



STATE OF INDIANA

Eric Holcomb, Governor

Department of Administration
Procurement Division

402 W Washington Street, Room W468
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204
317.232.3053

Award Recommendation Letter

Date: November 17, 2020

To: Mark Hempel, Director of Account Management
Indiana Department of Administration

From: Teresa Deaton-Reese, Senior Account Manager
Indiana Department of Administration

Subject: Recommendation of Selection for RFP 21-1935; Juvenile Food Services for the Department of Correction (IDOC)

Based on its evaluation of responses to RFP 21-1935, it is the evaluation team's recommendation that Aramark Correctional Services, LLC be selected to begin contract negotiations to provide Juvenile Food Services.

Aramark Correctional Services, LLC has committed to subcontract 8% of the contract value to Cristina Food Services (a certified Minority-owned Business (MBE) and 10.8 % of the contract value to Stanz Cheese. (a certified Women-owned Business (WBE), and 4.2% of the contract value to Klosterman Bakery (a certified Women-owned Business (WBE), and 3% of the contract value to J2 Systems and Supply (a certified Indiana Veteran-owned small business (IVOSB).)

The terms of this recommendation are included in this letter.

Estimated one (1) year contract value: \$696,095.99

The evaluation team received two (2) proposals from:

1. Aramark Correctional Services, LLC
2. Summit Food Service, LLC

The proposals were evaluated by IDOC and IDOA according to the following criteria established 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)
7. Indiana Veterans Owned Small Business 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 were deemed responsive and adhered to the mandatory requirements and were moved forward for evaluation.

B. Management Assessment/Quality (45 points)

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

Business Proposal (5 points)

For the Business Proposal evaluation, the evaluation team considered the information the Respondent provided in the Business Proposal. These areas were reviewed to assess the Respondent’s ability to serve the State:

- Company Information
- References
- Respondents Company Structure
- Company Financial Information
- Integrity of Company Structure and Financial Reporting
- Contract Terms
- References
- Experience Serving State Government
- Experience Serving Similar Clients

Technical Proposal (40 points)

For the Technical Proposal evaluation, the evaluation team considered the Respondent’s proposal in following areas:

- Adherence to Rules, Regulations and Standards
- Minimum Meal Requirements
- Master Menu
- Flatware, Utensils, Trays and Eating Implements
- Cleanliness and Sanitation
- Emergency Situations
- Kitchen and Food Service Equipment
- Consumable Supplies
- Food Preparation
- Staffing Requirements
- Employee Training and Licensing Requirements
- Juvenile Offender Workers
- Transportation of Meals
- Utilities
- Prior Experience
- Uniform and Clothing

Table 1: Management Assessment/Quality Scores – Round 1

Respondent	MAQ Score 45 pts.
Aramark Correctional Services, LLC	35.05

Summit Food Service	30.35
---------------------	-------

C. Cost Proposal (35)

Cost scores were 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:

- Respondent's Cost Score = (Lowest Cost Proposal / Total Cost of Proposal) X 35*

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

Table 2: Cost Scores – Round 1

Respondent	Cost Score 35 pts.
Aramark Correctional Services, LLC	35.00
Summit Food Services	14.83

D. First Round Total Scores and Shortlisting

The combined Round 1 MAQ and Cost scores from the initial evaluations are listed below.

Table 3: Round 1 – Total Scores

Respondent	Total Score 80 pts.
Aramark Correctional Services, LLC	70.05
Summit Food Services	45.18

The evaluation team elected to issue Best and Final Offer (BAFO) requests, to all Respondents.

E. Post BAFO Responses

The Respondent's cost scores were reviewed and re-evaluated based on the BAFO. The scores for the Respondents after the BAFO responses were as follows:

Table 4: Post BAFO Responses Round 2 – Evaluation Scores

Respondent	MAQ Score (45)	Cost Score (35)	Total Score (80)
Aramark Correctional Services, LLC	35.05	35.00	70.05
Summit Food Services	30.35	15.07	45.42

F. IDOA Scoring

IDOA scored the Respondents in the following areas: Buy Indiana (5 pts.) MBE Subcontractor Commitment (5 points + 1 available bonus point) and WBE Subcontractor Commitment (5 points + 1 available bonus point),

Indiana Veterans Owned Small Business (5 points + 1 available bonus point) using the criteria outlined in the RFP. When necessary, IDOA clarified certain M/WBE and IVOSB information with the Respondents. Once the final M/WBE forms were received from the Respondents, the total scores out of 103 possible points were tabulated and are as follows:

Table 5: Final 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	35.05	35.00	0.00	5.00	6.00	5.00	86.05
Summit Food Services	30.35	15.07	0.00	-1.00	3.13	-1.00	46.54

Award Summary

During the course of evaluation, the State scrutinized all proposals to determine the viability of the proposal to meet the goals of the program and the needs of the State. The team evaluated proposals 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.