

# Memo



To: Doug Wilson, PE, Town Engineer, East Hartford

From:  John McGrane, PE; Michael Flynn, PE

Date: 5/6/2020

Re: Review of Bids  
East Hartford Flood Control System  
Toe Drain Repair Project Phase 1  
Bid # 20-18

This memo presents a summary of our review of the bids received by the Town on April 15, 2020. Three bids were received by the Town from the following firms:

- B&W Paving and Landscaping, LLC, of Waterford, CT
- Waters Construction Company, Inc., of Bridgeport, CT
- Colossale Concrete, Inc., of New Britain, CT

## Review of Bids

Attached is the Bid Tabulation & Comparison Sheet for the above project. We inserted all bid prices into this spreadsheet to check for mathematical accuracy, and to allow for comparison of unit prices against the engineer's estimate and among each bidder. The bids were found to be mathematically correct for B&W Paving & Landscaping and Waters Construction, however the Colossale Concrete bid had a slightly different total as noted on the spreadsheet. This discrepancy was not enough to alter the results.

Further details of the bidding are as follows:

### 1. B&W Paving & Landscape is the apparent low bidder at \$1,634,110,

- Total time of completion is listed as 129 days on the bid form, which conforms to the bid requirements.
- B&W proposed to substitute HDPE pipe for the entire project instead of PVC as specified. In a follow up conversation with B&W, GEI was told that their supplier would have difficulty filling the order for 21" perforated PVC, and instead is proposing to use 24" HDPE. When questioned about whether the specified PVC product was available as a special order or long lead time item, B&W stated that they were unsure.
- One of the references listed by B&W (Anchor Engineering) initially provided a verbal response on April 23, 2020 that was considered positive. However, on April 30, 2020, this same reference contacted GEI and reported that he had recently come into possession of a number of documents that allege various poor contracting practices by B&W. This included suits for non-payment of suppliers and subs, an official employee complaint regarding prevailing wages/benefits, and rejection of a bid by a municipality based on unacceptable past performance. GEI has not

attempted to corroborate these claims but did provide all such documents to the Town by email on 4/30/2020.

## **2. Waters Construction Co. is the apparent second lowest bidder at \$1,729,783**

- Waters lists 84 days on the bid form which conforms to bid requirement but represents a more aggressive schedule than required Their attached schedule shows 114 days+/- for total completion, so their overall schedule is well within the maximum time allowed. (Addenda 2 requires substantial completion within 99 days and another 30 days for punch list = 129 days).
- There were no exceptions taken or mention of alternate pipe materials in their bid.
- Waters proposes to work 6 days per week with 2 pipe crews. In a follow up conversation with Waters, GEI was informed that Waters would prefer to start the project on a 6 day per week schedule and reduce to 5 days per week provided adequate progress is being made.
- The Waters Mobilization item is high (\$200k ~ 11% of bid total). However, the General Conditions section 8.1 requires that if the Mobilization item is greater than 5% of total bid value, that it must be spread over the contract duration (including final payment). Accordingly, this will not result in front-loading of the mobilization payment. Adjustment of payment for Mobilization will be addressed in the Contractor's schedules of values.

## **3. Colossale Concrete is the apparent third lowest bidder at \$1,979,315**

- Colossale's proposed schedule conforms to the required time of completion.
- There were no exceptions or mention of alternate pipe materials in their bid.
- Given that Colossale's bid is \$345,205 above the apparent low bid, we did not spend time inquiring about references. For reasons of efficiency, we have not evaluated their bid further.

