AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION/MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT				1. CONTRACT ID CODE	PA	GE OF PAGES	
	3. EFFECTIVE	DATE	4 DE				
2. AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION NO.		~		QUISITION/PURCHASE REQ. NO. R000108	5. PROJE	ECT NO. (If applicable)	
0163 6. ISSUED BY CODE	See Blo	JK IOC					
	892435					01601	
Strategic Petroleum Reserve SPRO	Project		SPF				
U.S. Department of Energy			SPF	5. Department of Energy			
900 Commerce Road East US 492			-) Commerce Road East US 4	492		
New Orleans LA 70123			New Orleans LA 70123				
8. NAME AND ADDRESS OF CONTRACTOR (No., street,	, county, State and	ZIP Code) ((x) ^{9/}	A. AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION NO.			
Fluor Federal Petroleum Opera	ations	LT.C					
Attn: Janet Rodriguez			91	B. DATED (SEE ITEM 11)			
850 S Clearview Pkwy				· · · ·			
New Orleans LA 701233401		_					
		2	$X _{L}^{10}$	DA. MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT/ORDER N DE-FE0011020	0.		
			1(DB. DATED (SEE ITEM 13)			
CODE 078490442	FACILITY COD	E		09/18/2013			
	11. THIS IT	EM ONLY APPLIES TO AN		MENTS OF SOLICITATIONS			
The above numbered solicitation is amended as set for					nded 🗌	is not extended.	
Offers must acknowledge receipt of this amendment p							
.				eceipt of this amendment on each copy of the off	• • •		
separate letter or electronic communication which inclu-	udes a reference	e to the solicitation and am	nendn	nent numbers. FAILURE OF YOUR ACKNOWL	EDGEME	NT TO BE	
RECEIVED AT THE PLACE DESIGNATED FOR THE							
OFFER. If by virtue of this amendment you desire to each letter or electronic communication makes referer	•					Ided	
12. ACCOUNTING AND APPROPRIATION DATA (If requ						000.00	
See Schedule					, ,		
13. THIS ITEM ONLY APPLIES TO M	ODIFICATION O	F CONTRACTS/ORDERS	. IT N	ODIFIES THE CONTRACT/ORDER NO. AS DE	SCRIBED I	IN ITEM 14.	
CHECK ONE A. THIS CHANGE ORDER IS ISSUED F	PURSUANT TO:	(Specify authority) THE C	CHAN	GES SET FORTH IN ITEM 14 ARE MADE IN TH	HE CONTR	RACT	
B. THE ABOVE NUMBERED CONTRAC		ODIFIED TO REFLECT TH		DMINISTRATIVE CHANGES (such as changes i Y OF FAR 43.103(b).	n paying o	ffice,	
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		OINI				
C. THIS SUPPLEMENTAL AGREEMEN	T IS ENTERED	NTO PURSUANT TO AUT	THOF	RITY OF:			
D. OTHER (Specify type of modification	and authority)						
X See Block 14							
E. IMPORTANT: Contractor X is not	is required t	o sign this document and	returr	copies to the issuing	g office.		
14. DESCRIPTION OF AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION	(Organized by U	CF section headings, inclu	uding	solicitation/contract subject matter where feasib	le.)		
UEI: KJDUB6XQDTN4							
Pursuant to the authority of	I.132,	dear clause 9	970.	.5232-3 Obligation of Fu	nds ai	nd H.14	
FY25 Performance Evaluation				-			
hereby modified to incorpora					0 0 .		
nereby mourried to incorpora	le line I	orrowing chan	iye:				
A. Reference Section B, B.4:							
The total amount of \$7,500,0	00.00 is	hereby oblig	fate	ed for the Bryan Mound Li	E 2 wo	ork per	
Baseline Change Proposal 01	(BCP-01)	Funding memo	da	ated December 3, 2024. T	he to	tal funds	
obligated to this contract h	as incre	ased by \$7,50	0,0	000.00 from \$3,221,372,5	51.81	to	
\$3,228,872,5551.81.							
Continued							
Except as provided herein, all terms and conditions of th	e document refe	renced in Item 0.4 or 104	ac h	eretofore changed remains upshanged and in f	ull force cr	nd effect	
Except as provided herein, all terms and conditions of th 15A. NAME AND TITLE OF SIGNER (<i>Type or print</i>)		a criceu in item 9 A OF 10A	-	. NAME AND TITLE OF CONTRACTING OFFIC			
			Ke	lly M. Gele			
15B. CONTRACTOR/OFFEROR		15C. DATE SIGNED	16B	. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA		16C. DATE SIGNED	
			1	Lacyree. B.	Qi		
(Signature of person authorized to sign)			-	(Signature of Contracting Officer)		12/23/2024	
(=		I	1	1-3. Stare of Contracting Onioor			

Previous edition unusable

STANDARD FORM 30 (REV. 11/2016) Prescribed by GSA FAR (48 CFR) 53.243

	REFERENCE NO. OF DOCUMENT BEING CONTINUED
CONTINUATION SHEET	REFERENCE NO. OF DOCUMENT BEING CONTINUED DE-FE0011020/0163

NAME OF OFFEROR OR CONTRACTOR

Fluor Federal Petroleum Operations, LLC

EM NO. (A)	SUPPLIES/SERVICES	QUANTITY			AMOUNT
A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)
	B. Reference Section J, Attachment J -				
	Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan				
	(PEMP): The Performance Evaluation and				
	Measurement Plan for the period October 1, 2024,				
	through March 31, 2025, is hereby incorporated.				
	(See attached)				
	All other terms and conditions remain unchanged.				
	Payment:				
	OR for SPRO				
	U.S. Department of Energy				
	Oak Ridge Financial Service Center				
	P.O. Box 6017				
	Oak Ridge TN 37831				
	Period of Performance: 04/01/2014 to 03/31/2025				

PAGE

2

OF

2



U. S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY STRATEGIC PETROLEUM RESERVE PROJECT MANAGEMENT OFFICE

PARTIAL FISCAL YEAR 2025

(OCTOBER 1, 2024 – March 31, 2025)

PERFORMANCE EVALUATION AND MEASUREMENT PLAN

FOR

FLUOR FEDERAL PETROLEUM OPERATIONS, LLC

CONTRACT NO. DE-FE0011020

SPRPMO 0474

SIGNATURE PAGE

SUBMITTED BY:

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY	
KELLY GELÉ CONTRACTING OFFICER	DATE
PAUL S. OOSTERLING PROJECT MANAGER	DATE
ACCEPTED BY:	
FLUOR FEDERAL PETROLEUM OPERATION	S, LLC
KATHRYN MARSHALL PROJECT MANAGER	DATE
APPROVED BY:	
DOUGLAS MACINTYRE DEPUTY DIRECTOR OFFICE OF PETROLEUM RESERVES	DATE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	. 1
ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE	. 1
FEE STRUCTURE	2
AWARD COMPONENTS	3
EVALUATION CRITERIA	3
1. Objective Fee Criteria	3
2. Subjective Fee Criteria	5
ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES	6
AWARD FEE PROCESS	8
ATTACHMENT 1 - AWARD FEE BOARD MEMBERSHIP	. 11
ATTACHMENT 2 - AWARD FEE PLAN OBJECTIVE MEASURES	. 12
ATTACHMENT 3 – SUBJECTIVE MEASURE GRADING TABLE	21
ATTACHMENT 4 - SUBJECTIVE FEE EVALUATION AREAS	. 22

INTRODUCTION

Purpose: This Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan (PEMP) supplements and implements the total available fee provisions of Contract No. DE-FE0011020 with Fluor Federal Petroleum Operations, LLC (FFPO). This plan is for the management and operation of the Strategic Petroleum Reserve (SPR). This plan will define methodology and responsibilities associated with determining the incentive fee to be awarded to FFPO. The plan outlines the organization, procedures, and evaluation period for implementing the fee provisions of the contract. The purpose of the incentive/award fee is to motivate the contractor to exceed standards and to emphasize key areas of performance and concern without jeopardizing minimum acceptable performance in all areas.

Incentive/Award Fee Period: The PEMP is for the six-month performance period beginning October 1, 2024, and ending March 31, 2025.

ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE

The organizational structure of the incentive fee process is established to ensure a fair and full evaluation of the contractor's performance. This PEMP is used in conjunction with the latest revision of SPR Project Management Office (PMO) Order 210.2, SPRPMO Measurement Order, and the Quality Assurance Review. The PEMP states the key contract objective measures, including effectiveness and efficiency measures, corresponding execution targets (and stretch targets where applicable), and the percentage of potential fee to be earned. The PEMP also includes the criteria descriptions and evaluation criteria for each of the subjective measures. This PEMP may be changed unilaterally by the government as stipulated in the total available fee provisions of the contract. All parties involved in the incentive/award fee process, including the contractor, are encouraged to recommend changes with a view toward redirecting management emphasis, motivating performance improvements, or enhancing the fee process. Any changes to the plan will become effective consistent with the time frames outlined in the total available fee clause of the contract, or by mutual agreement of the parties. The Fee-Determining Official (FDO) approves all changes to the Plan, with the exception of administrative changes (e.g., changes in format, grammar, spelling etc.), which can be approved by the Award Fee Board (AFB) Chairperson.

