

**REPORT FROM EVALUATION COMMITTEE**  
**REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL FOR CUSTODIAL SERVICES - RFP NO.**  
**9520**

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS:**

BRIAN BARR\*– Assistant Director, Department of Transportation  
JOE VARGAS\*– Assistant Director, Department of Transportation  
BELINDA MCMILLAN HAENER – Administrative Manager, Department of Transportation  
JOSEPH BURGEN – Chief of Facilities Maintenance, Department of Transportation  
HARPREET KAUR – Fleet Operations Specialist, Department of Transportation

\*Mr. Joe Vargas assumed Mr. Brian Barr's evaluation duties as employee was absent on FMLA leave following the initial evaluations.

**FACILITATOR**

SANDRA GAMEZ – Senior Procurement Specialist, Purchasing Division, Finance Department

**BACKGROUND**

The City of Fresno Department of Transportation/FAX (hereinafter "FAX") issued a request for proposals (RFP) on 02/05/2020 to provide custodial services at various FAX facilities. This RFP is to cover separate custodial staffing and supplies for seven (7) buildings, totaling approximately 24,207 interior square feet to supply custodial services for various FAX and Fleet Maintenance buildings. Monday through Sunday custodial services are required for day and evening shifts; weekend and holiday services are limited. This request is for a three-year (3) contract with two (2) optional one (1) year extensions. This contract will be awarded to the company deemed to be the best value for the City of Fresno.

Proposals were submitted by four vendors in response to the Request for Proposal.

**SIGNIFICANT EVENTS**

- |                             |                                    |
|-----------------------------|------------------------------------|
| • March 10, 2020 (3:00 pm)  | Bid opening                        |
| • March 11 – March 24, 2020 | City review of Proposers           |
| • April 6, 2020             | Committee Meeting                  |
| • July 2, 2020              | Interview of top two firms         |
| • July 14, 2020             | Committee Evaluations and decision |

**EVALUATION CRITERIA:**

FAX's solicitation included the following six evaluation criteria ranked in order of relative importance:

1. Technical Qualifications and Experience: Experience in performing work similar in nature and/or related to the work described in the Scope of Services and this Request for Proposals; strength and stability of the firm;

2. Record of Past Performance Proven track record of:
  - a. Work experience
  - b. Satisfaction of key references
3. Qualifications and Experience of Key Personnel: Qualifications and previous experience of personnel; key personnel's level of involvement in performing related work and ability to meet the department's needs in terms of performance and schedule.
4. Project Understanding: The proposal demonstrates a clear and complete understanding of the project.
5. Implementation Schedule: Detailed implementation work plan and timeline.
6. Cost: Competitive and reasonable, based on contract base years pricing and all option year pricing. Evaluation of cost will be based on the basic maintenance items in Schedules 1 & 2. Costs proposed for items in Schedule number 2 will be evaluated on an as needed basis.

#### **INITIAL EVALUATION RANKING SUMMARY**

<b>Proposer</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>Rank</b>
Commercial Cleaning	277.00	1
Scrubcan, Inc	275.56	2
Janitorial, Inc.	252.00	3
MJM Facility Services	249.32	4

#### **INTERVIEW PROCESS**

After review and scoring, the committee determined the proposals submitted by Janitorial, Inc. and MJM Facility Services were not sufficient to warrant interviews. The major oversight by Janitorial, Inc. is that they did not acknowledge that their firm currently services FAX and has familiarity with facilities and current needs. As such they did not specify or customize the proposal to indicate any expertise in our environment. The committee determined this to be a major oversight. MJM Facility Services did not provide a specified plan to have local personnel, had the highest cost proposal, and finished 4<sup>th</sup> in all evaluators scoring – more than 26 points lower than the top two proposers.

The competitive range determined that Commercial Cleaning and Scrubcan, Inc. were the top two proposers, with only 1.44 points separating the ranking of the proposals. Interviews were held via web-conference on Friday, July 2, 2020.

#### **COMMITTEE NOTES FOLLOWING INTERVIEWS**

Commercial Cleaning – This company has its operations in five states, headquartered in Denver, CO. The initial consensus was that this vendor is highly qualified and empowered with the latest technology. Of concern was the lack of familiarity with the department and the city of Fresno, as well as no specified plan to have local personnel. The vendor did not confidently answer interview questions, nor did the committee believe the prospective contractor fully understood the expectations. When offered the opportunity, no specific or clarifying questions were asked of the committee by the vendor, which the committee felt was inattentive to the process.

Scrubcan, Inc. – This company currently performs Custodial Services for the Public Utilities Department and Facilities Management Division of the City of Fresno. In addition, FAX has experience with the company for ad-hoc cleaning and sanitation needs, primarily due to COVID-19 events. The general consensus was that the vendor is a highly qualified SBE and DBE local firm in this field, with 5 years of operating experience in the commercial cleaning industry. The team at Scrubcan, Inc. was engaged, competent and eager to earn our partnership.

### **SUMMARY RECOMMENDATION**

The committee has unanimously agreed that Scrubcan, Inc. provides the best value to the City. Scrubcan, Inc. demonstrated a commitment to excellence, had competitive pricing, and established themselves as having a clear understanding of the project.

The key personnel responsible for meeting the performance of the terms are highly qualified, local and will be heavily involved in managing this contract. The work plan demonstrated by Scrubcan, Inc. was detailed, contained a thorough timeline for implementation and was priced competitively. It is due to these factors that the committee agreed unanimously to award to this firm.