

DISTRICT RESPONSES TO WRITTEN RFQ QUESTIONS 2/12/21

At the RFQ mandatory pre-proposal conference on 2/8/21, one question regarding potential proposal submission via a cloud-based storage program required additional research and the following written response from the District:

The District will accept electronic submission of proposals through a cloud-based storage program, which will be set up by the District. Potential proposers which attended the mandatory pre-proposal conference can request access information by emailing the District at ambulanceRFQ@sonomacountyfd.org. The District will respond and provide the access information to use the cloud-based storage program.

The following ten (10) written questions were received by the District after the conclusion of the 2/8/21 RFQ bidders' conference, prior to the deadline for written questions at 10:00 a.m. on 2/11/21:

1. **Can the District please elaborate on the “Evaluation of Proposals and Selection Process” described on pages 11 and 12 of the RFQ? Will the Evaluation Committee use a standardized system for scoring multiple proposals (such as calculating points or weighted scores for specific sections)?** For example, page 11, section 4 references weighted criteria, but we do not find information on weighting besides the subjects for consideration.

This question was asked and answered at bidders' conference. The District is not weighting the criteria. The five sections are weighted equally.

2. **Would the District consider shared use of fire stations for housing? Is there any plan for use of existing fire stations to house ambulance personnel at cost or no cost to the proposer?** Please see RFP page 45 (Appendix C, section 11.a.) for the section in question.

The District has some available resources and is open to a proposal and dialogue during negotiations.

3. **Can the District provide clarification whether the Cost Proposal (Appendix D) can be considered proprietary and kept confidential?** Page 13 mentions the “Price Proposal” cannot be kept confidential, but it is not clear if this appendix can be kept confidential.

Section 7 “Confidentiality” of the General Instructions and Provisions on pages 13 and 14 of the RFQ sets forth the process for a proposer to request confidentiality based on trade secrets or other proprietary information. If a proposer believes information on a specific Cost Proposal Sheet (or portion thereof) in Appendix D is proprietary confidential, the proposer may mark that page of the proposal as confidential.

A proposer requesting that any information be designated as confidential and exempt from disclosure under the California Public Records Act shall include in its proposal the hold harmless and indemnification language set forth in the third paragraph of Section 7 on pages 13 and 14 of the RFQ.

- 4. Can the District provide clarification on the dispatch service fees referenced on Page 37 of the RFQ? Is it the intent of the District to cover all REDCOM franchise area ambulance dispatch fees?**

As set forth in Section A.5 of the Scope of Work in Appendix C on page 37 of the RFQ, the District “shall provide dispatching service at no cost to the Contractor for dispatching of 911 responses.” If the County RFP ultimately includes the need for additional dispatch services, such County RFP provisions shall be negotiated with the successful proposer.

- 5. Can the District provide clarification regarding time standard compliance?** Specifically, page 40 of the RFQ (Appendix C, section C.8. indicates a 100% compliance standard to response time standards, while section D.13 (page 46) indicates a 90% compliance standard.

The expectation is 100% compliance with contract between the District and the successful proposer. Response times should be at a 90% compliance standard, or whatever the County RFP requires.

- 6. What is the purpose of the “Exclusivity Exception” on page 48 of RFQ (section “F. Third Tier Services: Surge Plan”)? Is this section in conflict w/ the non-exclusivity language in the Professional Services Agreement?** This language states that the Contractor will be the exclusive provider of all Contract, surge, and backup emergency ambulance services for the District except in exigent and extenuating circumstances.

This question was asked and answered at the bidders’ conference. The exclusive contract does not include District-provided ALS ambulance and paramedic services and does not

include pilot programs or research projects as set forth in Section C.12 of the Scope of Work in Appendix C on page 40 of the RFQ.

7. **Can the District please elaborate on which requested items count toward the 30-page response limit and which may be attached? Would you consider a recommendation of expanding the page limit to 60 pages to account for all requirements?** As a specific example, page 6 of the RFQ provides a desired layout/format/etc. for the proposal responses, which includes “a detailed description of the approach and methodology that will be used to fulfill each requirement listed in the Scope of Work”. However, the RFQ’s associated Scope of Work (Appendix C, beginning on page 35) includes dozens of questions that require written responses and documentation. One example, from page 42, is “The Proposal shall describe in detail the Proposer’s Employee Wellness & Personnel Assistance programs and/or resources.” There are more than 20 similar requests in the Scope of Work, which would make it difficult to provide a clear response that complies with the page constraints.

Based on the issues identified in the written question and the opportunity for proposers to use the cloud-based storage program addressed above, the District will expand the proposal page limit to 60 pages.

8. **Can the District clarify if they anticipate or plan to replace Contractor operated ambulances with District operated ambulances during the term of the Agreement, to include any extensions?**

The District intends to honor the scope of work and term of the Agreement as set forth in the RFQ and negotiated with the successful proposer.

9. **Can you please confirm that providers that did not participate in the mandatory pre- bid conference may not bid?**

Attendance at the pre-proposal conference on 2/8/21 was mandatory to be eligible to submit a proposal in response to the District’s RFQ.

10. **On the bidder’s conference, we recognized Medic Ambulance, LIFEWest, Bell’s Ambulance and AMR in attendance – were there any other attendees in addition to this list?**

At the mandatory pre-proposal conference on 2/8/21, there were observers from the Sonoma County Fire District, Bodega Bay Fire Protection District, and the Santa Rosa Fire Department. There were no other potential proposers in attendance.