

Metropolitan Area Planning Council

Produce for Eastern Massachusetts Schools

Fruit and Vegetable Provision

Request for Proposals

RFP #MAPC 2018 School Produce

Solicited in partnership with the cities and towns and school districts of Acton-Boxborough, Acushnet, Andover, Arlington, Ashland, Assabet Valley Regional Tech, Avon- Middle/High School, Blackstone Millville RSD, Belmont, Beverly, Billerica, Boston, Braintree, Burlington, Cambridge, Carver, Canton, Chelmsford, Cohasset, Concord - Carlisle RSD, Concord, Danvers, Dartmouth, Dedham, Dover – Sherborn, Dracut, Foxborough, Gloucester, Halifax Elementary, Hanover, Holliston, Keefe Regional Technical School District, Lincoln, Littleton, Mansfield, Marshfield, Medfield, Medford, Methuen, Milford, Milton, Nashoba Regional, Needham, Norfolk, Norwell, Old Rochester, Pembroke, Plainville, Quincy, Reading, Rockport, Scituate, Seem Ed. Collaborative, Sharon, Shrewsbury, Silver Lake RSD, Somerville, Southeastern Regional Vocational Tech HS, Triton Regional (Newbury, Rowley, Salisbury), Wakefield, Waltham, Watertown, Wareham, Wayland, Weston, Westwood, Wilmington and Wrentham/Plainville. Other districts from Metropolitan Area Planning Council member communities may also use the resulting contract upon execution.



Metropolitan Area Planning Council, 60 Temple Place, 6th Floor, Boston MA 02111 www.mapc.org
MAIN PHONE 617.933.0700 MAIN FAX 617.482.7185

Addendum # 1

Issued: May 22, 2018

Revisions:

The main RFP document and Appendices have been amended as described in the sections below. A new draft of the RFP and Appendices reflecting these changes has been posted on the MAPC website: mapc.org/produceprocurement.

Relating to Food Safety

1. In Section 5.2 Non-Price Proposal Preparation, Part 2 Minimum Quality Requirements by adding the language in the list of requirements:
 - Has provided its two most recent 3rd party food safety inspection reports.

Relating to Overall and Local Provision

2. In Section 5.2, Part 3 Overall and Local Provision, the paragraph has been amended as shown below with the changes highlighted in yellow.

For Part 3, Proposers must fill out and submit the Provision spreadsheet provided in Appendix B. That spreadsheet provides space for Proposers to answer three questions about the items specified: 1) whether they can provide each listed fruit and vegetable item as specified in the spreadsheet; 2) what percentage of the estimated annual cases they can provide if not the entire estimated amount; and 3) whether they can provide a significant amount of the items they can provide from local sources when available. Proposers must answer Y (yes) or N (no) for questions 1 and 3 and provide a percentage for question 2. Of course there are a number of produce items that cannot be provided locally at all – for such items, the vendor can write N/A in the local provision column.

3. A new draft of Appendix C – Overall and Local Provision has been reflects the changes described above.

Relating to Invoice Information

4. In Section 5.2 Non-Price Proposal Preparation, Part 4 Market Basket Workbook, the second paragraph has been amended as shown below with the changes highlighted in yellow:

For each item, it is required that the grower/shipper/wholesaler/supplier and freight invoices are made available to substantiate each cost. These **invoices DO NOT HAVE TO BE** submitted as part of the proposal but must be available for review to validate the information provided in the workbook submission. Items bought through brokers or intercompany subsidiaries must

have grower/shipper and freight invoices. The invoice must be directly from the grower/shipper or freight company and not an internal purchase order, requisition, sales order, sales confirmation or bill of lading.

5. In Section 8.1 Price and Weekly Price Provision, the second paragraph has been amended as shown below with the changes highlighted in yellow:

The Vendor's Delivered Price and therefore the weekly Contract Unit Price can be changed based on Economic Price Adjustments. MAPC reserves the right to request that the vendor substantiate their proposed delivered price with a grower/shipper/**wholesaler/supplier** invoice, as prescribed in this RFP. If the price on the grower/shipper invoice does not match the offered price due to a freight charge, the freight charge must be indicated on the grower/shipper invoice, by the vendor. A separate freight invoice may be required as further documentation. Bulk freight charges are to be broken down by the case, as prescribed in this RFP. The request for substantiating invoices can be made at any time during the term or as part of the agreed upon audit rights. Pricing errors will be resolved according to the agreed upon Price Discrepancy Resolution Process.

6. A new draft of Appendix C – Market Basket Workbook also makes clear that wholesaler/supplier invoices can be used to substantiate costs.

Relating to Lower Volume Items

7. In Section 5.3 Price Proposal Preparation, a new Sub-Section has been added, 5.3.1 Lower Volume Items. The new Sub-Section language is provided below and has been included in the RFP document.

Lower Volume Items

In the Price Proposal Spreadsheet (Appendix E), for items where the estimated quantity is lower than 100 cases, Vendors are invited to propose alternate items at the bottom of the spreadsheet. These can either be items that replace listed items above or additional items they would like to provide that are similar to a listed item – but again only for those items where the quantity is less than 100 cases. Vendors should add the items in following the information requested above for Appendix E columns D (Item Description), C (Item Comment, the Vendor must note which listed item the alternate is replacing or supplementing), M (Delivered Price), O (Distribution Price Year 1), Q (Contract Unit Price) and S and T (Distribution Price for Years 2 and 3). In column D, Item Description, the Vendor must provide the variety, count/size, weight, quality, origin and pack size for all proposed alternate items.

8. Appendix E – Price Proposal Spreadsheet, has been amended to allow for the submission of alternate items as described above.

Questions and Answers:

Below are written responses to the questions received by MAPC.

Q. Will you add to the RFP a higher standard for food safety.

A. The amended RFP as described above, includes a minimum requirement that Vendors provide their two most recent 3rd party food safety inspection reports with their proposal.

Q. 1. If a Vendor lists a subcontractor do they have to use them?

A. No. But the Vendor must not use a subcontractor that was not listed or for which they have not received approval to use from MAPC when under contract.

Q. In the event a Vendor does use a subcontractor, can the district(s) order with the subcontractor or will the order have to come to us first?

A. The contracted Vendor should be receive and is ultimately responsible for meeting district orders.

Q. If a distributor is able to deliver to some, but not all, of the 68 districts covered by the RFP, how would their plan for delivery be weighted within the non-price proposal? Does bidding on fewer than 68 schools automatically receive a rating of *not advantageous* for 7.4.3? Where else would the rating for the proposal be affected by offering a delivery plan for fewer than all 68 districts?

A. The selected Vendor will be one that can deliver to all 68 school districts. The evaluation criteria is taking into consideration the overall plan and capacity to meet the needs of all participating districts and not at whether a Vendor can do some schools and not others.