Exhibit II: Objectives, Scope, and Methodology

The objective of our Inspection was to identify and document any project management deficiencies during the construction of the Silver Spring Transit Center. In achieving our objectives, we attempted to determine which project management controls failed, how these controls should have functioned, why they failed, and what measures should be taken to ensure controls will be effective in future projects undertaken by Montgomery County.

The SSTC project implemented many controls, but some significant deficiencies identified by KCE Structural Engineers (KCE) and Whitlock Dalrymple Poston & Associates, P.C. (WDP) in the structure were not identified and/or not corrected during construction. Our review examined the key project controls that were in place during construction of the SSTC in order to determine:

- how the structural deficiencies occurred,
- the design and implementation of each construction project control specific to the SSTC,
- which, if any project control failed during the construction, resulting in a deficiency,
- the cause of the project control failure, and
- whether necessary actions are being taken to ensure that project controls will be effective during remediation.

In order to address these questions, a report on the Silver Spring Transit Center entitled "Analysis of Project Controls" was prepared at our request by the Alpha Corporation. That report, along with recommendations, lessons learned, and the appendices referenced in their analysis, is contained in its entirety in Exhibit I of this report. Work papers supporting information contained in Exhibit I have been independently assembled and referenced, and the report extensively considered by OIG staff.

We consulted with the subject matter expert we retained to provide professional expertise, Alpha Corporation, to ensure the accuracy of the technical aspects of the analysis prepared by the OIG staff.

We conducted this review from May 2013 through March 2014, in accordance with the Quality Standards for Inspection and Evaluation issued by the Council of the Inspectors General on Integrity and Efficiency. Those standards require that we plan and perform our work to obtain sufficient, appropriate evidence to provide a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions based on our objectives. We believe that the evidence obtained provides a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions based on our objectives.

Exhibit II: Objectives, Scope, & Methodology

We relied heavily on the data supporting the KCE report that is publically disclosed on the DGS website, but also reviewed meeting minutes, and other information developed during the construction process. We retained copies only of those documents used by us in direct support of our analysis. When additional data was needed for us to develop an opinion, or when available data referenced other data that was not reviewed by KCE, we requested that information and have incorporated it into our work papers.

Our review methodology included:

- Review of the evaluation report and evidence prepared by KCE Structural Engineers on behalf of Montgomery County Maryland
- Review of the evaluation report prepared by Whitlock Dalrymple Poston & Associates (WDP) on behalf of the Washington Metropolitan Area Transportation Authority
- Review of Montgomery County Council committee and regular meeting minutes and analyst packet relating to Capital Improvement Program submissions and changes.
- Identification of construction deficiencies reported in KCE and WDP reports that would likely have been subject to project or management control.
- Determining potential controls that should be tested to confirm the existence, success, or failure of the control during the inspection process.
- Identification and contracting with a Subject Matter Expert to assist in in assessing the sufficiency and adequacy of the controls.
- Evaluation of construction project vendor contracts and construction and performance specifications.
- Evaluation of construction project design, structural, and technical drawings.
- Close review of our subject matter expert's analysis and supporting documentation
- Close consultation with our subject matter expert regarding engineering construction and related materials methods techniques, industry standards, and related technical issues.
- Review of meeting minutes of the various oversight groups engaged in the construction project.
- Review of other construction documents.
- Review of industry standards and building codes that related to the project.
- Review of the Montgomery County Special Inspections Program.

Exhibit III: Standards

The following standards were either used in the design criteria for the SSTC, or were referenced within this report:

American Concrete Institute (ACI), Farmington Hills, Michigan

- ACI 117 - *Standard Tolerances for Concrete Construction and Materials*.
- ACI 214R - *Evaluation of Strength Test Results of Concrete*
- ACI 301 - *Specifications for Structural Concrete for Buildings*
- ACI 302.1R - *Guide for Floor and Slab Construction*
- ACI 304 - *Recommended Practice for Measuring, Mixing, Transporting and Placing Concrete*
- ACI 304R - *Guide for Measuring, Mixing, Transporting and Placing Concrete*
- ACI 305R - *Hot Weather Concreting*
- ACI 306R - *Cold Weather Concreting*
- ACI 306.1 - *Standard Specification for Cold Weather Concreting*
- ACI 308 - *Standard Specification for Curing Concrete*.
- ACI 308R - *Guide to Curing Concrete*
- ACI 311.1R - *Manual for Concrete Inspection*
- ACI 311.4R - *Guide for Concrete Inspection*
- ACI 318 - *Building Code Requirements for Structural Concrete*.

