

# Evaluation Committee Report

## Morris School District School District Evaluation Committee Report for the Food Services RFP 2019-2020

### 1. List of Proposers:

- Whitsons
- Pomptonian
- Chartwells
- Aramark

### 2. List of Evaluation Committee Members:

- Anthony Lo Franco
- John Pallino
- Greg Sumski
- Marc Gold
- Maureen Walker

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

Morris Financial Comparison of FSMC's Proposals				
Name of FSMC	Whitsons	Pomptonian	Chartwells	Aramark
<b>REVENUE TOTAL</b>				
	\$1,781,605.89	\$1,688,329.81	\$1,764,236.81	\$1,605,025.33
<b>NET FOOD COST</b>				
	\$587,738.24	\$589,386.22	\$590,618.00	\$470,358.63
Percent of Revenue	33%	35%	33%	29%
<b>NET PAPER AND CLEANING COST</b>				
	\$40,600.08	\$43,896.58	\$59,682.00	\$41,799.48
Percent of Revenue	2%	3%	3%	3%
<b>NET OTHER COST</b>				
	\$64,833.32	\$55,202.01	\$80,899.00	\$86,192.00
Percent of Revenue	4%	3%	5%	5%
<b>LABOR</b>				
Total Hourly Payroll	\$432,512.22	\$441,064.27	\$454,715.74	\$523,132.47
Total Hourly Taxes & Benefits	\$143,961.45	\$135,627.22	\$153,335.31	\$113,860.72
Total Hourly Wages, Taxes & Benefits	\$576,473.67	\$576,691.49	\$608,051.05	\$636,993.19
Total Yearly Hourly Work Days	179	180	188	194
Total Daily Hourly Food Service Workers Hours	185.50	185.50	185.50	185.50
Total Hourly Positions	32	32	32	33
<b>MANAGEMENT &amp; CLERICAL</b>				
Food Service Director	\$96,069.00	\$57,200.00	\$75,000.00	\$86,307.69
Assistant Director	\$40,953.00	\$41,800.00		
Chef	\$40,953.00	-	\$55,000.00	Inc in hourly
Shared Operations Director	-	\$3,760.00		-
Total Management Taxes & Benefits	\$46,314.00	\$42,436.90	\$40,433.00	\$42,435.31
Total Management & Clerical	\$224,289.00	\$145,196.90	\$170,433.00	\$128,743.00
Total Hourly & Management Wages, Taxes & Benefits	\$800,762.67	\$721,888.39	\$778,484.05	\$765,736.19
Percent of Revenue	45%	43%	44%	48%

# Evaluation Committee Report

Morris Financial Comparison of FSMC's Proposals				
Name of FSMC	Whitsons	Pomptonian	Chartwells	Aramark
<b>FSMC Management Positions &amp; Count:</b>				
Food Service Director	1	1	1	1
Chef	1	-	1	1
Asst. Director	1	1		-
	-	-		-
Total Management Position Count	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>PROJECTED MEAL COUNTS and MANAGEMENT FEE EXPENSE</b>				
Projected Breakfast Meals	167860	118604	116802	122940
Projected Lunch Meals	357186	372308	325305	328940
Projected Meal Equivalent Meals	65628	52260	99425	70623
Projected TOTAL Management Fee Expense	<b>\$105,671.58</b>	<b>\$77,945.18</b>	<b>\$89,894.31</b>	<b>\$78,375.45</b>
TOTAL Operation Expenses	<b>\$1,599,605.89</b>	<b>\$1,488,318.38</b>	<b>\$1,599,577.36</b>	<b>\$1,442,461.75</b>
<b>MANAGEMENT FEE and SFA SURPLUS/DEFICIT (form 23, page 1)</b>				
Projected Bottom Line	\$182,000.00	\$200,211.39	\$164,659.52	\$162,565.00
Cents per Meal Management Rate	\$0.1789	\$0.1435	\$0.1660	\$0.1500
Order Lowest to Highest	<b>4</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>
Guarantee Return	<b>\$182,000.00</b>	<b>\$200,011.39</b>	<b>\$164,142.52</b>	<b>\$161,565.00</b>
Order Highest to Lowest	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>

