

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

1. List of Proposers:

- Aramark
- Pritchard
- Temco

2. List of Evaluation Committee Members:

- Lirca Garcia
- Kevin Brentnall

Hillsdale Evaluation Committee Report

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

Comparison of Proposal Form A - PRICING

Description	Details	Pritchard		Aramark		Temco		
		Percent	Total Charges	Percent	Total Charges	Percent	Total Charges	
Custodial	Charge for Wages		\$87,464.00		\$113,984.00		\$332,259.20	
	Charge for Health Care Benefits	38%	\$33,372.00	40%	\$45,792.80	33%	\$111,240.00	
	Charge for Other Fringe Benefits	1%	\$1,140.00	0%	\$0.00	4%	\$12,218.40	
	Charge for Payroll Taxes	18%	\$16,005.91	8%	\$9,118.72	19%	\$63,825.72	
Consultant Recom'd FTE's	10.00	No. of FTEs (1 FTE=2080 Hours per Year)	3.00	4.00	10.00			
Consultant Recom'd Wage Rate	\$15.72	Avg. Wage Rate Excl. Benefits & Taxes	\$14.02	\$13.70	\$15.97			
Custodial Overtime	Charge for Wages		\$8,410.00		\$8,220.00		\$9,584.40	
	Charge for Payroll Taxes	18%	\$1,553.67	8%	\$657.76	17%	\$1,616.64	
Required Hours	400	Number of Annual Hours	400	400	400			
Consultant Recom'd Wage Rate	\$23.58	Avg. Wage Rate Excl. Benefits & Taxes	\$21.03	\$20.55	\$23.96			
Custodial - Head/Leads	Charge for Wages		\$251,014.40		\$209,539.20		\$0.00	
	Charge for Health Care Benefits	31%	\$77,868.00	33%	\$68,959.20	0%	\$0.00	
	Charge for Other Fringe Benefits	1%	\$2,660.00	0%	\$0.00	0%	\$0.00	
	Charge for Payroll Taxes	18%	\$45,935.64	8%	\$16,763.12	0%	\$0.00	
Consultant Recom'd FTE's	0.00	No. of FTEs (1 FTE=2080 Hours per Year) -	7.00	6.00	0.00			
Consultant Recom'd Wage Rate	\$0.00	Avg. Wage Rate Excl. Benefits & Taxes	\$17.24	\$16.79	\$0.00			
Custodial Heads/Lead Overtime	Charge for Wages		\$0.00		\$0.00		\$0.00	
	Charge for Payroll Taxes	0%	\$0.00	0%	\$0.00	0%	\$0.00	
Required Hours	0	Number of Annual Hours	0	0	0			
Consultant Recom'd Wage Rate	\$0.00	Avg. Wage Rate Excl. Benefits & Taxes	\$25.86	\$0.00	\$0.00			
General Manager	Charge for Wages		\$50,000.00		\$52,998.40		\$53,000.48	
	Charge for Health Care Benefits	11%	\$5,400.00	17%	\$8,840.00	13%	\$6,984.00	
	Charge for Other Fringe Benefits	5%	\$2,400.00	0%	\$0.00	2%	\$936.36	
	Charge for Payroll Taxes	18%	\$9,150.00	8%	\$4,240.00	10%	\$5,194.08	
Consultant Recom'd FTE's	1.00	No. of FTEs (1 FTE=2080 Hours per Year)	1.00	1.00	1.00			
Consultant Recom'd Wage Rate	\$25.48	Avg. Wage Rate Excl. Benefits & Taxes	\$24.04	\$25.48	\$25.48			
Contractor Start Up Charges – attach detail breakdown								
Years total amount amortized over:	5	Input Total Start Up Charges Amount	\$1.00	\$0.00	\$0.00			
Contractor Equipment Budget/Pool : \$37,500.00								
Years total amount amortized over:	5	Total Equip. Budget Pool Amount	\$7,500.00	\$7,500.00	\$7,500.00			
Contractor Charge for Computerized Quality Assurance System			\$1.00	\$1,428.00	\$80.04			
Contractor Charge for Office and or Warehouse Rent			\$1.00	\$1,500.00	\$0.00			
Contractor Charge for Required Office Equipment			\$1.00	\$3,419.00	\$2,318.04			
Contractor Charge for Supplies and On-Going Operating Costs			\$3,880.00	\$31,628.80	\$1,089.36			
Contractor Management Fee			2.9%	\$18,061.13	4.7%	\$29,000.00	2.5%	\$15,673.28
District Charge for Contract Monitoring			\$9,720.00	\$9,720.00	\$9,720.00			
TOTAL CONTRACT CHARGE YEAR ONE			\$631,538.75	\$623,309.00	\$633,240.00			
Increase for 2017-2018 - Input Dollar Amount			3.3%	\$21,085.95	3.2%	\$19,820.00	4.7%	\$29,736.00
TOTAL CONTRACT CHARGE YEAR TWO			\$652,624.70	\$643,129.00	\$662,976.00			
Increase for 2018-2019 - Input Dollar Amount			1.5%	\$9,888.00	3.4%	\$21,950.00	1.9%	\$12,480.00
TOTAL CONTRACT CHARGE YEAR THREE			\$662,512.70	\$665,079.00	\$675,456.00			
Increase for 2019-2020 - Input Dollar Amount			1.5%	\$10,135.20	2.9%	\$19,340.00	1.1%	\$7,632.00
TOTAL CONTRACT CHARGE YEAR FOUR			\$672,647.90	\$684,419.00	\$683,088.00			
Increase for 2021-2022 - Input Dollar Amount			1.6%	\$10,567.80	3.0%	\$20,480.00	3.1%	\$21,180.00
TOTAL CONTRACT CHARGE YEAR FIVE			\$683,215.70	\$704,899.00	\$704,268.00			
TOTAL CONTRACT CHARGE FOR FIVE YEARS			\$3,302,539.74	\$3,320,835.00	\$3,359,028.00			
Difference from Lowest Total 5 Year Contract Price			\$0.00	\$18,295.26	\$56,488.26			
Total for Health Benefits			\$116,640.00	\$123,592.00	\$118,224.00			
Total for Other Fringe Benefits			\$6,200.00	\$0.00	\$13,154.76			
Total for Employee Payroll Taxes excluding overtime			\$71,091.55	\$30,121.84	\$69,019.80			

