

September 5, 2017

Mr. Eric Rody
Vinton-Tecumseh School Corp.
2101 South 18th Street
Lafayette, IN 47903

Re: Lafayette School Corporation
Glen Acres Elementary School
Kettelhut Project No. 6503

Dear Mr. Rody:

Pursuant to our firm's initial review of bids for each Bid Category, we wish to provide the following information.

The enclosed Bid Tabulation is correct and coincides with the bidders' Bid Proposals. Upon receipt of this information, we suggest your attorney review same and likewise, we believe it would be prudent to also review the Bid Proposals, Financial Statements, and Bid Bonds as submitted on August 24, 2017.

Listed below by Bid Category Number are Contractors along with their Surety Company and that Surety Company's Policy Holders Rating, Financial Category and Policy Holder Surplus.

<u>Bid Category/Contractor</u>	<u>Surety Company</u>	<u>Policy Holder's Rating/ Financial Category/Surplus</u>
1. J.R. Kelly Company, Inc.	Great American Insurance Co. of Ohio	A+ XIV (\$1.5 to \$2 Billion)
2. Indiana Steel Fabricating, Inc.	Fidelity & Deposit Company of Maryland	A+ XV (> \$2 Billion)
3. GreenVision, LLC	Erie Insurance Company	A+ XV (> \$2 Billion)
4. Recreation Insites, LLC	Bid Security Check Provided	N/A
5. Stonecreek Interior Systems, LLC	Western Surety Company	A XIII (\$1.25 to \$1.5 Billion)
6. Lancaster-Schert Equipment, LLC	Westfield Insurance Company	A XV (> \$2 Billion)
7. Ryan Fireprotection, Inc.	Fidelity & Deposit Company of Maryland	A+ XV (>\$2 Billion)
8. Commercial Air, Inc.	Selective Insurance Company of America	A XIV (\$1.5 to \$2 Billion)
9. Huston Electric, Inc.	The Cincinnati Insurance Company	A+ XV (> \$2 Billion)

Bid Category No. 1 – General Building Construction

1. J. R. Kelly Company, Inc.
 - a. This Contractor appears to be the low bidder for this Category regardless of which Alternates are accepted.
 - b. The proposed Bid Form 96 and Bid Form Insert was submitted in duplicate as specified. All requested bids (base bid and alternates) were submitted upon as applicable for this package (non-applicable alternates were also clearly marked "No Work"). Additionally, the requested unit prices and primary subcontractors listing as requested was properly filled out. All three (3) addendums were properly acknowledged. All bid forms appear to contain the appropriate authorized signatures – the Non-Collusion Affidavit was also submitted as requested.
 - c. Financial Statement submitted was less than the specified ninety (90) day period (June 30, 2017 is date on Financial Statement).
 - d. Financial Statement was submitted on specified Form 96a and all requested information was provided.

- e. The contractor's Bid Bond in the amount of 5% of the total bid was also submitted as requested.

Bid Category No. 2 – Structural & Miscellaneous Steel

1. Indiana Steel Fabricating, Inc.
 - a. This contractor appears to be the low bidder for this Category regardless of which alternates are accepted.
 - b. The proposed Bid Form 96 and Bid Form Insert was submitted in duplicate as specified. All requested bids (base bid and alternates) were submitted upon as applicable for this package (non-applicable alternates were not marked as "no change" but are assumed as such). All three (3) addendums were properly acknowledged. All bid forms appear to contain the appropriate authorized signatures – the Non-Collusion Affidavit was also submitted as requested.
 - c. Financial information submitted was older than specified ninety (90) day period without a letter confirming that the financial condition of the company was not changed significantly from the date of the provided information (June 30, 2016 is the date on the information provided).
 - d. Financial Statement was not submitted on the specified Form 96a, but comparable information was provided.

Bid Category No. 3 – Landscaping, Seeding & Sodding

1. GreenVision, LLC
 - a. This Contractor appears to be the low bidder for this Category regardless of which Alternates are accepted.
 - b. The proposed Bid Form 96 and Bid Form Insert was submitted in duplicate as specified. All requested bids (base bid and alternates) were submitted upon as applicable for this package (non-applicable alternates were also clearly marked "N/A" with the exception of one alternate which is assumed as such). All three (3) addendums were properly acknowledged. All bid forms appear to contain the appropriate authorized signatures – the Non-Collusion Affidavit was also submitted as requested.
 - c. Financial information submitted was less than specified ninety (90) day period (August 24, 2017 is the date on the information provided).
 - d. Financial Statement was not submitted on the specified Form 96a, and limited information was provided. For the size/scope of the work being performed, this information should be sufficient.

