



Notice of Intent to Award

Solicitation Number	392414	Award Date	8/6/2025   6:41 AM CDT
Solicitation Title	Emergency Medical Services Billing and Collection (EMS)		
Buyer Name	Terri Ray	Buyer Email	terri.ray@nashville.gov
BAO Rep	Christopher Wood	BAO Email	christopher.wood@nashville.gov

Awarded Supplier(s)

In reference to the above solicitation and contingent upon successful contract negotiation, it is the intent of the Metropolitan Government of Nashville and Davidson County to award to the following supplier(s):

Company Name	Digitech Computer, LLC	Company Contact	Anthony Santos
Street Address	480 Bedford Road, Building 600, Second Floor		
City	Chappaqua	State	NT
		Zipcode	10514

Company Name		Company Contact	
Street Address			
City		State	
		Zipcode	

Company Name		Company Contact	
Street Address			
City		State	
		Zipcode	

Certificate of Insurance

The awarded supplier(s) must submit a certificate of insurance (COI) indicating all applicable coverage required by the referenced solicitation. The COI should be emailed to the referenced buyer no more than 15 days after the referenced award date.

Equal Business Opportunity Program

Where applicable, the awarded supplier(s) must submit a signed copy of the letter of intent to perform for any and all minority-owned (MBE) or woman-owned (WBE) subcontractors included in the solicitation response. The letter(s) should be emailed to the referenced business assistance office (BAO) rep no more than two business days after the referenced award date.

☐ Yes, the EBO Program is applicable.

☒ No, the EBO Program is not applicable.

Monthly Reporting

Where applicable, the awarded supplier(s) will be required monthly to submit evidence of participation and payment to all small (SBE), minority-owned (MBE), women-owned (WBE), LGBT-owned (LGBTBE), and service disabled veteran owned (SDV) subcontractors. Sufficient evidence may include, but is not necessarily limited to copies of subcontracts, purchase orders, applications for payment, invoices, and cancelled checks.

Questions related to contract compliance may be directed to the referenced BAO rep.

☐ Yes, monthly reporting is applicable.

☒ No, monthly reporting is not applicable.

Public Information and Records Retention

Solicitation and award documentation are available upon request. Please email the referenced buyer to arrange.

A copy of this notice will be placed in the solicitation file and sent to all offerors.

Right to Protest

Per MCL 4.36.010 – any actual or prospective bidder, offeror, or contractor who is aggrieved in connection with the solicitation or award of a contract may protest to the purchasing agent. The protest shall be submitted in writing within ten (10) days after such aggrieved person knows or should have known of the facts giving rise thereto.

       Management (Initial)

Dennis Rowland  
Dennis Rowland  
Purchasing Agent & Chief Procurement Officer

**RFQ 392414 - Emergency Medical Services Billing and Collection (EMS)****Scoring and Justification**

Offeror/Evaluation Criteria	Round 1	Round 2				Round 3			Total Round 1-3 (200 Points)
	Minimum Requirements (Pass/Fail)	Methodology and Approach (40 Points)	Qualifications and Experience (20 Points)	Capacity and Ability to Meet Scheduling Requirements (20 Points)	Round 2 Total (80 Points)	Demonstration (100 Points)	Compensation and Cost Data Total Net Collections (20 Points)	Round 3 Total (120 Points)	
Digitech Computer, LLC	Pass	35	19	20	74	100	20	120	194
ADEPT RCM Solutions	Pass	12	2	5	19	Submitted in Round 2 but not Shortlisted to Round 3		0	19
BW Interests, LLC	Pass	15	2	8	25	Submitted in Round 2 but not Shortlisted to Round 3		0	25
Coronis Health	Pass	20	9	9	38	Submitted in Round 2 but not Shortlisted to Round 3		0	38
Optum	Pass	25	10	15	50	Submitted in Round 2 but not Shortlisted to Round 3		0	50
Quick Med Claims, LLC	Pass	20	8	10	38	Submitted in Round 2 but not Shortlisted to Round 3		0	38
RescueMed Financial, LLC	Pass	20	2	15	37	Submitted in Round 2 but not Shortlisted to Round 3		0	37
Ann Mills dba MBAS Group LLC	Pass	Shortlisted but failed to submit to Round 2							
EMS Management & Consultants, Inc.	Pass	Shortlisted but failed to submit to Round 2							
Universal Solutions Group Inc	Pass	Shortlisted but failed to submit to Round 2							

\* ELS Medical Billing Group, LLC submitted in Round 2 but was deemed non-response since no offer was submitted in Round 1.

