MODIFICATION NO. M060
SUPPLEMENTAL AGREEMENT TO
CONTRACT NO. DE-AC02-98CH10886

MODIFICATION NO. M060

CONTRACTOR AND ADDRESS:	Brookhaven Science Associates, LLC Brookhaven National Laboratory Upton, NY 11973
MODIFICATION FOR:	Recognition of previous obligation increases; Modification to Article 31, Obligation of Funds; Addition of New DEAR Clauses, Article 6A, Performance Improvement and Collaboration; Article 23A, Federally Funded Research and Development Center Sponsoring Agreement, Replacement of Article 17, Key Personnel; Replacement of Article 46A, Travel Restrictions; Replacement of Articles 64 and 65, Lobbying Restrictions; Replacement of Article 133B, Diversity Plan; Modification to Appendix B, Performance Measures, Critical Outcomes; Replacement of Appendix I, DOE Directives; and Replacement of Appendix L/Fee Calculation.
PRIOR OBLIGATION:	$ 1,256,232,776.85
INCREASE IN MODS. A056 through A059	$ 293,823,769.01
INCREASE IN THIS MODIFICATION	$ -0-
CURRENT TOTAL OBLIGATION:	$ 1,550,056,545.86

THIS MODIFICATION, effective the 28th day of June 2001, by and between the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA (hereinafter referred to as the "Government"), as represented by the UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY (hereinafter referred to as "DOE"), and BROOKHAVEN SCIENCE ASSOCIATES, LLC (hereinafter referred to as the "Contractor"),

WITNESSETH THAT:

WHEREAS, the Government and the Contractor entered into Contract No. DE-AC02-98CH10886 on the 5th day of January 1998, for the operation of the Brookhaven National Laboratory; and

WHEREAS, said contract has been modified previously, and the parties desire to modify said contract further, as hereinafter provided; and

WHEREAS, this modification is authorized by law, including 41 U.S.C. 252(c)(15), P.L. 95-91 and other applicable law;

NOW, THEREFORE, said contract, as modified previously, is hereby further modified as follows:

1. The first sentence of paragraph (a) of Article 31, OBLIGATION OF FUNDS, is revised to read as follows: "The amount presently obligated by the Government with respect to this contract is $1,550,056,545.86."

2. ARTICLE 17. KEY PERSONNEL (DEVIATION) is deleted in its entirety and replaced with the attached DEAR Clause 952.215-70, KEY PERSONNEL (DEC 2000). This clause is also revised by deleting the names of Dr. Teresa Fryberger, Dr. Kenneth Brog, Dr. Satoshi Ozaki and Michael Schlender from the list of key personnel and by adding the name of Leslie M. Hill as key personnel.

3. ARTICLE 6A. Add the attached DEAR Clause 970.5203-2, Performance Improvement and Collaboration (DEC 2000).

4. ARTICLE 23A. Add the attached DEAR Clause 970.5235-1, Federally Funded Research and Development Center Sponsoring Agreement (DEC 2000).

5. ARTICLE 46A. Delete Travel Restrictions (AL-99-7) in its entirety and replace with the attached Article 46A,Travel Restrictions (AL-2000-11) Modified.

6. ARTICLE 64. Delete Lobbying Restriction (Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 2000), (AL-99-7) in its entirety and replace with the attached Lobbying Restriction (Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 2001) (AL-2000-11).

7. ARTICLE 65. Delete Lobbying Restriction (Department of Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2000), (AL-99-7) in its entirety and replace with the attached Lobbying Restriction (Department of Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2001) (AL-2000-11).

8. ARTICLE 133B. DEAR 970.5204-81, Delete Diversity Plan (DEC 1997) in its entirety and replace with the attached DEAR Clause 970-5226-1 (DEC 2000).

9. **APPENDIX B – CRITICAL OUTCOME PERFORMANCE MEASURES: Modification and additions are as follows:**

   a. Appendix B, Table of Contents, delete the Table of Contents page in its entirety and replace with the attached revised Table of Contents page, identified as Attachment 1, Modification No. M060, Appendix B.

   b. Critical Outcome Performance Measure – 2.0 Operational Excellence: 2.4.4, "Scientific Computing Infrastructure" is revised as reflected on the attached revised pages. Delete page 1-28, Attachment 1, Appendix B in its entirety, and replace with the attached revised pages 1-27 and 1-28, Identified as Attachment 1, Modification No. M060, Appendix B.

   c. Critical Outcome Performance Measure - 2.0 Operational Excellence: Addition of Counterintelligence Performance Measure, 2.5, "Excellence in Safeguards and Security." Add the attached page 1-28A, identified as Attachment 1, Modification No. M060, Appendix B.

   d. Critical Outcome Performance Measure – 2.0 Operational Excellence. Critical Outcome 2.3, ESH&Q Management Systems weight is reduced from 50% to 45% and 2.3.1, SBMS Implementation is deleted in its entirety. Delete pages 1-22 through 1-26 in their entirety and replace with the attached revised pages 1-22 through 1-26, identified as Attachment 1, Modification No. M060, Appendix B.

   e. Critical Outcome Performance Measure – 3.0 Leadership and Management - weight has been reduced from 20% to 12%. Metric for critical outcome element 3.1.1.6 is added. Pages 1-29 through 1-31 are deleted and replace with the revised attached pages 1-29 through 1-31, identified as Attachment 1, Modification No. M060, Appendix B.

   f. Critical Outcome Performance Measure – 3.3 Environmental Stewardship: 3.3, Environmental Stewardship changed to "Waste Management." 3.3.2, "Waste Management," is revised as reflected on the attached revised pages. Deleting pages 1-34 – 1-36, Attachment 1, Appendix B in their entirety, and replace with the attached revised pages 1-34 – 1-36, identified as Attachment 1, Modification No. M060, Appendix B.

g. Appendix B is Modified by adding an additional Critical Outcome Performance Measure – 4.0 Environmental Restoration. Add the attached Critical Outcome Performance Measure 4.0, Environmental Restoration, by inserting the attached pages 1-39 through 1-41, identified as Attachment 1, Modification No. M060, Appendix B.

10. **APPENDIX I - DOE DIRECTIVES**: DOE Directives identified as Modification M055 is deleted in its entirety and replaced with the attached revised Appendix I, identified as Modification M060.

11. **APPENDIX L - FEE CALCULATION, FY 2001, AND FEE DETERMINATION MATRIX**, identified as Modification M055 is deleted in its entirety and replaced with the attached modified Appendix B, identified as Modification M060.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties have executed this document.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

BY: _____
Robert P. Gordon
Contracting Officer
(*Title*)

DATE: 6-28-01

BROOKHAVEN SCIENCE ASSOCIATES, LLC

BY _____
Brian P. Sack
Chief Financial Officer
(*Title*)

DATE: 6/25/01

CONTRACT MODIFICATION M060
BROOKHAVEN SCIENCE ASSOCIATES, LLC
CONTRACT NO DE-ACO2-98CH10886

MOD NO.	INCREASED AMOUNT	REMARKS
A056	$ 205,424,073.95	
A057	49,626,141.78	
A058	34,803,331.47	
A059	3,970,221.81	

TOTAL	$293,823,769.01	

CONTRACT MODIFICATION M060
BROOKHAVEN SCIENCE ASSOCIATES, LLC
CONTRACT NO. DE-ACO2-98CH10886

CURRENT BSA CONTRACT AMOUNT (THRU MOD M055, INCL.)	$1,256,232,776.85
INCREASED AMOUNT (MODIFICATION A056 - A059)	$ 293,823,769.01
NEW CONTRACT TOTAL	$1,550,056,545.86

ARTICLE 6A 970.5203-2 -- PERFORMANCE IMPROVEMENT AND COLLABORATION (DEC 2000)

(a) The contractor agrees that it shall affirmatively identify, evaluate, and institute practices, where appropriate, that will improve performance in the areas of environmental and health, safety, scientific and technical, security, business and administrative, and any other areas of performance in the management and operation of the contract. This may entail the alteration of existing practices or the institution of new procedures to more effectively or efficiently perform any aspect of contract performance or reduce overall cost of operation under the contract. Such improvements may result from changes in organization, simplification of systems while retaining necessary controls, or any other approaches consistent with the statement of work and performance measures of this contract.

