

## Response to Written Questions

As per the Request for Applications for subgranting Title V / Maternal and Child Health (MCH) Block Grant (RFA #21734-Y3) released May 1, 2014 by the Nebraska Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS), DHHS will respond to questions at the conclusion of the two periods. These questions and answers are in response to the periods ending May 15 at 5:00 p.m. (numbered 1-6) and June 10 at 5:00 p.m. (numbered 7-12), respectively.

Question 1: *“Are activities to develop family engagement in the areas of Special Healthcare Needs and/or Underserved Populations fundable?”*

Answer 1: Family Leadership and Engagement may be an acceptable strategy under this RFA, depending on several considerations such as the strength of the strategy for the proposed project, and whether the project meets all three minimum criteria as described in the subsection **1.02.2 Type of Projects/Services**. If those considerations are satisfied, activities to develop Family Leadership and Engagement would be fundable under this RFA.

Additional points are possible for projects in which “children” (age 1-22) are the exclusive target population, as stated in subsection **1.02.2 Type of Projects/Services** and shown in Table 4 Evaluation Criteria & Points in subsection **2.05.1 Criteria and Scoring**. Children with Special Health Care Needs (CSHCN) and “children” are separate populations in Title V of the Social Security Act of 1935. A project that involves the population of Special Healthcare Needs will not receive extra points under this RFA. Use of evidence-based practice or an evidence-based program are optional but encouraged criteria.

Question 2: *“The RFA indicates that there needs to be an audit for the 3 preceding years. Would this be FY 2011, 2012 and 2013?”*

Answer 2: To clarify, please note revisions to item 2. in **Attachment C: Organization Overview** (RFA, p 56) to read:

2. Has the agency submitted audited financial statements to DHHS for the organization’s preceding three fiscal years?  
 Yes (no additional information is needed)  No (go to #3)

This would be FY 2011, 2012, and 2013 unless the organization’s FY 2013 audit has not yet been completed.

Question 3: *“If collaborating with other organizations, do the partnering entities decide which organization is the fiscal agent and the fiscal agent submits audits of only its organization? Would the other organizations complete only a memorandum of understanding?”*

Answer 3: Partnering entities determine the relationship of the collaborative partners. The Applicant organization is required to submit its audited financial statements to DHHS, and only if Applicant has not submitted the audited financial statements to DHHS for another award. (**Attachment C: Organization Overview** (RFA, p 56, as revised in the preceding response to written question #2).

The response to the second part of this question depends on whether the organizations partnering with the Applicant will be non-paid or paid, as addressed in subsection **1.06 Personnel, Collaborative Partners and Subcontractors** of the RFA. If the Applicant is relying on non-paid collaborative partners for the success of the proposed work, a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) must be submitted as part of the Application. Organizations that enter into an MOU do not need to submit audited financial statements to DHHS.

There are additional considerations for the relationship between the Applicant and its paid partner(s). If the Applicant (referred to as a Subrecipient if awarded a subgrant) provides monetary compensation to another party to perform work under this subgrant, the relationship between the Subrecipient and another party must be formalized in a legally-binding agreement. Subrecipients are responsible for monitoring paid partners, thus the Subrecipient will need to determine whether to require audited financial statements of a paid partner be submitted to Subrecipient.

Question 4: *“Can subgrant funds from another DHHS subgrant be used towards the matching requirement?”*

Answer 4: No, subgrant funds from another DHHS subgrant cannot be used towards the matching requirement. Federal awards that pass through to a lower-tier organization, or subrecipient, do not lose federal identity, and are unallowable as match to another federal award.

Question 5: *“Breastfeeding is on the list of priorities (#9) but states that it is not a priority for children. Can you further explain why this is not considered a priority?”*

Answer 5: Table 1 (RFA, p 6) lists the priorities resulting from the Five-Year Comprehensive Needs Assessment (RFA, p 3). Priority #9 is specific to infants who breastfeed exclusively through six months of age. MCH subpopulations, as defined by the federal Health Resources and Services Administration (HRSA), include

“infants” and “children” (**Appendix 3: Glossary**). Because additional points are possible for an application under this RFA in which “children” are identified as the exclusive target population with subgrant funding (RFA, pp 4, 21), Table 1 is intended to clarify the potential relationship of each priority to “children”. Priority #9 is not applicable to “children”.

