

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

1. List of Proposers:

- Atalian
- Pritchard
- Aramark
- ABM

2. List of Evaluation Committee Members:

- Joseph Kelly, Business Administrator/Board Secretary
- Anthony Paterno, Director of Building & Grounds
- Jeanna Velechko, Principal
- Kurt Schweitzer, Principal

Evaluation Committee Report

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

Comparison of Proposal Form A - PRICING

Description	Details	Atalian		Pritchard		Aramark		ABM		
		Percent	Total Charges	Percent	Total Charges	Percent	Total Charges	Percent	Total Charges	
Custodial	Charge for Wages		\$455,260.00		\$456,981.72		\$461,461.00		\$457,048.38	
	Charge for Health Care Benefits	38%	\$172,056.00	41%	\$187,344.00	42%	\$192,439.68	48%	\$221,325.00	
	Charge for Other Fringe Benefits	3%	\$12,635.52	1%	\$6,273.00	6%	\$29,157.06	0%	\$0.00	
	Charge for Payroll Taxes	19%	\$86,701.68	19%	\$86,826.53	9%	\$42,752.00	15%	\$68,100.21	
Consultant Recom'd FTE's	12.82	No. of FTEs (1 FTE=2080 Hours per Year)	12.88	12.82	12.81	12.82	12.82	12.82		
Consultant Recom'd Wage Rate	\$16.65	Avg. Wage Rate Excl. Benefits & Taxes	\$17.00	\$17.14	\$17.32	\$17.14	\$17.14	\$17.14		
Custodial Overtime	Charge for Wages		\$32,130.00		\$32,389.88		\$32,726.50		\$32,394.60	
	Charge for Payroll Taxes	14%	\$4,600.08	19%	\$6,154.08	8%	\$2,584.00	14%	\$4,688.81	
	Required Hours	1260	Number of Annual Hours	1,260	1,260	1,260	1,260	1,260		
	Consultant Recom'd Wage Rate	\$24.98	Avg. Wage Rate Excl. Benefits & Taxes	\$25.50	\$25.71	\$25.97	\$25.71	\$25.71		
Custodial - Leads	Charge for Wages		\$116,376.00		\$119,418.00		\$119,433.60		\$119,371.20	
	Charge for Health Care Benefits	40%	\$46,350.00	39%	\$46,368.00	40%	\$47,457.36	43%	\$51,075.00	
	Charge for Other Fringe Benefits	3%	\$3,219.48	1%	\$1,194.18	6%	\$7,554.75	0%	\$0.00	
	Charge for Payroll Taxes	19%	\$21,920.76	19%	\$22,689.42	9%	\$10,860.00	15%	\$17,786.31	
Consultant Recom'd FTE's	3.00	No. of FTEs (1 FTE=2080 Hours per Year)	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00			
Consultant Recom'd Wage Rate	\$18.65	Avg. Wage Rate Excl. Benefits & Taxes	\$18.65	\$19.14	\$19.14	\$19.13	\$19.13			
Custodial Leads Overtime	Charge for Wages		\$8,392.50		\$8,611.88		\$8,613.00		\$8,608.50	
	Charge for Payroll Taxes	14%	\$1,201.44	19%	\$1,636.26	8%	\$660.00	15%	\$1,250.48	
	Required Hours	300	Number of Annual Hours	300	300	300	300	300		
	Consultant Recom'd Wage Rate	\$27.98	Avg. Wage Rate Excl. Benefits & Taxes	\$27.98	\$28.71	\$28.71	\$28.70	\$28.70		
General Manager	Charge for Wages		\$63,564.80		\$65,520.00		\$64,359.36		\$67,392.00	
	Charge for Health Care Benefits	14%	\$8,886.84	12%	\$7,800.00	30%	\$19,307.81	19%	\$12,708.00	
	Charge for Other Fringe Benefits	2%	\$1,271.28	0%	\$0.00	6%	\$3,797.20	1%	\$337.00	
	Charge for Payroll Taxes	10%	\$6,087.48	19%	\$12,448.80	9%	\$5,498.00	15%	\$10,041.41	
Consultant Recom'd FTE's	1.00	No. of FTEs (1 FTE=2080 Hours per Year)	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00			
Consultant Recom'd Wage Rate	\$30.56	Avg. Wage Rate Excl. Benefits & Taxes	\$30.56	\$31.50	\$30.94	\$32.40	\$32.40			
Contractor Start Up Charges –										
Total amount amortized over 5 years:	Annual Charges		\$0.00		\$0.00		\$0.00		\$0.00	
Contractor Equipment Budget/Pool : All Proposed \$60,000										
Total amount amortized over 5 year:	\$60,000.00	Annual Charges	\$12,000.00	\$12,000.00	\$12,000.00	\$12,000.00	\$12,000.00	\$12,000.00		
Contractor Charge for Computerized Quality Assurance System			\$120.00	\$250.00	\$2,916.00	\$2,500.00				
Contractor Charge for Office and or Warehouse Rent			\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00				
Contractor Charge for Required Office Equipment			\$2,926.20	\$1,250.00	\$1,916.35	\$4,711.22				
Contractor Charge for Supplies and On-Going Operating Costs			\$4,216.80	\$8,554.20	\$20,876.72	\$31,198.88				
Contractor Management Fee			4.9%	\$55,771.14	2.9%	\$32,511.30	3.5%	\$39,402.04	5.0%	\$59,385.00
District Charge for Contract Monitoring			\$13,362.00	\$13,362.00	\$13,362.00	\$13,362.00				
TOTAL CONTRACT CHARGE YEAR ONE (2022-2023)			\$1,129,050.00	\$1,129,583.23	\$1,139,134.43	\$1,195,284.00				
Increase for 2023-2024 - Input Dollar Amount			3.0%	\$33,876.00	3.6%	\$40,665.00	4.2%	\$47,934.36	4.0%	\$47,811.00
TOTAL CONTRACT CHARGE YEAR TWO (2023-2024)			\$1,162,926.00	\$1,170,248.22	\$1,187,068.79	\$1,243,095.00				
Increase for 2024-2025 - Input Dollar Amount			3.0%	\$34,884.00	4.0%	\$46,809.93	4.1%	\$48,133.32	4.0%	\$49,724.00
TOTAL CONTRACT CHARGE YEAR THREE (2024-2025)			\$1,197,810.00	\$1,217,058.15	\$1,235,202.11	\$1,292,819.00				
Increase for 2025-2026 - Input Dollar Amount			3.0%	\$35,940.00	4.0%	\$48,682.33	3.9%	\$48,648.09	5.0%	\$64,651.00
TOTAL CONTRACT CHARGE YEAR FOUR (2025-2026)			\$1,233,750.00	\$1,265,740.48	\$1,283,850.20	\$1,357,470.00				
Increase for 2026-2027 - Input Dollar Amount			3.0%	\$37,008.00	4.0%	\$50,629.62	4.0%	\$50,801.47	5.0%	\$67,873.00
TOTAL CONTRACT CHARGE YEAR FIVE (2026-2027)			\$1,270,758.00	\$1,316,370.10	\$1,334,651.67	\$1,425,343.00				
TOTAL CONTRACT CHARGE FOR FIVE YEARS			\$5,994,294.00	\$6,099,000.18	\$6,179,907.21	\$6,514,011.02				

