University of Kentucky
Procurement Services

<u>Written Questions and Answers</u>

Development and Implementation of a Web-Based Research Project Tracking System (RPTS)
UK-2427-24
Closing Date: April 25, 2024
Today's Date: April 5, 2023

No.	Question	Answer
1	Whether companies from Outside USA can apply for this? (like, from India or Canada)	Anyone can apply.
2	Whether we need to come over there for meetings?	Section 3.3 of the RFP indicates that offerors may be required to make a presentation to the evaluation committee. It is anticipated that these presentations can be made via Zoom or Microsoft Teams. Once a contract is executed, periodic face-to-face meetings will be scheduled for the contractor and the project staff. For proposal purposes, assume these face-to-face meetings (in Kentucky) will occur twice per year throughout the duration of the contract.
3	Can we perform the tasks (related to RFP) outside USA? (like, from India or Canada)	There is no requirement that the project work be conducted within the United States.
4	Can we submit the proposals via email?	All proposals must be mailed in to the address denoted in Section 3.2 and in the format denoted in Section 3.6.
5	Is this RPTS the same one that is noted at the Transportation Pooled Fund (https://www.pooledfund.org/Details/Study/694), for which there was a phase I in 2015 (https://uknowledge.uky.edu/ktc_researchreports/1678/). If so, is this project Phase 2 of that initiative, which states a budget of $275,000?	This procurement is being conducted as part of project TPF-5(467) as listed on the Transportation Pooled Fund website. All funding commitments for this project from all participating states are listed on that website. Phase 1 was completed in late 2022, and Phase 2 is underway. There are 17 states participating in Phase 2, and each state has committed $46,000. Some of the project funding is allocated to the University of Kentucky for project management services. The remainder is available for development, hosting, and maintenance of the RPTS.

6	Do you have a budget range or an amount per state that each state will be contributing to this project?		There are 17 states participating in Phase 2 of TPF-5(467), and each state has committed $46,000. Some of the project funding is allocated to the University of Kentucky for project management services. The remainder is available for development, hosting, and maintenance of the RPTS.
7	Is the group that built the initial prototype an incumbent vendor and will they be participating in this procurement opportunity?		There is no initial prototype. Several of the participating states have existing systems, which vary widely in structure and capabilities, but none of these are considered prototypes for the new system.
8	Could you detail the University's requirements for data interoperability and exchange protocols between the RPTS and existing state DOT systems, particularly regarding the use of standards like JSON or XML? Given the critical nature of seamless data integration for the effective tracking of active and completed research projects, understanding these preferences is essential. This inquiry seeks to ascertain whether the project envisages leveraging more contemporary, lightweight data formats such as JSON for dynamic web applications or if there's an inclination towards XML for its extensive support in SOAP-based web services, each offering distinct advantages in parsing, data structure complexity, and compatibility with web APIs.		The RFP is not prescriptive regarding the selection of specific data exchange protocols or standards. We encourage offerors to provide recommendations regarding the best approach for providing data interoperability and exchange, along with the reasons supporting those recommendations.
9	Is the RPTS expected to seamlessly integrate with various academic research management systems, such as Institutional Review Board (IRB) systems or grant management software? This integration is crucial for streamlining workflows and enhancing the efficiency of research administration, enabling researchers to easily navigate compliance, funding, and project management processes within a unified system.		No such integration is expected or requested.
10	Does the University anticipate that proposals for the RPTS project should outline a phased implementation strategy, directly correlating with the stratified list of system capabilities and attributes (required, desired, optional) detailed in the Functional Requirements Document from Phase 1? This approach would naturally involve prioritizing essential features for initial rollout, subsequently integrating desired functionalities based on stakeholder feedback and availability of resources, and finally, considering the inclusion of optional features as the project evolves.		The RFP does not specify a phased implementation strategy. If a given offeror believes that such a strategy is advantageous to the partner states, that offeror is free to propose such a strategy (along with the reasons why it is advantageous) in the "Offeror Approach and Schedule" portion of the proposal.
11	In the context of providing comprehensive training and support for the RPTS, is there a preference from the University for utilizing specific e-learning platforms, such as Moodle or Blackboard, or		The RFP is not prescriptive regarding the selection of specific training platforms. We encourage offerors to provide recommendations regarding the

