

**THE METROPOLITAN GOVERNMENT OF NASHVILLE
AND DAVIDSON COUNTY**

**AMENDMENT NO. 2
RFP 10-123**

Notice to: All Prospective Bidders

From: Chuck Yancey
Division of Purchases

Re: RFP 10-123
Full Service Elevator, Escalator, Chair Lift and Platform Lift Maintenance and Repair

Date: November 9, 2010

This amendment is hereby incorporated into Metro's Request for Proposal 10-123 Full Service Elevator, Escalator, Chair Lift and Platform Lift Maintenance and repair. Proposers must acknowledge receipt of the amendment by including a copy of this document with their proposal submittal. Failure to acknowledge receipt may be cause for rejection of the response in whole or in part.

The following amendment items supplement, modify, change, delete from, or add to the Request for Proposal issued October 8, 2010. Where any provision or requirement, or Article, Paragraph, Subparagraph, Section or Clause is modified or deleted by this amendment, the unaltered portion(s) of any provision or requirement, or Article, Paragraph, Subparagraph, Section or Clause shall remain in effect.

THIS AMENDMENT SHALL BE BOUND IN AND MADE PART OF THE REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS.

STATEMENTS/QUESTIONS/ANSWERS

1. With our experience in participating in other national cooperative solicitations, such as the solicitation conducted by US Communities with the City and County of Denver as the sponsoring agency, it appears that Metro is not pursuing the option that is in their best interest. When the City and County of Denver bid was solicited, there were two separate packages 1. a local package and 2. a national package. The two packages were evaluated separately and there were 14 respondents to the local portion and 4 respondents to the national portion. In the end, the City and County of Denver decided to award the job to several companies on the local level and to one company nationally. Why would Metro not consider similarly splitting this bid into two separate packages so that they can analyze what is the best bid for them locally and the best bid for them nationally?

Answer: We are seeking a national solution that meets our local needs.. There appears to be no reason that these are mutually exclusive. We do not feel the US Communities contract meets our needs well.

2. Because of the restrictions by NIPA to be the exclusive cooperative for the vendor awarded the national contract, this will also limit the number of national companies who can respond to the RFP. How does Metro expect to get the best overall value with NIPA when competition is limited on both the local and national levels?

Answer: Neither US Communities nor National IPA has exclusivity limitations placed on the cooperative purchasing suppliers. As a result, we anticipate no challenges in achieving our competitive solicitation requirements. Our objectives are: A local provider with national backing, A simplified national pricing model that other municipalities will adopt, and An administrative fee to offset our costs of RFP development and contract administration.

3. Because Metro has limited the number of respondents to the RFP to those who can provide national coverage, many of the participating agencies for National IPA will not be able to participate in this contract unless a minimum of three companies respond to the RFP for the master contract. Can you confirm this? Also, how does Metro expect the best overall value when the possibility of cooperative purchasing power is limited to those agencies that do not have three bidder requirements for competitively bid contracts?

Answer: We anticipate a competitive process that Metro and other municipalities can reference.

4. The answer to the 25th question on Amendment 1 states that the door was left open in case a national proposer did not submit a local provider and wanted Metro to contract locally. Please direct us to where the bid documents leave this possibility on the table. Also, why would Metro choose to leave the door open for someone to bid nationally but not locally, but not also leave the door open for someone to bid locally but not nationally?

Answer: Our stated objective is to have one contract with a National firm who offers a local service provider. The selection will be based on the local, Nashville Service Provider but the national firm is a requirement. The local, Nashville Service Provider may be a local office of the national firm or a subcontractor. We misstated the possibility of entering into a local contract along with a national contract. Metro will only enter into a single contract.

Responses to questions numbered 5 through 21 have either been previously provided or do not include information that a vendor would need in order to respond to the Request For Proposal. Metro will not continue discussion of the pros and cons of cooperative purchasing in a competitive solicitation environment.

You stated that the reason that the original RFP was cancelled was because it did not satisfy Metro's objectives in its evolving strategies for procurement.

5. What are Metro's objectives in this RFP?
6. How does the revised RFP meet them?

7. Are these objectives peculiar to this RFP or will they be implemented on future purchases for all services?

You referenced NIPA's website to answer questions about this organization. The following questions were not definitively answered.

8. How long have they been in business?
9. The RFP states that the elevator company shall have been in business for 10 years. Is this also true for NIPA?
10. Is it nonprofit?
11. It appears that the only service agreement that NIPA has is the one in "Process" for Metro. Is this correct? If so, how have they demonstrated that this is a viable concept for Metro ?
12. How has NIPA demonstrated that they are capable of administering this service program?

You stated that shared objectives and needs were used as the criteria for selecting NIPA.

13. What were the shared objectives?
14. What were the shared needs?
15. Why was this service not bid competitively?

You stated that you were "absolutely not" excluding Automatic Elevator, Inc. from the bidding of this work. The result of this RFP is that a local SWBE is excluded from being a prime contractor on the work.

16. Why is it important for Metro to participate in a service for national coverage?
17. What advantage does Metro gain from using this service?
18. Is Metro required to be a "Prime Procurement Agency" in order to use NIAP's pricing on other commodities and services?

You state that Metro will receive a portion of the administrative fee for its efforts to establish and manage a national cooperative contract in conjunction with NIPA.

19. Could you give the projected costs to Metro of establishing and managing this national cooperative contract?
20. Could you give the projected revenues to Metro from this cooperative contract?
21. Could you select a projected sales amount associated with this contract nationwide and using percentages supplied in the RFP, calculate a dollar amount that Metro would receive annually?

Deadline for submitting questions has ended. The revised bid due date for this RFP shall be 11/19/2010. Time and location for submittals shall remain the same as set forth in the RFP.

END OF AMENDMENT NO. 2