Chris Duncan/DUNCCJ/CC01/INEEL/US
Sent by: Chris J Duncan

01/26/2009 07:42 AM

To Daniel P Neff/NEFFDP/CC01/INEEL/US@INEL
cc
bcc
Subject SPES

Dan -

The SPES I did before Christmas takes into account all of December, so their won't be a SPES to go with the last invoice.

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

Order No. 73577 SPES #9 (11-01-08 to 12-18-08) Response Due Date: Not requried

Supplier:	Eagle Rock Timber Inc.	3000 Wright Road	Idaho Falls	ID	83401
	Name	Address	City	State	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	170
2. Technical Performance	0-225	175
* 3. Quality Assurance/Inspection	0-200	175
4. Delivery/Schedule	0-200	180
* 5. Vendor Data	0-100	90
6. Administration	0-50	35
Total Possible	1,000	Total 825

* 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	12-22-08
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	20
25	Submittals (Manpower report, Safety Meeting Minutes, Timely.)	25
35	POD's and Weekly Tool Box Meetings conducted	25
30	Daily and Weekly Inspections performed	25
35	General attitude, list any safety violations	20

Attendance at required meetings has been poor. Many of ERT's subtiers do not attend the prejob briefing in the morning. Most notably Nash Electric and Highlander Masonry supervision.

Safety Violations:

#09-0038

On 11-13-08 an ERT employee was observed improperly using a step ladder in the RCL basement. The step ladder was being used as an extension ladder.

#09-0046

On 11-18-08 **(Repeat)** an ERT employee was observed improperly using a step ladder in the RCL basement. The step ladder was being used as an extension ladder.

#09-0049

On 11-20-08 a subcontractor arrived at the jobsite with sheetrock and metal studs without first going through a preplanning meeting. The subcontractor had no work control and no proof of the boom truck operator having mobile crane certification. The work activity was not addressed on the prejob briefing.

On 11-18-08 the masonry subcontractor could not produce proof and record of training, such as scaffold erector, user, and inspector, fall protection, PPE, power tools etc.

On 11-17-08 an ERT pickup leaked antifreeze to the ground and workers had to be told to clean up the spill by BEA personnel. The same pickup did not have proper signage to be inside MFC.

#09-0065

On 12-10-08 it was noted that ERT's assured equipment grounding was not current, and ERT had missed the entire 3rd quarter.

On 12-09-08 ERT had constructed access up onto the RCL foundation by stacking CMUs on top of each other, in lieu of providing secure adequate means.

On 12-08-08 ERT was issued a safety violation because of excess debris scattered through out the RCL basement floor.

#09-0073
On 12-16-08 **(Repeat)** the RCL basement and stairwell were noted to have trash and debris scattered throughout.

On 12-18-08 a Mason was observed laying block without safety glasses on.

On 12-08-08 it was observed that the Masons were using a weed burner (open flame) to heat their mortar mixer. A fire extinguisher was to far away for this activity.

On 12-18-08 a Mason was operating a block saw without hearing protection.

On 12-17-08 ERT was using a light string which was causing the bang board breaker to continually trip. Too many cords were plugged into the light string.

On 12-16-08 Subcontractor's scaffold was not cleated.

35 Housekeeping: 25

40 Adherence to Safety Plan: 30

Adequate except as noted above.

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
ERT's ability to manage work still has room for improvement. Project and contractual documentation needs to be provided to ERT's customer much quicker. ERT management needs to act aggressive and manage their engineering, suppliers, and sub tiers accordingly. ERT management's passive approach has not worked well.

The RCL door and window frames have caused delays in the project. The frames should have been on site prior to Highlander Masonry commencing work. The Architectural Drawings were revised on 6-21-08 to add an additional drawing (A-11). Drawing A-11 depicts a door schedule which has never been modified. Highland Masonry arrived back at MFC on 11-24-08 ready to begin their block work but promptly left the site when ERT told them the door and window frames were not on site yet. Between 6-21-08 and 11-24-08 (5 months) ERT was unable to secure basic door and window frames. ERT failed to procure according to the construction schedule.