RFQ 392414 - Emergency Medical Services Billing and Collection (EMS)			RFP Cost Points
			20
Offeror's Name	Bids	Evaluation Amount	RFP Cost Point Distribution
Digitech Computer	\$ 959,163.20	\$959,163.20	20.00

**Digitech Computer, LLC**

**Strengths** –Proposal demonstrated that implementation process would be seamless due to being the current contract holder; however, still provided a detailed process including an implementation timeline. Proposal stated that the offeror didn't anticipate any disruptions as the current contract holder since issues and challenges have already been worked through as the current contract holder. Proposal demonstrated forty plus (40+) years of billing and collection services experience. Proposal provided a singular point of contact name and experience. Proposal included a detailed summary of the team's capacity to perform the scope of services. Proposal provided detailed organizational structure provided with name at the management level only. Proposal provided detailed resumes of key individuals and bios for additional staff which demonstrated to a depth of experience. Proposal demonstrated five (5) projects of similar scope of which included ImageTrend integration on three (3) out of the five (5) projects. Proposal included a detailed billing process diagram/flowchart. Delivery requirements in proposal were detailed and specific to Metro. Proposal mentioned cross-training staff to ensure coverage and additional resources available. Proposal stated that there were no delivery concerns or risks and included details as to how any issues that arise would be mitigated or handled if necessary. Risk and mitigation plan included regular communications including meetings via web conference, detailed and documented account updates, email exchanges, and phone calls. Proposal provided numerous avenues in detail for obtaining demographic and insurance information. Proposal demonstrated the continued use of unique numbering process for patients so it can be searched and accessed by Metro. Proposal stated that as the incumbent there would be no need to incorporate prior runs as this is seamless. Demonstration was clear, concise, and detailed with Metro specific requirements shown.

**Weaknesses** - Proposal provided implementation process but doesn't detail anything regarding the project management methodology over the life of the contract. Project management process, tasks, and deliverables were high level and lack details since incumbent. Proposal lacked detail

**RFQ 392414 - Emergency Medical Services Billing and Collection (EMS)****Scoring and Justification**

regarding the use of ImageTrend even though the services are already established as the incumbent. Proposal provided 1 litigation for the company. Proposal didn't include end dates for project experience, so it is unclear if contracts are still active.

**ADEPT RCM Solutions**

**Strengths** - Proposal stated no litigation.

**Weaknesses** - Response to how the requirements and provisions of the scope of this project will be implemented was high level and lacked details specific to Metro compared to other offerors. Response to knowledge of the project objectives/goals and identify potential issues/challenges, your approach to minimizing and disruptions to performance, and present a comprehensive plan for completing the specified working accordance with the scope was high level and lacked details specific to Metro compared to other offerors. Project management methodology was high level and lacked details specific to Metro compared to other offerors. Approach to managing this project including the identification of clearly defined project management process, tasks, and deliverables demonstrated a proposed timeframe that was too long. Methodology and Approach response reads as if the contractor is a consultant working with Metro's biller which doesn't align with solicitation requirements. Methodology and Approach mentioned ImageTrend and referred to EMS System but limited details on the specifics of the EMS System. Firm has right at 5 years of billing and collection experience for Skilled Nursing Facility (SNF) which is not of similar scope. Qualifications and Experience proposal stated "ADEPT RCM Solutions acquired contract on a business-to-business basis. This contract was not prime or sub level related" which doesn't provide a response to the question asked. The team's (prime and sub level) capacity to perform work was high level response, contains no specific regarding any prime or sub capacity and was not specific to Metro compared to other offerors. Proposal reflected Adept RCM Solutions in the prime role and subcontractor role with another prime who is not defined. Proposal lacks information regarding the use of subcontractors and clearly defined structure. Proposal response included one resume that reflects employment with the prime and other resumes do not provide any detail on the relationship with the prime. Details on resumes provided failed to provide details on how the individual experience is related to this specific project. Provided one (1) project experience out of the five (5) required. The one project provided was not of similar scope since it is related to EMS billing consultant experience. The delivery requirements response was extremely high-level outline of delivery requirements and doesn't provide any details in how the requirements will be delivered. Response to how your firm is structured to ensure that timely delivery of these services/products didn't provide any firm structure information or how the service would be delivered timely. Proposal stated "no delivery concerns at the present moment, concerns will be further evaluated once contract is obtained", which demonstrates a lack of experience with performing scope of services. High level response that is not specific to Metro was provided for how the firm uses to obtain demographic and insurance information for patients. Proposal refers to consistent identifiers such as name, date of birth, and insurance ID but not specifics regarding a unique run number. How the firm would incorporate runs from prior billing company was high level and not specific to Metro.

