|   | RFA Section Reference  | Question  | Commission Response  |
|---|--|---|--|
| 1 | General  | My understanding is that this grant is intended to fund programs that support mental health and wellness, specifically providing culturally competent care through evidence-based practices.  | Autism Spectrum Disorder services may be considered under this grant. Additional early intervention programs that are designed with, by, and for youth may be considered eligible for grant funding with the submission of supplementary |
|   |  | Our organization provides in-clinic EBPs (ABA therapy, social skills groups, etc.) for children and youth with autism spectrum disorder. We are located in Compton and the majority of our patients Black and Hispanic. We also   | materials that demonstrate how implementing this program aligns with the Round 5 goals listed on page 6 and 7 of the RFA.  |
|   |  | provide educational training for parents and caregivers, as well as tutoring and mentorship for youth.  | A list of eligible grant recipients can be found under Section 1.C. on Page 5 of the RFA.  |
|   |  | My main question is regarding our organization's eligibility, and if autism falls under the umbrella of mental health and wellness?   |  |
| 2 | General  | Regarding RFA Early Intervention-001 (CYBHI R5) ATTACHMENT 3: APPLICANT BACKGROUND, if an applicant is submitting an application under the "Other Implementation Track (Start-Up)," does the applicant need to complete all the questions (C.7-C.9) in Applicant Background – Track 2 – Implementation Expansion?                 | Yes, respond to all questions. The RFA requirements state respond "not applicable" for any requirement that does not apply. This is to ensure all applicants have seen/read the requirements.  |
| 3 | Page 17, Section 6<br>Information Required in<br>the Grant Application | Section 6 states that "if there is a requirement that an Applicant deems "Not Applicable, "the Applicant must respond that the requirement is "Not Applicable" and provide a reason to support that statement. Does this mean that in Attachment 3 in the section for the Track for which we are not applying we would write "Not | Yes, respond to all questions. The RFA requirements state respond "not applicable" for any requirement that does not apply. This is to ensure all applicants have seen/read the requirements.  |

|   | RFA Section Reference                   | Question  | Commission Response  |
|---|---|---|--|
|   |   | Applicable" with the stated reason that we are applying for the other Track? If so, do we need to do this for each question listed in the section for that Track, or is recording that answer in the first question of that section sufficient?   |  |
| 4 | Page 13, Section 4.E<br>Allowable Costs | Data collection is listed as an allowable cost. Does this include purchasing data collection software/programs?   | Yes, data collection software/programs are an allowable cost as long as it is used solely for the program being funded by the grant. In addition, if applying for CSC First Episode of Psychosis, the grantee must use the TA's Beehive data collection tool, at no additional cost to the grantee.  |
| 5 | Page 10, Section 4.B<br>Grant<br>Tracks | Our school district currently maintains a Wellness Center that houses a student support counselor, behaviorists, and a school psychologist in addition to hosting programs run by outside partners. None of the programs we currently run are listed in Section 2. If we were to seek grant funding to start an EBP or CDEP listed in Section 2 would this be considered an expansion track or start-up track as the program itself would be new? | Based on your information, it does not appear that you have a program that is listed in Section 2, therefore if you apply for a grant to start one of the programs listed in Section 2, it would be considered a Start-Up.  Per the RFA, the Start-up track is designed for organizations that are seeking startup funds to newly implement an EBP and/or CDEP (or related adaptation). The Operational expansion track is designed for organizations looking to: 1) expand the provision of short-listed EBPs and/or CDEPs (or related adaptations) that they currently provide, or 2) scale delivery of a short-listed EBP and/or CDEP (or related adaptation) by training and |

