



JOSEPH M. GOLDSTEIN
PARTNER, BOARD CERTIFIED IN BUSINESS
LITIGATION
Shutts & Bowen LLP
201 East Las Olas Blvd.
Suite 2200
Fort Lauderdale, FL 33301
DIRECT (954) 847-3837
EMAIL JGoldstein@shutts.com

July 17, 2023

VIA EMAIL

Robert Gleason
Director of Purchasing
Broward County Purchasing Division
115 S Andrews Ave Ste 212
Fort Lauderdale, FL 33301
rgleason@broward.org

**Re: Formal Protest to Final Recommendation of Ranking to the Board of County
Commissioners/Director of Purchasing for Agreements 3 and 4 as to RFP
BLD2124561P1, Janitorial Services for County Facilities**

Dear Mr. Gleason:

Shutts & Bowen LLP represents Chi-Ada Corporation (“Chi-Ada”) regarding RFP BLD2124561P1, Janitorial Services for County Facilities (the “RFP”). As the second-ranked vendor for Agreements 3 and 4, Chi-Ada is an aggrieved vendor in connection with the proposed recommendation of ranking to the Board of County Commissioners/ Director of Purchasing (“Proposed Ranking”). Pursuant to Chapter 21, Part X., Section 21.65 of the Broward County Administrative Code, Chi-Ada protests the Final Recommendation of Ranking of the RFP for Agreements 3 & 4 and states the following grounds for its protest. Sunshine Cleaning Systems, LLC’s (“Sunshine Cleaning”) failure to follow the specification of the RFP renders its proposal non-responsive and non-responsible. Further, the Evaluation Committee’s evaluation and scoring of Sunshine Cleaning’s proposal was improper, arbitrary and capricious. With the exclusion of the Evaluation Committee’s improper scoring, Chi-Ada has the actual highest-ranked responsive and responsible proposal, including being the lowest priced for Agreements 3 & 4. Enclosed with this Protest are two checks each, valued at \$3,000.

I. Summary of Argument

Sunshine Cleaning’s proposal is non-responsive, non-responsible and should not have been evaluated or scored for Evaluation Criteria 3.1, rendering the evaluation committee’s ranking and scoring arbitrary and capricious, and Chi-Ada the highest ranked responsive and responsible proposal, including being the lowest priced for Agreements 3 & 4. Thus, Chi-Ada should be the number one ranked vendor for Agreements 3 & 4.

July 17, 2023

Page 2

II. Factual Background

a. The RFP

On August 12, 2022, Broward County Purchasing Division (the “County”) posted the RFP, seeking for the Broward County Facilities Management Division qualified vendors to provide comprehensive janitorial services for various Broward County facilities. *See RFP*, at 3, 16. The RFP encompassed “a total of five (5) separate Janitorial Service Agreements that may be awarded to separate vendors. There [is] a total of four (4) CBE Reserve Agreements and one (1) SBE Reserve Agreement.” RFP, at 16. Agreement No. 3 is a CBE Reserve for the South Regional Courthouse, and Agreement No 4. is a CBE Reserve for the Broward County Judicial Complex.

III. Legal Argument

a. The Final Recommendation of Ranking for Agreements 3 & 4 is improper because the Evaluation Committee’s ranking and scoring was arbitrary and capricious as Sunshine Cleaning’s Proposal is non-responsive and should not have been evaluated or scored for Evaluation Criteria 3.1.

i. Responsiveness

Pursuant to the RFP’s Standard Instructions to Vendors, “[a] Responsive (Vendor) means a vendor who submits a response to a solicitation that the Director of Purchasing determines meets all requirements of the solicitation.” *See Figure 1*. By writing in bold letters, the solicitation further emphasizes that the required information must be submitted with a solicitation response by the solicitation’s due date and time. *Id*. The instruction to vendors further explicitly stated in bold font that a vendor’s failure to timely submit required information may result in the Vendor being deemed non-responsive. *Id*.

A. Responsiveness Criteria:

A Responsive (Vendor) means a vendor who submits a response to a solicitation that the Director of Purchasing determines meets all requirements of the solicitation.

The required information and applicable forms must be submitted with solicitation response, electronically through Periscope SG2 by the solicitation’s due date and time. Failure to timely submit may result in Vendor being deemed non-responsive. The County reserves the right to waive minor technicalities or irregularities as is in the best interest of the County in accordance with Section 21.37(b) of the Broward County Procurement Code.

Figure 1. Responsiveness Criteria

Sunshine Cleaning failed to submit required information with its solicitation response by the solicitation’s due date and time. RFP Evaluation Criteria 3.1. References, required vendors to submit “**completed** Reference Verification Forms for previous projects referenced in its submittal.”

July 17, 2023
Page 3

RFP, at 124. (emphasis added.) The criterion further provides that “[v]endor[s] should submit the completed Vendor Reference Form with its response *by the solicitation’s deadline.*” *Id.* (emphasis added.)

In response to Evaluation Criteria 3.1 References, Sunshine Cleaning responded, “Vendor Reference Forms *have been distributed to our* references.” Sunshine Cleaning Proposal, at 24; *see also* Figure 2. (emphasis added.) It is abundantly clear from Sunshine Cleaning’s response that completed Reference Verification Forms were not *submitted* by the solicitation’s deadline.

Broward County Board of
County Commissioners

BLD2124561P1



3. Past Performance:

3.1. References – Vendor should submit completed Reference Verification Forms for previous projects referenced in its submittal. Vendor should provide the Vendor Reference Verification Form to its reference organization/firm to complete and return to the Vendor’s attention. Vendor should submit the completed Vendor Reference Form with its response by the solicitation’s deadline. The County will verify references provided as part of the review process. Vendor should provide five (5) non-Broward County Board of County Commissioners’ janitorial contract references, but no less than three (3). If the County is unable to verify at least three (3) references, additional references may be requested by the County.

Only provide references for non-Broward County Board of County Commissioners contracts. For Broward County contracts, the County will review performance evaluations in its database for vendors with previous or current contracts with the County. The County considers references and performance evaluations in the evaluation of Vendor’s past performance.

Vendor Reference Verification Forms have been distributed to our references.

Figure 2. Sunshine Cleaning’s Response to Evaluation Criteria 3.1

As evidenced by the County’s collection of Vendor References, Sunshine Cleaning unequivocally failed to meet the requirement of Evaluation Criteria 3.1, as one of its references is dated January 4, 2023, when the solicitation’s due date and its date of proposal submittal was November 17, 2022. *See* Figure 3. It is clear that Sunshine Cleaning could not and did not have all its references completed and submitted by the solicitation deadline as required by the RFP, as suggested by its proposal response, and evidenced by its actual reference.

July 17, 2023
Page 4

Broward County Board of
County Commissioners

**BROWARD
COUNTY
FLORIDA**

Vendor Reference Verification Form

Broward County Solicitation No. and Title:
RFP No. BLD2124561P1, Janitorial Services for County Facilities

Reference for: Sunshine Cleaning Systems,LLC

Organization/Firm Name providing reference:
Charlotte Douglas International Airport

Contact Name: Janitorial Services Reference date: 1/4/2023

Contact Email: Kevin.Lynch@cltairport.com Contact Phone: 704-359-1905

Name of Referenced Project: CLT Airport Janitorial Services

Contract No.	Date Services Provided:	Project Amount:
	2010 to 2020	\$12 mil

Figure 3. Sunshine Cleaning's Vendor Reference Verification Form

Therefore, Sunshine's Proposal cannot be deemed responsive, and such a determination by the evaluation committee was improper.

