

ADDENDUM No. 1

RFP No. 22-08

Construction Management Software

Updated Proposal Due Date and Time: **March 17, 2022 by 2:00 p.m. (local time)**

The information contained herein shall take precedence over the original documents and all previous addenda (if any) and is appended thereto. **This Addendum includes Twenty-Five (25) pages.**

The Offeror is to acknowledge receipt of this Addendum No. 1, including all attachments in its Proposal by so indicating in the proposal that the addendum has been received. Proposals submitted without acknowledgement of receipt of this addendum may be considered non-conforming.

The following forms provided within the RFP Document should be included in submitted proposal:

- Attachment C - Non-Discrimination Declaration of Compliance
- Attachment D - Living Wage Declaration of Compliance
- Attachment E - Vendor Conflict of Interest Disclosure Form

Proposals that fail to provide these completed forms listed above upon proposal opening may be rejected as non-responsive and may not be considered for award.

I. CORRECTIONS/ADDITIONS/DELETIONS

Changes to the RFP documents which are outlined below are referenced to a page or Section in which they appear conspicuously. Offerors are to take note in its review of the documents and include these changes as they may affect work or details in other areas not specifically referenced here.

Section/Page(s)	Change
Section I.O Page 7	Remove: Proposal Due Date March 10, 2022, 2:00 p.m. (Local Time) Tentative Interviews Week of April 4th Selection/Negotiations April 2022 Expected City Council Authorization June 6, 2022 Replace with: Proposal Due Date March 17, 2022, 2:00 p.m. (Local Time) Tentative Interviews Week of April 18th Selection/Negotiations April 2022 Expected City Council Authorization June 6, 2022
Section III.D Page 12	Remove: The proposal should include completion of the Functionality Matrix per Item 1 below as well as responses to the

functionality questions per Items 2-12 following.

Replace with: The proposal should include completion of the Functionality Matrix per Item 1 below as well as responses to the functionality questions per Items 2-11 following.

II. QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

The following Questions have been received by the City. Responses are being provided in accordance with the terms of the RFP. Respondents are directed to take note in its review of the documents of the following questions and City responses as they affect work or details in other areas not specifically referenced here.

Question 1: Whether companies from Outside USA can apply for this? (like, from India or Canada)

Answer 1: The City will accept proposals from all sources.

Question 2: Whether we need to come over there for meetings?

Answer 2: Being available for in-person meetings would be ideal but the City is willing to work with a provider via virtual communications like Zoom or Teams to the degree possible.

Question 3: Can we perform these tasks (related to the RFP) outside USA? (like, from India or Canada)

Answer 3: The City is indifferent on the physical location of employees, but interested parties, should be aware that the City's Living Wage requirements as provided in the RFP document apply no matter where those employees may be located geographically.

Question 4: Can we submit the proposals via email?

Answer 4: No. Proposals will only be accepted as outlined in the RFP document.

Question 5: The Fee Proposal instructions say, "Offerors shall be capable of justifying the details of the fee proposal relative to personnel costs, overhead, how the overhead rate is derived, material and time." If the offer is provided as a fixed fee and not hourly fee, would it be acceptable to provide pricing for deliverable items such as: Implementation, Training, Integrations, Licenses, etc.? Note that proposal section C. Implementation Approach would include an estimated timeline and estimated number of hours for each team member.

Answer 5: This is acceptable.

Question 6: Does the City have a preference for either an on-premises solution, or for a SaaS solution hosted in the cloud?

Answer 6: Either is acceptable. However, the City does want a web-based solution that will be made available remotely. Either solution must allow for intergation with current City software (ArcGIS, Cityworks, EnerGov, MERL, Roadsoft) if the City decides to pursue in the future.

Question 7: Should Offerors review the RFP provided terms/agreement/exhibits and provide exceptions with proposals, or will the City negotiate terms and agreements at a later time?

Answer 7: No exceptions will be made to the contract language or the exhibits B through G. Any other exceptions related to scope, deliverables, schedule, etc. should be clearly stated in the proposal.

Question 8: Does the Functionality Matrix in Attachment A count toward the page limit?

Answer 8: No.

