



Oregon

Theodore R. Kulongoski, Governor

Department of Corrections
Business and Finance Division
Purchasing/Contracts Unit
3601 State Street, Suite 280
Salem, OR 97301-5780
PHONE (503) 378-3798 x 22492
FAX (503) 371-3161
e-mail Terri.Woodvine@doc.state.or.us

November 24, 2004

ADDENDA #1
to
INMATE COMPACT DISCS, RFP #110304

Below you will find Revision, clarifications, deletions and/or additions to the bid specifications. This addenda modifies the related Request for Proposal only to extent specifically indicated herein. All other areas not specifically mentioned or affected by this addenda shall remain in full force and effect.

This addenda shall be added to and become part of the original Request for Proposal.

1) In reference to Section 6.2.9, SIGNATURE, what exactly is required in this signature page?

Section 6.2.9, Signature is an explanation and is referring to Section 11 and Appendix A (Pricing Template), however Appendix B and C must also be completed by the Proposer.

2) Where should the proposal be signed, and is there more than one place in the proposal where a signature is required?

Signature is required in Section 11 and Appendix A (Pricing Template), however Appendix B and C must also be completed by the Proposer.

3) Is Section 11 (pages 24, 25, 26) usable as the signature pages itself? Or is this additional signatures which must be included?

Section 11 is a required section to be completed and signed. Additional signatures are also required for Appendix A.

4) In reference to Section 6.2.10, COMPLETE PROPOSALS, is there a separate document that must be created to state that this is a complete proposal? Is there a checklist required to illustrate a complete proposal? Or is this just a reminder not to leave out any Mandatory information?

Section 6.2.10 is just a reminder that all required information requested of this RFP must be filled out.

5) Section 7, MANDATORY REQUIREMENTS, this section states that it is Pass/Fail only. However, when looking at the scoring, it seems to us that some of these requirements would otherwise help the scoring of a vendor who has experience in following these requirements as part of a daily business practice. While we realize that many of the same points will be brought up as part of Section 8-Desireables' we would like to see if criteria within the Mandatory requirements are all weighted the same, or are you allowing for different levels within the requirements met?

Refer to Section 7.1.2, Mandatory Requirements. All Mandatory requirements are weighted the same on a Pass/Fail basis. The purpose of this stage is to determine if the Proposal meets the Mandatory Proposal Requirements listed in Sections 7 through 7.2.24. Proposals will be reviewed by the Evaluation Committee to determine if they are complete. Proposer's failure to comply with the instructions or to submit a complete Proposal may result in the Proposal as being deemed non-responsive.

6) We feel that Section 7 should have some more influence over the scoring of the proposal, since there are different levels to which the requirements can be met by a Contractor. Examples would include: type/quality of catalog provided, proposer background, etc.

All Mandatory's are the minimum requirements for this RFP. Proposers must meet this minimum requirement to be responsive to this RFP. All Mandatory's are to be considered Pass/Fail.

- 7) **In Section 8, DESIREABLES, 8.2 Introduction and Summary, it states the introduction and summary should be brief, no more than 2 pages. Does that mean 8.2.1 Proposed Approach, 8.2.2 QA Projects should all be included in just those 2 pages?**

No. Section 8.2 should be a brief introductory of an overview/summary of your business. Section 8.2.1 and 8.2.2 would be in addition to the 2-page summary as referenced in 8.2.

- 8) **It appears that 100 points of the bid score are going to be pulled from this Section. 2 pages does not seem to be enough to fully describe all of the scored desirables in a way that would allow a vendor to display all of their advantages in fulfilling the desires of the RFP. We would like to see greater emphasis in the scoring placed on the desirables.**

All scoring is placed on desirables and pricing. All proposals meeting the Mandatory Criteria shall than be reviewed and scored by an evaluation committee according to the Desirable Criteria as indicated in Section 10.1.4 (Summary of Scored Desirables).

- 9) **In Section 9, PRICING PROPOSAL, there is some question to how this should be submitted. The RFP calls for a separate sealed envelope with 1 original and 4 copies of the pricing template. What is the original copy supposed to consist of?**

This is referring to Appendix A which consists of catalog list, total number of titles and price.

- 10) **The pricing template asks for: Price, Total Price, Grand Total. Since there are an average of over 15,000 available CD's, will this template be required for each item?**

No.

- 11) **What does "Total Price" mean versus "Price"? What will "Grand Total" be the total of?**

Total Price and Grand Total are to be deleted from the RFP referenced in Appendix A (Pricing Template)

- 12) **In 9.1 PROPOSER RESPONSE FORMAT, it calls for catalog list, number of titles and price per item, does this mean you want a listing, title by title, of every item in the available listing?**

Yes. A printout format or catalog will be acceptable.

- 13) **How will pricing be scored? Will it be scored on an item by item basis?**

Pricing will not be scored on an item by item basis. It will be scored on the price per CD. See scoring criteria in question 15.

- 14) **What about items which are not carried by other vendors?**

Yes, they will be scored as per Section 10.1.4 (types of CD's available).

- 15) **How will the scoring work? (will a low price receive points, while higher pricing receive zero points, will there be percentage of price higher/lower affecting points awarded, etc.?)**

Below is the criteria which will be used for the financial evaluation.

The lowest priced responsive and responsible Proposal shall be given a total of 100 points. Other Proposers will receive a percentage of the points relative to the amount they proposed as compared to the lowest Proposer. If the lowest priced Proposal was \$10 and a Proposer proposed \$15 it would receive 67 points: computes \$10 divided by \$15 times 100 points equals 67 points (rounded).

- 16) **We also would like to protest the fact that 100 points of the total bid award is based on price alone. Price is an important component of this overall RFP but it seems to be weighted as heavily as the entire qualifications, requirements of the RFP combined. We believe a better scoring system that would reflect the most qualified vendor would be approximately 150 points to vendor attributes, desirables and proposal, with 50 points for the pricing structure.**

The pricing is only half of the total maximum points that can be received. The point's structure, will remain the same as outlined in Section 10.1.4.

NOTE: Schedule of Event dates have changed as follows:

Closing Date and Time: December 2, 2004, @ 3:00 PM Pacific Standard Time (PST)

Announce Competitive Range: December 9, 2004

Protest of Competitive Range: December 16, 2004

Begin Final Contract Negotiation: December 17, 2004

Issue Intent to Award: December 22, 2004

Protest of Award Period Ends: December 30, 2004 @ 3:00 PM (PST)

Issue Notice to Proceed Letter: January 2, 2005

This addenda represents all material change to the Request for Proposal and is required to be signed and returned by the Bid closing date and time. Failure to do so may result in bid rejection.

Company Name: _____

Authorized Signature: _____

Date: _____