	adherence to particular e-learning standards like SCORM or xAPI for the dissemination of training materials? It would allow us to enhance the training experience by leveraging the advanced tracking and reporting capabilities of standards like SCORM or xAPI, should these be preferred.		best approach for accomplishing training objectives, along with the reasons supporting those recommendations.
12	What mechanisms or processes does the University envisage for managing change requests throughout the development cycle of the RPTS, especially concerning the governance structure and the prioritization of such changes? Given the collaborative nature of this project with multiple stakeholders involved, it's imperative to understand how modifications to the project scope or functionality will be assessed, approved, and integrated. This includes insights into whether there's a dedicated change control board, the criteria used to evaluate the impact of proposed changes, and how priorities are assigned in the context of the overall project timeline and objectives. Establishing a clear framework for handling change requests is crucial for maintaining project alignment, ensuring timely delivery, and optimizing resource allocation.		Although this project has multiple stakeholders, the selected contractor will not be required to deal with change requests from multiple entities. The project staff (representing the lead state) will serve as the interface between the partner states and the contractor and will filter all change requests. Only those requests that have consensus support will generate official change requests, and all such requests will be made by the project staff. Each Offeror is free, if desired, to recommend a specific method of managing and tracking such requests.
13	What is the University's expectation regarding the establishment of a formalized process for reporting and resolving technical challenges or issues that may arise during the RPTS development phase, including the adherence to specific Service Level Agreements (SLAs)? This inquiry aims to discern the structured approach the University envisages for issue management to ensure prompt and efficient resolution, minimizing potential delays in the project timeline. It seeks to understand if there are predefined SLAs that delineate the expected response and resolution times, thereby enabling us to align our project management and technical support frameworks to meet or exceed these benchmarks effectively.		As described in Section 7.1 of the RFP, the selected contractor will develop the RPTS in close cooperation with the project staff, who will serve as a liaison between the contractor and the steering committee. This close cooperation will involve frequent status updates, discussions of next steps, and (as necessary) course corrections. Any challenges or issues that were not anticipated and planned for by the contractor will be discussed and resolved in a manner that is most beneficial to the project partners. There are no predetermined SLAs, only an expectation of high professional competence, responsiveness, and a consistent focus on meeting customer needs.
14	Could the University detail whether the RPTS is expected to conform to specific compliance standards, such as FedRAMP or SOC 2, to ensure a robust security posture, given the system's broad engagement across multiple state Departments of Transportation? This question seeks to clarify the University's requirements for security certifications and compliance frameworks that are critical in safeguarding data integrity and confidentiality within a multi-stakeholder environment.		Since the RPTS will be developed, hosted, and maintained by the selected contractor, each offeror should use their proposal to demonstrate a clear understanding of the security requirements for such a system and to describe their recommended approach to meeting those requirements.
15	Is there an expectation from the University for the RPTS to incorporate specific functionalities or		There is no such expectation.

	features aimed at bolstering sustainability research or initiatives, in alignment with the objectives outlined in the UK Sustainability Strategic Plan? This inquiry is focused on understanding whether the development of the RPTS should integrate capabilities that directly contribute to the University's sustainability goals, such as data analytics for environmental impact assessments, project tracking features that highlight sustainability outcomes, or reporting tools dedicated to monitoring the progress of sustainability-focused research projects.	
16	Could the University elucidate whether there are predetermined performance metrics or Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) that the RPTS is expected to monitor and report on with regard to research project tracking? Given the diverse nature of research projects across state Departments of Transportation, understanding any specific KPIs, such as project timelines, budget adherence, publication outputs, or impact measures, is vital.	There are no predetermined performance metrics or key performance indicators.
17	Is the incorporation of advanced Geographic Information System (GIS) mapping functionalities within the RPTS a requirement from the University to facilitate the visual representation of transportation research projects statewide? Given the emphasis on infrastructure growth and improvement, understanding if such GIS capabilities — for example, project location plotting, spatial analysis of research impact, or integration with state DOT infrastructure databases — are expected will significantly influence our approach to developing the system.	Incorporation of advanced GIS mapping functionalities is not a requirement.
18	Does the University anticipate the RPTS to facilitate data sharing and foster collaboration across various academic and research disciplines, reflecting its interdisciplinary research approach? Given the University's diverse research landscape, it's crucial to ascertain if features such as cross-disciplinary project visibility, collaborative workspaces, or interdisciplinary data integration tools are envisioned as part of the system's capabilities.	No.
19	In the deployment of the RPTS, is compatibility with a hybrid cloud environment necessary to accommodate the unique requirements of certain state Departments of Transportation, particularly those with on-premise data center restrictions? This inquiry seeks to determine the extent to which the University expects the system to offer flexible deployment options, ensuring seamless integration and operation across diverse IT infrastructures.	By having the selected contractor host the RPTS, we avoid the complications of trying to meet the specific I.T. requirements of multiple state DOTs. The ability to offer flexible deployment options may be an attractive feature for some reviewers, but integration with multiple diverse IT infrastructures is not a requirement.
20	Does the University envisage the RPTS being equipped with an open API framework, thereby	An open API framework is not a requirement. Offerors are free to

