Q1: *E-mail Question:* On bid 003-NN03 you state on page 31 that a product can be submitted if it is an "acceptable equal." If a distributor bids an item that is found to be "not acceptable" by the district... Who will decide what product will be acceptable and by what means will this be determined prior to the bid being awarded? (19.5.6) Could it disqualify a bidder if the acceptable equal is found to be "not acceptable" for whatever reason?

A1: M-DCPS will request samples, as needed, and products will be evaluated and tested as required. The District will determine, based on this testing, whether or not the item is acceptable. If the equal is found unacceptable the results will be presented to the RFP Evaluation Committee for consideration and scored accordingly by the Evaluation Committee.

Q2: *E-mail Question:* On bid 003-NN03 you state on page 30 that you would prefer to have the commercial product be supplied by the same producer. (19.5.5) On bid 004-NN03 you asked the manufactures to bid a commercial price and a commodity price. In our opinion to enable the distributor to bid a item that meets your "approved or acceptable equal" request on Bid 003-NN04 we need to have the bid 004-NNO4 awarded. This would eliminate a potentially huge delay in awarding bid 003-NN03, considering the amount of testing that could be involved. Since the Commodity bid 004-NN03 was not awarded at the March 13 board meeting (as was previously planned to be per the bid) we cannot completely, without a shadow of a doubt, fulfill the request efficiently (noted above) until bid 004-NN03 is awarded. I am sure you can see the conflict for a distributor wanting to bid 003-NN04 correctly and per your stated requests within that bid. Again If 004-NN03 is awarded first... the distributor would know without a shadow of a doubt what product to bid on 003-NN03 as the commercial (and commodity) price to the distributor will have been established by the award of 004-NN03.

A2: Items that appear on RFP 004-NN03 will be removed from the list on RFP 003-NN03. Please refer to addendum.

Q3: *E-mail Question:* Will you delay the bid opening date on bid 003-NN03 until the bid 004-NN03 is awarded since 003-NN03 submit date is prior to the next board meeting?

A3: No.

Q4: *E-mail Question:* Pg-25 17.5 Since the cases on the market basket are for estimates only can you share sales dollars and the number of cases Miami Dade purchased from USF's in the 2011-12 school year?

A4: Yes, these can be provided. Please advise what e-mail address this should be sent to.

Q5: *E-mail Question:* Pg 30- 19.5.4- The bid language states the distributor is to provide the District with data sheets, ingredient statements, and allergen worksheets. Does the county want them submitted with the bid?

A5: This information should only be submitted for items being proposed as "acceptable equals". Please refer to addendum for corrected language.

Q6: *E-mail Question:* Section 24.1 & 24.2 The bid references the ability to service 392 locations on a once per week schedule with some larger secondary schools that may need twice per week delivery. Will you please provide the specific locations that require twice weekly deliveries? *We need this prior to the bid award in order to calculate cost, personnel and equipment needs.

A6: Currently there are no schools receiving twice per week delivery, however it may be required at some point. If so, the amount of schools would be a very small percentage. This would be arranged and coordinated with the awarded distributor

Q7: *E-mail Question:* Pg 40: 24.3 – Can Friday deliveries be an option?

A7: Friday deliveries will only be an option to make-up for a day where deliveries could not be made such as a Monday holiday.

Q8: *E-mail Question:* Pg 40: 24.7 – What percent of your sales occur during the summer? Is your current distributor USF's servicing this years summer school needs?

A8: Approximately 1% of sales occur in the summer months. This is an estimated number, however it should be noted that the sales are significantly lower than the regular school year. This contract will not require the servicing of the 2013 summer program.

Q9: *E-mail Question:* Section 24.7 Can you provide the locations that require summer deliveries? If 2013-14 locations are not yet determined, please provide 2012-2013 information.

A9: Information for the 2013-2014 school year is not available yet. Locations that received summer deliveries in 2012-2013 were as follows: Doral Middle, Lamar Curry, Ferguson Senior and Westland Senior.

Q10: *E-mail Question:* Pg 46:26.5-Do any schools receive palletized deliveries?

A10: Yes, depending of the size of the order/delivery of the school. However, items must be delivered inside the cafeteria.

Q11: *E-mail Question:* Pg 46: 26.9 – Proof of storage capacity. What is being requested for proof?

A11: Proposers should provide information such as a notarized affidavit that would confirm the square footage of the locations where the dry, frozen and refrigerated food items are stored.

Q12: *E-mail Question:* Pg 50: 33.1 – Requires that the prior distributor is responsible for transferring and delivering any inventory consigned to Miami Dade to the new distributor at the end of this proposed contract. If there is a new distributor awarded does the county anticipate any assumption inventory being transferred and will the current distributor be responsible for delivering the product? If so how many cases of product does the county anticipate?

A12: The current distributor will be responsible for delivering the product. A number of cases cannot be determined at this time.

