



State of Oklahoma
Oklahoma State Dept. of Health

Amendment of Solicitation

Date of Issuance: May 6, 2015

Solicitation No. 3400001352

Requisition No. _____

Amendment No. 1

Hour and date specified for receipt of offers is changed: No Yes, to: _____ CST

Pursuant to OAC 580:16-7-30(d), this document shall serve as official notice of amendment to the Solicitation identified above. Such notice is being provided to all suppliers to which the original solicitation was sent.

Suppliers submitting bids or quotations shall acknowledge receipt of this solicitation amendment prior to the hour and date specified in the solicitation as follows:

- (1) Sign and return a copy of this amendment with the solicitation response being submitted; or,
- (2) If the supplier has already submitted a response, this acknowledgement must be signed and returned prior to the solicitation deadline. All amendment acknowledgements submitted separately shall have the solicitation number and bid opening date printed clearly on the front of the envelope.

ISSUED BY and RETURN TO:

U.S. Postal Delivery:

Oklahoma State Dept. of Health
Purchasing
1000 NE 10th street
Oklahoma City, OK 73117 -
or

Susan Wiest, CPO
Contracting Officer

(405) - 271 - 4043
Phone Number

Personal or Common Carrier Delivery:

Oklahoma State Dept. of Health
Purchasing
1000 NE 10th street
Oklahoma City, OK 73117 -

susanw@health.ok.gov
E-Mail Address

Description of Amendment:

a. This is to incorporate the following:

Question and Answers attached.

b. All other terms and conditions remain unchanged.

Supplier Company Name (**PRINT**) _____

Date _____

Authorized Representative Name (**PRINT**) _____ Title _____

Authorized Representative Signature _____

Question 1	Received by D. Adkerson 5/4/2015	via: email	
In ref. to the OERSSIRF grant are we responsible for filling out any portion of the form titled "Solicitation Request"?			
Response for question 1			
No			
Question 2	Received by D. Adkerson 4/30/2015	via: email	
<p>As we discussed today, I have a client that is an association of regional city and county governments. Many of them operate aspects of the EMS system, including dispatch centers, EMRAs, CEMRAs and Ambulance services. They are interested in seeking OERSSIRF funds for a comprehensive assessment of their EMS system and identifying opportunities for improvement. This seems to me to be very true to the legislative goals of the program. When we were drafting the rule, the participants wanted to write the qualifying criteria broadly and inclusively. Since then, it seems to me some provider's attitudes have changed, and many would prefer a narrower definition.</p> <p>Consequently, I am concerned some reviewers may not agree the Association fits the definition of a "qualified entity," so I am seeking a ruling from the Department.</p> <p>The rule says: " 'Qualified entity' means any person or organization licensed, certified or approved by the Department as part of the EMS system, such as EMS personnel, certified emergency response agencies, licensed ambulance services, approved training institutions, approved emergency medical dispatch agencies, approved medical directors or any combination thereof, or their associations or sponsoring organizations, such as EMS districts, cities or counties that operate certified emergency response agencies or licensed ambulance services, or education systems operating EMS training institutions.</p> <p>My question is: "Does the client described above qualify as a qualified entity under the OERSSIRF rule?"</p>			
Response for question 2			
<p>There are several specific qualified entities named in this section of the regulation, from individual personnel and medical directors, to licensed, certified, and approved agencies and institutions. The question moves beyond the specifics to the associations or sponsoring organizations. Examples of how the associations or sponsoring organizations include: (A) EMS Districts are required to either contract for or own emergency medical services, cities or counties may own or contract for these services or education systems that are approved or within the organizational structure of an approved training program. In this case of the question, this association of governmental entities, which may legally operate these services, is seeking approval to be a qualified entity because it is an association of sponsoring organizations. These associations of governmental organizations themselves do not sponsor or own these EMS related agencies. It is the governmental entities themselves that own, contract, or sponsor the ems related services. Therefore, no, the client in this description does not qualify as a qualified entity under the OERSSIRF rule?</p>			
Question 3	Received by D. Adkerson 5/4/2015	via: email	
<p>I think there's an arithmetic problem in the matching calculation. This year's application and the new guidebook both state "Total encumbered matching funds divided by total requested OERSSIRF funds = % of the project funding that depends on matching funds." I think you probably meant it to read "Total encumbered matching funds divided by total project cost = % of the project that depends on matching funds". Otherwise, we're dividing the encumbered amount by the amount we're asking for, not the total project cost as in the past. I think that results in the inverse ratio of the encumbered amount to the requested amount, but someone better than me with 8th grade math will need to confirm it. Example: If I'm asking for \$120 and I have \$80 cash encumbered for the project, I'd have a total project cost of \$200, a requested amount of \$120 and an encumbered cash match of \$80. If I divide my encumbered cash match by the requested amount, I'm dividing \$80 by \$120, which equals .66, or 66%.</p> <p>It IS consistent with the statute, which says: "If the proposal proposes the use of matching funds, points shall be</p>			

