



# STATE OF INDIANA

ERIC J. HOLCOMB, GOVERNOR

DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATION

Commissioner's Office

402 West Washington Street, Room W469  
Indiana Government Center – South  
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204-2746

## Award Recommendation Letter

Date: October 18, 2024

To: Erin Kellam, Deputy Commissioner,  
Indiana Department of Administration

From: Arthur L. Sample IV, Procurement Specialist,  
Indiana Department of Administration

Subject: Recommendation of Selection for **215-24-77471, Cost Conversion Services**

Based on its evaluation of response to RFP 215-24-77471, it is the evaluation team's recommendation that **J Wayne Moore PHD, LLC**. be selected to begin contract negotiations to administer the Indiana Department of Local Government Finance (DLGF)

The details of this recommendation are included in this letter.

Estimated 2-year Contract Value: \$118,500.00

The evaluation team received two (2) proposal from:

- J Wayne Moore PHD, LLC
- Tyer Technologies

The Proposal was evaluated by DLGF 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)	50
3. Cost (Cost Proposal)	30
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 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. The 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:

- References
- Company Financials
- Experience Serving State Governments

**Technical Proposal**

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

- General Requirements and Definitions
- Right to use construction cost data.
- Conversion services and training

The evaluation team’s initial scoring is based on a review of the Respondent’s proposed approaches to each section of the Business Proposal and Technical Proposal. The initial results of the Management Assessment/Quality Evaluation are shown below:

**Table 1: Initial Management Assessment/Quality Scores**

Respondent	MAQ Score 50 pts.
J Wayne Moore PHD, LLC.	26.75
Tyer Technologies	9.50

**C. Cost Proposal (30 Points)**

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

Score = {

- If Respondent’s Cost amount is lowest among all Respondents, then score is 30.
- If Respondent’s Cost amount is NOT lowest among all Respondents, then score is:

$$30 * \frac{\text{Lowest Respondent's Cost Amount}}{\text{Respondent's Cost Amount}}$$

The cost scoring as a result of the Respondent’s cost Proposal is as follows:

**Table 2: Initial Cost Scores**

Respondent	Cost Score 30 pts.
J Wayne Moore PHD, LLC.	30.00
Tyer Technologies	16.27

**D. Combined MAQ and Cost Scores**

The MAQ and Cost Combined Scoring as a result of the Respondent's business, technical, and cost Proposal is as follows:

**Table 3: Round 1 – Total Scores (MAQ + Cost)**

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Total Score 80 pts.</b>
J Wayne Moore PHD, LLC.	56.75
Tyer Technologies	25.77

**E. Clarifications**

Score was finalized and remained unchanged after the clarification.

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

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>MAQ Score 50 pts.</b>
J Wayne Moore PHD, LLC.	26.75
Tyer Technologies	9.50

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

The Respondent's score was reviewed and re-evaluated based on the BAFO response.

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

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

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Cost Score 30 pts.</b>
J Wayne Moore PHD, LLC.	30.00
Tyer Technologies	15.46

**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**

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>MAQ Score</b>	<b>Cost Score</b>	<b>Total Score</b>
<b>Points Possible</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>80</b>
J Wayne Moore PHD, LLC.	26.75	30	56.75
Tyer Technologies	9.50	15.46	24.96

## 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 Proposal. 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**

<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>50</b>	<b>30</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>
J Wayne Moore PHD, LLC.	26.75	30.00	0.00	-1.00	-1.00	-1.00	53.75
Tyer Technologies	9.50	15.46	0.00	-1.00	-1.00	-1.00	21.96

### 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 initial term of the contract(s) shall be for two (2) years. The term of the contract(s) may be extended and/or renewed for a period not to exceed four (4) years from the date of contract execution.



Arthur L. Sample IV  
Procurement Specialist  
Indiana Department of Administration