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

<b>The Criteria Used In Evaluating Proposals</b> <i>The points awarded range from 1 to 5, with 5 being the highest score and 1 being the lowest</i>	<b>Weighting Factor</b>	<b>Points</b>
<b>1. Total Cost:</b> Total Cents per Meal Management Fee and FSMC Guarantee Return (if any). 1 to 5 points will be awarded to both a. and b.: a. The points awarded to the management fee will be based upon the lowest FSMC fee receiving the most points (5) with decreasing points for each FSMC's higher fee. b. The guaranteed return will be based upon the highest guaranteed return receiving the most points (5) with decreasing points for each FSMC's lower guarantee return. If no guarantee is offered then the points awarded will be zero.	26%	1 to 5 for a. and b.
<b>2. FSMCs capability, record of performance and financial condition:</b> 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.	12%	1 to 5
<b>3. Proposed onsite management:</b> 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 onsite manager.	22%	1 to 5
<b>4. The Food Service program proposed by the FSMC:</b> 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 an inviting and comfortable atmosphere? How will the FSMC operate the satellite program to the elementary school? Did the FSMC show how they used their creativity, skills, resources and staff to propose and provide a program that meets the District's stated goal? 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?	22%	1 to 5

# Evaluation Committee Report

<b>The Criteria Used In Evaluating Proposals</b> <i>The points awarded range from 1 to 5, with 5 being the highest score and 1 being the lowest</i>	<b>Weighting Factor</b>	<b>Points</b>
<b>5. FSMC's Start Up/Transition Plan:</b> Is the FSMC's start up plan customized to the start of this program? Is the plan a detailed plan from pre- planning (10 days prior to the start of the contract) through the start of the contract through the first two months to September 30, 2019? Did it detail the additional management/resources they will be providing 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:

<b>TOTALS</b>									
CRITERIA	Weight %	Points Awarded (1 to 5)				Weighted Points			
		Whitsons	Pomptonia	Chartwell	Aramark	Whitsons	Pomptonia	Chartwell	Aramark
Criteria 1-Total Meal Rate and FSMC Guarantee Return									
a. Management Fee	26%	17.50	25.00	20.00	22.50	10.400	13.000	10.400	10.400
b. Guaranteed Return		22.50	25.00	20.00	17.50				
Criteria 2-FSMCs Capability, Rec. of Performance and Financial	12%	20.50	21.50	14.00	17.50	2.460	2.580	1.680	2.100
Criteria 3-Proposed Onsite Management	22%	25.00	13.00	13.50	11.50	5.500	2.860	2.970	2.530
Criteria 4-Food Service Program Proposed by FSMC	22%	20.50	21.00	14.00	15.50	4.510	4.620	3.080	3.410
Criteria 5-FSMCs Startup/Transition Plan	10%	24.50	20.50	15.00	12.00	2.450	2.050	1.500	1.200
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>92%</b>	<b>130.50</b>	<b>126.00</b>	<b>96.50</b>	<b>96.50</b>	<b>25.320</b>	<b>25.110</b>	<b>19.630</b>	<b>19.640</b>

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

- A. **Whitson's 25.32 weighted points** – Whitson's scored the highest in two of the five evaluation categories. In terms of financial return, Guarantee Return and Management Fee, Whitson's finished second in Guaranteed Return and 4<sup>th</sup> in Management Fee. Whitson's, Capability/Record of Performance, were deemed to be second to only Pomptonian. In reviewing the resume of the company's' candidates and after candidate interviews, Whitson's proposed candidate received the highest ranking for On-Site Management. Their Proposed Program score was second as it met the stated objectives. Finally, their Startup Plan/Transition Plan ranked the highest.
- B. **Pomptonian 25.11 weighted points** - In terms of Financial return, Guarantee Return and Management Fee, Pomptonian scored the highest in both for the top score. In the category of FSMC capabilities, Pomptonian again had the highest score. In reviewing the resume of the company's' candidates and after candidate interviews, Pomptonian's proposed candidate received only the third highest ranking for On-Site Management. They finished with the highest score in the area of Food Service Program proposed and second to Whitson's in the area of FSMC Start Up/Transition Plan
- C. **Aramark 19.64 weighted points** – In terms of financial return, Guarantee Return and Management Fee, Aramark finished second in Management Fee and 4<sup>th</sup> in Guaranteed Return. Aramark finished 4<sup>th</sup> for Proposed On-Site Management. Aramark finished 3<sup>rd</sup> in categories two and four.
- D. **Chartwells 19.63 weighted points** – In terms of financial return, Guarantee Return and Management Fee, Chartwells finished third in Management Fee and third in Guaranteed Return. Chartwells finished third for Proposed On-Site Management. Chartwells finished fourth in categories two and four.

# Evaluation Committee Report

---

## **7. Recommendation of the Morris 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 Whitson proposal is the most advantageous for the Morris Board of Education.