Workmanship; performed in a professional manner resulting in top quality goods and services.
Some of the block walls are rough and will require attention prior to acceptance. Other sub tier work has been adequate.

Engineering capabilities and expertise applied as needed and with cooperation.
YMC mechanical foreman has provided ES2 and ERT with valuable field engineering data, including isometric layouts of each pipe system to include steam & condensate, soft water, hot water supply & return. This information provided ES2 and ERT most of the necessary engineering for the mechanical systems as they relate to MFC-752 Analytical Laboratory.

On 11-19-08 ES2 Mechanical Engineer, YMC General Superintendent, YMC Mechanical Foreman, and BEA toured through the Analytical Lab basement again. ES2's Mechanical Engineer is the only Engineer from ES2 willing to put forth enough effort to walk-down the project in person.

BEA appreciates ERT's willingness to comply with additional USQ requirements imposed on the project. ERT has complied with this restriction and continues to work through the issues.

Assure compliance with technical requirements including codes & standards.
ERT needs to instill in their masonry sub tier the importance of following codes & standards associated with block work. The consequences of not following these codes & standards can be costly.

Outage requests submitted timely.
ERT has asked for two electrical, one sewer, and one fire water outage to date. CFR did not require ERT to submit the outage requests to him. No issues.

Quality and cooperation of superintendents.
Again as noted in the prevous SPES, ERT Superintendent needs to think activites through better before going forward with them. On 11-19-08 the Superintendent ordered concrete for the first topping placement late in the afternoon. The concrete truck didn't arrive at the jobsite until 3:00 p.m. ERT and BEA support were at the jobsite until 12:30 a.m. finishing and trying to cover the concrete. The slab was actually finished at 9:00 a.m. on 11-20-08. The secound half of the topping slab wasn't placed until 12-02-08, 13-calander days after the first half of the topping slab was placed. The second topping slab was delayed because the elevator block walls were not installed and cured in a timely manner. The second topping was placed on hollow core slabs that were 20 to 24 degrees fahrenheit. This was a poor decision. The concrete was finished the next day and continually worked over by a concrete finisher until approximatley 4:00 p.m. 12-03-08. The hollow cores should have been covered, heated and brought up to temperature prior to placement. The heater being used to heat the RCL basement kept failing. ERT superintendent had no back up plan. There wasn't an alternate heater secured in case the first heater failed. This again is exteremly poor planning.

On 12-08-08 the masons blocked over the only RCL window and had to demo the block out. ERT Supervison needs to keep in front of the masons and work with them better to help stop the rework activies.

Home office support.
Reference Management of Work.

Sub tier performance.
YMC Mechancial:
YMC's field crew continues to perform well during this performance period. They are eager to please and willing to provide and install what the project asks.

YMC Management is struggling with obtaining a proper JSA from their sub tier Idaho Abatement. Multipule JSA submittals have been sent to BEA, and each time a significant issue with the document has arisen.

Continental Steel:
On 11-10-08 CSI sent a welder out to the jobsite without any weld rod or a method in which to preheat the steel prior to welding. CSI didn't bring out a rattle gun to tighten the structural steel nuts and bolts. Once again CSI was totally unprepared to perform any type of work. Their performance continues to leave plenty of room for improvement.

Teton Prestress:
On 11-13-08 Teton Prestress with CCI set the hollow core slabs. Both Teton Prestress and their sub tier (CCI) performed their work in a professional manner and were very responsive to BEA.

Highlander Masonry:
On 11-17-08 Highlander Masonry attended their preplanning meeting with ERT and BEA as required by the special conditions. Highlander struggles at times to grasp the importance of scaffolding requirements. It would serve Highlander Masonry better if they would purchase adequate scaffolding plank, in lieu of wasting time culling through trailer loads of unusable planks.

Highlander Masonry Supervison needs to be apart of ERT's prejob briefings everyday. ERT and their other sub tiers do not know if their assistance will be needed by the masons for the day, etc.

