



Questions and Answers No. 4
RFP 060B2490023-2016
Consulting and Technical Services + (CATS+)

Ladies/Gentlemen:

This list of questions and responses is being issued to clarify certain information contained in the above referenced RFP. The statements and interpretations contained in the following responses to questions by potential Offerors are not final or binding on the State. Nothing in the State's response to these questions is to be construed as agreement to or acceptance by the State of any statement or interpretation on the part of the vendor.

346) Could the same reference be noted for multiple functional areas?

RESPONSE: Yes, one reference may be noted for multiple Functional Areas.

347) Are selected vendors prohibited from partnering with MBEs, SBEs or other firms?

RESPONSE: You may propose to a TORFP as a prime and/or as subcontractor for another master contractor.

348) Does the State have an estimated annual number of task orders and dollar volume per functional area? If so, please provide.

RESPONSE: No, the State does not have an estimated annual number of task order and dollar volume per functional area.

349) Would the selected vendor be locked in to the hourly rates noted for the next 12 years or would the State offer the opportunity to negotiate rates?

RESPONSE: Yes, Offerors will be locked in the rates noted for the next 12 years.

350) Is there a reason why the State is requesting rates for 12 years?

RESPONSE: Offerors must provide rates for ALL labor categories to be compliant with the requirements of the RFP.



351) In section 3.4.2.6 Required Submissions, it indicates we should submit the Attachment T Reference Evaluation Sheet. However, when we checked the questions, they looked as questions the evaluator will ask to the offeror references. Does the offeror need to submit the Attachment T Reference evaluation sheet filled by references? How many Attachment T Reference Evaluation Sheet should the offeror submit with the proposal?

RESPONSE: Offeror must provide a Reference Evaluation Sheet for each proposed functional area(s). One Reference Evaluation Sheet that includes multiple Functional Areas is permissible.

352) In Attachment A MBE ATTACHMENT D-1A: MBE UTILIZATION AND FAIR SOLICITATION AFFIDAVIT & MBE PARTICIPATION SCHEDULE on page 140 says “MBE Participation Schedule Set forth below are the (i) certified MBEs I intend to use, (ii) the percentage of the total Contract amount allocated to each MBE for this project and, (iii) the items of work each MBE will provide under the Contract. I have confirmed with the MDOT database that the MBE firms identified below are performing work activities for which they are MDOT certified.”

- a. Since this is a master contract what will be the total amount allocated to each MBE for this project?
- b. The master contract has multiple functional areas but there is not a specific project at this time. So, what will be the project number and project description for the MBE’s required in the form?

RESPONSE: There is not a specific amount allocated to each MBE.

The project number and description will be decided by the agencies at the secondary level.

353) On attachment CATS + 2016 Attachment F- Price Form A_12 Years spreadsheet F-A1 – there is two labor categories with Number 99 Electricians Helper and Facilities Engineering Manager. Please clarify if the Labor Category Number should be the same.

RESPONSE: Yes, the Labor Category Number should be the same as this is a duplicate.

354) On attachment CATS + 2016 Attachment F- Price Form A_12 Years spreadsheet F-A1 – there is two labor categories with Number 101 Engineer-Facility Operations, and Engineer- Stationary. Please clarify if the Labor Category Number should be the same.

RESPONSE: See Response to Question 353.

355) Does full time employees past performance count as a demonstrated past performance?

RESPONSE: Past performance must be met by the proposing entity.

356) Does the company’s owner past performance count as a demonstrated past performance?



RESPONSE: Each Offeror must include evidence of past performance pursuant to RFP 3.4.2.4.

357) It is indicated that at least one past performance reference should be provided for each functional area to which we are applying. Should that project have occurred within a certain number of years (i.e. 3 or 5)? Is there a preferred or maximum number of project examples that may be provided for each functional area?

RESPONSE: Except for examples involving the State of Maryland, there is no requirement that the example of past performance have occurred within a specific number of years. However recent examples are preferred. Each Functional Area proposed must be provided with an example of a successful project, but there is no preferred or maximum number of project examples.

