

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

1. List of Proposers:

- GCA
- Pritchard
- Temco

2. List of Evaluation Committee Members:

- René Rovtar
- James Tevis
- Steven Toth

Evaluation Committee Report

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

Comparison of Proposal Form A - PRICING								
Description	Details	GCA		Pritchard		Temco		
		Percent	Total Charges	Percent	Total Charges	Percent	Total Charges	
Custodial	Charge for Wages		\$787,664.80		\$764,306.40		\$927,492.80	
	Charge for Health Care Benefits	36%	\$287,065.40	37%	\$279,036.00	35%	\$325,404.00	
	Charge for Other Fringe Benefits	2%	\$17,743.89	3%	\$19,292.00	7%	\$68,697.48	
	Charge for Payroll Taxes	16%	\$128,489.74	18%	\$139,868.07	20%	\$186,294.12	
	Consultant Recom'd FTE's 31.50	No. of FTEs (1 FTE=2080 Hours per Year)	26.50		25.50		30.50	
Consultant Recom'd Wage Rat \$14.29	Avg. Wage Rate Excl. Benefits & Taxes	\$14.29		\$14.41		\$14.62		
Custodial Overtime	Charge for Wages		\$35,367.75		\$35,664.75		\$36,184.50	
	Charge for Payroll Taxes	17%	\$6,012.52	18%	\$6,526.65	14%	\$5,180.88	
	Required Hours 1650	Number of Annual Hours	1650	1,650		1,650		
	Consultant Recom'd Wage Rat \$21.44	Avg. Wage Rate Excl. Benefits & Taxes	\$21.44		\$21.62		\$21.93	
Custodial - Leads	Charge for Wages		\$230,776.00		\$266,406.40		\$103,209.60	
	Charge for Health Care Benefits	35%	\$80,026.60	33%	\$88,992.00	32%	\$33,372.00	
	Charge for Other Fringe Benefits	3%	\$7,353.11	2%	\$5,936.00	7%	\$7,288.20	
	Charge for Payroll Taxes	16%	\$35,828.11	18%	\$48,752.37	20%	\$20,496.00	
	Consultant Recom'd FTE's 2.00	No. of FTEs (1 FTE=2080 Hours per Year)	7.00		8.00		3.00	
Consultant Recom'd Wage Rat \$15.85	Avg. Wage Rate Excl. Benefits & Taxes	\$15.85		\$16.01		\$16.54		
Custodial Leads Overtime	Charge for Wages		\$4,755.00		\$4,803.00		\$4,962.00	
	Charge for Payroll Taxes	17%	\$808.35	18%	\$878.95	14%	\$710.28	
	Required Hours 200	Number of Annual Hours	200	200		200		
	Consultant Recom'd Wage Rat \$23.78	Avg. Wage Rate Excl. Benefits & Taxes	\$23.78		\$24.02		\$24.81	
Courier	Charge for Wages		\$0.00		\$0.00		\$0.00	
	Charge for Health Care Benefits	-	\$0.00	-	\$0.00	-	\$0.00	
	Charge for Other Fringe Benefits	-	\$0.00	-	\$0.00	-	\$0.00	
	Charge for Payroll Taxes	-	\$0.00	-	\$0.00	-	\$0.00	
	Consultant Recom'd FTE's 0.00	No. of FTEs (1 FTE=2080 Hours per Year)	0.00		0.00		0.00	
Consultant Recom'd Wage Rat \$0.00	Avg. Wage Rate Excl. Benefits & Taxes	\$0.00		\$0.00		\$0.00		
General Manager	Charge for Wages		\$73,985.60		\$74,000.00		\$74,006.40	
	Charge for Health Care Benefits	7%	\$4,818.00	0%	\$1.00	10%	\$7,680.00	
	Charge for Other Fringe Benefits	3%	\$2,034.95	6%	\$4,800.00	2%	\$1,307.40	
