



THE SCHOOL BOARD OF MIAMI-DADE COUNTY, FLORIDA
 SCHOOL BOARD ADMINISTRATION BUILDING
 Procurement Management Services
 1450 N.E. 2nd Avenue, Room 650
 Miami, FL 33132

Direct All Inquiries To
 Procurement Management Services

Buyer's Name: Yusbel Gonzalez, CPPB

PHONE: (305) 995- 4203

Email: yusbelg@dadeschools.net

TDD PHONE: (305) 995-2400

BID/RFP ADDENDUM

Date: 06/18/2026

Addendum No. 3

BID/RFP No. ITN-25-024-YG BID/RFP TITLE: Copier Services

This addendum modifies the conditions of the above-referenced BID/RFP as follows:

Answers to questions received from prospective proposers are attached.

All other terms and conditions of the ITN will remain the same.

All information, specifications terms, and conditions for the above-referenced BID/RFP, are included on the document posted on the Procurement Management website at <http://procurement.dadeschools.net>

The attached pages containing clarifications, additional information and requirements constitute an integral part of the referenced bid. If your bid/proposal has not been submitted, substitute the pages marked REVISED and mail your entire bid/proposal package.

I acknowledge receipt of Addendum Number _____

PLEASE NOTE: If your firm has forwarded a copy of this bid/proposal to another vendor, it is your responsibility to forward him/her a copy of this addendum.

(PLEASE TYPE OR PRINT BELOW)

LEGAL NAME OF BIDDER: _____

MAILING ADDRESS: _____

CITY, STATE ZIP CODE: _____

TELEPHONE NUMBER: _____ E-MAIL _____ FAX # _____

BY: SIGNATURE (Manual): _____
 OF AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE

NAME (Typed): _____ TITLE: _____
 OF AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE

Invitation to Negotiate (ITN)

ITN-25-024-YG

Copier Services

ADDENDUM NO. 3

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS:

Q1: Can the district provide a current fleet list including make, model, serial number, current meter count, average monthly volume, as well as indicate whether the device is leased or purchased?

A1: Please refer to Attachment A of this addendum.

Q2: Will the district provide lifecycle expectations or replacement thresholds for legacy fleet equipment that vendors will be expected to support under this contract?

A2: The District strives to adhere to a 5–6 year lifecycle, depending on annual funding availability.

Q3: Will implementation occur in phases, and if so, can the district provide anticipated deployment sequencing?

A3: There is no fixed sequential rollout schedule. New equipment deployment may occur fluidly across the District as existing machine leases expire and individual site or school budgets become available. School sites and departments will determine whether to lease or purchase new equipment under the awarded contract terms at the time of their transition.

Q4: Would the district consider a dual-OEM solution in which different manufacturers are proposed for CL6/CL7/CL8 devices versus low-volume device categories to optimize functionality, cost efficiency, and service support?

A4: The District encourages solutions that optimize functionality and cost-efficiency. Proposers may propose a dual-OEM solution, provided that all proposed equipment fully meets the technical specifications, data security standards, and full-service maintenance requirements outlined in Section 4 for each respective copier class. The District will evaluate all proposals without manufacturer preference.

Q5: Aside from software to obtain meter reads, does the district utilize any other software solutions? i.e. Secure/Follow-Me print software, Print Management software, Driver Deployment software, etc.

A5: No.

Q6: Does the District currently utilize card/badge authentication for copier access and secure print release?

A6: No.

Q7: Is the District currently utilizing centralized print servers, direct IP printing, hybrid print architecture, or cloud-based print services?

A7: No cloud-based print services are currently utilized. Schools and some administrative offices use direct IP printing, while Information Technology Services (ITS) and the District's Main Administration Offices use centralized print servers.

Q8: Approximately how many print servers are currently supporting the environment, and are they managed centrally or by individual departments/sites?

