

Evaluation Committee Report

Elmwood Park School District School District Evaluation Committee Report for the Food Services RFP 2024-2025

1. List of Proposers:

- Aramark
- Chartwells
- Maschio's
- Pomptonian
- Whitsons

2. List of Evaluation Committee Members:

- Steven Bakreski
- Corinne DiMartino
- Mark Jacobus

3. Proposal Comparison Summary: The following is financial review of the FSMC's proposal:

Elmwood Park Financial Comparison of FSMC's Proposals					
Name of FSMC	Aramark	Chartwells	Maschio	Pomptonian	Whitson
REVENUE TOTAL					
Total Operational Revenue	\$1,188,420.25	\$1,365,170.16	\$1,314,648.25	\$1,296,838.32	\$1,269,616.00
NET FOOD COST					
Food Cost	\$317,061.98	\$515,090.88	\$497,331.43	\$500,052.82	\$397,153.94
Percent of Revenue	27%	38%	38%	39%	31%
Cents per Meal	\$1.11	\$1.58	\$1.60	\$1.63	\$1.30
NET SUPPLY COST					
Supply Cost (Paper and Cleaning)	\$19,464.07	\$54,318.27	\$59,135.42	\$33,229.94	\$46,600.00
Percent of Revenue	2%	4%	4%	3%	4%
Cents per Meal	\$0.07	\$0.17	\$0.19	\$0.11	\$0.15
NET OTHER COST					
Other Cost	\$60,122.48	\$27,670.18	\$32,139.56	\$31,147.91	\$41,990.41
Percent of Revenue	5%	2%	2%	2%	3%
Cents per Meal	\$0.21	\$0.08	\$0.10	\$0.10	\$0.14
LABOR					
Sub Total Hourly Payroll	\$414,389.28	\$313,731.43	\$293,447.88	\$327,866.88	\$290,631.25
Sub Total Hourly Taxes & Benefits	\$83,701.67	\$96,991.63	\$111,059.46	\$89,831.76	\$71,278.13
Total Hourly Wages, Taxes & Benefits	\$498,090.95	\$410,723.06	\$404,507.33	\$417,698.64	\$361,909.38
Total Yearly Hourly Work Days	177	175	175	175	175
Total Daily Hourly Food Service Workers Hours	110.50	104.50	110.00	110.00	110.00
RFP Minimum Staffing Hours	110.00	110.00	110.00	110.00	110.00
Total Hourly Positions	19	18	19	19	19
RFP Minimum Staffing Positions	19	19	19	19	19
Food Service Director Salary	\$96,756.00	\$86,120.00	\$65,800.00	\$58,600.00	\$88,920.00
Chef Salary			\$54,000.00		\$54,720.00
Shared Ops Director(Pomptonian); Shared RD (Whitson's)	-	-	-	\$9,496.34	\$24,320.00
Sub Total Management Taxes & Benefits	\$21,079.00	\$34,887.21	\$35,133.75	\$23,030.77	\$54,232.80
Total Management Salary, Taxes & Benefits	\$117,835.00	\$121,007.21	\$154,933.75	\$91,127.11	\$222,192.80
Total Hourly & Management Wages, Taxes & Benefits	\$615,925.95	\$531,730.27	\$559,441.08	\$508,825.75	\$584,102.18
Percent of Revenue	52%	39%	43%	39%	46%
Cents per Meal	\$2.16	\$1.63	\$1.80	\$1.65	\$1.92

