



Napa County Emergency Ambulance Service Proposal Evaluation Process

Goal:

Conduct a proposal evaluation process that is thorough and objective that will result in the identification of the Ambulance Service Provider that offers the County the best combination of service delivery, quality, and value.

Objectives:

Establish a process that provides a "level playing field" to attract multiple qualified Proposers.

Create an evaluation process that can distill complex components included in the Proposal and the EMS system design in such a manner that reviewers understand the system, its requirements, and the commitments contained in the proposals.

The Process:

In accordance with procedures established by the Napa County Health and Human Services Agency, a three-member Proposal Review Committee was empanelled. The membership was exclusively recruited from outside of the County in order to provide objectivity. The members of the committee bring a variety of relevant experience and expertise. A description of the membership of the committee follows:

- (1) Two Directors of an Emergency Medical Services Agencies from Northern California counties
- (2) A California EMS Agency Medical Director familiar with Napa County

Each of the Review Panel members received instructions and an agenda for the evaluation process that was conducted on June 16th through June 18th, 2010. The document is attached to this process summary.

The Proposals were due and received on May 26, 2010 and distributed to the Review Panel members the following day. The Review Panel members were requested to read and review each of the Proposals prior to convening the Panel on June 16, 2010. The evaluation process occurred over three days.

The Review Panel convened on June 16, 2010 at 1300. The agenda for the first day was orientation of the Panel to the process, the RFP, the Proposals, and the criteria by which the Proposals were compared. Review of the proposals was also initiated on the first day. (Agenda attached)

The review panel was welcomed by Randy Snowden, Dr. Karen Smith, and Ty Cook from the Napa County Health and Human Services Agency. Richard Keller, Partner, Fitch & Associates led the orientation process. The key agenda items were the overview of the scoring procedures and a review of the criteria to be evaluated in the review process.

All three reviewers were present for all sessions of the Review Panel. In addition, Richard Keller and Mike Ragone from the consultant team were present for the review process. Hunter Alexander, Mendocino County EMS Coordinator, was present

for the reviewer evaluation and scoring and collected and entered the individual scores into a spreadsheet.

RFP and Criteria Review

Most of the first day was dedicated to the review of the 58 criteria that would be evaluated for each Proposer. Seven of the criteria involved determining if the firms met the minimum qualification requirements and the remaining 51 identified the Proposers' methods and commitments to providing emergency ambulance services.

Each criterion was discussed in detail by the Review Panel Members and the RFP was referenced. Minimum requirements were defined based on the RFP and the intent and relevance of each criterion was reviewed. The purpose of this process was to ensure that each Review Panel member was aware of the EMS System's minimum performance requirements and expectations as defined in the RFP. It also allowed open discussion on what should be considered during the review of the criteria and why the requirement was included in the system design and RFP.

Scoring Process

The RFP outlined the required Proposal format which consisted of 8 sections. The first section included the criteria for determining that the proposing organization is qualified to provide emergency ambulance service in Napa County.

The next 6 sections form the basis of the Proposer's plan including clinical activities, human resources, operations and management, EMS System participation, and organizational criteria. The final section contains the Proposer's pricing for services.

The six categories of evaluation contained 58 discreet criteria. The RFP defined the total points to be available for each category. Each criterion was assigned a point value and the total points available in each category were the sum of the points assigned to the all of the criteria in the category. The categories and total points possible for each are identified in the following table.

Section	Category	Total Points
1	Credentials and Qualification	Pass/Fail
2	Commitment to Clinical Quality	250
3	Commitment to Employees	250
4	Operations Management	200
5	Commitment to EMS System and Community	200
6	Management and Administration	250
7	Organizational Requirements	100
8	Proposed Patient Charges	250
	TOTAL POSSIBLE POINTS	1,500

The criteria were listed on 16 separate score sheets. Two for Proposer qualifications and the remaining 14 score sheets contained one to seven individual criterion for evaluation of the Proposers' submissions. The score sheets were given to the Reviewers one at a time. The criteria on one sheet were evaluated and scored, the Reviewers would sign the score sheet and turn it in to the Score Tabulator and the next score sheet was given to the Reviewers.

Seven criteria were evaluated to determine if each Proposer met the minimum organizational requirements to be considered qualified to provide emergency ambulance services in Napa County. Each qualification requirement would be awarded a "yes" if the Proposer met the criteria or a "no" if the Proposer did not meet the qualification criteria.

