



March 15, 2019

MVEMSA Response Regarding: Potential Exceptions and Change Requests- RFP# MVEMS-2018-12*

MVEMSA is in receipt of a request for Potential Exceptions & Change Requests for the RFP # MVEMS-2018-12 submitted in an envelope following the Proposers Conference Friday, March 8.

Although the request for exceptions and changes came after the close of the meeting, in an effort to provide clarity to all potential proposers, MVEMSA is providing the following response:

1) Request #1 – Rural Area Compliance (Page 26-6.3 A (3))

“In the written questions period, XXXXXXXX stated its concern about rural area compliance requirements in the RFP. The County's reply to our question suggested that the issue could be addressed in negotiations, but without knowing what accommodation might be allowed in negotiations by either the County or the State, we are reluctant to agree to the current requirement without adding numerous unit hours to our proposal.”

XXXXXXX Suggested Solution – “We therefore intend to bid with an exception for the requirement as written. Alternative language will be provided that ensures our intention to provide response time equity and not abandon rural areas, and we are willing to meet with stakeholders to discuss response times and solicit input for potential remedies. Specific suggested language change is to separately measure and report suburban and rural compliance but roll the two zones together for penalties and breach measurement.”

MVEMSA Response - MVEMSA will amend language as follows, please refer to the amendment on the website:

Response time compliance for suburban and rural responses, within each of the five (5) response zones, shall be calculated in a rolled-up manner for the purposes of calculating monthly penalties and/or for the purposes of breach of contract. Contractor shall be required to report the performance for suburban and rural separately for the purpose of data collection and system improvement.

2) Request #2 - CPI Increases (Page 41, Section 6.11, H)

“XXXXXXXXXX stated its concern about the use of straight CPI increases - which are cut by 80% or more - because of local collection rate dynamics where we collect less than 20% of a billed charge. No company that has a high labor component can keep pace with annual cash increases of less than 1 %, when labor, real market costs, and payments mandated in the RFP will increase at a rate equal to or greater than CPI. In a contract that could last more than five years, this degradation creates and allows financial instability.”

XXXXXXXXXX Suggested Solution - “In lieu of proposing artificially higher rates at the start of the contract to make up for future losses, XXXXXXXXXXXX requests MVEMSA amends section 6.11 H to require annual increases tied to a multiple of CPI (for example 2.0 x CPI) or by correcting CPI to that year's collection rates.”

MVEMSA Response - MVEMSA does not agree with the suggested change. The RFP provides adequate language for the Proposer to provide justification for a rate increase beyond the Bay Area CPI. Section 6.11 H, 1 and 2 of the RFP and our response to Proposer questions and answers posted on MVEMSA website provide a clear response with a mechanism to account for the Contractor's collections rate when requesting a rate increase.

Sincerely,



Executive Director

*Language that would identify the specific potential bidder has been removed.