

Evaluation Committee Report

Manville School District School District Evaluation Committee Report for the Food Services RFP 2022-2023

1. List of Proposers:

- Aramark
- Maschio's
- SFE

2. List of Evaluation Committee Members:

- Michael Magliacano
- Jamil Maroun
- Alicia Mathewson
- Aldo Russ
- Adam Wright

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

Financial Comparison of FSMC's Proposals			
Name of FSMC	ARAMARK	MASCHIO'S	SFE
REVENUE TOTAL			
Total Operational Revenue	\$846,822.09	\$790,452.45	\$761,745.74
NET FOOD COST			
	\$250,860.59	\$277,844.04	\$212,068.30
Percent of Revenue	30%	35%	28%
Cents per Meal	\$1.06	\$1.22	\$0.96
NET PAPER AND CLEANING COST			
	\$43,982.67	\$24,504.03	\$26,076.57
Percent of Revenue	5%	3%	3%
Cents per Meal	\$0.19	\$0.11	\$0.12
NET OTHER COST			
	\$39,433.00	\$23,384.48	\$26,035.61
Percent of Revenue	5%	3%	3%
Cents per Meal	\$0.17	\$0.10	\$0.12
LABOR			
Sub Total Hourly Payroll	\$262,949.80	\$236,916.00	\$239,880.00
Sub Total Hourly Taxes & Benefits	\$57,313.00	\$75,003.72	\$86,666.62
Total Hourly Wages, Taxes & Benefits	\$320,262.80	\$311,919.72	\$326,546.62
Total Yearly Hourly Work Days	184	180	195
Total Daily Hourly Food Service Workers Hours	92.00	85.00	85.00
Total Hourly Positions	13	12	12
Food Service Director Salary	\$81,000.00	\$46,512.00	\$81,800.00
Assistant Director Salary	-	-	-
Chef Salary	-	-	-
Sub Total Management Taxes & Benefits	\$18,095.00	\$11,780.09	\$28,670.01
Total Management Salary, Taxes & Benefits	\$99,095.00	\$58,292.09	\$110,470.01
Total Hourly & Management Wages, Taxes & Benefits	\$419,357.80	\$370,211.81	\$437,016.63
Percent of Revenue	50%	47%	57%
Cents per Meal	\$1.78	\$1.63	\$1.97
FSMC Management Positions & Count:			
Food Service Director	1	1	1
Chef	-	-	-
Asst. Director	-	-	-
Total Management Position Count	1	1	1

Evaluation Committee Report

Financial Comparison of FSMC's Proposals			
Name of FSMC	ARAMARK	MASCHIO'S	SFE
PROJECTED MEAL COUNTS and MANAGEMENT FEE EXPENSE			
Projected Breakfast Meals	43,200	41,630	47,156
Projected Lunch Meals	166,560	160,740	160,095
Projected Meal Equivalent Meals	26,167	24,615	14,781
Projected TOTAL Meals	235,927	226,985	222,032
Projected TOTAL Management Fee Expense	\$47,728.03	\$29,508.05	\$60,969.99
TOTAL Operation Expenses	\$801,362.09	\$725,452.41	\$762,167.10
MANAGEMENT FEE and SFA SURPLUS/DEFICIT (form 23, page 1)			
Projected Bottom Line	\$45,460.00	\$65,000.04	-\$421.36
Cents per Meal Management Rate	\$0.2023	\$0.1300	\$0.2746
Order Lowest to Highest	2	1	3
Guarantee Return	\$45,460.00	\$65,000.00	-\$421.24
Order Highest to Lowest	2	1	3
PROPOSAL QUESTIONS			
Is the surplus guaranteed?	Yes	Yes	Yes
Guarantee limited or unlimited?	Unlimited	Unlimited	Unlimited
Meals prices increased?	No	No	No
Total investment by FSMC	\$0	\$0	\$0
Is investment charged to program?	NA	NA	NA
Is investment included in guarantee?	NA	NA	NA
Did FSMC include minimum wage increase of \$14 per hour?(1/1/2023)	Yes	Yes	Yes
Has the fsmc submitted any exceptions to anything contained 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's 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.	10%	1 to 5
4. Proposed onsite 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 onsite 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 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	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
and less reliance on starches? How will the FSMC pricing strategy increase sales?		
6. FSMC's Start Up/Transition Plan: 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, 2022? 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?	13%	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	Maschio	SFE	Aramark	Maschio	SFE
Criteria 1-Total Cost	22%	15.00	25.00	20.00	3.300	5.500	4.400
Criteria 2-Guaranteed Return	15%	20.00	25.00	15.00	3.000	3.750	2.250
Criteria 3-FSMCs Capability, Rec. of Performance and Financial	10%	25.00	16.00	8.00	2.500	1.600	0.800
Criteria 4-Proposed Onsite Management	21%	25.00	16.00	9.00	5.250	3.360	1.890
Criteria 5-Food Service Program Proposed by FSMC	19%	25.00	17.00	7.00	4.750	3.230	1.330
Criteria 6-FSMCs Startup/Transition Plan	13%	25.00	17.00	8.00	3.250	2.210	1.040
TOTALS	100%	135.00	116.00	67.00	22.050	19.650	11.710

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

- A. **Aramark 22.050 weighted points** – Aramark scored the highest in four of the six evaluation categories. In terms of the Total Cost, their score was the lowest and in the Guaranteed Return criteria, Aramark scored in second place. In FSMC Capability/Record of Performance, Aramark scored first based upon their performance in the District and the district's they provide services to. In reviewing the resume of the company's candidate, Aramark's proposed candidate received the highest ranking for the Onsite Management. Their Proposed Program score was the highest. Finally, their Startup Plan/Transition Plan ranked the highest.
- B. **Maschio's 19.650 weighted points** – In terms of Total Cost and Guaranteed Return criteria, Maschio's scored the highest in both for the first-place score. In the category of FSMC Capability/Record of Performance, Maschio's scored in second place after reviewing their client base. They also scored in second place after reviewing the resume of the company's management candidate. They finished in second place in criteria five based upon the Food Service Program Proposed. Finally, they scored in second place for their Start Up/Transition Plan.
- C. **SFE 11.710 weighted points** – In terms of Total Cost SFE scored the second highest score. In terms of Guarantee Return criteria, SFE finished in third place. After review of the SFE proposal, they scored the third highest total in criteria three, four, five and six.

Evaluation Committee Report

7. Recommendation of the Manville 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 Aramark proposal is the most advantageous for the Manville Board of Education.