

Evaluation Committee Report

Keansburg School District Evaluation Committee Report for the Food Service RFP 2026-2027

1. List of Proposers:

- Aramark
- Chartwells
- Maschio's
- Nutri-Serve
- Ordo
- Pomptonian
- SFE
- Whitsons

2. List of Evaluation Committee Members:

- Sean Brophy
- Lindsey Case
- Anne Hazeldine
- Michael Sette

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

Keansburg Financial Comparison of FSMC's Proposals								
Name of FSMC	Aramark	Chartwells	Maschio's	Nutri-Serve	Ordo	Pomptonian	SFE	Whitsons
REVENUE TOTAL								
Total Operational Revenue	\$1,292,844.53	\$1,286,008.30	\$1,148,838.00	\$1,305,230.00	\$1,406,530.00	\$1,062,783.95	\$1,287,705.08	\$1,185,110.00
NET FOOD COST								
Food Cost	\$426,622.38	\$477,335.02	\$383,005.20	\$445,450.65	\$613,939.49	\$339,453.19	\$415,748.92	\$355,714.97
Percent of Revenue	33%	37%	33%	34%	44%	32%	32%	30%
Cents per Meal	\$1.32	\$1.49	\$1.35	\$1.37	\$1.70	\$1.11	\$1.15	\$1.17
NET SUPPLY COST								
Supply Cost (Paper and Cleaning)	\$21,612.25	\$36,206.27	\$46,300.00	\$57,950.00	\$39,000.00	\$23,912.64	\$116,187.48	\$32,772.00
Percent of Revenue	2%	3%	4%	4%	3%	2%	9%	3%
Cents per Meal	\$0.07	\$0.11	\$0.16	\$0.18	\$0.11	\$0.08	\$0.32	\$0.11
NET OTHER COST								
Other Cost	\$36,239.50	\$26,817.22	\$27,250.00	\$28,595.00	\$32,200.00	\$18,236.06	\$57,620.71	\$37,617.00
Percent of Revenue	3%	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	4%	3%
Cents per Meal	\$0.11	\$0.08	\$0.10	\$0.09	\$0.09	\$0.06	\$0.16	\$0.12
LABOR								
Sub Total Hourly Payroll	\$354,747.80	\$370,514.37	\$350,806.16	\$342,751.50	\$357,159.60	\$350,806.16	\$321,052.00	\$341,944.56
Sub Total Hourly Taxes & Benefits	\$95,672.60	\$101,564.46	\$89,451.60	\$87,039.00	\$55,566.60	\$88,596.11	\$88,993.86	\$54,974.62
Total Hourly Wages, Taxes & Benefits	\$450,420.40	\$472,078.84	\$440,257.76	\$429,790.50	\$412,726.20	\$439,402.27	\$410,045.86	\$396,919.18
Total Yearly Hourly Work Days	180	188	178	180	180	178	184	178
Total Daily Hourly Food Service Workers Hours	110	110	110	110	118	110	98.5	111
RFP Minimum Staffing Hours	110	110	110	110	110	110	110	110
Total Hourly Positions	19	19	19	19	21	19	18	19
RFP Minimum Staffing Positions	19	19	19	19	19	19	19	19
Food Service Director Salary	\$100,000.00	\$67,000.00	\$70,000.00	\$60,000.00	\$58,968.00	\$54,000.00	\$82,500.00	\$58,000.00
Assistant Director Salary	-	-	-	-	-	\$6,086.50	-	-
Chef Salary	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Administrative Assist.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sub Total Management Taxes & Benefits	\$46,168.00	\$20,272.63	\$17,850.00	\$23,238.00	\$10,793.20	\$24,848.32	\$16,432.41	\$12,000.00
Total Management Salary, Taxes & Benefits	\$146,168.00	\$87,272.63	\$87,850.00	\$83,238.00	\$69,761.20	\$84,934.82	\$98,932.41	\$70,000.00
Total Hourly & Management Wages, Taxes & Benefits	\$596,588.40	\$559,351.46	\$528,107.76	\$513,028.50	\$482,487.40	\$524,337.09	\$508,978.27	\$466,919.18
Percent of Revenue	46%	43%	46%	39%	34%	49%	40%	39%
Cents per Meal	\$1.85	\$1.75	\$1.86	\$1.58	\$1.34	\$1.71	\$1.41	\$1.54

