SUPPLIER PERFORMANCE EVALUATION SYSTEM {PRIVATE }
SUPPLIER RATING FORM ENGINEERED HARDWARE, CONSTRUCTION AND SERVICE

5. VENDOR DATA SUBMITTALS 100 pts

Factors to consider: 1) Timeliness of submittal 2) Quality, i.e., accuracy, legibility, correct no. of copies, and data correctly sorted.

Timeliness of submittal.
ERT continues to submit contractual vendor data on time.

Vendor data has been continuously submitted during this performance period. However on 2-19-09 BEA asked ERT to provide O&M manuals and product data on all of the RCL equipment requiring testing, so that BEA Laboratory users can develop procedures. No evidence of these manuals has been seen during this performance period.

Quality, i.e., accuracy, legibility, correct no. of copies, and data correctly sorted.
No issues during this performance period.

6. ADMINISTRATION 50 pts

Factors to consider: 1) Accurate, complete, and timely submittal of progress reports, invoices, proposals for changes and modifications, 2) Fair, equitable, and ethical contract administration, 3) Support of suppliers upper management to assure successful completion of the work, 4) Responsiveness to BEA, the customer.

Accurate, complete, and timely submittal of progress reports, invoices, proposals for changes and modifications.

ERT began following their contract and provided a SOV that matches their updated CPM. Now invoices are much easier to understand.

Fair, equitable, and ethical contract administration.
Submitting cost proposals in a timely manner is difficult for ERT, but they are making some progress.

Support of supplier's upper management to assure successful completion of the work.
See Home Office Support under Section 2 (Technical Performance).

Responsiveness to BEA, the customer.
Getting better.

SUPPLIER PERFORMANCE EVALUATION SYSTEM {PRIVATE }
SUPPLIER RATING FORM ENGINEERED HARDWARE, CONSTRUCTION AND SERVICE

Order No. 73577 SPES #12 *Rev. 01 (for the month of March)

Response Due Date: Not Required

Supplier: Eagle Rock Timber Inc. (Name) | 3000 Wright Road (Address) | Idaho Falls (City) | ID (State) | 83401 (Zip)

PA: Daniel Neff

Requester: Terry Jorgensen

QE: Evert Mouser

Construction Coordinator: Chris Duncan

Item/Service Procured:

As Defined in Contract #073577

{PRIVATE } Rating Category	Points Possible	Rating
* 1. Safety	0-225	165
2. Technical Performance	0-225	215
* 3. Quality Assurance/Inspection	0-200	190
4. Delivery/Schedule	0-200	190
* 5. Vendor Data	0-100	95
6. Administration	0-50	45
Total Possible	1,000	Total 900

* If one or more of these categories do not apply, the points possible for that category or those categories shall be added to the points possible for Technical Performance.

** If the supplier is rated 80% or less than the points possible, the basis must be provided in the comments section.

Chris Duncan	C. J. Duncan	*5-07-09
Rater Printed Name	Rater Signature	Date

{PRIVATE }Total Points	Rating Classification
801-1000	1. Acceptable
0-800	2. Unacceptable

Supplier's with an average score of 900 points or higher will be sent a letter recognizing their excellent performance.
Corrective action program required.

SUPPLIER PERFORMANCE EVALUATION SYSTEM {PRIVATE }
SUPPLIER RATING FORM ENGINEERED HARDWARE, CONSTRUCTION AND SERVICE

INSTRUCTIONS

CATEGORY		POINTS
1. SAFETY		
If supplier is on site evaluation is to be based on compliance with safety requirements of the subcontract.		225 pts
POSSIBLE POINTS		SCORE
25	Attendance at required meetings	15
25	Submittals (Manpower report, Safety Meeting Minutes, Timely.)	25
35	POD's and Weekly Tool Box Meetings conducted	35
30	Daily and Weekly Inspections performed	30
35	General attitude, list any safety violations	20

Attendance at required meetings continues to be very poor for some of ERT's sub tiers. These sub tiers do not attend the prejob briefing in the morning. Most notably Nash Electric and Quality Electric. This is a habitual occurrence which ERT allows to continue.

Safety Violations:

#09-0124

On 3-11-09 a CAT II Safety Violation was written against ERT for allowing three workers to erect scaffolding without being trained for the task.

On 3-11-09 a CAT II Safety Violation was written against ERT for allowing welding activities to be performed without a fire-watch.

On 3-11-09 a CAT II Violation for allowing a worker to be exposed to high noise without having hearing conservation training.

On 3-11-09 a CAT III Safety Violation was written against ERT for allowing work to commence with electrical cords strewn throughout the area without regard to keeping the aisle ways clear.

On 3-11-09 a CAT III Safety Violation was written against ERT when BEA Construction Safety witnessed a worker grinding steel pipe without hearing protection.

On 3-11-09 a CAT III Safety Violation was written against ERT for allowing workers to use scaffolding without a current inspection tag.

#09127

On 3-18-09 a CAT III Safety Violation was written against ERT when their Supervisor de-energized a disconnect inside the Analytical Lab which was supplying the RCL basement with lights. Several workers were caught performing work activities when the basement lost light.

