

BUSINESS DECISION

The buyer is a commercial building owner seeking to replace an aging 15,000 square-foot low-slope roof. The buyer's primary decision criteria are long-term weather durability (especially wind-uplift resistance and protection against heavy storms), drainage performance to prevent standing water, warranty protection (covering both materials and workmanship), and minimizing tenant disruption during business hours.

PROPOSAL COMPARISON

FEATURE: Membrane Thickness & Material Quality

Proposal A — Offers a standard 45-mil mechanically fastened white TPO membrane with a 15-year manufacturer material warranty.

Proposal B — Offers a heavy-duty 60-mil fleece-back white TPO membrane fully adhered with low-VOC adhesive, backed by a 20-year No Dollar Limit (NDL) manufacturer warranty.

SIGNIFICANCE: Membrane thickness and attachment method directly dictate puncture resistance, hail damage tolerance, and long-term weathering under intense UV exposure and high winds.

Proposal B's 60-mil fleece-backed, fully adhered system provides roughly 33% greater membrane thickness and superior wind-uplift performance compared to Proposal A's 45-mil mechanically fastened system.

FEATURE: Drainage & Insulation Design

Proposal A — Includes a flat 1.5-inch rigid polyisocyanurate insulation board without specified tapering.

Proposal B — Includes a custom tapered polyisocyanurate insulation package engineered to direct water toward drains and eliminate standing water ponding.

SIGNIFICANCE: Standing water is the leading cause of premature roof failure and leaks on low-slope commercial roofs. Proposal B actively addresses drainage engineering, whereas Proposal A relies on the existing flat roof plane configuration.

FEATURE: Warranties (Material & Workmanship)

Proposal A — 15-year manufacturer material warranty and a 2-year contractor workmanship warranty.

Proposal B — 20-year No Dollar Limit (NDL) manufacturer warranty and a 10-year contractor workmanship warranty.

SIGNIFICANCE: The length and scope of warranties determine the buyer's financial exposure in the event of premature failure. Proposal B offers significantly expanded protection, notably providing 5 times longer contractor workmanship coverage (10 years vs. 2 years) and a comprehensive NDL manufacturer backing.

FEATURE: Tenant Disruption & Installation Schedule

Proposal A — 5 to 7 working days timeline, strictly executed during standard weekday business hours (7:00 AM – 4:00 PM).

Proposal B — 8 to 10 working days timeline, with flexible scheduling options designed to mitigate noise and disruption for building tenants.

SIGNIFICANCE: Commercial building owners face tenant relations risks during major construction. Proposal B explicitly builds in scheduling flexibility, whereas Proposal A's rigid daytime-only hours may create friction and noise complaints for active office or retail tenants.

FEATURE: Quality Assurance & Testing

Proposal A — Standard visual inspection and basic contractor startup.

Proposal B — Includes rigorous electronic leak detection (ELD) testing upon completion prior to sign-off.

SIGNIFICANCE: ELD testing provides objective verification that the roof membrane and seams are 100% watertight before final payment, reducing the risk of hidden post-installation leaks.

PRICE AND SCOPE

- Proposal A Total: \$95,500
- Proposal B Total: \$128,500
- Price Difference Analysis: Proposal B is \$33,000 higher than Proposal A. This price variance is accounted for by substantial scope and quality enhancements: upgrading from a 45-mil mechanically attached membrane to a thicker 60-mil fully-adhered fleece-back system, adding an engineered tapered insulation system for drainage, extending the contractor workmanship warranty from 2 to 10 years, providing a 20-year NDL manufacturer warranty, performing electronic leak detection testing, and incorporating tenant-sensitive schedule coordination.

IMPORTANT UNCERTAINTIES

- Neither proposal explicitly defines the exact tear-off disposal fees if hidden structural deck damage exceeds their allotted wood sheet replacement limits (3 sheets for Proposal A, 5 sheets for Proposal B).
- Proposal A does not outline any post-installation leak testing methodology to verify membrane integrity.

QUESTIONS FOR THE VENDORS

- To Proposal A: What is the estimated cost per square foot for decking replacement if we exceed the 3-sheet inclusion limit, and can work hours be adjusted to accommodate tenant operating constraints?
- To Proposal B: Does the 20-year NDL manufacturer warranty cover ponding water, and what specific provisions are included to protect tenant parking and access during the 8-to-10-day install?
- To Both: What is the tested wind-uplift rating (e.g., UL 90) for your proposed assembly?

BOTTOM LINE

The two proposals present a classic trade-off between upfront capital expenditure and long-term risk mitigation. Proposal A provides a lower-cost entry point (\$95,500) with standard commercial specifications suited for a budget-constrained replacement. Proposal B requires a higher initial investment (\$128,500) but delivers superior long-term asset protection through a thicker 60-mil adhered membrane, engineered positive drainage, electronic leak verification, and extensive 10-year workmanship / 20-year NDL warranties.