



ADDENDUM NO. 1

Date: May 28, 2026

From: City of Grand Junction Purchasing Division

To: All Proposers

RE: Emergency Medical Services (EMS) Billing, Claims Processing, and Revenue Cycle Management for the City of Grand Junction's Fire Department, RFP-5926-26-KF

Proposers responding to the above-referenced solicitation are hereby advised that certain requirements have been **clarified, modified, or supplemented** as of the date of this Addendum, as outlined below.

Please take note of the following:

1. Legacy / Pre-Transition Accounts Receivable

1.a. Question: Will the awarded vendor assume responsibility for pre-transition A/R balances, or will the incumbent continue servicing legacy accounts?

1.a. Answer: Refer to Section 4.3.2.12. of the Solicitation.

1.b. Question: Is the City planning a defined A/R cutoff date and transition period?

1.b. Answer: Refer to Section 4.3.2.12. of the Solicitation.

2. Accounts Receivable & Performance Metrics

2.a. Question: Can the City provide current A/R aging information by aging bucket?

2.a. Answer: Current A/R aging information is not included as part of this Addendum. Interested parties may submit a request through the City's Colorado Open Records Act (CORA) process through the City's [Open Records Request](#) portal.

2.b. Question: Can the City share historical EMS RCM performance metrics for the past 24 months, including:

- Net Collection rate
- Days in A/R
- Denial Rates

- Clean claim rates
- Average days to bill

2.b. Answer: The City is not providing additional historical EMS revenue cycle management performance metrics as part of this Addendum. Additional operational and performance-related information may be coordinated with the awarded Contractor during transition and implementation activities.

3. Denials and Payer Mix

3.a. Question: Can the City provide the current payer mix by percentage?

3.a. Answer: The City's current approximate payer mix is as follows:

- Medicare: 17.86%
- Medicare HMO: 28.79%
- Medicaid: 4.05%
- Medicaid HMO: 19.38%
- Commercial Insurance: 19.11%
- Private Pay: 9.91%
- Other: 0.91%

3.b. Question: What are the primary denial categories currently being experienced?

3.b. Answer: The City currently experiences multiple denial categories. The top five denial categories currently include:

- CO109
- COA1
- CO18/OA18
- CO23/OA23
- PI22

4. Billing Platform / Technology Environment

4.a. Question: What billing platform is currently being utilized by the incumbent provider?

4.a. Answer: The underlying billing platform utilized by the incumbent Contractor is a proprietary billing platform. The City accesses reporting and operational information through the incumbent Contractor's portal environment.

4.b. Question: Is the City expecting the awarded vendor to provide the billing platform environment as part of the solution?

4.b. Answer: Yes. Refer to Sections 4.3.2.7, 4.3.2.8, 4.3.2.9, 4.5.3, and 4.5.7 of the Solicitation.

5. Coding and Billing Scope

Question: Can the City clarify the expected scope of coding-related responsibilities for the awarded vendor, including any expectations related to coding validation, mileage verification, documentation review, or QA processes?

Answer: Refer to Sections 4.3.2.1, 4.3.2.2, and 4.3.2.6. of the Solicitation.

6. GEMT Reimbursements

6.a. Question: How are GEMT reimbursements treated within the City's reporting and financial calculations?

6.a. Answer: Refer to Section 4.2 – Background Information. The City's annual collection information currently includes GEMT reimbursement amounts.

6.b. Question: Are GEMT reimbursements included in "Net Collections" for reporting and/or compensation purposes?

6.b. Answer: For purposes of this Solicitation, Proposers should clearly identify and describe any assumptions related to GEMT reimbursements within their proposed pricing methodology and compensation structure

7. Data Migration

Question: What historical billing and claims data does the City anticipate migrating to the awarded vendor?

Answer: Refer to Section 4.3.2.12 – Transition and Implementation. The City anticipates migration of historical and active accounts receivable data necessary to support continuity of billing operations, reporting, audit support, and revenue cycle management activities. Final migration scope and retention requirements will be coordinated during implementation planning.

8. Customer Service Volume

Question: Approximately how many patient billing inquiry calls or account-related customer service interactions are received monthly?

Answer: The City does not maintain a formal monthly tracking metric for patient billing inquiry calls or account-related customer service interactions. Proposers should anticipate a substantial volume of patient account inquiries and shall review the customer service requirements identified in the Solicitation and

demonstrate the ability to effectively manage and respond to patient billing inquiries.