### **Bid Submittal Requirements**

Based on GEI's review of the required documents, both B&W and Waters appear to have submitted the required bid forms and attachments. We did note that Waters did not submit evidence of good standing documentation with the State of CT, which would seem to be an informality. We have checked that the following completed forms and documents have been submitted in accordance with the bid requirements (except as noted), however, we recommend that the Town's procurement or legal staff verify this as part of the award process:

- Executed Bid Form
- Completed Bid Schedule
- Bid Bond (5% of bid amount)
- Corporate Resolution
- Collusion of Fraud Statement
- Acknowledgement of Addendums
- Qualifications
- Project Staffing Plan
- Schedule
- List of Subcontractors (none listed for Waters)
- Evidence of Good Standing with State of Connecticut DRS (we did not find this for document for Waters)

### **Review of Qualifications and References**

Each contractor submitted a list of previous projects and references to demonstrate their qualifications to perform the work. As of this writing, GEI was able to connect with 4 references for B&W, and 4 references for Waters Construction. GEI also spoke directly with both B&W and Waters to inquire about schedule, pipe materials proposed, and other details. Both firms were cooperative and forthcoming with information.

In the Contractor Reference Check forms attached, we have provided the list of the individual references contacted and the comments received, which are summarized below:

- B&W listed numerous projects of similar size as qualifications, although the majority involved paving, site, and flatwork. They do have some projects involving piping and underground utilities. The Town of Waterford expressed satisfaction with their work on emergency repairs to sewers and force mains. B&W has done some work for the Town of Manchester which included some water main replacements, and has done some work for the Town of East Hartford (we assume there are internal references for these jobs). Although there were some “adequate” ratings for B&W, there were no negative reports from the references when verbally contacted. However, the follow up documentation provided by Anchor Engineering by email contained significant negative reports which, if accurate, would call into question their suitability for the Town’s project.
- Waters Construction performed successfully on a project that GEI managed at the Kerite site in Shelton, CT, and they received strong praise from GEI’s project engineer on this job. Also, Waters included a reference involving work on a toe drain system repair as part of a USACE regulated levee in Ansonia. This was part of a larger bridge and pedestrian walkway project. In speaking with Luchs-Decarlo-Doll (the design and inspection firm), Waters performed very well and is considered a skilled contractor. Positive references were also received from STV consulting engineers for work performed by Waters in Stratford, CT; and from CT DOT District 3 where they have performed multiple projects. There were no negative comments received from the references contacted.

### **Summary**

We understand that the apparent low bid submitted by B&W is being evaluated by the Town for responsiveness in consideration of the negative reports received regarding their contracting practices and may not award to B&W. B&W appears to have minimal qualifications for pipe installation. More experience with piping installations, and levee piping in particular, is certainly preferred. The majority of their projects and qualifications listed were with paving and flatwork. Also, B&W’s proposed use of HDPE pipe as a substitution for PVC pipe for 100% of the pipe on the project could also be considered unresponsive. The 21” pipe is the only size where availability was raised as a concern, but this is only 25% of the total pipe quantity. Substitution for the remaining 75% of the pipe quantities with HDPE (12” and 15” sizes) by B&W appears unnecessary and does not benefit the project.

Based on our review of qualifications and bid prices, Waters Construction Company appears to be a responsible bidder, and has strong qualifications for the Toe Drain project. In reviewing the references and qualifications of Waters Construction, they have good qualifications for underground pipe installation work and other complex civil projects. They have provided 4 very positive references for projects relevant to the East Hartford Toe Drain project. In speaking with Waters Construction, they did not feel that PVC pipe was unavailable, although it would likely be a special order which will take longer to obtain. They also mentioned that it may be possible to obtain solid 21” PVC pipe and drill the required perforations in the PVC pipe, or substitute HDPE for just the 21” size.

### **Recommendation**

The East Hartford Toe Drain project involves some complex trenching and pipe installation challenges. This includes proper support for the deep trenches involved to prevent movement of the levee embankment and potential damage to adjacent buildings and concrete floodwall. Waters Construction successfully completed a toe drain replacement project on a USACE regulated levee recently, as well as other similar projects which demonstrate their skill in this area. Based on technical proficiency, we believe that Waters Construction is the best qualified bidder for an involved piping project of this type, and it is our recommendation that the Town proceed with an award to Waters Construction Company.

