AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION/MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT				CONTRACT ID CODE	PAGI	OF PAGES		
2. AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION NO.	3. EFFECTIVE	DATE	4. REQ	UISITION/PURCHASE REQ. NO.	5. PROJEC	T NO. (If applicable)		
0178	See Bloo	ck 16C	25CR	000375				
6. ISSUED BY CODE	892435		7. ADN	IINISTERED BY (If other than Item 6)	CODE 0	1601		
Strategic Petroleum Reserve Project SPRO U.S. Department of Energy 900 Commerce Road East US 492 New Orleans LA 70123				SPRO U.S. Department of Energy SPRO 900 Commerce Road East US 492 New Orleans LA 70123				
8. NAME AND ADDRESS OF CONTRACTOR (No., street,	county. State and	ZIP Code)	, J9A.	AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION NO.				
Fluor Federal Petroleum Opera Attn: Janet Rodriguez 350 S Clearview Pkwy New Orleans LA 701233401	•	LLC	9B. X 10A DE	DATED (SEE ITEM 11) MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT/ORDER N -FE0011020 DATED (SEE ITEM 13)	0.			
CODE 078490442	FACILITY COD	E	0	9/18/2013				
070490442	11 TUIS ITE	EM ONLY ADDLIES TO AN		ENTS OF SOLICITATIONS				
separate letter or electronic communication which incle RECEIVED AT THE PLACE DESIGNATED FOR THE OFFER. If by virtue of this amendment you desire to c each letter or electronic communication makes referen 12. ACCOUNTING AND APPROPRIATION DATA (If requ See Schedule	ies of the amen- ides a reference RECEIPT OF O RECEIPT OF O ce to the solicita ired)	dment; (b) By acknowled; to the solicitation and an FFERS PRIOR TO THE Halready submitted , such cution and this amendment.	ging red nendme HOUR A shange , and is Inc	eipt of this amendment on each copy of the of nt numbers. FAILURE OF YOUR ACKNOWL ND DATE SPECIFIED MAY RESULT IN REJE nay be made by letter or electronic communic received prior to the opening hour and date sp	fer submitted EDGEMENT ECTION OF Y ation, provide ecified.	; or (c) By TO BE OUR d		
	T/ORDER IS MO IN ITEM 14, PU	ODIFIED TO REFLECT T IRSUANT TO THE AUTH	HE ADI ORITY	ES SET FORTH IN ITEM 14 ARE MADE IN TI MINISTRATIVE CHANGES (such as changes in OF FAR 43.103(b).				
D. OTHER (Specify type of modification	and authority)							
X See Block 14								
E.IMPORTANT: Contractor is not 14. DESCRIPTION OF AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION (UEI: KJDUB6XQDTN4 Pursuant to the authority of	Organized by U	•	uding s	olicitation/contract subject matter where feasib	le.)	3 н.14		
FY25 Performance Evaluation and thereby modified to incorporate A. Reference Section B, B.4: The total amount of \$12,553,6	and Measi te the fo Pursuan	urement Plan ollowing chan to I.132, I	(PEN ige: DEAR	MP), Contract Number DE	-FE0011	020 is of Funds:		
\$12,553,024.22 to cover estiment and includes all of November Continued	mated re	quirements. I	his'	amount funds FFPO to 9				
Except as provided herein, all terms and conditions of the 15A. NAME AND TITLE OF SIGNER (<i>Type or print</i>)	e document refe	renced in Item 9 A or 10A	16A. I	etofore changed, remains unchanged and in for NAME AND TITLE OF CONTRACTING OFFICE BY M. Gele				
15B. CONTRACTOR/OFFEROR		15C. DATE SIGNED	16B. U	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	Qi.	16C. DATE SIGNED 09/25/2025		
(Signature of person authorized to sign)				(Signature of Contracting Officer)		33,23,2023		

 CONTINUATION SHEET
 REFERENCE NO. OF DOCUMENT BEING CONTINUED DE-FE0011020/0178
 PAGE DE-FE0011020/0178
 OF DE-FE0011020/0178