On 3-18-09 a CAT III Safety Violation was written against ERT for allowing their work site to be littered with cigarette butts and construction debris.

On 3-18-09 a CAT III Safety Violation was written against ERT for allowing work to take place inside the RCL without any lights.

On 3-18-09 a CAT III Safety Violation was written against ERT when workers were observed using an extension cord with bad insulation.

On 3-18-09 a CAT III Safety Violation was written against ERT when workers were observed performing work on the exterior of the RCL on uneven scaffolding.

35 Housekeeping: 20

40 Adherence to Safety Plan: 20

2. TECHNICAL PERFORMANCE 225 pts

Factors to consider: 1) Management of Work; 2) Workmanship; performed in a professional manner resulting in top quality goods and services, 3) engineering capabilities and expertise applied as needed and with cooperation, 4) assure compliance with technical requirements including codes & standards, 5) outage requests submitted timely, 6) quality and cooperation of superintendents, 7) home office support, 8) subtier performance, 9) management support.

Management of Work

Management of work for the month of March has improved since the previous performance period. Most project issues and concerns are being addressed in a timely manner.

Resubmittal of drawings and specification are still a problem and haven't been resolved by ERT. The project is 13 months into design and construction and still there are old unresolved issues. BEA is careful not to make comments on submittals that are not required by the contract. The final comments on all submittals are there because ERT has not followed the RFP specification. To be 13 months into the project and still have multiple comments on nearly all drawing packages is embarrassing.

* The owner of ERT needs to interject himself and help his employees manage the project. ERT management has struggled since the commencement of the project and would benefit from the owner's guidance.

Workmanship; performed in a professional manner resulting in top quality goods and services.

Adequate.

Engineering capabilities and expertise applied as needed and with cooperation.

*The RCL design package is less than stellar. Little to no overlay of engineering disciplines was performed.

Assure compliance with technical requirements including codes & standards.

ERT tries to design and construct following all codes and standards. See the Quality Section.

Outage requests submitted timely.

No issues.

Quality and cooperation of superintendents.
*ERT's Primary and Alternate Superintendents are good to work with, and seem to be performing to the best of their abilties.

Home office support.
Reference Management of Work.

Sub tier performance.
YMC Mechancial:
YMC continues to struggle to keep up with ERT's aggressive schedule, however they are making a greater effort and man loading the project.

BEA was notified by ERT on 3-31-09 that YMC will not have the RCL fume hoods until 5-01-09 or later. YMC's in abliltly to procure the fume hoods in a timely manner is unforgivealbe when the contract was issued 13 months ago. YMC has caused the project schedule to slip beyond repair.

Idaho Abatement:
*Supported the steam outage attempts and without complaint.

Nash Electric Inc:
No issues except for their poor attendance at prejob briefings.

3-D Fire Protection:
Have been exceptionally patient with other crafts and performed rerouting of the sprinkler system mutlipule times without complaint.

Robison Roofing:
Their work is adequate, however they did not procure their standing seam roof panels until the roof was framed and sheathed. Based on project drawings, a fabricator should be able to provide a roof package well before the roof is framed. This seriously delayed the completion of the roof.

Management support.
Improving since the previous performance period.

3. QUALITY ASSURANCE/INSPECTION _____200 pts_____
Factors to consider: 1) Degree of implementation of the suppliers documented QA Program as required by the Subcontract.; 2) Control of subtiers; 3) Responses to assessment findings, NCR's; 4) SDR's, NDE and testing is performed adequately to assure goods meet contractual requirements; 5) Inspection of materials and services provided by subtiers include both source and receiving inspections; 6) Timely notice of hold points for BEA's witnessing of the inspection; and 7) Successful completion of the inspection as scheduled so as not to cause BEA to waste resources.

Degree of implementation of the suppliers documented QA Program as required by the Subcontract.
See Responses to assessment findings and NCRs below.

Control of subtiers.
See sub tier performance in section #2.

Responses to assessment findings, NCRs.
Since ERT's PM (Paul Jenkins) resigned from ERT, there is no one from ERT who understands their

Quality Program. ERT's inspector allowed YMC to test their plastic drain pipe with air. UPC (2003) prohibits air test on plastic pipe. Once this issue was brought to ERT's attention, they should have written an NCR to capture the issue, but didn't until persuaded by BEA to follow their QAP.

SDR's, NDE and testing is performed adequately to assure goods meet contractual requirement.
No issues.

Inspection of materials and services provided by subtiers include both source and receiving inspections.
Not applicable.

Timely notice of hold points for BEA's witnessing of the inspection.
BEA Quality provides temporary oversight only.

Successful completion of the inspection as scheduled so as not to cause BEA to waste resources.
No issues.

4. DELIVERY/SCHEDULE 200 pts

For subcontracts in which an automated evaluation can be used, the following method shall be used:

$$\frac{\text{Days Late}}{\text{* Period of Performance}} = \text{Lead Time Variance (LTV\%)}$$

* Effective date is used as the start of the period of performance.
* The delivery due date is the ending date of the period of performance.

