

Exhibit “A”



February 14, 2024

Ms. Panayiota Reynolds, QPA
Township of West Orange
66 Main Street
West Orange, NJ 07052

**RE: Evaluation of 2024 Proposals for the Operation of the Township of West
Orange Recycling Center
Sent via Electronic Mail to
preynolds@westorange.org**

This Document Does Not Purport to Substitute for Legal Advice

Dear Ms. Reynolds,

I have reviewed the proposal submitted for the provision of the above referenced services and offer the following evaluation for your consideration.

This RFP included one significant change from the current contract in the scope of work. Specifically, respondents were asked to offer a revenue sharing percentage for gross sales at the facility in addition to any rent being paid to the Township.

The Township released an RFP for the above referenced services on January 19, 2024. An addendum was issued on January 25, 2024. Twelve companies either viewed the RFP or received the RFP. They included:

1. ADP Group, Inc.
2. Deltek, Inc.
3. Filco Carting
4. Grabowski Construction
5. Mazza Mulch, Inc.
6. Natures Choice NJ, LLC
7. Priority Group Services
8. RER Supply
9. Rich's Tree Service
10. RVH Mulch Supply
11. The Firewood Farm, Inc.
12. Yannuzzi Group, Inc.

A site walk through/pre-proposal meeting was held at the site on January 4, 2024. Six companies attended the meeting:

1. Grabowski Construction



2. Mazza Mulch
3. Natures Choice NJ, LLC
4. RER Supply
5. Rich's Tree Service
6. Yannuzzi Group, Inc.

Subsequent to this meeting, and in response to inquiries raised by potential respondents as well as the need to revise the award schedule, an Addendum was issued on January 25, 2024.

Responses were due at 3:30 P.M. on February 7, 2024. The RFP opening was held at the Township Council Chambers in West Orange, New Jersey.

Four proposals were received.

1. Mazza Mulch, Inc.
2. Natures Choice NJ, LLC
3. The Firewood Farm, Inc.
4. Yannuzzi Group, Inc.

Under the terms of a Request for Proposal (RFP), price is only one consideration in determining a contract award. In addition to price, the Township designed the RFP evaluation to include the following evaluation components:

Cost Criteria

- 1) Revenues to be received or cost to be paid.
 - (1) Does the Proposal offer the best financial benefit to the Township whether the Proposal is for a monthly fee to be paid to the Township, a Revenue Sharing Proposal or a combination of both.
 - (2) Is the Proposal adequately explained and consistent with the requirements set forth in this RFP?

Management Criteria

- 2) Experience of the Respondent.
 - (1) Does the Respondent provide sufficient documentation or evidence of experience performing similar work?
 - (2) Does the Respondent document a record of reliability, competent performance of work; and the skillset needed to perform the Contract.
- 3) Qualifications of staff to be assigned the work
 - (1) Has the Respondent provided the specific backgrounds and qualifications of the staff who will perform the work under the Contract?

- (2) Does the Respondent provide sufficient documentation that its staff has the requisite qualifications and experience to perform the work under the Contract.
- 4) Violations, Fines, Notices of Violations history from any governmental agency
 - (1) Does the Respondent have a history of violations, fines or other citations which evidence a pattern of the Respondent disregarding of the governing Federal and State statutes?
 - (2) Does the Respondent have a history of violations, fines or other citations which evidence a pattern of the Respondent disregarding of the governing regulations and local ordinances or law?

Technical Criteria

- 5) Equipment to be assigned to perform the work
 - (1) Does the Respondent document that it has the requisite equipment or resources to perform the work required under the Contract?
- 6) Detailed site improvement plan
 - (1) Does the Respondent's proposed site improvement plan offer the best use of the space for performance of the Contract?

For each respondent, the following evaluation is provided for the selection committee's use. Note that this evaluation does not include a review of the formal submission requirements. Submission requirements are being reviewed separately by the Purchasing Agent's Office.

Further, DeFeo Associates notes that with regard to Cost Criteria, the full five -year term has been utilized for the purpose of this evaluation. Although this is a three-year contract with two-one-year renewal options, New Jersey requires that the five - year term be utilized for purposes of any financial evaluation.

Mazza Mulch, Inc.

