## **Table Of Contents**

## CAO-6: WIPP TRU WASTE TRANSPORTATION PRIVATIZATION

A.1. Project Identification/Header Information (Section A.0. in 2/28/97 PBS)	1
A.2. TECHNICAL AND SCOPE NARRATIVES (SECTION A.1. IN 2/28/97 PBS)	2
A.3. MILESTONES	7
A.4. PERFORMANCE MEASURE METRICS	8
A.5. RELEASE SITES AND FACILITIES	8
A.6. VALIDATION (SECTION C.2. IN THE 2/28/97 PBS)	8
A.7. Project Assumptions (Section C.3. in the 2/28/97 PBS)	9
B.1. BUDGET BY APPROPRIATIONS ACCOUNT (IN THOUSANDS)	9
C.1. RISK (SECTION E.1. IN THE FY 1999 BUDGET UPDATE)	9
D.1. DIRECT SAFETY & HEALTH AND RISK NARRATIVES	10
D.2. SAFETY AND HEALTH DIRECT DATA	
E. ENHANCED PERFORMANCE MEASURES	11
E.1. PROJECT ESTIMATES (ALL DOLLARS IN THOUSANDS)	11
E.2. PERFORMANCE FOR FY 1997 (ALL DOLLARS IN THOUSANDS)	11
E.3. COMPARING BASELINE TO THE ACTUALS (ALL DOLLARS IN THOUSANDS)	11
E.4. ENHANCED PERFORMANCE CATEGORIZATION PROCESS	12
E.5. CATEGORIZING SOURCES OF ENHANCED PERFORMANCE	12
E.6. TOTAL CALCULATED ENHANCED PERFORMANCE (ALL DOLLARS IN THOUSANDS)	12
E.7. ENHANCED PERFORMANCE NARRATIVES	12

### A.1. Project Identification/Header Information (Section A.0. in 2/28/97 PBS)

A.1.1. Project Title: WIPP TRU Waste Transportation Privatization

A.1.2. Unique Site-Designated Project ID: CAO-6

A.1.3. Site/Group of Sites: Waste Isolation Pilot Plant

A.1.4. Operations/Field Office : Carlsbad Area Office

A.1.5. DOE Project Manager: Michael H. MeFadden

A.1.6. DOE Project Manager Phone Number: 505-234-7300

A.1.7. DOE Project Manager FAX Number: 505-234-7027

A.1.8. DOE Project Manager e-mail Address (Internet Format): mcfaddenm@wipp.carlsbad.nm.us

A.1.9. Contractor Project Manager:

A.1.10. Contractor Project Manager Phone Number:

A.1.11. Contractor Project Manager FAX Number:

A.1.12. Contractor Project Manager e-mail Address (Internet Format):

A.1.13. Unique Project ID: CBWP0013

A.1.14. Program Element: WM

A.1.15. Is this a Pure, Operational, or Privatization Project? R: Privatization

A.1.16. Is this a High Visibility Project? (Y/N)

A.1.17. DOE Project Manager's Signature/Date

A.1.18. Contractor Project Manager's Signature/Date

Page 1 June 1998

## A.2. Technical and Scope Narratives (Section A.1. in 2/28/97 PBS)

### **A.2.1.** Purpose of Project:

The purpose of this project is to describe the effort for privatizing a dedicated transuranic (TRU) waste transportation system for Contact-Handled (CH) and Remote-Handled (RH) TRU waste. This project only includes the capital equipment costs funded through the Congressional Privatization program. All costs associated with operating, executing, and maintaining the TRU waste transportation system are reported in Project CAO-3. The funds identified in this project are reported in the President's budget but are not included within the Department of Energy, Office of Waste Management targets.

### **A.2.2.** Definition of Scope:

The methodology used for developing the scope of activities for privatizing a dedicated TRU waste transportation system was defined by Congress. These guidelines allow for Congress to fund the initiation of projects with private vendors including any required capital equipment. Congressional allocations provide the DOE with "Budget Authority (BA)" the first year contracts are awarded. With the award of a contract and the BA from Congress, the vendor awarded the privatization contract can begin work. Because the Congressional money is not intended to fully fund the projects, vendors will be required to fund the project start-up and re-coop their operating investment through the products they produce or services they render. After one year from receiving the BA from Congress and a contract is awarded, DOE will begin reimbursing the vendor for their initial capital outlay. This reimbursement will be amortized over a five year period and include escalation. Throughout this process, DOE does not purchase or have claim to ownership for any of the equipment or facilities. In the case of the TRU waste transportation system, the vendor will be responsible for all the transportation activities to meet the full throughput of the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP). This includes purchasing and/or obtaining: 1) all additional NRC certified TRUPACT-IIs and HALFPACKs, 2) all certified and equipped tractors, 3) hiring and training drivers, and 4) any equipment maintenance. All equipment currently owned by DOE will be supplied to the vendor as Government Furnished Equipment (GFE). The GFE will be used until additional resources can be obtained to help offset initial vendor expenditures.

