

MINI 3A

CAPITAL DECISION REVIEW

ROOF RESTORATION PROJECT MULTI-FAMILY PROPERTY

Three bids.
One apparent project.
One capital decision.

A sanitized real-world demonstration
of what is seen before capital
is committed.

SILICONE ROOF RESTORATION

CONTRACTOR A

\$51,030

CONTRACTOR B

\$58,550

CONTRACTOR C

\$67,590

\$16,560

spread between the lowest and highest proposal



THE QUESTION THIS REVIEW ADDRESSES

**Did all three contractors
actually price the same
defined job?**



Sanitized demonstration based on an actual preliminary review.
Names, property details and identifying information
have been removed or generalized.

Executive Summary

Ownership is being asked to approve a roof restoration project based on three contractor bids. This Mini 3A review assesses what the current information supports, identifies key gaps, and outlines what should be clarified before a decision is made.



Three bids were provided

from qualified roofing contractors for an apparent silicone roof restoration project.



The bids do not clearly establish

that all three contractors priced the same scope of work, quantities, specifications, and inclusions.



Key items require clarification

including roof areas, materials, application rates, preparation, warranty terms, permits, and responsibilities.



Additional information is needed

before the bids can be considered directly comparable and a decision can be made with confidence.



MINI 3A RESULT

NOT READY

Clarification Needed Before Approval



WHAT THIS MEANS FOR OWNERSHIP

- The current bids do not provide a clear basis for a like-for-like comparison.
- Additional clarification is needed to confirm scope, quantities, materials, and key assumptions.
- Once the open items are addressed, the bids can be re-evaluated to determine which option best aligns with the property's needs and budget.

Project Overview

This section summarizes the key property details, project scope, and bidding information based on the information provided in the three contractor proposals.

PROPERTY TYPE	Condominium Association
PROJECT	Roof Restoration
BUILDINGS	5 Residential Buildings
ROOFING TYPE	Existing Roof – Silicone Restoration (Reflective Coating System)
APPROXIMATE AGE	15–20 Years (original roofs)
APPROXIMATE AREA	~52,000 sq. ft. (total roof area)
SCOPE AS DESCRIBED	Clean and prepare existing roofing system and install silicone coating system with related details, penetrations, and associated work.
BIDS RECEIVED	3 Contractors
DECISION BEING ASKED	Approve contractor and budget to proceed with roof restoration project
ESTIMATED PROJECT VALUE (BID RANGE)	\$51,030 – \$67,590 (\$16,560 spread between lowest and highest)



WORK GENERALLY DESCRIBED AS

Remove existing roofing system and install a silicone coating restoration system, including preparation, application, flashing, details, and associated work as described in each proposal.



IMPORTANT CONTEXT

All three proposals appear to be for a silicone roof restoration approach. However, the bids contain differences in quantities, materials, application rates, inclusions, exclusions, and other key inputs, which require clarification before a direct comparison can be made.

Key Findings

The three proposals include the same general roofing approach (silicone restoration), but the bids contain key differences that make it unclear if they are pricing the same scope of work.

1



Scope of Work Not Clearly Aligned

All three bids reference a silicone roof restoration approach, but the descriptions, inclusions, and levels of detail differ, making it unclear if they are pricing the same work.

2



Materials and Systems Differ

The proposals include different silicone application rates, preparation requirements, and material manufacturers, which affect performance, durability, and cost.

3



Quantities and Roof Areas Not Established

Roof areas (sq. ft.), wall areas, penetrations, drains/scuppers, and detail quantities were not established on a common basis, making direct price comparison difficult.

4



Warranty Terms Vary

Warranty length, type, and coverage differ between contractors (manufacturer warranty, NDL warranty, or material warranty), making true comparison difficult.

5



Responsibilities Not Consistent

Permits, access, staging, site logistics, disposal, and interior protection responsibilities are defined differently or not stated consistently across the bids.



OVERALL FINDING

The current bids do not clearly establish that all three contractors are pricing the same defined job.

The differences in scope, quantities, materials, assumptions, and responsibilities need to be clarified before a direct price comparison can be made and a contractor can be selected with confidence.



Bid Comparison (Key Items)

The table below summarizes selected items from the three contractor proposals. These items highlight where the bids align and where key differences make direct price comparison difficult.

Item		Contractor A Proposal A \$51,030	Contractor B Proposal B \$58,550	Contractor C Proposal C \$67,590
	Total Price	\$51,030	\$58,550	\$67,590
	Roof Area (sq. ft.)	Not stated	Not stated	Not stated
	Silicone Application Rate	3.0 gal / 100 sq. ft.	2.5 gal / 100 sq. ft.	Approx. 3.0 gal / 100 sq. ft.
	Walls / Vertical Surfaces	Included / referenced	Not stated	Not stated
	Membrane / Product Type	Brand X Silicone System	Brand Y Silicone System	Brand Z Silicone System
	Permit	Permit contemplated	States not required	Not stated
	Underlayment	Self-Adhered	Synthetic	Self-Adhered
	Disposal Included	Yes	Yes	No (Allowance)
	Warranty (System / Manufacturer)	Manufacturer 20-year warranty	NDL warranty	Material warranty
	Warranty (Contractor Labor)	10 Years	20 Years	15 Years



WHAT THIS TABLE SHOWS

All three contractors appear to be proposing a silicone roof restoration approach, but key inputs such as quantities, materials, application rates, permits, and warranties differ.



