540.19
10/03/2006
Rev. 01

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

Order No. 73577 SPES #1 (4-15-08)

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: Robert Waters

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	225
2. Technical Performance	0-225	215
* 3. Quality Assurance/Inspection	0-200	190
4. Delivery/Schedule	0-200	190
* 5. Vendor Data	0-100	100
6. Administration	0-50	40
Total Possible	1,000	Total 960

* 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.

Rater Printed Name	Rater Signature	Date
Chris Duncan		

{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	30
30	Daily and Weekly Inspections performed	30
35	General attitude, list any safety violations	30

In this early stage of the project, ERT has exhibited a strong safety culture, and has elected to intermittently utilize their Construction Safety Officer as additional over site during the design and construction phases of the project. ERT's overall attitude toward safety is good as they have shown a willingness to provide a safe work environment for their employees.

ERT has been proactive in helping their lower tier subcontractors with developing JSAs and explaining what is expected of them on a DOE facility.

ERT submitted their mobilization, excavation and concrete JSA on 3-3-08, well before the start of construction work. The JSA was reviewed by BEA CM as well as ES&H organizations and returned to ERT twice, with minor comments.

35 Housekeeping: — 35

Activities have been minimal, with good housekeeping displayed.

40 Adherence to Safety Plan: — 40

ERT has performed work under the desgin effort and within the limitations of their approved JSA.

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 design build effort has been challenging for ERT.

Workmanship; performed in a professional manner resulting in top quality goods and services.
Minimal physical work as been performed. No issues.

Engineering capabilities and expertise applied as needed and with cooperation.
ERT is pursuing the RCL design, and has submitted a floor plan draft to BEA. No issues.

Assure compliance with technical requirements including codes & standards.
Unknown at this time. RCL specification and design has not been submitted to BEA to date.

Outage requests submitted timely.
Not applicable at this time.

Quality and cooperation of superintendents.
ERT Superintendent has been proactive in supporting BEA with subsurface investigations and has done a good job in supervising during the limited amount of physical work activities. However, ERT superintendent needs to submit daily reports when performing physcial work.

Home office support.
No issues.

Sub tier performance.
No issues.

Management support.
No issues.

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.
Subcontractor has submitted two QPP drafts and is currently finalizing the document for submittal.

Control of subtiers.
Unknown at this time. QPP has not been submitted for approval.

Responses to assessment findings, NCRs.
Not applicable at this time.

SDR's, NDE and testing is performed adequately to assure goods meet contractual requirement.
Not applicable at this time.

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

Timely notice of hold points for BEA's witnessing of the inspection.
Not applicable at this time.

Successful completion of the inspection as scheduled so as not to cause BEA to waste resources.
Not applicable at this time.

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 has submitted one SRS. The SRS should have reflected work under the design effort only. Main excavation activities were depicted on the SRS, without an approved CPM schedule.

Long Range Schedule (actual vs. scheduled).
Initial bar chart schedule was submitted on 3-24-08, 24 days late. Special Conditions require a bar chart schedule to be issued 7 days after contract award.

Initial CPM schedule was due 14 days after award. CPM has not been issued to BEA as of 4-15-08. 39 days late.

Final CPM schedule was required to be submitted 28 days after the contract award date of 2-22-08. As of 4-15-08 the schedule has not be submitted. 25 days late.

However, due to this project being a Design-Build it is unrealistic to expect a CPM schedule so quickly after award, when the QPP and Design require a substantial amount of time to complete.

Schedule of Values.
SOV was submitted 3-26-08, two days after the initial bar chart, and 26 days late. ERT needs to review the Special Conditions, Section 20 (Design/Construction Schedule/Schedule Of Values) and implement all the information required in an SOV.

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.
Vendor data item #1 has been submitted. No issues.

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

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.
No progress reports have been submitted to BEA to date. One invoice has been submitted but needs to be resubmitted after the CPM is submitted, in order to match up line item activities.

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

Support of supplier's upper management to assure successful completion of the work.
ERT management supports the project, but seems to have difficulty submitting required contractual documentation in the time specified in the contract.

Responsiveness to BEA, the customer.
ERT tries to accommodate BEA, but seems to be struggling as indicated above.

