California Department of Public Health, Alzheimer’s Disease Program
Questions Submitted for Information Teleconference: September 30, 2019

Applicant Eligibility

1. Question (Q): My organization is interested in submitting an application for RFA-19-10538 and would like clarity on the consortium requirement. What is the minimum number of participating institutions necessary to fulfill the consortium award requirement, 1 or 2 institutions?

Answer (A): See RFA Page 6, IV. Application Information, B. Categories of Awards – “(Consortium Research Awards) may be awarded to an institution for a research project performed through a collaborative, formalized agreement between the grantee institution and two (2) or more participating institutions.” In total there must be at least three institutions, including the grantee. In the case of two institutions collaborating, one may be a subcontractor on an Individual Investigator application.

2. Q: Can a consortium be defined as a primary institution and only 1 additional institution, or are two additional institutions required?

A: See Response to Question 1.

3. Q: Would you be able to clarify what constitutes allowable collaborating institutions for the collaborative projects? For example, I am considering submitting a collaborative project that would include two CADCs and one additional institution (the city of Stockton).

A: See RFA Page 6, IV. Application Information, B. Categories Awards A consortium is defined as “a collaborative, formalized agreement between the grantee institution and two (2) or more participating institutions.” Local government and California Alzheimer’s Disease Centers (CADCs) qualify towards the minimum number of participating institutions necessary to fulfill the consortium award requirement specified in Question 1.

4. Q: Can the application for the individual investigator award include sub-awards (i.e. paid collaborators)? Or does having two or more sub-awards define the consortium?

A: The application can include sub-awardees which are paid collaborators. Having two or more sub-awardees does not define a consortium. Paid collaborators on an Individual Investigator application may belong to the same academic institution, and be included in Exhibit B1 Budget Justification as Personnel or Consultants. For example, sites within the University of California (UC) Davis would be an individual application, but if investigators from UC Davis, UC Irvine, and UC Merced sites applied jointly then the application would be considered a consortium.
For paid collaborators on a consortium (i.e. sub awardees) see RFA Page 31 Exhibit B1 “Each participating consortium organization must submit a separate detailed budget for every year in the project period in Exhibit B2 Subcontracts. Include a complete justification for the need for any sub awardee listed in the application.”

Letter of Intent (LOI)

5. Q: What information needs to be included in the LOI?

A: See RFA Page 8, V. Application Requirements, 1. “Please include your proposed topic area of research.” The LOI is a submission requirement and helps the Program gauge the number of applicants. There is no format to the LOI. A confirmation of receipt of LOIs by the Alzheimer’s Disease Program will be sent to the prospective applicant via e-mail. It is the responsibility of applicants to contact the Alzheimer’s Disease Program in the event that a confirmation receipt is not received via e-mail to: AlzheimersD@cdph.ca.gov

Scope of Work and Research Strategy

6. Q: The RFA calls for "... a focus on women and communities of color". Please clarify this wording, does it mean:

   a. focus on both women and communities of color; two populations but must include both
   b. focus on women or focus on communities of color; two populations, one or the other
   c. focus on women in communities of color; one population that includes women in or from one or more communities of color.

A: See the RFA Page 5, III. Objectives, “All application research topics must focus on women and communities of color.” Though the objectives indicate both women and communities of color as the research topic focus, the intent is for research topics to focus on women and/or communities of color; two populations.

7. Q: The RFA calls for "a focus on...communities of color" and topic areas which include "Populations Suffering from Health Disparities.” Please clarify the distinction between these two.

A: All application research topics must focus on women and/or communities of color, and one of five topic areas (e.g. Populations Suffering from Health Disparities). See RFA Page 5, III Objectives “Communities of color include, but are not limited to, African American, American Indian/Alaska Native, Asian, Latino/Hispanic, and Native Hawaiian/other Pacific Islander communities.”
Examples of research study topic areas for Populations Suffering from Health Disparities are “investigating the racial, ethnic, gender, sexual orientation/identity, and socioeconomic differences; and increasing the quality of dementia care in health care delivery systems, particularly as it relates to cultural and linguistic competency.”