**BW Interests, LLC**

**Strengths** – Proposal stated no litigation. Proposal demonstrated dedicated project director proposed to help eliminate, reduce, or manage risks.

**Weaknesses** - Response to how the requirements and provisions of the scope of this project will be implemented was high level and lacked details specific to Metro compared to other offerors. Methodology and Approach proposal response reads as if Offeror is a consultant and not a billing provider. Response to knowledge of the project objectives/goals and identify potential issues/challenges, your approach to minimizing and disruptions to performance, and present a comprehensive plan for completing the specified working accordance with the scope was generic that outlines healthcare billing knowledge but is not specific to Metro's requirements. Project management methodology was high level and lacked details specific to Metro compared to other offerors. Project management methodology specifically mentions transition plan with current provider but doesn't provide details regarding the specifics for this project. Approach to managing this project including the identification of clearly defined project management process, tasks, and deliverables was high level and lacked details specific to Metro compared to other offerors. Proposal doesn't provide details as to the specific technology suite and its use of working historically with ImageTrend. Proposal doesn't detail any conversion or customization regarding the ability for the two applications to work without issues. Proposal demonstrated 20 years of billing and collections consultant services experience which doesn't align with the scope. Qualifications and Experience proposal provide team names and status but failed to provide experience details providing services. Qualifications and Experience provided high level response regarding the team's capacity to perform work. The team capacity proposal provided the CEO but no details regarding anyone else. High level organizational structure provided but lacks details and doesn't provide name(s) or outline any subs. Bios of key individual titles were provided rather than resumes. Key individuals have little to no experience of similar scope demonstrated in proposal response. Proposal included details regarding payment negotiations which is not performed by contracted vendor. Proposal didn't include any information regarding firm's structure to ensure timely delivery of services.

**RFQ 392414 - Emergency Medical Services Billing and Collection (EMS)****Scoring and Justification**

Project experience provided in proposal was not of similar scope and proposal states that details would be provided upon requesting from the CEO. Project experience details included in proposal doesn't include dollar value, dates, scope of project, and other requested project information. Delivery requirements response was detailed generic response that can be used for any project and was not specific to Metro compared to other offerors. Delivery concerns and proposed mitigation methods was generic and not specific to Metro. Demographic and insurance information response was high level and not specific to Metro compared to other offerors. Proposal failed to identify third party provider details for demographic and insurance information. Capacity and ability to meet scheduling requirements response mentions multiple patients on scene but fails to address how multiple runs for a single patient would be handled which demonstrates a lack of understanding of the scope of this solicitation. How the firm would incorporate runs from prior billing company was high level and not specific to Metro compared to other offerors.

**Coronis Health**

**Strengths** - Overall proposal was easy to read and follow compared to other offers. Proposal stated no litigation.

**Weaknesses** - Proposal response to how the requirements and provisions of the scope of this project will be implemented was detailed but lacked specifics to Metro compared to other offerors. Proposal didn't provide any specific issues or challenges and was a high-level response that was not specific to Metro. Project management methodology was detailed but lacked specifics to Metro compared to other offerors. Approach to managing this project including the identification of clearly defined project management process, tasks, and deliverables was detailed but lacked specifics to Metro compared to other offerors. Proposal states current technology as CentralSquare but doesn't state if this is the only technology to be used or the specific details as to how it will fully integrate with the various other systems such as ImageTrend. Proposal response about firm's and team's experience performing the scope of service lacks detail compared to other offerors. Team capacity response was high level and not specific to Metro. Organizational structure provided was leadership structure only. Bios were provided rather than resumes. Project experience provided was not of similar scope. Failed to provide dollar value, type project, project dates, scope of project, and other contact information requested. Delivery requirement response was detailed generic response that could be used on any project and was not specific to Metro compared to other offerors. Structure to ensure timely delivery of service response was detailed generic response that could be used on any project and was not specific to Metro compared to other offerors. Proposal failed to demonstrate any delivery concerns and associated mitigation. Proposal failed to demonstrate detailed process for obtaining demographic and insurance information. Unique run number response was high level and lack specific to Metro compared to other offerors. Proposal response stated "recognize that your former billing partner may continue managing legacy accounts receivable" which doesn't appear to be a transition plan focused.

