

**GRAND JUNCTION CITY COUNCIL
ADDITIONAL WORKSHOP AGENDA
OCTOBER 31, 2005, 11:30 A.M.
ADMINISTRATION CONFERENCE ROOM
2ND FLOOR, CITY HALL
250 N. 5TH STREET**

- 11:30 am **EMS REQUESTS FOR PROPOSAL:** Discussion of the RFP outcome and direction on proposers being directed to re-evaluate their financial structure and submit new financial documents. [Attach 1](#)
- 12:50 pm **REVIEW FUTURE WORKSHOP AGENDAS** [Attach 2](#)
- 1:00 pm **ADJOURN**

**Attach 1
EMS RFPs**

CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION

CITY COUNCIL AGENDA						
Subject		Ambulance Service Provider Recommendation				
Meeting Date		October 31, 2005				
Date Prepared		October 25, 2005			File #	
Author		R. Beaty		Fire Chief		
Presenter Name		Dave Varley R. Beaty		Assistant City Manager Fire Chief		
Report results back to Council		<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	When
Citizen Presentation		<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	Name
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Workshop	<input type="checkbox"/>	Formal Agenda		<input type="checkbox"/>	Consent
		<input type="checkbox"/>			<input type="checkbox"/>	Individual Consideration

Summary: Response(s) to the City of Grand Junction’s Request for Proposals (RFP) for ambulance service (within the Grand Junction Ambulance Service Area - GJASA) were due by 4:00 P.M. on Friday, October 7, 2005. Purchasing received three responses to the RFP. Of the responses, one was a notification of no bid from LifeCare Ambulance Inc., with the remaining two from American Medical Response (AMR) and the Grand Junction Fire Department (GJFD).

On Friday, October 14, 2005, a committee convened to review the proposals and provide a recommendation to the City Council. The committee was comprised of emergency medical professionals and other persons with experience in finance, government and the private sector.

The Review Committee heard oral presentations from representatives of the Grand Junction Fire Department and American Medical Response Inc., Following the presentations and review of the written proposals, the committee discussed and scored the proposals. The Grand Junction Fire Department received 851.67 Quality points with American Medical Response receiving 788.33 Quality points.

The financial aspects of both proposals were problematic for the Committee; the committee determined that additional information and clarification of the financial information is required to determine that the proposals are consistent with the requirements of the RFP. Therefore, the Committee recommended that the pricing element of the proposals not be scored at the time and concluded that each proposer should be given an opportunity to re-evaluate that section of their response. The RFP considered that additional information might be necessary. Section 3.1.3 of the RFP states, “The City of Grand Junction may solicit additional information and/or clarification from proposers, should the City in its sole and exclusive judgment deem such information necessary.”

Staff concurs with the Committee's recommendation and asks that Council direct the City Manager to request that both proposers be directed to clarify and provide additional information regarding required financial forms for consideration and scoring.

Budget: Undetermined

Action Requested/Recommendation: Direct the City Manager to instruct both proposers to re-evaluate their financial structure and submit new financial documents for consideration.

Background Information:

In 2003, Mesa County conducted a comprehensive study of the fire and EMS services and service delivery system within Mesa County. Based on the results of that study, the County set a course to make substantive changes to the EMS system. Those changes included the County contracting for an EMS physician, hiring an EMS supervisor and establishing comprehensive oversight of the EMS system pursuant to a County-wide resolution. That resolution established ambulance service areas in and for all of Mesa County. The resolution also provided Grand Junction with the right to establish a provider selection process.

In the Spring of 2005, the City of Grand Junction contracted with Emergency Services Consulting Incorporated (ESCi) to write a request for proposals (RFP) for ambulance service for the City of Grand Junction and that area of the County within the Grand Junction Ambulance Service Area. The City Council met in a work session on May 15, 2005, to provide policy direction regarding the ambulance RFP. At that meeting, the Council recommended that the RFP allow the Grand Junction Fire Department to compete for ambulance service. On August 5, 2005, the City advertised the ambulance RFP.

The process. The proposals were to be scored against a possible 1000 total points; 800 of those points were to be provided for the quality factors—clinical quality, first responder service integration, accounts receivable management, human resources management, fleet and equipment and so on. In addition, 100 points were allowed for the proposer's credentials and 100 points were to be made available for the scoring of the price proposal. In each of the scoring processes, the superior proposal was to be awarded the maximum number of points and the other proposer(s) was to be provided with fewer points based on the relative responsiveness of the proposal(s).