(b) The contractor agrees to work collaboratively with the Department, all other management and operating, DOE major facilities management contractors and affiliated contractors which manage or operate DOE sites or facilities for the following purposes: (i) to exchange information generally, (ii) to evaluate concepts that may be of benefit in resolving common issues, in confronting common problems, or in reducing costs of operations, and (iii) to otherwise identify and implement DOE-complex-wide management improvements discussed in paragraph (a). In doing so, it shall also affirmatively provide information relating to its management improvements to such contractors, including lessons learned, subject to security considerations and the protection of data proprietary to third parties.

(c) The contractor may consult with the contracting officer in those instances in which improvements being considered pursuant to paragraph (a) involve the cooperation of the DOE. The contractor may request the assistance of the contracting officer in the communication of the success of improvements to other management and operating contractors in accordance with paragraph (b) of this clause.

(d) The contractor shall notify the contracting officer and seek approval where necessary to fulfill its obligations under the contract. Compliance with this clause in no way alters the obligations of the Contractor under any other provision of this contract.

ARTICLE 17 952.215-70 -- KEY PERSONNEL (DEC 2000)

(a) The personnel listed below or elsewhere in this contract [*Insert cross-reference, if applicable*] are considered essential to the work being performed under this contract. Before removing, replacing, or diverting any of the listed or specified personnel, the Contractor must: (1) Notify the Contracting Officer reasonably in advance; (2) submit justification (including proposed substitutions) in sufficient detail to permit evaluation of the impact on this contract; and (3) obtain the Contracting Officer's written approval. Notwithstanding the foregoing, if the Contractor deems immediate removal or suspension of any member of its management team is necessary to fulfill its obligation to maintain satisfactory standards of employee competency, conduct, and integrity under the clause at 48 CFR 970.5203-3, Contractor's Organization, the Contractor may remove or suspend such person at once, although the Contractor must notify Contracting Officer prior to or concurrently with such action.

(b) The list of personnel may, with the consent of the contracting parties, be amended from time to time during the course of the contract to add or delete personnel.

List of Key Personnel: Dr. John Marburger
Dr. Peter Paul
Thomas Sheridan
Gregory Fess, J.D.
Dr. Thomas Kirk
Dr. Richard Osgood
Michael Bebon
Margaret Lynch
Dr. Nora D. Volkow
Dr. Brian P. Sack
Leslie M. Hill

ARTICLE 23A 970.5235-1 - FEDERALLY FUNDED RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT CENTER SPONSORING AGREEMENT (DEC 2000)

(a) Pursuant to 48 CFR 35.017-1, this contract constitutes the sponsoring agreement between the Department of Energy and the contractor, which establishes the relationship for the operation of a Department of Energy sponsored Federally Funded Research and Development Center (FFRDC).

(b) In the operation of this FFRDC, the contractor may be provided access beyond that which is common to the normal contractual relationship, to Government and supplier data, including sensitive and proprietary data, and to Government employees and facilities needed to discharge its responsibilities efficiently and effectively. Because of this special relationship, it is essential that the FFRDC be operated in the public interest with objectivity and independence, be free from organizational conflicts of interest, and have full disclosure of its affairs to the Department of Energy.

(c) Unless otherwise provided by the contract, the contractor may accept work from a nonsponsor (as defined in 48 CFR 35.017) in accordance with the requirements and limitations of DOE Order 481.1, Work for Others (Non-Department of Energy Funded Work) (see current version).

(d) As an FFRDC, the contractor shall not use its privileged information or access to government facilities to compete with the private sector. Specific guidance on restricted activities is contained in DOE Order 481.1.

ARTICLE 46A TRAVEL RESTRICTIONS (AL-2000-11) Modified

(a) For contractor travel expenses incurred on or after October 1, 2000, a ceiling limitation of $4,505,000.00 shall apply to all reimbursements made for contractor travel expenses funded by the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act under this contract, except as provided in paragraph (b) below. Expended funds which exceed the established ceiling in this paragraph will be unallowable unless otherwise authorized by the contracting officer.

(b) All contractor travel costs associated with the Spallation Neutron Source are charged only against the travel ceiling assigned to the Oak Ridge National Laboratory (ORNL) and not to the contractor (except for ORNL) who actually employs the traveler.

(c) Some travel costs are exempt from the ceiling, examples are:

(i) Travel performed under work for others agreements;
(ii) Travel of subcontractors;
(iii) Travel of non-DOE users to participate in experiments at DOE user facilities;
(iv) Travel costs of travel management centers;
(v) Travel costs funded by other appropriations;
(vi) Relocation costs;
(vii) Costs of workshops/seminars (other than travel costs), such as, rental of meeting rooms, public address equipment, speakers' fees;
(viii) Registration costs of training classes;
(ix) Travel expenses within the Laboratory Directed Research and Development program; and
(x) Travel associated with recruitment.

(d) Notwithstanding any other provisions of the contract or the source of funding, the contractor further agrees that none of the funds obligated under the contract may be used to reimburse employee travel costs incurred on or after October 1, 2000 and before October 1, 2001 which exceed the rates and amounts that apply to federal employees under subchapter I of Chapter 57 of Title 5, United States Code. Costs which exceed these rates and amounts will be unallowable. This restriction is in addition to those prescribed elsewhere in statute or regulation.

(e) Costs incurred for lodging, meals, and incidental expenses are considered reasonable and allowable to the extent that they do not exceed the maximum per diem rates in effect at the time of travel as set forth in:

(i) Federal Travel Regulations (FTR) for travel within the 48 states;
(ii) Joint Travel Regulations (JTR) for travel in Alaska, Hawaii, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and territories and possessions of the United States; or
(iii) Standardized Regulations (SR) for travel allowances in foreign areas.

(f) Subparagraph (d) does not incorporate the regulations cited above in their entirety. Only the coverages in the referenced regulations addressing the maximum per diem rates, the definitions of lodging, meals, and incidental expenses, and special or unusual situations are applicable to contractor travel.

(g) Airfare costs in excess of the lowest customary standard, coach, or equivalent airfare offered during normal business hours are unallowable except when such accommodations require circuitous routing, require travel during unreasonable hours, excessively prolong travel, result in increased cost that would offset transportation savings, are not reasonably adequate for the physical or medical needs of the traveler, or are not reasonably available to meet mission requirements. However, in order for airfare costs in excess of the above standard airfare to be allowable, the applicable condition(s) set forth above must be documented and justified.

ARTICLE 64 LOBBYING RESTRICTION (ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001) (AL-2000-11)

The contractor agrees that none of the funds obligated on this award shall be expended, directly or indirectly, to influence congressional action on any legislation or appropriation matters pending before Congress, other than to communicate to Members of Congress as described in 18 U.S.C. 1913. This restriction is in addition to those prescribed elsewhere in statute and regulation.

ARTICLE 65 LOBBYING RESTRICTION (DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001) (AL-2000-11)

The contractor agrees that none of the funds obligated on this award shall be made available for any activity of the publication or distribution of literature that in any way tends to promote public support or opposition to any legislative proposal on which Congressional action is not complete. This restriction is in addition to those prescribed elsewhere in statute and regulation.

ARTICLE 133B 970.5226-1 -- DIVERSITY PLAN (DEC 2000)

The Contractor shall submit a Diversity Plan to the contracting officer for approval within 90 days after the effective date of this contract (or contract modification, if appropriate). The contractor shall submit an update to its Plan annually or with its annual fee proposal. Guidance for preparation of a Diversity Plan is provided in Appendix K. The Plan shall include innovative strategies for increasing opportunities to fully use the talents and capabilities of a diverse work force. The Plan shall address, at a minimum, the Contractor's approach for promoting diversity through (1) the Contractor's work force, (2) educational outreach, (3) community involvement and outreach, (4) subcontracting, (5) economic development (including technology transfer), and (6) the prevention of profiling based on race or national origin.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Appendix B: Introduction 3

Attachment 1: Critical Outcomes, Objective, and Performance Measures

1: **Basic Science and Technology** 1-1
2: **Operational Excellence** 1-4
3: **Leadership and Management** 1-29
4: **Environmental Restoration** 1-39

2.3 ESH&Q Management Systems Objective

The weight of this Objective is 45%. - *Revised by MOD M060*

BNL will develop and implement next generation management systems and establish the necessary organizational constructs to ensure continuous improvement in ES&H performance and operations support.

