

RETURN THIS AMENDMENT TO THE ISSUING OFFICE AT:

AMENDMENT (1) ONE to RFP 2014-0900-2302



Department of Military and Veterans Affairs
Division of Administrative Services
Procurement Section
P.O. Box 5800
Joint Base Elmendorf-Richardson, Alaska 99505

THIS IS NOT AN ORDER

DATE AMENDMENT ISSUED: December 24, 2013

RFP TITLE: Purchase of Emergency Food Products for the State of Alaska

PROPOSALS DUE DATE AND TIME: Prior to 2:00 P.M. local Alaska time on February 4, 2014. Late offers will be rejected.

The following is provided in response to questions asked and comments made before and during the December 18, 2013 pre-proposal conference.

1. **Procurement Specialist** (moderator) reminders briefed during the conference:

- a. Reminder: We may not be able to answer all questions asked during the conference, however, they will be answered in the amendment issued within the next few days. The amendment will be posted to the State of Alaska Online Public Notice website and registered offerors will receive email notification when the amendment has been posted.
- b. Current deadline for receipt of proposals is 2:00 p.m. local Alaska time on February 4, 2014. Information on submitting proposals can be found in paragraph 1.01 of the RFP.
- c. Deadline for receipt of questions is 3:00 p.m. local Alaska time on January 3, 2014. Questions must be in writing. An amendment will be issued the following week. If you have questions that come up after the deadline, please don't hesitate to send them to us for a response.
- d. As stated in paragraph 2.12, offeror must have an Alaska Business License prior to award of a contract, however, to receive the Alaska Bidder and other preferences, the offeror must have an Alaska Business License prior to the deadline set for receipt of proposals. Review the paragraph for additional information on this requirement.

2. **QUESTION:** Do you have any minimum nutritional requirements?

RESPONSE: This food is being purchased for emergency use, and we have no specific minimum nutritional requirements. Offerors should provide nutritional information for the products they're offering with their proposals.

3. **QUESTION:** The RFP does not allow for Joint Ventures or subcontractors. Do these stipulations negate a partnership between our company and the potential offeror on this project?

RESPONSE: As stated in paragraph 2.08, the offeror must be an authorized distributor of the product(s) offered. This paragraph also states the offeror must be in the business of selling or have actually sold on a regular basis the supplies that are the subject of this solicitation OR add value to the contract by actually performing, controlling, managing or supervising the services to be provided. (Continued on next page)

As long as all business will be conducted directly with the distributor and not the parent company, and the offeror meets these requirements, the offer would not be considered a joint venture or subcontractor.

4. **QUESTION:** Can a manufacturer be the offeror of the products directly without a distributor?

RESPONSE: Yes.

5. **QUESTION:** Please define the term “immediate use.”

RESPONSE: Ready to eat with minimal preparation.

6. **QUESTION:** Please explain how the preferred freeze dry meals will be rehydrated without providing water.

RESPONSE: If water is required, and potable water is not available at the survivor’s location, it will be provided by emergency responders.

7. **QUESTION:** Are there any expectations of ingredients for the entrees? Does the RFP require any ingredient statements?

RESPONSE: No. Offerors should provide ingredient information for the products they’re offering with their proposal.

8. **QUESTION:** Is there more specific “adult” criteria that refer to the USDA Dietary Reference Intakes for key nutrients? Is there a minimum number of daily kilocalories that must be provided? Have you considered excess sodium and its effect on the water needs of disaster victims? Does the RFP require submitting the “Nutrition Facts” panel required for USDA food product labels?

RESPONSE: No there are no specific minimum requirements. Offerors should provide nutritional information for the products they’re offering within their proposal.

9. **QUESTION:** Is there more specific “meal” criteria that defines the required components of a meal?

RESPONSE: No. Offerors should define the meal components of the products they’re offering within their proposal.

10. **Project Manager Comments.** As stated in the RFP, the State of Alaska is looking for proposals for emergency disaster food supplies, safety of life food supplies, for a catastrophic disaster. We’ve identified the number and statistics primarily to provide food for 40,000 people for 7 days. Specifications are in the Scope of Work.

11. **QUESTION:** Please clarify the difference between an RFP and a bid.

RESPONSE: RFP gives us the opportunity to evaluate the products offered rather than awarding it on straight cost. Cost is just one of the factors that would be evaluated. When we do a bid we know exactly what we want, have it defined, have it specified and award based on the lowest price for it. For a proposal we don’t know exactly what is available on the market for providing these emergency meals, so we’re looking for vendors to give us a proposal so we can evaluate it. We’ve put the evaluation criteria in the RFP that we’re looking for but we don’t know what’s available in today’s market that would serve our purposes for this RFP. A proposal puts the sideboards out there and gives you an area within to come up with your ideas and what you have to offer for us to score it and determine what best meets the state’s needs at a reasonable price.

12. **QUESTION:** How would the state look at creativity in reference to this RFP? In terms of the State makes to a preference for freeze dry food, is the state open to considerations that potentially improve the feeding experience for health and safety in the event of an emergency?