Evaluation Committee Report

Elmwood Park Financial Comparison of FSMC's Proposals					
Name of FSMC	Aramark	Chartwells	Maschio	Pomptonian	Whitson
FSMC Management Positions & Count:					
Food Service Director	1	1	1	1	1
Chef	1	1	1	1	1
	-	-	-	-	-
Total Management and Admin. Position Count	2	2	2	2	2
PROJECTED MEAL COUNTS and MANAGEMENT FEE EXPENSE					
Projected Breakfast Meals	46,900	47,376	44,975	44,872	48,700
Projected Lunch Meals	215,075	220,130	209,825	208,497	225,000
Projected Meal Equivalent Meals	23,796	59,391	56,657	54,189	30,718
Projected TOTAL Meals	285,771	326,897	311,457	307,558	304,418
Projected TOTAL Management Fee Expense	\$71,442.78	\$86,627.55	\$100,600.76	\$73,198.76	\$85,237.06
TOTAL Operation Expenses	\$1,084,017.25	\$1,215,437.16	\$1,248,648.25	\$1,146,455.19	\$1,155,083.59
Order Lowest to Highest	1	4	5	2	3
MANAGEMENT FEE and SFA SURPLUS/DEFICIT (form 23, page 1)					
Projected Bottom Line	\$104,403.00	\$149,733.00	\$66,000.00	\$150,383.13	\$114,532.42
Cents per Meal Management Rate	\$0.2500	\$0.2650	\$0.3230	\$0.2380	\$0.2800
Order Lowest to Highest	2	3	5	1	4
Guarantee Return	\$104,403.00	\$149,733.00	\$66,000.00	\$140,000.00	\$93,713.00
Order Highest to Lowest	3	1	5	2	4
PROPOSAL QUESTIONS					
Is the entire surplus guaranteed?	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
Minimum Staffing Requirements Met?	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Any FSMC submitted exceptions to anything in this RFP?	No	No	No	No	No

4. **Evaluation Criteria** - The following was the criteria used by the committee in evaluating the proposals:

The Criteria Used In Evaluating Proposals <i>The points awarded range from 1 to 5, with 5 being the highest score and 1 being the lowest</i>	Weighting Factor	Points
1. Total Cost: points awarded to the cost of the contract (the amount indicated on page/tab 5 of Form 23CR, Total Program, Total Expenses) will be based on the lowest total cost receiving the most points with decreasing points for each FSMC's higher cost.	22%	1 to 5
2. The Guaranteed Return will be based upon the highest guaranteed return receiving the most points (5) with decreasing points for each FSMC lower guarantee return. If no guarantee is offered, then the points awarded will be zero.	15%	1 to 5
3. FSMCs capability, record of performance and financial condition: Corporate capability and experience will be measured by performance record, years in the industry, relevant experience, ability to successfully operate a non NSLP and a NSLP food service program, number of districts served, client retention, references, and the financial condition of the FSMC.	13%	1 to 5
4. Proposed on-site management: Considers the number of the management team proposed, references; proposal resumes, face to face interviews and any other method to discover the capabilities and skill level of the on-site manager.	21%	1 to 5
5. The Food Service program proposed by the FSMC: Considers how the FSMC will provide good variety, great taste, freshness, authenticity, healthy choices, ambiance, and excellent service that will be the norm, not the exception. Did the FSMC provide appropriate food concepts that will attract and retain the students in a comforting and comfortable atmosphere? How will the FSMC operate any satellite program? Did the FSMC show how they used their creativity, skills, resources, and staff to propose and provide a program that meets the district goals? Did and will the FSMC propose a program which increases the frequencies of vegetables and fruit and less reliance on starches? How will the FSMC pricing strategy increase sales?	19%	1 to 5

Evaluation Committee Report

The Criteria Used In Evaluating Proposals <i>The points awarded range from 1 to 5, with 5 being the highest score and 1 being the lowest</i>	Weighting Factor	Points
6. FSMC's Start Up/Transition Plan: Is the FSMC start up plan customized to the start of this program? Is the plan detailed plan from pre-planning (10 days prior to the start of the contract) through the start of the contract through the first three months to September 30, 2024? Did it detail the additional management/resources provided as well as the startup task any requirements for the district, implementation date, estimated completion date, and who is responsible (name and title)? Did the plan have enough different (not repetitive) tasks listed covering the startup activities in implementation, management, HR, food services and training? Was it submitted in Excel format or a Gantt chart?	10%	1 to 5

