

Questions submitted in response to the CDVSA RFP, Enhanced Services for Victims of Crime, FY2020-2022:

1. Can you share the process through which the three priority areas were determined?

Response: CDVSA determined the needs based on the types of service categories we are required to fund with VOCA dollars. Children's services are one area where we have provided significantly less funding. This was verified by reviewing our Victim Services data collected from current direct service grants also indicating very few services going to child victims. Legal services were determined by input from victim service agencies and legal advocates that indicated more service need than is currently available.

2. **94.116** – Purpose of VOCA-funded projects. This section (first paragraph) states that "VOCA funds shall be available to sub-recipients only to provide direct services and supporting and administrative activities as set out in this subpart." Language in the RFP does not allow for support/administrative costs related to priority areas 1 and 2. What is the rationale?

Response: As stated on page 11 of the Enhanced Services for Victims of Crime RFP:
Please note: Funding for the Legal Assistance and Mental Health Counseling categories is limited to personnel costs of direct service providers associated with providing the identified Legal Assistance or Mental Health Counseling services. As with all grant funding solicitations, parameters and limits are indicated in the RFP to guide applicants. Our intent as stated on page 5 of the RFP is to "Be creative and look for ways to leverage and maximize the available funding." Including budgets that are "reflective of partnerships and collaborations to maximize service provision across disciplines." The intent of this solicitation is to not solely fund any projects or programs, but to *enhance services to victims of crime*. Only VOCA allowable costs identified in this RFP are eligible for funding through this solicitation.

3. VOCA funds have an exception for project match for sub-recipients that are federally recognized American Indian or Alaska Native tribes or projects that operate on tribal lands are eligible for an exception. What is the definition of tribal lands?

Response: On page 2 of Attachment A: VOCA Subrecipient Eligibility Requirements it states: There is no match requirement for VOCA sub-recipients that are: federally-recognized American Indian or Alaska Native Tribes or Projects that operate on tribal land. In Alaska only Annette Island is considered 'tribal land.' This exemption will be based on applicants who are federally recognized tribes or an application from Annette Island, for services on Annette Island.

4. The RFP quotes from the VOCA Rules and regulations (**94.119**). Allowable direct service costs example number 7 – *Traditional, cultural, and/or alternative therapy/healing* – which is a subset of (b) *Personal advocacy and emotional support*. This specific example is not included under the section (c) *Mental health, counseling, and care*, which is included in the RFP and requires that this support be provided by a person who meets “professional standards to provide these services in which care is administered.” Does this mean that personal advocacy and emotional support is one of the priority areas OR is mental health counseling and care the priority area?

Response: As stated in the RFP on page 9 only VOCA rule 94.119 (c) Mental Health Counseling and Care is allowable for this funding. Please refer to this section to see what services are allowable for this RFP, including traditional, cultural, and/or alternative therapy/healing. As stated under Priority Category 2, Allowable Direct Services Costs, “All services must be provided by licensed providers, when applicable and delivered according to appropriate guidelines.”

5. Regarding Legal Assistance, Priority area 1:
- i. The RFP pulls direct language from section (f) – legal assistance and the direct services (including, but not limited to) are directly quoted from the VOCA Rules and Regulations. This is extremely clear – thank you. In section (**94.120**) – *Allowable costs for activities supporting direct services* says that VOCA funds may be used for a) Coordination of activities; b) Supervision of direct service providers; c) Multi-system, interagency, multi-disciplinary response to crime victim needs; and d) Contracts for professional services; e) Automated systems and technology; and g) Restorative justice. Can you discuss how these allowable costs under VOCA rules are/are not allowable under the current RFP?
 - ii. In reference to point (d) the example includes the following: contracting for specialized professional services (e.g., psychological/psychiatric consultation, legal services, interpreters). Can you please elaborate on how these professionalized services can be incorporated into provisions of direct legal assistance? Which of the supporting activities can be used to support the provision of legal assistance as some of them are absolutely required to ensure victims’ access, e.g. interpretation?

Response: As stated on page 8 of this RFP only services in section 94.119 (f) of VOCA Regulations are allowable for this RFP; section 94.120 is not allowable for this RFP. As with all grant funding solicitations, parameters and limits are indicated in the RFP to guide applicants. Only those VOCA rules indicated as allowable for this RFP will be considered as responsive to this solicitation.