#### A.2.3. Technical Approach:

CAO released a Request for Proposal in FY1998 for all activities related to transporting TRU waste from the TRU waste sites across the nation to WIPP. CAO will award the contract in late FY 1998. The private contractor will be operational on October 1, 1998. At that time, the vendor will be responsible for all TRU waste shipping requirements. DOE will schedule shipments from the TRU waste sites and coordinate with the vendor for shipping services. DOE will pay for only those services rendered.

#### A.2.4. Project Status in FY 2006:

By FY2006, the vendor will be required to be at full operational status having a dedicated transportation fleet capable of delivering 17 shipments per week of CH TRU waste to WIPP and

Page 2 June 1998

employing 15 RH TRU waste truck sets (one each tractor, trailer, and RH cask). The vendor will be required to maintain this fleet size through the operational life of WIPP regardless of Project Baseline Summary Case.

#### A.2.5. Post 2006 Project Scope:

Continued disposal of the remaining TRU waste inventory until the WIPP waste volume capacity reaches the statutory limits in FY2033, after which five years are planned to seal the repository and dismantle and decommission the surface facilities. Active institutional controls will then be activated and maintained for 100 years.

Maintain dedicated transportation services through the operational life of WIPP.

#### A.2.6. Project End State:

TRU waste management activities for both CH and RH waste are projected to be completed by FY 2038 after completing the Disposal Phase in FY 2033 and five years for decommissioning of the surface facilities and permanently closing the underground. In accordance with the WIPP Land Withdrawal Amendment Act of 1996, DOE will have disposed of 175,600 cubic meters of TRU waste in the WIPP facility. Starting in FY 2039, a reduced Federal staff and technical contractor support will maintain the active institutional controls associated with the land and records of the WIPP. Monuments and markers will be built at the site to warn people of the presence of the repository. Active institutional controls over the site will be maintained for 100 years. Low risk has been assigned based upon performance assessments included in the licensing of the facility, which requires no migration of hazardous or radioactive material for 10,000 years. Following completion of the active institutional control phase, the surface area will be unrestricted for recreational and agricultural uses.

After reaching the end of the WIPP operational life, the vendor will have the opportunity to used the formerly dedicated transportation resources for other waste shipments.

(Safety and Health Narrative, Section A.1.7. in the 2/28/97 PBS, has been replaced and is no longer maintained. Safety and Health Narratives are now found in Section D.1.)

#### A.2.7. General Narrative:

The CAO has recommended a management plan configuration for implementation that will guide the ten-year planning process consistent with the strategic objectives, as well as achieve the overall TRU waste management goals. The facilities and activities described in the National TRU Waste Management Plan, Revision 1, combined with the disposal-ready waste preparation schedules, summarize current guidance to support development of site 2006 Plan.

(Section A.1.9. in the 2/28/97 PBS has been moved to Section A.2.14.) (Section A.1.10. in the 2/28/97 PBS has been moved to Section A.2.15.) (Section A.1.11. in the 2/28/97 has been moved to Section A.2.16.)

Page 3 June 1998

#### A.2.8. Cost Baseline Narrative (A.2.5. in 2/28/97 PBS)

Since 1994, the CAO has institutionalized a formal program planning and budget execution process. The confidence level of cost estimates for the next three years is very high (+/- 5%). Out year estimates through FY 2008 have been developed with a confidence level of +/- 10 to 20%. Estimates from FY 2009 through completion are within +/- 30%. There are no contingency funds included in the CAO estimates.

Current CAO assumptions support operations of the WIPP facility, including its infrastructure, as an operational nuclear facility capable of receiving CH TRU waste at an initial disposal at a rate of 5 shipments per week and ramping to 17 shipments per week. The statutory requirement to pay impact assistance to the State of New Mexico is funded. The CAO baseline provides adequate funding to meet the National TRU Waste Management Plan, Rev. 1. Escalation has been applied to the activities in accordance with the DOE Environmental Management guidelines.

