOE Federal, Natural Resources Trustee Council (USFWS) and countries Alternative Programs. The CLUP includes a final land-use map, land-use definitions, land-use policies and land-use implementing priorities, based on an extensive public comment and review process.</td>
<td>USFWS, DOE, EPA &amp; State of Washington Dept. of Ecology.</td>
<td>Numerous sources, including public comments.</td>
<td>USFWS, BLM, DOE, EPA, State of Washington plus all OHCs.</td>
<td>Unconstrained – not a budget document.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure &amp; Services Alignment Plan</td>
<td>HNF-44328</td>
<td>Annual update with rolling 5 year planning horizon.</td>
<td>The site wide strategic planning report informed by technical information for 13 systems. The BAP annual update and supporting documents include the basin of need (gaps), basis of estimates, phases, and known schedule commitments seeking funding validation for individual capital expense, capital improvement, operations and other necessary expenses for MSA activities within the DOE-RL oversight.</td>
<td>MSA.</td>
<td>RPP, Master Plans, Annual Program Plans, other plans reports and studies.</td>
<td>DOE-RL, AMMS.</td>
<td>Constrained to reflect known BP annual budget limits for funding amounts, for rolling 5 year periods.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tri-Party Agreement (1989 with change package in 2010)</td>
<td>P-00-09-01</td>
<td>Periodically, when requirements or program changes occur.</td>
<td>The Tri-Party Agreement organizes how federal and state requirements including CERCLA, RCRA, NEPA, SEPA, Model Toxic Clean-Up and Hanford Waste Disposal laws and codes forming environmental regulations will be implemented in broad terms, setting major milestones, commitments for funding responsibility and liability for impacts created by 1943 to 1989 site uses and operations.</td>
<td>DOE, EPA &amp; State of Washington Dept. of Ecology.</td>
<td>Numerous sources, including public comments.</td>
<td>DOE, EPA, State of Washington plus all OHCs.</td>
<td>Unconstrained.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Cycle Scope, Schedule and Cost Report</td>
<td>DOE/RL-2012-13</td>
<td>Annual with a 75-year planning horizon to program end.</td>
<td>The site wide strategic planning report is informed by all of DOE systems and services with the FY 2090 planning horizon. The report presents DOE’s planning case for the Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) compliance and the costs have been escalated. Estimates show the best available annual budget for the current year and unconstrained (TPA compliant) budgets for future years through the end of the lifecycle. The report requirement was suspended in FY2017 to enable time for each major program to respond to Court Order Changes in TPA milestones.</td>
<td>DOE-RL, prepared by MSA Portfolio Management.</td>
<td>DOE-RL and DOE-ORP.</td>
<td>DOE-RL, DOE-ORP, HQ, Hanford Communities.</td>
<td>Unconstrained. Estimates show best available annual budget from the prior year, plus “go-forward” and unconstrained budgets for future years through end of program.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Mission Support Planning Process Description

### Ten Year Site Plan
**Reference Number:** DOE/RL-2012-29  
**Update Type:** Annual with rolling 10 year planning horizon.  
The site wide planning report informed by DOE and OHC sources for Hanford Site mission’s real property requirements in rolling 10 year planning horizons, basis of planned activity and changes, known commitments for funding responsibility for capital improvements and operations under DOE-EM oversight. The requirement to prepare the Ten Year Site Plan was suspended by DOE-RL in FY2016. The successor report will have a different planning horizon interval.  
**Author:** DOE-RL by MSA Real Estate Services.  
**Source:** DOE-RL annual internal information.  
**Information:** DOE-RL AMMS, DOE-HQ, DOE-EM.  
**Funding Classification:** Constrained – Must integrate Mission needs within budgetary constraints to produce a realistic and achievable real property asset management plan.

### Hanford Site Sustainability Plan Annual Update
**Reference Number:** HNF-54800  
**Update Type:** Annual update with no specific planning horizon.  
The site wide planning report provides compliance with Executive Orders for energy and water for primarily 20 goals of compliance requirements, reporting the basis of planned activity and changes, known commitments for funding responsibility for capital improvements and operations under DOE-EM oversight. The annual report is submitted to DOE-HQ annually for consolidation into a single annual compliance progress report on all DOE managed site programs.  
**Author:** DOE-RL by MSA Environmental Services.  
**Source:** DOE-HQ.  
**Information:** DOE-HQ.  
**Funding Classification:** Unconstrained.

### Site Wide Institutional Compliance Plan
**Reference Number:** DOE/RL-2001-41,  
**Update Type:** Annual update.  
The site wide compliance report informed by DOE and OHC sources for primarily land and facilities federal regulatory compliance requirements to meet CERCLA and RCRA permit requirements, for capital improvements and operations under DOE-EM oversight. The LTS Program organizes formal transitions by major site area for footprint reduction, environmental clearance following cleanup activities to prepare for long-term land and facilities management, including records management to meeting ongoing CERCLA reporting and monitoring reflecting commitments by DOE-RL and MSA program oversight including contracts, studies and planning.  
**Author:** DOE-RL by MSA Site Infrastructure & Logistics Long Term Stewardship Program.  
**Source:** DOE-RL internal information plus OHCs.  
**Information:** DOE-RL, ISAP, RCRA Corrective Actions.  
**Funding Classification:** Unconstrained, yet organized to annual budgets and forecast information within the IP.

