

Roxbury School District Evaluation Committee Recommendations for the *Custodial and Management Services RFP*

1. List of Proposers:

- Temco
- Aramark
- GCA

2. List of Evaluation Committee Members:

- Pat Tierney
- Susan Joyce
- Jim Monaghan
- Jeff Swanson
- John Eschmann
- Yvonne Hellwig

3. Cost of Proposals (Ranked from lowest to highest) :

PROPOSAL FORM A - PRICING COMPARISON							
Description	Details	Temco		Aramark		GCA	
		Percent	Total Charges	Percent	Total Charges	Percent	Total Charges
Custodial	Charge for Employee Wages		\$1,031,264.00		\$1,031,264.00		\$1,031,264.00
	Charge for Employee Health Care Benefit	6%	\$59,400.00	8%	\$82,581.12	7%	\$77,108.00
	Charge for Employee Other Fringe Benefit	0%	\$0.00	0%	\$0.00	2%	\$15,468.96
	Charge for Employee Payroll Taxes	19%	\$192,882.76	7%	\$72,188.48	16%	\$161,186.56
Consultant Recom'd FTEs 37.00	No. of FTEs (1 FTE=2080 Hours per Year) -	37.00		37.00		37.00	
Consultant Recom'd Wage Rate \$13.40	Avg. Wage Rate Excl. Fringe Benefits & Taxes	\$13.40		\$13.40		\$13.40	
Custodial Overtime	Charge for Employee Wages		\$61,867.80		\$63,745.38		\$61,867.80
	Charge for Employee Payroll Taxes	14%	\$8,857.44	7%	\$4,462.15	16%	\$9,669.94
	Required Hours 3078	No. of Annual Hours	3,078	3,078		3,078	
	Consultant Recom'd Wage Rate \$20.10	Avg. Wage Rate Excl. Fringe Benefits & Taxes	\$20.10		\$20.71		\$20.10
Head Custodial	Charge for Employee Wages		\$230,048.00		\$230,048.00		\$230,048.00
	Charge for Employee Health Care Benefit	5%	\$11,550.00	8%	\$18,403.84	6%	\$14,588.00
	Charge for Employee Other Fringe Benefit	0%	\$0.00	0%	\$0.00	2%	\$3,450.72
	Charge for Employee Payroll Taxes	19%	\$43,313.08	7%	\$16,103.36	16%	\$35,956.50
Consultant Recom'd FTEs 7.00	No. of FTEs (1 FTE=2080 Hours per Year) -	7.00		7.00		7.00	
Consultant Recom'd Wage Rate \$15.80	Avg. Wage Rate Excl. Fringe Benefits & Taxes	\$15.80		\$15.80		\$15.80	
Head Custodial Overtime	Charge for Employee Wages		\$13,793.40		\$14,212.44		\$13,793.40
	Charge for Employee Payroll Taxes	14%	\$1,974.72	7%	\$994.84	16%	\$2,155.91
	Required Hours 582	No. of Annual Hours	582	582		582	
	Consultant Recom'd Wage Rate \$23.70	Avg. Wage Rate Excl. Fringe Benefits & Taxes	\$23.70		\$24.42		\$23.70
On-Site Manager	Charge for Employee Wages		\$80,000.00		\$82,000.00		\$82,000.00
	Charge for Employee Health Care Benefit	14%	\$10,812.00	17%	\$13,940.00	7%	\$5,577.00
	Charge for Employee Other Fringe Benefit	1%	\$1,056.00	0%	\$0.00	2%	\$1,230.00
	Charge for Employee Payroll Taxes	9%	\$7,361.88	7%	\$5,837.00	16%	\$12,816.60
Consultant Recom'd FTEs 1.00	No. of FTEs (1 FTE=2080 Hours per Year) -	1.00		1.00		1.00	