NAME OF OFFEROR OR CONTRACTOR

Fluor Federal Petroleum Operations, LLC

ITEM NO.	SUPPLIES/SERVICES (B)	QUANTITY (C)	UNIT (D)	UNIT PRICE (E)	AMOUNT (F)
	The total funds obligated to this contract has increased by \$12,553,024.22 from \$3,349,955,553.12 to \$3,362,516,557.35.				
	The contract value remains unchanged at \$3,365,483,092.44.				
	B. Reference Section J, Attachment J - Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan (PEMP): The Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan for the period July 1, 2025, through September 30, 2025, is hereby incorporated. (See Attached)				
	All other contract terms and conditions remain unchanged.				
	Payment: VIPERS https://vipers.doe.gov Any questions, please contact by call/email 888-251-3557 or payments@hq.doe.gov Period of Performance: 04/01/2014 to 12/31/2025				
	reflot of reflormance. 04/01/2014 to 12/31/2023				



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

PARTIAL FISCAL YEAR 2025

(JULY 1, 2025 - SEPTEMBER 30, 2025)

PERFORMANCE EVALUATION AND MEASUREMENT PLAN

FOR

FLUOR FEDERAL PETROLEUM OPERATIONS, LLC CONTRACT NO. DE-FE0011020

SPRPMO 0485

SIGNATURE PAGE

SUBMITTED BY:	
DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY	
KELLY GELE Digitally signed by KELLY GELE Date: 2025.07.30 09:14:31	
KELLY GELÉ	DATE
CONTRACTING OFFICER	
PAUL Digitally signed by PAUL OOSTERLING	
OOSTERLING Date: 2025.07.30 10:23:50 -05'00'	
PAUL S. OOSTERLING PROJECT MANAGER	DATE
TROJECT MANAGER	
ACCEPTED BY:	
FLUOR FEDERAL PETROLEUM OPERATION	IS, LLC
KATHRYN MARSHALL PROJECT MANAGER	DATE
PROJECT WANAGER	
APPROVED BY:	
	DATE
	DAIE
KENNETH VINCENT ACTING DEPUTY DIRECTOR OFFICE OF PETROL FUM RESERVE	DATE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>PAGE</u>	=
INTRODUCTION	
ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE	
FEE STRUCTURE	
AWARD COMPONENTS3	
EVALUATION CRITERIA	
1. Objective Fee Criteria3	
2. Subjective Fee Criteria5	
ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES	
AWARD FEE PROCESS 8	
ATTACHMENT 1 - AWARD FEE BOARD MEMBERSHIP 10	
ATTACHMENT 2 - AWARD FEE PLAN OBJECTIVE MEASURES 11	
ATTACHMENT 3 – SUBJECTIVE MEASURE GRADING TABLE 18	
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). 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 three-month performance period beginning July 1, 2025, and ending September 30, 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 \$2,968,914, to be broken down as follows: The fee pool for Facilities is \$1,229,348 and for Life Extension 2 (LE2) is \$1,739,566. LE2 measures can be found within its own PEMP (document SPRPMO 0484). 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 July 1, 2025, through September 30, 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 June 30, 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 three-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.

3

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 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 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. 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. <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 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%	\$922,011
Subjective Performance Pool	25%	\$307,337
Subtotal	100%	\$1,229,348

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	Target: 2.25 Million Barrels Per Day (MMBD)	Target: 12%	Target: \$147,522
Maintenance Performance Appraisal Rating (MPAR) Maintain SPR facilities and systems at a level adequate to meet program requirements.	(three-month average). Calculated MPAR score	Stretch Target: > = 98-point three- month performance period average SPR- wide and > = 95-point three-month performance period average at each SPR site	Stretch Target: 11%	Stretch Target: \$135,228