All funding associated with this project is for reimbursing the successful vendor's initial capital equipment expenditures associated with obtaining the transportation packagings for TRU waste. DOE is not purchasing transportation packages with this money. Once the privatization contract is let, DOE does not, will not, or ever own equipment used to transport TRU waste. This includes tractors, trailers, and TRU waste packaging. The TRUPACT-IIs, HALFPACKs, RH Casks, tractors, and trailers will belong to the private vendor. DOE will only maintain the Certification of Compliance from the Nuclear Regulator Commission. DOE will only purchase transportation services not equipment. For all other costs associated with this project, see Project CAO-3.

#### A.2.9. Discuss How NEPA will be or has been Addressed

The WIPP Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS) was approved in September 1997 and the Record of Decision was issued in January 1998. A supplemental analysis may be required as WIPP prepares to receive Remote-handled TRU waste. The SEIS examined various alternatives for the disposal of TRU waste at WIPP, as well as alternatives for continued storage at TRU waste sites rather than disposal at WIPP. The process began with public meetings to obtain comment on the scope of the analysis. On November 19, 1996, DOE issued a draft SEIS and began the public hearings process to get comments on the SEIS. The final SEIS addresses all public comments and contains a revised analysis of the environmental impacts for the alternatives considered. DOE weighed the environmental impacts and considered all public comments prior to reaching a Record of Decision for WIPP. The SEIS is intended to provide information required for making a sound and justifiable decision to dispose or not dispose of TRU waste at WIPP. The Waste Management Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement, which followed the same process as the WIPP SEIS, is intended to provide the same type of information needed for deciding the proper locations to treat and store TRU waste prior to shipping to WIPP for permanent disposal.

### A.2.10. 1997 Actual Accomplishments

Preparing the Request for Proposal for a privatized carrier contract.

Page 4 June 1998

#### A.2.11. 1998 Planned Accomplishments

During FY 1998, the vendor awarded the contract for CH transportation will complete activities required to meet the qualification standards identified in the privatization contract and will begin transportation activities in FY 1999. During the transition period, CAO will ship waste using the current private carrier contractor.

The following accomplishments are contingent upon completion of all FY 1997 activities and all activities included in the remainder of the CAO projects. It is expected:

- 1) The Secretary of Energy will issue a Record of Decision for WIPP in January 1998;
- 2) WIPP will be declared operationally ready to receive waste in March;
- 3) The EPA will certify WIPP by approving the Compliance Certification Application in April;
- 4) The Secretary of Energy will make the decision to operate WIPP as a disposal facility in April;
- 5) DOE will notify the States and Native American Tribes of the intent to transport TRU waste in April;
- 6) Non-mixed, Contact-Handled TRU waste disposal will begin at WIPP with a rate of 5 shipments per week in May.

CAO will make receive approximately 67 shipments or approximately 592 cubic meters of non-mixed TRU waste from the Idaho National Engineering and Environmental Laboratory, Rocky Flats Environmental Technology Site, and Los Alamos National Laboratory.

### A.2.12. 1999 Planned Accomplishments

During FY 1999, the privatized transportation contractor will be in place with approximately 500 CH-TRU shipments being made to the WIPP.

The following accomplishments are contingent upon completion of all FY98 activities and all activities included in the remainder of the CAO projects. It is expected:

- 1) DOE will receive a RCRA Part B permit from the State of New Mexico sometime in FY 1999;
- 2) WIPP will receive approximately 500 shipments or approximately 3,786 cubic meters of Contact-handled TRU waste.

## A.2.13. 2000 Planned Accomplishments

The following accomplishments are contingent upon completion of all FY 1999 activities and all activities included in the remainder of the CAO projects. It is expected:

1) WIPP will receive approximately 751 shipments or approximately 5,474 cubic meters of Contact-Handled TRU waste. Waste shipments will continue from the FY99 TRU waste sites first three sites and WIPP will begin receiving Contact-Handled TRU waste from Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Nevada Test Site, and Small Quantity Sites.

