

**ADDENDUM 1 AND ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FOR
WINSLOW TOWNSHIP BOARD OF EDUCATION'S
RFP FOR CUSTODIAL, MAINTENANCE, GROUNDS AND MANAGEMENT SERVICES
ISSUED ON JUNE 6, 2024**

Public notice is hereby given that the Winslow Township Board of Education is issuing this notice on June 25, 2024 to answer contractor's questions concerning the District's RFP and to amend certain language issued June 6, 2024 for Custodial, Maintenance, Grounds and Management Services.

All changes to the original RFP, detailed below.

Ms. Tyra McCoy-Boyle
Business Administrator
June 25, 2024

Changes to the RFP

1. Throughout the RFP the Proposal Responses Due/ Proposal Opening of June 27, 2024 by 10:00 a.m. is hereby changed to July 9, 2024 by 10:00 a.m.
2. Page 70, Proposal Form A 8-1-24 to 6-30-25 - No. of FTEs is changed to (1 FTE=1904 Hrs. per 11 Mo.) – Attached is the revised Proposal Form Winslow - Proposal Forms for RFP A to C-2023-2028 Facilities (6.19.24).xlsx. See attached Excel file.

Below is the link to the Website to download the excel file Winslow – Proposal Forms for RFP A to C-2023-2028 Facilities.

https://www.winslow-schools.com/apps/pages/index.jsp?uREC_ID=259739&type=d

Once at the site, please see files under “CCRF 2024-02 – Management, Custodial, Maintenance and Grounds Services” and it will be listed under “Addendum 1” and it will be Labeled “Winslow – Proposal Forms for RFP A to C-2023-2028 Facilities”

3. Page 2, Timeline of Event – Proposer Employee Archivable Background Clearances & Back Seal Licenses Due July 15, 2024 at 10:00 a.m. is hereby changed to July 22, 2024 at 10:00 a.m.

Contractor Questions and District Answers

1. We are requesting a copy of the figures, evaluations and details, made for the 2021 award to Aramark.
Answer: See attached Evaluation Committee Report.

Below is the link to the Website to download the file for the Evaluation Committee Report

https://www.winslow-schools.com/apps/pages/index.jsp?uREC_ID=259739&type=d

Once at the site, please see files under “CCRF 2024-02 – Management, Custodial, Maintenance and Grounds Services” and it will be listed under “Addendum 1” and it will be Labeled “Evaluation Committee Report”

2. What is the current monthly amount paid for these services to the current vendor? What is the current price?

Answer: \$405,642.06 less the \$2,621.00 for contract monitoring.

3. Who is the current company?

Answer: Aramark

4. Are the current employees in a union?

Answer: Please refer to paragraph D. Current Employee on page 16 of the RFP.

Winslow Township School District Evaluation Committee Report for the Custodial, Maintenance, Grounds and Management Services RFP