awarded consistent with the following formula:

- (i) 90% of the requested funds: 90 points
- (ii) 80% of the requested funds: 80 points", etc.

It's not "the percentage of the project that depends on matching funds", however. If I divide my \$80 encumbered cash by the \$200 total project cost, I get .4, or 40% of the total project cost. That's what you've had us do since the first distribution, and what I suspect you wanted us to do this time as well.

I'm happy to do it either way, but this is significant departure from the way you had us do it in the past, and therefore probably ought to be highlighted if it's what you want.

Response to question 3

The application should read the: The encumbered matching funds percentage shall be calculated as follows: % matching dollars = total matching dollars divided by total project amount. Applicant shall identify calculation methodology. Entities providing matching funds shall provide documentation that verifies a commitment to provide matching funds and the amount to be provided. There are two types of matching funds: 1) "In Hand", which are funds set aside to accomplish the goals and benchmarks of the project; or 2) "In-Kind contributions" dedicated to the completion of the proposal. Each type of contribution must be identified through attestations, estimates, or other documents. Attach all documents associated with matching funds to the proposal.

Question 4	Received by D. Adkerson 5/4/2015	via: email	
-------------------	-------------------------------------	------------	--

Section 3 population density and multiple jurisdictions. Jurisdiction points are awarded for proposals with one town, two towns, three towns and then county wide. What if your proposal contains more than three towns but is not county wide? Is it automatically placed into the county wide category because it is more than three towns?

Response to question 4

The regulations for the contract and scoring do not allow for "rounding" or inclusions of that cannot be supported through documentation. If multiple towns are included, but it does not fully comprise the entire county, then the value of "three towns" will be awarded as that is the most correct answer, as the entire county is not included in the proposal.

Question 5	Received by D. Adkerson 4/29/2015	via: open meeting	
-------------------	--------------------------------------	-------------------	--

Can a MERC apply for an OERSSIRF Grant?

See response to question 2.

Question 6	Received by D. Adkerson 4/29/2015	via: open meeting	
-------------------	--------------------------------------	-------------------	--

The list of EMT's and zip codes is not complete, will this be corrected?

Yes, we will review the zip code list and make any corrections.

Question 7	Received by D. Adkerson 4/29/2015	via: open meeting	
-------------------	--------------------------------------	-------------------	--

The miles to the closest trauma center- can it be out of state, or is it for Oklahoma only trauma centers?

The application refers to Oklahoma licensed trauma centers.

Question 8	Received by D. Adkerson 4/29/2015	via: open meeting	
-------------------	--------------------------------------	-------------------	--

The State is responsible for doing the benchmark evaluations at the end of the contract period, correct?

Yes, the state is required to complete the benchmark evaluations.

Question 9	Received by D. Adkerson 5/4/2015	via: email	
Where do I find letters verifying OSDH benchmark ratings?			
The letters for the OERSSIRF benchmarks are not posted on the website. They are available through open record requests. The benchmark letters are specifically sent to the agencies that have received the awards, and then made available to the review panel to verify point awards. A first-time applicant will not have any points deducted or awarded for benchmarks or previous awards.			