- Question 9: Will the City please respond to Offeror questions or provide addenda before or by 2/25, or extend the Proposal Due Date so at least eight business days remain to complete, review, print, sign, and ship the proposal? Offerors typically target proposal delivery by carrier to occur a day before the due date.
- Answer 9: The due date is being extended to March 17, 2022 at 2:00 p.m. local time.
- Question 10: Once MDOT removes the City's access to AASHTOWare's Field Manager, will the City be required to submit any state required forms that were filled and submitted in Field Manager? If so, please provide or describe those forms.
- Answer 10: No, this program will not be utilized for state funded projects at this time.
- Question 11: In section 3. Technical Requirements, the City says the new CMS should be compatible with ArcGIS, Cityworks, EnerGov, MERL and Roadsoft. Does the City expect the Offeror to provide integrations in the initial implementation with all of the systems, or is the City only wanting to confirm that the CMS is able to integrate with these systems?
- a. If integrations with any of these systems are required for the initial implementation, please provide details for each one. Details for each system would include: the method of data exchange (manual import/export, batch, automated), the data points to be included, direction of the data exchange (one-way, bi-directional), etc.
- Answer 11: Currently, the City is only looking to make sure that the various systems have the capability to talk to one another, if and when we decide to do an integration.
- Question 12: Section II, #3, Technical Requirements, talks about compatibility with other City programs. Is the City looking for custom integration development as "work for hire" or are data import/export capabilities or calling services for data sufficient?
- Answer 12: Currently, the City is only looking to make sure that the various systems have the capability to talk to one another, if and when we decide to do an integration. The City would prefer an API or calling service.
- Question 13: In section D. Proposed Functionality, item 3 asks "Describe all integrations that will be required and who is responsible for creating those integrations." Is this asking about integrations required to provide features listed in Attachment A Functionality Matrix or are other integrations required by the City?
- Answer 13: This is referring to the features listed in the Functionality Matrix.
- Question 14: Section II, #2 mentions the need for "Bid Tabulations" in the new software. Please expand on this requirement. Bid tabulations are generally reports run on contractor bid submissions as a part of the electronic bidding and award process. I don't see any mention of eBidding functionality requirements in this RFP.
- Answer 14: The City does not use eBidding, so that is not a requirement. Staff is envisioning a system where we can enter the bid data we receive into the software once and it would create a bid tabulation, populate the project with the winning unit prices, and keep a database of past unit prices for future cost estimating purposes.
- Question 15: Can the City provide additional detail and/or clarification on desirable feature E: "[c]ollect data for project planning (collecting quantities for estimating purposes)"? Would the software need to interface with an existing estimation tool to meet this desirable functionality, or otherwise what output format would meet the City's planning needs?
- Answer 15: The software would not need to interface with an existing estimating tool for this purpose. See Question 14 for more information.

- Question 16: Can you provide a link to the “current City web security requirements”?
Answer 16: We do not have a link to specific requirements. However, the vendor should meet current web security best practices, actively work to find/fix vulnerabilities, and update software and prerequisites as needed to avoid using outdated/legacy software.
- Question 17: Can you provide additional information regarding notifications? The RFP mentions “when something is modified or submitted”. Can you be more specific on the notifications that are required or desired?
Answer 17: The ideal software would be able to send e-mail notices to selected members of the project team when documents are altered or ready for review. Ideally, it could be flexible enough to be able to select which people receive notices for which documents.
- Question 18: “Materials” are mentioned several places in the RFP. Is the City requesting materials/LIMS functionality (sampling, testing, etc) or are “materials” related to the descriptions of items to be placed and reported in the Construction Management Software?
Answer 18: The City is not requesting LIMS functionality.
- Question 19: Section D, “Proposed Functionality” says that the proposal should include the Functionality Matrix and responses to the functionality questions “per Items 2-12”. The functionality questions end at #11. Should there be a #12 that is missing?
Answer 19: There is no #12. This correction has been made in Section I above.
- Question 20: Please list the challenges you currently experience with FieldManager and what problems are you trying to solve with a new software?
Answer 20: The primary reason for replacing the FieldManager software is that it will no longer be supported. That said, there is additional functionality that we would like to have, and those items are captured in the RFP.
- Question 21: How does the city plan on managing the change management process to implement a new solution? Are you planning to hire technology consultant for implementation?
Answer 21: It is expected that the proposing firm will also work with the City to implement the solution.
- Question 22: What IT consultants does the city currently work with?
Answer 22: The City works with a large number of IT consultants. IT services are generally handled by City staff.
- Question 23: Does the City have a budget approved for this project in FY 22?
Answer 23: Yes.
- Question 24: Do you have challenges managing different project types with one software? Are you looking for a software that can be templatized to manage projects differently or are you looking for a COTS to manage all projects the same?
Answer 24: The City prefers COTS, but will use software that best meets the needs. We generally manage all our projects the same.
- Question 25: Does the City plan on migrating existing data from ASHOTWARE into the new solution as part of the implementation? Is that expected to be done by the software vendor or are you planning on hiring a consultant for that work?
Answer 25: The City is not planning to migrate existing data.

