

# Wanaque Evaluation Committee Report

---

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

### 1. List of Proposers:

- Pritchard
- GCA
- Temco

### 2. List of Evaluation Committee Members:

- Nancy DiBartolo
- Donna Cardiello
- Patrick Sarullo

# Wanaque Evaluation Committee Report

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

Comparison of Proposal Form A - PRICING							
Description	Details	Pritchard		GCA		Temco	
		Percent	Total Charges	Percent	Total Charges	Percent	Total Charges
Custodial	Charge for Wages		\$224,640.00		\$281,008.00		\$281,008.00
	Charge for Health Care Benefits	1%	\$1,560.00	8%	\$23,721.00	16%	\$44,887.20
	Charge for Other Fringe Benefits	0%	\$832.00	1%	\$3,810.00	0%	\$0.00
	Charge for Payroll Taxes	18%	\$41,109.12	14%	\$8.00	19%	\$53,170.68
Consultant Recom'd FTE's	10.00	No. of FTEs (1 FTE=2080 Hours per Year)	8.00		10.00		10.00
Consultant Recom'd Wage Rate	\$13.51	Avg. Wage Rate Excl. Benefits & Taxes	\$13.50		\$13.51		\$13.51
Custodial Overtime	Charge for Wages		\$8,100.00		\$8,106.00		\$8,106.00
	Charge for Payroll Taxes	18%	\$1,482.30	15%	\$1,192.00	17%	\$1,367.40
Required Hours	400	Number of Annual Hours	400		400		400
Consultant Recom'd Wage Rate	\$20.27	Avg. Wage Rate Excl. Benefits & Taxes	\$20.25		\$20.27		\$20.27
Custodial - Head/Leads	Charge for Wages		\$66,560.00		\$32,572.80		\$32,572.80
	Charge for Health Care Benefits	2%	\$1,560.00	11%	\$3,564.00	14%	\$4,488.72
	Charge for Other Fringe Benefits	0%	\$208.00	1%	\$375.00	0%	\$0.00
	Charge for Payroll Taxes	18%	\$12,180.48	15%	\$4,788.00	19%	\$6,138.84
Consultant Recom'd FTE's	1.00	No. of FTEs (1 FTE=2080 Hours per Year)	2.00		1.00		1.00
Consultant Recom'd Wage Rate	\$15.66	Avg. Wage Rate Excl. Benefits & Taxes	\$16.00		\$15.66		\$15.66
Custodial Heads/Lead Overtime	Charge for Wages		\$3,600.00		\$3,523.50		\$3,523.50
	Charge for Payroll Taxes	18%	\$658.80	15%	\$518.00	14%	\$504.48
Required Hours	150	Number of Annual Hours	150		150		150
Consultant Recom'd Wage Rate	\$23.49	Avg. Wage Rate Excl. Benefits & Taxes	\$24.00		\$23.49		\$23.49
General Manager	Charge for Wages		\$60,000.00		\$65,000.00		\$65,000.00
	Charge for Health Care Benefits	0%	\$0.00	15%	\$9,465.00	18%	\$11,760.00
	Charge for Other Fringe Benefits	0%	\$0.00	3%	\$1,800.00	2%	\$1,148.40
	Charge for Payroll Taxes	18%	\$10,980.00	17%	\$10,755.00	10%	\$6,175.92
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	\$31.25	Avg. Wage Rate Excl. Benefits & Taxes	\$28.85		\$31.25		\$31.25
Contractor Start Up Charges							
Years total amount amortized:5		Annual Amount	\$1.00		\$120.00		\$0.00
Contractor Equipment Pool \$30,000.00							
Years total amount amortized:5		Annual Amount	\$6,000.00		\$6,000.00		\$6,000.00
Contractor Charge for Computerized Quality Assurance System			\$1.00		\$288.00		\$80.04
Contractor Charge for Office and or Warehouse Rent			\$1.00		\$0.00		\$0.00
Contractor Charge for Required Office Equipment			\$1,070.00		\$1,200.00		\$2,333.04
Contractor Charge for Supplies and On-Going Operating Costs			\$11,621.54		\$2,779.00		\$1,072.56
Contractor Management Fee		3.8%	\$18,086.49	5.5%	\$29,400.00	2.3%	\$12,774.42
District Charge for Contract Monitoring			\$10,572.00		\$10,572.00		\$10,572.00
<b>TOTAL CONTRACT CHARGE YEAR ONE</b>			\$480,823.73		\$539,336.30		\$552,684.00
<b>Increase for 2017-2018 - Input Dollar Amount</b>		0.0%	\$1.00	1.7%	\$9,438.00	5.0%	\$27,588.00
<b>TOTAL CONTRACT CHARGE YEAR TWO</b>			\$480,824.73		\$548,774.30		\$580,272.00
<b>Increase for 2018-2019 - Input Dollar Amount</b>		1.0%	\$4,808.25	1.7%	\$9,603.00	2.2%	\$13,056.00
<b>TOTAL CONTRACT CHARGE YEAR THREE</b>			\$485,632.98		\$558,377.30		\$593,328.00
<b>Increase for 2019-2020 - Input Dollar Amount</b>		1.0%	\$4,856.33	1.7%	\$9,771.00	1.8%	\$10,908.00
<b>TOTAL CONTRACT CHARGE YEAR FOUR</b>			\$490,489.31		\$568,148.30		\$604,236.00
<b>Increase for 2020-2021 - Input Dollar Amount</b>		1.0%	\$4,904.90	1.7%	\$9,942.00	2.3%	\$13,596.00
<b>TOTAL CONTRACT CHARGE YEAR FIVE</b>			\$495,394.21		\$578,090.30		\$617,832.00
<b>TOTAL CONTRACT CHARGE FOR FIVE YEARS</b>			\$2,433,164.95		\$2,792,726.50		\$2,948,352.00
Difference from Lowest Total 5 Year Contract Price			\$0.00		\$359,561.55		\$515,187.05
Total for Health Benefits			\$3,120.00		\$36,750.00		\$61,135.92
Total for Other Fringe Benefits			\$1,040.00		\$5,985.00		\$1,148.40
Total for Employee Payroll Taxes excluding overtime			\$64,269.60		\$15,551.00		\$65,485.44
Does Total FTE Count Match the FTE Count of Form B			No		Yes		Yes

