

Before the Board of Supervisors

County of San Joaquin, State of California

B-06-977

MOTION: **Sieglock/Mow/4**

Approval of Responses to 2005-06 Grand Jury Reports

This Board of Supervisors does hereby:

1. Approve the responses to the 2005-06 Grand Jury Report from the following County departments (a copy of the Grand Jury Report is on file with the Office of the Clerk of the Board):
 - a. Registrar of Voters on Case #0405(A);
 - b. District Attorney's Office and the Facilities Management Division on Case #0405(B);
 - c. Public Guardian/Conservator's Office on Case #04-05(D);
 - d. Mental Health Services on Case #0605 concerning the CONREP Program;
 - e. Mental Health Services on Case #0705;
 - f. Health Care Services on Case #0805;
 - g. Probation Department on Probation Officers' caseloads;
 - h. Sheriff's Office on court services.
2. Authorize the Chairman to sign and submit the responses to the Presiding Judge of the Superior Court.

I HEREBY CERTIFY that the above order was passed and adopted on August 29, 2006, by the following vote of the Board of Supervisors, to wit:

AYES: **Mow, Sieglock, Gutierrez, Marengo**

NOES: **None**

ABSENT: **Ornellas**

ABSTAIN: **None**

LOIS M. SAHYOUN
Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
County of San Joaquin
State of California





LOIS M. SAIFYOUN
Clerk of the Board

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

222 EAST WEBER AVENUE, ROOM 701
STOCKTON, CALIFORNIA 95202
TELEPHONE: 209/468-3113
FAX: 209/468-3694

DARIO L. MARENCO
Chairman
Second District

VICTOR MOW
Vice Chairman
Third District

JACK A. SIEGLOCK
Fourth District

LEROY ORNELLAS
Fifth District

STEVEN GUTIERREZ
First District

August 29, 2006

Honorable George Abdullah
Presiding Judge of the Superior Court
County of San Joaquin
222 E. Weber Avenue, Room 303
Stockton, CA 95202

Dear Judge Abdullah:

Approval of Responses to 2005-06 Grand Jury Reports

Pursuant to Section 933.05 of the California Penal Code, attached please find the Board of Supervisors' responses to the Grand Jury Final Report cases listed above. If you have any additional questions regarding these responses, please contact Manuel Lopez, County Administrator, at (209) 468-3203.

Sincerely,

Dario L. Marengo, Chairman
San Joaquin County Board of Supervisors

DLM:ML:PK
Attachment

BOS08-04

**RESPONSE TO GRAND JURY REPORT – CASE # 0805 / SAN JOAQUIN
COUNTY HEALTH CARE SERVICES**

August 2, 2006

FINDINGS:

1. RFP process and award of the Ambulance contract to AMR was consistent with the RFP. There were no violations of policies and procedures by individuals involved with the RFP process, by the Proposal Review Committee or in the award of the contract by the BOS and/or county representatives.

RESPONSE: Agree.

2. The responses submitted by the Health Care Services Agency to the two protest letters submitted by bidders were generic, vague, and nonspecific.

RESPONSE: The response provided to each of the protesting bidders was reviewed and determined appropriate by the EMS Agency, Health Care Services, County Administration, County Purchasing, and County Counsel.

3. The language of the RFP, with regards to the evaluation and scoring process, could have been more specific.

RESPONSE: Agree.

4. No formal ranking/scoring system was used by the RFP review committee; therefore, no documentation of the scoring process was saved or available when later requested.

RESPONSE: Agree.

5. The BOS, through the RFP process, appears to have adhered to policies and procedures.

RESPONSE: Agree.

6. Bidders accepted RFP section 2.11, Waiver of Requirements, in which the County reserves the right to waive any RFP requirements it deems in the best interest of the County, which therefore provided the review committee the ability to alter the rating process.

RESPONSE: Agree.

7. No evidence of conflict of interest in the composition of the review committee or the rating process.

RESPONSE: Agree.

8. Next year's Grand Jury may elect to assess the impact of this change on the health and safety of county residents.

RESPONSE: Agree.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. A scoring system be clearly defined in advance to assist in properly and thoroughly evaluating applications and in adhering to the selection process.

RESPONSE: The EMS Agency, in consultation with County Purchasing and County Counsel, will re-evaluate the process for scoring proposals prior to the next RFP for emergency ambulance service.

2. The scoring system/sheet be included as part of the supporting documentation in the RFP.

RESPONSE: The EMS Agency, in consultation with County Purchasing and County Counsel, will re-evaluate the process for documenting the scoring of proposals prior to the next RFP for emergency ambulance service.

3. Said scoring sheets be retained as part of the evidentiary chain in the event of challenges or appeals in awards.

RESPONSE: The EMS Agency, in consultation with County Purchasing and County Counsel, will re-evaluate the process for documenting the scoring of proposals prior to the next RFP for emergency ambulance service.

4. The review committees receive clear and precise training/information as to their role and responsibilities in reviewing and rating applications.

RESPONSE: Agree.

5. The proposal review committee members examine each proposal/application independently so as to avoid the appearance or

implication of impropriety in making a recommendation for selection. Once all reviews have been completed an examination of all recommendation/selections should be made by the selection committee in an open forum with an impartial County representative.

RESPONSE: Agree.

6. The selection/award process should be formally developed by the selection committee and presented in writing, along with all supporting documentation.

RESPONSE: Disagree. The development of the selection/award process is the responsibility of the County as specified by State and County regulations. The Board of Supervisors establishes the selection and award process when approving the RFP for release. The selection committee's role is to review, rate, and recommend the proposals, in accordance with the RFP procedures.

7. In the interest of disclosure and openness, responses to complaints might have been less dismissive. Responses to appeals/challenges submitted by bidders who were not selected should specifically detail the reason(s) for each item/objective raised and avoid generic response without substantiation.

RESPONSE: The EMS Agency, in consultation with County Purchasing and County Counsel, will re-evaluate the process for appeals and challenges prior to the next RFP for emergency ambulance service to ensure constructive responses.

8. The BOS should direct that an analysis of the adequacy of the ambulance service at six months and twelve month intervals be conducted (November 2006 and May 2007), submitting a copy to the 2006/07 Grand Jury.

RESPONSE: The EMS Agency, which conducts daily, weekly, and monthly monitoring of the exclusive emergency ambulance contract, will provide performance reports at least quarterly to the Board of Supervisors. Once accepted and approved by the Board of Supervisors, copies of the performance reports will be available to the public on the EMS website. Additionally, copies of these reports can be submitted to the 2006-07 Grand Jury at their request.