



FOOD SERVICES DEPARTMENT

2150 East Fifteenth Street
Tucson, Arizona 85719-6316

Office: (520) 225-4700
FAX: (520) 225-4867

TO: Shirley Sokol, Director of Food Service

FR: Patricia K. Bowers, Purchasing Manager

RE: Letter of Recommendation: RFP No. 16-29-17PR
Produce

Date: June 29, 2015

Dept.: Food Services

Date Issued: June 10, 2015

Pre-Offer Conference Date: NA

Proposal Due Date: June 25, 2015

Addendum: NA

No. of Vendors on Vendor's List: 175

Responses Received: 4 Proposal Responses – 1 deemed unresponsive, however pricing was used for evaluation purposes.

No. of "No Bid" Responses: 32

BACKGROUND:

The purpose of this solicitation is to award to multiple vendors who can provide fresh produce delivery to Central Warehouse and twenty Middle and High school service sites.

Category A will be awarded to one vendor who can provide large volume deliveries to Central Warehouse and delivery to multiple sites 1 x week.

Category B will be awarded to the amount of vendors who can best meet the Department's needs to provide information, pricing and delivery to Central Warehouse only of Arizona grown produce.

EVALUATION:

- A. A committee was formed to evaluate the proposals based upon the selection criteria set forth in the Request for Proposal. The committee was composed of Stephen Protz and Michelle Welsh, members of the Department who are familiar with Warehouse logistics, produce needs at all grade levels of the District, and knowledge of state and federal produce initiatives and grant programs. Each member received copies and returned signed Conflict of Interest and Confidentiality statements.
- B. Prior to releasing the respondents' proposals to the committee, an initial review was conducted to insure that all requested information and legal documentation had been submitted. One vendor, Sysco Arizona, did not comply with the requirement of submitting invoice documentation to prove the basis for the costs submitted. This vendor also stated that their software system only had capability to add the delivery fee to each line item, as opposed to adding the delivery fee as a separate line item. This type of response is deemed unresponsive. However, I included their pricing for a fuller evaluation. All other responders provided all documentation required.
- C. I performed an analysis which showed a Market Basket Analysis and a High Volume analysis. A summary is provided. (see attached)
- D. Based on criteria set forth in the Request for Proposal, the committee evaluated and scored the four responses.
- E. A unanimous consensus was made to award to two vendors. No need to ask proposers further questions of clarification and no need for a Best and Final offer. Based on the evaluation criteria contained in the Request for Proposal, a written letter of recommendation for award was submitted and accepted on June 29, 2015.

Contract award is recommended to the following firm(s) for the indicated services:

Fresh Pac: Group A and Group B

Community Food Bank Inc. – Group B only