

Request for Grant Applications (RFGA)

Application due 08/07/2026 at 5:00 p.m. Mountain Time MT



Department of Health & Human Services

Utah Rural Health Transformation Program

Sustainable Provider Revenue, Infrastructure, and
Network Technology (SPRINT) Consortium

Opportunity number: URHTP-2858-2026

Table of contents

Section 1: Project Overview	3
Background	3
Purpose of Request for Grant Application (RFGA)	4
Eligible Applicants	4
Required Letter of Intent	4
Minimum Mandatory Eligibility Requirements (Pass/Fail)	5
Partners	6
Completeness and Responsiveness Criteria	7
Application Limits	8
Section 2: Funding Details	8
Funding type: Grant agreement	8
Agreement Period	9
Cost Sharing	9
Use of Funds	9
Section 3: Services and Deliverables	9
Grantee Expectations	12
Section 4: Payments	13
Section 5: Application	14
Instructions	14
Application Questions	14
Section 6: Application Review	17
Compliance and Eligibility Review Process	17
Technical Review Committee	17
Scoring for Applications	17
Award timeline	18
Disqualification	18
Section 7: Additional Resources	19

Apply by the application deadline:
08/07/2026 at 5:00 p.m. Mountain Time (MT)

Section 1: Project Overview

Background

The Rural Health Transformation Program (RHTP) is a five-year federally funded initiative from the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services (CMS) designed to modernize and strengthen health systems within rural communities. In November 2025, the Utah Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS), acting as the state's lead agency, submitted a stakeholder-informed application to CMS. Consequently, Utah was awarded \$195.7 million in federal funding for Year 1. While the program is anticipated to run through 2030, continued annual funding is contingent upon program outcomes, the availability of funds, and CMS discretion.

[Utah's RHTP framework](#) is built upon four strategic pillars: Making Rural Utahns Healthy, Workforce Development, Innovation and Access, and Technology Innovation. These pillars are operationalized through 24 key action activities divided into seven integrated initiatives: PATH, RISE, SHIFT, FAST, LIFT, SUPPORT, and LINC. These initiatives and activities aim to unite rural stakeholders to transform rural healthcare delivery, strengthen patient-centered care, and drive measurable improvements in health, coordination, and financial sustainability across rural Utah.

The Sustainable Provider Revenue, Infrastructure, and Network Technology (SPRINT) consortium is a unique operational component of [Utah's RHTP plan](#). Aligned with Innovation & Access and Technology Innovation, this consortium encompasses ten key actions designed to support capital infrastructure, financial sustainability, technology and artificial intelligence, and interoperability in rural Utah. The selected Grantee will assume administrative, operational, and fiscal responsibility for the included key actions. This involves designing, releasing, and managing subsequent competitive funding opportunities and providing project implementation technical assistance and support which drives critical healthcare advancements in rural Utah.

Detailed eligibility criteria and program expectations are outlined in the subsequent sections of this application packet.

Purpose of Request for Grant Application (RFGA)

The purpose of this request is to select a Grantee via a competitive application process to serve as an implementation and administrative partner over the following RHTP activities:

- **Capital Infrastructure (SHIFT 3.1):** Fund minor renovations and equipment to expand services locally.
- **Financial Sustainability (FAST 4.2, 4.3):** Optimize revenue cycles and pilot alternative payment models for specialist access.
- **Technology and Artificial Intelligence (SUPPORT 6.1, 6.2, 6.3, 6.4, 6.5):** Modernize electronic health records (EHRs), deploy cybersecurity (multi-factor authentication, endpoint detection and response software), and implement consumer-facing and clinical artificial intelligence (AI) solutions.
- **Interoperability (LINCS 7.1, 7.2):** Enhancing secure data exchange and patient access to health information (excluding subactivities 7.A–B).

Questions regarding this RFGA should be addressed to the Utah RHTP team at ruralht@utah.gov. All questions and answers will be compiled and posted publicly in a continuously updated Q&A document located on Utah's RHTP funding opportunities website at dhhs.utah.gov/ruralhealth/funding-opportunities/. Applicants are encouraged to check the document regularly for updates. The final day to submit questions is **August 5, 2026 at 5:00 p.m. MT**, and the final Q&A document will be updated by **August 6, 2026 at 5:00 p.m. MT**.