LTV	INDEX		POSSIBLE POINTS		SCORE
- .000	1.00	x	200	=	200
.001 - .030	.95	x	200	=	190
.031 - .060	.90	x	200	=	180
.061 - .090	.85	x	200	=	170
.091 - .120	.80	x	200	=	160

For subcontracts where a manual evaluation is to be performed, apply the following criteria:
1) Short range schedules submitted timely and accurately reflects the actual work,
2) Long Range Schedule (actual vs. scheduled) 3) Schedule of Values 4) Maintain Schedule.

Short range schedules submitted timely and accurately reflects the actual work.
SRSs have been submitted timely during this performance period. Detail continues to be sufficient.

Long Range Schedule (actual vs. scheduled).
ERT submitted an updated CPM on 2-23-09 with an agreed upon final turnover end date of 4-30-09. This was one of ERT's better attempts at providing a complete schedule. However a few activities needed to be rearranged on the schedule and took ERT until 4-03-09 to correct the schedule.

Schedule of Values.
Adequate.

Maintain Schedule.
See Long Range Schedule.

5. VENDOR DATA SUBMITTALS 100 pts

Factors to consider: 1) Timeliness of submittal 2) Quality, i.e., accuracy, legibility, correct no. of copies, and data correctly sorted.

Timeliness of submittal.
ERT continues to submit contractual vendor data on time.

Vendor data has been continuously submitted during this performance period. However on 2-19-09 BEA asked ERT to provide O&M manuals and product data on all of the RCL equipment requiring testing, so that BEA Laboratory users can develop procedures. No evidence of these manuals has been seen during this performance period.

Quality, i.e., accuracy, legibility, correct no. of copies, and data correctly sorted.
No issues during this performance period.

6. ADMINISTRATION 50 pts

Factors to consider: 1) Accurate, complete, and timely submittal of progress reports, invoices, proposals for changes and modifications, 2) Fair, equitable, and ethical contract administration, 3) Support of suppliers upper management to assure successful completion of the work, 4) Responsiveness to BEA, the customer.

Accurate, complete, and timely submittal of progress reports, invoices, proposals for changes and modifications.
Invoices are becoming more accurate and less time has to be spent discussing percentage complete on individual line item activities.

Fair, equitable, and ethical contract administration.
No issues.

Support of supplier's upper management to assure successful completion of the work.
See Home Office Support under Section 2 (Technical Performance).

Responsiveness to BEA, the customer.
ERT continues to show improvement and appears to be getting back to the "Partnering" atmosphere the project experienced at the commencement of this contract.

540.19
10/03/2006
Rev. 01

SUPPLIER PERFORMANCE EVALUATION SYSTEM SUPPLIER RATING FORM ENGINEERED HARDWARE, CONSTRUCTION AND SERVICE

Order No. 73577 SPES #13 (for the month of April)

Response Due Date: Not Required

Supplier: Eagle Rock Timber Inc. (Name) | 3000 Wright Road (Address) | Idaho Falls (City) | ID (State) | 83401 (Zip)

PA: Daniel Neff

Requester: Terry Jorgensen

QE: Evert Mouser

Construction Coordinator: Chris Duncan

Item/Service Procured:

As Defined in Contract #073577

Rating Category	Points Possible	Rating
* 1. Safety	0-225	190
2. Technical Performance	0-225	205
* 3. Quality Assurance/Inspection	0-200	180
4. Delivery/Schedule	0-200	185
* 5. Vendor Data	0-100	90
6. Administration	0-50	45
Total Possible	1,000	Total 895

* If one or more of these categories do not apply, the points possible for that category or those categories shall be added to the points possible for Technical Performance.

** If the supplier is rated 80% or less than the points possible, the basis must be provided in the comments section.

Chris Duncan	C. J. Duncan	5-02-09
Rater Printed Name	Rater Signature	Date

Total Points	Rating Classification
801-1000	1. Acceptable
0-800	2. Unacceptable

Supplier's with an average score of 900 points or higher will be sent a letter recognizing their excellent performance.
Corrective action program required.

SUPPLIER PERFORMANCE EVALUATION SYSTEM SUPPLIER RATING FORM ENGINEERED HARDWARE, CONSTRUCTION AND SERVICE

INSTRUCTIONS

CATEGORY	POINTS
1. SAFETY	
If supplier is on site evaluation is to be based on compliance with safety requirements of the subcontract.	225 pts

POSSIBLE POINTS		SCORE
25	Attendance at required meetings	15
25	Submittals (Manpower report, Safety Meeting Minutes, Timely.)	25
35	POD's and Weekly Tool Box Meetings conducted	35
30	Daily and Weekly Inspections performed	30
35	General attitude, list any safety violations	25

Based upon the previous performance period's safety issues, ERT provided a full time safety representative to oversee the project's high risk activities, and helped regain control of the multiple crafts working together within a small work area.

ERT has hired three (3) full time laborers to do nothing more than housekeeping.

Safety Violations:

#09-0139

On 4-01-09 a CAT III Safety Violation was written against ERT because the RCL main floor hallway lacked sufficient light.