**Attachments:** Toe Drain Phase 1 Bid Tabulation & Comparison Sheet  
Contractor Reference Check Forms (B&W and Waters)

**Bid Tabulation Comparison Sheet**  
*Toe Drain Repair Project Phase 1*

Apr-20

Item	Description	Engineer's Estimate (2013)				B&W Paving		Waters Construction		Colossale Concrete	
		Units	Quantity	Unit Cost	Item Cost	ITEM TOTAL	Units	Subtotal	Units	Subtotal	Units
<b>1</b>	<b>Initial General Items</b>										
1.01	Site Mobilization	LS	1	\$ 60,520	\$ 60,520	\$ 140,000.00	\$ 140,000.00	\$ 200,000.00	\$ 200,000.00	\$ 60,000.00	\$ 60,000.00
					ITEM 1 SUBTOTAL: \$ 60,520		\$ 140,000.00		\$ 200,000.00		\$ 60,000.00
<b>2</b>	<b>Erosion and Traffic Control</b>										
2.01	Silt Fence/Hay Bales	LF	2,300	\$ 6	\$ 13,800	\$ 5.00	\$ 11,500.00	\$ 7.00	\$ 16,100.00	\$ 9.00	\$ 20,700.00
2.02	Anti-Tracking Pad	EA	2	\$ 3,000	\$ 6,000	\$ 2,000.00	\$ 4,000.00	\$ 1,500.00	\$ 3,000.00	\$ 3,000.00	\$ 6,000.00
2.03	Catch Basin Erosion Protection	EA	12	\$ 300	\$ 3,600	\$ 200.00	\$ 2,400.00	\$ 110.00	\$ 1,320.00	\$ 300.00	\$ 3,600.00
2.04	Temporary Fencing	LF	2,300	\$ 7	\$ 16,100	\$ 15.00	\$ 34,500.00	\$ 30.00	\$ 69,000.00	\$ 22.00	\$ 50,600.00
2.05	Traffic Control Signage	LS	1	\$ 12,000	\$ 12,000	\$ 5,000.00	\$ 5,000.00	\$ 4,000.00	\$ 4,000.00	\$ 20,000.00	\$ 20,000.00
2.06a	Traffic Control -Police Services	DCA	1	\$ 10,000	\$ 10,000	\$ 10,000.00	\$ 10,000.00	\$ 10,000.00	\$ 10,000.00	\$ 10,000.00	\$ 10,000.00
2.06b	Traffic Control Person -Uniform Flagger	Hourly	100	\$ 75	\$ 7,500	\$ 70.00	\$ 7,000.00	\$ 65.03	\$ 6,503.00	\$ 55.00	\$ 5,500.00
					ITEM 2 SUBTOTAL: \$ 69,000		\$ 74,400.00		\$ 109,923.00		\$ 116,400.00
<b>3</b>	<b>Site Improvements</b>										
3.01	Site Preparation and Maintenance	LS	1	\$ 25,000	\$ 25,000	\$ 35,000.00	\$ 35,000.00	\$ 15,000.00	\$ 15,000.00	\$ 75,000.00	\$ 75,000.00
3.02	Demolition of Pavement	SY	1250	\$ 10	\$ 12,500	\$ 15.00	\$ 18,750.00	\$ 9.00	\$ 11,250.00	\$ 30.00	\$ 37,500.00
3.03	Demolition of Curb	LF	725	\$ 7	\$ 5,075	\$ 6.00	\$ 4,350.00	\$ 4.00	\$ 2,900.00	\$ 8.00	\$ 5,800.00
