



# STATE OF INDIANA

Mike Braun, Governor

## DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATION Commissioner's Office

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

### Award Recommendation Letter

Date: February 6, 2026

To: Jenny Jansen, Procurement Director,  
Indiana Department of Administration

From: Kevin March, Procurement Consultant,  
Indiana Department of Administration

Subject: Recommendation of Selection for RFP 25-81401,  
Equipment Maintenance Management

Based on its evaluation of responses to RFP 25-81401, it is the evaluation team's recommendation that Electronic Risk Consultants, Inc (ERC) and Remi Holdings, LLC (Remi) be selected to begin contract negotiations to administer the Equipment Maintenance Management Quantity Purchase Agreement for All State Agencies (ASA).

*ERC has committed to subcontract 9.0% of the contract value to **Lee Infinite Solutions** (a certified Minority-owned Business (MBE)). Remi has committed to subcontract 8.0% of the contract value to **Geyer Fire Protection, LLC** (a certified Minority-owned Business (MBE)).*

The terms of this recommendation are included in this letter.

The evaluation team received three (3) proposals from:

1. Electronic Risk Consultants, Inc. (ERC)
2. Remi Holdings, LLC (Remi)
3. Specialty Underwriters, LLC (SU)

The proposals were evaluated by Key Stakeholder State Agencies 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. Three (3) 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:

- Company Financials
- References
- Experience Serving State Government

##### Technical Proposal

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

- Section 2.4.1 – General Requirements and Definitions
- Sections 2.4.2 – 2.4.3 – Covered Equipment & Coverage
- Sections 2.4.4 – 2.4.6 – Customer Service, Response Time, & Third-Party Maintenance/Repair Service Providers
- Sections 2.4.7 – 2.4.11 – Tagging Equipment, Replacement Parts, Rental/Substitution of Equipment & Removal of Equipment
- Sections 2.4.12 – 2.4.17 – Policy Period, Renewals, Service Provider Notification, Portfolio Analysis, & Service Agreement
- Sections 2.4.18 – 2.4.19 – Invoicing and Payment, & Reporting
- Sections 2.4.20 – 2.4.22 – Dispatch, Training, & Implementation

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	41.50
Remi	42.67
SU	41.83

#### C. Cost Proposal (30 Points)

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

Score =

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \bullet \text{ If Respondent's \% Discount amount is highest among all Respondents,} \\ \text{then score is 30.} \\ \\ \bullet \text{ If Respondent's \% Discount amount is NOT highest among all} \\ \text{Respondents, then score is:} \\ \\ 30 * \frac{(\text{Highest Respondent's \% Discount})}{(\text{Respondent's \% Discount})} \end{array} \right.$$

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

**Table 2: Round 1 – Cost Scores**

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Cost Score 30 pts.</b>
ERC	29.73
Remi	30.00
SU	27.72

**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)**

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Total Score 80 pts.</b>
ERC	71.23
Remi	72.67
SU	69.55

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

**E. Post Oral Presentations – Second Round MAQ Scores**

The Respondents' 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 after the Oral Presentations were as follows.

**Table 4: Round 2 – Management Assessment/Quality Scores**

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>MAQ Score 50 pts.</b>
ERC	43.42
Remi	43.75
SU	41.83

**F. Round 2 - Total Scores**

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

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

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>MAQ Score</b>	<b>Cost Score</b>	<b>Total Score</b>
<b>Points Possible</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>80</b>
ERC	43.42	29.73	73.15
Remi	43.75	30.00	73.75
SU	41.83	27.72	69.55

#### **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. The total scores out of 100 possible points were tabulated and are as follows:

**Table 7: Final 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>50</b>	<b>30</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 pt.)</b>
ERC	43.42	29.73	0.00	5.00	-1.00	-1.00	76.15
Remi	43.75	30.00	0.00	5.00	-1.00	-1.00	76.75
SU	41.83	27.72	0.00	-1.00	-1.00	-1.00	66.55

\* 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 four (4) years from the date of contract execution. There may be two (2) one-year renewals for a total of six (6) years at the State's option.

