

ATTACHMENT 2 – Quality Assurance Surveillance Plan Dugway Proving Ground; Area 2 of SWMU 11

October 2022

1 Overview

1.1 Introduction. This performance-based Quality Assurance Surveillance Plan (QASP) sets forth the procedures and guidance that the Contracting Officer's Representative (COR) will use in evaluating the technical performance of the Contractor in accordance with the terms and conditions of the PWS. A copy of the signed final QASP will be furnished to the Contractor so that the Contractor will be aware of the methods that the COR will use in evaluating performance for each task order under this contract.

The Contractor is responsible for the completeness and accuracy of all work performed under the task order, and for compliance with all parts of the contract. The government is relying upon the professional quality of the Contractor's work. All submittals are expected to go through an internal review process before being submitted to the Government. The Contractor shall correct all deficiencies relating to completeness, accuracy of work, compliance with the contract, task order, laws and regulations which are identified from their own quality control review, or by the Government.

1.2 Purpose. The QASP objective is to explain Government procedures to be used to verify that appropriate performance and quality assurance methods are used in the management of this performance-based contract. The purpose of the QASP is to assure that performance of specific activities and completion of milestones are accomplished in accordance with all requirements set forth in the PWS.

This QASP describes the mechanism for documenting noteworthy accomplishments or discrepancies for work performed by the Contractor. Information generated from COR's surveillance activities will directly feed into performance discussions with the Contractor. The intent is to ensure that the Contractor performs in accordance with performance metrics set forth in the PWS documents, the Army receives the quality of services called for in the contract, and the Army only pays for the acceptable level of services received.

The QASP details how and when the COR will monitor, evaluate, and document Contractor performance on the contract. The QASP is intended to accomplish the following:

1. Define the role and responsibilities of participating Army officials.
2. Define the key milestones/deliverables that will be assessed.
3. Define Exceptional, Very Good, Satisfactory, Marginal, and Unsatisfactory performance standards for key milestones/deliverables.
4. Describe the surveillance methodology that will be employed by the Army in assessing the Contractor's performance.
5. Describe the surveillance documentation process and provide copies of the form that the Army will use in evaluating the Contractor's performance.

6. Outline corrective action procedures.
7. Describe payment procedures.

This QASP will be revised and finalized by the COR and Contractor upon completion of the PMP in accordance with Section 4.1, Project Management, of the PWS.

2 Roles and Responsibilities of Army Officials

2.1 Contracting Officer.

The Contracting Officer (KO) has overall responsibility for overseeing the Contractor's performance. The KO is responsible for the day-to-day monitoring of the Contractor's performance in the areas of contract compliance, and contract administration; reviewing the COR's assessment of the Contractor's performance; and resolving all differences between the COR's assessment and the Contractor's assessment of performance. It is the KO that assures the Contractor receives impartial, fair, and equitable treatment under the contract. The KO is ultimately responsible for the final determination of the adequacy of the Contractor's performance. The KO is the only one authorized to obligate the Government on this contract.

2.2 Contracting Officer's Representative (COR).

The COR is responsible for technical administration of the project and assures proper Army surveillance of the Contractor's performance. The COR is responsible for monitoring, assessing, recording, and reporting on the technical performance of the Contractor on a day-to-day basis.

2.3 Technical Expertise and Subject Matter Experts.

The KO and COR may call upon the technical expertise of other Army officials and subject matter experts (SME) as required. These Army officials/SMEs may be called upon to review technical documents and products generated by the Contractor. Contracting Agency representatives will also conduct review of contract documentation such as invoices, monthly status reports, and work plans.

3 Key Milestones/Deliverables to be Assessed

Reference Table 8– Performance Milestone Table of the PWS for key milestones and associated deliverables.

Additionally, the Army will evaluate performance on the key quality control activities and events specified by the Contractor through the QASP.

3.1 Performance Standards for Key Milestones/Deliverables

Since price is fixed in the performance-based acquisitions utilized by the Army, the Contractor's performance will be evaluated by assessing the key milestones/deliverables described above according to five standards: quality, schedule, safety, management of key personnel and resources, and stakeholder concurrence. For each of these performance standards, the COR will assign one of five ratings of the Contractor's performance: exceptional, very good, satisfactory,

marginal, or unsatisfactory as defined in Table A-1 of the QASP. Note: These performance standards may be modified to meet the needs of the Army.

