



## STATE OF INDIANA

Michael R. Pence, Governor

Department of Administration  
Procurement Division

402 W Washington Street, Room W468  
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204

317.232.3053

### Award Recommendation Letter

Date: April 29, 2016

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

From: Jennifer Michael CPPB, Account Manager, Indiana Department of Administration

Subject: Recommendation of Selection for RFP 16-061; State Operated Facilities (SOF) Meal Services

Based on the evaluation of responses to RFP 16-061, **Aramark Correctional Services, LLC** (Aramark) and **A'viands, LLC** (A'viands) are recommended to begin contract negotiations to provide SOF Meal Services for the Family and Social Services Administration Division of Mental Health and Addiction (DMHA) as follows:

- Evansville Psychiatric Children's Center & Evansville State Hospital (EPCC/ESH) - A'viands
- LaRue D. Carter Memorial Hospital (LCH) - A'viands
- Logansport State Hospital (LSH) - A'viands
- Madison State Hospital (MSH) - A'viands
- Richmond State Hospital (RSH) - Aramark

*For EPCC/ESH, A'viands has committed to subcontract 5.7% to **Gerber and Company Foods, LLC** and 1.9% to **Klostermans Baking Co.** (certified Woman-owned Businesses (WBE)), and 8.5% to **NutriPledge, LLC** (a certified Minority-owned Business (MBE)) of the estimated contract value for those SOFs (\$1,075,290.00 in year 1 of the contract).*

*For LCH, A'viands has committed to subcontract 6.9% to **Gerber and Company Foods, LLC** and 2.8% to **Klostermans Baking Co.** (certified Woman-owned Businesses (WBE)), and 11.1% to **NutriPledge, LLC** (a certified Minority-owned Business (MBE)) of the estimated contract value for that SOF (\$827,820.00 in year 1 of the contract).*

*For LSH, A'viands has committed to subcontract 6.0% to **Gerber and Company Foods, LLC** and 2.4% to **Klostermans Baking Co.** (certified Woman-owned Businesses (WBE)), and 9.7% to **NutriPledge, LLC** (a certified Minority-owned Business (MBE)) of the estimated contract value for that SOF (\$944,802.50 in year 1 of the contract).*

*For MSH, A'viands has committed to subcontract 6.2% to **Gerber and Company Foods, LLC** and 2.4% to **Klostermans Baking Co.** (certified Woman-owned Businesses (WBE)), and 10.7% to **NutriPledge, LLC** (a certified Minority-owned Business (MBE)) of the estimated contract value for that SOF (\$856,655.00 in year 1 of the contract).*

*For RSH, Aramark has committed to subcontract 6.8% to **Stanz Cheese** and 1.2% to **Klostermans Baking Co.** (certified Woman-owned Businesses (WBE)), 5.2% to **NutriPledge, LLC** and 2.8% to **BC Forward, LLC** (certified*

Minority-owned Businesses (MBE)), and 3.0% to **J2 Systems** (a certified Indiana Veteran Business Enterprise (IVBE)) of the estimated contract value for that SOF (\$1,120,323.70 in year 1 of the contract).

The terms of this recommendation are included in this letter.

Estimated 2-year Contract Value – Aramark: \$2,274,257.11

Estimated 2-year Contract Value – A’viands: \$7,520,272.03

The evaluation team received three (3) proposals from:

- Aramark Correctional Services, LLC
- A’viands, LLC
- Healthcare Services Group

The proposals were evaluated by FSSA 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)	50
3. Cost (Cost Proposal)	25
4. Indiana Economic Impact	5
5. Buy Indiana	5
6. Minority Business Enterprise Subcontractor Commitment	5 (1 bonus pt. available)
7. Women Business Enterprise Subcontractor Commitment	5 (1 bonus pt. available)
8. Indiana Veteran Business Enterprise Subcontractor Commitment	5 (1 bonus pt. 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 adherence to mandatory requirements. Healthcare Services Group did not submit a complete RFP response and was therefore deemed unresponsive. The remaining proposals were considered for further evaluation.

**B. Management Assessment/Quality**

Each proposal was then evaluated based on its Business Proposal and Technical Proposal.

**Business Proposal (5 points)**

For the business proposal evaluation, the team considered the information each respondent provided in the business proposal. These areas were reviewed to assess the respondent’s ability to serve the State:

- Company Structure

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

**Technical Proposal (45 Points)**

For the technical proposal evaluation, the team considered each respondent’s proposal in the following areas:

- Section 1.1 - Overview of Contractor’s Responsibilities
- Section 1.2 - Cleanliness and Sanitation/Performance Measurements
- Section 1.3 - Emergency Situations
- Section 1.4 - Equipment and Consumable Supplies
- Section 1.5 - Food Preparation
- Section 1.6 - Staffing Requirements
- Section 1.7 - Patient/Inmate Workers
- Section 1.8 - Standards
- Section 1.9 - Transportation