FEE STRUCTURE

Total available fee consists of an award fee based on objective performance measures and an award fee based on a subjective evaluation. The total available fee pool is **\$5,937,828**, to be broken down as follows: The fee pool for Facilities is **\$2,458,696** and for Life Extension 2 (LE2) is **\$3,479,132**. LE2 measures can be found within its own PEMP (document SPRPMO 0469). For each evaluation period, the government and the contractor will mutually agree upon, or in the event an agreement cannot be reached, the government will unilaterally establish: the evaluation areas, individual requirements, and the allocation of fee. The contractor's performance relative to the evaluation areas identified in the objective measures (Attachment 2), and the subjective measures based on the evaluation areas listed in Attachment 4, determines the amount of fee earned. The method for arriving at this determination is described herein. The evaluation period represented in this document is October 1, 2024, through March 31, 2025.

In addition to evaluating the contractor's achievement of the measures and the subjective evaluation areas, the government will consider the impact of any material performance deficiencies in all areas of performance, regardless of whether a weight or fee has been specifically assigned. This includes, for example, marginal or unacceptable performance of work authorization directive (WAD) requirements; or less serious, but recurring or systemic, negative events. In evaluating the impact of performance deficiencies, the government will consider the timeliness and adequacy of corrective actions as well as the overall success of the contractor in exceeding the government's expectations.

The government expects the contractor to perform all contract work in a satisfactory manner. Therefore, if the contractor's performance is considered to be at a less than satisfactory level of performance established in any area of contract performance, regardless of whether a weight or fee has been specifically assigned, the amount of otherwise earned fee may be reduced in whole or in part. In exercising this discretion, the government will consider the extent to which the unfavorable performance:

• Posed a threat to the environment, the health and safety of workers, or the public as defined by the Integrated Safety Management System as approved by the Department of Energy (DOE).

- Contributed to the occurrence of a catastrophic event such as a fatality or serious workplace-related injury or illness, hazardous material exposure exceeding regulatory limits, loss of control over classified material, or an event that causes significant damage to the environment.
- Jeopardized attainment of overall contract requirements, including essential mission requirements such as drawdown readiness.
- Increased the cost to the government.

AWARD FEE COMPONENTS

The amount of fee earned will be based on an assessment of the contractor's performance through March 31, 2025, relative to the objective measures contained in Attachment 2 and a subjective fee component in Attachment 4. Unearned fees will not be rolled over to any subsequent evaluation period but shall be forfeited. The AFB will also take into consideration any special accomplishments or deficiencies that may arise through this six-month performance period. This information is received from the performance evaluators' assessment of the performance metrics set forth in the included measures and WADS. The method for determining earned fee is described below.

EVALUATION CRITERIA

1. Objective Fee Criteria

The objective measures represent outcomes DOE considers to be critical to the successful execution of the SPR mission. The objective measures are the core outcomes needed to achieve essential contract objectives. A fee is allocated to each measure. Notwithstanding the contractor's success in achieving the targets assigned to each measure, the final determination of fee will consider the extent to which material performance deficiencies (if any) occurred in any area of contract performance. When determining the amount of reduction to otherwise earned fee because of material performance deficiencies, due consideration will be given to the timeliness and adequacy of corrective actions as well as the overall success of the contractor in exceeding the government's expectations.

The contractor will continuously monitor performance toward all objective measures in the PEMP. A monthly, informal report of performance will be provided to DOE counterparts within the first five days of the new month. The report will be broken down by measure. A formal, roll-up report of overall contractor performance will be developed and transmitted to the DOE Contracting Officer during the first ten days of each new guarter. This report will be discussed in a formal meeting with DOE and contractor management. If at any point the contractor becomes aware that they are unlikely to achieve the requirements defined for the lowest target for any objective measure due to a performance deficiency within their control, that fact and any steps taken to mitigate the performance deficiency must be formally reported to the DOE Contracting Officer within ten days of discovery of the deficiency. If the contractor becomes aware that they are unlikely to achieve the requirements defined for the lowest target for any objective measure due to a deficiency or condition outside their control, they may formally request that DOE review the circumstances and may be granted dispensation for not meeting the measure based upon DOE's review. Such requests for dispensation must be transmitted to the DOE Contracting Officer within ten days of becoming aware of the problem.

If the contractor self-identifies a deficiency or condition within its control that will likely cause the contractor to miss a performance goal and provides a list of actions taken to mitigate the issue (or a plan deemed by DOE to be likely to result in mitigation) and subsequently misses the goal for that reason, the contractor may still earn some of the fee as determined by the Award Fee Board.

If the contractor does not self-identify any deficiency or condition within its control that will likely cause the contractor to miss a performance goal and DOE subsequently identifies an issue affecting the measure, even if the contractor subsequently makes the goal, the Award Fee Board may reduce the fee earned due to lack of communication of the condition or deficiency.

2. Subjective Fee Criteria

Each DOE Director may identify one or more desired outcomes to be addressed by the contractor during the PEMP cycle. Desired outcomes will become subjective measures in the PEMP. Desired outcomes may include improved performance in some narrowly defined area, development of new tools/approaches/processes that add value, or any other improvement that benefits the government. Desired outcomes will include elements as listed below:

- Definition: Each desired outcome will be succinctly defined as to the end product or condition and identify the period of evaluation (typically quarterly or annually).
- Metric(s): Each desired outcome will define the metric(s) to be used to track progress toward the desired outcome. Metrics should be trackable to the extent possible (such as counts or measurable improvements).
- Validation Method: Each director will identify the method to be used to validate performance. Validation activities should be formally documented using existing oversight methods and rely upon review of the contractor's self-assessment.
- Adjectival Table (AT): Each desired outcome will have its own AT which defines success for each specific desired outcome. The AT will have grading levels including Unsatisfactory, Satisfactory, Good, Very Good, and Excellent. Each category will define the level of performance for that category and provide a fractional fee modifier associated with the category. The fee modifier will be multiplied by the total fee allocated to the desired outcome in order to determine the final fee earned.

The contractor will continuously monitor performance toward all subjective measures in the PEMP. A monthly, informal report of performance will be provided to DOE counterparts within the first five days of the new month. The report will be broken down by measure. Quarterly, a formal, roll-up report of overall contractor performance will be developed and transmitted to the DOE Contracting Officer during the first ten days of the new quarter. This report will be discussed in a formal meeting with DOE and contractor management. If at any point the contractor becomes aware that they are unlikely to achieve the requirements defined performance below the satisfactory level defined for any subjective measure due to a performance deficiency within their control,

that fact and any steps taken to mitigate the performance deficiency must be formally reported to the DOE Contracting Officer within ten days of discovery of the deficiency. If the contractor becomes aware that they are unlikely to achieve the requirements defined for the performance below the satisfactory level defined for any subjective measure due to a deficiency or condition outside their control, they may formally request that DOE review the circumstances and may be granted dispensation for not meeting the measure based upon DOE's review. Such requests for dispensation must be transmitted to the DOE Contracting Officer within ten days of becoming aware of the problem.

Desired Outcomes (Subjective Measures) can be found in Attachment 4 below.

ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

- **a.** <u>Fee-Determining Official</u>. The FDO is the Deputy Assistant Secretary for the Office of Petroleum Reserves. The primary responsibilities of the FDO are to:
 - Approve the PEMP and any significant changes.
 - Approve the amount of fee earned and payable for each evaluation period.
 - Notify the contractor of the amount of total fee earned during the evaluation period. This notification will identify specific areas of strengths and performance deficiencies.
- **b.** <u>Award Fee Board</u>. The AFB membership is set forth in Attachment 1. The primary responsibilities of the AFB are to:
 - Prepare and submit the PEMP, including any significant changes, for the approval of the FDO.
 - Submit an AFB report to the FDO covering its findings regarding performance and recommendations for the determination of earned fee.

c. <u>Performance Evaluators</u>.

- Monitor and evaluate the contractor's performance.
- Conduct monthly counterpart meetings with the contractor to provide feedback on performance.
- Develop quarterly reports of contractor performance in conjunction with the Performance Management Coordinator to be submitted to the AFB.
- Submit reports to the AFB covering the evaluation of the contractor's performance.
- Recommend, as appropriate, changes to this plan.

d. Performance Management Coordinator.

- Develops the PEMP with consultation from the AFB and the Contracting Officer.
- Prepares a letter for the FDO for notification to the contractor of the amount of fee that has been earned for an evaluation period.
- Coordinates Reviews of proposed performance measures and performance evaluation information in conjunction with DOE Legal and DOE Contracts.
- Prepares the agenda and manages the quarterly AFB meetings.

e. <u>Contracting Officer</u>.

- Assures appropriate coordination of performance expectations and evaluation criteria with Headquarters and policy organizations.
- Submits the PEMP to Headquarters Office of Acquisition Management for approval.
- Negotiates award fee amounts.
- Forwards the approved PEMP or evaluation criteria to the contractor through a contract modification.

- Provides technical direction to the contractor.
- Participates in quarterly AFB meetings.

AWARD FEE PROCESS

Performance reviews will be conducted on a schedule as defined in the latest revision of SPRPMO O 210.2, *SPRPMO Performance Measurement Order*. Formal feedback of strengths and weaknesses will be documented and provided on a quarterly basis by the performance evaluators while a formal fee evaluation and determination by the AFB will be completed at the end of the evaluation cycle and recommended to the FDO.

The evaluation cycle consists of a yearlong evaluation period or may provide for multi-year incentive. During the evaluation period, DOE and FFPO counterparts will meet monthly to discuss performance and review the contractor's self-assessment reports. The AFB will meet with the contractor quarterly to address the contractor's progress, any changes in goals and priorities, any serious problems or issues requiring resolution, and the results of the contractor's self-assessment process. The AFB, including the Contracting Officer and Performance Evaluation Coordinator, will attend these meetings. Performance evaluators are also invited to attend. The Executive Secretary to the AFB will provide a schedule for these quarterly progress meetings.