- Question 26: Page 13 questions 10 & 11...can the city provide sample reports to the vendors? What specific reports are you looking to see?
Answer 26: Attached
- Question 27: Can you provide your contractor evaluation form?
Answer 27: Attached
- Question 28: Is the City looking for a COTS with little ability to change over time or a configurable tool to meet City specifications?
Answer 28: The City is looking for a system that will allow us to manage and make some changes to the software via a configuration module. We don't want to have to go the vendor for basic changes.
- Question 29: How does the City currently track funding today? What type of funds are being tracked?
Answer 29: Funding for our projects comes from a variety of sources, including Street Millage, Sidewalk Millage, ACT 51, Federal Aid, Drinking Water, Sanitary Sewer, Stormwater, and others. Projects are set up using some combination of these funding sources. The selected software thus must be able to track spending on a project, on an item-by-item basis, for multiple funding sources. For example, some items may be paid for entirely by one funding source, and some items may be split between one or more funding sources.
- Question 30: Has the City seen demonstrations from any Construction Management Software vendors prior to the release of this RFP? If so, which ones has the City seen so far?
Answer 30: We have seen demos from e-Builder and Aurigo.
- Question 31: There isn't a fee proposal template listed. Should we send our own? What is the term the City would like for the initial contract?
Answer 31: There is no template for a fee proposal for this RFP. Firms should send their own. The term of the contract will depend on the individual solution and how long it will take to implement.
- Question 32: How many system users, internal and external, is the City looking for?
Answer 32: Internal users will be approximately 45. External users will vary and is difficult to predict.
- Question 33: Do you know how many internal users you will have using the software?
Answer 33: Internal users will be approximately 45.
- Question 34: How many users will need access to the system? How many will need read-only access?
Answer 34: 45 internal users are estimated. External users are difficult to quantify and will consist mostly of outside consultants doing engineering and inspection work for the City. Users requiring read-only access will consist primarily of contractors and should not have a limit.
- Question 35: Do you want the fee proposal to also be included with Exhibit B or is that the exhibit once a contract is signed?
Answer 35: That is the exhibit once the firm is selected and the contract sent for signature. Your fee proposal should ONLY be submitted separately from the proposal as indicated in the RFP.

- Question 36: We assume that if interviews are held the week of April 4th, they will be held virtually. Those involved with this project will be on the road that week and we want to make sure we can participate in those meetings.
- Answer 36: Interviews will be held virtually. Note the change in schedule referenced in Section 1 as well.
- Question 37: What date do you plan to release the answers to the submitted questions? Some of these responses may have significant impact on our proposal response. If the addendum day listed of March 4th is the intended release of the responses, this is a tight timeframe for turnaround of a printed, mailed-in proposal.
- Answer 37: The due date has been extended to March 17, 2022.
- Question 38: Will the County migrate data into the new system and if so 1) How much data will be need to migrated in terms of A) years of historical data, B) number of projects (active vs. historical), C) data types (Budgets, Contracts, etc.) and D) record counts?
- Answer 38: No, the City will not migrate data from the old system into the new system.
- Question 39: Does the city have a need for portfolio planning?
- Answer 39: No.
- Question 40: What type of reports would the city like to see and use in PMWeb?
- Answer 40: See page 12-13 Section D. Proposed Functionality, specifically numbers 10 and 11 of the RFP and additional examples are attached.
- Question 41: Will the city have the need to integrate PMWeb with third party systems? What are these systems and what direction will these integrations go e.g. bidirectional, etc.
- Answer 41: The City wants the option to be able to integrate with our other systems (Cityworks, GIS, EnerGov, Logos), however we don't currently have any integrations planned.
- Question 42: How would the City like to host PMWeb? We offer three options for hosting. SaaS hosting in which the client leases PMWeb and we host. Managed hosting in which the client purchases PMWeb and we host. And Self Hosting in which the clients purchases the software and host on their own servers.
- Answer 42: The City would be open to all of these options. The ability to integrate with current software may drive the selection of SaaS or purchased.
- Question 43: Could you provide additional details and/or information regarding the function "Permit to place" and what is expected from the acquired software in terms of functionality?
- Answer 43: Once the contractor has completed a certain task (such as preparing the subgrade or the aggregate base), the City would like the ability to be able to issue an informal "Permit to Place" to indicate to the contractor that it has been accepted and is ready for the next step in the process. We would like the software to be able to record this acceptance and notify the contractor that it has been accepted.
- Question 44: Has the City seen any recent demos for construction management software prior to issuing this RFP, and if so, can you say by who?
- Answer 44: We have seen demos from e-Builder and Aurigo.
- Question 45: In the RFP you mention that the City reserves the right to waive the interview process and evaluate the offerors based on their proposals and open fee schedules. Is there any scenario where you wouldn't interview vendor submittals?
- Answer 45: If, after reviewing the proposals received, one software product seems clearly superior to the rest, the City may elect to waive interviews. However, that scenario is unlikely.

Offerors are responsible for any conclusions that they may draw from the information contained in the Addendum.