On 11-21-08 Highlander Masonry grouted the elevator walls and had three (3) unnecessary blowouts. As journeyman masons Highlander Masonry should know better than to try and grout 10-feet of wall in one evolution.

On 12-09-08 the masons grouted the north and north west walls. The walls were again to high to properly grout. The Misko Inspector had several issues with this activity. The masons did not vibrate the block cells as the grout was being pumped in. This is a code violation and an NCR was written.

Nash Electric Inc:
Nash Electric employees need to be apart of ERT's prejob briefings everyday. ERT and their sub tiers are unaware of Nash Electric's work activities, or if those activities will impact other sub tier's work plans for the day.

On 11-20-08 ERT encountered a large ground cable while excavating for the fire water tie in. Due to the late hour MFC plant services electricians were unavailable. MFC Compelx Manager asked if ERT's electrical subcontractor would verify zero energy at the cable. CFR called Nash Electric Superintendent who went out of his way to drive from CFA to MFC at 5:00 p.m. to test the cable. BEA recognizes and appreciates the great support Nash Electric has provided to the RCL project.

3-D Fire Protection:
Performed well on the underground firewater tie in and testing. Installation of the RCL basement sprinkler lines are also proceeding well. 3-D personnel are doing well coordinating with other crafts such as YMC to ensure no piping and ducting conflicts arise.

Idaho Interiors:
On 12-01-08 Idaho Interiors attended their preplanning meeting with ERT and BEA as required by the special conditons. Idaho Interiors seemed to grasp the safety related aspects of working at the INL better than some of ERT's other sub tiers. No issues.

Management support.
Reference Home office support.

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 needs to do a better job at providing approved design change control documents (CCRs) prior to non approved work commencing. This method of design change control is becoming a habit for ERT, and needs to stop.

Misko Inspector is an asset to the RCL project. Inspector is very conscientious and confident in his abilities. Inspector tries to help ERT resolve their NCRs by providing ideas on how to effectively close them out, such as performing infrared thermography on the block walls to look for voids in the CMUs.

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

Responses to assessment findings, NCRs.
ERT needs to be more aggressive at resolving NCRs. The topping slab NCRs should have been resolved before Highlander Masonry began installing block walls on top of it.

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.
ERT has improved in providing their inspectors with adequate notice of inspections.

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

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.
Most of the SRSs have been submitted timely during this performance period. However the schedules need to provide more detail.

Long Range Schedule (actual vs. scheduled).
The CPM schedule submitted on 11-22-08 is adequate.

Schedule of Values.
On 10-30-08 BEA Project Coordinator requested that the SOV be broken down further. One of YMC's line items titled "Drain Waste & Vent" has an enormous dollar value which cannot be explained. At Construction Status Meeting #13 on 11-20-08, BEA was informed by ERT that YMC refuses to break the line item down. This greatly disappoints BEA and is definitely outside the realm of "Partnering".

Maintain Schedule.
Some activities are slipping such as the installation of the RCL roof which has a start date of 12-15-08, per CPM dated 11-22-08.

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 has been good at submitting contractual vendor data.

Some vendor data submittals which ERT has agreed to provide to BEA, continue to have outstanding comments.

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.
BEA did not receive an invoice for nearly two months since the previous invoice. Invoice #9 had to be revised to reflect NCR conditions and YMC's "Drain Waste & Vent" line item.

BEA Subcontract Administrator has asked ERT Management multiple times to provide adequate and timely cost proposals for outstanding CFPs. In order to help ERT, SA has scheduled RCL resolution meetings every other week, between construction status meetings. The resolution meeting is scheduled to help ERT and their sub tiers actively pursue resolving cost and schedule issues with BEA. However ERT and their sub tiers are never prepared to discuss these issues.

CFPs 007r1, 016r1, 017, 018, 019, 021, 022, and 023 cost proposals have not been submitted to BEA. Some of these CFPs were issued in October 2008.

