



Department of Energy
National Nuclear Security Administration
Washington, DC 20585



January 24, 2018

The Honorable Sean Sullivan
Chairman
Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board
625 Indiana Avenue NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20004

Dear Chairman Sullivan:

Consistent with the Board's letter dated February 26, 2016, attached please find the Fiscal Year 2017 Annual Metrics Report on the nuclear criticality safety criteria. This metrics report includes a series of tables and satisfies the annual reporting requirement established for closure of Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board Recommendation 97-2, *Continuation of Criticality Safety at Defense Nuclear Facilities in the Department of Energy (DOE) Complex*.

If you have any specific questions regarding the report, please contact Kevin Hahn, National Nuclear Security Administration, who has overall responsibility for the consolidated report, at (505) 845-4106. Robert Wilson, Office of Environmental Management (EM), (303) 236-3666, is responsible for the EM information; and Joanna Serra, Office of Science (SC), (301) 903-6136, is responsible for the SC information.

Sincerely,

James J. McConnell
Associate Administrator for
Safety, Infrastructure and Operations

Joseph A. McBrearty
Deputy Director for Field Operations
Office of Science

Matthew B. Moury
Associate Under Secretary for
Environment, Health, Safety and Security

James A. Hutton
Deputy Assistant Secretary for
Safety, Security and Quality Assurance
Environmental Management

cc: Kevin Hahn, NNSA
Robert Wilson, EM
Joanna Serra, SC
Joe Olencz, AU-1.1



2017
ANNUAL METRICS
REPORT

To
THE DEFENSE NUCLEAR
FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD

January 2018

NUCLEAR CRITICALITY
SAFETY PROGRAMS



National Nuclear Security Administration
United States Department of Energy
Washington, DC 20585

Purpose

A Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board (DNFSB) letter dated February 26, 2016, requested that the Department of Energy (DOE) provide an annual metrics table on the nuclear criticality safety criteria listed below in its Annual Report on Nuclear Criticality Safety (NCS) Programs. The Board's letter modified the annual reporting requirement established for closure of DNFSB Recommendation 97-2, *Continuation of Criticality Safety at Defense Nuclear Facilities in the Department of Energy (DOE) Complex*, which requires DOE to provide a report and briefing on the requested subject areas for its various NCS programs.

The points-of-contact for this report are Kevin Hahn, National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA), 505-845-4106, Dr. Robert Wilson, Office of Environmental Management (EM), 303-236-3666, and Joanna Serra, Office of Science (SC), 301-903-6136.

The requested metrics include:

1. DOE's overall evaluation of the contractors' performance in the functional area of criticality safety, consistent with DOE Order 226.1B, *Implementation of Department of Energy Oversight Policy*.

- This qualitative grading is determined by the Field Office.
- Grading is based on the following scheme:

| | |
|--------|--------------------------------|
| Green | Meets or exceeds expectations |
| Yellow | Adequate but needs improvement |
| Red | Does not meet expectations |

Note: Grading for Fiscal Year (FY) 17 was divided into program health and operational implementation. Previous years had only an overall performance grade for the site's NCS program.

The overall performance of the site has been broken into program health and operational implementation.

- The program health grade is based on items such as contractor staffing levels, quality, timeliness and backlog of NCS Evaluations, adequate funding, NCS procedures and policies...etc.
 - The operational implementation grade is based on items such as those events and issues affecting the handling and processing of nuclear materials...i.e., infractions, conduct of operations, implementation of NCS in operating procedures...etc.
- 2. The number of criticality safety infractions in each severity level, per site-specific criteria;**

3. **The number of identified non-compliances with DOE Order 420.1, Facility Safety, and the American National Standards Institute/American Nuclear Society-8 series of criticality safety standards. Includes the number of contractor-identified non-compliances and the number identified by external parties;**
4. **The number of contractor and federal criticality safety assessments completed including the total number of findings and opportunities for improvement from these assessments;**
 - The number of assessments focused on criticality safety include:

For Contractors: Management self-assessments, criticality safety committee reviews, operational readiness assessments, and biennial/triennial external reviews but does not include regularly scheduled operational reviews.

For Federal: DOE Headquarters, field office, and Office of Enterprise assessments; Criticality Safety Support Group's (CSSG) reviews, federal readiness assessments, and "For-cause" assessments but does not include day-to-day oversight conducted by facility representatives.
 - Findings: Total number of assessment observations that generate a corrective action plan.
 - Opportunities for Improvement (OFIs): Total number of all other assessment observations that were not findings.

Note: Information from this metric may overlap the information provided for the third metric.

5. **Current contractor and federal criticality safety staffing levels, including the average years of experience in criticality safety, number of qualified staff, number in training, number of staff lost, number of staff hired in the previous year;**
 - The number of qualified NCS engineers reflects the number of staff qualified to independently perform criticality safety work consistent with site specific criteria.
 - The “target” metric indicates whether the number of qualified NCS staff is sufficient to meet programmatic needs.
 - The “experience” metric is an average of the years of experience in criticality safety for the qualified staff at the time of reporting.

The following tables represent the requested data for DOE sites for FY 17. The overall performance grades and metrics have been provided by each site's Field Office.

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|----|
| Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory (LLNL) | 5 |
| Nevada National Security Site (NNSS) | 7 |
| Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL) | 9 |
| Sandia National Laboratories (SNL) | 11 |
| Pantex | 13 |
| Y-12 National Security Site (Y-12) | 15 |
| Uranium Processing Facility (UPF) | 17 |
| Pacific Northwest National Laboratory (PNNL) | 19 |
| Richland CHPRC..... | 21 |
| River Protection WTP..... | 23 |
| River Protection Tank Farms..... | 25 |
| Idaho Flour Idaho LLC..... | 27 |
| Oak Ridge UCOR..... | 29 |
| Oak Ridge Isotek | 31 |
| Oak Ridge TWPC..... | 33 |
| Savannah River SRNS | 35 |
| Savannah River Parsons | 37 |
| Savannah River SRR..... | 39 |

Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory (LLNL)

1. LLNL Overall Performance

| Fiscal Year | Program Health | Operational Implementation |
|-------------|----------------|----------------------------|
| FY 15 | Green | |
| FY 16 | Green | |
| FY 17 | Green | Green |

Comments:

The Livermore Field Office criticality safety engineer retired in December 2017. NA-512, Office of Nuclear Safety Services, will provide temporary oversight during FY 18.

