

THE CITY OF WALTHAM  
MASSACHUSETTS

PURCHASING DEPARTMENT

**Design, Roof Replacement, Waltham Community Center**  
**(Former South Middle School)**

**ADDENDUM NO. 2**

April 18, 2014

**CHANGES, CORRECTIONS AND CLARIFICATIONS**

The attention of bidders submitting proposals for the above subject project is called to the following addendum to the specifications. The items set forth herein, whether of omission, addition, substitution or clarification are all to be included in and form a part of the proposal submitted.

---

**ITEM NO.: 1**      **DELETE**

The Price sheet Page at the end of the document as this solicitation is conducted under the rules of MGL Chapter 7c and based on qualifications

**ITEM NO.: 2**      **ADD COMPARATIVE SELECTION CRITERIA.**

The following comparative criteria will be used for the ranking of the qualified respondents. See Attached.

**End of Addendum 2**

## Comparative Criteria

All proposals must have a section labeled COMPARATIVE CRITERIA and must provide all necessary documentation as evidence that they meet each of the following criteria. If documentation or identification of page number is not clearly evident for each criterion the proposal may be deemed unresponsive. The evaluation of the Technical Proposals will be based on the “comparative criteria” described in this section. In accordance with applicable Massachusetts law, the following scale will be used to rate each evaluation criterion, as well as to determine a composite rating for each proposal:

“Highly advantageous”

“Advantageous”

“Not advantageous”

### 1. Interviews Value = 35 Points

The Evaluation Committee will schedule interviews with all or selected Proposers who have met the minimum criteria and are determined to be responsive to this RFP. The Evaluation Committee will prepare ten questions which will be asked of all Proposers.

Highly Advantageous: Lead Consultant and at least one other key team member for this project were present, communicated a comprehensive plan of action, and responded, in a logical and easily understood manner, to all ten questions from the Evaluation Committee. = **25 points**

Advantageous: Lead Consultant and at least one other key team member for this project were present, communicated a comprehensive plan of action, and responded, in a logical and easily understood manner, to a minimum of seven of the ten questions from the Evaluation Committee. = **10 points**

Not Advantageous: Lead Consultant for this project, but no other key team member, was present. The consultant did not communicate a comprehensive plan of action or did not respond in a logical or easily understood manner, to fewer than seven of the ten questions from the Evaluation Committee = **0 points**

### 2. Experience Value = 35 Points

Highly Advantageous: The Proposer has ten or more years of experience in conducting roofing designs including all of the following: detailed analysis of current roof conditions, cost analyses, construction administration and presentation of construction options. The Proposer has also provided three project examples of similar or larger projects in a municipal and school setting. = **25 Points**

Advantageous: The Proposer has seven or more years of experience in conducting roofing designs including at least two of the following: detailed analysis of current roof conditions, cost analyses, construction administration and presentation of construction options. The Proposer has also provided three project examples of similar or larger projects in a municipal and school setting.  
= **10 Points**

Not Advantageous: The Proposer has less than three years of experience in conducting roofing designs including one of the following: detailed analysis of current roof conditions, cost analyses, construction administration and presentation of construction options. The Proposer has also provided three project examples of similar or larger projects in a municipal and school setting.  
= **0 Points**

### **3. Past Studies = 30 points**

Highly Advantageous: Three or more project examples where the proposed Lead Consultant/Key Personnel assigned to this project roof studies for municipalities and or public school districts. The technical proposal submitted demonstrates a clear and detailed process for the study. The proposer partners with an Architect/Engineer firm with 10 years or more of experience in the roof work design and construction administration= **20 points**

Advantageous: Two project examples where the proposed Lead Consultant/Key Personnel assigned to this project performed roof studies for public school districts. The technical proposal submitted demonstrates a clear and detailed process for the study. The proposer partners with an Architect/Engineer firm with 5 years or more of experience in the roof work design and construction administration = **10 points**

Not Advantageous: Less than two project examples where the proposed Lead Consultant/Key Personnel assigned to this project performed special education studies for public school districts. The technical proposal submitted does not demonstrate a clear and detailed. The proposer partners with an Architect/Engineer firm with less than 5 years of experience in the roof work design and construction administration = **0 points**