



March 11, 2025

Ms. Charlotte Jensen
Senior Vice President, West Region
C&W Services, Inc.

Subject: Protest letter from C&W Services, Inc. dated March 3, 2025
Reference: Request for Proposals for Janitorial Services at Levi's Stadium (RFP Number FY 24-0062)

Dear Ms. Jensen,

The Santa Clara Stadium Authority received the subject letter from C&W Services, Inc. (C&W), dated March 3, 2025, regarding Request for Proposals (RFP) Number FY 24-0062 for Janitorial Services at Levi's Stadium. In the letter, C&W expresses concerns about an inconsistency in the Notice of Intended Award issued on February 24, 2025, as well as the potential for other errors and inconsistencies in the RFP process.

A. Background

On May 6, 2024, the Forty Niners Stadium Management Company LLC (Stadium Manager) issued an RFP to select a qualified firm for janitorial services at Levi's Stadium. The RFP was published on the Stadium Manager's eProcurement system, and closed on June 12, 2024.

An evaluation committee consisting of subject matter experts reviewed and scored the proposals in a two-step process as outlined in the RFP. Phase One evaluation is based on the criteria outlined in Table 1. Phase Two evaluation included interviews, presentations, and cost evaluations as outlined in Table 2.

Table 1

Evaluation Criteria - Phase One	Aramark	Pritchard	ABM	C&W
Proposal Responsiveness	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass
Corporate Strength, Experience. References, and Reputation of Proposer (30 points)	26.70	27.00	27.60	26.40
Qualifications, Management and Administrative Capabilities (40 points)	35.60	36.00	36.80	35.60
Methodology to Provide Required Services (30 points)	21.00	27.00	26.70	27.00
Total	83.30	90.00	91.10	89.00

Following interviews and presentations, Phase 2 scores were tabulated as shown in Table 2.

Table 2

Evaluation Criteria - Phase Two	Aramark	Pritchard	ABM	C&W
Interview and Presentations (40 points)	34.00	36.00	36.00	34.00
Cost (60 points)	51.00	43.20	49.80	39.00
Total	85.00	79.20	85.80	73.00

The Notice of Intended Award was published on February 24, 2025 recommending for award of contract to ABM Industry Groups, LLC based on the total combined scores from Phase One and Phase Two (Table 3):

Table 3

Total Combined Phase One and Phase Two Score	168.30	169.20	176.90	162.00
---	---------------	---------------	---------------	---------------

B. Discussion – Response to C&W’s Protest

Correction of Clerical Error in the Notice of Intended Award (NOIA)

On March 3, 2025, C&W submitted via email a bid protest letter raising concerns regarding inconsistencies in the RFP evaluation criteria and NOIA.

After review, I can confirm that the NOIA contained a clerical error in the description of one evaluation criteria. Specifically, the document incorrectly listed “Methodology to Provide Required Services (30 points)” instead of the correct criterion, “Cost (60 points).” However, this was a clerical error in the NOIA only and did not impact the actual scoring, evaluation, or award determination.

To further clarify, the actual scores assigned for this Cost criterion were: 51.00 (Aramark), 43.20 (Pritchard), 49.80 (ABM), and 39.00 (C&W). These scores align with a 60-point scale, not a 30-point scale. This confirms that the evaluation committee applied the correct weight during scoring, and that all tabulations, calculations, and final scores remain accurate and in accordance with the evaluation criteria published in the RFP. My review confirms that this clerical error did not impact the fairness, integrity, or outcome of the process.

Section 23.1.6 of the RFP states that the Stadium Manager reserves the right to remedy errors in the RFP process. Accordingly, a corrected Notice of Intended of Award was published on March 7, 2025 by Stadium Manager noting the clerical error, and we thank you for bringing it to our attention.

Charlotte Jensen, C&W Services, Inc.

Re: Protest letter from C&W Services, Inc. dated March 3, 2025 APPROVAL OF STADIUM
MANAGER'S REQUEST TO

March 11, 2025

Page 3 of 3

Regarding Delays and Communication

I acknowledge your concerns regarding communication throughout the RFP process. However, a review of the correspondence between C&W and Stadium Manager demonstrates that regular engagement occurred at key stages of the RFP. While I understand the desire for additional updates, it is important to note that the procurement timelines must balance transparency with the confidentiality required during the evaluation phase. The Stadium Manager remained engaged throughout the process and provided responses when feasible, ensuring that C&W received key information as the evaluation progressed.

C. Conclusion

Given that the clerical error in the NOIA was limited to wording and did not impact the actual evaluation or scoring, that the correct Cost criterion (60 points) was applied during the evaluation process, and that the final award recommendation remains based on accurate scoring, I am upholding the recommendation of award to ABM as stated in the NOIA. I find that all parties acted in good faith, that denial of the protest (and upholding the Notice of Intended Award) would not undermine the intent and purpose of the Stadium Authority's procurement policies, and that the clerical error that forms the basis for the protest did not prevent substantial compliance with the Stadium Authority's procurement policies.

In accordance with the procedures outlined under Santa Clara City Code Chapter 17.30.140 (Bid Contest Procedures), you have seven days after receipt of this letter to appeal this decision and request a hearing with the Stadium Authority Board.

We appreciate the time and effort C&W had invested in this RFP and value your interest and participation in this process.

Sincerely,



Jovan D. Grogan
Executive Director