



Department of Health and Social Services
Finance and Management Services
Grants and Contracts Support Team
333 Willoughby Avenue, Suite 760
Juneau, Alaska 99801

Amendment # 5
FY14-17 Request for Proposals
Tobacco Prevention and Control Community Grant Program

Amendment Issue Date: 4/3/2013

This amendment is to provide answers to questions asked during pre-proposal teleconference for the FY2014 Tobacco Prevention and Control Community Grant Program. The pre-proposal teleconference was held on Wednesday, March 20, 2013 at 11:00 A.M. Below is a summary of the conference.

Program/RFP Overview

Program staff provided a brief overview of the TPC program and the RFP. Alex spoke of the program's changes to the regional model. Alison added that the focus of this grant is eliminating exposure to second-hand smoke, prevent the initiation of tobacco use and promote cessation among current tobacco users as in the RFP, Section 1.02.

Questions and Answers

Q1: Is it acceptable to apply for the one grant as one agency with another agency as a sub recipient?

A1: Yes. The emphasis is on collaboration and partnership.

Q2: Is the .95 FTE grant coordinator a concrete requirement? Or is it acceptable to maintain a .75 FTE Grant coordinator? If a .95 FTE position is required, would it be acceptable to split the duties between two positions (i.e. one .75 FTE and one .25 FTE)?

A2: The RFP requires a minimum of one .95 FTE staffing position. If an application was received that had an alternative staffing proposal, that alternative would have to be very well thought out, detailed, comprehensive, and supported by an action plan that clearly outlined how the work was to be performed and the budget would need to reflect staffing equal to a minimum of .95 FTE.

Q3: With the limited funding meant to cover such a large area, is there a mechanism to hire for a part-time position in a small community employed by the applicant agency, but who would work from home?

A3: It is answered by the preceding one.

Q4: What were the factors that warranted the major changes to the TPC program?

A4: The opening statements covered, in detail, the reason for the changes, which included focusing efforts strategically and looking more closely at efforts that are tailored to communities and regions. We understand through our work in past TPC grant programs accomplishing our objectives come as a result of partnerships and collaborations, both at the community level as well as regionally.

Q5: Can a consortium of small communities apply for the TPC grant?

A5: Yes, Consortiums of tribal governments are eligible. Consortiums must demonstrate the capacity to do the work in the RFP. To be an eligible consortium outside of a tribal government, it must be a legal entity as allowed by the State of Alaska. They need to be like entities with a lead agency. Subcontracting was envisioned for this solicitation.

Q6: Was the TPC budget cut?

A6: The FY14 budget has not been confirmed yet. However, no cuts are expected, nor planned. As a matter of fact, the program added an additional \$1million dollars to grant funding this year; as reflected in the current solicitation.

Q7: Was funding for direct cessation services removed from the grant?

A7: Funding for direct cessation services is not supported in this solicitation.

Q8: What is the justification for funding on a regional basis? Who defines the regional breakouts and by what method(s) were they defined?

A8: Funding predicated on a regional model was described earlier. The program understands the need to tailor specific interventions for specific populations or communities. This regional funding scenario was identified as the most efficient and natural way to work the

comprehensive programming necessitated. As a matter of fact several current grantees are working in this manner, and the collaborative model has proven very successful to date. The geographical challenges are recognized but the program is confident that these challenges can be addressed and minimized when working collectively. This regionalization is based on the Public Health Regions of Alaska map, developed by the Division of Public Health, and can be viewed in Attachment 3 of the RFP.

Q9: Are lump-sum contracts appropriate to identify in a proposal?

A9: Page 17 of the RFP describes that subcontracts must be identified in the budget, and the subcontractor's qualifications as well as the work they will do must be described and meet the qualifications, same as the proposer. The State does not ask for the contract between the grantee and subcontractor, but it must follow the State of Alaska laws. The State Regulations do not disallow lump sums for subcontractors.

Q10: Could a successful applicant request an advance to meet the obligations of a subcontract?

A10: Typically the grant funds are advanced at 25%. For this grant, that would be approximately \$100,000 to be paid within the first quarter of the award.

Q11: If the proposal identifies a subcontract, must it include the subcontractor's action plan?

A11: The agency submitting the proposal is to submit one action plan. The narrative can describe the portion of work the subcontractor will do.

Q12: Are organizational documents (i.e. board member lists) required for subcontractors?

A12: *postponed*

Q13: Which fiscal year schedule (the applicant agency's or the State's) should be used to develop a budget?

A13: Use the State budget timeline. For example, FY14 is from July 1, 2013 to June 30, 2014. The duration of this solicitation is FY14-FY16.

Q14: Do applicants need to propose work in all three settings in order to be considered comprehensive?

A14: Proposals must include the minimum qualifications as listed on page 7 of the RFP. All must include Goal 1, and strategy 3.1 as well as the eight strategies as listed in Goal 4. The proposal can include additional work as capacity allows, but the minimum qualifications must be met.

Q15: Can organizations apply for more than one grant (i.e. one regional and one statewide)?

A15: Yes they can. Multiple applications from the same agency are allowed, however must address separate area's or scopes of work within the proposal. If all qualifying criteria is met, more than one proposal from an applicant may be considered. Please note, it is the programs intent to secure qualified applicants to support communities and populations in this work. These communities and populations who are most in need of services across are state should be covered by a funded grantee. Considering such, a well written and defined proposal will be reviewed through the PEC or Proposal Evaluation Committee. These recommendations will be passed to the Program and a strategic determination (involving many criteria, some of which is listed here) will be made to award, or fund.

Q16: Does the term "public spaces" primarily refer to indoor? Or outdoor?

A16: The focus is secondhand smoke, primarily indoors. This definition may expand in the future, but for these purposes it refers to indoor.

