



# STATE OF INDIANA

## DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATION Commissioner's Office

Mike Braun, Governor

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

### Award Recommendation Letter

Date: September 2, 2026

To: Jonathan Huth, Category Director - Health and Human Services  
Indiana Department of Administration

From: Alexis Humbert, Procurement Consultant - Health and Human Services  
Indiana Department of Administration

Subject: Recommendation of Selection for RFS 26-87589  
Ag-Retailer and Crop Advisor Soil Sampling Program

Signed by:  
*Jonathan Huth*  
DC845F9289414C0...

Based on its evaluation of responses to RFS 26-87589, it is the evaluation team's recommendation that the following respondents are selected to begin contract negotiations to administer the Ag-Retailer and Crop Advisor Soil Sampling Program for the Indiana State Department of Agriculture (ISDA).

Brian D. McCarty  
Folsom Precision Agriculture  
Basic Package, LLC  
Hill Ag LLC  
Nicholson Consulting Services LLC  
Premier Ag Co-Op Inc.

The terms of this recommendation are included in this letter.

3-year Contract Value: \$150,000.00

The evaluation team received 6 proposals from:

1. Brian D. McCarty
2. Folsom Precision Agriculture
3. Basic Package, LLC
4. Hill Ag LLC
5. Nicholson Consulting Services LLC
6. Premier Ag Co-Op Inc.

The proposals were evaluated by ISDA, and IDOA according to the following criteria established in the RFS:

| Criteria                                                                    | Points    |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|
| 1. Adherence to Mandatory Requirements                                      | Pass/Fail |
| 2. Management Assessment/Quality (Business and Technical Proposal)          | 50        |
| 3. Cost (Cost Proposal)                                                     | Omitted   |
| 4. Buy Indiana                                                              | 5         |
| 5. Indiana Veteran Owned Small Business Enterprise Subcontractor Commitment | Omitted   |
| Total: 55                                                                   |           |

The proposals were evaluated according to the process outlined in Section 3.2 ("Evaluation Criteria") of the RFS. Scoring was completed as follows:

**A. Adherence to Requirements**

Each proposal was reviewed for responsiveness and adherence to mandatory requirements. 6 proposals were deemed responsive and adhered to the mandatory requirements. 0 proposals were disqualified.

**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 Information
- References

**Technical Proposal**

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

- **Att. F, Question 1.** Service Area: The Respondent must provide a clear description of the Respondent's service area, including the geographic regions, specific counties, or statewide coverage where services can be provided. (e.g., Indiana statewide, specific counties, regions).
- **Att. F, Question 2.** Primary point of contact: The Respondent must provide the contact information for the individual responsible for program coordination, including name, title, email address, phone number. If there are multiple business locations that the Respondent is associated with please provide all locations where this program will be made available.
- **Att. F, Question 3.** Relevant Experience: The Respondent must provide a brief summary of the Respondent's experience in conducting soil sampling, nutrient management planning, and related agronomic services. This may include years of experience, client types served, and examples of comparable work.
- **Att. F, Question 4.** The Respondent must be able to provide, at minimum, the following information for the Lite Nutrient Management Plan. Provide examples, without sharing any specific landowner details, that have been previously provided by the Respondent that meet this requirement.
  - Name of farm operation
  - Names of individuals associated with farm operation
  - Farm operation address location, including county (to confirm with Mississippi River Basin)
  - Total acres enrolled in the program
  - Soil test results
  - Field boundary map showing sample collection points
  - Crop plan for the next two crop years
  - Recommended nutrient application maps (flat rate or variable rate)
  - Field map identifying sensitive areas
- **Att. F, Question 5.** Standard Operating Procedures/Performance Standards: The Respondent must provide a description of the Respondent's standard operating procedures for soil sampling, sample handling, and nutrient planning, including any internal performance standards or quality controls.
- **Att. F, Question 6.** Conflict of Interest Disclosure: The Respondent must provide disclosure of any potential conflicts of interest relevant to program activities, including any financial or organizational relationships that may influence service delivery.
- **Att. F, Question 7.** Certifications and Qualifications: List applicable professional certifications held by the business and/or its employees who will be working with this program (e.g., Certified Crop Advisor, 4R Nutrient

Management Specialist, Sustainability certifications, Precision Agriculture credentials), as well as any specialty or technical qualifications relevant to program delivery.