358) If a vendor applies for 3 functional areas and doesn't meet the minimum qualifications for one area, will they still be considered for the remaining two?

RESPONSE: A responsible Offeror that meets all requirements of the Functional Areas will be awarded a contract.

359) The proposal states in section 4.3 "Financial Proposals will be evaluated separately. Offerors shall propose prices for all labor categories, regardless of an Offeror's ability to provide resources for the labor category. Offerors shall provide prices for Contract years 1 through 12 for all labor categories listed in the Financial Proposal, Attachment F-1. These are the maximum prices the State will pay for all proposed labor categories." Is the offeror ability to submit pricing for labor categories we cannot supply at \$0.00 to be compliant?

RESPONSE: No.

360) Pricing is only offered in hourly rates. Is there any way to offer a per user license pricing?

RESPONSE: No, modification of Attachment F-1 may result in a bid being considered not reasonably susceptible for award.

361) Section 2.2 states, in part, that the Procurement Officer may, at any time, by written order make changes in the work within the general scope of the Contract, the TORFP/RFR or the TO Agreement. Are these changes limited to scope of work changes? Is Vendor required to perform the modified scope of work or is Vendor given an opportunity to accept the change order/modified scope of work?

RESPONSE: No, these changes are not limited to the scope of work, and the Offeror is required to agree to the changes.



362) Section 3.2: Will the State consider making the contract extension decision mutual between the State and the Contractor?

RESPONSE: Within the next several weeks, current CATS+ Master Contractors who were awarded a master contract in April of 2013 will receive a modification to their Master Contract that incorporates the terms and conditions of this Expansion Window RFP, issued June 30, 2016. If current CATS+ Master Contractors wish to continue participating as a CATS+ Master Contractor, they must agree to the terms of the modification.

363) Section 4.2: Section 4.2 states, in part, that in consideration of the satisfactory performance of work set forth in this Contract and any TO Agreement, the State shall pay Contractor in accordance with the rates established in the Contractor's TO/RFR Proposal. Would the State agree to delete the word "satisfactory" as it is vague and could lead to unnecessarily costly disputes?

RESPONSE: No.

364) Section 4.5: Will the State agree to provide a reasonable specified notice period and opportunity to cure as withholding payments should be reserved for uncured material breaches?

RESPONSE: No.

365) Sections 4.6 and 4.7:

- a. Payments will be withheld until completion of the TO Agreement and amount withheld paid within 30 days of State's acceptance of all deliverables required under TO Agreement and receipt from Contractor of release. Will the State agree to a deemed acceptance period for deliverables?
- b. Release in a form prescribed by the State for any claims arising out of or related to the TORFP. This is too broad. Will the State agree to delete requirement that Contractor provide a release for any claims arising out of or related to TORFP as a co-condition to receiving the amount withheld?

RESPONSE: The terms and conditions of the Master Contract will remain unchanged throughout the duration of the contract.

366) Sections 5.2 et al: Ownership should remain with Contractor who is in the business of providing IT services and products.

- a. Will the State agree to the approach that (i) except for unique and exclusive deliverables custom built for the State, Contractor will maintain ownership of the deliverables and provide the State with a license to use the deliverables for internal purposes; and (ii) for certain unique and exclusive deliverables identified in a SOW as deliverables and agreed to by the parties, ownership can be provided to the State?



- b. Will the State agree that Contractor retains all IP Rights in the “Utilities” (e.g. know-how, IP, methodologies, processes, technologies, algorithms, software or development tools used in performing Services)?
- c. Will the State agree that Contractor retains all IP Rights in “Residual IP” (e.g. ideas, concepts, know-how, processes, reusable reports, designs, charts, documentation, forms, templates or output developed, created or otherwise used by or on behalf of Contractor in course of performing the Services or creating the Deliverables, other than portions that specifically incorporate proprietary or Confidential Information or data of the State)?

RESPONSE: See response to Question #365.