2. LLNL Criticality Safety Infractions

| Fiscal Year | Level 1 | Level 2 | Level 3 | Level 4 |
|-------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| FY 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| FY 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| FY 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |

3. LLNL Program Non-Compliances

| Fiscal Year | Contractor Identified | Externally Identified |
|-------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| FY 15 | 0 | 0 |
| FY 16 | 0 | 0 |
| FY 17 | 0 | 0 |

4. LLNL Contractor and Federal Assessments

| Fiscal Year | Contractor Assessments | | | Federal Assessments | | |
|-------------|------------------------|----------------|------------|---------------------|----------------|------------|
| | Total Assessments | Total Findings | Total OFIs | Total Assessments | Total Findings | Total OFIs |
| FY 15 | 3 | 0 | 9 | 5 | 1 | 4 |
| FY 16 | 3 | 0 | 10 | 6 | 0 | 1 |
| FY 17 | 1 | 0 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 1 |

5. LLNL Contractor Staffing

| Fiscal Year | Contractor Staffing | | | | | |
|-------------|---------------------|--------------|-------------|------------|-------------|------------|
| | Qualified | Meets Target | In Training | Staff Lost | Staff Hired | Experience |
| FY 15 | 8 | Yes | 2 | 2 | 2 | 25 |
| FY 16 | 6 | Yes | 1 | 1 | 0 | 20 |
| FY 17 | 5 | Yes | 1 | 2 | 1 | 19 |

6. LLNL Federal Staffing

| Fiscal Year | Federal Staffing | | | | | |
|-------------|------------------|--------------|-------------|------------|-------------|------------|
| | Qualified | Meets Target | In Training | Staff Lost | Staff Hired | Experience |
| FY 15 | 1 | Yes | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 |
| FY 16 | 1 | Yes | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 |
| FY 17 | 1 | Yes | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 |

Nevada National Security Site (NNSS)

1. NNSS Overall Performance

| Fiscal Year | Program Health | Operational Implementation |
|-------------|----------------|----------------------------|
| FY 15 | Green | |
| FY 16 | Green | |
| FY 17 | Green | Green |

Comments:

Program Health and Metrics Data is for the NNSS Management and Operating (M&O) Contractor only. Other programs that perform work at NNSS report their metrics through their own program mechanisms.

2. NNSS Criticality Safety Infractions

| Fiscal Year | Level 1 | Level 2 | Level 3 | Level 4 | Level 5 |
|-------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| FY 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| FY 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| FY 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |

3. NNSS Program Non-Compliances

| Fiscal Year | Contractor Identified | Externally Identified |
|-------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| FY 15 | 0 | 0 |
| FY 16 | 0 | 0 |
| FY 17 | 0 | 0 |

4. NNSS Contractor and Federal Assessments

| Fiscal Year | Contractor Assessments | | | Federal Assessments | | |
|-------------|------------------------|----------------|------------|---------------------|----------------|------------|
| | Total Assessments | Total Findings | Total OFIs | Total Assessments | Total Findings | Total OFIs |
| FY 15 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| FY 16 | 1 | 3 | 11 | 2 | 4 | 4 |
| FY 17 | 2 | 2 | 7 | 2 | 2 | 1 |

5. NNSS Contractor Staffing

| Fiscal Year | Contractor Staffing | | | | | |
|-------------|---------------------|--------------|-------------|------------|-------------|------------|
| | Qualified | Meets Target | In Training | Staff Lost | Staff Hired | Experience |
| FY 15 | 2 | Yes | 1 | 1 | 0 | 10 |
| FY 16 | 2 | Yes | 1 | 1 | 0 | 8 |
| FY 17 | 3 | Yes | 1 | 1 | 1 | 17 |

6. NNSS Federal Staffing

| Fiscal Year | Federal Staffing | | | | | |
|-------------|------------------|--------------|-------------|------------|-------------|------------|
| | Qualified | Meets Target | In Training | Staff Lost | Staff Hired | Experience |
| FY 15 | 1 | Yes | 1 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| FY 16 | 1 | Yes | 1 | 0 | 0 | 10 |
| FY 17 | 1 | Yes | 1 | 0 | 0 | 11 |

Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL)

1. LANL Overall Performance

| Fiscal Year | Program Health | Operational Implementation |
|-------------|----------------|----------------------------|
| FY 15 | Yellow | |
| FY 16 | Red | |
| FY 17 | Red | Red |

Comments:

The LANL NCS Program continues to demonstrate improvements in program health and operational implementation as evidenced by internal and external reviews. Overall performance remains below expectations due to legacy evaluation and implementation deficiencies and continuing challenges to program improvement efforts. Rigorous compensatory measures are in place to ensure continued safe operations while implementing program improvements. The NCS Program Improvement Plan includes commitments to correct the legacy evaluations and defines the path to a stable and compliant program over the next several years.

A federal staffing analysis performed in FY 16 showed that more criticality safety federal staff were required. Therefore, the target for federal staffing levels was not met for FY 16 and 17. Headquarters' staff is providing additional support as needed until staffing levels improve.