Consultant Recom'd Wage Rate \$39.42	Avg. Wage Rate Excl. Fringe Benefits & Taxes	\$38.46		\$39.42		\$39.42	
On-Site Supervisor/s	Charge for Employee Wages		\$110,000.00		\$110,000.00		\$110,000.00
	Charge for Employee Health Care Benefit	20%	\$21,624.00	17%	\$18,700.00	10%	\$11,154.00
	Charge for Employee Other Fringe Benefit	1%	\$1,452.00	0%	\$0.00	2%	\$1,650.00
	Charge for Employee Payroll Taxes	11%	\$11,853.00	7%	\$7,700.00	16%	\$17,193.00
Consultant Recom'd FTEs 1.00	No. of FTEs (1 FTE=2080 Hours per Year) -	2.00		2.00		2.00	
Consultant Recom'd Wage Rate \$26.44	Avg. Wage Rate Excl. Fringe Benefits & Taxes	\$26.44		\$26.44		\$26.44	
Clerical	Charge for Employee Wages		\$38,480.00		\$38,480.00		\$38,480.00
	Charge for Employee Health Care Benefit	28%	\$10,812.00	8%	\$3,078.40	14%	\$5,577.00
	Charge for Employee Other Fringe Benefit	1%	\$507.96	0%	\$0.00	2%	\$577.20
	Charge for Employee Payroll Taxes	11%	\$4,159.36	7%	\$2,693.60	16%	\$6,014.42
Consultant Recom'd FTEs 1.00	No. of FTEs (1 FTE=2080 Hours per Year) -	1.00		1.00		1.00	
Consultant Recom'd Wage Rate \$18.50	Avg. Wage Rate Excl. Fringe Benefits & Taxes	\$18.50		\$18.50		\$18.50	
Contractor Start Up Charges – attach detail breakdown							
Total amount amortized over 5 years: Annual Charges			\$0.00		\$0.00		\$2,324.00
Contractor Equipment Budget/Pool: All Proposed \$100,000							
Total amount amortized over 5 years: Annual Charges			\$20,000.00		\$20,000.00		\$20,000.00
Contractor Charge for Computerized Quality Assurance System			\$140.00		\$2,878.00		\$100.00
Contractor Charge for Office and or Warehouse Rent			\$0.00		\$0.00		Included
Contractor Charge for Required Office Equipment			\$6,901.00		\$7,331.71		\$2,504.00
Contractor Charge for Supplies and On-Going Operating Costs			\$4,461.60		\$154,618.68		\$20,685.00
Contractor Management Fee		2.5%	\$50,892.00	3.5%	\$73,003.00	5.0%	\$105,500.00
District Charge for Contract Monitoring			\$19,464.00		\$19,464.00		\$19,464.00
TOTAL CONTRACT CHARGE YEAR ONE			\$2,054,928.00		\$2,093,728.00		\$2,119,404.02
Increase for 2014-2015 - Input Dollar Amount		1.5%	\$30,828.00	1.0%	\$20,937.28	0.0%	
TOTAL CONTRACT CHARGE YEAR TWO			\$2,085,756.00		\$2,114,665.28		\$2,119,404.02
TOTAL CONTRACT CHARGE YEAR'S ONE AND TWO			\$4,140,684.00		\$4,208,393.28		\$4,238,808.03
Difference from Lowest Price			\$0.00		\$67,709.28		\$98,124.03
Total for Health Benefits			\$103,386.00		\$133,624.96		\$108,427.00
Total for Other Fringe Benefits			\$2,508.00		\$0.00		\$21,799.68
Total for Employee Payroll Taxes excluding overtime			\$266,242.88		\$107,285.83		\$238,978.51