On 4-01-09 a CAT III Safety Violation was written against ERT because they continue to allow poor cord management on the jobsite. The cluster of cords hinders access into the building and confuses the workers.

On 4-01-09 a CAT III Safety Violation was written against ERT because the main floor openings were not adequately guarded.

#09-0144

On 4-06-09 a CAT III Safety Violation was written against ERT because a worker was observed working from a step ladder facing away from the ladder.

On 4-07-09 a CAT III Safety Violation was written against ERT because a power cord was found in a walk-way 10" off of the ground, in front of a step ladder.

#09-0149

On 4-14-09 a CAT III Safety Violation was written against ERT for allowing their roofing sub tier to perform work while being exposed to high noise levels, without the sub tier having a hearing conservation program.

On 4-15-09 a CAT III Safety Violation was written against ERT for not using ventilation while gluing pipe together in the RCL basement, as directed by the product's MSDS.

On 4-16-09 a CAT II Safety Violation was written against ERT when BEA observed two (2) YMC Sheet Metal Supervisors transporting a gas bottle in the back of a pickup truck without the bottle being supported upright and secured.

ERT has not been providing BEA with adequate man power reports, as specified in this contract. Some of ERT's sub tiers are not listed on the man power report. ERT did not report the eye injury which the YMC pipefitter incurred a couple of weeks ago. The injury has been deemed "Reportable" by DOE, because the pipefitter's Doctor gave him a prescription type eye salve.

Attendance at required meetings continues to be very poor for some of ERT's sub tiers. These sub tiers either do not attend the prejob briefing in the morning or are hit and miss. Nash Electric, Ross Fork Painting, Robison Roofing. This is a habitual occurrence which ERT allows to continue.

On 4-09-09 BEA was informed by the Analytical Lab Manager (Pam Crane) that YMC Pipefitters had dropped a section of plywood on the Analytical Lab's pure water unit. The plywood snapped off a valve at the bottom of one of the reservoirs and starting releasing water on to the floor in an RBA. YMC safety immediately took charge of the situation and sat their crew down and discussed situational awareness when performing work.

35 Housekeeping: 25

40 Adherence to Safety Plan: 30

2. TECHNICAL PERFORMANCE 225 pts

Factors to consider: 1) Management of Work; 2) Workmanship; performed in a professional manner resulting in top quality goods and services, 3) engineering capabilities and expertise applied as needed and with cooperation, 4) assure compliance with technical requirements including codes & standards, 5) outage requests submitted timely, 6) quality and cooperation of superintendents, 7) home office support, 8) subtier performance, 9) management support.

Management of Work

Management of work for the month of April has improved since the previous performance period. Most project issues and concerns are being addressed in a timely manner. Action items are being addressed and closed out far faster than at any other time during the performance of this contract.

Workmanship; performed in a professional manner resulting in top quality goods and services.

The RCL tank storage room concrete walls are very rough and don't have a good textured finish to them. A second coat of sand and grout would have been more appropriate and gave the room a finished appearance, much like other areas in the RCL basement. The storage room walls are somewhat disappointing.

The electrical conduit installed by Nash Electric could be installed in a more workmanship type manner in some areas of the RCL. Conduit is not routed down conduit racks in places that if could have been.

Engineering capabilities and expertise applied as needed and with cooperation.

The true incompetency of the RCL design package continues to be revealed. The fire sprinkler lines continue to be rerouted due to HVAC and electrical component interferences. The Mechanical room is not large enough and bizarre installation of components is being performed. Metal plates have to be installed beneath heavy items in the Mechanical room to redistribute the weight properly, such as the primary HEPA bank and the HVAC monitoring stack, because the hollow core floor was not designed to

hold all of the point loading of these items. Some places in the RCL appear to be more of a remodel, than a newly constructed building. Many items were all together forgotten, such as several motor starters for various pumps.

ERT's engineering firm had not provided any requirements for testing steam and condensate tie-ins. There are no cleanliness or flushing requirements for most piping systems.

Assure compliance with technical requirements including codes & standards.
See the Quality Section.

Outage requests submitted timely.
No issues.

Quality and cooperation of superintendents.
ERT's Primary and Alternate Superintendents are good to work with, and seem to be performing to the best of their abilties.

Home office support.
ERT home office personnel need to support some of the project's technical issues more aggressively. The home office personnel continue to struggle with the RCL 2 hour fire rating issue, even after mulitpule disucssions with BEA Fire Protection Engineers. ERT continues to struggle with designing an effective 2 hour fire rated method in which to tie the RCL to the Analytical Lab roof.

On 4-07-09 ERT owner and his superintendents gathered their major sub tier leads, and developed a real schedule to completion. This was a postive move and encouraging to see.

Sub tier performance.
YMC Mechancial:
YMC needs to communicate better within their own group. Mechancial Forman and Mechancial Field Engineer never seem to be on the same page. Mechancial Forman needs to ensure that the Field Engineer and other crew memebers understand not to deviate from the approved Mechancial Package (CCR-29 rev. 03) which has gone through an extensive USQ review. Every time YMC wants to change pipe routing and core hole locations it causes work delays, because ERT has to modify CCR-29, and then INL Nuclear Safety has to perform a USQ review against the revised package. ERT Field Engineer has marked up the Analystical Lab walls in numerous places with black marker, where he wants to deviate from the approved USQ pacakge. This was a waste of time and effort on YMC's part.