Regarding Interpretation services, these are required by federal Civil Rights Non-Discrimination Requirements as outlined on pages 6-7 in Attachment A: VOCA Subrecipient Eligibility Requirements. Please review prior to applying in response to the RFP.

6. Regarding **94.121** – *Allowable sub-recipient administrative costs*. This section is referenced under Priority Category 3 – CAC service. Does this mean that the current RFP only allows for these allowable costs to be used solely by CACs? If so, could you please share which costs are allowable for priority areas 1 and 2. From the VOCA regulations, it appears that 94.122 lays out “expressly unallowable sub-recipient costs”. Are there other costs that are allowable under VOCA as outlined in sections 94.119 and 94.120 that are not allowable under the current RFP?

Response: As stated on pages 9-11 of the RFP, Priority Category 3 (Child Advocacy Center Services) allows costs for Personnel, Skills training for staff, Training-related travel, and Equipment and furniture to facilitate the delivery of direct services. As stated on page 11 of the Enhanced Services for Victims of Crime RFP: **Please note:** Funding for the Legal Assistance and Mental Health Counseling categories is limited to personnel costs (salary and employee benefits) of direct service providers associated with providing the identified Legal Assistance or Mental Health Counseling services. Only VOCA allowable costs identified in this RFP are eligible for funding through this solicitation.

7. Under a current OVW *Legal Assistance to Victims* grant award, we have the following special condition: “The recipient agrees to provide regular and emergency attorney supervision for project attorneys who have practiced law for less than five years and who are providing legal services in connection with the grant-funded project.” Would this also be a special condition under this current RFP?

Response: This condition is not a Special Condition for CDVSA’s VOCA funding, so it will not be a Special Condition for funds awarded through this RFP.

8. On page 8 of 20, of the CDVSA Enhanced Services for Victims of Crime RFP, the list of allowable direct service costs for the Legal Assistance priority category is not as broad as the Child Advocacy Services priority category. Can administrative, travel, commodities, etc. costs also be allocated to this funding source? In a similar vein, what about evaluation and process monitoring costs?

Response: On page 11 of 20 of the CDVSA Enhanced Services for Victims of Crime RFP it states, “Funding for the Legal Assistance category is limited to personnel costs of direct service providers associated with providing the identified Legal Assistance.” Personnel costs include salaries and benefits for the direct service providers.

Administrative, travel, commodities, evaluation and process monitoring costs are not allowable direct service costs under the Legal Assistance priority category for this RFP.

9. In reviewing the application, it is noted that “Applicants may only apply for one of the three Priority Categories.” Due to the wide range of services provided within the region, there are identified needs to expand services in two of the three Priority Categories. Is there a possibility of modifying this requirement to allow a single application for two categories or to allow an organization to submit two separate applications?

Response: At the bottom of page 5 of 20 of the CDVSA Enhanced Services for Victims of Crime RFP it states, “Applicants may only apply for one of the three Priority Categories.” And, on page 9 of 20 of the same RFP under Mental Health Counseling priority category 2, a note stating, “CAC’s applying for mental health counseling services should apply for Priority Category 3.” We will only accept one proposal from one priority category per agency.

10. Under the Legal Assistance category, are victim advocate services related to the criminal justice process allowable? For example, assistance with creating a victim impact statement and providing court accompaniment.

Response: If you review Allowable Direct Service Costs for the Priority I Category—Legal Assistance on page 8 of the Enhances Services for Victims of Crime RFP it states “Legal Assistance services (including, but not limited to, those provided on an emergency basis), where reasonable and where the need for such services arises as a direct result of victimization. Such services include, but are not limited to: 1) Those (other than criminal defense) that help victims assert their rights as victims in a criminal proceeding directly related to the victimization, or otherwise protect their safety, privacy, or other interests as victims in such a proceeding; 2) Motions to vacate or expunge a conviction, or similar actions, where the jurisdiction permits such a legal action based on a person's being a crime victim; and 3) Those actions (other than tort actions) that, in the civil context, are reasonably necessary as a direct result of the victimization;

The underlined areas above provide you with guidance and flexibility related to assistance with services that are in the interest of victims (such as creating a victim impact statement and providing court accompaniment).

