



### Award Recommendation Letter

Date: March 3, 2023

To: Roxie Coble, Director of Strategic Sourcing  
Indiana Department of Administration

From: Stephanie Nelson, Procurement Consultant  
Indiana Department of Administration

Subject: Recommendation of Selection for RFP 23-72798  
Four County Landfill Leachate Disposal Services

Based on the State's evaluation of responses to RFP 23-72798, it is the evaluation team's recommendation that **KERAMIDA, Inc. (KERAMIDA)** be selected to begin contract negotiations to provide the Four County Landfill Leachate Disposal Services for the Indiana Department of Environmental Management (IDEM).

*KERAMIDA has committed to subcontract 13.06% of the contract value to **C&P Lawncare LLC** (a certified Woman-Owned Business (WBE)).*

The terms of this recommendation are included in this letter.

Estimated Four (4) Year Contract Amount: \$568,476.00

The evaluation team received two (2) proposals from:

- KERAMIDA, Inc. (KERAMIDA)
- Patriot Engineering and Environmental, Inc. (Patriot)

The proposals were evaluated by the Indiana Department of Environmental Management (IDEM) and the Indiana Department of Administration (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 points
3. Cost (Cost Proposal)	35 points
4. Buy Indiana	5 points
5. Minority Business Enterprise Subcontractor Commitment	5 (1 bonus point available)

6. Women Business Enterprise Subcontractor Commitment 5 (1 bonus point available)

7. Indiana Veterans Owned Small Business Subcontractor Commitment 5 (1 bonus point 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**

The proposals were reviewed for responsiveness and adherence to mandatory requirements. All Respondents adhered to the mandatory requirements and were moved to the next step in the evaluation process.

**B. Management Assessment/Quality (45 points)**

The Respondent’s proposals were evaluated based on their respective Business Proposal and Technical Proposal.

**Business Proposal**

For the Business Proposal evaluation, the evaluation team considered the Respondents organizational structure and financial stability as defined in Section 2.3 of the RFP. The evaluation teams scores were based on a review of the Respondents Business Proposal, Attachment E.

**Technical Proposal**

For the Technical Proposal evaluation, the evaluation team considered the Respondents ability to effectively perform the scope of work in Section 2.4 of the RFP. The evaluation teams scores were based on a review of the Respondents Technical Proposal, Attachment F.

The evaluation team’s initial (Round 1) scores were based on a review of the Respondents 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 (MAQ)**

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>MAQ Score</b>
KERAMIDA	43.67
Patriot	37.92

**C. Cost Proposal (35 points)**

Cost score would then be normalized to one another, based on the lowest cost proposal evaluated. The lowest cost proposal received a total of 35 points. The normalization formula is as follows:

- *Respondents Cost Score = (Lowest Cost Proposal / Total Cost of Proposal) X 35*

The cost scoring as a result of the Respondent’s cost proposal is as follows:

**Table 2: Round 1 – Cost Score**

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Cost Score</b>
KERAMIDA	35.00
Patriot	31.51

**D. Initial (Round 1) Total Scores and Shortlisting**

The initial Management Assessment and Quality (MAQ) Scores in Table 1 were combined with the initial Cost Scores in Table 2 to generate the combined initial scores in Table 3. The combined initial MAQ and Cost Scores from the initial evaluation is listed below.

**Table 3: Round 1 – Total Score**

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Total Score 80 pts.</b>
KERAMIDA	78.67
Patriot	69.43

In accordance with Section 3.2 of the RFP, the State had the option to “short-list.” The State did not short-list Respondents. The State moved all Respondents on to the second round of evaluations.

**E. Second Round Score – BAFO Responses**

Respondents were given the opportunity to provide a Best and Final Offer (BAFO). Where necessary, the State requested clarification or modification of proposed costs with their BAFO submission.

Following the second round of scoring, MAQ scores were finalized and remained unchanged for the duration of the evaluation. The Respondent’s scores were reviewed and re-evaluated based on the BAFO responses.

The scores for the Respondents after these updates are as follows:

**Table 4: Round 2 – Post BAFO**

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>MAQ Score (45)</b>	<b>Cost Score (35)</b>	<b>Total Score (80)</b>
KERAMIDA	43.67	30.74	74.41
Patriot	37.92	35.00	72.92

**F. IDOA Scoring**

IDOA scored the Respondents in the following areas: Buy Indiana (5 pts.), MBE Subcontractor Commitment (5 points + 1 available bonus point), WBE Subcontractor Commitment (5 points + 1 available bonus point), and Indiana Veteran Owned Small Business Subcontractor Commitment (5 points + 1 available bonus point) using the criteria outlined in the RFP. The total scores out of 103 possible points were tabulated and are as follows:

**Table 5: Final Overall Evaluation Scores**

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>MAQ Score</b>	<b>Cost Score</b>	<b>Buy Indiana</b>	<b>MBE</b>	<b>WBE</b>	<b>IVOSB</b>	<b>Total Score</b>
<b>Points Possible</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5 (+1 bonus pt.)</b>	<b>5 (+1 bonus pt.)</b>	<b>5 (+1 bonus pt.)</b>	<b>100 (+3 bonus pts.)</b>
KERAMIDA	43.67	30.74	5.00	-1.00	5.00	-1.00	82.41
Patriot	37.92	35.00	0.00*	-1.00	6.00	-1.00	76.92

\*Claimed Buy Indiana, but did not qualify according to the requirement outlined in Section 2.6.2 and 2.6.3 of the RFP.

## Award Summary

During the course of evaluation, the State scrutinized the proposals to determine the viability of the proposed solution to meet the goals of the program and the needs of the State. The team evaluated the 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 from the date of contract execution.

*Stephanie Nelson*

---

Stephanie Nelson  
Procurement Consultant - Account Management  
Indiana Department of Administration