For the sake of time, BEA wrote a revision to CCR-29 to reroute the condensate pipe in the AL basement for YMC. BEA was led to believe that it was impossible for YMC to obtain the proper slope of the condensate line from the RCL to the condensate pump, located in the Analytical Lab basement. After further questioning about the condensate line by BEA, YMC determined that the change was not necessary and that this modification was more of a wish by their Field Engineer. Again this wasted YMC and BEA's time.

YMC asked BEA to provide Analytical Lab facility escorts and radcon support for a 10 hour day, so that YMC could get the most out of working in the AL basement. BEA concurred and made special arrangements for BEA support personnel to work overtime, since BEA's working hours are 8 hours a day. On 4-06-09 the Analytical Lab Facilty Manager (Pam Crane) and AL FAS (Scott Wilde) contacted BEA project personnel regarding YMC's work hours. They stated that YMC's crew is coming out of the AL basement at approximatley 4:45 p.m. and wasting BEA support personnel's time, and project funding.

Idaho Abatement:
IA has been very patient and supportive of the steam outages. The outages continue to be postponed due to ambient air temperatures dropping below 32 F.

Nash Electric Inc:
On 4-14-09 all subcontractor Lockout/Tagout work at the INL was suspended due to NFPA 70E violations. Nash Electric was unable to work in the RCL main power panel because they had been working under a Lockout/Tagout. Nash Electric did a good job in finding other work in the RCL in order to keep the project moving from an electircal standpoint.

3-D Fire Protection:
Continue to be exceptionally patient with other crafts and performed rerouting of the sprinkler system mutlipule times without complaint.

Robison Roofing:
The RCL roof appears to be installed adequately and is being constructed in a workmanship type manner. On 4-30-09 one of the roofers had to be reminded to wear gloves while cutting metal with tin snips. The roofer complained but not after dispersing several derogatory comments. The same worker was asked to use handrail while assending a staircase with metal trim in one hand. The roofer ignored the request of the MFC Nuclear Operations Manager which caused a lot of unnecessary negative attention. Robison Roofing Foreman and ERT Supervision politely asked the roofer not to come back to the jobsite.

ThyssennKrupp:
The elevator installers performed well during the elevator installation. It was very obvious that this company brought with them a strong safety culture and technical knowledge. BEA had no issues with ThyssennKrupp.

Management support.
Improving since the previous performance period.

3. QUALITY ASSURANCE/INSPECTION 200 pts

Factors to consider: 1) Degree of implementation of the suppliers documented QA Program as required by the Subcontract.; 2) Control of subtiers; 3) Responses to assessment findings, NCR's; 4) SDR's, NDE and testing is performed adequately to assure goods meet contractual requirements; 5) Inspection of materials and services provided by subtiers include both source and receiving inspections; 6) Timely notice of hold points for BEA's witnessing of the inspection; and 7) Successful completion of the inspection as scheduled so as not to cause BEA to waste resources.

Degree of implementation of the suppliers documented QA Program as required by the Subcontract.
ERT installed RCL Door #19 wrong. The door frame was installed to allow the door slab to open into the north stairwell. This is wrong, and a code violation. Again ERT has to be reminded that once an item is installed and is not in the process of being installed anymore, and if it has to be modified due to a code or standard violation, it is a non conforming item.

Control of subtiers.
On 4-08-09 A-core showed up on the project and began saw cutting the RCL basement floor, where one of YMC's sink drains and water supply systems had been installed in the wrong place. ERT still struggles with "when" an NCR needs to be issued, and that work should not commence until engineering has been informed and given an adequate solution to the non conformance. ERT needs to have their Specialty

Inspector on the jobsite at least one day a week to perform random surveillances.

Responses to assessment findings, NCRs.
Poor, see above.

SDR's, NDE and testing is performed adequately to assure goods meet contractual requirement.
No issues.

Inspection of materials and services provided by subtiers include both source and receiving inspections.
Not applicable.

Timely notice of hold points for BEA's witnessing of the inspection.
BEA Quality provides temporary oversight only.

Successful completion of the inspection as scheduled so as not to cause BEA to waste resources.
No issues.

4. DELIVERY/SCHEDULE 200 pts

For subcontracts in which an automated evaluation can be used, the following method shall be used:

$$\frac{\text{Days Late}}{\text{* Period of Performance}} = \text{Lead Time Variance (LTV\%)}$$

* Effective date is used as the start of the period of performance.
* The delivery due date is the ending date of the period of performance.

LTV	INDEX		POSSIBLE POINTS		SCORE
- .000	1.00	x	200	=	200
.001 - .030	.95	x	200	=	190
.031 - .060	.90	x	200	=	180
.061 - .090	.85	x	200	=	170
.091 - .120	.80	x	200	=	160

For subcontracts where a manual evaluation is to be performed, apply the following criteria:
1) Short range schedules submitted timely and accurately reflects the actual work,
2) Long Range Schedule (actual vs. scheduled) 3) Schedule of Values 4) Maintain Schedule.

