

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

1. List of Proposers:

- Aramark
- GCA
- Pritchard
- Temco

2. List of Evaluation Committee Members:

- Patricia Salvati
- John Doller
- Jessica Viola
- Nancy Meyer

Evaluation Committee Report

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

Comparison of Proposal Form A - PRICING WYCKOFF									
Description	Details	Pritchard		GCA		Temco		Aramark	
		Percent	Total Charges	Percent	Total Charges	Percent	Total Charges	Percent	Total Charges
Custodial	Charge for Wages		\$255,656.86		\$261,206.40		\$260,769.60		\$417,185.60
	Charge for Health Care Benefits	3%	\$6,930.00	11%	\$29,555.00	3%	\$8,028.00	12%	\$48,152.00
	Charge for Other Fringe Benefits	3%	\$7,954.64	4%	\$10,448.00	4%	\$9,181.08	4%	\$15,015.00
	Charge for Payroll Taxes	18%	\$46,785.20	14%	\$36,568.96	20%	\$50,985.12	15%	\$61,992.86
Consultant Recond FTEs	15.50	No. of FTEs (1 FTE=2080 Hours per Year)	10.50	10.50	10.50	10.50	15.50		
Consultant Recond Wage Rate	\$11.60	Avg. Wage Rate Excl. Benefits & Taxes	\$11.71	\$11.96	\$11.94	\$11.94	\$12.94		
Custodial Overtime	Charge for Wages		\$22,826.51		\$23,322.00		\$23,283.00		\$25,233.00
	Charge for Payroll Taxes	18%	\$4,177.25	14%	\$3,265.08	14%	\$3,337.08	15%	\$3,749.57
Required Hours	1300	Number of Annual Hours	1,300	1,300	1,300	1,300	1,300		
Consultant Recond Wage Rate	\$17.40	Avg. Wage Rate Excl. Benefits & Taxes	\$17.56	\$17.94	\$17.91	\$17.91	\$19.41		
Custodial - Head/Leads	Charge for Wages		\$329,699.55		\$330,928.00		\$330,720.00		\$165,464.00
	Charge for Health Care Benefits	2%	\$6,600.00	9%	\$29,555.00	7%	\$24,084.00	19%	\$30,814.00
	Charge for Other Fringe Benefits	2%	\$7,968.13	4%	\$13,237.12	2%	\$7,368.60	3%	\$5,005.00
	Charge for Payroll Taxes	18%	\$60,335.02	14%	\$46,329.32	19%	\$64,252.13	14%	\$22,742.20
Consultant Recond FTEs	5.00	No. of FTEs (1 FTE=2080 Hours per Year)	10.00	10.00	10.00	10.00	5.00		
Consultant Recond Wage Rate	\$15.70	Avg. Wage Rate Excl. Benefits & Taxes	\$15.85	\$15.91	\$15.90	\$15.90	\$15.91		
Custodial Heads/Lead Overtime	Charge for Wages		\$7,109.15		\$7,135.64		\$7,131.15		\$7,135.64
	Charge for Payroll Taxes	18%	\$1,300.97	14%	\$998.98	14%	\$1,021.32	14%	\$980.76
Required Hours	299	Number of Annual Hours	299	299	299	299	299		
Consultant Recond Wage Rate	\$23.55	Avg. Wage Rate Excl. Benefits & Taxes	\$23.78	\$23.87	\$23.85	\$23.85	\$23.87		
General Manager	Charge for Wages		\$62,120.66		\$61,484.80		\$62,712.00		\$61,484.80
	Charge for Health Care Benefits	10%	\$6,000.00	11%	\$6,666.00	15%	\$9,600.00	10%	\$6,300.00
	Charge for Other Fringe Benefits	1%	\$929.45	1%	\$400.00	6%	\$3,482.16	7%	\$4,200.00
	Charge for Payroll Taxes	18%	\$11,368.08	15%	\$9,085.63	9%	\$5,916.96	14%	\$8,450.78