American Institute of Steel Construction (AISC) – Chicago, Illinois

- Specifications for Design, Fabrication, and Erection of Structural Steel for Buildings

ASTM International (formerly American Society for Testing and Materials), West Conshohocken, Pennsylvania.

- ASTM C31/C31M - *Standard Practice for Making and Curing Concrete Test Specimens in the Field*
- ASTM C39/C39M - *Standard Test Method for Compressive Strength of Cylindrical Concrete Specimens*
- ASTM C94/C94M - *Standard Specifications for Ready Mixed Concrete*
- ASTM C125 - *Standard Terminology*

Exhibit III: Standards

- ASTM C172 - *Standard Practice for Sampling Freshly Mixed Concrete*
- ASTM C1064C/C1064M - *Standard Test Method for Temperature of Freshly Mixed Hydraulic-Cement Concrete*

Concrete Reinforcing Steel Institute (CRSI), Schaumburg, Illinois

- MSP2 - *Manual of Standard Practice*

International Code Council (ICC) - Washington, District of Columbia

- 2003 International Building Code.

Post-Tensioning Institute (PTI) - Farmington Hills, Michigan

- Specifications for Bonded Single Strand or Multi-Strand Tendons for use in Corrosive Environments.

Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority (WMATA) - Washington, District of Columbia

- WMATA Manual of Design Criteria – Release 6.

Remainder of this Page Intentionally Blank

Exhibit IV: Comparison of KCE In-Situ Compressive Strength & Petrographic Test Pairing to Balter Construction Inspection Tests

The following chart isolated areas in the SSTC where we determined close adjacencies between Balter and KCE compressive strength and composition analysis testing that allowed for a relatively close comparison of the testing results. Tests made at (or nearly at) the same concrete location at the time of construction and after completion of the structure should exhibit the nearly same compressive strength. Records maintain by Balter during construction and the KCE testing firms during core collection both noted the approximate location of the sample in terms of a column and row grid matrix in use at the SSTC. This grid matrix is indicated on most structural drawings.

How to Read:

Chart 1: Comparison of KCE In-Situ Compressive Strength & Petrographic Test Pairings to Balter (RBB) Construction Inspection Tests

Average KCE psi as % of RBB: 62%

Pour Information		Testing Information		Strength	Grid Location		Concrete Attributes				KCE psi as %	KCE psi as %
Date	#	Core #	KCE Tset Type	(psi)	Row	Column	Entrained	Entrapped	w/c	unhydrated	of 1st RBB	of 2nd RBB
7-Dec-10	2B	121	Compressive Strength	**11,040**	A3 - A8	8 - 9					81% Δ	80% Δ
		122	Petrographic		A3 - A8	8 - 9	6.00%		.35 - .40			
		123	Petrographic		A2 - A3	7 - 8	5.20%	0.70%	.35 - .45	7% - 11%		
		124	Compressive Strength	10,060	A2 - A3	7 - 8					74%	73%
KCE-Reported average compressive strength - Pour 2B				8,810							65%	64%
56-day RBB Test Cylinder Batch 91111: Test Report # 486				13,575	A2.8 - A3	8 - 9	5.50%		.26			
56-day RBB Test Cylinder Batch 91160: Test Report # 495				13,740	A1 - A2	7 - 8	5.30%		.24			

In the sample above for Pour 2 B, a first comparison set was located for KCE testing extracted in the area between Rows A3 and A8 at Columns 8 to 9. Two testing cores were extracted adjacent to each other. One core (#121) was used to conduct a compressive strength test, and the second (#122) was used to conduct the petrographic analysis. By reference to Balter inspection tickets, we found that the concrete specimen cylinder represented in Balter test report # 486 was for the concrete that was placed at the location where the KCE cores had been extracted. Comparison of the of the KCE and Balter test results should complement each other as the tests were conducted on the same batch of concrete.

For core # 121, we note that the KCE reported compressive strength was 11,040 psi, while Balter reported a compressive strength of 13,575 psi. The first of the two rightmost columns indicate that the KCE sample demonstrated 81% of the strength reported by Balter (and 80% of the second Balter sample reported by test #495). For all of the compressive strength tests it conducted on Pour 2B, KCE determined that the average strength was 8,810 psi.