9. Future Growth

Question: Are there any anticipated operational, transport volume, or program changes expected over the next 12–24 months that may materially impact EMS billing volume or workflows?

Answer: The City continually evaluates operational needs, service demands, deployment models, and system improvements that may affect EMS operations and related billing workflows. Proposers should anticipate potential fluctuations in transport volumes and operational processes during the Contract term and should demonstrate the ability to effectively adapt to operational or programmatic changes that may materially impact EMS billing services.

10. **Question:** Section 1.0. Administrative Information & Conditions for Submittal, Page 4. Please clarify the specific Americans with Disabilities Act compliance mandate that is expected for the submitted PDF proposal or the services in scope.

Answer: The City expects both submitted Proposal materials and Deliverables provided under the Contract to comply with accessibility requirements, including Colorado HB21-1110, as applicable. Accessibility requirements may apply to electronic documents, PDFs, digital communications, customer-facing portals, websites, dashboards, software interfaces, and other electronic materials or systems associated with the Proposal or Services. Applicable accessibility features may include compatibility with assistive technologies, accessible navigation and readability functions, and user personalization or accessibility display options, where appropriate, to support equitable public access. Proposers are responsible for independently reviewing Colorado accessibility laws, Office of Information Technology (OIT) guidance, and associated accessibility standards to ensure compliance with all requirements.

11. **Question:** Section 4.2. Background Information, Page 23. Please clarify the average number of inter-facility transfers that require manual prior authorization verification as compared to emergency scene responses.

Answer: Refer to Section 4.2 of the Solicitation regarding the 2025 inter-facility transfer volume. The City does not currently maintain a tracking metric identifying the number of inter-facility transfers requiring manual prior authorization verification.

12. **Question:** Section 4.2. Background Information, Page 23. Please clarify how many patients, out of the total annual transports, are currently enrolled in active monthly payment plans.

Answer: The City does not currently maintain a formal tracking metric identifying the number of patients enrolled in active monthly payment plans.

- 13. Question:** Section 4.3. Scope of Services and Specifications, Page 24. Please clarify how many of the 18,006 EMS incidents reported in 2025 resulted in a “Refusal of Care” for which a notice of privacy practices was not provided on scene.

Answer: The City does not currently maintain a formal tracking metric identifying the number of EMS incidents resulting in a refusal of care where a notice of privacy practices was not provided on scene.

- 14. Question:** Section 4.3. Scope of Services and Specifications, Page 26. Please clarify whether the City requires bi-directional synchronization to write billing status or narrative flags back into ImageTrend, or if the requirement is limited to data pulls.

Answer: The City does not currently require bi-directional synchronization, native status updates, or narrative flag write-back functionality into ImageTrend. The City is seeking Proposers to describe and demonstrate the Proposer’s integration capabilities, workflows, and available technology solutions in accordance with the Solicitation requirements.

- 15. Question:** Section 4.3. Scope of Services and Specifications, Page 26. What was the total volume of credit balances or overpayments that required processing and refunding in the last fiscal year?

Answer: The City does not currently maintain a formal tracking metric identifying the annual volume of credit balances or overpayments requiring refund processing. Proposers are encouraged to describe available reporting capabilities, refund management workflows, and operational tools that support transparency and account reconciliation functions.

- 16. Question:** Section 4.3. Scope of Services and Specifications, Page 26. Please clarify the denial rate by payer category for the last 12 months to assist in estimating the efforts of the full-time equivalent required for appeals processing.

Answer: The City does not currently maintain denial reporting categorized by payer type in a format readily available for this Solicitation. Each Proposer should describe its denial management, appeals processing, reporting capabilities, and staffing approach as part of its proposed solution.

- 17. Question:** Section 4.3. Scope of Services and Specifications, Page 28. Please clarify whether offshore personnel may access protected health information through secure VPN connectivity if all data storage, hosting, and processing infrastructure remains within the United States.

Answer: No. Offshore personnel (personnel located outside the United States) shall not have access to protected health information.

- 18. Question:** Section 4.3. Scope of Services and Specifications, Page 33. Please clarify whether the City prefers RESTful API ingestion over encrypted SFTP batch transfers for the primary daily incident data transfer process.