For the plan elements of the Proposals, the Review Panel members were instructed that the Proposal with the best offering for each criterion would be awarded the maximum amount of points allotted to that item. The second and third Proposals would be scored with an equal or lesser number of points based on the individual Review Panel member's sole opinion of how the Proposals compared to the one deemed "best" for that particular criterion. If one or more Proposals were evaluated as equivalent, then the Panel member could award one or more Proposals the total number of points available for the criterion. In the event all three of the Proposals were unresponsive to a specific criterion, in keeping with the process, all were to be awarded the maximum available points for that criterion.

Review Panel members were instructed to base their evaluation and scoring solely on what the Proposers included in their Proposals and not to let outside knowledge or perceptions play a role in scoring.

The criteria review process was to review each Proposal individually specifically for what the firm proposed for each item. The information in the Proposal was located and reviewed by the Panel Members. The process was repeated for the second and third Proposals. The Panel Members then discussed the strengths and weaknesses of all Proposals regarding the criterion.

After discussions were complete the Panel Members were instructed to score the criterion.

The process was repeated for each of the criterion on the score sheet. After each score sheet was completed, the Panel member signed and dated the score sheet and submitted it to the Score Tabulator. The Tabulator checked the score sheet for accuracy insuring that the Panel member awarded the maximum points allowed for each criterion to one Proposal and an equal or lesser number of points to the second and third.

During the review process, the facilitator and staff expressed no opinions or recommendations regarding the Proposals, their commitments, offerings, or scoring.

Proposer Presentations

Review Panel Members were instructed to take notes and identify specific questions or areas needing clarification regarding the individual Proposals. The Panel Members would have the opportunity to ask questions of the Proposers during their formal presentations conducted on June 18, 2010.

The Presentations were delivered and the Review Panel asked questions of the Proposers. After the formal presentations, the Review Panel was reconvened.

At that time, the criteria on each score sheet was identified and the Review Panel members were asked if they would like to review or modify their scores awarded for a criterion based on information obtained through the Proposers' presentations and answers to questions from Review Panel members.

If a Panel member indicated a desire to review and or modify his scores on a score sheet, their original score sheet was provided and they could modify their scores. If they changed a score awarded during the review process, they made the change, initialed and dated it on the original score sheets and returned it to the Tabulator. This concluded the activities of the Review Panel.

Calculating Proposal Scores

The Independent Score Tabulator entered all of the Panel members' scores for each Proposal into a spreadsheet. The total points for each Panel member were totaled for each Proposal. After the conclusion of the evaluation, no one was aware of the total scores of the Review Panel members or of the Proposals. Sub-totals or total scores were not kept during the review process. The results were only be tallied after the completion of the Review Process by the Score Tabulator.

Pricing Scoring

Scores awarded for Pricing were solely based on formulaic calculations and were not reviewed or discussed by the Review Panel. A total of 250 points were available for Pricing.

Proposers submitted prices for the ambulance base rate, loaded mileage, oxygen, and treat and no transport fees. The gross fees to be charged for emergency ambulance transportation for the first year of the contract were calculated. The Proposer with fees resulting in the lower total charges was awarded the full amount of points available for the category (250 points). The Proposers with the higher fees were awarded points based on the percentage that the Proposers' fees exceeded the lowest priced Proposal. (for example only—not actual results—if the Proposer with the higher fees had fees that were 25% higher, the higher priced Proposer would receive 25% fewer points)

Average Scores

The Pricing scores for each Proposal were added to the total scores awarded by the Review Panel Members. Based on the methodology described in the RFP, the average of the individual scores of the Review Panel was identified for both Proposals and reported as the Proposals' Final Scores.

Role of Napa County EMS Proposal Review Committee Members

Participation on the Proposal Review Committee to recommend an Emergency Ambulance Service provider for Napa County is an important responsibility and requires a significant commitment from the Reviewers.

Each Reviewer must commit to the following:

- Maintain confidentiality of the review process and results,
- Have no communication with Proposers prior to completion of the Proposal Review proceedings,
- Objectively and fairly evaluate Proposals solely on the merits of the Proposals,
- Prior to convening the Review Committee, each Reviewer must carefully read each proposal and related exhibits, compile notes, and be prepared to discuss each component of the Proposals,
- Mandatory participation in all sessions for Proposal evaluation including:

16 June 2010

1300-1700

Reviewer Orientation
Scoring Procedure Review
Review of Pertinent Criteria for Scoring Proposals
Begin Proposal Review and Scoring

17 June 2010

0800 – 1700+

Proposal Review and Scoring

18 June 2010

0800 – 1400

Proposer Presentations

1400 – 1500

Reevaluate Scores based on Presentations

(Reviewers activities will be complete at this point)

1500 – 1530

Total scores with pricing impact

We will provide lunch for the committee on Thursday