

Roxbury School District Evaluation Committee Report for the Custodial & Management Services RFP

1. List of Proposers:

- ABM
- Aramark
- Pritchard

2. List of Evaluation Committee Members:

- Joe Mondanaro
- Peter Riffel
- Dominick J. Miller

Evaluation Committee Report

3. Cost of Proposals (Ranked from lowest to highest five-year price):

| Roxbury Comparison of Proposal Form A - PRICING | | | | | | | | |
|---|----------------------------------|---|-----------------|--------------|-----------------|--------------|-----------------|--------------|
| Description | Details | Pritchard | | ABM | | Aramark | | |
| | | Percent | Total Charges | Percent | Total Charges | Percent | Total Charges | |
| Custodial | Charge for Wages | | \$896,454.00 | | \$898,560.00 | | \$927,253.60 | |
| | Charge for Health Care Benefits | 28% | \$247,698.00 | 28% | \$247,698.00 | 42% | \$391,734.45 | |
| | Charge for Other Fringe Benefits | 0% | \$0.00 | 3% | \$30,326.09 | 6% | \$57,499.66 | |
| | Charge for Payroll Taxes | 19% | \$168,085.13 | 15% | \$133,435.57 | 9% | \$86,811.00 | |
| Consultant Recom'd FTE's | 27.00 | No. of FTEs (1 FTE=2080 Hours per Year) | 27.00 | 27.00 | 27.00 | 27.00 | | |
| Consultant Recom'd Wage Rate | \$14.65 | Avg. Wage Rate Excl. Benefits & Taxes | \$15.96 | \$16.00 | \$16.51 | \$16.51 | | |
| Custodial Overtime | Charge for Wages | | \$73,698.86 | | \$73,872.00 | | \$76,230.95 | |
| | Charge for Payroll Taxes | 19% | \$13,818.54 | 15% | \$10,969.00 | 8% | \$6,188.00 | |
| Required Hours | 3,078 | Number of Annual Hours | 3,078 | 3,078 | 3,078 | 3,078 | | |
| Consultant Recom'd Wage Rate | \$21.98 | Avg. Wage Rate Excl. Benefits & Taxes | \$23.94 | \$24.00 | \$24.77 | \$24.77 | | |
| Custodial - Head/Leads | Charge for Wages | | \$261,534.00 | | \$254,800.00 | | \$261,497.60 | |
| | Charge for Health Care Benefits | 25% | \$64,218.00 | 25% | \$64,218.00 | 40% | \$104,218.80 | |
| | Charge for Other Fringe Benefits | 0% | \$0.00 | 3% | \$7,862.40 | 6% | \$15,851.35 | |
| | Charge for Payroll Taxes | 19% | \$49,037.63 | 15% | \$37,837.00 | 9% | \$24,031.00 | |
| Consultant Recom'd FTE's | 7.00 | No. of FTEs (1 FTE=2080 Hours per Year) - | 7.00 | 7.00 | 7.00 | 7.00 | | |
| Consultant Recom'd Wage Rate | \$17.30 | Avg. Wage Rate Excl. Benefits & Taxes | \$17.96 | \$17.50 | \$17.96 | \$17.96 | | |
| Custodial Heads/Lead Overtime | Charge for Wages | | \$15,142.39 | | \$14,752.50 | | \$15,140.28 | |
| | Charge for Payroll Taxes | 19% | \$2,839.20 | 15% | \$2,198.00 | 8% | \$1,157.00 | |
| Required Hours | 562 | Number of Annual Hours | 562 | 562 | 562 | 562 | | |
| Consultant Recom'd Wage Rate | \$25.95 | Avg. Wage Rate Excl. Benefits & Taxes | \$26.94 | \$26.25 | \$26.94 | \$26.94 | | |
| Courier | Charge for Wages | | \$0.00 | | \$0.00 | | \$0.00 | |
| | Charge for Health Care Benefits | 0% | \$0.00 | 0% | \$0.00 | 0% | \$0.00 | |
| | Charge for Other Fringe Benefits | 0% | \$0.00 | 0% | \$0.00 | 0% | \$0.00 | |
| | Charge for Payroll Taxes | 0% | \$0.00 | 0% | \$0.00 | 0% | \$0.00 | |
| Consultant Recom'd FTE's | 0.00 | No. of FTEs (1 FTE=2080 Hours per Year) | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | | |
| Consultant Recom'd Wage Rate | \$0.00 | Avg. Wage Rate Excl. Benefits & Taxes | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | | |
| General Manager | Charge for Wages | | \$72,800.00 | | \$89,481.60 | | \$90,521.60 | |
| | Charge for Health Care Benefits | 7% | \$5,400.00 | 14% | \$12,356.00 | 19% | \$17,296.35 | |
| | Charge for Other Fringe Benefits | 0% | \$0.00 | 1% | \$1,178.00 | 6% | \$5,186.89 | |
| | Charge for Payroll Taxes | 19% | \$13,650.00 | 15% | \$13,287.00 | 8% | \$7,500.00 | |
