

Indiana Department of Transportation
REPORT ON CONTRACTOR'S PERFORMANCE

Name of Contractor ██████████	This Contractor is a Prime	Contract Number B-36175	Contract Amount \$1,732,600.51	Subcontract Amount
Name of Contractor Person in Charge at Site ██████████	Evaluation ID 14300	Type of Evaluation Final	District Seymour	Final Inspection Date

Work Performed
Pavement, Bridges, Grading, Erosion Control, Small Structures / Pipe Lining.

Project Location/Description
Small Structure, Replacement - ON SR 60 AT VARIOUS LOCATIONS

GRADING SCALE	
+2	For outstanding performance throughout the project that strongly contributed to its success
+1	For performance above expectations throughout the project
+0	For adequate performance meeting expectations
-1	For periodic inadequate performance, causing occasional problems adversely affected the project
-2	For consistent inadequate performance, causing constant problems adversely impacting the project
NA	If there were insufficient opportunities to observe contractor performance in this area

Organization Equipment And Personnel	POINTS
1 Contractor management personnel were knowledgeable and available with full authority to execute contract documents and implement the directions of the engineer.	-2
2 The superintendent or foreman on the jobsite had the required knowledge and training to comply with the plans, special provisions, and specifications on the project.	0
3 The project was staffed with competent field personnel.	0
4 The prime contractor ensured that subcontractors were knowledgeable and capable to perform the subcontracted work.	0
5 Contractor effectively scheduled and organized construction operations, including subcontractors, and anticipated upcoming issues.	-1
6 The contractor complied with applicable wage rates and employment regulations and timely submitted accurate certified payrolls.	0
7 The contractor complied with EEO and DBE requirements and procedures.	0
8 The contractor provided safe, adequate, and well-maintained equipment to perform the required work.	0
9 The contractor provided an adequate and fully equipped field office throughout the project.	0
Section Total	-3
Prosecution Of Work	
1 The prime contractor informed the PE/PS in advance of the daily schedule.	POINTS
2 The contractor submitted followed, and kept the work schedule up-to-date and met intermediate and final completion dates.	0
3 The contractor furnished the required documentation and reports in a timely manner (i.e. certification of materials, delivery tickets, invoices, progress schedules, shop drawings, material sampling, early notice of time extension, potential claims, etc.)	-2
4 The project site was maintained in a safe condition and the work conducted in a safe manner.	-1
5 The contractor complied with the phasing requirements.	0
6 The contractor provided proper MGT to accommodate safe movement of traffic.	0
Section Total	-3
General Relationships / Cooperation	
1 The contractor's supervisory personnel demonstrated a positive attitude toward the PE/PS and department regulations, including the INDOT chain of command.	POINTS
2 The contractor complied with the direction of INDOT personnel.	0
3 The contractor responded to contract issues and disputes in a timely manner and resolved at the appropriate level.	0
4 The contractor properly notified and coordinated with the utility companies for the protection of existing utilities.	0
5 The contractor coordinated with other contractors performing work on adjacent projects.	NA
6 The contractor communicated and cooperated with the adjacent property owners and local agencies.	0
7 The contractor showed consideration to the traveling public.	0
Section Total	0