RESPONSE: We are open to creativity within the sideboards of the RFP. We are not considering special needs, women, children, infants, food allergies, in this RFP. Those will be dealt with on a case by case basis during the disaster by DHS&EM. Also, as far as the freeze dried, that is not a hard and fast requirement, but is ideally or preferred, and is just an example. If you’ve got something better or different, offer it. The concept is a long term shelf stable safety of life emergency food supply. Special needs will be addressed as necessary by event.

13. **QUESTION:** With regards to temperature, it is going to be held in temperature moderated spaces where the cold is controlled in some measure?

RESPONSE: The warehousing and management of the food supply will be another proposal request. Your identification of the best requirements for the shelf life stability of your food based upon temperature deviations, what the best environments for your proposal would be is what we'd be considering.

14. **QUESTION:** There is no grading criteria in Section Seven but you addressed the question for nutritional requirements, and the answer is No. So to go back to the question on creativity, there is no advantage for a company providing, say, a menu of 1800 calories a day versus a company providing a menu of 1000 calories per day. Obviously there is a significant price difference. I don't see anywhere in here where it would be advantageous for a company providing 1800 versus, say, 1000. Am I missing something here?

RESPONSE: No, you're not missing anything. We've discussed this in detail and will be adding evaluation criteria to the RFP to address this issue. Offerors need to understand this is for seven days and not survival for a year. It is only to feed people for seven days. We're not that concerned about calories for these seven days.

15. **Final Procurement Specialist comments.** If there are no further comments we'll close the conference. If you do think of anything, please send us an email to MVA.DASProcurement@alaska.gov. This will ensure all of the Procurement Specialists in our office receive the email and you get a quicker response. A fax would also be acceptable.

16. **Add to paragraph 6.08, Product and Sample Meals:** Offerors should include information within their proposal identifying nutritional value(s), ingredient(s), and meal component(s) of the product(s) being offered.

17. **Change the percentage for paragraph 7.03,** Management Plan for the Project, from 4 Percent to 3 Percent. This change will be reflected in the Amended Proposal Evaluation Worksheet attached to this amendment.

18. **Change the percentage for paragraph 7.04,** Experience and Qualifications, from 5 Percent to 4 Percent. This change will be reflected in the Amended Proposal Evaluation Worksheet attached to this amendment.

19. **Change the percentage for paragraph 7.05,** Product and Sample Meal, from 8 Percent to 10 Percent. This change will be reflected in the Amended Proposal Evaluation Worksheet attached to this amendment.

19. **Add to paragraph 7.05, Product and Sample Meals:** (This change will be reflected in the Amended Proposal Evaluation Worksheet attached to this amendment.)

[e] Did the offeror include information on the nutritional value(s), ingredient(s), and meal component(s) of the product(s) being offered within their proposal? Does the information provided indicate a product that may be better suited to the needs of the State based on the requirements outlined within the RFP and any amendment(s) to the RFP?

This is a MANDATORY RETURN AMENDMENT. Proposers must acknowledge receipt of this amendment on or before the proposal due deadline of 2:00 p.m. local Alaska time on February 4, 2014.

Name of Company

Representative's Signature

Date

//SIGNED ORIGINAL ON FILE//

Douglas Moore
Procurement Officer
PHONE: (907) 428-7109
FAX: (907) 428-7101
EMAIL: MVA.DASProcurement@alaska.gov

Attachment:

1. Amended Proposal Evaluation Worksheet (Attachment 1 in the RFP).

AMENDED PROPOSAL EVALUATION FORM

This worksheet was amended by Amendment 1 to RFP 2014-0900-2302. All proposals will be reviewed for responsiveness and then evaluated using the criteria set out herein.

Person or Firm Name _____

Proposal Evaluation Member (PEC) Packet Number (Circle One) 1 of 3 2 of 3 3 of 3

Name of Proposal Evaluation (PEC) Member _____

Date of Review _____

RFP Number 2014-0900-2302

EVALUATION CRITERIA AND SCORING

THE TOTAL NUMBER OF POINTS USED TO SCORE THIS PROPOSAL IS 100

7.01 Understanding of the Project—3 Percent

Maximum Point Value for this Section - 3 Points

100 Points x 3 Percent = 3 Points

Proposals will be evaluated against the questions set out below.

[a] How well has the offeror demonstrated a thorough understanding of the purpose and scope of the project?

EVALUATOR'S NOTES _____

[b] How well has the offeror demonstrated an understanding of the project's time schedule and identified how they will meet it?

EVALUATOR'S NOTES _____

[c] Is the proposed sequence of tasks logical and feasible?

EVALUATOR'S NOTES _____

EVALUATOR'S POINT TOTAL FOR 7.01

7.02 Methodology Used for the Project—10 Percent

Maximum Point Value for this Section - 10 Points
100 Points x 10 Percent = 10 Points

Proposals will be evaluated against the questions set out below.

- [a] How comprehensive is the methodology and does it depict a logical approach to fulfilling the requirements of the RFP?

EVALUATOR'S NOTES _____

- [b] How well has the offeror identified potential concerns, logistical problems, production schedules, issues, or events that may delay or inhibit the contractor's ability to provide required products, and possible solution(s) to mitigate or overcome these issues?