2.3.1 ISM Performance Composite

The weight of this Measure is 10%.

2.3.1.1 Develop a system for long-term performance monitoring of the ISM system by December 1, 2000. 20%

DOE-BHG will have the opportunity to review and comment on the system. Achieving this milestone is based on resolution of comments received from DOE-BHG within the review period.

Metrics:

Ahead of Schedule	Outstanding
0-30 days	Excellent
31-60 days	Good
61-90 days	Marginal
>90 days	Unsatisfactory

2.3.1.2 Benchmark ISMS measurement system by April 1, 2001 40%

Metrics:

Ahead of Schedule	Outstanding
0-30 days	Excellent
31-60 days	Good
61-90 days	Marginal
>90 days	Unsatisfactory

2.3.1.3 Develop ISMS improvement plan based on measurement system and benchmarking activities by May 30, 2001 20%

DOE-BHG will have the opportunity to review and comment on the Improvement plan. Achieving this milestone is based on resolution of comments received from DOE-BHG within the review period.

Metric:

Within 30 days	Outstanding
31-60 days	Excellent
61-90 days	Good
91-120 days	Marginal
>120 days	Unsatisfactory

2.3.1.4 Achieve progress in Accelerator Safety Basis documentation upgrades 20%

Measures:

A. By 9/30/01 complete the following:
   NSLS Accelerator Safety Envelope (ASE) upgrade
   BLIP ASE and Safety Assessment Document upgrade

B. Self-Assessment of the process for managing accelerator safety basis documentation upgrades.

Note:
BHG will have an opportunity to review and comment on the assessment plan.

Metric:

Outstanding:	Stated safety basis documents upgrades completed and self-assessment of processes results in an outstanding adjectival rating in accordance with established assessment criteria.
Excellent:	Stated safety basis document upgrades completed and self-assessment of processes results in an excellent adjectival rating in accordance with established assessment criteria.
Good:	One of two safety basis document upgrades completed and self-assessment of processes results in an excellent or above adjectival rating in accordance with established assessment criteria.
Marginal:	One of two safety basis document upgrades completed and self- assessment of processes results in a good adjectival rating in accordance with established assessment criteria.
Unsatisfactory	No safety basis documentation upgrade completed

2.3.2 Environmental Management System

The weight of this Measure is 20%.

Achieve Laboratory-wide ISO 14001 registration by September 30, 2001.

Outstanding	Registration before September 30, 2001
Excellent	Within 30 days
Good	Within 60 days
Marginal	Within 90 days
Unsatisfactory	>90 days

2.3.3 IAP Implementation

The weight of this Measure is 30%.

2.3.3.1 % of required assessment activities (as defined in the IAP Subject Area) completed on schedule. 20%

Metric:

>95%	Outstanding
91-95%	Excellent
86-90%	Good
81-85%	Marginal
<80%	Unsatisfactory

2.3.3.2 % of Institutional level Corrective/Improvement Actions (as tracked through the ATS) completed on schedule 20%

Metrics:

>95%	Outstanding
85-95%	Excellent
75-84%	Good
65-74%	Marginal
<65%	Unsatisfactory

2.3.3.3 BHG review of BNL's Self Evaluation of its Overall Program 60%

2.3.4 Quality Management System Verification

The weight of this Measure is 20%.

2.3.4.1 Develop Verification Plan by February 15, 2001 30%
This Plan will have been previously reviewed by DOE and will incorporate resolution of comments as agreed to by DOE-BHG

2.3.4.2 Complete Verification by July 30, 2001 70%

Metrics:

- Prior to, or meeting milestone = outstanding
- +15days = excellent
- +16 - 30days = good
- +31 - 45days = marginal
- >45days = unsatisfactory

2.3.5 Rad Con Program Implementation

The weight of this Measure is 20%.

2.3.5.1 Performance measurement based on the composite ratings received in the four program element reviews of the triennial assessment.

Weighting Factor 60%

Rating Level	Performance
Outstanding	Composite is Outstanding
Excellent	Composite is Excellent
Good	Composite is Good
Marginal	Composite is Marginal
Unsatisfactory	Composite is Unsatisfactory

2.3.5.2 Overall radiological control program performance evaluation based on annual self-assessment evaluation.

Weighting Factor 40%

Performance Rating Levels

Rating Level	Performance
Outstanding	Excellent overall evaluation
Excellent	Very good overall evaluation
Good	Good overall evaluation
Marginal	Marginal overall evaluation
Unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory overall evaluation

2.4 Information Infrastructure

The weight of this Objective is 25%.

Conduct information services and related operations with distinction, as described by and in support of Operational Excellence. Focus on developing the institutional-level operating infrastructure needed to underpin an excellent business/information technology infrastructure.

2.4.1 Information Services

Re-engineer the desktop lifecycle support services, from procurement, through operations, to retirement. This includes the scientific as well as the administrative desktops.

The weight of this Measure is 20%

Identify the best approach for each IT service in terms of efficiency, quality, customer satisfaction, and cost-effectiveness.

Performance Measure Milestones:

1. Outsource the hardware service (break/fix) function by 12/31/00.
2. Purchase, test and deploy software distribution tools by 12/31/00
3. Purchase, test and deploy remote management tools by 12/31/00
4. Purchase, test and deploy asset management tools by 12/31/00.
5. Establish a customer service center to replace the current helpdesk model by 12/31/00.

Metric: Meeting the project milestones above will be considered Excellent performance and bettering a milestone by 30 days or more will comprise Outstanding performance for that milestone. Missing a milestone by up to 45 days will be considered Good performance for that milestone. Missing a milestone by more than 45 days will be considered Marginal performance for that milestone and by more than 90 days will be considered Unsatisfactory performance for that milestone.

Each milestone will be awarded points as follows based on accomplishment of that milestone:

Outstanding	4 Points
Excellent	3 Points
Good	2 Points
Marginal	1 Point
Unsatisfactory	0 Points

The evaluation of the Performance Measure will be the numerical average of the scores of the supporting milestones.

2.4.2 Cyber Security

Provide a computing and communications environment that is secure, yet open for interaction to effectively conduct the Laboratory's business.

The weight of this Measure is 45%.

Continue to implement the Laboratory's computer security program, according to DOE guidelines and directives, and as documented in BNL's Cyber Security Protection Plan (CSPP). Note that the CSPP contains details on the milestones listed below.

Performance Measure Milestones:

1. Formally evaluate, on a quarterly basis, the Multi-Tier Network architecture and the Perimeter Defense Network with the Cyber Security Advisory Council (CSAC) and the Cyber Security Incident Response Team (CSIRT) throughout 2001.
2. Complete the establishment of the Perimeter Defense Network – 3/31/01.
3. Implement Host-based security (including clear text passwords, Kerberos evaluation) and authentication services by 07/31/01.
4. Establish a Security Information Management System, including a Threat Assessment Subsystem, Intrusion Detection Subsystem, and a data fusion system for Monitoring Independent Trends to Enhance Network Security by 4/15/01.
5. Conduct a comprehensive vulnerability assessment and assess results by 9/30/01.
6. Develop an application level security strategy by 09/30/01.

Metric: Meeting the project milestones above will be considered Excellent performance and bettering a milestone by 30 days or more will comprise Outstanding performance for that milestone. Missing a milestone by up to 45 days will be considered Good performance for that milestone. Missing a milestone by more than 45 days will be considered Marginal performance for that milestone and by more than 90 days will be considered Unsatisfactory performance for that milestone.

Each milestone will be awarded points as follows based on accomplishment of that milestone:

Outstanding	4 Points
Excellent	3 Points
Good	2 Points
Marginal	1 Point
Unsatisfactory	0 Points

The evaluation of the Performance Measure will be the numerical average of the scores of the supporting milestones.

2.4.3 World Wide Web Support Strategy

Develop a World Wide Web support strategy that will centralize and standardize web functions across the site.

The weight of this Measure is 15%

Develop standards and tools for Web support that will enhance BNL's use of the Internet and Intranet and provide capabilities that will foster the improvement of BNL's business processes.

Performance Measure Milestones:

a. Develop web application programming and design capabilities to meet the needs of

Laboratory scientific and business programs.

1. Train staff in application and database technologies by 6/30/01.

b. Define policy and standards for web site creation, content attributes, and content maintenance.