Fair, equitable, and ethical contract administration.
BEA does not feel that it is fair that ERT will not provide CFP cost and potential schedule impacts to them. BEA struggles with anticipating additional cost and days to the project, and doesn't want ERT to wait until the end of the project.

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 has worked with BEA in trying to overcome the unanticipated USQ issues that have risen. However to truly be responsive to their customer, ERT needs to provide requested information to BEA, such as resolving drawing and specification comments, providing adequate schedules, schedule of values and cost proposals.

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

Order No. 73577 SPES #10 (for the month of January) Response Due Date: Not requried

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	205
* 3. Quality Assurance/Inspection	0-200	190
4. Delivery/Schedule	0-200	150
* 5. Vendor Data	0-100	95
6. Administration	0-50	20
Total Possible	1,000	Total 825

* 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	2-09-08
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	25
30	Daily and Weekly Inspections performed	25
35	General attitude, list any safety violations	25

Weekly tool box meetings were not being conducted during this performance period, until BEA questioned ERT Supervision.

Scaffold inspections have been inadequate and poor during this performance period.

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, Highlander Masonry, and 3-D Fire Protection. Other sub tiers such as YMC attend on time and regularly.

Safety Violations:

#09-0092

On 1-05-09 it was noted by BEA Construction Safety that the RCL basement was strewn with trash and that the main floor of the RCL had personnel working on it with excessive snow and ice build up on it. It was also noted that the RCL basement lighting was inadequate to perform work.

#09-0098

On 1-20-09 it was noted that trash was again allowed to accumulate in the work area, this time around ladders. Scaffolding being used by workers was not fully decked. Access to the scaffolding was gained by a ladder situated at an improper angle.

#09-0104

On 1-29-09 it was noted that the RCL main floor had an accumulation of ice in some areas, which workers were continually exposed to. A fire extinguisher staged in the work area had not been inspected and dated accordingly. Scaffolding being used by workers on the exterior of the RCL was unlevel, and had wheels in stead of mud sills at the base.

35	Housekeeping:	20
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 January remains much the same as the previous performance period. Project issues and concerns are not being addressed and resolved in a timely manner. ERT Management does not seem to share the same sense of urgency that BEA does with issues and concerns. Issues such as the fire rated RCL roof system design, and the mechanical package cost both ERT and BEA time and money if they are not aggressively acted upon.

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

The block walls are rough and will require attention prior to acceptance. Other sub tier work has been adequate.

Engineering capabilities and expertise applied as needed and with cooperation.

The mechanical package containing all of the piping systems e.g. steam & condensate, soft water, hot water supply & return began on 11-07-08. BEA didn't receive the mechanical package from ERT until 1-19-09. This is far too much time for this amount of engineering. Especially for such a crucial part of the completion of the RCL project.

Some issues have been resolved fairly quickly by ERT's engineering group, such as calculations for supporting conduit for temporary power.

Assure compliance with technical requirements including codes & standards.

ERT tries to design and construct following all codes and standards.

Outage requests submitted timely.

No issues.

Quality and cooperation of superintendents.

ERT has made great strides in providing a responsible Superintendent for the project beginning during this performance period. The Superintenedent has exihbited more of a company attitude, and care of how activities are progressing. On 1-20-09 the ready mix company brought out grout for the masonry work. The grout was the wrong slump, and in stead of taking a chance that engineering would accept the higher slump, he sent the truck back to the ready mix plant, and had another truck come out.

This Superintendent listens to his crew and customers and takes advice without feeling threatened.

Home office support.

Reference Management of Work.

Sub tier performance.

YMC Mechancial:

YMC's field crew continues to perform well during this performance period. YMC struggles to understand the invoicing process at the INL, and would benefit from reading and understanding the project contract.

Highlander Masonry:
This sub tier needs to improve their safety culture. They were a handful for ERT and BEA during the performance of their work. It is suggested that Highlander Masonry take OSHA safety classes to improve and gain some knowledge regarding safety not only for work at the INL but on every project they may be working on.

