

First 5 San Francisco
RFQ 2008/03 Dental Services Access Project
Bidder's Conference - May 7, 2008

Participants: Jennifer Tejano, SFSU Head Start - jetejano@headstart.sfsu.edu
Kristen McClymer, SFSU Head Start - kristenm@headstart.sfsu.edu
Rosemary Lee, SFDPH/MCAH - rosemary.lee@sfdph.org
Wynne Grossman, Dental Health Foundation - wgrossman@tdhf.org
Bruce Boyer, Dental Health Foundation - bboyer@tdhf.org
Evelyn Chan, Wu Yee Children's Services - evelyn@wuyee.org
Nadia Thind, Wu Yee Children's Services - nadia@wuyee.org
Kristy Ouyang, SFUSD Child Development Program - OuyangK@sfusd.edu
Margaret Sheehan, SFUSD Child Development Program - sheehanm@sfusd.edu
Samantha Stephen, DPH - Samantha_Stephen@sfgov.org
Pam DenBesten, UCSF Pediatric Dentistry - Pamela.denbesten@ucsf.edu
Ling Zhan, UCSF Pediatric Dentistry - ZhanL@dentistry.ucsf.edu
Marina Dronsky, UCSF Pediatric Dentistry - dronskym@dentistry.ucsf.edu
Margaret Fisher, DPH-CHDP - margaret.fisher@sfdph.org
Dorothy Quan, DPH-CHDP - dorothy.quan@sfdph.org
Adrian Nunez, SF Health Plan - anunez@sfhp.org

Corrections: On page 5, the administrative cost policy cannot exceed 15% of the total grant budget (this is the new guideline that will take effect by the time this grant is awarded).

On page 14 - Form C, the section on Agency Experience and Qualifications should have a 6 page limit rather than 3.

1) Question: Is the real goal to build a provider referral pool or develop a methodology for increasing the number of children who get dental visits? Which is relatively more important, building a provider pool or increasing access?

Answer: From the language of the RFQ and the expressed model that came out of the Thinking Group, the suggested idea was to develop a referral pool that consisted of dentists who have agreed to accept cases that are insured with subsidized insurance programs such as Medi-Cal, Health Families, and Denti-Cal. They saw that the providers available to these children were limited. A referral pool was seen as the way to enhance access to these children (which was written into the RFQ). The ultimate goal is to increase access, increase the number of visits that are available to this population, and a method has been suggested by which to achieve that.

The importance of building a provider pool or increasing access will depend on the model expressed and the assessment of the success of the model.

2) Question: Would you define a "share the care dental referral pool?" Does this include "encouraging" dental providers to accept Denti-Cal, etc.? If there are an "X" amount of providers in San Francisco that offer Delta Dental, Denti-Cal, and other subsidized programs, is this RFQ limited to encouraging those folks to join the pool or does this RFQ include expanding the network and encouraging other providers to accept Delta Dental, etc.?

Answer: It's both. It's to create a pool of providers that family resource centers, public health nurses, or others can have reference to. So when they find children that need care, there won't be as many hurdles to locate a provider to provide service.

3) Question: You mentioned "ability to recruit volunteer dentists" earlier in today's meeting. Was that just an example to explain the process or is this something you want included?

Answer: What we suggested to be done is the creation of a “share the care” referral pool. The idea probably is that dentists will have to agree/volunteer to be listed in the pool. Dentists can continue to be paid from billable insurance while agreeing to be in the pool.

4) **Question:** How many agencies will be awarded? Is the \$175,000 per grantee or the total amount to be awarded?

Answer: Our vision currently is that there would be one grant to achieve this full amount of funds.

5) **Question:** What are the qualifications of the reviews of the proposals? Will the names of the review panel be published?

Answer: A qualified pool for the review panel will be recruited by the Program Officer. If needed, applicants could receive access to the name of their reviewers and their agency affiliation if appropriate.

6) **Question:** Will parents and family members of 0-5 kids be counted in units of services? Are pregnant women counted?