540.19
10/03/2006
Rev. 01

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

Order No. 73577 SPES #2 (5-15-08) 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: Robert Waters

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	220
2. Technical Performance	0-225	215
* 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 950

* 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		
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	30
30	Daily and Weekly Inspections performed	30
35	General attitude, list any safety violations	35

ERT continues to exhibit a strong safety culture, and intermittently utilizes their Construction Safety Officer as additional safety over site. ERT's Superintendent has been cautious during excavation and demolition activities, and has actively kept the CFR and BEA Construction Safety abreast of all activities. Superintendent has a questioning attitude, and relies on ERT and BEA support organizations in helping determine appropriate methods for performing construction activities. ERT excavation crew has displayed a very good attitude as well, and willingly complies with all safety requirements.

ERT Superintendent has given good Prejob briefings to his crew and BEA support organization, every morning. Superintendent ensures that everyone present understands the work activities for the day, the hazards associated with the work, and everyone's roles and responsibilities.

ERT Superintendent did not perform, or show evidence of performing a "Weekly Tool Box Meeting" for this crew, the week of 5-05-08.

35	Housekeeping:	35

ERT has kept there job site orderly during demolition and excavation activities.

40	Adherence to Safety Plan:	40

ERT worked to their JSAs, with no issues noted. ERT Superintendent will continue to benefit from reading and understating the SRM requirement documents.

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 design build effort continues to be challenging for ERT.

Workmanship; performed in a professional manner resulting in top quality goods and services.
Only demolition and vacuum excavation activities have been performed thus far in the project. No issues.

Engineering capabilities and expertise applied as needed and with cooperation.
ERT continues to pursue the RCL design, and is currently working to an engineer stamped excavation drawing.

Assure compliance with technical requirements including codes & standards.
RCL specification and design requiring technical scrutiny has not been submitted to BEA to date.

ERT failed to notify BEA of their intention of bringing major equipment on site, such as the 370 John Deere excavator. This is a SRM requirement, in which the subcontractor is obligated to submit a Major Equipment Declaration INL Form 432.30.

Outage requests submitted timely.
ERT has asked for one outage to date. CFR did not require ERT to submit the outage to him. No issues.

Quality and cooperation of superintendents.
ERT Superintendent continues to be proactive in supporting BEA. Superintendent is continuing to progress in his role.

Home office support.
Always available to answer all BEA project questions and concerns.

Sub tier performance.
Nash Electric Inc. is the only sub tier to perform any work on the project to date. No issues with Nash.

Management support.
No issues.

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.
Subcontractor has submitted an overarching QPP, which only identified design and testing requirements. Inspection and Acceptance requirements by code or the designer are not identified at this time.

Control of subtiers.
Nash Electric Inc. is the only sub tier which has been on the project to date. Nash has submitted their JSA with minimal comments, and has willingly supported the first power outage. No issues.

Responses to assessment findings, NCRs.
Not applicable at this time.

SDR's, NDE and testing is performed adequately to assure goods meet contractual requirement.
Not applicable at this time.

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

Timely notice of hold points for BEA's witnessing of the inspection.
Not applicable at this time.

Successful completion of the inspection as scheduled so as not to cause BEA to waste resources.
Not applicable at this time.

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

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 needs to pay more attention to detail before they submit their SRS'. They need to ensure simple items read correctly, such as project titles, contract numbers etc. Two SRS' have been submitted for approval for the two weeks that ERT has been working. Both SRS' were late. However since confronting ERT on this issue, they have made more effort in providing accurate, detailed SRS'.

Long Range Schedule (actual vs. scheduled).
Three (3) CPM schedules have been submitted to BEA to date. The first CPM was submitted and rejected on 4-20-08. The second CPM was submitted and rejected on 4-28-08. The CPMs were rejected due to starting dates which had already gone by, prior to the CPMs being submitted. Some of the activities on the CPM were not broken down to an acceptable level, with some items having large amounts of work, and showing only one or two line items. With some concessions, BEA accepted the third CPM on 5-05-08, with the understanding that the CPM would have more line items added as ERT's sub tiers completed their portions of the RCL design.

Schedule of Values.
Three (3) SOVs were submitted. The initial SOV was submitted on 3-26-08. Second on 4-28-08, and the third on 5-06-08. The rejected SOVs were not matching up with their respective CPMs, line for line.

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 generous enough to submit non-required vendor data, such as a QPP, at the request of the project team, when only chemical inventory reporting as a requirement.

