

Evaluation Committee Report

Barneгат Township School District School District Evaluation Committee Report for the Food Services RFP 2024-2025

1. List of Proposers:

- Chartwells
- Nutri-serve
- Pomptonian

2. List of Evaluation Committee Members:

- Sandra Churney
- Doreen Continanza
- Dr. Brian Latwis
- Scott Sarno

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

Barneгат Financial Comparison of FSMC's Proposals			
Name of FSMC	Pomptonian	Chartwells	Nutri-Serv
REVENUE TOTAL			
Total Operational Revenue	\$1,514,121.54	\$1,644,290.11	\$1,701,338.87
NET FOOD COST			
Food Cost	\$528,453.47	\$518,309.05	\$584,881.98
Percent of Revenue	35%	32%	34%
Cents per Meal	\$1.28	\$1.17	\$1.28
NET PAPER AND CLEANING COST			
Paper and Cleaning Cost	\$45,423.65	\$62,972.39	\$74,562.00
Percent of Revenue	3%	4%	4%
Cents per Meal	\$0.11	\$0.14	\$0.16
NET OTHER COST			
Other Cost	\$21,341.13	\$32,489.00	\$51,844.00
Percent of Revenue	1%	2%	3%
Cents per Meal	\$0.05	\$0.07	\$0.11
LABOR			
Sub Total Hourly Payroll	\$484,127.96	\$469,308.57	\$495,854.00
Sub Total Hourly Taxes & Benefits	\$127,393.13	\$95,832.81	\$107,896.02
Total Hourly Wages, Taxes & Benefits	\$611,521.09	\$565,141.38	\$603,750.02
Total Yearly Hourly Workdays	6,408	6,408	6,916
Total Daily Hourly Food Service Workers Hours	166.50	166.50	172.75
Total Hourly Positions	36	36	38

Evaluation Committee Report

Food Service Director Salary	\$51,250.00	\$97,926.00	\$75,000.00
Assistant Food Service Director	\$38,000.00	\$40,127.00	\$49,000.00
Operations Manager (Part Time)	\$8,831.30	-	-
Administrative Assist.	-	-	-
Sub Total Management Taxes & Benefits	\$37,944.34	\$72,378.82	\$48,692.00
Total Management Salary, Taxes & Benefits	\$136,025.64	\$210,431.82	\$172,692.00
Total Hourly & Management Wages, Taxes & Benefits	\$747,546.73	\$775,573.20	\$776,442.02
Percent of Revenue	49%	47%	46%
Cents per Meal	\$1.81	\$1.75	\$1.69
FSMC Management Positions & Count:			
Food Service Director	1	1	1
Operations Manager	0.1	-	-
Asst. Director	1	1	1
Administrative Assist.	-	-	-
Total Management and Admin. Position Count	2.1	2	2
PROJECTED MEAL COUNTS and MANAGEMENT FEE EXPENSE			
Projected Breakfast Meals	123,283	131,848	122,844
Projected Lunch Meals	249,057	265,431	256,319
Projected Meal Equivalent Meals	40,424	44,646	79,149
Projected TOTAL Meals	412,764	441,925	458,312
Projected TOTAL Management Fee Expense	\$86,978.21	\$123,618.47	\$100,828.64
TOTAL Operation Expenses	\$1,429,743.19	\$1,512,962.11	\$1,588,558.64
Order Lowest to Highest	1	2	3
MANAGEMENT FEE and SFA SURPLUS/DEFICIT (form 23, page 1)			
Projected Bottom Line	\$84,378.34	\$131,328.00	\$112,780.24
Cents per Meal Management Rate	\$0.2081	\$0.2750	\$0.2200
Order Lowest to Highest	1	3	2
Guarantee Return	\$58,000.00	\$131,328.00	\$100,000.00
Order Highest to Lowest	3	1	2
PROPOSAL QUESTIONS			
Is the surplus guaranteed	Yes	Yes	Yes
Meals prices increased?	No	No	No
Minimum Staffing Requirements Met?	Yes	Yes	Yes
Any FSMC submitted exceptions to anything in this RFP?	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

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
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
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		
		Chartwells	Nutri-Serve	Pomptonian	Chartwells	Nutri-Serve	Pomptonian
Criteria 1-Total Cost	22%	16.00	12.00	20.00	3,520	2,640	4,400
Criteria 2-Guaranteed Return	15%	20.00	16.00	10.00	3,000	2,400	1,500
Criteria 3-FSMCs Capability, Rec. of Performance and Financial Cond.	13%	8.00	20.00	8.00	1,040	2,600	1,040
Criteria 4-Proposed Onsite Management	21%	12.00	20.00	4.00	2,520	4,200	0.840
Criteria 5-Food Service Program Proposed by FSMC	19%	10.00	16.00	6.00	1,900	3,040	1,140
Criteria 6-FSMCs Startup/Transition Plan	10%	20.00	20.00	4.00	2,000	2,000	0.400
TOTALS	100%	86.00	104.00	52.00	13,980	16,880	9,320

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

- A. Nutri-serve 16.88 weighted points – Nutri-Serve scored the highest in four of the six evaluation categories. In terms of Total Cost and Guaranteed Return, Nutri-Serve finished second in Guaranteed Return and 3rd in Total Cost. Nutri-Serve, Capability/Record of Performance, were deemed to be the best of the proposals with the committee rewarding them the highest points in criteria three. In reviewing the resume of the company's' candidates, Nutri-Serve proposed candidate received the

Evaluation Committee Report

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 13.98 weighted points** - In Criteria One, Total Cost, Chartwells scored the second 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 tied with Pomptonian for the second highest score. In reviewing the resume and history of the company's' candidates Chartwells' proposed candidate received the second highest ranking for On-Site Management. They finished with the second highest score in category five, Food Service Program proposed, and tied with Nutri-Serve in FSMC Start Up/Transition Plan, for the highest score for criteria six.
- C. **Pomptonian 9.32 weighted points** – In terms of Total Cost, Pomptonian proposed the lowest cost and therefore received the highest score for the first scoring criteria. In Category Two, Guaranteed Return, Pomptonian had the lowest score. Pomptonian finished tied for second for Criteria Three, and finished with the lowest score for Criteria four, five, and six.

7. Recommendation of the Barnegat Township 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 Nutri-serve proposal is the most advantageous for the Barnegat Township Board of Education.