Answer: The focus of this RFQ is to increase access to dental services for children 0 -5 years old. The measurement of the impact of the services created by these funds will focus on the service utilization and provider participation as it relates to 0 - 5 year old children. This would not preclude a partner or pool provider from serving other members of a family or developing the ability to make referrals for them.

7) **Question:** Are you imagining several organizations collaborating on one grant?

Answer: It is a possibility. The RFQ language will not discourage this from happening.

8) **Question:** Are the forms fillable and on the internet or do we duplicate them from this packet?

Answer: There are forms posted to the website that you can download in Excel and/or Word formats.

9) **Question:** Can a portion of the \$175,000 be used as partial subsidy of current reimbursement for dental treatment especially for very young children?

Answer: Cannot comment on this question.

10) **Question:** If we have other process questions, how can we ask them?

Answer: This is your last opportunity to ask process questions. Once this bidder’s conference is over, First 5 San Francisco does not want to have individual conversations that may be construed as favoritism or unfairness in the process.

11) **Question:** How frequent will reporting be? Is the frequency of the reporting negotiable?

Answer: The standard frequency of reporting for First 5 San Francisco is quarterly. There may be some aspects of it that may be negotiable but the standard is quarterly.

12) **Question:** Could you clarify the fiscal year and how the first year will be prorated? How does a prorated year work with the budget forms?

Answer: As it relates to contracting, First 5 San Francisco’s fiscal year is from July to June. We strive to keep all grants on the fiscal year. If the grant is not awarded by July but rather in October, the first year will be prorated so the grant will be from October to June. The second year will be from July to June.

As it relates to completing a proposal, applicants will need to prepare the budget for any anticipated start-up period and for one full year of operational activities. The budget should be prepared to give First 5 San Francisco staff and proposal reviewers a description of the cost involved to develop and plan the project and the cost to run the project for a year.

13) Question: How frequent are payments? Are they paid in arrears?

Answer: All First 5 San Francisco grants are cost reimbursement grants. We accept invoices monthly.

14) Question: If a joint/collaborative application is sent in, are Memorandums of Understanding (MOUs) required between lead applicant and collaborators? How do you see this handled or how has it been handled with previous grantees?

Answer: If you are planning a collaborative project, it would be helpful to have letters of commitment or MOUs to demonstrate that an agreement has taken place.

15) Question: Have the quarterly reporting requirements (such as forms, numbers, etc.) been determined yet for this grant? If so, what are they? Is the project management portion part of the quarterly reporting at this point?

Answer: They are in development. The reporting forms that are in the packet significantly mirror what the forms will look like to collect the data. The majority of our grantees are on our Contract Management System (CMS) which is a web-based data collection system. We are in the process of phasing in performance measures into CMS as a part of the quarterly reporting. In the future our quarterly reporting will center on performance measures. It will be most likely that our CMS will be set up by the time this grant starts. Another piece in CMS is some basic attendance reporting. Activities are set up in CMS with attendance data with some basic demographics questions.

There are some open-ended spaces on the quarterly reporting where the project management information can come into play in those sections. However, it is something typically more part of the site visit and fiscal monitoring than the quarterly reports but it may differ somewhat across grantees.

16) Question: In developing the proposal should we be developing multi-year plans and budgets? If so, how many?

Answer: According to the RFQ, the budget should be in two parts. The first part is the ramp-up and planning period (what would you be expending in the ramp-up and planning portion?). The second part is a one-year operational budget (what are your on-going operational costs?). As stated in the RFQ, we hope services will begin in December.

There should be a budget for the ramp-up period and one for one year of on-going operational costs. The grant award allocation is \$175,000 annually for operating costs. Most of the time the ramp-up is not more than the on-going operational costs. The budgets submitted with the proposal are more like planning documents for First 5 San Francisco to review. What will be available will be part of the grant negotiations.

The logic model and evaluation plan should focus on a full year of implementation. The project management Form E can capture all of the start-up elements.

Next Steps: If you are interested in applying and submitting a proposal, please send a letter of intent. The letter of intent is not mandatory or binding. However, it will help First 5 San Francisco get a sense of the number of proposals it may receive and to plan out the time for reviewers.