2. LANL Criticality Safety Infractions

| Fiscal Year | Level 1 | Level 2 | Level 3 | Level 4 | Level 5 |
|-------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| FY 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 20 |
| FY 16 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 17 |
| FY 17 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 22 |

3. LANL Program Non-Compliances

| Fiscal Year | Contractor Identified | Externally Identified |
|-------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| FY 15 | 16 | 5 |
| FY 16 | 21 | 3 |
| FY 17 | 31 | 0 |

4. LANL Contractor and Federal Assessments

| Fiscal Year | Contractor Assessments | | | Federal Assessments | | |
|-------------|------------------------|----------------|------------|---------------------|----------------|------------|
| | Total Assessments | Total Findings | Total OFIs | Total Assessments | Total Findings | Total OFIs |
| FY 15 | 4 | 16 | 24 | 3 | 5 | 0 |
| FY 16 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 5 |
| FY 17 | 5 | 5 | 7 | 3 | 1 | 0 |

5. LANL Contractor Staffing

| Fiscal Year | Contractor Staffing | | | | | |
|-------------|---------------------|--------------|-------------|------------|-------------|------------|
| | Qualified | Meets Target | In Training | Staff Lost | Staff Hired | Experience |
| FY 15 | 8 | No | 9 | 4 | 3 | 10 |
| FY 16 | 9 | No | 11 | 1 | 6 | 8.8 |
| FY 17 | 9 | No | 12 | 5 | 6 | 6.25 |

6. LANL Federal Staffing

| Fiscal Year | Federal Staffing | | | | | |
|-------------|------------------|--------------|-------------|------------|-------------|------------|
| | Qualified | Meets Target | In Training | Staff Lost | Staff Hired | Experience |
| FY 15 | 1 | Yes | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 |
| FY 16 | 1 | No | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 |
| FY 17 | 1 | No | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 |

Sandia National Laboratories (SNL)

1. SNL Overall Performance

| Fiscal Year | Program Health | Operational Implementation |
|-------------|----------------|----------------------------|
| FY 15 | Green | |
| FY 16 | Green | |
| FY 17 | Green | Green |

Comments:

The program health grade is green based on SNL's emphasis on completing criticality safety evaluations (CSEs) to support operations. SNL initiated a Program Improvement Plan in FY I6 and updated the plan in FY 17. SNL performed a triennial assessment with external reviewers which resulted in the program being graded as adequate. In FY 17, SNL started the training of six staff to address the need for resources and is scheduled to qualify two staff in the 1st quarter of FY 18.

The operational implementation grade is green based on the excellent support given to completing three CSEs for the handling and processing of fissile materials. The number of infractions and non-compliances continues to be low and the SNL program for assessing facilities continues to improve.

2. SNL Criticality Safety Infractions

| Fiscal Year | Level 1 | Level 2 | Level 3 | Level 4 | Level 5 |
|-------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| FY 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| FY 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| FY 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

3. SNL Program Non-Compliances

| Fiscal Year | Contractor Identified | Externally Identified |
|-------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| FY 15 | 0 | 0 |
| FY 16 | 0 | 0 |
| FY 17 | 1 | 0 |

4. SNL Contractor and Federal Assessments

| Fiscal Year | Contractor Assessments | | | Federal Assessments | | |
|-------------|------------------------|----------------|------------|---------------------|----------------|------------|
| | Total Assessments | Total Findings | Total OFIs | Total Assessments | Total Findings | Total OFIs |
| FY 15 | 7 | 0 | 8 | 4 | 0 | 4 |
| FY 16 | 7 | 0 | 13 | 5 | 1 | 5 |
| FY 17 | 9 | 0 | 11 | 4 | 0 | 5 |

5. SNL Contractor Staffing

| Fiscal Year | Contractor Staffing | | | | | |
|-------------|---------------------|--------------|-------------|------------|-------------|------------|
| | Qualified | Meets Target | In Training | Staff Lost | Staff Hired | Experience |
| FY 15 | 6 | Yes | 3 | 1 | 0 | 15 |
| FY 16 | 6 | Yes | 4 | 0 | 1 | 17 |
| FY 17 | 6 | Yes | 6 | 0 | 0 | 18 |

6. SNL Federal Staffing

| Fiscal Year | Federal Staffing | | | | | |
|-------------|------------------|--------------|-------------|------------|-------------|------------|
| | Qualified | Meets Target | In Training | Staff Lost | Staff Hired | Experience |
| FY 15 | 1 | Yes | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 |
| FY 16 | 1 | Yes | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 |
| FY 17 | 1 | Yes | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 |

Pantex

1. Pantex Overall Performance

| Fiscal Year | Program Health | Operational Implementation |
|-------------|----------------|----------------------------|
| FY 15 | Yellow | |
| FY 16 | Green | |
| FY 17 | Green | Green |

Comments:

The Program Health grade reflects the combined performance of the contractor at Y-12, Pantex and Uranium Processing Facility (UPF). However, the Operational Implementation grade is specific to implementation at this site.

The contractor has three Y-12 engineers qualified in Pantex operations as well as two on-site. Average years of experience reported for Pantex is for Pantex employees only.

The NNSA Production Office (NPO) has no NCS staff dedicated solely to Pantex or any specific location. Oversight is provided by periodic site visits and communication with local NPO staff.

2. Pantex Criticality Safety Infractions

| Fiscal Year | Level 1 | Level 2 | Level 3 | Level 4 | Level 5 |
|-------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| FY 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| FY 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| FY 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

3. Pantex Program Non-Compliances

| Fiscal Year | Contractor Identified | Externally Identified |
|-------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| FY 15 | 0 | 0 |
| FY 16 | 0 | 0 |
| FY 17 | 0 | 0 |

4. Pantex Contractor and Federal Assessments

| Fiscal Year | Contractor Assessments | | | Federal Assessments | | |
|-------------|------------------------|----------------|------------|---------------------|----------------|------------|
| | Total Assessments | Total Findings | Total OFIs | Total Assessments | Total Findings | Total OFIs |
| FY 15 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| FY 16 | 3 | 2 | 10 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| FY 17 | 4 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 0 |

5. Pantex Contractor Staffing

| Fiscal Year | Contractor Staffing | | | | | |
|-------------|---------------------|--------------|-------------|------------|-------------|------------|
| | Qualified | Meets Target | In Training | Staff Lost | Staff Hired | Experience |
| FY 15 | 1 | No | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 |
| FY 16 | 4 | Yes | 2 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| FY 17 | 5 | Yes | 1 | 0 | 0 | 8.625 |

6. Pantex Federal Staffing

Note: Criticality Safety Federal oversight of Pantex, Y-12 and UPF is performed by the NPO.

| Fiscal Year | Federal Staffing | | | | | |
|-------------|------------------|--------------|-------------|------------|-------------|------------|
| | Qualified | Meets Target | In Training | Staff Lost | Staff Hired | Experience |
| FY 15 | 2 | Yes | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8.8 |
| FY 16 | 2 | Yes | 1 | 0 | 1 | 20 |
| FY 17 | 3 | Yes | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 |

Y-12 National Security Site (Y-12)

1. Y-12 Overall Performance

| Fiscal Year | Program Health | Operational Implementation |
|-------------|----------------|----------------------------|
| FY 15 | Yellow | |
| FY 16 | Green | |
| FY 17 | Green | Green |

Comments:

The Program Health grade reflects the combined performance of the contractor at Y-12, Pantex and UPF. However, the Operational Implementation grade is specific to implementation at this site.