1. Establish policies and standards by 9/30/01.
2. Establish development/approval/publish process for web content by 9/30/01.

c. Centralize web content editors into a single shared resource in support of all BNL programs.

1. Identify and integrate existing resources by 12/31/01.

d. Develop workflow applications using existing resources to increase efficiency of BNL business processes.

1. Badge/CryptoCard assignment process by 9/30/01.
2. PC/Software/Peripheral/Documentation procurement process by 9/30/01.

Metric: Meeting the project milestones above will be considered Excellent performance and bettering a milestone by 30 days or more will comprise Outstanding performance for that milestone. Missing a milestone by up to 45 days will be considered Good performance for that milestone. Missing a milestone by more than 45 days will be considered Marginal performance for that milestone and by more than 90 days will be considered unsatisfactory performance for that milestone.

Each milestone will be awarded points as follows based on accomplishment of that milestone:

Outstanding - 4 Points
Excellent - 3 Points
Good - 2 Points
Marginal - 1 Point
Unsatisfactory - 0 Points

The evaluation of the Performance Measure will be the numerical average of the scores of the supporting milestones.

2.4.4 Scientific Computing Infrastructure – *Revised by MOD M060*

Develop a scientific computing infrastructure that is fully supportive of the Laboratory's scientific mission, focusing initially on those areas where leveraging existing expertise and local/regional collaborations can produce significant improvement over the current status.

The weight of this Measure is 20%.

a. Strengthen and upgrade the existing Visualization Program to address the visualization and data analysis requirements for the major BNL scientific initiatives – in particular for RHIC and ATLAS. This initiative includes both the research component to be pursued in collaboration with the Center for Data Intensive Computing (CDIC) and service components, applicable to the BNL Computing Facility (BCF) and desktop services.

Performance Measure Milestones:

(1) Research component – Generate one or more peer-reviewable research proposals in collaboration with the CDIC *by 09/15/01*.

(2) Service Component – Develop a plan for improving a visualization infrastructure and initiate its implementation, including: an upgrade path for the Visualization Theater; evaluation of distributed and parallel visualization technology; and support of the advanced applications required by the Laboratory Research Programs which are enabled by this infrastructure. (The latter includes accelerator simulation, medical imaging, and structural biology computations). *Milestone Date: 09/15/01*

(b) Strengthen and upgrade the scientific computing resources present in the BNL computing Facility (BCF), to provide strategic value to the major scientific programs at the Laboratory, as well as to local/regional collaborations.

Performance Measure Milestones:

(1) Upgrade the high-performance computing resources required for support of the enhanced Visualization function, as well as other scientific initiatives; namely, the hardware and advanced system administration for the BNL Linux Cluster (BLC). *Milestone Date: 03/01/01*

(2) Expand collaboration with the CDIC by developing and supporting the infrastructure to connect the CDIC's Galaxy Cluster located in the BCF, and the counterpart machine, located at Stony Brook University. This extended high-performance platform will provide the requisite interoperability to perform otherwise intractable computations. Examples of such computations appear in BNL research programs in Accelerator Design, RHIC Data Management, Meterology/Climatology and Fluid Dynamics.
Milestone Date: 04/15/01

2.5 Excellence in Safeguards and Security – Added by MOD M060

The weight of this Objective is 5%:

BNL will develop and implement management programs to maintain and continuously improve a safeguards and security and counterintelligence infrastructure in order to ensure effective protection of national security interests, proprietary information, sensitive information, personnel, property and the general public.

2.5.1: Counterintelligence (CI)

Note: In August 2000 The DOE Office of Counterintelligence (OCI) performed an appraisal of BNL's Counterintelligence program. The appraisal determined that BNL's program lacked several key elements and an overall rating of *marginal* was assigned. The initial purpose of this measure is to determine the effectiveness of improvements that have been implemented to address deficiencies noted during the OCI appraisal.

Measure: Appraisal of the BNL Counterintelligence Program.

The Department of Energy (DOE) Office of Counterintelligence (OCI) is expected to conduct this review. If OCI does not perform the review prior to August 2001, BNL shall coordinate an independent assessment of all topical areas within the program for input to DOE OCI for grading. If OCI does not conduct annual reviews of the Program, BNL will annually conduct a self-assessment of the Program and forward the results to OCI.

Total points for each appraisal area will be given as follows:

Appraisal Area	Points (PTS)
Personnel Management/Resource Allocation	10
Foreign Visits and Assignments	25
Investigations	10
CI Cyber Security	20
CI Awareness	10
Executive Management/Program Management	10
CI Analysis/Threat Assessment	10
CI Training	5
Total	100

The overall adjectival rating is determined in accordance with the table below:

Overall Score	Adjectival Rating
96-100	Outstanding
91-95	Excellent
81-90	Good
71-80	Marginal
<71	Unsatisfactory

Critical Outcome 3.0: Leadership and Management

BNL WILL BE RECOGNIZED BY ITS USERS, STAFF, STAKEHOLDERS, AND CUSTOMERS AS HAVING THE HIGHEST QUALITY LEADERS AND STAFF; BEING A COMMUNITY ASSET, GOOD NEIGHBOR AND VALUED EMPLOYER; BEING AN EXEMPLARY ENVIRONMENTAL STEWARD; AND SUPPORTING ITS MISSIONS WITH THE BEST BUSINESS PRACTICES.

The weight of this Outcome is *12%*

Objectives and Performance Measures:

3.1 Leadership

The weight of this Objective is *35%*.

3.1.1 Talented and Empowered Employees Performance

The weight of this Measure is 80%.

3.1.1.1 Percent of Level 3 managers (and new Level 1 and 2 managers) participating in 360° Leadership Feedback process and having action plans. (adds Level 3s) 10%

Metric:

Outstanding	90%
Excellent	85%
Good	80%
Marginal	70%
Unsatisfactory	60%

3.1.1.2 Establish evaluation criteria for succession planning, evaluation Level 1 and 2 managers' succession plans, identify deficiencies and establish corrective actions. 20%

Metric:

Outstanding	95% with established corrective actions
Excellent	90% with established corrective actions
Good	80% with established corrective actions
Marginal	70% with established corrective actions
Unsatisfactory	<70% with established corrective actions

3.1.1.3 Percent of Level 1 and 2 managers with personal development goals in FY 2001 goal planning. 20%

Metric:

Outstanding	90%
Excellent	85%
Good	60%
Marginal	50%
Unsatisfactory	<50%

3.1.1.4 Implementation of Lessons Learned on Performance Appraisal and Goal Planning based on results of FY00 Quality Review Board. 20%

Metric:
Quality of improvements and their communication as judged by self-evaluation approved by Laboratory Director and validated by DOE Group Manager.

3.1.1.5 Percent of Exempt employees with established goals. 15%

Metric:

Outstanding	90%
Excellent	85%
Good	80%
Marginal	70%
Unsatisfactory	60%

3.1.1.6 Percentage improvement from average of 1998 and 1999 position openings in "Officials & Managers" and "Professionals" for which at least one (1) viable diversity candidate was offered. 15%

Metric

Outstanding	10% or more improvement
Excellent	5% - 9.9% improvement
Good	Maintain current level + or – 4.9%
Marginal	5% - 9.9% decline
Unsatisfactory	10% or more decline

3.1.2 Quality of Work life Performance

The weight of this Measure is 10%.

3.1.2.1 Assessment of improvement in Training, Employee Involvement, Diversity, and Communications as judged by re-survey results and completed actions in these four focus areas.

3.1.2.2 BHG review of BNL's Self-Assessment on the appropriateness and effectiveness of accomplishments in upgrading services and facilities to the user community with input form RHIC and NSLS User Offices, the Users Executive Committee, and BNL management.

3.1.3 Corporate Involvement Performance

The weight of this Measure is 10%.

Brookhaven Science Associates believes that active corporate involvement is a critical success factor in the management of BNL. To implement this, BSA is committed to the following types of activities at BNL:

- Providing highly skilled candidates for senior management positions at the Laboratory;
- Providing proven management systems and processes for enhancing business operations;
- Facilitating the implementation of these with long-term assignments of key leaders and short-term assignments of subject matter experts;
- Conducting management assessments in various areas of Laboratory operations;
- Providing strategic guidance to the science, technology and cleanup missions of the Laboratory

Metric:
BSA performance relative to this measure will be evaluated by the BHG Manager. Performance relative to each item will be determined as acceptable or unacceptable.

