



May 3, 2011

**REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL  
#519**

**Fire and Life Safety  
Non-Emergency Basic Life Support Ambulance Transport Service**

**ADDENDUM #1**

The City of Springfield is hereby amending or clarifying the above mentioned Request for Proposal (RFP). The original document can be found on the City's website at [www.springfield-or.gov](http://www.springfield-or.gov) by selecting the hyperlink *Purchasing/Contracts* from the menu on the left side of the home page, interested parties will be linked to the RFP/ITB page.

- 1. Question:** Page 22-23 / 4.c.i.5 & Page 25 / 4.d.i "Official timekeeper...shall be Springfield Fire and Life Safety" "provider must provide its own dispatch services" We presume that all of the times we will receive will be from our dispatch and want to ensure there will be no conflict with any times collected by the City.  
**City's Response:** Providers dispatch times are acceptable
- 2. Question:** Page 28 / 4.k.ii We want to confirm that the "qualified driver" must also be an EMT-B or higher.  
**City's Response:** Correct.
- 3. Question:** Page 33 / 5.d.i Monthly response time report - add "scheduled time" to bullets?  
**City's Response:** Page 33, 5.d.i is revised to include 'scheduled time' on bulleted list.
- 4. Question:** Page 29 / 4.k.vii.2 & Page 34 / 5.e Training records must be provided within 24 hours; Training reports within 15 working days. There appears to be an inconsistency in reporting times in these two sections.  
**City's Response:** Page 29 4.k.vii.2 Is envisioned to be individual employee's existing training records, and should be readily available, if requested.

Page 34, 5.e refers to reports requested by Springfield, to be generated by provider, for applicable data set (i.e. all vehicle maintenance records for the past month, or EMT recertification records for all field personnel, etc.).

5. **Question:** Page 32 / 5.c Quality audits in minimum 48 hours including all reports and data. This section also deals with reports and data and the 48 hour notice requirement that may conflict with previous reporting deadlines of 15 working days.  
**City's Response:** We see no conflict here. Quality audits may be requested with 48 hours notice, no new reports or data would need to be generated as a result of these requests.
6. **Question:** Page 36 / 7.e.ii "The provider shall also notify the City any time the provider or any of its employees are audited by any regulatory authority." The agency may not be notified immediately of individual audits by regulatory authorities. We feel it needs to be clarified that the City will be notified within 5 working days of when the agency is notified.  
**City's Response:** Page 36 / 7.e.ii, second paragraph is modified to read: "The provider shall also notify the City any time the provider or any of its employees are audited by any regulatory authority. This notice shall be in written form and forwarded to the City within (5) working days of the date the provider becomes aware of any such audit."
7. **Question:** Page 23 / 4.c.iii & Page 39 / 8.c.ii (table) Zone 1 90% compliance, any other zone 80% compliance. Under zone compliance, penalties start at 84% in liquidated damages. This appears to conflict with previous response time criteria.  
**City's Response:** Page 39, 8.c.ii is revised, Replace table with the following:

**Zone % Compliance for Non-Emergency Transfers**

<u>Percent Compliant</u>	<u>Percent Compliant</u>	
<u>Zone 1</u>	<u>Other Zones</u>	<u>Fine per month</u>
84%	74%	\$500
83%	73%	\$750
82%	72%	\$1,000
81%	71%	\$1,250
80%	70%	\$1,500
<80%	<70%	\$2,000

8. **Question:** Page 2, Section I
- 1.) Is there a map that shows the geographic locations of the various facilities mentioned in this section?
  - 2.) Is there any projection on the number of transports that would likely be encountered in this expanded role?
  - 3.) Is there a timeline for this potential expansion of BLS and ILS transports?

**City's Response:**

- 1.) No, see a City of Springfield map.
- 2.) No.

- 3.) No. This RFP is only for inter-facility transports, and they are no guarantees when or if this agreement would be expanded.

**9. Question:** Page 8, Sub-section e.

- 1.) What is the total number of FireMed memberships in ASA #5 compared to population?
- 2.) Are the BLS non-emergent transports included in this FireMed program?
- 3.) If the answer to #2 is yes, will there be a proportional sharing of this revenue associated with FireMed with the provider since they will be running these calls?
- 4.) How would those membership fees be applied to the fee-based transports of the provider?

**City's Response:**

- 1.) 11,224 memberships; estimated population 58,000
- 2.) Yes, if medically necessary.
- 3.) No.
- 4.) See sample contract – page 42.

**10. Question:** Page 25, Sub-section d, part i: "...and adjusted annually thereafter". Is this adjustment to be based on CPI or is there some other method or process from which the annual adjustment will be determined?

**City's Response:** Adjusted annually based on a formula determined by 9-1-1 Central Lane Communications.

**11. Question:** Page 35, Section 7, Sub-section c - The current rates being charged as \$1600 base rate and \$20 mileage rate per pt. mile.

