



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: July 10, 2024

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

From: Kevin March, Procurement Specialist
Indiana Department of Administration

Subject: Recommendation of Selection for RFP 24-77622
Development of Materials Management Plan

Based on its evaluation of responses to RFP 24-77622, it is the evaluation team's recommendation that **Eunomia Research & Consulting, Inc. (ERC)** be selected to begin contract negotiations to administer the Development of Materials Management Plan for the Indiana Department of Environmental Management (IDEM).

*Eunomia has committed to subcontract 15.82% of the contract value to **McFarland PR & Public Affairs, Inc.** (a certified Women-owned Business (WBE)).*

The terms of this recommendation are included in this letter.

Initial contract term of one (1) year, and one, optional, one (1) year renewal, with an estimated amount of \$299,605.72.

The evaluation team received four (4) proposals from:

1. Eunomia Research & Consulting, Inc. (ERC)
2. GT Environmental, Inc. (GT)
3. HUSarchitecture (HUS)
4. Resource Recycling Systems, Inc. (RRS)

The proposals were evaluated by IDEM 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)	30
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 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 responsiveness and adherence to mandatory requirements. All four (4) 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:

- References
- Experience Serving State Government and Experience Serving Similar Clients
- All other remaining sections of the Business Proposal

Technical Proposal

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

- Project Experience and Qualifications
- IC 13-21-1 State Solid Waste Management Plan
- State and Federal Regulations
- Waste Management Hierarchy and Wasted Food Scale
- Plan Duration
- Key Plan Components
- Materials Management Strategy
- Public Outreach and Stakeholder Engagement
- Timeline
- Communications / Reporting Process

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 50 pts.
ERC	47.75
GT	41.13
HUS	14.25
RRS	39.94

C. Cost Proposal (30 Points)

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

- The cost score
- If Respondent's Cost amount is lowest among all Respondents, then score is 30.
 - If Respondent's Cost amount is NOT lowest among all Respondents, then score is:
- $$30 * \frac{(\text{Lowest Respondent's Cost Amount})}{(\text{Respondent's Cost Amount})}$$

Respondent	Cost Score 30 pts.
ERC	30.00
GT	27.38
HUS	27.52
RRS	27.10

D. First Round Total Scores

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.
ERC	77.75
GT	68.51
HUS	41.77
RRS	67.04

The evaluation team elected not to conduct Oral Presentations.

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

The State elected to issue Best and Final Offers (BAFOs) to the four Respondents.

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

Table 4: Round 2 – BAFO Cost Scores

Respondent	Cost Score 30 pts.
ERC	30.00
GT	26.25
HUS	26.09
RRS	26.28

F. Round 2 - Total Scores

The combined final scores for the Respondents, based on Round 1 Management Assessment/Quality and BAFO Cost Scores are listed below.

Table 5: Round 2 - Evaluation Scores

Respondent	MAQ Score	Cost Score	Total Score
Points Possible	50	30	80
ERC	47.75	30.00	77.75
GT	41.13	26.25	67.38
HUS	14.25	26.09	40.34
RRS	39.94	26.28	66.21

G. 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 Respondent, the total scores out of 100 possible points were tabulated and are as follows:

Table 6: Final Evaluation Scores

Respondent	MAQ Score	Cost Score	Buy Indiana*	MBE*	WBE*	IVOSB*	Total Score
Points Possible	50	30	5	5 (+1 bonus pt.)	5 (+1 bonus pt.)	5 (+1 bonus pt.)	100 (+3 bonus pt.)
ERC	47.75	30.00	0.00	-1.00	6.00	-1.00	81.75
GT	41.13	26.25	5.00	5.00	5.00	-1.00	81.38
HUS	14.25	26.09	0.00	-1.00	-1.00	6.00	44.34
RRS	39.94	26.28	0.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	81.21

* 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.

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 one (1) one-year renewal for a total of two (2) years at the State's option.