Eligible Applicants

For the purpose of this RFGA, the lead entity must apply on behalf of a consortium of rural healthcare partners. To ensure stewardship of federal funds and the highest quality project execution, applicants will be evaluated on two distinct tiers of criteria: Minimum Mandatory Eligibility Requirements (evaluated on a pass/fail basis) and Scored Technical Criteria (evaluated by reviewers based on the application proposal).

Required Letter of Intent

To be eligible to apply for this funding opportunity, lead entity applicants must submit a letter of intent to DHHS by **July 27, 2026 at 5:00 p.m. MT**.

This information is used to gauge interest, assist in planning the technical review process, and ensure all prospective applicants receive direct communication regarding important updates and clarification documents. The letter of intent is non-binding. Although required, it does not impact the scoring of the application.

Please email the letter to ruralht@utah.gov.

In the email and letter, include:

- The funding opportunity number and title.
- Name of the lead entity applicant.
- Confirmation of intent to apply.
- A list of consortium members, with representation from the required stakeholder categories.
- A contact name, title, phone number, and email address.

Minimum Mandatory Eligibility Requirements (Pass/Fail)

Applicants must meet all of the following minimum criteria to move forward to the technical review. Failure to meet any of these items will result in immediate disqualification.

Lead entity applicants must meet all of the following minimum criteria. Failure to meet any of these items will result in immediate disqualification.

- **Represent a consortium:** The applicant must provide separate letters of collaboration from each consortium member. The consortium must provide a letter verifying consortium membership and identify how the participants represent each of the required stakeholder categories. Each letter must:
 - Include representation from Rural hospitals, Rural clinics, Federally Qualified Health Centers (FQHCs), and independent rural providers;
 - Demonstrate diverse geographic representation from across rural Utah; and
 - Maintain a documented governance and operating structure that includes a framework for decision-making and conflict of interest management.
- **Legal Entity Status and State Vendor Registration:** The applicant must prove legal operational status as a recognized entity (for-profit, non-profit, or government) and formally attest to their eligibility and intent to register as an active vendor with Utah State Purchasing within 14 business days of receiving a Notice of Intent to Award. Depending on the applicant's status, the applicant must provide the following documentation:
 - **For-Profit Businesses:** Must provide a valid business license and active registration with the Utah Division of Corporations.

- **Non-Profit Entities:** Must provide proof of active 501(c)(3) tax-exempt status and active registration with the Utah Division of Corporations.
- **Government / Public Entities:** Must provide proof of public status (e.g., statutory authorization, charter, or an official letter from a department head/authorized official).
- **Federal and State Standing:** The applicant must not be debarred, suspended, or otherwise excluded from receiving federal or state funding.
- **Business and Fiscal Capacity:** Attest that the lead entity has the necessary business and fiscal capacity, including established fiduciary systems, to effectively administer and monitor funding opportunities. DHHS may request documentation as evidence.

Partners

Only the organization that serves as the lead entity can be the primary recipient of the award. Applicants may sub-award or contract RHTP funds to partners for various activities. However, these partners are not co-applicants. The lead entity applicant, as the awarded recipient, assumes the role of Grantee and is solely accountable to DHHS for all terms of the agreement.

Scored Technical Criteria (Evaluated via Application)

Reviewers will score the quality, depth, and feasibility of the application based on the following technical competencies:

- **Establish an outreach strategy for announcing funding opportunities:** Demonstrated ability to incorporate multiple information-sharing methods and technical assistance processes to recruit diverse rural providers, specifically reaching tribal and high-needs populations.
- **Design an application process that prioritizes user experience:** Exceptional capacity to design an accessible application workflow utilizing plain language principles (8th-grade reading level or lower), universal design, and easy access to technical assistance while minimizing repetitive requirements.
- **Develop application(s):** The applicant must provide collaboratively developed, plain-language applications that limit unnecessary evaluation elements, utilize the Results-Based Accountability (RBA) framework, ensure budgetary sustainability, and enforce stakeholder collaboration expectations.
- **Develop scoring criteria:** Demonstrated ability to engage the full consortium to define impartial scoring criteria that prioritize RBA outcomes, ensure the appropriate use of funds, and promote long-term financial and programmatic sustainability.