Page 5 June 1998

A.2.14. Baseline Cost Summary (Section A.2.1. in the 2/28/97 PBS)  A.2.15. Baseline Costs (Section A.2.2. in the 2/28/97 PBS)	1997- 2006:	40,605		Post 2006:	0		Total Project Cost:	40,605
All dollars in thousands.	Date Submitted	1997-2006 Total	2007- Completion Total	Grand Total	19	97	1998	1999
					Planned	Actual		
Original	2/28/97	48,805	0	48,805		Empty	29,200	19,605
Current Cost Baseline		40,605	0	40,605			21,000	19,605
Escalation Rate							0.00%	2.70%
Cost Baseline in Constant FY 1998 Dollars					0	0	21,000	19,090

(Section A.2.3. in the 2/28/97 PBS has been removed.)

(Section A.2.4. in the 2/28/97 PBS has been removed.)

(Section A.2.5. in the 2/28/97 PBS has been moved to Section A.2.9.)

(Section A.2.6. in the 2/28/97 PBS has been moved to Section A.2.13.)

### A.2.16. Non-EM Costs Included in the Cost Baseline (Section A.2.6. in the 2/28/97 PBS) (All dollars in thousands)

	Organization	1997	1998	1999
% EM	EM	100%	100%	100%
EM Dollars (Calculated)	•	0	21,000	19,605

## A.2.17. Related Projects at the Same Site or Operations/Field Office (Section A.1.9. in the 2/28/97 PBS)

#### **Unique Site-Designated Project ID and Project Name**

008: CB, CAO-1 – WIPP Base Operations

009: CB, CAO-2 - WIPP Disposal Phase certification and Experimental Program

010: CB, CAO-3 - WIPP Transportation

011: CB, CAO-4 – WIPP TRU Waste Sites Integration and Preparation

#### **Relation to this Project**

Primary support to all WIPP facility operations

Regulatory activity and continuing experimental programs for continued WIPP compliance certainty

Safe transportation of TRU waste from TRU waste sites to WIPP

Continued TRU waste sites communication and preparation for waste acceptance at the WIPP

## A.2.18. Operations/Field Offices with Activities Related to this Project (Section A.1.10. in the 2/28/97 PBS)

**Unique Site-Designated** Operations/

**Field Office Name Project ID** All All

Relation to this Project

All TRU programs are dependent upon disposal availability at WIPP

June 1998 Page 6

## **A.2.19.** Drivers (Section A.1.11. in the 2/28/97 PBS)

	CERCLA	RCRA	DNFSB	AEA	UMTRCA	State	DOE Orders	Other
Select all applicable Drivers	X	X	X	X		X	X	X

## A.2.20. Is this project A-106 (FEDPLAN) compliant?

Yes

(Section D.2.1. in the FY 1999 Budget Update)

## .3. Milestones

		Planned Date	Forecast Date	Actual Date								
Milestone/Activity	Field Milestone Code	Month/Yea r	Month/Yea r	Month/Yea r	Status Indicator	EA (Y/N)	DNFSB (Y/N)	EM-1 or S-1 (Y/N)	Intersite (Y/N)	HQ Change Control (Y/N)	Management Commitments (Y/N)	Key Decision (Y/N)
Project Start												
Project Mission Complete		Sep-05										
LT S&M Completion (If applicable)												
M & O Transportation Contract term	ninates	Sep-98				N	N	Y	Y	N	N	N
CAST contract in place		Oct-97				N	N	Y	Y	N	N	N
CAST contract terminates		Sep-98				N	N	Y	Y	N	N	N
Privatized Carrier Contracts in place through	the life of WIPP	Oct-98				N	N	Y	Y	N	N	N
WIPP operational phase ends - carrier contr	racts terminate	Sep-33				N	N	Y	Y	N	N	N

Page 7 June 1998

#### **A.4. Performance Measure Metrics**

(Section A.4.a. in the 2/28/97 PBS; Attachment 2 in the 1997 Mid-year Performance Measures Update; Section C.1. in the FY 1999 Budget Update)

#### A.5. Release Sites and Facilities

Not applicable

### A.6. Validation (Section C.2. in the 2/28/97 PBS)

A.6.1. Project Validated? (Y/N) Y

**A.6.2.** Date Validated: 9/23/96

#### A.6.3. Validation Method:

Public Law 104-201 Compliance Certification Application to EPA, SEIS-II, and the National Research Council Report, "WIPP, a Potential Solution for the Disposal of Transuranic Waste" dated November 1996.