	enabling the research community to develop third-party extensions or integrations? This capability could significantly enhance the system's utility and adaptability, facilitating a broad spectrum of customized functionalities tailored to the specific needs of various research projects.	propose such a framework if they believe it would provide additional value to the partner states.
21	Given the evolving nature of transportation research and the anticipated expansion of project data, could the University specify the scalability and performance benchmarks for the Research Project Tracking System's database? For instance, understanding the expected volume of data growth yearly and the system's capability to handle concurrent user access without compromising performance is essential. It's also beneficial to know if there are preferences for particular database management systems (DBMS) like PostgreSQL for its scalability and JSON handling capabilities or MongoDB for its schema flexibility. Moreover, insights into any expected integrations with existing databases or data warehousing solutions would help ensure that the proposed system architecture can effectively support both current and future data management needs, aligning with best practices for database optimization and maintenance observed in similar complex systems.	There are no scalability and performance benchmarks. There are no preferences for particular database management systems.
22	For the Research Project Tracking System's report-generating capabilities, could the University elaborate on the types of 'canned' reports that are anticipated to be most frequently utilized by stakeholders, and to what extent customization is envisaged for user-defined reports? Identifying specific examples, such as financial summaries, project milestone completions, or performance metrics against set benchmarks, would greatly aid in understanding the scope and complexity of reporting needs.	The list of canned reports to be provided will be developed by the selected contractor in cooperation with the partner states (as described in Section 7.1 of the RFP). Examples of canned reports that might be provided include: periodic status reports for individual research projects; reports on the status of the overall research program; and overall program statistics (total projects, annual budget and spending, cost per project, average project duration, on-time completion of projects, overdue projects, etc.). These are just examples, and there are many other reports that could be provided if desired by the partner states. With regard to providing customized, user-defined reports, the RFP is not prescriptive on how best to accomplish this. We encourage offerors to provide recommendations regarding the best approach for providing such reports, along with the reasons supporting those recommendations.
23	Regarding the integration of the Research Project Tracking System with the University's existing financial systems for accurate tracking and reporting of financial data, could the University	There is no requirement to integrate the RPTS with the University's existing financial systems.

	specify the preferred methodologies or technologies for this integration? For example, is there an expectation for API-based integration with systems like SAP or Oracle Financials, or would file-based exchanges (e.g., CSV uploads) be more aligned with the University's current processes? Understanding the level of automation and real-time data synchronization required will be crucial. Additionally, insights into any particular financial reporting standards or compliance requirements that the integration must adhere to would enable us to ensure that the system not only facilitates seamless financial data flow but also adheres to best practices in financial data management and security, characteristic of leading-edge systems in similar institutional settings.	
24	Could the University specify the security protocols and compliance standards required for the storage and access of sensitive project-level and program-level documents within the Research Project Tracking System? Given the importance of safeguarding confidential information, it would be beneficial to understand whether there are specific data encryption standards, such as AES-256 for at-rest data, or secure access protocols like SSL/TLS for data in transit, that the University mandates. Additionally, considering potential regulatory frameworks that might apply—such as FERPA for educational records or HIPAA for health-related research data—clarity on these compliance obligations would ensure the system's architecture is designed from the outset to meet these rigorous security and privacy benchmarks.	Since the RPTS will be developed, hosted, and maintained by the selected contractor, each offeror should use their proposal to demonstrate a clear understanding of the security requirements for such a system and the recommended approach to meeting those requirements. As described in the RFP, the RPTS is designed to store data for managing state DOT research programs, so there is no expectation of storing educational records or health-related data.
25	For the Research Project Tracking System, could the University detail the anticipated levels of user access and the envisioned strategy for managing permissions across various user roles? Specifically, insights into whether a role-based access control (RBAC) system is preferred, or if attribute-based access control (ABAC) might better serve the system's needs, would be invaluable. Moreover, understanding how granular the permission settings should be—for instance, distinguishing between read, write, edit, and delete permissions at different hierarchical levels of project information—would greatly assist in architecting a secure and flexible access control mechanism.	For proposal preparation, offerors may assume four levels of users within each jurisdiction: a view-only user; a project manager (with ability to edit data for his/her projects); a program manager (with ability to edit multiple projects as well as program-level data); and a system administrator.