**Optum**

**Strengths** - Proposal stated no litigation. Proposal demonstrated bios provided on seven (7) individuals that have over ten (10) years' experience.

**Weaknesses** - Overall proposal response was not in a easily readable format. Proposal response how the requirements and provisions of the scope of this project will be implemented was detailed response but lacked specific to Metro compared to other Offerors. Ninety (90) day implementation timeline was very aggressive. Response to knowledge of the project objectives/goals and identify potential issues/challenges, your approach to minimizing and disruptions to performance, and present a comprehensive plan for completing the specified working accordance with the scope was generic and not specific to Metro's requirements compared to other offerors. Project management methodology was high level and lacked details specific to Metro compared to other offerors. Clear project management process, tasks, and deliverables was high level and lacked details specific to Metro compared to other offerors. Proposal demonstrated ImageTrend working with Optum's technology but lacked specific details as to what that entails and use of this in past projects. Methodology and Approach proposal response exceeded page limit outlined in solicitation. Proposal response to firm's experience was not in appropriate section which made reading Proposals difficult. Proposal demonstrated thirty plus (30+) years EMS billing experience which includes years under ChangeHealthcare Ownership. Bio responses had to be used to connect firm experience which resulted in lack of detail provided. Team capacity response was high level and not specific to Metro. Names and titles provide for organizational structure but no specifics to Metro were provided. Bios were provided rather than resumes. Proposal demonstrated five (5) projects, but experience was not of similar scope. Failed to provide dollar value, type project, project dates, scope of project, and other contact information requested. Provided case studies which were not requested and didn't bring value to the evaluation. Qualifications and Experience proposal response exceed page limit outlined in solicitation. Delivery requirement response was detailed generic response that could be used on any project and was not specific to Metro compared to other offerors. Structure to ensure timely delivery of service response was detailed generic response that could be used on any project and was not specific to Metro compared to other offerors. Delivery concerns and associated mitigation response was a detailed generic response that could be used on any project and was not specific to Metro compared to other offerors. 0 Proposal failed to provide how prior billing company runs would be incorporated.

**RFQ 392414 - Emergency Medical Services Billing and Collection (EMS)****Scoring and Justification****Quick Med Claims, LLC**

**Strengths** - Proposal demonstrated thirty plus (30+) years EMS billing experience.

**Weaknesses** - Matrix assisted with navigating response to evaluation criteria but overall the entire proposal was still difficult to follow. Response to how the requirements and provisions of the scope of this project will be implemented was high level and lacked details specific to Metro compared to other offerors. Response to knowledge of the project objectives/goals and identify potential issues/challenges, your approach to minimizing and disruptions to performance, and present a comprehensive plan for completing the specified working accordance with the scope was high level and lacked details specific to Metro compared to other offerors. Project management methodology was high level and lacked details specific to Metro compared to other offerors. Approach to managing this project including the identification of clearly defined project management process, tasks, and deliverables was high level and lacked details specific to Metro compared to other offerors. Technology platform provided but lacks specifics regarding how it will work with ImageTrend. Methodology and Approach proposal response exceeded page limit outlined in solicitation. Had to use bio responses to connect back firm experience which resulted in lack of detail provided. Team capacity response was high level and not specific to Metro. Proposal only outlined the leadership structure within response to different sections. Executive leadership bios provided rather than resumes and were included in a different response PDF section. Proposal failed to provide a response to litigations. Proposal demonstrated two (2) out of the five (5) project experience of similar scope requested. One (1) of the two (2) provided projects just started in January 2025. No dollar amount or project information was provided with project experience information provided. Delivery requirement response was detailed generic response that could be used on any project and was not specific to Metro compared to other offerors. Structure to ensure timely delivery of service response was detailed generic response that could be used on any project and was not specific to Metro compared to other offerors. Delivery concerns and associated mitigation response mentions compliance but lacks specific details as to what this entails. Demographic and insurance information response could be used on any project and was not specific to Metro compared to other offerors. Proposal failed to include how the firm will incorporate unique run number. Proposal failed to provide how prior billing company runs would be incorporated.

