AMENDMENT TO REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL
FIREFIGHTER TURNOUTS, COATS & PANTS

BID NO. 12B0016RD
Procurement Officer: Rick A. Danielson
Issue Date: April 4, 2012

AMENDMENT NO. 1
Effective Date: April 16, 2012

ISSUED TO:
All Prospective Bidders

ISSUED BY:
University of Alaska Fairbanks
Procurement & Contract Services
PO Box 757940
Fairbanks AK 99775-7940

Dear Vendor:

The following clarifications have been provided to Invitation for Bid No. 12B0016RD for UAF Firefighter Turnouts, Coats & Pants:

This amendment does not provide for a change in the solicitation closing date: Wednesday, April 25, 2012, 3:00PM local time.

This amendment does not require acknowledgement.

Based on question(s) submitted, the following information, modifications, and UAF’s response to questions and clarifications shall be incorporated as part of the above referenced proposal and its specification.

Questions presented to UAF for clarification:

1) You have specified both Globe and Honeywell turnouts. On Globe you reference a style but on Morning Pride you are referring to another departments spec (TVF&R in Aloha, Oregon) with their part numbers LTO54M3 and BPR54M3. Does this mean Morning Pride is allowed to offer the TVF&R spec in lieu of the UAF specification you have provided in your bid?

UAF ANSWER: The reference to the Tualatin Valley Fire & Rescue specification for the Morning Pride by Honeywell turnouts was for the purpose of describing or demonstrating the style and model UAF requires with similar features and design. The manufacturer’s web site list of styles, the “classic” most closely meets the UAF specification, but in all regards, it is incumbent upon the bidder to provide a bid that meets the significant salient characteristics and specifications of UAF bid, 12B0016RD. This includes, but is not limited to specified fabric, construction, features, options, quality, performance, durability, and utility.
2) In your performance part of the specification in regards to the gear construction how will you know if each manufacturer is meeting the exact specification? Is there direction to notify the UAF if the manufacturer cannot or does not want to meet the spec?

UAF ANSWER: As stated on page 3, it is the bidders burden to demonstrate that they meet or exceed the salient characteristics of the specification. They can do this in a number of ways, including descriptive literature, narratives, independent evaluations. Our requirement is not to meet "exact" specifications, but to "meet or exceed the identified manufacturer's model and shall be considered to be substantially equivalent, when, in UAF's opinion, the salient characteristics set forth in the purchase description, UAF can reasonably anticipate sufficiently similar quality, capacity, durability, performance, utility, and productivity by the specified or equal product."

We used the two manufacturer's represented models to establish our expectation of performance, construction, and durability, not to eliminate competition. We will use the salient characteristics of these models as the basis for a comparison of any "or equal" up to, and including requiring samples be presented to UAF for evaluation.

3) Basis of award – is there a points system breakdown for price, responsiveness, and the responsibility of the bidder? If you could please elaborate on this it would be appreciated.

UAF ANSWER: Page 3 of the bid document also provides the basis of award statement which states: "Award will be made to the low, responsive, responsible, bidder demonstrating they meet or exceed the specification and characteristics as described herein, pending availability of funding."

In a bid process, there is no evaluation of how good, good is. Award will be to low price that meets the defined clause answered in your question 2 above regarding technical acceptability. Upon bid closing, the prices shall be logged, and I will make a determination of whether a bid is administratively acceptable. The low price, administratively acceptable bid will be forwarded to the department for determination technical acceptability. The award will be made to the low price, technical and administratively acceptable. Responsiveness and responsible refer to a bidder properly submitting a bid with all required information and being able to demonstrate they can meet the specification and requirements including support as defined in the bid.

4) I see that your bid will accept “equal” brands, but how likely do you think the end user will accept a different brand than what they are requesting?

UAF ANSWER: We have provided two manufacturer's models in an attempt to set a standard of quality and construction we feel necessary to meet the defined health and safety requirements stated above. Our intent is not to eliminate competition, but to set a standard for acceptable products. When we state brand name or equal, and as it is defined on page 3 of the solicitation, our evaluation of an "or equal" bid will determine that it meets the salient characteristics and we can anticipate sufficiently similar quality, durability, performance, utility, and productivity.

To answer your original question, any vendor offering an "or equal" bid bears the burden of providing adequate descriptive literature and documentation and be prepared to provide samples if we deem it necessary to allow for UAF to make a determination of technical responsiveness.

All other terms and conditions remain the same.

Sincerely,

UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA FAIRBANKS

Rick A. Danielson
Contracting Officer