- ii. Even if Sunshine's Proposal is not deemed non-responsive, its Proposal should not have been scored for Evaluation Criteria 3.1 per the RFP and thus renders the Evaluation Committee's Scoring Arbitrary and Capricious.

Pursuant to the RFP's Standard Instructions to Vendors, "[v]endors that fail to submit any information and/or documentation required by an evaluation criteria will not be evaluated or scored for the corresponding criteria." RFP, at 112; *see also* Figure 4. (emphasis added.)

F. Evaluation Criteria

1. The Evaluation Committee will evaluate Vendors as per the **Evaluation Criteria**. The County reserves the right to obtain additional information from a Vendor.
2. Unless the Evaluation Criteria is identified in the solicitation as an Additional Responsiveness or Responsibility Requirement (i.e., Special Instructions to Vendors, e.g., pricing, certifications, etc.), a Vendor's failure to respond to evaluation criteria will not be considered a matter of responsiveness or responsibility. Vendors that fail to submit any information and/or documentation required by an evaluation criteria will not be evaluated or scored for the corresponding evaluation criteria.

Figure 4. Standard Instructions to Vendors

July 17, 2023
Page 5

Section 21.42(c) of the Broward County Code of Ordinances also provides that the Evaluation Committee's review of scoring and ranking "shall be solely based on evaluation factors set forth in the solicitation." The Evaluation Committee's scoring was improperly conducted and was not based solely on evaluation factors set forth in the solicitation.

"[W]here discretion is vested in [a government agency] with respect to letting public contracts on a competitive basis, the discretion may not be exercised arbitrarily or capriciously but must be based upon facts reasonably tending to support the conclusions reached by [the government agency]." *City of Pensacola v. Kirby*, 47 So. 2d 533, 535-36 (Fla. 1950). A procurement decision is arbitrary and capricious or not otherwise in accordance with the law if:

- i. In reaching its decision, the government either relied on factors it was not supposed to consider or failed to adequately consider an important aspect of the issue before it. *See, e.g., Kirby*, at 534-36 (affirming injunction in favor of disappointed bidder where government awarded contract to highest bidder without considering whether the lower bidders were responsive or responsible);
- ii. The government's explanation for its decision either runs counter to the evidence before it or is so implausible that it cannot be reasoned to be due to a difference in view or the product of government expertise. *See All Seasons Air Conditioning v. Fla. Dep't of Transp.*, DOAH No. 17-3184BID ¶¶ 3-9, 15-27, 49-59, 2017 WL 5958620, at *2-5, 9-10 (Fla. Div. Admin. Hrgs. Aug. 28, 2017) (although bidders had to demonstrate their ability to perform by providing references for recently performed work that was similar in type, scope and volume to that called for in the solicitation the awardee's references consisted entirely of jobs that were significantly less complex than and for a very small fraction of the work called for in the solicitation)

When a government agency awards a contract, its decision to do so "must be based upon facts reasonably tending to support" it. *Kirby*, 47 So. 2d at 535-36. Here, the Final Recommendation of Ranking is contrary to the facts that were before the Evaluation Committee.

Evaluation Criteria 3.1. References, required vendors to submit "**completed** Reference Verification Forms for previous projects referenced in its submittal" and further provided that "[v]endor[s] should submit the completed Vendor Reference Form with its response **by the solicitation's deadline**." RFP, at 124. (emphasis added.) Despite this explicit requirement and Sunshine Cleaning's failure to adequately respond, the evaluation committee still found its proposal responsive and further evaluated and scored Sunshine Cleaning's proposal for this criteria in contradiction to the requirements of the RFP and Broward County's Code of Ordinances.

July 17, 2023
Page 6

As evidenced by each Evaluation Committee member's score sheets, Sunshine Cleaning was evaluated and scored by each committee member for Evaluation Criteria 3.1. *See* Evaluation Committee Scoring Sheets, attached hereto as Composite **Exhibit 1**. Per the RFP, this action was improper. Therefore, the Evaluation Committee's determination that Sunshine Cleaning had the highest-ranked responsive and responsible proposal could not have been determined solely based on evaluation factors set forth in the solicitation as required by the Broward County Code of Ordinances.

The Evaluation Committee's evaluation and scoring of an entire Evaluation Criteria that should not have been evaluated or scored is a failure of the Evaluation Committee to adequately consider an important aspect of the solicitation review. The Final Recommendations of Ranking and, in turn, a Recommendation for Award to Sunshine Cleaning would not be based upon facts reasonably tending to support an award of this solicitation, rendering the Evaluation Committee's scoring arbitrary and capricious since the vendor deemed to have the highest-ranked responsive and responsible proposal is, in fact, non-responsive and should not have received a total of 40 points for its proposal for Agreement 3 or its proposal for Agreement 4.

iii. Without the Points Improperly Allocated to Sunshine Cleaning for Evaluation Criteria 3.1, Chi-Ada is the Highest Ranked Responsive and Responsible Proposal and the Lowest Bid.

Excluding the points improperly allocated to Sunshine Cleaning for Evaluation Criteria 3.1, Sunshine Cleaning's total score would be reduced by 40 points for each Agreement, which would place Chi-Ada ahead of Sunshine Cleaning for Agreements 3 & 4. *See* demonstration below:

AGREEMENT 3:

Company	Total Points	Deduction From Eval. 3.1	Actual Total
Sunshine Cleaning	429.7015	40	389.7015
Chi-Ada	391.7414	0	391.7414

AGREEMENT 4:

Company	Total Points	Deduction From Eval. 3.1	Actual Total
Sunshine Cleaning	422.1432	40	382.1432
Chi-Ada	386.7241	0	386.7241

July 17, 2023
Page 7

- b. **No CBE bidder would surpass Chi-Ada as the highest ranked Non-CBE responsive and responsible proposal and the lowest bid after conducting a Chapter 1 Article IV. Section. 1-81.3 (f) (2) Analysis.**

i. **McKenzie does not qualify for the Section. 1-81.3 (f) Privilege.**

Pursuant to Chapter 1, Article IV., Section. 1-81.3(f) of the Broward County Code of Ordinances, solicitations involving Broward County certified County Business Enterprises (“CBE”) reserves favor CBE firms with the capacity to perform the work. A CBE firm with the capacity to perform the work who submits a responsive and responsible Bid or Proposal will be awarded the contract if it submits either the lowest responsive and responsible Bid or the highest-ranked responsive and responsible Proposal (“CBE Presumptive Awardee”), subject to the following conditions:

(1) Monetary Differential; and

- a. The total bid or proposal amount of the CBE Presumptive awardee
 - i. Does not exceed \$3,000,0000; and
 - ii. Does not exceed the total amount of the lowest responsive & responsible Bid by more than 10% OR
 - iii. Does not exceed the total amount of the highest-ranked responsive and responsible Proposal by more than 10%
- b. Points Differential
 - i. After deducting points awarded for price from the total points awarded
 - ii. The points assigned to the CBE Presumptive Awardee
 1. Are not more than 10% less than the total points assigned to the highest-ranked responsive non-CBE.

McKenzie’s Cleaning, Inc. (“McKenzie”) is the highest-ranked CBE ranked sixth overall, and Janitorial 5 Star Services LLC (“Janitorial 5 Star”), is the lowest CBE bidder. Janitorial 5 Star is excluded from this analysis because it fails to meet the points differential requirement.

