



IMPORTANT BID ADDENDUM

RFP Number: **75-07232024**
ADDENDUM: **#1**
PURCHASER: **Thomas
Hartman**

COMMODITY: **Signage**
USING AGENCY: **Alamance Community College**
OPENING DATE/TIME: **07/23/2024 / 4:00 pm**

Questions, Responses & Clarification

Question #1: Is this solicitation Generic, Brand Name or Functional Equivalent, or Brand Specific?

Response #1: *Generic*

Question #2: Per Section 3.4 “Evaluation of Product & Service Description - Technical Proposal”, does #1 “Array of exterior signage products and services which provide the most qualified and advantageous proposal to the College” carry more weight to the award of contract than #7 “Quality of physical product sample” or do #1 and #7 have equal weight in the decision of who will be awarded the contract?

Response #2: *Factors reviewed by the evaluating committee will include all factors #1- #7 being reviewed with equal importance, with the overall “Evaluation of Product & Service Description- Technical Proposal” criteria being listed as the highest in order of importance.*

Question #3: Will ACC provide the evaluation scoring method for Section 3.4 “Evaluation of Product & Service Description - Technical Proposal” #1-7 (page 11 of the RFP)?

Response #3: *The evaluation method to be completed by the evaluating committee will be narrative and by consensus explaining strengths and weaknesses of each proposal as related to the criteria listed in descending order of relative importance as stated the RFP.*

Question #4: What type of documentation is ACC looking for us to submit with the bid to satisfy the requirements of Section 3.4 “Evaluation of Product & Service Description - Technical Proposal”, #1 “Array of exterior signage products and services which provide the most qualified and advantageous proposal to the College” ?

Response #4: *The vendor should, at a minimum, provide a listing of exterior product types offered, specifications and actual image examples of each, typically used installation methods and warranty/repair service offerings as related to Section 5.0 of the RFP. As stated in the RFP, “Section 2.9 – Alternate Proposals”, the vendor may submit alternate proposals for comparable Goods, various methods or levels of Service(s), or that propose different options.*

Question #5: The detail of the escutcheon plate was not clear. Can the escutcheon plates be made out of plastic or composites, or do they need to be made out of metal?

Response #5: *The College prefers metal, but as stated in the RFP, “Section 2.9 – Alternate Proposals”, the vendor may submit alternate proposals for comparable Goods, various methods or levels of Service(s), or that propose different options.*

Question #6: Can the escutcheon plates be 2 piece construction, or do they need to be 1 piece construction?

Response #6: *One piece construction is preferred, but as stated in the RFP, “Section 2.9 – Alternate Proposals”, the vendor may submit alternate proposals for comparable Goods, various methods or levels of Service(s), or that propose different options*

Question #7: Can the escutcheon plates be square with a round hole for the post to fit through, or do they need to have domed tops?

Response #7: *As stated in the RFP, “Section 2.9 – Alternate Proposals”, the vendor may submit alternate proposals for comparable Goods, various methods or levels of Service(s), or that propose different options*

Question #8: Would ACC consider requiring a smaller sample or a sample that is not the most expensive sign type product that is being solicited? Would ACC agree that the sample is very expensive and seems to be an undue burden that could reduce competition? If we also have many different solutions that we could offer the college that may be better than this design, would you require us to provide samples of all of those types of signs via an Alternate proposal/solution?

Response #8: *The College recognizes the concern, but also believes the full-size sample provides the best opportunity for the evaluating committee to evaluate the product to be provided and determine if vendor’s proposed solution provides the best value to the State. However, the College will allow a smaller sample of SignType 3B (reduced to, at most, 50% of size listed in the RFP) to be evaluated by the evaluating committee, if the vendor chooses not to submit the full-size sample requested.*

In terms of different solutions that could be offered, as stated in the RFP, “Section 2.9 – Alternate Proposals”, the vendor may submit alternate proposals for comparable Goods, various methods or levels of Service(s), or that propose different options. If vendor chooses to submit alternate proposals, all required performance factors listed in Section 2.9 must be followed.