



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: July 31, 2026

To: Kevin March, Category Director – Information Technology
Indiana Department of Administration

Signed by:

Kevin March
F57C5348AE7D4C5...

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

Subject: Recommendation of Selection for RFP 26-86529, Centralized Billing Office and Cost Report

Based on its evaluation of responses to RFP 26-86529, it is the evaluation team's recommendation that Blue & Co., LLC be selected to begin contract negotiations to administer the Centralized Billing Office and Cost Report program.

*Blue & Co., LLC has committed to subcontract 3% of the contract value to **GenTech Associates** (a certified Indiana Veteran Owned Small Business (IVOSB)).*

The terms of this recommendation are included in this letter.

Annual value during initial 4-year term: \$996,000.00
Total value during initial 4-year term: \$3,984,000.00
Annual value of optional years, at the State's option: \$1,095,600.00
Total value of 6-year term, at the State's option: \$6,175,200.00

The evaluation team received three (3) proposals from:

1. Blue & Co., LLC (Blue & Co)
2. CB Healthcare Services (CB)
3. Medical Billing Partners (MBP)

The proposals were evaluated by IOT, 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. No 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 Financials
- References
- Experience Serving State Governments

Technical Proposal

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

- Centralized Billing Office
- Cost Report
- Training or Certifications

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 and Cost 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.
Blue & Co	33.00
CB	8.25
MBP	8.00

C. Cost Proposal (30 Points)

The price points on the Respondent’s Costs were awarded 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: Round 1 – Cost Scores

Respondent	Cost Score 30 pts.
Blue & Co	28.32
CB	4.40
MBP	30.00

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)

Respondent	Total Score 80 pts.
Blue & Co	61.32
CB	12.65
MBP	38.00

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

The State elected to issue Best and Final Offers (BAFOs) to Blue & Co..

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.
Blue & Co	28.32
CB	4.40
MBP	30.00

F. Round 2 - Total Scores

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

Table 6: Round 2 - Evaluation Scores

Respondent	MAQ Score	Cost Score	Total Score
Points Possible	50	30	80
Blue & Co	33.00	28.32	61.32
CB	8.25	4.40	12.65
MBP	8.00	30.00	38.00

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. IDOA requested updated M/WBE and IVOSB commitments from the Respondents who submitted BAFO Cost Proposals. Once the final M/WBE and IVOSB forms were received from the Respondent, the total scores out of 100 possible points were tabulated and are as follows:

Table 7: Final Evaluation Scores

Respondent	MAQ Score	Cost Score	Buy Indiana*	MBE*	WBE*	IVOSB*	Total Score
Points Possible	50	30	5	5 (+1 bonus pt.)	5 (+1 bonus pt.)	5 (+1 bonus pt.)	100 (+3 bonus pt.)
Blue & Co	33.00	28.32	0.00	-1.00	-1.00	5.00	64.32
CB	8.25	4.40	5.00	1.88	1.35	6.00	26.88
MBP	8.00	30.00	0.00	-1.00	-1.00	-1.00	35.00

* 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 optional years for a total of six (6) years at the State's option.