- **Att. F, Question 8.** Submission Format Compliance: Describe how digital deliverable will be submitted to ISDA-DSC using acceptable formats like: MS Office, PDF, and/or zip files.
- **Att. F, Question 9.** Regular Communication Commitment: Describe how you will maintain regular communication with the Nutrient Stewardship Program Manager every two months to report on sampling work.
- **Att. F, Question 10.** Vendor Certification Checklist: Please describe how you will meet the Vendor Certification Statement found in Section VI of the Scope of Work.

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**

| <b>Respondent</b>                 | <b>MAQ Score<br/>50 pts.</b> |
|-----------------------------------|------------------------------|
| Brian D. McCarty                  | 48.22                        |
| Basic Package LLC                 | 48                           |
| Folsom Precision Agriculture      | 47.11                        |
| Nicholson Consulting Services LLC | 44.89                        |
| Hill Ag LLC                       | 43.11                        |
| Premier Ag Co-Op Inc.             | 42.44                        |

**C. Cost Proposal (Omitted)**

**D. First Round Total Scores and Shortlisting**

The Round 1 MAQ from the initial evaluations are listed below.

**Table 3: Round 1 – Total Scores (MAQ)**

| <b>Respondent</b>                 | <b>Total Score<br/>50 pts.</b> |
|-----------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Brian D. McCarty                  | 48.22                          |
| Basic Package LLC                 | 48                             |
| Folsom Precision Agriculture      | 47.11                          |
| Nicholson Consulting Services LLC | 44.89                          |
| Hill Ag LLC                       | 43.11                          |
| Premier Ag Co-Op Inc.             | 42.44                          |

The evaluation team elected to issue invites to Oral Presentations to the 6 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 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**

| <b>Respondent</b>                 | <b>MAQ Score<br/>50 pts.</b> |
|-----------------------------------|------------------------------|
| Brian D. McCarty                  | 48.22                        |
| Basic Package LLC                 | 48                           |
| Folsom Precision Agriculture      | 48.22                        |
| Nicholson Consulting Services LLC | 44.89                        |
| Hill Ag LLC                       | 45.33                        |
| Premier Ag Co-Op Inc.             | 42.44                        |

**F. Round 2 - Total Scores**

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

**Table 6: Round 2 - Evaluation Scores**

| <b>Respondent</b>                 | <b>MAQ<br/>Score</b> |
|-----------------------------------|----------------------|
| <b>Points Possible</b>            | <b>50</b>            |
| Brian D. McCarty                  | 48.22                |
| Basic Package LLC                 | 48                   |
| Folsom Precision Agriculture      | 48.22                |
| Nicholson Consulting Services LLC | 44.89                |
| Hill Ag LLC                       | 45.33                |
| Premier Ag Co-Op Inc.             | 42.44                |

**G. IDOA Scoring**

IDOA scored the Respondents in the following areas: IVOSB Subcontractor Commitment (Omitted in this RFS) and Buy Indiana (5 points) using the criteria outlined in the RFS.

**Table 7: Final Evaluation Scores**

| <b>Respondent</b>                 | <b>MAQ Score</b> | <b>Buy Indiana*</b> | <b>IVOSB*</b>  | <b>Total Score</b> |
|-----------------------------------|------------------|---------------------|----------------|--------------------|
| <b>Points Possible</b>            | <b>50</b>        | <b>5</b>            | <b>Omitted</b> | <b>55</b>          |
| Brian D. McCarty                  | 48.22            | 0                   | 0              | 48.22              |
| Basic Package LLC                 | 48               | 0                   | 0              | 48                 |
| Folsom Precision Agriculture      | 48.22            | 0                   | 0              | 48.22              |
| Nicholson Consulting Services LLC | 44.89            | 0                   | 0              | 44.89              |
| Hill Ag LLC                       | 45.33            | 0                   | 0              | 45.33              |
| Premier Ag Co-Op Inc.             | 42.44            | 0                   | 0              | 42.44              |

#### **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 RFS document.

The term of the contract shall be for a period of three (3) years from the date of contract execution. There may be two (2) 1-year term extensions for a total of five (5) years at the State's option.