3.04	Demolition of Sidewalks	SY	135	\$ 17	\$ 2,295	\$ 10.00	\$ 1,350.00	\$ 15.00	\$ 2,025.00	\$ 30.00	\$ 4,050.00
3.05	Excavation	CY	4500	\$ 20	\$ 90,000	\$ 25.00	\$ 112,500.00	\$ 70.00	\$ 315,000.00	\$ 140.00	\$ 630,000.00
3.06	Backfill	CY	2100	\$ 30	\$ 63,000	\$ 15.00	\$ 31,500.00	\$ 36.00	\$ 75,600.00	\$ 60.00	\$ 126,000.00
3.07	Imported Ordinary Fill	CY	0	\$ 45	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 22.00	\$ 22.00
3.08	Imported Pervious Fill	CY	250	\$ 45	\$ 11,250	\$ 55.00	\$ 13,750.00	\$ 119.00	\$ 29,750.00	\$ 65.00	\$ 16,250.00
3.09	Filter Sand	CY	1525	\$ 40	\$ 61,000	\$ 80.00	\$ 122,000.00	\$ 94.00	\$ 143,350.00	\$ 45.00	\$ 68,625.00
3.10	Drain Aggregate	CY	825	\$ 70	\$ 57,750	\$ 55.00	\$ 45,375.00	\$ 126.00	\$ 103,950.00	\$ 60.00	\$ 49,500.00
3.11	12" Dia PVC Toe Drain	LF	1825	\$ 60	\$ 109,500	\$ 200.00	\$ 365,000.00	\$ 47.00	\$ 85,775.00	\$ 50.00	\$ 91,250.00
3.12	21" Dia PVC Toe Drain	LF	620	\$ 100	\$ 62,000	\$ 230.00	\$ 142,600.00	\$ 90.00	\$ 55,800.00	\$ 75.00	\$ 46,500.00
3.13	15" Dia PVC Solid Pipe	LF	27	\$ 80	\$ 2,160	\$ 80.00	\$ 2,160.00	\$ 55.00	\$ 1,485.00	\$ 70.00	\$ 1,890.00
3.14	Manhole	EA	15	\$ 6,000	\$ 90,000	\$ 4,000.00	\$ 60,000.00	\$ 8,000.00	\$ 120,000.00	\$ 3,900.00	\$ 58,500.00
3.15	Manhole/Catch Basin Adjustment	EA	2	\$ 1,500	\$ 3,000	\$ 1,500.00	\$ 3,000.00	\$ 1,500.00	\$ 3,000.00	\$ 400.00	\$ 800.00
3.16	Subbase	TON	775	\$ 40	\$ 31,000	\$ 35.00	\$ 27,125.00	\$ 35.00	\$ 27,125.00	\$ 54.00	\$ 41,850.00
3.17	Bituminous Concrete	TON	600	\$ 130	\$ 78,000	\$ 110.00	\$ 66,000.00	\$ 136.00	\$ 81,600.00	\$ 300.00	\$ 180,000.00
3.18	Concrete Sidewalk	SY	135	\$ 115	\$ 15,525	\$ 117.00	\$ 15,795.00	\$ 140.00	\$ 18,900.00	\$ 96.00	\$ 12,960.00
3.19	Concrete Dumpster Pad	LS	1	\$ 6,000	\$ 6,000	\$ 4,000.00	\$ 4,000.00	\$ 2,900.00	\$ 2,900.00	\$ 1,400.00	\$ 1,400.00
3.20	Granite Curb	LF	100	\$ 45	\$ 4,500	\$ 55.00	\$ 5,500.00	\$ 59.00	\$ 5,900.00	\$ 75.00	\$ 7,500.00
3.21	Bituminous Curb	LF	750	\$ 12	\$ 9,000	\$ 6.00	\$ 4,500.00	\$ 8.00	\$ 6,000.00	\$ 14.00	\$ 10,500.00