IMPORTANT CONTEXT

These differences do not mean a contractor is wrong. They mean ownership cannot tell from the supplied record whether the price differences are caused by contractor pricing or differences in what was priced.



NEXT STEP

Confirm and align key items to ensure a true apples-to-apples comparison before a contractor is selected and a decision is made.



Note: This is a summary of key items from the bids provided. See Appendix for additional details.

Gaps and Clarification Needed

The following items should be clarified with all three contractors to ensure a true apples-to-apples comparison before approval. These gaps affect scope, quantities, materials, assumptions, and long-term responsibilities.

1



Scope and Quantities

Confirm exact roof areas, wall areas (if included), penetrations, drains/scuppers, details, and total square footage for all buildings.

2



Materials and Systems

Confirm membrane type (silicone), manufacturer, product line, application rates, thickness, preparation requirements, and system components (primer, mesh, flashing, etc.).

3



Detail and Accessories

Confirm treatment of parapets, edges, penetrations, drains, scuppers, curbs, HVAC supports, walk pads, and other details.

4



Permits and Code Requirements

Confirm whether permits are required, who will obtain them, and what code requirements apply.

5



Staging and Site Logistics

Confirm access, roof loading, staging areas, work hours, building occupancy considerations, and impact on residents.

6



Warranty Terms and Responsibilities

Confirm warranty type (manufacturer, NDL, or material), length, coverage, contractor labor warranty, and what is included or excluded.

7



Allowances and Exclusions

Identify all allowances, exclusions, and potential additional costs (e.g., insulation exposure, wood replacement, wet areas, unforeseen conditions).



WHY THIS MATTERS

Without clear and consistent inputs, ownership cannot determine whether the price differences are caused by contractor pricing — or by differences in what was priced.



GOAL

Obtain consistent and complete information from each contractor so the bids can be evaluated on the same defined project basis and ownership can proceed with confidence.

Mini 3A Result



NOT READY

Clarification Needed Before Approval

Based on the current information, the three bids are not directly comparable and do not clearly establish that all contractors are pricing the same scope of work. Key items should be clarified and aligned before a contractor is selected and capital is approved.



WHAT THIS MEANS FOR OWNERSHIP



The current bids do not provide a clear basis for a like-for-like comparison.

Differences in scope, quantities, materials, assumptions, and responsibilities make it unclear if the price differences are for the same defined work.



Additional clarification is needed.

Key items such as roof areas, system details, application rates, permits, warranty terms, and inclusions should be confirmed with each contractor.



The bids can be re-evaluated once open items are addressed.

With consistent information and aligned assumptions, the proposals can be compared directly to determine which option best fits the property's needs and budget.



Approval should be held at this time.

Proceeding without clarification creates risk of misaligned scope, unforeseen costs, and inconsistent expectations.



KEY FACTORS DRIVING THIS RESULT

- Scope of work not clearly aligned across bids
- Materials and systems differ
- Quantities and roof areas not established
- Permit requirements are inconsistent
- Warranty terms and coverage vary
- Responsibilities and exclusions are not aligned



OBJECTIVE

Obtain consistent, complete, and clearly defined information from each contractor so the bids can be compared on the same basis and a confident, defensible decision can be made.



Next Steps

The following steps are recommended to clarifying the open items, align the bids on a comparable basis, and support a well-informed decision before approval.

1



Confirm Final Details

Obtain written clarification from each contractor on the open items, including scope, quantities, materials, application rates, inclusions, exclusions, permits, and warranties.

2



Align Scope for True Comparison

Ensure all three bids are based on the same defined scope, quantities, materials, assumptions, and responsibilities so the proposals can be accurately compared.

3



Re-Evaluate Pricing

Once the open items are clarified and aligned, review the revised bids to determine the appropriate price and value for the project.

4



Confirm Funding and Contingency

Validate budget, contingency, and any potential additional costs (e.g., unforeseen conditions, permit requirements, or insulation exposure) before proceeding.

5



Proceed with Decision

Present the revised, comparable analysis to ownership for consideration and final approval.



GOAL

Move forward with a clearly defined, comparable, and defensible decision.

By addressing the open items and aligning the bids, ownership can proceed with confidence, knowing the selected contractor is pricing the same scope of work and meeting the property's needs.



IMPORTANT NOTE

This Mini 3A review is based on the information provided at the time of this analysis. It identifies what the current inputs support and highlights areas that require clarification. It is not a design review, engineering report, or construction recommendation.



How Are Your CapEx Decisions Being Built?

Owner-side Decision Architecture™ for major commercial real estate capital decisions.



Before the contract.



Before the commitment.



Before execution.

We help owners and sponsors structure the decision before they own the outcome.

RoDevia Bringham | Founder & CEO

Featured on Next Level CEO Hosted by Daymond John of Shark Tank