These are assumptions. Exact details will be established as the selected contractor and the project staff work together to turn the high-level functional requirements into an actual system design (see Section 7.1 of the RFP).

The RFP does not dictate the strategy to be used. Each offeror should provide a recommendation regarding the best strategy and why it is advantageous to the partner states. |

26	Could the University provide insights into the types of modules or additional features it envisages might be required in the future to enhance the Research Project Tracking System's capabilities? For instance, are there considerations for advanced analytics modules, integration capabilities with external data sources, or specialized modules for handling specific types of research data, such as geospatial information? Furthermore, understanding the University's perspective on the scalability of these modules— whether they should be developed as plug-and-play options to ensure minimal disruption to the existing system functionality—would be crucial.		No decisions have been made on additional features beyond those listed in the RFP.
27	For the Research Project Tracking System's data import/export functionalities, could the University specify which additional common data formats, beyond ASCII and CSV, are anticipated to be necessary for seamless data interchange? Considering the diverse ecosystem of software typically used across various departments and by external partners, formats such as JSON for web data, XML for structured data interchange, or even specialized formats like Excel for widespread office use might be crucial. Furthermore, insights into whether there's a need for direct integration capabilities with other database systems or cloud storage services, facilitating automated data syncing, would be invaluable.		The RFP is not prescriptive regarding the selection of specific data exchange protocols or standards. We encourage offerors to provide recommendations regarding the best approach for providing data interoperability and exchange, along with the reasons supporting those recommendations.
28	Regarding the integration of the Research Project Tracking System with the agency's current document storage solutions, could the University elucidate on the preferred approach for ensuring seamless access to and storage of documents within the RPTS? Specifically, is there an anticipation for API-driven integrations with established document management systems such as SharePoint or Google Drive, or would the University require a bespoke solution tailored to its existing infrastructure? Also, understanding the priority levels for features like version control, access logs, and secure document sharing within this integration framework would enable a more targeted development strategy.		The RFP is not prescriptive regarding the selection of specific data exchange protocols or standards. We encourage offerors to provide recommendations regarding the best approach for providing data interoperability and exchange, along with the reasons supporting those recommendations.
29	Could the University elaborate on the desired functionalities within the Research Project Tracking System for monitoring and reporting on project funding that serves as a match for federal funds? Specifically, understanding the level of detail required for tracking these contributions— such as the ability to segregate direct costs, indirect costs, and in-kind contributions, or the need for automated reporting features that comply with federal auditing requirements—would be crucial. Insights into whether the system should facilitate proactive alerts when funding allocations		The RFP lists this as one of the "Capabilities/Attributes of Lesser Value." It has not been discussed or described in detail by the project partners. As a minimum (if included), it would provide a yes/no flag for each research project indicating whether funding for that project has been used to provide match for other federal funding. It could also identify the other project for which it provided matching

