

Automated Construction Management User's Group (ACMUG) Agenda

Thursday, November 13, 2025

8:30 a.m. – 10:30 a.m.

Teams Meeting

Join on your computer or mobile app.

[Click here to join the meeting](#)

Or call in (audio only) 608-571-2209

Conference ID: 262 995 323 492 0#

Facilitator/Note taker: Stacy Lehmann (NWR)

Attendees (highlighted) : David Castleberg (BPD), Adam Bleskacek (BPD), Annette Czerneski (BPD), Anthony Reddy (BPD), Trisha Ganshart (BPD), Lisa Koca (NC), Carolyn LaVake (NC), Kendra Jelinek (NC), Winter King (NC), Laura Debaere (NE), Stacy Lehmann (NW), Lindsay Furtak (NW), Heidi Peterson (SE), Josephine Dagley (SW), Sharayah Streich (SW), Patrick Tubbs (SW), Craig Wilkinson (SW), Vanessa Chapman (SW), Brian Boothby (BPD), Chad Hayes (BPD), Kristin VanHout (NE), Christine Krall, Dave Platz (FHWA)

Introduction: NWR

Accepted 08/14/2025 meeting minutes.



20250814-acm-mtgminutes.pdf

Action Items:

ACM Distribution Lists –

• DOT DL ACM -Additions/Deletions

- **NWR** – Denise Foster is retired (just Stacy Lehmann and Lindsay Furtak)
- **SWR** – Patrick Tubbs no longer a CS; position is vacant. Vanessa Chapman is permanent now.
- **Central Office** – No changes
- **SER** – Karen was removed since last meeting, so nothing new
- **NER** – No changes
- **NCR** – Kendra Jelinek would like to be included and will attend if available; Annette will add her back in.

Agenda Items:

Agenda Item #1

- **Contract Status Dates AV/Informational Times component label change – Annette Czerneski**
 - There was an inconsistency between Contract Status Dates AV = Construction Start (Work Begin) date vs Informational Times = Work Begin Date (Construction Start Date). This will be changed to Work Start (Earliest onsite work), and the tool tip will be: The date the contractor begins any onsite work on the contract including anything allowed in a conditional start notice. This can, and in most cases, will, be different from the Time Charges Start Date.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Annette will be making the change to all existing contracts so that it reflects this on Informational Times tab. Anthony has already updated Contract Status Dates AV to reflect the new field name. Annette would like Anthony to update it to reflect mixed case with only first word capitalized (Earliest onsite work).
Agenda Item #2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contract Status Dates AV refreshes – Annette Czerneski <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The importance of refreshing in Contract Status Dates was stressed. We will only be entering the three materials fields there, but when entering information in other parts of the system, like Informational Times, please get in the habit of going to Contract Status Dates to do a refresh so that information is pulled in and is accurately reflected. Anthony reiterated that information that is entered in Informational Times will only be reflected on Contract Status Dates AV if refreshed. ○ David asked if a reminder message could be added at the top of the screen to remind us to do the refresh. Annette said she could do that.
Agenda Item #3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Materials Tracking System (MTS) materials dates and data entry responsibilities recap – David Castleberg <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Reminder that the dates entered in MTS no longer pull in to Contract Status Dates. Temporary workaround is that when materials staff enter the dates in MTS, they will then notify region CS and Project Engineer so that we can enter the dates in Contract Status Dates AV.
Agenda Item #4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contractor evaluations – Craig Wilkinson (Craig out, so Vanessa Chapman spoke on his behalf) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ When closing projects and evals are being generated, PM said their guidance did not say to separate evals. Question was asked if guidance need to be updated to reflect this or what are other regions doing. Most regions ask PM to separate, but it seems the PM's who have been around longer already know to do this. ○ Curious if subs have access to their own reports or are they notified when a report is generated that pertains to them. When looking at evals is it possible to have the subs' emails on the Contractor Evaluation Report to make it easier to figure out who to send it to (for example, how the bonding company email is on the Completion Certificate). Looking to see if there is a way to streamline that process to make it easier/quicker for us to find the email address. Feedback is that it could be added but the concern is it may not be accurate, knowing contacts could change and we may not be updated. Annette and Adam will look in to adding business email address to the evaluations. ○ Discussion was had about prime contractor contacts and possibility of having a tab in AWP where email contacts are stored for contractors. Also, discussion of adding an attachment on a screen in AWP with the email contacts. Anthony said once a decision is made on where it should be displayed, he can do that. David suggested to have an AV at Contract Administration Summary > Additional Information to add the additional information or within the collapsible panel dropdown. Contact lists are often provided at time of PreCon. Suggestion was also made to attach the PreCon contact list within AWP to reference email addresses when needed. Regions seem to have different processes. Issue is that contractor contacts can change without us knowing. No definitive decision/solution has been made at this time.
Agenda Item #5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Punch Lists – Josie Dagley <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Question was if we still need to send a Substantially Complete letter if the punch list is already complete. SW region handles punch lists, but other regions do not manage the punch lists and leave as the responsibility of the project team. Most regions do not send a Substantially Complete letter because the AWP notification is essentially saying the same thing, and the contractor receives the AWP notification (SW and NW send the letter). For regions who CC this letter to other recipients, like Compliance Specialist, Area Maintenance Coordinator, County Commissioner, etc.,

	Kristin VanHout suggested an option of forwarding the AWP Time Charges Stop notification to the others rather than doing the Substantially Complete letter. Decision on how to handle is currently being left to the regions.
Agenda Item #6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ACMUG information – Josie Dagley/Lisa Koca/Lori Debaere <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Some people don't know where to find the information, so discussion was should we take time at the beginning of the meetings to just remind people where the information is available or add a link to the top of the meeting minutes. Consensus was to add a link that will direct user to the AWPKB site, ACMUG page. ACMUG Link ○ The site lists expectations of the facilitator as well as links to prior agendas and the dates of meetings along with the region rotation. ○ David shared some information on the history of ACMUG and why it has been important/helpful to continue the group for consistency as a group, keeping people updated, and allowing a time where people can share ideas, get answers, and help each other. ○ Annette changed the meeting invite to come from the support mailbox rather than being sent by an individual. This will ensure the meetings will appear on our calendars and not get missed in the future. ○ It was deemed beneficial to continue to meet quarterly to share information. ○ Meeting time will be updated on the site to reflect the new start time of 8:30 (8:30-10:30 a.m.).
Agenda Item #7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wrap Up – Anything Else? Nope. Thank you to all for your participation.
NEXT MEETING: February 12, 2026, SW Region to Host	