	Charge for Payroll Taxes	16%	\$11,659.65	18%	\$13,542.00	9%	\$6,912.12	
	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 Rat \$35.58	Avg. Wage Rate Excl. Benefits & Taxes	\$35.57		\$35.58		\$35.58		
Custodial Evening Supervisor(s)	Charge for Wages		\$50,003.20		\$50,000.00		\$50,003.20	
	Charge for Health Care Benefits	10%	\$4,818.00	6%	\$3,000.00	15%	\$7,680.00	
	Charge for Other Fringe Benefits	3%	\$1,374.99	10%	\$4,800.00	2%	\$883.44	
	Charge for Payroll Taxes	16%	\$7,878.25	18%	\$9,150.00	10%	\$4,948.68	
	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 Rat \$24.04	Avg. Wage Rate Excl. Benefits & Taxes	\$24.04		\$24.04		\$24.04		
Clerical	Charge for Wages		\$41,600.00		\$41,600.00		\$41,600.00	
	Charge for Health Care Benefits	0%	\$0.00	7%	\$3,000.00	18%	\$7,680.00	
	Charge for Other Fringe Benefits	3%	\$1,144.06	0%	\$1.00	2%	\$735.00	
	Charge for Payroll Taxes	16%	\$6,554.56	18%	\$7,612.80	15%	\$6,349.44	
	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 Rat \$20.00	Avg. Wage Rate Excl. Benefits & Taxes	\$20.00		\$20.00		\$20.00		
Contractor Start Up Charges -								
Annual Charges			\$0.00		\$1.00		\$0.00	
Contractor Equipment Budget/Pool : All Proposed \$120,000								
Annual Charges			\$24,000.00		\$24,000.00		\$24,000.00	
Contractor Charge for Computerized Quality Assurance System			\$288.00		\$0.00		\$80.04	
Contractor Charge for Office and or Warehouse Rent			\$0.00		\$1.00		\$0.00	
Contractor Charge for Required Office Equipment			\$1,250.00		\$1.00		\$5,428.08	
Contractor Charge for Supplies and On-Going Operating Costs			\$15,116.47		\$9,414.00		\$4,076.40	
Contractor Management Fee		4.5%	\$88,000.00	3.8%	\$76,215.26	3.2%	\$65,673.94	
District Charge for Contract Monitoring			\$19,464.00		\$19,464.00		\$19,464.00	
TOTAL CONTRACT CHARGE YEAR ONE			\$1,975,881.00		\$2,001,065.65		\$2,047,800.00	
Increase for 2017-2018 - Input Dollar Amount			3.0%	\$59,276.00	3.6%	\$72,392.81	4.1%	\$83,700.00
TOTAL CONTRACT CHARGE YEAR TWO			\$2,035,157.00		\$2,073,458.46		\$2,131,500.00	
Increase for 2018-2019 - Input Dollar Amount			3.0%	\$61,054.00	3.8%	\$78,137.38	4.3%	\$92,700.00
TOTAL CONTRACT CHARGE YEAR THREE			\$2,096,211.00		\$2,151,595.84		\$2,224,200.00	
Increase for 2019-2020 - Input Dollar Amount			2.7%	\$57,645.00	4.0%	\$86,198.22	4.5%	\$99,600.00
TOTAL CONTRACT CHARGE YEAR FOUR			\$2,153,856.00		\$2,237,794.06		\$2,323,800.00	
Increase for 2020-2021 - Input Dollar Amount			2.7%	\$59,231.00	3.6%	\$79,608.78	4.0%	\$93,900.00
TOTAL CONTRACT CHARGE YEAR FIVE			\$2,213,087.00		\$2,317,402.84		\$2,417,700.00	
TOTAL CONTRACT CHARGE FOR FIVE YEARS			\$10,474,192.00		\$10,781,316.83		\$11,145,000.00	

