



**Municipal Building Committee:
Malden River Works Salt Shed & Boathouse
Agenda**

October 27, 2026

1PM – 3PM

Virtual Teams Meetings

Roll Call

Deborah Burke
Peg Crowe
Amanda Linehan
Nelson Miller
Paul Myers
Eric Rubin
Stephen Winslow

Malden River Works Salt Shed & Boathouse OPM Interviews

Committee to interview 3 firms that responded to the Malden River Works Salt Shed & Boathouse Owner's Project Manager RFP, with the intent to select one for the project. Each committee member to use the attached ranking sheet to evaluate each firm individually.

Interview 1 will be 1PM-1:30PM at this Teams link: https://teams.microsoft.com/l/meetup-join/19%3ameeting_MGFhMmRlZjMtZjI1Yy00ZTgxLTlkNmItMzBIZTRmOWVhYmMx%40thread.v2/0?context=%7b%22Tid%22%3a%224a074cd1-7906-46af-b38f-90cd429d7f1b%22%2c%22Oid%22%3a%22651237f4-9307-4b52-8dcf-3f04c3fa328b%22%7d

Interview 2 will be 1:45PM-2:15PM at this Teams link: https://teams.microsoft.com/l/meetup-join/19%3ameeting_YWl3ZWE0ZTU0ZjQ4ZS00ODE0LWFjYjUtZDhmNGM3MTgwNjA0%40thread.v2/0?context=%7b%22Tid%22%3a%224a074cd1-7906-46af-b38f-90cd429d7f1b%22%2c%22Oid%22%3a%22651237f4-9307-4b52-8dcf-3f04c3fa328b%22%7d

Interview 3 will be 2:30PM-3PM at this Teams link: https://teams.microsoft.com/l/meetup-join/19%3ameeting_ZmQ1ZTM3NjAtZGVmMi00MWM2LTlhYjEtYTAXMGViOTdjMTFI%40thread.v2/0?context=%7b%22Tid%22%3a%224a074cd1-7906-46af-b38f-90cd429d7f1b%22%2c%22Oid%22%3a%22651237f4-9307-4b52-8dcf-3f04c3fa328b%22%7d

Adjournment

If you would like to request a reasonable accommodation, please contact Maria Luise, ADA Compliance Coordinator at mluise@cityofmalden.org or 781-397-7000 Ext. 2005

215 Pleasant Street, Malden, MA 02148 | Phone: 781-397-7000 | info@cityofmalden.org

Strong Past... Proud Future

For instructions on enabling live translated captions in Teams, please visit: www.cityofmalden.org/captions

SALT SHED & BOAT HOUSE OPM - RANKING SHEET

Consultant Name: _____

Reviewer: _____

Submission Requirements: The non-priced proposal shall include the following

A. Background history and experience
B. Description of recent similar projects, a list of recent clients, and references
C. Qualifications of key personnel and any subconsultants to be assigned
D. A plan of services with proposed scope of work & project schedule
E. Good working knowledge of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts procurement laws
F. Thorough knowledge of the Mass. Building Codes, ADA Act, and applicable construction-related codes and regulations
G. A completed DSB Application Form
H. A Certificate of Non-Collusion
I. A Tax Compliance Certification
J. An IRS form W-9

DECISION TO USE COMPETITIVE SEALED PROPOSALS:

The Chief Procurement Officer has determined that in order to select the most advantageous proposal for services (“Services”) related to the scope of work contained in the RFP, comparative judgments of technical factors, in addition to price, will be necessary for the following reasons:

1. The City of Malden has determined there are factors beyond minimum quality requirements which require comparative judgements of factors in addition to price.
2. As such, the determination has been made that the City places a premium on criteria above and beyond best price.