1. List of Proposers:

- Aramark
- ABM

2. List of Evaluation Committee Members:

- Tyra McCoy-Boyle
- Kurtis Marella
- Jack Mills
- Regina Chico

Evaluation Committee Report

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

Comparison of Proposal Form A - PRICING					
Description	Details	ABM		Aramark	
		Percent	Total Charges	Percent	Total Charges
Custodial	Charge for Wages		\$1,114,713.60		\$1,139,090.52
	Charge for Health Care Benefits	39%	\$431,496.00	32%	\$368,111.48
	Charge for Other Fringe Benefits	0%	\$0.00	6%	\$69,154.87
	Charge for Payroll Taxes	14%	\$157,103.59	9%	\$106,429.00
Consultant Recom'd FTE's	38.50	No. of FTEs (1 FTE=2080 Hours per Year)	38.50	38.50	
Consultant Recom'd Wage Rate	\$13.95	Avg. Wage Rate Excl. Benefits & Taxes	\$13.92	\$14.22	
Custodial Overtime	Charge for Wages		\$52,095.60		\$53,234.84
	Charge for Payroll Taxes	14%	\$7,183.58	9%	\$4,820.00
Required Hours	2,495	Number of Annual Hours	2,495	2,495	
Consultant Recom'd Wage Rate	\$20.93	Avg. Wage Rate Excl. Benefits & Taxes	\$20.88	\$21.34	
Custodial - Head/Leads	Charge for Wages		\$307,569.60		\$318,240.00
	Charge for Health Care Benefits	35%	\$107,874.00	27%	\$86,052.04
	Charge for Other Fringe Benefits	0%	\$0.00	6%	\$19,197.42
	Charge for Payroll Taxes	14%	\$43,275.04	9%	\$29,475.00
Consultant Recom'd FTE's	9.00	No. of FTEs (1 FTE=2080 Hours per Year) -	9.00	9.00	
Consultant Recom'd Wage Rate	\$16.32	Avg. Wage Rate Excl. Benefits & Taxes	\$16.43	\$17.00	
Custodial Heads/Lead Overtime	Charge for Wages		\$12,322.50		\$12,750.00
	Charge for Payroll Taxes	15%	\$1,795.89	8%	\$1,021.00
Required Hours	500	Number of Annual Hours	500	500	
Consultant Recom'd Wage Rate	\$24.48	Avg. Wage Rate Excl. Benefits & Taxes	\$24.65	\$25.50	
Maintenance	Charge for Wages		\$446,097.60		\$456,979.64
	Charge for Health Care Benefits	24%	\$107,874.00	19%	\$88,858.08
	Charge for Other Fringe Benefits	0%	\$0.00	6%	\$27,212.04
	Charge for Payroll Taxes	13%	\$58,344.00	9%	\$40,133.00
Consultant Recom'd FTE's	9.00	No. of FTEs (1 FTE=2080 Hours per Year)	9.00	9.00	
Consultant Recom'd Wage Rate	\$24.24	Avg. Wage Rate Excl. Benefits & Taxes	\$23.83	\$24.41	
Prevailing Wages for Maintenance	Charge for Wages		\$89,148.80		\$249,977.52
	Charge for Other Fringe Benefits	0%	\$0.00	6%	\$14,498.70
	Charge for Payroll Taxes	13%	\$11,535.85	8%	\$20,849.00
		Number of Hours 7-1-2021 to 6-30-2022	2,080	5,304	
		Incremental Average Hourly Wage Rate	\$42.86	\$47.13	
Maintenance Overtime	Charge for Wages		\$11,903.09		\$12,193.45

Evaluation Committee Report

Comparison of Proposal Form A - PRICING

Description	Details	ABM		Aramark	
		Percent	Total Charges	Percent	Total Charges
	Charge for Payroll Taxes	14%	\$1,621.21	8%	\$934.00
Required Hours	333 Number of Annual Hours	333		333	
Consultant Recom'd Wage Rate	\$36.36 Avg. Wage Rate Excl. Benefits & Taxes	\$35.75		\$36.62	
Grounds	Charge for Wages		\$145,849.60		\$187,200.00
	Charge for Health Care Benefits	33%	\$47,944.00	26%	\$49,365.60
	Charge for Other Fringe Benefits	0%	\$0.00	6%	\$11,053.35
	Charge for Payroll Taxes	14%	\$19,952.23	9%	\$17,195.00
Consultant Recom'd FTE's	4.00 No. of FTEs (1 FTE=2080 Hours per Year)	4.00		5.00	
Consultant Recom'd Wage Rate	\$18.54 Avg. Wage Rate Excl. Benefits & Taxes	\$17.53		\$18.00	
Lead Grounds	Charge for Wages		\$48,339.20		\$49,732.80
	Charge for Health Care Benefits	25%	\$11,986.00	20%	\$9,873.12
	Charge for Other Fringe Benefits	0%	\$0.00	6%	\$2,884.50
	Charge for Payroll Taxes	14%	\$6,612.80	9%	\$4,379.00
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	\$23.24 Avg. Wage Rate Excl. Benefits & Taxes	\$23.24		\$23.91	
Grounds Overtime	Charge for Wages		\$3,286.25		\$3,375.00
	Charge for Payroll Taxes	14%	\$450.28	8%	\$257.00
Required Hours	125 Number of Annual Hours	125		125	
Consultant Recom'd Wage Rate	\$27.81 Avg. Wage Rate Excl. Benefits & Taxes	\$26.29		\$27.00	
Courier	Charge for Wages		\$0.00		\$0.00
	Charge for Health Care Benefits	0%	\$0.00	0%	\$0.00
	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	
Consultant Recom'd Wage Rate	\$0.00 Avg. Wage Rate Excl. Benefits & Taxes	\$0.00		\$0.00	
General Manager	Charge for Wages		\$96,491.20		\$96,450.00
	Charge for Health Care Benefits	14%	\$13,320.00	17%	\$16,184.24
	Charge for Other Fringe Benefits	0%	\$308.60	6%	\$5,594.10
	Charge for Payroll Taxes	13%	\$12,207.25	8%	\$7,954.00
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	\$46.39 Avg. Wage Rate Excl. Benefits & Taxes	\$46.39		\$46.37	
Assistant/Maintenance Manager	Charge for Wages		\$79,996.80		\$80,000.00
	Charge for Health Care Benefits	17%	\$13,320.00	17%	\$13,424.00