One of the three NPO staff retired in December 2017. Another is on a long-term detail at the Savannah River Site.

2. Y-12 Criticality Safety Infractions

| Fiscal Year | Occurrences | Deficiencies | Minor Non-Compliances |
|-------------|-------------|--------------|-----------------------|
| FY 15 | 8 | 18 | 44 |
| FY 16 | 5 | 20 | 35 |
| FY 17 | 3 | 16 | 18 |

3. Y-12 Program Non-Compliances

| Fiscal Year | Contractor Identified | Externally Identified |
|-------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| FY 15 | 0 | 7 |
| FY 16 | 0 | 0 |
| FY 17 | 0 | 0 |

4. Y-12 Contractor and Federal Assessments

| Fiscal Year | Contractor Assessments | | | Federal Assessments | | |
|-------------|------------------------|----------------|------------|---------------------|----------------|------------|
| | Total Assessments | Total Findings | Total OFIs | Total Assessments | Total Findings | Total OFIs |
| FY 15 | 5 | 7 | 0 | 7 | 2 | 0 |
| FY 16 | 7 | 1 | 9 | 7 | 1 | 0 |
| FY 17 | 16 | 11 | 32 | 6 | 1 | 8 |

5. Y-12 Contractor Staffing

| Fiscal Year | Contractor Staffing | | | | | |
|-------------|---------------------|--------------|-------------|------------|-------------|------------|
| | Qualified | Meets Target | In Training | Staff Lost | Staff Hired | Experience |
| FY 15 | 20 | No | 8 | 4 | 7 | 20 |
| FY 16 | 22 | No | 15 | 3 | 3 | 15.5 |
| FY 17 | 21 | No | 13 | 6 | 3 | 17.5 |

6. Y-12 Federal Staffing

Note: Criticality Safety Federal oversight of Pantex, Y-12 and UPF is performed by the NNSA Production Office (NPO).

| Fiscal Year | Federal Staffing | | | | | |
|-------------|------------------|--------------|-------------|------------|-------------|------------|
| | Qualified | Meets Target | In Training | Staff Lost | Staff Hired | Experience |
| FY 15 | 2 | Yes | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8.8 |
| FY 16 | 2 | Yes | 1 | 0 | 1 | 20 |
| FY 17 | 3 | Yes | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 |

Uranium Processing Facility (UPF)

1. UPF Overall Performance

| Fiscal Year | Program Health | Operational Implementation |
|-------------|----------------|----------------------------|
| FY 15 | Yellow | |
| FY 16 | Green | |
| FY 17 | Green | N/A |

Comments:

The Program Health grade reflects the combined performance of the contractor at Y-12, Pantex and UPF. However, the Operational Implementation grade is specific to implementation at this site.

Staffing levels were significantly reduced in FY 17 due to completion of final design in July.

NPO has no criticality safety staff dedicated solely to UPF or any individual location. In FY 17 two NPO NCS engineers supported design review efforts and the Preliminary Documented Safety Analysis (DSA) submittal which included review of Criticality Safety Process Studies.

2. UPF Program Non-Compliances

| Fiscal Year | Contractor Identified | Externally Identified |
|-------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| FY 15 | 0 | 0 |
| FY 16 | 0 | 0 |
| FY 17 | 0 | 0 |

3. UPF Contractor and Federal Assessments

| Fiscal Year | Contractor Assessments | | | Federal Assessments | | |
|-------------|------------------------|----------------|------------|---------------------|----------------|------------|
| | Total Assessments | Total Findings | Total OFIs | Total Assessments | Total Findings | Total OFIs |
| FY 15 | 5 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| FY 16 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 1 |
| FY 17 | 6 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

4. UPF Contractor Staffing

| Fiscal Year | Contractor Staffing | | | | | |
|-------------|---------------------|--------------|-------------|------------|-------------|------------|
| | Qualified | Meets Target | In Training | Staff Lost | Staff Hired | Experience |
| FY 15 | 30 | No | 1 | 3 | 7 | 22 |
| FY 16 | 29 | No | 6 | 5 | 3 | 22.1 |
| FY 17 | 18 | Yes | 1 | 18 | 2 | 27 |

5. UPF Federal Staffing

Note: Criticality Safety Federal oversight of Pantex, Y-12 and UPF is performed by the NNSA Production Office (NPO).

| Fiscal Year | Federal Staffing | | | | | |
|-------------|------------------|--------------|-------------|------------|-------------|------------|
| | Qualified | Meets Target | In Training | Staff Lost | Staff Hired | Experience |
| FY 15 | 2 | Yes | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8.8 |
| FY 16 | 2 | Yes | 1 | 0 | 1 | 20 |
| FY 17 | 3 | Yes | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 |

Pacific Northwest National Laboratory (PNNL)

1. PNNL Overall Performance

| Fiscal Year | Program Health | Operational Implementation |
|-------------|----------------|----------------------------|
| FY 15 | Green | |
| FY 16 | Yellow | |
| FY 17 | Green | Green |

Comments:

PNNL has made improvements to the program including augmenting the criticality safety staffing that are expected to improve the weaknesses identified previously. PNSO will continue to monitor PNNL program improvements in FY 18.