Hillsdale 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"> · Should have at least one year 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 7-1-2016. · 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, 2016? 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

Hillsdale Evaluation Committee Report

5. Scoring:

Hillsdale Evaluations of Award Criteria for Custodial & Management Services							
Evaluator: Lirca Garcia	Weighing Percent	Points Awarded (1 to 5)			Weighted Points		
CRITERIA		Aramark	Pritchard	Temco	Aramark	Pritchard	Temco
Program Price:	15%	4.50	5.00	4.00	0.675	0.750	0.600
Contractor's capability and record of performance:	12%	4.50	4.00	3.50	0.540	0.480	0.420
On-Site Management:	25%	4.50	3.50	3.00	1.125	0.875	0.750
Staffing Viability	24%	4.00	4.00	4.00	0.960	0.960	0.960
Contractor's Proposed Program:	10%	4.00	4.00	4.00	0.400	0.400	0.400
Contractor's Start Up/Transition Plan:	14%	4.00	4.00	3.50	0.560	0.560	0.490
TOTALS	100%	25.50	24.50	22.00	4.260	4.025	3.620
Evaluator: Kevin Brentnall	Weighing Percent	Points Awarded (1 to 5)			Weighted Points		
CRITERIA		Aramark	Pritchard	Temco	Aramark	Pritchard	Temco
Program Price:	15%	4.50	5.00	4.00	0.675	0.750	0.600
Contractor's capability and record of performance:	12%	4.50	4.00	3.50	0.540	0.480	0.420
On-Site Management:	25%	4.50	3.50	3.00	1.125	0.875	0.750
Staffing Viability	24%	4.00	4.00	4.00	0.960	0.960	0.960
Contractor's Proposed Program:	10%	4.00	4.00	4.00	0.400	0.400	0.400
Contractor's Start Up/Transition Plan:	14%	4.00	4.00	3.50	0.560	0.560	0.490
TOTALS	100%	25.50	24.50	22.00	4.260	4.025	3.620
TOTALS							
	Weighing Percent	Points Awarded (1 to 5)			Weighted Points		
CRITERIA		Aramark	Pritchard	Temco	Aramark	Pritchard	Temco
Program Price:	15%	9.00	10.00	8.00	1.350	1.500	1.200
Contractor's capability and record of performance:	12%	9.00	8.00	7.00	1.080	0.960	0.840
On-Site Management:	25%	9.00	7.00	6.00	2.250	1.750	1.500
Staffing Viability	24%	8.00	8.00	8.00	1.920	1.920	1.920
Contractor's Proposed Program:	10%	8.00	8.00	8.00	0.800	0.800	0.800
Contractor's Start Up/Transition Plan:	14%	8.00	8.00	7.00	1.120	1.120	0.980
TOTALS	100%	51.00	49.00	44.00	8.520	8.050	7.240

Hillsdale Evaluation Committee Report

6. Scoring Summary

- a. **Aramark: 8.52 Points** – Aramark ranked number two for Program Price because they had the second lowest five-year price. Contractor’s Capability and Record of Performance was based on the references provided as well as financial stability and was worthy of first place. For On-Site Management, Aramark’s proposed candidate stood out as being the strongest. Each company proposed the same total number of FTE’s which created a three way tie for Staffing Viability. All proposers received the same scores for Contractor’s Proposed Program because they all met the requirements of the RFP. Aramark’s Startup/Transition Plan tied with Pritchard for the highest score because they both demonstrated that they had the systems, procedures and corporate support to achieve success through the life of the contract.
- b. **Pritchard: 8.05 Points** - Pritchard had the lowest price which earned them the highest ranking for Program price. Their references were good enough to earn second place for Contractor’s Capability and Record of Performance. In reviewing the resume and the interview of Pritchard’s proposed candidate, they were given the second highest score for On-Site Management. Each company proposed the same total number of FTE’s so there was a three way tie for Staffing Viability. All proposers received the same scores for Contractor’s Proposed Program because they all met the requirements of the RFP. Pritchard’s Startup/Transition Plan tied with Aramark for the highest score because they both demonstrated that they had the systems, procedures and corporate support to achieve success through the life of the contract.
- c. **Temco: 7.24 Points** - Temco had the highest price of all proposers. The school districts served and references were adequate but scored slightly less than Aramark and Pritchard for Contractor’s Capability and Record of Performance. Temco’s proposed candidate ranked third amongst the companies for On-Site Management. Each company proposed the same total number of FTE’s so there was a three way tie for Staffing Viability. All proposers received the same scores for Contractor’s Proposed Program because they all met the requirements of the RFP. Temco’s Startup/Transition Plan met the requirements of the RFP but was slightly less impressive than the other two proposals.

7. Recommendation of the Hillsdale School District’s 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 Hillsdale School District.