Consultant Recond FTEs	1.00	No. of FTEs (1 FTE=2080 Hours per Year)	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00		
Consultant Recond Wage Rate	\$29.56	Avg. Wage Rate Excl. Benefits & Taxes	\$29.87	\$29.56	\$30.15	\$30.15	\$29.56		
Clerical	Charge for Wages		\$31,028.82		\$30,100.00		\$30,700.80		\$30,097.60
	Charge for Health Care Benefits	2%	\$660.00	22%	\$6,666.00	31%	\$9,600.00	9%	\$2,612.00
	Charge for Other Fringe Benefits	3%	\$785.98	1%	\$250.00	6%	\$1,733.64	0%	\$0.00
	Charge for Payroll Taxes	18%	\$5,678.27	16%	\$4,864.37	11%	\$3,292.56	14%	\$4,136.76
Consultant Recond FTEs	1.00	No. of FTEs (1 FTE=2080 Hours per Year)	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00		
Consultant Recond Wage Rate	\$14.47	Avg. Wage Rate Excl. Benefits & Taxes	\$14.92	\$14.47	\$14.76	\$14.76	\$14.47		
Contractor Start Up Charges -									
Total amount amortized over 5 years:			\$1.00		\$666.20		\$0.00		\$0.00
Contractor Equipment Budget/Pool:			\$35,000						
Total amount amortized over 5 years		\$7,000.00	Annual Charges	\$7,000.00	\$7,000.00	\$7,000.00	\$7,000.00	\$7,000.00	\$7,000.00
Contractor Charge for Computerized Quality Assurance System			\$270.55		\$76.00		\$100.00		\$2,004.00
Contractor Charge for Office and or Warehouse Rent			\$0.00		\$0.00		\$0.00		\$0.00
Contractor Charge for Required Office Equipment			\$1,300.00		\$975.00		\$3,849.20		\$0.00
Contractor Charge for Supplies and On-Going Operating Costs			\$16,898.31		\$15,973.00		\$3,096.84		\$67,521.00
Contractor Management Fee		3.3%	\$31,539.02	5.0%	\$49,500.00	3.0%	\$28,754.76	2.2%	\$22,918.43
District Charge for Contract Monitoring			\$13,476.00		\$13,476.00		\$13,476.00		\$13,476.00
TOTAL CONTRACT CHARGE YEAR ONE			\$946,399.42		\$999,732.49		\$973,476.00		\$1,033,671.00
Increase for 2018-2019 - Input Dollar Amount		2.1%	\$20,105.09	2.0%	\$19,994.65	3.9%	\$38,328.00	1.5%	\$15,302.93
TOTAL CONTRACT CHARGE YEAR TWO			\$966,504.51		\$1,019,727.14		\$1,011,804.00		\$1,048,973.92
Increase for 2019-2020 - Input Dollar Amount		0.7%	\$7,107.07	2.0%	\$20,394.00	3.7%	\$37,728.00	1.5%	\$15,532.47
TOTAL CONTRACT CHARGE YEAR THREE			\$973,611.58		\$1,040,121.14		\$1,049,532.00		\$1,064,506.39
Increase for 2020-2021 - Input Dollar Amount		1.3%	\$12,989.70	2.0%	\$20,802.00	2.6%	\$27,072.00	1.5%	\$15,765.46
TOTAL CONTRACT CHARGE YEAR FOUR			\$986,601.28		\$1,060,923.14		\$1,076,604.00		\$1,080,271.85
Increase for 2021-2022 - Input Dollar Amount		1.4%	\$13,379.40	2.0%	\$21,218.00	3.4%	\$36,804.00	1.5%	\$16,001.94
TOTAL CONTRACT CHARGE YEAR FIVE			\$999,980.68		\$1,082,141.14		\$1,113,408.00		\$1,096,273.79
TOTAL CONTRACT CHARGE FOR FIVE YEARS			\$4,873,097.47		\$5,202,645.07		\$5,224,824.00		\$5,323,696.96