### Reliability Project Investment Portfolio (RPVP)
**Reference Number:** MSA-1505792A R3  
**Update Type:** Annual update.  
The RPVP comprises all of the work scope related to updating, upgrading or replacing elements of the fixed infrastructure. These DOE investments may be capital asset projects, either line item or general plant projects, or they may be maintenance activities. The projects and activities may be designed and implemented by either MSA staff or subcontractor. The RPVP is reviewed quarterly by RL and the RPVP was formerly called the IRPPL prior to FY2016.  
**Author:** Prepared by MSA.  
**Source:** ISAP, Master Plans, ICDs, other reports and studies.  
**Information:** DOE-RL internal information plus OHCs.  
**Funding Classification:** Constrained to reflect known BP annual budget limits for funding amounts, for rolling 5 year periods.

### Long Term Stewardship Program Plan
**Reference Number:** DOE/RL-35  
**Update Type:** Periodic update.  
The LTS Program organizes formal transitions by major site area for footprint reduction, environmental clearance following cleanup activities to prepare for long-term land and facilities management, including records management to meeting ongoing CERCLA reporting and monitoring reflecting commitments by DOE-RL and MSA program oversight including contracts, studies and planning.  
**Author:** DOE-RL by MSA Site Infrastructure & Logistics Long Term Stewardship Program.  
**Source:** DOE-RL internal information plus OHCs.  
**Information:** DOE-RL.  
**Funding Classification:** Unconstrained, yet organized to annual budgets and forecast information within the IP.

### Annual Forecast of Services Report
**Reference Number:** MSA-1503106  
**Update Type:** Annual update.  
The AFS organizes and summarizes a list of approximately 26 major support services from MSA that are required by Other Hanford Contractors (OHC) based on annual business plans of each OHC. The main focus is estimated service volume one year ahead as the basis for User Based Service fees.  
**Author:** MSA Interface Management.  
**Source:** Other Hanford Contractors.  
**Information:** DOE-RL, ISAP, MSA Operations.  
**Funding Classification:** Constrained (for items included).
Attachment 1
Annual Planning & Budget Calendar
### Annual Planning & Budget Calendar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>October</th>
<th>November</th>
<th>December</th>
<th>January</th>
<th>February</th>
<th>March</th>
<th>April</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>June</th>
<th>July</th>
<th>August</th>
<th>September</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MISSION SUPPORT INTERNAL PLANNING</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure &amp; Services Alignment Plan (ISAP)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ISAP – DRAFT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RL ISD Planning Workshops</td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability Project Investment Portfolio (RPIP)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>– RPIP Webhosted Continual Updates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System Master Plans*</td>
<td>Master Plan 30%</td>
<td>Master Plan 60%</td>
<td>Master Plan 90%</td>
<td>Master Plan Final</td>
<td>Master Plan 60%</td>
<td>Master Plan 90%</td>
<td>Master Plan Final</td>
<td>Master Plan Final</td>
<td>Master Plan Final</td>
<td>Master Plan Final</td>
<td>Master Plan Final</td>
<td>Master Plan Final</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Electrical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Water</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sanitary Sewer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Roads</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• General Purpose Facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Fleet Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• HAMMER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Forecast of Services</td>
<td>Final Annual Forecast of Services</td>
<td>Draft Annual Forecast of Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ANNUAL BUDGET - IIP BY RL &amp; MSA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Execution Year IIP</td>
<td>Early Budget Guidance for Future FY by April 15th</td>
<td></td>
<td>Final CBAG to MSA</td>
<td>Annual Budget &amp; IIP Prepare, Submit</td>
<td>DOE Review &amp; Approval</td>
<td>DOE-HQ Review</td>
<td>FY Budget Guidance</td>
<td>Field Budget Guidance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal Year + Out Year Budget Formulation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXTERNAL PLANNING REPORTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- ISAP – DRAFT indicates the draft of the Infrastructure & Services Alignment Plan.
- Master Plan 30%, Master Plan 60%, Master Plan 90%, Master Plan Final indicate the progress of the system master plans.
- Final Annual Forecast of Services and Draft Annual Forecast of Services refer to the stages of the annual forecast process.
- Early Budget Guidance for Future FY by April 15th refers to the preparation of the early budget guidance.
- Final CBAG to MSA refers to the finalizing of the cost-benefit analysis.
- Annual Budget & IIP Prepare, Submit refers to the submission of the annual budget.
- DOE Review & Approval refers to the review and approval process by the DOE.
- LIFECYCLE REPORT – FINAL indicates the final lifecycle report.
- Successor document to TYSP - DRAFT refers to the successor document of the Ten Year Site Plan (TYSP).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hanford Site Sustainability Plan (H-SSP)</th>
<th>H-SSP - DRAFT</th>
<th>H-SSP - FINAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Legend</td>
<td>Internal (RL &amp; ORP)</td>
<td>External - DOE-HQ and/or Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Documents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tactical Documents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget Documents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Schedule per structured improvement activity/Kaizen in mid FY2015.