EVALUATOR'S NOTES _____

- [c] Does the proposal address the shelf-life under various storage conditions, storage considerations/limitations such as temperatures, dryness, environmental, heat, light, etc., and ideal storage requirements? Does the information provided meet or exceed the requirements of the RFP?

EVALUATOR'S NOTES _____

- [d] Does the offeror specify any timelines within their proposal? If so, are they clear and specific in the tasks(s) involved and time per individual?

EVALUATOR'S NOTES _____

- [e] Has the offeror proposed conducting any tasks beyond the minimum necessary to meet the objectives of the RFP? If so, how well do these proposed tasks contribute to the successful completion of the project?

EVALUATOR'S NOTES _____

EVALUATOR'S POINT TOTAL FOR 7.02 _____

7.03 Management Plan for the Project—3 Percent

Maximum Point Value for this Section - 3 Points
100 Points x 3 Percent = 3 Points

Proposals will be evaluated against the questions set out below.

[a] Is the organization, accountability, and lines of authority and communication of the project team clear?

EVALUATOR'S NOTES _____

[b] To what extent does the offeror already have the hardware, software, equipment, and licenses necessary to perform the contract?

EVALUATOR'S NOTES _____

EVALUATOR'S POINT TOTAL FOR 7.03 _____

7.04 Experience and Qualifications—4 Percent

Maximum Point Value for this Section - 4 Points
100 Points x 4 Percent = 4 Points

Proposals will be evaluated against the questions set out below.

[a] Did the offeror include an organizational chart within their proposal? If so, does the chart clearly show the lines of authority and who will have responsibility for completion of each component of the contract, to include when and where the contractor's project manager or equivalent will interact with DMVA staff?

EVALUATOR'S NOTES _____

[b] Did the offeror provide resumes on each individual who will work on this contract? If so, do the resumes clearly show the experience and qualifications of staff in performing work of a similar nature, specifically with regards to providing emergency food supplies within the State of Alaska?

EVALUATOR'S NOTES _____

[c] Did the offeror provide current reference names and telephone numbers or email addresses from previous clients for similar projects the offeror's firm has completed?

EVALUATOR'S NOTES _____

- [d] Is the offeror an authorized distributor for the product(s) offered and did they provide written proof from the manufacturer as required by paragraph 2.08 of this RFP and?

EVALUATOR'S NOTES _____

EVALUATOR'S POINT TOTAL FOR 7.04 _____

7.05 Product and Sample Meal – 10 Percent

Maximum Point Value for this Section - 10 Points
100 Points x 10 Percent = 10 Points

Proposals will be evaluated against the questions set out below.

- [a] Is the sample meal of the type and quality the State desires to purchase?

EVALUATOR'S NOTES _____

- [b] Does the sample meal packet contain instructions and other equipment or supplies necessary for an untrained person to satisfactorily prepare and consume the meal?

EVALUATOR'S NOTES _____

- [c] Does the sample meal packet contain any accessories such as plastic ware, seasonings, or other items that would enhance the overall culinary experience?

EVALUATOR'S NOTES _____

- [d] Is the meal packaging of a quality that would indicate suitability for use under various environmental conditions within Alaska, including rural "bush" areas?

EVALUATOR'S NOTES _____

- [e] Did the offeror include information on the nutritional value(s), ingredient(s), and meal component(s) of the product(s) being offered within their proposal? Does the information provided indicate a product that may be better suited to the needs of the State based on the requirements outlined within the RFP and any amendment(s) to the RFP?

EVALUATOR'S NOTES _____

EVALUATOR'S POINT TOTAL FOR 7.05 _____

EVALUATOR'S SUBTOTAL FOR 7.01 through 7.05 _____

7.06 Contract Cost — 60 Percent

To avoid the possibility of cost influencing scoring, Sections 7.06 and 7.07 will be evaluated by the Procurement Officer.

Maximum Point Value for this Section - 60 Points
100 Points x 60 Percent = 60 Points

Overall, a minimum of 60 percent of the total evaluation points will be assigned to cost. The cost amount used for evaluation may be affected by one or more of the preferences referenced under Section 2.13.

Converting Cost to Points

The lowest cost proposal will receive the maximum number of points allocated to cost. The point allocations for cost on the other proposals will be determined through the method set out in Section 2.16.

EVALUATOR'S POINT TOTAL FOR 7.06

7.07 Alaska Offeror Preference — 10 Percent

Alaska bidders receive a 10 percent overall evaluation point preference.
Point value for Alaska bidders in this section -- 10 Points
100 Points x 10 Percent = 10 Points

If an offeror qualifies for the Alaska Bidder Preference, the offeror will receive an Alaska Offeror Preference. The preference will be 10 percent of the total available points. This amount will be added to the overall evaluation score of each Alaskan offeror.

EVALUATOR'S POINT TOTAL FOR 7.07 (either 0 or 10)

EVALUATOR'S COMBINED POINT TOTAL FOR ALL SECTIONS

-- END OF WORKSHEET --