



# Department of Public Safety and Correctional Services

## Office of the Secretary

300 E. JOPPA ROAD • SUITE 1000 • TOWSON, MARYLAND 21286-3020  
(410) 339-5000 • FAX (410) 339-5071 • TOLL FREE (877) 379-8636 • V/TTY (800) 735-2258 • [www.dpscs.maryland.gov](http://www.dpscs.maryland.gov)

STATE OF MARYLAND

LARRY HOGAN  
GOVERNOR

BOYD K. RUTHERFORD  
LT. GOVERNOR

STEPHEN T. MOYER  
SECRETARY

WILLIAM G. STEWART  
DEPUTY SECRETARY  
ADMINISTRATION

J. MICHAEL ZEIGLER  
DEPUTY SECRETARY  
OPERATIONS

RHEA L. HARRIS  
ASSISTANT SECRETARY  
PROGRAMS AND SERVICES

DAVID N. BEZANSON  
ASSISTANT SECRETARY  
CAPITAL PROGRAMS

## QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES #15 SOLICITATION NO. Q0016025

### DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SAFETY AND CORRECTIONAL SERVICES PHARMACY SERVICES

April 10, 2019

Ladies/Gentlemen:

This list of Questions and Responses #15, question #291 is being issued to clarify certain information contained in the above RFP.

In most instances, the Department's response to the submitted questions merely serves to clarify the existing requirements of the RFP. Sometimes, however, in submitting questions potential Offerors may make statements or express interpretations of contract requirements that may be inconsistent with the Department's intent. To the extent that the Department recognizes such an incorrect interpretation, the provided answer will note that the interpretation is erroneous and either state that the question is moot once the correct interpretation is explained, or provide the answer based upon the correct interpretation.

No provided answer to a question may in and of itself change any requirement of the RFP. If it is determined that any portion of the RFP should be changed based upon a submitted question, the actual change may only be implemented via a formal amendment to the RFP. In this situation the answer provided will reference the amendment containing the RFP change.

**291. The REVISED answer to Question #287 (from Questions and Responses (Q&A) #11 issued March 28, 2018 and from Questions and Responses (Q&A) #11 (AMENDED) issued April 3, 2018) is as follows:**

**287. Weighting vs. Technical Pricing**

This concern is by far the most important. The problem is simple; only one small portion of the RFP is fixed in price while 90% of price is variable. More importantly, it is the technical component that will impact the large variable costs.

The danger in an RFP when the pricing component is given greater weighting than the technical, is that vendors are incentivized to offer discounted prices at the expense of services or risk losing. Without the proper investment in service, any vendor will struggle to fulfill their contractual obligations of this contract. Decreased services lead to breaches in patient care, increased scrutiny and oversight, and exposure to litigation. The Department will be charged with uncovering non-

compliance, monitoring corrective action plans and enforcing penalties, liquidated damages and defending itself in court.

**RESPONSE:** The RFP requirements have been stringently drafted to assure the quality of services. ~~In making the most advantageous proposal determination, financial factors will receive greater consideration than technical factors. The State declines to change the award determination language in RFP Section 5.5.3.~~

The State has changed the award determination language in RFP Section 5.5.3 to read as follows: **In making this most advantageous Proposal determination, financial factors will receive equal weight with technical factors.**

See Amendment #33, Item 2.

**NOTE: No additional questions will be accepted or answered.**

Date Issued: **APRIL 10, 2019**

Issued and Authorized By: <signed>  
Andrea R. Lockett  
Procurement Officer