

Evaluation Committee Report

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

1. List of Proposers:

- Maschio's
- Pomptonian
- Sodexo

2. List of Evaluation Committee Members:

- George Chidiac
- Lourdes LaGuardia
- Tammy Wagner
- Kristin Ducker
- Dawn Reo
- Stacey Hegedus

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

Stafford Financial Comparison of FSMC's Proposals				
Name of FSMC		Maschio	Pomptonian	Sodexo
REVENUE TOTAL				
Total Operational Revenue		\$786,494.06	\$708,754.18	\$764,433.53
NET FOOD COST				
Food Cost		\$290,688.21	\$222,115.79	\$245,340.99
Percent of Revenue		37%	31%	32%
Cents per Meal		\$1.37	\$1.16	\$1.20
NET PAPER AND CLEANING COST				
Paper and Cleaning Cost		\$27,527.29	\$14,409.55	\$25,291.00
Percent of Revenue		3%	2%	3%
Cents per Meal		\$0.13	\$0.08	\$0.12
NET OTHER COST				
Other Cost		\$20,386.52	\$22,413.68	\$41,026.30
Percent of Revenue		3%	3%	5%
Cents per Meal		\$0.10	\$0.12	\$0.20
LABOR				
Sub Total Hourly Payroll		\$236,091.00	\$256,830.86	\$260,258.93
Sub Total Hourly Taxes & Benefits		\$69,238.41	\$67,155.94	\$55,276.42
Total Hourly Wages, Taxes & Benefits		\$305,329.41	\$323,986.80	\$315,535.35
Total Yearly Hourly Work Days		2,754	2,848	2,960
Total Daily Hourly Food Service Workers Hours		77.00	83.50	84.26
Total Daily Hourly Food Service Workers Hours Required By RFP		94.00	94.00	94.00
Total Hourly Positions		15	16	16
Total Daily Hourly Positions Required By RFP		15.00	15.00	15.00

Evaluation Committee Report

Stafford Financial Comparison of FSMC's Proposals			
Name of FSMC	Maschio	Pomptonian	Sodexo
Food Service Director Salary	\$54,000.00	\$49,200.00	\$67,699.00
Operations Manager	-	\$4,415.65	
Chef Salary	-	-	-
Administrative Assist.	-	-	-
Sub Total Management Taxes & Benefits	\$21,836.58	\$19,165.13	\$22,369.00
Total Management Salary, Taxes & Benefits	\$75,836.58	\$72,780.78	\$90,068.00
Total Hourly & Management Wages, Taxes & Benefits	\$381,165.99	\$396,767.58	\$405,603.35
Percent of Revenue	48%	56%	53%
Cents per Meal	\$1.7948	\$2.0658	\$1.9802
FSMC Management Positions & Count:			
Food Service Director	1	1	1
Operations Manager	-	0.1	-
Asst. Director	-	-	-
Administrative Assist.	-	-	-
Total Management and Admin. Position Count	1	1.1	1
PROJECTED MEAL COUNTS and MANAGEMENT FEE EXPENSE			
Projected Breakfast Meals	59,274	53,596	54,850
Projected Lunch Meals	135,635	127,589	133,075
Catering	426	774	426
Projected Meal Equivalent Meals	17,043	10,110	16,474
Projected TOTAL Meals	212,378	192,069	204,825
Projected TOTAL Management Fee Expense	\$45,726.05	\$42,832.17	\$47,171.89
TOTAL Operation Expenses	\$765,494.06	\$698,538.77	\$764,433.53
Order Lowest to Highest	3	1	2
MANAGEMENT FEE and SFA SURPLUS/DEFICIT (form 23, page 1)			
Projected Bottom Line	\$21,000.00	\$10,215.41	-
Cents per Meal Management Rate	\$0.2150	\$0.2222	\$0.2300
Order Lowest to Highest	1	2	3
Guarantee Return	\$21,000.00	\$10,215.41	Breakeven
Order Highest to Lowest	1	2	3
PROPOSAL QUESTIONS			
Is the surplus/breakeven guaranteed	Yes	Yes	Yes
Meals prices increased?	Yes	Yes	Yes
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

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
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
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		
		Maschio's	Pomptonian	Sodexo	Maschio's	Pomptonian	Sodexo
Criteria 1-Total Cost	22%	18.00	30.00	24.00	3.96	6.60	5.28
Criteria 2-Guaranteed Return	15%	30.00	24.00	18.00	4.50	3.60	2.70
Criteria 3-FSMCs Capability, Rec. of Performance and Financial Cond.	13%	29.00	22.00	15.00	3.77	2.86	1.95
Criteria 4-Proposed Onsite Management	21%	29.00	21.00	14.00	6.09	4.41	2.94
Criteria 5-Food Service Program Proposed by FSMC	19%	30.00	19.00	12.00	5.70	3.61	2.28
Criteria 6-FSMCs Startup/Transition Plan	10%	30.00	21.00	15.00	3.00	2.10	1.50
TOTALS	100%	166.00	137.00	98.00	27.02	23.18	16.65

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

- A. **Maschio's 27.02 weighted points** – Maschio's scored the highest in five of the six evaluation categories. In terms of Total Cost, Maschio's finished third in category one. For criteria two, Guaranteed Return Maschio's had the highest guarantee so received the highest points for this category. Maschio's, 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

Evaluation Committee Report

candidate and after interviews, Maschio's 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. **Pomptonian 23.18 weighted points** - In Criteria One, Total Cost, Pomptonian scored the highest as they had the lowest proposed total cost. In terms of Guaranteed Return, Pomptonian proposed the second highest guarantee and was awarded the second most points for criteria two. In the category of FSMC capabilities, Pomptonian finished with the second highest score. In reviewing the resume, history and after interviewing the company's candidate, Pomptonian's 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 a second-place finish as well for criteria six.
- C. **Sodexo 16.65 weighted points** – In terms of Total Cost, Sodexo proposed the second lowest cost and therefore received the second highest score for the first scoring criteria. In Category Two, Guaranteed Return, Sodexo had the lowest score. Sodexo finished in third for criteria three, and finished with the lowest score for criteria four, five, and six.

7. Recommendation of the Stafford 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 Maschio's proposal is the most advantageous for the Stafford Township Board of Education.