Short range schedules submitted timely and accurately reflects the actual work.
ERT Superintendent struggled creating an adequate short range schedule due to YMC's refusal to provide ERT with data regarding when the continuous air monitoring stack will arrive and be installed, and providing ERT with a time frame for when YMC's activities will be complete in the RCL mechanical room. Other items not directly related to the mechanical room were provided in sufficient detail in ERT's short range schedule for the month of April.

Long Range Schedule (actual vs. scheduled).
ERT seems to fully understand now that they must provide an updated CPM schedule with every invoice. ERT is beginning to fall behind on several activities and will not make their contractual end date of 5-11-09.

Schedule of Values.
Adequate.

Maintain Schedule.
See Long Range Schedule.

5. VENDOR DATA SUBMITTALS 100 pts

Factors to consider: 1) Timeliness of submittal 2) Quality, i.e., accuracy, legibility, correct no. of copies, and data correctly sorted.

Timeliness of submittal.
ERT continues to submit contractual vendor data on time.

Vendor data has been continuously submitted during this performance period. However ERT still struggles with resubmitting vendor data that does not meet the RFP specification 945. There are still multiple unresolved comments on most of the drawing packages and ERT's specification, and the project is deemed 86 percent complete.

Quality, i.e., accuracy, legibility, correct no. of copies, and data correctly sorted.
No issues during this performance period.

6. ADMINISTRATION 50 pts

ctors to consider: 1) Accurate, complete, and timely submittal of progress reports, invoices, proposals for ,anges and modifications, 2) Fair, equitable, and ethical contract administration, 3) Support of suppliers upper management to assure successful completion of the work, 4) Responsiveness to BEA, the customer.

Accurate, complete, and timely submittal of progress reports, invoices, proposals for changes and modifications.
Invoices are becoming more accurate and less time has to be spent discussing percentage complete on individual line item activities. Cost proposals have been provided in a timely manner during this performance period.

Fair, equitable, and ethical contract administration.
No issues. A good attempt at closing out CFPs was made during this performance period.

Support of supplier's upper management to assure successful completion of the work.
See Home Office Support under Section 2 (Technical Performance).

Responsiveness to BEA, the customer.
ERT continues to show improvement and appears to be getting back to the "Partnering" atmosphere the project experienced at the commencement of this contract.

SUPPLIER PERFORMANCE EVALUATION SYSTEM {PRIVATE }
SUPPLIER RATING FORM ENGINEERED HARDWARE, CONSTRUCTION AND SERVICE

Order No. 73577 SPES #14 (for the month of May)

Response Due Date: Not Required

Supplier: Eagle Rock Timber Inc. (Name) | 3000 Wright Road (Address) | Idaho Falls (City) | ID (State) | 83401 (Zip)

PA: Daniel Neff

Requester: Terry Jorgensen

QE: Evert Mouser

Construction Coordinator: Chris Duncan

Item/Service Procured:

As Defined in Contract #073577

{PRIVATE } Rating Category	Points Possible	Rating
* 1. Safety	0-225	215
2. Technical Performance	0-225	180
* 3. Quality Assurance/Inspection	0-200	155
4. Delivery/Schedule	0-200	150
* 5. Vendor Data	0-100	90
6. Administration	0-50	25
Total Possible	1,000	Total 815

* If one or more of these categories do not apply, the points possible for that category or those categories shall be added to the points possible for Technical Performance.

** If the supplier is rated 80% or less than the points possible, the basis must be provided in the comments section.

Chris Duncan	C. J. Duncan	6-18-09
Rater Printed Name	Rater Signature	Date

{PRIVATE }Total Points	Rating Classification
801-1000	1. Acceptable
0-800	2. Unacceptable

Supplier's with an average score of 900 points or higher will be sent a letter recognizing their excellent performance.
Corrective action program required.

SUPPLIER PERFORMANCE EVALUATION SYSTEM {PRIVATE }
SUPPLIER RATING FORM ENGINEERED HARDWARE, CONSTRUCTION AND SERVICE

INSTRUCTIONS

CATEGORY		POINTS
1. SAFETY If supplier is on site evaluation is to be based on compliance with safety requirements of the subcontract.		225 pts
POSSIBLE POINTS		SCORE
25	Attendance at required meetings	25
25	Submittals (Manpower report, Safety Meeting Minutes, Timely.)	25
35	POD's and Weekly Tool Box Meetings conducted	35
30	Daily and Weekly Inspections performed	30
35	General attitude, list any safety violations	30

ERT's safety culture has improved. Workers have been wearing their required PPE while in the construction area. This can be attributed to ERT and their subtiers, notably YMC for instilling the importance of safety to their workers.

Safety Violations:

#09-0164

On 5-04-09 a CAT III Safety Violation was written against ERT because fire extinguishers lacked proof of monthly inspection.

#09-0165

On 5-14-09 a CAT III Safety Violation was written against ERT for poor housekeeping inside and outside of the RCL.