Performance related to the measure as a whole will be determined as follows:

Outstanding-	All 5 items determined acceptable
Excellent-	4 of the 5 items determined acceptable
Good-	3 of the 5 items determined acceptable
Marginal-	2 of the 5 items determined acceptable
Unsatisfactory-	1 or less of the 5 items determined acceptable

3.2 Communications and Trust

The weight of this Objective is 35%

The following metric applies to all Performance Measures in this Objective:

BNL and BHG will conduct a peer review process to evaluate all of the activities enumerated under each of two Measures contributing to this Objective. This peer review will engage qualified, experienced, outside experts who will evaluate programs on an annual basis using Baldrige Criteria and other relevant criteria appropriate to their state of development. Consistent with DOE expectations, a Baldrige scoring system will be used. The primary focus of the peer review will be on evaluating Communications & Community Relations Program effectiveness. The peers will also provide counsel on how best to improve the communications and community relations programs at the Laboratory and the most appropriate techniques for measuring and assessing the quality, appropriateness and effectiveness of these programs. The peer review will serve as the basis for the Laboratory's evaluation under this Critical Outcome. At a minimum the peer review process will include a pre-meeting, evaluation and closeout session, so Laboratory and DOE concerns are addressed before the peers provide a rating for the Laboratory's performance.

The key aspects of the Communications & Community Relations Program at the Laboratory are presented below in the Performance Measures. It is expected that each element of the Communications & Community Relations Program at the Laboratory will have associated self-assessment activities in the appropriate organizations (i.e.: CIGPA, Departments and Divisions). These activities and the resulting findings and conclusions will be made available to the peer review team. Information regarding community feedback, outcomes testing, surveys and follow-ups will also be made available to the peer review team.

3.2.1 Effectiveness & Understanding

Enhance the effectiveness of Laboratory communications and the Laboratory's relationships with internal and external stakeholders.

The weight of this Measure is 70%.

3.2.1.1 Strategic Communications & Community Relations Program

The Laboratory's Strategic Communications and Community Relations Program is an integration and overall compilation of the Laboratory's proposed communications activities for FY01 based on a systematic analysis of as much available stakeholder data as possible. The Program will provide Laboratory-wide communications goals and objectives and include specific communications plans and activities to meet the expectations and performance measures of science and operational departments and divisions across the Laboratory. Stakeholder feedback will be collected and research will be conducted throughout the year to determine program effectiveness, to evaluate the usefulness of the programs and to make mid-course corrections as necessary.

The peer review process will be used to determine whether Program activities and project- and event- specific plans and programs:

- are based on reliable research/ stakeholder feedback;
- appropriately identify, target and communicate effectively with key stakeholders;
- are selectively tested, understood by stakeholders and are consistent throughout the Program;
- use Laboratory resources effectively and appropriately.

requests, correspondence management, etc. in an efficient and timely manner. The Laboratory will also support subcommittees and task forces formed by the CAC as well as panel discussions and special event of interest to CAC members and the community. Feedback from Council membership will be provided to, or independently gathered by, reviewers for consideration in the evaluation to evaluate Laboratory responsiveness and commitment to the Council.

3.3 Waste Management

The weight of this objective is 10%

3.3.1 Routine Waste Disposition

The weight of this Measure is 40%

Expectation:

Wastes, derived from current laboratory activities, are managed properly to ensure regulatory compliance and cost efficiency. Laboratory institutionalizes processes which estimate planned waste generation, consider waste reduction options, formulate cost effective treatment/disposition approaches, and confirm available funding prior to the initiation of the activity of the waste producing activity. The contractor does not generate any waste that cannot be properly disposed of within 12 months or in accordance with the 435.1 Implementation Plan.

Performance Measure 3.3.1addresses Laboratory routine waste generation and disposition in accordance with DOE Order 435.1 as outlined in the BNL DOE Order 435.1 Implementation Plan. Performance Measure 3.3.2 addresses Laboratory performance in reducing the "unplanned costs" concerning the dispositioning of Laboratory generated regulated wastes, including the costs associated with characterization, shipping, disposal, and general costs of mitigation/facilitation to resolve waste acceptance issues at the designated waste receiving facilities.

3.3.1 Routine Waste Disposition 60%

Measure Weighting Objectives:

Performance Level	Performance Metric
Outstanding	Lab disposes of 100 % of each newly generated, routine waste stream within 12 months or, in accordance with the 435.1 Implementation Plan, submits zero exemption requests.
Excellent	Lab disposes of 100 % of each newly generated, routine waste stream within 12 months or, in accordance with the 435.1 Implementation Plan, submits no more than five exemption requests.
Good	Lab disposes of 100 % of each newly generated, routine waste stream within 12 months or, in accordance with the 435.1 Implementation Plan, submits no more than 10, but greater than five exemption requests.
Marginal	Lab disposes of 100 % of each newly generated, routine waste stream within 12 months or, in accordance with the 435.1 Implementation Plan, submits no more than 15, but less than 10 exemption requests.
Unsatisfactory	Lab disposes of 100 % of each newly generated, routine waste stream within 12 months, or, in accordance with the 435.1 Implementation Plan, submits greater than 15 exemption requests.

Specific Assumptions:

- In accordance with the 435.1 Implementation Plan, assume implementation of DOE 435.1 Order by July 01.
- DOE SC is cognizant management for Waste Management Program
- WM Performance evaluation not impacted by "Force Majeure" events (which includes disposal facility shut-down).
- Exemptions pertain to waste streams
- Excludes non-routine, non-newly generated wastes including, but not limited to, clean-up wastes, spill residues, radioactive mixed waste being managed under the Site Treatment Plan, TRU wastes, and legacy wastes. WMD will file exemption requests for these wastes in accordance with the 435.1 Implementation Plan and will manage all wastes in accordance with the Radioactive Waste Management Basis (RWMD) document.
- All excess materials identified by BNL will be planned and scheduled for disposition during FY01 in accordance with BNL's DOE O 435.1 Implementation Plan through the RWMD.
- Placing wastes into the RWMD assumes that funding will be made available in accordance with the schedule for disposition of the wastes.

3.3.2: Waste Shipping and Disposal Performance 40%

Measure Weighting Objectives:

Performance Level	Metrics
Outstanding	Total FY Unplanned Disposal/Disposition Costs of $50,000 or less
Excellent	Total FY Unplanned Disposal/Disposition Costs of $50,000 to $100,000
Good	Total FY Unplanned Disposal/Disposition Costs of $100,000 to $250,000
Marginal	Total FY Unplanned Disposal/Disposition Costs of $250,000 to $500,000
Unsatisfactory	Total FY Unplanned Disposal/Disposition Costs of $500,000 or greater

Assumptions:

- Performance against this Measure is based on fiscal year incurred costs captured by BNL.
- Disposition costs include costs paid by DOE through DOE held contracts.
- Unplanned FY Disposal/Disposition Costs are defined as those costs resulting from unplanned characterization, shipping disposal, and general costs of mitigation/facilitation to resolve waste acceptance issues at the designated waste receiving facilities.
- WMD is granted authorization control of characterization techniques used to define the nature of the waste.
- WMD is granted authorization control for all waste shipments at BNL.
- Cost for disposition of the unplanned disposal/disposition cost is bore by the organization originating the waste issue.

3.4 Business Management

BNL will conduct its business operations with distinction, as described by and in support of the Leadership and Management Critical Outcome.

The weight of this Objective is 10%.

3.4.1 Business Services

The weight of this Measure is 25%.

3.4.1.1 BNL will manage uncosted operating balances for Landlord and EM activities at levels needed to ensure continuity of operations. This encompasses approximately 85% of the DOE funding for BNL.

To facilitate this, BNL will monitor the percentage of uncosted operating balances of SC and EM funding to operating funds received in the financial plan.

The weight of this element is 30%

Metric:

Expectations in this area are as follows:

8% or less	Outstanding
>8% - 9%	Excellent
>9% - 13%	Good
>13% - 16%	Marginal
>16%	Unsatisfactory

3.4.1.2 Assess results of implementing Enterprise Resource Planning (PeopleSoft) modules.

At the end of the fiscal year, the monthly average number of active PeopleSoft users will be measured.