Per 1-81.3(f)(1)(a)(i): McKenzie’s total bid does not exceed \$3,000,000 for Agreements 3 or 4. As per Agreement 3, the companies’ pricing are as follows:

AGREEMENT 3:

Company	Pricing	10% Threshold	Difference
Sunshine Cleaning	\$484,473.23	\$48,447.323	From McKenzie: \$ 44,062.77; within 10% threshold
Chi-Ada	\$465,282.44	\$46,528.244	From McKenzie \$63, 253.56; not within 10% threshold
McKenzie	\$528,536.95		

July 17, 2023
Page 8

Adhering to the requirements of 1-81.3(f)(1)(a)(ii)-(iii), McKenzie would fail to meet the monetary differential, as Chi-Ada as the actual highest-ranked proposal is not only lower priced than McKenzie, but McKenzie's pricing far exceeds 10% of Chi-Ada's bid.

As for Agreement 4, the companies' pricing are as follows:

AGREEMENT 4:

Company	Pricing	10% Threshold	Difference
Sunshine Cleaning	\$2,907,630.67	290,763.067	From McKenzie: \$29,604.42; within 10% threshold
Chi-Ada	\$2,612,646.45	\$261,264.645	From McKenzie \$324,588.64; not within 10% threshold
McKenzie	\$2,937,235.09		

Similar to Agreement 3, the same conclusion applies to Agreement 4. McKenzie would fail to meet the monetary differential, with Chi-Ada as the actual highest-ranked responsive and responsible proposal and the lowest priced bid.

c. A Scoring Comparison reveals that Chi-Ada's score should be equal to or higher than Sunshine Cleaning's score.

Chi-Ada is lower priced than Sunshine Cleaning for both Agreements 3 & 4, as accurately reflected by the pricing scores however; the following areas highlight where Chi-Ada should have been scored equal to or better than Sunshine Cleaning:

The analysis of the scoring of Evaluation Criteria 3.1 reveals why Chi-Ada should be scored significantly higher than Sunshine Cleaning in the Past Performance category. Chi-Ada, unlike Sunshine Cleaning, included all its references within its proposal on November 17, 2022, the date solicitation responses, and thus references, were due per the RFP. *See* Chi-Ada RFP Proposal Criteria 3.1 Response.

Chi-Ada should have received higher scores than Sunshine Cleaning for its Vendor Experience under Evaluation Criteria 2.1. Criteria 2.1 asked Vendors to list 10 janitorial contracts that are the **most similar** to the agreements for which the vendor is proposing. Under this criteria, Sunshine Cleaning listed fewer contracts than Chi-Ada, and more importantly, fewer contracts that are similar to Agreements 3 & 4 than Chi-Ada. Chi-Ada detailed experience providing janitorial services for buildings identical to Agreements 3 & 4. Chi-Ada serviced Sarasota County's Criminal Justice Center, Judicial Center, and Historic Courthouse, projects similar to Agreement 3 for the South Regional Courthouse and Agreement 4 for the Governmental Center East Complex.

July 17, 2023
 Page 9

See Chi-Ada's RFP Response, at 62; *see also* Figure 5; *cf.* Sunshine Cleanings Proposal, at 19-23. While Chi-Ada has direct vendor experience with cleaning a courthouse, Sunshine Cleaning's listed vendor experience does not demonstrate the same, yet Sunshine Cleaning was ranked higher for Evaluation Criteria 2.1 by evaluators Tim Waln, Jeffrey White, and Andrew Sebo for Agreement 3, and likewise by the same evaluators and Elsie Lewin for Agreement 4.

Broward County Board of County Commissioners		BLD2124561P1
Janitorial Services for County Facilities		CHI-ADA CORPORATION
Solicitation BLD2124561P1		
1660 Ringling Blvd. Sarasota, FL 34236		
g. Number of floors in each facility on the contract	6	
h. Size of each facility area cleaned in square feet	125,393	
i. Number of days per week service is/was provided	7	
j. Total number of Vendor's employees assigned to each facility	5	
k. Total number of daily facility users: employees, customers, passengers, etc.	356	
l. Whether or not the facility operated 24 hours per day, 7 days per week	M - F - 8:00 a.m. - 5:00 p.m.	
m. Whether or not the contract required background checks	Yes	
n. Whether or not the contract required green cleaning	Yes	
f. Name and address of each facility on the contract	Responses	
Criminal Justice Center		
2071 Ringling Blvd. Sarasota, FL 34237		
g. Number of floors in each facility on the contract	8	
h. Size of each facility area cleaned in square feet	96,960	
i. Number of days per week service is/was provided	5	
j. Total number of Vendor's employees assigned to each facility	4	
k. Total number of daily facility users: employees, customers, passengers, etc.	135	
l. Whether or not the facility operated 24 hours per day, 7 days per week	M - F - 8:00 a.m. - 5:00 p.m. Courtrooms (5 p.m. - 10 p.m.)	
m. Whether or not the contract required background checks	Yes	
n. Whether or not the contract required green cleaning	Yes	
f. Name and address of each facility on the contract	Responses	
Historic Courthouse		
2000 Main Street Sarasota, FL 34237		
g. Number of floors in each facility on the contract	10	
h. Size of each facility area cleaned in square feet	65,411	
i. Number of days per week service is/was provided	5	
j. Total number of Vendor's employees assigned to each facility	125	
k. Total number of daily facility users: employees, customers, passengers, etc.		
l. Whether or not the facility operated 24 hours per day, 7 days per week	M - F - 8:00 a.m. - 5:00 p.m.	
m. Whether or not the contract required background checks	Yes	
n. Whether or not the contract required green cleaning	Yes	
f. Name and address of each facility on the contract	Responses	
Historic Center Museum		
701 North Tamiami Trail Sarasota		
g. Number of floors in each facility on the contract	1	
h. Size of each facility area cleaned in square feet	6,812	
i. Number of days per week service is/was provided	6	
j. Total number of Vendor's employees assigned to each facility	1	
k. Total number of daily facility users: employees, customers, passengers, etc.	110	
l. Whether or not the facility operated 24 hours per day, 7 days per week	M - F - 8:00 a.m. - 5:00 p.m.	
m. Whether or not the contract required background checks	Yes	
n. Whether or not the contract required green cleaning	Yes	
f. Name and address of each facility on the contract	Responses	
Judicial Center		
2002 Ringling Blvd. Sarasota, FL 34236		

Figure 5. Chi-Ada's Vendor Experience

July 17, 2023
Page 10

d. Responsibility

i. Failure to Disclose Company Principals and Out-of-State PPB renders Sunshine Cleaning's Proposal Non-Responsible.

As mentioned in Chi-Ada's Objection Letter, Sunshine Cleaning, on November 17, 2022, failed to include in its proposal response or update the County at its June 5, 2023 presentation of its actual principals, owners, and out-of-state principal place of business ("PPB"), as required by the solicitation.