KCE's petrographic analysis conducted on core # 122 indicates that the in-situ concrete at this location exhibited a water to cement ratio (*w/c*) between .35 and .40, while Balter reported that *w/c* at this area was .26. KCE reported entrained air of 6%, while Balter reported 5.5%.

Exhibit IV: Comparison of KCE In-Situ Compressive Strength & Petrographic Test Pairing to Balter Construction Inspection Tests

Chart 1: Comparison of KCE In-Situ Compressive Strength & Petrographic Test Pairings to Balter (RBB) Construction Inspection Tests

Average KCE psi as % of RBB	62%

Pour Information		Testing Information		Strength	Grid Location		Concrete Attributes				KCE psi as %	KCE psi as %
Date	#	Core #	KCE Tset Type	(psi)	Row	Column	Entrained	Entrapped	w/c	unhydrated	of 1st RBB	of 2nd RBB
18-Oct-10	1C	6	Compressive Strength	6,690	A2 - A4	3 - 4						46% ↓
		47	Petrographic		A2 - A4	3 - 4	5.00%		.38 - .43			
		48	Petrographic		A2 - A4	3 - 4	1.40%	6.10%	.35 - .45	5% - 10%		
KCE-Reported average compressive strength - Pour 1C				6,210								43% ▼
56-day RBB Test Cylinder Batch 87901: Test Report # 387 *				14,470	A1 - A3	3.3 - 4	4.20%		.25			
20-Dec-10	1D	72	Compressive Strength	7,100	A2 - A4	2 - 3						49%
		71	Petrographic		A2 - A4	2 - 3	6.00%		.35 - .40			
KCE-Reported average compressive strength - Pour 1D				6,780							▼	47% ▼
56-day RBB Test Cylinder Batch91832: Test Report # 522				14,400	A2 - A4	2 - 3	4.10%		.26			
12-Nov-10	1E	95	Compressive Strength	9,370	C1 - C6	10 - 10.1					66%	68%
		96	Petrographic		C1 - C6	10 - 10.1	6.00%		.35 - .40			
		99	Petrographic		C1 - C6 (c5)	10 - 10.1	2.60%	3.00%	.35 - .45	7% - 13%		min
		100	Compressive Strength	**5,070**	C1 - C6 (c5)	10 - 10.1					36% ↓	37% ↓
KCE-Reported average compressive strength - Pour 1E				6,740							47% ▼	49% ▼
56-day RBB Test Cylinder Batch 89739: Test Report # 462				14,270	C6	10.1	5.10%		.25			
56-day RBB Test Cylinder Batch 89748: Test Report # 463				13,735	C6	10.1	4.40%		.26			
30-Dec-10	1F	105	Petrographic		C1 - C6	7 - 8	7.00%		.35 - .40			
		106	Compressive Strength	9,350	C1 - C6	7 - 8						69%
		107	Compressive Strength	9,000	C1 - C6	7 - 8						67%
		108	Petrographic		C1 - C6	7 - 8	6.30%	0.30%	.35 - .45	8% - 13%		
KCE-Reported average compressive strength - Pour 1F				6,990								52%
56-day RBB Test Cylinder Batch 92297: Test Report # 551				13,495	C3 - C8	7 - 8	5.20%		.26			
8-Feb-11	1G	79	Petrographic		C1 - C6	5 - 6	7.00%		< .38			
		80	Compressive Strength	7,990	C1 - C6	5 - 6					60%	64%
		85	Compressive Strength		C1 - C6	3 - 4						
		86	Petrographic	7,770	C1 - C6	3 - 4	6.30%	3.90%	.35 - .45	8% - 12 %	58%	62%
KCE-Reported average compressive strength - Pour 1G				6,490							48% ▼	52%
56-day RBB Test Cylinder Batch 93856: Test Report # 642				13,410	C - C5	5 - 6	5.50%		.26			
56-day RBB Test Cylinder Batch 93860: Test Report # 644				12,505	C - C5	5 - 6	5.50%		.26			
2-Nov-10	2A	111	Compressive Strength	7,920	A2 - A3	10.2 - 10.9					57%	57%
		112	Petrographic		A2 - A3	10 - 10.2	4.50%		.35 - .45			
		115	Compressive Strength	8,160	A2 - A3	10.2 - 10.9					58%	59%
		116	Petrographic		A2 - A3	10.2 - 10.9	2.00%	1.60%	.35 - .45	8% - 13%		
KCE-Reported average compressive strength - Pour 2A				6,440							46% ▼	47% ▼
56-day RBB Test Cylinder Batch 88958: Test Report # 436				13,965	A2	10.3	4.30%		.26			
56-day RBB Test Cylinder Batch 88980: Test Report # 439				13,815	A3	10.7	4.50%		.25			
7-Dec-10	2B	121	Compressive Strength	**11,040**	A3 - A8	8 - 9					81% Δ	80% Δ
		122	Petrographic		A3 - A8	8 - 9	6.00%		.35 - .40			
		123	Petrographic		A2 - A3	7 - 8	5.20%	0.70%	.35 - .45	7% - 11%		
		124	Compressive Strength	10,060	A2 - A3	7 - 8					74%	73%
KCE-Reported average compressive strength - Pour 2B				8,810							65%	64%
56-day RBB Test Cylinder Batch 91111: Test Report # 486				13,575	A2.8 - A3	8 - 9	5.50%		.26			
56-day RBB Test Cylinder Batch 91160: Test Report # 495				13,740	A1 - A2	7 - 8	5.30%		.24			
14-Jan-11	2C	127	Petrographic		A4 - A9	5 - 6	7.00%		< .38		max	
		128	Compressive Strength	10,710	A4 - A9	5 - 6					86% Δ	74%
		131	Petrographic		A4 - A9	3 - 4	5.90%	1.00%	.35 - .45	7% - 12%		
		132	Compressive Strength	5,330	A4 - A9	3 - 4					43% ↓	37% ↓
KCE-Reported average compressive strength - Pour 2C				6,870							55%	48% ▼
56-day RBB Test Cylinder Batch 93009: Test Report # 590				12,480	A3 - B	3.3 - 4	4.50%		.26			
56-day RBB Test Cylinder Batch 93019: Test Report # 591				14,390	A3 - B	3.3 - 4	5.40%		.26			
31-Jan-11	2D	141	Petrographic		A4 - A9	2 - 3	6.60%	0.60%	.35 - .45	8% - 13%		
		142	Compressive Strength	8,460	A4 - A9	2 - 3					72%	57%
KCE-Reported average compressive strength - Pour 2D				8,070							69%	54%
56-day RBB Test Cylinder Batch 93512: Test Report # 615				**11,750**	A4 - B	2 - 3	6.10%		.25			
56-day RBB Test Cylinder Batch 93517: Test Report # 616				**14,905**	A4 - B	2 - 3	4.70%		.26			

