



# 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 19, 2024

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

From: Robert Cohen, Procurement Consultant  
Indiana Department of Administration

Subject: Recommendation of Selection for RFP 24-77179  
USDA Foods Warehousing and Distribution Services

Based on its evaluation of responses to RFP 24-77179, it is the evaluation team's recommendation that **Dilgard Frozen Foods, Inc.** be selected to begin contract negotiations to administer USDA Foods Warehousing and Distribution Services for the Indiana Department of Education (IDOE).

The terms of this recommendation are included in this letter.

**Initial contract term of one (1) year, and three, optional, one (1) year renewals, with an estimated contract amount of \$286,162.40.**

The evaluation team received two (2) proposals from:

1. Dilgard Frozen Foods, Inc. (Dilgard)
2. Stanz-Troyer Holdings, LLC (Stanz-Troyer)

The proposals were evaluated by IDOE 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. Minority Business Enterprise Subcontractor Commitment	5 (1 bonus pt. available)
5. Women Business Enterprise Subcontractor Commitment	5 (1 bonus pt. available)
Total: 90 (92 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. Both proposals were deemed responsive and adhered to the mandatory requirements.

#### B. Management Assessment/Quality: Initial Scoring

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

Proposal.

### Business Proposal

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 Financials
- References
- Experience Serving State Governments

### Technical Proposal

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

- Section 2.4.1 Mandatory Requirements
- Section 2.4.2 Facilities and Management
- Section 2.4.3 Fleet and Shipping
- Section 2.4.4 Inventory
- Section 2.4.5 Records and Reporting

The evaluation team's Round 1 scoring is based on a review of the Respondent's proposed approach to each section of the Business Proposal and Technical Proposal. The initial results of the Management Assessment/Quality Evaluation are shown below:

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

Respondent	MAQ Score 45 pts.
Dilgard	35.35
Stanz-Troyer	39.30

### C. Cost Proposal (35 Points)

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

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

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.
Dilgard	35.00
Stanz-Troyer	26.19

A Best and Final Offer request (BAFO) was issued to each respondent. Costs remained the same.

#### **D. IDOA Scoring**

IDOA scored the Respondents in the following areas: MBE Subcontractor Commitment (5 points + 1 available bonus point) and WBE Subcontractor Commitment (5 points + 1 available bonus point using the criteria outlined in the RFP. IDOA requested updated M/WBE commitments from the Respondents who submitted BAFO Cost Proposals. Once the final M/WBE forms were received from the Respondent, the total scores out of 90 possible points were tabulated and are as follows:

**Table 3: Final Evaluation Scores**

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>MAQ Score</b>	<b>Cost Score</b>	<b>MBE*</b>	<b>WBE*</b>	<b>Total Score</b>
<b>Points Possible</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>5 (+1 bonus pt.)</b>	<b>5 (+1 bonus pt.)</b>	<b>90 (+2 bonus pt.)</b>
Dilgard	35.35	35.00	-1.00	-1.00	68.35
Stanz-Troyer	39.30	26.19	-1.00	-1.00	63.49

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

#### **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 one (1) year from the date of contract execution. There may be three (3) one-year renewals for a total of four (4) years at the State's option.