**RescueMed Financial, LLC**

**Strengths** - Methodology and Approach included a process flow outline.

**Weaknesses** - Response to how the requirements and provisions of the scope of this project will be implemented was high level and lacked details specific to Metro compared to other offerors. Project management methodology was high level and lacked details specific to Metro compared to other offerors. Proposal identified objectives/goal and challenges/solutions but lacked detail compared to other offerors. Approach to managing this project, including the identification of clearly defined project management process, tasks, and deliverables mentioned key terminology, but lacked details specific to Metro compared to other offerors. Proposal demonstrates the use of TramaSoft but makes no mention of how it works with ImageTrend or the use of TramaSoft working with ImageTrend on previous projects. Proposal demonstrates the firm doesn't have five (5) years' experience (launched from another company in 2024). Qualifications and Experience proposal doesn't demonstrate teams' knowledge and project experience in the provision of the services. Qualifications and Experience proposal doesn't demonstrate the team's capacity to perform the work. Defined responsibilities missing for some of the proposed team members outlined on organizational structure. Bios were provided for some staff members rather than resumes. Missing resumes for some project management members. Proposal failed to provide a response to litigations. Failed to provide five (5) projects of similar scope. Delivery requirement response was detailed generic response that could be used on any project and was not specific to Metro compared to other offerors. Structure to ensure timely delivery of service response was detailed generic response that could be used on any project and was not specific to Metro compared to other offerors. Delivery concerns and associated mitigation response was in a different PDF response section and lacks detail compared to other offerors. Demographic and insurance information response could be used on any project and was not specific to Metro compared to other offerors. Proposal failed to provide how prior billing company runs would be incorporated.



**Notice**  
**Unacceptable Offer**

Solicitation Number	392414-2,1	Date	
Solicitation Title	Emergency Medical Services Billing and Collection (EMS)		
Buyer Name	Terri Ray	Buyer Email	terri.ray@nashville.gov
BAO Rep	Christopher Wood	BAO Email	christopher.wood@nashville.gov

**Unacceptable Offer**

The following supplier has submitted an offer that is unacceptable:

Company Name	ADEPT RCM Solutions	Company Contact	Gwendolyn Collins
Street Address	11816 Inwood Rd #1089		
City	Dallas	State	TX
		Zipcode	75244

Suppliers with unacceptable offers will not be considered for award.

**Public Information and Records Retention**

Solicitation and award documentation will be available upon request after the intent to award is issued. Please email the referenced buyer to arrange.

A copy of this notice will be placed in the solicitation file and sent to all offerors.

**Right to Protest**

Per MCL 4.36.010 – any actual or prospective bidder, offeror, or contractor who is aggrieved in connection with the solicitation or award of a contract may protest to the purchasing agent. The protest shall be submitted in writing within ten (10) days after such aggrieved person knows or should have known of the facts giving rise thereto.



**Notice**  
**Unacceptable Offer**

Solicitation Number	392414-2,1	Date	
Solicitation Title	Emergency Medical Services Billing and Collection (EMS)		
Buyer Name	Terri Ray	Buyer Email	terri.ray@nashville.gov
BAO Rep	Christopher Wood	BAO Email	christopher.wood@nashville.gov

**Unacceptable Offer**

The following supplier has submitted an offer that is unacceptable:

Company Name	ADEPT RCM Solutions	Company Contact	Gwendolyn Collins		
Street Address	11816 Inwood Rd #1089				
City	Dallas	State	TX	Zipcode	75244

Suppliers with unacceptable offers will not be considered for award.

**Public Information and Records Retention**

Solicitation and award documentation will be available upon request after the intent to award is issued. Please email the referenced buyer to arrange.

A copy of this notice will be placed in the solicitation file and sent to all offerors.

**Right to Protest**

Per MCL 4.36.010 – any actual or prospective bidder, offeror, or contractor who is aggrieved in connection with the solicitation or award of a contract may protest to the purchasing agent. The protest shall be submitted in writing within ten (10) days after such aggrieved person knows or should have known of the facts giving rise thereto.



