

**RFP-CM-14-003 Maintenance, Repairs and Operations (MRO)
– Facility Supplies and Equipment**

Vendor Questions and State Purchasing Office’s Answers

In accordance with the **RFP Section 1.5, Schedule of Activities** and **1.6, Vendor Inquiries and Questions**, this document represents the compilation of Vendor questions received and the Colorado State Purchasing Office (SPO) answers. This is referred to as the “Q & A” process. Additionally, two changes resulted from Vendor questions, see below.

=====

TAKE NOTE: Due to a conversion problem into the Excel 97-2003 format, the spreadsheet would allow print out of several of the category market baskets only up to row 31 of the items listed. A new file for **Attachment 3, Vendor Response Worksheet** was created 5/27/14 and again on 5/29/14. **Discard all prior versions and use ONLY the file dated “5/29/14”.**
(From Q&A #3.)

TAKE NOTE: There is a change in the submission deadline and public opening of proposals. Due to a typographical error on page one (Cover page) of the RFP, the later of the times will become the new submission deadline and the later of times for the public opening of the proposals. **A similar notice will be post to BIDS as a modification.** Therefore, these are the changes:

Submission deadline: 06/25/14, Wednesday 3 p.m. (MT) (revised)

Public Opening: 06/25/14, Wednesday 4 p.m. (MT) (revised)

Delivery and Event Location: (remains at) 1525 Sherman Street, Third Floor, Denver, Co 80203.
(From Q&A #31)

=====

Q1: We were noticing that on items listed under the janitorial supplies, you have specific vendor products. Are you accepting bids on comparable products from other vendors?

A1: State Purchasing Office (SPO) Response: Yes, expect bidding vendor to submit either that item or a comparable product. As stated in part in **RFP Section 3.12, Cost Proposal**, “Each Market Basket represents an item makeup representative of past usage and item preference for that category. Market Baskets include our best estimate of the highest use and most essential items. The included products represent a viable set of standardized products which should account for a high percentage of spend. Any brand name items in the Market Baskets may be substituted with items equal to or better than the item listed. “

Historical usage showed that a vendor's product number and description was one which had a majority of usage and other vendors' products for the same item were incorporated into the total number of sales for that item. For example: vendor A sold 3900 items for SKU item #123 for 2" grey duct tape- 50 yards, vendor B sold 1100 items for the same item and vendor C sold 450. The sales were combined under vendor A's SKU number and the common description for a total of 5,450 shown as historical sales.

- Q2: Also there is usually floor finish/strippers and accessories on the State Award Bid, are they not bidding these items out this year?
- A2: SPO Response: Yes, floor finish/strippers and accessories are part of this solicitation. As there can be over 100,000 of possible items within the MRO category, the market basket cannot show all of them. The Market Basket is representative of the most common items purchased. In (Tab 2) "Discounts – Non-Market Basket" of the **Vendor Response Worksheet (Attachment 3)**, a Vendor is to enter its discount in the line for "Janitorial - Equipment (electrical)".
- Q3: I just came across a problem when I try to print category 7 for Janitorial-Cleaning. It will only allow me to print up to sequence 31 for some reason. I am unable to adjust the print area. Would it be possible to send me a copy of category 7 so I can print the entire sheet?
- A3: SPO Response: Due to a conversion problem into the Excel 97-2003 format, the spreadsheet would allow print out of several of the category market baskets only up to row 31 of the items listed. A new file for **Attachment 3, Vendor Response Worksheet** was created 5/27/14 and again on 5/29/14. **TAKE NOTE: Discard all prior versions and use ONLY the file dated "5/29/14"**.
- Q4: In reference to the category discounts on the attachment titled 1- MRO- Attachment 3- Vendor Response Worksheet- Excel 97-2003version- updated 5-27-14, can vendors add additional manufacturer's discounts that would fall into each category?
- A4: SPO Response: No, a vendor cannot add rows into the **Attachment 3, Vendor Response Worksheet** for additional manufacturer's discounts. No alterations to the spreadsheet's page template can be made by the Vendor. However, a Vendor may include additional discount breakouts for categories as a supplement document to its cost proposal. Vendors are to use a similar format as the Discounts page and the title of the document and electronic file must be marked "Additional Discount Breakout".
- Q5: In reference to section 4.3.3 are we supposed to only submit the first tab of the document titled 1- MRO- Attachment 3- Vendor Response Worksheet- Excel 97-2003version- updated 5-27-14 for this section?
- A5: SPO Response: No. The Vendor is to complete and submit both the tab for "Regions" and for "Category Group Pricing – Discounts" as part of its technical proposal portion. (Yes, it does have cost-related data; however, rather than have the Vendor duplicate efforts, the "Discounts" page can identify which categories it will provide services and equipment and which can also be used for the cost evaluation portion of its proposal.) Further, the Vendor must also submit a narrative response to **RFP Section 4.3.3.A., Technical Response**.