Evaluation Committee Report

Keansburg Financial Comparison of FSMC's Proposals								
Name of FSMC	Aramark	Chartwells	Maschio's	Nutri-Serve	Ordo	Pomptonian	SFE	Whitsons
FSMC Management Positions & Count:								
Food Service Director	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Chef	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asst. Director	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Administrative Assist.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total Management and Admin. Position Count	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
PROJECTED MEAL COUNTS and MANAGEMENT FEE EXPENSE								
Projected Breakfast Meals	93,272	89,344	77,600	89,500	129,500	85,688	98,032	84,800
Projected Lunch Meals	204,700	205,021	182,900	205,000	205,000	193,095	235,155	194,060
Projected ASSP Meals	16,120	16,000	15,000	16,000	16,000	18,512	18,969	14,900
Projected Meal Equivalent Meals	9,218	9,872	8,885	13,820	9,872	8,771	9,986	9,872
Projected TOTAL Meals	323,310	320,237	284,385	324,320	360,372	306,066	362,142	303,632
Projected TOTAL Management Fee Expense	\$88,200.00	\$77,662.32	\$56,175.04	\$68,074.84	\$234,927.93	\$65,352.66	\$50,663.49	\$67,938.38
TOTAL Operation Expenses	\$1,169,262.53	\$1,177,372.30	\$1,040,838.00	\$1,113,098.99	\$1,402,554.82	\$971,291.64	\$1,149,198.87	\$960,961.53
Order Lowest to Highest	6	7	3	4	8	2	5	1
MANAGEMENT FEE and SFA SURPLUS/DEFICIT (form 23, page 1)								
Projected Bottom Line	\$123,582.00	\$108,636.00	\$108,000.00	\$192,131.01	\$3,975.18	\$91,492.31	\$138,506.21	\$224,148.47
Cents per Meal Management Rate	\$0.2700	\$0.2400	\$0.1950	\$0.2099	Flat Fee	\$0.2106	\$0.1390	\$0.2200
Order Lowest to Highest	7	6	2	3	8	4	1	5
Guarantee Return	\$123,582.00	\$108,636.00	\$108,000.00	\$192,131.01	None	\$50,000.00	\$138,280.21	\$191,000.00
Order Highest to Lowest	4	5	6	1	8	7	3	2
PROPOSAL QUESTIONS								
Is the entire surplus guaranteed?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	No
Minimum Staffing Requirements Met?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes

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.	21%	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.	18%	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.	15%	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 site manager.	20%	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

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
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, 2026? 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?	7%	1 to 5

5. Scoring: The following are the scoring totals of the Evaluation Committee:

TOTALS																	
CRITERIA	Weight %	Points Awarded (1 to 5)								Weighted Points							
		Aramark	Chartwells	Maschio's	Nutri-Serve	Ordo	Pomptonian	SFE	Whitsons	Aramark	Chartwells	Maschio's	Nutri-Serve	Ordo	Pomptonian	SFE	Whitsons
Criteria 1-Total Cost	21%	10.00	8.00	16.00	14.00	4.00	18.00	12.00	20.00	2.100	1.680	3.360	2.940	0.840	3.780	2.520	4.200
Criteria 2-Guaranteed Return	18%	14.00	12.00	10.00	20.00	4.00	8.00	16.00	18.00	2.520	2.160	1.800	3.600	0.720	1.440	2.880	3.240
Criteria 3-FSMCs Capability, Rec. of Performance and Financial Cond.	15%	14.00	12.00	20.00	13.50	4.00	15.00	13.50	10.50	2.100	1.800	3.000	2.025	0.600	2.250	2.025	1.575
Criteria 4-Proposed Onsite Management	20%	13.00	12.00	19.00	18.50	14.50	8.00	8.00	13.00	2.600	2.400	3.800	3.700	2.900	1.600	1.600	2.600
Criteria 5-Food Service Program Proposed by FSMC	19%	12.50	12.50	18.00	9.50	5.00	10.00	12.00	16.00	2.375	2.375	3.420	1.805	0.950	1.900	2.280	3.040
Criteria 6-FSMCs Startup/Transition Plan	7%	8.00	12.00	19.50	14.00	4.00	11.00	9.00	15.50	0.560	0.840	1.365	0.980	0.280	0.770	0.630	1.085
TOTALS	100%	71.50	68.50	102.50	89.50	35.50	70.00	70.50	93.00	12.26	11.26	16.75	15.05	6.29	11.74	11.94	15.74

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

- A. **Maschio’s 16.75 weighted points** – Maschio’s scored the highest in four of the six evaluation criteria. For criteria one, Maschio’s finished third and finished in sixth for criteria two. For criteria three, four, five and six, Maschio’s had the highest score.
- B. **Whitsons 15.74 weighted points** - In criteria one, Whitsons had the highest score. For criteria two, Whitsons had the second highest score. Whitsons finished seventh in criteria three and tied for fourth in criteria four. For criteria five and six, Whitsons had the second highest score.
- C. **Nutri-Serve 15.05 weighted points** – For criteria one, Nutri-Serve finished fourth and had the highest score for criteria two. In criteria three, Nutri-Serve tied for fourth and had the second highest score for criteria four. Nutri-Serve finished seventh in criteria five and had the third highest score in criteria six.
- D. **Aramark 12.26 weighted points** – Aramark finished sixth in criteria one. In criteria two, Aramark finished fourth and finished third in criteria three. For criteria four, Aramark tied for fourth and tied for third in criteria five. Aramark finished seventh for criteria six.
- E. **SFE 11.94 weighted points** – SFE finished fifth in criteria one. In criteria two, SFE had the third highest score. For criteria three, SFE tied for fourth and tied for seventh in criteria four. SFE finished fifth in criteria five and finished sixth in criteria six.
- F. **Pomptonian 11.74 weighted points** – Pomptonian had the second highest score in criteria one. In criteria two, Pomptonian finished seventh and finished second in criteria three. Pomptonian

Evaluation Committee Report

tied for seventh in criteria four and finished sixth in criteria five. In criteria six, Pomptonian finished fifth.

G. **Chartwells 11.26 weighted points** – Chartwells finished seventh in criteria one. In criteria two, three, and four, Chartwells finished fifth. Chartwells tied for third in criteria five and finished fourth in criteria six.

H. **Ordo 6.29 weighted points** – Ordo had the lowest score in criteria one, two and three. For criteria four, Ordo finished third. Ordo had the lowest score in criteria five and six.

7. Recommendation of the Keansburg 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 Keansburg Board of Education.