- 1.) We just wish to verify that this is the same rates that are being charged for the BLS non-emergent service currently.
- 2.) What is (sic) the average pt miles per transport for the BLS NE transports?
- 3.) Would we be able to get a breakdown of the payer mix % based on the following financial classes:
  - a. Medicare/Medicare HMO
  - b. Medicaid/Medicaid HMO
  - c. Contracted Insurance
  - d. Non-contracted Insurance
  - e. Uninsured (self pay)
  - f. Veteran's Administration
- 4.) Would the City be willing to share their current cash per transport collected for the above mentioned financial classes as this would assist in providing as accurate as possible financials.
- 5.) Because the county sets the rates, is there no discounting for services for DRG or PPS transports? Emergent versus non-emergent?

**City's Response:**

- 1) Yes, same rates apply.
- 2) 4.47 miles
- 3)
  - a. Medicare/Medicare HMO 59.78%
  - b. Medicaid/Medicaid HMO 14.86%

- c. Contracted Insurance n/a
- d. Non-contracted Insurance 8.88%
- e. Uninsured (self pay) 5.98%
- f. Veteran's Administration 1.63%
- g. Facility Contract 8.87% flat rate\*  
\* inter-hospital transports w/in ASA#5

4)

- a. Medicare/Medicare HMO \$135.58
- b. Medicaid/Medicaid HMO \$114.54
- c. Contracted Insurance n/a
- d. Non-contracted Insurance \$1340
- e. Uninsured (self pay) \$8.29
- f. Veteran's Administration \$739
- g. Facility Contract \$410 flat rate BLS\*  
\* inter-hospital transports w/in ASA#5

5) County does not set ambulance rates, City does. The agreement with Peacehealth and McKenzie Willamette Hospital is for inter-facility transports which are DRG. If it does not meet DRG criteria (In-Patient status) we bill the patients insurance or the patient.

**12. Question:** Page 36, Section 7, subsection d: Supply annual audited financial statements.

Would the City be open to reviewed financial statements rather than audited financial statements?

**City's Response:** No, audited financial statements are required.

**13. Question:** Besides SFLS, are other providers currently providing BLS transports within this ASA? If so, do you know the number of annual transports?

**City's Response:** Yes, a private provider on a short-term contract. Estimated # of transports are indicated in the RFP. All transports, including BLS non-emergencies are the responsibility of the ASA provider, according to Lane Code, Chapter 18. This RFP is to establish a private provider to assist the City of Springfield with some ambulances transport services.

**14. Question:** Are all BLS transports within ASA #5 required to become part of this contract under the provisions the ASA Plan?

**City's Response:** RFP is for inter-facility BLS transports only, within ASA#5. The ASA Plan does not require BLS transports to be contracted to a private provider. The decision when/if to contract ambulance transports is strictly the ASA holder's prerogative. The City of Springfield will determine when/if to contract with a private provider, and which transports to contract on an as-needed basis. Two factors will be used to base this decision - the need to maintain emergency medical service capabilities, and the need to protect the revenue stream supporting the Ambulance Fund.

**15. Question:** How many patient discharges occur from PeaceHealth Riverbend and McKensie (sic) Willamette facilities that require BLS or ILS ambulance transports?

**City's Response:** Unknown. Reliable information from the hospitals is currently not available. Information on the number of BLS transports done by the City of Springfield is included in the RFP on page 19 2.j.



**16. Question:** We also understand that Eugene Fire and Springfield Fire are currently working collaboratively on ambulance transport issues and there have been discussions about transferring 911 BLS and ILS transports to a contracted provider.

- 1) If that were to occur, would another RFP be issued to address that expanded scope of operations?
- 2) How likely is that to occur within the period of this contract period?

**City's Response:** This RFP is to solicit proposals, and presumably, enter into a contract that could extend through January 31, 2014. After that, a new procurement process would be conducted if the department chose to continue contracting the work. Multiple variables are still being evaluated, with no timeline for future expansion of any private provider's role in the ambulance transport system as a whole.

In the event that it is necessary to further amend, revise or supplement any part this RFP, additional addenda will be posted on the City's website at <http://www.springfield-or.gov> (select the *Purchase Contracts* hyperlink and Addendum 1 – RFP #519 Non-Emergency Basic Life Support Ambulance Transport Service ). As stated in the original solicitation, City will make a reasonable effort to provide the addenda to all Proposers to whom City provided the initial Request for Proposal. This addendum shall be considered part of the specification of the Request for Proposal. The City is not responsible for any explanation, clarification, interpretation or approval made or given in any manner except by written addenda issued by City.

**ALL BIDDERS SHALL ACKNOWLEDGE AND INCLUDE THIS ADDENDA #1 AS PART OF THEIR SUBMITTAL PACKAGE.**