In 2022, Pritchard, a New York-based company, acquired Sunshine Cleaning. See Prichard Website Screenshot 1, attached hereto as **Exhibit 2**. On November 14, 2022, Thomas Melton, the Executive Vice President of Pritchard and Sunshine Cleaning, signed the Price Sheets for Agreements 1-4. See Sunshine Proposal, at 4-6, 8, excerpts attached hereto as **Exhibit 3**. However, as required by the RFP, Mr. Melton was not included in Sunshine Cleaning's proposal as company principal, officer, or owner. On November 17, 2022, three days after Executive Vice President Thomas Melton signed price sheet documents for Agreements 1-4, Sunshine Cleaning submitted its proposal to the County. Under Evaluation Criterion 1, titled "Ability of Personnel," the RFP required that vendors "[s]ubmit a resume or brief biography for each of the company principal." RFP, at 123 of 180. (emphasis added.) Additionally, pursuant to Question 11 under the Vendor Questionnaire and Standard Certifications Section ("Vendor Questionnaire"), the RFP required vendors to "list name and title of each principal, owner, officer, and major shareholder." RFP, at 135 of 180.

Sunshine Cleaning argues that Mr. Melton nor any of the two New York based principals were listed because they will not be involved in the operations of Sunshine Cleaning for the projects at issue, however, this argument is no excuse for Sunshine Cleaning's failure to include required information. The solicitation required a list of names and titles of each principal, owner, and major shareholder. Had the solicitation solely required a list of names and titles of each principal, owner, officer, and major shareholder that would be involved with the contract, such a response would be valid, however the solicitation made no such narrow distinction, instead it required a list of EACH principal, owner, officer, or major shareholder, which Sunshine failed to provide. Sunshine Cleaning admits that Mr. Melton is an authorized person for the purposes of all four Agreements he signed, yet claims it was an oversight to not include the Executive Vice President as a principal when he clearly is an owner with the legal authority to bind Sunshine Cleaning contractually with the County. If the Executive Vice President is authorizing the company's actions, it is also true that he has some decision-making authority over this project, whether or not he is involved with the performances of services. For these reasons, he and the other two principals should have been listed, and Sunshine Cleaning's failure to list them renders their proposal non-responsible.

July 17, 2023
Page 11

Omission of Out-of-State PPB

Pursuant to Question 6 of the Vendor Questionnaire, the RFP required vendors to list their PPB address. In response to this question, Sunshine Cleaning represented that its PPB is “Sunshine HQ 3445 ne 12th terrace Ft. Lauderdale, FL 33334” *See Sunshine Proposal, at 114 of 133.* This again as previously argued renders Sunshine Cleaning’s proposal non-responsive at the time of its submittal.

IV. Conclusion and Request for Relief

Sunshine Cleaning’s proposal is non-responsive, and the Evaluation Committee’s scoring and evaluation of Sunshine Cleaning’s proposal for Evaluation Criteria 3.1 was improper, which renders the Final Recommendation of Ranking arbitrary and capricious as such Chi-Ada is the highest ranked responsible and responsive proposal and the lowest priced bid for Agreements 3 & 4 and therefore should be number one ranked for Agreements 3 & 4.

Sincerely,

Shutts & Bowen LLP



Joseph M. Goldstein
Janeil A. Morgan

cc:

Fernando Amuchastegui, Esq., FA@broward.org
Carolyn Messersmith, Purchasing Manager, CMESSERSMITH@broward.org
Mary Moss, Purchasing Agent, mmoss@broward.org
Constance Mangan, Purchasing, CMANGAN@broward.org

FTLDOCS 8857784 4

Exhibit 1

SCORING SHEET

Final Evaluation - Agreement No. 3 - South Reiona Courthouse (CBE Reserve)

RFP No. and Name: BLD2124561P1, Janitorial Services for County Facilities

Date: June 7, 2023

Date: June 7, 2023

SCORING SHEET

Final Evaluation Meeting - Agreement No. 3 - South Regional Courthouse (CBE Reserve)
BLDP No. and Name: BLD2124561P1, Janitorial Services for County Facilities

SCORING SHEET

Final Evaluation Meeting - Agreement No. 3 - South Regional Courthouse (CBE Reserve)
FP No.: and Name: BLD212481P1, Janitorial Services for County Facilities
Date: June 7, 2023

SCORING SHEET

Final Evaluation Meeting - Agreement No. 3 - South Regional Courthouse (CBE Reserve)
 RFP No. and Name: BLDZ12456 (P) - Janitorial Services for County Facilities
 Date: June 7, 2023
 Location: Virtual and In-Person (Microsoft Teams and Room GC-430)

Evaluation Criteria - Project Specific Criteria (Complete list of questions provided separately)		Maximum Points	Ameri-Plus Janitorial Maintenance LLC	ALJ Services LLC	Ameri-Plus Janitorial Services, Inc.	Chi-Adi Corporation	Clean Freak's Janitorial Services, LLC	Comet Cleaning Systems Inc.	J and A Cleaning Company LLC	Kwik Stop Solutions, Inc.	L & B Janitorial Services LLC	McCurdy's Professional Cleaning Services, Corp.	McKenzie's SFM Janitorial Cleaning Inc.	Sunshine Cleaning Systems, LLC	Triangle Services of Florida, Inc.			
ABILITY OF PROFESSIONAL PERSONNEL (Total Maximum Points = 10)																		
See Evaluation Criteria - question 1.1.	5	3	3	3	3	4	4	2	4	4	0	3	3	4	5			
See Evaluation Criteria - question 1.2.	5	3	3	3	3	4	4	3	3	4	0	3	3	4	5			
VENDOR EXPERIENCE (Total Maximum Points = 25)																		
See Evaluation Criteria - question 2.1.	20	12	8	14	15	8	10	8	12	0	15	12	16	18	19			
See Evaluation Criteria - question 2.2.	5	2	3	2	4	4	2	3	2	3	0	3	3	4	5			
PAST PERFORMANCE (Total Maximum Points = 10)																		
See Evaluation Criteria - question 3.1.	10	5	6	4	6	6	4	8	5	7	0	5	6	6	9			
PROJECT APPROACH (Total Maximum Points = 30)																		
See Evaluation Criteria - question 4.1.	5	3	4	3	4	4	3	3	2	3	0	4	3	4	5			
See Evaluation Criteria - question 4.2.	5	4	4	3	3	3	3	3	3	4	0	4	3	3	4			
See Evaluation Criteria - question 4.3.	5	3	3	3	3	4	3	4	2	3	0	4	3	4	5			
See Evaluation Criteria - question 4.4.	5	3	3	4	4	3	3	3	3	0	3	3	4	5	4			
See Evaluation Criteria - question 4.5.	5	3	3	2	4	3	2	3	3	4	0	4	3	3	4			
See Evaluation Criteria - question 4.6.	5	3	4	3	3	4	3	3	2	3	0	3	3	4	4			
Points Entered by Purchasing																		
Location - See Evaluation Criteria - question 5.1	5	5	0	5	5	5	5	5	5	0	5	5	0	3	0			
Pricing - See Evaluation Criteria - question 6.1	20	12.8267	10.9723	11.9407	15.3483	11.4214	15.2574	11.1175	13.2857	20.0000	8.6305	15.5478	11.6700	13.5114	14.2693	14.7403	13.5961	12.8915
TOTAL SCORE (CALCULATED BY PURCHASING) Maximum 100 Points	100	61.8267	58.9723	54.9407	73.3483	70.4214	56.2574	63.1175	56.2457	74.0000	8.6305	71.5478	61.6700	73.5114	83.2693	86.7403	62.5961	50.8915
Tim Wain																		
Name:																		
By submitting this document I certify that I have abided and adhered to the Core of Silence Ordinance influenced or coerced by anyone in the assignment of the points by me for this procurement.																		

6/7/2023
Date:

Name:

By submitting this document I certify that I have abided
and adhered to the Core of Silence Ordinance
influenced or coerced by anyone in the assignment of the points by me for this procurement.