| Consultant Recom'd FTE's | 1.00 | No. of FTEs (1 FTE=2080 Hours per Year) | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | | |
| Consultant Recom'd Wage Rate | \$43.03 | Avg. Wage Rate Excl. Benefits & Taxes | \$35.00 | \$43.02 | \$43.52 | \$43.52 | | |
| Custodial Evening Supervisor/s | Charge for Wages | | \$45,760.00 | | \$55,993.60 | | \$66,830.40 | |
| | Charge for Health Care Benefits | 12% | \$5,400.00 | 15% | \$8,520.00 | 20% | \$13,610.25 | |
| | Charge for Other Fringe Benefits | 0% | \$0.00 | 2% | \$1,178.00 | 6% | \$3,829.38 | |
| | Charge for Payroll Taxes | 19% | \$8,580.00 | 15% | \$8,315.00 | 9% | \$5,687.00 | |
| Consultant Recom'd FTE's | 1.00 | No. of FTEs (1 FTE=2080 Hours per Year) | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | | |
| Consultant Recom'd Wage Rate | \$26.92 | Avg. Wage Rate Excl. Benefits & Taxes | \$22.00 | \$26.92 | \$32.13 | \$32.13 | | |
| Clerical | Charge for Wages | | \$39,520.00 | | \$42,120.00 | | \$41,600.00 | |
| | Charge for Health Care Benefits | 0% | \$0.00 | 11% | \$4,716.00 | 10% | \$4,237.35 | |
| | Charge for Other Fringe Benefits | 0% | \$0.00 | 3% | \$1,178.00 | 6% | \$2,383.68 | |
| | Charge for Payroll Taxes | 19% | \$7,410.00 | 15% | \$6,254.00 | 9% | \$3,757.00 | |
| Consultant Recom'd FTE's | 1.00 | No. of FTEs (1 FTE=2080 Hours per Year) | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | | |
| Consultant Recom'd Wage Rate | \$20.25 | Avg. Wage Rate Excl. Benefits & Taxes | \$19.00 | \$20.25 | \$20.00 | \$20.00 | | |
| Contractor Start Up Charges - | | | | | | | | |
| Total amount amortized over 5 years: | | Annual Charges | \$0.00 | | \$3,046.40 | | \$0.00 | |
| Contractor Equipment Budget/Pool | \$100,000 | All Proposed \$100,000 | | | | | | |
| Total amount amortized over 5 years: | \$0.00 | Annual Charges | \$20,000.00 | | \$20,000.00 | | \$20,000.00 | |
| Contractor Charge for Computerized Quality Assurance System | | | \$0.00 | | \$3,413.84 | | \$5,688.00 | |
| Contractor Charge for Office and or Warehouse Rent | | | \$0.00 | | \$0.00 | | \$0.00 | |
| Contractor Charge for Required Office Equipment | | | \$723.00 | | \$9,550.00 | | \$7,622.00 | |
| Contractor Charge for Supplies and On-Going Operating Costs | | | \$32,220.46 | | \$37,261.00 | | \$117,909.90 | |
| Contractor Management Fee | | | 3.8% | \$81,759.57 | 4.8% | \$107,233.00 | 3.9% | \$97,510.28 |
| District Charge for Contract Monitoring | | | \$21,480.00 | | \$21,480.00 | | \$21,480.00 | |
| TOTAL CONTRACT CHARGE YEAR ONE (2020-2021) | | | \$2,147,228.76 | | \$2,223,070.00 | \$0.00 | \$2,500,263.76 | |
| Increase for 2021-2022 - Input Dollar Amount | | | 12.2% | \$262,763.29 | 11.6% | \$257,876.12 | 2.4% | \$60,006.33 |
| TOTAL CONTRACT CHARGE YEAR TWO (2021-2022) | | | \$2,409,992.05 | | \$2,480,946.12 | | \$2,560,270.09 | |
| Increase for 2022-2023 - Input Dollar Amount | | | 3.5% | \$83,979.00 | 4.0% | \$99,237.84 | 3.8% | \$97,290.27 |
| TOTAL CONTRACT CHARGE YEAR THREE (2022-2023) | | | \$2,493,971.05 | | \$2,580,183.96 | | \$2,657,560.36 | |
| Increase for 2023-2024 - Input Dollar Amount | | | 3.8% | \$95,972.34 | 4.0% | \$103,207.36 | 3.8% | \$100,987.29 |
| TOTAL CONTRACT CHARGE YEAR FOUR (2023-2024) | | | \$2,589,943.39 | | \$2,683,391.32 | | \$2,758,547.65 | |
| Increase for 2024-2025 - Input Dollar Amount | | | 3.3% | \$86,536.69 | 4.0% | \$107,335.65 | 3.8% | \$104,824.81 |
| TOTAL CONTRACT CHARGE YEAR FIVE (2024-2025) | | | \$2,676,480.08 | | \$2,790,726.97 | | \$2,863,372.46 | |
| TOTAL CONTRACT CHARGE FOR FIVE YEARS | | | \$12,317,615.31 | | \$12,758,318.37 | | \$13,340,014.32 | |