| RFAI | Early Intervention-001 Questions and Responses 2 |   |  |
|------|--|---|--|
|      | RFA Section Reference                            | Question  | Commission Response  |
| 6    | 6 B, 1 and 2                                     | We are a 501(c)(3) nonprofit with EIN 35-2262709. We received 501(c)(3) status at our address in Seattle, WA in 2007. We have run programs in Riverside, California for 5+ years, and now have a California mailing address and a California Secretary of State (SOS) certification showing an "Active Status." Are we eligible to apply?   | Applicants must have a physical location in California.  Section 5.A.1.a.1) states, "The Grantee will be responsible for and agree to: 1) Be located in and conduct all grant activities in the State of California."  |
| 7    | General  | Question C.3.: Easter Seals Southern California (ESSC) operates across 65 service sites in 10 counties. Would you like for us to include ALL zip codes or keep this at the county level? (Currently we have listed our Headquarters address/zip and then the 10 counties.)  | Please provide all zip codes. Requirement states, county and zip code.   |
| 8    | C.6.   | Question C.6.: ESSC operates five service lines. Our grant will be for our Autism Services line. Would you prefer funding sources for the entire organization or more specifically for the Autism Services line (which we feel may be more informative for this grant)?   | Provide funding sources for the program that is being funded, which appears to be Autism Services.   |
| 9    | Grant Funding section E. ALLOWABLE COSTS         | In receiving inquiries from California providers regarding Managing and Adapting Practice (MAP) and MATCH training the question of potential reimbursement for lost clinical time while training was raised. Would this be an allowable expense within Round 5 funding for Early Intervention Programs? MAP supports early intervention providers/supervisors/administrators by guiding | Reimbursement of lost clinical time is not an allowable cost. If staff are funded by this grant, then all of their activities related to the program are covered by the grant. This includes training.  Only costs that are incurred are covered by this grant. Lost revenue is not covered. |
|      |  | evidence-informed treatment planning, individualizing treatment for client needs, methods for monitoring progress, and ideas for promoting family engagement.   | A list of allowable costs can be found under Section 4. E. on Page 13 of the RFA.  |

|    | RFA Section Reference | Question   | Commission Response  |
|----|-----------------------|--|--|
|    |                       | The comprehensive training for MAP and MATCH may span multiple days, and we are hoping to address the question of lost clinical time reimbursement so we may better inform those seeking MAP and/or MATCH to support early intervention.   |  |
| 10 | General               | We're in the process of developing a grant proposal for the CYBHI Round 5 - Early Intervention funding and question 41 on the RFA Early Intervention-001CYBHI Early Intervention Programs Questions and Responses 1 document caused us concern (see the text of the question below). We are writing to clarify the response and in order to clarify, we're providing some additional context for your information. | The Commission and DHCS stands behind the original response, Section 5.A.1.a.1) states, "The Grantee will be responsible for and agree to: 1) Be located in and conduct all grant activities in the State of California." This applies to subcontractors and anyone else who may be paid with these grant funds. Therefore, you cannot contract a provider that is out of state. |
|    |                       | Question 41 Regarding Section - 4.A.a.1  | Funds cannot be used to pay for trainers or other consultation services from organizations not based in California.  |
|    |                       | Question: Can the applicant contract a provider that is out of state? The applicant has excellent relationships with a leading Psychologist that offers evaluation tests for various PTSDs and intends to use those for self-assessment tests, that will be reviewed by a local provider who will be trained by the creator of the tests.  |  |
|    |                       | Answer: Section 5.A.1.a.1) states, "The Grantee will be responsible for and agree to: 1) Be located in and conduct all grant activities in the State of California." This applies  |  |

| RFA Section Reference | Question   | Commission Response |
|-----------------------|--|---------------------|
|                       | to subcontractors and anyone else who may be paid with   |                     |
|                       | these grant funds. Therefore, you cannot contract a  |                     |
|                       | provider that is out of state.   |                     |
|                       | Our proposal will be for a program expansion grant, to   |                     |
|                       | expand an innovative early intervention program for  |                     |
|                       | students of UC Berkeley, as well as community members  |                     |
|                       | of Alameda County (in partnership with the Behavioral  |                     |
|                       | Health Collaborative of Alameda County).   |                     |
|                       | Our concern is related to funding for training and   |                     |
|                       | consultation to expand the CDEP of Stepped Care 2.0 and  |                     |
|                       | Give Me Five. Both of these programs are innovative,   |                     |
|                       | unique, evidence-based and as such there are no  |                     |
|                       | comparable programs available in-state. The funding for  |                     |
|                       | training related to this CDEP would be paid to   |                     |
|                       | subcontractors that are based outside of California. That  |                     |
|                       | said, the bulk of the money from the grant will be going   |                     |
|                       | directly to a California-based organization (UC Berkeley), people hired to staff the program would be based in |                     |
|                       | California and all services would be provided in California.   |                     |
|                       | Camorina and all services would be provided in Camorina.   |                     |
|                       | We are concerned that the stipulation that any funding for   |                     |
|                       | subcontractors only be paid to California-based  |                     |
|                       | organizations. This restriction risks stifling innovation and  |                     |
|                       | scaling of these CDEP programs. Also many of the EBPs  |                     |
|                       | that you identified are based out of state, which means  |                     |

