

Amendment 1, issued 2/25/15, serves to summarize the 2/18/15 pre-proposal teleconference for the FY2016-2017 Senior In-Home Services RFP, answers the questions received, and amends Section 4.04.4 to allow applicants to upload an attachment.

#1 Question: In section 1.01 Introduction, paragraph 4, it states that " the SIH grant program offers older individuals, 60 years of age or older, who are low-income, **and** need assistance....", however in section 1.05 Target population, The target population includes ADRD any age, 60+ with physical or cognitive impairments or 18+ with approval AND priority given to individuals as listed. These two statements are contradictory. Could you please clarify?

Answer: The priority is to serve individuals who are low income, which is why grantees are required to have a sliding fee scale. This same instruction was present in the last RFP. The statements are not contradictory. Section 1.01 is a brief summary of the program and Section 1.05 details and clarifies which persons are eligible to receive Senior In-Home funded services. It clearly lists who may be served from the grant funds by age, income status and mental / physical condition; and further defines a prioritization for services among those eligible individuals, if it is needed, given potential limits on available resources.

#2 Question: In section 1.02 Program Goals and Anticipated, #2 - anticipated outcomes for the program, it is unreasonable to expect an increase in the number of individuals served when there is the same amount (or less) of grant dollars for these programs with costs to provide services increasing. My recommendation is to change to "increase, maintain, (or decrease depending on funding)" the number of individuals served.

Answer: Although we may not be able to increase services, it is not reasonable to establish an anticipated outcome that diminishes results we wish to aim for. The intent of the new DHSS Results Based Accountability efforts, discussed in Section 1.04, are to reduce inefficiencies and increase effectiveness; to strive for the best possible outcomes, especially considering the limited resources we all are faced with. Additionally, it has never been expected that providers will operate entirely dependent upon limited grant funding. Please refer to Section 1.06, the 3rd paragraph under the heading "Proposed Budget". *"It is understood that these funds may not cover the cost of the demand for SIH services. Budgets that propose added match, above and beyond the grant award requested and the required 10% match and that direct the added match toward providing additional service delivery may be awarded extra points."* Please also refer to the associated criteria in Section 4.04.6.

#3 Question: 1.03 – new section – under case management – chores and extended respite – There's an expectation of an assessment or evaluation to include home safety and fall prevention. Are you sending out a assessment tool for that or what is the plan. – Why is it being added to the SIH when it's duplication of other programs around the state that are being implemented under Public Health?

Answer: This is not a new requirement and was present in the language of the previous RFP. It doesn't have to be a separate program. It is reasonable, as well as critical to the well-being of

seniors, and in enabling them to remain in their home and community, that providers incorporate this into the delivery of other services. While assessing the individual's needs, which requires the provision of services by formal service providers, family caregivers, and other formal supports, the provider may use their own form or use the SIH Case Management Assessment form, which incorporates ways of suggesting and instituting home safety and falls prevention in the senior's environment (Please review Section 1.03 – under Case Management, page 4). Please also refer to the Attachment to the RFP, SIH Case Management Assessment page 6, starting with "Home Safety".

#4 Question: In the criteria 4.04 #4 *"Describe the timeline for the project including Effectiveness and Efficiency performance measures and when they will be implemented."* it only has a text box. We would have to write up everything, there's not a way to take a timeline of the implementation of activities and what's done, perhaps from a senior in-home handbook, and just attach that. You'd have to write up the whole narrative again and I'm wondering if it's possible to have an attachment available that can just be put on there.

Answer: The criterion 4.04.4 is hereby amended to allow an attachment to be uploaded in the response. It now states: *"Describe and/or attach the proposed timeline for the project, including when Effectiveness and Efficiency performance measures will be implemented."*

#5 Question: Regarding follow-up on the letter received from Audit department if this is a grant or a contract. Although this was answered, since we do not have anything in writing at this time, it would be good to have a written response.

Answer: There was an error with categorizing the grantee relationship as a contractor (formerly vendor) rather than as a sub-recipient. It has been re-determined that grantees are sub-recipients for most of the grants programs, including this program. The DHSS Audit section is drafting a letter to be sent out soon to rescind the letter that went out in January. The information stated in Section 2.03, under the heading "Audit Requirements" is correct.

#6 Question: For those of us new to GEMS, I believe you cannot submit an application unless all the boxes that say complete are checked, if applying as a federally recognized tribal entity, or if we don't have a federally negotiated indirect cost rate, do we just check complete?

Answer: Yes, you must check all boxes "complete" even if that question does not apply to your agency.

#7 Question: If audits have been required and have been submitted through the appropriate divisions and department and we can just write in the text, we don't have to resubmit as part of this application, do we?

Answer: No, please do not submit audits with the proposal. If an applicant is a prior year grantee and current with requirements, audits will have been submitted to the appropriate entity as described in Section 2.03.

#8 Question: In the Criteria 4.02 #9 in the application sliding fee scale, we were intending to contract with another agency for chore and respite services in an underserved community, I'm wondering if the sliding fee scale is still a requirement of the organization we are contracting with.

Answer: Anytime an agency subcontracts or subgrants with funds from the program, they are responsible for the management of that subgrant or subcontract and their provider must meet all program requirements. Please refer to 7 AAC 78.180 for additional information concerning subcontracting.

#9 Question: 4.03 History of Compliance with Grant Requirements per 7AAC 78.100(2)(B) # 1. Verify the following criteria pertaining to past performance and history of compliance are met – in GEMS it says to upload, what kind of document are you looking for?

Answer: The criterion offers the ability to upload a record of performance for an applicant that is not a prior or current grantee of the department, which may include audit findings (findings only and their resolution), site visit reports, quality assurance reviews, etc. Prior or current year grantees will have those records of compliance on file and should not attach any additional documentation.