



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: June 19, 2026

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

From: Robert Cohen, Procurement Governance Director,
Indiana Department of Administration

Subject: Recommendation of Selection for RFP 26-85265, USDA Foods Warehousing and Distribution Services

Signed by:

Mike Huth

DC845F9289414C0...

Based on its evaluation of responses to RFP 26-85265, it is the evaluation team's recommendation that Gordon Food Services, Inc. (GFS) be selected to begin contract negotiations to administer the USDA Foods Warehousing and Distribution Services (Region 3) for the Indiana Department of Education (IDOE).

The terms of this recommendation are included in this letter.

Estimated 5-year Contract Value: \$636,601.88

The evaluation team received three (3) proposals from:

1. Gordon Food Services, Inc. (GFS)
2. The Distribution Group, Inc. (Van Eerden)
3. Sysco Indianapolis (Sysco)

The proposals were evaluated by IDOE 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)
5. Women 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. All 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:

- Experience Serving State Governments/Similar Clients
- Company Financial Information
- References

Technical Proposal

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

- Scope of Work Section 2.4.2 – Facilities and Management
- Scope of Work Section 2.4.3 – Fleet and Shipping
- Scope of Work Section 2.4.4 – Inventory
- Scope of Work Section 2.4.5 – Records and Reporting

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 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.
GFS	37.00
Van Eerden	34.75
Sysco	40.50

C. Cost Proposal (30 Points)

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

Score =

$$\begin{cases}
 \bullet \text{ If Respondent's Cost amount is lowest among all Respondents, then score is 30.} \\
 \bullet \text{ If Respondent's Cost amount is NOT lowest among all Respondents, then score is:} \\
 30 * \frac{(\text{Lowest Respondent's Cost Amount})}{(\text{Respondent's Cost Amount})}
 \end{cases}$$

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

Table 2: Round 1 – Cost Scores

Respondent	Cost Score 30 pts.
GFS	30.00
Van Eerden	19.29

Sysco	22.22
-------	-------

D. First Round Total Scores and

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 80 pts.
GFS	67.00
Van Eerden	54.04
Sysco	62.72

The evaluation team elected to issue invites to Oral Presentations to the two (2) Respondents.

E. Post Oral Presentations – Second Round MAQ Scores

The Respondents' MAQ scores were reviewed and re-evaluated based on the Oral Presentations. The scores for the Respondents after the Oral Presentations were as follows.

Table 4: Round 2 – Management Assessment/Quality Scores

Respondent	MAQ Score 50 pts.
GFS	36.50
Van Eerden	34.75
Sysco	37.75

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

The State elected to issue Cost Clarifications and Best and Final Offers (BAFOs) to the two (2) 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 30 pts.
GFS	30.00
Van Eerden	28.89
Sysco	25.08

G. 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. Once the final M/WBE forms were received from the Respondent, the total scores out of 90 possible points were tabulated and are as follows:

Table 6: 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 pt.)
GFS	36.50	30.00	-1.00	-1.00	64.50
Van Eerden	34.75	28.89	-1.00	-1.00	61.64
Sysco	37.75	25.08	-1.00	-1.00	60.83

* See Sections 3.2.5 and 3.2.6 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 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 one (1) one-year renewal for a total of six (6) years at the State's option.