SCORING SHEET

Final Evaluation Meeting - Agreement No. 3 - South Regional Courthouse (CBE Reserve)

RFP No. and Name: BLD2124561P1, Janitorial Services for County Facilities

Date: June 7, 2023

Evaluation Criteria - Project Specific Criteria (Complete text of questions provided separately)										
Maximum Points	AJL Services LLC	Ameri-Plus Janitorial Maintenance LLC	Chi-Adas Corporation Services, Inc.	Clean Freak's Janitorial Services, LLC	Clean Space, Inc.	Comet Cleaning Systems Inc.	J and A Cleaning Company LLC	L & B Janitorial Services, Inc.	McJ Cleaning Services, Corp.	Sunshine Cleaning Systems, LLC
ABILITY OF PROFESSIONAL PERSONNEL (Total Maximum Points = 10)										
See Evaluation Criteria - question 1.1.	5	4	3	4	5	3	2	0	3	3
See Evaluation Criteria - question 1.2.	5	3	2	4	5	2	1	2	0	5
VENDOR EXPERIENCE (Total Maximum Points = 25)										
See Evaluation Criteria - question 2.1.	20	14	11	10	20	6	12	8	0	15
See Evaluation Criteria - question 2.2.	5	3	3	2	5	2	3	1	0	2
PAST PERFORMANCE (Total Maximum Points = 10)										
See Evaluation Criteria - question 3.1.	10	8	6	6	8	2	6	5	2	6
PROJECT APPROACH (Total Maximum Points = 30)										
See Evaluation Criteria - question 4.1.	5	3	3	5	2	3	3	0	3	2
See Evaluation Criteria - question 4.2.	5	4	2	4	5	2	2	0	2	0
See Evaluation Criteria - question 4.3	5	4	3	3	4	2	1	4	0	2
See Evaluation Criteria - question 4.4	5	4	4	4	4	2	3	3	0	4
See Evaluation Criteria - question 4.5	5	4	3	3	5	2	1	2	0	3
See Evaluation Criteria - question 4.6	5	5	2	4	4	3	1	4	0	3
Points Entered by Purchasing										
Location - See Evaluation Criteria - question 5.1	5	5	0	5	5	5	5	5	0	3
Pricing - See Evaluation Criteria - question 8.1	20	12.8267	10.9723	11.9407	15.3483	11.4214	15.2574	11.1175	13.2857	20.0000
TOTAL SCORE (CALCULATED BY PURCHASING) Maximum 100 Points	100	73.8267	52.9723	63.9407	90.3483	44.4214	55.2574	54.1175	20.2857	61.0000

Elsie Lewin

3000/270

6/1/2023 Date:

REVIEW

and have no names

ପ୍ରକାଶକ ମହିନେ

卷之三

SCORING SHEET

Final Evaluation Meeting - Agreement No. 4 - Broward County Judicial Complex (CBE Reserve)

RFP No. and Name: BLD2124561P1, Janitorial Services for County Facilities
Date: June 7, 2023
Location: Virtual and In-Person (Microsoft Teams and Room GC 430)

Evaluation Criteria - Project Specific Criteria (Complete text of questions provided separately)		Maximum Points	AuJ Services LLC	An's Janitorial Services, Inc.	Chi-Ada Corporation	Clean Freak's Janitorial Services, LLC	Clean Space, Inc.	Comet Cleaning Systems Inc	J and A Cleaning Company LLC	Janitorial 5 Star Services LLC	Kwik Stop Solutions, Inc.	L & B Janitorial Services, Inc.	McKenzie's Cleaning Inc.	Sunshine Cleaning Systems, LLC	Triangle Services of Florida, Inc.	
ABILITY OF PROFESSIONAL PERSONNEL (Total Maximum Points = 10)		5	2	3	3	2	2	2	1	2	0	2	2	5	5	
See Evaluation Criteria - question 1.1.		5	2	3	3	2	2	2	1	2	0	2	2	5	5	
SEE EVALUATION CRITERIA - question 1.2. (Total Maximum Points = 25)		20	12	14	16	10	12	10	5	6	0	16	14	20	20	
See Evaluation Criteria - question 2.1.		5	2	3	3	2	2	2	1	2	0	2	2	5	5	
See Evaluation Criteria - question 2.2.		10	6	5	6	8	5	3	6	6	0	6	8	8	1	
PAST PERFORMANCE (Total Maximum Points = 10)		5	5	4	4	4	4	4	4	0	3	0	5	5	5	
See Evaluation Criteria - question 3.1.		5	5	4	4	4	4	4	4	0	3	0	5	5	5	
PROJECT APPROACH (Total Maximum Points = 30)		5	5	4	4	4	4	4	4	0	3	0	5	5	5	
See Evaluation Criteria - question 4.1.		5	5	4	4	4	4	4	4	0	3	0	5	5	5	
See Evaluation Criteria - question 4.2.		5	5	4	4	4	4	4	4	0	3	0	5	5	5	
See Evaluation Criteria - question 4.3.		5	5	4	4	4	4	4	4	0	3	0	5	5	5	
See Evaluation Criteria - question 4.4.		5	5	4	4	4	4	4	4	0	3	0	5	5	5	
See Evaluation Criteria - question 4.5.		5	5	4	4	4	4	4	4	0	3	0	5	5	5	
See Evaluation Criteria - question 4.6.		5	5	4	4	4	4	4	4	0	3	0	5	5	5	
Points Entered by Purchasing																
Location See Evaluation Criteria - question 5.1		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	0	3	
Pricing - See Evaluation Criteria - question 6.1		20	8.9312	10.8330	14.9448	10.9146	14.1302	8.9937	13.8752	20.0000	8.2521	14.7364	13.2933	11.9364	13.4286	13.3698
TOTAL SCORE (CALCULATED BY PURCHASING)		100	67.9312	67.8330	63.9146	66.1302	61.9937	32.8752	61.0000	8.2521	77.7364	58.2933	84.9364	89.4286	61.3698	
Jeffrey White		6/7/2023														
Name: _____		Date: _____														
By submitting this document I certify that I have abided by the Cone of Silence Ordinance and not been influenced or coerced by anyone in the assignment of the points by me for this procurement.																

SCORING SHEET

Final Evaluation Meeting - Agreement No. 4 - Broward County Judicial Complex (CBE Reserve)
RFP No. and Name: BL.D2124561P1, Janitorial Services for County Facilities
Date: June 7, 2023
Location: Virtual and In-Person (Microsoft Teams and Room GC 430)