Table B-1: QASP Performance Standards and Ratings Definitions

| Performance Standard | Exceptional | Very Good | Satisfactory | Marginal | Unsatisfactory |
|---|---|--|---|--|--|
| Basic Definition | Contractor exceeds the performance requirements for the milestone, deliverable, or standard, with no substantive input from the government. | Contractor exceeds the performance requirements for the milestone, deliverable, or standard, with minimal input from the government. | Contractor meets the performance requirements for the milestone, deliverable, or standard, with moderate input from the government. | Contractor meets the performance requirements for the milestone, deliverable, or standard, with significant input from the government. | Contractor does not meet the performance requirements for the milestone, deliverable, or standard, after significant input from the government. |
| Performance Category: Quality of Product or Service | | | | | |
| Quality | Draft Final and Final deliverables are of excellent quality, approved as submitted, or with no substantive comments limited to grammar, spelling, or terminology. | Draft Final deliverables are of high quality and comments are mostly minor. Final deliverables are approved after one (1) round of Army comments on the Draft Final through acceptance of response to comments | Draft Final deliverables are of acceptable quality with only a few numbers of comments identifying major weaknesses. Final deliverables are approved after two (2) rounds of Army comments on | Draft Final deliverables are of poor quality with a significant number of comments identifying major weaknesses or deficiencies. Final deliverables require more than two (2) rounds of Army comments on Draft Final | Draft Final deliverables are of very poor quality and are rejected for re-submittal without comment. Final deliverables did not comply with contract requirements, or one or more document |

| Performance Standard | Exceptional | Very Good | Satisfactory | Marginal | Unsatisfactory |
|----------------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| | <p>Army audit finds that the data collected and/or the work performed exceeds the requirement of the PWS. No deficiencies noted.</p> | <p>of Final report against original comments. No further revisions are required.</p> <p>Army audit of work does not identify any deficiencies that compromise the quality of the data collected or work performed.</p> | <p>further revisions are required.</p> <p>Army audit of work identifies deficiencies that do not compromise the quality of the data collected or work performed, and can be corrected.</p> | <p>(e.g., changes are required to the Final document due to inadequate incorporation of comments).</p> <p>Army audit of work identifies deficiencies that compromise the quality of the data collected or work performed, but was corrected.</p> | <p>than three (3) rounds of Army comments before being approved.</p> <p>Army audit of work identifies deficiencies that compromise the quality of the data collected or work performed, and cannot be corrected.</p> |

| Performance Category: Schedule | | | | | |
|--------------------------------|--|---|---|---|---|
| Performance Standard | Exceptional | Very Good | Satisfactory | Marginal | Unsatisfactory |
| Schedule | Contractor Achieves milestone more than 90 days ahead of schedule (unless the COR waives this requirement), per criteria established in the PWS and the QASP.) | Contractor Achieves milestone less than 90 days but more than 30 days ahead of schedule (unless the COR waives this requirement), per criteria established in the PWS and the QASP. | Contractor achieves milestone according to the schedule (unless the COR waives this requirement), per criteria established in the PWS and the QASP. | Contractor achieves milestone more than 30 days but less than 90 days behind schedule (unless the COR waives this requirement), per criteria established in the PWS and QASP. | Contractor achieves milestone more than 90 days behind schedule (unless the COR waives this requirement), per criteria established in the PWS and QASP. |

| Performance Category: Safety | | | | | |
|------------------------------|--|--|--|--|---|
| Performance Standard | Exceptional | Very Good | Satisfactory | Marginal | Unsatisfactory |
| Safety | No significant safety deficiencies are reported during QA inspection of fieldwork. No lost time accidents or injuries are recorded during the fieldwork. | No more than one (1) serious safety deficiencies are reported during QA inspection of fieldwork. If any serious safety deficiency is noted during the project, appropriate investigation, corrective action, implementation, and written verification of the corrective action are provided to the Army. No lost time accidents or injuries are recorded during the fieldwork. | No more than two (2) serious safety deficiencies are reported during QA inspection of fieldwork. If any serious safety deficiency is noted during the project, appropriate investigation, corrective action, implementation, and written verification of the corrective action are provided to the Army. No lost time accidents or injuries are recorded during the fieldwork. | No more than three (3) serious safety deficiencies are reported during QA inspection of fieldwork. If any serious safety deficiency is noted during the project, appropriate investigation, corrective action, implementation, and written verification of the corrective action are provided to the Army. No more than one lost time accident or injury is recorded during the fieldwork. | More than three (3) serious safety deficiencies are reported during QA inspection of field activities, or a serious safety deficiency is reported but not properly investigated and corrected, or two or more lost time accidents or injuries is recorded during the fieldwork. |

