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

- 1. List of Proposers:
  - Atalian
  - Pritchard
- 2. List of Evaluation Committee Members:
  - Theresa Linskey
  - Rebecca Gensel

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

Comparison of Proposal Form A - PRICING									
Description	Details	Pritchard Percent Total Charges		Atalian Percent Total Charges					
	Charge for Wages	rereem	\$444,132.00	rereent	\$392,296.32				
	Charge for Health Care Benefits	33%	\$144,576.00	39%	\$154,728.00				
Custodial	Charge for Other Fringe Benefits	1%	\$6,273.00	8%	\$30,022.68				
	Charge for Payroll Taxes	19%	\$82,386.49	20%	\$78,131.64				
Consultant Recom'd FTE's 13.00	No. of FTEs (1 FTE=2080 Hours per Year)	13.00	·	12.00					
Consultant Recom'd Wage Rate \$13.91	Avg. Wage Rate Excl. Benefits & Taxes	\$16.43		\$15.72					
Custodial Overtime	Charge for Wages		\$24,637.50		\$23,575.50				
Custodiai Overtine	Charge for Payroll Taxes	19%	\$4,570.26	17%	\$3,952.80				
Required Hours 1000	Number of Annual Hours	1,000		1,000					
Consultant Recom'd Wage Rate \$20.87	Avg. Wage Rate Excl. Benefits & Taxes	\$24.64		\$23.58					
	Charge for Wages		\$0.00		\$0.00				
Custodial - Head/Leads	Charge for Health Care Benefits	0%	\$0.00	0%	\$0.00				
Custodiai - Head/Leads	Charge for Other Fringe Benefits	0%	\$0.00	0%	\$0.00				
	Charge for Payroll Taxes	0%	\$0.00	0%	\$0.00				
Consultant Recom'd FTE's 0.00	No. of FTEs (1 FTE=2080 Hours per Year) -	0.00		0.00					
	Avg. Wage Rate Excl. Benefits & Taxes	\$0.00		\$0.00					
Custodial Heads/Lead	Charge for Wages		\$0.00		\$0.00				
Overtime	Charge for Payroll Taxes	0%	\$0.00	0%	\$0.00				
Required Hours 0	Number of Annual Hours	0		0					
Consultant Recom'd Wage Rate \$0.00	Avg. Wage Rate Excl. Benefits & Taxes	\$0.00		\$0.00					
	Charge for Wages		\$63,585.60		\$63,585.60				
General Manager	Charge for Health Care Benefits	10%	\$6,600.00	13%	\$8,240.40				
General Manager	Charge for Other Fringe Benefits	0%	\$0.00	4%	\$2,263.68				
	Charge for Payroll Taxes	19%	\$11,795.13	10%	\$6,049.80				
Consultant Recom'd FTE's 1.00	No. of FTEs (1 FTE=2080 Hours per Year)	1.00		1.00					
Consultant Recom'd Wage Rate \$30.57	Avg. Wage Rate Excl. Benefits & Taxes	\$30.57		\$30.57					
	Charge for Wages		\$0.00		\$0.00				
Custodial Evening	Charge for Health Care Benefits	0%	\$0.00	0%	\$0.00				
Supervisor/s	Charge for Other Fringe Benefits	0%	\$0.00	0%	\$0.00				
	Charge for Payroll Taxes	0%	\$0.00	0%	\$0.00				
Consultant Recom'd FTE's 0.00	No. of FTEs (1 FTE=2080 Hours per Year)	0.00		0.00					
	Avg. Wage Rate Excl. Benefits & Taxes	\$0.00		\$0.00					
	Charge for Wages		\$0.00		\$0.00				
Clerical	Charge for Health Care Benefits	0%	\$0.00	0%	\$0.00				
Cicrical	Charge for Other Fringe Benefits	0%	\$0.00	0%	\$0.00				
	Charge for Payroll Taxes	0%	\$0.00	0%	\$0.00				
	No. of FTEs (1 FTE=2080 Hours per Year)	0.00		0.00					
	Avg. Wage Rate Excl. Benefits & Taxes	\$0.00		\$0.00					
Contractor Start Up Charges –									
Total amount amortized over 5 year	9		\$6,000.00		\$6,000.00				
Contractor Equipment Budget/Pool									
Total amount amortized over 5 year			\$0.00		\$0.00				
Contractor Charge for Computerize	d Quality Assurance System		\$0.00		\$0.00				
Contractor Charge for Office and or			\$0.00		\$0.00				
Contractor Charge for Required Off	ice Equipment		\$1,364.00		\$1,459.08				
Contractor Charge for Supplies and On-Going Operating Costs			\$17,973.82		\$432.00				
Contractor Management Fee		0.0%	\$16,389.45	0.0%	\$27,946.50				
TOTAL CONTRACT CHARGE YEAR ONE (2019-2020)			\$830,283.24		\$798,684.00				
Increase for 2019-2020 - Input Dollar Amount		0.4%	\$3,460.16	2.0%	\$16,308.00				
TOTAL CONTRACT CHARGE YEAR TWO (2020-2021)			\$833,743.40		\$814,992.00				
Increase for 2020-2021 - Input Dollar Amount			\$29,002.83	4.3%	\$34,800.00				
TOTAL CONTRACT CHARGE YEAR THREE (2021-2022)			\$862,746.23	110,0	\$849,792.00				
Increase for 2021-2022 - Input Dollar Amount			\$30,226.83	4.2%	\$35,760.00				
TOTAL CONTRACT CHARGE YEAR FOUR (2022-2023)			\$892,973.06	1.270	\$885,552.00				
Increase for 2022-2023 - Input Dollar Amount				4.00/					
_			\$30,226.83	4.0%	\$35,424.00				
TOTAL CONTRACT CHARGE YEAR FIVE (2023-2024)			\$923,199.89		\$920,976.00				
TOTAL CONTRACT CHARGE FOR FIVE YEARS			\$4,342,945.84		\$4,269,996.00				

