



STATE OF INDIANA
Eric Holcomb, Governor

Department of Administration
Procurement Division
Indiana Government Center South
402 W. Washington Street, Room W462
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204

Award Recommendation Letter

Date: July 11, 2023

To: L. Erin Kellam, Deputy Commissioner
Indiana Department of Administration

From: Teresa Deaton-Reese, CPPB, CPPO, Procurement Consultant
Indiana Department of Administration

Subject: Recommendation of Selection for RFP 23-74802; Juvenile Food Services for Indiana Department of Correction (IDOC)

Based on the evaluation of responses to RFP 23-74802, it is the evaluation team's recommendation that Aramark Correctional Services, LLC be selected to begin contract negotiations to provide the Juvenile Food Services for IDOC.

Aramark Correctional Services, LLC has committed to subcontract 8% to Cristina Foods, Inc. (a certified Minority-owned Business (MBE)), and 11% to Stanz Cheese Company, (a certified Women-owned Business (WBE)).

The terms of this recommendation are included in this letter.

Estimated four (4) Year Contract Value: \$3,723,324.12

The evaluation team received one (1) RFP responses:

- Aramark Correctional Services, LLC

The proposals were evaluated by IDOC and the Indiana Department of Administration (IDOA) according to the following in the RFP:

Criteria	Points
1. Adherence to Mandatory Requirements	Pass/Fail
2. Management Assessment/Quality (Business and Technical Proposal)	45 points
3. Cost (Cost Proposal)	35 points
4. Buy Indiana	5 points
5. Minority Business Enterprise Subcontractor Commitment	5 (1 bonus point available)
6. Women Business Enterprise Subcontractor Commitment	5 (1 bonus point available)

Total: 100 (103 if bonus awarded)

The proposals were evaluated according to the process outlined in Section 3.2 (“Evaluation Criteria”) of the RFP. Scoring was completed as follows:

A. Adherence to Requirements

Each proposal was reviewed for responsiveness and adherence to mandatory requirements. All Respondents adhered to the mandatory requirements and were moved to the next step in the evaluation process.

B. Management Assessment/Quality (45 points)

The Respondents proposals were evaluated based on their respective Business Proposal and Technical Proposal.

Business Proposal (5 points)

For the Business Proposal evaluation, the evaluation team considered the Respondents organizational structure and financial stability as defined in Section 2.3 of the RFP. The evaluation teams scores were based on a review of the Respondents Business Proposal, Attachment E.

Technical Proposal (40 points)

For the Technical Proposal evaluation, the evaluation team considered the Respondents ability to effectively perform the scope of work in Section 2.4 of the RFP. The evaluation teams scores were based on a review of the Respondents Technical Proposal, Attachment F.

The evaluation teams Round 1 scoring was based on a review of the Respondents proposed approach to each section of the Business Proposal and Technical Proposal. The initial results of the Management Assessment/Quality Evaluation are shown below:

Table 1 – MAQ

Respondents Name	MAQ Score
Aramark Correctional Services, LLC	34.00

C. Cost Proposal (35)

Cost scores would then be normalized to one another, based on the lowest cost proposal evaluated. The lowest cost proposal received a total of 35 points. The normalization formula is as follows:

- $Respondents\ Cost\ Score = (Lowest\ Cost\ Proposal / Total\ Cost\ of\ Proposal) \times 35$

The cost scoring as a result of the Respondents cost proposal is as follows:

Table 2 – Cost

Respondents Name	Cost Score
Aramark Correctional Services, LLC	35.00

D. Initial (Round 1) Total Scores

The initial Management Assessment and Quality (MAQ) Score in Table 1 were combined with the initial Cost Score in Table 2 to generate the combined initial scores in Table 3. The combined initial MAQ and Cost Scores from the initial evaluations are listed below:

Table 3 – Total Scores

Respondent	Total Score 80 pts.
Aramark Correctional Services, LLC	69.00

None of the shortlisted Respondents elected to change their pricing.

E. Second Round Scores – BAFO Responses

The shortlisted Respondents MAQ and Cost Scores were reviewed and re-evaluated based on clarification and BAFO responses. The Round 2 scores for the shortlisted Respondents after clarification and the BAFO responses were as follows:

Table 4: BAFO Responses

Respondent	MAQ Score (45)	Cost Score (35)	Total Score (80)
Aramark Correctional Services, LLC	35.50	35.00	70.50

F. IDOA Scoring

IDOA scored the Respondent in the following areas: Buy Indiana (5 pts.), MBE Subcontractor Commitment (5 points + 1 available bonus point), WBE Subcontractor Commitment (5 points + 1 available bonus point), and Indiana Veterans Owned Small Business Subcontractor Commitment (5 points + 1 available bonus point) using the criteria outlined in the RFP. The total scores out of 103 possible points were tabulated and are as follows:

Table 5: Final Overall Evaluation Scores

Respondent	MAQ Score	Cost Score	Buy Indiana	MBE	WBE	IVOSB	Total Score
Points Possible	45	35	5	5 (+1 bonus pt.)	5 (+1 bonus pt.)	5 (+1 bonus pt.)	100 (+3 bonus pts.)
Aramark Correctional Services, LLC	35.50	35.00	0.00	5.00	6.00	-1.00	80.50

Award Summary

During the course of evaluation, the State scrutinized all proposals to determine the viability of the proposed solutions to meet the goals of the program and the needs of the State. The team evaluated the proposal based on the stipulated criteria outlined in the RFP document.

The term of the contract shall be for a period of one (1) year from the date of contract execution.