On August 26, 2005, four potential proposers attended a mandatory pre-proposal conference in Grand Junction. Of those, only American Medical Response and the City of Grand Junction Fire Department submitted proposals.

On October 14, the City conducted an evaluation of the proposals, using a committee of six evaluators. The team included local business professionals, an emergency physician, an outside expert on Fire Department emergency services, an outside expert on private ambulance services, and the Assistant City Manager. The Committee viewed a 30-minute presentation by each proposer, followed by 30 minutes of questions and answers. Following the presentations, the committee scored the qualitative and

credentialing factors of the respective proposals. The table below specifies the details of the proposal scoring.

Scoring Criterion	Total	AMR	GJFD
Credentials (100 points total)	100	88.00	96.50
Clinical Performance (165 points total)	165	138.33	163.67
Community Service and Education (75 points total)	75	61.50	66.50
Control Center Operations (100 points total)	100	94.00	91.83
Human Resources (135 points total)	135	100.00	134.17
First Responder Program Support (175 points total)	175	167.17	166.00
Fleet and Equipment (100 points total)	100	89.33	97.00
Accounts Receivable Management (50 points total)	50	50.00	36.33
TOTAL	900	788.33	852.00
Percent of Total Points		87.6%	94.7%

As a result of the qualitative evaluation, members of the committee noted that both proposers can do the job and can effectively serve the citizens of Grand Junction; however, as noted above, each proposal had definite financial drawbacks. Because of the problems with the financial aspects of the proposals, that element was not scored.

Issues related to AMR's proposal. AMR offered a number of appropriate and valuable benefits to the system. For example, AMR proposed a 60 percent-paramedic staffing plan; proposed to implement a plan to provide 40 automatic defibrillators during the course of the contract (about \$6,000 per year); offered to make use of the GJRCC Dispatch Center for both emergency and non-emergency dispatching; and offered backboards and EMS supplies to the Grand Junction ASA. The evaluation team judged AMR superior in its Control Center Operations category (which includes system status management) as well as First Responder Program Support and Accounts Receivable Management.

The Evaluation Committee found fault with the AMR financial structure. Specifically, the committee could not reconcile the financial documentation in the proposal with the information provided in the appendix. AMR recognized the flaws prior to its presentation and offered to provide additional financial information during its presentation. The Committee could not accept oral changes to the proposal and still be within the requirements of the RFP. The fundamental problem with AMR's proposed price is that it is in excess of the maximum allowed by the County resolution. In addition, while AMR provided a management structure with regional personnel specified, it was unclear how AMR would fulfill its requirement to provide a local manager.

Issues related to the GJFD proposal. The Grand Junction Fire Department offered in its proposal an extension of its current emergency services program. As part of that proposal, GJFD would purchase three additional ambulances to supplement its

current fleet and hire 21 additional firefighters. Its deployment plan would place the ambulances at three current fire stations within the City and would use the current management infrastructure to manage the system. The Evaluation Committee judged the GJFD proposal to be superior in the categories related to Credentials, Clinical Performance, Community Services, Human Resources and Fleet and Equipment.

The Evaluation Committee was uncomfortable with the GJFD pricing proposal because in order for it to be viable a general fund expenditure of nearly \$1 million the first year and between \$400 and \$600 thousand for each year thereafter would be required. The Evaluation Committee determined that whether or not to subsidize the operation as detailed in the proposal is a policy matter that is outside of the purview of the Committee and therefore declined to score the pricing aspect of the Fire Department proposal. Furthermore, the Committee recognized that the GJFD price proposal was premised on fees that are less than allowed by the County resolution. The fact that the Fire Department presumed the need for a subsidy, while at the same time not maximizing revenue, caused the Committee to be concerned about GJFD's ability to manage the financial considerations of the process. Although GJFD's price was lower and would ordinarily be awarded the maximum number of points in that category, pricing could not be effectively scored without conceding the subsidy. In addition, GJFD did not have a fully developed plan to provide non-emergency services. Instead, it offered to seek a contract with a non-emergency provider at some unspecified point in the future.