2. PNNL Criticality Safety Infractions

| Fiscal Year | Level 1 | Level 2 | Level 3 | Level 4 | Level 5 |
|-------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| FY 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| FY 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| FY 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

3. PNNL Program Non-Compliances

| Fiscal Year | Contractor Identified | Externally Identified |
|-------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| FY 15 | 0 | 1 |
| FY 16 | 0 | 0 |
| FY 17 | 1 | 0 |

4. PNNL Contractor and Federal Assessments

| Fiscal Year | Contractor Assessments | | | Federal Assessments | | |
|-------------|------------------------|----------------|------------|---------------------|----------------|------------|
| | Total Assessments | Total Findings | Total OFIs | Total Assessments | Total Findings | Total OFIs |
| FY 15 | 6 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3 |
| FY 16 | 13 | 1 | 10 | 1 | 0 | 2 |
| FY 17 | 12 | 0 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

5. PNNL Contractor Staffing

| Fiscal Year | Contractor Staffing | | | | | |
|-------------|---------------------|--------------|-------------|------------|-------------|------------|
| | Qualified | Meets Target | In Training | Staff Lost | Staff Hired | Experience |
| FY 15 | 4 | Yes | 1 | 0 | 0 | 15 |
| FY 16 | 4 | Yes | 1 | 0 | 0 | 17 |
| FY 17 | 3 | Yes | 4 | 0 | 3 | 12.4 |

6. PNNL Federal Staffing

| Fiscal Year | Federal Staffing | | | | | |
|-------------|------------------|--------------|-------------|------------|-------------|------------|
| | Qualified | Meets Target | In Training | Staff Lost | Staff Hired | Experience |
| FY 15 | 1 | Yes | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 |
| FY 16 | 1 | Yes | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 |
| FY 17 | 1 | Yes | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 |

Richland CHPRC

1. CHPRC Overall Performance

| Fiscal Year | Program Health | Operational Implementation |
|-------------|----------------|----------------------------|
| FY 15 | Green | |
| FY 16 | Green | |
| FY 17 | Green | Green |

Comments:

Washington Closure Hanford (WCH) contract was completed on August 29, 2016. The remaining nuclear criticality safety work scope was transferred to the CHPRC in August of 2016.

The CH2M Hill Plateau Remediation Company (CHPRC) Criticality Safety Program is effectively implemented on the Hanford Site. With a minimal, yet sufficient, staff, criticality safety evaluations have been provided to further the CHPRC scope at Hanford; a criticality has been shown incredible in all facilities except for potential areas of two process buildings currently in surveillance and maintenance mode. This has been accomplished with few non-conformances attesting to the successful implementation of the program in the facilities.

2. CHPRC Criticality Safety Infractions

| Fiscal Year | Criticality | Violation | Infraction | Discrepancy | Deviation |
|-------------|-------------|-----------|------------|-------------|-----------|
| FY 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| FY 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| FY 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |

3. CHPRC Program Non-Compliances

| Fiscal Year | Contractor Identified | Externally Identified |
|-------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| FY 15 | 0 | 0 |
| FY 16 | 3 | 0 |
| FY 17 | 0 | 0 |

4. CHPRC Contractor and Federal Assessments

| Fiscal Year | Contractor Assessments | | | Federal Assessments | | |
|-------------|------------------------|----------------|------------|---------------------|----------------|------------|
| | Total Assessments | Total Findings | Total OFIs | Total Assessments | Total Findings | Total OFIs |
| FY 15 | 3 | 1 | 8 | 2 | 0 | 4 |
| FY 16 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 14 | 0 | 4 |
| FY 17 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 7 | 0 | 3 |

5. CHPRC Contractor Staffing

| Fiscal Year | Contractor Staffing | | | | | |
|-------------|---------------------|--------------|-------------|------------|-------------|------------|
| | Qualified | Meets Target | In Training | Staff Lost | Staff Hired | Experience |
| FY 15 | 4 | Yes | 0 | 0 | 1 | 19 |
| FY 16 | 8 | Yes | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20.6 |
| FY 17 | 5 | Yes | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 |

6. CHPRC Federal Staffing

Note: Federal oversight is combined for CHPRC and WCH.

| Fiscal Year | Federal Staffing | | | | | |
|-------------|------------------|--------------|-------------|------------|-------------|------------|
| | Qualified | Meets Target | In Training | Staff Lost | Staff Hired | Experience |
| FY 15 | 1 | Yes | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| FY 16 | 1 | Yes | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| FY 17 | 1 | Yes | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |

River Protection WTP

1. WTP Overall Performance

| Fiscal Year | Program Health | Operational Implementation |
|-------------|----------------|----------------------------|
| FY 15 | Yellow | |
| FY 16 | Green | |
| FY 17 | Green | N/A |

Comments:

The Hanford's Waste Treatment and Immobilization Plant (WTP) criticality safety program continues to grow and improve as the facility progresses toward completion. Office of River Protection (ORP) and Bechtel National, Inc. (BNI) interfaces with the CSSG and DNFSB regarding issue closure have improved this year, though some issues remain. Recent changes in DSA completion timeline and expected commissioning activities for the Low-Activity Waste facility might introduce previously unexpected complications due to the low staff and relative inexperience of recently qualified criticality safety staff. ORP maintains its interface with the contractor on the subject.

2. WTP Program Non-Compliances

| Fiscal Year | Contractor Identified | Externally Identified |
|-------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| FY 15 | N/A* | N/A* |
| FY 16 | 0 | 0 |
| FY 17 | 0 | 0 |

* No assessments performed in FY 15.