The contractor will perform at the satisfactory level in all areas of performance regardless of whether a measure or fee has been assigned. If the contractor's performance is determined to be less than the minimum level of performance, earned fee may be reduced consistent with "Conditional Payment of Fee, Profit and Other Incentives – Facility Management Contract's clause (DEAR 970.5215-3)."

In applying these standards, the government will consider any mitigating factors presented by the contractor. Such factors must have directly and materially affected the contractor's ability to achieve the specified standard and must be beyond the control and responsibility of the contractor.

The contractor's performance, as a whole, for all evaluation periods will be a factor in considering the exercise of any contract option.

Key Contract Objectives	Fee Percentage	Fee Allocation
Objective Performance Pool	75%	\$ 1,844,022
Subjective Performance Pool	25%	\$ 614,674
Subtotal	100%	\$ 2,458,696

ATTACHMENT 1

AWARD FEE BOARD MEMBERSHIP

Chairperson:	Project Manager Strategic Petroleum Reserve
Members:	SPR Program Office Representative
	Assistant Project Manager* Management and Administration
	Assistant Project Manager Maintenance and Operations
	Assistant Project Manager Systems and Projects
	Assistant Project Manager Technical Assurance
Ex-officio Member:	Director Acquisition and Sales Division
Executive Secretary:	Performance Management Coordinator
General Attorney:	Office of Chief Counsel Serves in an Advisory capacity to the AFB

* REPRESENTS THE CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER

ATTACHMENT 2

OBJECTIVE FEE EVALUATION AREAS PERFORMANCE MEASURES

For any completed measure that is validated to have fallen between the Target and Stretch Target range, the fee percentage will be subject to linear interpolation in calculating the fee. If a fee calculation cannot be reached using linear interpolation, then the calculation will be made by the Award Fee Board, with approval of the Chairperson.

Key Contract Objectives	Effectiveness and Efficiency Measures	Execution Targets	Fee Percentage	Fee Allocation
 90-Day Drawdown Rate Ensure the SPR's capability to respond to an energy emergency consistent with the established Drawdown criteria. 90-day Drawdown rate in barrels per day (six-month average) 	Ensure the SPR's capability to respond to an energy emergency consistent with the established Drawdown criteria. 90-day Drawdown rate in barrels per day (six- month average)	Target: 2.64 MMBB	Target: 12%	Target: \$295,044
Maintenance Performance Appraisal Rating (MPAR) Maintain SPR facilities and systems at a level adequate to meet program requirements.	Calculated MPAR score	Stretch Target: ≥ 98-point six-month performance period average SPR-wide and ≥ 95-point six-month performance period average at each SPR site	Stretch Target: 11%	Stretch Target: \$270,457

Key Contract Objectives	Effectiveness and Efficiency Measures	Execution Targets	Fee Percentage	Fee Allocation
Maintenance		Target:	Target:	Target:
Performance Appraisal Rating (MPAR) (Continued)		≥ 95 point six-month performance period average SPR-wide and ≥ 94 point six-month performance period average at each SPR site	8%	\$196,696
Cavern Workovers Ensure compliance	Execute workovers	Stretch Target:	Stretch Target:	Stretch Target:
with regulations regarding Cavern and Brine Disposal Wells.	(excluding cavern remediations) per the workover schedule and budget.	Completion of 5 diagnostic workovers	13%	\$319,630
		Target:	Target:	Target:
		Completion of 4 diagnostic workovers	11%	\$270,457

Key Contract Objectives	Effectiveness and Efficiency Measures	Execution Targets	Fee Percentage	Fee Allocation
Reliability Availability Maintainability (RAM)				
Provide adequate assurance of the	Calculated percentage of site availability to be	Stretch Target:	Stretch Target:	Stretch Target:
availability and reliability of system components necessary to carry out the SPR mission.	validated by quarterly equipment exercise and required performance of drawn-down critical equipment to support full rate Drawdown.	>= 95 percent of drawdown must operate equipment for each site each quarter.	4%	\$98,348
		Target:	Target:	Target:
		>= 95 percent of drawdown must operate equipment for SPR-wide average each quarter calculated of all four sites.	2%	\$49,174
Annual Operating Plan (AOP)	Executes six-month performance period AOP total labor at or below	Stretch Target:	Stretch Target:	Stretch Target:
	obligated amount for the six-month performance period approved AOP Note: Consideration will be given to anomalies that occur during the six- month performance period that may impact this measure.	0% to 3.00%	4%	\$98,348
		Target:	Target:	Target:
		3.01% to 3.50%	2%	\$49,174
		Lower Target:	Lower Target:	Lower Target:
		3.51% to 4.00%	1%	\$24,587

Key Contract Objectives	Effectiveness and Efficiency Measures	Execution Targets	Fee Percentage	Fee Allocation
Master Project Milestone Schedule	Percentage of six-month performance period Level 1, 2, and 3 milestones for which FFPO is responsible (excluding milestones	Stretch Target: Complete all Level 1 and 2 milestones by the scheduled date. Complete at least 95% of all Level 3 milestones by the end of the six-month performance period. Target: Complete all Level 1 and 2 milestones by the scheduled date. Complete at least 90% of all Level 3 milestones by the	Stretch Target: 4% Target: 2%	Stretch Target: \$98,348 Target: \$49,174
Ensure effective delivery and receipt of External Crude Oil Movements	Successfully deliver and receive external crude oil in a safe and environmen- tally compliant manner to/from customers that were awarded contracts under Congressionally mandated and authorized oil sales, Emergency Exchanges, presidentially authorized Emergency Drawdowns and Fill Program.	end of the six-month performance period. Target: Per approved oil delivery/receipt schedule and oil contract requirements.	Target: 12%	Target: \$295,044

Key Contract Objectives	Effectiveness and Efficiency Measures	Execution Targets	Fee Percentage	Fee Allocation
Reportable Spills	Reportable releases to the environment, as defined by Federal and state regulatory agencies (this does not include any Reportable Releases that would correspond to the "Severe" or	Stretch Target: 1 reportable release	Stretch Target: 6%	Stretch Target: \$147,522
	"Catastrophic" consequences as defined by the SPR Risk Coding Matrix, FFPO Document #AAA9020.1057, dated 08/2017). This target goal shall not include any releases determined to be caused by action beyond the operational control of the M&O, such as Acts of God, or emergency that require use of fire control products like AFFF. All reportable releases cannot result in natural resource damage and must be properly reported and mitigated/cleaned in accordance with applicable environmental	Target: 3 reportable releases	Target: 3%	Target: \$73,761

Key Contract Objectives	Effectiveness and Efficiency Measures	Execution Targets	Fee Percentage	Fee Allocation
Repeat Findings during SEOD Security Surveys, Assessments, Self- Assessments, Emergency Management Audits and Assessments	Complete all scheduled SEOD Security Surveys, Special Assessments, Self-Assessments, Emergency Management Audits and Assessments with a Satisfactory Rating without Repeat Findings documented from the previous 3- years of Security Surveys, Special Assessments, Self- Assessments, and Emergency Management Audits and assessments during the performance period.	Stretch Target: Zero Repeat Findings as a result of Emergency Management Audits and Assessments, SEOD Security Surveys, Assessments and Self-Assessments during the performance period. Target: One Repeat Finding as a result of Emergency Management Audits and Assessments, SEOD Security Surveys, Assessments and Self-Assessments and Self-Assessments during the	Stretch Target: 4% Target: 2%	Stretch Target: \$98,348 Target \$49,174
		performance period.		

Key Contract Objectives	Effectiveness and Efficiency Measures	Execution Targets	Fee Percentage	Fee Allocation
Internal Audit - Audit Plan	i ciccitage of adales	Stretch Target: 90% of audits completed in the six- month performance period FFPO IA Audit Plan	Stretch Target: 3%	Stretch Target: \$73,761
		Target: 85% of audits completed in the six- month performance period FFPO IA Audit Plan	Target: 2%	Target: \$49,174
Known Exploited Vulnerabilities (KEVs) Tracking, Reporting, and Remediation	Monitor Known Exploited Vulnerabilities (KEVs) as released by the Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency (CISA). Report KEV remediation status into the DOE KEV database. Remediate KEVs utilizing the SPR vulnerability	Stretch Target: All quarterly KEVs are reported and tracked in the DOE KEV database. KEV summaries and remediation exceptions provided in the monthly AO report.	Stretch Target: 2%	Stretch Target: \$49,174
	management process per the KEV defined remediation timelines. Report remediation status and exceptions in the monthly Authorizing Official (AO) report.	Target: 99% of quarterly KEVs are reported and tracked in the DOE KEV database. KEV summaries and remediation exceptions provided in the monthly AO report.	Target: 1%	Target: \$24,587

ATTACHMENT 3

SUBJECTIVE MEASURE GRADING TABLE (FAR 16.401)

AWARD-FEE ADJECTIVAL RATING	AWARD-FEE POOL AVAILABLE TO BE EARNED	DESCRIPTION
Excellent	91%- 100%	Contractor has exceeded almost all of the significant award-fee criteria and has met overall cost, schedule, and technical performance requirements of the contract in the aggregate as defined and measured against the criteria in the award-fee plan for the award-fee evaluation period.
Very Good	76%-90%	Contractor has exceeded many of the significant award-fee criteria and has met overall cost, schedule, and technical performance requirements of the contract in the aggregate as defined and measured against the criteria in the award-fee plan for the award-fee evaluation period.
Good	51%-75%	Contractor has exceeded some of the significant award-fee criteria and has met overall cost, schedule, and technical performance requirements of the contract in the aggregate as defined and measured against the criteria in the award-fee plan for the award-fee evaluation period.
Satisfactory	No Greater Than 50%	Contractor has met overall cost, schedule, and technical performance requirements of the contract in the aggregate as defined and measured against the criteria in the award-fee plan for the award-fee evaluation period.
Unsatisfactory	0%	Contractor has failed to meet overall cost, schedule, and technical performance requirements of the contract in the aggregate as defined and measured against the criteria in the award-fee plan for the award-fee evaluation period.