Quality, i.e., accuracy, legibility, correct no. of copies, and data correctly sorted.
Vendor data report #195860 (Testing Agency Certifications) was incomplete. The submittal did not state the ASTM D 3740 Laboratory Certification.

Vendor data report #195865 (Quality Program Plan) was incomplete. The submittal did not contain all items required in a QPP.

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

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.
Daily reports from the ERT Superintendent have been timely. No issues with invoice #2. CFP 01 cost proposal was submitted by ERT in a timely fashion, prior to the work being performed.

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

Support of supplier's upper management to assure successful completion of the work.
ERT management is committed and supports the project, but continues to have difficulty submitting required contractual documentation, such as the full QPP with the attached ASME NQA-1 2000 documentation.

ERT would benefit from pushing harder on their design firm, and to complete action items in a more timely manner.

Responsiveness to BEA, the customer.
ERT tries to accommodate BEA, but at times seems to be struggling as indicated above.

540.19
10/03/2006
Rev. 01

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

Order No. 73577 SPES #3 (6-04-08) 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	205
2. Technical Performance	0-225	215
* 3. Quality Assurance/Inspection	0-200	200
4. Delivery/Schedule	0-200	195
* 5. Vendor Data	0-100	95
6. Administration	0-50	40
Total Possible	1,000	Total 950

* 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		
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.)	20
35	POD's and Weekly Tool Box Meetings conducted	30
30	Daily and Weekly Inspections performed	30
35	General attitude, list any safety violations	25

ERT continues to exhibit a strong safety culture, and intermittently utilizes their Construction Safety Officer as additional safety over site. ERT's Superintendent continues to be cautious during excavation and demolition activities, and has actively kept the CFR and BEA Construction Safety abreast of all activities. Superintendent continues to exhibit a questioning attitude, and relies on ERT and BEA support organizations in helping determine appropriate methods for performing construction activities. ERT excavation crew has displayed a very good attitude as well, and willingly complies with all safety requirements. They performed well during the removal of the contaminated industrial waste line, having to follow RADCON's direction. ERT Equipment Operator (Jeff Plummer) has shown a light touch when excavating with the 370 excavator, and has shown great awareness when excavating.

ERT Superintendent continues to evaluate the RCL excavation, and fills out his excavation checklist daily. It has been noted that during prejob briefings, the Superintendent reminds his crew not to enter the excavation before the excavation checklist has been completed.

ERT Home Office did not provide the monthly manpower report for the month of May within the required specified time.

ERT Superintendent struggles to remember to perform his "Weekly Tool Box Meeting." Only one tool box meeting has been performed with ERT's crew to date.

One safety violation was issued to ERT by BEA Construction Safety Rep. on 5-20-08. The violation was issued as a CAT II for the Superintendent driving a dump truck without a CDL. The severity of the violation resulted from the Superintendent willing performing the act, after previous warnings from the Construction Safety Rep. ERT promptly provided a corrective action plan.

35	Housekeeping:	35

ERT has kept there job site and lay-down area orderly during demolition and excavation activities.

40	Adherence to Safety Plan:	40

ERT continues to work to their JSAs, with no issues noted. DOE Facility Rep. has reviewed ERT's JSAs and has no issues.

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 design build effort continues to be challenging for ERT. Physical work "in the field" is being adequately managed.

Workmanship; performed in a professional manner resulting in top quality goods and services.
Only demolition and minor mechanical and vacuum excavation activities have been performed thus far in the project. No issues.

Engineering capabilities and expertise applied as needed and with cooperation.
ERT continues to pursue the RCL design, and is currently working to an engineer stamped excavation drawing. ERT's design firm has submitted all the design drawings, but many lack sufficient detail. No specification has been submitted to date.

Assure compliance with technical requirements including codes & standards.
No issues at this time.

Outage requests submitted timely.
ERT has asked for one outage to date. CFR did not require ERT to submit the outage to him. No issues.

Quality and cooperation of superintendents.
ERT Superintendent continues to be proactive in supporting BEA. With the exception of the one safety violation, the Superintendent continues to show marked improvement.

Home office support.
Always available to answer all BEA project questions and concerns. Could possibly be overloading the RCL Project Manager.

Sub tier performance.
Nash Electric Inc. is the only sub tier to perform any work on the project to date. No issues with Nash.