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 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 7-1-2016. • Must be fluent in English. On- site Supervisor(s): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should have at least one year experience in managing a comparable sized educational institution. • Should 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

Evaluation Committee Report

5. Scoring of the Committee:

Montville Evaluations of Award Criteria for Custodial & Management Services							
Evaluator: René Rovtar	Weighing						
CRITERIA	Percent	GCA	Pritchard	Temco	GCA	Pritchard	Temco
Program Price:	15%	5.00	4.00	3.00	0.750	0.600	0.450
Contractor's capability & record of performance:	12%	4.00	5.00	3.00	0.480	0.600	0.360
On-Site Management:	25%	5.00	4.00	1.00	1.250	1.000	0.250
Staffing Viability	24%	3.00	2.00	1.00	0.720	0.480	0.240
Contractor's Proposed Program:	10%	3.00	3.00	3.00	0.300	0.300	0.300
Contractor's Start Up/Transition Plan:	14%	5.00	3.00	3.00	0.700	0.420	0.420
TOTALS	100%	25.00	21.00	14.00	4.200	3.400	2.020
Evaluator: James Tevis	Weighing						
CRITERIA	Percent	GCA	Pritchard	Temco	GCA	Pritchard	Temco
Program Price:	15%	5.00	4.00	3.00	0.750	0.600	0.450
Contractor's capability & record of performance:	12%	3.00	4.00	2.00	0.360	0.480	0.240
On-Site Management:	25%	4.00	3.00	1.00	1.000	0.750	0.250
Staffing Viability	24%	4.00	3.00	1.00	0.960	0.720	0.240
Contractor's Proposed Program:	10%	3.00	3.00	3.00	0.300	0.300	0.300
Contractor's Start Up/Transition Plan:	14%	3.50	3.50	3.50	0.490	0.490	0.490
TOTALS	100%	22.50	20.50	13.50	3.860	3.340	1.970
Evaluator: Steven Toth	Weighing						
CRITERIA	Percent	GCA	Pritchard	Temco	GCA	Pritchard	Temco
Program Price:	15%	5.00	4.00	3.00	0.750	0.600	0.450
Contractor's capability & record of performance:	12%	3.00	4.00	3.50	0.360	0.480	0.420
On-Site Management:	25%	4.50	4.00	2.50	1.125	1.000	0.625
Staffing Viability	24%	4.00	3.50	3.50	0.960	0.840	0.840
Contractor's Proposed Program:	10%	3.50	3.50	3.50	0.350	0.350	0.350
Contractor's Start Up/Transition Plan:	14%	4.00	4.00	4.00	0.560	0.560	0.560
TOTALS	100%	24.00	23.00	20.00	4.105	3.830	3.245
TOTALS							
CRITERIA	Percent	GCA	Pritchard	Temco	GCA	Pritchard	Temco
Program Price:	15%	15.00	12.00	9.00	2.250	1.800	1.350
Contractor's capability & record of performance:	12%	10.00	13.00	8.50	1.200	1.560	1.020
On-Site Management:	25%	13.50	11.00	4.50	3.375	2.750	1.125
Staffing Viability	24%	11.00	8.50	5.50	2.640	2.040	1.320
Contractor's Proposed Program:	10%	9.50	9.50	9.50	0.950	0.950	0.950
Contractor's Start Up/Transition Plan:	14%	12.50	10.50	10.50	1.750	1.470	1.470
TOTALS	100%	71.50	64.50	47.50	12.165	10.570	7.235

Evaluation Committee Report

6. Scoring Summary

- a. **GCA: 12.165 Points** – GCA ranked number one for Program Price because they had the lowest price for all five years. Their references and our experience with their service were good enough to earn second place for Contractor’s Capability and Record of Performance. For On-Site Management, GCA’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. All three companies ranked evenly for Contractor’s Proposed Program. GCA ranked number one for Contractor’s Startup/Transition Plan demonstrating that they had the systems, procedures and corporate support to achieve success through the life of the contract.
- b. **Pritchard: 10.57 Points** - Pritchard ranked number two for Program Price because they had the second lowest 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. In reviewing the resume and the interview of Pritchard’s proposed candidate, they were given the second highest score for On-Site Management. Pritchard also received the second highest score for Staffing Viability. All three companies ranked evenly for Contractor’s Proposed Program as they met the requirements of the RFP. Finally their Startup Plan/Transition Plan ranked second in comparison to the comprehensiveness and detail of the other proposer.
- c. **Temco: 7.235 Points** - Temco had the highest price. The school districts served and references had them score slightly less than GCA and Pritchard for Contractor’s Capability and Record of Performance. Temco’s proposed candidate ranked third amongst the companies for On-Site Management. Temco also ranked a close third in Staffing Viability. All three companies ranked evenly for the Contractors Proposed Program but Temco shared the second highest score with Pritchard for their Transition Plan.

7. Recommendation of the Montville Township School District’s Custodial & Management Services RFP Evaluation Committee:

- Upon review of the proposal books submitted, and based upon the RFP evaluation criteria, the committee concludes that the GCA Service Group, Inc. proposal is most advantageous for the Montville Township School District.