Also, on page 6 of the RFP where it states: “As applicants determine which service area they will apply for, the Council encourages partnerships and collaborative work that strengthens and supports the intersectionality of violent crimes and the need for trauma-informed services focused on legal assistance, mental health and supportive forensic care for child victims of abuse. Proposals should demonstrate strong collaboration between agencies working with victims of crime and the services being proposed for this population. Recognizing that each community and/or service area has unique demographics, needs, resources, cultures, strengths and challenges, the Council requests applicants to think broadly, strategically and with a focus on interventions and approaches to best meet these unique needs.”

These key statements on page 6 of the RFP recognizes each community and its needs are unique and will require services to specifically address the identified needs.

11. Under the Legal Assistance category, are services that help prevent individuals from becoming victimized allowable?

Response: consider the wording on page 8 that says: services arise as a direct result of victimization

12. Regarding match, is the opportunity for a waiver only for the first year, or can there be a waiver for years 2 and 3?

Response: A waiver can happen over multiple years, but subgrantees will have to complete an application for the waiver each year. There is intent that at some point an agency will be able to meet the match requirement, but if conditions continue that make this impossible, then you can continue to apply for the waiver.

13. Clarification on allowable costs for equipment for CACs.

Response: Page 10 of the RFP lays out what equipment and furniture is an allowable cost. In general, it is allowable if it helps facilitate delivery of direct service. Only Priority Area 3, CACs, has equipment (page 10) as an allowable expenditure.

14. On Page 10 it seems that all funding would be used for equipment. Is a rental fee or construction of a new site allowable?

Response: Building expenses, rent and construction are not allowable expenditures.

15. Regarding paying for training/travel for direct service staff, does this exclude multi-disciplinary team members?

Response: Members of a CAC team, like members of a SART team, need consistent training so it would be allowable to use these funds for training all members of the team providing the direct service to children.

16. Is a prevention coordinator who supports training and education considered direct service staff?

Response: No. Paying for this position would not be allowable within this RFP parameters.

17. Is it allowable to cover the costs of travel for children to come from outlying communities into the center to access services?

Response: Travel for clients to receive services is not an allowable expenditure.

18. What about travel for program personnel to go outside the primary community and meet with clients in their home community?

Response: As defined on page 10 of the RFP, the only travel expenses allowable in this RFP is training related travel.

19. Under priority area 1, does direct service include supervision of direct service legal staff?

Response: This would not be considered a direct service. It would be appropriate if one direct service provider provided consultation to another direct service provider to consult on a case to determine the most appropriate direct service to provide. Ongoing supervision of direct service providers is not an allowed cost within this RFP.

20. Would consulting could be covered?

Response: See above response. Ongoing supervision is not a direct service cost.

21. A question was asked regarding the indirect cost rate and if it applied to all 3 priority areas.

Response: Yes. Please review the information on page 12 of the RFP regarding the different mechanisms for indirect calculations. Due to the limited allowable expenditures within this RFP, most indirect costs are not be an allowable expenditure (such as administrative costs) The state is required to honor all federally negotiated indirect rates if requested.

22. State grant funding can be used as match for federal funding, but CAC receives grant money from OCS who are passing through federal grant monies. Therefore, is this considered federal or state money?

Response: Federal money passed through to a state agency is usually still considered federal funds. In the case of Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) money, if it is from TANF state bonus funds, it may be considered state funding. We recommend you check with your OCS grant administrator to provide you with clarification.

23. Attachment A says there is no match requirement for tribes or for agencies on tribal lands. Do they need to fill out the waiver form in this instance?

Response: No, the Match Waiver is for all programs required to meet the 25% match. In Alaska, since there is no tribal land (except for Annette Island) for the most part, this waiver will be for federally recognized tribes and therefore there is no match requirement. On the face page of the application, select “tribal government”. If documentation is needed regarding being a federally recognized tribe, CDVSA will follow up. There is no need to fill out the match waiver form.

24. On page 15, it says to include something in writing from partnering agencies. Would a MOA already in place suffice as that document?

Response: If a MOA/MOU is already in place, it is sufficient to include, and the MOA/MOU must be specific to the project you are requesting to be funded. If this project is a new collaboration, you would need to submit documentation of a commitment to this particular project by the partner agency.