Key Contract Objectives	Effectiveness and Efficiency Measures	Execution Targets	Fee Percentage	Fee Allocation
Maintenance Performance Appraisal Rating (MPAR) (Continued)		Target: > = 95-point three- month performance period average SPR- wide and > = 94-point three- month performance period average at each SPR site	Target: 8%	Target: \$98,348
Cavern Workovers Ensure compliance with regulations regarding Cavern and Brine Disposal Wells.	Execute workovers (excluding cavern remediations) per the workover schedule and budget.	Target: Completion of 1 diagnostic workover: WH-111	Target: 11%	Target: \$135,228
Reliability Availability Maintainability (RAM)	Provide adequate assurance of the availability and reliability of system components necessary to carry out the SPR mission.	>= 95 percent of drawdown must operate equipment for each site each quarter.	Stretch Target: 5%	Stretch Target: \$61,467
		>= 95 percent of drawdown must operate equipment for SPR-wide average each quarter calculated on all four sites.	Target: 2.5%	Target: \$30,734

Key Contract Objectives	Effectiveness and Efficiency Measures	Execution Targets	Fee Percentage	Fee Allocation
Master Project Milestone Schedule				
Ensure effective mission execution	Percentage of three- month performance	Stretch Target:	Stretch Target:	Stretch Target:
through management and control of project milestones.	period; Level 1, 2, and 3 milestones for which FFPO is responsible (excluding milestones associated with the Program Cyber Security Plan (PCSP) Implementation) that are completed in compliance	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 three-month performance period.	5%	\$61,467
	with established Control Milestone Change Requests (CMCRs)	Target:	Target:	Target:
	Requests (CMCRs).	Complete all Level 1 and 2 milestones by the scheduled date. Complete at least 90% of all Level 3 milestones by the end of the threemonth performance period.	2.5%	\$30,734
Ensure effective delivery and	Successfully deliver and receive external crude oil	Target:	Target:	Target:
receipt of External Crude Oil Movements	in a safe and environmentally 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.	Per approved oil delivery/receipt schedule and oil contract requirements.	12%	\$147,522

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 "Catastrophic" consequences as defined by the SPR Risk Coding Matrix, FFPO Document #AAA9020.1057, dated 08/2017).	Stretch Target: 0 reportable releases	Stretch Target: 8%	Stretch Target: \$98,348
		Target: 1 reportable release	Target: 4%	Target: \$49,174
	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 emergencies 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 quidelines.			

Key Contract Objectives	Effectiveness and Efficiency Measures	Execution Targets	Fee Percentage	Fee Allocation
Repeat Findings during SEOD	Complete all scheduled SEOD Security Surveys,	Stretch Target: Zero Repeat Findings	Stretch Target:	Stretch Target:
Security Surveys, Assessments, and Emergency Management Audits	Special Assessments, and Emergency Management Audits with a Satisfactory Composite Rating without Repeat Findings documented from the previous 2 years of Security Surveys, Special Assessments, and Emergency Management Audits during the contract performance period.	as a result of Emergency Management Audits, SEOD Security Surveys, and Assessments during the performance period.	4%	\$49,174
		Target:	Target:	Target
		One Repeat Finding as a result of Emergency Management Audits, SEOD Security Surveys, and Assessments during the performance period.	2%	\$24,587
Internal Audit - Audit Plan	Percentage of audits completed in the three-month performance period FFPO IA Audit Plan, including all scheduled audits within the FY 2024 Audit Plan and including any audits	100% of audits completed in the three-month performance period FFPO IA Audit Plan	Stretch Target: 3%	\$36,880
	added or substituted as needed.	Target:	Target:	Target:
		50% of audits completed in the three-month performance period FFPO IA Audit Plan	2%	\$24,587

Key Contract Objectives	Effectiveness and Efficiency Measures	Execution Targets	Fee Percentage	Fee Allocation
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 management process per the KEV defined remediation timelines. Report remediation status and exceptions in the monthly Authorizing Official (AO) report.	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: 4%	\$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 management process per the KEV defined remediation timelines. Report remediation status and exceptions in the monthly Authorizing Official (AO) report.	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: 2%	Target: \$24,587