## 4. Evaluation Criteria:

	he Criteria Used in Evaluating Proposals se points awarded range from 1 to 5, with 5 being the highest score and 1 being the lowest	Weighting Factor	Points
1.	<b>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
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):  • 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 7-1-2019.  • Must be fluent in English. On- site Supervisor(s):  • 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 7-1-2019.  • Must be fluent in English.	25%	1 to 5
4.	<ul> <li>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:</li> <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
5.	<b>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
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, 2019? 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

#### 5. Scoring:

Evaluations of Award Criteria for Branchburg										
Custodial & Management Services RFP										
Evaluator: Theresa Linskey	Weighing	Points Awar	ded (1 to 5)	Weighte	Weighted Points					
CRITERIA	Percent	Atalian	Pritchard	Atalian	Pritchard					
Program Price:	15%	5.00	4.00	0.75	0.60					
Contractor's capability and record of performance:	12%	3.00	3.00	0.36	0.36					
On-Site Management:	25%	5.00	3.00	1.25	0.75					
Staffing Viability	24%	4.00	5.00	0.96	1.20					
Contractor's Proposed Program:	10%	5.00	5.00	0.50	0.50					
Contractor's Start Up/Transition Plan:	14%	5.00	4.00	0.70	0.56					
TOTALS	100%	27.00	24.00	4.52	3.97					
Evaluator: Rebecca Gensel	Weighing	Points Awar	Points Awarded (1 to 5)		Weighted Points					
CRITERIA	Percent	Atalian	Pritchard	Atalian	Pritchard					
Program Price:	15%	5.00	4.00	0.75	0.60					
Contractor's capability and record of performance:	12%	3.00	3.00	0.36	0.36					
On-Site Management:	25%	5.00	3.00	1.25	0.75					
Staffing Viability	24%	4.00	5.00	0.96	1.20					
Contractor's Proposed Program:	10%	5.00	5.00	0.50	0.50					
Contractor's Start Up/Transition Plan:	14%	5.00	4.00	0.70	0.56					
TOTALS	100%	27.00	24.00	4.52	3.97					
	OTALS									
	Weighing	Points Awarded (1 to 5)		Weighted Points						
CRITERIA	Percent	Atalian	Pritchard	Atalian	Pritchard					
Program Price:	15%	10.00	8.00	1.50	1.20					
Contractor's capability and record of performance:	12%	6.00	6.00	0.72	0.72					
On-Site Management:	19%	10.00	6.00	1.90	1.14					
Staffing Viability	24%	8.00	10.00	1.92	2.40					
Contractor's Proposed Program:	15%	10.00	10.00	1.50	1.50					
Contractor's Start Up/Transition Plan:	14%	10.00	8.00	1.40	1.12					
TOTALS	100%	54.00	48.00	8.94	8.08					

#### 6. Scoring Summary

- a. Atalian: 8.94 Points Atalian ranked number one for Program Price because they had the lowest five-year price. Contractor's Capability and Record of Performance was based on the references provided as well as financial stability and they tied for first place. For On-Site Management, Atalian's proposed candidate stood out as being the strongest, therefore the highest score. The proposed staffing, wages and benefits provided caused their proposal to be in second place for Staffing Viability. Atalian also tied for first in the Contractor's Proposed Program. The Contractor's Startup/Transition Plan they ranked first because they demonstrated that they had the systems, procedures and corporate support to achieve success through the life of the contract.
- b. **Pritchard: 8.08 Points** Pritchard had the highest price which earned them the lowest ranking for Program price. Their references were good enough to earn a tie for first 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. Pritchard also received the highest score for Staffing Viability. They tied for the highest score 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 proposers.

### 7. Recommendation of the Branchburg 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 Atalian proposal is most advantageous for the Branchburg School District.