- **Solicit applications for competitive funding opportunities:** Exceptional capacity to execute the designated outreach plan to post funding opportunities and successfully recruit applicants throughout the agreement period within expected timelines.
- **Fairly score and award contracts:** The applicant must provide a clear process for accepting applications, impartially scoring submissions, and awarding contracts and funding strictly within the expected review timeline.
- **Execute contracts:** Demonstrated ability to establish plain-language contracts that codify RBA performance measures, mandate ongoing stakeholder collaboration, adhere to budgetary sustainability requirements, and outline clear processes for remediating compliance failures.
- **Monitor contracts:** Exceptional capacity to implement a comprehensive monitoring plan that actively tracks measurable outcomes alongside contractual and fiscal compliance, culminating in quarterly progress reports delivered to DHHS.
- **Provide technical assistance support for project implementation:** The applicant must provide ongoing, targeted technical assistance to contracted partners to ensure milestone adherence while leveraging consortium platforms to foster shared learning and strategic alignment.

Completeness and Responsiveness Criteria

DHHS will review the application to make sure it meets the requirements set forth in this RFGA document.

DHHS will not consider an application that:

- fails to submit the mandatory letter of intent by the deadline;
- is from an organization that does not meet all minimum eligibility criteria;
- is submitted after the deadline;
- is not submitted via the provided application link; and
- does not include all of the components required in the application.

Application Limits

DHHS will accept only one formal application per lead entity. In the event that multiple completed applications are received from the same entity, only the final submission recorded prior to the application deadline will be considered for review, and all preceding versions will be disqualified.

Section 2: Funding Details

Funding type: Grant agreement

Maximum funding available for Year 1 of the agreement: Up to a total of \$59,200,000.00

- Capital Infrastructure: Up to \$26,300,000.00
- Revenue Cycle: Up to \$9,000,000.00
- Alternative Payment Models: Up to \$3,000,000.00
- Electronic Health Records: Up to \$9,400,000.00
- Cybersecurity: Up to \$4,500,000.00
- Artificial Intelligence: Up to \$3,000,000.00
- Interoperability: Up to \$4,000,000.00

Expected total number of awards: Up to one.

Over the RHTP five-year federally funded period, the anticipated total funding for this agreement is up to \$291,800,000.00. Agreements may be extended contingent on project progress and the availability of federal funds.

DHHS may:

- Fund applications in whole or in part.
- Fund applications at a lower amount than requested.
- Award multiple agreements under this RFGA.
- Choose to fund no applications under this RFGA.

Grant extensions and terminations are determined by availability of funds, grantee performance, and the discretion of CMS and DHHS.

Agreement Period

The agreement period is anticipated to begin **September 11, 2026** and end on **September 30, 2031**. All funds related to project implementation must be expended for each Budget Period by the end of the following federal fiscal year (September 30 of the following year). Failure to expend funds by the end of each following federal fiscal year will result in funds recouped by DHHS to return to CMS.

Budget Period			Budget Period funds must be expended by end of the following fiscal year
"Year"	Beginning date	End date	
1	Agreement start date	October 30, 2026	September 30, 2027
2	October 31, 2026	October 30, 2027	September 30, 2028
3	October 31, 2027	October 30, 2028	September 30, 2029
4	October 31, 2028	October 30, 2029	September 30, 2030
5	October 31, 2029	October 30, 2030	September 30, 2031

Cost Sharing

This RFGA has a no costs-sharing requirement, meaning applicants are not required to contribute to the costs of this project.

Use of Funds

The Grantee agrees to use all funds received under this agreement only for the permissible uses defined in the CMS [Notice of Funding Opportunity \(NOFO\)](#) and Utah's initial [Notice of Award \(NOA\)](#). These uses are governed by Federal statute: Pub. L. No. 119 21, § 71401 (July 4, 2025) (codified at 42 U.S.C. § 1397ee(h)) ("Rural Health Transformation Program"). Use of funds categories may not be applicable to specific project tasks or to all phases of project implementation. Descriptions of Use of Funds categories are outlined in the NOFO p. 11, 12 and NOA p. 9-12.

The Grantee shall not use funds provided under this agreement for any unallowable costs. Prohibited expenditures under CMS guidelines and the federal RHTP may not be applicable to specific project tasks or to all phases of project implementation. Unallowable costs are outlined in the NOFO p.18-20 and the NOA p. 9-12.

