FOR ACTION: Approve a Plan to Standardize the Food Service Sanitation Program

Recommendation

It is recommended that the Board approve a plan to standardize the sanitation program for the Food Service Department as follows:

- Divide the services between SFS PAC and LabTek
  - a. Implement the SFS PAC sanitation program (manual ware washing only) in all schools beginning August 2009.
  - b. Implement the LabTek (dish machine & laundry program) in all schools beginning August 2009.

Background Information

Between January 2007 and now the Food Service Department has issued two (2) RFQ’s and pilot studies. The most recent RFQ was canceled last spring and a third pilot study was implemented in August 2008. All MCCSC schools have experienced food service sanitation and safety programs from multiple vendors (SFS PAC, Gordon Food Service, LabTek and HP Products). At this point in time the Food Service Director finds the situation to be exactly as it was in 2007; a mixture of products throughout the district resulting in varying levels of product availability, product quality and service. She is still seeking a uniform program across all MCCSC schools.

Two possible recommendations evolved from the pilot studies:

1. Implement the SFS PAC sanitation program (Dish machines & manual ware washing) in all schools beginning August 2009.

   In this scenario all schools would get all cleaning products from the same source and all cleaning procedures would be the same; allows for greater consistency, easier to monitor.

2. Divide the services between SFS PAC and LabTek
   - a. Implement the SFS PAC sanitation program (manual ware washing only) in all schools beginning August 2009.
   - b. Implement the LabTek (dish machine & laundry program) in all schools beginning August 2009.

   In this scenario all schools would have two (2) chemical suppliers: one (1) for dish machine chemicals and one (1) for manual ware washing chemicals. While purchases would be made from two (2) different vendors, there would be consistency across the district within the two (2) types of cleaning systems used.

Procurement procedures do not require a formal bid for this volume of purchases. The preferred vendor based on end user preference (Kitchen manager), product quality and service provided is SFS PAC (Smart Systems).

Attached is a cost comparison between vendors for actual cost (August – December 2008) and projected costs for a full school year.
PILOT STUDY RESULTS

DISH MACHINE SYSTEMS

For product alone, in relation to the dish machine programs, SFS PAC and LabTek are fairly equal. The major difference is the level of service offered. SFS PAC service representatives visit the schools every six weeks to service dispensing equipment and to replenish stock (if necessary). LabTek does a service call at the start of the school year and returns only for emergency calls. Running out of stock has been an on-going problem for most schools.

The HP product does not clean to our satisfaction. It has a very strong aroma (resulting in a lot of sneezing and coughing). Our new dish towels were gray following the first washing with HP laundry detergent. Service calls are in response to emergencies only; there are no periodic checks of dispensing equipment to ensure they are functioning properly.

The GFS dish machine product easily clogs in the line resulting in dishes that are not clean as the machine continues to run with an inadequate amount of soap. Service calls are in response to emergencies only. There are no periodic checks of dispensing equipment to ensure they are functioning properly.

MANUAL SYSTEMS

The SFS PAC manual ware washing program far exceeds all the others. The product is premeasured and easy to dispense at the proper concentration. Ancillary products such as sanitizer buckets, test strips, and packet openers are available as needed for no additional charge. There are no dispensers to check or adjust during service calls however, the representative spot checks our program to ensure that staff is using the products properly. Any corrections necessary and or potential health code violations are reviewed with the staff and noted on the service report. These spot checks keep us “on our toes” and in a better position to avoid citations during our biannual health inspections from Monroe County Health Department.

LabTek and GFS all provide manual ware washing products in 5 gallon or 4/1 gallon containers. The 5 gallon buckets are heavy and difficult for the staff to handle. Sanitizer test strips are provided but sanitizer buckets, spray bottles and other ancillary products are available for purchase. There are no periodic checks of dispensing equipment to ensure they are functioning properly. Unlike the dish machine there are no buzzers to sound when the dispensers malfunction; as a result there is a greater chance of overuse or underuse of product. Overuse results in higher costs and underuse results in a kitchen that is not properly cleaned or sanitized.

HP Products are dispensed through a wall mounted dispensing system. The products are ordered and stocked by the custodian. This portion of the program is paid for through the general fund (works for food service) however; I’d rather be in control of the purchasing process even if it means the food service budget has to cover the expense. Sanitizer test strips are provided but sanitizer buckets, spray bottles and other ancillary products are available for purchase. There are no periodic checks of dispensing equipment to ensure they are functioning properly. Unlike the dish machine there are no buzzers to sound when the dispensers malfunction; as a result there is a greater chance of overuse or underuse of product. Overuse results in higher costs and underuse results in a kitchen that is not properly cleaned or sanitized.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VENDOR</th>
<th>MEALS</th>
<th>MEQ</th>
<th>TOTAL MEALS</th>
<th>AUG - DEC EXPENSE</th>
<th>COST PER MEAL</th>
<th>SCHOOL SERVED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HP</td>
<td>137,979.00</td>
<td>74,464.40</td>
<td>212,443.40</td>
<td>$4,636.00</td>
<td>0.02182228</td>
<td>North, Tri-North, Marlin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LABTEK</td>
<td>168,098.00</td>
<td>15,215.47</td>
<td>183,313.47</td>
<td>$5,490.46</td>
<td>0.02995121</td>
<td>Childs, J. Creek, Templeton, University, Unionville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFS PAC</td>
<td>204,415.00</td>
<td>58,421.35</td>
<td>262,836.35</td>
<td>$6,550.00</td>
<td>0.02492045</td>
<td>Binford, New Tech, Lakeview, South, Summit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GFS</td>
<td>189,469.00</td>
<td>14,282.75</td>
<td>203,751.75</td>
<td>$1,598.88</td>
<td>0.0078472</td>
<td>Arlington, Batchelor, Fairview, Grandview, Highland</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**meal equivalent:**
- Free lunch rate $2.5700
- + commodity Rate $0.1825
- Total $2.7520
- divide total alacarte income by total free income
to get the meal equivalents (MEQ)

**MEALS:** actual reimbursable meals served August - December 2008
**MEQ** actual meal equivalents served August - December 2008
**Total** actual meals + MEQ served August - December 2008
**Expense:** what we paid between August & December 2008
**cost / meal** expenses divided by the total meals