# Wanaque Evaluation Committee Report

## 4. Evaluation Criteria:

<b>The Criteria Used In Evaluating Proposals</b> <i>The points awarded range from 1 to 5, with 5 being the highest score and 1 being the lowest</i>	<b>Weighting Factor</b>	<b>Points</b>
<b>1. Program Price:</b> 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
<b>2. Contractor's financial viability, strength, capability and record of performance:</b> 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
<b>3. On-Site Management:</b> 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: <b>On- site Manager(s):</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Should have at least two years' experience in managing a comparable sized public school district.</li> <li>• Should have four years' experience in the custodial management industry.</li> <li>• Must have a high school diploma or GED equivalent diploma.</li> <li>• Must be in the process of obtaining or have a Black Seal License by 7-1-2016.</li> <li>• Must be fluent in English.</li> </ul>	25%	1 to 5
<b>4. Staffing Viability:</b> 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"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• The current outsourced average wage rates and wages as detailed in Exhibit 6 wage rates.</li> <li>• The Consultant's Recommended Staffing, Wage Rates and Salaries as detailed in Exhibit 7.</li> <li>• 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?</li> <li>• Is the number of proposed custodial, management and clerical staff sufficient to meet the Scope of Work in this RFP?</li> </ul>	24%	1 to 5
<b>5. Contractor's Proposed Program:</b> 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
<b>6. Contractor's Start Up/Transition Plan:</b> 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