Key Contract Objectives	Effectiveness and Efficiency Measures	Execution Targets	Fee Percentage	Fee Allocation
Known Exploited Vulnerabilities		Lower Target:	Lower Target:	Lower Target:
(KEVs) Tracking, Reporting, and Remediation (Continued)		97% of quarterly KEVs are reported and tracked in the DOE KEV database. KEV summaries and remediation exceptions provided in the monthly AO report.	1%	\$12,293

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
Quality & Performance Assurance Division QPAD 2024-1, Trending Analysis: (4.60%) — \$56,550 Develop Quality trending analyses that inform work planning, allocation of resources, and process improvement initiatives. Demonstrate use of these to improve technical performance, cost reduction, safety improvement, or schedule improvement. *Identified areas include improved technical performance, reduced costs, improved safety, or improved schedule. Subject Measure Metric: 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.	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. Adjectival Table: • Unsatisfactory: No new trending analyses. (Fee Modifier 0.00) • Satisfactory: Any number of analyses that do not result in documentable improvements. (Fee Modifier 0.01 to 0.50) • 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: One analysis that results in at least two documentable improvement in at least one *identified area. (Fee Modifier 0.76 to 0.90) • Excellent: One analysis that results in at least two documentable improvements in at least two *identified areas. (Fee Modifier 0.91 to 1.00)

Criteria Description

Evaluation Criteria (Includes but Not Limited To)

Environmental Safety & Health Division

ESHD 2024-1, Training Program Effectiveness: (4.50%) – \$55,321

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 to:

- 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)

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, and training necessary to perform task.

Adjectival Table:

- <u>Unsatisfactory</u>: No training enhancements that result in increased developments to safety improvement opportunities, technical performance, and compliance. (Fee Modifier 0.00)
- <u>Satisfactory</u>: One safety and health training enhancement in development 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 0.30)
- Good: Two safety and health training enhancements in development with a completion rate 91-100% that result in increased developments to safety improvement opportunities, technical performance, and compliance. (Fee Modifier 0.31 to 0.50)
- Very Good: One safety and health training enhancement implemented with a completion rate 91-100% that result in increased developments to safety improvement opportunities, technical performance, and compliance. (Fee Modifier 0.51 to 0.80)
- <u>Excellent</u>: Two or more safety and health training enhancements implemented with a completion rate 91-100% that result in increased developments to safety improvement opportunities, technical performance, and compliance. (Fee Modifier 0.81 to 1.00)

Criteria Description	Evaluation Criteria (Includes but Not Limited To)
Environmental Safety & Health Division: (Cont'd) Subject Measure Matrix: Implementation of safety and health training programs which ensure that all personnel possess the experience, knowledge, skills, and abilities necessary to discharge their safety and health responsibilities (ISM Guiding Principle 3).	
Security and Emergency Operations Division: Emergency Management: SEOD 2025-1, Preparedness Readiness Exercise Program (PREP): (0.70%) — \$8,605 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 EXPLAN. Adjectival Table: Unsatisfactory: Four 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 0.00) Satisfactory: Three 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 will be reduced by 0.1. (Fee Modifier 0.01 to 0.39)

Criteria Description	Evaluation Criteria (Includes but Not Limited To)
Emergency Management: (Cont'd) Subject Measure Metric: 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.	 Good: Two 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 the fee modifier will be reduced by 0.1. (Fee Modifier 0.40 to 0.59) Very Good: One instance 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 the fee modifier will be reduced by 0.1. (Fee Modifier 0.60 to 0.89) Excellent: Zero 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 the fee modifier will be reduced by 0.1. (Fee Modifier 0.90 to 1.00)

Criteria Description	Evaluation Criteria (Includes but Not Limited To)
MAINTENANCE & OPERATIONS: (3.80%) 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: (3.80%) – \$46,715 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	Adjectival Table: Unsatisfactory: No plans developed. (Fee Modifier 0.00) Satisfactory: Plans developed but weekly schedules no provided to DOE, at least 50% of schedule completed during period (each site) (Fee Modifier 0.01 to
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.	