The evaluation team’s scoring is based on a review of the Respondents’ proposed approach to each section of the technical proposal, as well as specific questions that respondents were asked to respond to in the RFP and clarifications. The results of the management assessment/quality evaluation are shown below:

**Table 1: Initial Management Assessment/Quality Scores**

RESPONDENT	MAQ SCORE - 50 PTS
Aramark	21.00
A’viands	20.00

**C. Cost Proposal (25)**

Price points were awarded on each Respondent’s SOF-specific cost proposal as follows:

Score =

- If Respondent’s SOF-specific cost proposal amount is lowest among all Respondents, then score is 25
- If Respondent’s SOF-specific cost proposal amount is NOT lowest among all Respondents, then score is

$$25 * \frac{\text{(Lowest Respondent’s SOF-specific cost proposal amount)}}{\text{(Respondent’s SOF-specific cost proposal amount)}}$$

The cost scoring as a result of Respondents’ initial proposals is as follows:

**Table 2: Initial Cost Scores**

SOF	RESPONDENT	COST SCORE - 25 PTS
EPCC/ESH	Aramark	19.50
	A’viands	25.00

LCH	Aramark	20.98
	A'viands	25.00
LSH	Aramark	16.61
	A'viands	25.00
MSH	Aramark	20.55
	A'viands	25.00
RSH	Aramark	25.00
	A'viands	24.40

**D. First Round Total Scores**

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

**Table 3: First Round Total Scores**

SOF	RESPONDENT	TOTAL SCORE - 75 PTS
EPCC/ESH	Aramark	40.50
	A'viands	45.00
LCH	Aramark	41.98
	A'viands	45.00
LSH	Aramark	37.61
	A'viands	45.00
MSH	Aramark	41.55
	A'viands	45.00
RSH	Aramark	46.00
	A'viands	44.40

All Respondents were asked to respond to clarification questions and given an opportunity to reduce pricing through a Best and Final Offer (BAFO).

**E. Post Clarification Evaluations**

Both Respondents' MAQ and cost scores were updated based on clarification responses and BAFOs. The final scores for the Respondents after these updates are as follows:

**Table 4: Post Clarification Evaluation Scores**

SOF	RESPONDENT	MAQ (50)	COST (25)	TOTAL (75)
EPCC/ESH	Aramark	22.00	19.53	41.53
	A'viands	26.75	25.00	51.75

LCH	Aramark	22.00	21.17	43.17
	A'viands	26.75	25.00	51.75
LSH	Aramark	22.00	16.85	38.85
	A'viands	26.75	25.00	51.75
MSH	Aramark	22.00	21.17	43.17
	A'viands	26.75	25.00	51.75
RSH	Aramark	22.00	25.00	47.00
	A'viands	26.75	24.23	50.98

## F. IDOA Scoring

IDOA scored the Respondents in the following areas: Buy Indiana (5 points), Indiana Economic Impact (IEI) (5 points), MBE Subcontractor Commitment (5 points + 1 available bonus point), WBE Subcontractor Commitment (5 points + 1 available bonus point), and IVBE Subcontractor Commitment (5 points + 1 available bonus point) using the criteria outlined in the RFP. When necessary, IDOA clarified certain Buy Indiana, IEI, MWBE, and IVBE information with the Respondents. Once the final MWBE, IVBE and IEI 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**

SOF	Respondent	MAQ (50)	Cost (25)	Buy IN (5)	IEI (5)	MBE* (5+1)	WBE* (5+1)	IVBE* (5+1)	Total (100+3)
EPCC/ESH	Aramark	22.00	19.53	0.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	61.53
	A'viands	<b>26.75</b>	<b>25.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>3.53</b>	<b>6.00</b>	<b>5.00</b>	<b>-1.00</b>	<b>65.28</b>
LCH	Aramark	22.00	21.17	0.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	63.17
	A'viands	<b>26.75</b>	<b>25.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>3.57</b>	<b>6.00</b>	<b>6.00</b>	<b>-1.00</b>	<b>66.32</b>
LSH	Aramark	22.00	16.85	0.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	58.85
	A'viands	<b>26.75</b>	<b>25.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>3.00</b>	<b>6.00</b>	<b>6.00</b>	<b>-1.00</b>	<b>65.75</b>
MSH	Aramark	22.00	21.17	0.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	63.17
	A'viands	<b>26.75</b>	<b>25.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>3.95</b>	<b>6.00</b>	<b>6.00</b>	<b>-1.00</b>	<b>66.70</b>
RSH	<b>Aramark</b>	<b>22.00</b>	<b>25.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>5.00</b>	<b>5.00</b>	<b>5.00</b>	<b>5.00</b>	<b>67.00</b>
	A'viands	26.75	24.23	0.00	4.68	5.00	6.00	-1.00	65.66

\* See Sections 3.2.6 and 3.2.7 of the RFP for information on available M/W/IVBE bonus points.

## **Award Summary**

During the course of evaluation, the State scrutinized all proposals to determine the viability of the proposed business solutions' ability 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 two (2) years from the date of contract execution. There may be four (4) one-year renewals for a total of six (6) years at the State's option.