	approach predefined thresholds or require detailed historical tracking for audit purposes would significantly influence the development of this module.	funds and indicate how much funding was allocated to the match.
30	What frequency and integration method does the University anticipate for the Research Project Tracking System to update from national research databases such as RiP and TRID? Clarifying whether the expectation leans towards real-time API integrations, periodic batch uploads, or manual entry points is essential for aligning the system's capabilities with the University's operational workflow. Moreover, if there are specific data elements or records the University prioritizes for synchronization—such as project abstracts, funding details, or research outcomes—detailing these would ensure the development of a tailored, efficient process.	The RFP lists this as one of the "Capabilities/Attributes of Lesser Value." It has not been discussed or described in detail by the project partners. There is no anticipated need for real-time integration.
31	Could the University specify which events and conditions within the Research Project Tracking System should trigger automated email notifications to stakeholders? For instance, it would be beneficial to know if notifications are expected for milestones such as project proposal submissions, approval status changes, upcoming deadlines, or budget threshold exceedances. Additionally, insights into the customization of these notifications—whether stakeholders can opt in or out of specific alerts or if there's a need for tiered notification levels based on the user's role within a project—would aid in designing a comprehensive and user-centric notification system.	The RFP lists this as one of the "Capabilities/Attributes of Lesser Value." It has not been discussed or described in detail by the project partners.
32	What specific functionalities and user interface features is the University looking for in the online portals designed for the submittal, review, and approval of research projects, work plans, and budgets within the Research Project Tracking System? It would be insightful to understand if the University envisages capabilities such as drag-and-drop submission forms, dynamic fields that adapt based on the type of project being submitted, integrated review and feedback loops, or automated routing for approval processes. Additionally, clarifications on the desired level of interactivity, such as real-time updates on submission status or the ability for reviewers to request additional information directly through the portal, would be instrumental in developing a user-centric portal interface.	The RFP lists this as one of the "Capabilities/Attributes of Lesser Value." It has not been discussed or described in detail by the project partners.
33	While the RFP provides a comprehensive outline of current requirements, it does not specifically mention the exploration of some features that are covered in our existing "Intelligent Project Tracking Dashboard." Given the potential of these futuristic features to transform experiences, would	Offerors are free to include descriptions of additional/optional features in their proposals. It must be clearly communicated in the proposal which features are included in the offeror's

	the University be interested in reviewing the capabilities of our system? If so, may we include them in our proposal by adding an additional/optional section to the proposal submission?	proposed solution and which features are additional/optional.
34	Please describe the acceptance criteria and DoD for this project.	As noted in Section 7.1 of the RFP, the selected Contractor will work with the Project Manager and the RPTS Steering Committee to refine and finalize the RPTS functional requirements and to develop a step-by-step plan for system development. Acceptance criteria will be established and mutually agreed upon during that process.
35	What are the technology preferences from DOT IT in case they choose to host and maintain the software themselves?	We have not indicated any specific technology preferences.
36	Please confirm that DOT will provide business requirements and selected vendor will be responsible for technical specifications document.	The RFP contains high-level functional requirements. The process for finalizing those requirements and developing a system development plan will be a cooperative process as described in Section 7.1 of the RFP.
37	Is there a set budget for this phase of the project? We know the Research Project Tracking System study TPF-5(467) indicated "Phase 2 - $275,000 or $46,000 per state for the next year"	There are 17 states participating in Phase 2 of TPF-5(467), and each state has committed $46,000. Some of the project funding is allocated to the University of Kentucky for project management services. The remainder is available for development, hosting, and maintenance of the RPTS.
38	Should a table of contents be included in the final proposal?	The RFP does not require a table of contents to be provided, so it is optional.
39	Should the Business Classification table listed under section 4.4 in the RFP be included in the final proposal?	Yes. That is preferred for tracking purposes required by the Commonwealth of Kentucky.
40	For project scheduling purposes, does the Project Team have a date/time of when they expect to have a final decision made and issue a NTP (notice to proceed) to the successful candidate?	This will depend on how long it takes to select a contractor and execute a contract.
41	Could the proposal team please clarify the discrepancy between sections 6.1 and 8.2. Section 6.1 reads "…an initial period of 4 years and is renewable for up to (3) additional two-year periods. The total contract period will not exceed ten (10) years." Section 8.2 reads "…fixed price for three years of system hosting, maintenance, and periodic training as described in Section 7.2 of this RFP. In addition, the Offeror should propose an annual cost for system hosting and maintenance for each	The initial contract period is specified in Section 6.1 to be four (4) years. This includes up to one year for system development, implementation, debugging, testing, and acceptance. The three-year hosting and maintenance period (as described in Section 8.2) begins when the development and implementation is complete. So, the initial contract period is four years. At the end of the initial four years, the contract may be

