



Mike Braun, Governor

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

Award Recommendation Letter

Date: October 16, 2026

To: Kevin March, Category Director
Indiana Department of Administration

From: Kristine Kruger, Procurement Consultant
Indiana Department of Administration

Subject: Recommendation of Selection for RFP 26-87397,
Onsite Clinic Services

Signed by:
Kevin March
F57C5348AE7D4C5...

Based on its evaluation of responses to RFP 26-87397, it is the evaluation team's recommendation that Vera Whole Health be selected to begin contract negotiations to administer the onsite clinic services for the Indiana State Personal Department (SPD).

This award recommendation is conditioned upon successful finalization of a contract between the State and Vera Whole Health within ninety (90) calendar days. If the State and Vera Whole Health fail to reach an agreement on contract terms in a timely manner, the State may choose to withdraw this award recommendation and may select an alternative respondent.

The terms of this recommendation are included in this letter.
Five-year initial contract value: \$3,060,867.99

The evaluation team received four (4) proposals from:

1. OurHealth LLC
2. Premise Health
3. TrueCare24, INC
4. Vera Whole Health

The proposals were evaluated by Indiana State Personal Department (SPD) 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)	50
Total: 100	

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. 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 Respondent’s proposal in the following areas:

- COMPANY INFORMATION
- REFERENCES
- EXPERIENCE SERVING STATE GOVERNMENTS/SIMILAR CLIENTS

Technical Proposal

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

- GENERAL ORGANIZATION
- ADMINISTRATION
- ADMINISTRATION/INTEGRATION WITH SOI HEALTH
- MANAGEMENT
- QUALITY MANAGEMENT
- LEGAL, COMPLIANCE, AND LIABILITY
- SERVICES, COMMUNICATION AND MARKETING SUPPORT
- STAFFING
- TECHNOLOGY
- REPORTING
- FINANCIALS & PERFORMANCE GUARANTEES

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 evaluation team issued MAQ and Cost Clarifications to all Respondents prior to finalizing Round 1 scores. 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.
OurHealth LLC	37.78
Premise Health	31.11
TrueCare24, INC	0.00
Vera Whole Health	39.56

C. Cost Proposal (50 Points)

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

Score =

- If Respondent's Cost amount is lowest among all Respondents, then score is 50.
- If Respondent's Cost amount is NOT lowest among all Respondents, then score is:

$$50 * \frac{(\text{Lowest Respondent's Cost Amount})}{(\text{Respondent's Cost Amount})}$$

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

Table 2: Round 1 – Cost Scores

Respondent	Cost Score 50 pts.
OurHealth LLC	42.73
Premise Health	39.22
TrueCare24, INC	10.72

Vera Whole Health	50.00
-------------------	-------

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 100 pts.
OurHealth LLC	80.51
Premise Health	70.33
TrueCare24, INC	10.72
Vera Whole Health	89.56

With IDOA approval, the evaluation team elected to shortlist OurHealth, LLC, Premise Health, and Vera Whole Health based on Round 1 Total Scores.

The evaluation team elected to issue invites to Oral Presentations to the three (3) shortlisted Respondents.

E. Post Oral Presentations – Second Round MAQ Scores

The Respondents' (who were shortlisted after the First Round) MAQ scores were reviewed and re-evaluated based on the Oral Presentations and the written responses to questions asked during Oral Presentations. The scores for the Respondents (who were shortlisted after the First Round) after the Oral Presentations were as follows.

Table 4: Round 2 – Management Assessment/Quality Scores

Respondent	MAQ Score 50 pts.
OurHealth LLC	40.00
Premise Health	31.11
Vera Whole Health	37.33

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

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

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 50 pts.
OurHealth LLC	45.93
Premise Health	43.71
Vera Whole Health	50.00

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	50	50	100
OurHealth LLC	40.00	45.93	85.93
Premise Health	31.11	43.71	74.82
Vera Whole Health	37.33	50.00	87.33

H. IDOA Scoring

Table 7: Final Evaluation Scores

Respondent	MAQ Score	Cost Score	Total Score
Points Possible	50	50	100
OurHealth LLC	40.00	45.93	85.93
Premise Health	31.11	43.71	74.82
Vera Whole Health	37.33	50.00	87.33

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 five (5) years from the date of contract execution. There may be eight (3) one-year extensions for a total of eight (8) years at the State's option.