Q17: Are there any budget matching requirements for this program?

A17: No. The capacity of the applicant to do the work must be clear and obvious in the proposal.

Q18: Does the "strategy overview worksheet" refer to Attachment 7?

A18: Yes. The first page is the Action Plan with an overview and checklist. The remainder is the work plan.

Q19: Should work plans be included in the body of the proposal? Or should they be included as attachments?

A19: Work plans are attached as part of the applicant's proposal.

Q20: Is there a page limit for proposals?

A20: There is no limit listed in the RFP. If there was a limit, it would have been included in Section 3.05, on page 21. The only limitations discussed there are margins and the type of pitch.

Q21: From a statewide perspective, do applicants need to develop community coalitions for each community they serve? Or would a statewide coalition suffice?

A21: Each applicant should develop a regional coalition and that is focused on statewide priorities as outlined in the RFP. Existing coalitions may be utilized. The intent with requiring coalition development and unity is to foster community awareness, and participation in our work. The overarching theme for our work is collaboration. This could happen at a community level, as well as regionally. The expectation is coordination, with leadership and focus on the program objectives.

Q22: Does coalition leadership need to be defined/demonstrated in the proposal?

A22: In terms of the application and through the course of the work, regional grantee leaders will need to be identified. The vision, from the program standpoint was an applicant would self identify and in turn be supported by the other regional grantee(s). An intent to lead could be made in initial proposal and the capacity, willingness and leadership ability to do so should be highlighted. Proposed corresponding budget to carry out such duties should be reflected in proposal.

Q23: Can grantees leverage technology to satisfy the requirement for quarterly meetings among regional coalitions? Or must the meetings occur in a face-to-face setting?

A23: The geographical challenges are appreciated and understood. The ability to use technology to supplement face-to-face meetings is acceptable. An in-person meeting is highly

encouraged at least once a year. Applicants need to determine what works best for their region.

Q24: If applying for a statewide grant, is it acceptable to meet the MOA requirements with MOAs from statewide agencies?

A24: Yes

Q25: Can MOUs and/or letters of support be submitted with the proposal? Would these take the place of the minimum MOA requirement?

A25: Yes, MOUs and letters of support are encouraged. The intent from the program side is for applicants to have time to establish MOAs. The RFP was listed online for six weeks to accommodate those needs (i.e., assembly approvals). If it is in the RFP as a requirement, it is required. If an applicant demonstrates effort and due diligence, and that effort is documented in their proposal, what is intended and submitted will be considered. Letters of support from each applicant's leadership are highly encouraged and anticipated.

Q26: Will the PEC be identifying successful applicants on a regional basis? Is there a scenario whereby a region may not have two successful applicants?

A26: The intent is to fund, AT A MINIMUM, two grantees in each region. The only reason that would not occur would be if two proposals were not received along with criteria outlined above in question Q15.

Q27: How many grantees is the State currently funding for TPC programs? By how much will the program changes reduce the number of agencies to be funded?

A27: The State currently has 37 grant awards in place across single component programs; these include K-12, Community and Cessation. Multiple awards are housed within single agencies currently; thus comparing number or amount of awards between the two grant programs is not logical.

Q28: What are the requirements/regulations regarding subcontracts?

A28: Subcontract requirements/regulations are found in 7 AAC 78.180 and in the following link:

[http://www.legis.state.ak.us/basis/folioproxy.asp?url=http://www.jnu01.legis.state.ak.us/cgi-bin/folioisa.dll/aac/query=\[JUMP:'7+aac+78!2E180'\]/doc/{@1}?firsthit](http://www.legis.state.ak.us/basis/folioproxy.asp?url=http://www.jnu01.legis.state.ak.us/cgi-bin/folioisa.dll/aac/query=[JUMP:'7+aac+78!2E180']/doc/{@1}?firsthit)

Q29: Are grantees expected to work in all villages within the region they serve? Or is strategic location selection permissible?

A29: The expectation is the applicant will strategically apply programming through collaboration and partners and clearly define geographic area to be served. The applicant is expected to understand the region in which they work; i.e. how services are most efficiently and effectively deployed. Applicants are encouraged to be innovative in proposed work-plan.

Q30: If submitting a proposal as an agency from Anchorage, must the proposal include plans to serve the Mat-Su Borough as well?

A30: Not necessarily, but ideally. We are looking for applicants to partner and collaborate, supported by a comprehensive work plan addressing at least the three minimum requirements to be applied across the region in which they reside. Applicants must identify the areas they are going to work.

Q31: Can a school district apply to this program?

A31: As long as the proposal meets the minimum qualifications and demonstrates they have a comprehensive work plan, yes, school districts are eligible and encouraged to apply.

Q32: Is there a form that will be used to meet the Minimum Responsiveness requirement to promote Alaska's Tobacco Quit Line?

A32: Attachment 7, on the first page of the action plan then further descriptions in the narrative should promote smokefree and resources to quit smoking.

Q34: Should Mission 100 be discussed in the proposal?

A34: Mission 100 is a comprehensive initiative of the current statewide program. The proposals should demonstrate an understanding of this initiative and incorporate ideas and strategies on how to collaborate.

Q35: Does the \$400,000 award per organization pertain to a single fiscal year? Or for all four years?

A35: The \$400,000 grant award is per grantee, per fiscal year.

Q36: When will successful applicants be announced?

A36: The PEC date is to be determined. The intent is to award in mid-to-late May.

Reminders discussed at close of teleconference:

- *A summary of the questions will be posted by Friday, March 29*
- *Any additional inquiries should be sent to Britten Burkhouse via email*
- *The deadline for written inquiries or protests of the RFP is Tuesday, April 9*
- *The deadline for receipt of proposals is Friday, April 19, 2013 by 4:00pm*