

Operational Analysis of EMS and Fire Deployment Response Consultant Services

July 24, 2012

RFP Development and Timeframe

1. EMS/Fire Transport Committee held meetings to establish scope of work for RFP document
2. Evaluation Committee formed to evaluate RFP submittals
3. RFP was released on February 27, 2012
4. RFP submittal date was April 12, 2012
5. Evaluation of written submittals was held on May 4, 2012

Evaluation of Written Proposals

1. At the April 10, 2012 EMS/ Fire Transport Committee meeting the standard County RFP evaluation process was demonstrated to the Evaluation Committee and refreshed at the date (May 4) of evaluation of the four (4) written proposals received.
2. Proposals are evaluated utilizing a consensus scoring process. A consensus scoring process greatly reduces the opportunity to skew an evaluation process
3. Oral discussion pertaining to each criterion for each firm is initiated. All evaluators have an opportunity to provide input. Oral discussion is then closed

Evaluation of Written Proposals Continued

1. A consensus percentage range is then established for each criterion.
2. Each evaluator then selects an individual percentage within the consensus range selected
3. The process continues until all firms and criteria are complete.
4. Cost is pre-populated to the scoring sheets by the Purchasing Department (quantitative). The firm with lowest cost receives total points available. Other firms receive mathematical point relationship from the lowest cost proposal.
5. Formula – $\text{Lowest cost} / \text{Cost Evaluated} \times \text{Maximum points available}$

Committee Decision for Oral Presentation

1. After lengthy discussion, the Evaluation Committee (6 out of 7 members) decided to short list the two highest scoring firms and proceed with oral presentation.
2. Oral presentation is always an option in any RFP evaluation process. It is generally utilized as a means to differentiate between two or more close scores after completion of written submittal evaluations.
3. Scoring for oral presentations is separate and distinct from written submittal evaluations. The highest score from the oral presentation receives recommendation.
4. The oral presentations are scripted and the evaluation criteria is drafted to reflect the presentations which are strictly qualitative.

Oral Presentation Process

1. EMS/Fire Committee drafted and vetted the scripts and evaluation criteria for oral presentations.
2. Cost is not evaluated in an oral presentation process and was explained as such to the Evaluation Committee. This has been inaccurately misrepresented. Cost has already been evaluated (written submittals) by the Purchasing Department and is basically utilized to establish a benchmark for negotiations.
3. In any RFP process, cost bears a low overall scoring weight (typically 10 to 25 percent of total points); the objective of a competitive RFP process is to seek quality and qualifications.

Oral Presentation Process Continued

1. Oral presentations from each firm are completed then scored by the Evaluation Committee utilizing the same consensus scoring process as written submittals.
2. Fitch and Associates was evaluated as the number one ranked firm and is recommended by the Evaluation/EMS Fire Transport Committee for BCC consideration at the July 24th meeting.