ATTACHMENT 4 SUBJECTIVE FEE EVALUATION AREAS

Subjective fee will be determined by DOE by reviewing the monthly and quarterly contractor self-assessment reports, monitoring the metrics, and applying the validation techniques to arrive at a score for each subjective measure. The score will be categorized according to the adjectival table for each measure and the corresponding fee modifier will be applied. Gradings will be as follows:

EXCELLENT VERY GOOD GOOD SATISFACTORY UNSATISFACTORY

Criteria Description	Evaluation Criteria
TECHNICAL ASSURANCEQuality & Performance AssuranceDivisionQPAD 2025-1 Trending Analysis: (4.6%)- \$113,100Develop Quality trending analyses that informwork planning, allocation of resources, andprocess improvement initiatives. Demonstrateuse of these to improve technicalperformance, cost reduction, safetyimprovement, or schedule improved technicalperformance, reduced costs, improved safety,or improved schedule.Subject Measure Metric: Implementation ofanalyses that direct management's steps inconducting work planning, resource allocation,or process improvements and can be tied toimproved technical performance, reducedcosts, improved safety or improved schedule.DOE will review FFPO Quarterly SelfAssessments for evidence that trendinganalyses are being developed and having thedesire affect. FFPO must demonstrate thatimprovements occurred as a result of newdocumented trending analyses and data andassociate the value of the improvementsbased upon the categories defined above.	 Measure Validation: DOE will review FFPO Quarterly Self Assessments for evidence that trending analyses are being developed and having the desired effect. DOE will review demonstrations and other evidence supporting self- assessments to validate progress. Evaluation Criteria: Unsatisfactory: No new trending analyses. (Fee Modifier 0) Satisfactory: Any number of analyses that do not result in documentable improvements. (Fee Modifier 0.01 to 0.5) Good: One analysis that results in at least one documentable improvement in at least one *identified area. (Fee Modifier 0.51 to 0.75) Very Good: Two analyses that result in at least one documentable improvement in at least one of the *identified areas (Fee Modifier 0.76 to 0.9) Excellent: Two or more analyses where each one results in documentable improvements in at least two of the *identified areas. (Fee Modifier 0.91 to 1)

	Evaluation Criteria (Includes but Not Limited To)
Environmental Safety & Health Division ESHD 2025-1 Training Program Effectiveness: (4.5%) – \$110,641 Analyze incidents, accidents, and near misses for lack of knowledge, skills, and training necessary to perform tasks. Where training is not a causal factor, include supporting documentation of the analysis of the training. Ensure training programs for similar tasks are uniform and effective SPR wide. Demonstrate use of these analyses to enhance safety improvement opportunities, technical performance, and compliance. Enhancements may include, but are not limited	Measure Validation: DOE will review FFPO incident reports, weekly SH reports, ATS findings, Organizational Assessments, self-assessments, emails, and formal correspondence for evidence that training gaps are being identified and addressed in an appropriate manner. DOE will review revised training plans, APM sections, and other media to establish where FFPO identifies increased developments to safety improvement opportunities, technical performance, and compliance. DOE will ensure that processes and procedures are enforced in the field by supervisors. DOE will also ensure changes from previous incidents and lessons learned are appropriately applied to future training. DOE will utilize routine surveillance reports and oversight documentation to document discrepancies in contractor and subcontractor lack of knowledge, skills,
 Newly defined training (including Toolbox Topics, technical on-the-job training plans, required reading, and other structured training plans) for employees to eliminate recurrence of similar incidents. Developing improved training, which is more structured, has clearer language, removes incorrect procedures, or captures missing components to previous training. Identifying areas which training is insufficient for employees and developing further training to meet these needs. Involving management/supervision to attend trainings for personnel they are overseeing, which they are not trained to the same level as their craft personnel. Implementing new ways to verify employee Knowledge, Skills, and Abilities (KSAs) after training and during their course of employment, both managerial and craft employees. (Continued on the next page) 	 and training necessary to perform task. Evaluation Criteria: <u>Unsatisfactory:</u> No training enhancements that result in increased developments to safety improvement opportunities, technical performance, and compliance. (Fee Modifier 0) <u>Satisfactory:</u> One safety and health training enhancement with a completion rate 91-100% that results in in increased developments to safety improvement opportunities, technical performance, and compliance. (Fee Modifier 0.01 to 0.3) <u>Good:</u> Two safety and health training enhancements with a completion rate 91-100% that result in increased developments to safety improvement opportunities, technical performance, and compliance. (Fee Modifier 0.01 to 0.3) <u>Good:</u> Two safety and health training enhancements with a completion rate 91-100% that result in increased developments to safety improvement opportunities, technical performance, and compliance. (Fee Modifier 0.31 to 0.5) <u>Very Good:</u> Three safety and health training enhancements with a completion rate 91-100% that result in increased developments to safety improvement opportunities, technical performance, and compliance. (Fee Modifier 0.51 to 0.8) <u>Excellent:</u> Four or more safety and health training enhancements with a completion rate 91-100% that result in increased developments to safety improvement opportunities, technical performance, and compliance. (Fee Modifier 0.51 to 0.8)

Criteria Description	Evaluation Criteria (Includes but Not Limited To)
Environmental Safety & Health Division: (Cont'd) Subject Measure Matrix: Implementation of analyses that direct management's steps in conducting work planning, resource allocation, or process improvements and can be tied to improved technical performance, reduced costs, improved safety or improved schedule. DOE will review FFPO Quarterly Self Assessments for evidence that trending analyses are being developed and having the desire affect. FFPO must demonstrate that improvements occurred as a result of new documented trending analyses and data and associate the value of the improvements based upon the categories defined above.	
Security and Emergency Operations Division: Emergency Management: SEOD 2025-1 Preparedness Readiness Exercise Program (PREP): (0.7%) – \$17,211 Develop an Oil Spill Response Exercise Program consistent with the requirements of the Oil Pollution Act of 1990 (OPA 90) and the requirements of DOE O 151.1D, Comprehensive Emergency Management. Demonstrate the ability to meet submission timeline requirements of the Exercise Plans (EXPLANs) and After-Action Reports (AARs) while conducting three announced exercises per performance period. Demonstrate that lessons learned in the exercises are implemented to validate improvements. (Continued on the next page)	 Measure Validation: DOE will review and approve EXPLANs and AARs for submission timeliness and overall quality of the submitted exercise documents. DOE will validate contractor submitted evidence supporting exercise evaluation grades. DOE will attend exercises to validate lessons are incorporated into AARs and that technical proficiency is demonstrated. This will be documented through DOE written response to AARs and review and approval of EXPLANs. Evaluation Criteria: Unsatisfactory: Five or more instances where a submission date was missed due to untimely submission or a lack of supporting documentation for an exercise plan or evaluation grade. In addition, if the contractor fails to provide and document training to address noted deficiencies in the PREP AAR from the previous year. (Fee Modifier 0.0) Satisfactory: One safety and health training enhancement with a completion rate 91-100% that results in in increased developments to safety improvement opportunities, technical performance, and compliance. (Fee Modifier 0.01 to 0.39) Good: Two safety and health training enhancements with a completion rate 91-100% that result in increased developments to safety improvement opportunities, technical performance, and compliance. (Fee Modifier 0.4 to 0.59)

Criteria Description	Evaluation Criteria (Includes but Not Limited To)
Emergency Management: (Cont'd) <u>Subject Measure Metric</u> : Number of instances where a submission date was missed or lack of supporting documentation for an EXPLAN or evaluation grade and if the contractor fails to provide and document training to address noted deficiencies in the PREP AAR from the previous year.	 <u>Very Good</u>: Three safety and health training enhancements with a completion rate 91-100% that result in increased developments to safety improvement opportunities, technical performance, and compliance. (Fee Modifier 0.6 to 0.89) <u>Excellent</u>: Four or more safety and health training enhancements with a completion rate 91-100% that result in increased developments to safety improvement opportunities, technical performance, and compliance. (Fee Modifier 0.9 to 1)
 Security SEOD 2025-2 Security Self- Assessments: (4.4%) – \$108,183 Improve the quality of FFPO Security Self- Assessments (Site Security Self-Assessments, Canine Program Self-Assessment, and Weapons Qualification Range Self- Assessment) to ensure a higher degree of confidence in oversight of programmatic activities and order compliance by adhering to and documenting good assessment practice to include: 1) Ensure that assessment activities (data call, records review, interviews, performance monitoring, performance testing, etc.) are adequate to assess programs and are properly documented in assessment reports. 2) Ensure that sufficient evidence to support the program and topical area ratings are collected and documented in assessment reports. 3) Ensure assessment reports are comprehensive, well written, and accurate. Subject Measure Matrix: Required elements defined above are adequate and documented in assessment reports. 	 Measure Validation: DOE will review M&O contractor security self-assessments for evidence of documented contractor and subcontractor oversight of all topical and sub-topical areas, and a thorough analysis is being conducted and process improvements are developed that achieve the desired outcome(s). DOE will review contractor self-assessments, utilize follow-on site security surveys, or conduct focused special assessments to validate contractor self-assessments. Evaluation Criteria: Unsatisfactory: Four or more documented gaps in confidence due to deviations from good assessment practice (inadequate/undocumented assessment activities, unsupported topical or sub-topical ratings, poorly written, etc.) (Fee Modifier 0) Satisfactory: Three documented gaps in confidence due to deviations from good assessment practice (inadequate/undocumented assessment activities, unsupported topical and sub-topical ratings, poorly written, etc.) (Fee Modifier 0.01 to 0.5) Good: Two documented gaps in confidence due to deviations from good assessment practice (inadequate/undocumented assessment activities, unsupported topical and sub-topical ratings, poorly written, etc.) (Fee Modifier 0.51 to 0.75) Very Good: One documented gap in confidence due to deviations from good assessment practice (inadequate/undocumented assessment activities, unsupported topical and sub-topical ratings, poorly written, etc.) (Fee Modifier 0.76 to 0.9) Excellent: No documented gap in confidence due to deviations from good assessment practice (inadequate/undocumented assessment activities, unsupported topical and sub-topical ratings, poorly written, etc.) (Fee Modifier 0.76 to 0.9) Excellent: No documented assessment activities, unsupported topical and sub-topical ratings, poorly written, etc.) (Fee Modifier 0.91 to 1)