Evaluation Committee Report

Comparison of Proposal Form A - PRICING

Description	Details	ABM		Aramark	
		Percent	Total Charges	Percent	Total Charges
	Charge for Other Fringe Benefits	1%	\$400.00	6%	\$4,640.00
	Charge for Payroll Taxes	12%	\$9,808.00	8%	\$6,695.00
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	\$38.46 Avg. Wage Rate Excl. Benefits & Taxes	\$38.46		\$38.46	
Custodial Evening Supervisor/s	Charge for Wages		\$157,310.40		\$156,998.40
	Charge for Health Care Benefits	15%	\$23,472.00	17%	\$26,344.33
	Charge for Other Fringe Benefits	1%	\$925.80	6%	\$9,105.91
	Charge for Payroll Taxes	13%	\$19,896.81	9%	\$13,735.00
Consultant Recom'd FTE's	3.00 No. of FTEs (1 FTE=2080 Hours per Year)	3.00		3.00	
Consultant Recom'd Wage Rate	\$25.21 Avg. Wage Rate Excl. Benefits & Taxes	\$25.21		\$25.16	
Clerical	Charge for Wages		\$54,870.40		\$56,659.20
	Charge for Health Care Benefits	9%	\$5,040.00	9%	\$5,000.00
	Charge for Other Fringe Benefits	1%	\$308.60	6%	\$3,286.23
	Charge for Payroll Taxes	13%	\$6,941.06	9%	\$4,910.00
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	\$26.38 Avg. Wage Rate Excl. Benefits & Taxes	\$26.38		\$27.24	
Contractor Start Up Charges – Total amount amortized over 5 years:	<i>Annual Charges</i>	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Contractor Equipment Budget/Pool : Total amount amortized over 5 years: \$200,000	<i>Annual Charges</i>		\$40,000.00		\$40,000.00
Contractor Charge for Computerized Quality Assurance System			\$8,949.00		\$840.00
Contractor Charge for Office and or Warehouse Rent			\$0.00		\$0.00
Contractor Charge for Required Office Equipment			\$13,799.17		\$0.00
Contractor Charge for Supplies and On-Going Operating Costs			\$85,873.61		\$23,710.42
Contractor Management Fee		5.0%	\$204,885.09	3.4%	\$143,919.45
District Charge for Contract Monitoring			\$29,376.00		\$29,376.00
TOTAL CONTRACT CHARGE YEAR ONE (2021-2022)			\$4,123,874.10		\$4,199,353.27
Increase for 2022-2023 - Input Dollar Amount		9.7%	\$399,836.00	10.9%	\$458,737.46
TOTAL CONTRACT CHARGE YEAR TWO (2022-2023)			\$4,523,710.10		\$4,658,090.73
TOTAL CONTRACT CHARGE FOR TWO YEARS			\$8,647,584.19		\$8,857,443.99

