

Exhibit “A”

TOWNSHIP OF WEST ORANGE

COMPETITIVE CONTRACT REPORT FOR THE PRIVATE COLLECTION OF MUNICIPAL COURT DEBT

Overview

On January 16, 2010, L. 2009, c. 233 was signed into law which authorized municipalities to enter into contracts with private collection agencies or firms for the collection of outstanding municipal court debt.

On March 31, 2011, the Honorable Glenn Grant, Director of the Administrative Office of the Courts (the "AOC") issued the Supreme Court Procedures Governing the Private Collection of Municipal Court Debt, outlining the requirements governing the procurement and the implementation of contracts under the new law.

On June 16, 2011, the Township submitted a request to the Division of Local Government Services to authorize the use of Competitive Contracting, pursuant to N.J.S.A. 40A:11-4.1(k), to evaluate and score proposals submitted by vendors using criteria including price and other factors. On June 27, 2011, the Division of Local Government Services authorized the Township to utilize Competitive Contracting for the evaluation and scoring of proposals.

On July 1, 2011, the Township also submitted a draft Request for Proposal ("RFP") to the AOC for approve to proceed with the procurement process. On October 4, 2011, the AOC approved the Township's RFP and authorized the Township to commence the procurement process.

On July 26, 2011 the Township Council adopted Resolution #188-11 authorizing the use of competitive contracting for the Private Collection of Municipal Court Debt.

On October 14, 2011, the Township advertised the RFP in the Star Ledger for a base term of two (2) years with an option to extend the contract for an additional year.

Following receipt of the proposals from five (5) vendors, the Township established a four (4) person evaluation committee (the "Evaluation Committee") to evaluate and score the proposals. The Evaluation Committee reviewed and scored the responsive proposals and issued a report recommending the award of a contract with TaxServ as the highest scored proposal.

The Township Council passed Resolution No. 289-11 authorizing the Township to enter into an Agreement with TaxServ for the Private Collection of Municipal Court Debt.

On February 25, 2014, the Township Council adopted Resolution No. 37-14 authoring a one-year extension of the Agreement with TaxServ for the Private Collection of Municipal Court Debt.

On March 20, 2015, the Township advertised a second RFP in the Star Ledger for a base term of three (3) years with an option to extend the contract for two (2) additional one year extensions.

On April 14, 2015, on response to the second RFP, the Township received three (3) proposals.

Pioneer
26 Edward Street

Arcade, NY 14009

MSB Government Services
8325 Tuscany Way
Austin, TX 78754

TaxServ Capital Services NJ, LLC
1313 Dolley Madison Blvd
Suite LL-130
McLean, VA 22101-3926

Pursuant to the Local Public Contracts Law and the New Jersey Administrative Code, the Township created an Evaluation Committee (the "Committee") to establish weighted criteria for the evaluation of proposals and evaluate and score the proposals. The Committee was composed of four members including:

- (1) Anne DeSantis, Purchasing Agent for the Township
- (2) John Gross, Chief Financial Officer for the Township
- (3) Edrie Daniels, Court Administrator for the West Orange Municipal Court and

Pursuant to N.J.A.C. 5:34-4.3(f) each member of the Committee executed a certification that they do not have a conflict of interest as to any of the vendors.

In addition, the Committee utilized an advisor to assist in evaluating the proposals: Mark Y. Moon, Esq. from the office of the Township Attorney, Richard D. Trenk, Esq.

The Process

Prior to the evaluation of the proposals, the Committee met and established weighted criteria for the evaluation of proposals as follows:

A. Technical Criteria –

	Weighting
Does the vendor utilize software that can accurately track the status of accounts?	7.5
Does the vendor utilize software which will provide the Township and its personnel with access to monitor the status of accounts to be collected by the vendor?	6
What is the level of security utilized by the vendor to insure that the information pertaining to the accounts are protected from unauthorized access?	7.5
Does the vendor's plan of implementation sufficiently meet the requirements set forth in this RFP?	5

Does the vendor's plan of implementation comply with all federal, state and local laws, rules, and ordinances?	10
Does the vendor provide the best and most effective manner in which to collect all outstanding fines and penalties owed to the Township?	4

B. Management Criteria –

	Weighting
Does the vendor's prior experience reflect the type of services required under this RFP?	15
Does the vendor employ personnel with the qualifications, experience and knowledge to effectively perform the services required under this RFP?	10
Do the vendor's references provide positive testimony regarding the vendor's abilities and qualifications? Do the vendor's references provide positive testimony regarding the success of the vendor in collecting outstanding debts and obligations?	10
Does the vendor have a history of violating federal law governing debt collection?	10
Does the vendor's plan of implementation comply with the Supreme Court's Procedures Governing the Private Collection of Municipal Court Debt?	5

C. Cost Criteria

	Weighting
Does the vendor's cost proposal comply with the requirements contained in the Supreme Court Procedures Governing the Private Collection of Municipal Court Debt?	5
Does the vendor's cost proposal provide the best economic advantage to the Township?	5
Will the vendor's cost proposal result in an excessive Administrative Fee which may affect the likelihood of collecting on the fines and penalties owed to the Township?	5

Evaluation

On April 22, 2015, the members of the Evaluation Committee met, decided on the weighting of the criteria and received a copy of the three (3) proposals from the three (3) vendors. Upon review of the proposals, no material defects were found to disqualify any of the vendors. Following the initial meeting, a scoring sheet reflecting the weighted scoring was circulated to each member of the Evaluation Committee.

Each member of the Committee separately evaluated and scored the three (3) proposals. Attached hereto as Exhibit "A" is a copy of the scoring sheets completed by the members of the Committee and a Cumulative Scoring Sheet totaling the scores.