The weight of this element is 40%

Critical Outcome 4.0: Environmental Restoration

BNL WILL IMPLEMENT THE ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT (EM) PROGRAM IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE COMMITMENTS CONTAINED IN THE ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION PROGRAM MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING (ATTACHMENT A) EXECUTED BETWEEN J. MARBURGER, BNL AND M. HOLLAND, BAO ON MAY 4, 2001.

The weight of this Outcome is 8%
Objective and Performance Measures:

4.1 Near Term Expectations

The weight of this Objective is 50%.

BSA will be evaluated on its implementation of the recommendations of the DOE/BSA Workshop, meeting and exceeding expectations outlined in M. Holland's letter to Dr. Marburger, dated March 22,2001, Subject: BNL Environmental Restoration Program-Near Term Performance Expectations, and progress toward Re-engineering the program to achieve the Accelerated Cleanup Goal.

Progress will be assessed against the following activities:

- New EM Director is proposed as Key Personnel in BSA contract (Completed on Schedule).
- MOU for Accelerated Cleanup executed between BSA and DOE by 4/30/01.
- Finalize project team staffing analysis / resource evaluation commensurate with the accelerated completion goal by 4/16/01.
- Implement human resource program to support the accelerated completion including proposed employee and subcontracting incentive plans and supporting career path/outplacement activities by 5/16/01.
- BSA will submit a revised Baseline that supports the defined Accelerated Cleanup Goal at BNL as defined in M. Holland's letter to Dr. Marburger dated March 9, 2001.

The progress against this task will be evaluated by the following activities:

1) Support DOE validation and BAO review of the ERD and HFBR Baselines. Validation support will be defined through submission of an Action Plan to address DOE comments. This Action Plan will be submitted within 10 workings days after receipt of DOE Baseline validation and BAO review comments.

2) Incorporation and resolution of comments from BSA Review, BAO review and DOE Validation. Completion will be defined as submission of the Final Baseline to DOE within 30 days of receipt of comments.

3) Complete revision of the HFBR Program Baseline and submittal to DOE by 6/5/01.

4) Complete BSA Project Oversight Team review of revised ERD and HFBR Baselines and incorporate recommendations into revised baseline. Completion will be defined with the submittal of the Project Oversight Team's Closeout Report and comment resolution to DOE and incorporation of comments into the Baseline.

Metrics

Outstanding:	BSA completes all 6 NTPE's within 2 weeks of specified due date.
Excellent	BSA completes all 6 NTPE's : 4 within 2 weeks of specified due date, 2 within weeks of specified due date.
Good	BSA completes all 6 NTPE's: within 4 weeks of specified due date.
Marginal	BSA completes all 6 NTPE's: 2 within 4 weeks of specified due date, 4 more than 4 weeks of specified due date.
Unsatisfactory	BSA does not complete all 6 NTPEs: within 4 weeks of specified due date

Assumptions:

- Work Breakdown Structure (WBS) Dictionary or comparable documentation that clearly identifies the program's approved scope/technical baseline.
- Cost Estimate detail and basis for cost estimate for all authorized work scope, including all supporting assumptions.
- Network schedules which relate to authorized work scope, including the identification of activity relationship, interdependencies, and critical path analysis, and current estimates of schedule float.
- Contingency analysis that corresponds to the authorized scope and areas of estimated uncertainty.
- All other parameters as specified in M. Holland's letter to Dr. Marburger dated 3/9/01 Subject: Development of Program Baselines to Support an Accelerated Environmental Clean-up of BNL.
- BSA will follow the change control procedure to implement this request.

4.2 Execution of Program Activities

The weight of this Objective is 50%.

BSA will execute the DOE approved/BSA accepted EM Baseline program in accordance with acceptable cost and schedule thresholds and the following parameters:

BSA will meet all primary, secondary and removal action milestones scheduled under the Interagency Agreement (IAG) as agreed upon with the U.S. EPA and NYSDEC and all Level 1, 2A, and 2B Milestones for the third and fourth quarters of FY01.

Metrics

Outstanding	*All Milestones described above are met on schedule. In addition, 2 or more of these milestones are completed 10 or more working days early.*
Excellent	*All Milestones described above are met on schedule. In addition, 1 of these milestones is completed 10 or more working days early.*
Good	*BSA completes all milestones described above on schedule.*
Marginal	*BSA misses one milestone.*
Unsatisfactory	*BSA misses two or more milestones.*

Assumptions:

1.) All IAG milestone dates are subject to change through IAG Milestone Extension requests.
2.) Level 1 and 2 milestones are subject change through to baseline change control.

Conditions:

In addition, the following conditions must be met. If these conditions are not met, the rating for 4.2 will be subject to reduction by DOE.

1.) The cumulative Total Program cost and schedule performance variances must be greater than – 5% for FY01. Total cost and total schedule variance are those calculations reported in the CPR-Format 1, EM Monthly Report for the month of September 2001 as accepted by DOE. The figures used will be those indicated as the totals given for total "Project to Date" BCWP, BCWS and ACWP and will include DOE costs. The data will be reviewed by DOE and subject to reconciliation for consistency (e.g. the ACWP and BCWP must be taken on the same tasks).

2.) The program's latest variance at completion (based on the latest revised estimate (LRE) and authorized TPC) must be greater than –1 percent as of September 30th, 2001. The LRE will be reflected in the CPR-Format 1, EM Monthly Report, for the month of September 2001 and is subject to validation by DOE.

Variance at Completion = (Total Project Budgeted Cost at Completion – Total Project Latest Revised Estimate) * 100 / Total Project Budgeted Cost at Completion

APPENDIX I

DOE DIRECTIVES

There is no List A to this Appendix.

List B to this Appendix contains two parts as follows:

Part I: " Directives List"

This section contains a list of Directives that are considered by DOE as applicable to the BNL contract.

Part II: "Partial Deletions of Directives"

This section contains a list of Directives that were accepted and implemented by the previous contractor but have subsequently been revised by DOE to remove certain sections.

CRD=Contract Requirements Document

DIRECTIVES LIST		
DATE	DOE DIRECTIVE NUMBER	SUBJECT TITLE
7/14/99	N 142.1	UNCLASSIFIED FOREIGN VISITS AND ASSIGNMENTS (Extended until 12/31/00 by DOE N 251.37 dated 9/1/00)
10/02/00	N 203.1	CRD - SOFTWARE QUALITY ASSURANCE
7/26/99	N 205.1	CRD - UNCLASSIFIED CYBER SECURITY PROGRAM (Extended until 12/31/00 by DOE N 251.37 dated 9/1/00)
11/1/99	N 205.2	CRD - FOREIGN NATIONAL ACCESS TO DOE CYBER SYSTEMS (Extended until 12/31/00 by DOE N 251.37 dated 9/1/00)
11/23/99	N 205.3	CRD - PASSWORD GENERATION, PROTECTION, AND USE (Extended until 12/31/00 by DOE N 251.37 dated 9/1/00)
4/15/99	N 350.5	CRD - USE OF FACILITY CONTRACTING EMPLOYEES FOR SERVICES TO DOE IN THE WASHINGTON, D.C., AREA
7/15/97	N 440.1	CRD - INTERIM CHRONIC BERYLLIUM DISEASE PREVENTION PROGRAM
9/30/95	N 441.1	RADIOLOGICAL PROTECTION FOR DOE ACTIVITIES (using ORNL/TM-11497 in lieu of Attachment 1)(Extended until 6/30/00 by DOE N 441.4 dated 11/20/98)
12/15/00	N 470.2	REPORTING UNOFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL
5/26/00	N 473.4	CRD - DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY BADGES
6/5/00	N 473.5	CRD - SECURITY AREA VOUCHING AND PIGGYBACKING
9/18/00	N 473.6	CRD - SECURITY CONDITIONS
10/26/00	N 473.7	CRD - EXPLOSIVE DETECTION PROGRAM
11/3/99	O 110.3	CRD - CONFERENCE MANAGEMENT
9/29/95	O 130.1	CRD - BUDGET FORMULATION PROCESS
9/30/95	O.135.1	BUDGET EXECUTION-FUNDS DISTRIBUTION AND CONTROL (Extended until 9/30/00 by DOE N 135.1 dated 11/29/99)
11/01/00	O 151.1A	CRD - COMPREHENSIVE EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT SYSTEM
9/30/96	O 200.1	CRD - INFORMATION MANAGEMENT SYSTEM
9/27/95 10/26/95 5/1/95	O 210.1 Change 1 Change 2	CRD - PERFORMANCE INDICATORS AND ANALYSIS OF OPERATIONS INFORMATION
12/8/97	O 224.1	CRD - CONTRACTOR PERFORMANCE-BASED BUSINESS MANAGEMENT PROCESS
11/26/97	O 225.1A	CRD - TYPE A AND B ACCIDENT INVESTIGATIONS
9/30/95 10/26/95 11/7/96	O 231.1 Change 1 Change 2	CRD - ENVIRONMENT, SAFETY & HEALTH REPORTING CANCELLATION - ES&H Reporting, dated 11/7/96, Paragraph 5b(2).