Criteria Description	Evaluation Criteria (Includes but Not Limited To)
A&SD 2024-1, Procurement: (7.90%) — \$97,118 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 womanowned small business concerns to participate in contract performance. Subjective Measure Metric: Quarterly reviews indicate Purchasing System trending, and the final Adjectival rating shall be based upon the cumulative three-month performance period metrics of standards averaged.	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 0.00) 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 85%-94%. (Fee Modifier 0.76 to 0.90) Excellent: A rating of 95% or greater. (Fee Modifier 0.91 to 1.00)

Criteria Description

Evaluation Criteria (Includes but Not Limited To)

<u>A&SD 2025-2, Training Program</u> <u>Effectiveness</u>: (3.50%) - \$43,027

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.

<u>Subjective Measure Metric</u>: 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.

Adjectival Table:

25

- <u>Unsatisfactory</u>: Training was implemented no training enhancements that result in increased developments to procurement improvement opportunities, technical performance, and compliance. (Fee Modifier 0.00)
- <u>Satisfactory</u>: One training enhancement in development with a completion rate 91-100% that results in procurement improvement opportunities, technical performance and compliance. (Fee Modifier 0.01 to 0.50)
- Good: Two training in development with a completion rate 91-100% that result in procurement improvement opportunities, technical performance, and compliance. (Fee Modifier 0.51 to 0.75)
- Very Good: One training enhancement that result in increased developments to procurement improvement opportunities, technical performance, and compliance. (Fee Modifier 0.76 to 0.90)
- <u>Excellent</u>: Two or more training enhancements that result in increased developments to procurement improvement opportunities, technical performance, and compliance. (Fee Modifier 0.91 to 1.00)

Evaluation Criteria (Includes but Not Criteria Description Limited To) A&SD 2025-4, Procurement: (4.00%) -Measure Validation: DOE CO will document findings of each significant weakness of standards within Management Appraisals, consent packages, monthly reviews, or during Ensure procurement is in full compliance with quarterly reviews. approved purchasing procedures, statutes, regulations, or contract terms and condition. A significant weakness is defined as: one or more of the applicable standards are not met Compliance is measured by the following there are no compensating factors to reduce the impact standards: on effectiveness, and Acquisition of quality products and resulting deficiencies seriously degrade effectiveness. services at fair and reasonable prices using techniques identified within FAR Adjectival Table: 15.404-1. Unsatisfactory: A rating of 64% or lower. Use of capable and reliable (Fee Modifier 0.00) subcontractors. Satisfactory: A rating of 65%-74%. Reduction of performance risks associated (Fee Modifier 0.01 to 0.50) with subcontractors, and facilitation of Good: A rating of 75%-84%. quality relationships which can include (Fee Modifier 0.51 to 0.75) techniques such as partnering Very Good: A rating of 85%-94%. agreements, ombudsmen, and alternative (Fee Modifier 0.76 to 0.90) dispute procedures. Excellent: A rating of 95% or greater. Maintenance of professional and ethical (Fee Modifier 0.91 to 1.00) 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 womanowned small business concerns to participate in contract performance. <u>Subjective Measure Metric</u>: Quarterly reviews indicate Purchasing System trending, and the final Adjectival rating shall be based upon the cumulative threemonth performance period metrics of

standards averaged.



