



STATE OF INDIANA

Eric J. Holcomb, Governor

DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATION Commissioner's Office

Indiana Government Center South
402 West Washington Street, Room W462
Indianapolis, IN 46204

Award Recommendation Letter

Date: February 16, 2023

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

From: Arthur L. Sample IV, Procurement Specialist,
Indiana Department of Administration

Subject: Recommendation of Selection for RFP 23-72658,
Strategic Stockpile and Logistics Services

Based on its evaluation of responses to RFP 23-72658, it is the evaluation team's recommendation that Life Science Logistics, LLC (LSL) be selected to begin contract negotiations to administer Strategic Stockpile and Logistics Services for the Indiana Department of Health (IDOH).

*LSL has committed to subcontract 0.67% of the contract value to **Cassady Electrical Contractors, Inc.** (a certified Women-owned Business (WBE)).*

The terms of this recommendation are included in this letter.

Estimated 4-year Contract Value: \$15,000,000.00

The evaluation team received two (2) proposals from:

1. Life Science Logistics, LLC (LSL)
2. Langham Logistics (Langham)

The proposals were evaluated by IDOH 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
3. Cost (Cost Proposal)	35
4. Buy Indiana	5
5. Minority Business Enterprise Subcontractor Commitment	5 (1 bonus pt. available)
6. Women Business Enterprise Subcontractor Commitment	5 (1 bonus pt. available)
7. Indiana Veteran Owned Small Business 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 responsiveness and adherence to mandatory requirements. Two (2) proposals were deemed responsive and adhered to the mandatory requirements. None were disqualified.

B. Management Assessment/Quality: Initial Consensus Scoring

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
- Experience & References

Technical Proposal (40 Points)

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

- Scope of Work Section 2.0 – Minimum Requirements
- Scope of Work Section 3.0 – Warehouse and Site Location Requirements
- Scope of Work Section 4.0 – Facility Design and Warehouse Space Requirements
- Scope of Work Section 5.0 – Warehousing and Storage
- Scope of Work Section 6.0 – Distribution/Shipping
- Scope of Work Section 7.0 – Logistics
- Scope of Work Section 8.0 – Receiving
- Scope of Work Section 9.0 – Inspection and Maintenance
- Scope of Work Section 10.0 – Warehouse and Personnel Security and Access Requirements
- Scope of Work Section 11.0 – Lifecycle Management
- Scope of Work Section 12.0 – Personnel Non-Security Requirements
- Scope of Work Section 13.0 – Service Interruptions
- Scope of Work Section 16.0 – Reporting and Tasks/Deliverables Expectations
- Scope of Work Section 17.0 – Staffing Requirements
- Scope of Work Section 18.0 – Quality Assurance Surveillance Plan (QASP)
- Scope of Work Section 19.0 – Transition Planning and Readiness Activities

The evaluation team's Round 1 scoring is based on a review of the Respondent's proposed approach to the above-listed sections of the Business Proposal and Technical Proposal. The evaluation team issued MAQ & Cost Clarifications prior to finalizing Round 1 scores. The initial results of the Management Assessment/Quality Evaluation and Pricing Questions are shown below:

Table 1: Round 1 – Management Assessment/Quality Scores*

Respondent	MAQ Score 45 pts.
LSL	30.3
Langham	17.3

* Note: Additive scores have been rounded to the nearest decimal.

C. Cost Proposal (35 Points)

The price points on the Respondent's Costs were awarded as follows:

Score =
$$\begin{cases} \text{If Respondent's Cost amount is lowest among all Respondents, then} \\ \text{score is 35.} \\ \\ \text{If Respondent's Cost amount is NOT lowest among all Respondents,} \\ \text{then score is:} \\ \\ 35 * \frac{(\text{Lowest Respondent's Cost Amount})}{(\text{Respondent's Cost Amount})} \end{cases}$$

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

Table 2: Round 1 – Cost Scores*

Respondent	Cost Score 35 pts.
LSL	20.5
Langham	35.0

* Note: Additive scores have been rounded to the nearest decimal.

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 (MAQ + Cost)*

Respondent	Total Score 80 pts.
LSL	50.7
Langham	52.3

* Note: Additive scores have been rounded to the nearest decimal.

E. Post MAQ Clarification Responses – Second Round MAQ Scores

The evaluation team issued MAQ Clarifications to all Respondents prior to finalizing Round 2 scores. The Respondents' MAQ scores were reviewed and re-evaluated based on the written responses to these clarification questions. The scores for the Respondents after the second round of MAQ scoring are listed below.

Table 4: Round 2 – Management Assessment/Quality Scores*

Respondent	MAQ Score 45 pts.
LSL	36.5
Langham	16.8

* Note: Additive scores have been rounded to the nearest decimal.

F. Post Best and Final Offer Opportunity – Final Round Cost Scores

The State elected to issue Best and Final Offers (BAFOs) to the two Respondents. Langham did not lower their pricing in the BAFO response.

The cost scoring as a result of the Respondents’ BAFO Cost Proposals is as follows:

Table 5: Round 2 – BAFO Cost Scores*

Respondent	Cost Score 35 pts.
LSL	29.1
Langham	35.0

* Note: Additive scores have been rounded to the nearest decimal.

G. Round 2 - Total Scores

The combined final scores for the Respondents, based on Round 2 Management Assessment/Quality and BAFO Cost Scores are listed below.

Table 6: Round 2 - Evaluation Scores*

Respondent	MAQ Score	Cost Score	Total Score
Points Possible	45	35	80
LSL	36.5	29.1	65.6
Langham	16.8	35.0	51.8

* Note: additive scores have been rounded to the nearest decimal

H. IDOA Scoring

IDOA scored the Respondents in the following areas: MBE Subcontractor Commitment (5 points + 1 available bonus point), WBE Subcontractor Commitment (5 points + 1 available bonus point), IVOSB Subcontractor Commitment (5 points + 1 available bonus point), and Buy Indiana (5 points) using the criteria outlined in the RFP. IDOA requested updated M/WBE and IVOSB commitments from the Respondents who submitted BAFO Cost Proposals. Once the final M/WBE and IVOSB forms were received from the Respondents, the total scores out of 100 possible points were tabulated and are as follows:

Table 7: Final Evaluation Scores**

Respondent	MAQ Score	Cost Score	MBE*	WBE*	IVOSB*	Buy Indiana*	Total Score
Points Possible	45	35	5 (+1 bonus pt.)	5 (+1 bonus pt.)	5 (+1 bonus pt.)	5	100 (+3 bonus pt.)
LSL	36.5	29.1	-1.0	0.5	-1.0	5.0	69.0
Langham	16.8	35.0	0.6	-1.0	-1.0	5.0	55.4

* See Sections 3.2.5, 3.2.6, and 3.2.7 of the RFP for information on available M/WBE and IVOSB bonus points.

** Note: Additive scores have been rounded to the nearest decimal

Award Summary

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