

May 2026 - Pre-EMSA Review Placer County Zone 3 RFP Public Comments S-SV EMS Responses

RFP Section	Comment Summary	S-SV EMS Agency Response
2.1 Oversight Fee Structure	<p>The commentator indicated that the RFP states the contractor shall pay \$350,000 annually for S-SV EMS oversight costs. Will this fee remain fixed for the full five-year contract term, or is it subject to CPI-based or other escalation adjustments? Additionally, the commentator requested confirmation on whether the \$175,500 charge for the West Placer County EMS Assessment and RFP development costs is a one-time payment due at contract execution, or whether it is structured differently.</p>	<p>RFP language revised to state: <i>"The contractor shall pay S-SV EMS for such oversight costs in the amount of \$350,000 annually, with a 5% annual increase for the second and subsequent years of the EOA agreement."</i></p> <p>The full \$175,500 one time charge to cover the costs of the West Placer County EMS System Assessment as well as the development/implementation of the RFP and resulting EOA agreement will be due upon execution of the agreement.</p>
2.1 (E) S-SV EMS Functional Responsibilities - Placer County First Responder Fund	<p>The commentator recommended the Placer County EMS Improvement Fund amount be increased to \$200,000 annually with the growth of the City of Roseville and the addition of ALS first responder programs within the EOA.</p>	<p>RFP language revised to require the Contractor to reserve \$50,000 each quarter (\$200,000 annually) for the Placer County EMS Improvement Fund.</p>
2.2 Coordination within the EOA	<p>The commentator recommended language be added to allow public agencies to provide emergency ground ambulance medical transport within the EOA when the Contractor cannot provide these services in a timely manner.</p>	<p>S-SV EMS does not believe that this should be a mandatory RFP requirement as bidders are submitting proposals for an exclusive operating area (EOA), and the selected Contractor will be responsible for meeting response time performance standards. However, the following language was added to this section of the RFP to clarify that such arrangements may be considered: <i>"which may include subcontracting agreements with first responder agencies to provide emergency ground ambulance services when the Contractor cannot provide these services in a timely manner."</i></p>

May 2026 - Pre-EMSA Review Placer County Zone 3 RFP Public Comments S-SV EMS Responses

RFP Section	Comment Summary	S-SV EMS Agency Response
2.5 Emergency Ambulance Dispatch Services	The commentor recommended language that requires the Contractor to seek opportunities to collocate or have ambulance dispatching done by a public agency.	S-SV EMS does not believe that this should be a mandatory RFP requirement as there are multiple different PSAPs that process 911 medical calls within the EOA. It is also unclear which, if any, PSAP(s) would be willing/able to provide these services and at what cost. However, the following language was added to this section of the RFP to clarify that this type of arrangement may be considered: <i>"Bidders should consider opportunities to collocate emergency ground ambulance dispatch services or to have these dispatch services performed by an applicable public agency."</i>
2.6 Response Time Standards (B) (Table 2) - Emergency Code 3 Response (Lights and Sirens)	The commentor recommended that response time methodology should be consistent for urban jurisdictions and recommended reducing response time requirement to 8 minutes for the City of Rocklin.	No RFP revisions made. S-SV EMS has previously provided information to justify a 10 minute Emergency Code 3 response time requirements in urban jurisdictions that provide ALS first responder services, consistent with similar response time requirements throughout California.
2.6 (E)(6) Response Time Exemption Requests - 'Call Cluster' Exemption Language	The commentor recommended reducing the time from 8 minutes to 4 minutes.	No RFP revisions made. The 'Call Cluster' exemption time is consistent with, or less than, other similar emergency ground ambulance EOAs (Example: Yolo County EOA uses a 10 minute time between calls to define a 'Call Cluster').
2.10 Clinical Performance Standards Non-Compliance Liquidated Damages (Table 6)	The commentor stated that the RFP imposes a \$5,000 per-occurrence liquidated damage for unrecognized endotracheal tube misplacement and requested clarification on how S-SV EMS intends to verify this finding. Will S-SV EMS clarify the verification methodology, the evidentiary standard required to trigger this penalty, and whether the contractor will have a formal opportunity to review and contest findings prior to assessment of damages?	S-SV EMS intends to verify all findings that result in the assessment of liquidated damages using objective criteria (ePCR reviews, documentation of waveform capnography, discussions/interviews with applicable individuals, etc.). Additionally, consistent with industry standard, the resulting EOA agreement will include provisions for the Contractor to dispute/contest such findings.

