

Appendix A-1

Contract Performance Reports

ARRA

Format 1 - Work Breakdown Structure

Format 3 - Baseline

Format 5 - Explanation and Problem Analysis



April 2012
CHPRC-2012-04, Rev. 0
Contract DE-AC06-08RL14788
Deliverable C.3.1.3.1 - 1

FORMAT 1, DD FORM 2734/1, WORK BREAKDOWN STRUCTURE

CONTRACT PERFORMANCE REPORT FORMAT 1 - WORK BREAKDOWN STRUCTURE													CLASSIFICATION (When Filled In)			FORM APPROVED OMB No. 0704-0188					
1. CONTRACTOR										2. CONTRACT			3. PROGRAM			4. REPORT PERIOD					
a. NAME CH2M HILL Plateau Remediation Company										a. NAME Plateau Remediation Contract			a. NAME Plateau Remediation Contract			a. FROM (YYYYMMDD)					
b. LOCATION (Address and ZIP Code) Richland, WA										b. NUMBER RL14788			b. PHASE			2012 / 03 / 26					
										c. TYPE CPAF			d. SHARE RATIO			c. EVMS ACCEPTANCE NO YES X 9/18/2009			b. TO (YYYYMMDD) 2012 / 04 / 22		
5. CONTRACT DATA																					
a. QUANTITY		b. NEGOTIATED COST	c. ESTIMATED COST OF AUTHORIZED UNPRICED WORK			d. TARGET PROFIT/ FEE	e. TARGET PRICE	f. ESTIMATED PRICE	g. CONTRACT CEILING	h. ESTIMATED CONTRACT CEILING			i. DATE OF OTB/OTS (YYYYMMDD)								
		1,305,191	0			70,859	1,376,050	1,377,345	1,376,050	1,377,345											
6. ESTIMATED COST AT COMPLETION																					
a. BEST CASE		MANAGEMENT ESTIMATE AT COMPLETION (1)			CONTRACT BUDGET BASE (2)			VARIANCE (3)			7. AUTHORIZED CONTRACTOR REPRESENTATIVE			d. DATE SIGNED (YYYYMMDD)							
		1,306,485									a. NAME (Last, First, Middle Initial) Bang, M.V.			b. TITLE Prime Contract Manager							
b. WORST CASE		1,326,035									c. SIGNATURE			2012 / 04 / 22							
c. MOST LIKELY		1,306,485			1,305,191			(1,295)													
8. PERFORMANCE DATA																					
WBS[1]		CURRENT PERIOD				CUMULATIVE TO DATE					REPROGRAMMING ADJUSTMENTS			AT COMPLETION							
ITEM (1)	BUDGETED COST		ACTUAL COST WORK PERFORMED (4)	VARIANCE		BUDGETED COST		ACTUAL COST WORK PERFORMED (9)	VARIANCE		COST VARIANCE (12a)	SCHEDULE VARIANCE (12b)	BUDGET (13)	BUDGETED (14)	ESTIMATED (15)	VARIANCE (16)					
	WORK SCHEDULED (2)	WORK PERFORMED (3)		SCHEDULE (5)	COST (6)	WORK SCHEDULED (7)	WORK PERFORMED (8)		SCHEDULE (10)	COST (11)											
RL-0011.R1 PFP D&D	1,653	1,018	2,079	(636)	(1,062)	286,678	282,321	291,173	(4,357)	(8,852)	0	0	0	290,945	297,258	(6,313)					
RL-0013C.R1.1 MLLW Treatment	0	0	1	0	(1)	47,707	47,699	42,680	(8)	5,018	0	0	0	47,707	42,740	4,967					
RL-0013C.R1.2 TRU Waste	0	0	(45)	0	45	255,312	255,312	253,623	(0)	1,689	0	0	0	255,312	253,525	1,786					
RL-0013C.R1.3 TRU Wst Facil Trans MinSafe	0	0	120	0	(120)	1,500	1,500	1,395	0	105	0	0	0	1,500	1,393	107					
RL-0030.R1.1 GW Capital Asset	0	0	92	0	(92)	175,008	175,008	174,828	0	180	0	0	0	175,008	174,997	11					
RL-0030.R1.2 GW Operations	0	0	(3)	0	3	92,146	92,146	89,509	(0)	2,637	0	0	0	92,146	89,510	2,636					
RL-0040.R1.1 U Plant/Other D&D	0	76	304	76	(228)	199,391	199,391	193,504	(0)	5,887	0	0	0	199,391	193,699	5,692					
RL-0040.R1.2 Outer Zone D&D	0	0	(7)	0	7	84,279	84,279	71,647	0	12,632	0	0	0	84,279	71,648	12,630					
RL-0041.R1.1 100 K Area Remediation	231	8	(1,276)	(224)	1,284	178,478	177,716	179,613	(762)	(1,897)	0	0	0	179,749	181,715	(1,966)					
b. Cost of Money	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0					
c. Gen. and Admin.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0					
d. Undist. Budget														0	0	0					
e. Sub Total	1,885	1,102	1,265	(783)	(163)	1,320,497	1,315,371	1,297,972	(5,127)	17,399	0	0	0	1,326,035	1,306,485	19,550					
f. Management Resrv.														0							
g. Total	1,885	1,102	1,265	(783)	(163)	1,320,497	1,315,371	1,297,972	(5,127)	17,399	0	0	0	1,326,035							
9. Reconciliation to CBB																					
a. Variance Adjustment										0	0										
b. Total Contract Variance									(5,127)	17,399				1,326,035	1,306,485	19,550					

