OUTREACH COLLABORATIVES FOR NORTH COUNTY AND EAST PALO ALTO REGIONS RFP QUESTIONS & ANSWERS

The following are answers to questions that were posed by prospective applicants:

1. **Is there currently a collaborative in North County?**

   Yes, the North County Outreach Collaborative.

2. **Page 12 of the RFP, Section E. LENGTH OF AGREEMENT states: "The anticipated duration of the agreement will be for two years, with the term tentatively to begin July 1, 2018 and end June 30, 2021."**
   Q. Will the agreement be for two years, or, will the agreement be from July 1, 2018 – June 30, 2021 (which is, in fact, 3 years)?

   The anticipated duration of the agreement will be for three years, with the term tentatively to begin July 1, 2018 and end June 30, 2021. Included in this RFP is the option to renew for an additional two (2) years pending program evaluation, availability of funding, and division approval.

3. **Page 17 of the RFP, TENTATIVE SCHEDULE OF EVENTS, states that *Contract Negotiations Begin July 9, 2018*, and a *Recommendation to the Board of Supervisors will occur September 4, 2018*. This would indicate that the start date for the project occurs before the contract is approved by the Board, and funded.**
   Q. Can you please clarify how this would occur, or provide an amended tentative timeline?

   Should an existing provider that is currently providing these services be selected as the service provider through this RFP, then the services would continue while the new contract is being negotiated and the start date would be July 1. However, if a new provider is selected, then the start date for services would change to the date the contract is approved by the Board (which is anticipated to be September 4th).

4. **Pages 8–9 of the RFP, section II "Scope of Work," subsection D "Scope of Work and Specifications," item 2 "Program Description" mentions the communities to be targeted in both regions. In the demographics list for the East Palo Alto region (subsection b.), youth are mentioned, but they are not listed for the North County region (subsection a.). However, on page 10 of the RFP, youth *are* included as a population to be served in North County. Are youth going to be served in the North County region, or no?**

   Yes, both subsections mention communities of all ages. Specifically calling out, "youth" was inadvertently left out in subsection a.

5. **Page 17 of the RFP (IV.B) states: "The whole proposal should not exceed 10 pages not including attachments, exhibits or charts." Section V requires 9 different tabbed sections.**

    a. **Does this mean that Proposers must physically provide tabs for these sections? If so, it is likely that the proposal will exceed the 10-page limit, even if the text itself does not, since sections will have to split up in order to be tabbed.**

    The actual tabbing section dividers do <u>not</u> count as your 10 pages of RFP content.

    b. **Or are there specific tabbed sections which the County is considering to be the proposal, with other tabbed sections (such as Tab 7: References) not counting toward the 10-page limit? If so, which tabbed sections is the County considering to count toward the 10-page limit of the proposal?**

    None of the tabbing sections dividers count as your 10 pages of RFP content.

6. **Page 18 of the RFP, Section D. Proposal Evaluation Criteria, lists several sections for evaluation, but does not have any indication of a scoring rubric, or maximum points allotted to each section. This will make it difficult for evaluators to fairly score proposals in a standardized way. Will the County please consider adding a maximum point allocation for each scoring criteria outlined in Section D. Proposal Evaluation Criteria?**

    The County as a whole is considering this change and will pursue it when a new County Procurement Manager has been hired. We anticipate a decision in the hiring process by July 1, 2018. However, specific evaluation criteria has been provided in this RFP.

7. **Page 20 of the RFP (IV.D.2.d.iii) states: "Does the proposer and collaborative partners have expertise in similar program evaluation activities?" Similar to what? To each other? To what the County requires?**

    Similar to the evaluation activities described in the RFP in Section D. Item 5. Data Collection, Reporting and Evaluation (page 12).

8. **Page 21 of the RFP (IV.D.2.d.v) states: "Was an adequate contingency emergency plan included?" What is a "contingency emergency" plan, in the context of the services of this RFP? Also, Tab 6, item 3 prompts Proposers to "*describe*" the contingency emergency plan. Should Proposers include a description or should they include the entire plan?**

   Yes, the contingency emergency plan as it pertains to the services described in this RFP. If proposers already have a contingency emergency plan, they should include that as opposed to describing one.

9. **Page 23 of the RFP (V.D), Tab 1, items 1 and 5 both ask the Proposer to include an organization chart. Is there a difference between these two org charts?**

   No.

10. **Page 24 of the RFP (V.D), Tab 1, item 6, requires Proposers to "list the qualifications for each partner agency and individual that will be assigned to provide services requested by this RFP." The RFP then states that CVs/resumes can be included for individuals. Are CVs/resumes included in the 10-page limit? Can resumes be included for partner agencies as well?**

    You can include CVs and resumes as an attachment to the proposal without having them count as the 10 pages of content. If you are the lead agency that is preparing and submitting a proposal that includes partnerships, yes…you should include the resumes for the partner agencies as well.

11. **Page 25 of the RFP (V.D), Tab 6 states "Each program may have specific quality/evaluation issues, below are some examples," but the items listed after that (1–4) appear to be prompts for describing quality/program evaluation. It does not appear that examples of specific quality/evaluation *issues* are listed. Is it possible that the County meant "procedures" or "processes" rather than "issues" in this context?**

    Yes, it should read as "procedures".