Answer: The City has no preference between RESTful API ingestion and encrypted SFTP batch transfer methods. If SFTP is proposed, the transfer shall be an outbound push from the City. The City shall not host an SFTP server within its infrastructure.

- 19. Question:** Section 4.3. Scope of Services and Specifications, Page 33. Please clarify whether the City currently possesses the “Open Data Exchange” API licenses for ImageTrend Elite required for external data ingestion.

Answer: The City does not currently possess an Open Data Exchange (ODE) API license for ImageTrend Elite. Billing data is currently exchanged utilizing ImageTrend's Xchange service, which is included as part of the City's existing ImageTrend service agreement. If the ODE API license is required to support a proposed integration approach, it would be evaluated and potentially acquired as part of the implementation process.

- 20. Question:** Section 4.3. Scope of Services and Specifications, Page 34. Please clarify the total dollar value and claim count associated with the active Accounts Receivable balance currently managed by the incumbent vendor.

Answer: The City does not currently maintain a finalized claim count associated with the active Accounts Receivable balance in a form that is readily available for this Solicitation. The City's current year-to-date gross charges are approximately \$16.8 million.

- 21. Question:** Please describe the interfacility transports, what level of care and what destination facilities are they being transported to?

Answer: The City provides Basic Life Support (BLS), Advanced Life Support (ALS), and Critical Care inter-facility transports. Destination facilities may include hospitals, skilled nursing facilities, long-term care facilities, rehabilitation facilities, and patient residences, depending upon patient care needs and transport requirements.

- 22. Question:** What is the total annual dollars collected not including the GEMT reimbursements?

Answer: The City's annual collections, excluding GEMT reimbursements, are approximately \$7 million. This amount is approximate and may vary based on reconciliation timing, payer activity, and reporting periods.

- 23. Question:** Who is responsible for billing for the Stand by events? The vendor or the City?

Answer: The City bills for all EMS standby events. If EMS transport services or other billable patient care services are provided during a standby event, the awarded Contractor shall be responsible for processing and billing applicable patient accounts in accordance with the Contract Documents and applicable billing requirements.

- 24. Question:** What is the total GEMT monies collected by year for the last 2 years?

Answer: The City's GEMT reimbursements for the past two years have averaged approximately \$1.1 million annually. Actual reimbursement amounts may vary based on program participation, cost reporting, and state reimbursement methodologies.

- 25. Question:** Is the fee structure from the current vendor a percentage of net collections, flat fee per transport, a combination of both or other? Provide the amount with the fee structure currently charged to the City.

Answer: The City's current compensation structure is based upon a percentage of collections. Information regarding the current Contract and compensation structure may be requested by submitting a request through the City's Colorado Open Records Act (CORA) process through the City's [Open Records Request](#) portal.

- 26. Question:** Are payments currently received directly at the City, at the current vendor, at a bank lockbox or other?

Answer: Refer to Section 2.5 of the Solicitation.

- 27. Question:** To what extent will the location of the bidder's proposed location or headquarters have a bearing on any award?

Answer: Refer to Section 4.3.2.5, and Section 6.3 of the Solicitation regarding customer service expectations, technical capabilities, operational requirements, and evaluation criteria. The City will evaluate Proposals based on the criteria identified in the Solicitation and is not prescribing a required headquarters or office location.

- 28. Question:** What were your annual total adjustments for last year or for the last 12 months?

Answer: The City does not currently maintain total annual adjustment reporting in a format readily available for this Solicitation.

29. **Question:** What were your annual contractual allowance write offs for last year or for the last 12 months?

Answer: The City's annual contractual allowance write-offs for the past 12 months are estimated to be approximately \$11.3 million. This amount is approximate and has not been independently audited or reconciled for purposes of this Solicitation.

30. **Question:** What is your average per-trip charge?

Answer: The City is not providing additional financial analysis or calculated billing metrics beyond the information contained in Section 4.2 of the Solicitation.

31. **Question:** When were the last changes to your transport rates, and are you considering raising any of the rates currently charged?

Answer: The City periodically evaluates and updates EMS transport rates in accordance with operational, financial, regulatory, and market considerations, which may include healthcare-related Consumer Price Index (CPI) adjustments and other applicable factors. The City reserves the right to modify transport rates during the Contract term as determined appropriate.