Highlander Masonry Supervison seldom particiaptes in ERT's prejob briefings. This was noted on the previous SPES but no action was taken by ERT to remedy this.

Nash Electric Inc:
Nash Electric employees are still not attending ERT's prejob briefings. This was noted on the previous SPES but no action was taken by ERT to remedy this. ERT and their sub tiers are unaware of Nash Electric's work activities, or if those activities will impact other sub tier's work plans for the day.

Nash Electric installation of conduit and elecrtical components have been installed in a professional manner.

3-D Fire Protection:
Installation of the RCL basement sprinkler lines has proceeded well. This sub tier also never attends prejob briefings.

Management support.
Reference Home office support.

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 has effectively answered their NCRs, such as core drilling the topping slab and providing substantial data from engineering to support accepting the conditions listed in NCR 3 and 4.

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

Responses to assessment findings, NCRs.
On 1-07-09 BEA Quality Assurance Engineer red tagged certain areas of the RCL. ERT effectively handled the situation with open communication and resolved the issues in a timely manner.

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.
ERT would benefit from having their inspectors perform periodic inspections on the project. It would help to avoid rework and customer concerns. BEA is not required to witness inspections for this project.

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

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 has improved.

Long Range Schedule (actual vs. scheduled).
The CPM schedule submitted on 1-05-09 was not adequate. The contract has not been extended yet, and the CPM showed an end date of 5-12-09. This contract requirement was not met during this performance period.

Schedule of Values.
ERT continues to have problems integrating their CPM schedule with their SOV, as spelled out in the Special Conditions Section 20 and section 8.1 of this contract. This is a contractual requirement that is not being met. The CPM ERT submitted for this performance period has an incorrect end date. Therefore the CPM is not valid.

Maintain Schedule.
Per the last approved CPM dated 10-28-08, ERT is approximately five (5) weeks behind schedule with no obvious plan to regain lost days.

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.

ERT has shown some improvement at resubmitting vendor data quicker than in previous performance periods.

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 was provided a spread sheet with a project time line of events from BEA, but to BEA's knowledge, ERT has not put any effort toward reviewing this information. The RCL is listed as being five weeks behind schedule which is very disappointing to BEA.

ERT is making it very difficult to determine the actual project percentage complete because ERT won't provide a timely accurate CPM schedule. This slows down payment of an invoice and makes it more difficult when the line item identifies installation when it is really both "installation and material" making it time consuming to distinguish costs for labor.

Fair, equitable, and ethical contract administration.
ERT's performance is one of the worst BEA has ever encountered regarding waiting for final resolution on CFP/Cs. ERT makes it very difficult for BEA to determine where ERT is at with the contract, even though most of the CFP/Cs have been issued unilaterally.

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 needs to make adjustments as noted and requested to keep up contractual requirements and maintain their partnering agreement.

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

Order No. 73577 SPES #11 (for the month of February) 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	180
2. Technical Performance	0-225	210
* 3. Quality Assurance/Inspection	0-200	195
4. Delivery/Schedule	0-200	185
* 5. Vendor Data	0-100	95
6. Administration	0-50	40
Total Possible	1,000	Total 905

* 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	3-06-09
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. This is a habitual occurrence which ERT allows to continue.

Safety Violations:

#09-0109

On 2-03-09 a CAT III safety violation was issued to ERT for having a fire extinguisher available for use without current inspection identified.

On 2-03-09 a CAT III safety violations was issued to ERT for allowing workers to perform work on scaffolding without all the handrails in place.

On 2-05-09 a CAT III safety violation was issued to ERT for allowing three (3) workers to use ladders without having been ladder trained.

#09-0113

On 2-11-09 a CAT III safety violation was issued to ERT for using scaffolding that was not level or plumb.

On 2-12-09 a CAT III safety violation was issued to ERT when scaffold planking was raised up, but the handrails associated with the scaffolding were not, and a man was observed working from the raised platform.