	Evaluation Criteria (Includes but Not Limited To)
MAINTENANCE & OPERATIONS: (3.8%) Site Operations & Maintenance Division (SOMD):	Measure Validation: DOE Site Engineers will inspect schedules to ensure work has been completed and site is maintaining acceptable levels of grounds maintenance and corrosion control. Validation will be documented using Observation Reports or on the OMP SharePoint site.
SOMD 2025-1 Site Management and Preservation: (3.8%) – \$93,430 Contractor to develop plans focusing on maintaining acceptable levels of grounds maintenance and corrosion control. Ground's maintenance will be evaluated according to security and personnel safety needs. Corrosion control will be evaluated to ensure items needing attention are identified and addressed before equipment/system integrity is compromised. This measure is needed to ensure grounds maintenance is addressed before becoming non-compliant with security requirements while also keeping safety risks to personnel to a minimum. The corrosion control portion is needed to ensure maintenance is addressing corrosion items before they evolve from aesthetic issues to actual degradation needing replacement before the end of the equipment/system's useful life. Subject Measure Metric: Each site to develop and execute plans to address grounds maintenance and corrosion control. The contractor shall provide a weekly schedule of work to be performed to each DOE Senior Site Representative.	 Evaluation Criteria: <u>Unsatisfactory</u>: No plans developed. (Fee Modifier 0.0) <u>Satisfactory</u>: Plans developed but weekly schedules not provided to DOE, at least 50% of schedule completed during period (each site). (Fee Modifier 0.1 to 0.5) <u>Good</u>: Plans developed, weekly schedules provided to DOE, at least 65% of schedule completed during period

	Evaluation Criteria (Includes but Not Limited To)
 CONTRACTS: (7.0%) A&SD 2025-1, Procurement: (3.5%) – \$86,054 Ensure procurement is in full compliance with approved purchasing procedures, statutes, regulations, or contract terms and condition. Compliance is measured by the following standards: Acquisition of quality products and services at fair and reasonable prices using techniques identified within FAR 15.404-1. Use of capable and reliable subcontractors. Minimization of acquisition lead-time and administrative costs of purchasing as calculated by the FY 2025 BSCSA. Use of competitive techniques as identified within FAR 6.102 as calculated by the FY 2025 BSCSA. Reduction of performance risks associated with subcontractors, and facilitation of quality relationships which can include techniques such as partnering agreements, ombudsmen, and alternative dispute procedures. Use of self-assessment and benchmarking techniques to support continuous improvement in purchasing provided monthly to the cognizant DOE official. Maintenance of professional and ethical standards. Audits of file documentation appropriate to the value of the purchase and which is adequate to establish the propriety of the transaction and the price paid. Maximization of opportunities for small business, HUBZone small business, small, disadvantaged business, and woman- owned small business concerns to participate in contract performance. 	 Measure Validation: DOE CO will document findings of each significant weakness of standards within Management Appraisals, consent packages, monthly reviews, or during quarterly reviews. A significant weakness is defined as: one or more of the applicable standards are not met there are no compensating factors to reduce the impact on effectiveness, and resulting deficiencies seriously degrade effectiveness. Evaluation Criteria: Unsatisfactory: A rating of 64% or lower. (Fee Modifier 0) Satisfactory: A rating of 65%-74%. (Fee Modifier 0.51 to 0.5) Good: A rating of 75%-84%. (Fee Modifier 0.76 to 0.90) Excellent: A rating of 95% or greater. (Fee Modifier 0.91 to 1)

CONTRAC	T NO. DE-FE0011020
CONTRAC final Adjectival rating shall be based upon the cumulative six-month performance period metrics of standards averaged.	
cumulative six-month performance period	
metrics of standards averaged.	
5	
	1

	Evaluation Criteria (Includes but Not Limited To)
 A&SD 2025-2, Training Program Effectiveness: (3.5%) - \$86,054 Analyze audit findings, PERT reviews, and PER for lack of knowledge, skills, and training necessary to perform tasks. Ensure training programs for similar tasks are uniform and effective SPR-wide. Demonstrate use of these analyses to enhance procurement improvement opportunities, technical performance, and compliance. Enhancements may include, but are not limited to: Newly defined training (including power point, technical on-the-job training plans, required reading, and other structured training plans) for employees to eliminate recurrence of similar incidents. Developing improved training, which is more structured, has clearer language, removes incorrect procedures, captures missing components to previous training. Identifying areas which training is insufficient for employees and developing further training to meet these needs. Involving management/supervision to attend trainings for personnel they are overseeing, which they are not trained to the same level as their craft personnel. Implementing new ways to verify employee Knowledge, Skills, and Abilities (KSAs) after training and during their course of employment, both managerial and craft employees. Subjective Measure Metric: Implementation of training programs which ensure that all personnel possess the experience, knowledge, skills, and abilities necessary to discharge their procurement responsibilities. 	 Measure Validation: DOE will review the M&O contractor weekly status on contract actions and consents, audit findings, PERT Reviews, small business consents and reporting, self-assessments, etc. to ensure that training gaps are being identified and addressed. DOE will review training plans, the items above, and other oversight tools, evaluate whether the M&O contractor has identified opportunities to improve procurement performances and compliance. The M&O contractor will ensure corrective actions from previous audits and lessons learned are applied to future training. DOE will utilize audits and other oversight documentation to document discrepancies in contractor and subcontractor lack of knowledge, skills, and training necessary to perform task. Evaluation Criteria: <u>Unsatisfactory</u>: No training enhancements that result in increased developments to procurement improvement opportunities, technical performance, and compliance. (Fee Modifier 0.) <u>Satisfactory</u>: One training enhancement that results in increased developments to procurement improvement opportunities, technical performance, and compliance. (Fee Modifier 0.01 to 0.5) <u>Good</u>: Two training enhancements that result in increased developments to procurement improvement opportunities, technical performance, and compliance. (Fee Modifier 0.75 to 0.90) <u>Very Good</u>: Three training enhancements that result in increased developments to procurement improvement opportunities, technical performance, and compliance. (Fee Modifier 0.76 to 0.90) <u>Excellent</u>: Four or more training enhancements that result in increased developments to procurement improvement opportunities, technical performance, and compliance. (Fee Modifier 0.76 to 0.90)



U. S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY STRATEGIC PETROLEUM RESERVE PROJECT MANAGEMENT OFFICE

PARTIAL FISCAL YEAR 2025

(OCTOBER 1, 2024 – MARCH 31, 2025)

LIFE EXTENSION 2 PERFORMANCE EVALUATION AND MEASUREMENT PLAN

FOR

FLUOR FEDERAL PETROLEUM OPERATIONS, LLC

CONTRACT NO. DE-FE0011020

SPRPMO 0475

SIGNATURE PAGE

SUBMITTED BY:

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

KELLY GELÉ CONTRACTING OFFICER

PAUL S. OOSTERLING PROJECT MANAGER

ACCEPTED BY:

FLUOR FEDERAL PETROLEUM OPERATIONS, LLC

KATHRYN MARSHALL PROJECT MANAGER

APPROVED BY:

DOUGLAS MACINTYRE DEPUTY DIRECTOR OFFICE OF PETROLEUM RESERVES DATE

DATE

DATE

DATE

.C

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION1
ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE1
FEE STRUCTURE2
AWARD FEE COMPONENTS
EVALUATION CRITERIA
1. Objective Fee Criteria
2. Subjective Fee Criteria5
ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES
AWARD FEE PROCESS
ATTACHMENT 1 - AWARD FEE BOARD MEMBERSHIP 11
ATTACHMENT 2 - PERFORMANCE FEE PLAN OBJECTIVE MEASURES 12
ATTACHMENT 3 - SUBJECTIVE MEASURE GRADING TABLE
ATTACHMENT 4 - SUBJECTIVE FEE EVALUATION AREAS

INTRODUCTION

Purpose: This Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan (PEMP) supplements and implements the total available fee provisions of Contract No. DE-FE0011020 with Fluor Federal Petroleum Operations, LLC (FFPO). This plan is for the management and operation of the Strategic Petroleum Reserve (SPR) Life Extension II Program. This plan will define methodology and responsibilities associated with determining the incentive fee to be awarded to FFPO. The plan outlines the organization, procedures, and evaluation period for implementing the fee provisions of the contract. The purpose of the incentive/award fee is to motivate the contractor to exceed standards and to emphasize key areas of performance and concern without jeopardizing minimum acceptable performance in all areas.

