



*MARTIN O'MALLEY*  
Governor

*ANTHONY BROWN*  
Lieutenant Governor

*T. ELOISE FOSTER*  
Secretary

*DAVID C. ROMANS*  
Deputy Secretary

***PRE-PROPOSAL CONFERENCE SUMMARY***  
***MARCH 13, 2012***

**PROJECT TITLE:**  
**STATEWIDE LANGUAGE INTERPRETATION SERVICES**

**SOLICITATION NUMBER – 050B2400001**

Ladies/Gentlemen:

The State of Maryland conducted a Pre-Proposal Conference at the Department of Budget & Management 45 Calvert Street, Annapolis, MD 21401. An Attendance List is included with this summary as an Attachment. Attending on behalf of the State were: Erin Oliver, Procurement Officer; Joel Leberknight, DBM Chief of Procurement; Jamie Tomaszewski, Contract Administrator; and Tom McLamore, MBE Liaison for DBM.

This Summary is being issued to document the Pre-Proposal Conference. The Procurement Officer, Erin Oliver, convened the conference at about 10:10 am, recognized the Department (DBM) personnel present, and reiterated that all prospective offerors should sign in. Attendees representing prospective offerors in attendance introduced themselves. Personnel of firms participating in the conference via teleconferencing then introduced themselves.

Ms. Erin Oliver then reviewed the RFP:

- Section 1 – General Information (reviewed summary statement, contract commencement and duration, procurement officer/contract administrator, submission of questions, oral presentation, multiple and alternate proposals, duration of offer, mandatory contractual terms, revisions to the RFP, incurred expenses, living wage, closing date & time of proposals submission, MBE goal, and Liquidated Damages. It was emphasized that proposals must be received by 2 pm on 4/4/12. Any proposal received by the procurement officer after that time and date will be rejected. It was also emphasized that this contract will be open to use by local governments in Maryland, and by Maryland not-for-profit entities. In answer to a question concerning whether a contractor performing under the contract had any choice in whether to provide services to not-for-profit entities, it was answered that contractors could only refuse to provide services for circumstances such as history of non-payment. It was also stated that the contract administrator would make a final decision as to whether any instance of non-provision of services to not-for-profit entities was justifiable.
- Section 3 – Proposals Submission Requirements (reviewed content of proposals submission);

~Effective Resource Management~

45 Calvert Street • Annapolis, MD 21401-1907

Tel: (410) 260-7430 • Fax: (410) 974-3274 • Toll Free: 1 (800) 705-3493 • TTY Users: call via Maryland Relay

<http://www.dbm.maryland.gov> • [ptracey@dbm.state.md.us](mailto:ptracey@dbm.state.md.us)

- Section 4 – Evaluation Criteria and Selection Procedure (reviewed technical evaluation criteria, financial criteria, selection process sequence and selection procedures);

Mr. Joel Leberknight presented an overview of the scope of work in the RFP:

- Section 3 – Scope of Work;

Ms. Erin Oliver announced that Attachment F – Financial Proposal would be revised and presented to the prospective Offerors via an amendment.

Ms. Erin Oliver, Mr. Joel Leberknight and Mr. Tom McLamore reviewed the Minority Business Enterprise Forms:

- Attachment D – Minority Business Enterprise Participation (explained that the MBE forms will be revised and that only submission of Attachment D-1 (Certified MBE Utilization and Fair Solicitation Affidavit) completed in its entirety, to include the MBE Participation Schedule is required; also reviewed the **15% goal for Category One- Telephonic, 10% MBE goal for Category Two- On-site and the 15% goal for Category Three – Written Documents** and explained the fact that the failure to include Attachment D-1 is not curable and will cause rejection of a proposal. Further, the failure to properly complete Attachment D-1 also may not be curable. Prospective offerors were encouraged to actually look at the certification letter from the Maryland Department of Transportation (MDOT) to verify that a prospective subcontractor is certified. Moreover, accessing the MDOT certified MBE web site was even better in terms of assuring that a prospective subcontractor is actually MDOT certified.

It also emphasized that only firms certified as minority business by the Maryland Department of Transportation could be counted toward meeting the established MBE goal for each category of service (15% for telephonic interpretation and written document translation and 10% for on-site interpreting.) It was also emphasized that MBE firms that might win a contract as a prime contractor could not by themselves satisfy an MBE goal. Even MBE prime contractors would still have to subcontract with one or more Maryland certified MBEs to meet an MBE subcontracting goal.

Ms. Oliver then opened the floor to questions with the caveat that formal written answers to questions would only be given if the question were submitted in writing, preferably by e-mail. Since many questions had previously been submitted by prospective offerors it was stated that all such questions would be answered in writing and sent to all known prospective offerors.

Ms. Oliver stated that any question asked and answered at the conference should be asked formally by e-mail if the questioner wanted a coordinated, official response. The conference was adjourned at 11:30 am.

Date Issued: March 13, 2012

By: <signed>

Erin Oliver  
Procurement Officer

Attachment 1:

Pre-Proposal Conference Attendance List