Evaluation Committee Report

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 two 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. 	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 position 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? 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

Evaluation Committee Report

5. Scoring:

Evaluations of Award Criteria for Custodial & Management Services									
Evaluator: Patricia Salvati	Weighing	Points Awarded (1 to 5)				Weighted Points			
CRITERIA	Percent	Aramark	GCA	Pritchard	Temco	Aramark	GCA	Pritchard	Temco
Program Price:	15%	1.00	3.00	5.00	2.00	0.15	0.45	0.75	0.30
Contractor's capability and record of performance:	12%	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.00	0.60	0.60	0.60	0.48
On-Site Management:	25%	2.50	3.00	5.00	5.00	0.63	0.75	1.25	1.25
Staffing Viability	24%	5.00	3.00	4.00	5.00	1.20	0.72	0.96	1.20
Contractor's Proposed Program:	10%	5.00	5.00	3.00	4.00	0.50	0.50	0.30	0.40
Contractor's Start Up/Transition Plan:	14%	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	0.70	0.70	0.70	0.70
TOTALS	100%	23.50	24.00	27.00	25.00	3.78	3.72	4.56	4.33
Evaluator: John Dollar	Weighing	Points Awarded (1 to 5)				Weighted Points			
CRITERIA	Percent	Aramark	GCA	Pritchard	Temco	Aramark	GCA	Pritchard	Temco
Program Price:	15%	1.00	3.00	5.00	4.00	0.15	0.45	0.75	0.60
Contractor's capability and record of performance:	12%	4.00	3.00	2.00	3.00	0.48	0.36	0.24	0.36
On-Site Management:	25%	3.00	2.00	4.00	2.00	0.75	0.50	1.00	0.50
Staffing Viability	24%	4.00	3.00	4.00	2.00	0.96	0.72	0.96	0.48
Contractor's Proposed Program:	10%	4.00	4.00	3.00	3.00	0.40	0.40	0.30	0.30
Contractor's Start Up/Transition Plan:	14%	3.00	5.00	4.00	4.00	0.42	0.70	0.56	0.56
TOTALS	100%	19.00	20.00	22.00	18.00	3.16	3.13	3.81	2.80
Evaluator: Jessica Viola	Weighing	Points Awarded (1 to 5)				Weighted Points			
CRITERIA	Percent	Aramark	GCA	Pritchard	Temco	Aramark	GCA	Pritchard	Temco
Program Price:	15%	1.00	3.00	5.00	2.00	0.15	0.45	0.75	0.30
Contractor's capability and record of performance:	12%	5.00	5.00	3.00	5.00	0.60	0.60	0.36	0.60
On-Site Management:	25%	2.00	2.00	5.00	2.00	0.50	0.50	1.25	0.50
Staffing Viability	24%	3.00	5.00	4.00	4.00	0.72	1.20	0.96	0.96
Contractor's Proposed Program:	10%	3.00	4.00	2.00	4.00	0.30	0.40	0.20	0.40
Contractor's Start Up/Transition Plan:	14%	5.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	0.70	0.56	0.56	0.56
TOTALS	100%	19.00	23.00	23.00	21.00	2.97	3.71	4.08	3.32
Evaluator: Nancy Meyer	Weighing	Points Awarded (1 to 5)				Weighted Points			
CRITERIA	Percent	Aramark	GCA	Pritchard	Temco	Aramark	GCA	Pritchard	Temco
Program Price:	15%	1.00	3.00	4.00	2.00	0.15	0.45	0.60	0.30
Contractor's capability and record of performance:	12%	4.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	0.48	0.36	0.36	0.36
On-Site Management:	25%	3.00	3.00	4.00	2.00	0.75	0.75	1.00	0.50
Staffing Viability	24%	4.00	3.00	4.00	3.00	0.96	0.72	0.96	0.72
Contractor's Proposed Program:	10%	4.00	4.00	3.00	3.00	0.40	0.40	0.30	0.30
Contractor's Start Up/Transition Plan:	14%	3.00	5.00	4.00	4.00	0.42	0.70	0.56	0.56
TOTALS	100%	19.00	21.00	22.00	17.00	3.16	3.38	3.78	2.74
TOTALS									
CRITERIA	Weighing Percent	Aramark	GCA	Pritchard	Temco	Aramark	GCA	Pritchard	Temco
Program Price:	15%	4.00	12.00	19.00	10.00	0.60	1.80	2.85	1.50
Contractor's capability and record of performance:	12%	18.00	16.00	13.00	15.00	2.16	1.92	1.56	1.80
On-Site Management:	25%	10.50	10.00	18.00	11.00	2.63	2.50	4.50	2.75
Staffing Viability	24%	16.00	14.00	16.00	14.00	3.84	3.36	3.84	3.36
Contractor's Proposed Program:	10%	16.00	17.00	11.00	14.00	1.60	1.70	1.10	1.40
Contractor's Start Up/Transition Plan:	14%	16.00	19.00	17.00	17.00	2.24	2.66	2.38	2.38
TOTALS	100%	80.50	88.00	94.00	81.00	13.07	13.94	16.23	13.19

Evaluation Committee Report

6. Scoring Summary

- a. **Aramark: 13.07 Points** – Aramark ranked fourth place for Program Price because they had the highest 5-year price. Contractor’s Capability and Record of Performance ranked first place. For On-Site Management, Aramark’s proposed candidate ranked third place. The Staffing Viability was tied for first place with Pritchard. Aramark also ranked second place in the Contractor’s Proposed Program category and ranked in third place in the Contractor’s Startup/Transition Plan.
- b. **GCA: 13.94 Points** – GCA was ranked second place for Program Price. Their references ranked second place for Contractor’s Capability and Record of Performance. In reviewing the resume and the interview of GCA’s proposed candidate, they were ranked fourth place for On-Site Management. GCA tied for second place with Temco for Staffing Viability. They ranked first place for Contractor’s Proposed Program. Finally, their Startup Plan/Transition Plan ranked first place in comparison to the other proposers.
- c. **Pritchard: 16.23 Points** – Pritchard Ranked first place by having the lowest price. The school districts served and references had them ranked in fourth place Contractor’s Capability and Record of Performance. Pritchard’s proposed candidate ranked in first place amongst the companies for On-Site Management. Pritchard also tied for first place with Aramark in Staffing Viability. Pritchard ranked third place for the Contractors Proposed Program and also tied for second place with Temco for their Transition Plan.
- d. **Temco: 13.19 Points** – Temco ranked third place for Program Price. Their list of school districts served and references had them rank in third place regarding Contractor’s Capability and Record of Performance. In reviewing Temco’s proposed candidate’s resume, they ranked third place for On-Site Management. Temco also tied for second place with GCA in Staffing Viability. Temco ranked third place in Proposed Program of the four contractors. They also tied for Second Place scoring in Contractor’s Startup/Transition Plan.

7. Recommendation of the Wyckoff 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 Wyckoff School District.