4. Evaluation Criteria:

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"> · Must have at least five years' experience in managing a comparable sized public school district. · Must have a high school diploma or GED equivalent diploma. · Must be in the process of obtaining or have a Black Seal License by 07-1-2015. · Must be fluent in English. On- site Supervisors: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Must have at least three years' experience in managing a comparable sized educational institution. · Must have a high school diploma or GED equivalent diploma. · Must be in the process of obtaining or have a Black Seal License by 07-1-2015. · Must be fluent in English. 	25%	1 to 5
4. Staffing Viability: Considers whether wages are sufficient to recruit and maintain a stable workforce by comparing the Contractors proposed wage rates to 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 well as to current outsourced contractual average wage rates and wages as detailed in Exhibit 7 wage rates. 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? Also considers whether the number of custodial, management and clerical staff provided and recommended by the Contractor is sufficient to meet the Scope of Work in this RFP? Considers the Consultant's Recommended Staffing, Wage Rates and Salaries as detailed in Exhibit 8.	24%	1 to 5
5. Contractor's Proposed Program: Is the contractor'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 contractor's start-up plan customized to the start of this program? 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, 2015? Did it detail the additional management/resources they will 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

5. Scoring:

Roxbury Evaluations of Award Criteria for Custodial & Management Services							
Evaluator: Pat Tierney							
CRITERIA	Weighing Percent	Points Awarded (1 to 5)			Weighted Points		
		Temco	Aramark	GCA	Temco	Aramark	GCA
Program Price:	15%	5.00	4.50	4.00	0.750	0.675	0.600
Contractor's capability and record of performance:	12%	4.50	5.00	4.50	0.540	0.600	0.540
On-Site Management:	25%	3.00	5.00	3.00	0.750	1.250	0.750
Staffing Viability	24%	3.50	4.00	3.50	0.840	0.960	0.840
Contractor's Proposed Program:	10%	4.00	5.00	3.00	0.400	0.500	0.300
Contractor's Start Up/Transition Plan:	14%	4.00	5.00	3.00	0.560	0.700	0.420
TOTALS	100%	24.00	28.50	21.00	3.840	4.685	3.450
Evaluator: Susan Joyce							
CRITERIA	Weighing Percent	Points Awarded (1 to 5)			Weighted Points		
		Temco	Aramark	GCA	Temco	Aramark	GCA
Program Price:	15%	5.00	4.50	4.00	0.750	0.675	0.600
Contractor's capability and record of performance:	12%	5.00	5.00	4.00	0.600	0.600	0.480
On-Site Management:	25%	4.00	5.00	3.00	1.000	1.250	0.750
Staffing Viability	24%	4.00	5.00	4.00	0.960	1.200	0.960
Contractor's Proposed Program:	10%	4.00	4.50	3.50	0.400	0.450	0.350
Contractor's Start Up/Transition Plan:	14%	3.00	5.00	2.00	0.420	0.700	0.280
TOTALS	100%	25.00	29.00	20.50	4.130	4.875	3.420
Evaluator: Jim Monaghan							
CRITERIA	Weighing Percent	Points Awarded (1 to 5)			Weighted Points		
		Temco	Aramark	GCA	Temco	Aramark	GCA
Program Price:	15%	5.00	4.50	4.00	0.750	0.675	0.600
Contractor's capability and record of performance:	12%	4.50	5.00	4.50	0.540	0.600	0.540
On-Site Management:	25%	3.00	5.00	3.00	0.750	1.250	0.750
Staffing Viability	24%	3.50	4.00	3.50	0.840	0.960	0.840
Contractor's Proposed Program:	10%	4.00	5.00	3.00	0.400	0.500	0.300
Contractor's Start Up/Transition Plan:	14%	4.00	5.00	3.00	0.560	0.700	0.420
TOTALS	100%	24.00	28.50	21.00	3.840	4.685	3.450
Evaluator: Jeff Swanson							
CRITERIA	Weighing Percent	Points Awarded (1 to 5)			Weighted Points		
		Temco	Aramark	GCA	Temco	Aramark	GCA
Program Price:	15%	5.00	4.50	4.00	0.750	0.675	0.600
Contractor's capability and record of performance:	12%	4.50	5.00	4.50	0.540	0.600	0.540