DIRECTIVES LIST		
DATE	**DOE DIRECTIVE NUMBER**	**SUBJECT TITLE**
9/30/95 11/7/96 01/28/00	DOE M 231.1-1 Change 1 Change 2	ENVIRONMENT, SAFETY, AND HEALTH REPORTING MANUAL CANCELLATION - ES&H Reporting Manual, dated 11/7/96, Chapter IV.
8/1/97	O 232.1A	CRD - OCCURRENCE REPORTING AND PROCESSING OF OPERATIONS INFORMATION (As modified by letter Grahn/Gordon, dated 4/10/98, effective 5/5/98)
7/21/97	M 232.1-1A	OCCURRENCE REPORTING AND PROCESSING OF OPERATIONS INFORMATION (As modified by letter Grahn/Gordon, dated 4/10/98, effective 5/5/98)
8/17/98	O 241.1	CRD - SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL INFORMATION (STI) MGMT.
1/30/98	O 251.1A	CRD - DIRECTIVES SYSTEM
11/19/99	O.252.1	CRD - TECHNICAL STANDARDS PROGRAM
12/30/96	O 311.1A	CRD - EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY AND DIVERSITY PROGRAM (Extended until 12/30/01 by DOE N 311.1 DATED 12/20/00)
9/30/96 5/8/98	O 350.1 Change 1	CRD - CONTRACTOR HUMAN RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PROGRAMS CRD - EMPLOYEE BENEFITS
12/6/95	O 413.1	CRD - MANAGEMENT CONTROL PROGRAM (Extended until 12/6/00 by DOE N 413.1 dated 12/10/99)
1/08/01	O 413.2A	CRD - LABORATORY DIRECTED RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT
10/13/00	O 413.3	CRD - PROGRAM AND PROJECT MANAGEMENT FOR THE ACQUISITION OF CAPITAL ASSETS
11/24/98	O 414.1	CRD - QUALITY ASSURANCE
10/13/95 11/16/95 10/24/96 11/22/00	O 420.1 Change 1 Change 2 Change 3	CRD - FACILITY SAFETY
1/08/01	O 420.2A	CRD - SAFETY OF ACCELERATOR FACILITIES
12/21/00	O 425.1B	CRD - STARTUP AND RESTART OF NUCLEAR FACILITIES
10/14/98	O 430.1A	CRD - LIFE CYCLE ASSET MANAGEMENT
6/13/96	O 430.2	IN HOUSE ENERGY MANAGEMENT (NO CONTRACTS REQUIREMENT DOCUMENT) (Extended until 6/13/01 by DOE N 430.3 dated 12/13/00)
7/9/99	O 435.1	CRD - RADIOACTIVE WASTE MANAGEMENT
7/9/99	M 435.1-1	RADIOACTIVE WASTE MANAGEMENT MANUAL
3/27/98	O 440.1A	CRD - WORKER PROTECTION MANAGEMENT FOR DOE CONTRACTOR EMPLOYEES

DIRECTIVES LIST		
DATE	DOE DIRECTIVE NUMBER	SUBJECT TITLE
9/25/95 10/13/95 10/26/95 1/08/01	O 440.2 Change 1 Change 2 Change 3	CRD - AVIATION
2/1/99	O 442.1	CRD - DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY EMPLOYEE CONCERNS PRG.
5/15/00	O 443.1	PROTECTION OF HUMAN SUBJECTS
10/26/00	O 451.1B	NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT COMPLIANCE PROGRAM
10/2/96	O 460.1A	CRD - PACKAGING AND TRANSPORTATION SAFETY
9/27/95 10/26/95	O 460.2 Change 1	CRD - DEPARTMENTAL MATERIALS TRANSPORTATION AND PACKAGING MANAGEMENT
9/28/95 6/21/95	O 470.1 Change 1	CRD - CONTRACTOR SAFEGUARDS AND SECURITY PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS (Extended until 12/31/00 by DOE N 251.37 dated 9/1/00)
03/01/00	O 470.2A	CRD - SECURITY AND EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT INDEPENDENT OVERSIGHT AND PERFORMANCE ASSURANCE PROGRAM
6/30/00	O 471.1A	CRD - IDENTIFICATION AND PROTECTION OF UNCLASSIFIED CONTROLLED NUCLEAR INFORMATION
6/30/00	M 471.1-1	IDENTIFICATION AND PROTECTION OF UNCLASSIFIED CONTROLLED NUCLEAR INFORMATION MANUAL
3/27/97	O 471.2A	CRD - INFORMATION SECURITY PROGRAM (Extended until 12/31/00 by DOE N 251.37, dated 9/1/00)
1/6/99	M 471.2-1B	CRD - PROTECTION AND CONTROL OF CLASSIFIED MATTER
8/3/99	M 471.2-2	CRD - CLASSIFIED INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY MANUAL (DOE N 205.3, dated 11/23/99 cancel Paragraphs 4j(2) and 4j(6) of Chapter VI, and Paragraph 12a(2)(a) of Chapter VII.)
3/24/97	O 472.1B	CRD - PERSONNEL SECURITY ACTIVITIES
11/6/00	M 472.1-1A	PERSONNEL SECURITY PROGRAM MANUAL
6/30/00	O 473.2	CRD - PROTECTIVE FORCE PROGRAM
6/30/00	M 473.2-2	PROTECTIVE FORCE PROGRAM MANUAL
11/20/00	O 474.1A	CRD - CONTROL AND ACCOUNTABILITY OF NUCLEAR MATERIALS
11/22/00	M 474.1-1A	CRD - MANUAL FOR CONTROL AND ACCOUNTABILITY OF NUCLEAR MATERIALS
5/8/98	M 475.1-1	CRD - IDENTIFYING CLASSIFIED INFORMATION
9/30/96	O 481.1	CRD - WORK FOR OTHERS (NON DOE FUNDED WORK)
8/25/00	O 551.1A	CRD - OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

DIRECTIVES LIST		
DATE	**DOE DIRECTIVE NUMBER**	**SUBJECT TITLE**
9/29/95	O 534.1	CRD - ACCOUNTING (Extended until 9/29/00 by DOE N 534.1 dtd. 9/29/99)
7/12/00	M 573.1-1	MAIL SERVICES USER'S MANUAL
6/10/00	P 413.1	PROGRAM AND PROJECT MANAGEMENT POLICY FOR THE PLANNING, PROGRAMMING, BUDGETING, AND ACQUISITION OF CAPITAL ASSETS
6/23/92	1270.2B	SAFEGUARDS AGREEMENT WITH THE INTERNATIONAL ATOMIC ENERGY AGENCY
5/18/92	2030.4B	REPORTING FRAUD, WASTE, AND ABUSE TO THE OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL
1/27/93	2100.8A	COST ACCOUNTING, COST RECOVERY, & INTERAGENCY SHARING OF INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY FACILITIES
7/14/88 10/5/88 5/18/92	2110.1A Change 1 Change 2	PRICING OF DEPARTMENTAL MATERIALS AND SERVICES
6/8/92	2300.1B	AUDIT RESOLUTION AND FOLLOWUP
5/18/92	2320.1C	COOPERATION WITH THE OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL
2/10/94	4330.4B	MAINTENANCE MANAGEMENT PROGRAM (Nuclear Facilities Portion Only)
11/9/88 6/29/90	5400.1* Change 1	GENERAL ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION PROGRAM
2/8/90 6/5/90 1/7/93	5400.5* Change 1 Change 2	RADIATION PROTECTION OF THE PUBLIC AND THE ENVIRONMENT
5/15/84 5/16/88 5/16/89 9/20/91	5480.4* Change 1 Change 2 Change 3	ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION, SAFETY, AND HEALTH PROTECTION STANDARDS
7/9/90 5/18/92	5480.19 Change 1	CONDUCT OF OPERATIONS REQUIREMENTS FOR DOE FACILITIES
11/15/94	5480.20A	PERSONNEL SELECTION, QUALIFICATION AND TRAINING REQUIREMENTS FOR DOE NUCLEAR FACILITIES
12/24/91	5480.21	UNREVIEWED SAFETY QUESTIONS
2/25/92 9/15/92 1/23/96	5480.22 Change 1 Change 2	TECHNICAL SAFETY REQUIREMENTS
4/10/92 3/10/94	5480.23 Change 1	NUCLEAR SAFETY ANALYSIS REPORTS
1/19/93	5480.30	NUCLEAR REACTOR SAFETY DESIGN CRITERIA
9/20/91	5530.1A	ACCIDENT RESPONSE GROUP
1/14/92 4/10/92	5530.3 Change 1	RADIOLOGICAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