3. WTP Contractor and Federal Assessments

| Fiscal Year | Contractor Assessments | | | Federal Assessments | | |
|-------------|------------------------|----------------|------------|---------------------|----------------|------------|
| | Total Assessments | Total Findings | Total OFIs | Total Assessments | Total Findings | Total OFIs |
| FY 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| FY 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 0 |
| FY 17 | 2 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

4. WTP Contractor Staffing

| Fiscal Year | Contractor Staffing | | | | | |
|-------------|---------------------|--------------|-------------|------------|-------------|------------|
| | Qualified | Meets Target | In Training | Staff Lost | Staff Hired | Experience |
| FY 15 | 3 | Yes | 2 | 1 | 0 | 17 |
| FY 16 | 2 | Yes | 2 | 1 | 0 | 13 |
| FY 17 | 3 | Yes | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 |

5. WTP Federal Staffing

Note: Federal oversight is combined for WTP and Tank Farms.

| Fiscal Year | Federal Staffing | | | | | |
|-------------|------------------|--------------|-------------|------------|-------------|------------|
| | Qualified | Meets Target | In Training | Staff Lost | Staff Hired | Experience |
| FY 15 | 5 | Yes | 5 | 0 | 1 | 7 |
| FY 16 | 5 | Yes | 2 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| FY 17 | 5 | Yes | 2 | 0 | 0 | 8 |

River Protection Tank Farms

1. Tank Farms Overall Performance

| Fiscal Year | Program Health | Operational Implementation |
|-------------|----------------|----------------------------|
| FY 15 | Yellow | |
| FY 16 | Green | |
| FY 17 | Green | Green |

Comments:

The Tank Farm's criticality safety program continues to exhibit overall good health and improved ownership of programmatic criticality safety issues.

2. Tank Farms Criticality Safety Infractions

| Fiscal Year | Level 1 | Level 2 | Level 3 | Level 4 | Level 5 |
|-------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| FY 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| FY 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| FY 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

3. Tank Farms Program Non-Compliances

| Fiscal Year | Contractor Identified | Externally Identified |
|-------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| FY 15 | 0 | 0 |
| FY 16 | 0 | 0 |
| FY 17 | 1 | 0 |

4. Tank Farms Contractor and Federal Assessments

| Fiscal Year | Contractor Assessments | | | Federal Assessments | | |
|-------------|------------------------|----------------|------------|---------------------|----------------|------------|
| | Total Assessments | Total Findings | Total OFIs | Total Assessments | Total Findings | Total OFIs |
| FY 15 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| FY 16 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 |
| FY 17 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 2 | 0 | 0 |

5. Tank Farms Contractor Staffing

| Fiscal Year | Contractor Staffing | | | | | |
|-------------|---------------------|--------------|-------------|------------|-------------|------------|
| | Qualified | Meets Target | In Training | Staff Lost | Staff Hired | Experience |
| FY 15 | 4 | Yes | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 |
| FY 16 | 3 | Yes | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 |
| FY 17 | 3 | Yes | 0 | 1 | 1 | 20 |

6. Tank Farms Federal Staffing

Note: Federal oversight is combined for WTP and Tank Farms.

| Fiscal Year | Federal Staffing | | | | | |
|-------------|------------------|--------------|-------------|------------|-------------|------------|
| | Qualified | Meets Target | In Training | Staff Lost | Staff Hired | Experience |
| FY 15 | 5 | Yes | 5 | 0 | 1 | 7 |
| FY 16 | 5 | Yes | 2 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| FY 17 | 5 | Yes | 2 | 0 | 0 | 8 |

Idaho Flour Idaho LLC

1. Flour Idaho Overall Performance

| Fiscal Year | Program Health | Operational Implementation |
|-------------|----------------|----------------------------|
| FY 16 | Green | |
| FY 17 | Green | Green |

Comments:

Fluor Idaho, LLC assumed the contract scope for CH2M-WG Idaho, LLC (CWI) and Idaho Treatment Group, LLC (ITG) on June 1, 2016.

2. Flour Idaho Criticality Safety Infractions

| Fiscal Year | Level 1 | Level 2 | Level 3 | Level 4 | Level 5 |
|-------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| FY 16 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| FY 17 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 0 |

3. Flour Idaho Program Non-Compliances

| Fiscal Year | Contractor Identified | Externally Identified |
|-------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| FY 16 | 0 | 0 |
| FY 17 | 0 | 0 |

4. Flour Idaho Contractor and Federal Assessments

| Fiscal Year | Contractor Assessments | | | Federal Assessments | | |
|-------------|------------------------|----------------|------------|---------------------|----------------|------------|
| | Total Assessments | Total Findings | Total OFIs | Total Assessments | Total Findings | Total OFIs |
| FY 16 | 14 | 16 | 21 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| FY 17 | 43 | 63 | 77 | 4 | 0 | 0 |

5. Flour Idaho Contractor Staffing

| Fiscal Year | Contractor Staffing | | | | | |
|-------------|---------------------|--------------|-------------|------------|-------------|------------|
| | Qualified | Meets Target | In Training | Staff Lost | Staff Hired | Experience |
| FY 16 | 4 | Yes | 1 | 0 | 0 | 15 |
| FY 17 | 6 | Yes | 1 | 0 | 2 | 18 |

6. Flour Idaho Federal Staffing

| Fiscal Year | Federal Staffing | | | | | |
|-------------|------------------|--------------|-------------|------------|-------------|------------|
| | Qualified | Meets Target | In Training | Staff Lost | Staff Hired | Experience |
| FY 16 | 3 | Yes | 0 | 2 | 0 | 7 |
| FY 17 | 3 | Yes | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 |

Oak Ridge UCOR

1. UCOR Overall Performance

| Fiscal Year | Program Health | Operational Implementation |
|-------------|----------------|----------------------------|
| FY 15 | Green | |
| FY 16 | Green | |
| FY 17 | Green | Green |

Comments:

The URS/CH2M Oak Ridge LLC (UCOR) NCS Program meets expectations from both a program health and operational implementation standpoint.