On 5-14-09 a CAT III Safety Violation was written against ERT for allowing their painting subtier to perform work without adequate ventilation to remove paint vapors from inside the RCL.

35	Housekeeping:	30
40	Adherence to Safety Plan:	35

2. TECHNICAL PERFORMANCE 225 pts

Factors to consider: 1) Management of Work; 2) Workmanship; performed in a professional manner resulting in top quality goods and services, 3) engineering capabilities and expertise applied as needed and with cooperation, 4) assure compliance with technical requirements including codes & standards, 5) outage requests submitted timely, 6) quality and cooperation of superintendents, 7) home office support, 8) subtier performance, 9) management support.

Management of Work
The RCL/AL roof snow load issue is aggravating to BEA. ERT management has been aware of this potential problem since early July 2008, and still has done very little in resolving the issue.

ERT management has to push their engineering group harder. Several drawing packages have had comments associated with them for months, and many of the systems are near completion. Some of these comments are ignored while systems continue to be installed. It is unprofessional and embarrassing to allow comments from ERT's customer to be ignored and take months for resolution. This is not being very responsive to the customer.

Workmanship; performed in a professional manner resulting in top quality goods and services.
Some of the RCL sidewalks were not finished very well. In stead of being flat some have uneven surfaces that roll.

The Radiochemistry lab where YMC cut out and repaired an island sink supply was painted over with epoxy paint before the cut out section was properly prepared. The cut out is lower than the rest of the floor in the lab, and is very visible.

Engineering capabilities and expertise applied as needed and with cooperation.
On 5-06-09 BEA brought to ERT's attention that the RFP Programming Sheets called out for HVAC and electrical provisions for the ICPMS (Inductively Coupled Plasma Mass Spectrometer). ES2 stated that they accounted for the CFM in the RCL design for the ICPMS, however forgot to add it to the Mechanical and Electrical Drawings. At this time the HVAC ductwork was virtually complete. YMC protested since this system requires stainless duct routed through the HEPA system and another Phoenix valve to control it. This oversight by ES2 continues to delay the completion of this project.

On 5-06-09 ES2 Lead Engineer performed a walk-down of the RCL with ERT management. Several issues were discussed and the engineer took actions down to resolve them. It was refreshing to see the Lead Engineer on the jobsite since so many issues were unresolved with ES2's design.

Multiple CCRs have been issued to ERT from their engineering group due to the lack of detail in their design. ES2 obviously did not study the RFP specification thorough enough when designing the RCL. Simple things like the emergency truck pump shut off system was forgotten.

ES2 was given electrical limitations for the RCL prior to bid. The entire RCL electrical configuration and loads were to be designed to a 250 amp load limit. Because ES2 had to continually add motor starters, lights, receptacles etc. through out the RCL, the snow melt system power supply cannot be derived from the RCL. Again a result of poor design configuration management.

Assure compliance with technical requirements including codes & standards.
On 5-06-09 the Owner of Misko Inspection agency wrote a NCR for all welding performed on the RCL project. Misko believes that YMC is not following ERT's Quality Assurance Program. In Misko's view, YMC was not providing Misko with adequate information and became non responsive to Misko's needs.

Outage requests submitted timely.
No issues.

Quality and cooperation of superintendents.
Superintendents need to be more active in their subtiers plans and shedule activities. On 5-18-09 YMC scheduled a vendor to open and set all of the Phoenix valves, however Nash Electrical wasn't ready to

bring power to the valves yet. The Phenix valves are assembled in the closed position and require a vendor to use software at the thermostat to open them. YMC was forced to send their vendor away for the day. YMC had scheduled the startup of the exhaust fan and AC units for 5-19-09, with ATS coming in behind them Wednesday to program the VAV supply air units. The lack of coordination between Nash Electrical and YMC cost further delays in the completion of the project.

YMC Superintendents continue to try and manage the project to the best of their abilities. They are easy to work with and take suggestions by other seriously. They are learning but still lack experience.

Home office support.
ERT home office personnel have played a larger role in the project during the month of May. It has not been determined if it has been effective yet.

Sub tier performance.
YMC Mechancial:
YMC needs to receive engineering direction before they begin installation of system configurations and locations, such as mounting the hot water recirculation system on top of an airhanlder. Or supporting the HDPE suspect waste sump with unistrut and plywood, without it being engineered.

YMC's work in the Analtical side of MFC-752 is exteremly slow. It is realized that working in a RBA has its challenges, however it has been noted by "others" that there continues to be a lack of adequate supervison by YMC when working in the AL. There doesn't seem to be a sense of urgency with the work activities being completed on the AL side. A suggestion would be to place a full time Supervisor with the pipefitter crew to direct work, control work activities, or the lack thereof.

Idaho Abatement:
No issues for this performance period.

ATS Inland NW:
ATS has been very cooperative and helpful in explaining to the customer the RCL LM and BM systems.

Quality Electric:
No issues for this performance period.

Nash Electric Inc:
No issues for this performance period.

Fire Protecton Services:
It was noted by the customer that FPS provided very good NOTIFER Fire Alarm System training during this performance period.

