

FRANK BROCCOLINA STATE COURT ADMINISTRATOR (410) 260-1295 Fax: (410) 974-2066 frank.broccolina@mdcourts.gov

FAYE D. MATTHEWS
DEPUTY STATE COURT ADMINISTRATOR
(410) 260-1257 Fax: (410) 974-2066
faye.matthews@mdcourts.gov

SHARON SAMPSON BALL
Executive Director
Human Resources
(410) 260-1283 Fax: (410) 974-2849
sharon.ball@mdcourts.gov

GRAY BARTON
Executive Director
Office of Problem-Solving Courts
(410) 260-3617 Fax: (410) 841-9850
gray.barton@mdcourts.gov

ROBERT BRUCHALSKI
Acting Executive Director
Judicial Information Systems
2661 Riva Road, Suite 900
Annapolis, Maryland 21401
(410) 260-1007 Fax: (410) 974-7170
robert.bruchalski@mdcourts.gov

ALLEN C. CLARK, III
Executive Director
Budget & Finance
(410) 260-1579 Fax: (410) 260-1290
allen.clark@mdcourts.gov

DAVID R. DURFEE JR.
Executive Director
Legal Affairs
(410) 260-1405 Fax: (410) 974-2066
david.durfee@mdcourts.gov

SUSAN HOWELLS
Executive Director
Procurement & Contract
Administration
(410) 260-1410 Fax: (410) 260-1749
susan.howells@mdcourts.gov

CONNIE KRATOVIL-LAVELLE
Executive Director
Family Administration
(410) 260-1296 Fax: (410) 974-5577
connie.kratovil-lavelle@mdcourts.gov

DIANE S. PAWLOWICZ
Executive Director
Court Research & Development
(410) 260-1725 Fax: (410) 974-2066
diane.pawlowicz@mdcourts.gov

JESSICA PITTS
Executive Director
Emergency Mgmt. & Court Security
(410) 260-3515 Fax: (410) 260-3524
jessica.pitts@mdcourts.gov

ROXANNE P. McKAGAN
Director, Administrative Services
(410) 260-1407 Fax: (410) 974-2066
rocky.mckagan@mdcourts.gov

DEBORAH A. UNITUS Director, Program Services (410) 260-1291 Fax: (410) 260-3570 deborah.unitus@mdcourts.gov

ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE COURTS MARYLAND JUDICIAL CENTER 580 TAYLOR AVENUE ANNAPOLIS, MARYLAND 21401

Second Revision (Offerors are to disregard any previous responses)

Questions/Responses #1

RFP Project No. K11-0044-40

Workstations – Rockville Courthouse

January 14, 2011

Ladies and Gentlemen:

The following questions for the above referenced RFP were received by e-mail and are answered and posted for all prospective Offerors who received the RFP. The statements and interpretations contained in the following responses to questions are not binding on the Judiciary unless the RFP is expressly amended. Nothing in the Judiciary's response to these questions is to be construed as agreement to or acceptance by the Judiciary of any statement or interpretation on the part of the Offeror asking the question.

1. Question: Has the size of the workstations being requested been scaled to fit into the spaces of the areas it is to be set up at?

Response: Offeror shall submit design/layout with as many of the different typicals attached as possible. The list supplied under RFP Section 2.2.6 is the "desired" number of each workstation typical per area. Offerors are encouraged to base the proposed design/layout on the "desired" amount of workstations or better. If the offeror's design/layout allows more than the "desired" amount of workstations, the offeror should show that in the proposal. In addition, please see RFP Addendum #3 revising proposal submission requirements.

2. Question: RFP Section 2.2.1, It is noted that "The workstations must be Center Core cluster configurations" and it is also noted in RFP Section 2.7.1 that "Center Core or Hamilton Sorter Workstations" system manufactures would be accepted for this project.

Response: Workstations must have a cluster design with power pole and panel to access electric, data, telecommunications as already installed. If units are placed in areas with electric, data telecommunications available off the wall, a cluster with power pole is not necessary and unit can be designed to be hardwired. (See RFP Addendum 2).

3. Question: Will another manufacturer that offers system furniture with the same configurations and function be accepted?

Response: Yes, desired product is a cluster design with center access to wiring. (See RFP Addendum 2).

Page 2 Questions/Responses # 1 RFP K11-0044-40

4. Question: The material for the file pedestals and overheads is not specified, are they matching laminate or is plain metal acceptable?

Response: All to be matching laminate; no exposed metal.

5. Question: The work surfaces are described as bullnose OR rounded edge. Which are you requesting?

Response: Bullnose is specified but rounded edge is acceptable if there are no exposed seams.

6. Question: The prints provided show overheads on all stations except the four station units, is that correct, are some people not getting the overheads?

Response: Correct, the typicals provided are accurate with all sizes, panel heights, components etc.

7. Question: Can offerors propose using metal filing pedestals, or are wood laminated pedestals required?

Response: Wood laminate is required – no metal.

8. Question: Does panel trim have to match the wood work surface laminate?

Response: Yes.

9. Question: Is the power panel in the core (Quick Connect) required (or preferred) over powered raceways?

Response: Core power panel is preferred. Raceways are discouraged. (See Addendum 2)

10. Question: Are upper storage and pedestals to be finished in matching wood grain laminate?

Response: All must be matching laminate – no metal.

11. Question: Is the top cap and end trim finish to match the wood grain laminate upper storage, work surface and pedestals?

Response: Yes; no rubber or metal trim and top caps.

12. Question: Is it acceptable for offerors to propose a Center Core alternative or is this a RFP for Center Core with no substitutions?

Response: Yes it is acceptable to propose manufacturers other than Center Core, please see RFP Addendum 2.

13. Question: The print provided shows a center overhead not typically used in that application by Center Core. They have a trapezoid center overhead. Is the trapezoid overhead acceptable?

Response: There is to be a "center" corner overhead unit over the corner work surface only. Overhead unit must be fully supported to bear weight.

Page 3 Questions/Responses # 1 RFP K11-0044-40

14. Question: Is this now a Trendyway specification for the workstations?

Response: No.

15. Question Do the workstations have a core in the center? Are they per the old typicals provided?

Response: The cluster units would need a core; wall units could be proposed without a core if the designed electric, data, telecommunications can be hardwired to the individual unit.

16. Question: Please confirm ceiling heights and types of ceilings for all of the workstation locations to confirm power pole heights that will be needed for the project?

Response: Power poles are to be open and without channels. Ceiling heights are 9' and ceilings are all acoustical tile (lay in).

17. Question: Other than the typical is there a Floor Plan? Also, please confirm that the "desired" typicals fit best.

Response: There is no Floor Plan. RFP Section 2.2.5 states the following. "Contractor shall submit design/layout with as many of the different typicals attached as possible. The list supplied under 2.2.6 is a "desired" number of each typical per area. Contractor is encouraged to base their "design/layout" on the "desired" amount of stations or better. (ie: if Contractor's design/layout allows more than the "desired" amount of stations, they are encouraged to show that layout).

18. Question: Is there a way to get the RFP and attachments in an MS word format?

Response: No.

Note: If unable to open Attached G and H from eMaryland Marketplace, it may be accessed at mdcourts.gov, Bids/Proposals under Quick links.