367) Section 5.9: Will the State agree to delete this and move it to specific SOWs for software development for Deliverables that will be owned by the State?

RESPONSE: See response to Question #365.

368) Section 6.1: Does the State agree this indemnity applies to third party claims only?

RESPONSE: See response to Question #365.

369) Section 7 LOL:

- a. Section 7.4: Will the State agree to delete the last sentence that all subcontractors shall be held to be agents of Contractor?
- b. Will the State agree to add industry standard disclaimer of indirect, consequential, punitive and other types of damages?

RESPONSE: See response to Question #365.

370) Section 9: Will the State agree to some sort of deemed acceptance period?

RESPONSE: See response to Question #365.

371) Section 11: Contractor should not be responsible for back up of data or make it recoverable. Will the State agree to remove Section 11 or limit it to the extent that the services itself are specifically to back up the data?

RESPONSE: See response to Question #365.

372) Section 18.6: Will the State agree to add a 30 day cure period prior to termination?

RESPONSE: See response to Question #365.

373) Section 18.15:



- a. Section 18.15 provides, in part, that Contractor is required to notify the Procurement Officer in writing if policies are cancelled or not renewed 5 days of learning of such cancellation and/or nonrenewal. Will the State agree instead that notice of cancellation shall be provided in accordance with policy provisions or notice provisions of the policy?
- b. Section 18.15 states that the State shall be named as an additional named insured on the property and casualty policy and as required in the RFP. Will the State agree to “additional insured” in lieu of “additional named insured”?

RESPONSE: See response to Question #365.

374) **Section 18.18:** Section 18.18 provides that Procurement Office may unilaterally order Contractor in writing to suspend, delay or interrupt all or any part of its performance for such period of time as Procurement Officer may determinate appropriate for convenience of the State. Would State agree to some cap on the length of time for this suspension, delay or interruption or some sort of reasonableness standard?

RESPONSE: See response to Question #365.

- 375) Both the Contractor and the State have to comply with federal laws regarding export. Would the State agree to the following language?
- a. The State’s purchase of Contractor’s Products or Services is for its own use, not for resale, export, re-export, or transfer. The State is subject to and solely responsible for compliance with the export control and economic sanctions laws of the United States and other applicable jurisdictions. The State’s purchase may not be used, sold, leased, exported, re-exported, or transferred except in compliance with such laws, including, without limitation, export licensing requirements, end-user, end-use, and end-destination restrictions, and prohibitions on dealings with sanctioned individuals and entities, including but not limited to persons on the Office of Foreign Assets Control's Specially Designated Nationals and Blocked Persons List or the U.S. Department of Commerce Denied Persons List. The State represents and warrants that it is not the subject or target of, and that the State is not located in a country or territory that is the subject or target of, economic sanctions of the United States and other applicable jurisdictions.
 - b. The State certifies that all items (including hardware, software, technology and other materials) it provides to Contractor for any reason that contain or enable encryption functions either (i) satisfy the criteria in the Cryptography Note (Note 3) of Category 5, Part 2 of the Wassenaar Arrangement on Export Controls for Conventional Arms and Dual-Use Goods and Technologies or (ii) employ key length of 56-bit or less symmetric, 512-bit asymmetric or less, and 112-bit or less elliptic curve. Contractor is not responsible for determining whether any Third-Party Product to be used in the Products and Services satisfies regulatory requirements of the country to which such Products or Services are to be delivered or performed, and Contractor shall not be obligated to provide any



Product or Service where the resulting Product or Service is prohibited by law or does not satisfy the local regulatory requirements.

RESPONSE: See response to Question #365.

376) Will the State allow Vendor/Contractor to add additional terms it deems necessary for providing particular services that are not included in the State's template?

RESPONSE: No.

377) Are we allowed to use sub-contractors?

RESPONSE: See response to Question #347.

378) What are the State IT standards? (As noted in Function Area One- Enterprise Service Provider (ESP)

**RESPONSE: The State IT Standards can be found at:
<http://doit.maryland.gov/support/pages/securitypolicies.aspx>.**

379) What evaluation process is the government using to endure the validity of attachment T?