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

PARTIAL FISCAL YEAR 2025

(JULY 1, 2025 – SEPTEMBER 30, 2025)

LIFE EXTENSION 2 PERFORMANCE EVALUATION AND MEASUREMENT PLAN

FOR

FLUOR FEDERAL PETROLEUM OPERATIONS, LLC CONTRACT NO. DE-FE0011020

SPRPMO 0486

SIGNATURE PAGE **SUBMITTED BY: DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY** KELLY GELE Digitally signed by KELLY GELE Date: 2025.07.30 09:13:29 -05'00' **KELLY GELÉ** DATE **CONTRACTING OFFICER** PAUL Digitally signed by PAUL OOSTERLING **OOSTERLING** Date: 2025.07.30 10:14:37 -05'00' **PAUL S. OOSTERLING** DATE PROJECT MANAGER **ACCEPTED BY:** FLUOR FEDERAL PETROLEUM OPERATIONS, LLC KATHRYN MARSHALL DATE PROJECT MANAGER **APPROVED BY:** KENNETH VINCENT DATE **ACTING DEPUTY DIRECTOR** OFFICE OF PETROLEUM RESERVES

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>PAGE</u>
INTRODUCTION1
ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE
FEE STRUCTURE 2
AWARD FEE COMPONENTS
EVALUATION CRITERIA 3
1. Objective Fee Criteria
2. Subjective Fee Criteria5
ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES6
AWARD FEE PROCESS 8
ATTACHMENT 1 - AWARD FEE BOARD MEMBERSHIP11
ATTACHMENT 2 - PERFORMANCE FEE PLAN OBJECTIVE MEASURES12
ATTACHMENT 3 - SUBJECTIVE MEASURE GRADING TABLE17
ATTACHMENT 4 - SUBJECTIVE FEE EVALUATION AREAS18

<u>INTRODUCTION</u>

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 2 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 July 1, 2025, and ending September 30, 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 \$2,968,914, to be broken down as follows: The fee pool for Facilities is \$1,229,348 and for Life Extension 2 (LE2) is \$1,739,566. The Facilities measures can be found within its own PEMP (document SPRPMO 0483). 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 July 1, 2025, through September 30, 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 from July 1, 2025, through September 30, 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)

3

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 quarter. 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. 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 overing 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. <u>Performance Management Coordinator</u>.

- 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 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%	\$1,391,653
LE2 Subjective Performance Pool	20%	\$347,913
LE2 Subtotal	100%	\$1,739,566

Note: This fee allocation table pertains to the third quarter of FY 2025 (the second FY 2025 period of Performance)

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
provides of subcon welding p	Prime Contractor provides governance of subcontractor welding performance by monitoring First	Stretch Target: 95% FTQ	Stretch Target: 10%	Stretch Target: \$173,957
	Time Quality (FTQ). Weld Acceptance rate of "X" %.	Target : 90% FTQ	Target: 5%	Target: \$86,978
	Three-Month Performance Period.			
Cost Control for Construction Subcontracts Cost Management	The total value of Construction Subcontracts that are in progress shall not exceed X% of cost growth between July 1,2025 and September 30, 2025.	Stretch Target: 107% of July 1, 2025, 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.	Stretch Target: 15%	\$260,935

12

Key Contract Objectives	Effectiveness and Efficiency Measures	Execution Targets	Fee Percentage	Fee Allocation
Cost Control for		Target:	Target:	Target:
Construction Subcontracts Cost Management (Continued)		110% of July 1, 2025, contract value	7.5%	\$130,467
		Does not include changes driven by additional approved Scope, Force Majeure, and Differing Site Conditions, and Directed Changes such as the emergency oil sales.		
Cost Control for	The total value of GFP	Stretch Target:	Stretch Target:	Stretch Target:
Government Furnished Property Cost Management	Purchase Orders that are in progress shall not exceed X% of cost growth between July 1, 2025, and September 30, 2025. Does not include changes driven by additional approved Scope, Force Majeure, and Differing Site Conditions, and Directed Changes such as the emergency oil sale.	103% of July 1, 2025, 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 sale.	15%	\$260,935

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 July 1, 2025, 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: \$130,467
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.	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: \$260,935

