



STATE OF INDIANA  
Eric Holcomb, Governor

Department of Administration  
Procurement Division  
Indiana Government Center South  
402 W. Washington Street, Room W462  
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204

### Award Recommendation Letter

Date: June 20, 2022

To: Erin Kellam, Deputy Commissioner  
Indiana Department of Administration

From: Teresa Deaton-Reese, CPPB, CPPO, Procurement Consultant  
Indiana Department of Administration

Subject: Recommendation of Selection for RFP 22-71266; Water and Wastewater Operation Services for the  
Indiana Department of Correction

Based on the evaluation of responses to RFP 22-71266, it is the evaluation team's recommendation to selected Astbury Water Technology, Inc. to begin contract negotiations to provide Water and Wastewater Operation Services for the Department of Correction.

The terms of this recommendation are included in this letter.

Estimated Four (4) Years Contract Value: \$648,000.00

The evaluation team received one (1) RFP response:

1. Astbury Water Technology, Inc.

The proposal was evaluated by the Department of Correction and Department of Administration (IDOA) according to the following 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 (plus 5 bonus pts)
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)
7. Indiana Veterans Owned Small Business Subcontractor Commitment	5 (1 bonus point available)

Total: 100 (108 if bonus awarded)

The proposal was 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 adhered to the mandatory requirements and were moved to the next step in the evaluation process.

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

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

**Business Proposal (5 points)**

For the Business Proposal evaluation, the evaluation team considered the Respondents organizational structure and financial stability as defined in Section 2.3 of the RFP. The evaluation teams scores were based on a review of the Respondents Business Proposal, **Attachment E**.

**Technical Proposal (40 points)**

For the Technical Proposal evaluation, the evaluation team considered the Respondent’s ability to effectively perform the scope of work in Section 2.4 of the RFP. The evaluation teams scores were based on a review of the Respondents Technical Proposal, **Attachment F**.

The evaluation teams Round 1 scoring was based on a review of the Respondent’s proposed approach to each section of the Business Proposal, Technical Proposal, and responses to clarification questions. The initial results of the Management Assessment/Quality Evaluation are shown below:

**Table 1a – MAQ – Child Support**

<b>Respondents Name</b>	<b>MAQ Score</b>
Astbury Water Technology, Inc	44.25

**C. Cost Proposal (35 + 5 bonus pts)**

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 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 Respondent cost area follows:

**Table 2a – Cost**

<b>Respondents Name</b>	<b>Cost Score</b>
Astbury Water Technology, Inc.	-28.00

#### **D. Initial (Round 1) Total Scores and Shortlisting**

The initial Management Assessment and Quality (MAQ) Score in Table 1 were combined with the initial Cost Score in Table 2 to generate the combined initial scores in Table 3. The combined initial MAQ and Cost Scores from the initial evaluations are listed below.

**Table 3a: Round 1 - Total Scores**

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Total Score 80 pts.(+5 bonus pts)</b>
Astbury Water Technology, Inc.	16.25

#### **E. Second Round Scores – Clarifications and BAFO Responses**

The Respondent's MAQ and Cost Scores were reviewed and re-evaluated based on clarification and BAFO responses. The Round 2 scores for the Respondents after clarification and the BAFO responses were as follows:

**Table 4a: BAFO Responses**

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>MAQ Score (45)</b>	<b>Cost Score (35 +5 bonus Pts)</b>	<b>To.tal Score 80 pts. (+5 bonus pts.)</b>
Astbury Water Technology, Inc	44.25	-28.00	16.25

#### **F. IDOA Scoring**

IDOA scored the Respondent in the following areas: Buy Indiana (5 pts.), MBE Subcontractor Commitment (5 points + 1 available bonus point), WBE Subcontractor Commitment (5 points + 1 available bonus point), and Indiana Veterans Owned Small Business Subcontractor Commitment (5 points + 1 available bonus point) using the criteria outlined in the RFP. The total scores out of 108 possible points were tabulated and are as follows:

**Table 5a: Final Overall 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>
Astbury Water Technology, Inc.	44.25	-28.00	5.00	4.38	-1.00	6.00	30.63

### **Award Summary**

During the course of evaluation, the State scrutinized the proposal to determine the viability of the proposed solutions 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 four (4) years from the date of contract execution. There will no renewals.