Incentive/Award-fee Period: The PEMP is for the performance period beginning October 1, 2024, and ending March 31, 2025.

ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE

The organizational structure of the incentive fee process is established to ensure a fair and full evaluation of the contractor's performance. This PEMP is used in conjunction with the latest revision of SPR Project Management Office (PMO) Order 210.2, *SPRPMO Measurement Order* and the *Quality Assurance Review*. The PEMP shall include the key contract objective measures, with their effectiveness and efficiency measures, their corresponding execution target (and in most cases their stretch targets as well), and percentage of the fee potential to be earned. The PEMP also will include the criteria description and evaluation criteria of each of the subjective measures.

This PEMP may be changed unilaterally by the government as stipulated in the total available fee provisions of the contract. All parties involved in the incentive/award fee process, including the contractor, are encouraged to recommend changes with a view toward redirecting management emphasis, motivating performance improvements, or enhancing the fee process. Any changes to the plan will become effective consistent with the time frames outlined in the total available fee clause of the contract, or by mutual agreement of the parties. The Fee-Determining Official (FDO) approves all changes to the Plan, with

the exception of administrative changes (e.g., changes in Performance Evaluators), which can be approved by the Award Fee Board (AFB) Chairperson.

FEE STRUCTURE

Total available fee consists of an award fee based on objective performance measures and an award fee based on a subjective evaluation. The total available fee pool is \$5,937,828, to be broken down as follows: The fee pool for Facilities is \$2,458,696 and for Life Extension 2 (LE2) is \$3,479,132. The Facilities measures can be found within its own PEMP (document SPRPMO 0468). For each evaluation period, the government and the contractor will mutually agree upon, or in the event an agreement cannot be reached, the government will unilaterally establish: the evaluation areas, individual requirements, and the allocation of fee. The contractor's performance relative to the evaluation areas identified in the objective measures (Attachment 2), and the subjective measures based on the evaluation areas listed in Attachment 4, determines the amount of fee earned. The method for arriving at this determination is described herein. The evaluation period represented in this document is October 1, 2024, through March 31, 2025.

In addition to evaluating the contractor's achievement of the measures and the subjective evaluation areas, the government will consider the impact of any material performance deficiencies in all areas of performance, regardless of whether a weight or fee has been specifically assigned. This includes, for example, marginal or unacceptable performance of work authorization directive (WAD) requirements; or less serious, but recurring or systemic, negative events. In evaluating the impact of performance deficiencies, the government will consider the timeliness and adequacy of corrective actions as well as the overall success of the contractor in exceeding the government's expectations.

The government expects the contractor to perform all contract work in a satisfactory manner. Therefore, if the contractor's performance is considered to be a less than satisfactory level of performance established in any area of contract performance, regardless of whether a weight or fee has been specifically assigned, the amount of otherwise earned fee may be reduced in whole or in part. In exercising this discretion, the government will consider the extent to which the unfavorable performance:

- Posed a threat to the environment or the health and safety of workers or the public as defined by the Integrated Safety Management System as approved by the Department of Energy (DOE).
- Contributed to the occurrence of a catastrophic event such as a fatality or serious workplace-related injury or illness, hazardous material exposure exceeding regulatory limits, loss of control over classified material, or an event that causes significant damage to the environment.
- Jeopardized attainment of overall contract requirements, including essential mission requirements such as drawdown readiness.
- Increased the cost to the Government.

AWARD-FEE COMPONENTS

The amount of fee earned will be based on an assessment of the contractor's performance through March 31, 2025, relative to the measures contained in Attachment 2 and a subjective fee component in Attachment 3. Unearned fee will not be rolled over to any subsequent evaluation period but shall be forfeited. The AFB will also take into consideration any special accomplishments or deficiencies that may arise through this performance period. This information is received from the performance evaluators' assessment of the performance metrics set forth in the included measures and WADs. The method for determining earned fee is described below.

EVALUATION CRITERIA

Performance Measures

1. Objective Fee Criteria

The objective measures represent the outcomes DOE considers to be critical to the successful execution of the SPR mission. The objective measures are the core outcomes needed to achieve essential contract objectives. A fee is allocated to each measure. Notwithstanding the contractor's success in achieving the targets assigned to each measure, the final determination of fee

will consider the extent to which material performance deficiencies (if any) occurred in any area of contract performance. In determining the amount of reduction to otherwise earned fee because of material performance deficiencies, due consideration will be given to the timeliness and adequacy of corrective actions as well as the overall success of the contractor in exceeding the government's expectations.

The contractor will continuously monitor performance toward all objective measures in the PEMP. A monthly, informal report of performance will be provided to DOE counterparts within the first five days of the new month. The report will be broken down by measure. Quarterly, a formal, roll-up report of overall contractor performance will be developed and transmitted to the DOE Contracting Officer during the first ten days of the new guarter. This report will be discussed in a formal meeting with DOE and contractor management. If at any point the contractor becomes aware that they are unlikely to achieve the requirements defined for the lowest target for any objective measure due to a performance deficiency within their control, that fact and any steps taken to mitigate the performance deficiency must be formally reported to the DOE Contracting Officer within ten days of discovery of the deficiency. If the contractor becomes aware that they are unlikely to achieve the requirements defined for the lowest target for any objective measure due to a deficiency or condition outside their control, they may formally request that DOE review the circumstances and may be granted dispensation for not meeting the measure based upon DOE's review. Such requests for dispensation must be transmitted to the DOE Contracting Officer within ten days of becoming aware of the problem.

If the contractor self-identifies a deficiency or condition within its control that will likely cause the contractor to miss a performance goal and provides a list of actions taken to mitigate the issue (or a plan deemed by DOE to be likely to result in mitigation) and subsequently misses the goal for that reason, the contractor may still earn some of the fee as determined by the Award Fee Board.

If the contractor does not self-identify any deficiency or condition within its control that will likely cause the contractor to miss a performance goal and DOE subsequently identifies an issue affecting the measure, even if the

contractor subsequently makes the goal, the Award Fee Board may reduce the fee earned due to lack of communication of the condition or deficiency.

2. <u>Subjective Fee Criteria</u>

Each DOE Director may identify one or more desired outcomes to be addressed by the contractor during the PEMP cycle. Desired outcomes will become subjective measures in the PEMP. Desired outcomes may include improved performance in some narrowly defined area, development of new tools/approaches/processes that add value, or any other improvement that benefits the government. Desired outcomes will include elements as listed below:

- Definition: Each desired outcome will be succinctly defined as to the end product or condition and identify the period of evaluation (typically quarterly or annually).
- Metric(s): Each desired outcome will define the metric(s) to be used to track progress toward the desired outcome. Metrics should be trackable to the extent possible (such as counts or measurable improvements).
- Validation Method: Each director will identify the method to be used to validate performance. Validation activities should be formally documented using existing oversight methods and rely upon review of the contractor's self-assessment.
- Adjectival Table (AT): Each desired outcome will have its own AT which defines success for each specific desired outcome. The AT will have grading levels including Unsatisfactory, Satisfactory, Good, Very Good, and Excellent. Each category will define the level of performance for that category and provide a fractional fee modifier associated with the category. The fee modifier will be multiplied by the total fee allocated to the desired outcome in order to determine the final fee earned.

The contractor will continuously monitor performance toward all subjective measures in the PEMP. A monthly, informal report of performance will be provided to DOE counterparts within the first five days of the new month. The report will be broken down by measure. Quarterly, a formal, roll-up report of overall contractor performance will be developed and transmitted to the DOE Contracting Officer during the first ten days of the new quarter. This

report will be discussed in a formal meeting with DOE and contractor management. If at any point the contractor becomes aware that they are unlikely to achieve the requirements defined performance below the satisfactory level defined for any subjective measure due to a performance deficiency within their control, that fact and any steps taken to mitigate the performance deficiency must be formally reported to the DOE Contracting Officer within ten days of discovery of the deficiency. If the contractor becomes aware that they are unlikely to achieve the requirements defined for the performance below the satisfactory level defined for any subjective measure due to a deficiency or condition outside their control, they may formally request that DOE review the circumstances and may be granted dispensation for not meeting the measure based upon DOE's review. Such requests for dispensation must be transmitted to the DOE Contracting Officer within ten days of becoming aware of the problem.

Desired Outcomes (Subjective Measures) can be found in Attachment 4 below.

ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

- a. **<u>Fee-Determining Official</u>**. The FDO is the Deputy Assistant Secretary for the Office of Petroleum Reserves. The primary responsibilities of the FDO are to:
 - Approve the PEMP and any significant changes.
 - Approve the amount of fee earned and payable for each evaluation period.
 - Notify the contractor of the amount of total fee earned during the evaluation period. This notification will identify specific areas of strengths and performance deficiencies.

- b. **Award Fee Board**. The AFB membership is set forth in Attachment 1. The primary responsibilities of the AFB are to:
 - Prepare and submit the PEMP, including any significant changes, for the approval of the FDO.
 - Submit an AFB report to the FDO covering its findings regarding performance and recommendations for the determination of earned fee.

c. **Performance Evaluators**.