14

Key Contract Objectives	Effectiveness and Efficiency Measures	Execution Targets	Fee Percentage	Fee Allocation
Master Project Milestone Schedule		Target:	Target:	Target:
Adherence. (Continued)		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.	7.5%	\$130,467
Bayou Choctaw Post	For the Bayou	Stretch Target	Stretch Target	Stretch Target
CD-4 Actions	Choctaw Subproject all of the following post CD-4 approval actions are to be completed: 1) Provide all the required Critical Decision	CD-4 submittal package to the LE2 FPD by September 1, 2025.	15%	\$260,935
	Documents to the Federal Project	Target	Target	Target
	Director for submission to Office of Project Management; 2) Finalize PARS reporting (including reporting earned value data through the completion of the Project Management Baseline); 3) Submit Lessons Learned not previously recognized regarding project execution and facility	CD-4 submittal package to the LE2 FPD by September 30, 2025.	7.5%	\$130,467

Key Contract Objectives	Effectiveness and Efficiency Measures	Execution Targets	Fee Percentage	Fee Allocation
Bayou Choctaw Post CD-4 Actions (Continued)	start-up into the DOE lessons learned system of record, as described by DOE O 210.2; 4). Submit an Initial Project Closeout Report.			
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.	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 10%	Stretch Target \$173,957
		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%	\$86,978

16

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.

17

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
Project: (5%) – \$86,978 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: • Unsatisfactory: 5 or more documented instances (using the methods described above) of Management failures during the performance period. (Fee Modifier 0.00) • Satisfactory: No more than 4 documented instances of Management failures during the performance period. (Fee Modifier 0.01 to 0.50) • Good: No more than 3 documented instances of Management failures during the performance period. (Fee Modifier 0.51 to 0.75) • Very Good: No more than 2 documented instances of Management failures during the performance period. (Fee Modifier 0.76 to 0.90) • Excellent: No more than 1 documented instances of Management failures during the performance period. (Fee Modifier 0.91 to 1)

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%) – \$86,978 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 LE2 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. 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: • Unsatisfactory: 5 or more documented instances (using the methods described above) of a failure in the Quality Program during the performance period. (Fee Modifier 0.00) • Satisfactory: No more than 4 documented instances of a failure in the Quality Program during the performance period. (Fee Modifier 0.01 to 0.50) • Good: No more than 3 documented instances of a failure in the Quality Program practices during the performance period. (Fee Modifier 0.51 to 0.75) • Very Good: No more than 2 documented instances of a failure in the Quality Program during the performance period. (Fee Modifier 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	Excellent: No more than 1 documented instances of a failure in the Quality Program during the performance period. (Fee Modifier 0.91 to 1.00) Subjective Measure Validation: DOE personnel will attend
Safety Program: (6%) – \$104,374 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.	pertinent meetings and observe field activities. DOE will provide feedback which will include Program 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: • Unsatisfactory: 5 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 0.00) • Satisfactory: No more than 4 documented instances of DOE identified deficiencies in the Health and Safety Program during the performance period. (Fee Modifier 0.01 to 0.50) • Good: No more than 3 documented instances of DOE identified deficiencies in the Health and Safety Program during the performance period. (Fee Modifier 0.51 to 0.75) • Very Good: No more than 2 documented instances of DOE identified deficiencies in the Health and Safety Program during the performance period. (Fee Modifier 0.76 to 0.90) • Excellent: No more than 1 documented instances of DOE identified deficiencies in the Health and Safety Program during the performance period. (Fee Modifier 0.76 to 0.90)

Criteria Description	Evaluation Criteria (Includes but Not Limited To)
A&SD 2025-4, Procurement: (4%) — \$69,583 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. • Maintaining 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. (Continued on the next page)	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 64.01%-74%. (Fee Modifier 0.1 to 0.50) Good: A rating of 74.01%-84%. (Fee Modifier 0.51 to 0.75) Very Good: A rating of 84.01%-94%. (Fee Modifier 0.76 to 0.90) Excellent: A rating of 94.01%-1.0. (Fee Modifier 0.91 to 1.00)

Criteria Description	Evaluation Criteria (Includes but Not Limited To)
CONTRACTS: (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.	