Question 6: *“Can this grant be awarded to individual graduate student researchers who are collecting data for their dissertation? I know the grant focuses on mothers, but my work is on fathers (which is an important area). Could funds be awarded to me for this purpose?”*

Answer 6: No, individuals are ineligible to apply for these funds (**2.01.3 Eligible Applicants**). While ineligible to apply for these funds, individuals may participate as collaborative partners with an eligible Applicant, as stated in **1.06 Personnel, Collaborative Partners and Subcontractors**. Fathers are not specifically defined by the federal Health Resources and Services Administration (HRSA), although HRSA defines family-centered care which is included in **Appendix 3: Glossary** of the RFA. A project that involves a population other than “children” will not receive extra points under this RFA.

**The preceding ends the responses to questions received in the 1<sup>st</sup> period.  
The following are responses to questions received in the 2<sup>nd</sup> period.**

Question 7: *“Does the Letter of Intent still need to be submitted even though it was not a requirement?”*

Answer 7: No. The Letter of Intent is optional.

Question 8: *“Our organization plans to submit an application. Two entities have approached our organization about a partnership in our service area that has a focus similar to one of several focuses we plan to address in our own application. If our organization goes with the partnership, can we apply for funding through this RFA to cover that project in addition to our own?”*

Answer 8: Yes, an organization could be the applicant for its own application, and as either the applicant organization or a partnering organization in another application. Organizations should weigh whether to be involved in more than one application because of the competitive process of this RFA. Partnering organizations should determine which organization is applicant and whether MOUs or contracts are appropriate to formalize the partnership with the other two entities.

Question 9: *“Does the applicant’s project need to solely reside in one of the identified priorities or can the project be a compilation of a component of several of the priorities?”*

Answer 9: An application may address more than one of Nebraska’s ten MCH/CSHCN priorities if the priorities are supported by a community needs assessment, and also satisfy the other minimum criteria that it not require extended start-up time or effort. See subsection **1.02.2 Type of Projects/Services** of the RFA.

Question 10: *“Recruiting schools would be part of the project and we would plan to offer funds from the subgrant to support each school’s participation. How should we handle the requirement for contract versus MOU, not knowing for certain what particular schools will be partners?”*

Answer 10: Use of a contract versus a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) depends on whether schools, or other partners, will be involved with, or without, monetary compensation. MOUs and contracts are addressed in subsection **1.06 Personnel, Collaborative Partners and Subcontractors** of the RFA. Consider if the relationship will necessitate monetary compensation in exchange for services from a partnering organization (contract required), or whether the applicant will incur expense on behalf of a partnering organization (MOU required). If the work plan has a strong rationale to recruit post-award because it is determinant on accomplishing certain activities/objectives in order to recruit, and if that relationship necessitates contracts, the application should reflect a projected budget for contracted services. In that event, DHHS reserves the right to approve a budget revision request post-award to consider specific contract requests. If schools or other partners cannot reasonably be identified pre-award, but the success of the project depends on their participation without monetary compensation, MOUs will be required post-award when partners are identified.

Question 11: *“We have partners that will be providing staff and project services as in-kind match. They would not be contractors or employees of our organization. Should we list them in the Attachment G: Personnel Cost Worksheet? Or should we list our employees only?”*

Answer 11: No, do not include in the required **Personnel Cost Worksheet (Attachment G)** calculations for the value of personnel contributed from a third-party as in-kind match. The purpose of the **Personnel Cost Worksheet (Attachment G)** is to calculate and show allocable costs of applicant’s employee(s) budgeted with subgrant funds.

Applicant may use a separate Personnel Cost Worksheet to calculate its personnel budgeted as cash match for the project, if any. If doing so, Applicant is not

required to submit the separate worksheet, but if applicant chooses to submit it for cash match, clearly indicate that it is for cash match in the separate worksheet.

Applicant and/or partnering organizations may use the worksheet as a tool to assist in negotiating contracted personnel services and/or to assess the value of personnel contributed from a third-party as in-kind match, however, separate worksheets for those purposes are not required to be submitted as part of the application.

Submitting any optional Personnel Cost Worksheets for either or both types of match or calculations of contracted personnel costs should correspond to the **Budget Justification (Attachment I)**.

Question 12: *“What does “as relevant” mean for the applicant? Is it determined by the applicant?”*

Answer 12: The phrase *“as relevant”* means for the applicant that materials listed in the checklist in subsection **3.01 Application Checklist** of the RFA that are denoted with *“as relevant”* may not be applicable to all applicants. *“As relevant”* is not so much determined by the applicant, as much as it depends on the applicant and the application it submits. The submission of materials where *“as relevant”* appears in the checklist depends on type of entity (if claiming non-profit status), if applicant budgets indirect costs, plans a project on Tribal land, and/or if applicant has partnering organizations and, if so, whether a partner does or does not requires monetary compensation.