Section 3: Services and Deliverables

Section 3: Services and Deliverables

This section describes the expected activities and deliverables of the Grantee in their role as an implementation and administrative partner. As the lead fiscal entity, the Grantee will manage and distribute funding opportunities for RHTP projects aligned with the activities below. Applicants should incorporate the following milestones and benchmarks into their project description and approach:

Outreach Strategy and Application Framework —At a minimum:

1.1. Establish an outreach strategy for announcing funding opportunities. The outreach strategy must:

- Incorporate multiple methods for sharing information and consider methods to recruit applicants that represent tribal and high-needs populations encountering significant challenges to accessing resources and services;
- Clearly outline the ways in which the consortium will reach all types of rural providers and entities; and
- Establish a process for technical assistance for all applicants. The process should include strategies that will support applicants that represent tribal and high-needs populations.

1.2. Design an application process that prioritizes user experience.

- Address and incorporate the following in the design of the application process:
 - Plain language principles, targeting a reading level of 8th grade or lower for application materials;
 - Universal design and user experience principles;
 - Ease of access to technical assistance; and
 - Minimal repetitive requirements for applicants pursuing more than one key action.

Application and Scoring Development—At a minimum:

2.1. Develop application(s).

- Engage the full consortium membership to create application(s) related to the required activities (3.1, 4.2–4.3, 6.1–6.5, 7.1–7.2, except subactivities 7.A–B).
- Ensure the application(s):

- Follows plain language principles, targeting a reading level of 8th grade or lower for application materials;
- Limits the elements necessary for evaluation, scoring, and award, and is not unduly burdensome;
- Incorporate expectations related to an activity's key actions performance objectives, outcomes, and measures as defined in the RHTP plan. Incorporates the Results-based Accountability (Results Based Accountability) framework as a method for monitoring outcomes;
- Adhere to budgetary requirements in the RHTP NOFO and NOA. This must include sustainability; and
- Incorporate expectations related to collaboration with an activity's key actions stakeholders, as defined in the RHTP plan; and
- Minimizes repetitive requirements for applicants pursuing more than one key action.

2.2. Develop scoring criteria.

- Engage the full consortium membership to define an impartial scoring criteria, including:
 - Prioritizing criteria that support Results Based Accountability outcomes;
 - Ensuring appropriate use of funds; and
 - Promoting financial and programmatic sustainability.

Solicitation and Award—At a minimum:

3.1. Solicit applications for competitive funding opportunities.

- Follow the outreach plan to post funding opportunities and recruit applicants throughout the agreement period. Meet the expected timeline for posting.

3.2. Fairly score and award contracts.

- Manage accepting applications, scoring applications, and awarding contracts and funding. Meet the expected timeline for review, scoring, and award.

Contract Monitoring and Administration—At a minimum:

4.1. Execute contracts.

- Establish contracts that:
 - Follow plain language principles, targeting a reading level of 8th grade or lower for application materials;
 - Incorporate expectations related to an activity's key actions performance objectives, outcomes, and measures. Incorporates the Results-based Accountability (Results Based Accountability) framework as a method for monitoring outcomes;
 - Incorporate expectations related to collaboration with an activity's key actions stakeholders, as defined in the RHTP plan;
 - Include clear requirements for meeting contractual obligations and a process for remediation of compliance failures, including a defined process for terminating contracts in the event of ongoing compliance failures.; and
 - Adhere to budgetary requirements in the RHTP NOFO and NOA. This must include sustainability.

4.2. Monitor contracts.

- Develop a monitoring plan that incorporates tracking of measurable outcomes and contractual and fiscal compliance.
- Submit a report outlining the progress on the measurable outcomes to DHHS quarterly and present on progress as requested by DHHS.

Project Technical Assistance and Support—At a minimum:

5.1. Provide technical assistance support for project implementation.

- Deliver ongoing targeted technical assistance to contracted partners to ensure project effective project implementation and performance milestones adherence.
- Foster ongoing stakeholder engagement and collaboration by leveraging the consortium and other platforms for shared learning, strategic alignment, and the coordination of efforts to strengthen project outcomes.

Grantee Expectations

The Grantee will be expected to adhere to the following:

- Meet at least bi-weekly with the Utah RHTP team to coordinate activities, provide updates about findings and progress of activities, and ensure all contractual requirements are met.