On 2-12-09 a CAT III safety violation was issued to ERT when it was noted that workers were using a laser for layout, and didn't have the area posted to warn others of the hazard.

#09-021

On 2-27-09 a CAT II safety violation was issued to ERT for allowing their sub tier (YMC) to weld stainless steel ducting without calibrating their personal sampling pump to determine proper flow and volume. No qualitative sampling analysis was available to determine that the worker did not require the use of a respirator while performing the task.

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 February is getting better, but still has room for improvement. Project issues and concerns are being addressed in a timelier manner. Cost proposals still need to be provided for CFPs. 16r1, 19, 21r1 and 28. Some of these have been out since October of 2008.

ERT management needs to coordinate with their sub tiers more frequently. It would help alleviate some of the confusion between lower tiers. On 2-12-09 Nash Electric asked ERT's Superintendent which company was going to install conduit and wiring for the Alerton controllers and sensors, since it isn't in Nash Electric's contract, and ERT wants to begin installing gypsum board on 2-16-09. This came as a great surprise to the Superintendent. The company hired by YMC to perform this work hadn't even been contacted. This is a prime example of ERT's inability to communicate and coordinate with their sub tiers.

ERT management sent out blow-in insulation without submitting the MSDS to BEA first. A little forethought by ERT management would have alleviated the stop work that was issued by BEA Industrial Hygiene on 2-25-09. ERT was not prepared to perform sampling during the placement of the insulation, nor were any of their workers trained to a respirator program. This resulted in a delay to the project, by having to schedule physicals and respirator fit test on their workers.

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 speaks for itself.

Assure compliance with technical requirements including codes & standards.

ERT tries to design and construct following all codes and standards.

Outage requests submitted timely.

No issues.

Quality and cooperation of superintendents.

ERT's greatest assest is the current RCL Superintendent. The Superintedent encourages his sub tiers to complete their work in order to stay on schedule. He is aggressive and has taken ownership of the RCL project.. He is not easily frustrated and stays the course. On 2-02-09 he culled his crew and laid off individuals not contributing to the project. On Friday 2-27-09 and Saturday 2-28-09 he worked with his crew to blow-in the insulataion for the RCL roof system. He makes an honest effort to keep up with ERT's

schedule.

Home office support.
Reference Management of Work.

Sub tier performance.
YMC Mechancial:
YMC is struggeling to keep up with ERT's aggressive schedule. ERT Superintendent had to cancel piping inspections on 2-16-09 because the RCL basement piping systems were not ready yet.

Idaho Abatement:
On 2-18-09 two (2) Idaho Abatement workers were scheduled to take Rad II training at the Central Facilites, but failed to attend. This cost BEA over $700.00 per man, to enroll them in the class.

Nash Electric Inc:
Nash Electric is very safety concious, works well with others, exibits good craftmanship, but refuses to attend ERT's prejob briefings. At least one (1) representative from Nash Electric with the day's work details should attend the prejob briefings so that the prime subcontractor and sub tiers are aware of Nash's work activites for the day. This has been noted on multipule SPES but no action has been taken by ERT to remedy the concern.

3-D Fire Protection:
Installation of the RCL basement sprinkler lines has proceeded well. This sub tier has attended prejob briefings during this performance period. 3-D works well with others and accomadates other crafts with rerouting sprinkler lines.

Robison Roofing:
Have performed well during this performance period.

Management support.
Reference Home office support.

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.
No issues for the month of February.

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

Responses to assessment findings, NCRs.
No issues for the month of February.

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.
ERT's electrical inspector performed a large inspection for the work Nash Electric had performed in the RCL basement. No rework was required.

2-17-09 ERT's mechanical inspector witnessed pneumatic testing of all the piping systems in the RCL basement. No rework was required.

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

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 ERT's better attempts at providing a substantial schedule.

Schedule of Values.
Adequate.

Maintain Schedule.
Due to the negotiation process and agreements made during construction status meetings the CPM schedule sent to BEA on 2-23-09 would indicate ERT is on schedule during the month of February.