Evaluation Committee Report

4. Staffing Summary: The following is a comparison of the staffing each contractor proposed:

Classification	ABM FTEs	Aramark FTEs
Custodial	38.50	38.50
Head Custodial	9.00	9.00
Maintenance	9.00	9.00
Grounds	5.00	6.00
Management & Clerical	6.00	6.00
Totals	67.50	68.50

5. 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.	23%	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: <p>General Manager:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Should have at least two years' experience in managing a comparable sized public school district. Should have more than five years' experience in the facilities management industry. Should hold a NJ Black Seal license. Must have a high school diploma or GED equivalent diploma. Must be a NJ Certified Educational Facilities Manager (CEFM) pursuant to 18A:17-49 Must be fluent in English. <p>Assistant/Maintenance Manager:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Should have at least one-year experience in managing a comparable sized public school district. Should have more than five years' experience in the facilities management industry. Should hold a NJ Black Seal license. Must have a high school diploma or GED equivalent diploma. Must be fluent in English. Must have or obtain a CEFM certificate by 6-15-22. <p>Custodial Supervisor/s:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Should have at least one-year experience in managing a comparable sized public school district. Should have two years' experience in the custodial industry. Should have a Black Seal license. Should be fluent in English and Spanish. Must have a high school diploma or GED equivalent diploma. 	21%	1 to 5
4. Staffing Viability: Considers whether proposed wages and staffing levels are sufficient to recruit and maintain a stable workforce by comparing the proposed wage rates to the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The New Jersey Department of Labor's most current OES Wage Data Survey for average wages for the District's county for custodial, maintenance, grounds, management and clerical positions as detailed in Exhibit 6. The current outsourced average wage rates and wages as detailed in the current outsourced roster in Exhibit 6. 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, maintenance, grounds management and clerical staff 	20%	1 to 5

Evaluation Committee Report

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
sufficient to meet the Scope of Work in this RFP?		
5. Contractor's Proposed Program: Are the Proposer's program, systems, training, and procedures for custodial and management services thorough and comprehensive enough 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, 2021? Did it detail the additional management and resources they shall be providing as well as the startup tasks, 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, maintenance, grounds and training? Was it submitted in Excel format or a Gantt chart?	14%	1 to 5

6. Scoring:

Evaluation Scoring of Award Criteria for Winslow Custodial, Maintenance, Grounds & Management Services RFP					
CRITERIA	Weighing Percent	Points Awarded (1 to 5)		Weighted Points	
		ABM	Aramark	ABM	Aramark
Program Price:	23%	14.00	9.00	3.22	2.07
Contractor's capability and record of performance:	12%	13.00	17.00	1.56	2.04
On-Site Management:	21%	8.00	17.00	1.68	3.57
Staffing Viability	20%	11.00	14.00	2.20	2.80
Contractor's Proposed Program:	10%	13.00	16.00	1.30	1.60
Contractor's Start Up/Transition Plan:	14%	17.00	17.00	2.38	2.38
TOTALS	100%	76.00	90.00	12.34	14.46

7. Scoring Summary

- a. **Aramark: 13.87 Points** – Aramark ranked number two for Program Price because they had the second lowest two-year price. Contractor's Capability and Record of Performance was based on past performance, the references provided as well as financial stability and was worthy of first place. For On-Site Management, Aramark was scored in first place as their 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 therefore ranked first. Aramark also ranked first in the Contractor's Proposed Program because they demonstrated that they had the systems, procedures and corporate support to achieve success through the life of the contract. Aramark tied for first with another contractor in Startup Plan/Transition Plan.
- b. **ABM: 12.31 Points** - ABM 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 of ABM's proposed candidate, they were given the second highest score for On-Site Management. ABM also received the second highest score for Staffing Viability. They received second place ranking for Contractor's Proposed Program as they met the requirements of the RFP. Finally their Startup Plan/Transition Plan ranked them tied for first place with another contractor.

8. Recommendation of the Winslow Township School District's 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 Winslow Township School District.