**Notice**  
**Unacceptable Offer**

Solicitation Number	392414-2,1	Date	
Solicitation Title	Emergency Medical Services Billing and Collection (EMS)		
Buyer Name	Terri Ray	Buyer Email	terri.ray@nashville.gov
BAO Rep	Christopher Wood	BAO Email	christopher.wood@nashville.gov

**Unacceptable Offer**

The following supplier has submitted an offer that is unacceptable:

Company Name	ADEPT RCM Solutions	Company Contact	Gwendolyn Collins
Street Address	11816 Inwood Rd #1089		
City	Dallas	State	TX
		Zipcode	75244

Suppliers with unacceptable offers will not be considered for award.

**Public Information and Records Retention**

Solicitation and award documentation will be available upon request after the intent to award is issued. Please email the referenced buyer to arrange.

A copy of this notice will be placed in the solicitation file and sent to all offerors.

**Right to Protest**

Per MCL 4.36.010 – any actual or prospective bidder, offeror, or contractor who is aggrieved in connection with the solicitation or award of a contract may protest to the purchasing agent. The protest shall be submitted in writing within ten (10) days after such aggrieved person knows or should have known of the facts giving rise thereto.





**Notice**  
**Unacceptable Offer**

Solicitation Number	392414-2,1	Date	
Solicitation Title	Emergency Medical Services Billing and Collection (EMS)		
Buyer Name	Terri Ray	Buyer Email	terri.ray@nashville.gov
BAO Rep	Christopher Wood	BAO Email	christopher.wood@nashville.gov

**Unacceptable Offer**

The following supplier has submitted an offer that is unacceptable:

Company Name	ADEPT RCM Solutions	Company Contact	Gwendolyn Collins
Street Address	11816 Inwood Rd #1089		
City	Dallas	State	TX
		Zipcode	75244

Suppliers with unacceptable offers will not be considered for award.

**Public Information and Records Retention**

Solicitation and award documentation will be available upon request after the intent to award is issued. Please email the referenced buyer to arrange.

A copy of this notice will be placed in the solicitation file and sent to all offerors.

**Right to Protest**

Per MCL 4.36.010 – any actual or prospective bidder, offeror, or contractor who is aggrieved in connection with the solicitation or award of a contract may protest to the purchasing agent. The protest shall be submitted in writing within ten (10) days after such aggrieved person knows or should have known of the facts giving rise thereto.



**Notice**  
**Unacceptable Offer**

Solicitation Number	392414-2,1	Date	
Solicitation Title	Emergency Medical Services Billing and Collection (EMS)		
Buyer Name	Terri Ray	Buyer Email	terri.ray@nashville.gov
BAO Rep	Christopher Wood	BAO Email	christopher.wood@nashville.gov

**Unacceptable Offer**

The following supplier has submitted an offer that is unacceptable:

Company Name	ADEPT RCM Solutions	Company Contact	Gwendolyn Collins
Street Address	11816 Inwood Rd #1089		
City	Dallas	State	TX
		Zipcode	75244

Suppliers with unacceptable offers will not be considered for award.

**Public Information and Records Retention**

Solicitation and award documentation will be available upon request after the intent to award is issued. Please email the referenced buyer to arrange.

A copy of this notice will be placed in the solicitation file and sent to all offerors.

**Right to Protest**

Per MCL 4.36.010 – any actual or prospective bidder, offeror, or contractor who is aggrieved in connection with the solicitation or award of a contract may protest to the purchasing agent. The protest shall be submitted in writing within ten (10) days after such aggrieved person knows or should have known of the facts giving rise thereto.



**Notice**  
**Unacceptable Offer**

Solicitation Number	392414-2,1	Date	
Solicitation Title	Emergency Medical Services Billing and Collection (EMS)		
Buyer Name	Terri Ray	Buyer Email	terri.ray@nashville.gov
BAO Rep	Christopher Wood	BAO Email	christopher.wood@nashville.gov

**Unacceptable Offer**

The following supplier has submitted an offer that is unacceptable:

Company Name	ADEPT RCM Solutions	Company Contact		Gwendolyn Collins	
Street Address	11816 Inwood Rd #1089				
City	Dallas	State	TX	Zipcode	75244

Suppliers with unacceptable offers will not be considered for award.

**Public Information and Records Retention**

Solicitation and award documentation will be available upon request after the intent to award is issued. Please email the referenced buyer to arrange.

A copy of this notice will be placed in the solicitation file and sent to all offerors.

**Right to Protest**

Per MCL 4.36.010 – any actual or prospective bidder, offeror, or contractor who is aggrieved in connection with the solicitation or award of a contract may protest to the purchasing agent. The protest shall be submitted in writing within ten (10) days after such aggrieved person knows or should have known of the facts giving rise thereto.