- A8: Schools and some administrative offices use direct IP printing, while ITS and the District's Main Administration Offices use centralized print servers. Currently, there are approximately 3 centralized print servers supporting the environment.
- Q9: Who is currently responsible for managing print queues, print drivers, queue creation, driver updates, and workstation printer deployments?**
- A9: Schools and some administrative offices use direct IP printing, while ITS and the District's Main Administration Offices use centralized print servers.
- Q10: Is the District currently utilizing an enterprise e-fax solution, and if so, should proposers include support or integration for that platform?**
- A10: The District is not currently utilizing an enterprise e-fax solution.
- Q11: Can MDCPS clarify whether current printer leases will continue through their full term or if the associated lease contract will be terminated for convenience upon award of a new contract?**
- A11: A final determination is currently pending and has not yet been made by the District.
- Q12: What is the current mix of color vs Black and white copiers?**
- A12: 98% are black and white and 2% are color copiers.
- Q13: What is the districts direction on Color printers vs Black and white?**
- A13: The District primarily purchases/leases black and white copiers.
- Q14: How should we submit alternative pricing proposals outside of the excel pricing sheet ?**
- A14: Per ITN Section 8 – Proposal Pricing, completion of the Proposal Pricing Table is required. Any alternative pricing structures may be included as a separate supplemental document or appendix in the vendor's proposal response.
- Q15: Will you allow documents embedded within the proposal response (click to open)? Are links also permitted if documents are too large to embed?**
- A15: Yes. Proposers may use embedded documents and external links. However, the proposer is solely responsible for ensuring all links and attachments are functional and accessible. The proposer must ensure the link does not require a password or special permissions to access. Links must not expire. Failure to access a document due to technical issues or security restrictions may result in that portion of the proposal being excluded from evaluation.
- Q16: Currently you utilize a device management application for approx 600 devices which allows you to view all of the devices on a single platform at one time and also allows for certain functions such as pushing out device settings and firmware. Are you planning to use this type of solution moving forward?**
- A16: The District prefers a device management software where all devices can be viewed and managed (including pushing settings and firmware), with additional features to view current and past billing, and device locations.
- Q17: Please provide average monthly print volumes for entire fleet of MFP devices for black-and-white & color prints for both school and administration fleet of printers.**
- A17: This data is not currently available. Print usage fluctuates heavily across school and administrative locations. Please refer to Attachment A in this addendum to gauge fleet capacity requirements.

- Q18: Please provide entire fleet of Ricoh models including Model Number, Serial Number, location (dept. and address), lease expiration date, and average monthly volume of prints.**
- A18: Please refer to the answer for Question 1 in this addendum.
- Q19: Please provide the total number of legacy Ricoh MFPs that will remain after vendor is awarded new contract with lease expiration dates.**
- A19: Please refer to the answer for Question 1 in this addendum.
- Q20: To avoid an unfair advantage, would the School Board of Miami-Dade County consider removing remanufactured equipment from the ITN, given that only certain dealers and manufacturers are able to provide a comprehensive remanufactured fleet while maintaining pricing throughout the contract term?**
- A20: As outlined in Section 4.3.1 (Remanufactured Equipment Standards), proposing factory-remanufactured or factory ISO-certified equipment is strictly optional and may be offered as an alternative to new units.
- Q21: Would the School Board of Miami-Dade County Public Schools consider revising the required service response time to respond by the next business day, given the size of the fleet and the geographic distribution of approximately 1,000 devices across 300 locations?**
- A21: The service response time requirements must remain as specified in the ITN. Given the critical role of multifunctional devices in school operations and administrative functions, the District cannot accommodate extended downtime. Proposers are required to comply with the service level agreements and response times outlined in Section 4.3 (page 20).
- Q22: Please provide the CURRENT AVERAGE number of device relocations annually within the School Board of Miami-Dade County? Would the School Board of Miami-Dade County consider allowing for logistical moving costs (such as fuel costs) to relocate to different locations within Miami-Dade County?**
- A22: Devices are relocated primarily during the copier replacement period, and the number of copiers replaced depends on available funding and equipment needs. Very few relocations occur outside of that timeframe. Additionally, per ITN page 24, Section 4.3, 8.J., "If a device/machine needs to be moved (i.e., an M-DCPS location is closing or is under construction, etc.), the vendor will move the device/machine at no cost to the District."
- Q23: Please provide additional clarification regarding the requirements for maintaining legacy Ricoh MFPs, including whether the cost of parts may be invoiced separately from the cost-per-copy requested pricing which includes toner and labor.**
- A23: Cost of parts may not be invoiced separately. Please refer to the "Note" in the Proposal Pricing Table (Legacy Copiers Service & Maintenance).
- Q24: Could a list of all legacy Ricoh devices be provided if the awarded vendor will be expected to service them, so that appropriate pricing for parts and supplies can be developed?**
- A24: Please refer to the answer for Question 1 in this addendum.
- Q25: Would the School Board of Miami-Dade County consider maintaining month-to-month service agreements with the current Ricoh vendor until the fleet transition under the new ITN contract is complete?**
- A25: The School Board is currently working on a 90-day extension of the existing contract, with anticipated expiration date of September 28, 2026.

Q26: Badge Readers: Does the District require the installation of badge readers for the new multifunctional devices?

A26: No.

Q27: Equipment Breakdown: Regarding the 297 copiers for the Admin Offices and Graphics Department, could you provide a breakdown of the required classes for these units?

A27: Please refer to the answer for Question 1 in this addendum.