By way of summary, the following sets forth the cumulative score for the three (3) remaining vendors:

<u>Vendor</u>	<u>Total Score</u>	<u>Total Weighted Score</u>
Pioneer	141	1,085
MSB Government Services	144	1,109
TaxServ Capital Services NJ, LLC	165	1,277.5

Members of the Committee provided comments regarding their individual review of the proposals. One member noted that TaxServ's history of violations was less extensive than the other vendors demonstrating a stronger compliance history. In addition, the lower percentage rate charged for collections compared to the other vendors could make collection efforts more effective. Another member noted that the record keeping software offered by TaxServ appeared more user friendly for the Township's personnel.

Conclusion/Recommendation

Based on the cumulative scoring from the Committee, the Committee unanimously recommends that the Contract for Private Collection of Municipal Court Debt be awarded to TaxServ Capital Services NJ, LLC.

Exhibit “A”

Completed by:
Edrie Daniels

Weighting *		7.5		6		7.5		5		10		4		15		10		10		10		5		5		5		100	
Notes Reference:		A		B		C		D		E		F		G		H		I		J		K		L		M			
		Technical												Management								Cost							
Selection Criteria:		Accurtely Tracks account Status		Access to monitor account status		Protected from unauthorized access		Sufficient implementation plan		Implementation complies with Legal requirements		Effective collection protocols		Other Criteria		Personnel qualifications , experience		Vendor References		History of legal compliance		Compliance Supreme Court Procedures		Cost		Excessive administrative fees		TOTAL	TOTAL WEIGHTED
Score Range		1 - 5		1 - 5		1 - 5		1 - 5		1 - 5		1 - 5		1 - 5		1 - 5		1 - 5		1 - 5		1 - 5		1 - 5		1 - 5		1 - 100	1 - 500
1	Pioneer	3	23	3	18	3	23	3	15	4	40	3	12	3	45	3	30	3	30	3	30	5	25	5	25	5	25	46	343
2	MSB Gov. Svc.	3	23	3	18	3	23	3	15	4	40	3	12	3	45	3	30	3	30	3	30	5	25	5	25	5	25	46	343
3	Tax Serv Cap.	5	38	4	24	4	30	4	20	5	50	4	16	4	60	5	50	4	40	4	40	5	25	5	25	5	25	58	446.5

- 1 - Poor or Unsatisfactory
- 2 - Weak / Below Average
- 3 - Average or Satisfactory
- 4 - Good / Above Average
- 5 - Excellent

Completed by:
John Gross

Weighting *		7.5		6		7.5		5		10		4		15		10		10		10		5		5		5		100		
Notes Reference:		A		B		C		D		E		F		G		H		I		J		K		L		M				
		Technical												Management								Cost								
Selection Criteria:		Accurtely Tracks account Status		Access to monitor account status		Protected from unauthorized access		Sufficient implementation plan		Implementation complies with Legal requirements		Effective collection protocols		Other Criteria		Personnel qualifications , experience		Vendor References		History of legal compliance		Compliance Supreme Court Procedures		Cost		Excessive administrative fees		TOTAL	TOTAL WEIGHTED	
Score Range		1 - 5		1 - 5		1 - 5		1 - 5		1 - 5		1 - 5		1 - 5		1 - 5		1 - 5		1 - 5		1 - 5		1 - 5		1 - 5		1 - 100	1 - 500	
1	Pioneer	4	30	4	24	4	30	4	20	4	40	4	16	4	60	4	40	4	40	4	40	4	4	20	1	5	4	20	49	389
2	MSB Gov. Svc.	4	30	4	24	4	30	4	20	4	40	4	16	4	60	4	40	4	40	4	40	4	4	20	1	5	4	20	49	389
3	Tax Serv Cap.	4	30	4	24	4	30	4	20	4	40	4	16	4	60	4	40	4	40	4	40	4	4	20	5	25	4	20	53	409

- 1 - Poor or Unsatisfactory
- 2 - Weak / Below Average
- 3 - Average or Satisfactory
- 4 - Good / Above Average
- 5 - Excellent

Completed by:

Weighting *		7.5		6		7.5		5		10		4		15		10		10		10		5		5		5		100	
Notes Reference:		A		B		C		D		E		F		G		H		I		J		K		L		M			
		Technical												Management								Cost							
Selection Criteria:		Accurtely Tracks account Status		Access to monitor account status		Protected from unauthorized access		Sufficient implementation plan		Implementation complies with Legal requirements		Effective collection protocols		Other Criteria		Personnel qualifications , experience		Vendor References		History of legal compliance		Compliance Supreme Court Procedures		Cost		Excessive administrative fees		TOTAL	TOTAL WEIGHTED
Score Range		1 - 5		1 - 5		1 - 5		1 - 5		1 - 5		1 - 5		1 - 5		1 - 5		1 - 5		1 - 5		1 - 5		1 - 5		1 - 5		1 - 100	1 - 500
1	Pioneer	4	30	3	18	4	30	4	20	5	50	3	12	3	45	3	30	3	30	3	30	5	25	3	15	3	15	46	353
2	MSB Gov. Svc.	4	30	3	18	4	30	4	20	5	50	4	16	3	45	4	40	4	40	3	30	5	25	3	15	3	15	49	377
3	Tax Serv Cap.	4	30	3	18	4	30	4	20	5	50	4	16	3	45	5	50	5	50	5	50	5	25	4	20	3	15	54	422

- 1 - Poor or Unsatisfactory
- 2 - Weak / Below Average
- 3 - Average or Satisfactory
- 4 - Good / Above Average
- 5 - Excellent