FORMAT 3, DD FORM 2734/3, BASELINE

CONTRACT PERFORMANCE REPORT													Form Approved		
FORMAT 3 - BASELINE											OMB No. 0704-0188				
April FY2012 - ARRA			DOLLARS IN THOUSANDS												
1. CONTRACTOR CH2M HILL Plateau Remediation Company b. LOCATION: Richland, WA			2. CONTRACT a. NAME: Plateau Remediation Contract b. NUMBER: RL14788 c. TYPE: CPAF d. SHARE RATIO:			3. PROGRAM a. NAME: Plateau Remediation Contract b. PHASE c. EVMS ACCEPTANCE NO YES X 9/18/2009			4. REPORT PERIOD a. FROM: 2012/03/26 b. TO: 2012/04/22						
5. CONTRACT DATA															
a. ORIGINAL NEGOTIATED COST 0			b. NEGOTIATED CONTRACT CHANGE \$1,305,191		c. CURRENT NEGOTIATED COST (A + B) \$1,305,191		d. ESTIMATED COST AUTH UNPRICED WORK \$0	e. CONTRACT BUDGET BASE (C + D) \$1,305,191		f. TOTAL ALLOCATED BUDGET \$1,326,036		g. DIFFERENCE (E - F) (\$20,845)			
h. CONTRACT START DATE 4/9/2009			i. DEFINITIZATION DATE		j. PLANNED COMPL DATE 9/30/2012		k. CONT COMPLETION DATE			l. EST COMPLETION DATE 9/30/2012					
6. PERFORMANCE DATA															
BUDGETED COST FOR WORK SCHEDULED (NON - CUMULATIVE)															
ITEM (1)	BCWS CUM TO DATE (2)	BCWS FOR REPORT PERIOD (3)	SIX MONTH FORECAST						FY09 (10)	FY10 (11)	FY11 (12)	FY12 (13)	OUT YEARS (14)	UNDISTRIB BUDGET (15)	TOTAL BUDGET (16)
			+1 May-12 (4)	+2 Jun-12 (5)	+3 Jul-12 (6)	+4 Aug-12 (7)	+5 Sep-12 (8)	6+ Oct-12 (9)							
a. PM BASELINE (BEGIN OF PERIOD)	1,318,613	2,580	2,125	1,469	1,366	307	270	0	161,538	565,906	585,572	13,020	0	0	1,326,036
b. BASELINE CHANGES AUTH DURING REPORT PERIOD None															0
c. PM BASELINE (END OF PERIOD)	1,320,497	1,885	2,125	1,469	1,366	307	270	0	161,538	565,906	585,572	13,020	0	0	1,326,036
7. MANAGEMENT RESERVE															0
8. TOTAL															1,326,036