# Wanaque Evaluation Committee Report

## 5. Scoring:

Evaluations of Award Criteria for Custodial & Management Services							
Evaluator: Nancy Di Bartolo	Weighing Percent	Points Awarded (1 to 5)			Weighted Points		
CRITERIA		Pritchard	GCA	Temco	Pritchard	GCA	Temco
Program Price:	15%	5.00	4.50	1.00	0.750	0.675	0.150
Contractor's capability and record of performance:	12%	4.00	4.00	4.00	0.480	0.480	0.480
On-Site Management:	25%	1.00	5.00	4.00	0.250	1.250	1.000
Staffing Viability	24%	3.00	5.00	4.00	0.720	1.200	0.960
Contractor's Proposed Program:	10%	4.00	5.00	4.00	0.400	0.500	0.400
Contractor's Start Up/Transition Plan:	14%	4.00	5.00	4.00	0.560	0.700	0.560
<b>TOTALS</b>	100%	21.00	28.50	21.00	3.160	4.805	3.550
Evaluator: Donna Cardiello	Weighing Percent	Points Awarded (1 to 5)			Weighted Points		
CRITERIA		Pritchard	GCA	Temco	Pritchard	GCA	Temco
Program Price:	15%	5.00	4.50	1.00	0.750	0.675	0.150
Contractor's capability and record of performance:	12%	4.00	4.00	4.00	0.480	0.480	0.480
On-Site Management:	25%	2.00	5.00	1.00	0.500	1.250	0.250
Staffing Viability	24%	1.00	4.00	3.00	0.240	0.960	0.720
Contractor's Proposed Program:	10%	3.00	5.00	2.00	0.300	0.500	0.200
Contractor's Start Up/Transition Plan:	14%	4.00	5.00	2.00	0.560	0.700	0.280
<b>TOTALS</b>	100%	19.00	27.50	13.00	2.830	4.565	2.080
Evaluator: Patrick Sarullo	Weighing Percent	Points Awarded (1 to 5)			Weighted Points		
CRITERIA		Pritchard	GCA	Temco	Pritchard	GCA	Temco
Program Price:	15%	5.00	4.50	1.00	0.750	0.675	0.150
Contractor's capability and record of performance:	12%	4.00	4.00	4.00	0.480	0.480	0.480
On-Site Management:	25%	2.00	5.00	1.00	0.500	1.250	0.250
Staffing Viability	24%	2.00	5.00	2.00	0.480	1.200	0.480
Contractor's Proposed Program:	10%	4.00	5.00	4.00	0.400	0.500	0.400
Contractor's Start Up/Transition Plan:	14%	2.00	5.00	1.00	0.280	0.700	0.140
<b>TOTALS</b>	100%	19.00	28.50	13.00	2.890	4.805	1.900
TOTALS							
	Weighing Percent	Points Awarded (1 to 5)			Weighted Points		
CRITERIA		Pritchard	GCA	Temco	Pritchard	GCA	Temco
Program Price:	15%	15.00	13.50	3.00	2.250	2.025	0.450
Contractor's capability and record of performance:	12%	12.00	12.00	12.00	1.440	1.440	1.440
On-Site Management:	25%	5.00	15.00	6.00	1.250	3.750	1.500
Staffing Viability	24%	6.00	14.00	9.00	1.440	3.360	2.160
Contractor's Proposed Program:	10%	11.00	15.00	10.00	1.100	1.500	1.000
Contractor's Start Up/Transition Plan:	14%	10.00	15.00	7.00	1.400	2.100	0.980
<b>TOTALS</b>	100%	59.00	84.50	47.00	8.880	14.175	7.530

# Wanaque Evaluation Committee Report

---

## 6. Scoring Summary

- a. **GCA: 14.175 Points** – GCA 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. For this criterion, all proposers were found to be equal. For On-Site Management, GCA’s proposed candidate stood out as being, by far, the strongest. The proposed staffing, wages and benefits provided caused their proposal to be deemed the most advantageous to the District in terms of Staffing Viability. GCA 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.
- b. **Pritchard: 8.880 Points** - Pritchard had the lowest price which earned them the highest ranking for Program price. Contractor’s Capability and Record of Performance was based on the references provided as well as financial stability. For this criterion, all proposers were found to be equal. In reviewing the resume of Pritchard’s proposed candidate, they were given the lowest score for On-Site Management. Pritchard also received the lowest score for Staffing Viability because they proposed less custodial FTE’s than the other two proposers. They received the second highest score for Contractor’s Proposed Program and Startup Plan as they adequately met the requirements for both criteria.
- c. **Temco: 7.530 Points** - Temco had the highest price and therefore the lowest score for the Program Price criterion. Contractor’s Capability and Record of Performance was based on the references provided as well as financial stability. For this criterion, all proposers were found to be equal. Temco’s proposed candidate resume did not impress to the extent that GCA’s candidate did which earned them second place for Proposed Management. Temco came in second for Staffing Viability because their benefits package did not seem as likely to attract and retain a quality workforce as GCA’s. Despite meeting the requirements, Temco had the lowest score for the Contractors Proposed Program as well as the lowest score for their Transition Plan, because they were the least impressive of the three.

## 7. Recommendation of the Wanaque 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 GCA proposal is most advantageous for the Wanaque School District.