Pours 1 A, 1 B, and 1 D were not part of the sample set used for data calculations, and 1 H presented no adjacent compressive strength and petrographic test locations.

↓ KCE Core sample less than 50% strength of proximate RBB-tested strength
▼ KCE all sample average for pour area less than 50% strength of proximate RBB-tested strength
Δ KCE Core sample at least 80% strength of proximate RBB-tested strength
* All 56-day RBB test results are the average of two specimen cylinders

Average Unhydrated Cementitious Material	
Low	**Hi**
7	12

Exhibit V: Comparison of Same Batch, Inspection Station to Surface Deck Field Cured Strength Results

The following charts capture compressive strength test results for those sets of comparison specimens cast from the same batch of concrete. One set of cylinders was cast at the inspection station. The second set was cast on the deck after the concrete had been pumped from the truck to the surface. Up to three comparison sets (a total of 6 specimen cylinders) were cast for each pour that exceeded 50 cubic yards of concrete.

How to Read:

Locate the first box below for Pour 1 A. Three comparison sets were cast for this pour – Set 1 from truck # 65, Set 2 from truck # 68, and Set 3 from truck 411.

For truck 65, the tests conducted on the specimens that were cast at the inspection station 26 minutes after leaving the concrete plant were reported in Robert B. Balter Company's Report of Concrete Cylinder Test, report number 283, while results for the specimens collected on the deck 41 minutes after batching were contained in report number 284. Note that if this batch of concrete exceeded the 90 minute maximum batch age, it would be indicated in this column. If water had been added to the mix after the specimen was collected at the inspection station, it would be reported in the column "Added H_2O (gal)".

