

### **TRIBAL CONSULTATION AND COLLABORATION**

It is unclear if the county engaged actual tribal community members (this is not limited to federally recognized Tribes). Please provide a response to the following.

1. Did the county invite and engage Tribes when developing the CPP?
2. Which Tribes were invited to participate in the development of the CPP?
3. Which Tribes participated in providing input into the CPP?
4. If there was no Tribal representation, what efforts were made by the county to encourage Tribal representation?
5. What input did the Tribes provide to the county?
6. Did the county communicate the outcome of the tribe's input into the plan?

Although there are no federally-recognized Tribes in San Mateo County and the County has just a handful of ICWA cases per year, San Mateo – as indicated in page 7 of the CPP – included Tribal representation (Lana Burnett from Bay Area Collaboration of American Indian Resources) within the cross-sector team that was formed to oversee development and implementation of the CPP. This cross-sector team met monthly throughout the CPP development phase and was involved in reviewing and making decisions about all facets of the plan. Unfortunately, the Tribal representatives did not provide feedback during development of the CPP. Despite these initial challenges in getting Tribal engagement, San Mateo County is committed to continuing to seek collaboration with, and feedback from, the Tribal community throughout implementation of the plan. San Mateo is also seeking to be formally added to the BACAIR regional collaborative before the end of the year to further Tribal engagement efforts.

### **INTEGRATED CORE PRACTICE MODEL (ICPM)**

The San Mateo CPP provided an overview of how CFS staff engage with families through the ICPM philosophy. However, the following is unclear:

1. How did the county incorporate ICPM in the development of the CPP?
2. What strategies will the county use to incorporate ICPM with their partners and Tribes?
3. What strategies will the county use to incorporate ICPM in their elected prevention services?

Yes, ICPM was incorporated in all aspects of CPP development. The County formed the San Mateo Child Abuse Prevention Cross-Sector Team for the purpose of engaging cross-system partners and community members in co-designing the CPP. Cross-sector engagement with public agency staff and a broad range of community stakeholders was consistent and critical to the development of the plan. Monthly meetings throughout the CPP development process gave all stakeholders an opportunity to identify challenges, design strategies, and provide continuous

feedback as the plan was drafted. The process in and of itself exemplified a teaming model, and included the integration of foundational leadership behaviors throughout. The standard of open, honest, clear and respectful communication was set from the inception of the team process, and throughout the development of a shared vision and shared accountability to that vision.

Looking ahead, San Mateo County is in the process of redesigning its Child Abuse Prevention Council (CAPC). One of the primary goals of the re-envisioned CAPC is to provide better engagement and broader representation from the community in designing and managing County prevention initiatives, including the EBPs listed in the CPP as well as the County's Differential Response and Family Resource Center programming. Finally, as noted in the CPP Spending Plan, San Mateo County intends to use \$400,000 in FFPS State Block Grant funds to contract out for parent and youth partners who can help evaluate and continuously improve prevention programming.

### **SERVICE/ASSET MAPPING**

The following items are unclear. Please provide a response.

1. What data sources were used to identify populations to be served? What priority populations will be served and why are they prioritized? Data to produce local estimates for each of the Candidate Group populations was collected from a range of sources by cross-sector team representatives, primarily internal data sources within Child Welfare Services and other cross-sector public agencies (Probation, Behavioral Health, Public Health and County Office of Education). Additional data was collected from a range of public sources and through collaboration with community-based organizations operating in San Mateo County. In addition to the Candidate Group estimates, additional data to develop the Needs Assessment on pages 16-19 was collected from the four publicly available plans listed on page 16. San Mateo County's five priority populations are outlined on page 24.
2. How was the data used to help identify candidate group or other priority population? The selection of the five priority populations was informed by the data outlined above related to County needs (Needs Assessment) and subpopulations (Candidate Groups) and discussion amongst cross-sector team members about the primary drivers of child welfare system involvement in San Mateo County.
3. Did the county consult with their local behavioral health agencies in the selection of EBPs? If yes, who did the agency consult with? Yes. Several staff from Behavioral Health participated throughout the development of the CPP and their names are listed on page 7 as members of the cross-sector team. They were instrumental in understanding local capacity for EBP delivery and were heavily involved in the selection of the EBPs included in the plan.
4. The CPP provides a list of services available to children and families. However, it is unclear what the county's secondary prevention and intervention strategies and services that support the ability of parents and families to provide safe, stable, and

nurturing environments for their children are. Please clearly identify the secondary prevention strategies and services.

**Secondary:**

- Differential Response
  - Prenatal-To-Three (Pre-to-3)
  - Protective Day Care
  - Parent Education/Home Visiting Services
5. The CPP provides a list of services available to children and families. However, it is unclear what the county's tertiary prevention and intervention strategies and services that support the ability of parents and families to provide safe, stable, and nurturing environments for their children are. Please clearly identify the tertiary prevention strategies and services.

**Tertiary:**

- Resource Adoption Family Meetings and Support Groups
- Parent Education/Home Visiting Services
  - Triple P Level 4 and Level 5
  - SafeCare
- Public Health Nursing/Home Visiting
- Protective Day Care
- Mental Health and Clinical Services

**SPENDING & SUSTAINABILITY PLAN**

1. How will Title IV-E prevention funding sources be used?

As noted on page 42 of the CPP, San Mateo County intends to leverage Title IV-E prevention funding to develop, expand and replicate Healthy Families America, Motivational Interviewing, Nurse Family Partnership, and Parents as Teachers. The County is aware of the non-supplantation requirements and IV-E funding would be used to develop additional capacity for these programs.

2. What were the additional funds leveraged for comprehensive planning?

San Mateo County utilized Family First Transition Act (FFTA) funds as well as significant County resources in the form of staff time for comprehensive planning.

3. Will the county use funding sources already available in the community to support the implementation of the CPP?

Yes, in addition to FFPSA funding the County intends to leverage its redesigned CAPC and existing Differential Response program and Family Resource Centers to support implementation

of the CPP. San Mateo County will also continue to direct funding from OCAP (Title IV-B, CBCAP and state funding) as well as County general funds to support prevention programming.

4. What are the identified barriers to ensure sustainability?

A major challenge to sustainability is the one-time nature of the Family First Prevention Services (FFPS) State Block Grant funds. The County hopes that the State will invest additional resources into the FFPS Block Grant to support counties in sustaining EBPs until Title IV-E claiming is available for these services in California. Currently, the FFPS funds are also required to be expended by June 30, 2024 – posing an additional challenge. San Mateo County urges the State to extend the deadline for expenditure of these funds.

San Mateo County would also like to see California's Title IV-E Prevention Plan expanded to include additional services. Many of the programs listed in Tier 2 of the CPP (pages 33-34) would provide additional opportunities to leverage Title IV-E funding for program expansion if these programs were included in the State Plan.

Finally, should MHSR reforms outlined under AB 326 pass, there would be a decrease in local MHSR funding for prevention and early intervention services. The proposed reforms would also decrease local capacity to deliver innovative services and supports to target populations, and provide less flexibility in how MHSR dollars can be spent. It is still too early to determine the entirety of how the proposed changes would impact San Mateo County, but certainly presents as a potential challenge to sustainability of services outlined under the San Mateo County CPP.