RESPONSE: Each reference provided will be contacted to validate the information provided.

380) Is the State willing to consider further clarifying language in order to outline the differences between Staffing and Deliverable based services?

RESPONSE: No.

381) Can the State further clarify the liability and indemnification obligations for Staffing verses Deliverable engagements?

RESPONSE: These provisions are as stated in the Master Contract.

382) Does the State of Maryland have standard Drug and Background requirements?

RESPONSE: Yes. See RFP § 1.23, Contract Affidavit. All successful Offerors will be required to complete a Contract Affidavit (a sample of which is provided as RFP Attachment C) which includes a certification regarding Drug and Alcohol Free Workplace. The Security Clearance/ Criminal Background Check requirements are stated in RFP § 2.4.3.



383) In order to ensure EEOC compliance and avoid co-employment concerns will the State allow the vendor to assume the responsibility of completing the Drug, Background and adjudication processes?

RESPONSE: See response to Question 383 and RFP § 2.4.3.

384) If the State will not allow the vendor to assume responsibility for adjudicating the drug and background investigation process will the state assume responsibility for and EEOC or discriminatory employment charges resulting from the State adjudication?

RESPONSE: See RFP § 2.4.3.

385) Would it be possible to obtain an example or previously executed Task Orders for previous RFR and TORFP's to ensure that our services meet the State's objectives?

RESPONSE: Previously executed Task Orders for previous TORFP's and RFR's can be found on the CATS+ TORFP Status website.

386) For section 3.4.2.4 (Past Performance) – Does the State require that the past performance be deliverables based or is staff augmentation support for the proposed categories sufficient to demonstrate a vendors capabilities?

RESPONSE: Past performance must be based on the Offeror's experience providing service.

387) Please clarify whether or not a bidder must provide pricing for all labor categories, even if only bidding for one or a few functional areas. What if we do not staff one or more of these labor categories?

RESPONSE: See response to Question #350.

388) Does the State publish a list of current approved labor rates?

RESPONSE: No, the State does not publish a list of current approved labor rates.

389) Is there a specific format or requirement for number of past performance descriptions?

RESPONSE: No.

390) Are small business joint ventures allowed to bid ?

RESPONSE: No, however joint ventures are permitted at the secondary level of competition.



391) We are seeking to add functional areas to our existing CATS+ Master Contract. Do we need to submit a complete proposal covering the additional functional areas or may we submit only relevant information, including related past performance and pricing, for each functional area that we are seeking to add?

RESPONSE: Within the next several weeks, current CATS+ Master Contractors who were awarded a master contract in April of 2013 will receive a modification to their Master Contract that incorporates the terms and conditions of this Expansion Window RFP, issued June 30, 2016. Current Master Contractors will be required to agree to the terms of the modification to continue participating as a CATS+ Master Contractor even if they do not wish to add new functional areas.

Once the modification process is complete, an invitation to add functional areas will be issued to the current CATS+ Master Contractors. Master Contractors will submit their responses according to the instructions in the invitation and responses will be evaluated for qualification to add new functional areas to their Master Contract.

392) I am writing regarding the CATS+ RFP (Project No. 060B2490023–2016). The form entitled, “CATS Plus 2016 Attachment F - Price Form A_12 Years” will not allow for the entry of the sufficient enough characters to complete the following fields:

- Address
- Fax
- FEIN

Can this form be updated and posted as an Addendum?

RESPONSE: The State looked into this problem and did not have any issues. Offeror’s must click above the footer. There is a text box to enter the requested information.

393) Are there any restrictions on using a subcontractors past performance? Only one past performance is required for each functional area we are bidding on, but is it permitted to use a subcontractors past performance for a select few functional areas as well?

RESPONSE: Past performance must be met by the proposing entity.

394) Are client reference letters required in past performance?

RESPONSE: The pertinent requirements are as stated in RFP Section 3.4.2.4

395) What universe should the max pricing be in (i.e., federal GSA)?