The City’s evaluation committee shall review, evaluate and rate each proposer’s technical (non-price) information. After this rating has been reviewed and accepted, the most qualified candidates, as determined by the City, may be interviewed and provided the opportunity to explain and supplement the information contained in their proposals. After the final selection is made, the selected candidate shall provide the City a detailed breakdown of the estimated labor and expenses the candidate believes are necessary to perform each task. All related cost information requested by the City shall be furnished by the candidate for the purpose of complete disclosure during negotiations. If an acceptable price can be negotiated, a contract will be executed. If an agreement cannot be reached, then negotiations with the top-ranked firm are closed and the second-ranked firm is invited to undertake negotiations. This process can continue to the third-ranked firm and beyond, if agreement cannot be reached.

The City reserves the right to reject any or all proposals and to only award a contract it deems is in the best interest of the City.

Minimum Qualifications: Applicants must be a registered Professional Engineer or Registered Architect in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. Applicants must possess a minimum of five (5) years of experienced construction supervision of public buildings. Applicants who are not registered engineers or architects must possess a minimum of seven (7) years of relevant experience.

Comparative Evaluation Criteria: Check Applicable Rating

The City of Malden shall apply the criteria, which follows, in its evaluation of the proposals. The purpose of the information requested in this section is to assist the evaluation committee in making decisions about the proposers overall qualifications, including technical abilities and previous experience. Proposers should clearly respond in writing to each criterion as enumerated, responses to the following areas shall be complete and full.

The Committee will evaluate each proposal for conformance with the objectives, submission requirements, and criteria outlined in this Request for Proposals. Preference categories have been established for the purpose of further distinguishing competitive proposals. In addition, the preference categories will be used to compare the relative advantages of each competing proposal.

The ratings of "Highly Advantageous", "Advantageous", "Not Advantageous", and/or "Unacceptable" will be used to evaluate each proposal using the following evaluation criteria. The following preference categories must be addressed in the proposal:

1. Completion of projects of a comparable size, nature, and complexity.

Ratings	✓	OPM Experience.
Highly Advantageous		The proposer has at least fifteen (15) years experience in completing projects of a comparable size, nature, and complexity. Experience with municipal facilities and/or experience working with municipal government agencies a plus.
Advantageous		The proposer has at least ten (10) years experience in completing projects of a comparable size, nature, and complexity.
Not Advantageous		The proposer has less than ten (10) years experience in completing projects of a comparable size, nature, and complexity.

2. Qualifications and experience of the designated project manager.

Ratings	✓	OPM Experience.
Highly Advantageous		The proposer has at least ten (10) years of related experience and required qualifications and professional background.
Advantageous		The proposer has at least five (5) years experience in completing projects of a comparable size, nature, and complexity.
Not Advantageous		The proposer has less than five (5) years experience in completing projects of a comparable size, nature, and complexity.

3. Demonstrated ability to complete projects on a timely basis.

Ratings	✓	OPM Experience.
Highly Advantageous		All of the proposer's references indicate that the projects were completed on schedule of with minimal, insignificant delays.
Advantageous		Only one of the proposer's references indicates that the project was completed with substantial delays attributable to the proposer, and no current project or project completed in the last three (3) years experienced substantial delays attributable to the proposer.
Not Advantageous		Two of the proposer's references indicate that the project was completed with substantial delays attributable to the proposer, and no current project or project completed in last year experienced substantial delays attributable to the proposer.
Unacceptable		More than two of the proposer's references indicate that the project was completed with substantial delays attributable to the proposer.

4. Plan of services methodology.

Ratings	✓	OPM Experience.
Highly Advantageous		The plan of services proposed a detailed timeline for completing the project.
Advantageous		The plan of services proposed a credible scheme for completing the project.
Not Advantageous		The plans of services is not sufficiently detailed to fully evaluate, or the plan does not contain all the components necessary to complete the project.

Total Composite Rating: (check one)

___ Highly Advantageous ___ Advantageous ___ Not Advantageous ___ Unacceptable

COMMENTS:

Reviewer Signature

Date