



Michael LaFranzo  
United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Materials Control, ISFSI, and Decommissioning Branch  
2443 Warrenville Road  
Suite 210  
Lisle, Illinois 60532-4352  
630-829-9865

Direct tel: 630-829-9865  
Direct fax:  
e-mail: Michael.LaFranzo@nrc.gov  
Your ref:  
Our ref:

17 August 2016

Dear Mr. LaFranzo,

We are currently responding to the Department of Energy (DOE) Request for Proposals No. DE-SOL-0009226 for the West Valley Demonstration Project (WVDP) Technical Services for the Development of a Supplemental Impact Statement Procurement and we are asking for your assistance in completing the attached questionnaire and forwarding to the DOE to aid in its evaluation of our past performance.

The solicitation places emphasis on past performance as a source selection factor. In addition to requesting the attached Questionnaire be completed, the Government is requiring that clients of entities responding to the solicitation be identified and their participation in the evaluation process be requested. We are asking for input to be provided for your interaction with Westinghouse regarding the Hematite, Missouri Decommissioning Project.

In the event you are contacted for information by the Government on work we have performed, you are hereby authorized to respond to those inquiries.

We are asking for your assistance in completing the attached questionnaire and forwarding to the DOE to aid in its evaluation of our past performance.

Please return the completed questionnaire within ten calendar days.

**YOU ARE HIGHLY ENCOURAGED TO SCAN AND EMAIL THE QUESTIONNAIRE TO THE EMAIL ADDRESS PROVIDED BELOW:**

Email Address: [Jodi.Gordon@emcbc.doe.gov](mailto:Jodi.Gordon@emcbc.doe.gov)

If you are unable to scan and email a copy, it can be mailed to the following address:

**United States Department of Energy  
Environmental Management Consolidated Business Center  
Attn: Jodi Gordon, Contract Specialist  
250 E. 5<sup>th</sup> Street, Suite 500  
Cincinnati, OH 45202**

If mailing, please mark the envelope:

**“TO BE OPENED ONLY BY ADDRESSEE ONLY.  
RFP NO. DOE-SOL-0009226”**

Thank you for time and assistance; Westinghouse appreciates your candid evaluation.

Sincerely,

*Karen M. Randall*

Karen M. Randall  
Westinghouse

C: Ed Dzenis, Westinghouse  
Myron Kaczmarzsky, Westinghouse  
Layla Sandell, Westinghouse



**PAST PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE**

Past Performance Information Questionnaire for: Westinghouse Electric Company, LLC	
<b>A. Respondent: Please fill in the following table.</b>	
1. Complete Name and Title of Responder:	
2. Company or Agency Name, Address, Telephone Number, Facsimile Number (w/Area Code), and E-mail Address:	
3. Contract Name or Title, Contract Number and Type of Contract:	<b>Hematite Decommissioning Project</b>
3. Signature:	

**B. RATING SCALE AND DEFINITIONS:**

Rating	Definition	Note
Exceptional	Performance meets contractual requirements and exceeds many to the Government's benefit. The contractual performance of the element or sub-element being assessed was accomplished with few minor problems for which corrective actions taken by the contractor were highly effective.	To justify an Exceptional rating, identify multiple significant events and state how they were of benefit to the Government. A singular benefit, however, could be of such magnitude that it alone constitutes an Exceptional rating. Also, there should have been NO significant problems identified.





Rating	Definition	Note
Very Good	Performance meets contractual requirements and exceeds some to the Government's benefit. The contractual performance of the element or sub-element being assessed was accomplished with some minor problems for which corrective actions taken by the contractor were effective.	To justify a Very Good rating, identify a significant event and state how it was a benefit to the Government. There should have been NO significant problems identified.
Satisfactory	Performance meets, but does not exceed, all contractual requirements. The contractual performance of the element or sub-element contains some minor problems, and possibly major, problems for which corrective actions taken by the contractor were satisfactory and resulted in minimal or no impact to the contract/task order/project.	<p>To justify a Satisfactory rating, there should have been only minor problems, or major problems the contractor recovered from without impact to the contract/task order/project</p> <p>A fundamental principle of assigning ratings is that Contractors will not be assessed a rating lower than Satisfactory solely for not performing beyond the requirements of the contract/task order/project.</p>
Marginal	Performance does not meet some contractual requirements. The contractual performance of the element or sub-element being assessed reflects a serious problem for which the contractor has not yet identified corrective actions. The contractor's proposed actions appear only marginally effective or were not fully implemented.	To justify a Marginal performance, identify a significant event that the contractor had trouble overcoming and state how it impacted the Government. A Marginal rating should be supported by referencing the management tool that notified the contractor of the contractual deficiency (e.g., management, quality, safety, or environmental deficiency report or letter).