**INSERT 17 PAGE
ATTACHEMENT WHICH IS
REFERENCED IN A26 & A27**

Contractor Performance Evaluation - New Item

Project Name *

File Number

Bid Number

Contractor

Project Evaluation Type Interim Final

Responsible Unit

Contract Value

Major Subcontractors

Brief Description of Work

Rate the Contractor using any whole number from one to ten (ten being the highest rating). Basic guidelines can be found below each question. Please use the comment section below each question to further document any specific instances supporting your rating. Feel free to reference any IDRs by date as further documentation. This evaluation must be completed by a City employee. An additional evaluation form may be completed for major subcontractors if desired or warranted.

Performance of Project Supervisor & Management *

N/A

To what degree are the Contractor's project supervisor or project management personnel available and given the proper authority to execute the work? Does the Contractor's Project Supervisor work harmoniously with the City and all other parties typically involved with work of this nature? Was the Contractor's Project Supervisor responsive to the City's requests? Mention the supervisor and/or manager by name in the Comments section below.

Ratings Guidelines

10: Management personnel have proper authority to execute the work and are always available and responsive to requests by City staff.

8: Management personnel have proper authority to execute the work and are usually available and responsive to requests by City staff.

5: Management personnel do not have full authority to execute the work and are sometimes available or offer resistance to the requests of City staff prior to compliance.

1: Management personnel do not have authority to execute the work and are routinely not available or disregard the requests of City staff.

Performance of Project Supervisor & Management Comments

Scheduling *

N/A ▼

To what degree is the Contractor competent and effective in scheduling the work and organizing construction operations? Was the project completed on schedule? Did the Contractor meet critical intermediate phases in accordance with the contract? Did the Contractor mobilize on site in a timely manner as directed by the contract?

Ratings Guidelines

10: The Contractor is very competent in scheduling work and punctual starting the project and meeting all contract dates. The Contractor always informs City staff of his schedule of operations. The Contractor completed the project on or ahead of schedule.

8: The Contractor schedules work operations carefully and meets all contract dates. The Contractor usually informs City staff of his work schedule. The Contractor completed the project on schedule.

5: The Contractor schedules the work, but often fails to follow the schedule. Contract dates are not always met. Updates to the progress schedule and/or critical path are provided only after requests from City staff.

1: The Contractor does not use a work schedule or if one exists it is seldom used or followed. Contract dates are not met.

Scheduling Comments

Documentation & paperwork *

N/A ▼

To what degree does the Contractor furnish required documentation and reports in a timely manner? This includes, but is not limited to, signed Contract or Change Orders, proper insurance certificates, proper bonds, updated progress schedules, certification of materials, delivery tickets, invoices, Contractor Declarations and Affidavit, shop drawings, material sampling, requests for extensions of time, contractor staking, health and safety plans, prevailing wage documentation, and Contractor Quality Assurance/Quality Control (QA/QC) plans and documentation.

Ratings Guidelines

10: The Contractor always furnishes all paperwork, documentation, reports, information, plans, etc., as required on time without being requested.

8: The Contractor furnishes all paperwork, documentation, reports, information, plans, etc., as required on time with minimal request.
5: The Contractor must be asked numerous times to furnish required paperwork, documentation, reports, information, plans, etc. Paperwork is sometimes late.
1: The Contractor typically does not furnish the required paperwork, documentation, reports, information, plans, etc., or is usually late and must be asked in writing.

Documentation & paperwork
Comments

Compliance with plans & specifications *

N/A ▼

To what degree does the Contractor comply with the direction of City staff and follow the Detailed Specifications for General Conditions, Maintenance of Traffic, or Project Supervision?

Ratings Guidelines

10: The Contractor always complies with the directions from City staff and the Contract plans and specifications.
8: The Contractor follows the Project plans and specifications and complies with the directions from City staff.
5: The Contractor usually follows the Project plans and specifications and complies with the directions from City staff after repeated notification.
1: The Contractor occasionally follows the Project plans and specifications and complies only upon written direction from City staff.

Compliance with plans & specifications
Comments

Problem Solving & Cooperation

N/A ▼

To what degree does the Contractor work with City in a timely, professional manner to resolve issues that arise during the project, submit and/or respond to requests for information in a timely manner, provide adequate detail to requests for extra compensation to allow City staff to evaluate the requests?

Ratings Guidelines

10: The Contractor always actively and cooperatively participates in the resolution of issues on the project. Project documentation was always accurate, provided with adequate detail and submitted in timely manner.
8: The Contractor actively and cooperatively participates in the resolution of issues on the project. Project documentation was accurate, provided with adequate detail and submitted in timely manner.
5: Usually the Contractor actively and cooperatively participates in

3: Usually the Contractor actively and cooperatively participates in the resolution of issues on the project. Contractor had to be prompted to provide project documentation that was accurate, provided with adequate detail and submitted in timely manner.

