



STATE OF INDIANA
Eric Holcomb, Governor

Department of Administration
Procurement Division
402 W Washington Street, Room W468
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204
317.232.3053

Award Recommendation Letter

Date: December 30, 2020

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

From: Teresa Deaton-Reese, Strategic Sourcing Analyst,
Indiana Department of Administration

Subject: Recommendation of Selection for RFP 21-2133, Drug Testing Supplies and Services

Based on its evaluation of responses to RFP 21-2133, it is the evaluation team's recommendation that **Cordant Health Solutions** be selected to begin contract negotiations to provide Drug Testing Supplies and Services for the Indiana Department of Child Services (DCS).

Cordant Health Solutions has committed to subcontract 1.26% of the contract value to **CulturaLink LLC**, a certified Minority-owned Business (MBE), 0.40% of the contract value to **Together We Can Consulting LLC**, a certified Minority-owned Business (MBE), 1.00% of the contract value to **Vergence**, a certified Minority-owned Business (MBE), 1.39% of the contract value to **Pillow Logistics**, a certified Minority-owned Business (MBE), 0.50% of the contract value to **Rite Quality Office Supply, Inc.**, a certified Minority-owned Business (MBE), and 10.70% of the contract value to **Work-Comp Management Services, Inc.**, a certified Women-owned Business (WBE).

The terms of this recommendation are included in this letter.

Estimated four (4) year Contract Value: \$31,763,160.00

The evaluation team received four (4) proposals from:

1. Averhealth
2. Forensic Fluids Laboratories
3. Redwood Toxicology Laboratory, Inc. DBA Abbot
4. Technical Resource Management, LLC DBA Cordant Health Solutions

The proposals were evaluated by DCS 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. Minority 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. None of the Respondents was deemed non-responsive, as they met the mandatory requirements listed in the RFP.

B. Management Assessment/Quality: Initial Scoring (50 Points)

The four (4) responsive Respondents' proposals were each evaluated based on their respective Business Proposal and Technical Proposal.

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: Management Assessment/Quality Scores – Round 1

Respondent	MAQ Score 50 pts.
Averhealth	42.75
Forensic Fluids Laboratories	34.75
Redwood Toxicology Laboratory, Inc. DBA Abbot	36.00
Technical Resource Management, LLC DBA Cordant Health Solutions	45.25

C. Cost Proposal (30)

Price points were awarded on the Respondents' Costs as follows:

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:

$$30 * \frac{(\text{Lowest Respondent's Cost amount})}{(\text{Respondent's Cost amount})}$$

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

Table 2: Cost Scores – Round 1

Respondent	Cost Score 30 pts.
Averhealth	13.33
Forensic Fluids Laboratories	18.78
Redwood Toxicology Laboratory, Inc. DBA Abbot	30.00
Technical Resource Management, LLC DBA Cordant Health Solutions	28.75

D. First Round Total Scores

The combined Round 1 MAQ and Cost scores from the initial evaluations are listed below.

Table 3: Total Scores – Round 1

Respondent	Total Score 80 pts.
Averhealth	56.08
Forensic Fluids Laboratories	53.53
Redwood Toxicology Laboratory, Inc. DBA Abbot ¹	66.00
Technical Resource Management, LLC DBA Cordant Health Solutions	74.00

The evaluation team elected to invite all Respondents to give oral presentations. Additionally, the evaluation team issued a request for Best and Final Offers (BAFOs) and requested responses to clarification questions.

E. Post Oral Presentations, BAFO Evaluations, and Clarification Questions

The Respondents' cost scores were updated based on their BAFOs. The Respondents' MAQ scores were reviewed based on the oral presentations and the responses to the clarification questions. The scores for the Respondents after the oral presentations, BAFOs, and clarification questions were as follows:

Table 4: Post-Oral Presentation, BAFO, and Clarification Questions Total Scores – Round 2

Respondent	MAQ Score (50)	Cost Score (30)	Total Score (80)
Averhealth	42.75	13.91	56.66
Forensic Fluids Laboratories	34.75	19.60	54.35
Technical Resource Management, LLC DBA Cordant Health Solutions	45.25	30.00	75.25

F. 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. When necessary, IDOA clarified certain M/WBE information with Respondents. Once the final M/WBE forms were received from the Respondents, the total scores out of 92 possible points were tabulated and are as follows:

¹ Redwood Toxicology Laboratory, Inc. DBA Abbot formally withdrew its proposal on November 3, 2020 and did not participate in oral presentations on November 4, 2020.

Table 5: Final Evaluation Scores

Respondent	MAQ Score	Cost Score	MBE*	WBE*	Total Score
Points Possible	50	30	5 (+1 bonus pt.)	5 (+1 bonus pt.)	90 (+2 bonus pts.)
Averhealth	42.75	13.91	6.00	5.00	67.66
Forensic Fluids Laboratories	34.75	19.60	0.63	6.00	60.97
Technical Resource Management, LLC DBA Cordant Health Solutions	45.25	30.00	3.13	5.00	83.38

* See Section 3.2.5 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 ability of the proposed solutions to meet the goals of the program and the needs of the State. The evaluation 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. There may be two (2) one-year renewals for a total of six (6) years at the State's option.