Q13: *E-mail Question:* Pg 51: 34.1 - Need clarification of the policy for a damaged case of USDA commodity product. Does the product have to be condemned by Miami-Dade County Health Department before we can dispose of it? Is this the current policy in place?

A13: Typically yes. And yes, this is the current policy in place.

Q14: *E-mail Question:* Pg 51-35.1.2-Can you clarify what the County mean by "supply a refrigerated trailer, to hold the contents of a school's freezer/cooler in the event of an emergency or planned maintenance or modernization of school." Does the County plan on paying for the supplied trailer? If not, outside of emergencies how many requests per school year should a distributor budget to cover the Counties planned maintenance and school modernizations, so it can be factored into the fixed fee?

A14: M-DCPS will pay for this separately. This should not be taken into consideration when calculating proposals.

Q15: *E-mail Question:* Does 6320.05 Local Vendor Preference apply to this RFP since it is for distribution services? If not why?

A15: No, Local Vendor Preference does not apply to this RFP. Federal law prohibits any restrictions when Federal funds are used in procurements.

Q16: *E-mail Question:* How many changes do you anticipate making to the market basket post award?

A16: M-DCPS expects the market basket to encompass the majority of the District's needs, however new items may be added.

Q17: *E-mail Question:* If manufacturer or brokers are not willing to give 12 month pricing on certain items can 6 month pricing be submitted?

A17: No.

Q18: *E-mail Question:* When is the first anticipated week of delivery for the 2013-14 school year?

A18: The first week for full delivery of the regular 2013-2014 school year will be the week of August 12, 2013.

Q19: *E-mail Question:* Pg 30- 19.5.4- The bid language states the distributor is to provide the District with data sheets, ingredient statements, and allergen worksheets. Does the county want them submitted with the bid? If yes, can they be submitted via CD or flash drive or at least just keep it to one hard copy to cut down on the size of the proposals?

A19: Please refer to answer for question 5 and submit copies and flash drives as requested in the RFP.

Q20: *E-mail Question:* My question is, since these appear to be products that will be purchased off your commodity bid, should they be on this bid and should we provide commercial quotes to the bidding distributors?

A20: Please refer to answer for question 2.

Q21: *E-mail Question:* Can we have the list requested with current pricing?

A21: Please refer to answer for question 4.

Q22: *E-mail Question:* How were the Estimated # of Cases calculated? (Past sales or future estimations) If future estimations can we have the past sales. Or formula used to calculate?

A22: Past sales were used to estimate the number of cases on the market basket.

Q23: *E-mail Question:* Subsection 4.5.7, Pricing, asks for all information under section 21 to include the price proposal form. Subsection 4.5.14 asks for the product pricing form as well as the associated product information. Is there a difference in the requested information between these two subsections?

A23: There is no difference; the information being requested is one and the same.

Q24: *E-mail Question:* With regard to section 8.0 Evaluation Criteria, subsection 8.2, Implementation, Marketing, Delivery and Distribution Plans, M-DCPS is judging proposals based in part, upon Marketing Strategies designed to increase student participation and menu enhancement. Keeping in mind the language of section 28.1, POS and other marketing materials are produced and supplied through our vendor partners. Other than strongly encouraging those partners to improve and increase their efforts in this area, we would like clarification as to the criteria that will be used to assign a score.

A24: The Evaluation Committee will assign a maximum of 25 points for Implementation, Marketing, Delivery and Distribution Plans, with an emphasis on the Implementation, Delivery and Distribution plans and with consideration that the Marketing plan will support the promoting of healthy eating practices and physical activity. Examples of the marketing materials that will be offered are encouraged.

Q25: *E-mail Question:* In subsection 8.5, Product Acceptability, we would like an explanation of your thought process for this evaluation. It is noted that samples may be requested for certain items and shall be submitted within 5 business days of the request. Is this to be used as an evaluation of items that are offered as "acceptable equals" as per section 19.5.6 and is the overall score of 70% for just those products or the entirety of those submitted under 4.5.14? In addition, under subsection 19.5.4, Initial Distributors' Submittal, M-DCPS is asking for samples within 3 working days. Does this supersede the five business days allowed under the Product Acceptability criteria?

A25: The evaluation will only be performed on the products offered as “acceptable equals”. The scoring determination of an overall score of 70% will only be used for the proposed “acceptable equals”. Proposals of products not meeting the 70% overall score will be presented to the Evaluation Committee and scored accordingly. The 3 working days supersedes the 5 working days required for samples. Please refer to the addendum for a correction to this language.

Q26: *E-mail Question:* Subsection 19.3.6 requires proof of application to the Florida Department of Agriculture and approval by the USDA for a State of Florida Commodity Processing Agreement. We are requesting why this is necessary as Distribution is not required to obtain this document. This is a manufacturer's requirement.

A26: This requirement will be removed. Please refer to the addendum.

Q27: *E-mail Question:* Subsection 24.5, Confirmed Delivery Schedules, please clarify your definition of an 'emergency'. Our understanding of an emergency would preclude the knowledge of the event, 48 hours in advance.