Connective Computer Cabling:
On 5-26-09 BEA met with CCC a Subtier of Nash Electrical to discuss the network switch and UPS that had not been installed in the RCL communciations room yet. CCC had no intentions of providing these devices and intentionally left them out of their bid to Nash Electrical even though the RFP and ERT's specification stated that they would be provided. CCC stated that they would honor the specification and would write a CFP asking clarfication on specifics for the RCL, such as how many CPUs would be used etc. However this CFP was never sent to BEA leaving BEA in the dark for several weeks. CCC didn't ask anymore questions nor did they provide any equipement. This delayed the testing of the RCL BMS.

3-D Fire Protection:
No issues for this performance period.

Ross Fork Painting:
No issues for this performance period.

Idaho Interiors:
No issues for this performance period.

Management support.
See management of work.

3. QUALITY ASSURANCE/INSPECTION 200 pts

Factors to consider: 1) Degree of implementation of the suppliers documented QA Program as required by the Subcontract.; 2) Control of subtiers; 3) Responses to assessment findings, NCR's; 4) SDR's, NDE and testing is performed adequately to assure goods meet contractual requirements; 5) Inspection of materials and services provided by subtiers include both source and receiving inspections; 6) Timely notice of hold points for BEA's witnessing of the inspection; and 7) Successful completion of the inspection as scheduled so as not to cause BEA to waste resources.

Degree of implementation of the suppliers documented QA Program as required by the Subcontract.
On 5-06-09 the Owner of Misko Inspection agency wrote a NCR for all welding performed on the RCL project. Misko believes that YMC is not following ERT's Quality Assurance Program. In Misko's view, YMC was not providing Misko with adequate information and became non responsive to Misko's requests for information.

ERT PM canceled the steam & condensate outage which YMC had scheduled for 5-19-09 and 5-20-09. ERT and Misko continue to have problems with YMC's management providing all the required documentation in support of NCR #7. Also, ES2 still hadn't provided the appropriate acceptance criteria for the steam and condensate tie-in testing. These issues are delaying the completion of this project.

Control of subtiers.
YMC has been installing steam and condensate pipe in the AL for a very long time. YMC began dropping the new steam pipe, valve, etc down from overhead, to a location in front of an existing 480V air compressor. BEA had to explain to YMC NEC code requirements regarding access to equipment and required distances driven by code. YMC had to reconfigure their steam pipe in order to stay clear of the AL air compressor. As stated in last months SPES, ERT needs to have their Specialty Inspector on the jobsite at least one day a week to perform random surveillances. Because of the lack of QA oversight by ERT's Quality group, mistakes continue to happen because ERTs subtiers to not possess the knowledge or background to understand code requirements of all disciples, nor should they be required to. By not having adequate QA oversight, ERT has cost themselves, their subtiers, and BEA time and money on this project.

Responses to assessment findings, NCRs.
ERT still lacks the will to add obvious problems to their deficiency list without being prodded by BEA. The spaulding concrete in the RCL Gas Storage Room has been evident for months, but ERT chooses not to formally address the issue until persuaded.

SDR's, NDE and testing is performed adequately to assure goods meet contractual requirement.
No issues.

Inspection of materials and services provided by subtiers include both source and receiving inspections.
Not applicable.

Timely notice of hold points for BEA's witnessing of the inspection.
BEA Quality provides temporary oversight only.

Successful completion of the inspection as scheduled so as not to cause BEA to waste resources.
No issues.

4. DELIVERY/SCHEDULE 200 pts

For subcontracts in which an automated evaluation can be used, the following method shall be used:

$$\frac{\text{Days Late}}{\text{* Period of Performance}} = \text{Lead Time Variance (LTV\%)}$$

* Effective date is used as the start of the period of performance.
* The delivery due date is the ending date of the period of performance.

LTV	INDEX		POSSIBLE POINTS		SCORE
- .000	1.00	x	200	=	200
.001 - .030	.95	x	200	=	190
.031 - .060	.90	x	200	=	180
.061 - .090	.85	x	200	=	170
.091 - .120	.80	x	200	=	160

For subcontracts where a manual evaluation is to be performed, apply the following criteria:
1) Short range schedules submitted timely and accurately reflects the actual work,
2) Long Range Schedule (actual vs. scheduled) 3) Schedule of Values 4) Maintain Schedule.

Short range schedules submitted timely and accurately reflects the actual work.
ERT struggles with providing real system testing dates.

ERT constructed the RCL system testing schedule and placed dates on it without having procedures written, or with having comments on previously submitted procedures addressed and answered. ERT seems to be inexperienced with how systems should be tested and what documentation would normally be required, such as test procedures, start-up procedures etc.

Long Range Schedule (actual vs. scheduled).
On 5-11-09 BEA Subcontract Administrator sent ERT Home Office a Letter Of Concern because ERT is not complete with the RCL project and 5-11-09 was the contractual end date. SA gave ERT until 5-14-09 to provide a written response to BEA on how ERT is going to make necessary correction and bring the schedule into compliance.

Schedule of Values.
Adequate.