Quality Of Materials And Workmanship:		POINTS
1	The contractor assured consistent quality of work through the use of good construction practices and quality materials, eliminating the need to remedy or remove defective work.	-2
2	The prime contractor monitored the subcontractor's activities to ensure approved materials and quality work.	0
3	The contractor completed the punch list and final cleanup as directed by the PE/PS.	0
4	The overall project conformed to the contractual requirements.	-2
Section Total		POINTS
		0
Pavement		
1	The contractor provided and followed a QC plan that accurately reflected contract specific conditions.	-1
2	The contractor followed best practices to ensure a quality pavement was constructed.	0
3	The contractor utilized equipment capable of producing quality pavement with accurate profile and cross-slope lines.	0
4	The contractor promptly identified and resolved all material quality problems.	NA
5	The concrete pavement was properly cured.	0
6	The tack coat for asphalt pavement was placed at the proper rate.	0
7	The contractor met the smoothness requirements of the contract.	0
8	The contractor completed paving operations with minimal assessed penalties (mix, density, smoothness).	-1
Section Total		POINTS
		0
Bridges		
1	The contractor maintained accurate survey lines and used proper construction practices to construct the bridge in accordance with plan grades.	0
2	The contractor promptly identified and resolved all material quality problems.	NA
3	The contractor followed procedures for scheduling and conducting test piles.	0
4	The contractor completed the structure elements within all specified tolerances.	0
5	The reinforcing steel was placed according to plans with proper clearances.	-1
6	The contractor constructed the concrete deck in a manner that provided a smooth driving surface.	0
7	The bridge deck was properly cured.	0
8	Concrete surfaces were thoroughly cleaned before application of surface seal/color.	0
9	The contractor took appropriate measures to ensure smooth transition between bridge and approach as well as approach to existing pavement.	0
Section Total		POINTS
		-1
Grading		
1	The contractor accurately constructed work to plan profiles, slopes, and alignments.	0
2	The contractor managed material sources and delivery to ensure uniform construction with known material properties on all lifts.	0
3	The contractor provided positive drainage during construction of embankments.	0
4	Existing topsoil was stored and used to cap slopes.	0
5	Slopes were finished with track lines perpendicular to slope (parallel to roadway).	0
6	Riprap was placed at the specified depth and quantity, and with underlying geotextiles.	0
7	The contractor followed contract requirements to construct embankments using proper lift thicknesses, compaction methods, and moisture content.	0
Section Total		POINTS
		0
Erosion Control		
1	The contractor implemented an effective Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan and adapted the plan as needed for changed site conditions.	0
2	The contractor's staff was knowledgeable and had the required training and certification to perform erosion control best practices.	0
3	The contractor followed contract requirements for installing and maintaining erosion and sediment control devices, disposal of materials, borrow sites, and other environmental matters.	0
4	The contractor completed required weekly and post-event reports in an accurate and timely manner.	0
5	The contractor responded quickly to INDOT and IDEM correction requests.	0
6	The contractor completed erosion and sediment control operations in a manner that led to no regulatory violations.	NA
7	Sod was placed neatly and watered according to specifications.	NA
8	The soil was properly prepared to ensure the best possibility for seed and sod to thrive.	0
Section Total		POINTS
		0
Small Structures / Pipe Lining		
1	The contractor constructed proper flow line elevations and drainage.	0
2	Pipe sections were joined together properly.	0
3	Contractor adequately compacted material around structures.	0
Section Total		POINTS
		0

CONTRACTOR SCORE	
Section	Points Available
Organization Equipment And Personnel	-3
Prosecution Of Work	-3
General Relationships / Cooperation	0
Quality Of Materials And Workmanship	-2
Pavement	-1
Bridges	-1
Grading	0
Erosion Control	0
Small Structures / Pipe Lining	0
Total Score	-10

Note: A total score below zero in any Section or a score of -2 on any question may be cause for referral to the Prequalification Committee. The total scores will be used in the overall contractor evaluation process.