| Performance Category: Management of Key Personnel and Resources | | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|---|--|
| Performance Standard | Exceptional | Very Good | Satisfactory | Marginal | Unsatisfactory |
| Management of Key Personnel and Resources | <p>All personnel proposed by the contractor were assigned to the project. Some personnel were substituted by higher qualified individuals.</p> <p>Zero (0) instances of resource management issues creating a negative impact to the activity.</p> | <p>All personnel proposed by the contractor were assigned to the project. Some personnel were substituted by higher qualified individuals.</p> <p>No more than one (1) instance of resource management issues creating a negative impact to the activity.</p> | <p>All personnel proposed by the contractor were assigned to the project. Some personnel were substituted by equally qualified individuals.</p> <p>Informal poor performance feedback on conduct of personnel is provided by the COR but are corrected.</p> <p>No more than two (2) instances of resource management issues creating a negative impact to the activity.</p> | <p>All personnel proposed by the contractor were assigned to the project. Some personnel were substituted by equally qualified individuals.</p> <p>Formal letter of poor performance feedback on conduct of personnel is provided by the COR but are corrected.</p> <p>No more than three (3) instances of resource management issues creating a negative impact to the activity.</p> | <p>All personnel proposed by the contractor were assigned to the project. Some personnel were substituted by lesser qualified individuals.</p> <p>Written request from KO requesting removal of assigned personnel for poor performance or notification of poor performance is provided by the COR and is not corrected.</p> <p>More than three (3) instances of resource management creating a negative impact to the activity.</p> |

| Performance Category: Stakeholder Concurrence | | | | | |
|---|---|--|---|--|--|
| Performance Standard | Exceptional | Very Good | Satisfactory | Marginal | Unsatisfactory |
| Stakeholder Concurrence | Contractor obtains concurrence on deliverables from all Army stakeholders to include USACE and the installation and from Federal and/or State regulators. This concurrence is obtained independently with little involvement and coordination required by the Government. | Contractor obtains concurrence on deliverables from all Army stakeholders to include USACE and the installation and from Federal and/or State regulators. This concurrence is obtained independently with limited involvement and coordination required by the Government. | Contractor obtains concurrence on deliverables from all Army stakeholders to include USACE and the installation and from Federal and/or State regulators. This concurrence is obtained with moderate involvement and coordination required by the Government. | Contractor obtains concurrence on deliverables from all Army stakeholders to include USACE and the installation and from Federal and/or State regulators. This concurrence is obtained with significant involvement and coordination required by the Government. | Contractor does not obtain concurrence on deliverables from Army stakeholders to include USACE and the installation and/or from Federal and/or State regulators. |

| Performance Standard | Exceptional | Very Good | Satisfactory | Marginal | Unsatisfactory |
|---|-------------|-----------|--------------|----------|----------------|
| Performance Category: Cost Control (Applicable for Cost Reimbursement Contracts Only) | | | | | |
| NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |

If a milestone/deliverable as described in the QASP is rated as being of unsatisfactory quality at the time that the PMP deadline for the milestone/deliverable expires, the milestone/deliverable will automatically receive an unsatisfactory rating for timeliness. At no point will a milestone/deliverable receive an exceptional, very good, or satisfactory rating for timeliness if it is rated as being of unsatisfactory quality. Overall satisfactory performance on a milestone/deliverable requires ratings of satisfactory, very good or exceptional for the quality, timeliness, and safety standards.

4 Surveillance Methodology

The surveillance methods listed below will be used in the execution of this QASP.

4.1 Quality Assurance Inspection

All key milestones and deliverables will be evaluated through periodic inspection (e.g., on-site inspection, document review). The COR will document performance for each completed milestone/deliverable prior to payment, as described in Section 5.0 of the QASP.

4.2 Periodic Progress Inspection

At the COR's discretion, periodic inspections may be conducted to evaluate progress toward and/or completion of key milestones and deliverables. The COR may complete a periodic progress inspection if s/he believes that deficiencies exist that must be addressed prior to milestone/deliverable completion. While corrective action or re-performance will be required if necessary, the Contractor will not be financially penalized for unacceptable performance recorded in periodic progress reports, provided that final performance evaluation of the milestone/deliverable is deemed acceptable.

4.3 Customer Feedback

Additional feedback will be obtained through random customer feedback. To be considered valid, input must set forth clearly and in writing the detailed nature of the feedback, must be signed, and must be forwarded to the KO. The KO will maintain a summary log of all formally received customer feedback as well as a copy of each feedback in a documentation file.

5 Surveillance Documentation

5.1 Quality Assurance Monitoring Form. The COR will use a performance evaluation form to record evaluation of the Contractor's performance for each milestone and deliverable in accordance with the methodology described in Sections 3.0 and 4.0 of the QASP. The COR must substantiate, through narratives in the form, all exceptional, very good, marginal, and unsatisfactory ratings. Performance at the satisfactory level is expected from the Contractor. At a minimum, the evaluation form will indicate actual and scheduled delivery times and number of reviews required to achieve the final product. The COR will forward copies of all completed performance evaluation forms to the KO and Contractor within one week of performing the inspection.

5.2 Corrective Action Process. When a milestone/deliverable receives an overall marginal or unsatisfactory rating, the Contractor will explain, within 15 days, in writing to COR why performance was marginal or unsatisfactory, how performance will be returned to satisfactory levels, and how recurrence of the problem will be prevented in the future.