Evaluation Committee Report

4. Evaluation Criteria - The following was the criteria used by the committee in evaluating the proposals:

| The Criteria Used in Evaluating Proposals <i>The points awarded range from 1 to 5, with 5 being the highest score and 1 being the lowest</i> | Weighting Factor | Points |
|---|-------------------------|---------------|
| 1. Program Price: What is the price of the program proposed and its impact upon the District's operating budgets? Are the charges detailed in the proposal form realistic; i.e., Health care costs, payroll taxes, management fee, etc. | 15% | 1 to 5 |
| 2. Contractor's financial viability, strength, capability and record of performance: Considers the Contractor's capability and experience as measured by financial statements, performance record, litigation, years in the industry, number of public school districts served and references. | 12% | 1 to 5 |
| 3. On-Site Management: Considers the references; proposal resumes, face to face interviews and any other method to discover the capabilities and skill level of the on-site management. At a minimum the proposed candidate must demonstrate the following: On- site Manager(s): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should have at least two years' experience in managing a comparable sized public school district. • Should have four years' experience in the custodial management industry. • Must have a high school diploma or GED equivalent diploma. • Must be in the process of obtaining or have a Black Seal License by 7-1-2020. • Must be fluent in English. On- site Supervisor(s): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should have at least one year experience in managing a comparable sized educational institution. • Should have a high school diploma or GED equivalent diploma. • Must be in the process of obtaining or have a Black Seal License by 7-1-2020. • Must be fluent in English. | 25% | 1 to 5 |
| 4. Staffing Viability: Considers whether proposed wages and staffing levels are sufficient to recruit and maintain a stable workforce by the proposed wage rates to the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The NJ Dept. of Labor's most current New Jersey Department of Labor OES survey for median average wages for the District's county for custodial, management and clerical positions as detailed in Exhibit 6. • The current outsourced average wage rates and wages as detailed in Exhibit 6 wage rates. • The Consultant's Recommended Staffing, Wage Rates and Salaries as detailed in Exhibit 7. • Are benefits and paid time off provided/offered and employee contribution to insurance premiums and copays/deductibles sufficient to recruit and maintain a stable workforce? • Is the number of proposed custodial, management and clerical staff sufficient to meet the Scope of Work in this RFP? | 24% | 1 to 5 |
| 5. Contractor's Proposed Program: Are the Proposer's program, systems, training, and procedures for custodial and management services thorough and comprehensive to meet the scope of work? | 10% | 1 to 5 |
| 6. Contractor's Start Up/Transition Plan: Is the Proposer's start-up plan customized to the needs of the District? Is the plan detailed from pre- planning (30 days prior to the start of the contract) through the start of the contract and the first three months to September 30, 2020? Did it detail the additional management and resources they shall be providing as well as the startup task, any requirements for the District, implementation date, estimated completion date, and who is responsible (name and title)? Did the plan have 100 or more different (not repetitive) tasks listed covering the startup activities in implementation, management, HR, custodial and training? Was it submitted in Excel format or a Gantt chart? | 14% | 1 to 5 |