- Facilitate ongoing communication between DHHS and the consortium, including active coordination, strategic decisions, and approvals. Extend standing invitations for DHHS to attend all consortium meetings.
- Provide monthly reimbursement requests/invoices of expenses in accordance with State Procurement processes.
- Demonstrate fiscal compliance across all agreements, including strict adherence to restrictions for Category J, Category B, and administrative costs.
- Attend all RHTP trainings related to the project.
- Provide all services and deliverables described in the agreement.
- Participate in the DHHS evaluation process.
- Timely delivery of reports to Utah DHHS as outlined in the Grantee agreement.
- Collaborate with DHHS in determining how SPRINT-covered activities (3.1, 4.2–4.3, 6.1–6.5, 7.1–7.2, except subactivities 7.A–B) could best support tribal health priorities.

Section 4: Budget

Utah RHTP shall reimburse the Grantee based on the negotiated budget, not to exceed the funding available for this agreement. Expenses shall be reimbursed based on actual expenditures with appropriation documentation. Expenditures must follow the guidelines described below. The categories defined below are the only expenditures allowed under this agreement.

Grantees must submit reimbursement invoices of expenses monthly in accordance with State Contracting processes. Payment(s) may be withheld until the services and deliverables defined in this agreement are completed. These funds are not to be used for purchasing meals. The only exception is for per diem reimbursement for authorized personnel while traveling.

Categories	Rate/allowable costs*
Personnel: salaries/fringe	Personnel working on project implementation
Administration of funding	Up to 6% of the total amount requested for Year 1. This 6% limit applies to administrative costs for your entire budget for Year 1, including indirect and direct costs.
Category B: Provider Payments	No more than 15% of total State funding in a given budget period can support funding provider payments.

Category J: Capital Infrastructure	Up to \$11,600,00.00 for Year 1.
HITECH Certified EMR System	No more than 5% of total State funding in a given budget period can support funding the replacement of an EMR system if a previous HITECH certified EMR system is already in place as of September 1, 2025.
Project implementation	Expenses to create and execute project and agreement requirements
Travel	Mileage/meal reimbursement (per diem)
Supplies	Purchases under \$10,000.00
Other	Other costs (e.g., software licenses, data sources, etc.)

*See the CMS NOFO for full information on allowable and unallowable costs.

Section 5: Application

To be considered for this RFGA, interested applicants must submit an application using the following linked forms:

- utahdhs.iad1.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_4ZAf0TXZkyYFH9k
- docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1KhcYr7liy2BCUo2ANq74t1js8_AXNTgMkiiEff-trcs/edit?usp=sharing

The application must be submitted by August 7, 2026 at 5:00 p.m. MT. Late applications will not be considered.

Instructions

Application Questions

The application questions are detailed below for reference. To ensure a smooth application submission, applicants are encouraged to prepare responses to the following sections before using the application link. Please note that character limits apply to certain responses.

Part 1: Lead entity information

1. Lead Entity Name
2. Lead Entity Website (if applicable)
3. Lead Entity Contact Name
4. Lead Entity Email Address
5. Lead Entity Phone Number

Part 2: Minimum Mandatory Eligibility Criteria (Pass/Fail)

Please provide objective confirmation of the lead entity's legal and operational eligibility. Note: False statements will result in immediate disqualification from the application process.

6. **Consortium members:** List the consortium's member organizations.
7. **Representation of consortium:** Attach letters of collaboration from each member organization. Letters should include how the participants represent each of the required stakeholders. (Maximum 1 upload — please combine/compress these documents into a single file before uploading.)
8. **Lead Entity Legal Structure:** Select the lead entity's legal framework:
 - a. ☐ For-Profit Business
 - b. ☐ Non-Profit Organization / 501(c)(3)
 - c. ☐ Government / Public Entity (e.g., Public University, State/Local Agency)
9. **Legal Status Documentation Upload:** Please upload the appropriate verification document based on your selection above (e.g., Business License, IRS 501(c)(3) Determination Letter, or Government/Statutory Charter). (Maximum 1 upload — please combine/compress these documents into a single file before uploading.)
10. **Ability & Commitment to Register as a State Vendor:** Disbursements for this project can only be made to lead entities registered with the Utah Division of Purchasing (via the U3P/Jaggaer system). Please review the following attestation and check the box to confirm compliance:
 - a. "I certify that my organization is eligible to register as a vendor with the State of Utah and, if selected for an award, agrees to fully complete and submit our Utah State Purchasing vendor registration within 14 business days of receiving the Notice of Intent to Award. I understand that failure to complete this registration in a timely manner may result in the forfeiture of the award."
 - i. ☐ I agree and attest.
11. **Federal and State Standing:** Do you certify that the lead entity is in good standing and is not currently debarred, suspended, or otherwise restricted from participating in federal or state grant programs? [Yes / No]