Three days after the specimens were cast, two cylinders from each specimen set were tested for compressive strength. Specimens from the inspection station were measured at 5,860 and 4,730 psi, while the specimens from the deck were measured at 6,130 and 6,120 psi. In this example, KCE records did not include twenty-eight day inspection station strength test results.

Concrete Batch			Sample	RBB Strength Test		Slump	Air	Added	Revs	W/C	Time	3-Day Strength		28-Day Strength	
Pour	Truck #	Ticket #		#	Location		Content	H_2O (gal)		ratio	Lapse	Sample 1	Sample 2	Sample 1	Sample 2
1 A	65	85320	Set 1	283	Inspection Station	8.0	6.0%	0.0	125	0.25	26	5,860	4,730	Data Not Avialable (DNA)	
				284	Deck	8.0	5.0%	0.0	133	0.25	41	6,130	6,120		
	68	85354	Set 2	291	Inspection Station	8.0	5.7%	0.0	110	0.26	65	5,750	5,900		
				292	Deck	7.3	4.4%	0.0	181	0.26	90	6,270	6,690		
	411	85413	Set 3	299	Inspection Station	8.0	6.8%	0.0	232	0.27	65	7,870	8,130		
				300	Deck	7.3	5.9%	0.0	265	0.27	75	7,920	7,610		
1 B	56	86785	Set 1	334	Inspection Station	8.0	6.9%	0.0	115	0.26	37	Data Not Avialable			
				335	Deck	7.5	6.4%	Data Not Available							
	67	86827	Set 2	342	Inspection Station	8.0	6.5%	0.0	105	0.26	63				
				343	Deck	8.0	6.0%	Data Not Available							
	32	86859	Set 3	349	Inspection Station	8.0	5.9%	0.0	187	0.26	59				
				350	Deck	7.0	6.0%	Data Not Available							
1 C	67	87816	Set 1	373	Inspection Station	8.0	4.5%	0.0	125	0.25	50	Data Not Avialable			
				374	Deck	8.0	5.4%	0.0	DNA	0.25	65				
	78	87855	Set 2	381	Inspection Station	8.0	4.2%	0.0	129	0.25	68				
				382	Deck	7.5	4.0%	0.0	DNA	0.25	86				
	69	87901	Set 3	387	Inspection Station	8.0	4.2%	0.0	73	0.25	51				
				388	Deck	7.5	4.7%	0.0	DNA	0.25	81				

Exhibit V: Comparison of Same Batch, Inspection Station to Surface Deck Field Cured Strength Results