Notice of Rejection

Solicitation Number	392414-2	Date	4/10/2025   4:22 PM CDT
Solicitation Title	Emergency Medical Services Billing and Collection (EMS)		
Buyer Name	Von L Bell	Buyer Email	von.bell@nashville.gov
BAO Rep	Christopher Wood	BAO Email	christopher.wood@nashville.gov

The Metropolitan Government of Nashville and Davidson County has determined the offer submitted by the following supplier is not minimally responsive to the requirements of the referenced solicitation:

Company Name	ELS Medical Billing Group LLC	Company Contact		Ericia Smith	
Street Address	1246 Mooty Bridge Road				
City	#96 Lagrange Troup	State	Georgia	Zipcode	30240
Reason	Offer fails to conform in all material aspects to the solicitation and is not responsive.				
Other/Notes					

Public Information and Records Retention

Solicitation and award documentation will be available upon request after the intent to award is issued. Please email the referenced buyer to arrange.

A copy of this notice will be placed in the solicitation file and sent to all offerors.

Right to Protest

Per MCL 4.36.010 – any actual or prospective bidder, offeror, or contractor who is aggrieved in connection with the solicitation or award of a contract may protest to the purchasing agent. The protest shall be submitted in writing within ten (10) days after such aggrieved person knows or should have known of the facts giving rise thereto.

*Danny C. Clay*

*Dennis Rowland*

## Certificate Of Completion

Envelope Id: 6FACA499-B472-43B7-A1FA-5B080F112F5D

Status: Completed

Subject: Intent to Award - RFQ # 392414 for Emergency Medical Services Billing and Collection (EMS)

Source Envelope:

Document Pages: 12

Signatures: 1

Envelope Originator:

Certificate Pages: 2

Initials: 1

Terri Ray

AutoNav: Enabled

730 2nd Ave. South 1st Floor

Envelopeld Stamping: Enabled

Nashville, TN 37219

Time Zone: (UTC-06:00) Central Time (US & Canada)

terri.ray@nashville.gov

IP Address: 170.190.198.185

## Record Tracking

Status: Original

Holder: Terri Ray

Location: DocuSign

8/5/2025 1:27:26 PM

terri.ray@nashville.gov

Security Appliance Status: Connected

Pool: StateLocal

Storage Appliance Status: Connected

Pool: Metropolitan Government of Nashville and Davidson County

Location: Docusign

## Signer Events

## Signature

## Timestamp

Zak Kelley

Sent: 8/5/2025 1:29:30 PM

Zak.Kelley@Nashville.gov

Viewed: 8/5/2025 2:04:54 PM

Finance Manager

Signed: 8/5/2025 2:07:32 PM

Metro Nashville Government

Signature Adoption: Uploaded Signature Image

Security Level: Email, Account Authentication (None)

Using IP Address: 170.190.198.185

## Electronic Record and Signature Disclosure:

Not Offered via Docusign

Dennis Rowland

Sent: 8/5/2025 2:07:33 PM

Dennis.Rowland@nashville.gov

Viewed: 8/6/2025 6:40:51 AM

Purchasing Agent & Chief Procurement Officer

Signed: 8/6/2025 6:41:00 AM

Security Level: Email, Account Authentication (None)

Signature Adoption: Pre-selected Style

Using IP Address: 170.190.198.185

## Electronic Record and Signature Disclosure:

Not Offered via Docusign

## In Person Signer Events

## Signature

## Timestamp

## Editor Delivery Events

## Status

## Timestamp

## Agent Delivery Events

## Status

## Timestamp

## Intermediary Delivery Events

## Status

## Timestamp

## Certified Delivery Events

## Status

## Timestamp

## Carbon Copy Events

## Status

## Timestamp

## Witness Events

## Signature

## Timestamp

## Notary Events

## Signature

## Timestamp

## Envelope Summary Events

## Status

## Timestamps

Envelope Summary Events	Status	Timestamps
Envelope Sent	Hashed/Encrypted	8/5/2025 1:29:30 PM
Certified Delivered	Security Checked	8/6/2025 6:40:51 AM
Signing Complete	Security Checked	8/6/2025 6:41:00 AM
Completed	Security Checked	8/6/2025 6:41:00 AM
Payment Events	Status	Timestamps