Next Steps

The City Manager, City Attorney, Fire Chief and Assistant City Manager met and discussed the status of the RFPs and based on that discussion recommend the following:

1. That the Assistant City Manager notify Grand Junction Fire Department (GJFD) and American Medical Response (AMR) and request clarification and additional information regarding the financial documents for the respective proposals.
 - a. The Fire Department must submit a proposal that complies with TABOR and recognizes an enterprise fund approach.
 - b. AMR must submit financial documents which comply with the Mesa County resolution and all other applicable rules/regulations for pricing.
2. If the Fire Department submits a proposal that is consistent with 1a above, then it will be judged the apparent winning bidder as it was rated highest by the Committee in quality points; however, if the Department does not meet TABOR requirements and is found not to be viable, the City Manager will consider AMR's proposal.
3. The proposers will be afforded 30 days to provide financial documents for the City Manager's review and consideration.
4. The City Manager will have 30 days to review the documents and make a decision on a recommended award. If the City Manager views the GJFD

proposal will have significant TABOR consequences, he shall notify the GJFD that its proposal is no longer under consideration. If that occurs then the City Manager may begin negotiations with AMR.

5. The City will notify the County Emergency Manager that selection of an Ambulance Provider for the Grand Junction Ambulance Service Area has been delayed and that the process will be concluded on or before February 15, 2006.

**Attach 2
Future Workshop Agendas**

FUTURE CITY COUNCIL WORKSHOP AGENDAS

(26 October 2005)

NOVEMBER

↳ **NOVEMBER 5, → SATURDAY ← 9:00AM – 4:00PM**

at City Hall Auditorium

8:30 CONTINENTAL BREAKFAST

9:00 BUDGET REVIEW (Lunch will be served)

4:00 ADJOURN



↳ **NOVEMBER 14, MONDAY 11:30 AM (Meet at the Police Department, Sixth & Ute)**

11:30 TOUR OF POLICE DEPARTMENT CRIME LAB



↳ **NOVEMBER 14, MONDAY 7:00PM**

7:00 COUNCIL REPORTS, REVIEW WEDNESDAY AGENDA AND FUTURE WORKSHOP AGENDAS

7:25 CITY MANAGER'S REPORT

7:30 APPOINTMENTS TO BOARDS & COMMISSIONS

7:40 YOUTH COUNCIL PRESENTATION RE: MINORS IN POSSESSION

8:00 MESA LAND TRUST AND PURCHASE OF DEVELOPMENT RIGHTS UPDATE

8:25 STRATEGIC PLAN UPDATE (INCLUDING THE WEEDS REPORT)

DECEMBER

↳ **DECEMBER 5, MONDAY 11:30 AM IN ADMINISTRATION CONFERENCE ROOM**

11:30 OPEN

↳ **DECEMBER 5, MONDAY 7:00PM**

7:00 COUNCIL REPORTS, REVIEW WEDNESDAY AGENDA AND FUTURE WORKSHOP AGENDAS

7:25 CITY MANAGER'S REPORT

↳ **DECEMBER 19, MONDAY 11:30 AM at STATION #5**

11:30 FIRE DEPARTMENT UPDATE/PRESENTATION



↳ **DECEMBER 19, MONDAY 7:00PM**

- 7:00 COUNCIL REPORTS, REVIEW WEDNESDAY AGENDA AND FUTURE WORKSHOP AGENDAS
- 7:25 CITY MANAGER'S REPORT
- 7:30 APPOINTMENTS TO BOARDS & COMMISSIONS

JANUARY 2006



↪ **JANUARY 2, MONDAY**

Canceled for New Year's Holiday

↪ **JANUARY 16, MONDAY 11:30 AM**

11:30 OPEN

↪ **JANUARY 16, MONDAY 7:00PM**

7:00 COUNCIL REPORTS, REVIEW WEDNESDAY AGENDA AND FUTURE WORKSHOP AGENDAS

7:25 CITY MANAGER'S REPORT

7:30 APPOINTMENTS TO BOARDS & COMMISSIONS

↪ **JANUARY 30, MONDAY 11:30 AM**

11:30 OPEN

↪ **JANUARY 30, MONDAY 7:00PM**

7:00 COUNCIL REPORTS, REVIEW WEDNESDAY AGENDA AND FUTURE WORKSHOP AGENDAS

7:25 CITY MANAGER'S REPORT

7:30 OPEN

↪ **BIN LIST** ↪

1. Joint City/County RTC Master Plan Meeting (waiting for a date)
2. Billboard Ordinance: (County moratorium adopted on 10 October 2005, drafting an ordinance is in progress)
3. Jarvis Property Resource Panel (07 November)

2005/6 Department Presentations to City Council

December Fire Department: December 19

January TRCC and the Avalon Theater