25. Is there a word limit for the narrative?

Response: There is no word limit for the application questions. However please note that more points will not be awarded for more words. CDVSA expects narratives will be concise and clear. Please review the language on page 2 of Attachment G, Instructions for Completing and Submitting Application Packet. Under the third bullet, Application Questions, it states “please read [the questions] carefully and respond thoroughly and concisely (include enough information to clearly respond to the questions without providing information that does not strengthen your response).”

26. Our agency is a tribal nonprofit but works with multiple tribes who contract them for services. Does this qualify them to be considered as a “tribal government” applicant?

Response: The challenge in Alaska is our unique tribal system does not always fit federal documents and guidelines. Per federal definition:

Indian Tribes and Tribal Organizations. Any Indian tribe, band, nation, or other organized group or community, including any Alaska Native village or regional or village corporation as defined in or established pursuant to the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C.A. Sec. 1601, et. seq.), which is recognized as eligible for the special programs and services provided by the United States to Indians because of their status as Indians.

This definition does not support your agency, as a tribal nonprofit, being considered a "Tribal Government." Please note that your agency does qualify to apply for a VOCA match waiver to reduce the 25% match requirement.

27. Page 12 states there is a required attendance at the annual grant meeting to be funded in years 2 and 3. What about year 1?

Response: This year's annual grant meeting happens in November 2019; new subgrantees will not be required to attend this meeting until year 2 and 3 of this grant cycle. The information was included in the RFP as a cost for future planning.

28. Regarding the monitoring step of the community survey, is that conducted by CDVSA?

Response: Yes, if you become a funded program CDVSA is required to conduct a Financial Desk Review of the agency every year. We are also required to do an annual risk assessment to see if additional monitoring is needed. In addition, CDVSA is required to perform onsite monitoring every other year. As part of the onsite monitoring visit, a community partner survey is conducted via survey monkey to gather partner input about the collaborative work agencies are engaged in. The results are then shared with the program.

This information was included in the RFP to let programs know what CDVSA is responsible for in terms of monitoring via the federal regulations.

29. Who is the authorizing official who needs to sign?

Response: Whomever is considered the official signer in your organization. It could be the Executive Director, Board Chair, or who your agency designates as the person able to commit your agency to the award and award conditions.

30. To clarify, grantees will have to totally spend out their funding every year and cannot roll over any monies, correct?

Response: Correct. The State does not allow carry over of any funds including federal dollars from one fiscal year to the next fiscal year. Projects will get a new award the second and third years. When CDVSA's budget is authorized by the legislature and the governor, it cannot carry over into a new fiscal year. For this reason, it is expected that applicants will carefully and thoughtfully develop their budgets to request enough funds to accomplish the project and that can be expended within the grant period.

31. If the application proposes a project in conjunction with other agencies, is there a need to indicate the lead on those agencies and submit paperwork like Articles of Incorporation for them?

Response: Articles of Incorporation and proof of non-profit status are needed only for the agency submitting the application and receiving the funds, not the partner agencies. These documents need only be submitted once for those who are not already awardees of CDVSA. If you are receiving other funds from CDVSA, this requirement does not apply.

32. Regarding CACs, it says they need to be already established. What about a new CAC that is just starting up using tribal/federal dollars? Does it have to be fully up and running?

Response: These grant funds are not for startup. However, if a CAC is already in the works and already being funded with federal or tribal dollars, these funds could be considered as enhancing development of that program and it would be appropriate to apply.

33. Can match for this RFP be satisfied if the attorney providing legal services donates back 20-25% of her legal fees provided under the grant to the program for that purpose?

Response: On page 11 of 20 of the CDVSA Enhanced Services for Victims of Crime RFP it states, "Funding for the Legal Assistance category is limited to personnel costs of direct service providers associated with providing the identified Legal Assistance services" and in Section 1.11 Required Match it states, "in-kind resources used as match must be directly related to the project services for which they are matching and must be documented clearly showing the source, the amount, the calculation and the timing of all matching contributions. Additionally, sources of match are restricted to the same uses allowed under federal allowable expenditures"

The attorney providing legal services who donates 20-25% of her legal fees can be used as match under Priority category 1 of this RFP. You must have clear documentation of what is "volunteer in-kind" versus the billable hours.

34. The RFP notes in Section 1.09 that FY21 and FY22 budget projections should be included in Question #12, however the RFP Application Questions document only has 11 questions on it. Can you please clarify?

