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 96 percent complete by ERT.

Quality, i.e., accuracy, legibility, correct no. of copies, and data correctly sorted.
ERT has room for improvement in this area. More attention to detail would be appreciated when submitting vendor data. Some vendor data reports have been submitted as revision zero when in actuality they are a higher revision. This can cause confusion as each initial submittal is give a new vendor data number. Trying to cross reference submittals with different VDR numbers is time consuming and aggravating.

6. ADMINISTRATION 25 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.
Progress in accordance with the contractual completion date was not accomplished by ERT for May. ERT did not follow and maintain their own CPM schedule. May's invoice was submitted on time. A couple of mistakes between the invoice and the SOV were noted and delayed processing of the invoice. ERT turnaround for price and affect on schedule are consistently slower than what is required by the contract of three working days for CFP/Cs. When BEA construction meetings are held specific items are identified that need to be timely accomplished. In the next subsequent BEA construction meeting only a few of the items are resolved. Greater attention to resolve issues timely is expected.

Fair, equitable, and ethical contract administration.
ERT can not maintain their own CPM schedule even though it is extended by revision. BEA was promised by ERT that the CPM April 30, 2009 completion would be maintained at all cost. Now it does not seem practical to maintain ERT revision extensions of the CPM.

Support of supplier's upper management to assure successful completion of the work.
See Home Office Support under Section 2 (Technical Performance). ERT seems not to be able to manage their lower-tier subcontractors to ensure compliance with the ERT CPM. This lack of support from the ERT team for a design build is negative for future work at the INL.

Responsiveness to BEA, the customer.
Improving but still is below what is seen of most other construction subcontractors.

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

Order No. 73577 SPES #15 (for the month of June 2009)

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	165
4. Delivery/Schedule	0-200	140
* 5. Vendor Data	0-100	95
6. Administration	0-50	40
Total Possible	1,000	Total 835

* 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	7-07-09
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	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

ERT's safety culture continues to improve. ERT has managed their Lockout/Tagout Program well, which has stood up to DOE surveillances.

Safety Violations:
On 6-01-09 scaffolding fell over on top of an air conditioning unit on the west side of the RCL. This scaffolding had been erected for over a week without being used. Scaffolding needs to be secured or taken down when not in use for extended periods of time.

On 6-01-09 and again on 6-02-09 Cannon Carpet vinyl tile installer was observed working in the RCL and not adhering to his JSA.

35	Housekeeping:	35
40	Adherence to Safety Plan:	40

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
As stated in the previous SPES, ERT management has to push their engineering group harder. The Plumbing, Mechanical, Electrical, Fire Alarm System, and Exhaust Stack drawing packages continue to have comments associated with them, which has remained stagnated for months now.

The closing out of action items is once again beginning to slow down. Many items are over a month behind as noted during the RCL Construction Status Meeting held on 6-03-09. Crucial items such as Action Item #169 getting ERT's engineering group to provide acceptance criteria for the steam tie in locations. Action Item #170 developing a welding acceptance report for Misko etc.

Workmanship; performed in a professional manner resulting in top quality goods and services.
As noted in the previous SPES some of the RCL sidewalks were not finished very well. The sand finish walls in the south stairwell are rough and could possibly pose a hazard due to their rough texture. The south stairwell has a few to many corners, some which are not shaped into a 90 degree angle as they should be. The building as a whole appears to be adequate.

Engineering capabilities and expertise applied as needed and with cooperation.
On 6-11-09 ERT's Mechanical Inspector witnessed YMC perform two (2) hydrostatic tests. The sections of pipe were tested at 150% of operating pressure, however they should have been tested at 150% of design pressure. Because the design package lacked this basic information ERT and YMC were confused as to the required test pressures. The pipe sections had to be retested at the correct pressures, resulting in loss of schedule and cost.

On 6-16-09 the Project was informed by the Analytical Lab System Engineer that YMC was installing their condensate pump in an area that would cause NEC violations. The pump was to close to an existing UPS. Had ERT's engineering group actually walked the project down and specified to YMC where a suitable location for the pump would have been, it would have alleviated unnecessary problems and rework.

ERT's engineering group failed to include details on their Mechanical drawings depicting the installation of the Mass Spectrometer ventilation system. This forgotten detail cost the project time and money by delaying the completion of the HVAC.

ERT's engineering group designed a pot feeder into the closed loop recirculation system but didn't provide any details regarding the chemicals to be used.

Assure compliance with technical requirements including codes & standards.
Misko, ERT's Mechanical and Electrical inspectors are assuring compliance.

Outage requests submitted timely.
No issues.

Quality and cooperation of superintendents.
The Superintendent is very cooperative, and continually shows marked improvement. He is gaining experience from working at the INL and is an asset to ERT.

Home office support.
ERT Project Manager has worked well with the Construction Field Rep. to identify required system testing and scheduling of those activities.