Management support.
ERT Project Manager seems to be constantly inundated, and has some difficulty in providing requested documentation on committed dates, such as updated CPM, SOV, QPP Matrix, CFP cost proposals etc.

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.
Subcontractor submitted an overarching QPP on 4.29.08, which only identified design and testing requirements. Inspection and Acceptance requirements were not identified. The ASME NQA-1 2000 program was submitted for review on 6-03-08.

Control of subtiers.
Nash Electric Inc. is the only sub tier which has performed physical work on the project to date. Nash has submitted their JSA with minimal comments, and has willingly supported the first power outage, and implemented their assured ground program. No quality issues noted.

Responses to assessment findings, NCRs.
Not applicable at this time.

SDR's, NDE and testing is performed adequately to assure goods meet contractual requirement.

Not applicable at this time.

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

Timely notice of hold points for BEA's witnessing of the inspection.
Not applicable at this time.

Successful completion of the inspection as scheduled so as not to cause BEA to waste resources.
Not applicable at this time.

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.
The last two SRSs have been submitted on time. Marked improvement.

Long Range Schedule (actual vs. scheduled).
With some concessions, BEA accepted the third CPM on 5-05-08, with the understanding that the CPM would have more line items added as ERT's sub tiers completed their portions of the RCL design. The CPM has not been revised again to date.

Schedule of Values.
SOVs are being updated with each invoice.

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 be generous enough to submit non-required vendor data, at the request of the project team, when only chemical inventory reporting as a requirement. Some submittals have comments, and need to be addressed in a more timely fashion.

Quality, i.e., accuracy, legibility, correct no. of copies, and data correctly sorted.
No issues for the month of May 2008.

6. ADMINISTRATION 50 pts

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

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.
Daily reports from the ERT Superintendent have been timely. Invoice #3 has some issues regarding agreed upon dollar values. Other than CFP 01 cost proposal, the other four (4) cost proposals have been constantly requested by BEA, but have been non existent.

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

Support of supplier's upper management to assure successful completion of the work.
ERT management is committed and supports the project, but continues to have difficulty submitting required contractual documentation, such as the entire QPP, updated CPM, SOV, CFPs, Design Specifications, Cost Proposals etc.

ERT needs to do a better job at completing their action items in a timelier manner. Some action items drag on for weeks.

Responsiveness to BEA, the customer.
ERT tries to accommodate BEA, but is struggling as indicated above.

540.19
10/03/2006
Rev. 01

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

Order No. 73577 SPES #4 (7-16-08) 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	210
2. Technical Performance	0-225	200
* 3. Quality Assurance/Inspection	0-200	180
4. Delivery/Schedule	0-200	180
* 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		
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.)	20
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 continues to exhibit a good safety culture, and intermittently utilizes their Construction Safety Officer as additional safety over site. ERT's Superintendent has successfully completed the majority of the RCL basement excavation, without incident. Superintendent continues to exhibit a questioning attitude, and relies on ERT and BEA support organizations in helping determine appropriate methods for performing construction activities. ERT Superintendent has given his crew "Weekly Tool Box Meetings." during the month of June.

ERT Home Office did not provide the monthly manpower report for the month of June within the required specified time.

One safety violation was issued to ERT by BEA Construction Safety Rep. on 6-26-08. The violation was issued as a CAT III for the Pipefitter foreman walking into a construction area without safety glasses on. ERT quickly mitigated this issue by directing their mechanical subcontractor to provide subscription safety glasses to their employee.

35	Housekeeping:	35

ERT has kept their job site and lay-down areas orderly during demolition and excavation activities.

40	Adherence to Safety Plan:	35

ERT continues to work to their JSAs, with the exception of the isolated pipefitter incident.

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 design build effort continues to be very challenging for ERT, as is evident by the lack of substantial progress being made. Action items are very slow in being addressed and closed out. There doesn't appear to be a sense of urgency in completing the RCL design from ERT management. It is imperative that ERT address and resolve these action items, and complete the RCL design.

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

Mechanical and vacuum excavation activities have been performed well. Sanitary sewer installation was performed in a professional manner. No issues.