12. **Business and Fiscal Capacity:** Do you certify that the lead entity has the necessary business and fiscal capacity, including established fiduciary systems, to effectively administer and monitor funding opportunities? [Yes / No]

Part 3: Stakeholder Representation

13. **Operational Structure:** Describe the consortium's governance and operational structure. Include how the consortium ensures equitable decision-making authority across stakeholders and manages conflict of interest. (3500 characters)
14. **Consortium Expertise:** Describe the technical expertise and experience of the consortium membership related to each of the required activities (3.1, 4.2–4.3, 6.1–6.5, 7.1–7.2). (4000 characters)
15. **Technical Experts (or Outside Consultants):** Identify any anticipated technical experts or outside consultants that the consortium may draw upon to develop applications, determine scoring criteria, and develop and execute contracts. (3000 characters)
16. **Organization Chart Upload:** Please upload an organization chart or diagram detailing the consortium's structure.

Part 4: Processes and Approaches

17. **Contract Management:** Describe the lead entity's anticipated method for developing applications, posting, awarding, managing and monitoring contracts, including tracking measurable outcomes, following fiduciary standards, and maintaining fiscal compliance. (3500 characters)
18. **Accountability Framework:** Detail the lead entity's approach to implementing the Results Based Accountability framework into contracts. Describe how the contracts will measure whether rural Utahns are better off as a result of these investments and will hold contractors accountable for outcomes. (3000 characters)
19. **Outreach Strategy:** Describe the lead entity's outreach strategy and technical assistance plan, and how these plans will ensure that the funding opportunities attract applicants of varying size, location, and resources, including applicants representing tribal and high-needs populations. (3000 characters)
20. **Ongoing Assistance:** Describe the lead entity's anticipated plan for ongoing targeted technical assistance and stakeholder collaboration to support contracted partners and ensure effective project implementation. (3000 characters)

Part 5: Experience and Qualifications

21. **Organizational Expertise:** Describe the lead entity's prior experience managing and monitoring contracts.(3000 characters)
22. **Evaluation Expertise:** Describe the lead entity's experience evaluating program progress, outcomes and sustainability. (3000 characters)
23. **Relevant Project:** Highlight one relevant project that demonstrates the lead entity's capability to distribute funding and oversee contracts. (4000 characters)
24. **Project Lead & Key Personnel Qualifications:** Identify the Project Lead and up to two additional key personnel and describe their roles in supporting implementation. (3000 characters)
25. **Resumes/CVs Upload:** Upload the Resume or Curriculum Vitae (CV) for the Project Lead and two key personnel named in the previous question (Limit of 4 pages per CV. Maximum 1 upload — please combine/compress these documents into a single file before uploading).

Part 6: Budget

26. **Proposed Budget:** What is your proposed budget for this project?
27. **Budget Upload:** Upload an itemized budget sheet using the template provided.

Section 6: Application Review

Compliance and Eligibility Review Process

Each application submitted by the due date and time will first be reviewed by DHHS for completeness and compliance with the requirements provided in this RFGA. All applications that fail to address all requirements shall be deemed incomplete and shall receive no further consideration.

Compliance Criteria

- Lead entity meets all minimum mandatory eligibility requirements (Pass/Fail)
- Application submitted by the deadline (Pass/Fail)
- Application submitted via the provided application link (Pass/Fail)
- Application includes all of the components required in the application (Pass/Fail)

Minimum Mandatory Eligibility Requirements

- Lead entity agrees and attests to their eligibility and intent to register as a state vendor.
(Pass/Fail)

- Lead entity certifies the organization is in good standing and is not currently debarred, suspended, or otherwise restricted from participating in federal or state grant programs. (Pass/Fail)
- Lead entity submits a letter of intent to DHHS by **July 27, 2026 at 5:00 p.m. MT.**

Technical Review Committee

DHHS will conduct a comprehensive, fair, and impartial review of applications received as a result of this RFGA. The Technical Review Committee will review the applications, rank them according to the scoring system described below, and meet as a group to compare evaluations. The committee will then make award recommendations to DHHS.