- Q6: In reference to section 4.1 is the cost proposal to be printed with the technical proposal?
- A6: SPO Response: No. The cost proposal portion of a Vendor's proposal is separate from its technical proposal in hard copy format and as an electronic file. The cost proposal portion consists of **Attachment 3, Vendor Response Worksheet** for all Tabs except "Regions", "Category Group Pricing – Discounts" (see answer "A5" above), and "Category Group Descriptions". (For additional guidance, see **RFP Section 4, Format and Proposal Instructions**.)
- Q7: Considering the very broad scope of the RFP, and the number of manufacturers involved to cover all categories, we request an extension of the due date for receipt of proposals from 6/25/2014 to 7/3/2014.
- A7: SPO Response: At this time, there is no extension of the proposal due date.
- Q8: Where can we get the Recap of the previous bid for RFP-CM-14-003?
- A8: SPO Response: A solicitation has not been done by the SPO and previous awards for State Price Agreements were through cooperatives. This is the first time the SPO has performed its own solicitation for all of the categories in a single solicitation; thus, no such "recap" exists.
- Q9: We are requesting clarification on Section 1.4 of the RFP-CM-14-003 MRO. Will the WSCA Price Agreement #45000YYY12M/WSCA for Industrial Supplies be extended and will it be an option for State Agencies to use?
- A9: SPO Response: The current State Price Agreements for industrial supplies, which are based on the WSCA/NASPO awards for Facilities MRO through the Lead State of Nevada, have a current expiration of 9/30/14. However, the WSCA Master Agreement expires 2/28/2017. Although it is the SPO's intent to consider renewal of the current State Price Agreements to match the WSCA term, renewals are determined on an annual basis. Yes, in the event the current State Price Agreements for the WSCA-based Facilities MRO awards are kept active, the then current Ordering Entities will continue to have access for utilization. (For definition of "Ordering Entities", refer to **RFP Section 6, Definition of Terms**.)
- Q10: Can you please provide an unlocked version of Attachment 3 Vendor Response Worksheet?
- A10: SPO Response: No. The worksheet's format cannot be altered by the Vendor in anyway.
- Q11: I have two questions that was asked during a company meeting about the current Colorado bid. We are a chemical manufacturer and will prefer to focus on that area. Can specialized companies like ours enter the bid with a goal of competing for 25% of particular product line (eg. chemical cleaners)?
- A11: SPO Response: No, offering 25% of a single product line is not acceptable. As stated in part in **RFP Section 3.12, Cost Proposal**, "Vendor must provide pricing for at least 50% of the items on the Market Basket (MB), and discount percentages for 100% of the items on the Non-Market Basket (Non-MB) in one category or multiple categories to be considered complete and responsive." The purpose is for the Vendor to provide a full line of janitorial supplies and equipment, not just a single product line.