2. UCOR Criticality Safety Infractions

| Fiscal Year | Level 1 | Level 2 | Level 3 | Level 4 | Level 5 |
|-------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| FY 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 4 |
| FY 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 |
| FY 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 1 |

3. UCOR Program Non-Compliances

| Fiscal Year | Contractor Identified | Externally Identified |
|-------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| FY 15 | 0 | 0 |
| FY 16 | 0 | 0 |
| FY 17 | 0 | 0 |

4. UCOR Contractor and Federal Assessments

| Fiscal Year | Contractor Assessments | | | Federal Assessments | | |
|-------------|------------------------|----------------|------------|---------------------|----------------|------------|
| | Total Assessments | Total Findings | Total OFIs | Total Assessments | Total Findings | Total OFIs |
| FY 15 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| FY 16 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 |
| FY 17 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 1 |

5. UCOR Contractor Staffing

| Fiscal Year | Contractor Staffing | | | | | |
|-------------|---------------------|--------------|-------------|------------|-------------|------------|
| | Qualified | Meets Target | In Training | Staff Lost | Staff Hired | Experience |
| FY 15 | 5 | Yes | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 |
| FY 16 | 4 | Yes | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 |
| FY 17 | 5 | Yes | 0 | 1 | 2 | 21 |

6. UCOR Federal Staffing

Note: Federal oversight is combined for UCOR, Isotek Systems, LLC (Isotek), and Transuranic (TRU) Waste Processing Center (TWPC).

| Fiscal Year | Federal Staffing | | | | | |
|-------------|------------------|--------------|-------------|------------|-------------|------------|
| | Qualified | Meets Target | In Training | Staff Lost | Staff Hired | Experience |
| FY 15 | 2 | Yes | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 |
| FY 16 | 2 | Yes | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 |
| FY 17 | 2 | Yes | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 |

Oak Ridge Isotek

1. Isotek Overall Performance

| Fiscal Year | Program Health | Operational Implementation |
|-------------|----------------|----------------------------|
| FY 15 | Green | |
| FY 16 | Green | |
| FY 17 | Green | Green |

Comments:

The Isotek NCS Program meets expectations from both a program health and operational implementation standpoint.

2. Isotek Criticality Safety Infractions

| Fiscal Year | Level 1 | Level 2 | Level 3 | Level 4 | Level 5 |
|-------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| FY 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| FY 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| FY 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |

3. Isotek Program Non-Compliances

| Fiscal Year | Contractor Identified | Externally Identified |
|-------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| FY 15 | 0 | 0 |
| FY 16 | 0 | 0 |
| FY 17 | 0 | 0 |

4. Isotek Contractor and Federal Assessments

| Fiscal Year | Contractor Assessments | | | Federal Assessments | | |
|-------------|------------------------|----------------|------------|---------------------|----------------|------------|
| | Total Assessments | Total Findings | Total OFIs | Total Assessments | Total Findings | Total OFIs |
| FY 15 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| FY 16 | 1 | 0 | 7 | 4 | 0 | 0 |
| FY 17 | 2 | 0 | 17 | 4 | 0 | 0 |

5. Isotek Contractor Staffing

| Fiscal Year | Contractor Staffing | | | | | |
|-------------|---------------------|--------------|-------------|------------|-------------|------------|
| | Qualified | Meets Target | In Training | Staff Lost | Staff Hired | Experience |
| FY 15 | 5 | Yes | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 |
| FY 16 | 5 | Yes | 0 | 1 | 1 | 25+ |
| FY 17 | 5 | Yes | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26+ |

6. Isotek Federal Staffing

Note: Federal oversight is combined for UCOR, Isotek, and TWPC.

| Fiscal Year | Federal Staffing | | | | | |
|-------------|------------------|--------------|-------------|------------|-------------|------------|
| | Qualified | Meets Target | In Training | Staff Lost | Staff Hired | Experience |
| FY 15 | 2 | Yes | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 |
| FY 16 | 2 | Yes | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 |
| FY 17 | 2 | Yes | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 |

Oak Ridge TWPC

1. TWPC Overall Performance

| Fiscal Year | Program Health | Operational Implementation |
|-------------|----------------|----------------------------|
| FY 15 | Green | |
| FY 16 | Green | |
| FY 17 | Green | Green |

Comments:

The TWPC NCS Program meets expectations from both a program health and operational implementation standpoint.

2. TWPC Criticality Safety Infractions

| Fiscal Year | Level 1 | Level 2 | Level 3 | Level 4 | Level 5 |
|-------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| FY 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| FY 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| FY 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |

3. TWPC Program Non-Compliances

| Fiscal Year | Contractor Identified | Externally Identified |
|-------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| FY 15 | 0 | 0 |
| FY 16 | 0 | 0 |
| FY 17 | 0 | 0 |

4. TWPC Contractor and Federal Assessments

| Fiscal Year | Contractor Assessments | | | Federal Assessments | | |
|-------------|------------------------|----------------|------------|---------------------|----------------|------------|
| | Total Assessments | Total Findings | Total OFIs | Total Assessments | Total Findings | Total OFIs |
| FY 15 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| FY 16 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 0 |
| FY 17 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 |

5. TWPC Contractor Staffing

| Fiscal Year | Contractor Staffing | | | | | |
|-------------|---------------------|--------------|-------------|------------|-------------|------------|
| | Qualified | Meets Target | In Training | Staff Lost | Staff Hired | Experience |
| FY 15 | 4 | Yes | 0 | 0 | 0 | 27 |
| FY 16 | 4 | Yes | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28+ |
| FY 17 | 4 | Yes | 0 | 1 | 1 | 28+ |

6. TWPC Federal Staffing

Note: Federal oversight is combined for UCOR, Isotek, and TWPC.

| Fiscal Year | Federal Staffing | | | | | |
|-------------|------------------|--------------|-------------|------------|-------------|------------|
| | Qualified | Meets Target | In Training | Staff Lost | Staff Hired | Experience |
| FY 15 | 2 | Yes | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 |
| FY 16 | 2 | Yes | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 |
| FY 17 | 2 | Yes | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 |

Savannah River SRNS

1. SRNS Overall Performance

| Fiscal Year | Program Health | Operational Implementation |
|-------------|----------------|----------------------------|
| FY 15 | Yellow | |
| FY 16 | Green | |
| FY 17 | Green | Green |

Comments:

No comments.