3.22	Grouting of Existing Utilities	LF	545	\$ 15	\$ 8,175	\$ 13.00	\$ 7,085.00	\$ 115.00	\$ 62,675.00	\$ 20.00	\$ 10,900.00
3.23	Cleaning Existing Stormdrain	LF	355	\$ 45	\$ 15,975	\$ 10.00	\$ 3,550.00	\$ 14.00	\$ 4,970.00	\$ 80.00	\$ 28,400.00
3.24	Inspection of Existing Stormdrain Pipes	LF	355	\$ 6	\$ 2,130	\$ 4.00	\$ 1,420.00	\$ 16.00	\$ 5,680.00	\$ 18.00	\$ 6,390.00
3.25	Disposal of Storm Drain Sediment	TON	80	\$ 345	\$ 27,600	\$ 500.00	\$ 40,000.00	\$ 47.00	\$ 3,760.00	\$ 60.00	\$ 4,800.00
3.26	Disposal of Excess Soil	TON	1400	\$ 30	\$ 42,000	\$ 13.00	\$ 18,200.00	\$ 16.00	\$ 22,400.00	\$ 18.00	\$ 25,200.00
3.27	Disposal of Polluted Soil	TON	315	\$ 60	\$ 18,900	\$ 50.00	\$ 15,750.00	\$ 46.00	\$ 14,490.00	\$ 60.00	\$ 18,900.00
3.28	Disposal of Contaminated Soil	TON	1750	\$ 75	\$ 131,250	\$ 85.00	\$ 148,750.00	\$ 69.00	\$ 120,750.00	\$ 60.00	\$ 105,000.00
					\$ -		\$ -		\$ -		\$ -
					ITEM 3 SUBTOTAL: \$ 984,585		\$ 1,315,010.00		\$ 1,342,035.00		\$ 1,665,465.00
<b>4</b>	<b>Site Restoration Items</b>										
4.01	Topsoil	CY	1,200	\$ 28.50	\$ 34,200	\$ 9.00	\$ 10,800.00	\$ 12.00	\$ 14,400.00	\$ 9.00	\$ 10,800.00
4.02	Seeding	SY	7,250	\$ 2	\$ 14,500	\$ 3.00	\$ 21,750.00	\$ 2.50	\$ 18,125.00	\$ 4.00	\$ 29,000.00
4.03	Erosion Control Matting	SY	5,500	\$ 7	\$ 38,500	\$ 4.00	\$ 22,000.00	\$ 3.00	\$ 16,500.00	\$ 12.00	\$ 66,000.00
4.04	Riprap Restoration	SY	175	\$ 60	\$ 10,500	\$ 150.00	\$ 26,250.00	\$ 120.00	\$ 21,000.00	\$ 90.00	\$ 12,000.00
4.05	Pavement Markings	LF	1,300	\$ 1	\$ 1,300	\$ 3.00	\$ 3,900.00	\$ 1.00	\$ 1,300.00	\$ 3.00	\$ 3,900.00
					ITEM 4 SUBTOTAL: \$ 99,000		\$ 84,700.00		\$ 71,325.00		\$ 121,700.00
<b>5</b>	<b>Project Closeout Items</b>										
5.01	Demobilization/As-Builts/Closeout	LS	1	\$ 57,630	\$ 57,630	\$ 20,000.00	\$ 20,000.00	\$ 6,500.00	\$ 6,500.00	\$ 16,000.00	\$ 12,000.00
					ITEM 5 SUBTOTAL: \$ 57,630		\$ 20,000.00		\$ 6,500.00		\$ 12,000.00
						\$ 1,634,110.00	\$ 1,729,783.00	\$ 1,975,565.00			