FORMAT 5, DD FORM 2734/5, EXPLANATION AND PROBLEM ANALYSIS

CLASSIFICATION (When Filled In)									
CONTRACT PERFORMANCE REPORT FORMAT 5 - EXPLANATIONS AND PROBLEM ANALYSES								FORM APPROVED OMB No. 0704-0188	
1. CONTRACTOR		2. CONTRACT			3. PROGRAM			4. REPORT PERIOD	
a. NAME CH2M HILL Plateau Remediation Company		a. NAME Plateau Remediation Contract			a. NAME Plateau Remediation Contract			a. FROM (YYYY/MM/DD) 2012/03/26	
b. LOCATION (Address and ZIP Code) Richland, WA 99354		b. NUMBER RL		b. PHASE ARRA		b. TO (YYYY/MM/DD) 2012/04/22			
		c. TYPE CPAF	d. SHARE RATIO		c. EVMS ACCEPTANCE 2009/09/18 NO YES X				
	BCWS	BCWP	ACWP	SV in \$	SV in %	CV in \$	CV %	SPI	CPI
Current:	1,885	1,102	1,265	(783)	-41.5%	(164)	-14.8%	0.58	0.87
Cumulative:	1,320,497	1,315,371	1,297,972	(5,127)	-0.4%	17,399	1.3%	1.00	1.01
	BAC	EAC	VAC in \$	VAC in %	CPI to BAC	CPI to EAC			
At Complete:	1,326,035	1,306,485	19,550	1.5%	0.4	1.3			
Explanation of Variance/Description of Problem:									
<p>Current Period Schedule Variance: The Current Month unfavorable Schedule Variance (-\$0.8M) reflects the following:</p> <p>The RL-0011 negative variance (-\$0.6M) results from RMA/RMC D&D teams unable to effectively work planned shifts due to contamination events and recovery actions, work documents not released to support planned activities. Baseline schedule durations were predicated on an "enhanced time on tools efficiency" after January 01, 2012 which has not yet been realized. The RL-0041 negative variance (-\$0.2M) is due to backfills for Waste Sites being behind due to the activity being level loaded. Backfill will not occur until mid to late summer.</p> <p>Current Period Cost Variance: The Current Month unfavorable Cost Variance (-\$0.2M) reflects the following:</p> <p>The RL-0011 negative variance (-\$1.1M) primarily results from inefficiencies associated with issues discussed above and the limited ability to re-assign resources to other projects when events prevent work in assigned areas. Three months of TRU waste disposal cost occurring in the current period also contribute to the variance. The RL-0013 negative cost variance (-\$0.0M) is within threshold. The RL-0030 Current Month Cost Variance (-\$0.1M) is within threshold. The RL-0040 negative variance (-\$0.2M) is within reporting threshold, but due to demobilization and surveys requiring increased resources and costs for MSA fleet services (equipment rental) significantly greater than plan. The RL-0041 positive variance (+\$1.3M) is due to due to a cost transfers for work completed earlier in the fiscal year that had been inadvertently charged to ARRA. These cost transfers were processed during the month.</p> <p>Cumulative Schedule Variance: The unfavorable Cumulative Schedule Variance (-\$5.1M) is within reporting thresholds.</p> <p>Cumulative Cost Variance: The CTD favorable Cost Variance (+\$17.4M) is within reporting thresholds and reflects the following:</p> <p>The RL-0011 negative variance (-\$8.9M) is within reporting thresholds. The RL-0013 positive variance (+\$5.0M) is due to efficiencies in TRU Characterization and Shipping, TRU Repackaging, T Plant and WRAP, Mixed Low Level Waste (MLLW) efficiencies created by treating waste at Energy Solutions (ES) - Clive rather than planned treatment at PFNW due to a waiver received from the Department of Energy (DOE), Environmental Restoration Disposal Facility (ERDF) negotiated rate reduction with vendor for waste containers, partially offset by increased materials and labor costs in support of the Trench Face Retrieval and Characterization System (TFRCS), and increased resources for TRU Retrieval deteriorated waste containers, increased allocations for additional office space and other assessments as a result of allocations to Recovery Act expenditures. The RL-0030 Contract to Date Cost variance is within threshold. The RL-0040 positive variance (+\$18.5M) reflects the following: RL-0040.R1.1 U Plant/Other D&D (+\$5.9M) positive variance is due to performance of the Cold and Dark and Sampling and Characterization/Waste Identification Form teams (D4); overhead allocations, less than anticipated resources for Program Management and C-3 Sampling; lower than planned costs for capital equipment (D4), and less asbestos abatement required for 200W buildings. This is offset by increased material and equipment costs, increased use of masks and respirators due to the unexpected asbestos levels in the ancillary buildings in U Ancillary (D4), coupled with increased insulator staff and the use of overtime to recover schedule, 200E Administration and 209E Project delays, less resources required at U Canyon (D4), and Usage Based Services higher than planned. The RL-0040.R1.2 Outer Zone D&D positive variance (+\$12.6M) is due to efficiencies in Arid Lands Ecology (ALE), North Slope Facilities, disposition of railcars D&D, and Outer Area waste sites. The waste site favorable cost-to-date variance is primarily due to an O-Zone Remove, Treat, and Dispose (RTD) Waste Sites adjustments (pass back) to ERDF waste disposal costs reflecting the operational efficiencies of the super dump trucks. Within the waste sites area, this favorable cost variance is partially offset by higher than planned costs associated with remediation of pipelines and increased costs for the 212N/P/R Project due to the walls of the basins being much thicker than estimated. The RL-0041 negative variance (-\$1.9M) is due to higher costs for the Utilities Project than planned.</p>									