### Budget and Allowable Costs

8. Q: We notice that in previous years, Indirect/F&A costs have been capped at 8% of Modified Total Direct Cost (MTDC). This year's RFA does not specify a cap to indirect costs, and Exhibit B to the RFA (Budget) allows any rate to be used. Will we be able to use our organization’s full Indirect Cost Rate (ICR) in responding to this year’s RFA?

   A: Grantees are required to abide by the negotiated indirect cost rates. For example, UC’s and CSU’s will use an AB20. Non-UC’s will use a CDPH 1229. The California State University, Office of the Chancellor, negotiated ICR’s with the California Department of General Services. The AB 20 became effective and authorized under California Education Code Section 67325. The purpose of AB 20 was to negotiate a model contract term along with negotiated ICRs. Effective July 1, 2019, the ICR’s is 40% (facilities 15% & administration 25%). For further details, refer to the letter dated May 1, 2016, CSU Implementation of the AB 20/California Model Agreement.

9. Q: Is there a cap on the indirect costs rate?

   A: See Response to Question 8.

10. Q: Could you confirm the amounts listed are the total for all awards in each of these years (not max per award)? “The amount available for the Alzheimer’s Disease Program Grant Awards under this RFA is approximately $2,355,000 in year one, $2,655,000 in year two, and $2,655,000 in year three beginning April 1, 2020 through June 30, 2022.” A: Yes, the amounts listed do reflect the total for all awards in each of these years (not max per individual or consortium award). See RFA Page 8, V Application Requirements “The maximum grant amount request, per year, including indirect costs, may not exceed:

   - Individual Investigator Awards – $400,000
   - Consortium Awards – $600,000 (per year per award, not per Institution)”

11. Q: Is there a salary cap?

   A: Yes, salaries should be comparable to CALHR. Refer to CALHR Pay Scales. Applicants may reference the Civil Service Pay Scales alphabetically by class title to identify personnel titles and applicable salary cap(s).
12. Q: Are there minimum requirements for the recommended reviewers? For example, does the individual need to have an appointment of Associate professor or higher?

A: See RFA Page 37, Reviewer Recruitment – “please identify six (6) potential reviewers residing in the United States that are qualified to review the five topic areas.” There is no specified title(s) or education level required for individual reviewers. Review the topic area examples to verify that the reviewer’s area of expertise aligns with one or more of the five research topics.

13. Q: What degree of professional overlap is allowed for the recommended reviewers? Can the recommended reviewers be people that we have published with? Can they be people we are on other grants with? What constitutes a conflict of interest for these individuals?

A: See RFA Page 38, Reviewer Recruitment Recommendation – “Identify any known conflicts of interest of [each] reviewer. If none, write none.” By indicating “none,” the applicant certifies the following:

- The Recommended Reviewer is not named on the application in a major professional role.
- The Principal Investigator or others on the application with a major role are not part of the Recommended Reviewer’s institution or institutional component (e.g. department).
- Within the past three (3) years, the Recommended Reviewer has not been a collaborator or has had any other professional relationship (e.g., served as mentor) with any person on the application who has a major role.
- The Recommended Reviewer would not receive a direct financial benefit if the application is funded.
- The Recommended Reviewer does not have an indirect financial interest from the applicant’s institution or from the Principal Investigator of over $10,000 in honoraria, stocks, or fees during the course of the previous year or during the proposed project period(s).

14. Q: Do the recommended reviewers need to agree to be reviewers prior to submitting the application?

A: Yes, recommended reviewers must agree to be included in the application.
15. Q: What are the preferred margins for the application documents?

A: See RFA Page 15, X. Grant Application Formatting Guideline. 1-inch margins are required for the Project Summary, Scope of Work, Body of Proposal/Research Strategy, Budget Justification, and Biographical Sketch(es). There is no preferred margin requirement for all other documents. However, printer-friendly margins are requested.

16. Q: Are there restrictions on the use of international data resources or international collaborations?

A: See RFA Page 7, C. Applicant Eligibility, “Applicants and all other associated co-applicants and subcontractors must be California-based, and all relevant project activities must take place in California. Institutions and PIs participating in a Consortium Research Award are also subject to these requirements.” Use of international data is allowable, however, please keep in mind the diverse population of California when selecting data sets to ensure comparability.