Evaluation Criteria - Project Specific Criteria (Complete text of questions provided separately)									
ABILITY OF PROFESSIONAL PERSONNEL (Total Maximum Points = 10)	Maximum Points	AJ Services LLC	An's Janitorial Services, Inc.	Chi-Ada Corporation	Clean Freak's Janitorial Services, LLC	Clean Space, Inc.	Comet Cleaning Systems Inc	J and A Cleaning Company LLC	Kwik Stop Solutions, Inc.
See Evaluation Criteria - question 1.1.	5	4	5	5	4	3	4	2	0
See Evaluation Criteria - question 1.2.	5	4	5	5	4	3	3	2	4
SELLER'S EXPERIENCE (Total Maximum Points = 25)									
See Evaluation Criteria - question 2.1.	20	15	16	14	15	12	12	15	0
See Evaluation Criteria - question 2.2.	5	4	4	3	4	3	2	3	0
PAST PERFORMANCE (Total Maximum Points = 10)									
See Evaluation Criteria - question 3.1.	10	8	8	6	8	5	7	8	0
PROJECT APPROACH (Total Maximum Points = 30)									
See Evaluation Criteria - question 4.1.	5	5	4	5	3	3	3	3	0
See Evaluation Criteria - question 4.2.	5	5	4	5	3	2	3	3	0
See Evaluation Criteria - question 4.3	5	5	4	5	4	2	3	1	2
See Evaluation Criteria - question 4.4	5	5	4	3	3	3	3	3	0
See Evaluation Criteria - question 4.5	5	5	3	4	3	3	2	3	0
See Evaluation Criteria - question 4.6	5	5	3	4	3	2	3	2	3
Points Entered by Purchasing									
Location - See Evaluation Criteria - question 5.1	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	0
Pricing - See Evaluation Criteria - question 6.1	20	8.9312	10.8330	14.9448	10.9146	14.1302	8.9937	13.8752	20.0000
TOTAL SCORE (CALCULATED BY PURCHASING) Maximum 100 Points	100	78.9312	75.8330	81.9448	67.9146	64.1302	60.9937	58.8752	76.0000
									80.7364
									83.9364
									88.4286
									82.3698
Andrew Sebo									
Name:									
Date : have influenced or coerced by anyone in the assignment of the points by me for this procurement.									

6/7/2023

Date : have influenced or coerced by anyone in the assignment of the points by me for this procurement.
By submitting this document I certify that I have abided by the Cone of Silence Ordinance and not been

SCORING SHEET

Final Evaluation Meeting - Agreement No. 4 - Broward County Judicial Complex (CBE Reserve)

RFP No. and Name: BLD2124561P1, Janitorial Services for County Facilities

Date: June 7, 2023

Location: Virtual and In-Person (Microsoft Teams and Room GC 430)

Evaluation Criteria - Project Specific Criteria (Complete text of questions provided separately)	Maximum Points	ALJ Services LLC	Ari's Janitorial Services, Inc.	Chi-Ada Corporation	Clean Freak's Janitorial Services, LLC	Clean Space, Inc.	Comet Cleaning Systems Inc	J and A Cleaning Company LLC	Jantorial 5 Star Services LLC	Kwik Stop Solutions, Inc.	L & B Janitorial Services, Inc.	McKenzie's Cleaning Inc.	SFM Janitorial Services, LLC	Sunshine Cleaning Systems, LLC	Triangle Services of Florida, Inc.
ABILITY OF PROFESSIONAL PERSONNEL (Total Maximum Points = 10)															
See Evaluation Criteria - question 1.1.	5	3	3	3	4	4	3	3	3	0	4	4	3	4	4
See Evaluation Criteria - question 1.2.	5	3	3	3	4	4	3	3	3	0	3	4	3	4	4
VENOR EXPERIENCE (Total Maximum Points = 10)															
See Evaluation Criteria - question 2.1.	20	10	10	15	10	15	10	10	10	0	15	15	10	15	15
See Evaluation Criteria - question 2.2.	5	3	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	0	4	4	0	4	4
PAST PERFORMANCE (Total Maximum Points = 10)															
See Evaluation Criteria - question 3.1.	10	6	7	6	7	6	5	5	5	5	5	4	5	5	7
PROJECT APPROACH (Total Maximum Points = 30)															
See Evaluation Criteria - question 4.1.	5	3	3	3	4	4	3	3	3	0	3	3	3	3	4
See Evaluation Criteria - question 4.2.	5	3	3	3	4	4	3	3	3	0	4	3	3	3	4
See Evaluation Criteria - question 4.3	5	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	0	3	3	3	3	3
See Evaluation Criteria - question 4.4	5	3	3	3	3	4	3	3	3	0	3	4	3	3	4
See Evaluation Criteria - question 4.5	5	3	3	3	3	4	3	3	3	0	3	4	3	3	4
See Evaluation Criteria - question 4.6	5	3	3	3	3	4	3	3	3	0	3	4	3	4	4

Points Entered by Purchasing

Location - See Evaluation Criteria - question 5.1	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	0	5	5	0	3	0	
Pricing - See Evaluation Criteria - question 6.1	20	8.9312	10.8330	14.9448	10.9146	14.1302	8.9937	13.8752	20.0000	8.2521	14.7364	13.2933	11.9364	13.4286	13.3698
TOTAL SCORE (CALCULATED BY PURCHASING) Maximum 100 Points	100	56.9312	60.8330	69.9448	63.9146	76.1302	56.93937	61.8752	68.0000	13.2521	69.7364	70.2933	54.3364	71.4286	70.3698

Katrina Jackson

6/7/2023

Name:

Date:

have
not been
influenced or coerced by anyone in the assignment of the points by me for this procurement.

Final Evaluation Meeting - Agreement No. 4 - Broward County Judicial Complex (CBE Reserve)

BEP No. and Name: B1 D2124561P1 - Janitorial Services for County Facilities

Date: June 7, 2023

Datum: Julte 1, 2023
Klasse: Virtuell und In Person (Microsoft Teams) und Raum 601-120)

Evaluation Criteria - Project Specific Criteria (Complete text of questions provided separately)	Maximum Points	ALJ Services LLC	Aun's Janitorial Services, Inc.	Chi-Ada Corporation	Clean Freak's Janitorial Services, LLC	Clean Space, Inc.	Comet Cleaning Systems Inc	J and A Cleaning Company LLC	Janitorial 5 Star Services LLC	Kwik Stop Solutions, Inc.	L & B Janitorial Services, Inc.	Mckenzie's Cleaning Inc.	SFM Janitorial Services, LLC	Sunshine Cleaning Systems, LLC	Triangle Services of Florida, Inc.
ABILITY OF PROFESSIONAL PERSONNEL (Total Maximum Points = 10)															
See Evaluation Criteria - question 1.1.	5	3	4	5	2	2	3	2	2	0	3	4	3	5	5
See Evaluation Criteria - question 1.2.	5	3	4	5	2	1	2	0	0	2	0	3	3	3	5
VENDOR EXPERIENCE (Total Maximum Points = 25)															
See Evaluation Criteria - question 2.1.	20	12	9	18	4	10	4	0	0	7	0	12	14	17	19
See Evaluation Criteria - question 2.2.	5	2	2	5	2	3	1	0	0	2	0	4	3	5	5
PAST PERFORMANCE (Total Maximum Points = 10)															
See Evaluation Criteria - question 3.1.	10	7	5	7	2	6	5	2	5	4	7	7	7	9	9
PROJECT APPROACH (Total Maximum Points = 30)															
See Evaluation Criteria - question 4.1.	5	3	3	5	2	3	3	0	0	3	0	4	3	5	4
See Evaluation Criteria - question 4.2.	5	3	3	5	2	3	3	0	0	2	0	4	4	4	4
See Evaluation Criteria - question 4.3	5	4	3	4	2	1	4	0	0	2	0	4	4	5	4
See Evaluation Criteria - question 4.4	5	5	4	4	2	3	3	0	0	4	0	3	4	4	5
See Evaluation Criteria - question 4.5	5	4	3	5	2	1	2	0	0	3	0	4	5	5	4
See Evaluation Criteria - question 4.6	5	5	4	4	2	1	4	0	0	3	0	4	4	5	5
Points Entered by Purchasing															
Location - See Evaluation Criteria - question 5.1	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	0	3
Pricing - See Evaluation Criteria - question 6.1	20	8.9312	10.8330	14.9448	10.9146	14.1302	8.9937	13.8752	20.0000	8.2521	14.7364	13.2933	11.9364	13.4286	13.3698
TOTAL SCORE (CALCULATED BY PURCHASING) Maximum 100 Points	100	64.9312	59.8330	86.9448	39.9146	53.1302	47.9937	22.8752	60.0000	12.2521	71.7364	73.2333	75.9364	87.4286	79.3698

- 1 -

6/7/2023

Name: _____ Date: have _____
By submitting this document I certify that I have abided by the Cone of Silence Ordinance and not been influenced or coerced by anyone in the assignment of the points by me for this procurement.