RESPONSE: The max pricing structure for the labor categories is dependent upon the Offeror.



396) Will the State expect any pricing to be discounted?

RESPONSE: Pricing will be determined at the secondary level of competition.

397) Does this RFP apply to task orders that are staff-oriented, in the sense that the projects will oversee the staffing and tasks of qualified personnel in key labor categories for specific functional areas? Or, will some task orders be deliverable-oriented, in the sense that the projects will track deliverables but leave the actual management of internal resources (including qualified personnel) to the contractors?

RESPONSE: This is determined at the secondary level of competition.

398) Are the qualified personnel identified by the contractor required to work on premise, or do some projects take into account that some qualified personnel may work remotely?

RESPONSE: See response to Question #397.

399) If the Prime and Sub are both MBEs will a subcontracting plan still be required?

RESPONSE: See response to Question #397.

400) Regarding the attachment T – Reference Evaluation Sheet should our clients email to Miss Alicia Baltimore directly or we will provide a hardcopy during our submission? What is the business hours M – F for us to deliver the proposal?

RESPONSE: The Reference Evaluation Sheet must be submitted with the Offeror's proposal. See RFP Section 1.3 – Abbreviations and Definitions, Normal State Business Hours.

401) With regard to Attachment D, there are several places that state we should be submitting Attachment D-1A but in the attachment section itself, it states that D-A (the acknowledgement) is the only thing to submit now and tht D-1A should only be submitted IF we are awarded a master contract. Can you please confirm which form should be submitted with this RFP?

RESPONSE: See Amendment #3.

402) If you are already an approved CATS + vendor, do we have to acknowledge this solicitation? It is not mentioned in the video or questions?

RESPONSE: See response to Question #391.

403) As a current vendor who does not wish to add functional areas is there a specific response that is required of us for RFP 060B2490023-2016?



RESPONSE: See response to Question #391.

- 404) Do we need to provide a current certificate of liability insurance as an attachment to the bid, or is that only required after the contract is awarded?

RESPONSE: Offerors that do not provide proof of insurance will be considered not susceptible for award.

- 405) For each functional area we can provide examples of successful completion of projects similar in scope as requested in the RFP. However, due to contractual restraints we cannot provide a PoC or contact information for many of the pertinent examples that demonstrate our capabilities and experience. What do you suggest we do in this case?

RESPONSE: The pertinent requirements are as stated in RFP Section 3.4.2.3.

- 406) In the RFP, Section 3.5 (page 93) refers to Attachments F-A1, F-A2, F-B, and FC, and Section 4.3 (page 94) refers to Attachment F-1. However, the documents provided with the RFP include Attachment F, Forms A, B, and C. Can you please confirm that offerors are to use Attachment F, Forms A, B, and C instead of the attachments referred to in Sections 3.5 and 4.3 of the RFP?

RESPONSE: Offerors are to use Attachment F, Forms A, B, and C.

- 407) Section 3.5 instructs offerors to "propose pricing for all labor categories to be considered for Award," while Section 4.3 instructs offerors to "propose prices for all labor categories, regardless of an Offeror's ability to provide resources for the labor categories." Since we do not, for example, provide archeology/historic preservation services or facilities management services, we would have no way of knowing the rates for related labor categories. Can you please confirm that the statement in Section 4.3 pertains to only the functional areas that offerors are bidding on?

RESPONSE: See response to Question #350.

- 408) Our company is an existing CATS+ Master Contractor. We are seeking to add functional areas to our Master Contract. We have already provided a financial proposal and rates for the two functional areas that we currently hold (Electronic Document Management and Geographical Information Systems). Can you please confirm that we do **not** need to resubmit our rates for the two functional areas that we already hold?

RESPONSE: See response to Question #391.

- 409) Are we to send it to our References and include the returned Attachment(s) in our Proposal. Or do we just complete the part marked "completed by Offeror" and include that in our Proposal for you to send out.



If we send the Form to the our References do we just include the Functional Area's covered in our Proposal.