- Monitor and evaluate the contractor's performance.
- Conduct monthly meetings with the contractor to provide feedback on performance.
- Develop quarterly reports of contractor performance in conjunction with the Performance Management Coordinator to be submitted to the AFB.
- Submit reports to the AFB covering the evaluation of the Contractor's performance.
- Recommend, as appropriate, changes to this plan.

d. Performance Management Coordinator.

- Develops the PEMP with consultation from the AFB and the Contracting Officer.
- Prepares a letter for the FDO for notification to the contractor of the amount of fee that has been earned for an evaluation period.
- Coordinates Reviews of proposed performance measures and performance evaluation information in conjunction with DOE Legal and DOE Contracts.
- Prepares the agenda and manages the quarterly AFB meetings.

• Submits a copy of the Quality Assurance Review results to the AFB regarding performance.

e. **Contracting Officer.**

- Assures appropriate coordination of performance expectations and evaluation criteria with Headquarters and policy organizations.
- Submits the PEMP to Headquarters Office of Acquisition Management for approval.
- Negotiates award fee amounts.
- Forwards the approved PEMP or evaluation criteria to the contractor through a contract modification.
- Provides technical direction to the contractor.
- Participates in quarterly AFB meetings.

AWARD FEE PROCESS

Performance reviews will be conducted on a schedule as defined in the latest revision of SPRPMO O 210.2, *SPRPMO Performance Measurement Order*. Formal feedback of strengths and weaknesses will be documented and provided on a quarterly basis by the performance evaluators while a formal fee evaluation and determination by the AFB will be completed at the end of the evaluation cycle and recommended to the FDO.

The evaluation cycle consists of a yearlong evaluation period or may provide for multi-year incentive. During the evaluation period, DOE and FFPO counterparts will meet monthly to discuss performance and review the contractor's self-assessment reports. The AFB will meet with the contractor quarterly to address the contractor's progress, any changes in goals and priorities, any serious problems or issues requiring resolution, and the results of the contractor's self-assessment process. The AFB, including the Contracting Officer and Performance Evaluation Coordinator, will attend these meetings. Staff members, who provide input to the

performance evaluators, are also invited to attend. The Executive Secretary to the AFB will provide a schedule for these quarterly progress meetings.

 The contractor will perform at the satisfactory level in all areas of performance regardless of whether a measures or fee has been assigned. If the contractor's performance is determined to be less than the minimum level of performance, earned fee may be reduced consistent with "Conditional Payment of Fee, Profit and Other Incentives – Facility Management Contract's clause (DEAR 970.5215- 3)."

In applying these standards, the government will consider any mitigating factors presented by the contractor. Such factors must have directly and materially affected the contractor's ability to achieve the specified standard and must be beyond the control and responsibility of the contractor.

The contractor's performance, as a whole, for all evaluation periods will be a factor in considering the exercise of any contract option.

Key Contract Objectives	Fee Percentage	Fee Allocation
LE2 Objective Performance Pool	80%	\$2,783,306
LE2 Subjective Performance Pool	20%	\$695,826
LE2 Subtotal	100%	\$3,479,132

ATTACHMENT 1

AWARD FEE BOARD MEMBERSHIP

Chairperson:	Project Manager Strategic Petroleum Reserve
Members:	SPR Program Office Representative
	Federal Project Director Life Extension 2
	Assistant Project Manager* Management and Administration
	Assistant Project Manager Maintenance and Operations
	Assistant Project Manager Systems and Projects
	Assistant Project Manager Technical Assurance
Ex-officio Member:	Director Acquisition and Sales Division
Executive Secretary:	Performance Management Coordinator
General Attorney:	Office of Chief Counsel Serves in an Advisory capacity to the AFB

* REPRESENTS THE CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER

ATTACHMENT 2

PERFORMANCE FEE PLAN PERFORMANCE MEASURES

For any completed measure that is validated to have fallen between the Target and Stretch Target range, the fee percentage will be subject to linear interpolation in calculating the fee. If a fee calculation cannot be reached using linear interpolation, then the calculation will be made by the Award Fee Board, with approval of the Chairperson.

Key Contract Objectives	Effectiveness and Efficiency Measures	Execution Targets	Fee Percentage	Fee Allocation
First Time Quality	Prime Contractor	Stretch Target:	Stretch Target:	Stretch Target:
	provides governance of subcontractor welding performance by monitoring First	95% FTQ	5%	\$173,957
	Time Quality (FTQ).	Target:	Target:	Target:
	Weld Acceptance rate of "X" %.	90% FTQ	2.5%	\$86,978
	Annual measure reported quarterly.			
Cost Control for	The total value of	Stretch Target:	Stretch Target:	Stretch Target:
Construction Subcontracts Cost Management	Construction Subcontracts that are in progress shall not exceed X% of cost growth between October 1,2024 and March 20, 2025.	107% of initial contract award value	15%	\$521,870

Key Contract Objectives	Effectiveness and Efficiency Measures	Execution Targets	Fee Percentage	Fee Allocation
Cost Control for Construction Subcontracts Cost Management (Continued)		Target: 110% of initial contract award value Does not include changes driven by additional approved Scope, Force Majeure, and Differing Site Conditions, and Directed Changes such as the emergency oil sales	Target: 7.5%	Target: \$260,935
Cost Control for Government Furnished Property Cost Management	The total value of GFP Purchase Orders that are in progress shall not exceed X% of cost growth between October 1, 2024, and March 20, 2025.	Stretch Target: 103% of initial contract award value Does not include changes driven by additional approved Scope, Force Majeure, and Differing Site Conditions, and Directed Changes such as the emergency oil sales.	Stretch Target: 15%	Stretch Target: \$521,870

Key Contract Objectives	Effectiveness and Efficiency Measures	Execution Targets	Fee Percentage	Fee Allocation
Cost Control for Government Furnished Property Cost Management (Continued)		Target: 105% of October 1, 2024, contract value Does not include changes driven by additional approved Scope, Force Majeure, and Differing Site Conditions, and Directed Changes such as the emergency oil sales	Target: 7.5%	Target: \$260,935
Master Project Milestone Schedule Adherence.	Complete all Level 1 and Level 2 Milestones by the schedule date. Additionally, meet Level 3 Milestones by end of the performance period end and at least within 30 days of the scheduled date.	Stretch Target: Meet 100% of Level 1 and Level 2 Milestones by the scheduled date. Additionally, Complete at least 90% of all Level 3 Milestones by the end of the performance period.	Stretch Target: 15%	Stretch Target: \$521,870

Key Contract Objectives	Effectiveness and Efficiency Measures	Execution Targets	Fee Percentage	Fee Allocation
Master Project Milestone Schedule Adherence. (Continued)		Target: Meet 100% of Level 1 and Level 2 Milestones by the scheduled date. Additionally, complete at least 85% of all Level 3 Milestones by the end of the performance period.	Target: 7.5%	Target: \$260,935
Bayou Choctaw Subproject Submittals	Project Director to include: (1) draft CD-4 Presentation to the Project Management Risk Committee (PMRC); (2) Key Performance Parameters and Project Completion Verification; and (3) Final Transition to	Stretch Target CD-4 submittal package to the LE2 FPD by February 28, 2025, with a TPC of \$359M or less.	Stretch Target 10%	Stretch Target \$347,913
		Target CD-4 submittal package to the LE2 FPD by March 15, 2025, with \$360M >= TPC >= \$369M		Target \$173,957

Key Contract Objectives	Effectiveness and Efficiency Measures	Execution Targets	Fee Percentage	Fee Allocation
Cost Performance Index cumulative for the Bayou Choctaw, Bryan Mound, and Big Hill Subprojects	The Cost Performance Index (CPI) ensures activities leading up to and post CD-2/ CD-3 are performed in a cost-effective manner and in accordance with initial baselines. Proportional by percentage based on when CD-2/3 occurs. X% of the control accounts that are >=25% complete for the three subprojects have CPIs that are >= 0.XX.	Stretch Target Ninety percent of active (at least 25% complete) or Completed Control Accounts with Cumulative Cost Performance Index (CPI) greater than or equal to 0.95 of the approved baseline budgets.	Stretch Target	Stretch Target \$347,913
		Target	Target	Target
		Ninety percent of Active (at least 25% complete) or Completed Control Accounts with CPI is greater than or equal to 0.85 of the approved baseline budgets.	5%	\$173,957

Key Contract Objectives	Effectiveness and Efficiency Measures	Execution Targets	Fee Percentage	Fee Allocation
To Complete Performance Index (TCPI)	The To Complete Performance Index (TCPI) based on the Estimate at Completion (EAC) for the Bryan Mound, Bayou Choctaw and Big Hill subprojects reported monthly from the Earned Value Management	Stretch Target Cost Performance (CPI) To Complete Performance Index (TCPI) for each subproject = +/- 0.1>	Stretch Target	Stretch Target \$347,913
	Value Management System (EVMS) Project Review data or Project Assessment and Reporting System (PARS), if available, through February 2025. The TCPI is an Earned Value Management metric computed by dividing value of the work remaining by the target cost remaining. The target cost remaining value is tied to the EAC for each subproject. The TCPI metric represents the cost efficiency from the present time until the end of each subproject. The TCPI will be compared to the Cost Performance Index reported monthly for each subproject during reporting period through February 2025 with the following formula: • Cost Performance Index (CPI) – To Complete Performance Index (TCPI) = XX	Target Cost Performance (CPI)-To Complete Performance Index (TCPI) for each subproject = +/- 0.2	Target 5%	Target \$173,957

ATTACHMENT 3

SUBJECTVE MEASURE GRADING TABLE (FAR 16.401)

AWARD-FEE ADJECTIVAL RATING	AWARD-FEE POOL AVAILABLE TO BE EARNED	DESCRIPTION
Excellent	91%-100%	Contractor has exceeded almost all of the significant award-fee criteria and has met overall cost, schedule, and technical performance requirements of the contract in the aggregate as defined and measured against the criteria in the award-fee plan for the award-fee evaluation period.
Very Good	76%-90%	Contractor has exceeded many of the significant award- fee criteria and has met overall cost, schedule, and technical performance requirements of the contract in the aggregate as defined and measured against the criteria in the award-fee plan for the award-fee evaluation period.
Good	51%-75%	Contractor has exceeded some of the significant award- fee criteria and has met overall cost, schedule, and technical performance requirements of the contract in the aggregate as defined and measured against the criteria in the award-fee plan for the award-fee evaluation period.
Satisfactory	No Greater Than 50%	Contractor has met overall cost, schedule, and technical performance requirements of the contract in the aggregate as defined and measured against the criteria in the award-fee plan for the award-fee evaluation period.
Unsatisfactory	0%	Contractor has failed to meet overall cost, schedule, and technical performance requirements of the contract in the aggregate as defined and measured against the criteria in the award-fee plan for the award-fee evaluation period.