### A.6.4. Technical Approach Reference Documents:

WIPP SEIS-II

**Compliance Certification Application** 

RCRA Part B Permit Application

#### A.6.5. Current Status of your Project Baseline:

Life Cycle cost and technical scope has had continuous reviews since FY 1988 by the GAO, IG, NAS, EEG, and other stakeholders.

#### A.6.6. Is this PBS Consistent with your Site Baseline? (Y/N) Y

A.6.7. If A.6.6. was answered No, why not?

#### A.6.8. Future Validation Plans and Schedule

None

#### A.6.9. Site Baseline Consistency

How consistent is the Site Baseline(s) with this PBS? Check the appropriate box.

X 100% - PBS Fully Supported by Site Baseline(s)

75% - PBS Well Supported by Site Baseline(s) 50% - PBS Mostly Supported by Site Baseline(s)

25% or less- PBS Not Well Supported by Site Baseline(s)

## A.6.10. Project End State Definition

How certain is the Project End State for this PBS? Check the appropriate box.

X 100% - Agreement with Stakeholders

75% - Project End State is Well Defined 50% - Project End State is Mostly Defined

25% or less- PBS Not Well Supported by Site Baseline(s)

Page 8 June 1998

### A.7. Project Assumptions (Section C.3. in the 2/28/97 PBS)

- 1) WIPP will open in 1998
- 2) Funding will be adequate to meet the National TRU Waste Management Plan, Rev. 1 (NTWMP) schedule.
- 3) WIPP will receive non mixed TRU waste until the RCRA permit is received.
- 4) WIPP will receive only defense generated TRU waste.
- 5) CAO will provide an integrated transportation system.
- 6) TRU waste sites will have adequate road ready waste to meet the objectives of the NTWMP.
- 7) Remote Handled TRU waste will be disposed at WIPP starting in FY2003
- 8) WIPP will be filled to capacity (175.6 thousand cubic meters) by FY2033.
- 9) All WIPP dismantlement and decommissioning will take 5 years (FY2034 FY2038)
- 10) Active institutional controls will be implemented in FY2039 and last for 100 years.
- 11) EPA will certify every 5 years.

### **B.1.** Budget by Appropriations Account (in thousands)

Appropriations Account	1997 BA	1998 BA	1999 BA	2000 BA
Defense Environmental Management	0	21,000	19,605	0
Energy Supply, Research and Development				
Uranium Enrichment Decontamination and Decommissioning Fund				
Total	0	21,000	19,605	0

### C.1. Risk (Section E.1. in the FY 1999 Budget Update)

#### C.1.1. Risk Data

Worker 2C		1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
	Public	1D									
	Worker	2C									
Environment 3C 3C 3C 3C 3C 3C 3C 3C	Environment	3C									

	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011-2015	2016-2020	2021-2025	2026-2030	2031-2035	2036-2040
Public	1D	1D	1D	1D	1D	1D	1D	1D	1D	1D
Worker	2C	2C	2C	2C	2C	2C	2C	2C	2C	2C
Environment	3C	3C	3C	3C	3C	3C	3C	3C	3C	3C

	2041-2045	2046-2050	2051-2055	2056-2060	2061-2065	2066-2070
Public	3D	3D	3D	3D	3D	3D
Worker	4D	4D	4D	4D	4D	4D
Environment	3D	3D	3D	3D	3D	3D

Page 9 June 1998

C.1.2. Choose either the public, worker, or the environment as the End-State Risk driver: (P, W, or E):	
C.1.3. Choose either the public, worker, or the environment as the Interim Risk driver: (P, W, or E):	
C.1.4. If upon completion of this project, another project manages its hazards, indicate that project ID:	
C.1.5. Has the risk evaluation been internally peer reviewed by ES&H professionals? (Y/N)	Y
C.1.6. Has the risk evaluation been externally peer reviewed? (Y/N)	Y
C.1.7. Have regulators, stakeholders, & Tribal Nations been involved in validating the project risk evaluations? (Y/N)	Y

### D.1. Direct Safety & Health and Risk Narratives

(Indirect Safety & Health Narratives are located in the Site Summary Level) (Section D.1.1. in the FY 1999 Budget Update has been replaced by narratives below and in the Site Summary Level and is no longer maintained.)