1: Occasionally the Contractor actively and cooperatively participates in the resolution of issues on the project, but this was a rare instance and only after prompting from City staff. Project documentation was not accurate, did not provide adequate detail and was rarely submitted in a timely manner.

Problem Solving & Cooperation
Comments

Equipment *

N/A ▼

To what degree does the Contractor have adequate and sufficient equipment to keep the project on schedule? Does the equipment meet the requirements of the specifications and efficiently provide a quality product?

Ratings Guidelines

10: The Contractor has sufficient equipment to complete the project ahead of schedule. All equipment meets or exceeds the specification requirements.

8: The Contractor has sufficient equipment to complete the project on schedule. All equipment meets the specification requirements.

5: The Contractor usually has adequate and sufficient equipment to complete the project on schedule. On some occasions, the Contractor has to be notified to provide equipment that meets the specification requirements.

1: The Contractor does not have adequate and sufficient equipment to complete the project on schedule. The Contractor has to be given written notification to provide equipment meeting the specification requirements.

Equipment
Comments

Personnel *

N/A ▼

To what degree does the Contractor have competent and sufficient personnel to keep the project on schedule?

Ratings Guidelines

10: The Contractor has competent and sufficient personnel to complete the project ahead of schedule.

8: The Contractor has competent and sufficient personnel to complete the project on schedule.

5: The Contractor usually has competent and sufficient personnel to complete the project on schedule. Occasionally, the Contractor's personnel demonstrate lack of knowledge and skills.

1: The Contractor does not have competent and sufficient personnel to complete the project on schedule.

Personnel
Comments

Safety *

N/A ▼

To what degree does the Contractor have good safety practices? Did the Contractor create an unsafe work environment (for example failing to cautiously work around existing utilities)? Does the Contractor comply with MIOSHA requirements and follow their own safety program?

Ratings Guidelines

10: The Contractor takes the initiative to ensure the safety and health of the employees. They always comply with and sometimes exceed MIOSHA requirements. Safety equipment and devices are in excellent condition and are used by all the Contractor employees. MIOSHA issued no citations. The Contractor always follows their safety program.

8: The Contractor ensures the safety and health of the employees and complies with the MIOSHA requirements. Safety equipment and devices are in good condition and are used by the Contractor's employees. The Contractor immediately carries out any requests by City staff or MIOSHA for changes in safety measures. MIOSHA issued no citations. The Contractor follows their safety program.

5: The Contractor usually ensures the safety and health of the employees and usually complies with the MIOSHA requirements. Safety equipment and devices are in average condition and are sometimes not used by Contractor's employees. The Contractor carries out requests by City staff or MIOSHA for changes in safety measures after written notification. MIOSHA may have issued citations.

1: The Contractor's safety and health practices are unsatisfactory or MIOSHA issued the Contractor citations. City staff imposed stoppages of work for safety issues. The Contractor only reluctantly makes changes requested by City staff or did not make the change.

Safety Comments

Maintenance of
Traffic *

N/A ▼

To what degree did the Contractor comply with contract requirements for maintaining traffic?

Ratings Guidelines

10: Traffic control devices are in excellent condition, in proper position, clean and serviced regularly. The Contractor continually monitors and meets all traffic control requirements. Any job site

conditions which affect the traveling public are addressed immediately (even after hours) with no direction from City staff. Traffic regulators are competent and effective.

8: Traffic control devices are in good condition, placed properly, maintained and working effectively. The Contractor monitors and meets all traffic control requirements. Deficiencies are immediately corrected with minimal notification by City staff. Traffic regulators are competent and effective.

5: Traffic control devices usually meet the minimum requirements. The Contractor usually monitors and meets the traffic control requirements. The deficiencies are only corrected upon notification from City staff. Traffic regulators are usually competent and effective.

1: The Contractor has numerous traffic control deficiencies which are corrected only upon written notification from City staff. Safety shut downs may be issued for non compliance.

Maintenance of Traffic Comments

Punchlist *

N/A ▼

Did the Contractor complete the punchlist in a timely manner?

Ratings Guidelines

10: The Contractor exceeds expectations and completed the punchlist in a timely manner.

8: The Contractor meet expectations and completed the punchlist in a timely manner.

5: The Contractor completed the punchlist only after repeated request and oversight by City staff.

1: The Contractor did not complete punchlist.

Punchlist Comments

Claims *

N/A ▼

To what degree does the Contractor work with in the intended scope of pay items? Did the Contractor submit baseless claims for extra compensation? On Lump Sum contracts: to what degree does the Contractor provide an adequately detailed Schedule of Values that effectively represents the scope of work and is an effective tool for monitoring progress?