Exhibit 2

https://www.pritchardindustries.com/about-us/

CompuLaw MyView LawDrill Intranet: Shutts & B... SmartTime Westlaw Sign In | T... Florida Senate Code of Ordinances... Land Development... Seventeenth Judicia... Shutts Academy ADP

PRITCHARD Why Pritchard Services Industries Locations Blog Careers Contact

Get To Know Pritchard Industries

The timeline diagram illustrates the growth of Pritchard Industries over three decades. It features a blue background with a large, stylized white arrow pointing from left to right. The years are marked in green boxes along the top and bottom of the arrow. Arrows between the years indicate specific events or acquisitions.

Year	Event
1986	Pritchard Industries Founded in NYC
1987	Enters Washington DC
1988	Enters Florida
1989	Enters Alabama & Georgia
1990	Enters New Jersey
1994	Enters Houston
1996	Enters Austin & Dallas
2004	Enters San Antonio
2005	Forms SMM
2011	Forms CORE Facility Services
2012	Enters Oklahoma
2017	Enters Massachusetts
2018	Enters Rhode Island
2019	Acquires PM of Alabama
2020	Acquires PBS of Texas
2021	Acquires DOW Janitorial, Global Industrial Services & Raritan Building Services
2022	Acquires Capitol City Janitorial, AffinEco, The Arthur Jackson Company, GBM, and Sunshine Cleaning Systems
2023	More to Come!

Privacy • Terms

Exhibit 3

Janitorial Services - Price Sheets - Agreement 1					
QTY	UOM	DESCRIPTION	Year 1		
			Per Hour	Annual	2 years
Additional Labor - Routine:					
50	HR	Project Supervisor	\$ 30.00	\$ 1,500.00	\$ 3,150.00
50	HR	Site Supervisor	\$ 24.30	\$ 1,215.00	\$ 2,466.50
50	HR	Full Time Service Crew Emp.	\$ 18.93	\$ 946.50	\$ 1,921.50
50	HR	Part Time Service Crew Emp.	\$ 18.93	\$ 946.50	\$ 1,921.50
Additional Labor - Emergency:					
50	HR	Project Supervisor	\$ 30.00	\$ 1,500.00	\$ 3,150.00
50	HR	Site Supervisor	\$ 24.30	\$ 1,215.00	\$ 2,466.50
50	HR	Full Time Service Crew Emp.	\$ 18.93	\$ 946.50	\$ 1,921.50
50	HR	Part Time Service Crew Emp.	\$ 18.93	\$ 946.50	\$ 1,921.50
Pass Thru:	1	EA Materials/Supplies		\$ 1,000.00	\$ 2,000.00
Total (2)			\$ 10,216.00	\$ 10,703.00	\$ 20,919.00
Grand Total - Whole Group (Total 1 + Total 2)			\$ 1,289,775.89	\$ 1,332,784.23	\$ 2,622,560.12
Provide the Percentage of Price Attributed to Labor Portion of Services: <u>75%</u>					
NAME OF COMPANY:	Sunshine Cleaning Systems				
AUTHORIZED PERSON NAME:	<u>Thomas Melton</u>				
AUTHORIZED PERSON TITLE:	<u>Executive Vice President</u>				
	DATE: <u>Monday, November 14, 2022</u>				

Broward County Board of
 County Commissioners
 Page 1 of 1

BLD2124561P1

Janitorial Services - Price Sheets - Agreement 2										
ITEM NO.	FACILITY LOCATION	QTY	UOM	DESCRIPTION	Year 1		Year 2			Two Year Total
					Unit Price	Annual	Unit Price	Annual		
1 MAIN LIBRARY										
100 SOUTH ANDREWS AVENUE FORT LAUDERDALE, FL 33301				Basic Services						
		12	MTH	General Cleaning	\$ 47,670.17	\$ 572,042.04	\$ 49,152.56	\$ 589,830.72	\$ 1,161,872.76	
		12	MTH	Restroom Cleaning	\$ 3,575.26	\$ 42,903.12	\$ 3,686.44	\$ 44,237.28	\$ 87,140.40	
		12	MTH	Floor Care	\$ 7,150.53	\$ 85,806.36	\$ 7,372.88	\$ 88,474.56	\$ 174,280.92	
		12	MTH	Cleaning Supplies	\$ 1,839.88	\$ 22,078.56	\$ 1,895.08	\$ 22,740.96	\$ 44,819.52	
		12	MTH	Paper Products/Trash Bags	\$ 1,986.37	\$ 23,836.44	\$ 1,986.37	\$ 23,836.44	\$ 47,672.88	
				Additional Services						
		1	YR	Deep Cleaning	\$ 14,301.05	\$ 14,301.05	\$ 14,745.77	\$ 14,745.77	\$ 29,046.82	
		1	YR	Window Cleaning	\$ 13,955.00	\$ 13,955.00	\$ 13,955.00	\$ 13,955.00	\$ 27,910.00	
		195	HR	Porter Hours Per Month	\$ 18.93	\$ 44,296.20	\$ 19.50	\$ 45,630.00	\$ 89,926.20	
		9,833	SQF	Pressure Cleaning	\$ 0.07	\$ 688.28	\$ 0.07	\$ 688.28	\$ 1,376.55	
		23,838	SQF	Carpet Cleaning, Additional	\$ 0.12	\$ 2,860.37	\$ 0.12	\$ 2,860.37	\$ 5,720.74	
		47,673	SQF	Electrostatic Disinfection	\$ 0.10	\$ 4,767.28	\$ 0.10	\$ 4,767.28	\$ 9,534.56	
				Total		\$ 827,534.69		\$ 851,766.65	\$ 1,679,301.35	
				Total (1) - Summary, all facilities		\$ 827,534.69		\$ 851,766.65	\$ 1,679,301.35	
QTY	UOM	DESCRIPTION	Year 1		Year 2					
			Per Hour	Annual	Per Hour	Annual	2 years			
Additional Labor - Routine:										
50	HR	Project Supervisor	\$ 30.00	\$ 1,500.00	\$ 33.00	\$ 1,650.00	\$ 3,150.00			
50	HR	Site Supervisor	\$ 24.30	\$ 1,215.00	\$ 25.03	\$ 1,251.50	\$ 2,466.50			
50	HR	Full Time Service Crew Emp.	\$ 18.93	\$ 946.50	\$ 19.50	\$ 975.00	\$ 1,921.50			
50	HR	Part Time Service Crew Emp.	\$ 18.93	\$ 946.50	\$ 19.50	\$ 975.00	\$ 1,921.50			
Additional Labor - Emergency:										
50	HR	Project Supervisor	\$ 30.00	\$ 1,500.00	\$ 33.00	\$ 1,650.00	\$ 3,150.00			
50	HR	Site Supervisor	\$ 24.30	\$ 1,215.00	\$ 25.03	\$ 1,251.50	\$ 2,466.50			
50	HR	Full Time Service Crew Emp.	\$ 18.93	\$ 946.50	\$ 19.50	\$ 975.00	\$ 1,921.50			
50	HR	Part Time Service Crew Emp.	\$ 18.93	\$ 946.50	\$ 19.50	\$ 975.00	\$ 1,921.50			
Pass Thru:	1	EA	Materials/Supplies		\$ 1,000.00		\$ 1,000.00	\$ 1,000.00	\$ 2,000.00	
					Total (2)		\$ 10,216.00		\$ 10,703.00	\$ 20,919.00
					Grand Total - Whole Group (Total 1 + Total 2)		\$ 837,750.69		\$ 862,469.65	\$ 1,700,220.35
Provide the Percentage of Price Attributed to Labor Portion of Services: _____ 75%										
NAME OF COMPANY: Sunshine Cleaning Systems, LLC										
AUTHORIZED PERSON NAME: Thomas Melton										
AUTHORIZED PERSON TITLE: Executive Vice President										
DATE: Monday, November 14, 2022										