Rating	Definition	Note
Unsatisfactory	Performance does not meet most contractual requirements and recovery is not likely in a timely manner. The contractual performance of the element or sub-element contains a serious problem(s) for which the contractor's corrective actions were ineffective.	To justify an Unsatisfactory rating, identify multiple significant events that the contractor had trouble overcoming and state how it impacted the Government. A singular problem, however, could be of such serious magnitude that it alone constitutes an unsatisfactory rating. An Unsatisfactory rating should be supported by referencing the management tools used to notify the contractor of the contractual deficiencies (e.g., management, quality, safety, or environmental deficiency report or letter) and by describing the inability of the Contractor to implement effective corrective action.





**C. ASSESSMENT AREAS:**

<b>1. Quality of Product or Service</b>						
Example: How well did the Contractor provide services that met the terms of the contract? How technically accurate were the contractor deliverables? What was the quality level of the contractor deliverables? How well did the Contractor perform the contract services in a safe and secure manner?						
○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Exceptional	Very Good	Satisfactory	Marginal	Unsatisfactory	Not Applicable	Do Not Know
<b>Supporting Narrative:</b>						

<b>2. Schedule Compliance</b>						
Example: How well did the Contractor provide timely services in accordance with contract schedules or at the requested time(s)? How well did the Contractor take measures to minimize delays that were within their control?						
○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Exceptional	Very Good	Satisfactory	Marginal	Unsatisfactory	Not Applicable	Do Not Know
<b>Supporting Narrative:</b>						



**3. Cost Control**

Example: How well did the Contractor control its costs? How effective was the cost control? Was there any Request for Equitable Adjustments (REAs)? If so, were they justified? Was the Contractor supportive during the REA process?

○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Exceptional	Very Good	Satisfactory	Marginal	Unsatisfactory	Not Applicable	Do Not Know

**Supporting Narrative:**

**4. Business Relations**

Example: How well did the Contractor interface with you to address requests, complaints, and inquiries? How responsive were they to your inquiries?

○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Exceptional	Very Good	Satisfactory	Marginal	Unsatisfactory	Not Applicable	Do Not Know

**Supporting Narrative:**



**5. Management of Key Personnel/Staffing**

Example: How well did the Contractor allocate the appropriate personnel and other resources to meet customer needs? How well did the Contractor provide staff on short notice for quick turnaround of personnel?

<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Exceptional	Very Good	Satisfactory	Marginal	Unsatisfactory	Not Applicable	Do Not Know

**Supporting Narrative:**



## LaFranzo, Michael

---

**From:** Randall, Karen M <randalkm1@westinghouse.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, August 17, 2016 1:47 PM  
**To:** LaFranzo, Michael  
**Cc:** Kaczmarsky, Myron M.; Sandell, Layla; Dzenis, Edward A.  
**Subject:** [External\_Sender] Past Performance Questionnaire for RFP DE-SOL-0009226  
**Attachments:** Hematite Project Transmittal Cover Letter.pdf; Hematite \_West Valley SEIS - Questionnaire\_Final.pdf

Dear Mr. LaFranzo,

Westinghouse is currently responding to DOE RFP DE-SOL-0009226 Development of a Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement for the West Valley Demonstration Project. The solicitation places emphasis on past performance as a source selection factor. I would appreciate your assistance in completing the attached questionnaire (regarding the Hematite Decommissioning Project) and forwarding to the DOE to aid in its evaluation of our past performance.

The instructions for responding are in the cover letter.

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Regards,

Karen Randall  
Westinghouse  
860-731-1840

---

This e-mail may contain proprietary information of the sending organization. Any unauthorized or improper disclosure, copying, distribution, or use of the contents of this e-mail and attached document(s) is prohibited. The information contained in this e-mail and attached document(s) is intended only for the personal and private use of the recipient(s) named above. If you have received this communication in error, please notify the sender immediately by email and delete the original e-mail and attached document(s).