FORMAT 5, DD FORM 2734/5, EXPLANATION AND PROBLEM ANALYSIS

<p>Impact:</p> <p>Current Period Schedule: For RL-11R.1, current period reflects a slight decline in schedule performance. For RL-0013, current period, there is no impact. For RL-0030, there are no impacts, work complete. For RL-40.R1.1, and RL-40.R1.2, there is no significant schedule impact for the current period. For RL-41.R1.1 the current period schedule impacts are the same as the CTD schedule impacts (see below).</p> <p>Current Period Cost: For RL-11.R1, cost performance reflects a slight decline in cost performance. For RL-0013, no impacts at this time. For RL-0030, there are no impacts, work complete. For RL-40.R1.1, and RL-40.R1.2, there is no significant cost impact for the current period. For RL-41.R1.1 no impacts at this time.</p> <p>CTD Schedule: For RL-11.R1, Responses were provided on the lifecycle performance measurement baseline DOE-RL review comments and BCR-011-12-002R0, <i>PFP PB R3 Update per RCR Response</i>, was implemented in March 2012 (COMPLETE). Value Engineering (VE) Study, assigned to spearhead the VE initiatives (COMPLETE). PFP will begin to develop the implementation plan (ECD April 2012). For RL-0013, CTD there is no impact. For RL-0030, there are no impacts, work complete. For RL-40.R1.1, and RL-40.R1.2, there are no significant CTD schedule impacts. For RL-41.R1.1 schedule will be monitored.</p> <p>CTD Cost: For RL-11.R1, no specific actions are planned at this time. Responses were provided on the lifecycle performance measurement baseline DOE-RL review comments, and BCR-011-12-002R0, <i>PFP PB R3 Update per RCR Response</i>, was implemented in March 2012 (COMPLETE). For RL-13, the overall positive cost impact is due to project efficiencies. For RL-0030, there are no impacts, work complete. For RL-40.R1.1, and RL-40.R1.2, there is overall positive cost impact due to project efficiencies. For RL-41.R1.1, costs will be monitored.</p>																				
<p>Corrective Action:</p> <p>Current Period Schedule: For RL-11.R1 see CTD Schedule. For RL-0013, no corrective actions required. For RL-0030, no corrective actions required, work is complete. For RL-40.R1.1, and RL-40.R1.2 no corrective actions are required at this time. For RL-41.R1.1, the current period schedule corrective actions are the same as CTD schedule corrective actions (see below).</p> <p>Current Period Cost: For RL-11.R1 no corrections are planned. For RL-0013, no corrective actions required. For RL-0030, no corrective actions required, work is complete. For RL-40.R1.1, and RL-40.R1.2 no corrective actions are required at this time. For RL-41.R1.1, the current period cost corrective actions are the same as the CTD cost corrective actions (see below).</p> <p>CTD Schedule: For RL-11.R1, Action plans have been scheduled for all major Value Engineering initiatives and the majority of the stand-alone initiatives. For RL-0013, no corrective action required. For RL-0030, no corrective actions required, work is complete. For RL-40.R1.1, and RL-40.R1.2, no corrective actions are required at this time. For RL-41.R1.1 has implemented a baseline change request (BCR) to address additional soil contamination (realized risk). Schedule recovery actions are being evaluated to recover the D&D structure demolition and waste site remediation schedule activities where they can to offset where other demolition and remediation activities have been delayed.</p> <p>CTD Cost: For RL-11.R1, no specific actions are planned at this time. Responses will be provided on the lifecycle performance measurement baseline RL review comments in March 2012. For RL-13C.R1.1, the favorable cost variance is expected to continue. For RL-13C.R1.2, no corrective actions required. For RL-13C.R1.3, no corrective actions required. For RL-0030, no corrective actions required, work is complete. For RL-40.R1.1, and RL-40.R1.2, no corrective actions are required at this time. For RL-41.R1.1, no corrective actions are required at this time.</p>																				