On-Site Management:	25%	3.00	5.00	3.00	0.750	1.250	0.750
Staffing Viability	24%	3.50	4.00	3.50	0.840	0.960	0.840
Contractor's Proposed Program:	10%	4.00	5.00	3.00	0.400	0.500	0.300
Contractor's Start Up/Transition Plan:	14%	4.00	5.00	3.00	0.560	0.700	0.420
TOTALS	100%	24.00	28.50	21.00	3.840	4.685	3.450
Evaluator: John Eschmann							
CRITERIA	Weighing Percent	Points Awarded (1 to 5)			Weighted Points		
		Temco	Aramark	GCA	Temco	Aramark	GCA
Program Price:	15%	4.50	4.00	3.50	0.675	0.600	0.525
Contractor's capability and record of performance:	12%	3.50	4.50	3.00	0.420	0.540	0.360
On-Site Management:	25%	3.50	5.00	3.00	0.875	1.250	0.750
Staffing Viability	24%	3.50	4.50	3.00	0.840	1.080	0.720
Contractor's Proposed Program:	10%	3.50	4.50	3.00	0.350	0.450	0.300
Contractor's Start Up/Transition Plan:	14%	3.50	4.50	3.00	0.490	0.630	0.420
TOTALS	100%	22.00	27.00	18.50	3.650	4.550	3.075
Evaluator: Yvonne Hellwig							
CRITERIA	Weighing Percent	Points Awarded (1 to 5)			Weighted Points		
		Temco	Aramark	GCA	Temco	Aramark	GCA
Program Price:	15%	5.00	4.50	4.00	0.750	0.675	0.600
Contractor's capability and record of performance:	12%	4.50	5.00	4.00	0.540	0.600	0.480
On-Site Management:	19%	4.00	5.00	3.00	0.760	0.950	0.570
Staffing Viability	24%	3.50	4.00	3.50	0.840	0.960	0.840
Contractor's Proposed Program:	15%	4.00	5.00	3.00	0.600	0.750	0.450
Contractor's Start Up/Transition Plan:	15%	4.00	5.00	3.00	0.600	0.750	0.450
TOTALS	100%	25.00	28.50	20.50	4.090	4.685	3.390
TOTALS							
CRITERIA	Weighing Percent	Points Awarded (1 to 5)			Weighted Points		
		Temco	Aramark	GCA	Temco	Aramark	GCA
Program Price:	15%	29.50	26.50	23.50	4.425	3.975	3.525
Contractor's capability and record of performance:	12%	26.50	29.50	24.50	3.180	3.540	2.940
On-Site Management:	25%	20.50	30.00	18.00	5.125	7.500	4.500
Staffing Viability	24%	21.50	25.50	21.00	5.160	6.120	5.040
Contractor's Proposed Program:	10%	23.50	29.00	18.50	2.350	2.900	1.850
Contractor's Start Up/Transition Plan:	14%	22.50	29.50	17.00	3.150	4.130	2.380
TOTALS	100%	144.00	170.00	122.50	23.390	28.165	20.235

6. Scoring Summary

1. Aramark: 28.165 Points – Aramark ranked number two for Program Price because they had the second lowest two year contract price. Contractor’s Capability and Record of Performance was based on the references provided and was worthy of first place. For On-Site Management, Aramark’s proposed candidate stood out as being the strongest. The proposed staffing, wages and benefits provided caused their proposal to be the most advantageous to the District in terms of Staffing Viability. Aramark also ranked first in the Contractor’s Proposed Program and the 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.
2. Temco: 23.390 Points - Temco had the lowest price which earned them the highest rank for Program Price. The school districts served and references had them score second regarding Contractor’s Capability and Record of Performance. Temco’s proposed candidate ranked second amongst the companies for On-Site Management. Temco also ranked second in Staffing Viability. Their Contractors Proposed Program and Transition Plan were also good enough for second place.
3. GCA: 20.235 Points - GCA had the highest price and therefore ranked lowest for Program Price. Their references and list of school district’s served received the lowest score for Contractor’s Capability and Record of Performance. GCA’s proposed candidates were ranked third amongst the companies for On-Site Management Team. GCA also received the lowest score for Staffing Viability. They received the lowest score for Contractor’s Proposed Program and Transition Plan as they met the requirements of the RFP but were deemed inferior to the others.

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

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