Cost Criteria:

Mazza Mulch, Inc. (Mazza) submitted an annual rent payment of \$162,000/year for the five - year contract term totaling \$810,000 in rent over five years.

No revenue sharing proposal was submitted. No specific revenue contribution for site improvements was offered.

The submission appears to meet the requirements outlined in the RFP with regard to form and information requested.



Management Criteria:

The company has significant experience with Class B wood operations at both their company owned site in Tinton Falls, and based on the submission, as a site contractor for multiple locations.

The company has listed one community for experience in Class C operations. DeFeo Associates contacted Holmdel Township and determined that Mazza provided leaf transfer services, but not leaf compost services to the that township.

The company did not list any additional facilities available for the receipt of material overflow within the proposal.

In addition, the company has significant experience marketing Class A recyclable materials such as those required from the Township convenience center.

The company does have a number of staff who are Certified Compost Facility Operators as required under the terms of the RFP, and New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection Regulations.

The company has listed a limited number of violations related to pile height, horizontal markers and record keeping. These violations appear to be minor in nature and are common at such facilities due to simple human error. In some cases, the violations are a judgement call on the part of the inspector. It does not appear that any of the violations listed posed a threat to the environment.

Technical Criteria:

The company has sufficient equipment to perform any of the functions required at the Recycling Center.

Natures Choice NJ, LLC

Cost Criteria:

Natures Choice NJ, LLC (Natures Choice) is the incumbent service provider. They submitted an annual rent payment of \$120,000/year for the first three – years of the contract term rising to \$129,227 in year four and \$142,642 in year five. The total rent proposed is \$631,869 over five years.

Natures Choice did not propose a percentage revenue sharing proposal on gross sales. Rather, the company submitted an annual payment of \$75,000 for each year totaling \$375,000 over five years.



Note that this is a deviation from the proposal requirements which requested a percentage of revenue sharing. While the Township specifically states that it can waive any irregularities in the RFP outline, this deviation will require a legal determination as to acceptance.

In addition to the above payments, the company is offering a contribution of 10,000 bags of mulch to the Township for each year of the contract. The projected value of this mulch is \$30,000/year. The Township can offer these bags to residents, schools, or for use in the Township.

Finally, the company is offering to contribute \$35,000 toward storm water permit and site testing over the life of the contract. The site does have certain storm water permit testing requirements as well as the need to obtain a storm water permit. The current status of the permit is not known.

The total value of the price submission is thus \$1,156,869 plus the permit contribution of \$35,000 or a grand total of \$1,191,869 over five years.

The company has offered to increase plantings, improve drainage and signage and upgrade the fire hydrant as a part of the site improvement proposal.

Except as noted above, the submission appears to meet the requirements outlined in the RFP with regard to form and information requested.

Management Criteria:

As the incumbent, the company has a significant level of experience in the operation of Class C, Class B wood and Convenience Center marketing. In addition, the company has several other locations in New Jersey to receive leaf and wood overflow. Finally, the company runs several other locations in the state.

The company does have sufficient staff who are Certified Compost Facility Operators as required under the terms of the RFP, and New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection Regulations.

The company has listed one recent violation related to horizontal markers. It does not appear that this violation posed any threat to the environment.

Technical Criteria:

The company has sufficient equipment to perform any of the functions required at the Recycling Center.



The Firewood Farm, Inc.

Cost Criteria:

The Firewood Farm, Inc, submitted an annual rent payment of \$60,000/year for the full five - year term of the contract. The total rent proposed is \$300,000 over five years.

In addition to the above payments, the company is offering a 2% gross revenue share for each of the five years.

To evaluate the financial value of the 2% revenue share, DeFeo Associates has used an average value for each of the major material streams at the facility. The breakdown is as follows:

Incoming Class C = 19,542 cubic yards @ \$12/cubic yard
Compost/Topsoil sales = 14,242 cubic yards at \$35/cubic yard
Incoming Class B = 48,632 cubic yards at \$26/cubic yard
Sales of Mulch = 14,306 cubic yards at \$25/cubic yard

NOTE: Values based on 2022 Natures Choice reports for incoming and outgoing materials. Values adjusted for “no” charge on West Orange materials, volume reductions for compost and an average price value based on Natures Choice retail price sheets for each category of material. All values are estimates based on available data. Actual values may be lower or higher in any given year.