5.3 KO Role in the Surveillance Process. The KO will review each performance evaluation form prepared by the COR. When appropriate, the KO may investigate further to determine if all the facts and circumstances surrounding the event were considered in the COR opinions outlined on the form. The KO will immediately discuss any marginal or unsatisfactory rating with the Contractor to assure that corrective action is promptly initiated.

5.4 Annual Performance Assessment. At the end of every year, the COR will prepare a written Contractor Performance Assessment Report (CPAR) for the KO summarizing the overall results of his/her surveillance of the Contractor's performance during the previous 12 months. This report will become part of the formal QA documentation.

5.5 QA File. The COR will maintain a complete QA file. This file will contain copies of all performance evaluation forms and any other related documentation. The COR will forward these records to the KO at termination or completion of the contract. All performance assessment forms, attachments and working papers must be marked "FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY/SOURCE SELECTION INFORMATION - SEE FAR 2.101 AND 3.104" According to Freedom of Information Act Program, FAR 3.104, and 41 USC Sect. 423. Assessment reports may also contain information that is proprietary to the contractor. Information contained on the CPAR, such as trade secrets and protected commercial or financial data obtained from the contractor in confidence, must be protected from unauthorized disclosure. COR's shall annotate on the assessment report if it contains material that is a trade secret, etc., to ensure that future readers of the evaluations are informed and will protect as required. Contractor performance information is privileged source selection information. It is also protected by the Privacy Act and is not releasable under the Freedom of Information Act.

6 Payment and Corrective Action

6.1 Satisfactory Performance. Full payment for a milestone/deliverable will be provided upon verification of overall satisfactory performance, as rated on quality and schedule. This verification will be recorded in a performance evaluation form submitted to the KO specifying overall Contractor performance as satisfactory, very good, or exceptional for the milestone/deliverable.

6.2 Marginal or Unsatisfactory Performance. If a milestone/deliverable receives a marginal or unsatisfactory rating for the quality performance standard, re-performance is required until the milestone/deliverable receives a rating of satisfactory or better. This re-performance is required regardless of cost or schedule constraints that may result from the marginal or unsatisfactory performance, unless the KO has opted to terminate the contract. If a rating of satisfactory or better is not achieved, the Government may reduce the contract price to reflect the reduced value of the services in accordance with FAR 52.246-4(e).

6.3 Table A-1 in the QASP provides a sample of the minimum key elements planned for the QASP. The final QASP will be developed with the COR and the contractor and will be based on the final PMP.

Additional Government surveillance activities may include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Work plan review and approval
- Participation in Technical Project Planning (or equivalent) sessions
- Oversight of survey & field activities
- Oversight of all waste management functions/responsibilities
- Review of all waste management documentation
- Separate/split laboratory QA samples
- Review and approval of all deliverables to regulatory agencies
- Review of quality control documentation
- Review of project safety record
- Adherence to the approved work plan
- Completion of ATOPSEC required training and adherence to ATOPSEC policy and procedures.

ATTACHMENT 2A – QUALITY ASSURANCE MONITORING FORM

QUALITY ASSURANCE MONITORING FORM

Date: __/__/____

Work Task (Milestone/Activity): _____

Survey Period: __/__/____ through __/__/____

Method of Surveillance: COR Review

Evaluation of Contractor's Performance: _____

| |
|------------|
| Evaluation |
|------------|

Corrective Action Required: Yes No

Narrative Discussion of Contractor's Performance during Survey Period:

| |
|------------|
| Discussion |
|------------|

ATTACHMENT 2B - CORRECTIVE ACTION FORM FOR QASP

1) Work Task (Milestone/Activity): _____

2) Survey Period: ____/____/____ through ____/____/____

3) Description of the Failure/Deficiency that Precipitated the Corrective Action:

| |
|-------------|
| Description |
|-------------|

4) Description of the Criterion that the Failure/Deficiency was Evaluated Against:

| |
|-------------|
| Description |
|-------------|

5) Personnel Involved in the Identification of the Failure/Deficiency, Determination of the Appropriate Corrective Action, Approval of the Corrective Action, and Implementation of the Corrective Action:

| |
|-------------|
| Description |
|-------------|

6) Description of the Corrective Action that was Required:

| |
|-------------|
| Description |
|-------------|

7) Date/Time of Implementation of the Corrective Action: __/__/____

| |
|-------------|
| Description |
|-------------|

8) Follow-Up Information to Prevent Recurrence of Failure/Deficiency (i.e., Need for Revision of Procedures or Specifications):

| |
|-------------|
| Description |
|-------------|

9) Personnel Responsible for Follow-Up Work:

| |
|-------------|
| Description |
|-------------|

10) Planned Date for Follow-Up Surveillance: __/__/____

11) Other