2. SRNS Criticality Safety Infractions

| Fiscal Year | Level 1 | Level 2 | Level 3 | Level 4 | Level 5 |
|-------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| FY 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 |
| FY 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| FY 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 |

3. SRNS Program Non-Compliances

| Fiscal Year | Contractor Identified | Externally Identified |
|-------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| FY 15 | 0 | 2 |
| FY 16 | 0 | 0 |
| FY 17 | 0 | 0 |

4. SRNS Contractor and Federal Assessments

| Fiscal Year | Contractor Assessments | | | Federal Assessments | | |
|-------------|------------------------|----------------|------------|---------------------|----------------|------------|
| | Total Assessments | Total Findings | Total OFIs | Total Assessments | Total Findings | Total OFIs |
| FY 15 | 30 | 16 | 52 | 22 | 4 | 36 |
| FY 16 | 137 | 16 | 77 | 24 | 3 | 8 |
| FY 17 | 156 | 14 | 121 | 16 | 3 | 8 |

5. SRNS Contractor Staffing

| Fiscal Year | Contractor Staffing | | | | | |
|-------------|---------------------|--------------|-------------|------------|-------------|------------|
| | Qualified | Meets Target | In Training | Staff Lost | Staff Hired | Experience |
| FY 15 | 20 | No | 6 | 0 | 2 | 21 |
| FY 16 | 20 | Yes | 8 | 1 | 3 | 21 |
| FY 17 | 21 | Yes | 7 | 2 | 3 | 21 |

6. SRNS Federal Staffing

Note: Federal oversight is combined for Savannah River Nuclear Solution (SRNS), Parsons Infrastructure and Technology Group, Inc. (Parsons), and Savannah River Remediation (SRR).

| Fiscal Year | Federal Staffing | | | | | |
|-------------|------------------|--------------|-------------|------------|-------------|------------|
| | Qualified | Meets Target | In Training | Staff Lost | Staff Hired | Experience |
| FY 15 | 4 | Yes | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 |
| FY 16 | 3 | No | 0 | 1 | 0 | 16 |
| FY 17 | 3 | No | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 |

Savannah River Parsons

1. Parsons Overall Performance

| Fiscal Year | Program Health | Operational Implementation |
|-------------|----------------|----------------------------|
| FY 15 | Green | |
| FY 16 | Green | |
| FY 17 | Green | Green |

Comments:

No comments.

2. Parsons Criticality Safety Infractions

| Fiscal Year | Level 1 | Level 2 | Level 3 | Level 4 | Level 5 |
|-------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| FY 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| FY 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| FY 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

3. Parsons Program Non-Compliances

| Fiscal Year | Contractor Identified | Externally Identified |
|-------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| FY 15 | N/A* | N/A* |
| FY 16 | N/A* | N/A* |
| FY 17 | N/A* | N/A* |

* No assessments performed.

4. Parsons Contractor and Federal Assessments

| Fiscal Year | Contractor Assessments | | | Federal Assessments | | |
|-------------|------------------------|----------------|------------|---------------------|----------------|------------|
| | Total Assessments | Total Findings | Total OFIs | Total Assessments | Total Findings | Total OFIs |
| FY 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| FY 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| FY 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

5. Parsons Contractor Staffing

| Fiscal Year | Contractor Staffing | | | | | |
|-------------|---------------------|--------------|-------------|------------|-------------|------------|
| | Qualified | Meets Target | In Training | Staff Lost | Staff Hired | Experience |
| FY 15 | 2 | Yes | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 |
| FY 16 | 2 | Yes | 1 | 2 | 1 | 25 |
| FY 17 | 2 | Yes | 0 | 0 | 0 | 30 |

6. Parsons Federal Staffing

Note: Federal oversight is combined for SRNS, Parsons, and SRR.

| Fiscal Year | Federal Staffing | | | | | |
|-------------|------------------|--------------|-------------|------------|-------------|------------|
| | Qualified | Meets Target | In Training | Staff Lost | Staff Hired | Experience |
| FY 15 | 4 | Yes | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 |
| FY 16 | 3 | No | 0 | 1 | 0 | 16 |
| FY 17 | 3 | No | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 |

Savannah River SRR

1. SRR Overall Performance

| Fiscal Year | Program Health | Operational Implementation |
|-------------|----------------|----------------------------|
| FY 15 | Green | |
| FY 16 | Green | |
| FY 17 | Green | Green |

Comments:

No comments.

2. SRR Criticality Safety Infractions

| Fiscal Year | Level 1 | Level 2 | Level 3 | Level 4 | Level 5 |
|-------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| FY 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| FY 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| FY 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

3. SRR Program Non-Compliances

| Fiscal Year | Contractor Identified | Externally Identified |
|-------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| FY 15 | 0 | 0 |
| FY 16 | 0 | 0 |
| FY 17 | 0 | 0 |

4. SRR Contractor and Federal Assessments

| Fiscal Year | Contractor Assessments | | | Federal Assessments | | |
|-------------|------------------------|----------------|------------|---------------------|----------------|------------|
| | Total Assessments | Total Findings | Total OFIs | Total Assessments | Total Findings | Total OFIs |
| FY 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 |
| FY 16 | 15 | 0 | 7 | 8 | 1 | 4 |
| FY 17 | 9 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |

5. SRR Contractor Staffing

| Fiscal Year | Contractor Staffing | | | | | |
|-------------|---------------------|--------------|-------------|------------|-------------|------------|
| | Qualified | Meets Target | In Training | Staff Lost | Staff Hired | Experience |
| FY 15 | 3 | Yes | 0 | 1 | 0 | 30 |
| FY 16 | 2 | Yes | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29 |
| FY 17 | 2 | Yes | 1 | 0 | 0 | 28 |

6. SRR Federal Staffing

Note: Federal oversight is combined for SRNS, Parsons, and SRR.

| Fiscal Year | Federal Staffing | | | | | |
|-------------|------------------|--------------|-------------|------------|-------------|------------|
| | Qualified | Meets Target | In Training | Staff Lost | Staff Hired | Experience |
| FY 15 | 4 | Yes | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 |
| FY 16 | 3 | No | 0 | 1 | 0 | 16 |
| FY 17 | 3 | No | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 |