Bid Category No. 4 – Playground Equipment and Surfaces

1. Recreation Insites, LLC
 - a. This contractor appears to be the low bidder for this Category regardless of which alternates are accepted.
 - b. The proposed Bid Form 96 and Bid Form Insert was submitted in duplicate as specified. All requested bids (base bid and alternates) were submitted upon as applicable for this package (non-applicable alternates were not marked as "no change" but are assumed as such). All three (3) addendums were properly acknowledged. All bid forms appear to contain the appropriate authorized signatures – the Non-Collusion Affidavit was also submitted as requested.
 - c. Financial information submitted was older than specified ninety (90) day period without a letter confirming that the financial condition of the company was not changed significantly from the date of the provided information (December 30, 2016 is the date on the information provided).

- d. Financial Statement was not submitted on the specified Form 96a, but comparable information was provided.
- e. In lieu of providing the Bid Bond, this contractor provided a certified check in the amount of 5% of the total bid for its bid security.

Bid Category No. 5 – Casework and Millwork

- 1. Stonecreek Interior Systems, LLC
 - a. This Contractor appears to be the low bidder for this Category regardless of which Alternates are accepted.
 - b. The proposed Bid Form 96 and Bid Form Insert was submitted in duplicate as specified. All requested bids (base bid and alternates) were submitted upon as applicable for this package (non-applicable alternates were also clearly marked “Zero (0)”). All three (3) addendums were properly acknowledged. All bid forms appear to contain the appropriate authorized signatures – the Non-Collusion Affidavit was also submitted as requested.
 - c. Financial information submitted was over the specified ninety (90) day period without a letter confirming that the financial condition of the company was not changed significantly from the date of the provided information (December 31, 2016 is the date on the information provided).
 - d. Financial Statement was not submitted on the specified Form 96a, but comparable information was provided.

Bid Category No. 6 – Food Service

- 2. Lancaster-Schert Equipment
 - f. This contractor appears to be the low bidder for this Category regardless of which alternates are accepted.
 - g. The proposed Bid Form 96 and Bid Form Insert was submitted in duplicate as specified. All requested bids (base bid and alternates) were submitted upon as applicable for this package (non-applicable alternates were clearly marked as “no change”). All three (3) addendums were properly acknowledged. All bid forms appear to contain the appropriate authorized signatures – the Non-Collusion Affidavit was also submitted as requested.
 - h. Financial information submitted was less than the specified ninety (90) day period (August 23, 2017 is the date on the information provided).
 - i. Financial Statement was not submitted on the specified Form 96a, but comparable information was provided.

Bid Category No. 7 – Fire Protection

- 2. Ryan Fireprotection, Inc.
 - a. This Contractor appears to be the low bidder for this Category regardless of which Alternates are accepted.
 - b. The proposed Bid Form 96 and Bid Form Insert was submitted in duplicate as specified. All requested bids (base bid and alternates) were submitted upon as applicable for this package (non-applicable alternates were also clearly marked “No Change”). All three (3) addendums were properly acknowledged. All bid forms appear to contain the appropriate authorized signatures – the Non-Collusion Affidavit was also submitted as requested.
 - c. Financial information submitted was older than specified ninety (90) day period without a letter confirming that the financial condition of the company was not changed significantly from the date of the provided information (December 31, 2016 is the date on the information provided).
 - d. Financial Statement was not submitted on the specified Form 96a, but comparable information was provided.

Bid Category No. 8 – Mechanical

1. Commercial Air, Inc.
 - a. This Contractor appears to be the low bidder for this Category regardless of which Alternates are accepted.
 - b. The proposed Bid Form 96 and Bid Form Insert was submitted in duplicate as specified. All requested bids (base bid and alternates) were submitted upon as applicable for this package, (non-applicable alternates were also clearly marked "N/A"). All three (3) addendums were properly acknowledged. All bid forms appear to contain the appropriate authorized signatures – the Non-Collusion Affidavit was also submitted as requested.
 - c. Financial Statement submitted was older than specified ninety (90) day period without a letter confirming that the financial condition of the company has not changed significantly from the date of the provided information. (December 31, 2016 is date on Financial Statement).
 - d. Financial Statement was submitted on specified Form 96a and all requested information was provided.

Bid Category No. 9 – Electrical

1. Huston Electric, Inc.
 - a. This Contractor appears to be the low bidder for this Category regardless of which alternates are accepted.
 - b. The proposed Bid Form 96 and Bid Form Insert was submitted in duplicate as specified. All requested bids (base bid and alternates) were submitted upon as applicable for this package (non-applicable alternates were also clearly marked "N/A"). All three (3) addendums were properly acknowledged. All bid forms appear to contain the appropriate authorized signatures – the Non-Collusion Affidavit was also submitted as requested.
 - c. Financial Statement submitted was older than specified ninety (90) day period without a letter confirming that the financial condition of the company has not changed significantly from the date of the provided information. (December 31, 2016 is date on Financial Statement).
 - d. Financial Statement was submitted on the specified Form 96a, and all requested information was provided.

The review of submitted Subcontractors and Products Lists still needs completed. As you are aware, KJG Architecture, Inc. / Schmidt Associates must review these lists and approve same to determine if Contractors are in accordance with the Contract Documents.

Sincerely,

KETTELHUT CONSTRUCTION, INC.



Brad Deno
Executive Vice President

BD: jas

Enclosure