Response: Page 7 of 20 section 1.09, states, “The proposal should be written to cover the multi-year period, **except for the budget which is only required for the planning and development year of State Fiscal Year 2020.** Projected amounts for SFY21 and SFY22 should be addressed in Question #12 of the Applicant Questions form.

The last line of this paragraph (highlighted above) should have read: “**Projected amounts for a full 12-month award should be addressed in Question #4 of the Application Face Page.**” As you can see from the Applicant Question form, there is no Question #12. Information regarding a projected amount for 12-months should be included in Q. 4 of the Application Face Page.

35. How often are reimbursement payments? (Quarterly? Monthly?) what are timeframes? (e.g. we bill for Q1 on Oct 31, when do we get reimbursed?)

Response: There are 12 scheduled monthly reimbursements each fiscal year. Reimbursement requests are due on the 15th calendar day following each monthly reporting period. If the 15th falls on a Saturday or Sunday, then the due date becomes following Monday. Please allow three weeks for payments to be made. CDVSA processes requests within 3 to 5 business days. Certification of payment can take an additional 7 to 10 business days. Late submissions may be delayed and processed in the following monthly reimbursement schedule.

Attached is the [Reimbursement schedule guide](#) for all our Federal funds.

36. Option 3 94.121 (b) Skills Training for Staff notes that “VOCA funds cannot be used for training that addresses any aspect of investigation of a crime, prosecution or criminal activities or crime prevention” – does this preclude any costs associate with a training that is not primarily focused on this, but does include reference to or individual session on this topic. Specifically, MDT members are encouraged to attend the Child Maltreatment Conference which has different tracks (for forensic interviewing, medical, advocacy, behavioral health, law enforcement, etc.) and some attendees choose to stay on one track and others attend session that cross over into other disciplines). Link to last year’s conference for reference
<https://www.regonline.com/builder/site/Default.aspx?EventID=2411511>

Response: “Training exclusively for developing the skills of direct service providers, including paid staff and volunteers (both VOCA-funded and not), so that they are better able to offer quality direct services”. If the training primarily “addresses any aspect of investigation of a crime, prosecution or criminal activities or crime prevention” this is

NOT ALLOWABLE under 94.121 (b). MDT staff will need to ensure they're attending multi-disciplinary tracks offered at the conference for full reimbursement of training costs.

37. Section 3.04 notes that the “Council may deviate from the numerical ranking in the case of a specific grant or region” – can you clarify if the Council has determined structure or strategy in deviating from numerical score? Because we expect more requests for CAC (Option 3) funding than is available statewide, we are wondering if the Council always provides 100% of funding requested by successful applicants (with some applicants not receiving any grant), or will the Council be considering partial funding for applicants in order to ensure equitable funding across regions that show need? If the Council is considering partial funding will they be looking at a % of the total amount requested (e.g. requested amount of \$100k and funding awarded at \$80k), or will they be looking at what the program request is and fund a portion of the activities based on proven community need (e.g. a grantee asks for funding for a MH Counselor and a forensic interviewer and the Council decides to fund the interviewer only).

Response: Page 17 of 20, “Other factors may include demographics, overall accessibility to other communities, sustainability of the programs, the availability of other services in the region, unique services for underserved populations, and other funding source restrictions and requirements.” “In the case that total funding requests exceed the available funds for this RFP (see Section 1.03 Funding Available for this RFP), the Council Board reserves the right to reduce proposed budgets in a careful and judicious manner. If applicants are awarded a dollar amount lower than what was requested, CDVSA staff will work with agencies to adjust services, activities and budgets to correspond with the amount of funding awarded.” Final grant award decisions are the responsibility of the CDVSA Board of Directors, using the criteria and process identified above.

38. ALLOWABLE COSTS: there seem to be some inconsistencies between the RFP and the Budget Attachment B. Specifically:
1) The RFP under Option 3 does not identify cost of rent, communications, etc. as allowable costs for CAC personnel. However, Budget Attachment B notes a list of facility expenses that might be allowable. Can you please clarify if CACs can include facility costs associated with personnel funded by the CDVSA in the budget? And

Response: Facility expense is NOT ALLOWABLE under priority category 3. RFP Attachment B – Budget Preparation “Guidelines”, serves as a guideline only, for generic budget category development. Only those expenditures identified within this RFP (Section 1.10) are allowable.