A27: This section has been clarified to read “Confirmed delivery schedules must be met. In the event that a delivery cannot be met, the Department of Food and Nutrition must be notified immediately to determine the course of action.” Please refer to addendum for corrected language.

Q28: *E-mail Question:* “Please confirm this is a fixed price bid with an opportunity to provide updated pricing annually and not a cost-reimbursable bid; thus, the language in Sections 19.2.2, 21.11 and 21.11.1, regarding the disclosure and passing through of “…discounts, rebates or other applicable credits…”, is only included to ensure compliance with applicable USDA regulations and not meant to impose additional obligations.”

A28: This is a fixed price solicitation. Sections 19.2.2, 21.11 and 21.11.1 have been included to ensure compliance as well as provide all applicable discounts, rebates and credits to M-DCPS.

Q29: *E-mail Question:* Is it possible to state the results of those products that were submitted for testing for Bid #004-NN03 so it can be determined if it is officially considered by Dade County as a "acceptable equal" on Bid #004-NN03?

A29: Results are pertinent to RFP 004-NN03, which will be awarded at the May board meeting. Those products are not relevant and have been removed from this solicitation.

Q30: *E-mail Question:* Can you confirm on the specs for juice that some of the cartons are listed as frozen, and others are refrigerated. Is this correct?

A30: Yes this is correct.

Q31: *E-mail Question:* Can you please tell me how this bid is awarded? Is it itemized or awarded as a whole?

A31: This is an RFP that shall be awarded to one qualified distributor to purchase and deliver all the items on the market basket that is attached to the solicitation.

Q32: *Pre-proposal Meeting Question:* A question about what has been the trend in the increase of the free lunch program been over the last couple of years was asked.

A32: Ms. Parham mentioned that we serve approximately 205,000 federally reimbursed lunches every school day. The government gives us $2.85 for each reimbursable meal served. We serve about 80,000 breakfast meals a day and it is at no charge to our students because the meals are federally funded. We have a big opportunity to serve more meals at breakfast and we need the support of our vendors to help us with the marketing plans, and with products that make that easy to do. We have a very big program and we offer students in the afterschool care program a snack, we serve students on Saturday, who are part of the Saturday Academy, we also have some schools open during Spring Break. We are part of a national school meal program where we also offer dinner. We have a mobile Food Truck which produces and serves breakfast and lunch throughout the District. This contract is considered the biggest contract within the Department of Food and Nutrition.

Q33: *Pre-proposal Meeting Question:* You keep referring to cost, the market basket that is in the bid language, traditionally would be the specification, for example, sodium, fat grams, used as a benchmark. Are those the items that you expect to be quoted or is there room for alternative items. I would like to identify what would be considered as an improved equal.

A33: Ms. Parham mentioned that a vendor can quote a product that is not listed on the RFP as long as it meets and/or exceeds the listed approved items specifications. If the product is an alternative, you have to attach the nutritional information for each item to the RFP so it can be reviewed and if necessary, we would request samples of the products. Ms. Flores requested that no samples be submitted at this time. Vendors will receive a formal letter requesting samples, if needed.

Q34: *Pre-proposal Meeting Question:* On questions 1 and 2, clarification was asked with regards to the evaluation committee and the testing of the equal product. If a vendor has a product that they feel that for some reason does not qualify as 70%, even though it might be a perfect match and have the nutritional ingredients, how does that affect the distributors' situation and what does that mean score wise.

A34: Ms. Flores mentioned that it could hurt the vendor in the scoring process. In the few days between, when the RFP is due and the committee meeting, the Department of Food and Nutrition will take all those equals and review the specs, review the nutritionals, and then if needed, will have a student focus group, where the students taste the products and grade them accordingly. These results would be presented to the Evaluation Committee and they would score the proposer accordingly.

Q35: *Pre-proposal Meeting Question:* It was asked if the Department of Food and Nutrition was considering multiple vendors or looking for one distributor.

A35: Ms. Flores mentioned that through this RFP we are looking for one distributor.

Q36: *Pre-proposal Meeting Question:* With regards to Q28, can you give more history on the intent of Sections 19.2.2, 21.11 and 21.11.?

A36: Ms. Parham mentioned that if a specific product is purchased on behalf of the school district, and there is a rebate attached to that product, then that rebate is to be shared with the school district.

Q37: *Pre-proposal Meeting Question:* It was asked if the District is moving in the P Card direction?

A37: Mr. Gomez mentioned that the Director of Accounts Payable requested that we include that language in the RFP because of District is moving little by little toward that direction.

Q38: *Pre-proposal Meeting Question:* A question was asked about the program used for pre orders by the District.

A38: Ms. Parham mentioned that the District's Information Technology Department provides the electronic needs for the orders, however that is not proprietary.

Q39: *Pre-proposal Meeting Question:* It was asked if schools had delivery docks so that the trucks can be easily unloaded.

A39: Ms. Parham answered yes but that the orders could not stay out on the receiving docks.