#### D.1.2. Direct S&H Narrative - Hazards:

S&H activities are addressed in CAO-1 and CAO-3

### D.1.3. Direct S&H Narrative - Controls:

S&H activities are addressed in CAO-1 and CAO-3

#### **D.1.4.** Direct S&H Narrative - Work Performance:

S&H activities are addressed in CAO-1 and CAO-3

#### D.1.5. Direct S&H Narrative - Feedback and Continuous Improvement:

S&H activities are addressed in CAO-1 and CAO-3

# D.1.6. Risk Evaluation Narrative (Indicate incremental risk reduction metric and references to supporting risk and review information):

See CAO-1 and CAO-3 for Risk narrative.

#### D.2. Safety and Health Direct Data

 $(Section\ D.2.1.\ in\ the\ FY\ 1999\ Budget\ Update\ has\ been\ moved\ to\ Section\ A.2.17.)$ 

#### D.2.2. Safety and Health Cost Reporting - Direct Costs (All dollars in thousands)

1997	1998	1999	2000
-			

C. Industrial Hygiene
D. Industrial Safety
E. Occupational Medicine
F. Nuclear Safety
G. Radiation Protection

A. Emergency PreparednessB. Fire Protection

H. Transportation SafetyI. Management Oversight

Page 10 June 1998

Total S&H Direct Costs	0	0	0	0
Total Baseline Costs (from A.2.15.)	0	21,000	19,605	0
% S&H Direct Costs (calculated)	0	0%	0%	0

(Section D.2.3. in the FY 1999 Budget Update has been moved to the Site Summary Level) (Section D.2.4. in the FY 1999 Budget Update has been removed)

### D.2.5. Safety and Health FTE Reporting - Direct Contractor FTEs

	1997	1998	1999	2000
A. Emergency Preparedness				
B. Fire Protection				
C. Industrial Hygiene				
D. Industrial Safety				
E. Occupational Medicine				
F. Nuclear Safety				
G. Radiation Protection				
H. Transportation Safety				
I. Management Oversight				
Total Direct Contractor FTEs	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

(Section D.2.6. in the FY 1999 Budget Update has been moved to the Site Summary Level)

#### **E.** Enhanced Performance Measures

### **E.1.** Project Estimates (All dollars in thousands)

E.1.1. Current Estimated Lifecycle Cost of Project: 40,605

E.1.2. Previously Estimated Lifecycle Cost of Project: 48,805

E.1.3. Projected Cost for FY 97:

E.1.4. Projected % Work Completed by End of FY 98: [Assuming 0% was complete on 10/1/96]

E.1.5. Current Projected End Date of Project: Sep-05 ["Jan-00" is default value if the planned project

completion milestone date is blank]
E.1.6. Previously Projected End Date of Project:

#### **E.2.** Performance for FY 1997 (All dollars in thousands)

E.2.1. Actual Cost for FY 97:

E.2.2. Actual % Work Completed to Date: [Assuming 0% was complete on 10/1/96]

#### E.3. Comparing Baseline to the Actuals (All dollars in thousands)

E.3.1. Cost Deltas

Change % Difference
Diff. Between Actual and Projected Cost for FY 97: 0 0%

Page 11 June 1998

Change in Estimated Lifecycle Cost of Project:	-8,200	-17%
E.3.2. Change in % Work Completed:	[Empty u	ntil end of FY 1998]

## **E.4. Enhanced Performance Categorization Process**

	FY 1997		Lifecycle		
Change Type	Applicable? (Y/N)	If Yes, Why?	Applicable? (Y/N)	If Yes, Why?	
End State					
Scope					
End Date (Acceleration/Deferral)					

## E.5. Categorizing Sources of Enhanced Performance

If enhanced performance (cost avoidance, scope deletion, or accelerated schedule) was indicated in E.4., provide the % of total change in cost next to the categories that best represent the sources of enhanced performance:

Lifecycle
hnologies or techniques
cts (mortgage reduction
1
1
0%

E. 6	Total (	Calculated	Enhanced	<b>Performance</b>	(All	dollars in	(changendt
L.U.	I Viai v	Caiculaicu	Limanccu	i Ci iui mance	(AII	uvnai 5 ii	i uivusanus <i>i</i>

FY 1997:	
Lifecycle Projected:	

### **E.7. Enhanced Performance Narratives**

E.7.1. Cost Avoidance Narrative (if applicable):

Not applicable

**E.7.2.** Scope Deletion Narrative (if applicable):

Not applicable

Page 12 June 1998

## E.7.3. Accelerated Schedule Narrative (if applicable):

Not applicable

Page 13 June 1998