



**State of Oklahoma
Oklahoma State Department of Health**

Amendment of Solicitation

Date of Issuance: May 16, 2014

Solicitation No. _____

Requisition No. 3400001273

Amendment No. 3

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
Procurement-Susan Wiest
1000 NE 10th Street
Oklahoma City, OK 73117 -
or

Susan Wiest
Contracting Officer

(405) - 271 - 4043
Phone Number

Personal or Common Carrier Delivery:

Oklahoma State Dept. of Health
Procurement-Susan Wiest
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

b. All other terms and conditions remain unchanged.

Supplier Company Name (**PRINT**)

Date

Authorized Representative Name (**PRINT**)

Title

Authorized Representative Signature

Fy 2015 OERSSIRF Questions			Answers for questions submitted for FY 2015 OERSSIRF
Date	Received through	Question	
5/9/2014	email	If a paramedic response vehicle like a tahoe is something that could be requested with those funds?	Capital equipment purchases are allowable under the enabling legislation.
5/9/2014	pre-proposal conference	Numerous questions relating to this section of the application. All questions lead to a need to redefine and clarify this section on the application. Please define or further clarify what or how a loss will be defined. From previous dates, a tax subsidy has been considered a loss. It is not an income. It is not part of a traditional type of income. As a business, collections are the business model. Tax revenue is not an income in the traditional sense. An ambulance service is a business.	The contract has been modified to address the questions regarding matching funds. Clarification of what a matching fund is and examples have been provided.
5/9/2014	pre-proposal conference	How do we calculate the loss of the match to meet the needs of the purchase of the project. See question 2. Loss in respect to the project costs.	See above question regarding modification to the application and clarification of matching funds.
5/9/2014	pre-proposal conference	Is Mapquest a requirement on the grant-	Yes- See guidance.
5/9/2014	pre-proposal conference	Solicitation package A-24 all bids Correct- Do the applicants need to submit an electronic copy	An electronic copy is not required for this RFP. If an electronic copy is sent, then a minimum of nine copies must still be sent to the Department for the review panel
5/9/2014	pre-proposal conference	Attachment A- Letters of attestation for multiple jurisdictions or regional proposals- is there a minimum number or a maximum number.	There is not a minimum number of or a maximum number of letters of attestation. At a minimum, the letter or letters need to answer any specific questions presented in the applicants proposal, as well as confirm the support or inclusion in the project area.

5/9/2014	pre-proposal conference	Governmental pricing- need resource and what does it include.	The application has been modified to provide this information in the budget section.
5/9/2014	pre-proposal conference	Matching Funds- How to show the loss- what documents.	See above question regarding modification to the application and clarification of matching funds.
5/9/2014	pre-proposal conference	letter of attestations- Budget- what is required.	Letters of attestation for budgets must include evidence that the matching funds are available and in what amount, and requested funds and the matching funds together will complete the requirements of the contract.
5/9/2014	pre-proposal conference	Solicitation Package- What needs to be sent back in the application regarding the contract documents?	All of them. These documents do not count toward the 55 page limit within the application
5/9/2014	pre-proposal conference	Solicitation Number Form- How do we include that document in the package?	It may be included as part of the other legal documents.
5/9/2014	pre-proposal conference	Where can the applicant find the information for the government pricing. The website and reference information for the pricing on the Government Project.	The application has been modified to provide this information in the budget section.
5/9/2014	pre-proposal conference	What are the projections for the fund- Is it increasing, Decreasing, or maintaining?	No clear answer can be provided for this question.
5/9/2014	pre-proposal conference	Trauma Fund regulations for EMS and others- Have they been implemented?	Does not apply for the purposes for this contract.
5/12/2014	Phone call	What is the success rate of applications that are written by a vendor for an applicant vs. the success rate for applications written and submitted by the applicant?	The Department does not monitor or track this statistic.