Scoring for Applications

Applications are scored on a maximum 100 point scale. Reviewers will score each section using a 0–5 point scale, which is then multiplied by each criteria’s assigned weight to determine the total score. Maximum point values and evaluation criteria for each section are as follows:

1. Stakeholder Representation (25 points available)

a. Operational Structure (5 points)

- i. Fail: No governance or operational structure is provided, or it entirely omits equitable decision-making and conflict of interest management.
- ii. Satisfactory: Outlines the basic operational structure, but lacks specific, concrete mechanisms for ensuring equitable decision-making across all stakeholders or details vague procedures for managing conflicts of interest.
- iii. Excellent: Delivers a comprehensive operational and governance blueprint with explicit, enforceable structures that guarantee balanced decision-making power across all stakeholders and outlines a rigorous, clear policy for identifying and mitigating conflicts of interest.

b. Consortium Expertise (10 points)

- i. Fail: Fails to describe the technical expertise of the consortium membership.
- ii. Satisfactory: Describes the technical expertise and experience of the membership, but lacks detail.
- iii. Excellent: Provides a detailed mapping of the consortium's deep technical expertise and proven track record, explicitly demonstrating how their collective experience supports this funding opportunity.

c. Technical Experts (or Outside Consultants) (10 points)

- i. Fail: Does not identify any anticipated technical experts or outside consultants, or fails to explain their role in the program.
- ii. Satisfactory: Identifies potential outside consultants or experts, but lacks specificity regarding their exact roles.
- iii. Excellent: Clearly identifies highly qualified external experts or consultants and details a precise strategy for how their specialized skills will be leveraged to develop rigorous applications, establish objective scoring criteria, and efficiently execute contracts.

2. Processes and Approaches (35 points available)

a. Contract management (20 points)

- i. Fail: No contract management method is provided, or the response fails to address tracking outcomes, fiduciary standards, and fiscal compliance.
- ii. Satisfactory: Outlines a basic method for developing, posting, awarding, and monitoring contracts, but lacks specific details on how it will track measurable outcomes, enforce strict fiduciary standards, or maintain rigorous fiscal compliance.
- iii. Excellent: Details a robust, end-to-end contract management system that clearly outlines application development, posting, and awarding processes, while integrating explicit metrics for tracking outcomes and stringent mechanisms for ensuring fiduciary and fiscal compliance.

b. Accountability framework (5 points)

- i. Fail: Fails to incorporate the Results Based Accountability (RBA) framework or address how the contracts will measure outcomes and hold contractors accountable.
- ii. Satisfactory: Mentions the Results Based Accountability framework and general contractor accountability, but lacks a clear, operationalized approach to specifically measure whether rural Utahns are "better off" as a direct result of these investments.
- iii. Excellent: Fully integrates the Results Based Accountability framework into the contract structure, defining clear performance measures to prove rural Utahns are better off and establishing a rigorous, enforceable mechanism to hold contractors strictly accountable for outcomes.

c. Outreach strategy (5 points)

- i. Fail: No outreach strategy or pre-application technical assistance plan is provided, or it ignores tribal and high-needs populations.
- ii. Satisfactory: Outlines an outreach strategy and technical assistance plan, but relies on general marketing methods that may not effectively attract or accommodate applicants of varying sizes, locations, and resource levels, particularly tribal and high-needs populations.

- iii. Excellent: Proposes a highly proactive, equity-driven outreach strategy and technical assistance plan designed to lower barriers and attract a diverse applicant pool across varying sizes and locations, featuring explicit, tailored tactics to engage and support tribal and high-needs populations.
- d. Ongoing Assistance (5 points)
 - i. Fail: No plans for ongoing technical assistance or stakeholder collaboration during project implementation.
 - ii. Satisfactory: Describes a plan for ongoing technical assistance and stakeholder collaboration, but lacks targeted, localized interventions or specific methods to support contracted partners when implementation challenges arise.
 - iii. Excellent: Establishes a comprehensive, continuous plan for targeted technical assistance and robust stakeholder collaboration, ensuring contracted partners receive tailored, ongoing support to guarantee effective project implementation and long-term success.