32. **Question:** What percentage of your patients are residents versus non-residents, and do you charge the two groups differently?

Answer: The City does not currently maintain a formal tracking metric identifying resident versus non-resident patient percentages. EMS transport rates are not differentiated based upon patient residency status.

33. **Question:** Do you operate any shared services agreements with any other municipal or county governments in the region and, if so, with whom?

Answer: No.

34. **Question:** What were your transports per year for advanced life support for last year or for the last 12 months?

Answer: The City does not currently maintain ALS transport volumes in a separate reporting format readily available for this Solicitation.

35. **Question:** What were your transports per year for advanced life support emergency level 1 for last year or for the last 12 months?

Answer: The City's Advanced Life Support Emergency Level 1 (ALS1) transports average approximately 600 transports per month.

- 36. Question:** What were your transports per year for advanced life support emergency level 2 for last year or for the last 12 months?

Answer: The City's Advanced Life Support Emergency Level 2 (ALS2) transports average approximately 15–20 transports per month.

- 37. Question:** What were your transports per year for basic life support for last year or for the last 12 months?

Answer: The City's non-emergency Basic Life Support (BLS) transports average approximately 250 transports per month.

- 38. Question:** What were your transports per year for basic life support emergency for last year or for the last 12 months?

Answer: The City's Basic Life Support Emergency (BLS-E) transports average approximately 500 transports per month.

- 39. Question:** What were your transports per year for specialty care transport for last year or for the last 12 months?

Answer: The City's Specialty Care Transport volume averages approximately five (5) transports per month.

- 40. Question:** What were your transports per year for treatment without transport for last year or for the last 12 months?

Answer: The City does not currently maintain treatment without transport volumes in a separate reporting format readily available for this Solicitation.

- 41. Question:** What is your payer mix expressed as percentages of 100% billed?

Answer: Refer to Answer 3.a.

- 42. Question:** What is your payer remit mix expressed as percentages of 100% of what you typically receive?

Answer: The City does not currently maintain payer remittance mix reporting in a format readily available for this Solicitation.

- 43. Question:** What is your average revenue per call?

Answer: The City does not currently maintain average revenue per call reporting in a format readily available for this Solicitation.

44. Question: Do you have a lockbox provider and, if so, which provider?

Answer: Refer to Answer 26.

45. Question: If you have a lockbox provider, will that provider remain in place as a result of this procurement?

Answer: Refer to Answer 26.

46. Question: Do you have a collection agency provider and, if so, which provider?

Answer: Refer to Section 4.2 of the Solicitation.

47. Question: Why has this bid been re-released at this time?

Answer: The City is conducting the Solicitation in accordance with applicable procurement policies and procedures.

48. Question: When is the anticipated go-live date?

Answer: Refer to Section 4.3.2.12. of the Solicitation.

49. Question: Can you please provide greater explanation of your expectations related to any required subcontracting to minority-owned, women-owned, or other types or categories of small or disadvantaged businesses? For example, what is required with the proposal, and what is required to comply during the term of the contract?

Answer: The City is not establishing mandatory subcontracting participation goals or preferences related to minority-owned, women-owned, disadvantaged, or small business enterprises as part of this Solicitation. Proposers shall comply with all applicable federal, state, and local laws and requirements.

50. Question: Are bidders permitted to deviate in any way from any manner of quoting fees you may be expecting? For example, if there is a pricing page in the RFP, can bidders submit an alternate fee structure? If there is no pricing page in the RFP, do you have any preference for how bidders should quote fees or can bidders create their own pricing categories?

Answer: Refer to Sections 4.5.7. and 5.7 of the Solicitation.

51. Question: Please describe your level of satisfaction with your current or recent vendor(s) for the same purchasing activity, if applicable.

Answer: The City is conducting this Solicitation in accordance with applicable procurement policies and procedures and is seeking competitive proposals responsive to the requirements identified in the Solicitation.

This addendum amends the original solicitation for the referenced project as outlined above. All other terms and conditions of the solicitation remain unchanged.

Proposers must acknowledge receipt of this addendum by completing the acknowledgment section on the **Solicitation Response Form** (Section 7.0).

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Respectfully,



Kathleen Franklin
Senior Buyer/Purchasing Agent
City of Grand Junction