May 2026 - Pre-EMSA Review Placer County Zone 3 RFP Public Comments S-SV EMS Responses

RFP Section	Comment Summary	S-SV EMS Agency Response
<p>2.12 Mutual Aid/Zone Assists/Emergency Standbys</p>	<p>The commentor indicated concerns with the requirement to provide emergency standby services at no charge to the requesting public safety agency for up to 24 hours and requested to reduce the maximum required time or alternatively waive/suspend all response time compliance metrics when the Contractor's ground ambulance is assigned to an emergency standby event.</p>	<p>No RFP revisions made. S-SV EMS believes this is a necessary requirement for the safety of first responders and the public within the EOA. There is currently an average total of 9 hours of emergency standbys per month within the EOA. The EOA agreement will include language allowing the Contractor to request individual good cause response time exemptions in the event that an emergency standby event(s) unreasonably impacts their response time compliance.</p>
<p>2.13 (B) Radio Equipment</p>	<p>Communications remains a challenge between Placer County fire and law enforcement agencies. There are a variety of radio systems within the County that require patching between systems in order to communicate. These patches fail from time to time. The commentor recommended the contractor be required to provide "All Band" mobile and portable radios capable of communicating on a variety of radio frequencies within Placer County.</p>	<p>RFP language revised to state that all Contractor's ambulances and field supervisors vehicles must be equipped at a minimum with radio equipment necessary to communicate with Contractor's dispatch center, applicable receiving/base/modified base hospitals, and all PSAPs/first responder agencies within the EOA.</p>

May 2026 - Pre-EMSA Review Placer County Zone 3 RFP Public Comments S-SV EMS Responses

RFP Section	Comment Summary	S-SV EMS Agency Response
<p>2.14 Vehicle and Equipment Requirements</p>	<p>The commentor recommended that ambulances be of Type III construction to increase working space for critical patients. It is also the recommendation that emergency ambulances do not exceed 250,000 miles.</p>	<p>No RFP revisions made. Consistent with recent RFPs in other areas of California, bidders may propose to utilize Type I, Type II, or Type III ambulances. Bidders must consider procurement availability/time, relevant financial costs (purchase price, fuel, maintenance, repair, DMV fees, etc.), and operational matters (driver training, maneuverability, etc.) when determining the best type of ambulances to service the EOA. S-SV EMS is unaware of any specific studies/literature supporting a specific type of ambulance over another. It should also be noted that only 6% - 7% of Placer County patients are transported emergently (Code 3) and that first responder agencies within the EOA currently utilize mechanical CPR devices. Additionally, as a result of increased vehicle dependability and comprehensive vehicle maintenance programs, the 300,000 maximum mileage limit is consistent with recent RFPs in other areas of California.</p>
<p>2.14 Vehicle and Equipment Requirements</p>	<p>The commentor recommend emergency ambulance vehicles used in Placer County Zone 3 display the words "Placer County EMS". It is also recommended that emergency ambulance vehicles display their unit identifier on four sides of the vehicle. This minimizes confusion and creates efficiency. Emergency ambulances should be identified as "Medic" to reduce confusion between ALS and BLS ambulances (i.e., Placer County Medic 123 responding).</p>	<p>RFP language revised to require all emergency ambulance vehicles used within the EOA to display the words "Placer County EMS". The following language was also added to this section of the RFP: <i>"Additionally, all emergency ambulance vehicles used in the Placer County Zone 3 EOA must display their unit identifier on at least the driver's side and passenger side of the vehicle"</i>. Remainder of the comment is an operational issue that can be addressed in the resulting EOA agreement or directly with the Contractor.</p>

