



### Award Recommendation Letter

Date: June 1, 2021

To: Mark Hempel, Director of Account Management  
Indiana Department of Administration

From: Teresa Deaton-Reese, Senior Account Manager  
Indiana Department of Administration

Subject: Recommendation of Selection for RFP 21-66776; State Epidemiological Outcomes Workgroup

**Estimated annual contract value: \$305,000.00**

Based on its evaluation of responses to RFP 21-66776, it is the evaluation team's recommendation that Syra Health Corp be selected to begin contract negotiations to provide State Epidemiological Outcomes Workgroup.

*Syra Health Corp has committed to subcontract 8.28% of the contract value to IT Transformers, Inc. (a certified Minority-owned Business (MBE)), 10.16% of the contract value to Certified Fraud and Forensic Investigations (a certified Women-owned Business (WBE)), 6.50% of the contract value to Bingle Research Group, Inc. (a certified Indiana Veterans Small Business (IVOSB)).*

The terms of this recommendation are included in this letter.

The evaluation team received three (3) proposals from:

- KSM Consulting, LLC
- Syra Health Corp
- Trustees of Indiana University

The proposals were evaluated by FSSA, DMHA 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)	45 points
3. Cost (Cost Proposal)	35 points (5 bonus points available)
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)

Total: 100 (108 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 Respondents were deemed responsive and adhered to the mandatory requirements and were moved forward for evaluation.

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

The Respondents’ proposals were each evaluated based on their respective Business Proposal and Technical Proposal.

**Business Proposal (5 points)**

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 Financial Information
- References
- Experience Serving Similar Clients

**Technical Proposal (40 points)**

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

- support and management of the SEOW
- company’s experience in collecting and interpreting data in the areas of alcohol, tobacco, tobacco related products, other substances, and mental health.
- company’s familiarity with concepts of substance misuse prevention
- company’s experience in collecting and interpreting data among the following priority populations: college, students, Native Americans, rural populations, underserved high- need geographic areas in Indiana, underserved racial and ethnic minorities, including LGBTQ+
- will subcontract with an entity that has the experience to evaluate the DMHA Prevention Regional Model
- company’s ability to hold at least five meetings annually
- company’s experience in the preparation of summary documents regarding decisions and recommendations.
- company’s experience utilizing existing or archival data from various academic, federal, and state sources
- assure that the SEOW maintains a surveillance program consistent with the federal guidelines regarding the National Outcome Measures (NOMs) initiative
- identify project staff and detail their relevant statistical and epidemiological expertise.
- develop and implement a comprehensive and systematic strategy for monitoring substance use and abuse across the state
- ability to produce both regular statistical reports and special studies/report briefs
- assure that all data is stored on secure computers and servers in accordance with HIPAA and other state and federal regulations governing the protection of human subjects in research
- evaluate the functioning of the SEOW group and provide recommendations for improvement in the group and in the data reported
- company’s experience providing consultation on data interpretation and data application. What are your typical response and data turn-around times
- company’s experience in, and process for, providing technical assistance to groups and/or providers at the county or regional level

**Table 1: Management Assessment/Quality Scores – Round 1**

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>MAQ Score 45 pts.</b>
KSM Consulting, LLC	32.50
Syra Health Corp	33.50
Trustee of Indiana University	41.00

**C. Cost Proposal (35)**

## Price

**35** available points + 5 bonus points

Price will be measured against the State’s baseline cost for this scope of work. The cost that the State is currently paying or its best estimate will constitute the baseline cost. Cost scoring points will be assigned as follows:

- Respondents who meet the State’s current baseline cost will receive zero (0) cost points.
- Respondents who propose a decrease to the State’s current costs will receive positive points at the same rate as bid increasing cost.
- Respondents who propose an increase to the State’s current cost will receive negative points at the same rate as bid lowering cost.
- Respondents who propose a 10% decrease to the State’s current baseline cost will receive all of the available cost points.
- If multiple Respondents decrease costs below 10% of the current baseline, an additional 5 points will be added to the Respondent proposing the lowest cost to the State.

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

**Table 2: Cost Scores – Round 1**

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Cost Score 35 pts.</b>
KSM Consulting	35.00
Syra Health Corp	35.00
Trustee of Indiana University	1.38

**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**

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Total Score 80 pts.</b>
KSM Consulting	67.50
Syra Health Corp	68.50
Trustee of Indiana University	42.38

The evaluation team elected to issue Best and Final Offer (BAFO) requests, to all Respondents.

**E. Post BAFO Responses**

The Respondent’s cost scores were reviewed and re-evaluated based on the BAFO. The scores for the Respondents after the BAFO responses were as follows:

**Table 4: Post BAFO Responses Round 2 – Evaluation Scores**

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>MAQ Score (45)</b>	<b>Cost Score (35)</b>	<b>Total Score (80)</b>
KSM Consulting	32.50	35.00	67.50
Syra Health Corp	33.50	40.00	73.50
Trustee of Indiana University	41.00	35.00	76.00

**F. IDOA Scoring**

IDOA scored the Respondents in the following areas: Buy Indiana (5 points), MBE Subcontractor Commitment (5 points + 1 available bonus point), WBE Subcontractor Commitment (5 points + 1 available bonus point), and Indiana Veterans Owned Small Business (5 points + 1 available bonus point) using the criteria outlined in the RFP. When necessary, IDOA clarified certain M/WBE and IVOSB information with the Respondents. Once the final M/WBE forms were received from the Respondents, the total scores out of 108 possible points were tabulated and are as follows:

**Table 5: 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>45</b>	<b>35 (+5 bonus pts)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5 (+1 bonus pt.)</b>	<b>5 (+1 bonus pt.)</b>	<b>5 (+1 bonus pt.)</b>	<b>100 (+ 8 bonus pts.)</b>
KSM Consulting	32.50	35.00	5.00	6.00	6.00	5.00	89.50
Syra Health Corp	33.50	40.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	6.00	94.50
Trustee of Indiana University	41.00	35.00	5.00	-1.00	5.00	1.32	86.32

**Award Summary**

During the course of evaluation, the State scrutinized all proposals to determine the viability of the proposal 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 two (2) years from the date of contract execution. There may be two (2) one-year renewals for a total of four (4) years at the State’s option.