Total value of Class C materials incoming = \$12/cubic yard x 19,542 yards = \$234,504/year x .02 = \$4,690/year

Total value of compost/topsoil sold = \$35/cubic yard x 14,242 cubic yards = \$498,470/year x .02 = \$9,969/year

Total value of Class B materials incoming = \$26/cubic yards x 48,632 cubic yards = \$1,264,432/year x .02 = \$25,289/year.

Total value of Class B materials sold (mulch) – 14,306 cubic yards x \$25/cubic yard = \$357,650/year x .02 = \$7153/year.

The total value of the price submission is thus \$536,505 over five years. This figure is dependent on total retail sales and may factor higher or lower in any given year.

The company has offered to increase berm sizes as its site improvement proposal.



The submission appears to meet the requirements outlined in the RFP with regard to form and information requested.

Management Criteria:

The company has experience processing Class B material however, it does not appear to have any experience operating a Class B facility similar to that in West Orange. Further, it has no listed experience operating a Class C facility of any kind nor does it list any experience operating and marketing Class A materials from a convenience center.

The company's staff that are listed are not properly certified to operate the West Orange Class C facility.

Technical Criteria:

The company appears to have sufficient equipment to perform any of the functions required at the Recycling Center.

Yannuzzi Group, Inc.

Cost Criteria:

The Yannuzzi Group, Inc, submitted an annual rent payment of \$62,400/year for the full five - year term of the contract. The total rent proposed is \$312,000 over five years.

In addition to the above payments, the company is offering a .75% gross revenue share for each of the five years.

To evaluate the financial value of the .75% revenue share, DeFeo Associates has used an average value for each of the major material streams at the facility. The breakdown is as follows:

Incoming Class C = 19,542 cubic yards @ \$12/cubic yard
Compost/Topsoil sales = 14,242 cubic yards at \$35/cubic yard
Incoming Class B = 48,632 cubic yards at \$26/cubic yard
Sales of Mulch = 14,306 cubic yards at \$25/cubic yard

NOTE: Values based on 2022 Natures Choice reports for incoming and outgoing materials. Values adjusted for no charge on West Orange materials, volume reductions for compost and an average price value based on Natures Choice retail price sheets for each category of material. All values are estimates based on available data. Actual values may be lower or higher in any given year.



Total value of Class C materials incoming = \$12/cubic yard x 19,542 yards = \$234,504/year x .0075 = \$1759/year

Total value of compost/topsoil sold = \$35/cubic yard x 14,242 cubic yards = \$498,470/year x .0075 = \$3739/year

Total value of Class B materials incoming = \$26/cubic yards x 48,632 cubic yards = \$1,264,432/year x .0075 = \$9,483/year.

Total value of Class B materials sold (mulch) – 14,306 cubic yards x \$25/cubic yard = \$357,650/year x .0075 = \$2682/year.

Finally, the company has offered to make (at its estimated value) \$120,000 in site improvements including providing a new trailer, water truck and sweeper, plantings and visual entrance improvements.

The total value of the price submission is thus \$520,315 over five years. This figure is dependent on total retail sales and may factor higher or lower in any given year.

The submission appears to meet the requirements outlined in the RFP with regard to form and information requested.

Management Criteria:

The company has experience processing Class B material however, it does not appear to have any experience operating a Class C facility similar to that in West Orange. Further, it has no listed experience operating a Class C facility of any kind nor does it list any experience operating and marketing Class A materials from a convenience center.

The company has multiple staff members who are certified and thus qualified to operate the Class C operation.

Technical Criteria:

The company appears to have sufficient equipment to perform any of the functions required at the Recycling Center.



The information provided within this report provides no specific rankings or recommendations. The ranking process will be determined by the Committee established by the Township.

DeFeo Associates reserves the right to modify the opinions expressed within this letter based on the acquisition of new information.

Please contact me at your convenience to discuss any element of this letter or its recommendations.

Very truly yours,

A handwritten signature in black ink, which appears to read "Wayne D. DeFeo". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Wayne D. DeFeo, LEED AP
Consulting Solid Waste/Recycling Coordinator
ECUA