Engineering capabilities and expertise applied as needed and with cooperation.
ERT's design firm seems to be capable and have the required expertise to design the RCL, however their drawings continue to contain insufficient detail. BEA has commented on all the drawings and provided ERT with several comments and suggestions, of which ERT's design firm has implemented only a few. Cooperation could be better by the design firm. ERT management needs to perform a thorough review of the revised drawings, prior to allowing them to be send back to BEA. This would help alleviate multiple resubmittals.

The specification information is scattered between the drawings and the specification itself, in a somewhat confusing manner. Parts of information are located between several drawings and specification sections, making it unnecessarily difficult. Several specification sections should be added such as: Topsoil/Landscaping/Sprinkler System, Earthwork (Excavation/backfill/Compaction), Laboratory Exhaust Stack, Continuous Air Monitoring, Electrical Raceways, Lightning, Plumbing/Suspect Waste/Compressed Gas, Underground and Wet Pipe Fire Protection Systems.

Assure compliance with technical requirements including codes & standards.
No issues at this time.

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

Quality and cooperation of superintendents.
ERT Superintendent continues to be proactive in supporting BEA. Superintendent continues to show marked improvement. Alternate superintendent has never been on the job site, or introduced to BEA project personnel.

Home office support.
Always available to speak to BEA project personnel and address concerns. However, it is evident to BEA that the ERT RCL Project Manager is overloaded with mulitiple projects, and is not able to adequately manage the RCL project at the level expected by BEA. ERT upper management needs to recognize when their support team needs help and provide them with sufficent resources.

Sub tier performance.
From a physical work stand point, Nash Electric, and YMC have performed well with the few minor tasks they have performed for the project.

Management support.
See 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 been extremely slow developing their QA program. BEA has had to make a few exceptions to allow some of the physical work to take place in a timely manner.

Control of subtiers.
Nash Electric and YMC are the only sub tiers who have performed physical work on the project to date. Nash supported the first power outage, and implemented their assured grounding program. No quality issues noted. YMC worked hard getting the sanitary sewer line installed and tested. No issues with either

subcontractor.

Responses to assessment findings, NCRs.
Not applicable at this time.

SDR's, NDE and testing is performed adequately to assure goods meet contractual requirement.
YMC tested the new sanitary sewer line modification per the plumbing code, and showed patience when having to test the line three (3) times, due to minor leaks. 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.
CFR was notified by ERT of the need for the sanitary sewer testing. No issues.

Successful completion of the inspection as scheduled so as not to cause BEA to waste resources.
No resources were wasted during the sanitary sewer inspection.

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.
The past four (4) SRSs have been submitted on time.

Long Range Schedule (actual vs. scheduled).
ERT brought hardcopies of the fourth CPM to a construction status meeting on 6-19-08. This schedule was inadequate and not reviewed by the ERT project manager, prior to presenting it to BEA.

BEA accepted the fifth CPM on 7-02-08. This schedule is the most complete and reasonable CPM to date.

Schedule of Values.
SOV matches the most current accepted CPM.

Maintain Schedule.
ERT stopped all field work the morning of 6-30-08, following their Geosciences engineer's evaluation of the RCL soil. The engineer could have performed this evaluation much earlier, which may have resulted in the project not having to be delayed. The areas that were excavated for soil tests and observations were areas that had been excavated as early as 6-16-08. ERT management needs to be more pro-active

in scheduling crucial activities such as the soils evaluation.

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 be generous enough to submit non-required vendor data, at the request of the project team, when only chemical inventory reporting is a requirement. Some submittals have comments, and need to be addressed in a more timely fashion.

Quality, i.e., accuracy, legibility, correct no. of copies, and data correctly sorted.
No issues for the month of June 2008.

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.
Daily reports from the ERT Superintendent have been timely. Cost proposals have been constantly requested by BEA Subcontract Administrator, but have been slow in coming.

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

Support of supplier's upper management to assure successful completion of the work.
It is evident to BEA that the ERT RCL Project Manager is overloaded with mulitiple projects, and is not able to adequately manage the RCL project at the level expected by BEA. ERT upper management needs to recognize when their support team needs help and provide them with sufficent resources, or reduce their work load.

ERT needs to do a better job at completing their action items in a timely manner. Action items continue to drag on for weeks. ERT needs to commit to action item due dates.

Responsiveness to BEA, the customer.
ERT tries to accommodate BEA, but is struggling as indicated above. BEA would like to see the project move at a much faster more productive rate.