Amendment #1 - Issued September 14, 2020
RFP 210000148 - DPH, Training and Technical Assistance to Tobacco Prevention and Control Partners

Response to Questions Received

Question/ Answer#	Section Reference and/or Page Number	Questions Received / Responses Provided
Q1	**3.08/3.09**	**Our organization's staffing model includes consultants and strategists as key members of our team who have worked on various projects and contracts with us for years. Per the description on Sections 3.08 and 3.09 of the RFP that disallow subcontractors, would we be able to continue to utilize our long-term consultants and strategist to work on this project?**
A1		The RFP is amended in sections 3.07, 3.08, 3.11 and 5.04. After the program's reconsideration of this aspect, the State is opting to allow subcontractors. Section 3.09 is specific to a joint venture arrangement and remains unchanged.
Q2	**6.12**	**Alaska Bidder Preference - We are a national nonprofit organization, who has worked in Alaska for years and, as a current contractor to the State, has held a business license in the state of Alaska with one of our key consultants/ team members that has been working on this project also based in the State of Alaska for years. Although we are headquartered outside of the State, given our demonstrated work in Alaska and licenses to work in the State and our Alaska-based team member, would we qualify for the 5% Alaska Bidder Preference? As our organization model includes staff who work remotely across the country, does a team member working in Alaska count as a place of business in the State of Alaska as that is where that team member conducts their normal business activities? If so, is the 5% Bidder Preference an additional 5% of our requested budget or 5% of the allowable budget? Do we add that 5% in our proposed budget or is that added by the State after the contract is awarded?**
A2		Please refer to Section 6.16 Examples: Converting Cost to Points. Offerors are not to adjust cost proposals, as this area is meant as an evaluative tool only, which allows the State to convert costs to points for awarding. Although the examples shown in Section 6.16 use a 100 point scale, this RFP is utilizing the scale of 1000 points, with 40%, or up to 400 points being available to award for cost and is separate from any preferences that may apply. If an Offeror receives the Alaska Bidder's Preference of 5%, they will receive an additional 5% for the Alaska Offeror's preference totaling 10% of the points available for this preference. This would calculate to 100 possible points awarded for the Alaska Offerors preference. RFP language in Section 6.12 is referenced below, and is how the State evaluates and adds points for applying the preference. To receive the Alaska Bidder Preference, per Section 6.12 - An Alaska Bidder Preference of 5% will be applied to the price in the proposal. The preference will be given to an offeror who: 1) holds a current Alaska business license prior to the deadline for receipt of proposals; 2) submits a proposal for goods or services under the name appearing on the offeror's current Alaska business license; 3) has maintained a place of business within the state staffed by the offeror or an employee of the offeror, for a period of six months immediately preceding the date of the proposal;

Amendment #1 - Issued September 14, 2020
RFP 210000148 - DPH, Training and Technical Assistance to Tobacco Prevention and Control Partners

Response to Questions Received

Question/ Answer#	Section Reference and/or Page Number	Questions Received / Responses Provided
		4) is incorporated or qualified to do business under the laws of the state, is a sole proprietorship and the proprietor is a resident of the state, is a limited liability company (LLC) organized under AS 10.50 and all members are resident of the state, or is a partnership under AS 32.06 or AS 32.11 and all partners are residents of the state; and 5) if a joint venture, is composed entirely of ventures that qualify under (1)-(4) of this subsection. To receive the Alaska Offeror Preference, per Section 6.14 - 2 AAC 12.260(e) provides Alaska offerors a 10% overall evaluation point preference. Alaska bidders, as defined in AS 36.30.990(2), are eligible for the preference. An Alaska offeror will receive 10% of the total available points added to their overall evaluation score as a preference.
Q3 A3	**5.06/6.14**	**Similarly, regarding Section 5.06 or 6.14, would we qualify for the 10% Alaska Offeror Preference?** Refer to Answer A2 above.
Q4 A4		**Since the first year of the contract will be October 27, 2020 to June 30, 2021, does the budget for the first year need to be prorated as a fraction of the annual project budget, or, given the initial work for that first year, can we apply for the full annual budget in that first year?** The RFP contract start date is the State's best estimate given. Actual start date may vary. The cost proposal requests offeror to essentially provide a 12-month (annual) snapshot multiplied out to reflect cost for all 5 years at the bottom.
Q5 A5	**1.02** 3.07	**We understand that there will be additional $16,000 travel funds to cover two staff and two speakers once it is safer to meet in person. Does this include lodging, per diem, and speaker fees? Is this only for the annual training or for any/all in-person trainings that arise throughout the year? Additionally, as the structure and costs of in-person trainings differ from virtual trainings, will the State be paying for food, facilities, audio, etc. for the annual trainings once they are held in person or should this come out of the $16,000 travel costs or the $195,000 project budget? For both virtual and in-person training, will the State be covering the cost of honorariums or speaker fees or should this be part of our regular budget?** Of the total 195K available allocation to cover a 12 month/annual budget period, the State is allocating 16K out of the 195K to be allocated to travel in support of Deliverables 3 and 11. These funds are intended to cover air, hotel, rental car, ground transportation, and per-diem only. Section 1.02 remains the same. Section 3.07, Location of Work, is amended to add clarification for what these funds are intended to support. It is expected that offerors will allocate other costs specific to training-related and not travel-related costs for deliverables 3 and 11 from the remaining 149K budgeted. The project manager can choose to reallocate any unused travel funds as necessary during the course of the resultant contract.