

**2010 Medicaid Infrastructure Grant  
National Question & Answer Teleconference  
July 8, 2009**

**Minutes**

**In Attendance**

- CMS: Joe Razas, Effie George
- Ascellon Corporation: Michael Coe, Henri Abrams, Teresa Vandergriff
- Representatives from current grantee states<sup>1</sup>:
  - Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Connecticut, District of Columbia, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, New Jersey, Michigan, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming
- Representatives from other states:
  - Colorado
- Representatives from other organizations:
  - NCHSD
  - CWD

**Meeting Purpose:** To provide CMS responses to any questions about the MIG 2010 solicitations for both competitive and continuation grants.

**Questions/Answers:**

1. There appears to be a change in CMS's accepted methodology for calculating the 10% expenditure figure that will determine a grantee's proposed 2010 budget. In 2009, states were allowed to project expenditures for the budget grant year, but the 2010 continuation solicitation states:

"Funding above the \$500,000 Minimum: To receive additional funding, States are required to document expenditures from their Medicaid buy-in program either

in the form of expenditure reports for the previous grant year or actual budgeted expenditure levels approved by the legislature and Governor for the previous year, the current year, or the grant year.” (Page 7)

CMS confirmed that the 2009 phrase “as projected for the budget year” was omitted in 2010. Grantees may project the 10% amount. However, grantees: (a) should confirm that their state has a buy-in in place and that it is currently being implemented, given that this funding option is available only to states with such a buy-in, and (b) must include a justification for the projected amount.

2. Regarding the 10% buy-in, CMS confirmed that any state may apply for funding between \$500,000 and \$750,000 with or without a buy-in. However there is no guarantee of a grantee receiving funds or being rejected to receive these funds.

Note that, to ensure that funds previously granted are being spent adequately and appropriately in these final years of the MIG program, CMS will closely scrutinize the current spending. For carryover amounts over \$250,000 as of October 1, 2009, there will be an offsetting of 2010 funding awarded.

CMS also notes that it is not possible to have two grants open simultaneously.

3. The 2010 solicitation notes that for basic grants,

“Working from the proposed individual-level outcomes that show a meaningful change for individuals with disabilities, provide a narrative logic model that ties each outcome with any system-level outcomes, outputs, activities and inputs. In addition to a plain English narrative, States should provide a logic chart to accompany the narrative. “(page 5)

CMS confirmed that the 40-page narrative must include information about the logic model. If grantees wish to provide additional information about the logic model, such information can be included in an appendix (with a statement in the 40-page narrative directing the reader to the appendix).

Grantees are encouraged to contact their local technical assistance centers for guidance on crafting a comprehensive narrative within the page limits.

4. Given that only about six months of 2009 have elapsed, how should a grantee describe 2009 performance if it appears that a given goal or objective may not be accomplished as initially planned?

CMS advises grantees to describe their accomplishments and challenges as carefully as possible, and acknowledges that the proposals will be evaluated with

due consideration for: (a) the difficulty of predicting specific outputs and outcomes, and (b) the “time lag” between proposal submissions (in mid- to late summer) and award of new funds (in late fall).

CMS also notes that grantees may modify their workplans at any time. A key consideration is funding: will funds be spent in accordance with plans, even if outputs and outcomes are at risk of delay? As long as grantees do not reach the \$250,000 ceiling for carryover, they will be eligible for the funds for which they qualify.

CMS also notes that the grantees’ quarterly reports provide important information and context, and so there is already a record of a grantee’s past progress as CMS considers the proposals.

5. CMS confirms that the contents of the continuation solicitation are the only contents required for continuation. The contents listed on page 18 of the competitive solicitation apply only to competitive proposals.

6. In the competitive solicitation, CMS confirms that grantee information on technical assistance should be placed in the project narrative, and not exclusively in an appendix. If grantees wish to provide additional information about technical assistance, such information can be included in an appendix (with a statement in the narrative directing the reader to the appendix).

7. Pages 15-16 of the competitive proposal describe the criteria for funding categories. For a current “basic” state applying for “comprehensive” funds, CMS offers to review the state’s options related to the 10% calculation of the Medicaid Buy-In expenditures.

8. CMS confirmed that it is permissible to project buy-in expenditures based on “cost per member per month” data provided by a state’s Medical Services Administration Division. The grantee would need to include a brief explanation of the calculation criteria. However, expenditures for Medicare Part D cannot be included. CMS refers grantees to pp. 15-16 of the competitive solicitation, noting that certification by the State Medicaid Director is required.

9. For states developing their first MIG proposals, CMS encourages contact and consultation with the local technical assistance centers and current grantees (via meetings, telephone and e-mail). Internet resources like [www.mig-rats.org](http://www.mig-rats.org) and grantee websites are also useful.

10. For continuation proposals, CMS confirms that the appropriate SF-269a to submit for carryover funds is the one submitted on October 1 (for the third quarter). That is when spending should be completed or at least fully documented. CMS recognizes the possibility that the SF-269a may not reflect

the complete expenditure status; for example, state procurement requirements may prevent reporting of funds encumbered but not disbursed.

11. On page 24 of the competitive solicitation, grantees should note the requirement to register in the Central Contractor Registration (CCR) database. While many grantees may have registered there in the past, there may be new or updated requirements. Review of a grantee's previous registration is recommended.