	year after the initial three-year period, i.e., for year 4, year 5, year 6, year 7, year 8, and year 9. " Is the initial period a 3-year period or a 4-year period? Is the intent of the RFP to have a contract for development and hosting for years 1-4 years with 3 additional 2-year extensions covering hosting for years 5-6, 7-8, and 9-10?	extended up to three times as described in Section 6.1.
42	Due to the widespread nature of the stakeholder team, it is assumed that all meetings (requirements, kick-off, project closeout, trainings, etc.) will be done remotely using remote technologies such as Microsoft Teams, Zoom, or other acceptable platforms. Can the team confirm this?	All meetings involving all stakeholders (i.e., all 17 states) will involve remote technologies. However, we also anticipate having periodic face-to-face meetings involving the contractor and project staff. For proposal purposes, assume these face-to-face meetings (in Kentucky) will occur twice per year throughout the duration of the contract.
43	Do you expect this to be a product offering (COTS) or can it be a application that we build specifically for departmental needs?	We have not stated any expectation regarding this.
44	Do you have any technology preference in developing the web application?	No.
45	Could you please specify the current environment that the UK relies on: Office 365, Google Workspace, or any other?	The primary users of the RPTS will be state DOT research managers in 17 different states, so the current environment at UK is not germane.
46	Are there any third party tools that needs to be integrate with the application?	We have not specified the need to integrate any such third-party tools.
47	For any reporting requirements, Are you interested in utilizing BI tools such as PowerBI, Tableau, Qlick, etc.,?	We welcome recommendations from offerors on the best tools to use.
48	Do you have any preference in terms of cloud hosting (AWS vs Azure vs GovCloud)?	We have not stated any preference.
49	How many users will be concurrently accessing the application? Also, please specify the total number of users groups and their roles.	For proposal preparation purposes, assume up to 100 users needing concurrent access. Also assume four levels of users within each jurisdiction: a view-only user; a project manager (with ability to edit data for his/her projects); a program manager (with ability to edit multiple projects as well as program-level data); and a system administrator. These are assumptions. Exact details will be established as the selected contractor and the project staff work together to turn the high-level functional requirements into an actual system design (see Section 7.1 of the RFP).
50	Should any part of the application be accessible to the public?	There is no such requirement at present. This could be considered as a feature to be added if deemed beneficial to the partner states.

51	Is it necessary to submit the response as a hard copy, or can it be submitted electronically as a soft copy?		Proposals must be submitted per the instructions in Section 3.6 of the RFP. This requires a hard copy as well as a copy on a flash drive that must be submitted in person or by shipment prior to the RFP deadline stated in the RFP.
52	Since it takes a while to receive the reference letter from the client, would it be adequate to provide an email address and mobile number instead to get the required information?		As described in Section 4.5 of the RFP, letters of reference provide critical information regarding an offeror's prior performance and level of client satisfaction. Choosing to omit such letters may negatively impact reviewers' impression of the offeror.
53	Is the project funded? Do you have any not-to-exceed budget for this project?		There are 17 states participating in Phase 2 of TPF-5(467), and each state has committed $46,000. Some of the project funding is allocated to the University of Kentucky for project management services. The remainder is available for development, hosting, and maintenance of the RPTS.
54	What is the anticipated project go-live date and tenure?		The go-live date is dependent on how long it takes to select a contractor and execute a contract. The duration of the project is described in Section 6.1 of the RFP.
55	The table at the bottom of the page 2 is hard to fill out. For example, the cell for "Name of Company" does not have any space for that information to be provided. Could an updated form be provided for offerors to complete?		There appears to have been a formatting error with the document posted within the RFP. A corrected version is attached at the end of this document.
56	For Section 8.2 Ongoing Hosting how much user traffic is estimated per month? Modern hosting is often accomplished on services like AWS (Amazon Web Services) or Google Cloud. These services hosting costs are based on usage. Therefore to provide a good estimate on fixed price hosting knowing the amount of user traffic is key.		We really don't know at this point. For proposal purposes, assume 10 users in each state each using the system for 15 minutes per day. Multiply this by 17 member jurisdictions and 20 work days per month.

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL (RFP)

ATTENTION: This is not an order. Read all instructions, terms and conditions carefully.

PROPOSAL NO.: UK-2427-24 **Issue Date: March 13, 2024** **Title: Development and Implementation of a Web-Based** **Research Project Tracking System (RPTS) for State** **Departments of Transportation Research Programs** **Purchasing Officer: Randy Bartley** **Phone: 859-257-6759** **Email: randy.bartley@uky.edu**	**RETURN ORIGINAL COPY OF PROPOSAL TO:** **UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY** **PROCUREMENT SERVICES** **411 S LIMESTONE** **ROOM 322 PETERSON SERVICE BLDG.** **LEXINGTON, KY 40506-0005**

IMPORTANT: PROPOSALS MUST BE RECEIVED BY: April 25, 2024 3 P.M. LEXINGTON, KY TIME.

