Foundation Bid Review Sample

Understand the scope behind the price

Prepared for Alex and Morgan | Kitchen renovation and modest rear addition

Fictional example and selected report excerpts. All contractors, proposals, responses and amounts are invented. They illustrate Foundation's comparison method, not actual offers, market rates, contractor endorsements or a completed contract review.

The decision the homeowners face

Alex initially favors the $248,000 proposal because it is $28,000 below another headline. Morgan wants to understand why the prices differ. Before choosing, they need to know whether the proposals buy the same work and how the unresolved items affect their complete project spending and timing.

The common pricing brief

The fictional May 1 brief requests a roughly 150-square-foot addition, flat ceiling, 10-foot backyard opening and coordinated 36-inch range. Construction includes cabinets, counters and flooring transitions; owner appliance purchases remain separate. The comparison uses a $32,000 installed cabinet allowance and a $7,000 fixture package.

Comparison item	Contractor A	Contractor B	Contractor C
Headline construction price	$248,000	$276,000	$289,000
Installed cabinet allowance	$20,000	$32,000	$32,000
Counters	Excluded	Included	Included
Flooring and transitions	Excluded	Included	Included
Fixture allowance	$7,000	$5,000	$7,000
Stated duration	12 weeks on site; closeout unclear	16-18 weeks main work plus about 2 closeout	18 weeks including described closeout

Foundation's initial conclusion

The headline prices are not yet comparable. Obtain written responses on the cabinet amount, omitted work, fixture basis, applicable charges and timing before relying on the apparent gap. A shorter stated duration also needs its scope and prerequisites explained.

Get written answers before relying on the difference

The following June 4 clarifications are fictional contractor responses. Foundation identifies the questions and organizes the comparison; the contractors provide the scope and prices. The stated adjustments include the associated charges described below.

Response	Confirmed adjustment in the example
A2 Cabinets	Add $12,000 to align the installed allowance with the $32,000 common basis. No further contractor charge on this adjustment is stated.
A2 Counters	Add $12,000 for the common supply, fabrication and installation scope, including stated tax, delivery and contractor charges.
A2 Flooring	Add $6,000 for the requested finish flooring and transitions, inclusive of stated associated charges.
B2 Fixtures	Add $2,000 for the common fixture package, with no further adjustment for the listed labor or charges.
C2 Listed items	No adjustment to these comparison items. Other exclusions and readiness assumptions remain to be checked.

Compare the clarified construction scope

Reconciliation	Contractor A	Contractor B	Contractor C
Original headline	$248,000	$276,000	$289,000
Confirmed additions	$30,000	$2,000	$0
Comparable construction amount	$278,000	$278,000	$289,000

A and B now compare at the same construction amount for the listed common scope. The $28,000 headline gap was not a saving achieved by hiring Foundation; the original totals reflected different assumptions. This table is not a finding that every proposal term is equivalent.

What still needs a complete spending check

These construction amounts are not the whole project budget. Separately reconcile coaching, design and permit fees, owner purchases, household arrangements, financing and contingency. Confirm category coverage, current prices and funding timing before treating the project as affordable.

Use the comparison to make a better informed choice

Compare the working relationship as well as the amount

Ask who will lead the site, how progress and decisions will be communicated, and how questions are resolved. In the fictional proposals, B describes a named site lead and a weekly written update and decision log. The homeowners ask that the commitments important to them be reflected in the agreement.

Test the usable kitchen date

Ask each proposer to explain procurement, readiness, main work, corrections and closeout. “Twelve weeks on site” is not enough information to establish an earlier Thanksgiving-ready kitchen. The selected builder must develop and maintain its sequence using actual scope, products and availability.

The homeowner decision on June 8

After the written clarifications and their own conversations, Alex and Morgan prefer Contractor B for the common scope and proposed communication approach. Their choice remains subject to their independent contractor checks, agreed documents and terms, complete spending review, available funds, permits, purchasing and household readiness.

Foundation has helped them understand what they are comparing and prepare useful questions. It has not certified a contractor’s competence, financial position or future performance. A higher or lower proposal alone does not establish those things.

Before a larger commitment	Information to retain
Scope and price	One current written issue identifying inclusions, allowances, selections, exclusions and adjustment treatment.
Timing and responsibilities	Builder’s supported sequence, purchasing duties, delivery assumptions, household arrangements and decision dates.
Money and readiness	Complete project forecast, available funds and release conditions, permit status and remaining prerequisites.

Why this review is useful

The homeowners can explain why they prefer a proposal, which questions have been answered and which still need attention. Their next conversation is grounded in the supplied scope and contractor responses rather than the headline price alone.

Foundation provides independent homeowner education and decision support. The homeowners retain selection and spending decisions; the project professionals retain their respective responsibilities. Actual review scope, meetings and follow-up are agreed for the engagement.

Explore your project at foundationrenovationcoaching.com or book a Discovery Call through the website.