Evaluation Committee Report

5. Scoring: The following are the actual and weighted points for each proposer:

| TOTALS | | | | | | | |
|--|------------------|-------------------------|--------------|--------------|-----------------|--------------|--------------|
| CRITERIA | Weighing Percent | Points Awarded (1 to 5) | | | Weighted Points | | |
| | | ABM | Aramark | Pritchard | ABM | Aramark | Pritchard |
| Program Price: | 15% | 12.00 | 9.00 | 15.00 | 1.80 | 1.35 | 2.25 |
| Contractor's capability and record of performance: | 12% | 12.00 | 12.00 | 9.00 | 1.44 | 1.44 | 1.08 |
| On-Site Management: | 25% | 11.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 2.75 | 3.00 | 3.00 |
| Staffing Viability | 24% | 12.00 | 9.00 | 13.00 | 2.88 | 2.16 | 3.12 |
| Contractor's Proposed Program: | 10% | 9.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 0.90 | 1.20 | 1.20 |
| Contractor's Start Up/Transition Plan: | 14% | 9.00 | 10.00 | 15.00 | 1.26 | 1.40 | 2.10 |
| TOTALS | 100% | 65.00 | 64.00 | 76.00 | 11.03 | 10.55 | 12.75 |

6. Scoring Summary

- a. **Pritchard: 12.75 Points** –Pritchard ranked number one for Program Price because they had the lowest five-year price. Contractor's Capability and Record of Performance was based on the references provided as well as financial stability putting Pritchard in third place. For On-Site Management, Pritchard's proposed candidate tied with Aramark for first place. The proposed staffing, wages and benefits provided caused their proposal to be the most advantageous to the District in terms of Staffing Viability. Pritchard tied with Aramark for first place Contractors Proposed Program. Pritchard ranked number one for Contractor's Startup/Transition Plan because they demonstrated that they had the systems, procedures and corporate support to achieve success through the life of the contract.
- b. **ABM: 11.03 Points** – ABM had the second lowest Program Price therefore second place. The school districts served and references had them tied second with Aramark for Contractor's Capability and Record of Performance. ABM proposed candidate ranked third amongst the companies for On-Site Management. ABM ranked second in Staffing Viability . For Contractors Proposed Program and Startup/Transition Plan deemed ABM third place in scoring.
- c. **Aramark: 10.55 Points** - Aramark had the highest five-year Program Price causing them to rank in third place. Their list of school districts served and references had them rank second tied with ABM regarding Contractor's Capability and Record of Performance. In reviewing Aramark proposed candidate's resume, they tied first with Pritchard for On-Site Management. Aramark also ranked third in Staffing Viability. Proposed Program deemed Aramark to tie first with Pritchard. They also received the second highest scoring for Contractor's Startup/Transition Plan.

7. Recommendation of the Roxbury Township School District's Custodial RFP Evaluation Committee:

- Upon review of the proposals submitted and based upon the RFP evaluation criteria, the committee concludes that the Pritchard proposal is most advantageous for the Roxbury Township School District.