2) At the Informational teleconference on Nov 8, it was clarified that Outreach workers are not considered “direct service personnel”, however on Budget Attachment B, it is

noted Commodities (including office supplies and materials used for outreach) may be allowable. Can you please clarify?

Response: RFP Attachment B – Budget Preparation “Guidelines” - Program Supplies such as recreation and craft supplies; posters, pamphlets, brochures, and program-related literature for distribution to clients, schools, and community, agencies; educational and reference books for use by staff and clients; film/video/DVD rental and purchase costs. These are ALLOWABLE at a prorated cost as defined in page 10 of 20 under section 94.121 “VOCA grant may be charged only the prorated share of an item that is not used exclusively for victim-related activities. As stated in response to your previous question, RFP Attachment B – Budget Preparation “Guidelines”, serves as a guideline only, for generic budget category development, not specific to this RFP.

39. Can you provide further detail on what would be a “compelling reason” to have the volunteer requirement waived? For example, can the requirement be waived if the project is focused on working with victims who are part of on-going investigations or trials?

Response: If volunteers are not appropriate or allowable based on confidentiality and criminal justice issues (e.g. as a police department, in which volunteers are not allowed) you would need to present that information to us as justification for a request for waiver determination.

40. Can State of Alaska general operating funds be used as match?

Response: On pages 11 and 12 of 20, section 1.11 of the RFP it states, “Federal funds may not be used to meet the match for federal dollars”. State funds may be used to match federal funds as long as the identified match funds meet the criteria of being directly-related to the project services you are offering. Cash or In-Kind sources of match are restricted to the same requirements as funds allocated under the federal funding program (i.e. the same allowable categories identified in the RFP) and must be documented in the same manner as federal program funds, including financial and programmatic reports.

41. Are all the funds being distributed under the RFP federal?

Response: On page 5 of 20, section 1.01 of the RFP it states, “Funding for this RFP is from the CDVSA’s Victims of Crime Act (VOCA) federal formula fund.”

42. Page 7 of 20 section 1.09, it states, “Period of Grant Performance This Request for Proposals is being offered as a multi-year grant for approximately 5 months of FY20 (February 15, 2019 to June 30, 2020) referred to as year one and two additional option

years of funding for FY21 (July 1, 2020 to June 30, 2021) and FY22 (July 1, 2021 to June 30, 2022). The proposal should be written to cover the multi-year period, **except for the budget which is only required for the planning and development year of State Fiscal Year 2020.** Projected amounts for SFY21 and SFY22 should be addressed in Question #12 of the Applicant Questions form.

The last line of this paragraph (highlighted above) should have read: “**Projected amounts for a full 12-month award should be addressed in Question #4 of the Application Face Page.**” As you can see from the Applicant Question form, there is no Question #12. Information regarding a projected amount for 12-months should be included in Q. 4 of the Application Face Page.

43. It states under allowable direct service costs that “All services must be provided by licensed providers, when applicable, and delivered according to appropriate guidelines”. At our agency, and many other behavioral health providers, we have unlicensed (master’s level) staff who are under the direct supervision of a licensed provider, who signs off on treatment planning and oversees the services. This is a standard in the field. Is this saying that all services that are delivered/funded by this grant be delivered directly by providers who are licensed, or that following professional standards for these services (including supervision) is sufficient?

Response: The process you describe meets the criteria of for this category. While the language states on page 9 of the RFP that “services must be provided by a licensed provider” it also includes the qualifiers, “when applicable” and “according to appropriate guidelines.”

44. It states that substance abuse treatment is allowable “so long as the treatment is directly related to the victimization”. Can you describe how providers are expected to meet the requirement to indicate the relation?

Response: Federal VOCA funding is available specifically to meet the needs of individuals impacted by and/or victimized by a crime of domestic violence, sexual assault, and child abuse or is an underserved victim of other crimes. While CDVSA does not expect documentation of each person’s experience of victimization, through most client intake processes or as a result of the referral source, the service provider has a general idea of who meets the criteria. If, through your intake process you believe the participant has witnessed or been directly impacted by the indicated crimes, service provision will be eligible for the stated criteria. We also know, that often children and youth especially, will not report or disclose specific abusive behaviors, but are victims nevertheless.