Ratings Guidelines

10: The Contractor exceeded the scope of pay items and only submitted justified claims for extra compensation.

8: The Contractor performed the work in accordance with the scope of the pay items and only submitted justified claims for extra compensation.

5: The Contractor performed the work with in the minimum

5: The Contractor performed the work within the minimum requirements of the scope of the pay items and only submitted one or two baseless claims for extra compensation.
1: The Contractor failed to perform the work with in the minimum requirements of the scope of the pay items and submitted many baseless claims for extra compensation.

Claims Comments

Quality of Product *

N/A ▼

To what degree did the Contractor provide a quality product?

Ratings Guidelines

10: The quality of the materials and workmanship exceeds the contract requirements and is excellent.
8: The quality of the materials and workmanship meets the contract requirements.
5: The quality of the materials and workmanship meets the minimum contract requirements after notification from City staff.
1: The quality of the materials and workmanship may not meet the minimum contract requirements even after notification from City staff.

Quality of Product Comments

Coordination with others *

N/A ▼

To what degree did the Contractor properly notify and coordinate work with private utility companies, railroads, refuse collectors, property owners, local units of government, mail delivery personnel, and Contractors working on adjacent projects?

Ratings Guidelines

10: The Contractor exceeds expectations on project coordination. The Contractor always schedules and conducts operations in a timely manner that does not interfere with the work or damage the property of others. The Contractor always provides advance notifications to all potentially affected parties prior to commencing work and does whatever is necessary to cooperate with them and to protect their existing facility or property.
8: The Contractor meets expectations on project coordination. The Contractor schedules and conducts operations in a timely manner that does not interfere with the work or damage to the property of others. Any problems created are immediately corrected. The Contractor provides proper notification and cooperates with each affected party.
5: The Contractor usually meets expectations on project coordination. The Contractor usually schedules and conducts operations in a timely

manner that does not interfere with the work or damages the property of others. Corrections are made only after notification from City staff. The Contractor does not cooperate fully with or give proper notification to all affected parties.

1: The Contractor does not schedule and conduct operations in a timely manner. The Contractor's operations frequently interfere with the work or damages the property of others. The Contractor does not provide the proper notification nor make an effort to cooperate with the affected parties.

Coordination with Others Comments

Cleanliness *

N/A ▼

To what degree did the Contractor maintain a clean construction site? Did the Contractor attempt to reduce dust? Were construction materials stored in a neat and orderly fashion on site? Did the Contractor comply with the City noise ordinance/work hours?

Ratings Guidelines

10: The Contractor exceeded expectations of a clean construction site and performed dust control measures without prompting by City staff.

8: The Contractor meet expectations of a clean construction site and performed dust control measures without prompting by City staff.

5: The Contractor meet expectations of a clean construction site and performed dust control measures only after notification by City staff.

1: The Contractor did not meet expectations of a clean construction site and performed dust control measures only after repeated notification by City staff.

Cleanliness Comments

Soil Erosion Control *

N/A ▼

To what degree did the Contractor properly install and maintain soil erosion control measures and tree protection as detailed on the plans and in the specifications in accordance with the Soil Erosion Permit? Were soil erosion control devices removed at the end of the projects?

Ratings Guidelines

10: The Contractor exceeds the soil erosion control plan requirements and maintained the erosion control measures and tree protection without prompting by City staff.

8: The Contractor meets the soil erosion control plan requirements and maintained the erosion control measures and tree protection without prompting by City staff.

5: The Contractor meets the soil erosion control plan requirements

and maintained the erosion control measures and tree protection only after notification by City staff.

1: The Contractor meets soil erosion control plan requirements and maintained the erosion control measures and tree protection only after repeated notification from City staff. City staff may have had to issue orders to stop work, hold up payments, or have work completed by others.

Soil Erosion Control
Comments

Subcontractor
Management *

N/A ▼

To what degree does the Contractor coordinate work with Subcontractor's work, exercise authority over Subcontractors, kept the sub-contractors and suppliers informed on the project status, provide notice of Subcontractor work schedule and ensure that Subcontractors are in compliance with contract requirements?

Ratings Guidelines

10: The Contractor exceeds expectations in exercising authority, coordinating and monitoring work operations of their Subcontractors to ensure the schedule and specifications are met and that all documentation is submitted in a timely manner.

8: The Contractor always exercises authority, coordinates and monitors work operations with their Subcontractors to ensure the schedule and specifications are met, and that all documentation is submitted in a timely manner.

5: The Contractor usually exercises authority, coordinates and monitors work operations with their Subcontractors to ensure the schedule and specifications are met, and that all documentation is submitted in a timely manner. Any problems are corrected immediately upon notification by City staff.

1: The Contractor does not sufficiently exercise authority, coordinate or monitor work operations with their Subcontractors to ensure the schedule and specifications are met, and that all documentation is submitted in a timely manner. Problems are corrected only upon notification by City staff.