Janitorial Services - Price Sheets - Agreement 3									
ITEM NO.	FACILITY LOCATION	QTY	UOM	DESCRIPTION	Year 1		Year 2		Two Year Total
					Unit Price	Annual	Unit Price	Annual	
1 SOUTH REGIONAL COURTHOUSE									
	3550 HOLLYWOOD BOULEVARD HOLLYWOOD, FL 33021	12	MTH	General Cleaning	\$ 11,166.70	\$ 134,000.40	\$ 11,565.59	\$ 138,787.08	\$ 272,787.48
		12	MTH	Restroom Cleaning	\$ 837.50	\$ 10,050.00	\$ 867.42	\$ 10,409.04	\$ 20,459.04
		12	MTH	Floor Care	\$ 1,675.00	\$ 20,100.00	\$ 1,734.84	\$ 20,818.08	\$ 40,918.08
		12	MTH	Cleaning Supplies	\$ 504.97	\$ 6,059.64	\$ 520.12	\$ 6,241.44	\$ 12,301.08
		12	MTH	Paper Products/Trash Bags	\$ 847.50	\$ 7,770.00	\$ 647.50	\$ 7,770.00	\$ 15,540.00
Basic Services									
		1	YR	Deep Cleaning	\$ 3,350.01	\$ 3,350.01	\$ 3,469.68	\$ 3,469.68	\$ 6,819.69
		1	YR	Window Cleaning	\$ 3,975.00	\$ 3,975.00	\$ 3,975.00	\$ 3,975.00	\$ 7,950.00
		173	HR	Porter Hours Per Month	\$ 18.93	\$ 39,298.68	\$ 19.50	\$ 40,482.00	\$ 79,780.68
		8,547	SQF	Pressure Cleaning	\$ 0.07	\$ 598.29	\$ 0.07	\$ 598.29	\$ 1,196.58
		15,540	SQF	Carpet Cleaning, Additional	\$ 0.12	\$ 1,864.80	\$ 0.12	\$ 1,864.80	\$ 3,729.60
		10,360	SQF	Electrostatic Disinfection	\$ 0.10	\$ 1,036.00	\$ 0.10	\$ 1,036.00	\$ 2,072.00
				Total		\$ 228,102.82		\$ 235,451.41	\$ 463,554.23
Total (1) - Summary, all facilities									
Year 1									
					Per Hour	Annual	Per Hour	Annual	2 years
Additional Labor - Routine:									
		50	HR	Project Supervisor	\$ 30.00	\$ 1,500.00	\$ 33.00	\$ 1,650.00	\$ 3,150.00
		50	HR	Site Supervisor	\$ 24.30	\$ 1,215.00	\$ 25.03	\$ 1,251.50	\$ 2,466.50
		50	HR	Full Time Service Crew Emp.	\$ 18.93	\$ 946.50	\$ 19.50	\$ 975.00	\$ 1,921.50
		50	HR	Part Time Service Crew Emp.	\$ 18.93	\$ 946.50	\$ 19.50	\$ 975.00	\$ 1,921.50
Additional Labor - Emergency:									
		50	HR	Project Supervisor	\$ 30.00	\$ 1,500.00	\$ 33.00	\$ 1,650.00	\$ 3,150.00
		50	HR	Site Supervisor	\$ 24.30	\$ 1,215.00	\$ 25.03	\$ 1,251.50	\$ 2,466.50
		50	HR	Full Time Service Crew Emp.	\$ 18.93	\$ 946.50	\$ 19.50	\$ 975.00	\$ 1,921.50
		50	HR	Part Time Service Crew Emp.	\$ 18.93	\$ 946.50	\$ 19.50	\$ 975.00	\$ 1,921.50
	Pass Thru:	1	EA	Materials/Supplies		\$ 1,000.00		\$ 1,000.00	\$ 2,000.00
				Total (2)		\$ 10,216.00		\$ 10,703.00	\$ 20,919.00
Grand Total - Whole Group (Total 1 + Total 2)									
Percentage of Price Attributed to Labor Portion of Services <u>75%</u>									
NAME OF COMPANY:	Sunshine Cleaning Systems, LLC								
AUTHORIZED PERSON NAME:	Thomas Melton								
AUTHORIZED PERSON TITLE:	Executive Vice President								
	DATE: <u>Monday, November 14, 2022</u>								

Broward County Board of
County Commissioners
Page 2 of 2

BLD2124561P1

Janitorial Services - Price Sheets - Agreement 4						
QTY	UOM	DESCRIPTION	Year 1		Year 2	
			Per Hour	Annual	Per Hour	Annual
Additional Labor - Routine:						
50	HR	Project Supervisor	\$ 30.00	\$ 1,500.00	\$ 33.00	\$ 1,650.00
50	HR	Site Supervisor	\$ 24.30	\$ 1,215.00	\$ 25.03	\$ 1,251.50
50	HR	Full Time Service Crew Emp.	\$ 18.93	\$ 946.50	\$ 19.50	\$ 975.00
50	HR	Part Time Service Crew Emp.	\$ 18.93	\$ 946.50	\$ 19.50	\$ 975.00
Additional Labor - Emergency:						
50	HR	Project Supervisor	\$ 30.00	\$ 1,500.00	\$ 33.00	\$ 1,650.00
50	HR	Site Supervisor	\$ 24.30	\$ 1,215.00	\$ 25.03	\$ 1,251.50
50	HR	Full Time Service Crew Emp.	\$ 18.93	\$ 946.50	\$ 19.50	\$ 975.00
50	HR	Part Time Service Crew Emp.	\$ 18.93	\$ 946.50	\$ 19.50	\$ 975.00
Pass Thru:	1	EA Materials/Supplies		\$ 1,000.00		\$ 1,000.00
						\$ 2,000.00
Total (2)				\$ 10,216.00		\$ 10,703.00
						\$ 20,919.00
Grand Total - Whole Group (Total 1 + Total 2)				\$ 1,433,269.60		\$ 1,474,361.07
						\$ 2,907,630.67
Provide Percentage of Price Attributed to Labor Portion of Services			75%			
NAME OF COMPANY:	Sunshine Cleaning Systems,LLC					
AUTHORIZED PERSON NAME:	Thomas Melton					
AUTHORIZED PERSON TITLE:	Executive Vice President					
	DATE: Monday, November 14, 2022					