



# STATE OF INDIANA

## DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATION Commissioner's Office

Mike Braun, Governor

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

### Award Recommendation Letter

Date: October 1, 2025

To: Mark Hempel, Procurement Director,  
Indiana Department of Administration

From: Christina Garcia, Procurement Consultant,  
Indiana Department of Administration

Subject: Recommendation of Selection for RFP 25-81445,  
Laboratory Analytical Services

DocuSigned by:

*Mark Hempel*

AC1D5BEC2416499...

Based on the evaluation of responses to RFP 25-81445, it is the evaluation team's recommendation that Eurofins Eaton Analytical and Pace Analytical Services, LLC be selected to begin contract negotiations to provide the Laboratory Analytical Service for the Indiana Department of Environmental Management and (IDEM) Office of Water Quality (OWQ).

*Neither Eurofins Eaton Analytical and Pace Analytical Services nor committed to subcontract with any Minority-owned Business (MBE), certified Women-owned Business (WBE), or certified Indiana Veteran Owned Small Business (IVOSB).*

The terms of this recommendation are included in this letter.

Estimated Annual Contract Value to:  
Eurofins Eaton Analytical, LLC - \$150,000.00  
Pace Analytical Services, LLC. - \$751,150.00

The evaluation team received two (2) proposals from:

1. Eurofins Eaton Analytical, LLC ("Eurofins")
2. Pace Analytical Services, LLC ("Pace")

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)	45
3. Cost (Cost Proposal)	35
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. The 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:

- References
- Experience Serving State Governments and Experience Serving Similar Clients
- All other remaining sections of the Business Proposal

##### Technical Proposal

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

- Ability and Desire to Perform Work
- Subcontractors, Responsibilities and Qualifications
- Key Personnel
- Quality Assurance / Quality Control Program
- Analytical Reporting / Explanations Available
- Facilities Diagram, Description, and Instrumentation
- Plan to Participate in a Proficiency Testing (PT) Sample Program
- Previous Two (2) Years Proficiency Testing (PT) Results
- Method Detection Limit (MDL) Studies
- Contract Require Reporting Limits (CRQL) for Each Analyte
- Laboratory Capacity
- Hours of Delivery / After-Hour Deliveries / Friday Deliveries
- Maintaining All Documentation and Data

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 45 pts.
Eurofins Eaton Analytical, LLC	41.31
Pace Analytical Services, LLC	40.50

#### C. Cost Proposal (35 Points)

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

$$\text{Score} = \begin{cases} \bullet \text{ If Respondent's Cost amount is lowest among all Respondents, then score is 35.} \\ \bullet \text{ If Respondent's Cost amount is NOT lowest among all Respondents, then score is:} \\ 35 * \frac{(\text{Lowest Respondent's Cost Amount})}{(\text{Respondent's Cost Amount})} \end{cases}$$

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

**Table 2: Round 1 – Cost Scores**

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Cost Score 35 pts.</b>
Eurofins Eaton Analytical, LLC	35.00
Pace Analytical Services, LLC	32.86

**D. First Round Total Scores**

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>
Eurofins Eaton Analytical, LLC	76.31
Pace Analytical Services, LLC	73.36

The evaluation team elected to not have Oral Presentations.

**E. Second Round MAQ Scores**

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

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>MAQ Score 45 pts.</b>
Eurofins Eaton Analytical, LLC	41.31
Pace Analytical Services, LLC	40.50

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

The State elected to issue Best and Final Offers (BAFOs) to the two Respondents. Upon further review of the Cost Proposals, the evaluators noticed that Eurofins had not submitted a bid on every item listed on the cost proposal, while Pace had submitted a bid on every item listed. Eurofins submitted a BAFO cost proposal without significant changes, and Pace did not submit a BAFO cost proposal.

The cost scoring as a result of the Respondents' BAFO Cost Proposals is as follows:

**Table 5: Round 2 – BAFO Cost Scores**

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Cost Score 35 pts.</b>
Eurofins Eaton Analytical, LLC	33.56
Pace Analytical Services, LLC	35.00

**G. 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**

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>MAQ Score</b>	<b>Cost Score</b>	<b>Total Score</b>
<b>Points Possible</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>80</b>
Eurofins Eaton Analytical, LLC	41.31	33.56	74.87
Pace Analytical Services, LLC	40.50	35.00	75.50

#### **H. IDOA Scoring**

IDOA requested updated M/WBE and IVOSB commitments from the Respondents who submitted BAFO Cost Proposals. Since neither respondent included any MBE, WBE, or IVOSB suppliers in their proposal, and neither respondent claimed the Buy Indiana preference, 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>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 pt.)</b>
Eurofins Eaton Analytical, LLC	41.31	33.56	0.00	-1.00	-1.00	-1.00	71.87
Pace Analytical Services, LLC	40.50	35.00	0.00	-1.00	-1.00	-1.00	72.50

\* 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.

This award is conditioned upon the execution of a contract between the State and Pace within a reasonable time.

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.

