APR 26 1994

D. K. Rhyne, Jr.
Energy Programs Division
Oak Ridge Operations Office
U.S. Department of Energy
Post Office Box 2008
Oak Ridge, TN 37831

ATTENTION: ER-114:Rhyne

SUBJECT: DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY (DOE) EVALUATION OF MARTIN MARIETTA ENERGY SYSTEMS, INC. (ENERGY SYSTEMS), PERFORMANCE IN OPERATING THE OAK RIDGE NATIONAL LABORATORY (ORNL)

The Office of State Programs has recently established a task order contract with ORNL to assist our office. The first Task Order was initiated in October 1993 and a protocol has been approved to proceed with the review of State regulations. The evaluation form has been marked-up to denote that the work being done is technical assistance, not R&D work. The completed form is enclosed. We have not provided any specific narrative due to the early nature of this contract. We should be in a position to provide a more detailed evaluation at the time of the next review.

If you have any questions on the evaluation form, please contact Dennis Sollenberger at 301-504-2819.

/S/

Paul H. Lohaus, Deputy Director
Office of State Programs

Enclosure:
As stated

Distribution:
Dir RF S-46
RBangart
PLohaus
DSollenberger
~~Part 20 File~~
~~DOE File~~

DCD (SP01)
PDR YES X NO ___

ORNL Contract File

OFC	OSP:SA	OSP:DD				
NME	DSollenberger:dr	PLohaus				
DTE	04/25/94	04/26/94				

g:\ornleval.dms

SP01
1/1

ATTACHMENT

SPONSOR SATISFACTION SURVEY - RESEARCH EVALUATION

Evaluator: Dennis Sollenberger Project Title: Agreement States Program Assessment Assistance

Sponsor Division/Office: Office of State Programs / U.S. NRC

Route Symbol: SOFEW No. 70-94-012 B&R Category: E7044 Job Code 470196 2000 B&R No.

This form is to be used for a DOE evaluation of Energy Systems performance in operating ORNL. Your response will be significant input in determining the Energy Systems Award Fee for operation of the ORNL.

A. For each of the major program elements listed below that you are reviewing, please assign a rating. Provide support for these ratings in Part B. The definitions of the rating categories are attached. Please provide numerical score for each of the following criteria.

RESEARCH EVALUATION (ORNL)

Program Element	Unsatisfactory ≤ 65	Marginal 66-75	Satisfactory 76-85	Good 86-95	Outstanding 96-100
1. Quality and productivity of ORNL ~~R&D~~ TA				90	
2. Management of ORNL ~~R&D~~ TA				90	
3. Comparison of ORNL performance to other laboratories.			NA		
4. Achievement of cost and schedule targets.			85		
5. Quality of ~~R&D~~ TA proposals.				90	
6. Proactive and prompt reporting and response to TA ~~R&D~~ program concerns/issues.				90	
7. Contribution to the management of national and international TA ~~R&D~~ efforts.			NA		
8. Quality of ORNL staff participation in important sponsor committees and collaborative activities.			NA		

2716.ap

B. Please provide narrative information to support your ratings, using the format below. Relate to the program elements in Part A taken from the Performance Evaluation Plan for the Oak Ridge National Laboratory. The definitions of rating categories are attached.

Program Element -

Significant Achievements (by priority, 1-most significant)

1.

2.

3.

etc.

Notable Achievements (by priority, 1-most notable)

1.

2.

3.

etc.

Significant Deficiencies (by priority, 1-most significant)

1.

2.

3.

etc.

Notable Deficiencies (by priority, 1-most notable)

1.

2.

3.

etc.

Adjective Rating	Definition
Outstanding	Performance substantially exceeds expected levels of performance. Several significant or notable achievements exist. No notable deficiencies in performance. (96-100)
Good	Performance exceeds expected levels and some notable achievements exist. Although some notable deficiencies may exist, no significant deficiencies exist. (86-95)
Satisfactory	Performance meets expected levels. Minimum standards are exceeded and "good practices" are evident in contract operations. Notable achievements or notable deficiencies may or may not exist. (76-85)
Marginal	Performance is less than expected. No notable achievements exist, however, some notable deficiencies exist; or any notable achievements which exist are more than offset by significant or notable deficiencies. (66-75)
Unsatisfactory	Performance is below minimum acceptable levels. Significant deficiencies causing severe impacts on mission capabilities exist. Performance at this level in any area mentioned in Attachment 3 may result in a decision by the FDO to withhold all award fee for the period. (65 and below)

Definitions

Significant: This term indicates a major event or sustained level of performance which, due to its importance, has a substantial impact on the contractor's ability to carry out its mission.

Notable: This term indicates an event or sustained level of performance which is of lesser importance than a "significant" event, but nonetheless deserves recognition.

NOTE: Management judgement is essential in applying these definitions when determining the quality of achievements/deficiencies and whether achievements might offset deficiencies or vice versa. Isolated examples of significant or notable achievements and deficiencies should not be allowed to materially influence the overall evaluation of the contractor's performance.