RESPONSE: See response to Questions #351 and #400.

- 410) It assumed that Attachment T is to be filled out by the Offeror with the areas that are indicated (Completed by Offeror) and included in our proposal package so the State can send the form to our references listed in our Past Performance. Is that correct?

RESPONSE: See response to Question #351.

- 411) My question on the pricing form is that when I attempt to enter the requested information in the footer (see below) – I get an error that says “the text string you entered is too long; please reduce the number of characters used.” No matter what I do, I can’t edit or maneuver the data in such a way as to accept the information. Is it acceptable to create a footer with the same information that we can get Excel to accept? We wouldn’t alter the form in any way except make sure the footer information is accepted on all pages.

RESPONSE: See response to Question #392.

- 412) In "Attachment F" it looks like there is limitation of characters where we need to put company information at the end of each page and the current sheet is preventing us to write our complete address.

RESPONSE: See response to Question #392.

- 413) The instructions indicate that “Attachment D-1A - CATS+ Master Contract Acknowledgement of Task Order MBE Requirements” is required (page 93 of RFP). However, Attachment D-1A is titled “MBE Utilization and Fair Solicitation Affidavit & MBE Participation Schedule” (page 137 of the RFP). We’d like to confirm that the form required for this submission is Attachment D-A CATS+ Master Contractor Acknowledgement of Task Order MBE Requirements” as found on page 135 of the RFP.

RESPONSE: See Amendment #3.

- 414) Regarding Attachment T (Reference Evaluation Sheet), are the completed forms to be included in our company’s response as submitted or should our references send those directly to the State. We are comfortable with either approach but would like to make sure we follow the one that is preferable to the State.

RESPONSE: See response to Question #400.

- 415) Can you confirm subcontracting is or is not allowed?



RESPONSE: Subcontracting is permitted at the secondary level.

- 416) We are having trouble pulling up pricing from incumbents on CATS+ as we'd like some point of reference. We are so confused about pricing as one statement says that we can bid on as many functional areas as we'd like and another statement says that we need to provide pricing in every area for 12 years, that appears to be contradictory, please help!

RESPONSE: See response to Question #350.

- 417) In the RFP, it requires each firm to provide their certificate of insurance (3.4.2.5). Section 2.7 provides requirements for the limits. If a respondent submits a certificate of insurance that does not meet those limits, we assume the state will provide up to 5 business days after an award to provide an updated certificate of insurance that meets those limits (as in section 2.7.7). Is that correct?

RESPONSE: Yes.

- 418) In the document entitled "CATS Plus 2016 Attachments A-T_As Released.pdf", page 163, question 20, states that the technical proposal "shall be organized and numbered in the same order as the RFP", and further states the numbering should be 3.4.2.4 for Past Performance. Each functional area in the RFP document begins with 2.3.X. This is confusing as 3.4.2.4 seems to conflict with the 2.3.x numbering scheme. Should our numbering for past performance align with the 2.3.x numbers in the RFP for each functional area?

RESPONSE: The numbering for past performance should align with Section 3.4.2.4.

- 419) Is the Pre-Conference Video available. I could not find it on the website.

RESPONSE: The pre-proposal conference summary can be found on eMaryland Marketplace and the DoIT website.

- 420) The I am a small business and I was preparing my response to the CATS+ RFP issues by your office.

I reviewed Amendment #4, #060B2490023-2016 issued on August 5, 2016 (ref: <http://doit.maryland.gov/contracts/Documents/CATSPlus2016/060B2490023-2016Amend4.pdf>)

Does it mean that CATS+ is not looking for any "IT Enterprise Architecture Development" capability or is this capability placed under another Functional Area. I would appreciate if you could shed some light on the matter.



RESPONSE: At this time, the IT Enterprise Architecture Development capability is removed.