5. Scoring – The following is the scoring totals of the Evaluation Committee:

TOTALS											
CRITERIA	Weight %	Points Awarded (1 to 5)					Weighted Points				
		Aramark	Chartwells	Maschios	Pomptonian	Whitsons	Aramark	Chartwells	Maschios	Pomptonian	Whitsons
Criteria 1-Total Cost	22%	15.00	6.00	3.00	12.00	9.00	3.300	1.320	0.660	2.640	1.980
Criteria 2-Guaranteed Return	15%	9.00	15.00	3.00	12.00	6.00	1.350	2.250	0.450	1.800	0.900
Criteria 3-FSMCs Capability, Rec. of Performance and Financial Cond.	13%	4.00	7.00	15.00	3.00	3.00	0.520	0.910	1.950	0.390	0.390
Criteria 4-Proposed Onsite Management	21%	3.00	8.00	15.00	3.00	3.00	0.630	1.680	3.150	0.630	0.630
Criteria 5-Food Service Program Proposed by FSMC	19%	3.00	9.00	15.00	3.00	3.00	0.570	1.710	2.850	0.570	0.570
Criteria 6-FSMCs Startup/Transition Plan	10%	4.00	7.00	15.00	3.00	3.00	0.400	0.700	1.500	0.300	0.300
TOTALS	100%	38.00	52.00	66.00	36.00	27.00	6.770	8.570	10.560	6.330	4.770

6. Summary of Scoring: The following evaluation scores resulted after being scored by the evaluation committee:

- A. **Maschio's 10.56 weighted points** – Maschio's scored the highest in four of the six evaluation categories. In terms of Total Cost and Guaranteed Return, Maschio's finished fifth in Guaranteed Return and 5th in Total Cost. Maschio's, Capability/Record of Performance, were deemed to be the best of the proposals with the committee rewarding them with the highest points in criteria three. In reviewing the resume and conducting interviews of the company's candidates, Maschio's proposed candidates received the highest ranking for On-Site Management. Their Proposed Program score was first as it met the stated objectives. Finally, in category six, their Startup Plan/Transition Plan ranked the highest.
- B. **Chartwells 8.57 weighted points** – Chartwells scored the highest in one category and second highest in four categories. In Criteria One, Total Cost, Chartwells scored the fourth highest. In terms of Guaranteed Return, Chartwell proposed the highest guarantee and was awarded the most points for criteria two. In the category of FSMC capabilities, Chartwells finished with the second highest score. In reviewing the resume and conducting interviews of the company's candidates, Chartwells' proposed candidates received the second highest ranking for On-Site Management. They finished with the second highest score in category five, Food Service Program proposed, and the second highest score for criteria six.
- C. **Aramark 6.77 weighted points** – In terms of Total Cost, Aramark proposed the lowest cost and therefore received the highest score for the first scoring criteria. In Category Two, Guaranteed Return, Aramark received the third highest score. Aramark finished third for Criteria Three. In reviewing the resume and conducting interviews of the company's candidates, Aramark's proposed candidates received the third highest ranking, tied with Pomptonian and Whitson's for On-Site Management. They tied for 3rd in category five and finished third in category six.

Evaluation Committee Report

- D. **Pomptonian 6.33 weighted points** – In terms of Total Cost, Pomptonian proposed the second lowest cost and therefore received the 2nd place score for the first scoring criteria. In Category Two, Guaranteed Return, Pomptonian also finished in 2nd place. Pomptonian finished tied for fourth for Criteria three and finished tied for the lowest score for Criteria four, five, and six.
- E. **Whitsons 4.77 weighted points** – In terms of Total Cost, Whitsons proposed the third lowest cost and therefore received the third-place score for the first scoring criteria. In Category Two, Guaranteed Return, Whitson's finished in fourth place. Whitson's had the lowest score for Criteria three, four, five, and six.

7. Recommendation of the Elmwood Park School District Food Services RFP Evaluation Committee:

Upon review of the proposals submitted, and based upon the RFP evaluation criteria, the committee concludes that Maschio's proposal is the most advantageous for the Elmwood Park Board of Education.