|     | RFA Section Reference | Question   | Commission Response   |
|-----|-----------------------|--|---|
|     |                       | that it would be common practice to bring trainers for any EBPs in from out of state to provide training.  |   |
|     |                       | Is it possible to utilize any of the funding from this grant to pay trainers or other consultation services from organizations not based in California?  |   |
| 11  | E. Allowable Costs    | We see the Eligible Expenditures for f. (e.g., benefits, contractors, resources to support mental health, wellbeing, and retention of a diverse workforce) on page 12: My question is: Is paying for the total wages of staff working within a program using the new EBP; from training through the end of the grant cycle, i.e., 2 years, eligible? | Paying staff wages, from training through the end of the grant cycle, is allowed as long as it is directly related to the program being funded by the grant. The grant cycle will be from contract execution through June 30, 2025.   |
| 12. | General               | There are multiple references in the RFA to Section 2. I cannot find Section 2. Where is it and what is in it?   | Section 2 in the RFA is titled, Purpose and Goal of Grant Opportunity, and starts on Page 6. The section contains the list of EBPs and CDEPs, which is on Page 7.   |
| 13. | General               | I am the Family Support Service Counselor for the Mono County Office of Education We want to apply solo for Round 5: Early Intervention Programs and Practices. However, I noticed that we missed vital dates by the time this job was delegated to me. Is there any tutorial or way to still apply for the grant?                                   | Applications are due November 3, 2023 by 3:00 p.m.  The RFA and all questions and responses related to this RFA are located at: <a href="https://mhsoac.ca.gov/connect/grant-funding-opportunities/cybhi-round-5-early-intervention-programs-and-practices-request-for-application-early-intervention-001/">https://mhsoac.ca.gov/connect/grant-funding-opportunities/cybhi-round-5-early-intervention-programs-and-practices-request-for-application-early-intervention-001/</a> |

|     | RFA Section Reference                               | Question  | Commission Response  |
|-----|---|---|--|
| 14. | General   | I'm with Eastside Student Center in Bishop, CA. We were just made aware of these grant opportunities, both rounds 4 and 5 being very applicable to our work as a community based nonprofit. I know that deadlines have past, but thought I'd reach out see if late submissions are being accepted. If so, please let me know how to proceed and what the new deadline would be. Thank you for your time in this matter. | The due date for Round 4 has passed and not late submissions will be accepted. The due date for Round 5 is November 3, 2023 by 3:00 p.m.  All information necessary to submit an application is contained in the RFA at: <a href="https://mhsoac.ca.gov/connect/grant-funding-opportunities/cybhi-round-5-early-intervention-programs-and-practices-request-for-application-early-intervention-001/">https://mhsoac.ca.gov/connect/grant-funding-opportunities/cybhi-round-5-early-intervention-programs-and-practices-request-for-application-early-intervention-001/</a> |
| 15. | General   | I have intend to submit an application for my client. But I could not see the portal link. can you guide me how to submit an application for CYBHI Round 5: Early Intervention Programs and Practices Request for Application Early Intervention-001  | For this RFA, there is no portal. All applications must be submitted to procurements@mhsoac.ca.gov by November 3, 2023 by 3:00 p.m.  All Key Action Dates and contact information can be found in the RFA at: https://mhsoac.ca.gov/connect/grant-funding-opportunities/cybhi-round-5-early-intervention-programs-and-practices-request-for-application-early-intervention-001/  |
| 16. | Attachment 7:<br>Community<br>Collaboration Partner | If we have existing MOUs with collaborative partners that includes signatures & dates, may we fill out Attachment 7 and indicate (see MOU attachment) for signatures? We  | The existing MOUs would be acceptable as long as it meets all of the requirements in Attachment 7. Please provide an explanation in your Application for submitting the existing MOUs.   |

| RFA E | RFA Early Intervention-001 Questions and Responses 2 |  |                     |
|-------|--|--|---------------------|
|       | RFA Section Reference                                | Question   | Commission Response |
|       |  | have county and school district partners that we may not |                     |
|       |  | be able to obtain signatures before the deadline.        |                     |