Subcontractor
Management
Comments

Any Additional
Comments

Save

Cancel



Contract Modification

Michigan Department of Transportation

2/24/2022 2:23 PM

FieldManager 5.3c

Contract: _0000-000, Test Contract

Cont. Mod. Number 1	Revision Number	Cont. Mod. Date 2/24/2022	Electronic File Created No	Net Change \$6.00	Awarded Contract Amount \$10.00
Route	Managing Office City of Ann Arbor		District 0	Entered By Andrea M Wright	
Contract Location City Wide					

Short Description

Short Description

Description of Changes

Description of Changes

Increases / Decreases

Item Description	Item Code	Prop. Line	Proj. Line	Project	Catg.	Item Type	Quantity Change	Unit	Unit Price	Dollar Value
Barricade, Type III, High Intensity, Lig	_8	0040	0040	_0000-000	001	ORIGINAL	2.000	EA	1.00000	\$2.00

Reason: Reason

Total Dollar Value: \$2.00

New Items

Item Description	Item Code	Prop. Line	Proj. Line	Project	Catg.	ItemType	Proposed Quantity	Unit	Unit Price	Dollar Value
Sign, Type B, Temp, Prismatic, Oper	_11	0055	0055	_0000-000	001	SUPPLEMEI	2.000	SFT	2.00000	\$4.00

Reason: Extra Item of Work

Total Dollar Value: \$4.00

Project / Category Summary

Project/Catg	Project/Category Description	Federal Number	Project Status	Finance System	Control Section	Dollar Value
_0000-000	Test Contract	0	CNST			
001	Category					\$6.00



Contract Modification

Michigan Department of Transportation

2/24/2022 2:23 PM

FieldManager 5.3c

Project / Category Summary

Project/Catg	Project/Category Description	Federal Number	Project Status	Finance System	Control Section	Dollar Value
_0000-000	Test Contract	0	CNST			
001	Category					\$6.00
Total:						\$6.00

Total Net Change Amount: \$6.00

If authorized, the contractor agrees to do the work outlined above under the direction of the Engineer, and to accept as payment in full the basis of payment as indicated. Prime Contractor, you are authorized and instructed as the contractor to do the work described herein in accordance with the terms of your contract.

Prime Contractor: City of Ann Arbor _____ Signature _____ Date	Recommended by Construction Engineer: _____ Signature _____ Date
Prepared by Project Engineer: John Doe, P.E. _____ Signature _____ Date	Authorized by Managing Office Manager: _____ Signature _____ Date
Prepared by Consultant Project Manager: _____ Signature _____ Date	Authorized by Region Construction Engineer: _____ Signature _____ Date
Recommended by Local Agency: _____ Signature _____ Date	Authorized by Bureau of Field Services: _____ Signature _____ Date
Authorized by Airport Sponsor: _____ Signature _____ Date	Authorized by Airports Division: _____ Signature _____ Date



Inspector's Daily Report

Contract: _0000-000, Test Contract

IDR Date 2/24/2022	Day of Week Thursday	Seq. No. 1	Import Date N/A	Project Engineer John Doe, P.E.		Construction Engineer	
Inspector's Initials-Name AMW Andrea M Wright			Federal Project Number			Elec. Attachments 1	
Prime Contractor City of Ann Arbor							
Entered By AMW, Andrea M Wright			Revised By		Revision Date	Revision No.	
Temperatures Low: 32 ° F High: 52 ° F			Weather Sunny				

Comments
Daily site activities recorded here.

Contractors

Contractor's Name	Personnel	No.	Hrs.	Equipment	No.	Hrs.
City of Ann Arbor	A. Wright	1	1.50	Excavator	2	3.50

Site Information

Site Number	Site Description	Days Charged	Contractor(s) Working	Hours Available	Hours Worked	Controlling Operations	Reason for Delays	Comments
00	Overall Contract Site	1.000	Yes	2.00	1.00	Prime Contractor	Weather	See comment section

Item Postings

Item/Material Description	Item Code	Prop. Line	Project	Category	Quantity	Unit	Location	Brkdwn ID	Attn
---------------------------	-----------	------------	---------	----------	----------	------	----------	-----------	------

Barricade, Type III, High Intensity, _8 Lighted, Furn
 Contractor: City of Ann Arbor
 Item Remarks: Record additional remarks related to item.

