
ADDENDUM NUMBER 1

To the REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

Issued by:

Office of the Legislative Fiscal Analyst

Purchase of Copying or Printing Equipment and Associated Maintenance and Supplies

RFP No. LFA 2018-02

ADDENDUM # 1 August 28, 2018

This Addendum modifies the Request for Proposals, RFP No. LFA 2018-02 (“RFP”), issued by the Office of the Legislative Fiscal Analyst on August 10, 2018, as follows:

A. The RFP is supplemented by the following additional information in response to the questions indicated:

Question 1: Does LFA need the ability to (a) form multiple queues for Job Management; (b) use a stock library; and (c) use different line screens for prints?

Answer to Question 1: (a) Yes. (b) Yes. (c) Yes.

Question 2: Does the new contract have to be tied to the NASPO contract?

Answer to Question 2: No. LFA is seeking to purchase and service copiers under the RFP and is not procuring copiers or copier service under the NASPO (National Association of State Procurement Officials) contract.

Question 3: In the RFP, page 1 under Definitions 2-4 the models listed in the RFP for COPIER A (DPS 157), COPIER B (Versant 180) AND COPIER C (Xerox 560) did not match what we say (sic) on our walk through. Can you please confirm?

Answer to Question 3: COPIER A and COPIER B have the meanings described in the RFP. COPIER A and COPIER B are being purchased to replace copiers currently being used by LEGISLATIVE PRINTING, which are not the same as COPIER A and COPIER B, as defined in the RFP. The copiers seen during the tour of LEGISLATIVE PRINTING were the copiers that LFA intends to replace with COPIER A and COPIER B. COPIER C also has the meaning described in the RFP. LFA does not intend to replace COPIER C, unless a proposal that proposes to replace the Xerox 560 copier is awarded the contract, as outlined in the RFP.

Question 4: Under V. EVALUATION AND CONTRACT. 50 points is (sic) being given for "The quality, reliability, and durability of the PRODUCTS; the extent to which the PRODUCTS will meet the needs and expectations of LEGISLATIVE PRINTING; the extent to which the PRODUCTS meet the specifications described in this RFP and the extent to which the PRODUCTS will provide the best solution for and best value to LFA and LEGISLATIVE PRINTING"

How will you evaluate quality, reliability and durability without seeing a demo on the machine? Its (sic) the majority of points required to make it to Stage 2. Any explanation or additional information would be appreciated.

Answer to Question 4: Section V. 1. b. of the RFP, describing the Stage 1 process of evaluating proposals, is hereby deleted from the RFP. All proposals not eliminated in the technical review under Section V. 1. a. will be considered in Stage 2 under Section V. 1. c. of the RFP.

Question 5: Under 8. COST A.

"A RESPONDER shall indicate in a single cost figure, supported by the detailed information provided, the combined total of the overall cost of the RESPONDER's proposal, including all costs associated with LFA's purchase of the PRODUCTS and all costs associated with maintaining and servicing the PRODUCTS for a period of seven years after installation of the PRODUCTS. That single combined cost figure will be used as the basis for awarding points for costs under Section V.1.c."

Question is, are you wanting one cost including purchase price of equipment and 7 years maintenance based on provided volumes? Presenting in a line item format?

Answer to Question 5: A potential RESPONDER is encouraged to read carefully all of Section IV. 8. of the RFP relating to cost, including Section IV. 8. b., relating to the use of click charges as the basis for cost information for maintaining and servicing the PRODUCTS. There are two main components of cost: (1) the purchase price of the PRODUCTS; and (2) the cost of maintaining and servicing the PRODUCTS for a period of seven years after installation, as described in the RFP. The single cost figure that will be the basis on which points for costs are awarded is the combined total of the purchase price and

the cost of maintaining and servicing the PRODUCTS, as indicated. As to format, please see the answer to Question 6.

Question 6: Is there a particular layout/format that you are wanting the pricing presented in?

Answer to Question 6: No. Cost information may be provided in whatever format the RESPONDER chooses, as long as the information meets the requirements of Section IV. 8. of the RFP.

B. The RFP is further amended as follows:

In Section V. 1. c. v., the phrase “amount of \$24,745 per year, which is the approximate annual” is inserted after “will be reduced by the.”