45. Regarding the target population: Can you describe how providers will be required to document/prove that recipients of services are “direct victims of physical or sexual

abuse and/or have witnessed violent crimes”? For example, we know based on research that a significant portion of youth with behavioral health needs and/or substance abuse have histories of trauma and high scores of adverse childhood experiences, which include physical and sexual abuse and witnessing violent crime. Is this sufficient, to describe the overall population, or does each client proposed to be served in this program need to have some documented qualification criteria noted by the counselor?

Response: The response to this question is similar to question #44 above; you can certainly use demographic data that defines the populations you serve, and through your referral and intake processes you most likely will have a clear understanding of the experiences the individual has lived through as well as the trauma that impacts their lives. There is also a reasonable expectation that professionals in the behavioral health field have significant experience and understanding of the clients they serve to be able to “document” the impact of lived trauma and abusive behaviors.

46. Youth eligibility for services under priority category 2 - Mental Health Counseling services. It states that the participants in services will need to have been the direct victims of physical and/or sexual abuse, or have witnessed violent crimes. Does this include youth who have experienced abuse or neglect? For example, would a youth that has experienced abuse or neglect, including emotional and mental abuse, and is self-harming or suicidal be eligible to receive services?

Response: The response to this question is similar to questions #44 and #45.

47. Indirect Rate: On page 12, Section I.01 of the RFP, it is stated that if an applicant does not include an indirect rate for administrative costs, those costs may be included in their direct cost budget line. Our agency intends to apply for funds to support legal services and are restricted to personnel costs for direct service providers as articulated in the RFP. At the same time, the attached budget narrative and budget form has the category 700 for indirect costs. On the worksheet, category 700 does not include an option for including a direct cost budget line. Please advise on how we will include these direct costs – allowable as articulated on page 12 - in the budget form attached to the RFP. Should we also attach our own Modified Direct Cost worksheet as described in the budget narrative form?

Response: The Budget Overview and Narrative Form attached to this RFP is a generalized form containing all cost categories to serve other RFP categories. This was used to avoid generating three separate budget forms for the use of this RFP. If applying for a category restricted to direct service personnel, indirect costs are not allowable as indirect costs may only be charged for administrative staff time, which is not allowable in Category I.

48. On Contracting Legal Services: Our agency intends to honor the intent of the RFP by organizing several legal providers as contractors to ensure greater representation across our state and to assure that legal representation is responsive and flexible to meet to the needs of victims of crime. Please advise on how to include contractual costs within the budget format for individual attorneys employed through partner legal agencies as these contractual costs will be used to pay attorney fees to provide direct representation and will include both low-bono and staff attorney costs.

Response: Contracted personnel should be listed in Line 600: Other Contractual; Professional Services. The Budget Narrative should detail out each position being charged to Line 600, documenting these positions as “direct service” contract personnel.

49. Match Requirement and Financial Reports: Our agency understands that VOCA funds require a 25% match, and that CDVSA requires a monthly reimbursable process. Our understanding is that, by the end of the grant period, our agency will be required to show a 25% match to the overall grant awards. We further understand that we may not have a 25% match on each monthly financial report, and that this is acceptable provided our agency is able to prove a 25% match at the end of the grant award period. Please confirm that our understanding is correct.

Response: All federal grants require payments to be made through a monthly reimbursable process. The 25% match requirement is to be met by the end of the project period. If reported match is below the 25% amount of the Reimbursement Requests and/or Quarterly Financial Reports, CDVSA may contact the subgrantee to inquire if they are on track to meet the match requirements as a means of providing technical assistance.

50. Program Participant Definition: On page 14 of the RFP, section 2.02, the RFP requires background checks for individuals who work with program participants. Our agency does not consider individuals accessing civil legal services through a referral process as program participants but rather legal clients. Could you please provide a definition of “program” participant? This is important information to know when developing a statewide bank of low-bono attorneys.

Response: For Category I, Legal Assistance, the term Program Participant should be interpreted as a client receiving legal services. A client is a person who employs or retains an attorney to represent her or him in any legal business, to assist, to counsel. For Legal Assistance, the identified legal service provider does not need to complete a background check. Their status as a practicing attorney complying with professional standards is adequate.

51. Projected budgets for SFY21 and SFY22: On page 7 of the RFP, section 1.09 it states: “Projected amounts for SFY21 and FGY22 should be addressed in question 12 of the applicant questions form.” There is no question 12 on the form. Please advise where we should address these issues.

Response: Please consider the response to #42.