- Q12: Will further notice come out giving more detail of the bid request? (such as required volume of orders).
- A12: SPO Response: No, volume of orders cannot be forecasted for the eligible Ordering Entities. As stated in part in **RFP Section 2.1, Background** it advises “Current Purchasing Profile: The table below represents the spend in Fiscal Year 2013 for all Ordering Entities that made purchases using the State Price Agreements under the categories of Industrial Supplies and Equipment; Janitorial Supplies; and Disposable Paper, Plastic Liners, and Food Service Supplies. The expenditures reflect past usage and may fluctuate up or down. The State does not guarantee future spending at these levels.” Further, in **Section 2.2 Overview** it states in part “A Price Agreement, by its nature, is indefinite in its size and value. It does not determine a specific quantity, time, or place, for the State’s ordering practices; it does establish terms and conditions and a list of identified maximum prices for all applicable **MRO supplies and equipment** that are covered under an awarded contract. Ordering Entities will place orders for goods through “Delivery Orders” (i.e. orders, purchase orders, etc.) that are based on the pricing in the Price Agreement’s terms and conditions.” (For definition of “Ordering Entities”, refer to **RFP Section 6, Definition of Terms.**)
- Q13: Will you be kind enough to forward me the most recent award sheet for the Disposable Gloves, (Cat 8, General).
- A13: SPO Response: Sorry, it is not clear what you are asking for when you say "award sheet". Current State Price Agreement vendors' information is located on the ColoradoBIDS website: www.colorado.gov/BIDS. (Select "Price Agreements", scroll down to "Disposable Paper..." or "Industrial Supplies".)
- Q14: Page #13, Market Basket Pricing – The RFP states “The Vendor must also provide the discount off List Price percentage that the price represents for each item in the Market Basket.” *Does this discount off List Price have to be the same for all items within the Market Basket and the same discount off % as the non-market basket items in that category or can each item within the market basket be priced competitively at whatever price/discount % we feel is our most competitive price, irrespective of what the discount is for every other market basket item?*
- A14: SPO Response: The category Market Baskets and the “Discount – Non-Market Basket” (discount off List Pricing) are independent of each other. It is intended a Vendor be specific when showing pricing and discounts in the Market Basket for the categories they propose. It is intended the Vendor provide discount percentages for all “other” products within a category it proposes in the “Discount – Non-Market Basket” page. (Reference **RFP Section 3.12, Cost Proposal.**)
- Q15: Page #13, Non-Market Basket Discount Structure – The RFP states “Vendor must provide pricing for at least 50% of the items on the Market Basket, and discount percentages for 100% of the items on the Non-Market Basket (Non-MB) in one category or multiple categories to be considered complete and responsive.” *What constitutes a category for which discount percentages must be provided for 100% of the items? Specifically for Group #2 is the category all of Group #2 or is Hand Tools considered a category and Power Tools a category?*
- A15: SPO Response: For all categories except Tools where we are requesting specific brands of tools, a Vendor must submit a response to each category and its subcategories for the categories the Vendor proposes to provide products. See answer “A16” below in response to your question regarding specifically Category #2, Tools.

Q16: Likewise, is Group #8 all one category or can a vendor submit discount percentages on Batteries but not Material Handling items (or some other combination of categories/sub-categories within Group #8)?

A16: SPO Response: For the category "General", a Vendor must be able to provide all subcategories within the encompassing "General Supplies and Equipment". The purpose is for the Vendor to provide a full line of general supplies and equipment, not just a single product line. (For additional guidance, see **RFP Section 3.12, Cost Proposal.**)

Q17: For Group #2, unlike all other Groups, specific manufacturers are listed. In order to be responsive for this group must a vendor show a discount % off every manufacturer or if the vendor is a distributor for only some of these manufacturers can a vendor still be considered responsive if discount %'s are only given for a few/several of the manufacturers?