Reviewed By: _____ (Signature) _____ (Date)



Construction Pay Estimate Report

2/24/2022 2:18 PM

Michigan Department of Transportation

FieldManager 5.3c

Contract: _0000-000, Test Contract

Estimate Date	Estimate No.	Entered By	Estimate Type	Electronic File Created	All Contract Work Completed	Construction Started Date
02/24/2022	1	Andrea M Wright	SEMI-MONTHLY	No		
Prime Contractor City of Ann Arbor				Managing Office City of Ann Arbor		

Item Usage Summary

Item Description	Item Code	Prop. Line	Project	Category	Project Item Line No.	Mod. Type	Mod. No.	Quantity	Dollar Amount
Certified Payroll Compliance and Reporting	_3	0015	_0000-000	001	0015	00	000	1.000	\$1.00
General Conditions (MAX \$20,000)	_2	0010	_0000-000	001	0010	00	000	1.000	\$1.00
Total Estimated Item Payment:									\$2.00

Time Charges

Site	Site Description	Site Method	Days Charged	Liq. Damages
00	Overall Contract Site	Working Days	0	\$0
Total Liquidated Damages:				\$0

Pre-Voucher Summary

Project	Voucher No.	Item Payment	Stockpile Adjustment	Dollar Amount
_0000-000, Test Contract	0001	\$2.00	\$0.00	\$2.00
Voucher Total:				\$2.00

Summary

Current Voucher Total:	\$2.00	Earnings to date:	\$2.00
-Current Retainage:	\$1.50	- Retainage to date:	\$1.50
-Current Liquidated Damages:	\$0.00	- Liquidated Damages to date:	\$0.00
-Current Adjustments:	\$0.00	- Adjustments to date:	\$0.00
Total Estimated Payment:	\$0.50	Net Earnings to date:	\$0.50
		- Payments to date:	\$0.00
		Net Earnings this period:	\$0.50



Construction Pay Estimate Report

Michigan Department of Transportation

2/24/2022 2:18 PM

FieldManager 5.3c

Estimate Certification

I certify the items included on this report constitute my estimate of work completed and due the contractor as of the date of this document. I also certify the prime contractor is meeting all requirements for minority percentages and the payrolls are current.

John Doe, P.E. (Project Engineer) and/or

(Date)

(Construction Engineer)

(Date)



Insufficient Materials Report

Estimate: 1

Draft

2/24/2022 2:20 PM

FieldManager 5.3c

Michigan Department of Transportation

Contract: _0000-000, Test Contract

Item: Barricade, Type III, High Intensity, Lighted, Furn

Code: _8

Prop. Line: 0040

Quantity this Estimate: 0.000

Dollar Amount this Estimate: \$0.00

Allowable Quantity: 1.000

Allowable Dollar Amount: \$1.00

Material Description	Usage Factor	Total Quantity Approved	Total Quantity Used	Total Quantity Available	Other Items
Barr,TypeIII,HighInten,DbISided,Ltd	1.0000 Ea/EA	.00	1.00	-1.00	Yes

Total Dollar Amount This Estimate of Items With Insufficient Materials: **\$0.00**

Total Allowable Dollar Amount of Items With Insufficient Materials: **\$1.00**



Construction Pay Estimate Amount Balance Report

Estimate: 1

2/24/2022 2:19 PM

Michigan Department of Transportation



FieldManager 5.3c

Contract: _0000-000, Test Contract

Item Description	Item Code	Prop. Line	Project	Category	Authorized Quantity	Quantity This Estimate	Qty. Paid To Date	Total Qty. Placed	% Cpt	Unit Price	Dollar Amt. Paid To Date
Project Supervision, Max. \$ 10,000	_1	0005	_0000-000	001	1.000		0.000			1.00000	
Sign, Type B, Temp, Prismatic, Furn	_10	0050	_0000-000	001	1.000		0.000			1.00000	
General Conditions (MAX \$20,000)	_2	0010	_0000-000	001	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	100%	1.00000	\$1.00
Certified Payroll Compliance and Reporting	_3	0015	_0000-000	001	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	100%	1.00000	\$1.00
Allowance for Unforeseen Site Conditions	_4	0020	_0000-000	001	1.000		0.000			1.00000	
Preconstruction Audio-Visual Documentation (\$2,500 Max)	_5	0025	_0000-000	001	1.000		0.000			1.00000	
Plastic Drum, High Intensity, Lighted, Furn	_6	0030	_0000-000	001	1.000		0.000			1.00000	
Plastic Drum, High Intensity, Lighted, Oper	_7	0035	_0000-000	001	1.000		0.000			1.00000	
Barricade, Type III, High Intensity, Lighted, Furn	_8	0040	_0000-000	001	1.000		0.000	1.000	100%	1.00000	
Quantity Withheld: 1.000											
Barricade, Type III, High Intensity, Lighted Oper	_9	0045	_0000-000	001	1.000		0.000			1.00000	

Percentage of Contract Completed(curr): 20%
 (total paid to date / total of all authorized work)

Total Amount Paid This Estimate: \$2.00
Total Amount Paid To Date: \$2.00