

Evaluation Committee Report

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

1. List of Proposers:

- Chartwells
- Pomptonian
- SFE

2. List of Evaluation Committee Members:

- Louis Alfano
- Robert Bargna
- Larry Pinto
- Ciro Spinella

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

Cliffside Park Financial Comparison of FSMC's Proposals			
Name of FSMC	Chartwells	Pomptonian	SFE
REVENUE TOTAL			
Total Operational Revenue	\$1,939,461.48	\$1,641,919.20	\$1,853,567.90
NET FOOD COST			
Food Cost	\$740,117.23	\$721,891.59	\$646,864.51
Percent of Revenue	38%	44%	35%
Cents per Meal	\$1.50	\$1.62	\$1.32
NET SUPPLY COST			
Supply Cost (Paper and Cleaning)	\$69,001.00	\$43,003.81	\$84,846.65
Percent of Revenue	4%	3%	5%
Cents per Meal	\$0.14	\$0.10	\$0.17
NET OTHER COST			
Other Cost	\$26,302.00	\$31,903.11	\$59,496.30
Percent of Revenue	1%	2%	3%
Cents per Meal	\$0.05	\$0.07	\$0.12
LABOR			
Sub Total Hourly Payroll	\$461,878.25	\$430,444.12	\$447,887.27
Sub Total Hourly Taxes & Benefits	\$128,447.76	\$120,200.24	\$167,414.54
Total Hourly Wages, Taxes & Benefits	\$590,326.01	\$550,644.36	\$615,301.81
Total Yearly Hourly Work Days	190	177	181
Total Daily Hourly Food Service Workers Hours	98.00	92.00	98.25
Total Hourly Positions	18	17	18
Food Service Director Salary	\$72,500.00	\$69,056.00	\$83,830.98
Operations Manager (Shared)		\$13,086.70	
Chef Salary			
Administrative Assist.	-		-
Sub Total Management Taxes & Benefits	\$25,745.00	\$24,512.87	\$32,842.79
Total Management Salary, Taxes & Benefits	\$98,245.00	\$106,655.57	\$116,673.77
Total Hourly & Management Wages, Taxes & Benefits	\$688,571.01	\$657,299.93	\$731,975.58
Percent of Revenue	36%	40%	39%
Cents per Meal	\$1.40	\$1.47	\$1.50

Evaluation Committee Report

Cliffside Park Financial Comparison of FSMC's Proposals			
Name of FSMC	Chartwells	Pomptonian	SFE
FSMC Management Positions & Count:			
Food Service Director	1	1	1
Operations Manager(Shared)		0.1	
Asst. Director			
Administrative Assist.	1	-	-
Total Management and Admin. Position Count	2	1.1	1
PROJECTED MEAL COUNTS and MANAGEMENT FEE EXPENSE			
Projected Breakfast Meals	129,389	127,964	123,530
Projected Lunch Meals	248,875	248,847	243,494
Projected ASSP Meals	22,000	24,846	25,386
Projected Meal Equivalent Meals	92,937	45,086	96,820
Projected TOTAL Meals	493,201	446,743	489,230
Projected TOTAL Management Fee Expense	\$118,368.24	\$92,833.20	\$118,070.41
TOTAL Operation Expenses	\$1,642,359.48	\$1,546,931.64	\$1,641,253.45
Order Lowest to Highest	3	1	2
MANAGEMENT FEE and SFA SURPLUS/DEFICIT (form 23, page 1)			
Projected Bottom Line	\$297,102.00	\$94,987.57	\$212,314.45
Cents per Meal Management Rate	\$0.2400	\$0.2078	\$0.2413
Order Lowest to Highest	2	1	3
Guarantee Return	\$100,000.00	\$75,000.00	\$100,000.00
Order Highest to Lowest	1	3	1
PROPOSAL QUESTIONS			
Is the entire surplus guaranteed	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 with a 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

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
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	Pomptonian	SFE	Chartwells	Pomptonian	SFE
Criteria 1-Total Cost	22%	12.00	20.00	16.00	2.640	4.400	3.520
Criteria 2-Guaranteed Return	15%	20.00	12.00	20.00	3.000	1.800	3.000
Criteria 3-FSMCs Capability, Rec. of Performance and Financial Cond.	13%	13.00	19.00	15.00	1.690	2.470	1.950
Criteria 4-Proposed Onsite Management	21%	13.00	19.00	13.00	2.730	3.990	2.730
Criteria 5-Food Service Program Proposed by FSMC	19%	12.00	16.00	15.00	2.280	3.040	2.850
Criteria 6-FSMCs Startup/Transition Plan	10%	13.00	15.00	11.00	1.300	1.500	1.100
TOTALS	100%	83.00	101.00	90.00	13.640	17.200	15.150

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

- A. **Pomptonian 17.20 weighted points** – Pomptonian scored the highest in five of the six evaluation categories. In terms of Total Cost and Guaranteed Return, Pomptonian finished first in Total Cost and 3rd in Guaranteed Return. Pomptonian, 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 of the company's candidates and conducting interviews, Pomptonian proposed candidate 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. **SFE 15.15 weighted points** - In Criteria One, Total Cost, SFE scored the second highest. In terms of Guaranteed Return, SFE proposed the highest guarantee (tied with Chartwells) and was awarded the most points for criteria two. In the category of FSMC capabilities, SFE finished with the second highest score. In reviewing the resume and history of the company's candidate and after interviews, SFE proposed candidate finished tied with Chartwells and received the second highest ranking for On-Site Management. They finished with the second highest score in category five, Food Service Program proposed, and received the third highest score in category six.

Evaluation Committee Report

- C. **Chartwells 13.64 weighted points** – In terms of Total Cost, Chartwells proposed the Highest cost and therefore received the lowest score for the first scoring criteria. In Category Two, Guaranteed Return, Chartwells was tied with SFE for the highest guarantee and finished tied for first in criteria two. Chartwells finished third for Criteria Three. In reviewing the resume and history of the company's candidate and after interviews, Chartwells proposed candidate finished tied with SFE and received the second highest ranking for On-Site Management. Chartwells finished third in category five and second for the sixth criteria.

7. Recommendation of the Cliffside 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 Pomptonian proposal is the most advantageous for the Cliffside Park Board of Education.