A17: SPO Response: The category is "Tools – Hand Tools, Power Tools, and Accessories"; therefore, it is intended a Vendor can provide both hand tools and power tools. In the Market Basket, a Vendor must provide a response to at least 50% of the hand tool products AND 50% of the power tools products.

In the "Discount – Non-Market Basket" page (discount off List Pricing) a response is required for the overall category groups "Hand Tools", "Power Tools" and "Accessories"; and because we are requesting specific brands of tools, the Vendor can respond to all of the specific brands of tools the Vendor can offer; otherwise, insert the notation "N/A" (not applicable) for the brands the Vendor cannot offer.

(For additional guidance, see **RFP Section 3.12, Cost Proposal.**)

Q18: What is the current e-procurement system being used by the State of Colorado? When is the new e-procurement system being implemented by the State of Colorado?

A18: SPO Response: The State does not currently have an e-procurement system for MRO. However, hosted and punch-out vendor catalogs are planned to be implemented within the next 24 months. As stated in part in **RFP Section 3.5, Ordering and Delivery**, "Preference may be given for Vendors who can offer the ability to set up and maintain internally hosted catalogs (i.e. list of items and unit pricing) and/or punch-out catalogs. The State has the right to implement catalogs in a phased approach." (Refer to **RFP Section 3.5, Ordering and Delivery** for additional guidance.)

Q19: Can the State please provide a list of all locations/ participating entities that are currently participating under the current RFP contract with the State?

A19: SPO Response: No, a list of buyers or "Ordering Entities" cannot be provided. Itemized information at vendor sales level for individual items to individual customers is proprietary and confidential. (For definition of "Ordering Entities", refer to **RFP Section 6, Definition of Terms.**)

The Market Baskets represent historical information for Ordering Entities statewide and as stated in part in **RFP Section 3.12, Cost Proposal**, "Each Market Basket represents an item makeup representative of past usage and item preference for that category. Market Baskets include our best estimate of the highest use and most essential items. The included products represent a viable set of standardized products which should account for a high percentage of spend."

Additionally, as stated in part in **RFP Section 2.1, Background**, “Historically, maintenance, repairs, and operations supplies and equipment for facilities through the current awarded price agreements generates over \$11 million in annual spend (see below); which is based on sales reported by contracted Vendors. Additional spend is generated through non-contracted vendors and may account for an additional \$5 million annually. This high-volume customer base enables the State to negotiate exceptional rates and benefits. Any volume information (spend or quantity) provided by the State are estimated figures only and are intended to assist potential Vendors in understanding the scope of the State’s category needs. The State does not obligate itself to any or all quantities indicated.”

Q20: Can the State please provide the full usage reports for all market basket items and non-market basket products?

A20: SPO Response: See answer “A19” above.

Q21: What is the percentage of dockside delivery versus desktop delivery?

A21: SPO Response: Unknown. The State Purchasing Office does not track any information on this demographic. Each Order Entity makes the decision on where deliveries are received.

Q22a: How will the State of Colorado be evaluating pricing for chemicals? Will dilution ratios and/or end-use costs be taken into consideration?

a. Example... Vendor A and Vendor B can provide pricing on ‘like for like’ items based on unit of measure/ quantity in case. However, it is our experience that dilution ratios of the chemicals within the case can significantly impact true end-use cost and overall savings.

A22a: SPO Response: Dilution ratios and end-use costs will be a consideration of the Ordering Entity and how a specific product best meets its needs. For the purpose of this RFP, Market Basket products were derived from historical usage and dilution ratios are not necessary at this stage. As stated in part in **RFP Section 3.12, Cost Proposal** “Each Market Basket represents an item makeup representative of past usage and item preference for that category. Market Baskets include our best estimate of the highest use and most essential items. The included products represent a viable set of standardized products which should account for a high percentage of spend.”