<p>Monthly Summary: (to include technical causes of VARs, Impacts, and Corrective Action(s):</p> <p>All ARRA Subproject's cumulative to date cost and schedule variances are within reporting thresholds except for RL-13C.R1.1 MLLW Treatment and RL-40.R1.2 Outer Zone D&D which have favorable cost variances of 10.5% and 15% respectively. Overall, the current period schedule and cost variances are mixed between favorable and unfavorable performance. The RL-0011 The Current Month Schedule Variance results from RMA/RMC D&D teams unable to effectively work planned shifts due to contamination events and recovery actions, work documents not released to support planned activities. Baseline schedule durations were predicated on an "enhanced time on tools efficiency" after January 01, 2012 which has not yet been realized. The RL-41.R1.1 100K Area negative cost variance is due to a cost transfer, waste disposal costs and unplanned equipment rental. No significant impacts or corrective actions noted.</p>																				
<p>Contractually Required Cost, Schedule, EAC variance, Management Reserve Use</p>																				
<p>Variance in Performance BAC and EAC: The variance at complete (VAC) between the BAC and EAC this month is positive \$19.5 million and 1.5%. This variance is within threshold for the Project. For information, the VAC threshold limit is +or- 5% and +or- \$15 million.</p>																				
<p>Format 1 and 3 Contract Data:</p> <table border="1" style="margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto;"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2" style="text-align: center;">Contract Price Adjustments</th> </tr> <tr> <th colspan="2" style="text-align: center;">ARRA ONLY</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>CPs - In Process</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td style="text-align: right;">Total Authorized Unpriced Work</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td style="text-align: right;">-</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Approved Adjustments to Contract Price (not reflected in B.4-1 Table)</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td style="text-align: right;">Total Negotiated Cost Changes</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td style="text-align: right;">0</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td style="text-align: right;">Grand Total Adjustments</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td style="text-align: right;">0</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Contract Price Adjustments		ARRA ONLY		CPs - In Process			Total Authorized Unpriced Work		-	Approved Adjustments to Contract Price (not reflected in B.4-1 Table)			Total Negotiated Cost Changes		0		Grand Total Adjustments		0
Contract Price Adjustments																				
ARRA ONLY																				
CPs - In Process																				
	Total Authorized Unpriced Work																			
	-																			
Approved Adjustments to Contract Price (not reflected in B.4-1 Table)																				
	Total Negotiated Cost Changes																			
	0																			
	Grand Total Adjustments																			
	0																			
<p>Use of Management Reserve: ARRA MR was unchanged (\$0.0) in April 2012.</p>																				
<p>Best/Worst/Most Likely Estimate: The Best EAC is the EAC reported this month, which assumes all efficiencies gained contract-to-date will</p>																				

FORMAT 5, DD FORM 2734/5, EXPLANATION AND PROBLEM ANALYSIS

remain at completion with no use of management reserve. The most likely EAC is the EAC reported this month plus the to-go (available) management reserve, which assumes all efficiencies gained contract-to-date will remain at completion but all available management reserve is used (e.g., all identified risks realized). The worst EAC is the BAC reported this month plus the to-go (available) management reserve, which assumes all efficiencies gained contract-to-date will be eroded at completion and all available management reserve is used (e.g., all identified risks realized). The Best/Worst and Most Likely EAC values are documented in the Format 1 Report.

Prepared by: Project Control Staff	Date: 5/21/2012	Approved by:	Date:
--	---------------------------	---------------------	--------------

(1) = Trench Face Process System; (2) = Trench Face Retrieval & Characterization System; (3) = Remove, Treat and Dispose; (4) = Confirmatory Sampling/No Action; (5) Project Specific Distributables Rewards & Recognition Program; (6) Defense Contract Audit Agency