

Questions and Answers for

**Availability of Grant Funds (AGF)**  
**for FFY 2020 State Traffic Safety Information System Improvements Grant,**  
**Section 405(c) Funding**  
as of April 13, 2020

Questions were lightly edited for readability, formatting, and anonymity purposes.

Q 1. What is the maximum that we are allowed to apply for?

A 1. Up to the \$1.3 million that is available through the AGF.

Q 2. Just finished reading the AGF, 2020 Strategic Plan, and 2019 Assessment. It appears that the AGF is asking for proposals that allow us or a consultant working for us to improve the state's crash reporting database. For example, there are 6 state data systems that the state utilizes in this area:

1. Crash
2. Driver
3. Vehicle
4. Roadway
5. Citation and Adjudication and
6. Injury Surveillance/EMS

The only one we contribute to is #1 - Crash

The State created a **2019 Traffic Records Assessment** and they appear to want applicants to meet one unmet recommendation from the Assessment. In the 2019 Assessment, under the Crash database they suggest:

1. Improve the applicable guidelines for the Crash data system that reflect best practices identified in the Traffic Records Program Assessment Advisory.
2. **Improve the interfaces with the Crash data system that reflect best practices identified in the Traffic Records Program Assessment Advisory; and**
3. Improve the data quality control program for the Crash data system that reflect best practices identified in the Traffic Records Program Assessment Advisory

The only one we even intersect with appears to be their crash database. And if we apply we should work out a proposal to #2 - Improving the Interface. The "interface" in relationship to our crash data would be improvement of OUR database so that it better interfaces with the State's Crash database.

A 2.

- An AGF response could allow for a government entity or another eligible respondent to conduct a project on its own, or it could involve a government entity or other eligible respondent subcontracting to a contractor/consultant to conduct some or almost all of the project. Or a combination of the two approaches.
- An AGF response must seek to achieve the grant program's intent as described in the AGF overview section on page 1 of the AGF. It is possible a project proposed by a local or regional government or other eligible respondents could be determined during the review process to not achieve the program's intent. This conclusion could also be reached by the ETRCC or others during later review of the proposed project.
- Police departments feed data into the citation system as well as the crash system.
- In regards to the AGF requirement that a proposed project must address **at least one** unmet recommendation from the 2019 Traffic Records Assessment for Massachusetts, please considering reviewing this document referenced in the AGF before responding: Traffic Records Program Assessment Advisory, 2018 Edition. This document can be requested at [brook.chipman@mass.gov](mailto:brook.chipman@mass.gov).

Q 3. Are members of the Massachusetts TRCCs able to respond to this AGF?

A 3. Yes, though if they and/or anyone from their TRCC member entry submit a response to the AGF, they or anyone from their TRCC member entry cannot serve on the AGF review committee nor participate in the expected vote on proposed projects/awards at the Executive-level TRCC meeting scheduled for April 29, 2020.

Q 4. Members of the ETRCC that are from TRCC entities with projects being reviewed by the ETRCC on April 29 can't participate in the expected vote on proposed projects/awards, right?

A 4. Yes, to avoid a conflict of interest situation.

Q 5. Reviewing the AGF for 405C funding and see "Only units of state and local government or not-for-profit organizations in Massachusetts with a public purpose are eligible to apply for this funding. Private sector organizations are not eligible to receive this funding". This is not new text but since this AGF is now going through a different review procedure, I wanted to make sure that state universities of higher education fit in this category

A 5. Yes, for the purposes of this AGF, state universities of higher education are covered by the state government reference.

Q 6. Given that the funds would not be awarded presumably until September, what is the earliest acceptable start date for a project?

A 6. OGR has all funds in-hand that can be awarded under this AGF, so we could contract soon after formal awards anticipated in early May/early June. Though for state agencies a July 1 start date for the ISA would be the most realistic.

*4/13/20 Update:* given COVID-19 impacts, we do not anticipate awards being made to mid to late June 2020 and any contracts or ISAs starting until mid to late July 2020. Depending on unanticipated events related to COVID-19, even this contract/ISA start goal may need to be extended.

Q 7. Several questions were posed during the application period regarding changes to the key dates in the AGF based on COVID-19 impacts as well as to the anticipated meeting for project presentations on 4/1/20.

A 7. Below is the most recent Key Dates for this AGF process. Please also see March 23, 2020 AGF amendment.

**\*\* Updated \*\* Key Dates**

- **AGF Posted:** January 31, 2020
- **Letters of Intent Due:** by 11:59 pm, March 20, 2020
- **Questions regarding AGF:** by 11:59 pm, April 13, 2020
- **E-Applications Due:** *by 11:59 pm, April 16, 2020*
- **Original, Signed Applications Due:** by 4:30 pm, April 28, 2020
- **ETRCC Review of Projects:** late May 2020
- **Anticipated Award Announcements:** mid-June 2020
- **Anticipated Project Start Dates:** Summer 2020

Q 8. Can the AGF requirement that makes overtime an unallowable cost be waived?

A 8. This requirement will not be waived.

Q 9. Can I ask who is on the AGF selection committee?

A 9. As noted in the AGF, there is an Office of Grants and Research-selected (OGR) review committee as part of the AGF application review process. It consists of OGR staff members and currently one outside reviewer with TRCC affiliation (the entity this outside reviewer is directly associated with did not submit an AGF response). As noted at a past ETRCC meeting, I (Brook

Chipman of OGR) will be one of the committee members. It is EOPSS/OGR policy to keep the names of reviewers confidential to the extent possible so those outside OGR can feel comfortable volunteering for AGF review committees and be honest about their findings. All reviewers participating have grant management experience and/or subject matter expertise.

Q 10. Will e-signatures be acceptable for the e-application step on 4/16/20?

A. 10. Yes, if the signatures are as described in the April 10, 2020 AGF Amendment.