Q22b. b. A suggested approach for ensuring a fair and equal comparison and possible end-use cost for the State’s procured items would be providing additional areas of comparison and cost breakdown per use on the state’s market based items. Suggest adding columns highlighted in ‘yellow’.

Bidder's SKU	Bidder's Manufacturer	GREEN	Recycled Content	Unit of Measure	Dilution Ratio	Your Cost (Chemicals)	Cost per ready to use in UoM	Total Cost of product based on Qty Used	Quantity in Case/ Package	Minimum Order Quantity	List Price	Net State Price	Applied Discount from List
052750403W	Cleaner - SOLSTA 255 All Purpose Cleaner - 3 Liter			case	1:32	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -					

A22b: SPO Response: See answer “A22a” above.

- Q23: How will the State evaluate the non-market basket “list Less” competitiveness if each bidder can provide a different list price used, therefore putting each bidder at a different starting point than the next bidder?
- A23: SPO Response: As stated in part in **RFP Section 2.1, Background**, “The State may award all or part of this RFP based on the best interests of the State and reserves the right to award to multiple Vendors. To maximize chances of success in this process, Vendors are encouraged to provide an aggressive response to this RFP.” Additionally, the State may request a Vendor to provide detailed information based on the manufacturer’s catalog it used to provide its Discounts Off List information to establish a “base-line” for List pricing.
- Q24: What factors or evaluation criteria will the State of Colorado be looking to identify and award the non-market basket “list less” category, should bidders be identical and/or similar in percentage offered?
- A24: SPO Response: See answer “A23” above.
- Q25: On the pricing sheet there are hand sanitizer dispensers but no hand sanitizer item on the list.
- Would the State of Colorado like a quote on hand sanitizer?
 - What hand sanitizer will the dispensers be used for?
 - Approximate usage?
- A25: SPO Response: As stated in part in **RFP Section 3.12, Cost Proposal** “Each Market Basket represents an item makeup representative of past usage and item preference for that category. Market Baskets include our best estimate of the highest use and most essential items. The included products represent a viable set of standardized products which should account for a high percentage of spend.” The hand sanitizer products did not generate large enough spend to fall within the top 50 product line items for the current State Price Agreement vendors.
- Q26: Does the State of Colorado use Universal dispensers for their paper products? If not, are they proprietary? Does the State have any estimation of the current dispenser environment, both proprietary and non-proprietary?
- A26: SPO Response: Unknown. The SPO does not track any information on this demographic. State government procurement is decentralized and other Ordering Entities such as political subdivisions and non-profit organizations could also be decentralized within their own jurisdictions. Each Order Entity makes the decision on what supplies it needs and which type and brand of dispenser works best for its needs.
- Q27: If a bidder does not carry Proprietary towels that are included in the market basket list, please provide further direction on how the State of Colorado would like the bidder to provide an alternative towel dispensers/refills?
- A27: SPO Response: As noted in answer “A26” above, **RFP Section 3.12, Cost Proposal** states in part, “Each Market Basket represents ... Any brand name items in the Market Baskets may be substituted with items equal to or better than the item listed.” Further, it also states in part, “Products to be submitted at a minimum of “good” quality level; however, Vendor may submit offered items at “better” and “best” levels of quality with an explanation on the merits of the offering.

Products may be submitted as Vendor's "house brand" with an explanation of the merits of the offering. Note: the use of a brand name is for the purpose of describing the standard of quality, performance, and characteristics desired and does not limit or restrict competition. Product equivalency is at the sole determination of the State. Vendors may provide an alternative manufacturer and SKU number equal to or better than product shown in the Market Basket."

A Vendor may also provide an explanation of its offering in its narrative proposal response.