421) Our company is responding to the RFP specified in the subject line. We are an MBE and would like to be certified as such for purposes of this RFP and subsequent TORFPs. We are certified by the Chicago and National Supplier Diversity Councils, but I am told that this is not acceptable for the State of Maryland, and that we need to get DBE certification from Maryland DOT. However, MDOT told us that we must get certified by our home state Illinois Department of Transportation. When I spoke with the Illinois DOT, they said that their DBE is for companies that work on transportation construction projects, not Information Technology companies.

So, I am pretty much back to square 1. Can you advise? We'd like to get the certification in process as soon as possible, but I'm not sure which certification I need to pursue.

RESPONSE: In order for a company to be recognized as an MBE in Maryland, they must be certified through the Maryland Department of Transportation - no other State's certification is acceptable. MDOT now offers an online application using the following link <http://www.mdot.maryland.gov/newMDOT/MBE/Index.html>.

422) On the Attachment A-T document, there is **ATTACHMENT G-1 Maryland Living Wage Requirements Affidavit of Agreement**. We do not currently have contract # as highlighted in the form to be completed. Can you please advise how we should handle that?

RESPONSE: The contract number is 060B2490023-2016.

423) Amendment #4 was issued this past Friday on 08/5. This amendment appears to be striking the sub-category for FA 10 for IT Enterprise Architecture Development.

Just need to confirm if that is the case because we had a response to that are in our submittal. Will that section be moved to a different area or removed completely?

RESPONSE: See response to Question #420.

424) Bullet point number 4 in the Amendment #3 attachment, has mentioned as "Revise Section 3.4.2.6 Required Submission on (p.93) as follows" however could not find difference in the submission in RFP and amendment # 3. Does that mean attachment document has been revised? Can you please clarify?

RESPONSE: The Amendment was released to correct the MBE Form. Offerors must submit Attachment D-A with their proposal.



425) I have been to the site and tried to open Amendment #6, but nothing happens. Am I doing something wrong, or is there something wrong with the link?

RESPONSE: The State has looked into the issue and has found no problems with the link.

426) Task Order #1 – Section A.7 of the task order states that the tower site perimeter fence is to be 60' x 60'. The Task Order #1 Pricing Sheet, Line #14, requests pricing for the tower site perimeter fence to be 100' x 100'. Which size perimeter fence should we include in our pricing?

RESPONSE: Propose as the RFP requests. The exact specifications of each TORFP will dictate any additional updated technical details.

427) Task Order #4 – The tower requirements for this Task Order is a 75' monopole. Attachment L provides loading for 180', 250', 330' and 450' towers, but does not provide loading for a 75' monopole. What loading should we assume for the 75' monopole?

RESPONSE: This is incorrect, there is no 75' monopole.

428) Reference Task Order #1 thru Task Order #5 – Are the SWM features noted in the sample task orders referring to erosion and sediment control measures (i.e. silt fence, temporary seeding) or Stormwater Management Features such as culverts, rip rap lined ditches, rain gardens, weirs, etc? If the later, can the State provide specific SWM features (including sizes and details) that are to be included?"

RESPONSE: Yes, the exact specifications of each TORFP will dictate any additional updated technical details.

429) Reference Task Order #1 thru Task Order #4, Section B – Tower designs are to be based on Rev G. However, wind speeds in Rev G are specific to each county and the Rev G design categories of exposure and topography are specific to each site location. (Note, we are assuming that the Rev G Structure Class would be Class III.) How should we handle the tower design for pricing purposes given these Task Orders are not site specific?

RESPONSE: Propose as the RFP requests. The exact specifications of each TORFP will dictate any additional updated technical details.

430) Reference Attachment L-2 – Loading for a 250' tower was provided, but does not appear to be needed for any of the Task Order pricing. Please confirm that is correct?

RESPONSE: This is to confirm that the loading for 250' tower provided is not needed for any Task Order pricing.



431) I am confident after reviewing the RFP that DoIT does not intend to use a VSP or MSP in the middle of TO's. Notwithstanding, can you please confirm that the State does not use an Managed Services Provider.

RESPONSE: The State does not understand your question.

