



STATE OF INDIANA

MICHAEL R. PENCE, Governor

DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATION
Procurement Division
402 W Washington Street, Room W468
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204
317 / 232-3053

Award Recommendation Letter

Date: May 27th, 2016
To: Debbie Walker, Deputy Commissioner, Indiana Department of Administration
From: Patrick O'Connor, Strategic Sourcing Analyst
Subject: Request for Proposal 16-076, Integrated Marketing Communication Services

Estimated 2-year Contract Amount: \$2,000,000.00

Based on the evaluation of our team, we recommend for selection **Williams Randall** to begin contract negotiations to provide Integrated Marketing Communication Services for the State of Indiana.

*Williams Randall is committed to subcontracting 8% of the total contract value to **Fineline Printing** (a certified Minority-owned Business (MBE)), 8% of the total contract value to **Propeller Marketing** (a certified Women-owned Business (WBE)) and 3% of the total contract value to **One Point** (a certified Veteran-owned Business (IVBE)). Terms of the State's recommendations are included in this letter.*

The evaluation team received proposals from (eight) 8 vendors:

- Bailey Lauerman
- Bohlsen
- Brand Innovation
- BVK
- Caldwell VanRiper
- Hirons
- Mortenson
- Williams Randall

The proposals were evaluated by IDOA and the evaluation team according to the following criteria established in the RFP:

- Adherence to Requirements (Pass/Fail)
- Management Assessment/Quality (50 points)
- Cost Proposal (25 points)
- Indiana Economic Impact (5 points)
- Buy Indiana (5 points)
- Minority Business Participation (5 +1 potential points)
- Woman-Owned Business Participation (5+1 potential points)
- Indiana Veteran Business Enterprise (5+1 potential points)

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

All proposals were reviewed for adherence to mandatory requirements. All of the respondents adhered to the mandatory requirements and were then evaluated based on their business proposal, technical proposal, and cost proposal.

B. Management Assessment/Quality

Business Proposal

For the business proposal evaluation, the team considered the respondent's information provided in the business proposal. These areas were reviewed to assess the respondent's ability to serve the state:

- Respondent Information and Financial Stability
- References
- Proposed Subcontractors and Team Structure

Technical Proposal

For the technical proposal evaluation, the team considered the respondent's proposal in the following areas:

- Section 2.4.1 - Question 1 – General Information
- Section 2.4.1 - Question 2 – General Information
- Section 2.4.1 - Question 3 – General Information
- Section 2.4.1 - Question 4 – General Information
- Section 2.4.1 - Question 5 – General Information
- Section 2.4.1 - Question 6 – General Information
- Section 2.4.2 - Question 1 – Financial Information and References
- Section 2.4.2 - Question 2 – Financial Information and References
- Section 2.4.2 - Question 3 – Financial Information and References
- Section 2.4.3 - Question 1 – Project Plan and Estimate
- Section 2.4.4 - Question 1 – Other Information
- Section 2.4.4 - Question 2 – Other Information

The evaluation team's scores were based on a review of each respondent's business proposal, Section 2.3, and each respondent's proposed approach to each section of the technical proposal, Section 2.4, as well as responses to proposal clarifications.

Results of the management assessment/quality evaluation are shown below:

Table 1: Initial Management Assessment/Quality Scores

RESPONDENT	MAQ SCORE (50 Max)
Bailey Lauerman	30.25
Bohlsen	26.25
Brand Innovation	26.75
BVK	37.58
Caldwell VanRiper	40.00
Hirons	24.50
Mortenson	35.33
Williams Randall	42.83

C. Cost Proposal

Cost scores were then normalized to one another, based on the lowest cost proposal evaluated. The lowest cost proposal receives a total of 25 points. The normalization formula is as follows:

$$\text{Respondent's Cost Score} = (\text{Lowest Cost Proposal} / \text{Total Cost of Proposal}) \times 25$$

In an effort to ensure transparent and symmetrical cost scoring, the Core Services and Monthly Retainer rates were evaluated independently, using the normalization formula above, and combined for a final score that, while not necessarily representative of all available points, was allocated equitably across all bidders.

The cost scoring is as follows:

Table 2: Initial Cost Scores

RESPONDENT	COST SCORE (25 Max)
Bailey Lauerman	16.26
Bohlsen	13.40
Brand Innovation	11.95
BVK	10.75
Caldwell VanRiper	10.86
Hirons	24.04
Mortenson	14.41
Williams Randall	16.93

D. Short-List

The First Round Management Assessment and Quality Score in Table 1 (above) were combined with the Initial Cost Scores in Table 2 (above) to generate the total scores used to create a “short list”, as described in the RFP (Section 3.2). The combined scores out of a maximum possible 75 points are tabulated in Table 3 below.

Table 3: Pre Short-list Scores

RESPONDENT	MAQ SCORE (50 Max)	COST SCORE (25 Max)	TOTAL SCORE (75 Max)
Bailey Lauerman	30.25	16.26	46.51
Bohlsen	26.25	13.40	39.65
Brand Innovation	26.75	11.95	38.70
BVK	37.58	10.75	48.33
Caldwell VanRiper	40.00	10.86	50.86
Hirons	24.50	24.04	48.54
Mortenson	35.33	14.41	49.74
Williams Randall	42.83	16.93	59.76

There was a clear and natural break in the scores between Caldwell VanRiper, Hirons, Mortenson and Williams Randal from Bailey Lauerman, Bohlsen, Band Innovation and BVK. As such, Bailey Lauerman, Bohlsen, Band Innovation and BVK were eliminated from further evaluation. The short-listed vendors were then asked to provide an oral presentation to the evaluation team. The updated MAQ and best and final offer cost scores, after oral presentations, are reflective in Table 4 (below).

E. IDOA Scoring

IDOA scored the respondents in the following areas – Indiana Economic Impact (5 points), Buy Indiana (5 points), Minority Business Participation (5 +1 potential points), Women Business Participation (5 +1 potential points), and Indiana Veteran Business Enterprise (5 +1 potential points) using the criteria outlined in the RFP. When necessary, IDOA clarified certain Indiana Economic Impact, Buy Indiana, Minority and Women Business Participation, and Indiana Veteran Business Enterprise information with the respondents. Once the final IEI, MWBE, and IVBE forms were received from the respondents, the total scores out of 103 possible points were tabulated, and are as follows:

Table 3: Final Overall Evaluation Scores

RESPONDENT	MAQ SCORE (50 Max)	COST SCORE (25 Max)	Buy Indiana (5 Max)	IEI (5 Max)	MBE (6 Max)	WBE (6 Max)	IVBE (6 Max)	TOTAL SCORE (103 Max)
Caldwell VanRiper	35.50	11.22	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	2.50	69.22
Hirons	17.58	24.41	5.00	0.81	5.00	5.00	5.00	62.80
Mortenson	34.08	16.09	5.00	2.84	5.00	5.00	5.00	73.01
Williams Randall	46.92	17.47	5.00	1.40	5.00	5.00	5.00	85.79

Award Summary

During the course of evaluation, the state scrutinized all proposals to determine the viability of the proposed business solutions to meet the goals of the program and to meet 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.

Patrick O'Connor, Strategic Sourcing Analyst
Indiana Department of Administration