**BASE BID TOTAL (2013): \$ 1,270,735**

Cost Escalation 2013 to 2020 @20% \$ 254,147  
**Engineer's Estimate 2020 \$ 1,524,882**

Submitted Bid total **\$ 1,979,315.00**

## Contractor Reference Check

Contractor:	B&W Paving & Landscaping, LLC
-------------	-------------------------------

Project Number:	124390
Project:	East Hartford Toe Drain Phase 1
Completed by:	J. McGrane
Date:	4/23/2020

Reference	Mr. Keith Rapoza, City of Hartford, DPW
Phone Number	860-757-9984

### **Questions:**

What project(s) did the contractor work on? **Bushnell Park North, \$10M street reconstruction.**

How was your working relationship with the contractor? **Acceptable**

Did the contractor provide adequate resources for the project? **Yes, had some difficulties in the beginning but improved later in the job. Performance was adequate.**

Did the project come in on schedule/budget? **Finished the project on time and budget.**

Were there any changes or negotiations required and were they fair to work with on those items? **Major design change for Gold Street required change order and extended time. Negotiation was acceptable.**

Were you satisfied with the Contractors work and would you work with them again? Work overall was acceptable. **Neutral opinion on awarding on future work.**

## Contractor Reference Check

Contractor:	B&W Paving & Landscaping, LLC
-------------	-------------------------------

Project Number:	124390
Project:	East Hartford Toe Drain Phase 1
Completed by:	J. McGrane
Date:	4/22/2020

Reference	Jim Bartelli, Town of Waterford
Phone Number	860-460-9108

### **Questions:**

What project(s) did the contractor work on? **Emergency repairs on sewers and force mains**

How was your working relationship with the contractor? **Very good**

Did the contractor provide adequate resources for the project? **Yes, well staffed and well versed in pipe work**

Did the project come in on schedule/budget? **Yes, performed well on multiple occasions**

Were there any changes or negotiations required and were they fair to work with on those items? **Much of the work was emergency. Reported that B&W was reasonable on costs for negotiated work.**

Were you satisfied with the Contractors work and would you work with them again? **Yes, had good experience with B&W and would use them again.**

## Contractor Reference Check

Contractor:	B&W Paving & Landscaping, LLC
-------------	-------------------------------

Project Number:	124390
Project:	East Hartford Toe Drain Phase 1
Completed by:	J. McGrane
Date:	4/23/2020

Reference	Matt Brown, PE, Anchor Engineering (as consultant town engineer, various towns)
Phone Number	860-633-8770

### **Questions:**

What project(s) did the contractor work on? **East Hampton paving program; Windsor Locks paving and deep sewer repairs**

How was your working relationship with the contractor? **B&W was responsive and cooperative and did good work.**

Did the contractor provide adequate resources for the project? **Yes, adequate staffing and equipment for the jobs**

Did the project come in on schedule/budget? **Yes**

Were there any changes or negotiations required and were they fair to work with on those items? **Negotiated a cost adjustment per 817 Manual with B&W for a section of paving that achieved lower compaction than spec'd. B&W was reasonable in accepting the adjustment. Generally, not a lot of change orders on these projects.**

Were you satisfied with the Contractors work and would you work with them again? **Yes, they do good work and are cooperative to work with.**

**\*\*NOTE:** *The above verbal reference was later followed up by an email on 4/30/20 which included 8 written documents which Mr. Brown sent to GEI, with a recommendation to forward to the Town of East Hartford. The documents described various (alleged) contracting practices which call into question B&W's suitability for this project. GEI reviewed the documents, but has not attempt to corroborate the extensive amount of information included.*

## Contractor Reference Check

Contractor:	B&W Paving and Landscaping
-------------	----------------------------

Project Number:	124390
Project:	East Hartford Toe Drain Phase 1
Completed by:	J. McGrane
Date:	4/24/2020

Reference	Mark Czerepuszko, Town of Manchester
Phone Number	860-647-3152

### **Questions:**

What project(s) did the contractor work on? **Various paving jobs and some 8" DI water main replacement on 5 streets.**

How was your working relationship with the contractor? **Generally, good to work with, majority of work was paving related**

Did the contractor provide adequate resources for the project? **Yes, sometimes quality and logistical efficiency varies with the specific crew, but generally good. Pipe crew on water main job was good.**

Did the project come in on schedule/budget? **Generally yes.**

Were there any changes or negotiations required and were they fair to work with on those items? **B&W was fair to deal with on change order negotiation.**

Were you satisfied with the Contractors work and would you work with them again? **Yes**



## Contractor Reference Check

Contractor:	Waters Construction Company
Project Number:	124390
Project:	East Hartford Toe Drain Phase 1
Completed by:	J. McGrane
Date:	4/22/2020

