CIMFP Exhibit P-02747

Pag	<mark>e</mark> 1	

From:	markturpin@lowerchurchillproject.ca
То:	scottobrien@lowerchurchillproject.ca; pathussey@lowerchurchillproject.ca; lanceclarke@lowerchurchillproject.ca; roylewis@nalcorenergy.com
Date:	Monday, July 28, 2014 11:13:57 AM
Attachments:	EOI - Responses to Additional Questions.docx

All

Please see summary results from the additional information requested from ASI Constructors and EBC-Neilson

Unfortunately both have failed to make the cut.....this leaves us with three Bidders for CH-0009

- 1. Astaldi
- 2. Barnard-Pennecon JV
- 3. HJOC-Dragados JV



EOI - Responses to Additional Questions.docx

Mark Turpin Package Leader - CH-0009 Construction North and South Dams PROJECT DELIVERY TEAM Lower Churchill Project t. 709 733 5604 c. 709 725-7172 e. MarkTurpin@lowerchurchillproject.ca w. muskratfalls.nalcorenergy.com

You owe it to yourself, and your family, to make it home safely every day. What have you done today so that nobody gets hurt?

EOI – Response to Additional Questions

In response to the Telecon(s) of Friday July 18, 2014

ASI

ASI reverted with a strategy to JV with Coastal Drilling (Jet Grouting Specialist) and a subcontract with Johnson Construction. The strategy appears to utilize the combination of ASI & Coastal to provide specialized experience plus consolidated, combined financial security and stability; allied with a subcontract with Johnson to deliver the Heavy Civil and local content experience (rock; river diversion; crushing and Labour Relations).

Overall, ASI's strategy for the work is still considered to have serious shortfall in:

- Overall Financial Capacity and Security
- Heavy Civil capability Johnson is lacking in the necessary hydro/river diversion experience.
- Overall Coordination and interface with other Contractors (sic. CH0007)
- Labour Relations Johnson record not stellar
- Safety Performance (Johnson)
- SDRL deliverables and initial Work Packages likely to be a problem.

Conclusion

Fail.

EBC-Neilson

EBC – Neilson has responded with a complete reversion to their original submission and appear (RPL opinion) to not have tried very hard to beef up their RCC portion of the submission with an acceptable strategic alliance despite Company encouragement to so do.

Conclusion

Fail.