Concrete Batch			Sample	RBB Strength Test		Slump	Air	Added	Revs	W/C	Time	3-Day Strength		28-Day Strength	
Pour	Truck #	Ticket #		#	Location		Content	H_2O (gal)		ratio	Lapse	Sample 1	Sample 2	Sample 1	Sample 2
1 D	67	91818	Set 1	518	Inspection Station	6.5	5.1%	20.0	71	0.25	53	10,480	10,220	13,100	13,440
				519	Deck	6.5	5.3%	20.0	71	0.25	74	5,140	5,020	10,620	10,890
	77	91837	Set 2	523	Inspection Station	7.0	6.2%	0.0	112	0.26	45	9,190	9,580	12,100	11,820
				524	Deck	8.0	5.7%	0.0	112	0.26	65	3,820	3,930	7,550	7,410
	79	91883	Set 3	530	Inspection Station	7.0	5.7%	0.0	250	0.26	53	9,910	10,190	11,470	11,460
				531	Deck	7.5	5.9%	0.0	250	0.26	73	4,460	4,130	9,120	9,510
1 E (a)	68	89704	Set 1	454	Inspection Station	7.5	5.5%	10.0	100	0.27	52	9,240	9,060	10,020	10,070
				455	Deck	7.5	5.7%	10.0	DNA	0.29	67	5,470	5,200	11,630	11,560
	29	89730	Set 2	460	Inspection Station	7.0	5.0%	10.0	175	0.27	41	5,530	5,030	11,430	11,530
				461	Deck	7.5	5.5%	10.0	DNA	0.29	46	8,710	8,320	10,080	10,070
	69	89793	Set 3	468	Inspection Station	8.0	4.6%	0.0	83	0.25	69	5,380	5,450	12,390	12,500
				469	Deck	8.0	5.0%	0.0	**DNA**	0.25	87	9,920	10,280	12,020	11,850
1 F	77	92269	Set 1	543	Inspection Station	7.5	5.0%	0.0	116	0.26	19	6,560	6,730	12,220	11,700
				544	Deck	7.0	4.7%	0.0	150	0.26	44	6,910	6,960	8,780	9,340
	62	92282	Set 2	547	Inspection Station	8.0	6.3%	0.0	120	0.26	45	7,930	7,810	12,690	12,660
				548	Deck	7.5	5.8%	0.0	153	0.26	75	6,120	6,670	9,160	9,250
	32	92316	Set 3	554	Inspection Station	8.0	6.1%	0.0	128	0.25	52	5,700	5,310	12,040	11,910
				555	Deck	7.5	5.9%	**15.0**	160	0.27	**101**	7,190	7,550	8,680	8,730
1 G	67	93856	Set 1	642	Inspection Station	7.0	5.5%	0.0	185	0.26	44	8,150	8,380	12,140	12,260
				643	Deck	7.3	5.0%	0.0	211	0.26	66	7,200	7,080	10,260	10,870
	69	93889	Set 2	649	Inspection Station	8.0	4.5%	0.0	33	0.25	65	9,690	9,950	13,630	13,510
				650	Deck	7.5	4.3%	0.0	33	0.25	80	6,230	6,080	11,630	11,500
	61	93913	Set 3	654	Inspection Station	7.5	4.9%	0.0	250	0.26	51	10,060	9,680	12,210	12,400
				655	Deck	7.0	4.8%	0.0	250	0.26	67	6,130	6,750	11,350	10,950
1 H	65	94393	Set 1	667	Inspection Station	7.5	4.9%	12.0	120	0.26	49	7,610	7,710	11,550	11,780
				668	Deck	8.0	4.4%	0.0	131	0.26	59	6,320	6,520	8,590	9,750
	84	94422	Set 2	674	Inspection Station	8.0	4.9%	15.0	119	0.26	34	7,650	7,860	12,030	11,530
				675	Deck	8.0	4.6%	10.0	137	0.26	47	7,770	7,580	11,490	11,170
	411	94476	Set 3	682	Inspection Station	7.5	4.8%	0.0	156	0.26	43	7,380	6,870	10,840	10,910
				683	Deck	7.0	4.5%	0.0	170	0.26	49	7,380	7,350	10,120	10,000
2A	67	88929	Set 1	428	Inspection Station	8.0	4.8%	0.0	98	0.26	59	5,150	5,520	12,550	13,470
				429	Deck	8.0	4.8%	0.0	98	0.26	74	7,620	7,610	12,480	12,870
	37	88953	Set 2	434	Inspection Station	8.0	4.2%	0.0	188	0.26	58	5,540	5,700	12,790	12,650
				435	Deck	8.0	4.7%	0.0	188	0.26	78	6,640	6,610	11,410	11,550
2 B	67	91088	Set 1	481	Inspection Station	8.0	6.3%	0.0	195	0.25	41	4,080	4,150	11,150	10,670
				482	Deck	8.0	5.1%	0.0	195	0.25	62	4,270	4,590	9,280	8,840
	69	91152	Set 2	493	Inspection Station	7.5	5.1%	0.0	119	0.26	77	6,840	6,910	12,680	12,790
				494	Deck	8.0	4.6%	0.0	119	0.26	**101**	5,990	6,060	11,180	11,310
	37	91251	Set 3	507	Inspection Station	7.0	4.7%	0.0	88	**DNA**	78	4,300	3,960	11,240	10,130
				508	Deck	7.0	4.2%	0.0	88	**DNA**	**94**	5,750	5,740	10,100	10,260
2 C	67	92950	Set 1	578	Inspection Station	7.0	4.5%	0.0	176	0.26	57	7,060	6,490	11,400	11,600
				579	Deck	8.0	4.3%	**20.0**	195	0.30	67	7,080	7,170	11,200	11,140
	81	92978	Set 2	585	Inspection Station	8.0	5.6%	0.0	110	0.26	60	5,380	5,300	12,890	13,120
				586	Deck	8.0	5.4%	0.0	110	0.26	75	8,030	8,060	12,830	12,700
	61	93053	Set 3	594	Inspection Station	7.0	4.8%	0.0	250	0.26	**95**	6,380	6,590	13,170	12,650
				595	Deck	8.0	5.1%	0.0	250	0.26	**109**	5,390	5,160	9,620	9,110
2 D	67	93509	Set 1	613	Inspection Station	7.0	6.2%	0.0	105	0.25	50	6,360	6,530	10,820	11,410
				614	Deck	8.0	6.0%	**15.0**	131	**DNA**	64	6,890	6,580	10,900	10,970
	82	93538	Set 2	620	Inspection Station	7.5	5.4%	0.0	240	0.25	**91**	6,980	7,470	12,340	12,110
				621	Deck	8.0	5.0%	**15.0**	280	**DNA**	**113**	5,850	6,420	13,550	13,660
	57	93600	Set 3	627	Inspection Station	8.0	7.0%	25.0	252	0.25	56	7,270	6,790	11,360	11,290
				628	Deck	7.0	6.7%	0.0	279	**DNA**	75	6,400	6,520	10,670	10,490
2 I (a)	78	96174	Set 1	767	Inspection Station	7.0	5.0%	0.0	126	0.25	40	5,830	5,830	11,720	11,800
				768	Deck	8.0	4.8%	**15.0**	140	0.27	51	5,170	5,190	9,230	9,120
	79	96187	Set 2	770	Inspection Station	7.5	4.9%	0.0	255	0.25	48	6,730	6,330	12,790	13,020
				771	Deck	7.0	4.5%	**37.0**	291	0.28	**123**	4,160	4,050	7,780	7,590