*See Part II, Partial Deletions

DIRECTIVES		
DATE	**DOE DIRECTIVE NUMBER**	**SUBJECT TITLE**
5/8/85	5560.1A	PRIORITIES AND ALLOCATIONS PROGRAM
8/1/80	5610.2	CONTROL OF WEAPON DATA
7/15/94	5632.1C*	PROTECTION AND CONTROL OF SAFEGUARDS AND SECURITY INTERESTS
5/26/94	5660.1B	MANAGEMENT OF NUCLEAR MATERIALS
9/4/92	5670.3	COUNTERINTELLIGENCE PROGRAM
5/18/92	5700.7C	WORK AUTHORIZATION SYSTEM

ACCOUNTING PRACTICES AND PROCEDURES HANDBOOK		
5/2/83	Chapter V	INVENTORIES
6/30/80	Chapter X	PRODUCT COST ACCOUNTING

Appendix I - Part II

PARTIAL DELETIONS OF DIRECTIVES				
DATE	**DOE DIRECTIVE NUMBER**	**SUBJECT TITLE**	**DELETION DIRECTIVE DATE**	**SECTIONS DELETED**
11/9/88 6/29/90	5400.1 Change 1	GENERAL ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION PROGRAM	O 231.1 9/30/95 Change 1 10/26/95 Change 2 11/7/96	Paras. 2d, 2b, 4b & 4c of Chap II; Paras 2d & 3b of Chap III; Para 10(c) of Chap IV
2/8/90 6/5/90 1/7/93	5400.5 Change 1 Change 2	RADIATION PROTECTION OF THE PUBLIC AND THE ENVIRONMENT	O 231.1 9/30/95 Change 1 10/26/95	Chapter II: Para 1a(3) (a)
5/15/84 5/16/88 5/16/89 9/20/91	5480.4 Change 1 Change 2 Change 3	ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION, SAFETY, AND HEALTH PROTECTION STANDARDS	O 440.1 9/30/95 Change 1 10/26/95	Attachment 2: Paras 2c, 2d(2) - (3), 2e(1) - (8); and Attach. 3: Paras 2c,; 2d(2) - (3), 2e(1) - (7)
7/15/94	M5632.1C-1	MANUAL FOR PROTECTION AND CONTROL OF SAFEGUARDS AND SECURITY INTERESTS	O 470.1 9/28/95 O 471.2A 3/27/97	Chapter XI Chapter III, Paras 1, 2, 4-9

APPENDIX L

(Modified by Mod M060 dated June 28, 2001)

FY2001 FEE COMPUTATION

FEE BASIS

APPENDIX L

FY2001 FEE COMPUTATION

FEE BASIS

For FY2001, the performance measure model has one class of performance measures in Appendix B of the Prime Contract that is directly associated with fee (fee bearing). This reflects the approved FY2001 Critical Outcomes of Science & Technology, Operational Excellence, Leadership & Management and Environmental Restoration. The FY2001 fee structure is in consonance with the following guidelines:

1. The maximum fee is to be in consonance with fees paid for the operation of similar FFRDC laboratories and will have a single tier structure;

2. The fees for integrated subcontractor(s) are included in the total fee;

3. The fee structure is to be based on individual critical outcomes and their associated weights as determined separately;

4. The critical outcome of Science and Technology will act as a "gate," in that a score of Excellent or above is required; there will be no fee if any critical outcome is scored as Marginal or below.

Maximum Fee

The maximum fee that BSA can earn under this matrix for FY 2001 is provisionally established at $7,000,000, if all performance measures areas were rated as "outstanding." The final FY2001 fee remains to be negotiated by the parties, an action to be taken upon conclusion of the final negotiations and amendment to the BSA subcontract No. 851261 with Bechtel National, Inc (BNI).

Fee Matrix and Fee Percentage Curve (Figure 1)

Figure (1) below is the fee-determining matrix for the case where Science and Technology (S&T) achieves a score of Excellent or above. The right two columns of the Figure (1) matrix contain a fee percentage that determines the fee earned within each of the score ranges of Outstanding, Excellent, Good and Marginal. In the event that a Critical Outcome score is between two matrix scores, the fee percentage will be determined by interpolation.

If S&T achieves a score below Excellent, the fee matrix is inapplicable. If S&T is scored in the Good range, a single partial-cost-recovery fee of $2.1M (the annual BSA operating budget) is applicable. If any critical Outcome (including S&T) is Marginal there will be no fee.

Fee for Integrated Subcontractors

The Laboratory's "integrated subcontractors" are defined as those subcontractors that are part of the BSA management structure and have responsibilities for the direct supervision of BSA employees. In FY2001, BSA's maximum fee pool is the only fee pool available for the integrated subcontractors fees for Bechtel National Inc. (BNI) and Duke Engineering.

Payments and Advances

For purposes of installments of fee, the historical fee of $6,600,000, based on an excellent performance rating will be used for determining the 90% fee payment authorized for FY 2001which is $5,940,000. If, after DOE's evaluation of BSA's performance for FY2001, a higher amount of fee is authorized then BSA may draw the difference between the higher fee and the amount received through the periodic installments for FY 2001. If however, after DOE's evaluation of BSA's performance for FY2001, a lower amount of fee is authorized, BSA will reimburse DOE all amounts received through periodic installments above the authorized fee amount within 30 days after receiving notice from DOE of the fee authorized for FY2001.

Figure (1)

Brookhaven Science Associates
Fiscal Year 2001

APPENDIX L

Figure (1): Fee Determination Matrix (000)

Citical Outcome (CO)		Excellence in Science & Technology	Operational Excellence	Leadership & Management	Environmental Restoration	Max Fee: $ 7,000	
CO Weight		60%	20%	12%	8%	% of Max Fee	
CO Max Fee		$ 4,200.0	$ 1,400.0	$ 840.0	$ 560.0	Science	Non-Science
	Score						
Outstanding	4.00	4,200.0	1,400.0	840.0	560.0	100.0%	100.0%
	3.75	4,128.6	1,376.2	825.7	550.5	98.3%	98.3%
	3.50	4,061.4	1,353.8	812.3	541.5	96.7%	96.7%
Excellent	3.25	3,990.0	1,330.0	798.0	532.0	95.0%	95.0%
	3.00	3,780.0	1,260.0	756.0	504.0	90.0%	90.0%
	2.75	3,570.0	1,190.0	714.0	476.0	85.0%	85.0%
	2.50	3,360.0	1,120.0	672.0	448.0	80.0%	80.0%
Good	2.25	Flat 2,100.0	1,015.0 *	609.0 *	406.0 *	30.0% **	72.5% *
	2.00	Flat 2,100.0	910.0 *	546.0 *	364.0 *	30.0% **	65.0% *
	1.75	Flat 2,100.0	805.0 *	483.0 *	322.0 *	30.0% **	57.5% *
	1.50	Flat 2,100.0	700.0 *	420.0 *	280.0 *	30.0% **	50.0% *
Marginal	1.25	No Fee				0.0%	0.0%
	1.00					0.0%	0.0%
	0.75					0.0%	0.0%
	0.50					0.0%	0.0%

* No Fee for this category

** This reflects a percentage of total fee.

Note: If any of the Critical Outcomes are rated less than "Good" then the Contractor earns no fee for FY 2001.