NOTICE OF REQUIREMENTS

1. The University's General Terms and Conditions and Instructions to Bidders, viewable at https://purchasing.uky.edu/bid-and-proposal-opportunities, apply to this RFP. When the RFP includes construction services, the University's General Conditions and Special Conditions for Construction and Instructions to Bidders, viewable at https://purchasing.uky.edu/bid-and-proposal-opportunities, apply to the RFP.
2. Contracts resulting from this RFP must be governed by and in accordance with the laws of the Commonwealth of Kentucky.
3. Any agreement or collusion among offerors or prospective offerors, which restrains, tends to restrain, or is reasonably calculated to restrain competition by agreement to bid at a fixed price or to refrain from offering, or otherwise, is prohibited.
4. Any person who violates any provisions of KRS 45A.325 shall be guilty of a felony and shall be punished by a fine of not less than five thousand dollars nor more than ten thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not less than one year nor more than five years, or both such fine and imprisonment. Any firm, corporation, or association who violates any of the provisions of KRS 45A.325 shall, upon conviction, be fined not less than ten thousand dollars or more than twenty thousand dollars.

AUTHENTICATION OF BID AND STATEMENT OF NON-COLLUSION AND NON-CONFLICT OF INTEREST

I hereby swear (or affirm) under the penalty for false swearing as provided by KRS 523.040:

1. That I am the offeror (if the offeror is an individual), a partner, (if the offeror is a partnership), or an officer or employee of the bidding corporation having authority to sign on its behalf (if the offeror is a corporation);
2. That the attached proposal has been arrived at by the offeror independently and has been submitted without collusion with, and without any agreement, understanding or planned common course of action with, any other Contractor of materials, supplies, equipment or services described in the RFP, designed to limit independent bidding or competition;
3. That the contents of the proposal have not been communicated by the offeror or its employees or agents to any person not an employee or agent of the offeror or its surety on any bond furnished with the proposal and will not be communicated to any such person prior to the official closing of the RFP:
4. That the offeror is legally entitled to enter into contracts with the University of Kentucky and is not in violation of any prohibited conflict of interest, including, but not limited to, those prohibited by the provisions of KRS 45A.330 to .340, and164.390;
5. That the offeror, and its affiliates, are duly registered with the Kentucky Department of Revenue to collect and remit the sale and use tax imposed by Chapter 139 to the extent required by Kentucky law and will remain registered for the duration of any contract award;
6. That I have fully informed myself regarding the accuracy of the statement made above.

SWORN STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE WITH CAMPAIGN FINANCE LAWS

In accordance with KRS45A.110 (2), the undersigned hereby swears under penalty of perjury that he/she has not knowingly violated any provision of the campaign finance laws of the Commonwealth of Kentucky and that the award of a contract to a bidder will not violate any provision of the campaign finance laws of the Commonwealth of Kentucky.

CONTRACTOR REPORT OF PRIOR VIOLATIONS OF KRS CHAPTERS 136, 139, 141, 337, 338, 341 & 342

The contractor by signing and submitting a proposal agrees as required by 45A.485 to submit final determinations of any violations of the provisions of KRS Chapters 136, 139, 141, 337, 338, 341 and 342 that have occurred in the previous five (5) years prior to the award of a contract and agrees to remain in continuous compliance with the provisions of the statutes during the duration of any contract that may be established. Final determinations of violations of these statutes must be provided to the University by the successful contractor prior to the award of a contract.

CERTIFICATION OF NON-SEGREGATED FACILITIES

The contractor, by submitting a proposal, certifies that he/she is in compliance with the Code of Federal Regulations, No. 41 CFR 60-1.8(b) that prohibits the maintaining of segregated facilities.

SIGNATURE REQUIRED: This proposal cannot be considered valid unless signed and dated by an authorized agent of the offeror. Type or print the signatory's name, title, address, phone number and fax number in the spaces provided. Offers signed by an agent are to be accompanied by evidence of his/her authority unless such evidence has been previously furnished to the issuing office

DELIVERY TIME:	NAME OF COMPANY:	DUNS #
PROPOSAL FIRM THROUGH:	ADDRESS:	Phone/Fax:
PAYMENT TERMS:	CITY, STATE & ZIP CODE:	E-MAIL:
SHIPPING TERMS: F. O.B. DESTINATION PREPAID AND ALLOWED	TYPED OR PRINTED NAME:	WEB ADDRESS:
FEDERAL EMPLOYER ID NO.:	SIGNATURE:	DATE: