



# COUNTY OF SANTA CRUZ

---

General Services Department  
Purchasing Division

701 OCEAN STREET, SUITE 330, SANTA CRUZ, CA 95060-4073  
(831) 454-2210 FAX: (831) 454-2710 TDD/TTY: 711

---

## ADDENDUM # 2

Request for Proposals 17P1-001

### ***Exclusive Emergency Ambulance Service Operator for the Santa Cruz County Exclusive Operating Area***

Issued: October 10, 2017

Addendum #2 is being issued to answer questions submitted in writing prior to the bidders' conference in accordance with RFP Section 5.2.

Direct any questions regarding Addendum #2 to [Kevin.Bratcher@santacruzcounty.us](mailto:Kevin.Bratcher@santacruzcounty.us).

Addendum #2 authorization:

10/10/2017

---

Kevin Bratcher

---

Date

**County of Santa Cruz**  
**RFP# 17P1-001 Addendum #2**

**Item #1 (Section 4.5 A)**

---

*RFP Language: Response times shall be calculated from 18 seconds after the call time (i.e., the average time to process the call and notify the unit), ...*

Q: Please clarify if the response time is calculated from the time that the dispatch center gets the call +18 seconds, or from the time of dispatch (Contractor receives call) +18 seconds. The Response Time definition provided at the end of the RFP further confuses the topic. There is no Call Time definition.

A: Response Time is calculated starting from the time the CAD creates the call, typically referred to as "Dispatch (DS) Time," and ending when the unit arrives on scene. Eighteen seconds is added to the response time standard to account for the average delay from when the CAD records the Dispatch Time and when the dispatcher actually broadcasts the call to the Contractor. For example, an ambulance would have 16:18 (16:00 standard + 00:18 processing time) minutes to arrive for an urban 9-1-1 call. Call Time is defined as the difference between Dispatch Time and On Scene Time.

**Item #2 (Section: 6.8)**

---

*RFP Language: Conflict of Interest*

Q1: Is there a Conflict of Interest in the current relationship of the Santa Cruz Fire Department being a member of the EMSIA and/or would another bidder see our current role in the EMSIA as a conflict?

A1: No. The County does not consider the current relationship to be a conflict of interest.

**Item #3 (Section: 7.1)**

---

*RFP Language: Insurance and Taxes*

Q1: Does the City have any restrictions with regards to being Self Insured when it comes to providing the comprehensive and commercial general liability greater than 1 million dollars and ten million dollar umbrella policy as stated in 7.1-A?

A1: First, the matter relates to County insurances not the City.

Second, the County does not have any restrictions with regards to the entity/agency submitting a proposal being self-insured for comprehensive and commercial general liability greater than one million dollars (\$1,000,000) and up to ten million dollars (\$10,000,000) umbrella policy.

**Item #4 (Section: 8.4 B (b) 8)**

---

*RFP Language: Provide a narrative description of ambulance services and related services currently provided by the organization.*

Q1: Will Emergency Medical Services "EMS" including the first response services at the ALS level be considered, evaluated and scored the same as ambulance services as noted above?

A1: No. While clinical experience provided by both first responder and ambulance service paramedics is important, the County is seeking a Bidder that also has experience in delivering ambulance services, including call demand analysis and staffing to meet this demand by time of day, day of week, etc. Most first responder agencies are based on a level of staffing model to cover a given geographic area. This RFP does not require a specific staffing level, but a level of performance instead. The Bidder has the flexibility to build the optimal deployment model to meet the performance standards. Experience with system status planning to most accurately position and dynamically reposition ambulance crews across a large geographic area is essential for a successful provider. This experience can be provided by the management team proposed by the Bidder. The management team can include 1) existing management with prior ambulance service experience and/or 2) thru acquisition of experienced ambulance service management personnel. There is no requirement to partner with another organization.

**County of Santa Cruz**  
**RFP# 17P1-001 Addendum #2**

Q2: Does this language handicap or create an uneven playing field for those who provide EMS/ALS first response and do not ambulance services?

A2: No. EMS/ALS first response is an important component of all EMS systems. The County considers ambulance service a separate, yet equally important, component. Any Bidder has the ability to provide the necessary ambulance service experience through proposed management; there is no requirement that the Bidder currently be an ambulance provider. Therefore, the County does not believe there is a handicap or uneven playing field for Bidders that do not currently transport.

Q3: Conversely, does the use of the word “ambulance” services handicap or create an uneven playing field for those ambulance providers who do not provide first response services?

A3: No. There is no requirement for the Bidder to provide first response services – the response time standards require advanced life support (ALS) within a set period of time. If that ALS is provided by something other than an ambulance unit, there is a second response time standard for the ambulance. The partnership with existing ALS first responders is critical to valuing the EMS resources within the County and providing cost effective and efficient care to our residents and visitors.

Q4: Does the RFP consider “Emergency Medical Services” synonymous with “ambulance services” for the purposes of evaluating and scoring the RFP responses?

A4: No. As described in A1 and A2 above, ambulance service is one component of an EMS system. Ambulance service experience is different than EMS experience.

**Item #5 (Section: 8.4 (b) 9)**

---

*RFP Language: Describe the organizations experience in providing ALS-level emergency ambulance service under a performance-based contract serving an area with service conditions similar to those of Santa Cruz County (e.g., geo-demographics, payer mix).*

Q1: Will the provision of first response ALS-level emergency services under response time criteria be considered, evaluated and scored in the same manner as described above?

A1: No. The evaluation committee may consider, evaluate, and score experience with first responder ALS-level emergency services under response time criteria; however, it is not likely that the evaluators would do so under the same manner as the ambulance service experience of a Bidder and its proposed management team.

Q2: Does this language handicap or create an uneven playing field for those who provide EMS/ALS first response and do not ambulance services?

A2: No. EMS/ALS first response is an important component of all EMS systems. The County considers ambulance service a separate, yet equally important, component. Any Bidder has the ability to provide the necessary ambulance service experience through proposed management; there is no requirement that the Bidder currently be an ambulance provider. Therefore, the County does not believe there is a handicap or uneven playing field for Bidders that do not currently transport.

**County of Santa Cruz**  
**RFP# 17P1-001 Addendum #2**

**Item #6 (Section: 8.4 B (b) 20)**

---

*RFP Language: Using the format below, document the number of ambulance responses/transport conducted by the organization and/or management team for this RFP in any contract or exclusive area with a similar performance expectation, population, geographical area or transport volume during the past 12 months.*

Q1: Santa Cruz Fire currently responds to all requests for EMS services within their jurisdiction as well as requests for EMS services outside of their jurisdiction. Based on the language above SCFD would respond to this RFP question with the number of responses, and include the number of transport facilitated by the ambulance provider. This includes response by the incumbent ambulance provider as well as mutual and automatic aid ambulance providers. Can SCFD assume and count on this response to the RFP to be considered, evaluated, and scored in the same manner as an ambulance provider?

A1: No. Bidders cannot utilize the number of ambulance responses/transport conducted by another provider to answer this RFP question. The number of ambulance responses/transport conducted by its existing management team at previous organizations or the proposed management team would be appropriate to include.

Q2: Does this language handicap or create an uneven playing field for those who provide EMS/ALS first response and do not ambulance services?

A2: No. EMS/ALS first response is an important component of all EMS systems. The County considers ambulance service a separate, yet equally important, component. Any Bidder has the ability to provide the necessary ambulance service experience through proposed management; there is no requirement that the Bidder currently be an ambulance provider. Therefore, the County does not believe there is a handicap or uneven playing field for Bidders that do not currently transport.

**Item #7 (Section: 8.4 B (c) 3 a)**

---

*RFP Language: Demonstrated experience as an ALS ambulance service provider to populations over 150,000 residents or equivalent experience in a single contiguous area. The contiguous area may be made up of multiple political jurisdictions which may include multiple cities, counties, states, or other jurisdictions.*

Q1: The City of Santa Cruz Emergency Services including EMS has been designed to provide services to not only the 66,000+ resident population but a daily influx population in excess of 100,000 individuals and visitor population that exceeds 200,000 on any given day. This 200,000 daily visitor population makes up more than half the calendar year. Does this daily and visitor population meet the "or equivalent experience in a single continuous area" of the RFP?

A1: No. Specific experience providing ALS ambulance service is necessary to meet this RFP question. The demonstrated ALS ambulance service experience by the Bidder's existing management team at previous organizations or the proposed management team would be appropriate to include.

Q2: Does this language as written create "exclusionary language" as envisioned by the BoS?

A2: No. The County desires a Bidder that has experience in delivering ambulance services in a similar size community. Any Bidder has the ability to demonstrate the necessary ambulance service experience through proposed management; there is no requirement that the Bidder currently be an ambulance provider.

**County of Santa Cruz**  
**RFP# 17P1-001 Addendum #2**

**Item #8 (Section: 8.4 B (c) 3 c)**

---

*RFP Language: Demonstrated experience providing 9-1-1 ambulance service or first response at the ALS level in a contiguous area totaling at least 900 ambulance hours per week.*

Q1: What formula does the RFP contemplate to draw a parallel between ambulance hours and first response hours?

A1: The RFP language shall be amended to read “*Demonstrated experience providing 9-1-1 ambulance service or first response at the ALS level in a contiguous area totaling at least 600 hours per week.*”

**Item #9 (Section: 9.2)**

---

*RFP Language: It is the intent of the Evaluation Committee to select an apparent successful Bidder with a recommendation to be forwarded to the Board of Supervisors based on the evaluation of all elements of this proposal.*

Q1: Does this statement mean the Board of Supervisors has the final decision in who the award is given to?

A1: Yes. The Board of Supervisors will make the final decision after receiving a recommendation from the Health Services Agency Director based on the Bidder with the highest proposal score.

Q2: Is this consistent with the County policy on awarding contracts?

A2: Yes.

**Item #10 (Section: 9.4) conflicts of interest**

---

*RFP Language: All Evaluation Committee, advisory group members, and other parties involved with the review of proposals shall be carefully screened by County for potential conflicts of interest. Each evaluation participant shall be required to complete a disclosure statement on the issue of conflict of interest. Any identified potential source of conflict shall be evaluated by the County. Those potential evaluation participants with a material conflict of interest, as determined by the County, will not be allowed to participate in the evaluation process.*

Q1: Define a conflict of interest.

A1: Conflict of interest as it relates to the evaluators and/or the evaluation process includes any of the following:

- An evaluator or immediate member of his/her family has a financial interest in the procurement;
- A business organization in which an evaluator or any member of his/her immediate family has a financial interest pertaining to the procurement; or
- Any other person, business or organization with whom an evaluator or any immediate family member is negotiating, or has arrangements concerning prospective employment, is involved with the procurement.

Q2: Who is responsible for determining if there exists a conflict of interest?

A2: The RFP Buyer, who may consult County Counsel.

Q3: Define what a “*potential*” source of conflict is.

A3: Refer to A1.

Q4: Define what a “*material*” source of conflict is.

A4: Refer to A1.

**County of Santa Cruz**  
**RFP# 17P1-001 Addendum #2**

- Q5: Is there a process for potential bidders to provide a list of individuals that may pose a potential or material conflict once those definitions have been identified?
- A5: The RFP language referenced (section 9.4) pertains specifically to evaluators and/or the evaluation process. Bidders will not be involved in the selection of evaluators; therefore, such a process as described is not necessary.

**Item #11 (Addendum #1: Items 9 and 10)**

---

In the new language contained in Item 9 (8.4.B.b(20)) and Item 10 (8.4.B.c), the terms “management team”, “management personnel acquired by Respondent”, “local management personnel”, and “acquisition of experienced management personnel” are seemingly used interchangeably. Please provide clarification to the questions posed below.

- Q1: Please define the similarities and difference between the above listed terms
- A1: The terms are synonymous. “Management personnel” shall include those proposed to meet the requirements of the RFP, whether existing or proposed through acquisition.
- Q2: What would be a fully qualifying way to meet the intent and requirements for any and/or all of the above listed terms?
- A2: The bidder may use any combination of existing and acquired management personnel experience to fulfill the minimum experience requirements of the RFP.
- Q3: Will hiring a consultant fully meet the intent and requirements for any and/or all of the above listed terms?
- A3: No. The proposed management team is expected to remain with the ambulance service operation long-term; a consultant is typically only short-term. Further, any change in ambulance service management team during the term of the Contract must be acceptable to the Contract Administrator.
- Q4: Will hiring the incumbent management workforce fully meet the intent and requirements for any and/or all of the above listed terms?
- A4: Yes. The incumbent management workforce would meet the experience intent and requirements for any and/or all of the above listed terms. Bidders planning to use the incumbent managers shall demonstrate that those managers are committed to accepting positions with the Bidder. One example would be signed letters of intent from said managers.