- Q28: Aside from the requested 'like for like' comparison on the market basket items, should the bidder identify a suggested product alternative that is comparable in function but more advantageous in pricing, would the state be interested in seeing such an option? If so, how would the State like for this information to be shown?
- A28: SPO Response: See answer "A27" above.
- Q29: Can you provide the State of Colorado's current average order size with the top 3 vendors providing the products within MRO and facilities?
- A29: SPO Response: Unknown. The SPO does not track any information on this demographic. State government procurement is decentralized and other Ordering Entities such as political subdivisions and non-profit organizations could also be decentralized within their own jurisdictions. Each Order Entity submits orders for goods that best meet its needs.
- Q30: Is there any consortium or GPO's that The State of Colorado is interested in seeing as part of this RFP?
- A30: SPO Response: We take "GPO" to mean Group Purchasing Organizations such as the multi-state cooperative like the WSCA/NASPO. The WSCA/NASPO is the only multi-state cooperative the SPO is considering at this time.

In **RFP Section 1.4, Scope of the RFP/Basis for Award** it states in part, "State agencies and institutions of higher education that have opted into the Procurement Code will also have the option to purchase supplies or services from other sources submitted for competition, including cooperative purchasing agreements entered into by the State Purchasing Office authorized under section § 24-110-101 et seq, Colorado Revised Statutes (C.R.S.), if any." Further, in **RFP Section 1.11, Selection of Successful Proposals** (etc.) in part it states, "The State reserves the right to continue with existing contracts should the pricing in these RFP responses be deemed non-beneficial to the State. Further, the State reserves the right to continue with existing contracts in addition to the awards resulting from this solicitation if deemed it is in the best interest of the State."

- Q31: Page 1 (Cover Page) notes the due date and time of the RFP as June 25, 2014 at 3:00pm mountain time. Section 1.5 notes the due date and time as June 25, 2014 at 1:00 pm mountain time. Please clarify and confirm the correct due date and time.
- A31: SPO Response: **TAKE NOTE:** There is a change in the submission deadline and public opening of proposals. Due to a typographical error on page one (Cover page) of the RFP, the later of the times will become the new submission deadline and the later of times for the public opening of the proposals. **A similar notice will be post to BIDS as a modification.** Therefore, these are the changes:

Submission deadline: 06/25/14, Wednesday 3 p.m. (MT) (revised)

Public Opening: 06/25/14, Wednesday 4 p.m. (MT) (revised)

Delivery and Event Location: (remains at) 1525 Sherman Street, Third Floor, Denver, Co 80203.

Q32: Section 1.5 states the deadline for written questions is June 2, 2015 at 5:00 pm mountain time. Will the State consider accepting additional questions after this date/time providing the questions are submitted in compliance with Section 1.6?

A32: SPO Response: No, no further questions regarding the statement of work of the RFP are being accepted. In order for all Vendors to have benefit of answers to the questions each asks and those of other prospective Vendors to incorporate into its proposal response, a specific time period is allowed for such questions.

However, in the event a Vendor experiences a technical problem with **Attachment 3, Vendor Response Worksheet**, we do want to hear from you immediately.

Q33: Section 1.12 states that the initial term of the price agreement “will be effective upon a fully executed contract and end on June 30, 2015”. Section 1.5 states projects the contract start date to be August 1, 2014. Thus, the first term of the contract is expected to be 11 months. Section 3.12 states that “Proposals submitted will be valid for and Market Basket pricing held for the first 12 months of a resulting award”. Is it the intent of the State to hold pricing for each term of the contract (i.e., first term projected for 11 months, subsequent terms being 12 months each)? Or, is it the State’s intent to hold pricing for the first 12 months regardless of when the initial term starts and thus allow for price adjustments during the middle of a contract term? Does the price hold apply to non-market basket items as well?

A33: SPO Response: The SPO intends to issue resulting contracts for State Price Agreements from this RFP that are planned to become active 08/01/2014; however, the actual effective date is dependent upon the appropriate time needed for review of proposals, the evaluation process, vendor selection, and the contracting process. Therefore, the Vendor will hold its pricing for the first 12-months of its initial contract and the initial term ending date may change to July 2015 or beyond.

---end---