ATTACHMENT 4

SUBJECTIVE FEE EVALUATION AREAS

Subjective fee will be determined by DOE by reviewing the monthly and quarterly contractor self-assessment reports, monitoring the metrics, and applying the validation techniques to arrive at a score for each subjective measure. The score will be categorized according to the adjectival table for each measure and the corresponding fee modifier will be applied. Gradings will be as follows:

EXCELLENT VERY GOOD GOOD SATISFACTORY UNSATISFACTORY

Criteria Description	Evaluation Criteria
 LE2 2025-1 Management of the LE2 Project: (5%) - \$173,957 Ensure that the Management of the LE2 Project is appropriate for a project of this size, importance, and complexity. To properly manage a project like LE2 the management actions below should be followed: Problem areas are resolved before they impact project cost and schedule. Senior Management is active in driving initiatives that will enhance management practices devoted to the program. Demonstrate proactive communication with all stakeholders to identify and resolve project issues before they impact productivity. Solicit and award quality, well defined subcontracts which result in few modifications to the bid package and/or change order requests after award. Management ensures that Lessons Learned are integrated into planning when applicable. (Continued on the next page) 	 Subjective Measure Validation: DOE personnel will attend pertinent meetings and observe field activities. DOE will provide feedback which will include, but is not limited to, DOE Routine Surveillance Reports, Observation Reports, On-Site Management Reviews, DOE Weekly Reports, ATS Findings, Contracting Officer's Letters, email correspondence and Monthly Self-Assessment Reviews. Adjectival Table: <u>Unsatisfactory</u>: 10 or more documented instances (using the methods described above) of Management failures during the performance period. (Fee Modifier 0.0) <u>Satisfactory</u>: From 7 to 10 documented instances of Management failures during the performance period. (Fee Modifier 0.01 to 0.50) <u>Good</u>: From 4 to 6 documented instances of Management failures during the performance period. (Fee Modifier 0.51 to 0.75) <u>Very Good</u>: From 2 to 3 documented instances of Management failures during the performance period. (Fee Modifier 0.76 to 0.90)

Criteria Description	Evaluation Criteria (Includes but Not Limited To)
 LE2 2025-1 Management of the LE2 Project: (Continued) Management ensures compliance with DOE Orders and Directives and FFPO Procedures. Management is responsible in selecting, retaining, supporting, and replacing Key Personnel. Management ensures that the FPD is provided the accurate project performance data in a timely manner. Subject Measure Metric: Required elements defined above are communicated and documented in LE2 Weekly Progress Meetings, LE2 Project Reviews, Counterpart Meetings and Monthly Self- Assessments. 	
 LE2 2025-2 LE2 Quality Program: (5%) - \$173,957 Ensure the LE2 Quality Program is sufficient to manage the complexities of the LE2 Project and will guide the project to a positive outcome. To determine if the LE2 Quality Program is sufficient the elements below should be followed: Compliance with the Quality Assurance procedures and the LE 2 Construction Management Procedures. Products and services meet contractual quality requirements. Analyses Non-Conformance Reports are accurate and effectively communicated. (Continued on the next page) 	 Subjective Measure Validation: DOE personnel will attend pertinent meetings and observe field activities. Constructive feedback regarding the LE2 Project's Quality Program will be provided using DOE Routine Surveillance Reports, Observation Reports, On-Site Management Reviews, DOE Weekly Reports, and Monthly Self-Assessment Reviews. Adjectival Table: Unsatisfactory: 13 or more documented instances (using the methods described above) of a DOE identified deficiencies in the Health and Safety Program during the performance period. (Fee Modifier 0.0) Satisfactory: From 10 to 12 documented instances of DOE identified deficiencies in the Health and Safety Program during the performance period. (Fee Modifier 0.01 to 0.50) Good: F rom 7 to 9 documented instances of DOE identified deficiencies in the Health and Safety Program during the performance period. (Fee Modifier 0.51 to 0.75)

Criteria Description	Evaluation Criteria (Includes but Not Limited To)
LE2 2025-2 LE2 Quality Program: (Continued) Subject Measure Metric: Required elements defined above are communicated and documented in LE2 Weekly Progress Meetings, LE2 Project Reviews, Counterpart Meetings and Monthly Self-Assessments. LE2 2025-3 LE2 Health and Safety Program: (6%) – \$208,748 Ensure that the LE2 Safety and Health	 <u>Very Good</u>: From 4 to 6 documented instances of DOE identified deficiencies in the Health and Safety Program during the performance period. (Fee Modifier 0.76 to 0.90) <u>Excellent</u>: From 0 to 3 documented instances of DOE identified deficiencies in the Health and Safety Program during the performance period. (Fee Modifier 0.91 to 1) Subjective Measure Validation: DOE personnel will attend pertinent meetings and observe field activities. Constructive foodback regarding the LE2 Project's Health and Safety
 Ensure that the LE2 Safety and Health Program is proactive in its safety monitoring of the LE2 project. To determine if the LE2 Safety and Health Program is sufficient the elements below should be followed: Proactively monitor the LE 2 project and provide Safety and Health oversight of subcontractor Safety and Health plans and programs, adherence to SPR applicable Accident Prevention Manual (APM) sections, subcontract language and special subcontract provisions. Identify, report, and immediately address Safety and Health issues and concerns. Subject Measure Metric: Required elements defined above are communicated and documented in LE2 Weekly Progress Meetings, LE2 Project Reviews, Counterpart Meetings, and Monthly Self-Assessments. 	 feedback regarding the LE2 Project's Health and Safety Program will be provided using DOE Routine Surveillance Reports, Observation Reports, On-Site Management Reviews, DOE Weekly Reports, and Monthly Self-Assessment Reviews. Adjectival Table: <u>Unsatisfactory:</u> 13 or more documented instances (using the methods described above) of a DOE identified deficiencies in the Health and Safety Program during the performance period (Fee Modifier 0.0) <u>Satisfactory:</u> From 10 to 12 documented instances of DOE identified deficiencies in the Health and Safety Program during the performance period (Fee Modifier 0.01 to 0.50) <u>Good:</u> From 7 to 9 documented instances of DOE identified deficiencies in the Health and Safety Program during the performance period (Fee Modifier 0.51 to 0.75) <u>Very Good:</u> From 4 to 6 documented instances of DOE identified deficiencies in the Health and Safety Program during the performance period (Fee Modifier 0.51 to 0.75)
	Modifier 0.76 to 0.90)

	Evaluation Criteria (Includes but Not Limited To)
 CONTRACTS: 4% A&SD 2025-4, Procurement: (4%) – \$139,165 Ensure Procurement is in full compliance with approved purchasing procedures, statutes, regulations, or contract terms and condition. Compliance is measured by the following standards: Acquisition of quality products and services at fair and reasonable prices using techniques identified within FAR 15.404-1. Use of capable and reliable subcontractors. Reduction of performance risks associated with subcontractors, and facilitation of quality relationships which can include techniques such as partnering agreements, ombudsmen, and alternative dispute procedures. Use of self-assessment and benchmarking techniques to support continuous improvement in purchasing provided monthly to the cognizant DOE official. Maintenance of professional and ethical standards. Audits of file documentation appropriate to the value of the purchase and which is adequate to establish the propriety of the transaction and the price paid. Maximization of opportunities for small business, HUBZone small business, small, disadvantaged business, and woman-owned small business concerns to participate in contract performance. 	 Subjective Measure Validation: DOE CO will document findings of each significant weakness of standards within Management Appraisals, consent packages, monthly reviews, or during quarterly reviews. A significant weakness is defined as: one or more of the applicable standards are not met, there are no compensating factors to reduce the impact on effectiveness, and resulting deficiencies seriously degrade effectiveness. Adjectival Table: Unsatisfactory: A rating of 64% or lower. (Fee Modifier 0.0) Satisfactory: A rating of 65%-74%. (Fee Modifier 0.1 to 0.50) Good: A rating of 75%-84%. (Fee Modifier 0.51 to 0.75) Very Good: A rating of 95% or greater. (Fee Modifier 0.91 to 1)

Criteria Description	Evaluation Criteria (Includes but Not Limited To)
<u>CONTRACTS</u>: (Cont'd) Subject Measure Metric: Quarterly reviews indicate Purchasing System trending, and the final Adjectival rating shall be based upon the cumulative performance period metrics of standards averaged.	