

Evaluation Committee Report

East Brunswick School District School District Evaluation Committee Report for the Food Services RFP 2023-2024

1. List of Proposers:

- Aramark
- Southwest
- Whitsons

2. List of Evaluation Committee Members:

- Joseph Crotchfelt
- Lori Tagerty
- Cathy Rowe-McKenzie

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

| East Brunswick Financial Comparison of FSMC's Proposals | | | |
|---|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Name of FSMC | Aramark | Southwest | Whitsons |
| REVENUE TOTAL | | | |
| Total Operational Revenue | \$3,749,390.03 | \$3,453,962.09 | \$3,480,809.30 |
| NET FOOD COST | | | |
| Food Cost | \$1,123,525.21 | \$1,187,910.43 | \$1,098,027.03 |
| Percent of Revenue | 30% | 34% | 32% |
| Cents per Meal | \$1.16 | \$1.34 | \$1.22 |
| NET PAPER AND CLEANING COST | | | |
| Paper and Cleaning Cost | \$144,990.26 | \$169,155.32 | \$107,418.00 |
| Percent of Revenue | 4% | 5% | 3% |
| Cents per Meal | \$0.15 | \$0.19 | \$0.12 |
| NET OTHER COST | | | |
| Other Cost | \$72,116.00 | \$104,315.66 | \$77,971.00 |
| Percent of Revenue | 2% | 3% | 2% |
| Cents per Meal | \$0.07 | \$0.12 | \$0.09 |
| LABOR | | | |
| District Hourly Payroll | \$1,158,750.74 | \$1,158,750.74 | \$1,158,720.74 |
| District Hourly Taxes & Benefits | Included | Included | Included |
| FSMC Hourly Payroll (Driver) | \$25,907.49 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 |
| FSMC Hourly Taxes & Benefits | \$4,982.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 |
| Total Hourly Wages, Taxes & Benefits | \$1,189,640.23 | \$1,158,750.74 | \$1,158,720.74 |
| Total Yearly Hourly Work Days | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Daily Hourly Food Service Workers Hours | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Total Hourly Positions | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Food Service Director Salary | \$90,691.00 | \$84,240.00 | \$102,960.00 |
| Assistant Director Salary | \$64,777.00 | \$0.00 | \$88,920.00 |
| Chef Salary | \$85,201.00 | \$0.00 | \$64,800.00 |
| Administrative Assist. | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | |
| Sub Total Management Taxes & Benefits | \$55,110.00 | \$27,298.96 | \$76,603.20 |
| Total Management Salary, Taxes & Benefits | \$295,779.00 | \$111,538.96 | \$333,283.20 |

Evaluation Committee Report

| East Brunswick Financial Comparison of FSMC's Proposals | | | |
|---|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Name of FSMC | Aramark | Southwest | Whitsons |
| Total Hourly & Management Wages, Taxes & Benefits | \$1,485,419.23 | \$1,270,289.70 | \$1,492,033.94 |
| Percent of Revenue | 40% | 37% | 43% |
| Cents per Meal | \$1.54 | \$1.43 | \$1.66 |
| FSMC Management Positions & Count: | | | |
| Food Service Director | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Chef | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Asst. Director | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Administrative Assist. | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Driver | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Management and Admin. Position Count | 4 | 1 | 3 |
| PROJECTED MEAL COUNTS and MANAGEMENT FEE EXPENSE | | | |
| Projected Breakfast Meals | 61,190 | 84,270 | 58,465 |
| Projected Lunch Meals | 723,000 | 655,729 | 690,000 |
| Projected Meal Equivalent Meals | 182,648 | 148,402 | 148,402 |
| Snacks | 500 | 500 | 500 |
| Projected TOTAL Meals | 967,338 | 888,901 | 897,367 |
| Projected TOTAL Management Fee Expense | \$184,430.99 | \$86,091.98 | \$153,260.77 |
| TOTAL Operation Expenses | \$3,010,481.77 | \$2,817,763.09 | \$2,928,710.74 |
| MANAGEMENT FEE and SFA SURPLUS/DEFICIT (form 23, page 1) | | | |
| Projected Bottom Line | \$738,908.26 | \$636,199.00 | \$552,098.56 |
| Cents per Meal Management Rate | \$0.1900 | \$0.0969 | \$0.1700 |
| Guarantee Return | \$725,000.00 | \$625,000.00 | \$552,098.86 |

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 |
| 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 | 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 |
|--|-------------------------|---------------|
| 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? | | |
| 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 | Weighting Percentage | Points Awarded (1 to 5) | | | Weighted Points | | |
| | | Aramark | Southwest | Whitsons | Aramark | Southwest | Whitsons |
| Criteria 1-Total Cost | 22% | 12.00 | 9.00 | 15.00 | 2.640 | 1.980 | 3.300 |
| Criteria 2-Guaranteed Return | 15% | 15.00 | 12.00 | 9.00 | 2.250 | 1.800 | 1.350 |
| Criteria 3-FSMCs Capability, Rec. of Performance and Financial Condition | 13% | 15.00 | 11.00 | 14.00 | 1.950 | 1.430 | 1.820 |
| Criteria 4-Proposed Onsite Management | 21% | 15.00 | 5.00 | 10.50 | 3.150 | 1.050 | 2.205 |
| Criteria 5-Food Service Program Proposed by FSMC | 19% | 12.00 | 9.50 | 12.50 | 2.280 | 1.805 | 2.375 |
| Criteria 6-FSMCs Startup/Transition Plan | 10% | 12.50 | 10.50 | 12.50 | 1.250 | 1.050 | 1.250 |
| TOTALS | 100% | 81.50 | 57.00 | 73.50 | 13.520 | 9.115 | 12.300 |

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

- A. **Aramark 13.52 weighted points** – Aramark’s scored the highest in five of the six evaluation categories. Regarding, Total Cost they came in second place. In terms of Guaranteed Return, FSMCs Capability, Record of Performance and Financial Condition, Proposed Onsite Management and Food Service Program Proposed by FSMC, Aramark came in first place. Finally, their Startup Plan/Transition Plan tied with Whitson’s for first place.
- B. **Whitson’s 12.30 weighted points** - In terms Total Cost Whitson’s came in in first place. Regarding Guaranteed Return Whitson’s scored the lowest. In FSMCs Capability, Record of Performance and Financial Condition, Proposed On-Site Management and Food Service Program Proposed by FSMC, Whitson’s scored in second place. They tied Aramark for first place, in the criteria for FSMCs Start Up/Transition Plan.
- C. **Southwest 9.115 weighted points** – In Total Cost Southwest scored last as the other FSMC’s met the requirement of having the minimum number of management positions required by the RFP, Southwest did not. They only provided one salaried manager. In Guaranteed Return and Start Up Plan they scored

Evaluation Committee Report

in second place. Regarding In FSMCs Capability, Record of Performance, Proposed On-Site Management and Food Service Program Proposed by FSMC Southwest finished in third place.

7. Recommendation of the East Brunswick 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 East Brunswick Board of Education.