



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 13, 2026

To: Robert Cohen, Category Director – Major Procurements, **Robert Cohen**
Indiana Department of Administration

From: Angie Alexander, Procurement Consultant,
Indiana Department of Administration

Subject: Recommendation of Selection for RFP 26-85961;
Vocational Rehabilitation Business Network

Based on its evaluation of responses to RFP 26-85961, it is the evaluation team's recommendation that Hamilton County Government/Economic Development be selected to begin contract negotiations to administer the Vocational Rehabilitation Business Network.

The term of the contract shall be for a period of two (2) years from the date of contract execution. There may be one (1) two-year renewal for a total of four (4) years at the State's option.

Estimated Contract Value: \$616,504.28

Estimated maximum contract value (including option renewal) \$1,202,174.53

The evaluation team received one (1) proposal from:

1. Hamilton County Government/Economic Development

The proposals were evaluated by IOT,DDRS, BRS, 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)	60
3. Cost (Cost Proposal)	20
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. One (1) proposal was deemed responsive and adhered to the mandatory requirements.

B. Management Assessment/Quality: Initial Scoring

The Respondent's proposal was 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 Information/Financials
- References
- Experience Serving State Governments/Similar Clients

Technical Proposal

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

- Scope of Work: Staffing & Expertise
- Scope of Work: Business Network
- Scope of Work: Connecting VR Requests with appropriate Business Network Partners
- Scope of Work: Capacity
- Scope of Work: Career Pathway Tools
- Scope of Work: 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 60 pts.
Hamilton County Government	51.14

C. Cost Proposal (20 Points)

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

Score =

$$\begin{cases}
 \bullet \text{ If Respondent's Cost amount is lowest among all Respondents, then score is 20.} \\
 \bullet \text{ If Respondent's Cost amount is NOT lowest among all Respondents, then score is:} \\
 20 * \frac{(\text{Lowest Respondent's Cost Amount})}{(\text{Respondent's Cost Amount})}
 \end{cases}$$

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

Table 2: Round 1 – Cost Scores

Respondent	Cost Score 20 pts.
Hamilton County Government	20.00

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.
Hamilton County Government	71.14

E. Oral Presentations/Clarifications – Second Round MAQ & Cost Scores

The State chose to forego any Clarifications and/or Oral Presentations therefore the scores remained the same

Table 4: Round 2 – Management Assessment/Quality Scores

Respondent	MAQ Score 60 pts.
Hamilton County Government	51.14

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

The State elected to issue Best and Final Offers (BAFOs) to Hamilton County Government and the Cost remained the same.

The cost scoring as a result of the Respondent's BAFO Cost Proposal is as follows:

Table 5: Round 2 – BAFO Cost Scores

Respondent	Cost Score 20 pts.
Hamilton County Government	20.00

G. Round 2 - Total Scores

The combined final scores for the Respondent, 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	60	20	80
Hamilton County Government	51.14	20.0	71.14

H. IDOA Scoring

IDOA scored the Respondent 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 Respondent 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	60	20	5	5 (+1 bonus pt.)	5 (+1 bonus pt.)	5 (+1 bonus pt.)	100 (+3 bonus pt.)
Hamilton County Government	51.14	20.00	0.00	-1.0	-1.0	-1.0	68.14

* 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 the proposal to determine the viability to meet the goals of the program and the needs of the State. The team evaluated the proposal 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 one (1) two-year renewal for a total of four (4) years at the State's option.