ERT Owner has taken the initiative to begin developing a project timeline. Although late in the project, it is encouraging to see the owner of the company becoming more involved. This shows a willingness to work out issues with INL project personnel and bring closure to this project.

Sub tier performance.
YMC Mechancial:
On 6-11-09 the CFR was informed by the Analytical Lab Radcon Supervisor that the AL FAS and YMC Foreman made a deal that YMC could temporarily remove an existing pipe to help YMC weld a section of the new steam pipe easier. Once the pipe was partially removed it was found to be contaminated. Radiation levels were 5000 dpm. ERT Management nor BEA Project personnel knew a thing about the

temporary removal of the pipe. This was an arrangement YMC Mechanical Foreman had made with the Analytical Lab FAS. Radcon had to write an RWP to continue with the pipe relocation. This delayed YMC's work in that area until Radcon was able to remove the pipe. YMC has to learn who their Prime Contractor is, follow protocol, and work through them accordingly.

On a positive note, during construction activities in the AL basement one of YMC's Pipefitters pointed out a small area of loose material on an existing pipe. A Radcon Tech checked the material and it was found to be radioactively contaminated. This is a perfect example of good situational awareness. If the Pipefitter or anyone else had leaned on the pipe, it could have been disastrous. The Pipefitter deserves kudos for paying attention while he was working and recognizing a potential problem.

YMC's work in the Analtical side of MFC-752 continues to be 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 still doesn't seem to be a sense of urgency with the work activities being completed on the AL side. In the prevous SPES it was suggested that ERT/YMC place a full time Supervisor with the pipefitter crew to direct work and control work activities. However this suggestion was ignored.

After Nash Electric demoblized from the project, they were not readily available to perform zero energy verifications for YMC personnel anymore. Thinking ahead, YMC arranged to have LEA Electric train to ERT's Lockout/Tagout Program, and to take INL NFPA 70E training. This arrangement worked well and kept the project moving.

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

Building Systems Technology:
No issues.

Quality Electric:
No issues.

Nash Electric Inc:
The Subcontacotor is comended for doing a very good job in controlling the electrical Lockout/Tagouts per ERT's Lockout/Tagout Program.

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

3-D Fire Protection:
No issues.

ThyssennKrupp:
No issues.

Ross Fork Painting:
No issues.

Idaho Interiors:
No issues.

Cannon Carpet:
The tile installer displayed a poor attitude during his brief stay at the RCL. This person could use more safety training. The installer was extremely slow due to his inability or unwillingness to stay focused on his tasks. ERT had problems with getting the installer to complete his job in a timely manner. The installer left the job site with his work unfinished on Tuesday 6-09-09 and did not return until 6-17-09.

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.
ERT displayed a great amount of control when dealing with BEA Quality Engineer who had a differing opinion regarding NCR-#7 (Welding). ERT handled the situation very professionally.

Control of subtiers.
YMC needs to plan better prior to arranging utility testing with ERT's Mechanical Inspector. On 6-09-09 YMC didn't have a calibrated test gauge to use for hydro testing pipe. A little bit of for thought would have prevented delaying the testing.

Responses to assessment findings, NCRs.
ERT has worked much harder to resolve and closeout deficiencies and NCRs.

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.
The scheduled are timely.

ERT constructed the RCL system testing schedule and placed dates on it without having procedures written, or without 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. regardless if the project is a design build or not.

Long Range Schedule (actual vs. scheduled).
ERT's CPM for the month of June shows an end date of 6-23-09. This date was established by ERT themselves. ERT chooses an end date but does not do everything possible to ensure this date is met by all parties. On 6-23-09 BEA Subcontract Administrator issued ERT a Letter Of Concern regarding their in ability to complete the RCL project.

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 SPC-945. There are still multiple unresolved comments on most of the drawing packages and ERT's specification, and the project is deemed 96 + percent complete by ERT.

Quality, i.e., accuracy, legibility, correct no. of copies, and data correctly sorted.
No major 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.
Cost Proposals are not submitted promptly. On 6-03-09 BEA Subcontract Administrator send ERT another email reminding them that specific information for CFP/C 25 had not been provided to BEA as requested months ago. Also CFP/C ERT-14 and associated cost proposal were provided to BEA for Heat and Cover Reimbursement. BEA was informed during a construction status meeting that a corrected lower price would be provided for this CFP/C. However, no corrected price has been received by BEA.

ERT continues to submit CFP/Cs for cost and schedule reimbursement. Many CPF/Cs contain a specific number of days identified by ERT for extension, but no backup or explanation of how they arrived at this number is given. ERT's CPM schedule doesn't show how these CFPs affected critical path, which they must in order to be valid. ERT's inability to manipulate and understand CPM schedules has been detrimental in processing these CFP/Cs and closing them out.

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.
Although BEA feels ERT falls short in some areas, it is obvious that ERT is committed to completing the RCL Project. ERT continues to show improvement and appears to be getting back to the "Partnering" atmosphere the project experienced at the commencement of this contract.