Section Name	Evaluation Number	Score	Score Comments
Organization Equipment And Personnel	1	-2	<p>All contractor personnel were inadequate as it pertains to their availability and communication responses to the PE/PS regarding various pertinent contract requirements and the implementation of said requirements. All contractor personnel lacked the necessary familiarity with applicable INDOT Standard Specifications and contract requirements including but not limited to: Storm Water Quality Manager Certifications, Storm Water Quality Plan, IC 203 disposal site information, material certifications, sign & barricade reports, HMA Mix Design Formulas, IC 124 weekly reports, IC-675 forms, Force Account Work, change order approval processes, etc. all of which further adversely impacted the projects overall progress. See attached additional documentation titled 1-PSGeneralComments, 2-R&RDirectiveExplanationEmails, 3-MultipleCO#9ForceAccountReviews, and 4-WeatherDayExplanationEmails under the evaluation log tab for further reference information.</p> <p>The contractor's initially assigned superintendent for both the bridge and the culvert projects possessed inadequate knowledge of general road building procedures as they pertained to INDOT Standard Specifications and the applicable contract documents. This situation continued to decline until the contractor decided to assign an additional superintendent to the project to oversee all road construction operations. See attached additional documentation titled 1-PSGeneralComments</p>
Organization Equipment And Personnel	2	0	<p>The contractor's initially assigned project superintendent and project manager both possessed inadequate knowledge regarding general INDOT Standard Specifications and contract requirements. Lack of communication responses and timeliness continued to degrade as the project progressed until the contractor decided to assign an additional superintendent, as well as, a different project manager to oversee the remaining construction operations. See attached additional documentation titled 1-PSGeneralComments under the evaluation log tab for further reference information.</p>
Organization Equipment And Personnel	3	0	<p>The contractor's initially assigned project superintendent and project manager both possessed inadequate knowledge regarding general INDOT Standard Specifications and contract requirements. Lack of communication responses and timeliness continued to degrade as the project progressed until the contractor decided to assign an additional superintendent, as well as, a different project manager to oversee the remaining construction operations. See attached additional documentation titled 1-PSGeneralComments under the evaluation log tab for further reference information.</p>
Organization Equipment And Personnel	5	-1	<p>The contractor was roughly two and a half months late beginning work on their controlling operations per the original project schedule the PE/PS received at the Preconstruction Conference. Subsequently, the contractor continued to fail to provide the required updated progress and or recovery schedules to the PE/PS in a timely manner throughout the life of the project despite numerous request to do so. There were also multiple occurrences of the prime contractor failing to get their subcontractors approved which lead many times to delaying work operations to be performed by said subcontractors. See attached additional documentation titled 1-PSGeneralComments under the evaluation log tab for further reference information.</p>
Prosecution Of Work	2	-2	<p>The contractor was behind schedule beginning from the initially intended start date of April 2018 and then throughout the remainder of the project. The contractor also failed to provide the required updated progress and or recovery schedules in a timely manner to the PE/PS throughout the entire project. Finally, despite being granted multiple time extensions to the original contract completion date the contractor was still 51 days late from completing the project on time per the revised contract completion date. As a result, the contractor had to be charged \$102,000 worth of liquidated damaged per the failure to complete on time contract special provision. See attached additional documentation titled 1-PSGeneralComments under the evaluation log tab for further reference information.</p>
Prosecution Of Work	3	-1	<p>The contractor was insufficient regarding their communication/response times, as well providing required documentation to the PE/PS as it pertains to various applicable project matters. At time weeks would pass without responses from the contractor's project manager regarding requests from the PE/PS for various required project submittals including, but not limited to: Storm Water Quality Manager Certifications, Storm Water Quality Plan, IC 203 disposal site information, material certifications, sign & barricade reports, HMA Mix Design Formulas, etc. all of which further adversely impacted the projects overall progress. Likewise the contractor failed to review/sign the required IC 124 weekly reports, progress estimates, approved change order drafts, IC-675 forms, etc. in a timely manner. See attached additional documentation titled 1-PSGeneralComments under the evaluation log tab for further reference information.</p>
General Relationships / Cooperation	3	0	<p>The contractor was unsatisfactory regarding their communication and response times to various pertinent project matters at all authority levels. There are still multiple change orders, and other various reports that the contractor refuses to sign despite multiple request by the PE/PS over a timeframe of several months. See attached additional documentation titled 1-PSGeneralComments under the evaluation log tab for further reference information.</p>

Quality Of Materials And Workmanship	1	-2
Pavement	2	<p>-1</p> <p>All of the originally installed permanent striping was almost completely gone only a few months after application and thus had to all be replaced as part of the punch list items. The originally placed HMA surface at the culvert for all lanes in both directions had to be removed and replaced due to failure to meet the smoothness specifications. Likewise the transition HMA at numerous locations in both directions at the bridge had to be diamond grinded for also failing to meet the smoothness specifications. Finally, during Phase 1 of the bridge construction the false work approved and installed by the contractor nearly failed resulting in a severe sag in the bridge deck between the two piers. As a result, the contractor had to also diamond grind the Phase 1 bridge deck to attempt to achieve the initially intended profile grade on the bridge. Furthermore, the contractor also had to mechanically fine Phase 1 and Phase 2 of the bridge deck to ensure proper texture was achieved regarding friction concerns. See attached additional documentation titled 1-PSSGeneralComments, 2-R&RDirectiveExplanationEmails and 5-InfoRegardingPhaseBridgeDeck under the evaluation log tab for further reference information.</p>
Bridges	6	<p>-1</p> <p>During Phase 1 of the bridge construction the false work approved and installed by the contractor nearly failed resulting in a severe sag in the bridge deck between the two piers. As a result, the contractor had to also diamond grind the Phase 1 bridge deck to attempt to achieve the initially intended profile grade on the bridge. Additionally, the contractor also had to mechanically fine Phase 1 and Phase 2 of the bridge deck to ensure proper texture was achieved regarding friction concerns. In the end the INDOT bridge asset management folks at Seymour approved of the resolution performed by the contractor although it was not the originally intended finished product. However, due to the slight sag in the vertical curve that still remains on the bridge at the fault of the contractor standing water sits against both bridge rails which was also not the original intent. See attached additional documentation titled 1-PSSGeneralComments and 5-InfoRegardingPhaseBridgeDeck under the evaluation log tab for further reference information.</p>

GENERAL COMMENTS

Checked By	Graded Date	Comments
Name of PE/PS Cobjglazier, John	Date 04/11/2019	Name of Area Engineer (concur) Cox, Ryan
	Date 04/22/2019	