Reference	Ms. Anna Hernberg, PE; GEI Consultants
Phone Number	860-368-5313

### **Questions:**

What project(s) did the contractor work on? **Kerite, Shelton CT, sheet pile side walls and channel bottom repairs in high flow stream channel**

How was your working relationship with the contractor? **Good to work with**

Did the contractor provide adequate resources for the project? **Well-staffed and good equipment**

Did the project come in on schedule/budget? **Yes, considering that a large design change was needed**

Were there any changes or negotiations required and were they fair to work with on those items? **Waters was helpful in developing a constructible solution required for the design change above. Once resolved, Waters was fair in negotiating a change order for the work**

Were you satisfied with the Contractors work and would you work with them again? **Yes, we have recommended them for other work.**

## Contractor Reference Check

Contractor:	Waters Construction Company
Project Number:	124390
Project:	East Hartford Toe Drain Phase 1
Completed by:	J. McGrane
Date:	4/23/2020

Reference	Ron Nault, PE; Luchs, Decarlo, Doll Consultants
Phone Number	(203) 379-0320

### **Questions:**

What project(s) did the contractor work on? **Ansonia walking trail with bridge and toe drain repairs on USACE regulated levee**

How was your working relationship with the contractor? **Very positive**

Did the contractor provide adequate resources for the project? **Yes, good quality of supervision and equipment—skilled contractor**

Did the project come in on schedule/budget? **Yes, Job finished within 1% of bid price.**

Were there any changes or negotiations required and were they fair to work with on those items? **Negligible change orders, but very fair with quantity adjustments during project.**

Were you satisfied with the Contractors work and would you work with them again?

**Yes, definitely would use them again. Have also worked with them on other pipe projects and have had good results.**

## Contractor Reference Check

Contractor:	Waters Construction Company
Project Number:	124390
Project:	East Hartford Toe Drain Phase 1
Completed by:	J. McGrane
Date:	5/1/2020

Reference	Tim Casey, PE; STV Consulting Engineers
Phone Number	Via email

### **Questions:**

What project(s) did the contractor work on: **King St. Culvert for the Town of Stratford which included work in the State highway.**

How was your working relationship with the contractor? **Very Good, they communicated well with my Project Engineer and inspector.**

Did the contractor provide adequate resources for the project? **Yes, he had the correct equipment and personnel for this construction.**

Did the project come in on schedule/budget? **Project was on schedule and within budget.**

Were there any changes or negotiations required and were they fair to work with on those items? **There were some changes during construction and the negotiations for out-of-scope work went well.**

Were you satisfied with the Contractors work and would you work with them again? **Yes, the Town and STV were satisfied with their work and we would be pleased if they won another project that we are involved with.**

## Contractor Reference Check

Contractor:	Waters Construction Company
Project Number:	124390
Project:	East Hartford Toe Drain Phase 1
Completed by:	J. McGrane
Date:	5/4/2020

Reference	Domenic LaRosa, DOT District 3, Assist. District Engineer
Phone Number	203-389-3100

### **Questions:**

What project(s) did the contractor work on: **Multiple DOT projects in DOT District 3 in Fairfield County (New Haven, CT to NY border).**

How was your working relationship with the contractor? Long standing relationship. **Very positive experience working with Waters Construction throughout the years. Waters is one of District 3's "go-to" firms.**

Did the contractor provide adequate resources for the project? **Yes, Waters has experienced personnel and good equipment for the construction work involved.**

Did the project come in on schedule/budget? **Waters has consistently performed well and generally within schedule and budget.**

Were there any changes or negotiations required and were they fair to work with on those items? **DOT District 3 has had good experience with Waters when changes and price negotiations for out-of-scope have ben required. Very fair with pricing.**

Were you satisfied with the Contractors work and would you work with them again? **Yes, DOT District 3 "would absolutely" consider hiring Waters for future both as a bidder and for emergency work.**