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 7-1-2022. • 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, 2022? 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			
		Atalian	Pritchard	Aramark	ABM	Atalian	Pritchard	Aramark	ABM
Program Price:	15%	18.00	15.00	12.00	4.50	2.70	2.25	1.80	0.68
Contractor's capability and record of performance:	12%	11.50	13.00	20.00	9.00	1.38	1.56	2.40	1.08
On-Site Management:	25%	17.50	10.50	18.00	12.00	4.38	2.63	4.50	3.00
Staffing Viability	24%	13.50	15.50	16.00	7.00	3.24	3.72	3.84	1.68
Contractor's Proposed Program:	10%	11.00	14.00	20.00	14.00	1.10	1.40	2.00	1.40
Contractor's Start Up/Transition Plan:	14%	12.00	14.00	20.00	10.00	1.68	1.96	2.80	1.40
TOTALS	100%	83.50	82.00	106.00	56.50	14.48	13.52	17.34	9.24

6. Scoring Summary

- a. **Aramark: 17.34 Points** – Aramark had the third highest price which earned them the third-place ranking for Program 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. 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.
- b. **Atalian: 14.48 Points** - Atalian ranked number one for Program Price because they had the lowest five-year contract price. The school districts served and references had them score less than Aramark and Pritchard placing them in third place for Contractor's Capability and Record of Performance. Atalian's proposed candidate ranked second amongst the companies for On-Site Management. Atalian ranked third in Staffing Viability. They received the lowest score for Contractor's Proposed Program. Atalian received the third-place score for their Contractor's Startup/Transition Plan.
- c. **Pritchard: 13.52 Points** - Pritchard had the second lowest five-year contract price and therefore ranked in second place for Program Price. Their list of school districts served and references had them rank second regarding Contractor's Capability and Record of Performance. In reviewing the resume and the interview of Pritchard's proposed candidate, they were given the lowest score for On-Site Management. They received the second highest ranking for Staffing Viability. Pritchard tied for second place with another contractor for Contractor's Proposed Program. They received the second highest scoring for Contractor's Startup/Transition Plan.
- d. **ABM: 9.24 Points** - ABM had the highest price which earned them the lowest ranking for Program price. Their references were good enough to earn fourth place for Contractor's Capability and Record of Performance. In reviewing ABM's proposed candidate's resume, they ranked third for On-Site Management. They received the lowest score in Staffing Viability. ABM tied for second place with another contractor for Contractor's Proposed Program. They received the lowest score for Contractor's Proposed Program and their Startup/Transition Plan.

7. Recommendation of the Rutherford 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 Aramark proposal is most advantageous for the Rutherford School District.