3. Experience and Qualifications (25 points)

- a. Organizational expertise (3 points)
 - i. Fail: No prior experience in managing or monitoring contracts is provided.
 - ii. Satisfactory: Mentions contract management experience but lacks specific monitoring frameworks, oversight tools, or evidence of compliance enforcement.
 - iii. Excellent: Demonstrates extensive, proven experience managing and monitoring complex contracts using robust oversight systems to ensure full compliance and performance.
- b. Evaluation expertise (2 points)
 - i. Fail: No experience evaluating program progress, outcomes, or sustainability is provided.
 - ii. Satisfactory: Describes basic evaluation experience but lacks robust frameworks or specific methodologies for tracking long-term programmatic and financial sustainability.
 - iii. Excellent: Showcases a proven track record of comprehensive program evaluation, using structured frameworks to successfully measure progress, outcomes, and long-term sustainability.
- c. Relevant project (10 points)
 - i. Fail: No project is highlighted, or the featured project fails to demonstrate funding distribution and contract oversight.
 - ii. Satisfactory: Highlights a project involving funding and contracts but lacks details on the operational scale, execution workflows, or specific oversight outcomes.
 - iii. Excellent: Highlights a highly relevant, successful project that explicitly

details operational scale, seamless funding distribution, and rigorous contract oversight workflows.

d. Project lead and key personnel qualifications (10 points)

- i. Fail: Personnel lack the necessary and relevant experience, or roles are undefined.
- ii. Satisfactory: Personnel have necessary and relevant experience, but roles are not well defined.
- iii. Excellent: Personnel are highly qualified with necessary and relevant expertise. Roles are highly defined.

4. Budget (15 points)

a. Total budget is within the maximum award amount (1 point)

- i. Fail: The proposed budget exceeds the maximum available funding caps for either Year 1 or the overall contract lifecycle (see Section 2: Funding details).
- ii. Excellent: The proposed budget is fully compliant and sits within the maximum award caps for both Year 1 and the multi-year cumulative agreement period.

b. Budgeted items are relevant and within scope of the RFGA project (7 points)

- i. Fail: Proposed lines contain unallowable expenditures or items detached from the scope of work.
- ii. Satisfactory: Proposed items are generally relevant and within scope, but the spending model leans heavily into recurring operational staffing costs rather than technical assets.
- iii. Excellent: Every proposed line-item is highly relevant, falls within the scope of work, adheres strictly to the 10% administrative overhead limit, and is logically structured to map cleanly to the non-recurring capital infrastructure goals of the grant.

c. Budget includes clear and rational justifications for each section (7 points)

- i. Fail: The budget submission lacks itemized specific justifications or transparent cost-rationale.
- ii. Satisfactory: Includes basic section-level justifications, but the underlying cost calculations or resource rationales are vague or generic.
- iii. Excellent: Demonstrates a transparent, clear, and logical financial justification for each operational section.

Total 100 points

Required technical point threshold: 80 points. Scores below 80 points will not qualify for funding.

Award timeline

DHHS will notify all applicants of the award decision by August 26, 2026. Upon award, DHHS will initiate the State of Utah procurement process. DHHS may negotiate modifications with the Grantee during contract implementation and funding cycle.

Disqualification

DHHS reserves the right to cancel an award if, in its sole discretion, any interest disclosed from any source could give the appearance of a conflict or cause speculation as to the objectivity of the program/project developed by the grantee. DHHS determination regarding any questions of conflict of interest shall be final.

Allotment Process

DHHS may:

- Fund projects in whole or in part.
- Fund projects at a lower amount than requested.
- Choose to fund no applications under this RFGA.

Section 7: Additional Resources

- CMS Notice of Funding Opportunity (NOFO): Provides CMS guidance on program scope, permissible use of funds, and unallowable cost.
dhhs.utah.gov/wp-content/uploads/NOFO-RHTP-2.pdf
- Utah's RHTP website: Updates on Utah's implementation and publicly available resources, including most of those listed here. dhhs.utah.gov/ruralhealth/
- Utah's RHTP Full Project Narrative: Utah's original application which guides implementation.
dhhs.utah.gov/wp-content/uploads/Rural-Health-Transformation-Plan.pdf
- Notice of Award (December 29, 2025): Initial notice of funding award that also outlines budget restrictions, reporting periods, and other guidelines aligned with the NOFO.
dhhs.utah.gov/wp-content/uploads/NOA_RHTCMS332051-01-00.pdf
- CMS Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs): Responses from CMS regarding inquiries from states.
cms.gov/files/document/rural-health-transformation-frequently-asked-questions.pdf