

Evaluation Committee Report

Elmwood Park School District School District Evaluation Committee Report for the Food Services RFP 2023-2024

1. List of Proposers:

- Chartwells
- Pomptonian
- SFE
- Whitson's

2. List of Evaluation Committee Members:

- Mark Jacobus
- Anthony Iachetti
- Corine DiMartino
- Karen Fasouletos

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	Pomptonian	SFE	Whitson's	Chartwells
REVENUE TOTAL				
Total Operational Revenue	\$1,088,259.26	\$1,152,280.26	\$1,212,626.00	\$1,212,626.00
NET FOOD COST				
Food Cost	\$439,357.19	\$293,241.81	\$386,959.93	\$453,325.73
Percent of Revenue	40%	25%	32%	37%
Cents per Meal	\$1.62	\$1.02	\$1.28	\$1.50
NET PAPER AND CLEANING COST				
Paper and Cleaning Cost	\$27,206.48	\$46,876.38	\$42,821.00	\$37,602.71
Percent of Revenue	2%	4%	4%	3%
Cents per Meal	\$0.10	\$0.16	\$0.14	\$0.12
NET OTHER COST				
Other Cost	\$25,955.54	\$56,034.12	\$48,373.75	\$46,296.00
Percent of Revenue	2%	5%	4%	4%
Cents per Meal	\$0.10	\$0.19	\$0.16	\$0.15
LABOR				
Sub Total Hourly Payroll	\$209,067.10	\$253,830.00	\$299,792.50	\$257,235.87
Sub Total Hourly Taxes & Benefits	\$57,871.76	\$85,683.86	\$74,948.13	\$75,303.54
Total Hourly Wages, Taxes & Benefits	\$266,938.86	\$339,513.86	\$374,740.63	\$332,539.41
Total Yearly Hourly Work Days	155	168	185	177
Total Daily Hourly Food Service Workers Hours	82.28	93.50	93.50	93.50
Total Hourly Positions	17	17	17	17
Food Service Director Salary	\$56,748.05	\$63,288.00	\$68,000.00	\$78,000.00
Assistant Director Salary			-	
Chef Salary		-	\$40,000.00	-
Administrative Assist.	\$37,996.35		-	
Sub Total Management Taxes & Benefits	\$33,613.54	\$20,594.34	\$42,240.00	\$26,327.00
Total Management Salary, Taxes & Benefits	\$128,357.94	\$83,882.34	\$150,240.00	\$104,327.00
Total Hourly & Management Wages, Taxes & Benefits	\$395,296.80	\$423,396.20	\$524,980.63	\$436,866.41
Percent of Revenue	36%	37%	43%	36%
Cents per Meal	\$1.46	\$1.47	\$1.74	\$1.45

Evaluation Committee Report

Elmwood Park Financial Comparison of FSMC's Proposals				
Name of FSMC	Pomptonian	SFE	Whitson's	Chartwells
FSMC Management Positions & Count:				
Food Service Director	1	1	1	1
Chef	-	-	1	-
Asst. Director	-	-	-	-
Administrative Assist.	1	-	-	-
Total Management and Admin. Position Count	2	1	2	1
PROJECTED MEAL COUNTS and MANAGEMENT FEE EXPENSE				
Projected Breakfast Meals	34,038	38,052	36,650	36,650
Projected Lunch Meals	201,440	205,791	221,500	221,500
Projected Meal Equivalent Meals	36,178	43,817	43,379	43,379
Projected TOTAL Meals	271,656	287,660	301,529	301,529
Projected TOTAL Management Fee Expense	\$60,986.85	\$38,491.54	\$84,428.12	\$105,535.15
TOTAL Operation Expenses	\$948,802.86	\$858,040.05	\$1,087,563.43	\$1,079,626.00
Order Lowest to Highest	2	1	4	3
MANAGEMENT FEE and SFA SURPLUS/DEFICIT (form 23, page 1)				
Projected Bottom Line	\$139,456.40	\$294,240.21	\$125,062.57	\$133,000.01
Cents per Meal Management Rate	\$0.2245	\$0.1338	\$0.2800	\$0.3500
Order Lowest to Highest	2	1	3	4
Guarantee Return	\$60,000.00	\$200,000.00	\$125,000.00	\$133,000.00
Order Highest to Lowest	4	1	3	2
PROPOSAL QUESTIONS				
Is the surplus guaranteed?	No	No	Yes	Yes
Meals prices increased?	No	No	No	No
Total investment by FSMC	\$0	\$0	\$15,566	\$0
Is investment charged to program?	NA	NA	No	NA
Is investment included in guarantee?	NA	NA	No	NA
include min. wage increase of \$15 per hour?(1/1/2023)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Any FSMC submitted exceptions to anything in this RFP?	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

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
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
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, 2023? 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			
		Chartwells	Pomptonian	SFE	Whitsons	Chartwells	Pomptonian	SFE	Whitsons
Criteria 1-Total Cost	22%	16.00	18.00	20.00	14.00	3.520	3.960	4.400	3.080
Criteria 2-Guaranteed Return	15%	18.00	14.00	20.00	16.00	2.700	2.100	3.000	2.400
Criteria 3-FSMCs Capability, Rec. of Performance and Financial	13%	20.00	12.00	4.00	10.00	2.600	1.560	0.520	1.300
Criteria 4-Proposed Onsite Management	21%	20.00	12.00	4.00	11.00	4.200	2.520	0.840	2.310
Criteria 5-Food Service Program Proposed by FSMC	19%	20.00	13.00	4.00	14.00	3.800	2.470	0.760	2.660
Criteria 6-FSMCs Startup/Transition Plan	10%	20.00	14.00	4.00	13.00	2.000	1.400	0.400	1.300
TOTALS	100%	114.00	83.00	56.00	78.00	18.820	14.010	9.920	13.050

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

- A. **Chartwells 18.82 weighted points** – Chartwells scored the highest in four of the six evaluation categories. In the Total Cost category, Chartwells scored the 3rd most points. In terms of financial return, Guarantee Return, Chartwells finished 2nd to only SFE. Chartwells Capability/Record of Performance earned them the highest score in category 3. In reviewing the resume of the company's' candidates and after interviews, Chartwells proposed on-site management team received the highest ranking for criteria four. Their Proposed Program score was the highest as it exceeded the district objectives. Finally, their Startup Plan/Transition Plan ranked the highest.
- B. **Pomptonian 14.01 weighted points** – Pomptonian finished second in the Total Cost category. For the second criterion, Guaranteed Return, Pomptonian offered the lowest guarantee and therefore finished with the lowest score in this category. Pomptonian finished in second place for both category three and

Evaluation Committee Report

four. Their proposed food service program earned them the 3rd highest score in category five. Finally, for category number 6, they had the second-place score.

- C. **Whitson's 13.05 weighted points** – Whitson's proposal had the highest cost so therefore received the lowest score for criteria 1. Their proposed guarantee returned earned them third place in category two. Whitson's Capability/Record of Performance earned them the 3rd highest score in category 3. In reviewing the resume of the company's' candidates and after interviews, Whitson's proposed on-site management team also earned them third place in criteria four. Their proposed food service program was ranked only behind Chartwells for the second highest score. Whitson's finished in 3rd place for category six.
- D. **SFE 9.92 weighted points** – In terms of Total Cost and Guarantee Return, SFE scored the highest in both categories. In the remaining categories, SFE had the lowest score in all four.

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 the Chartwell proposal is the most advantageous for the Elmwood Park Board of Education.