5/12/2014	email	<p>4. Project Feasibility: (310:642-3-1(c)(6) Appropriately credentialed consultant or other expert attestations to the feasibility and cost-effectiveness of the project shall be provided.</p> <p>Who is considered an expert? (e.g ambulance purchase)</p>	<p>Expert is not defined within 63 O.S. §1-2512.1 or O.A.C. 310:642. Per the grant guidance, The applicant shall submit attestations from an expert with the appropriate credentials that enable them to provide support for the economic validity</p>
5/12/14	email	<p>5. Statewide needs and public interest. (310:642-3-1(c)(7) EMS attestations of the benefits of the project to the public interest and welfare shall be provided by an appropriately credentialed consultant or other expert</p> <p>Who is considered an expert?</p>	<p>Expert is not defined within 63 O.S. §1-2512.1 or O.A.C. 310:642. Per the grant guidance, The applicant shall submit attestations from an expert with the appropriate credentials that enable them to provide support for the statewide needs and public interest.</p>
5/14/2014	email	<p>I understood since OKAMA was going to apply for a grant, none of the employees of our board are eligible to be evaluators, is this correct?</p>	<p>If OKAMA were to submit a proposal (as expected), then the Board Members of OKAMA would not be able to serve as reviewers. As far as employees of agencies that are members of OKAMA, the question would be if they have a personal interest in any of the submitted proposals. (Job duties, employment opportunities, promotion opportunities, etc.) (See O.A.C. 310:642 for scoring)</p>

5/14/14	email	<p>What is the statutory authority for the Department to determine the appropriateness of proposed matching funds? OAC 310:642-5(2)(G) does not specify criteria for matching. I believe matching is therefore left to the volunteer citizen reviewers to score, absent any other statutory authority, as it has been in the past.</p>	<p>The State Board of Health is enabled by 63 O.S. § 1-2512.1 to promulgate rules establishing a formula and procedure for the distribution of funds from the Oklahoma Emergency Response Systems Stabilization and Improvement Revolving Fund (OERSSIRF). Oklahoma Administrative Code 310:642-1-1 et seq. sets forth the rules and formula promulgated. Pursuant to the rules, a Request for Proposal (RFP) is issued yearly for the distribution of OERSSIRF funds (310:642-3-2). The terms and conditions of an RFP are subject to 580:16-7-30. The RFP “shall include specifications... and all terms and conditions must be included in the request.” Id. “Matching funds” is a term and condition defined by OSDH in the RFP to provide the bidders guidance in the process and to allow for a more defined measure to assist OSDH in the distribution and evaluation of the OERSSIRF funds.</p>
5/14/2014	email	<p>Assuming this change was in fact lawful, why was it not communicated until three weeks before the deadline? Many people work on grants for months before the process opens, and this change required rapid and extensive recalculation. This change favors agencies with on-staff grant writers, not the small rural agencies the grant is intended to stabilize.</p>	<p>The Request for Proposal process does not allow for the early release of any portion of the document. The criteria for scoring detailed in O.A.C. 310:642 is not the entire application. The solicitation documents and the criteria from the regulation (Attachment A) is the R.F.P, and falls under their criteria for the solitation of bids. Essentially, the Department is seeking proposals for the purposes of "Stabilizing and Improving" the nature of EMS in OK.</p>
5/14/2014	email	<p>What open process was provided to allow public comment on this change? I did not find any notice of any rule-making process.</p>	<p>The application change does not require a change in statute or regulation. Therefore, there was not a need to enter into the rule making process.</p>

5/14/2014	email	Assuming no process was provided, what staff positions determined this change, and what positions approved it?	The process for change included comments from the FY 2014 review panel, changing the application, gaining approval for the changes through the Medical Facilities leadership, and approval from the OSDH Legal Division.
5/14/2014	email	How was the effect of this change calculated to affect the process? Since small rural agencies are heavily dependent on community contributions for survival, was the exclusion of previously-allowed community funding intended to disadvantage these agencies?	The changes in the application amendment dated May 16, 2014 clarifies the examples of matching funds. In no way does the application discourage or disadvantage small rural communities in this process. The change in the matching fund is to require the respondent to dedicate specific dollars from their budget to the items and material described in the proposal. Essentially, the line item dedication of dollars in a budget for equipment can be the matching funds for equipment purchases in this proposal. Funds set aside for a new vehicle can be used as the matching funds for a proposal that includes a new vehicle.
5/14/2014	email	Is EMSC currently qualified to apply for the OERSSIRF Grant?	"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 medical 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.