May 2026 - Pre-EMSA Review Placer County Zone 3 RFP Public Comments S-SV EMS Responses

RFP Section	Comment Summary	S-SV EMS Agency Response
4.2 Qualifications of Bidders	The commenter stated that there doesn't appear to be a minimum qualification for 911 EMS experience stated in the draft RFP. We believe that for a high-performance system of this size and complexity, a minimum qualification of experience should be established, as a pass/no-pass criteria in the selection process.	RFP language revised to state: <i>"Bidders shall demonstrate at least three (3) years' experience, in a similar sized and comparable system, at the 911 ALS or ALS/BLS tiered response level."</i>
7 Proposal Content Requirements (Appendix Page Limit)	The commentor requested that the appendix page limit be increased from the maximum of 200 pages.	RFP language revised to allow for a maximum of 400 pages for appendices.
7.G.2 (Field Supervision)	The commenter expressed concerns regarding the requirement that field supervisors spend at least 70% of their time in the prehospital setting.	No RFP revisions made. S-SV EMS believes the commentor misread/misunderstood this RFP requirement. The 70% requirement includes many of the activities the commentor expressed were administrative and oversight duties in their comments. S-SV EMS's overall goal is to ensure that field supervisors are in the field setting as much as possible.
7.H.2 (Incumbent Work Force)	The commentor asked if S-SV EMS would facilitate the release of the incumbent provider's collective bargaining agreement to interested bidders under a mutually agreed confidentiality agreement.	S-SV EMS will not facilitate the release of the incumbent provider's collective bargaining agreement. As indicated in the RFP: 'Bidders must meet with the incumbent workforce's recognized employee organization or official representative to review and discuss the collective bargaining agreement of the incumbent workforce.' The incumbent workforce's recognized employee organization is United EMS Workers, AFSCME Local 4911.

May 2026 - Pre-EMSA Review Placer County Zone 3 RFP Public Comments S-SV EMS Responses

RFP Section	Comment Summary	S-SV EMS Agency Response
7 (K) Fiscal Strength	<p>The commentor stated that a profit cap is associated with a number of complex financial dynamics. Economic conditions in the healthcare/EMS sector may change considerably during a long-term contract. We are also concerned that there could be unintended consequences of this regulation. The commentor also included additional questions, comments, and suggestions related to this matter.</p>	<p>No RFP revisions made. Profit cap language is consistent with other recent emergency ground ambulance RFPs & resulting EOA Agreements. S-SV EMS intends to include language in the final contract to address some of the commentor's issues/concerns, including provisions for rate adjustments as necessary.</p>
8.1 Basis of Award	<p>The commentor requested clarification on why the RFP does not include standard public procurement language recognizing that the Governing Board retains ultimate discretion to award the contract to the proposal determined to be in the best interest of the public and the EMS system, rather than restricting award language solely to the highest-scoring bidder.</p>	<p>No RFP revisions made. It is the position of S-SV EMS that the current basis for award language is appropriate and legally sufficient.</p>
Multiple Sections - Subcontractor Qualification and Participation	<p>The commentor requested that S-SV EMS provide guidance on the minimum documentation required to demonstrate a subcontractor's qualifications during the proposal phase, as opposed to post-award? And will subcontractor financial statements be evaluated under the same confidentiality protections described in Section 3.11 for the prime contractor's financials?</p>	<p>Please refer to the answer above in response to the comment related to Section 4.2 Qualification of Bidders. Bidders are responsible for providing adequate documentation that they meet the minimum required qualifications. Yes, subcontractor financial statements be evaluated under the same confidentiality protections described in Section 3.11 for the prime contractor's financials.</p>