



MEMORANDUM

DATE: 1/14/10
TO: Bob Dunn - Chairman, Bus Barn Building Committee
FROM: Matthew N. Brown, P.E.
CC: Tim Griswold, First Selectman
RE: Bus Parking Lot - Bidders Supplementary Information Review



Per your request, this memo serves to summarize our discussions regarding the supplementary information provided by both Machnik Brothers, Inc. and Connecticut Carpentry Corporation. A request for the supplementary information was made to each company in letters from Anchor Engineering dated 12/30/09. The following information was requested:

1. A list of present commitments or obligations that may delay the work.
2. A list of the major tasks to be completed on the job (grading, paving, building construction, electrical, mechanical, retaining wall, storm drainage installation, etc) as well as who will be performing each task (i.e. your company or a subcontractor). If a subcontractor will be utilized, please identify their name.
3. A preliminary schedule of values.
4. A preliminary construction schedule.
5. A list of relevant project experience demonstrating ability to complete job within the time required and within the established budget. A minimum of four or five references and project owner's primary contact from construction projects completed in the last four years (note: projects shall be competitively bid, lump sum (as opposed to unit price) contracts. Preference is for projects of similar size and scope to this, with minimum contract value of \$250,000. Please also provide the original contract value (at time of contract signing) and final contract value (upon project completion), including all change orders.

Machnik Brothers, Inc. Supplementary Information

A review of the documentation provided by Machnik Brothers indicates that all the requested information requested was provided. Specific observations of the information provided are as follows:

1. Machnik Brothers indicated that they do not have any current obligations that might delay the work.
2. Machnik Brothers indicated that they would be performing a significant portion of the project work, including, clearing & grubbing, earth excavation and grading, drainage installation, septic system installation, and landscaping. Specific subcontractors are identified for the following tasks: Stake-Out, Building Construction, Electrical, Paving, and retaining wall construction. Machnik Brothers indicated their intention of utilizing local subcontractors, including several from Old Lyme.

3. Machnik Brother's preliminary schedule of values appears thorough and appropriately weighted. Their schedule of values indicates that approximately 74% of their bid value is related to the site related work while approximately 23% is related to the construction of the building itself, which is generally consistent with Anchor's previous estimates. Machnik indicates approximately 1% of the bid value is related to mobilization. Machnik did not break out bonding or general conditions related work other than E&S Control (2% of bid value).
4. Machnik Brother's preliminary construction schedule indicates a 106 day (March 1st to June 15th) construction schedule which is not consistent with the 90 day construction period specified in the Contract Documents. Their schedule does provide a two week buffer between when the project would be completed and when the Town would turn the facility over to a bus company.
5. Machnik Brothers provided the information pertaining to project references as well as initial contract value vs. final contract value. My understanding is that the Bus Barn Building Committee will follow-up with references if necessary. Accordingly, Anchor has not contacted any of Machnik Brother's references.

Connecticut Carpentry Corporation Supplementary Information

A review of the documentation provided by Connecticut Carpentry indicates that most of the requested information requested was provided, however several issues were noted. Specific observations of the information provided are as follows:

1. CT Carpentry indicated that they do not have any current obligations that might delay the work.
2. In an initial phone conversation with CT Carpentry, Anchor was informed that CT Carpentry would be performing all work except for Paving and Mechanical, Electrical and Plumbing (MEP) work and that the proposed subcontractors had yet to be selected. However, the initial supplementary information provided to Anchor indicated that CT Carpentry would be performing the paving work while the site work and MEP work would be performed by "TBD." Upon further discussions with CT Carpentry, they indicated that there was indeed an error in the information provided and that they intended to indicate that the site work would be performed by CT Carpentry and the paving and MEP work would be subcontracted out. Subsequent to this conversation, however, John Flower, the Clerk of the Works for this project as well as the Building Inspector for the Town of Old Lyme, received a call from a site contractor seeking a set of plans so that they could prepare a proposal for CT Carpentry for the site work on this project. This contractor, B&L, indicated that CT Carpentry had specifically requested the quote from them. This issue is significant in that the site work is clearly the largest component of this project. Based upon the above, it is unclear what CT Carpentry's intents are related to this component of the work.
3. CT Carpentry's preliminary schedule of values is inadequate in the breakdown of the site work related items. All of the site work is lumped into one item (63% of bid value), while Machnik's site work tasks are broken down into ten items, which Anchor believes is more appropriate. CT Carpentry's schedule of values indicates that approximately 25% is related to the construction of the building itself, which is generally consistent with Anchor's previous estimates. CT Carpentry further indicates approximately 6% of the bid value is related to mobilization, approximately 2% is related to bonding and approximately 4% is related to General Conditions.

4. CT Carpentry's preliminary construction schedule indicates a 108 day (March 15th to July 1st) construction schedule which is not consistent with the 90 day construction period specified in the Contract Documents. Their schedule does not provide a buffer between when the project would be completed and when the Town would turn the facility over to a bus company.
5. CT Carpentry provided the information pertaining to project references, but did not indicate initial contract value vs. final contract value as requested. My understanding is that the Bus Barn Building Committee will follow-up with references if necessary. Accordingly, Anchor has not contacted any of CT Carpentry's references.

We hope you find this information useful. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me via phone (860-633-8770) or email (mbrown@anchorengr.com).