432) We received a notification for a new Amendment for the CATS+ proposal effort with a bid No. MDF5031027640 which is different from the one that is in the RFP (060B2490023-2016). Question: has the bid number changed? Also when I went onto the site I could not find the MDF5031027640.

We notice no change in below mentioned revisions if we compare to RFP.

3. Revise Section 3.4.2.3.3 – Offeror General Information on (p.92) as follows:
Offeror MBE Form – Attachment D-1A- CATS+ Master Contractor Acknowledgement of Task Order MBE Requirements

4. Revise Section 3.4.2.6 Required Submission on (p.93) as follows:

1. Attachment B- Completed Bid/Proposal Affidavit
2. Attachment D-1A- Completed, signed and unedited CATS+ Master Contractor Acknowledgement of Task Order MBE Requirements form.
3. Attachment G – Completed Living Wage Affidavit
4. Attachment I - Completed Conflict of Interest Affidavit and Disclosure
5. Attachment S- Offeror Information Sheet
6. Attachment T- Reference Evaluation Sheet

RESPONSE: The bid number has not changed. Bid number MDF503102760 is the eMaryland Marketplace number and can only be found on eMaryland Marketplace.

Offerors must submit Attachment D-A – CATS+ Master Contractor Acknowledgement of Task Order MBE Requirement form with their proposal.

433) I want to verify that the Bid Opening date for RFP 060B2490023-2016 is August 26th versus the August 1, 2016 date listed in the original document online.

RESPONSE: The bid opening date for RFP 060B2490023-2016 is August 26th.

434) Can you please advise how to list additional approved FICO labor categories to our proposal for the CATS+ RFP? I added fields and included additional labor categories at the end of provided price schedule. Please advise if acceptable

RESPONSE: See response to Question #360.

435) Can you provide a link to the Attachment T Reference Evaluation Sheet?



RESPONSE: Attachment T can be found on eMaryland Marketplace and the DoIT website.

- 436) The CATS+ RFP requires Attachment T, Reference Evaluation Sheet, to be completed and then submitted with the offeror's response. Our company plans on submitting references from the a Federal Government, and our Federal customer has a policy that they will only submit a reference directly to the evaluating party and will not send it to us. Is there a way for a reference to submit Attachment T directly to DOIT as a part of this procurement?

RESPONSE: See response to Question #400.

- 437) I have carefully read the CATS+ Solicitation and all the Q&A, however there is one issue which seems to be less clear to me with each question/answer. It is regarding the requirement for Theft Insurance. I am trying to figure out if I need to spend \$10,000 to purchase Theft insurance now or am I allowed to wait and buy Theft Insurance upon notice of intent to award. I apologize for my lack of understanding, but I respectfully ask for a clear Yes or No:

Are Offerors required to have Theft Insurance at the time proposals are submitted?

RESPONSE: The pertinent requirements are as stated in RFP Section 2.7.

- 438) Does "certified financial statement" in section 3.4.2.3 mean that we need to provide an audited financial statement?

RESPONSE: The pertinent requirements are as stated in RFP Section 3.4.2.3.

- 439) I know we are beyond the Q&A period, however, we are concerned about one response to a question; specifically question #122 which asked about State of MD experience and getting references. We have State of MD experience as a subcontractor currently, however, our contracts with our primes PRECLUDE us from going directly to at State of MD employee as per the response on the Q&A. If we did so, we would face termination of our contract and potential legal ramifications.

This is something that I think needs to be addressed to all potential bidders asap as this does not seem to be a response that would be allowed by any prime currently on the CATS+ contract (with their subcontractors).

RESPONSE: This determination is between the subcontractor and the prime.

- 440) We are looking to include a service offering for Managed Services under existing FA Six-Systems/Facilities Management and Maintenance. Please advise if it is necessary to submit a full proposal response for this service offering or if a write up on Managed



Services is sufficient. Any assistance that you can provide would be greatly appreciated.

RESPONSE: Including a service offering for Managed Services under existing FA Six-Systems/Facilities Management and Maintenance is not permissible.

Thank you,

Alicia Baltimore
Procurement Officer