12. **Page 19–20 of the RFP (IV.D) in section 2 ("Program Specific Requirements") requires Proposers to respond to specific questions in their proposals, and for the most part, these correspond to the prompts in the tabbed sections. However, there are a few questions**

under item *a* ("Qualifications and Experience") that do not seem to have a corresponding section in the tabs, namely sub-items *v* through *viii*, about contract compliance, contract management, timelines, and staff recruitment/hiring/training. On page 23 of the RFP, the instructions for the tabbed sections state: "Each proposal should include tabbing sections addressing the information listed below and in the order shown." Given that there is no part of the tabbed sections that provide space for answering the Program Specific Requirements about contract compliance, contract management, timelines, and staff recruitment/hiring/training, can the County please identify where this information should be included?

The information should go in Tab 1: Qualifications and Experience.

13. **Are there current providers that are delivering these services in the North County and EPA regions?**

    Yes. The North County Outreach Collaborative (NCOC) is currently delivering these services in the North County region and is made up of Health Right 360 Asian and A, Daly City Peninsula Partnership Collaborative, Daly City Youth Health Center, Pacifica Collaborative and StarVista.

    The East Palo Alto Partnership for Mental Health Outreach (EPAPMHO) is currently delivering these services to the East Palo Alto region and is made up of One East Palo Alto, El Concilio of San Mateo County, Free at Last and the Multicultural Counseling and Education Services of the Bay Area.

14. **Do we have to get a date and time stamp when we deliver the proposals?**

    No. The staff person receiving your proposal packets can handwrite the date and time it was received. An actual stamp does not need to be used.

15. **What system are you using to track data? Is it Clarity?**

    We are using Survey Monkey.

16. **How do you envision the quarterly meetings to be? Will it just be the lead agency, or with partners?**

    The quarterly meetings are for each collaborative and relevant partners in each region.

17. **What is the rationale to combine the two regions into one RFP? There's information that indicates these are two separate programs.**

    The reason for combining of the two collaboratives in one RFP was strictly an RFP process streamlining. The collaboratives have the same goals, expected outcomes and evaluation strategy. Agencies can choose to apply to serve either region and do not need to propose to serve both.

18. **Will we have to submit more than one proposal?**

    For agencies that choose to serve both regions, you can submit one proposal, but you must address the two regions separately and answer the Tab sections for both regions.

19. **Is there a summary on what worked or lessons learned?**

    Yes, there are annual reports published and are available on the San Mateo County MHSA website, www.smchealth.org/mhsa; including a qualitative evaluation in FY 2015016. Scroll down to the Evaluation tab, Outreach Collaboratives section.

20. **The reporting document is for meaningful engagement, what about general contacts? How are we to capture those?**

    Only an engagement that results in completion of the Outreach Form will be counted. An individual interaction will need to be long enough to have a dialogue with an individual and provide individualized information sharing, a referral, specific service recommendation, etc.

21. **When you say "children", do you mean any age? Is there a percent expectation as to how many children vs adults are to be served?**

    There is no percent or age range expectation, agencies can propose what youth population they would like to focus on and the percentages.

22. **Will there be a tool for tracking initial contact to an actual engagement?**

    This is to be determined by BHRS staff and in collaboration with the selected agencies as needed. The required Outreach Form will collect information regarding referrals made and to what agencies. Actual engagement goals are specific to individuals with Serious Mental Illness (SMI) or Serious Emotional Disturbance (SED). Warm hand-off are expected for individuals with potential SMI/SED when possible.
    BHRS will be working with providers to collect information on source of the referrals made.

23. **Can you give us any direction on how to follow-up with clients?**

Follow up is only expected when there is a potential SMI/SED client that is referred to services and the ability to do this. We understand transient clients pose challenges. This is where a warm hand-off strategy and the use of mental health screeners such as the PHQ-9 or other, plays a role. BHRS will be working with providers to collect information on the source of the referrals made, to capture actual linkages to services.

24. **We think that 10 pages is not enough, and the line spacing (1.5) seems incorrect. Can we get more pages so that we can adequately describe the partnerships?**

Thank you for catching the error in line spacing – it's supposed to be 1.15, and we will change that in the RFP. Yes, you may have an additional 10 pages, bringing the total of pages to 20. The RFP will be reposted with this revision.

25. **My proposal will be based upon potential partnerships – is that okay?**

No. Proposals submitted must have the collaborative agencies identified along with a lead agency identified.

26. **Can we focus on one ethnic group?**

No, all ethnicities in each region must be addressed, which is the reason for the collaborative approach. We understand the value agencies bring with specific expertise for reaching one ethnic group and also value the benefits of strong collaborations.

27. **Have there been changes in the staffing expectations from the last RFP?**

The staffing model remains the same in terms of prioritizing outreach workers (based on the promotores/health navigator framework). The specific outreach worker expectations, as described on page 11 of the RFP, have been added and articulated based on learnings across the years.