Source: Robert B. Balter Company Report of Concrete Cylinder Test and Rockville Fuel and Feed Company, Inc. job batching and delivery tickets.

3-Day Strength results for Pour 1 F were actually tested on Day 4.

For Set 2 of Pour 1 H, truck numbers differ (84 & 86), an apparent transcription error by the inspector as the batch ticket # is the same for both comparative specimens.

Exhibit VI: Chief Administrative Officer's Statement to County Council

Statement by Chief Administrative Officer Tim Firestine

On Moving Ahead with Final Fix to Silver Spring Transit Center

May 8, 2014

County Executive Ike Leggett has directed County contractors to move ahead on remediation work at the Silver Spring Transit Center to address shear and torsion issues and ensure that the Center will not only be safe but also meet its projected 50-year life span – consistent with our Memorandum of Understanding with the Washington Metropolitan Transit Authority (WMATA).

The County Executive has directed KCE, the County's contract engineering team, to meet on Monday with Parsons Brinckerhoff, the project's engineer of record, to finalize the remediation plan consistent with concerns raised in the Augustine report. The County Executive has given the go-ahead to bring equipment on site to begin preparation for the remediation work.

WMATA, the "customer" for whom the facility is being built, is in agreement with the County Executive to undertake the remediation to address concerns raised about the possible effects of shear and torsion on the structure.

The County Executive has made it clear that he would not open the Transit Center until it was safe to do so. The County will deliver a facility to Metro that is safe and will meet its projected 50-year life. The County will ensure that any additional costs incurred because of faulty construction, design, or inspection by private contractors will be the responsibility of those contractors, not the County taxpayer.

In 2012 – when the facility was 95 percent complete, the County Executive rejected a proposal to simply "cover over" cracks in the concrete with a thin layer of poured concrete and "move on." That would have been wrong.

Instead, the County Executive hired KCE to conduct an in-depth review of the project. As a result of that review, KCE found significant flaws beyond the cracks in the concrete. KCE determined that these flaws would affect the maintenance and durability of the facility and would require repairs to address shear and torsion issues.

Because concerns remained about costs and scheduling, during the winter "weather window" when the overlay could not be done due to low temperatures, the County Executive asked former Lockheed Martin CEO Norman Augustine to undertake an independent review of the project. Mr. Augustine's report supported KCE's proposed remediation plan and introduced, for the first time, concern that the facility could experience safety issues.

The County is grateful to Mr. Augustine for his work and those associates whose expertise he solicited. Not only did they deliver a report at no cost to the taxpayers, but this report has also proved pivotal in helping to advance a consensus for remediation with WMATA and Parsons Brinckerhoff.

# # #